

THE TRUTH ABOUT
CONSCRIPTION. (Page 2)

THE 1943 METHODIST
CONFERENCE. (Page 3)

THE "LAND FOR THE
(Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET.
(Page 3)

STRIKING SPEECH ON
BRITISH WAR AIMS.
(Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE** PRICE—FOURPENCE

NEW TIMES

Vol. 9 No. 10 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MARCH 12 1943

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for
transmission by post as a newspaper.

Now, when our
land to ruin's
brink is verging,
In God's name,
let us speak while
there is time!

Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime.
Whittier (1807-1892).

Basic Facts About Our Post-War Problems

An Outstanding Broadcast From 7HO

After a short interval, the Electoral Campaign broadcasts from 7HO, delivered by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., have been resumed. Reading the script of Mr. Guthrie's second broadcast for 1943 is a wonderful tonic, after hearing the ballyhoo, pious platitudes and perverted nonsense that is so often served up to listeners, particularly by the A.B.C., as the last word on "post-war reconstruction." As most of our readers live outside the effective range of 7HO, we have much pleasure in publishing the full text of the aforesaid talk by Mr. Guthrie, broadcast last Sunday evening:—

We who pay for these broadcasts do so because we wish to make known to you the fact that there is a body of informed opinion in this country which most emphatically disagrees with many of the statements made by party politicians, radio commentators and other public men on the question of post-war reconstruction. The disagreement is fundamental because it concerns facts, not opinions; it concerns the basic facts of our social life.

Not only do we say that the opinions and statements put forward by many public men on post-war reconstruction have no basis in fact, but we further state that these opinions and statements can easily be proved to be false, and have been proved to be false, by men of the very greatest scientific and executive repute.

Notwithstanding this, no person holding contrary views to those stated is permitted access to the great organs of publicity or into the executive positions of the political parties.

To-night, I am going to place before you some of the facts on which the whole life of society is based, and I am going to show you how these facts are being completely ignored, and, in their stead, arguments are being put forward which are merely a collection of ancient clichés, which ceased to have any meaning long before I was born.

I think it is beyond dispute to say that our civilisation grew out of the ability of men to grow sufficient food for the community without demanding the help of the entire population. In other words, by reducing the amount of labour required to produce food men were given leisure to do things other than those necessary for mere animal existence.

Every intelligent person organises his life, if possible, so that he has leisure to do the things he wants to do (that is the meaning of leisure). Work, as opposed to leisure, means doing things you would not do unless you were compelled to do them by brute force or by the threat of starvation. The use of power-driven machinery has done away with the need for much of the unskilled and semi-skilled labour. By doing away with unnecessary labour, many hours of freedom and leisure have been—or, shall I say, should have been—given to all of us.

To-day, with the aid of machinery, a man can produce over sixty times as many

shoes in the same time as one pair was made by hand; in a modern brick-kiln one man can make 1000 times as many bricks as one man making them by hand; one man in a modern flour mill can produce over 10,000 times the quantity of flour one man could grind by hand; a power-driven knitting machine can knit at 10,000 times the speed of an expert hand-knitter.

Throughout many fields of production a similar story can be told, and the results are visible for those who wish to see.

Yet for the last 25 years the chief task of the controllers of our economic arrangements has been to do everything in their power to stop the ever-increasing flood of goods—of wheat, cotton, flour, tea, and sugar; of boots, clothes, rubber, radio sets, motor cars, etc., etc. . . .

The men who have been controlling the world during the last 25 years have not only done everything in their power to reduce the enormous production of the "machine," but at the same time they were trying to produce an artificial scarcity; they were telling us, by intensive and expensive propaganda, that we were a poor people; that we were spending too much; we were not saving enough; and that we must work harder. And that if we wanted some benefit, some old-age pension, or anything like that, we must save and scratch for it; we must go without this and that; we must realise that there was not enough wealth to go round.

This is the basis of the Beveridge Plan in England, which is being imitated in Australia—the plan heralded by the press as a masterpiece. That plan is the biggest and cruelest piece of political bluff put over in this war. It is a denial of all our facts and experience, and I think that every man and woman should do their utmost to prevent a repetition of similar methods here.

Before this war started the motor manufacturers in England said that even if they gave away motor cars for nothing, the majority of families could not afford to run them; the suppliers of electricity said the same about all-electric homes. Eminent medical experts stated that the people had not enough money to buy sufficient health-giving foods. And, on the top of all this authoritative and official evidence, the Beveridge Plan is hatched to take more money OUT of the wage-earner's pay envelope to pay for what is termed "social

"On Our Selection" In Alberta New Land-Tenure System Aids Settlers

Mr. H. E. Tanner, Alberta's Minister of Lands and Mines, explained the system of land tenure in that Canadian province at a recent meeting. He said that through the operation of the Alberta Government's farm land tenure system, put into effect under Premier Aberhart's guidance, new settlers are being assisted to put their land into production without cost. They pay rent only on the basis of a percentage of the ACTUAL crop production.

The plan has been so successful in the past three years that many other Canadian provinces and parts of the United States have asked to have its workings explained to them.

Under the old system, settlers were given title to any 160 acres of homestead land, providing they lived on the land for certain periods each year and made certain cultivation requirements. Settlers were not given assistance in locating good producing land. When they "filed" on the homesteads, they were required to pay taxes whether the land was of a productive nature or not. Many of the early settlers lost their homesteads, after working them for several years, because they were unable to pay the back taxes.

The present plan went into effect in 1939, and, under it, land is usually leased for twenty years, with arrangements for renewals. Applicants must be British

subjects, eighteen years or older, who do not own any other land. They sign an agreement to live on the land for at least six months each year, and to erect a dwelling costing at least 200 dollars within five years. They also must agree to meet cultivation requirements by breaking and seeding.

Rents and taxes are paid by the settler giving one-eighth of the crop. IF THE YIELD IS LESS THAN FIVE BUSHELS PER ACRE, NO RENT OR TAX MONEY IS COLLECTED. Thus no arrears of rentals or taxes could ever accumulate as a result of poor crops.

Since the new system went into operation 309 leases have been given by the provincial government. Mr. Tanner added that the plan would be of great value when the war is over and thousands of men return to the province wishing to settle on the land.

security"! And this plan is termed "brilliant" and "masterful" and the work of a great man! This is a sample of Planning by a "Brains Trust"—I nearly said by a "Brain Storm." It is a sample of the "Brave New World" to come!

Before this war the main task of the chief administrative brains behind Big Business was to curtail and destroy production. Most of the great monopolies in the world today were formed to try and reduce the tremendous flow of goods to the people. This was done by buying out small firms and buying up inventions. Governments did the same thing by means of Marketing Boards. All had the same object in view: the partial destruction of production and the productive system: by actual sabotage, by not using new inventions, and by making prices unprofitable—especially for the farmers.

Now what does all this mean? It means that the problem of production of the necessities and amenities of life for you and me has been solved—solved for all time. It means that there is no reason why you should have to worry about the economic future of your family. There is more than sufficient for everybody, and very much more can be made available if need be; and there are men and women in plenty whose only desire is to make everything you desire available to you.

In the past, every Government in Australia, England and America had refused to guarantee profitable prices to farmers because of the flood of produce that would

follow. By keeping prices unprofitable, production is cut down and people are kept struggling to make ends meet. In America, the Government actually paid farmers for not growing food. And that is the principal function of Marketing Boards—to pay producers for not growing food.

No, the question of production is not our problem after this war; the real problem is one of distribution, of getting the goods and services to the people—which is a question of getting sufficient money into the hands of the people.

Since the question of Freedom—which means the right to choose our own way of life—depends on the productive power of the community, then we can say that the problem has been solved. The mere fact, however, that we have not got freedom to choose our own way of life shows that the productive system is being used for some purpose other than merely providing us with the things we need.

The economic system, and the fight to get a job and to retain it, occupies far too great a portion of our daily lives. The immense part these things play is out of all proportion to the need; the facts do not justify them occupying so great a portion of our time, energy and thought.

In Russia, where there was no industrial system worth talking about, the whole population had to be set to build one. Their need was different to ours; their problem was a different problem. Failure to understand

(Continued on page 4.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Mr. Magnuson, chairman of the U.S. House Committee of Naval Affairs, has unfolded a master-plan covering "the use of Pacific bases as filling-stations for a big Pacific fleet, and for American trade with the Orient after the war." He also stated that "use of bases equipped by U.S. in Australia would be continued after the war." (Can it be that new "spheres of influence" are already fixed?) Commenting on this the New York "Herald Tribune" points out that "the acquisition of bases in Allied territory cannot be wholly reassuring to our Allies." Of course, one advantage of U.S. fixing post-war boundaries and "spheres of influence," in advance is that it would almost eliminate the need for a peace conference when the Axis is defeated!

SOVIET STAND: Mr. T. C. Davis, High Commissioner for Canada, provides more information to explain Russia's remarkable resistance to the Nazis. In addition to previously-mentioned enormous supplies from Britain and U.S., he says that Canada provided 900 tanks, large quantities of military clothing, shiploads of vital metal, 2000 universal carriers, 22 million rounds of ammunition, and a million dollars' worth of medical supplies. This indicates the tough proposition presented to Hitler by the enormous population of Russia, using the superior productive-capacity of "capitalistic" industries, supplemented, of course, by Russia's own war-production.

FRUIT AND FINANCE: Sydney kindergartens and day-nurseries report that fruit prices are so high that they are unable to give the children essential vitamin foods. Some nurseries had to cut the ration to half, while others had to cut out fruit altogether; even tomatoes as a substitute being, as explained, also prohibitive. That's the way the story was told by the daily press. It will be noticed that the "too dear" angle was emphasised. Presumably, the fruit was available, but the nurseries did not have enough money with which to purchase the available fruit. Too much emphasis is placed on the "too dear" idea, and not sufficient stress on the artificial and arbitrary lack of money.

CHINESE CLUE: In her appeal to the U.S. Congress, Madame Chiang Kai-shek furthered the bankers' "Federal Union" appeal for a post-war world police-force, and also declared that "Russia had sent substantial aid to China, including planes, before she became hard-pressed by Germany's attack." The daily press stated that as a result of her address Congress was swayed, but decided that the present war policy could not be altered—which indicates only a very slight sway.

GOLD GOSSIP: The announced inter-Allied currency conference indicates that the post-war gold standard fight has commenced. One paper comments thus: "Any arrangement will have to satisfy U.S. on the role of gold in the post-war monetary system. One idea widely discussed is that U.S. may lease-lend her surplus gold to Continental countries having little or no gold." Side by side with the attempt to foist the gold standard back on the people is the world-government plot (Federal Union). The two issues constitute the basis of the international bankers' New Order.

COMMUNIST CAPERS: Mr. Cremean, Deputy Leader of the Victorian Labor Party,

discussing Communists' overtures to the Labor Party, said: "Australian workers will not readily forget that when British workers and their wives and children were being bombed to death by the Nazis, Australian Communists were referring to the war as a filthy imperialist slaughter, advocating surrender to the Fascists and sabotaging the local war effort in every manner that their ingenuity could devise." It will be interesting to note the Communists' reply to these undeniable charges.

FROZEN FINANCE: Federal Treasurer Chifley recently informed us that the private trading banks now had £61 millions "frozen" in a special chamber at the Commonwealth Bank—at 15%. If a butcher had 61 million carcasses in a refrigerator, and they mysteriously "increased" at that percentage rate, he would obtain 457,500 extra carcasses each year. Of course, the butcher would have to BUY his 61 million carcasses, but the banks CREATED "their" £61 millions. Inspecting the refrigerator, the carcasses would be real and discernible; but the bankers' frozen millions consist merely of figures in ledgers, to which the interest figures are added.

SUN SPOTS: Professor Tchijevsky, a Russian scientist, states that observations for hundreds of years have proved that freak weather and warfare go hand in hand. Whilst serving in the last war "he noticed that increased activity on the battlefield coincided with dark spots on the sun's face." Although nothing can be done about this matter, it is interesting to recall that during the depression, which coincided with the bankers' "call-up" of overdrafts, we were informed by our economists that it also coincided with sun-spots. But economists are not scientists, of course.

POWER PLAGUE: A plague of power-lusters infests politics, industry, transport, and propaganda. Now comes the proposal of more power for the Lord Mayor, to permit him "to invoke police aid against any member of the Council who defies his orders." It is worth noting that, paradoxically enough, those who advocate these Gestapo tactics loudly denounce Hitlerism! It will indeed be a new note when the Mayor starts giving orders to the councillors elected by the ratepayers.

BANKERS' BAILIFFS: Figures supplied to the Federal Parliament by the Taxation Department (bankers' collection agency) disclose that unpaid taxes to June 30, 1942, amounted to over £13 millions. Perhaps this position encouraged the daily press to commit the misdemeanour of publishing the names of persons alleged to be

(Continued on Page 4.)

THE TRUTH ABOUT CONSCRIPTION

(Continued from last issue.)

The No-Conscription Campaign (Room 4, Savoy Theatre Buildings, Russell St., Melbourne) has issued a four-page pamphlet which, in our opinion, should be read by YOUR friends, workmates, etc. (Copies may be obtained by sending a 2/6 stamp to the foregoing address.) We congratulate the author, Mr. Maurice Blackburn, M.H.R., on its clearness and comprehensiveness—although we would qualify one or two of his statements (e.g., on trade unions) without detracting from his case against conscription. As the title ("Against Conscription—Forty Questions Answered") indicates, the presentation is in the form of questions and answers. It was written before the passing of Curtin's "Militia Bill." This week we reprint the second half of it—

24. Q.: Is it not better to fight Japan out of Australia than to fight her in Australia?

A.: Yes, and there is no difficulty in getting men to fight Japan. But Australia has to be secured against invasion and, if possible, against attack. Suppose that we send most of our available men away against Japan, what do you expect Japan to do? Are the Japanese going to hurry off home and hide there till our bombers reach their cities?

25. Q.: Well, what do you think Japan would do?

A.: Naturally, she would attack us and try to prevent Australia being used as a base from which men and materials could be poured out against her. Whether we send men as volunteers or conscripts we run that risk. But while we keep section 49 of the Defence Act unaltered we shall be sure that there is in Australia for the defence of Australia a force strong enough to prevent invasion, if not to ward off attack. It is agreed that while Australia may be fairly easily attacked by air, invasion in the face of strong resistance is not easy.

26. Q.: What do you say about America? She is helping us. Are not you anti-conscriptionists ungrateful to her?

A.: No question of gratitude arises. We value America's friendship, but friendship did not bring Americans to Australia. Without the surprise of Pearl Harbour and the loss of the Philippines we might never have seen the Americans. Australia is a convenient base for operations against Japan. That fact and not friendship brought Americans here.

27. Q.: But, of course, what you are saying is the opinion of selfish and disloyal people who don't care for anything but Australia. Don't you admit that?

A.: No. It is the opinion of most men who are willing to think and candid enough to say what they think. Major General G. J. Rankin, M.H.R., is a distinguished soldier of the last war. On 2nd July, 1941, he said: "Personally, I do not believe in conscription. During the last war I did not vote for it, and specific reasons have prompted me to adopt this attitude. For example, a general in battle will take the best weapon that comes to his hand, and will use it again and again. If Australia had four divisions in the field with an unlimited supply of reinforcements they would be employed repeatedly, and this country would be bled white." (Hansard, Vol. 167, page 765.) And what General Rankin said applies with equal force to the war in the Pacific.

28. Q.: But why make all this fuss about military conscription when men are already conscripted to work?

A.: It is true we have industrial conscription within Australia and its Territories. But this new proposal will extend industrial conscription as well as military conscription. Men can be compelled to work within the area of military conscription. Men can now be compelled to fight in Australia and her Territories; and they can be compelled to work in Australia and her territories. That is because behind the Order to Work is the threat to call up for military service the man who gives trouble. The Government can say as it has often said, "Don't stop work. If you do we'll make you fight."

29. Q.: Why should not the Government say that?

A.: Because that is depriving the working class of the protection and support of its trade unions and trying to deal with working men as single individuals. That is what the worker has been resisting all the time. He has no strength except as a member of a well-organised union, and industrial conscription is a plan for getting at him by himself and putting pressure on him.

30. Q.: Why do we want to worry about the Unions? Where would they be if the Japs. came here?

A.: Where would the workers be without their unions? The unions are trustees for posterity. They represent not only their present members, but also the generations of workers who will succeed those present members. Suppose we resisted Japan and, in the process, destroyed trade unionism, where do you think the workers would be? Everything that the workers of Australia have got they owe to their trade unions.

31. Q.: Well, how does Mr. Curtin's proposal make industrial conscription worse?

A.: If men can be sent to fight overseas far from Australia, workers can be called up to serve overseas far from Australia. Every worker will do his work feeling all the time,

"I must keep quiet. I must not offend my boss or the Government. If I am not careful I may be sent out of Australia, and I cannot risk that." The threat of military conscription makes industrial conscription possible. Extend military conscription and you extend industrial conscription, too. . .

32. Q.: All this leaves me feeling that you think the stay-at-home worker more valuable than the soldier?

A.: That is a wrong impression. The soldier is a worker, too. When the war is over ex-soldiers will be returning to work and looking to their unions to protect and support them. If we let trades-unionism rot away now will the soldier thank us?

33. Q.: I have been reading that you people think conscription will destroy freedom of conscience?

A.: Yes; what applies to the trade unionists applies more strongly to a man who, unsupported by a mass of loyal fellow-workers, makes a stand for what he thinks is right.

34. Q.: Do you draw a distinction between compulsion for military service in Australia and compulsion for service overseas?

A.: Yes. Though I dislike all forms of military compulsion, I think there is a real distinction here. Until 1916 England always drew a line between compulsion to serve at home and compulsion to serve abroad. Compulsion for home service was the English law from time immemorial, but men could not be compelled to serve overseas. As I have shown, Canada, South Africa, and Australia have drawn the line. Before the war of 1914-1918, only five European countries imposed conscription for service abroad. They were France, Germany, Italy, Spain and Portugal. (Answer by Lord Robert Cecil, Foreign Secretary, in the House of Commons on 14th October, 1915.)

35. Q.: Is this difference based upon any principle?

A.: I think so. It is human nature to resist an aggressor. Upon whatever excuse he comes into your country the invader comes as an enemy. Nature and reason call upon all but a tiny minority to resist. The Laws of War recognise this and now provide that, if the people of a territory not under occupation by the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading troops those people are to be regarded as belligerents provided that they carry arms openly and themselves respect the laws of war. (See the article on "The Laws of War" in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (14th Ed.), Vol. 13.) This rising is called the *Levee en Masse*. Though untrained and unorganised, members of the *Levee* must be treated as soldiers and combatants. Before the *Levee en Masse* was recognised, the Laws of War insisted that citizens should abstain from fighting and leave resistance to the regular soldiers.

36. Q.: What is the difference in principle between fighting the Japs here and fighting them overseas?

A.: Here the soldier can be sure that he is fighting the Japs. But overseas he can be used just as the military authorities order. He may not be used against Japanese.

37. Q.: Then you must think it wrong to volunteer for service overseas?

A.: No. The volunteer has a free will and knows what he is doing. He knows that he must obey all orders and thinks it right to do so.

38. Q.: You would never have compulsion for any purpose?

A.: Again, No. To compel a man to do

"B"/B.C. VERDICT

In the House of Commons recently Mr. Austin Hopkinson asked the Minister of Information whether he was aware that an hon. Member of the House, at the request of the B.B.C., prepared a script for a Sunday night "Postscript" broadcast, "the said script being a careful paraphrase of the Sermon on the Mount, and that it was rejected on three grounds: firstly, that it was Fascist; secondly, that it was anti-working-class; thirdly, that it was anti-Christian?"

Mr. Bracken did not know of the case mentioned, "but the B.B.C. is strongly opposed to repetition."

DINNER WITH STALIN

In Quentin Reynold's book, "Only the Stars Are Neutral," which is a record of the war travels of that accomplished American journalist, he describes a dinner with Stalin during the first siege of Moscow when food was very scarce in the Capital of the Proletariat. There were twenty-three courses, including several kinds of caviar, the rarest of mushrooms fried in sour cream, sturgeon in champagne, and pilaf of quail. The drinks were red wine, white wine, champagne and white vodka, yellow vodka and red vodka with peppers in it.

what he thinks wrong is evil. It is unnatural to take human life and many people think that homicide can never be justified. On that ground, thousands of people want to abolish capital punishment. Sometimes, by creating order, compulsion gives greater freedom. Pedestrians and motorists move with greater freedom under the restrictions of the traffic code than they would if there were no control. The trade unionist is, for all that matters, freer than the unorganised worker. Minimum wage laws and early closing provisions mean more and not less liberty.

39. Q.: You spoke just now about the tiny minority who think it wrong to resist invasion. What about their freedom of will and conscience?

A.: It should be protected. Men who think that way should be free from war service or work of any kind, but should be required to do useful civil work under civilian direction, such as cutting firewood, growing vegetables, working in civilian hospitals, and so on.

40. Q.: Having gone so far, ought we not accept conscription now and make up our minds never to have it again?

A.: That is just what we cannot do. In the last war, Britain, America and New Zealand tried conscription for the first time for overseas service in a War to end War. They have conscription now as a matter of course. If conscription is enforced here, we shall never be able to resist it again. Our Australian tradition of No Conscription will be destroyed and the struggle against militarism will never be renewed. If we yield now, our men will be fighting as conscripts overseas in every future war. The schoolboy of to-day will be the conscript of the next war. So long as overseas forces cannot be raised except by voluntary enlistment there is a check on aggressive war. Unless it can persuade people of the justice of its war, a warring government will not get recruits. But once accept compulsion for overseas service and the merits of the war will be no-one's concern. All that will matter will be that war has been declared, and from the moment of its declaration, until the last shot is fired, the military power will be supreme.

ABERDEEN ACTIVITIES

Social Credit has never lacked supporters at Aberdeen. It is an open secret that the defeat of the Duchess of Atholl in the parliamentary bye-election which she fought shortly before the war was due to their well-directed efforts in association with the electors' strong objection to a nominee who did not represent their policy. The formation of an Aberdeen Douglas Social Credit Association in affiliation with the Social Credit Secretariat is a development probably more closely related to the present political situation in Scotland than to any need for formalities.

Scotland has not taken so kindly to bureaucratic encroachment under cover of the war as have England and Wales. England has a large number of political prisoners, many of whom it is often said, do not know why they are in prison. It is whispered that a higher proportion of Scottish political prisoners know why they are in prison.

Professor Lindley Fraser's anti-social credit article in "World Review" was followed by an article in the "Banker" by Lord Roseberry (grandson of Baron Meyer de Rothschild), inviting Scotland to become a "marshalling-yard" (to use an expression now familiar) for goods en route from the U.S.A. to Europe. Newspapers as widely separated as Eastbourne and Edinburgh have suddenly become interested in the financing of the Guernsey Market; and the "Scotsman" has broken a long abstinence by printing an address delivered in Edinburgh on Social Credit. Following upon Lord Roseberry's patriotic effort the Duke of Montrose (q.v. any good Scots History) has called for devolution. N.B.: there is no need to contradict the rumour that the Duke shares the imprisonment of the Scots nationalist Douglas Young, because no one would dream of starting such a rumour in Scotland, and it couldn't spread.) Pieces of the Montrose once decorated the walls of Aberdeen. And so. . . .

—The "Social Crediter."

THE PURPOSE OF EDUCATION

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

The subject of post-war education has, of late, been given some prominence in the daily press. While a lot of nonsense has been talked about "unselfish democratic citizenship," and "knowledge of the fundamental learning processes," nothing has been said about the real purpose of education, and the manner in which the private banking system has made our present education system nothing more than a moulding machine to fit individuals to compete for work, the mainstay of the present barbarous economic system of artificial rewards and punishments.

Mr. Seitz, Victorian State Director of Education, is concerned about medical and dental services being extended for all State school children. Personally, I am of the opinion that the idea of children being dependent upon a State-controlled institution for medical and dental attention is one to be resisted. Parents should be so economically secure—i.e., have access to an adequate supply of money tickets—that they can have their children attended as they think fit. But neither Mr. Seitz nor his fellow "educationalists" are very concerned about the all important subject of money; what it is, who makes it, and why it is kept in short supply.

Mr. Thomas, secretary of the Victorian Teachers' Union, is pleased to inform us that the average American goes to school longer, and is better educated, than the average Australian. Let me ask Mr. Thomas and all our other great educationalists one question:

What is the purpose of education? Surely there can be no denying the fact that education is merely a means to an end, the end being the knowledge of real facts about the society in which we live, knowledge of how to control institutions for the benefit of the individual. And real education must necessarily be voluntary. We can only judge education on results. Where are these results which, if Mr. Thomas's ideas about education are correct, we should see in America? Does the average individual in America live a fuller, freer and more secure life than the average individual in Australia? He does not. America's social and economic conditions, compared with the potentialities of American production, have been probably the worst in the world. Judged by results, America's education system has failed. Going to school longer will not affect the economic conditions of the nation one iota. More youths may learn more technical work, which only means that there are more competitors for technical jobs. The present education system moulds the individual to compete for work under a system which says: no work, no money. Real education, concerned with realities, would deal with the following questions: Does the production system exist to serve individuals with goods, or does it exist to provide work for everyone? Can the present production machine, operated by a small group of keen experts, working reasonable hours, provide sufficient goods for the whole population? Why aren't sufficient money tickets given, as a birthright, to every individual in the community, irrespective of whether he "works" or not?

Much more could be said on this matter, but it should not be necessary. State-controlled education is a thing to be feared in the coming era of socialism. The planners and others who rave about "privilege"

are opposed to the public schools. While, as I will show, the public schools teach as much nonsense as the State schools, the idea of parents being so economically secure that they can send their children to a school of their own choice is preferable to State-controlled institutions. The ideal should be to ensure that every family can do this. However, as Mr. Darling, headmaster of Geelong Grammar, pointed out in December of last year, excessive taxation is crippling middle and upper class families to the extent that the attendance at public schools must suffer. This is all part of the "levelling down" process. Mr. Darling did not mention why taxation is excessive. The public schools, like the State schools, uphold the taboos which must finally destroy them. Nowhere is this more clearly perceived than in the teaching of official history, a history which was deliberately falsified early in the eighteenth century in order that that alien institution, the Bank of England, and the resultant debt-and-taxation system, might become an accepted and "normal" thing. No orthodox historian of to-day dare point out that Professor Thorold Rogers, outstanding British historian of last century, proved beyond doubt that, commensurate with productivity, potential and actual, conditions in the middle ages in England were better than conditions in the nineteenth century. And, relatively, things have deteriorated since then. Orthodox historians ignore the cancer introduced into England as the result of the Revolution of 1688; they actually teach us that the blow against the Monarchy and the introduction of the Dutch Jews and their debt-racket was a great help to Britain's subsequent development. The Jew, Disraeli, in his book, "Sybil," left no doubt about the real history of what happened. He gave us history which no student, even if he stay at school for twenty years, will ever learn.

No, the proposed "reforms" in "education" are, like most "reforms" now being introduced by the "State-worshippers," steps toward greater tyranny. These "reforms" propose to make us all dependent on the "State"—the "State" being the bankers and their servants, the bureaucratic dictators.

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 1/6d. (4/6 per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 6d. Postage 1/6d. (6/6 per dozen, post free.)

"New Times"

Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home every week are as follows:—

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. (HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.).

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

THE 1943 METHODIST CONFERENCE

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

Sir,—Compared with previous years, the 1943 Methodist Conference, which has just been completed in Melbourne, showed signs of progress. Although the signs were so remote that they could be likened to those of the first cloud at the time of the flood, they were, nevertheless, heartening. One of the things that have caused me so much amazement is the way in which so many of the men who profess to speak for God cling to so much of the hocus pocus which prevents God from being served. Men occupying high places in Methodism are no exception, and they carry a heavy responsibility for the needless suffering of mankind.

On Friday, February 26, the afternoon session of the Conference was devoted to a "discussion" on the subject of "Post-war Reconstruction." In the first half of the period allotted, attention was given to the economic and political aspects of the "problem." Addresses were given by Professor H. A. Woodruff and Dr. R. C. Johnson. Professor Woodruff is an elderly man, and undoubtedly has made some effort to disentangle himself from the absurdities of the past. He said a lot of things that did him credit, but spoiled his address by repeating the lie that over-production had been responsible for our community difficulties in the period between the two wars. Any man who could allow himself to talk of over-production of goods when people were dying of starvation, children suffering malnutrition, and half the population of England were underfed is simply admitting that he parrots what others say and is not a genuine thinker. It was the people's inability to PURCHASE the production that was the trouble, and that is entirely a matter of finance. Why did he put the soft pedal on that part of the piece?

Dr. Johnson is the principal of Queen's Theological College, at the Melbourne University. He recently came from overseas, and is much younger than Professor Woodruff. He, too, said some courageous things, but, unfortunately, repeated ideas of doubtful veracity, and placed emphasis on the wrong aspect. For example, he declared that a radical change of heart and spirit is the first necessity in any satisfactory reconstruction after the war. Such a statement implies that the world's troubles come from shortcomings in the heart and spirit of the ordinary man and woman, but somehow I can never get from the men who make such statements a clear indication of what is actually wrong with the present hearts and spirits. Let a calamity or a sudden emergency arise in a community and we immediately see men and women of all sections of society completely disregarding their own convenience, even their own personal safety, hurrying forward to help those threatened or in distress. The fact is that most people have good hearts, and spirits, and what appears otherwise in them is but the reflection of the conditions in which they are compelled to live. Those conditions, in nine cases out of ten, are imposed by FINANCE. The ordinary people did not cause the war, and they were not even consulted about it. They were put into it. They are similarly put into poverty and degradation. If this be so (and it IS so), then the subject calling for first attention is FINANCE, which Dr. Johnson did not even mention.

But the most extraordinary part of the session was the so-called "discussion." The truth is that discussion was not permitted. As was to be expected, Rev. T. C. Rentoul, head of the chaplains' department, was the first to speak after Dr. Johnson. He holds the rank of Major-General in the Forces, and his is quite an influential voice in Methodist circles. That being so, I expected

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

"Victory—Then What?"—This little pamphlet, full of extremely valuable quotations on finance, and compiled by John Hogan, is available from this office at 4d. per copy.

A New Leaflet: "More Money Does Not Make More Munitions," based on one of the above quotations, is now available. Send in without delay.

Fighting Forces Protection League: We are pleased to assist the above movement, and announce that demand-letters, protesting against tax on deferred pay for soldiers, are obtainable from our office.

The Secretary desires to thank the president, members and friends for their good wishes, expressed in various ways. I trust that in future I shall be able to do part of what I have been credited with doing in the past. From both of us, thank you. —M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Sec.

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 1½d).

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

him to get down to actualities, but his contribution did him no credit at all. He spoke more for those who have been crucifying humanity than for humanity itself. His remarks amounted to a warning that Britain would not be alone at the Peace Conference in determining the Peace Treaty or the after-war conditions, and that human nature after the war would be the same as it was before the war. He pointed out that Britain was prevented from incorporating her wishes in the last Peace Treaty, but, to my surprise, said not one word to inform this important conference of Methodist ministers of how Britain was prevented. The explanation could have been given in the few brief words of Lloyd George, as follows: "The international Bankers swept statesmen, politicians, jurists, and journalists all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute mon-

archs, who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees." It was the FINANCIERS who issued the orders, and they issued them without any regard whatever for the bodies or the hearts, or the natures or the spirits of men, women, and children the world over. The "temples of God" were nothing to them. Human nature in the sense referred to by Mr. Rentoul had nothing to do with Britain's failure to achieve her peace aims. Why did he fail to tell conference the truth on this vital matter? By withholding the facts he misled his colleagues.

The rest of the "discussion" was limited to remarks by Dr. Sweet, Rev. Cyril Walklate, Dr. Calvert Barber, Rev. Mansley Bennett, and Rev. Palmer Phillips. The only one of these who got to the root of the matter was the Rev. Mansley Bennett. He told the Conference that "when we have solved the Money problem we will be well on the way to the solution of most other problems." It may have been the merest coincidence, but when he reached that point, the president (Dr. Irving Benson) asked him to conclude his remarks! Rev. Palmer Phillips then "summed up" and no one else was permitted to speak. As I listened to the futilities, I wondered whether God laughs or weeps at such demonstrations.

Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne. 7th March, 1943

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor," England.

"The aristocracy of the goyim as a political force is dead—we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens on landed property—in loading land with debts."

(The foregoing quotation is alleged by the People to whom it is attributed to be a "forgery," so we will say that it is one of Grimm's Fairy Tales.)

I suppose that there never was a time when so much nonsense was talked by so many people on so many subjects, as the present. Sober judgment was once the object of respectful attention; but nowadays none is so poor as to do it reverence. The very foundations of considered opinion appear to be undermined; words, in our new "wonderland," mean what we want them to mean, and are used, not so much to conceal our thought as to advertise our determination to dispense with it.

High up on the list of matters on which almost everyone feels competent to give a firm, not to say strident, opinion, noticeably at a time like the present, which one would have imagined to be inopportune, is the subject of "the land." No experience is necessary; in fact, it is a serious handicap; it cramps your style. From the Archbishop of Canterbury, who

ment Department primarily concerned to collect taxes for international bondholders is not progress but reaction.

There are many concrete facts the consideration of which is essential to an appreciation of the threat, not to that system (whose assets are being bought up with paper money at scrap prices), but to the individual Briton, which its disappearance involves. If the delusive word "ownership" can be forgotten for a moment, it will be easy to realise that it was a highly articulated system of administration, developed by trial and error over a long period.

To the agitator (though not to his hidden paymaster) "land" is homogeneous; an acre is an acre whether it is on the slag heaps of Widnes or the High-farming land of the Lothians. Agitation is moulded to justify "office-management" in place of personal responsibility.

One of the first considerations of the old system was to maintain, in the real, not the financial sense, the capital value of the land, and to do this required extraordinarily detailed knowledge of local conditions and custom. The desperate condition of much English arable, which has been "farmed-out" by tenant farmers not properly supervised, and having little anxiety as to their ability to get another of the hundreds of farms on offer, is the direct result of the sabotage of this administrative system.

Now we are hypnotised by the propaganda of the international chemical combines into the belief that soil analysis, chemical fertilisers, and oil-driven farm machinery are far superior, and more "scientific" than the intimate farming of the older order. Not only is there not a particle of genuine evidence for this, but there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Never has there been so much "professorial" farming; and never have agricultural products been so unsatisfactory in quality. Bread which has to be reinforced with drugs; fruit which looks attractive and is both tasteless and lacking in all its old essential virtues (the Phoebe strawberry, the staple export of the Hampshire strawberry beds, looks large and delicious, and tastes like wet cotton wool); fabrics which are showy but neither warm nor durable; chemical beer, wine doctored and prohibitive in price. Progress!

But it is easy, more particularly in wartime, to look upon "the land" as though it were almost entirely an agricultural and production problem, which is the usual misdirection of emphasis fostered by international finance. It is primarily, but not principally, an agricultural problem. It is, I think, a problem which can easily be misapprehended, unless it is considered in intimate relation with the character of the population, as well as its numerical magnitude. For instance, the last pursuit in which the land agitator wishes to engage, is farming, nor do farmers do much agitating.

There are many very curious circumstances surrounding the question of population statistics, and population habits, in Great Britain. William Cobbett was aware of them. They have become still more curious in the last hundred years, as anyone who will take the trouble to consider the figures available in Whitaker's Almanack can see for himself. (All rights reserved. (To be continued.)

THE HAWTHORN MOVEMENT

The next general meeting of the above movement will be held in the Hawthorn Town Hall on Monday evening next March 15. "New Times" readers are cordially invited to attend.

We have received a copy of the Constitution of this newly-formed, non-party movement. We regret that we lack the space, in this issue, to publish it in full; but the following extracts will indicate the nature and objectives of the movement—

"The object of the movement shall be to promote clean politics and secure a functioning democracy in line with Christian principles.

A branch or branches of the movement may be formed in any electorate, and will remain such so long as they adhere to this constitution.

Each electorate branch or branches shall be in association with, but otherwise completely independent of, any other branch or branches in other electorates.

To serve as an authoritative guide to the sitting members [of Parliament] as to the results desired, public opinion shall be mobilised and expressed in each electorate by:

(a) Public and private meetings, lectures, debates, research and study groups at which discussion will be encouraged.

(b) Organised letter-writing campaigns

(c) Co-operation with other bodies with a view to securing specific results.

(d) Publicity campaigns, as authorised by the executive committee.

The sitting member will be supported irrespective of party affiliations, so long as he consistently takes appropriate action in line with clearly expressed public opinion in the electorate.

"Should the sitting member fail to take such action he will lose the support of the movement and the individuals comprising the branch or branches concerned will be free to support such other candidate as they may deem fit.

"Branches shall not, in any circumstances, select or endorse candidates."

FRUITGROWERS PROTEST

There will be a big public meeting at Tyabb, this evening (Friday, March 12), for the purpose of establishing a Mornington Peninsula Primary Producers' Transport Committee, and to take whatever steps the meeting determines to safeguard the various Peninsula primary industries from further Government interference. Fruitgrowers are expected to lodge an emphatic protest against the action of the Liquid Fuel Board in refusing to make available sufficient additional petrol to enable them to satisfactorily market their fruit; although some time ago the Minister for Commerce (Mr. W. J. Scully, M.H.R.), promised them these privileges upon the suspension of the Apple and Pear Board. Now the Liquid Fuel Board refuses Peninsula growers extra petrol and has told growers to either instal gas producers or put their trucks "up on blocks." Growers say that unless they are granted freedom of action by the immediate provision of extra petrol, tyres, etc., many thousands of cases of apples and pears may never be harvested. After a long fight against the Apple and Pear Board, the Federal Government gave growers their liberty to sell when and where they liked. Now they are being prevented from getting to market by another bureaucratic Board. Some few days ago at Tyabb the Transport Board chairman (Mr. Frazer) told growers that further petrol cuts were threatened. Producers would have to instal gas units or go back to horse-drawn vehicles. How on earth, growers ask, could primary produce grown in vast quantities ever be shifted with the available horses and carts?

WISE WORDS

"NO MAN is good enough or wise enough to govern another man without that other's consent."—Abraham Lincoln.

"Freedom is the ability to choose or refuse alternatives as they arise."—C. H. Douglas.

"To know what you prefer, instead of humbly saying 'Amen' to what the world tells you ought to prefer, is to have kept your soul alive."—R. L. Stevenson.

"Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."—Lord Acton (great English historian, formerly Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University).

"Experience keeps a dear school, but some men will learn in no other."—Benjamin Franklin.

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.

THE FEAR OF LEISURE

(Extracts from an address to the Leisure Society, England, by A. R. Orage.)
(Continued from last issue.)

The state and rate of Progress to-day are of such a degree that the alternatives before an increasing fraction of every modern community—apart from the catastrophe of war—are Leisure, as I have defined it (namely, economically guaranteed voluntary activity), and that form of Leisure called Unemployment—a Leisure without security that can more properly be defined as servilely waiting for a servile job.

The striving of Man against Nature has been so successful that unless Leisure is freely distributed, it may eventually be distributed by violence, with disastrous effects ultimately upon Progress itself. Progress, the fruit of Leisure, can hope for nothing but destruction from Unemployment.

We can get at the strength of the resistance to Leisure best, I think, by imagining a Referendum taken on a proposal to distribute Leisure to everybody. The formality of a Referendum itself may be improbable, but the idea is not so wild as you may suppose. For, in effect, an informal Referendum is in process to-day. Everybody who takes the trouble knows that Society now possesses the means to provide an ever-increasing amount of amply guaranteed Leisure to practically everybody. With our present resources alone, a rising standard of living could be guaranteed to our present population working for only a few years of their whole life. Why is there not, then, a universal clamour for it? Why, if even a formal Referendum were taken on the proposal, would it be rejected, as I think it would be rejected, by an overwhelming majority?

You can say, of course, that every kind of influence and pressure would be brought to bear on the voters by the class that now has a monopoly of Credit-power. Agreed; but since that influence would only make itself effective by trading on the fears of the majority, we have to register the fears of the majority as well as the fears of the minority in the total resistance.

Now, precisely what are these fears that inspire in one set of people a murderous resistance, and, in another set, a suicidal resistance to a proposal to distribute Leisure to everybody?

It is not so much the case that they doubt whether it can be done, as that they are indisposed to make sure, by inquiry, of the practical possibility of it. Any competent body of statisticians could demonstrate the amplitude of our resources for a general extension of Leisure. But very few people want the proof, for the simple reason that only a few are willing to draw the reasonable conclusion and to give effect to it.

The fears of the already Leisureed class and the fears of the present Unleisureed "masses" are, however, different in kind; and we have, I think, to distinguish them. Fortunately, we can do it briefly.

The fears of the already Leisureed class can be reduced to these two: fear that they will lose their present privileges, and fear that "the masses" would make a "bad" use of their Leisure.

The fears of the Unleisureed class, on the other hand, can be reduced to simply this—fear that, in a Leisure State, they would have nothing whatever to do. (Incidentally,

I do not agree that the demand for Employment is merely an alias for the demand for goods. I'm afraid that Employment, particularly servile employment, is sought also for its own sake. There is no responsibility for self-initiated activity in it.)

(To be continued.)

A Canadian View of the Housing Problem

We take the following from "To-day and Tomorrow" (Canada):

Current quote: "In My Father's house are many mansions."—John xiv.

But in Canada there are not enough hovels.

Nevertheless, the Housing Controller (Oh, yes, we have one) has "ordered" that no more homes may be built at a 500 dollar and up value without a license. More, he bluntly says that housing development must be "drastically curtailed."

Just fancy, Canadians in a "free" country sitting back and letting a yap of that kind push them around. If this continues, all the mush war songs with lines pertaining to "home" will need amendment. But will the semi-classics stand it? "When You Come Home, Dear" sounds hellish as "When You Return Homeless, Dear." And how about "Barracks, Sweet Barracks," instead of "Home, Sweet Home"?

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT (Lectures and Studies Section)

DIPLOMA OF ASSOCIATE.

The Social Credit Secretariat, England, of which Major C. H. Douglas is Advisory Chairman, has authorised the holding of an examination for the Diploma of Associate.

It is proposed to hold the examination in June, 1943. Entry is open to all at a fee of 10/6, whether enrolled students of the lecture course or not.

Copies of two earlier examination papers may be obtained from the undersigned on receipt of a stamped, addressed envelope.

Registered students are required to enrol for a special course of study based mainly upon 20 lectures supplied by the Social Credit Secretariat. These are available from March 1 onwards. The fee for such lectures is one guinea.

The examination will be held by correspondence, and application to enrol for this should be received by May 10, accompanied by 10/6.

All correspondence in reference to the above should be addressed to: Miss G. Marsden, 6 Harden-road, Artarmon, N.S.W.

BASIC FACTS ABOUT OUR POST-WAR PROBLEMS

(Continued from page 1.)

this is the reason for many of the stupid ideas of our local Communists.

In industry, there is—or should be—scope for the talents of all kinds of men; in industry many men should find a creative outlet for their energies. But to conscript men into industry by fear of starvation is another kettle of fish. As the Archbishop of York recently said: "It is as wrong to starve a man into work as to compel him with a whip."

Boys and girls and men crawl into any kind of a job in order to obtain the right to live; and because of this, they poison the atmosphere of factories, workshops and offices. One conscript among a group of volunteers is a constant source of trouble to everybody concerned.

To take a highly-skilled man, a man of initiative, and to put him on repetition work for the rest of his life is nothing short of cold-blooded murder; to take a man who loves the land and put him in an office is merely producing the type of man we see everywhere to-day—a man who has lost all sense of values, who has lost his initiative and all his creative impulses.

The position we have reached is this:

(1) That the "great" ones of the earth have decreed that nobody shall be permitted to live unless he can wangle himself into a job that has a salary attached to it.

(2) The use of power-driven machinery has reduced enormously the need for human labour.

(3) That if the machinery of the world were permitted to run at full speed everybody would be very well-off, and also they would be independent.

(4) For this reason, the machinery is not

allowed to run at full speed except in war time, and then only in parts.

(5) So that, with the use of power-driven machinery and the restriction of its output, men and women find they cannot get jobs and therefore they have no incomes, and so they are reduced to mendicants dependent on doles.

No statesman in the world to-day has put forward a solution to this problem. The only person who has given us a scientific solution that fits all the facts is Major Douglas—probably the greatest brain of this century. He says that the results of science and invention are the rightful inheritance of all people, and that as machines progressively displace labour, and as the need for human labour decreases, the wages system will break down—is breaking down—and in its place must come a national dividend paid to every man, woman and child. This dividend will keep on increasing, as production increases, so that people will have sufficient money to buy the products of the machine.

If men are assured of an income they will become free men, and uncongenial labour will have to be paid for at attractive wages. Other work will be engaged in, not because of necessity, but because some men like doing it. The change over from a Slave State to a Free State will, of course, be gradual, this being made necessary by the vicious results of our political and financial organisations, which have placed a premium on low cunning and subterfuge. This does not remove the fact that the design for the future must be along the lines suggested—that is, if the world is to be free and democratic.

We hear plenty of talk about the need for change, but the changes we have heard suggested are not changes at all; they are merely the same old mess hotted up and put over by high-pressure salesmen. They are merely suggesting the very same thing we are supposed to be fighting—the centralisation of all power and the monopolies in the hands of a small political clique. The destruction of State Governments is the outward and visible sign of the massed attack of the enemies of democratic Government. You are strongly advised to do everything in your power to counter this attack.

IN BRITAIN'S PARLIAMENT

A Striking Speech on British War Aims

HOUSE OF COMMONS: NOVEMBER 18 DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS:—

Commander Sir Archibald Southby (Epsom)*: . . . I believe that the British people are fighting to preserve the British Empire, and that the sailors, soldiers and airmen who are doing such magnificent work are desirous of preserving the British Empire; but I believe, at the same time, that they and everyone else are determined that when the war is over the British Empire shall be an even greater force for good and peace in the world than it has been in its not inglorious past.

I suppose that if one had to find one word with which to sum up the causes of the war, and indeed the causes of practically all the misery which has come upon the peoples of the world in the past that word would be "intolerance." To-day, reading the speeches and writings of various men and women, some well qualified and some not so well qualified to lay down the law and tell us what we ought to do, I sometimes detect a tendency to be completely intolerant of the views of people who do not agree with them, the views of ordinary people, the "little man" immortalised by Strube, the personification of the opinion of this country.

There are people who seem to think that the war is being waged in order to destroy a social and economic system with which they do not entirely agree. Nothing could be further from the truth than that. We are fighting the war for our bare existence, for the right to live at all. This is a war of the little man, that irresistible force which, in the end, will break every dictator. What will matter when the war is over is not the views of Archbishops, Distinguished Authors, Big Business Men, Trade Union Leaders, Cabinet Ministers, Members of Parliament, Naval Officers or Army Officers—it will be the views of the little man, whose unflinching heroism and undaunted faith will have brought us successfully through the war. His victory, I suggest, will have been in vain if, when the war is over, he is obliterated by the State which he fought to preserve.

The essence of the evil Nazi creed is that the State is greater than any individual. The essence of democracy, as I see it, is that the State is the servant of the individual and not his master. Therefore, let us, at all costs, when we are starting to rebuild the world and to improve it, not impose upon one another a bureaucratic tyranny which is none the less a dictatorship because it masquerades under the name of something which is politely called "democratic planning."

Our hope and belief is that this war will open a path for the advance of mankind to a better world, but if the new world is to be a success it must be, in my opinion, a world in which there is a square deal, and if that means anything it means a square deal, not only for the people who have little and, therefore, perhaps, not many responsibilities, but for those who have much and, therefore, great responsibilities and commitments. A square deal means a square deal for everybody, and not only for one section of the community. Some enthusiasts seem to support the idea that in the post-war world everything must be fairly shared. This is a nice, easy thing to say. If sharing everything means simply equitable distribution and possession, then certainly I do not quarrel with them. But who is to decide what is fair?

Mr. Stokes: Would it be pertinent to suggest that possibly the main point is equality of opportunity?

Sir A. Southby: I quite agree, but let me develop my argument in my own way. Who, for example, is to decide whether a doctor shall receive a greater emolument than a distinguished lawyer? Who is to decide whether the director of a bank is to get more or less than the captain of a battleship? Who is to decide whether the man who digs coal—I pay my tribute to the men who dig coal—is to get more or less than the man who works in agriculture—and I pay my tribute to the man who works in agriculture; it is by no means the easy life that many people seem to think it—or whether an artistic genius who writes or paints is to receive more or less than the leader of a popular dance band, or whether indeed the Archbishop of Canterbury is to receive more or less than Mr. J. B. Priestley, or whether Mr. George Robey, the inimitable and irreplaceable, is to receive more or less than either the Archbishop of Canterbury or Mr. Priestley?

Up to date it has been the community which has, in effect, decided what everyone is to receive for his or her effort or talent. [Interruption.] I knew that that would provoke dissent, but it is my view. I know the community has made many mistakes. For example, under the present system Miss Shirley Temple, charming though she may be, receives a much greater emolument than my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister. In the main, the system has not worked too badly. But there is something which no amount of planning will ever do away with and that is the law of supply and demand. You may regulate supply, and you may regulate demand, but in the end they must both remain. I do not know that it would be an improvement if the organisation of reward was decided, not by the general consensus of community opinion, but by some bureaucrat sitting in Whitehall, after he

*The seventeen lines allotted to Sir Archibald Southby's speech in the "Times" Parliamentary Report referred exclusively to his remarks on Admiral Darlan and the French Fleet which formed less than one-seventh of his speech as reported in "Hansard."

had, perhaps, taken a Gallup poll. Incidentally, I do not know that I have ever met a Member of Parliament who has been asked a question by a Gallup poll or has met anyone else who has; but this bureaucrat would, no doubt, decide who was to receive how much.

If the world after the war is to be a world of happiness and liberty, it will have to be built by common-sense men and women and not by visionary cranks. The danger that I see in planning is that there is too much visionary crankiness about. I believe we are all united in the desire to build a good, stable, splendid world when the war is over, but already we are hearing ominous talk about things like the conscription of youth—[An Hon. Member: "From the Tories!"]—from the Tories. That has a nasty, ominous ring to me. This is the age of youth, and we shall need all the fire and enthusiasm which youth can bring to the task of rebuilding the world. Therefore, we owe it to the young people who are going to follow us to see to it that they are not driven into some soulless, Government-controlled youth movement in order to satisfy the lust for importance and power of some bureaucrat in a Whitehall office.

It seems to me that the people who talk loudest about post-war equality are those who deny the right of anyone who disagrees with them to share in the planning of the new world, but I am certain of one thing, and it gives me great hope and courage. If the little man, who is the embodiment of British common sense and sanity, is capable, as he is, of destroying Hitler and Mussolini and all their works, he is quite capable, when the war is over, of destroying bureaucracy. He says, in effect, in the words of Geoffrey Dobbs:

"We who in the ashes dwell
Want no planned and ordered hell
Fight no wars to be policed
When the bombs and fires have ceased
Life's too precious far to give
For any freedom but to live."

What is the Difference?

To-day all cabalistic and subversive movements are oriented towards World Federal Union, and instinctively we ask what is the difference between this and Lenin's dream of a "World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics"?—From "The Patriot" (Canada).

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

in arrears and, in some cases, to have made false returns. This action may also be a form of blackmail to stimulate payment. It is definitely a misdemeanor to publish charges likely to prejudice any impending legal action. As yet the bankers' tax agency has not completely usurped the functions of the courts, but it is not for the want of trying.

MONEY MESMERISM: More bankers' inflation propaganda can be seen in the press reports that "money is fleeing from Germany," and that more and more people are trying to get rid of their money. If this is true it indicates that the German bankers' tax gatherers have a lot to learn from ours. The practice here is firstly to increase commodity prices by indirect taxes, then step-up direct taxation, and, as an extra safeguard, workers' wages are garnisheed by the employers, who act as honorary tax gatherers for the bankers (with the Government as an intermediary).

RUSSIAN RESERVES: Commenting on the Russians' colossal drive and reserves, a London special correspondent says: "Although the Russians are making a supreme effort for a final decision, it is not generally known that Germany is making an equally super effort to hold on without having to call on the substantial reserves set aside for the summer offensive." Consequently, he expects the Russian agitator for a "second" front to be greater than ever.

TOMATO TROUBLE: Following the criminal bungling that resulted in the loss of thousands of pears, we are now informed that thousands of cases of tomatoes are rotting at Shepparton. The press reports on this scandal say that "without exception all classes claimed that the man power authorities are responsible for this colossal blunder." War time, above all times, should not permit bungling officials to remain in positions of authority. And yet these bungling socialistic theorists are permitted to proceed from blunder to blunder. It is surely time these men were removed to where they could not endanger our war-effort's very foundation—i.e., food supplies.

—O.B.H.

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

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS