

**ON OTHER PAGES:**

ENGLAND AS SEEN FROM THE INSIDE. (Page 2)

U.S. REALIST SAYS POST WAR SLUMP UNNECESSARY. (Page 2)

MANY IN U.S. THINK AUSTRALIA WOULD LEAVE EMPIRE. (Page 3)

"SILENCE NO LONGER GOLDEN" SAYS ABERHART (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE

PRICE—FOURPENCE

**NEW TIMES**

Vol. 9. No. 7. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEB. 19, 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).

**Some Plain Speaking To Mr. Curtin****An Australian Soldier's Blunt Letter**

A pertinent and forthright letter, dealing with matters of vital concern to all Australians, was sent to Mr. Curtin at Canberra late last year (October 19) by Sergeant Eric D. Butler (V43270). Although more than adequate time had elapsed when a copy was forwarded to us, no reply had been received from Mr. Curtin. Slightly condensed, the letter reads as follows:—

Dear Mr. Curtin.—In the "New Times" of December 15, 1941, I wrote an open letter to Federal Members, entitled "The Pacific War and the Enemy Within." A marked copy of that letter was sent to every Federal Member. In that letter I clearly outlined the type of organisation, particularly in relationship to finance, that this country must adopt in order to win both the war and the peace. I also expressed the opinion that you lacked the guts to face up to an internal enemy which brought the whole British Empire to the verge of catastrophe before the outbreak of war, and has sabotaged our war effort since military hostilities started. Further, I was prepared to appear before any responsible group of members of the Federal House and substantiate my charges of treachery in the realms of financial policy. Although I am still prepared to do that, it is quite unnecessary because, as a result of years of educational work by social crediters like myself, there are many Members in every House of Parliament in Australia who know the facts. They make speeches trying to tell the people the truth, but the finance-dominated press and the A.B.C. take good care that these men are never reported.

The same position exists in Britain, where leading British citizens have done their utmost to save the Empire from destruction by a bunch of international gangsters, who, while smashing Britain up under the direction of Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, actively financed Nazi Germany. (I have dealt with this matter thoroughly in my book, "The Enemy Within The Empire," of which 20,000 copies have been sold in this country.) One of the international gangsters visited this country in 1930. His name was Sir Otto Niemeyer. A fine British sounding name! He gave his orders to our so-called representatives and produced untold suffering and misery in this country. We were told that we must sacrifice because we were a poor, poor country. But we were producing more real wealth than we had ever produced before. Then, what were we short of, Mr. Curtin? Money.

**The Humpty Dumpty Drama**

The nursery rhyme about Humpty Dumpty gives a remarkably good summary of the antics generally classed as politics to-day. By a turn of the wheel, first one Humpty Dumpty and then another is hoisted to the office of Premier, or Prime Minister, or President, or Fuhrer. These people seem to enjoy life in the limelight, they make a show of directing the departments, they add a few confusing statutes to the book of laws, they meddle ineffectively with community relationships, they may start a war, or a set of muddled feuds; and then they drop off, or are pushed off the exalted wall, seldom to repeat the star performance.

This part of the stage drama is tragically simple and farcical; but just now trouble is developing in the company of dancers (or whatever they may be) which forms the counterpart of "the show," the cross-currents of Party disaffection seem to be upsetting much of the former group-discipline.

One thing seems nearly certain—namely, that the power-lusters who have really controlled our commerce, our culture, most of our "public opinion" and our politics, are counting on citizens generally becoming distracted and disgusted, and less effective by reason of the cross-currents. The question which social crediters must ask themselves is whether or not electors, now aroused by the distracting experience, can be influenced to take a more effective part in politics than formerly, when dull apathy, or aloofness, was more general.

Social Credit is not just a rival to other "reform" movements, but it does make a challenge to individual persons to be themselves, to ignore (or defy if necessary) the stultifying influences of abstractions of all kinds, and of tabloided, institutionalised culture. Politically, this means much more than just dropping out of a Party, and voting for an "independent." It means

Tickets. Mere claims to real wealth, claims which are almost costless to create. We were so memorised that we starved and suffered because the local agents for the international bankers, the private trading banks and the servile Commonwealth Bank, did as Niemeyer advised. And some of your present colleagues were a party to that treacherous swindle. Worse still, although the public has learnt a lot since those days, you and your colleagues still support that swindle, even maintaining the services of Copland and Gibling, the very men who implemented Niemeyer's policy; the men who told us that we had to starve because we had produced too much! Now, sir, while some men may plead ignorance, you cannot. You know. Do you remember the articles you used to write in the West, many years ago? Do you recall what you said before strange circumstances placed you in charge of Australia? How do you reconcile your present policy with your past utterances and statements? Have you no conscience at all? Or are the words of Shakespeare applicable?

"Little office"

The hateful Commons will perform for us, Except like curs to tear us all to pieces."

Some of your perplexed supporters have tried to tell me that we must not be impatient, that the financiers are strongly entrenched. You now have more power under National Security Regulations than any other man has ever had in the history of this country. Why don't you use your power to prevent a further perpetuation of the financial racket in this country?

Let me now tell you why I am writing you this letter. At present my unit is living under conditions which I suppose you will never have to endure. Life is a little primitive up here; wielding a pick and shovel in the tropics is not easy. Civilisation is a long way away. Not that I mind that. This is war, and war is hard. But I thought your letter to service personnel appealing to them to set an example to the civilian population in austere living, outrageous. Your remarks about finance

that each one should retain a continuous sense of responsibility in insisting that people in constituted executive groups do, in fact, act as servants of the people who elect them—or, more exactly, that they should so act that the policies or objectives determined by the electors DO materialise.

Political theatre-goers have become so used to looking on at nothing but varied and variegated attempts to keep them amused by re-phrased and re-froked variants of the Humpty Dumpty act, that they have forgotten their power to have the whole idea of political management altered. Democracy is effective when each individual is able to choose and obtain finished products which are satisfactory. This means that if the people of Oolamaloo want a swimming pool for the children of the district, they merely demand a swimming pool, and then, when it is complete, they reward with their continued patronage, if they are pleased, those who have made the arrangements.

In the Humpty Dumpty period we have seen politics darkly as through a haze. We hope soon to see politics face to face, as befits the dignity of human beings.

—C. H. Allen.

are deliberately misleading. You state:—"In view of the heavy requirements of the Treasury in relationship to Loan Money for the current financial year, I have approved of an intensive three months campaign for the purposes of restricting public spending as the means of diverting all available money into bonds and war savings certificates, and of stimulating production and creating a more realistic war consciousness among the public. It is desired to raise by public subscription £100,000,000 before Christmas. A loan for this amount will be issued on September 3, but the intensive publicity drive will aim even to exceed this amount if possible. The basis of the appeal will be the need for a much more austere method of living by the public generally, and the publicity will be directed to securing the co-operation of the public in eliminating many of the avenues of surplus spending that to-day are resulting in a wastage of man-power, raw materials, and time and effort that could be diverted to war purposes."

Let me now analyse the above: Wars, like all other physical undertakings, are conducted by men consuming foodstuffs and utilising certain materials in a specific manner. Wars are not fought with money; money will neither build equipment nor feed men. Then what purpose does it serve? It is a convenient system of accountancy. The modern banking system, as you know, is merely an excellent book-keeping system. But, more than that, the private banks manufacture practically all money used in this country. They do this by making mere book entries—or, as it is

popularly termed, by "creating bank credit." As every authority, including prominent bankers themselves—and John Curtin!—admit that the only cost to the banks of writing figures in bank ledgers against the people's assets, and allowing the people to write cheques against them, is the pens, paper and ink used, plus the wages of their staffs, do you mean to tell me there is a shortage of pens, ink, paper and bank clerks, that you talk about "heavy requirements"? If you spoke in terms of men, materials and foodstuffs, I could understand you.

You have the constitutional power to issue all money in this country.

All unbiased students of organisation are convinced that the underlying secret of Germany's and Japan's big production is a more realistic financial policy than we are adopting, and the tragedy of the situation is that the totalitarian countries obtained their ideas from British thinkers to whom their own countries refused to take heed. The following is a pertinent extract from an editorial of the London "Times", a journal which no one could accuse of being unorthodox:—

"So far, Germany seems to have had no serious difficulty in financing the war. Nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory saving or the issue of enormous war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently one important tax was abolished. . . . These changes may well call for drastic readjustments in our established convention. . . . A hide-bound persistence in doctrines and methods which were sound fifty years ago may easily prove as costly in the financial and

(Continued on page 4)

**NOTES ON THE NEWS**

**Sir Kingsley Wood and Dr. H. Dalton (economist), men who steered Britain into pre-war economic chaos, are now telling the world that, far from having a New Order, "the British people will face sterner living alter the war, because of lost overseas investments." Britain's pre-war capacity, measured in physical terms, to give every one of her citizens a much higher standard of living than they were actually getting, has not been substantially or permanently impaired by the "blitzkrieg" or Japanese gains (which we are told will soon be won back, anyway). Under these circumstances such utterances can only be regarded as defeatist. Perhaps the bankers see the end of their racket in the distance, and are using these men as propagandists for the Old Order.**

**SOVIET STAND:** Lease-Lend officials now publish the following details of U.S. aid sent to Russia, which help to explain the remarkable Russian resistance: "U.S., so far, has shipped 3200 tanks, 2800 more aircraft than she has sent to any other country, she has also sent 81,000 trucks and other military vehicles, and is now sending food in greater quantities than to Britain, and this without the aid of the Russian Fleet." Of course, this is only a fraction of Britain's supplies to Russia. With all that British and U.S. supplies and equipment, supplemented by her own, and having immense manpower, the magnitude of Russia's counter-offensive can be realised.

**INSURANCE INDIGENCY:** The reports of the first claim under third-party compulsory insurance showed the defendant as the Secretary of the Underwriters' Association, thus keeping the particular company with whom the insurance was effected from the public view. The claim was for £2000, which the insurance racketeers haggled down to £1000 on a time-payment basis (£300 down and the balance to be invested, by whom or in what not mentioned.) This determination to refuse meeting their cash liabilities emphasises their connection with the bankers, who have everything in the way of figures in ledgers, and Bonds and Bills, but only a fraction in real cash. It is certainly a bad sign when they have to resort to such low practices.

**REPATRIATION ROAR:** Members of the R.S.L. arrived at Canberra with the intention of making an impressive demand, from the gallery of the House, for fitting repatriation allowances for soldiers. This sounds like badly-needed real action. The position has already reached the stage where charity-shows are already being organised in an attempt to alleviate the hardship of partially-blinded soldiers who have presumably been by-passed by Repatriation. A recent picture in the "Argus" showed a number of these unfortunate heroes with Gladys Monchieff and other social workers with oversized smiles handing out cake to them. The soldiers don't want hand-outs of cake or charity; they want justice and adequate financial security.

**POWERS PLOT:** After surviving an attempt to prevent him from submitting a resolution to preserve State Parliament sovereignty, Mr. Dillon, M.L.A., finally succeeded in lodging a motion that the Bill be read again—six months hence. His stated reason for this was that "no Member of the State Parliament had authority from his electors to vote on the Bill." That statement is the simple truth, and it shows that, at least in this instance, Mr. Dillon understands the function of Members of Parliament—which is merely to ascertain what their electors require, and to re-present such demands in Parliament.

**CHICAGO WAR AIMS:** The Chicago "Tribune" is quoted by our daily press thus: "Our objective is permanent safety for the United States, which can only be attained by the retention of all the islands we have occupied. This means all the islands in the western Pacific, New Caledonia, the Fijis, and Solomons; these and the Japanese mandated territory are going to be ours by right of conquest. Borneo, Java, Malaya, and Burma should be free for development by our people." Of course, that is NOT official. Officially, U.S. is in the war merely to liberate the enslaved peoples.

**PEAR PERIL:** Repeated warnings from practical fruitgrowers to theoretical manpower bureaucrats on the danger of losing the pear crop have gone unheeded, and now we are informed that "the odds appear heavily against saving the crop of one million cases of pears." Similar bungling has affected almost every food commodity—and, be it remembered, food is the very bed-rock basis of our war effort. Under these circumstances it is surely timely to ask if this sort of thing should be called sabotage, or merely socialistic bungling?

**LORD'S LOGIC:** A London report quotes Lord Winterton as throwing a verbal spanner, perhaps unwittingly, in the Federal Union Plot machine, thus: "Nothing would so alarm the rest of the world and make future war more certain than to try to create an exclusive Anglo-American financial plan." This chap seems to think that so long as China and Russia are included in the Bankers' World-Gov-

(Continued on page 3)



# ENGLAND SEEN FROM THE INSIDE

## Pink Propagandists Who Slander Britain

### THE LEFT-WING "BLOODLESS FASCISM" CULT

(Condensed from an editorial in "The 19th Century And After.")

Hardly a day passes without a well-attended meeting at which—under cover of speeches in praise of Russia or China, in support of Indian "freedom," or demanding a "second front"—England, her achievements, her institutions, and her imperial greatness are directly or indirectly attacked. There would be no end to the examples we could give, for these meetings are held in every London borough, in every large town, and are placarded on all the hoardings. A few examples must suffice for our present purpose.

On June 7 there was a meeting at the Kingsway Hall under the title, "Salute to Our Chinese Ally." Must the occasion when honours, certainly her due, are paid to China, also be used to disparage Great Britain, and that, too, in the presence of the Chinese Ambassador and the representatives of other foreign Powers? But it is precisely for this that the meeting at the Kingsway Hall was used. All honour to Chinese courage, but is it necessary to explain, as the chairman declared in his introductory speech, that Chinese courage "has been shown in a way that leaves us a little ashamed"? The next speaker, Mr. Philip Jordan, referred to Sir John Simon as a "shameless" person and said that the "Government" are "still exceedingly parsimonious in helping China." There "seems to be no gratitude," he continued, "for what China has done." He attacked "Whitehall" (attacks on Whitehall are always effected with a biased audience—and the audience at such meetings is always biased, is always a packed jury.) The Chinese, he said, were treated as a Colonial people. Mr. Jordan had the generosity to pay a tribute to the British troops who fought in Burma. But the "people"—the people of all countries—are always perfect, and troops are always splendid. It is the British authorities, British policy, British institutions, that are consistently maligned. When Marshal Chiang-Kai-Shek came to Delhi, according to Mr. Jordan, the Viceroy merely sent a junior adjutant to meet him. At this implied insult to our Chinese ally, the audience shouted "Shame!" It is with such small items that public emotion is worked up. Whether true or false, they stick; and, cumulatively, create a solid mass of anti-British prejudice and suspicion. This particular item happened to be untrue. When the Marshal arrived at Delhi he was met at the station by the Commander-in-Chief, the Military Secretary to the Viceroy (who has the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel), and one of the Viceroy's A.D.C.'s. The presence of General Wavell was a mark of the importance attached to the occasion. It was at his own desire that the Marshal resided, not at the Viceroy's house, but in a private residence put at his disposal by the Viceroy. The Viceroy and Lady Linlithgow went to his house, and were there to receive the Marshal and Madame Chiang-Kai-Shek on their arrival from the station. These are the facts—but, of course, it would not be good anti-British propaganda if they were stated.

On July 9 there was a meeting at the Kingsway Hall under the title, "Reopen Negotiations." Over the platform was a huge portrait of Mr. Nehru—not a good friend of Great Britain, or of any of the Allied nations (not even of Russia, of China, nor, for that matter, of India herself), at that moment. The caption over the portrait read: "The Indian National Congress Fights for the Freedom of India." "India," said the chairman, "has been let down," for her defences "have proved unsatisfactory." Englishmen, it would seem, are to shed their blood for India, but beyond this they must have nothing to do with her. Mr. Sorensen, M.P., followed, moving a resolution in favour of "an immediate settlement" on the basis of "Indian independence," and an Indian National Government. He qualified Sir John Simon as a man who is "obsessed by British self-interest." Would he were—and that others also were. Mr. Sorensen referred to India as a "remote playground for Rajahs and Maharajahs." We should have thought that this was hardly the time to insult the native Princes, some of whom are men of considerable ability and devoted to the common cause! Mr. Sorensen also referred to "the jungle civilisation we"—we, not India—"had before this war." It is one of the commonest devices of the demagogue to blacken the past so as to make the tinsel future he himself is advertising appear the brighter by comparison. It is a method of which Hitler is the greatest living exponent.

Meetings in honour of Russia are abundant. All honour to Russia, certainly, but what is said about her at these meetings, (for example, the "Brains-Trust Meeting" held at the Wigmore Hall, under the title of "The Russian Glory," on July, 8) is not true of any country—no human community that has been, is, or ever will be, could achieve such perfection. This idealisation, naive and silly as it is, would be relatively harmless if it did not imply denigration of England throughout. The speakers are all biased; they are, mostly, either members of the Communist Party or in close association with the Party. Their concern is not so much to exalt things Russian as to malign things English. The "people" are, it is true, always perfect, even in England—and, of course, in Ger-

many! An exhibition has been opened in Regent-street, which is meant to illustrate the achievement of "Allies in Germany," who are, thereby, placed in the same category as are our Allies everywhere. A whole series of meetings in honour of our "Allies in Germany" have been, and are being held (for example, on July 12, under the title, "Appeal to the Allies inside Germany," at the Caxton Hall). The exhibits in Regent-street do not bear critical examination. Copies of the "Rothe Fahne," and subversive literature that was secretly circulated, though not, for the most part, printed in Germany, is displayed. But none of it is of recent date. No evidence is given to show that there has been any subversive movement against the National Socialist despotism since the beginning of the war. The stand made by the Christian Churches in Germany is no secret, but it is not of a subversive character. The Bishop of Munster, who has shown sublime heroism in publicly denouncing the persecution of Christians, the murder of the feeble-minded and so

## "WHAT OF TO-MORROW?"

STANLEY F. ALLEN, F.C.A. (Aust.)

will give a 15-minute talk over 2GB

ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Commencing at 6.30 p.m.

SOME INTERESTING FACTS WILL BE DISCLOSED. DON'T MISS IT!

Tell Your Friends.

WHAT OF TO-MORROW?

on by the German State, is a German patriot who would repudiate with scorn the suggestion that he is an "ally" of his country's foes. So would Cardinal Faulhaber, so would Pastor Niemoller. A cruel deception is being practised on our people in so far as they are being led to believe that the German "people" will rise against their masters and so bring the war to an end. There is no prospect of such a rising, nor will there be until Germany has been defeated in the field. The illusion is also promoted that we are at war with the "Nazis" only, and not with the German nation. Not one German in ten is a "Nazi," that is to say, a member of the National Socialist Party, nor are we at war merely so that our principal foe may change his system of Government—he may still be formidable even if he does effect a change, and there can be no lasting peace unless the armed might of Germany, no matter what her political system, is broken and kept broken.

There are many who do not care if England perish so long as Russia live. But if England perish because the Government have been stampeded into premature action, Russia will not be saved. It is true that the Germans must be attacked on the Continent as soon as possible and, whatever else may be said about the Prime Minister, he does not lack pugnacity and will always prefer immediate action to delayed action if the risks are not excessive. The general popularity of the demand for a "second front" shows that the nation is in a combative mood. It is a tribute to the patriotism of the people that a demonstration in favour of this demand will always fill Trafalgar Square. But the motives of those who organise these demonstrations do not appear to be so disinterested. It is significant that many of those who support the demand for a "second front" have not, in the past, distinguished themselves by their patriotism, and would, in fact, be openly or secretly recommending a negotiated peace with the Germans if Russia were not in the war. There can be no doubt at all that if Russia were to be a combatant no longer, a powerful and organised movement for a negotiated peace would immediately show itself in this country.

There is a spirit of sectarian intolerance everywhere. The habit of free discussion, once so characteristic of English life, has begun to disappear. Sectarian intolerance prevails at the indoor meetings, which are being held everywhere—rarely is there any debate. There is so much talk of revolution. It is true that the war has produced sweeping changes such as years of reform might not have achieved. There has been a process of economic levelling. Inequalities of income have been drastically reduced. The Communists have an unexampled opportunity for increasing their influence, for they are, under cover of meetings in favour of Russia, China,

India, and a "second front," able to exploit the patriotism of unsuspecting people, and give these meetings a revolutionary, anti-British twist. Verbal attacks on in-quality, unfreedom, privilege, "vested interests," abound. These attacks are wholly uncritical and, in our opinion, unscrupulous, although it must be said that the Communists are at least acting in accordance with their convictions. It is true that all men are equal—but they are not all allowed;... U... -ticm; - W;... i; <i>i; i; i; \... alvi. /<... v!>... u... i; i; i; mod. ri an: ii' ai v-ii... "nib'c- M; i; J... state v... i... v... i... > i; \*... all ^\^A. i... x-c... U;Lh:l, the re^H >n l... </>... i... Yv:i-l, i-n-s-bar: ry, ^na p... <... i... i... (^ ^vt of mi; -ll... f u... t... -ijit be i'N... hen... v... i... !... t: n: e. v; /of... H; > ar: i... vi- c: rt; -Mf => v^A^ so... w... r... \* ti^A... Vh- >><... something.

Socialism is, for good or ill, gaining ground. Some Socialism, no doubt, there must be. "Planning" has become a craze, a kind of mystical faith. Some planning there must be also, especially in war time—in any case, the war itself has to be planned. But planning itself has no intrinsic merits and can become a deadly menace to initiative, enterprise, and personal liberty. Men of means are under a strong temptation to swim with the stream. The insecurity of the independent business manager or factory owner, the progressive expropriation of those who have independent incomes, together with an ever-growing distrust of independent thought and knowledge, of individual enterprise, and of all that is covered by the word "personality"—all these are a powerful help to the general levelling process. It is a sort of "Fascism," a Fascism of the Left, with Communists, semi-Communists, semi-intellectuals, popular ideologues; and a multitude of stunt journalists are the spokesmen of this Fascism. The capitalist is under a strong temptation to become a socialist. Security is exchanged for insecurity, the chances of a large income are smaller, but the chances of no income at all vanish altogether in the Socialist-Bureaucratic State. Socialism and bureaucracy are inseparable, and we see before us to-day the ever-growing expansion and power of the bureaucracy, accompanied by the spread of Socialism not so much amongst the labouring classes as amongst the capitalists. Not that the neo-capitalists have any intention of abdicating—they do not mean to go the way of the old governing class. On the contrary, Socialism and planning are their way to position and power—a new and secure position and power that is all the greater for being anonymous, while commanding widespread popular support. What is happening, therefore, is not revolution, but a sort of counter-revolution—a kind of bloodless Fascism (without the crudities of the full-blooded Fascism that has caused such ravages on the Continent) with the Communists and Lord Beaverbrook as its most energetic promoters, with Professor Laski as one of its principal ideologues, and sundry novelists, members of so-called "Brains Trusts," popular "philosophers," ostensibly scientific "thinkers," writers on "sociology," and many of the progressive and "modernist" clergy as its propagandists, and vulgarisers.

It would be an exaggeration to say that England is "going fascist." The spirit of independence is still strong, and there is still too much respect for personality and for civilised standards. Belief in the essential loyalties has not perished. But the process, which we venture to call bloodless Fascism, is there—and its exponents hold almost the entire field of publicity. What is disconcerting is that they are not challenged, that against all the obscurantism of our day, against the attack on all that England stands for, there is so little effective opposition.

England and the Empire are fighting for survival, and they stand or fall together. They are not fighting for any abstractions or for this or that "ideology." It is time that the simple loyalties, of which love of country is one, were reaffirmed with much greater vigour and persuasiveness than are customary to-day.

## U.S. REALIST SAYS POST-WAR SLUMP AND SOCIALISM ARE UNNECESSARY

Henry J. Kaiser, the American who is turning out cargo ships at a rate never before approached, and has plans for breaking records in the construction of cargo planes, is not only a master-builder but a thinker. Asked to discuss the shape of things to come, he said he had no patience with those who declare that "when peace comes we will enter a period of economic disaster."

"I don't believe these ominous prophecies," he said. "What an indictment they lay on civilisation itself! Peace should present us with an unparalleled opportunity."

The war has strengthened Mr. Kaiser's faith in free enterprise and democracy:

"I repudiate those theories that envision the world made up of super States, co-ordinated by a super-super State, where a man will be told what to do, and how, and where, and when, and how much."

"I have no faith in any such grandiose schemes. The production that is necessary to sustain mankind comes about when men operate under a minimum of restraint; when they are given the opportunity to risk and venture; to lose as well as to gain; to strive, yes, to compete; and, most

## THE LIFTING OF THE BAN

It's quite a while since first the Coms were placed beneath the ban, And many people thought that they would take it like a man;

For the lifting of the ban, For the lifting of the ban, We'll swallow all our principles For the lifting of the ban.

Jo: > do li'it t: -... -it.Mti<-... K...> in ii'1 «\*ii' d'loyv' L\*ii<u tru ollitr A-;

And now their attitude is such it beggars all description, They've got so low, that now you know, they advocate conscription.

For the lifting of the ban, For the lifting of the ban, They advocate conscription For the lifting of the ban.

To find the cash for war they said was just a bosses' stunt, To kid the slaves to lend their dough as well as bear the brunt, To heap up war loans was to put a burden on posterity, But now they boost for millions and call the loan "austerity."

For the lifting of the ban, For the lifting of the ban, They'd take the money from the "slaves" For the lifting of the ban.

In days of old when miners fought against the boss's might, There was a time when Coms would cry, "The miner's always right." But now that Curtin lifts the ban, they say the miner's wrong, Whatever be the issue now, the Coms all sing this song.

For the lifting of the ban, For the lifting of the ban, We'll even dump the miners For the lifting of the ban.

When seamen fought for better things and took a final stand, E'en Coms, at times, would cheer the lads as on the wharf they'd land, But now should seamen stop a ship, the Coms are sure to wail, Get back aboard, fifth columnists, the ships have got to sail.

For the lifting of the ban, For the lifting of the ban, We cannot have a ship stuck up For the lifting of the ban.

One time the Coms would demonstrate and claim they led the mass, But now they're marching step by step beside the Master Class, They've promised to co-operate and win the "master's war," In fact, they're boosting everything they denounced heretofore,

That's why Curtin lifts the ban, That's why Curtin lifts the ban, HE'S GOT THE COMMOS IN THE BAG, That's why he lifts the ban. —W.J.C.

## S.C.M. OF S.A.

The next monthly meeting of the Social Credit Movement of South Australia will be held in the Rechabite Hall, Grote St., Adelaide, on Thursday, Feb. 25, at 8 p.m. After general business a brief address will be given by Mrs. D. I. Coleman, entitled "Particularising Social Credit." All members are reminded that outstanding annual subscriptions are now overdue, and are requested to kindly forward them along, so as to help the Movement to continue the good work.—J. E. Burgess, Hon. Secretary.

of all, to escape the compulsion of excessive government.

"This is no plea for a return to rugged individualism or laissez faire. We have already learned to temper the brutality of competition with fair play.

"Closest to my own hope for the future are the prospects of Labour, but I know that the real interests of Labour lie with an independent economy rather than with the socialism which has again and again destroyed Labour's opportunity."

There spoke an enlightened employer, a man who stands so well with the unions and who is so universally regarded as an asset to the nation in every way, that the A.F.L., and the C.I.O. are fiercely competing for control of the unionists in his yards and works—though the A.F.L. got in first.



# THE "HIDDEN HAND" AGAIN?

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

Sir.—After being directly under the eyes of Professors Melville and Giblin for four years at the Commonwealth Bank, Dr. Coombs "went" to the Commonwealth Treasury in 1939 as an economist. The position at the Treasury was "found" and he, in due course, was "selected." The Treasury is the place where Budgets are prepared, and the budget is the financial instrument through which Parliaments aim their members are kept in their places. What could be better for -----trained than at the Treasury to preserve the -----of the International Financial Gang?

It is fair to assume that the ----- principles included in the Budget of Dr. Coombs went to the -----are the financial principles-----for controlling our activities in the post-war period, and any plans he may have in mind will not provide for the ----- of public activities with public credit instead of public debt. Those who like paying high taxation will doubtless find satisfaction in reminding themselves that the heaviest increases have taken place since this brilliant young fellow "went" to the Treasury, and that before going to the Treasury, his training had been carefully "supervised" by none other than Theodor Emanuel Gugenheim, who was the lieutenant of Sir Otto Niemeyer, in imposing the Premiers' plan upon us.

In 1942 he was "selected" for the position of Director of Rationing, and, according to the Melbourne "Herald" his work in that position was "his outstanding achievement so far." The paper went on: "The Australian rationing scheme was devised and applied with great speed, and the lack of serious criticism is a tribute to his ability, which is known to have impressed senior Ministers." To say that the rationing scheme was devised by Dr. Coombs is rather remarkable. Is it not a fact that the rationing scheme, as operating here, follows the lines of the rationing scheme in England, and that full details of this were available to Dr. Coombs for months and months before he was called upon to apply it? But what do such modest claims matter as between "brilliant economists" and a servile Press? In October last, he was again "selected." That time it was as a member of the Commonwealth Bank Board in place of Professor Giblin, who, though well past the normal retiring age, was to be retained at the Treasury as Economic Adviser. On that occasion, Mr. Chifley, as Treasurer, "paid a tribute to the distinguished services given by Dr. Coombs with the Treasury" ("Argus," 16/1/43). It was not explained what was meant by the word "distinguished," or for whom the "service" had been given. It was distinguished by heavy impositions on the people and the service was not for you or me, and was not "given."

In the Melbourne "Herald" of 24/10/42, we were informed that "before coming to Melbourne, Dr. Coombs was associated with Professors Giblin and Copland in many economic discussions in Canberra. His currency views are described by economists as "independent, but sound." That, you see, makes him "safe" so far as the controllers of the present fraudulent system are concerned. Note particularly that nothing was said in the "Herald" about his credit views, but there will be no need to inquire too closely into this aspect when it is pointed out that the National Debt has increased from about £1,200,000,000 to about £2,000,000,000 during the 7 years in which we have had the "benefit" of his brilliance. We are getting plenty of debt, you see, but apparently no credit at all. He has been helping to ensure that the members of the Fighting Forces will not escape the payment of higher taxation than ever when they return from the war, and this will "be done so as to "preserve the financial structure."

And now he has been "selected" yet again. This time as Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction. On this occasion we are told that he is "forthright and realistic," but that he "declined to discuss his ideas of reconstruction"; he nevertheless "indicated that he would make every effort to ensure that the waste of unemployment would be prevented, and that Public Works should naturally be a very important aspect of post-war activity." ("Argus" 18/1/43). If he is forthright and realistic now there must have been a recent and welcome change, but the results of his work in the past show anything but evidence of straightforwardness and realism. He has joined with others in placing the shadow of finance above the substance of material resources, and to him the welfare of men, women, and children has been a secondary consideration. Finance has been above all. His very attitude towards what he calls "unemployment" betrays him as nothing more than a gramophone record for the pre-historic ideas of his discredited predecessors. There is no problem of unemployment at all. The problem is one of disemployment. The "independent" people are no problem. They are looked upon as the best members of society. This comes about not because they are unemployed, as they are, but because they are not disemployed. It is income that makes all the difference. Actually we want less and less employment, as such, and more and more of the work to be done by machinery. It is not a slave State of employment we are after,

----- m wii-r, tiwM vii ->e m]rcv. .... \* -----, trie in<?he-r r:luidr'rdrf cf: ~^V,--v.~J the prxit: :i:ivi: jl-l'r. ~:~: / \*> nri:cr;>> hir: as po.YM.:l; \*~:~: <~:~: ~:~: stand ihc \*~:~: L.~:~: \*~:~: v.~:~: \*~:~: "o.~:~: >~:~: E T----- "p.ii.im "Wot,~:~: \*~:~: ~:~: I n-tu-aijy iv> i >~:~: <~:~: / important aspect of postwar activity," we then have to consider the still more important aspect of how the Public Works are to be financed. If they are to be financed as he has been instrumental in having Government war activities financed, then it will simply mean more debt, higher taxes, and eventually another attack on our standards at the instigation of international finance, similar to that experienced in the so-called depression. The manner in which the Public Works programme is to be financed is more important than the programme itself, but like all other brilliant economists who have had world tours and who have preceded him in meteoric advancement to high posts, Dr. Coombs is significantly silent in this paramount respect. This silence, combined with the other evidence before us, indicates that his "selection" for the various "high posts" has been influenced by the "hidden hand" again, and that he is not there to bring benefit and blessing to the people at large, but principally to maintain the conditions in which they will be subservient to finance and its controllers. —Yours faithfully,

BRUCE H. BROWN,  
189 Hotham St., East Melbourne, 14/2/43

## M.P. TALKS SENSE

John Maxton, an outspoken Labour Member of the British House of Commons, made the most revolutionary statement of his career when he said in the House of Commons on May 12: "The problem is not to find people work, but to meet the needs of a well-organised community. . . . I hope that the future that the world has to look forward to is not going to be one of arduous toil, and of finding jobs to keep people out of mischief; but one of finding homes for people, of finding food and clothing for people, and of finding recreation and enjoyment for people. I hope that our Government and our educational systems will direct themselves to these needs, the work coming in as incidental."

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

**POWERS BILL: Mr. W. McGillivray made a notable five-hour speech against the Bill, and showed that the States could completely cope with post-war problems, providing the Commonwealth Government made adequate finance available. The following circular is being sent to actionists in the campaign:**

### WHAT NOW?

Many people know that some rearrangement of Federal relationship is desirable. Also many people who have strenuously opposed the passage of the Commonwealth Powers Bill are insistent that moves to ensure a more satisfactory set-up of our social and economic systems are overdue. However, in the turmoil engendered by the Constitutional issue, ideas of real constructive value have not been much in evidence.

If Constitutional issues are postponed, until citizens and soldiers alike have the time and the leisure to review the matter carefully, the question arises—what constructive suggestions can be made for immediate consideration?

The following summary is presented to assist in a positive answer being formulated to the above query:

(1) The British idea of relations between the States being of the free family type is preferable to any centralisation of power implicit in any of the known "isms."

(2) Moves in the direction of a more satisfactory financial policy are possible at once. Figures published officially by the S.A. Statistical Department show that, for the year 1940-41, in over a hundred industries for which records are tabulated, wages and salaries totalled £10.8 millions, profits were about £6.1 millions, while the price of the goods put on the market totalled £43.6 millions. These figures are not complete, but they do show that there is a definite problem to be faced in equating the total of money incomes to the total of the prices of consumable goods. We suggest that both the States and the Commonwealth authorities at once tackle this problem.

(3) It will be found that when the above problem is solved (not by popular discussion, but by experts being given that responsibility) very many of the difficulties which confront us in the commercial and cultural realms will be eased most markedly.

# MANY AMERICANS THINK AUSTRALIA WANTS TO LEAVE THE EMPIRE

## A Lecturer on This Country in U.S.A. is Asked Some Extraordinary Questions

LOS ANGELES.—The question asked me most often by audiences during a series of lectures on Australia I am now giving in Pacific Coast cities is: "Will Australia quit the British Empire after the war?" When I tell them nothing is more unlikely, many people express surprise. Many Americans have the idea that the Empire will break up after the war, and that Australia will be the first to break away from the Commonwealth of Nations.

There are several reasons why Americans have this idea, but the most important are that they mistake traditional Australian outspokenness and criticism for dissatisfaction, and that they do not understand the modern setup or framework of the Empire.

It is extremely difficult to make Americans realise that Australia and New Zealand are completely free and independent nations, responsible to Great Britain in no way whatsoever. They still think that Australia and New Zealand are governed direct from London and that Australians and New Zealanders have little to say in the running of their own countries. They are genuinely astonished when I explain the very democratic Parliamentary systems of both countries, and when I tell them both probably have far greater democracy and freedom than America they are literally shocked.

Americans generally have the idea that Australia and New Zealand are run exclusively for the benefit of England and that they must do just what the British Government orders them; that they are still colonies and being exploited by the British.

As soon as I discovered this misconception I changed my lecture around to begin with the fact that both countries were completely free and independent nations, but each new audience demands more ample explanations during question periods. Some have suggested to me that Australia might want to draw closer to America in the near future and away from England. Several have gone so far as to suggest that Australia could become a kind of protectorate or even a 49th State.

I have discovered that the simplest explanations to give Americans why Australia is likely to remain within the framework of the Empire are economic ones. They can understand these. When told that Australia, and New Zealand for that matter, have everything to lose and little to gain by quitting the Empire they are visibly impressed. When it is pointed out that Britain is the No. 1 customer for Australian and New Zealand products, and that America buys very little from either country, they quickly realise the economic significance. Blood ties that bind Australia and New Zealand to England do not carry as much weight with hardheaded Americans as economic ones.

There is a great deal of ignorance here about Australia and New Zealand. Little is taught about either country in American schools, and quite a large percentage of the people could not tell you the difference between Australia and New Zealand. Many think they are a part of each other, and are really surprised to learn that they are separated by some 1400 miles of sea.

But with American troops down there people here are now hungry for news of the "down under" countries, as they are generally called. Mothers, wives, fathers, and sweethearts are anxious to know what kind of people their boys are among, and what kind of country they are helping defend.

I must admit that some Americans are quite surprised to learn that Australians are white and can speak English. During a question period at one recent lecture a young girl got up and asked me what language they spoke in Australia. I never did find out whether she couldn't understand my accent or whether she thought I had learned to speak English since arriving in the U.S.

However, a question such as this one is rare, although I do get quite a number of funny ones. So eager are people for news of Australia and New Zealand these days that after each lecture I am usually surrounded by 100 or more people who want to ask me further questions. All of those who have relatives with the armed forces down there tell me that their boys have been literally overwhelmed by the hospitality of Australians and New Zealanders. You people have earned yourselves a formidable reputation for hospitality in this country.

—LON JONES, in the Melbourne "Argus" Week-end Supplement, January 9.

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

ernment Plan all will be well. Another little think won't do him any harm.

**TAX TAKERS:** Maurice Hindus of the New York "Herald Tribune" makes it quite clear that our heroic Russian allies suffer, in addition to terrific physical sacrifices, identical financial tax burdens to those endured by the so-called capitalist countries. He says: "They work 11 to 12 hours producing the equipment for war, and then have stiff levies and taxes imposed on their wages." Again, it appears that State-Socialism and Finance-Capitalism have much in common.

**OVERSIGHT:** The recent A.W.U. convention held at Ballarat, after discussing alleged victimisation of workers and violation of industrial standards, carried the following resolution: "That a campaign be inaugurated throughout Australia against the usurpation of our individual and civil rights by the American authorities." Reading this, one would imagine that the Queensland Labour dictators, for example, had been bumped-off by their alleged competitors, for they, like the Bankers, and the Bureaucrats, are not mentioned. If the resolution had been aimed at such dictators it would have a wider appeal.

**COUNCIL COMICS:** Big-print press-items entitled "City Council's Sound Finance" state that the Melbourne City Council should be proud of its 100 years' record of management, and comment on how well the books and records were kept. If the figures quoted were taken from the said books they were certainly too well kept to be understood. The only clearly discernable item shown was, that after 100 years operation, a liability of approximately £4 million was held by debenture holders; a position which no sane person could regard as sound. An interesting form of finance engaged in by this body is to float a loan and then lend the proceeds to the Government. In this way they could act as a "dummy" for private banks to lend the Government some counterfeit credit-money. —O. B. H.

## Money in the Driver's Seat

"When this war is over, and all wars do end, we shall never again put money in the driver's seat. Never again shall money be the master of men. Never again shall we go through a depression comparable to the last one. Never again shall we by idleness destroy the morale of a nation while a central government is cloaked with the authority to issue and control currency and credit."—Premier Mitchell F. Hepburn, Premier of Ontario in Toronto "Daily Star" (Canada), July 17, 1942

**TAX ON DEFERRED PAY:** A fair number of the incensed public, as well as representatives from interested organisations, attended a meeting of the Fighting Forces Protection League, held on February 11 at 17 Waymouth-street.

The meeting unanimously agreed that the tax on deferred pay of the Fighting Forces was obnoxious and unjust, and for that reason it was decided to oppose vigorously any attempt to impose the tax.

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, February 25, at 8 p.m., at the same address. All interested are cordially invited to swell the volume of protest.

Demand forms will shortly be ready for distribution.



## THOSE "SCIENTIFIC" OBJECTIONS TO THE LEISURE STATE

By EIMAR O'DUFFY.

The sociological objections may be condensed into this form: that man, like the other animals, has evolved from lower forms of life as a result of a ceaseless struggle with his environment, which eliminates the unfit and keeps the rest up to the mark; and that if the stresses of circumstance are removed and a leisured existence instituted, the race will deteriorate and finally rot into inglorious quiescence.

As Mr. Wells put it fifty years ago in "The Time Machine"—"We are kept keen on the grindstone of pain and necessity"; and if that grindstone be broken we shall degenerate into something like the pretty and futile Eloi of that story. The argument, of course, does not always take this scientific shape. The ordinary man who is neither religious nor scientific is content to say loosely that it is not good for people not to have to work to do. This doctrine is extraordinarily widespread.

On one occasion I was invited to expound Social Credit to a party of young men and women whose main objection to what I may call the philosophy of my thesis was that I had "fixed standards" of judgment in ethical and metaphysical questions. They were the most nominalistically-minded people I had ever met. They had no fixed standards of any sort. All their ideas were fluid, and to my mind their thinking seemed utterly shapeless and incoherent. But one and all of these standardless gentry were dogmatically certain that it was bad form for a man not to have a good deal of work to do. (I did not ask what their standard of badness was, as I wanted to get on to the New Economics.) After a little wrangling they eventually agreed that four hours per day was the absolute minimum that a man should be compelled to do. I don't know how they fixed this standard, but fix it they did, and so it became unnecessary for me to continue my discourse. These, remember, were rationalising, free-thinking young people, so it is to be supposed that the dogma which bound them so straightly commands even closer allegiance among more conventional folk. There is no need for me to deal with it separately. It will be refuted a fortiori, by what I have to say about its scientific form, as summarised above.

Even if I were to grant the premise of this argument (which I don't), there is an important flaw in the conclusion. Organisms may have evolved through a struggle with environment; but who ever heard of an organism that deliberately sought a hostile environment in order to get evolved by it? And that is the course of our sociologists want us to take. To say the least, it is a long way round to achieve one's objective. It is like shutting oneself up in prison in order to learn to appreciate the value of freedom. If the race has the intelligence to will a certain end, surely it is better to go for that end consciously and directly, instead of awaiting the action of forces which are problematical and require an immense time to act in. Moreover, in trying to preserve circumstantial stresses, we should again be attempting to reverse the consciously directed efforts of the race; for the whole course of scientific invention has been bent towards making life easier. The sociologists are therefore in the same contradictory position as the religious objectors, and logically ought to demand the cessation of invention and a return to the Stone Age.

In any case, I do not admit the premise, and the theory that the struggle for existence (or circumstantial selection) is the cause of progressive evolution has been severely handled by competent scientists. Let me put the case against it as briefly and simply as possible. Suppose that a number of rose trees are left to struggle with an unfavourable environment as best they can. What will happen will be that some, whether through their own weakness or some tougher stress in their immediate locality, will be eliminated; others, either by having better luck, or because of some innate superiority, will manage to flourish; and between these two extremes there will be a multitude of mediocrities of varying quality. Circumstance will have selected for survival the rose trees best fitted to survive those particular circumstances. But is that the best way to produce good roses? Certainly not. Even the best roses have suffered in the struggle, and the average quality of the roses has been most adversely affected. If a gardener wants to produce good roses, he does not submit them to stresses. On the contrary, he protects them so that they will not have to waste their strength in overcoming them, and pays careful attention to their nourishment, thus strengthening the weak plants, making the good better, and turning the best into champions. Observe, though, that the gardener merely helps the rose to develop itself. Nothing he has done could turn a dead stick into a rose tree. His function has been to enable the rose tree to attain its fullest development by removing the obstacles in its way, and supplying the nourishment that its nature requires.

That environment can influence evolution is, therefore, obvious; but that influence may be bad, and may tend to retard progress. It may eliminate the unfit; but "unfit" is a relative term: the individuals eliminated by any particular circumstance might be intrinsically the more valuable. It may also land a whole race in a blind alley. For instance, the limpet survived the stresses of the sea by evolving a shell and a vacuum-like power of suction. But think of all the qualities it had to sacrifice for these advantages and how badly it is now situated for any further evolution. It must wait for the seas to stop raging before it can dare to attempt mobility. The human race has evolved to its present relatively high estate in spite of circumstances, which it

has overcome by its own inner powers, not by maintaining and yielding to them. If it had not possessed these powers, all the stresses in the world could not have moved it forward, any more than all the waters of the sea can turn a stone into a fish. Man's efforts all through history have been directed towards eliminating stresses. Why? Surely because some driving force within or behind us had some purpose in view which could only be achieved when those stresses were all overcome, and a state of leisure achieved. That purpose could only be the development of a being with less of the animal and more of the spirit in him than is apparent in modern man. We have had individual outcrops of such beings from time to time in the shape of philosophers, saints, and poets, but the circumstances of our civilisation have always

been against them. Men like Plato and Shelley would have starved and never been heard of but for the accident of their having private incomes; and we may take it as certain that men of equal quality actually have been "eliminated" for lack of that convenience.

Now it is pretty obvious that the type of man favoured by our present competitive civilisation is by no means a high type. Its richest rewards are for the grasping, cunning, acquisitive type, and it affords a modest livelihood to a certain proportion of the dull, patient, plodding type. To every other type it is fiercely intolerant. For the poet and philosopher it has no use at all; for the man of letters it cares only so far as he can market his talent; for the man of science, only so far as his discoveries have "commercial value" (sometimes, on account of its lack of imagination, not even then). If such men as these are not to starve, they must prostitute their gifts, or crush them out of the mind and undertake one of the routine occupations—and even these are increasingly hard to get. And it is not only genius that is thus discouraged. The ordinary man with spirit, active imagination, initiative, and so forth, who dislikes being tied to somebody else's stool, or harnessed to some company's machinery, also finds fewer openings in our increasingly monopolistic society. In short, it is yet another paradox of this astonishing age that high intellect and character have become as great a curse to the individual

as abundance of goods to the community. The continuance of the Work State is, then, not only NOT favourable to human evolution, but decidedly inimical to it. Religion and science unitedly demand the institution of the Leisure State; that is, a State in which the world's work will be done by a comparatively small number of highly-paid and highly-skilled mechanics and handicraftsmen working for mere love of their jobs (there will be no "Competition" to kill them, since there will always be enough money to buy whatever is produced). The "dirty work" will all be done, as far as possible, by machinery, and any that may have to be done by men will be paid for at the highest possible rate, instead of the lowest as at present. Those whose work is not required will use or abuse their leisure according to their natures, but since most people are sensible and decent, I presume that it will generally be used profitably. Apart from the simple pleasures of domestic life, there will be books to read, music to listen to, knowledge to acquire, sports to enjoy, and the thousand and one hobbies that are usually far more interesting and useful than the "work" which, in peace time, snatches many of us from them to sit futilely in somebody's office, or to do dreary, dirty or even dangerous tasks that machines could do. Above all, people will have time to THINK, and thus we shall revive a fundamental human function which our present civilisation has very nearly killed.

—From the book, "Life and Money."

### SOME PLAIN SPEAKING TO MR. CURTIN

(Continued from page 1.)

economic field as in the field of actual war. It might not lose the war, but it would almost certainly lose the peace. . . .

If new production is to be undertaken for public use, it should be financed by national credit, new money, issued against the real wealth of the nation as quickly as required, and those who manufacture the money should be paid once, and once only, for their services. Those engaged in manufacturing guns are only paid once for their services. The same must apply to those who merely do the book-keeping.

Your remarks about all "available money" give the impression that the supply of money, like the weather, is beyond the control of man. If, as you state, and I agree, there are certain things we can do without for the period of the war, there is only one sane, honest way to face the problem. Let us take a hypothetical case of refrigerators. Manufacturers producing refrigerators

### ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited Box 122G, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England Price, 6d. Postage 1½d. (4/- per dozen post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1½d.

could undoubtedly be switched to war production. There is only one sensible way to do this: The Government to approach the manufacturers and offer them war work at a remunerative price. Once the manufacturers switched to war production there would be no refrigerators produced, and the people couldn't buy them even if they had £100 a week. And that would be that. Such a process would remove the necessity of all the "control boards" employing hundreds of bureaucrats. But no. Someone is very concerned that the people, not being able to spend their money on certain goods, will start to liquidate all their debts. Overdrafts from the banks might even be paid off. The people would finish the war with no private debts whatever. I would suggest to you, sir that such a procedure would do far more to improve the moral of the people of this country than all your "pep talks put together."

### "SILENCE NO LONGER GOLDEN," SAYS PREMIER ABERHART

Declaring that "Silence is no longer golden," Premier Aberhart announced recently that a series of broadcasts would be delivered dealing with war and post-war problems. Following is Premier Aberhart's statement:—

"Silence is no longer golden. For three years, a lot of people, myself included, have kept quiet because mistakenly we felt that we might injure Canada's war effort if we spoke our minds.

"Events have proven the contrary. We now feel that our silence is no longer justifiable. Thus far it has only permitted bureaucracy to spread confusion among the people unchecked.

"Muddling, incompetence and pussy-footing have been condoned by this self-imposed silence. Silence on the part of those who are best informed has begun to sap public morale.

"The people are beginning to feel that they are being let down by their leaders in public life.

"I find that there is an increasing demand for a full and frank discussion of

Your suggestion that Service personnel set an example to civilians in austerity and sacrifice is an insult. As I have pointed out, if all industrialists capable of manufacturing war material are on defence contracts, they are not producing goods for the people to buy. That sacrifice by the people is necessary. But we are now seeing the maddest thing in Australian history: the destruction and sabotage of primary production by dozens of boards employing thousands of officials. Such a policy is destroying the country. Food-stuffs are the basis of our military effort. Asking people to sacrifice while we are wasting man-power restricting production is wrong.

If there are men and materials not being used to the best advantage, you have the power to issue the credits to get on with the job right away.

"Now, sir, as an Australian citizen, I would like you to answer clearly the following questions:

(1) Is it a fact that a considerable amount of taxation being collected from the public to-day goes in paying interest bills on debts incurred during the last war?

(2) Is it a fact that we still owe the original debt on the last war, although we have already paid half the total debt in interest bills?

(3) As we are pursuing the same policy as that adopted during the last war, how can any honest man suggest that things can be better after this war?

(4) Would you tell me the approximate amount of the national debt which belongs to the private trading banks and allied monopolies?

Whatever you may answer to the above questions, the fact remains that an increasing number of loyal Australian citizens are becoming annoyed at your (?) policy of sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice, sacrifice which is mainly dictated by a reasonable financial policy. You recently said that people were starting "to squeal." No not squeal, Mr. Curtin. What you are hearing is the start of a roar, the roar of the British lion, and that roar is going to grow. Remember, Mr. Curtin, that this war is being fought by and for the Australian people, not by the people for the banks and the would-be Hitlers.

In conclusion, I desire to inform you that I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., and to as many other "key" public servants as I find physically possible.

—Sincerely yours,  
Eric D. Butler.

### LESS NONSENSE

Let us have less nonsense from the friends of Joe;

We laud, we love him, but the nonsense—

no.  
In 1940 when we bore the brunt,  
We could have done, boys, with a Second

Front.  
A continent went down a cataract,  
But Russia did not think it right to act.  
Not ready? No. And who shall call her

wrong?  
Far better not to strike till you are strong.  
Better, perhaps, though this was not our

fate,  
To make new treaties with the man you

hate.  
Alas, these shy manoeuvres had to end

When Hitler leaped upon his largest friend.  
(And if he'd not, I wonder, by the way,  
If Russia would be in the war to-day.)

But who rushed out to aid the giant then—  
A giant rich in corn, and oil, and men,  
Long, long prepared, and having, so they

say,  
The most enlightened ruler of the day?  
This tiny island, antiquated, tired,  
Effete, capitalist and uninspired!

This tiny island, wounded in the war  
Through taking tyrants on two years before!  
This tiny isle of muddles and mistakes,  
Having a Front on every wave that breaks!  
We might have said, "Our shipping's on the

stretch;  
You shall have all the tanks that you can

fetch";  
But this is not the way we fight this war:  
We give them tanks—and take them to the

door!  
And now we will not hear from anyone  
It's not for us to show we hate the Hun.  
It does not profit much to sing this tune,  
But those who "prod" cannot be quite im-

mune;  
And those who itch to conquer and to kill,  
Should waste less breath on tubs on Tower

Hill.  
Honour the Kremlin, boys, but now and

then  
Admit some signs of grace at Number 10.

—A. P. Herbert, in "Punch," London.

### BANKERS' BARRAGE

From "To-day & To-morrow" (Canada):

This is the season of the Bankers' Barrage, when the nation resounds with the blasts of annual reports. They make revealing reading at times, since they frequently give us a little kite-flying which indicates what federal policy is likely to belike in the future.

Terribly stodgy in their prose, they nevertheless are quite subtle in their references to many important matters.

We may deal with some excerpts at a later date. Meantime, this from a bank advertisement is rather cute:

"We can't beat them (the Nazis) unless we have more and better weapons. And the only way to get more and better weapons is to raise the money to pay for them.

"Other than by taxation, the only way to raise this money is for Canada to borrow it.

"So—lend your share and buy the New Victory Bonds."

Quite ordinary, you say? Certainly. But listen to this:

"If time is required to pay for Victory Bonds the bank will lend you the money for convenient periods at low rates, the cost of carrying the loan for six months being covered by the interest on the bonds.

"The Bank will accept delivery of the bonds in your behalf whether you pay for them in full OR DESIRE TO BORROW AGAINST THEM." No comment.

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