

ON OTHER PAGES:

HOW BANKING RACKET EVOLVED. (Page 2)  
 H.G. LEAGUE OPPOSES POWERS BILL. (Page 3)  
 THAT MILDURA PETITION. (Page 3)  
 A LEISURE STATE THAT WAS. (Page 4)

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

Vol. 9 No. 8 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEB. 26, 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).

# The Arch-Priest of Conscription Abdicates

## Hughes Bows to Greater Claimant

"Highlight of the Conscription debate in Parliament was the contribution made by W. M. Hughes. He welcomed Curtin as a convert to Conscription. No man in the House knew better what was involved. Curtin winced as he was acclaimed by the man whom he had fought 27 years ago. A Daniel had come to judgment.

"Hughes—the man assailed by every true Labour man and woman for 27 years over his conscription referendum—watched with satiric delight a Labour Prime Minister do what he had failed to do. For him it was a belated day of retribution. For the Labour Movement it was an occasion of cruel mortification. At the table, while Hughes lashed himself into ecstatic fervour, sat John Curtin, national secretary of the Anti-Conscription Committee of 1916, sponsoring Australia's first absolute Conscription Bill. He was a lonely, worried man. He had isolated himself from the traditions of a generation of Labour stalwarts. At the apex of his political career, he had thrust aside the very principles through which he had climbed to the greatest position in Labour's proud history. For him it was a day of tragedy."—"The Century" (N.S.W. Labour weekly), February 12

This is what Mr. Hughes said:—  
 "This Bill imposes conscription in this country for the first time in its history, and it is imposed by a man who all his life has bitterly opposed it and has pledged himself and his party many times to prevent its imposition. He has not given us his reasons for his amazing change of front.

"No one listening to him could have imagined for a moment that the purpose of the Bill to which he was addressing himself was the imposition of conscription on the Militia forces of this country.

"The impression sought to be conveyed was that he is still the vigilant and faithful watchdog of the people, standing in his appointed place to protect them from those who wished to conscript them.

"Certainly not a word fell from his lips as to why he who had opposed conscription for 27 years now sought to enforce it.

"But whilst he gave the House no reasons for his volte face, the Press has told us that he did give reasons to the Labour conference.

"The 'Sydney Morning Herald' on November 20, 1942, stated:

"It was officially stated in Canberra yesterday that General MacArthur was the inspiration of the move."

"We may accept that as a statement of the position.

"The Prime Minister, then, rests his case for the imposition of conscription on the military situation which makes that which, until the other day, was unnecessary and unjustifiable, absolutely essential for the safety of the country. The Treasurer sought to persuade this House and the country that, despite what had been said in the Press and by the people, this is not conscription at all.

"ONLY A LITTLE ONE."

"What he said, in effect, was very much like the plea of the young woman who, being charged with having an infant born out of holy wedlock, pleaded in extenuation, 'It is only a little one.'

"I would say that it will no doubt grow. These efforts on the part of the Prime Minister and others to persuade the House, and particularly the rank and file of the Labor party, that this is not conscription, is so much camouflage.

"Conscription has nothing to do with

either distance or bulk, but it has to do with violation of individual liberty. As the member for Batman has pointed out eloquently, and, I consider, convincingly, the principle is the thing and not the degree to which the principle is applied.

"The position is clear. As a result of over twelve months' occupancy of the Treasury bench, the right honourable gentleman has been constrained to admit that in everything he has contended in the last 27 years he has been in the wrong.

"That, I think, explains the position.

"He has reminded us that the operation of this measure is to be confined to the South-west Pacific Zone, because that is the area over which General MacArthur has control.

"Are we, then, to suppose that the mere fact that General MacArthur has control of this area is a reason for enforcing a principle which is vicious and infamous?"

"What the right honourable gentleman says in effect is that that which for 27 years, and up to November last, was un-

justifiable, unnecessary and infamous, has now become a patriotic duty which no individual may neglect at his peril.

"He says that the military situation has compelled him to take this course.

"Let us for a moment put on one side the question of whether or not it is called conscription.

"It is compulsion. It is saying to a man, 'You shall go there when I direct you to do so; it is beyond the confines of Australia and its territories; you shall fight there.' If that is not conscription, what is?"

"Distance has nothing at all to do with the matter.

"In the last war millions of British soldiers went to France. They were conscripted in the last two years of the war.

"They went 20 miles across the Channel. Are we to say that they were not conscripted because they could get to their homes in a few hours, or a day at most? Many of them were given home leave (Continued on page 4)

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

The apex of absurdity was reached by the bankers' loan-stunt specialists when, according to the Melbourne "Sun" of February 22, the Milne Bay battle area was plastered with appeals to soldiers to invest in war bonds. The State Secretary of the Returned Soldiers' League, Mr. F. E. Reynolds, said that this action "caused dissatisfaction among men who risked their lives for 6/- per day, and who were faced with the prospect of being taxed even on their deferred pay." None know better than the soldiers that loans and bonds do not, in themselves, contribute one jot to the physical task of defeating the Japanese menace—and presumably they also resent providing interest-pensions for investors out of their meagre pay.

TEACHING TROUBLES: Mr. J. A. Seitz, Director of Education (Vic.), struck a realistic note when he recently told the Teachers' Union annual conference, that "suitable teachers could be obtained only if suitably paid." He also pointed out, "that the future of education was bound up with finance." That's an encouraging statement that should induce more teachers to study the money question, free from the influence of bankers and their economist apologists. Teachers should be wise enough to recognise these so-called authorities as interested persons in the money racket, and on that account to be very careful of any advice they may offer.

WORK WORRIES: The proposal to erect ready-made steel houses in Coventry (England) is, according to Mr. G. H. Morris, a housing official, "primarily to provide work for the armament factories after the war." Note the absence of consideration of whether such houses are desired by the people or not. The armament racketeers are fortunate in having such housing officials pre-arranging post-war rake-offs for them; but the people, whose money these officials are splashing about, may yet take a hand, and insist on spending their own money, in their own way, on the types of house they want, where they want them. The sooner these self-appointed planners of other people's lives are shown the gate, the better for all concerned.

POLITICAL POWER: There is a healthy sign that U.S. Congress is determined to recapture powers taken by the President and Executive during the past six months. The House Committee reported "a shocking picture of bureaucratic buck-passing, incompetent administration and almost traitorous activity of controlling interests." Here's a lead for the democracies to restore control of Parliament to the people before we are overtaken by the blight of bureaucratic socialism. When Governments seek more power, the answer should be to take more from them.

CRIME CAUSES: According to recent figures released by Mr. C. F. Knight, Secretary of the Crown Law Department, vide Melbourne "Herald," December 23 "economics (money) more than avarice and brutality caused the most violent fluctuations in the crime barometer; crime reached its peak during the financial depression years." That's worth filing for reference; and be it remembered that the bankers caused the financial depression by calling up loans in order to force the people to surrender their real assets to the bankers—whose hour of judgment surely cannot be far away.

TRADE TREATIES: The result of Dr. Evatt's visit to Wall Street is now visible in the following statement from Senator Keane: "The Federal Government" (not the people) "has decided to alter the Australian tariff so as to give U.S. most-favoured-foreign-nation treatment in the Australian schedule. This means that the protection margins previously enjoyed by British, Canadian and other Empire products will

be diminished." Irrespective of the merits or demerits of particular tariff measures, jockeying for post-war trade benefits under cover of war is likely to prejudice the final settlement, and even sow the seeds of another war.

TAX TRICKS: That the bankers' debt racket has nearly run its race is seen in the U.S. report that "tax limits on big incomes have been reached, and medium, incomes are subject to the hardest imposts in American history." This looks like a bad omen for small incomes. The U.S. Treasury expects wholesale defaults, and frankly admits that collection machinery does not exist. It looks as if the bankers will get the deeds of ownership over the real assets of the defaulting tax victims—in return for loans in the form of costless book entries; thus, by degrees, dispossessing all the people—the final goal of socialism.

BLACKMAIL: The Melbourne "Herald" reports strong objection by clerks at Victoria Barracks against a circular to the effect that "in accordance with a recent Government decision, increases in pay would apply only to members of the Temporary Clerks' Union." Here we have a position where the Government taxes the people to increase wages, provided the recipients pay part of it into Union funds which, in turn, are partly used as electioneering funds for the members of the Government authorising the increase.

CASH CONFIDENCES: London reports state that as a result of the Casablanca conference, the following changes will occur: Curtailment of certain munitions output, closing of some factories—and unemployment. The Government has decided to take workers fully into its confidence on these changes, particularly unemployment; but, as usual, they are not to be considered in the matter of unemployment. It should be obvious that unemployment caused by the Government should not react in the form of unemployment on the workers. This is an issue that the Unions should take up; but, alas, it is one they shun like the plague.

LINCOLN'S LOGIC: President, Roosevelt's "Lincoln Day" broadcast recalls that it was Abraham Lincoln who clearly foresaw the dangers of borrowing private bankers' counterfeit credit (or cheque money)—a fact not mentioned by Roosevelt. The vision of Lincoln was illustrated by Wendell Willkie's statement just prior to the broadcast, when he pointed out that "America's national debt after the war was envisaged at £90,000 million." A crippling burden indeed. Lincoln's prophecy is fulfilled to-day; but Roosevelt doesn't seem to have the answer, as Lincoln did.

ARMIES IN AMBUSH: In reply to a question in the Federal House asking would the total number of employees in the Departments of Supply, Shipping, War Organisation of Industry, and the Department of Labour and National Service be made available, the expected answer consisted of one syllable. —O.B.H.

## Work-Slavery For Disabled Men?

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

Further evidence of the work-mania, and the fact that powerful forces are working hard to see that everyone is to be put to work—even if only to dig holes and fill them in again—after the military war, comes to hand from Britain. The British Government has established a Committee, the Tomlinson Committee, "to prepare a comprehensive scheme for disabled people after the war." This Committee has submitted its first report to the British Government. The whole purpose of this Committee is to find work for disabled soldiers, etc.

And the proposed scheme is to be conducted in the best socialistic manner: "... for instance, the application to particular industries of a definite quota of disabled people and a schedule of occupations not open to able-bodied workers except under licence ... The proposals are intended to form a basis for discussion with the British Employers' Confederation, the Trades Union Congress and other interested bodies."

Reduced to simple language, the proposed scheme means that a man who has been injured in fighting for his country, must, at the conclusion of the war, submit to being regimented into working at some job which may not interest him. He will be at the mercy of a group of bureaucrats whose job it will be to push disabled men around wherever THEY (the bureaucrats) think fit.

Why must these disabled men be found work? Will there be such a shortage of consumable goods after the war that even disabled men must be given a task? NO. The following fact should be shouted from every housetop throughout the country until it is recognised and accepted as a demonstrable truth:—

Modern industry, administered and operated by a SMALL number of keen experts, working reasonable hours, can provide a FLOOD of goods for the WHOLE population; and the reason for having our productive system is to produce goods and services, NOT TO MAKE WORK.

Unless the above truth can be disproved, we must assume that those individuals not needed as producers are to be put to work after the war merely in order to keep them as slaves. Slaves are people who involuntarily do as they are told by other people who have the power to starve fellow-citizens by denying them any

claims to goods (i.e., money). The present source of money (together, with the power to allocate it and to drastically reduce the existing supply of it) is a monopoly under the control of the private banking system. The controllers of that system are determined that the overwhelming majority of individuals shall NOT receive money to buy goods (except, perhaps, a microscopic dole) unless they drudge at least seven or eight hours a day, five or six days a week, practically all their lives.

But there is a growing number of intelligent people who realise that some monetary claims must be distributed, unconditionally, to everyone, irrespective of whether he (or she) is "working" or not. Anyone who opposes this proposition denies the people their birthright: Science (the knowledge of how to do things, passed down over the centuries) is responsible for the new era of super-abundance. Science belongs to everyone. The money system is only a ticket system which should be used to distribute the benefits of Science.

Disabled men won't need work after the war, and their labour will not be needed by the farms, factories, etc. They are each entitled to a national dividend, a dividend which, although it could never adequately compensate for their injuries, would allow them to live the rest of their lives as free men, men who would soon find creative and cultural pursuits and hobbies of their OWN choosing.

Some might even take up the study of real history, and learn how the British peoples have been progressively enslaved by the Money Power ever since it established the Bank of England in 1696! Perhaps that is why it is decreed that we must be kept hard at work; so that we won't have the time or energy to read and think about such serious matters.

## HOW THE BANKING RACKET EVOLVED

In England, it began with the deposit of bullion and coins by wealthy people with goldsmiths for safe keeping. Landlords who received their rents on quarter day, or merchants receiving large payments for transactions, did not wish to keep the whole amount at home until they used it. It might be stolen, and was cumbersome to carry. They formed the habit of taking their gold and silver to a goldsmith, who had vaults where large amounts could be locked away in safety. The goldsmith naturally gave a receipt to the owner, which, being merely a piece of paper was easily carried about, and was comparatively safe, because it had the owner's name on it.

If the owner happened to want to make a payment of the same amount to someone else, he might make the receipt over to him, which would be readily acceptable, because the taker would know that it stood for the valuable metal. But this was not very convenient, because he would probably not want to pay out his whole quarter's income in any one payment. Goldsmiths then conceived the idea of giving receipts for different amounts totalling the whole deposit. These receipts were practically bank-notes, as they are known to-day, though different in appearance. Such notes could circulate as money, because the goldsmith whose name they bore was well known, and they were actually receipts for so much gold or silver.

Up to this point the goldsmith had merely provided a less bulky medium of exchange and the service of keeping the depositor's gold and silver safe until he wanted to withdraw it. The next step was in the direction of the actual CREATION of credit. The goldsmith found that his depositors did not call for all their gold at once, and that he could safely lend part of it to traders who wanted funds to buy goods to be sold later, or to send produce from one place to another for sale. He therefore began to lend a part of the money entrusted to him at interest, keeping in his safe only enough to meet withdrawals by the owners. The more his notes (or split-up receipts) circulated, the longer the coin was left with him, and the more of it he could lend out. This proved profitable enough to allow him to pay a low rate of interest to depositors to encourage them to bring their coin and leave it with him longer. The next step was quite as important as the first two described above. The goldsmith who thought of the idea of lending not the gold and silver coin deposited, but notes such as those he gave his depositors, hit upon the modern bank-note. Thus the goldsmith—or the banker, as he can now be called—could hold, say, £20,000 in gold and silver coin, giving notes to that amount to his depositors, and lend, say, another £80,000 in notes to merchants, whom he trusted to repay the loans at fixed dates. He then would owe his depositors £20,000, which he would pay in coin when they demanded it. He would also owe another £80,000 to the various people who took his notes from his customers in payment for various transactions. He would have in his vaults only £20,000. . . £80,000 [would be] owed to him by those who had borrowed from him. If a substantial number of the holders of his notes called for coin all at once, he would not be able to pay. . . In fact, the amounts given above as an example would probably have been safe enough, because note holders did not often call for coin—but if the goldsmith or banker went on issuing notes against merchants' promises to pay, with too optimistic an expectation of possible calls upon him, he would end in disaster, which would involve those persons who had believed in his good name sufficiently to accept his notes in payment for goods and services. As a matter of fact, these disasters were so frequent in the early days of banking that the Government began to take steps to regulate the issue of bank-notes. These regulations were so drastic that finally the Bank of England obtained the monopoly of bank-note issue in England and Wales, and even the uncovered issue of that institution was restricted to £14 millions, against which Government securities had to be held, while all other notes had to have behind them gold to their full amount. Though some of the country banks continued to issue notes for some time, the importance of note issues in the business of each bank diminished, while in London the Bank of England held a practical monopoly after 1844.

When the right to issue bank-notes was virtually taken away from joint-stock banks, and when in London private banks with unlimited liability had practically ceased issuing notes, it was thought that banking business would die out, since the issue of notes was considered the real source of profit. But meanwhile a new instrument, the cheque (or draft), had begun to come into use, and because of its greater convenience and safety, rapidly

developed after the restriction of note issues by bankers. In spite of the fact that cheques cannot from their very nature be legal tender, and that they necessitate a greater degree of trust in the drawer as well as in his bank, they are the most widely-used means of payment to-day.

Thus, by the use of cheques, banks could continue to lend to merchants and others, though deprived of the right to issue notes, for they could lend the right to draw cheques on them. The bank's loan then became a book entry, on which the borrower had the right to draw cheques, and the

## A PLEA FOR PROVINCIALISM

Walter Murdoch's article under this heading in the Melbourne "Herald" of February 13 is the most refreshing (and unexpected) we have read in that unrefreshing paper for a long time. What a timely antidote it was to Sir Keith Murdoch's "global strategy" blurb, which, two or three days previously, ran amok on the "Herald's" leader-page!

(By the way, there must surely have been a terrible blunder somewhere when Keith was recommended for a knighthood instead of his fellow-clansman. Walter is known as Professor of English at W.A. University for many years; as a distinguished and delightful essayist—his widely-read "Collected Essays" should be read by every intelligent Australian—as an occasional radio speaker; as the writer of syndicated newspaper-articles, most of them remarkable, alike for their literary quality, realism, humanism, logic, and entertaining freshness; and as a monetary reformer. In these capacities, Walter Murdoch has, on the whole, done much toward the preservation and extension of all that is best in British-Australian culture, toward pulling the wool from the eyes of his less-enlightened fellow-citizens, and toward ensuring that Tom, Dick and Harry shall become the masters of their own destinies. The kindest thing we can say about Sir Keith is that, as a power-lusting newspaper-magnate, etc., he has done just the opposite.)

To return to the aforesaid article: It began with characteristic reflections on a sausage-magnate who wanted everybody to become "sausage-minded," and on more abstract-minded enthusiasts: those who implored us to "think imperially, now shouted down by those who demand that we "think globally." After making a small tactful concession to globalists, Walter Murdoch quickly introduced his main theme. We cannot resist quoting most of what followed. Even if you did read the whole article when it appeared in the "Herald," you should re-read the following passages—

Yes, by all means think globally, or as globally as you can; but what I want to say is something different, something that may seem singularly unseasonable at this moment. I want to put in a word for that despised and discredited thing, provincialism; for what, when you desire to sneer at it, you call parochialism. I think a good deal of nonsense has been spoken about the parish pump. I think provincialism is one of the essentials of democracy.

Provincialism!—it was Matthew Arnold who brought the word into our vocabulary; and he never used it except to gibe at it. He is so much one of my own favourites that I hate to have to confess to finding him, at times, insufferably superior. He was a great man with a streak of littleness in him, which revealed itself in superciliousness. Chesterton hits the nail on the head when he says that Arnold "kept a smile of heart-broken forbearance, as of the teacher in an idiot school, that was enormously insulting." But he was also enormously persuasive. He was a great man who taught little men to sneer; and one of the things he taught them to sneer at was provincialism. When his teaching had sunk in, "how provincial!" became the fashionable way of damning an opponent.

I am not writing on politics, and I say nothing of what may or may not be expedient at the moment; but I do say that at times like the present, when our country's danger makes it urgently necessary for us all to become "Australia-minded," there is a danger of our forgetting the claims of local patriotism, the claims of provincialism. It is the small community within the large community that is the real nursery and training-ground of democracy. It is in the small community that the democratic spirit is kept alive; as you will see if you study history.

"The modern nation," says the American philosopher, Josiah Royce, "tends from its very vastness to become self-estranged, incomprehensible to its citizens, the prey of vast and fatally irresistible social forces." You may have to read that sentence twice before you see how profoundly true it is.

The British Empire is, on the whole, the greatest political institution that has ever lived in the tide of times. It was built with the labour and the courage, and cemented with the blood, of many generations of men and women of our race. We are proud of it, and we are loyal to it—at least, most of us are; those who are not loyal to it are not loyal to Australia, whose fate depends absolutely on the fate of the Empire. But—if anyone assures me that he not only admires, but actually loves, the British Empire, I don't think he is trying to deceive me, but I do think he is deceiving himself. I defy anyone to love the British Empire. It is an institution altogether too vast, too mighty, and too impersonal for affection. You might as well try to love the solar system.

Even our Commonwealth of Australia is too vast for a man to hold in his heart.

bank CREATED credit, in much the same way as it did when it issued notes. As soon as the borrower paid out some of his borrowed funds to another, those funds (in the same or in another bank) became deposits.

The banker must still, however, observe the same prudence in lending as he would in issuing notes—i.e., he must always keep enough cash in hand, or in his account at the Bank of England, to meet any reasonable, demand for cash. In some countries, the proportion of deposits to cash is regulated by law—e.g., the United States—but in England there is no statutory regulation. British banks generally keep this proportion at around 10 per cent., which they find in practice sufficient, both to meet the demands made on them, and at the same time to command the confidence of their depositors.

—Condensed from the article on "Banking" in the "Modern World Encyclopaedia" (1935 edition), which was NOT published by or for monetary reformers. (Our headline, of course!).

## FATE OF "JAPPY"

The "Dandenong Journal" (Feb. 17) reprints the following amusing verse from an American paper:

Yanker selly Jappy scrappy,  
Suddenly, irony scrappy,  
Jappy happy, clappy, clappy,  
Yankee sloppy, nappy, nappy,  
Jappy smile shooty, gassey,  
Yankee friendly, Jappy happy,  
Yankee fall him in a trappy,  
Jappy stabby Yankee backy,  
An-a-Zackey whacky Jappy,  
Makey Jappy necky snappy,  
Leavey Jappy nappy blacky,  
Jappy no like An-a-Zackey,  
Nazi plomise helpy Jappy,  
Jappy plomise helpy Nazi,  
Nazi die on Russian steppy,  
Jappy cryey, "No more helpy!"  
No more Jappy, no more Nazi,  
No more Nazi, no more Duce,  
Duce, Jappy, Nazi, Axey,  
Falley downy, crashy, smashy.

## AMERICAN HISTORY

From "Money," New York.

Our original thirteen colonies issued their own money—colonial scrip—and used it directly without borrowing, therefore without public debt. The British Parliament, in 1751, ordered the suppression of this debt-free money, and forced Bank of England money upon the colonies. In a few years the colonies were heavily in debt, and suffered from unemployment and poverty. Hence the Revolution.

The framers of the Constitution, to safeguard the new nation from this danger, were careful to provide that Congress should issue the money and regulate the value thereof—Article 1, Section 8. But Alexander Hamilton, and a few other banker-minded people, were able to set aside this provision and to organise the First United States Bank—a privately owned bank modelled upon the Bank of England, also privately owned. With the exception of about thirty years, from Andrew Jackson to Abraham Lincoln, during which time constitutional money was actually in use, our country has been at the mercy of the private banking interests. The Federal Reserve System, with its misleading name, is privately owned and operated. Result, once again, an intolerable burden of debt.

## "THE PEOPLE" AND "THE MASSES"

"When I say to myself 'the people,' I think of a confused but lively vision of a hundred faces and a hundred voices, as if a picture by old Breughel had suddenly come to life.

"In short, I think of persons. But when I say to myself 'the Masses' I see at once a great, featureless horde, and hear nothing but a muttering and a murmuring. I do not think of persons. The masses are not real human beings. They have been dehumanised.

"Hitler thinks and acts always in terms of the masses and never for a moment in terms of the people. The people have roots, whereas the masses are rootless; moving almost like sleep-walkers, everywhere, anywhere, in and out of their giant factories or mechanical places of amusement.

"You cannot fall in love with, marry, or give birth to one of the masses. You can employ or drill the masses; you can help to feed or entertain them, but you cannot ever really know or love the masses, otherwise they would stop being masses and turn into people."

—J. B. Priestley, in "Out of the People."

be a democracy without schooling for the strenuous task. In such a country as Switzerland, geography is on the side of democracy; in Australia, geography is on the side of Fascism. Nothing is more certain, to my mind, than that some form of Fascism is bound to come to Australia unless a sound training in democracy makes our people strong enough to avert the danger; and the only school where a people can get that training is—not in the great nation, where the single separate person feels himself dwarfed into insignificance and powerlessness—but in the small community; in one's own State, in one's own city, or perhaps, best of all, in one's own village.

I think this is something we need to be reminded of occasionally—and especially to-day, when our watchword is, and must be till the war is over, national unity. It is just because the need of national unity is so urgent that we are in danger of forgetting that all true patriotism springs from local patriotism. No-one wants to see interstate jealousies, spites, antagonisms; we have had enough of these in the past; we may hope we have done with them for ever—and a good riddance. Such things are a national weakness. The provincialism I am pleading for is not a national weakness, but a source of national strength. The human heart is not capacious enough to hold a whole continent at once; we have to begin by loving our own corner, our own group, our own associates in local affairs, the people we meet, the organisations in which we can play a part. It is round the parish pump that the seeds of the larger patriotism are sown. Beware of scoffing at provincialism.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Presentation: At the Executive Meeting on February 17 the opportunity was taken of presenting to our secretary, Mr. M. Wentworth Lee, a handsome black and gold inkstand as a wedding present. This was made possible by members, who appreciated the fine work Mr. Lee has done for the Movement. Thanking members, he said he was always willing to do what he could to help our cause.

Powers Bill: This is being so amended in the State Parliament that Dr. Evatt will hardly recognise the final product.

Taxation: A very striking letter form is available protesting against increased taxation. The "Banker" article on "Monetary Illusions" is quoted in the information part of the leaflet. Send for a supply now.

Fighting Forces Protection League: Letter forms opposing any taxation on the deferred pay of the Fighting Forces are now available.

—M. E. Dodd, President.

THE "NEW TIMES"  
IS OBTAINABLE  
AT  
ALL AUTHORISED  
NEWSAGENTS

## ANTI-CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN IN THE COBURG DISTRICT

Further public meetings were held in the Progress Hall, Merlyston, on 11th inst., and in the Andalusia Hall, East Coburg, on 18th inst. Mr. Nicholls, chairman, reminded those present at the East Coburg meeting that conscription of women as well as men meant interference with the liberty of all, and once that liberty was lost it would be a most difficult matter to regain it. He therefore urged all persons who had votes to exercise their democratic rights by writing to their representative in Parliament. A short specimen letter had been printed for the convenience of those who were too busy to write in their own words, and these would be distributed without charge.

Mr. E. J. Grogan regretted the absence of inducement in regard to the payment of soldiers. Trade unionists received extra money, called "dirt" money and "danger money," but soldiers were to be compelled to carry on their job for 6/- a day. It had been said that we should accept conscription because the Americans were conscripts. He failed to see that conscripts were superior to volunteers, and in asking for help we had not asked for conscripts. We should remember that the Labor Government was merely in office to serve a policy. The Labor Prime Minister, Mr. Scullin when in office, was subject to the power of Sir Otto Niemeyer, and the people had to suffer through reductions in their incomes, and even old age pensioners did not escape.

Mr. A. J. O'Callaghan referred to what was so frequently said at the start of this war. We were fighting for Democracy, Freedom, to live our own lives in our own way, and so on. A review of the political situation just now should be helpful. During the last war the people of the Commonwealth declared by referendum that no man should be compelled to serve outside Australian soil in overseas military forces. The opinion of the electors was so clear and unmistakable that it had been inserted into the Commonwealth Constitution. Yet in spite of the will of the people so clearly expressed, we subjected ourselves to a Government which had taken action contrary to the people's will. A Democratic Government could be judged by its response to the expressed will of the people. That was Government BY the people. Mr. Grogan had shown that the representative of the Money Power was the ruler above the representatives of the people, and while the electors allowed themselves to be fooled by the policy of confusion pursued by the Press and other means of publicity, the Money Power would continue to rule. The daily press stood together for conscription, therefore, wage-earners should not neglect their own interests, but should come together at their own meetings to compare notes, and so learn the truth. The inmates of Pentridge or other convicts were fed and clothed—they enjoyed freedom from want. They were housed and guarded—they were free of fear. They were free to practise any religion. They had freedom of speech, but not freedom to act as they chose. Freedom, in a nutshell, was a matter of choice. It was interesting to note that in dangerous military undertakings the experts relied upon volunteers to help them

to achieve success. Personal initiative could accomplish much more than external control. Freedom had to be fought for; it was something to be won by the initiative of the people, originating in the initiative of individuals who engaged in action to formulate Government policy; "the policy of each individual being the results he wants for himself as well as for others. If electors failed to take the initiative, they would fail to gain the freedom we are fighting for. Mr. F. C. Paice said that those who controlled the Government wished to retain their power and dictate the terms for post-war reconstruction. The Uniform Tax Bill, the Powers Bill, and the Conscription Bill were all designed to centralise control, to strengthen the government of the many by the few. The economic needs of the citizens were being produced by a small percentage of the population. Old men and women could do so with mechanised industry. After the war the workers could enjoy an enormous output from a few workers using machines, but the ruling powers were intent upon giving work to everybody, but only a restricted amount of money for each. The payment offered to soldiers, who were prepared, to shed their blood for us, was inadequate. The allowances made to dependants of soldiers and their widows and orphans should cause us to be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves if we were not prepared to write and protest vigorously to our Members in Parliament. Some people seemed to think of a Member of Parliament as a kind of demigod, sitting on the edge of a fleecy cloud, playing a harp. They were, in fact, ordinary mortals, who put food into their mouths like other people on this earth. He urged each and every listener to write to their Member in Parliament, to tell him what they want in regard to conscription. In the coming elections they would be offered Tweedledum or Tweedledee. The Labor Party would enforce limited conscription. The U.A.P. would enforce unlimited conscription. Those electors who could not see the futility of voting for party candidates could vote as they wished, but before they cast their votes they should write to their candidates, asking them for an undertaking that they would oppose the introduction of conscription when they got into Parliament.

Further meetings were to be held in the Tasma Theatre, West Coburg, on Thursday, 25th inst., and in the Labor Hall, Coburg, on Friday, 5th March.

## H. G. LEAGUE OPPOSES POWERS BILL

### "Electoral Campaign" Tactics Urged

A leaflet written by E. J. Craigie, of Adelaide, has been issued by the Henry George League, Melbourne. It carries two bold headlines: "The Constitutional Convention" and "Your Liberty In Danger." Citizens are urged to use the democratic, non-party procedure of writing to Members of Parliament, instructing them "to vote against the Bill, and if passed, demand a referendum for its repeal." Inter alia, the leaflet states:—

It is difficult to understand the unanimity reached at the Constitutional Convention. It is said that "politics make strange bedfellows," and this would appear to be true when we see socialists and alleged anti-socialists agreeing to a drastic change in control that can only bring disaster to the community. At one time those who claimed to be Liberal in politics had a great respect for the principle of freedom, and were prepared, to fight for its preservation. Not so with present-day Liberals.

In a democracy the supreme power in relation to government rests with the people. We are supposed to be fighting for democracy as against totalitarianism, yet we find that 24 party politicians who assembled at Canberra have taken unto themselves the right to grant extreme powers over industry without consulting the people who are vitally concerned. It seems that while we are fighting for freedom overseas we are to lose it in Australia.

Although there is a slight change in the verbiage of the Model Bill accepted by the Convention, it differs little from the original issued by Dr. Evatt, and which raised such a storm of protest. The fourteen new powers are laid down in general terms, without any definite statement as to how they will be given effect. Thus a blank cheque has been given to the Federal Government. . . . We are also to have "organised marketing of commodities" and control of "production and distribution"; the last-mentioned to apply to primary production with "the consent of the Governor-in-Council." This proviso means the Government in power for the time being. With Labor Governments in four States, there seems little hope for primary producers. Under wartime regulations we have had experience of organised marketing. We have the Apple and Pear Board, which already has caused a loss of £2,000,000 to the taxpayers, to say nothing of the loss to producers and consumers. We also have orderly marketing in regard to eggs, butter and cream, and

this has reacted disastrously upon a large section of the community. With the complete powers proposed to be granted, conditions will be worse. Under the Bill as passed by the Convention, there is nothing to prevent the Government dictating where and when commodities shall be produced and sold, the price that must be charged, and the number of people who shall engage in any industry.

Primary producers now enjoy (?) the blessings of control. The wheat growers who harvest the biggest crops and, therefore, must employ labour, get the magnificent price of 2/- a bushel for all wheat grown in excess of 3000 bushels. They have to pay up to £7/16/- and keep for a 48-hour week. They are expected to give preference to unionists, irrespective as to whether the unionist is a capable worker or not. The power sought to control "trusts, combines and monopolies" is a delusion and a snare. Such legislation has proved a failure in America. It is sheer hypocrisy on the part of the Government to grant privileges to certain industries so that they shall be shielded from competition, and then try and hoodwink the public by seeking powers to destroy a monster of their own creation. The abolition of special privileges is the only effective way of dealing with trusts and monopolies.

Party leaders have betrayed the trust reposed in them, so the people must act to protect their rights. A special session of Parliament is to be held to ratify or reject the proposal. If you wish to retain the right of controlling your industry, write your member and instruct him to vote against the Convention Bill, and if passed, demand a referendum for its repeal. The right to the product of your labour is at stake. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and never was vigilance more necessary than at the present time. Dictatorship is in the saddle, riding to the devil, and unless immediate action is taken there will be nothing but chaos and disaster in this fair land.

## NORMAN BEDE RYDGE AND THE BEVERIDGE PLAN

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

Sir,—Norman Bede Rydge is the editor of "Rydge's Business Journal." This journal is published monthly in Sydney, and its object is to tell business men how to improve the FINANCIAL results of their businesses. Its editor is a man of some influence, and it is fairly certain that his opinions carry some weight, at least amongst those who do not take the trouble to think for themselves. According to "Who's Who in Australia, 1941, he is 42 years of age, follows the occupation of Company Director, has a place on the Directorate of 21 companies, which depend for their success on the continuance of the present financial arrangements, and is the author of several publications on taxation.

I have been reading the Journal regularly and have come to the conclusion that he is so steeped in the existing financial set-up that his thinking had become lopsided. Any doubts in this regard were surely removed by his editorial dated 1st January, 1943. In the issue for that date he offered comment on the Beveridge Plan, and I want to invite particular attention to the following portion of that comment:

"Production of goods alone can give ultimate security to any nation. And production depends on labour. The key-note of reconstruction is the finding of a job for every man and woman, so that everyone can produce, and so pull his or her weight in helping to make the goods necessary to satisfy the needs of all in the community. And if a scheme can be devised which does guarantee a job to everyone, the need of unemployment insurance disappears. Paying weekly allowances to

sabotage of production was carried out in all countries NOT because the people had no jobs, BUT ENTIRELY BECAUSE THEY HAD NO MONEY. To a rational mind this suggests that the outrageous conditions were the result of our failure to give the people access to the production, and that so long as the gaining of an income depends entirely on having "a job," then so long will similar diabolical experiences occur.

And if he is really serious in advocating that there must be a job for everyone, why has he not conducted a campaign against the scientist and the engineer who between them have produced marvellous gadgets for producing goods without men having a job? These scientists and engineers have been so successful that the output of solar energy, plus machinery, is equal to the effort of five times the population of the earth. That was the case before the commencement of the present war. What must it be now? At that time able-bodied men between the ages of 25 and 45, working only 16 hours a week, could have done all the work that required doing. Even here we are producing more and more with less and less labour. That, obviously, means that we require people to work shorter hours and fewer years, but instead of that desirable result we are getting heavier debts, higher taxes, poverty, disease, premature death, insanity, war, crime, and almost everything the very antithesis of what we want. Clearly, therefore, the solution is not to be found in the getting of jobs. Something else is required.—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne. 21st February, 1943.

(To be continued.)

## ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, 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.

men out of work has not solved our problem in the past, and most definitely will not solve it in the future. Unemployment insurance may be a palliative—it is certainly not a cure. The only cure is creating the jobs so that idle hands can produce goods required for distribution amongst the rest of the community. Concentration on the problem of guaranteeing work for everyone, and not too much emphasis on unemployment payments, is the line along which the people expect postwar reconstruction to be founded. Give a man a job, give him decent rates of pay, and we have the chief essentials of the greatest Social Security Scheme of all time.

How any sane man with a knowledge of the conditions which obtained during the period of the so-called depression could express himself in such a way is more than I can understand. If the depression showed anything at all, it showed that production is NOT the problem. The only part of our organisation which failed, and failed lamentably, was the DISTRIBUTION side. We not only destroyed goods because the people could not BUY them, but we actually paid producers not to produce! Has he not heard of wheat being eaten by mice and weevils while millions and millions of people were short of bread? Did he not know that milk was poured down the drains while millions of children suffered from malnutrition? Is it news to him that coffee was used as locomotive fuel, that cattle were needlessly slaughtered by hundreds of thousands, that fish were deliberately tipped back into the sea, that fruit was left on the ground to rot, and that similar

## SODDY SPEAKS

Professor Frederick Soddy, world-famous physicist and winner of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry, wrote as follows in the Nov. 15, 1941, issue of the British newsweekly, "Cavalade":

"A growing and progressive civilisation demands, as the Social Credit party advocates, the continuous issue of new money to consumers—not as a loan or debt, but as a gift. This the writer unreservedly endorses."

On October 3, 1942, Professor Soddy sent a seven-word message to the General Secretary of the Social Credit party of Great Britain. It read:

"Science without Social Credit is sheer suicide."

Statements of this kind from him should command the deepest universal respect. They should have been put on the cables and widely republished. They were NOT—and readers will find a hidden resistance to publicity for them if they try to get Soddy's words widely circulated. Men of the calibre of Einstein, Eddington and Soddy can talk on any subject they please but one; if they happen to criticise orthodox finance, suddenly their views are not "news." All the same, Professor Soddy's short sentences will work their way to the surface of social thinking coming from a man of his eminence they cannot be altogether suppressed, cannot be forgotten, cannot lie inert on the printed page.

## THAT MILDURA MOVEMENT PETITION

Citizens in general, and reformers in particular, recently heard much about the Petition to the Governor-General sponsored by the Midura Movement for National and Social Reconstruction, in which the main objective was a Royal Commission of enquiry into financial theory and practice with a view to national and social reconstruction. The Petition was signed by thousands, and was duly presented. How many know of its ultimate fate? The metropolitan dailies are silent on the subject.

Hereunder we quote the Governor-General's reply, as published in the Mildura "Sunraysia Daily" of January 13. Note the extraordinary implication that Australia cannot deal with her own internal problems, and the "Leave It to the Planners" attitude in the last paragraph. The petitioners seem to have arrived at a dead-end, as so many petitioners have done before; which indicates that the new, but already frequently successful tactics of the "Electoral Campaign" (individual letters to M.P.s, demanding a specific RESULT) provide a much better political mechanism. Anyhow, here is His Excellency's reply to the Petition:

"My Ministers are in full accord with you as to the evils of poverty and unemployment from which our civilisation suffers. We are pledged to overcome them by every means within our power, and greatly appreciate your support in this endeavour.

"We have entered into solemn obligations with the United Nations to direct our policy after the war to the elimination of poverty and unemployment, and to the raising of living standards to the highest level which our resources and technical skill make possible. We have agreed to collaborate with the United Nations and all other people of like mind toward these ends, for poverty and unemployment in any country are not only a blot on our civilisation, but are a drag on the well-being of all other peoples. In these matters the nations are members one of another.

"My Ministers are in continual discussion with others of the United Nations on the best practical means of attaining these great objectives, and are seeking the best advice available in Australia on the subject. We have set up a number of commissions of enquiry to report on different aspects, and have instituted the Reconstruction Division of the Department of Labour and National Service to assemble and co-ordinate the advice given and to prosecute further enquiries.

"My Ministers ask, therefore, that any help you can give in the way of practical suggestions for the attaining of these objectives should be addressed to the Reconstruction Division of the Ministry of Labour and National Service, in order that my Government may give them full consideration."

## A LEISURE STATE THAT WAS

By EIMAR O'DUFFY.

I look to the Leisure State to produce within a generation or so a race of healthy, handsome, happy, and debonair people, as sociable and cultured as we are self-centred and uncouth. If I have any people in mind as a type, it is the people of Athens in the days of Pericles. Consider that wonderful people, the things they did, and the men they were. Their sociability, their wit, their joyousness, their mental agility.

Consider the great men that sprung up among them, and the thing of beauty they made of their city. What modern town of the size of Athens would build the temples of the Acropolis and fill them with marble, gold and ivory statues? Or build a theatre large enough to contain the whole population? Or listen en masse to plays with the tremendous intellectual and poetic content of those of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides? Or follow with discerning enjoyment a comedy full of literary criticism, like the "Frogs" of Aristophanes? Or build a fleet of three hundred vessels, and fight an empire for the freedom of distant kinsmen?

A modern town of the size of Athens is content with a handful of picture theatres for its intellectual fare, and would plaster the sides of the Acropolis with advertisements!

Consider the men of Athens again: their courage and resourcefulness. Picture the ten thousand Athenians marching to Marathon—a poet and a future statesman carrying spears in the ranks—and then their charge at a run into the heart of the astonished hordes of Persia. Consider their toughness and endurance. It took the Work-State Spartans twenty-seven years to beat them, with all Greece at their back, and the Persian Empire to boot. Consider the passion of every Athenian for the city he adorned with marble and gold:

"O richly renowned,  
And with violets crowned!  
O Athens, the envied of nations!"

—as Aristophanes sings. What a city, and what a people! Professor Mahaffy noted that there was but one instance in their life—the liability of slaves to be tortured in giving legal evidence—of that stupidity which is such a leading characteristic of ours. They had their faults, it is true; but they were refreshingly free from a vice distressingly prevalent to-day—that of cant. Aristophanes, who satirised them pretty freely, does not appear to have been aware of the existence of such a thing.

Periclean Athens marks the zenith of the human race. Since that age, despite all our science and all our printing presses, we have undergone a steady decline. This is too big a contention to prove in a brief essay on leisure, but an illustration will show what I mean:

Not so many years ago a certain tennis champion was invited by a newspaper to give his views on religion to the public, and, by another paper, to write on the disarmament conference. The ordinary reader was delighted, but there was a shriek of derision from the intellectuals. Both, I submit, were wrong. The champion's article on religion showed him to be intellectually a baby, knowing neither what he thought nor what other people have thought before him. I did not read his article on disarmament, but I doubt if he understood politics either. He was therefore quite unqualified to write those articles and the silly people who found them "consoling" and "enlightening" are past hoping for. On the other hand, why should the intellectuals have assumed that a tennis player must be incompetent to discuss serious subjects? Because, of course, in this age he generally is. But in ancient Athens that would not have been true. It would never have occurred to an Athenian to think that an athlete could not be a man of intellect, any more than it would have occurred to him that a man of intellect could not be an athlete. The Athenian philosopher generally was an athlete, and the Athenian athlete was quite often something of a philosopher, while the average Athenian was a bit of both. This was because in Athens men were educated not to be priests or politicians or business men, but to be fine, good men.

Take Alcibiades, for example, rascal as he was. For years he was the leading figure in Greek politics; he was a successful commander both on land and sea; he was an athlete and a sportsman, a man of culture and a wit; and he could

### 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.

carry on a conversation on philosophy with Socrates and Plato. Compare him with our generals and our admirals, with our politicians who know nothing even about politics, with our business-blinded business men, with our athletes who can not read, and our intellectuals who can not run. He was, of course, an exceptionally brilliant man even for Athens, but he was the kind of man that Athens produced in abundance; and she produced them by educating her children, with music and gymnastics, for life, not for business.

We cannot do that. In our un leisured, financially-starved and unduly competitive civilisation we cannot afford to be men. We must all be business men: that is, specialists. We must throw general culture overboard, and train whatever special faculty we may have that will fit us to grab what spoil we can in the scrimmage.

The decline, then, is pretty obvious, and the reason more obvious still. Athens was a Leisure State. Even with Pericles to govern it, with Pheidias and Ictinus to beautify it, with Plato to teach its citizens, with Sophocles and Euripides to inspire them, and with Aristophanes to amuse them, the Athenians would NOT have been what they were if they had had to hustle and toil like modern men.

**They were spared that necessity by the institution of slavery. We can deliver ourselves from it by the proper use of machinery—mechanical slaves.**

## THE ARCH-PRIEST OF CONSCRIPTION ABDICATES

(Continued from page 1.)

from time to time, and were able to visit their wives and families; because it must be remembered that the fighting was in northern France, and they were never more than 300 or 400 miles at most.

"The Member for Batman has brought back vividly to my mind those stirring days of long ago, when he and I crossed swords for the first time on this very subject.

### ADVICE OF MILITARY LEADERS.

"I remind the Prime Minister that, for the first two years of the last war, the Australian divisions were maintained at full strength by voluntary enlistment. Then we were advised by our military leaders that that was no longer possible without recourse to conscription. I point that out because he has rested his case on the advice of his military leaders. I was naturally moved similarly by advice from the same quarters.

**It is known that I, when Prime Minister, stated definitely that conscription would not be imposed on the people without their having been previously consulted, and I did consult them.**

"That was the first occasion on which the people of any country had had an opportunity to say whether they would accept conscription or not, and from that day to this the people of no other country have been so favoured. When the proposal submitted to the electors was rejected, their decision was accepted by the Government of the day.

**The Prime Minister has 'seen the light,' and has prevented the ship from running on the shoals. He promised the people that conscription would not be introduced until the people had been consulted. He stated in this House that the people had a positive guarantee, and that he was one of the guarantors, that conscription would not be imposed without their being consulted.**

"I shall not recall to the mind of the Prime Minister all that was reported in the Press as having been said at the Australian Labor conference in Victoria, but I remind him that the representatives of two of the greater States of the Commonwealth rejected his proposal. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out today, but for one man in Tasmania the Government would have been utterly undone. It is absurd at this stage to say that all this heat and passion was brought about by something which stopped short of conscription. The proposal did not stop short of conscription, and that is the whole trouble. Now, honourable members opposite are placed in a very difficult position. Nobody knows better than I do all that the rules, regulations and platform of the Labor Party involve. The party has taken the first step along this road, lest a worse thing should befall it. I think that it has done right, but it has not gone far enough.

"On examining the speech of the Prime Minister carefully, we note a promise that the measure will be developed and extended to meet the military situation; but at present it does not meet the situation.

### CURTIN FIRST TO IMPOSE CONSCRIPTION.

"Strange things have happened in the conscription campaigns in the past. As

## "GET OUT FROM UNDER"

In a recent book called "Southward Ho!" William La Varre tells of a "fugitive from civilisation" whom he discovered living a happy and dignified life amongst the natives in a remote North Amazon wilderness of South America. This man said: "Stay in a place like this for a year, and you will see how simple and uncontested human life can be when a man makes up his mind to 'get out from under' most of civilisation's new-fangled ideas and live basically."

We certainly do live down under some crippling forces which make so-called civilisation both devastating and unsatisfactory. This fugitive man found relief for himself by escaping to the wilderness, for it seemed to him that as civilisation got "bigger and better," wars would also be "bigger and better."

We who do not run away from the problem can and must find relief while we remain in the turmoil.

The effect of the toil and the turmoil leaves many people bewildered; but Social Crediters have sure tests by which to locate and particularise the forces causing the artificial turmoil, so that they can at least make some show of living basically, even in the midst of the turmoil.

Moreover, Social Crediters can indicate to citizens generally a step-by-step strategy by means of which citizens, as citizens, can "get out from under" the influences (whatever their nature), which threaten to enslave them; that is, which threaten to deprive them of a proper and adequate freedom of action.

People are less and less slaves according as they are able more and more to mind their own business their own way; and in this idea is to be found the way of escape, not of a few to the wilderness, but of every one of us, so that we may "get out from under" the slavery which has been imposed by anti-social financial policies, and which threaten to be more firmly imposed by legalised bureaucratic dictatorship.

The negative operations of exposing and opposing the financial and bureaucratic dictatorships are not so difficult as are the

positive ways of building up a vital and effective democracy.

Citizens must be induced to act in their own right, and on their own initiative. Citizens must remain alert and show a sense of active responsibility in controlling all those who are elected to serve them in bodies of control.

Elected persons must be on tap, and not on top. If they are allowed to be on top, then we remain down under; and we have no one to blame but ourselves.

## "CZAR" THORNTON

From the January issue of the "Rail Worker," organ of the Australian Rail Workers' Movement—

His Imperial Majesty, Czar Thornton, King of the Ironworkers and coming Fuehrer of the Munition and Ironworkers' Unions, in response to our demands that he publish a balance-sheet of the funds of the union, claims in the latest issue of the "Ironworker" that the union does publish a balance-sheet.

This, Ernie, is indeed very pleasant news, but at the risk of being tagged suspiciously minded, we suggest that it is one thing to say it, and quite another to do it.

For ourselves, we will not be satisfied until an authentically audited balance-sheet is published in the organ of the Union.

Last month we were presented with a totally unexpected explanation.

It appears that opponents of the Curtin Merger plan, a proposal to which Ernie has committed the Union without consulting the rank and file, have suggested that he and other Red union bosses who are quite capable of bearing arms, should give the workers a lead by joining up.

In last month's issue of the "Ironworker" the Czar, in an attempt to justify his position is quoted as follows.—"Apparently our critics would suggest that all people of INTELLIGENCE in the Labor movement join the army."

Such Modesty, Ernie!

## B. H. Brown to Debate "Sound Finance" Association Speaker

On March 10 our Melbourne readers will have the opportunity of hearing a debate between Mr. Bruce H. Brown and a representative of the "Sound Finance" Association of Victoria.

This event will take place at the Hawthorn Hall (cr. Burwood-road and Lauder-street—near Hawthorn Town Hall). The encounter will commence at 8 p.m. sharp. Subject: "Is it necessary to restrict the people's spending capacity during war?"

This "heckle hour," which has been arranged by the Hawthorn group of the N.W.R.M., will be open to the general public and there will be no charge for admission.

## CAMPAIGN FOR REPEAL OF CONSCRIPTION

Now that conscription for overseas service has been placed on the statute book, the No-Conscription Campaign Committee in Melbourne has decided to launch a campaign to secure the repeal of this contentious measure. The basis of the campaign will be on the same lines as that which secured the shelving of the National Insurance Plan, the Apple and Pear Board, the Commonwealth Bank inscribed-stock plot, and other obnoxious pieces of legislation.

The campaign will be launched at a public meeting in the Savoy Picture Theatre, Russell-street, Melbourne, next Sunday evening, February 28, at 8 o'clock. Anybody who is prepared to assist in furthering the aims of the organisation is invited to write to the Secretary, No Conscription Campaign, Room 4, Temperance Buildings, Russell St., Melbourne. A copy of the pamphlet, "Against Conscription—Forty Questions Answered," by Maurice Blackburn, M.H.R., will be sent anywhere in Australia on receipt of a 2/4d. stamp.

## NEW PAMPHLET

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

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE ISMS," the substance of which appeared in the "New Times" of November 6. Copies are now available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.1. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1/4d.).

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

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