

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF
WORLD FEDERATION
(Page 2)

NZ. LABOR MP. ATTACKS
GOVT. FINANCIAL
POLICY. (Page 2)

FRUSTRATION OF MOTOR
FUEL PRODUCTION.
(Page 3)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 9 No. 19 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 14 1943

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

Now, when our
land 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).

Do Consumers Want Factories or Goods? Ownership or Control?

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

The creation of the new Party, the Commonwealth Party, in Great Britain, again brings before the public the old subject of "common ownership" of the means of production. Most of those who talk about nationalising the means of production have little conception of present economic arrangements. They suffer from the delusion that ownership and control are synonymous terms. Nothing could be further from the truth, as a look at a few simple facts will quickly reveal.

Before dealing with private ownership, let us look at the two biggest actual examples of "common ownership" that we have in Australia: the Postal Department and the Railways. I would be very pleased if some Socialist or Communist could outline some practical scheme whereby we can control what we are told we own. Although we "commonly own" the postal services and the railways, we are being forced to pay higher postage charges, while every time we buy a railway ticket we are robbed to pay interest bills to financial interests which may not own the railways, but which control them as regards vital matters of policy. It might also be mentioned that the "commonly owned" Australian Broadcasting Commission is not concerned about the people who disagree with the present financial policy operating in this country.

The fact cannot be denied that every institution now "commonly owned" in this

country is, in one way or another, pursuing a policy detrimental to the welfare of the people. What folly, then, to talk about "common ownership" of everything! What we want is more control of the policy of all institutions and productive units.

In case some people think that the private owners of the means of production—the terrible capitalists!—have much real control over their programmes of production, it is as well to remember that thousands of these "capitalists" went bankrupt during the last depression. Most of them are hopelessly mortgaged to the private banks. They are dependent upon markets for their very existence. What is a market? It is simply a number of people with money, ticket claims to wealth, in their pockets. Whoever regulates the supply of tickets controls the people and the "capitalists."

The controllers of the supply of tickets are the private banks, the institutions

where our money tickets are manufactured. The banks do not own industry, but they control it through their monopoly of the manufacture of money. The basic problem before the people is to take action to ensure that they alone shall control production by having an adequate supply of money-votes in their possession.

No Socialist can give one example of people with sufficient money being unable to get unrestrained private enterprise to provide them with their requirements. Privately owned production units have demonstrated that they can provide goods in abundance. They have demonstrated that they will produce what people vote for with their money tickets.

This talk of "common ownership" of production units is misleading nonsense. What we urgently require is consumer-

control of industrial policy. That means ensuring that citizens must be issued with regular and adequate supplies of effective money tickets. To do this we must take the control of industry out of the hands of the private banks, who are not concerned about production units serving consumers. They are only concerned with using production units as taxing agencies for ensuring that interest payments are met.

The sole purpose of production is consumption. Join in the growing demand that every citizen be issued with a monetary dividend; a dividend which will allow him to partake of the super-abundance which can easily be produced after the war. Refuse to be side-tracked with this nonsense about "common ownership." It is a bankers' trap.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

An indication of the carefully conditioned mind is apparent in the following statement by economist Coombs to the New York State Chamber of Commerce: "Australia's post war conditions are DEPENDENT on the United States." Judging from this mental attitude a decision in favour of the bankers' Gold Standard Plot seems assured—unless the people of Australia instruct their Members of Parliament that they refuse to be committed to it. As a matter of cold logic it should be rather obvious that Australia's post-war conditions depend on the abundant physical resources of THIS country—NOT on pieces of yellow metal at Fort Knox, Kentucky, nor other overseas irrelevancies.

"GESTAPO" GANGS. The Melbourne "Sun" of May 3 reports Mr. E. J. Ward, M.H.R., as "justifying" the man-power raids on private citizens simply because a few executives of war undertakings have allegedly been discovered in some of the public places raided. The same issue of the "Sun" reported further activities of the press-gang at Richmond, where several car-loads of men were arrested and taken to the police station, in much the same way as Hitler is treating the conquered people of France. Continuing, the report stated that during the previous two weeks the raiders had also visited a number of lodging houses. It won't be long before the churches and private homes are "on the list."

GOLD STANDARD. Concerning the bankers' plot to impose the gold standard on an unsuspecting world, London currency experts (bankers' agents) believe that the U.S. "Unitas" and the British "Bancor" proposals are not irreconcilable. Since the difference of name is the biggest difference, that's not surprising; but another development has occurred—Mexico has returned to the gold standard so far as her internal currency is concerned. The fate of the Mexicans emphasises the need for Australian electors to get busy now, instructing their Federal members to resist any such proposal being imposed on Australia.

LEGAL LAMENT. Mr. Justice Herron of the Supreme Court recently ruled that "a person escaping enrolment for military service for 12 months" could not be punished. The judge, who is, of course, supposed to be unbiased and to administer the law, not to criticise it, commented that he gave a ruling "with reluctance, because it permitted an evasion of military duty." That is, he regretted giving the verdict to the accused. His mental attitude is obviously far from impartial, and is not likely to inspire confidence in the judiciary or to maintain the prestige of British legal tradition.

TAFT'S TACTICS. The much-criticised U.S. Senator, Taft, has increased his unpopularity with the press and the world-planners by introducing two resolutions requiring the Office of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs to file with the Senate copies of all propaganda circulated in foreign countries and among the armed forces. He insists that the people be kept informed of promises made on their behalf. No wonder he is unpopular! We could go even further and insist that Australia shall not be committed to international intrigues without the people's consent.

SPENDER SPEAKS. Mr. Spender, M.H.R., who usually spends his energies on financial jargon and bankers' inflation bogies, for once dealt with important matters when, as reported in the press of April 22, he condemned the manpower bureaucrats thus: "The complexion of society is fast assuming the same colour, on matters affecting the liberty of the subject, as that of enemy countries. We have surrendered our powers to the executive, who, in turn, have surrendered them to people not responsible to Parliament." This admission raises the question, "Who instructed the surrender of these powers?" It remains to

be seen whether or not the employers (electors) of Mr. Spender and others responsible will realise the connection.

STRIKE STRATEGY. N.S.W. members of the Amalgamated Engineering Union recently passed a resolution quite unique in the history of Unionism, in so far as it constitutes a disciplinary act against the executive—viz., "This meeting protests against the district committee's proposal to hold stop-work meetings throughout Australia on May 24 to discuss the position re Anzac Day." The press described this "as an act of loyalty," but omitted to point out that it was "a lesson in democracy." It is indeed a hopeful sign that rank-and-file Unionists are fed-up with power-lusters planted in executive positions imposing their decisions on their employers to cause unrest as means of furthering foreign "isms."

STALIN'S STRENGTH. An article in the British journal, "Nineteenth Century," is quoted by the Melbourne "Herald" as evidence that Stalin was the strong man, who, when Russian soldiers were surrendering in great numbers, ordered wholesale arrests and executions to save Russia. The article also stated that the Nazis made a fatal mistake when they occupied the Ukraine, where the people at first welcomed the invaders as their liberators, thinking they would be released from the detested socialistic collectivism; but the Germans foolishly committed atrocities more brutal than the terrorism habitually exercised by the Soviet O.G.P.U. From this it would seem that the heroic Russian people are sandwiched between two evils.

COMIC CAMPAIGN. One Communist strategy at the coming elections is to nominate "absentee candidates" and to win sympathy by capitalising the statement that these candidates are "at their battle stations." Such candidates may eventually come back safely, but the war may last longer than the life of the next Parliament, so that, if a majority were obtained in any electorate for an absentee candidate, the voters would not be represented in Parliament and would thus be virtually disfranchised. A queer idea indeed. In any case, so far as Kooyong is concerned, Menzies has declared himself "a full-blooded socialist"—so why not leave it to windy Bob! We have heard a lot about "absentee landlords," but what price "absentee politicians"?

HEALTH HALLUCINATIONS. Following the recent typhoid epidemic (which demonstrated the appalling inadequacy of our communal hospital facilities), health departments, aided by the press, are now clamouring for centralised control over health institutions and policy. An example of muddled argument for this is found in the following from Dr. S. V. Sewell: "Three or four Victorian local governments vied with each other politically for funds to finance health services, with the result that none had adequate resources." So the problem is money, not hospital administration! If each municipality were provided with adequate finance by the Federal Government, whose duty it is to manufacture sufficient money tokens, they could assume decentralised effective control in their local spheres, thus eliminating centralised bureaucratic control.

—O.B.H.

Candid Comments on Canberra

By GRACE A. MARSDEN.

Half a century ago proposals were put forward that the sovereign States of Australia should set up a federation. Such proposals were not accepted without considerable opposition from quarters which could not be regarded as unenlightened. During the last 42 years the Federal Parliament has done little that warrants a greater confidence from the Australian people. It has done much to undermine what confidence in it there was.

The proposals which were originally accepted provided only for the transfer of certain carefully specified powers to the Federal Parliament, and all those powers not so specified for transfer were to remain with the sovereign States.

From that time to the present, the Federal Parliament has never ceased to stretch out greedy hands for extended power, and referendum after referendum has been held to this end; but the efforts have been nearly always rejected by the people when consulted at the ballot-box. The people have consistently shown an unmistakable lack of confidence in proposals to further build up the powers of a Centralised Government at isolated and remote Canberra. They have shown a marked preference that the exercise of their powers shall proceed per medium of Parliaments established in their own capitals, in close touch with constituents, and more amenable to their will.

This preference reached such a degree of intensity in the West that the State Parliament of West Australia passed an Act as a first step in an endeavour to rid themselves of control from this remote quarter. There were found to be legal difficulties in renouncing federation, and the matter was dropped rather than resort to sterner methods of arbitrament.

The people of Australia are not alone in their preference for the administration of their affairs by Parliaments sitting in their own capitals. This preference was held so firmly by the people of Eire that they pushed forward in a long and bloody revolt to achieve it. So also did the American Republic.

The swashbucklers of Canberra are at a loss to understand the nature of this preference. If it could be so arranged that, instead of meeting in the peace and quiet and rustication of the bush capital, the Federal Government could administer Australian affairs from the fastnesses of the Himalayas, or from the seclusion of Mount Sinai, they would then be even less able to understand the desires and will of the Australian people—or better still (from their own point of view) they would not have to care. In their infinite wisdom they could then proceed without any impediment to manage the affairs of the Australian people unruffled by any vulgar interference.

The Federal Government is not pleased with the Australian people. That is just too bad! It is very obvious to all but the wilfully blind that the people are far from satisfied with what has come to them from Canberra, as is overwhelmingly shown by the ignominious rejection by the more realistic State Parliaments of the latest ambitious claim of Canberra to be the only quarter from which an enlightened policy can originate to provide for the welfare of returning members of the fighting forces.

Canberra, out of touch though it be with the people, knew full well that if the Powers Bill had been presented to the people at a Referendum it would have received the short shrift it deserved.

Canberra already has much more power than it cares to use for the benefit of returned men; as witness the niggardly spirit recently shown during the passage of the Amended Repatriation Act. In spite of the demands of the soldiers and their supporters, these dictators of Canberra have grudgingly granted the least possible assistance they can get away with.

Canberra, under the Financial Agreement and the Uniform Taxation Acts has acquired control of all financial policy. Let Canberra provide the necessary finance for the rehabilitation of our fighting forces and all details can be worked out to greater satisfaction of the people by the States and by Local Government bodies. If Canberra will not do this, then let us repeal the Financial Agreement, etc., and let us do something better than the Federal Government offers in the newly-constituted Repatriation Act. The Centralised Government has already shown that it is less concerned about our fighting men than it is concerned in preserving the equity of the external bond-holders who profit, not bleed, in war.

Above all, let Canberra, with such a record, cease to prate of soldiers' welfare while it attempts to hamstring the State Parliaments, to whom alone the men can now look for adequate recognition of their services to the nation. State Governments will be nearer to the people and take a more realistic view of what the post-war period should mean to the men who gave their all; at any rate, they will be made to do their duty by an ever-present expression of the people's will.

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

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

(Continued from previous issues)

During the past few months every considerable newspaper has printed, in its correspondence columns, a large selection of letters on the profit motive, and I do not think that it is unfair to say that this correspondence has in the main fostered two very significant ideas. The first of these is that the profit motive is both bad and is confined to a restricted class from whom all the evils of society proceed. And the second of these is that the profit motive is either another name for a system of private property, or if not that, is inseparable from it. There is not, I think, even a substratum of truth in either of these ideas. They are an evident example of systematic perversion applied to popular psychology.

One of the riddles current in our nursery days was: "Why does a hen walk cross the road?" To which a perfectly correct answer might have been returned: From the profit motive. The moment that any human being performs a single action for any reason other than that provided by the profit motive, is a certifiable lunatic. It is simply a question of what is, in the mind of the individual, profitable to him, taking all the factors and consequences of the action into consideration. The Trades Union Movement is the biggest example of an organisation run purely for profit, for nothing else but profit, making nothing whatever and with sublime disregard for the profit of anyone not belonging to it, which his country can show. During the present war, the economic profit of every class of the community has been sacrificed to the over-riding claims of the Trades Unions, and it is an essential aspect of this situation that Trades Unionism is normally more concerned with internationalism, at least overtly, than any other allegedly national institution. And the declared policy of Trades Unionism is Socialism, which is another word for monopoly in land, labour, and capital.

One of the remarkable features of the confiscatory taxation on land and private property of every description is the tenacity with which individuals have held on to it in the face of the heaviest financial loss. To say that, in the main, for the past Seventy-five years, landowners have been actuated by the determination to make a financial profit is simply another way of saying that landowners are all fools.

It may reasonably be asked why, if only lunatics act to their own disadvantage, anyone should want to "own" land. The answer to that is probably the key to the situation. A comparatively small number of individuals DO want to own land as distinguished from an income from land; but those people can do things for and to the land which no bureaucracy can ever hope to do. And those people will not do it if they are interfered with. Hundreds of farmers—and remember farming is only one aspect of the question—are throwing in their farms, although, for the first time since the last phase of the international war, they are making money.

What, then, was the genuine defect of the big estate system? Remember, the ruined country side is definitely the result of financial attack largely from alien sources. I think that the answer is evident to anyone who was familiar with the large estate. It was not primarily as a system of administering the land that it failed. It was that it gave too much power over the general lives of the individuals who worked on it.

Now this defect—and it was a serious defect—was not peculiar to landowning, and it is not less, but rather greater, in such large industrial settlements as those of the Ford interests in the United States, and the Port Sunlight "model villages" in this country.

Many of the American industrial organisations arrogate to themselves a right of supervision over the private lives and morals of their employees far exceeding that which would have been exercised by

a British landowner at any time, or tolerated by their tenants, and this is accompanied by a close knit organisation for card-indexing every applicant for employment, and penalising by unemployment and starvation anyone daring to rebel against the rules. But we do not hear of organised attack on these things.

Paradoxically enough, the very security of tenure enjoyed by tenants on large estates tended to increase their dependence on the landlord. Many of them were rooted in the soil to at least as great an extent as the titular owner of it. They were specialists and they instinctively recognised that transplanting was a serious, perhaps a fatal thing to them. When the landlord was equally stable in his tenure, the despotism was not so much felt since tradition limited it. But when estates began to change hands by purchase, in many cases coming into the possession of men with no knowledge of, or feeling for, the land, but an exaggerated idea of their own importance, the despotism tended to change from what was in the main, a benevolent, while rather mediaeval overlordship, to an irrational tyranny. To take a simple instance, fox-hunting. I need, perhaps, hardly say that the point I should like to make has nothing to do with the ethics, or otherwise, of fox-hunting as a sport. The Meet of Fox-hounds of John Peel's era was a neighbourly affair, comprising two or three squires and their families, and perhaps twice that number of yeomen and tenant farmers. All of them knew every inch of the land, rode carefully over it, and did negligible damage, which was jointly repaired. But as the City men began to take to hunting by the process of sending a subscription to packs which were too expensive to be kept by one man, the whole atmosphere changed. Hundreds of strangers mounted on horses brought in by train, ridden by people who knew little of the country, and cared less, galloped over the land leaving a trail of damage which was a serious nuisance, to put it no higher, to the tenant farmer, who was no longer welcomed, or in fact able to hunt himself in the expensive company of the larger Hunt. But protest was not healthy—it didn't pay.

During the last hundred years, the position of Agent, or, in Scotland, Factor, has become of increasing importance in considering the administration of the land. The Agent represents a definite step in the transition from personal to "office management." In considering it, it is important not to overlook the fact, that, particularly in Scotland, there are certain families, exclusively connected by long association with large landowners, who are just as hereditary as the owner. There is one family, whose name will be familiar to any Scottish farmer, whose estate management is by common consent as near perfection as an imperfect world will permit. But it should be particularly noted that the hereditary, personal touch is merely split into decision on main questions of policy, which are reserved for the attention of the proprietor, and routine administration, which is the field of the Factor. It is poles apart from Bureaucracy.

(All rights reserved. To be continued.)

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF WORLD FEDERATION

"Should a Federal World Government be established?" was the title of a discussion broadcast in the United States on November 2, 1942. It was opposed by Mr. David H. Wills, a director of the information division of the British Supply Council in Washington, D.C., and Mr. Malcolm Binay, editorial director of the "Detroit Free Press," whose address is reprinted below. Mr. Binay said:—

I speak as an American only. I am against a world government at this time for these reasons:

One hundred and fifty years ago the greatest experiment in government in the history of the human race began. It is still an experiment. Now the hour of trial is at hand. Can this nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, long endure?

The first half of our 150 years was spent in dodging the issue of moral slavery, of human slavery. Having refused to solve this question through political action, we fought the bloodiest civil war in history. The marks of that are still upon the nation.

For the next fifty years we kept right on moving away from our governmental problems in our expansion. Twenty-five

years later, the World War started. We have been living through that with no chance of concentrating on our own domestic problems. But, we did keep alive the spirit of political liberty. As long as we can do that, we will be able to cure the economic, social, and cultural maladjustments we have so long neglected. The time has come now when we can no longer move away from them. We again have our choice of solving them by political action or by civil war. These are the only two alternatives known to history.

Before the first war, we were beginning to be conscious of them. Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson made issues of them, but they were lost in the deluge. After the Armistice there came the years of disillusionment and lost faith. Cynical,

angry youth turned to Communism, Socialism, planned economy, and the other allurements of totalitarianism. Democracy, they said, had failed. Economic security was the answer. That could come, they said, only through regimentation and not through the free play of political action. They forgot that only by liberty of thought can we settle these questions peacefully. It must be by electioneering or by mutual slaughter. And now, with a war on again it is proposed that we organise a world government.

We are asked to move away once more from the domestic questions vital to our destinies. Having failed to solve our own differences, we will now solve the problems of the universe!

Good government, however, begins at home. If we can develop honest and efficient municipal, State, and Federal law in the United States, then we can solve, through democracy, the questions that now cry for settlement. Having done that, we can rightfully lead the world out of the chaos it now is in by the power of right, justice, and precepts. When the United States was established, Count Metternich, reactionary, genius of Austria, cried out: "Democracy is the gangrene of the body politic. It will never touch the shores of Europe. We will burn it out with a white-hot iron."

He knew what that meant—the implanting of an explosive idea in the mass mind of mankind. The Metternichs of the world have protested ever since. Once it was only the Tories. Now it is on the soap-boxes of Union Square. It is the cry of those who contend that the politician must rule the people rather than the people the politician. It is a throwback to the ancient order of absolutism under monarchy. It is significant that most of those advocating a regimented America under some form of Socialism are also advocating a new world order under some international plan of planned economy.

We cannot master our own vital issues if we surrender our sovereignty to a world federation, most of which will be made up of people who have not the slightest idea of what we mean by political democracy, let alone an economic democracy. It must be our task when the war is won to maintain law and order with the help of our Allies. That will be a form of martial law until sanity is restored. This may take years, and a peace conference should not be called until then. Then, we should insist upon a world order just as a good citizen insists upon peace in his neighbourhood, but that does not mean that he wants his neighbours to move into his home and to become a part of his family.

" THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY "

Great play is often made on this phrase by people, particularly Socialists, who clearly do not understand its implications. In certain quarters it is used, more often than not, to mean that on every specific subject the opinion or desire of the majority must be ascertained and must prevail. The problem is not as simple as that.

It is overlooked by these people that an individual is part of a majority in only a very few of his interests. If any one of us makes out a list of interests, tastes, desires, aspirations, dislikes and abhorrences, he will find that, with the exception of a few very general matters, he is in every instance one of a minority. For instance, one man might be a lawyer, a tennis player, a ballet fan, a non-smoker, a port drinker, a grower of orchids, a motorist and a wearer of very fancy socks. In every one of these he would be of a minority.

The point to be observed is that in none of his requirements does he encroach on the interests or desires of others. To speak of the others as a majority is therefore quite misleading. The whole pattern of human associations consists of a few generally applicable master lines criss-crossed and hatched by a multitude of minor matters applicable to minorities. If a social organisation is to work satisfactorily this must be understood, and the minority rights respected by the people as a whole. This is not to suggest that anti-social activities are to be tolerated, far from it. An educated and conscious Democracy will quickly recognise such activities, and at the same time turn its whole weight into the protection of minorities.

Voltaire put it this way, when speaking to one of his literary opponents: "I disagree with almost all you say; but I would fight to the death for your right to say it."

It is significant that for many years the controllers of publicity have deliberately

used the "others" to curtail existing rights or freedom of minorities. For instance, not many years ago, when the authorities had decided to "soak" the "rich" a little more by putting exorbitant taxation on the use of motor cars, it was quite common to see as headlines to newspaper paragraphs such tendentious irrelevancies as "motorist convicted of fraudulent bankruptcy"; "motorist accused of bigamy"; "motorist embezzles money," etc. At the time there was a clearly conscious campaign to create bad feeling in the minds of those who did not run cars towards those who did, for the sole purpose of injuring the latter without in the least benefiting the "others," who found themselves jockeyed into the role of opposition majority. When that succeeded, another minority was attacked by artificially creating another "majority."

The master lines in the pattern previously referred to, on which almost all individuals agree, are probably all covered by three desires, those of political security, economic security, and military security. Curiously enough, these are denied the citizens of every "civilised" country in the world. It is curious also that Socialists and Totalitarians in general, who are so free in their advocacy of the rights and duties of majorities, on every possible occasion advocate political non-existence, economic dependence, and military impotence. It does not matter that these are called by different names; e.g., "one party," "the right to work," "an international police force."

"The price of freedom is eternal vigilance."

—H.R.P., in the "Social Creditor."

N.Z. LABOR MEMBER'S ATTACK ON GOVERNMENT'S FINANCIAL POLICY

The following is a further interesting extract from the speech in the N.Z. Parliament, on March 5 by Mr. Frank Langstone, the Labor Member who recently resigned his position as N.Z. High Commissioner in Canada:—

"Then I find, too, that the trading banks have bought £35,000,000 worth of Government securities. What with? I ask the Prime Minister what the banks have parted with to buy £35,000,000 of public securities on which we are paying 3 per cent. interest. They are only using public credit. That is all it is. To use a term of the Minister of Public Works, they have not parted with 'one brass radoo.' What other section of the community do we allow to buy public securities without putting anything of their own down? We do not allow it.

"They say they used their fixed deposits—an unmitigated untruth. No trading bank can lend its fixed deposits. A trustee, a lawyer, the Post Office—they must lend their deposits, but no trading bank can. It is physically impossible for a bank to lend its deposits. If the banks have £35,000,000 on fixed deposits, what is that? It is money in cold storage, not to be used at all.

"No other matter comes so vitally or intimately into personal relationship with the people as does this one of pounds, shillings and pence. The Government may possess the Post Office, the means of communications, railways and other public services. But they are a mere bagatelle compared with the control of finance, the medium of exchange, and the measure of values. We have, however, done all sorts of things, putting the cart before the horse. Had we had finance in the hands of the Government it would have been a

lever or key that would have opened the door and would have enabled us to do easily many of the things we are finding the greatest hardship in doing.

"Obviously the banks used the public credit by making advances of about £45,000,000 on overdraft accounts. What else was it? They are drawing 4½ per cent., so we find almost £2,000,000 being exacted as a toll or tribute from industry and trade—a burden put on the back of labour.

"I recall the following statement made by the late Mr. Savage: 'It is just as necessary for the nation to be sole authority for the issue and control of money as it is for it to be the sole authority for the organisation and control of the army and navy.' We pledged ourselves that we were going to be the sole and complete controllers of banking, credit and currency. Time and again we put that in the forefront of our programme, but it is the last thing the Government seems to think of doing.

"Why is it impossible to get this great policy measure implemented for the benefit of the people? The Reserve Bank raised the discount rate to 4 per cent. Obviously that is to suit the other banks. It is a mistake to think that the public are not becoming increasingly conscious of this money factor. They are not going to stand much longer for the manipulation and exploitation that is taking place through the private banking institutions."

—"New Era."

ARE WE REALLY SERIOUS ABOUT "RECONSTRUCTION"?

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

Sr.—We have seen that the private banks create money when they grant an overdraft; and we have also seen that they cancel money when they discontinue an overdraft. That explains where all the Australian money WENT TO between 1929 and 1931. The banks called it in and cancelled it. The result was that actually and potentially the goods were plentiful but there was no FINANCE to buy the goods or to develop our resources. So the multitude went hungry in the midst of plenty. The members of the Commonwealth Bank Board allowed themselves to be used to enforce these conditions on the Government and people of Australia, even though Sir Denison Miller had shown them how to prevent such a calamity.

In 1931 there was a Federal Election, and through the mouths of the late J. A. Lyons, the present Chief Justice of the Commonwealth (Sir John Latham), Sir Earle Page, Rt. Hon. R. G. Menzies, and others, the bankers told us that if we would vote against a Labor Government they would permit an expansion of credit and allow the Government to borrow £28,000,000 for public works. A large majority of the Australian electors felt that we would never get anywhere unless the purse strings were loosened, and so the Scullin Government was dismissed and we got the loan of 28 millions. Granting of overdrafts was resumed, securities were sold, and the money "market" was made easier. So long as the banks permitted continuance of these conditions so long did the community appear more prosperous. There is not a shadow of doubt that our "progress" and "prosperity" have NOT depended on our productive capacity and natural resources but on the FINANCIAL POLICY OF THE BANKERS.

Is it to be any different after the present war? If it isn't, then our sons are dying in vain. If it is, then it is about time a start was made to effect the necessary changes. All depressions in the last 100 years have been the result of monetary manipulation. Not one of them was an accident, and not one of them can be explained by the so-called law of supply and demand. After the war there will be another depression if we allow the bankers to remain in control of financial policy. Indeed, an effort is already being made to set the stage for it. Many school teachers, especially the female section, are expressing the view that an after-the-war depression is inevitable. It is therefore urgently necessary that steps be taken NOW to protect the Australian people from such treachery, and in my opinion we should start by demanding the removal from positions of control of all persons who either acquiesced in the last depression or actually helped to impose it. Such persons are a menace to society in general and to the worker in particular, and if they are allowed to have a determining part in the "reconstruction" plans it is as certain as night follows day that the conditions after the war will be but a mockery of what they ought to be.

Only in war time is the Commonwealth Government able to get things done without reference to the Loan Council, and even in war time the Commonwealth Bank (as at present constituted) exercises a regarding influence. When war ceases the Commonwealth Government will again become subservient to the Loan Council.

Rectification of this position must therefore be the very first step in any Australian "reconstruction." As the members of the present Bank Board have been unfaithful to their public trust they should not be permitted to remain in charge, and we should press for the restoration of control by a Governor personally responsible to Parliament through its Executive—the Government. There is a tendency to look upon the Prime Minister as our chief boss, whereas, in reality, he is our chief servant. He is there to see that the legislative enactments of the Federal Parliament are faithfully carried out and Parliament is there to translate the will of the PEOPLE into legislative enactment. Consequently, if we want a change to be made we should make our wants known in Parliament, and the members of Parliament are the instruments through which we make those wants known. It naturally follows that if we have no faith in the members of the Bank Board and desire their replacement by a Governor, then we should communicate that fact to our respective members of Parliament.

Experience should be our best teacher, and no truthful person would deny that our only shortage during the depression was in the supply of money, and that that shortage was due absolutely to the fact that monetary policy was determined by the international bankers. No truthful person would deny either that it was these selfsame international bankers who prevented the British Government from influencing the Peace after the last war as the British people desired. In 1929 the money supply was deliberately cut off at a time when production was increasing, and the paid liars said this was because we had been living beyond our "means." Some of the university professors now being paid high salaries in key positions were parties to such lies, and these very professors helped to increase the difficulties in Australia by concocting what has been erroneously called the "Premiers" Plan, which further curtailed incomes, restricted the number and purchasing capacity of consumers, and caused untold misery. All this was done in the face of the fact that the crying need was for MORE customers, and that these customers could only be secured by providing an increase of purchasing power in the hands of the people at large. Unless we prevent it, a similar position will arise at the end of the war. What should we do about it?

—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, May 9, 1943

(To be continued.)

THE FRUSTRATION OF PRODUCTION OF MOTOR FUEL IN AUSTRALIA

(Continued from last issue)

The above heading is also the title of an extremely interesting sixpenny booklet, by Mr. A. W. Nokes, published very recently by The Electoral Campaign of Queensland, 12 Adelaide St., Brisbane. Although we are taking the liberty of quoting extensively from the booklet, we urge our readers to obtain copies for themselves, so that they will have the whole of its contents available under one cover for ready reference or for conveniently placing the facts before acquaintances.

In his introduction, the author states: "The object of this booklet is to awaken the people to a realisation of the fact that flow oil has definitely been discovered in Australia, and to expose the economically unsound action of the Federal Government in spending approximately £2,000,000 in the production of power alcohol from wheat, when sufficient motor fuel for all our requirements can be obtained much cheaper from our indigenous raw materials—oil, coal, and oil-bearing shale." The booklet continues as follows:—

In the report of the Committee appointed by the Federal Government to inquire into the question of establishing a plant in Australia for the production of oil from coal by hydrogenation process (Dr. A. C. D. Rivett, Chairman), September, 1934, it is stated:—

"It may be taken as definitely proved that there are in Australia ample supplies of bituminous coal thoroughly well suited for the production of liquid fuels by treatment with hydrogen gas under appropriate conditions of temperature and pressure, and in the presence of catalysts capable of bringing about the desired chemical changes, at a satisfactory rate. The proof of this is available in numerous tests carried out in the laboratories of Imperial Chemical Industries Limited, and at the Fuel Research Station of the British Department of Scientific and Industrial Research at East Greenwich. Parts of Australia are, as a matter of fact, particularly well provided with black coals quite as well adapted for treatment as are those which are being used at the present time in Great Britain in the large scale work

just mentioned at Billingham.

"From the point of view of quantity, this country is also well supplied in certain parts with brown coals, in the hydrogenation of which no inherent technical difficulties need be anticipated. Unfortunately, insufficient investigation of their relevant qualities has yet been made. Hitherto the main large scale work on brown coal has been carried out in Germany, and such experiments on Victorian brown coal as have been carried out at Billingham indicate that its properties differ somewhat from those of the German coal. Such differences will demand modifications in hydrogenation practice which are not likely to be radical, but which will require careful study."

"Possible Sites for Australian Works"

- (1) The Northern Coal-field of New South Wales.
- (2) The Southern Coal-field of New South Wales.
- (3) The Blair Athol Field in Queensland.
- (4) The Brown Coal-fields of Victoria.

SOUND ADVICE FOR SMALL FIRMS

The following points were made by Major Proctor, MP., speaking at a recent mass meeting in London of members of small paint firms:—

"I believe that unless we defend the small outposts we will find ourselves, at the end of this war, completely defenceless against anyone. The policy seems to be to crush out the little men, gather the middle men into a great pool, and then nationalise the lot. I oppose this sort of thing. This is the same way that Hitler used to get National Socialism into Germany. First the little man out of the way, then the middle man, then the big man is left, and Hitler bossing the lot. We are touching a matter of very great principle. The way this is being done is a little bit at once." It is like the man who did not want to be cruel who decided

he would cut off his dog's tail a little bit every day.

"We have to stand together; individually we are sunk. But as little men working together I believe that we shall go a long way, not only to arrest this concentration, or rather this crushing out of yourselves with its rank injustice, but we will do something to preserve our national life. As I said before, we are all Englishmen, but we are not prepared that sacrifice should be borne unequally. We have been far too silent. It was only when the National Chambers of Trade got together all through the country that the Government listened."

"If you all write to your Members of Parliament all over the country we will have such a volume of support in the House of Commons that we will get something done."

N.W.R.M. MEETING IN THE MELBOURNE TOWN HALL

The New World Reconstruction Movement will hold a mass citizens' meeting in the Melbourne Town Hall on Thursday, May 27, at 8 p.m. Speakers will include the Hon. King O'Malley (Founder of Commonwealth Bank), Senator Darcey, and Mr. Bruce H. Brown. Seats will be free, but may be booked for a small fee at Allan's. The second edition of the "New World Charter" will be released on this occasion. There will be a film sketch, a tableau, and a military band on the stage.—(Adv't.)

TO THE VICTOR . . .

"By the end of 1942 American production (of aircraft) alone may easily equal that of Germany and Great Britain together, and it will still go on rising. . . . Military supremacy in the air means economic supremacy afterwards." —"Saturday Evening Post," Philadelphia, U.S.A.

Negation of Democratic Freedom

Strangely suggestive of the doctrines of Herr Goebbels was a pronouncement by Mr. Curtin, in an address at Perth, on the subject of propaganda. The authority of the nation, Mr. Curtin said, would have to be exercised over propaganda, for stable government would be endangered if "the authority and responsibility of the Government for the ordering of the mind of the people is not acknowledged." The ordering of a nation's mind by its ruling caste has been carried to its highest pitch of perfection in Nazi Germany, but we find it difficult to believe that any Australian Government—even one with a passion for regimentation such as has been revealed by the Curtin administration—looks with favour upon such a negation of democratic freedom.—Melbourne "Sun," May 7, 1943.

"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 126 G.P.O., Melbourne.

"Of those named, the first three would provide bituminous coals, and so far the Northern Coal-field of New South Wales has received very much more attention than any of the others. Indeed, in 1933, Imperial Chemical Industries went so far as to prepare approximate estimates of costs of erecting and running a plant at Newcastle. Since that date, however, there have been such improvements in technique in Great Britain that very considerable modification of the design of the plant would now be required. The estimates made at that time are, in fact, now quite obsolete, and the Company is no longer willing to offer them for serious consideration.

"The Southern Coal-field of New South Wales and the brown coal-fields of Victoria are well enough explored from the standpoint of quantities and accessibility, but so far no special study has been made of possible sites in these regions.

"The Blair Athol field must, for the following reasons, be temporarily set on one side, despite its attractiveness in low costs of mining. We are informed that satisfactory bituminous coal may be obtained by open-cut methods at an estimated cost of 3/6 per ton at the mine (the cheapest in the world, we believe), and this possibility in itself indicates that the field is worthy of close consideration. So little, however, has been done in the way of accurate determination of its deposits that further consideration is not at present possible. We are, nevertheless, so impressed with the possibilities of cheap coal production in this area that we think

OVER-DOING IT?

"On July 27 all the Jewish inhabitants of a town near Kiev were ordered to the stadium. The women, of whom there were 500, were instructed to hold their little children in their arms. A few minutes after we had assembled, an eye-witness declares, a group of German soldiers in football attire entered the stadium. They snatched the infants from their mothers' arms and used them as footballs, bouncing and kicking them around the arena. Soon the ground was drenched with blood and the stadium was filled with the anguished cries of women driven insane as they saw their children being murdered before their eyes."

According to Mr. Hannen Swaffer of the London "Daily Herald," the above account was obtained by him from the manuscript of the Chief Rabbi who told it at a meeting on Sunday, December 13, 1942.

The "Social Creditor" (England) comments as follows:—

No wonder the Editor of "The New Statesman" calls it nonsense, and a correspondent of the paper, G. L. Schwarz, protestingly declares it to be a fabrication. If any analysis is given to many of these stories of German atrocities against the Jews, it will be found that most of them lack independent testimony, and find their way to this country via New York.

It would appear that strenuous efforts are being made to make England a foster mother for many of these refugees, and persons like Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P., and Lord Wedgwood are unremitting in their attention to Jewish interests. It is to be regretted that the Government has lent a willing ear to stories, many of which smell of a concerted propaganda. True, there have been atrocities; but the cause of Judaism is not likely to succeed when its leaders show their hands so obviously.

Madagascar is the obvious choice for the New Jerusalem, and the United Nations might arrange with France a quid pro quo.

Social Science Lectures

The next (second) fortnightly lecture and discussion in the series will take place at the rooms of the United Electors of Australia (343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne) on Wednesday next, May 19, commencing at 8 p.m. The lecturer, Mr. F. A. Parker, B.A., Dip.Ed., will speak on "A Summary of Democracy"—a subject which should provide ample scope for interesting and informative open discussion, at certain stages during the lecture as well as at its conclusion. YOU are invited to come along and bring your friends.

the attention of the Queensland Government should be drawn to the desirability of obtaining much more detailed information, as to the extent and characteristics of the Blair Athol Deposit, if this deposit is to be considered as a potential source of raw material for hydrogenation. If this information is to be available to this Committee in time to be of use to it, no time should be lost in instituting a thorough investigation, including an extensive boring campaign, a geological survey, detailed sampling, and analytical investigation of all accessible exposures of the seam."

(To be continued.)

NEW WORLD RECONSTRUCTION MOVEMENT

A HECKLE HOUR

at Christ Church Hall, Punt Road, South Yarra,

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 8 p.m.

Subject:

IS PUBLIC OWNERSHIP DESIRABLE?

Speakers: Mr. H. Pearson, B.Com., Dip.Ed. (Affirmative), and Mr. J. H. Murphy (Negative).

This question is important, so—

Come Along and Put Your Questions.

—Adv't.

THE TURN OF THE TIDE

(Continued from last issue.)

Now it appears to me that there is a considerable amount of evidence to be seen here and there that suggests that the tide of Materialism, dialectical and every other kind, is due to turn, if it has not already begun to ebb. A book † by the late Professor J. S. Haldane happened to come under my notice while I was engaged in following Mr. Chakotin's heated mental adventures. Professor J. S. Haldane (not at all to be confused with his son, J. B. S. Haldane, sometime member of the Board of the "Daily Worker") begins his book promisingly by invoking Bishop George Berkeley, Swift's contemporary, whose speculations on Individual Consciousness ("esse est percipi") constituted a direct challenge to the absolute materialism of Newton and Locke.

In this book, in controversy with Professor Hogben—a biologist apparently after the hearts of Mr. Chakotin and Mr. H. G. Wells, who confirms their most cherished, and worst fears regarding themselves and the world they inhabit—he exposes the basic fallacy of Experimental Psychology, or rather the bio-chemistry, a la Pavlov, from which it springs. This is the idea that the results of Pavlov's experimentation in "conditioned reflexes" in animals have a positive bearing on human social policy—an absolute value. This is to say, the notion that Pavlov's subject, the thing he actually had managed to isolate, in his dog kennels and mouse-traps and rabbit hutches, and on his operating tables, was Life—the whole of it, and all there is to it. The idea that it was seems to my unprofessional mind simply ludicrous, if for no other reason than that Pavlov and his collaborators did not know what life was to begin with, nor any more at the end of their labours. Who does?

Professor Haldane's small and interesting book, which puts forward his reason for disagreement, is, of course, outside the scope of this review; but it comes in for mention as my justification for the feeling already alluded to, that the impulse behind the mechanistic cult for organisation is already on the wane, and giving place, or about to, to an interest in organism—the living cell that is not exclusively acted upon, as Mr. Chakotin and Mr. Wells and the rest imagine, but also in its turn acts upon its environment and to a considerable extent makes it its own. What differentiates a biological organism from chemical organisation, the living from the dead, is, as Haldane says, that it "maintains itself and its environment," maintains and builds up its own organic structure and identity in, and with its environment. In short, that like Topsy, "it grow'd." No other organism grew it; that is its living uniqueness, which

†J. S. Haldane: "The Philosophical Basis of Biology," Hodder & Stoughton.

Douglas emphasises in the organic human individual as "the fact that he manoeuvres under his own steam."

That is the obvious truth that is denied by Experimental Psychology, which in appearance at least still holds the field. For we must not forget that all Planners are Experimental Psychologists, and it cannot be denied that they are still visibly triumphant, still in appearance at least, having it all their own way, and able to make their personal desire for centralising power in their own hands appear increasingly necessary and inevitable. But neither must we forget when we tend to be overwhelmed by the pervasiveness of it all, that we are still maintaining, in theory at least, a Distributive System which is an integral part of this mechanistic fashion—the "Mathematics of Materialism" it might be called; which while it persists (and insists on persisting) does really make our social manoeuvres appear inevitable. But if the mental impulse behind Materialism is actually waning, as there begins to be evidence that it is, then we may be certain the system which exists to serve the impulse will collapse, and with it all its self-created, artificial "necessities."

In that event, the tide may ebb swiftly, more swiftly and suddenly than any of us imagine perhaps, and no doubt we may look to see many strange creatures left stranded by the receding waters, and futilely and ridiculously struggling: Helpless leviathans; organicistic (if one may coin a word) rather than organic, half human, half machine (like Mr. Wells's own Martians), who previously disported themselves freely and at the expense of everyone else in that element. Perhaps, who knows, there are some who have touched bottom already, and it is their tail lashings and strivings to get out to sea again that are churning up the waters round our "island home"?

—N. F. Webb, in the "Social Creditor," England.

A "NONELECTED INDUSTRIAL DICTATORSHIP"

Lord Provost Darling of Edinburgh has taken up the challenge of Major Douglas's letter to "The Scotsman" of December 9 concerning the Scottish Hydro-Electric Power Bill. Writing to "The Scotsman" of January 29 from the Edinburgh City Chambers, Lord Provost Darling describes himself as "an unrepentant, and I hope, tireless critic of bureaucracy wherever I have been able to discover it barring progress."

"For myself," he says, "I feel if there is to be State management of hydro-electric undertakings, it must not be entrusted . . . to an unfettered Commission. The House of Commons, through the Secretary of State, must retain a measure of control over both policy and practice. The North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board may not be the last word on the subject."

"Surely the handing over of such absolute powers would produce a bureaucracy out of all keeping with the pattern of democracy. This Bill, on the other hand, seeks to impose the minimum restrictions on the work of the Board, while retaining the essential feature of a public service undertaking . . . that the Secretary of State is finally responsible to Parliament and to the country for what is done at every stage. No less safeguard of Scottish interests is acceptable. It would be small comfort to Scots who place great hopes in these reconstruction schemes if there should

emerge a non-elected industrial dictatorship running riot about the Highlands, damming here, blasting there, with powers to transform the country and its future, unshackled by the need to pause for approval. For Parliament to hand over such a portion of their powers—even if they could be persuaded to do so—would be an act of irresponsibility, a product of which would not be efficiency or the achievement in full measure of the objects in view."

In his earlier letter, Major Douglas said:—"Under a thin veneer of park-preservation, the report exhibits the implacable determination of the international 'Capitalist' (the Big Idea) to press forward the industrialised structure of the world in the teeth of any or all opposition. No vested interests will be allowed to intervene to delay—this vested interest. That is a clear challenge. Is there anyone in Scotland who will answer it?"

PROFIT, INTEREST AND PLANNING

In a letter published in the "Edmonton Bulletin" of August 11 1942 Mr. Norman Jaques, a member of the Canadian House of Commons, wrote:—

Those who condemn Capitalism—private enterprise for profit—ignore two facts:

1. Capitalism is a system of profit and loss.
2. Capitalism is planning by persuasion.

With regard to the first. It is significant that the attack on the profit (and loss) never includes financial interest—profit without risk of loss—usury. The difference between profit and interest is fundamental. Profit is individual reward for assuming individual risks to increase communal wealth. Interest assumes no risk, it is profit on an intangible, secured by mortgage—a "death grip." Christianity condemned interest, not profit, and for good reasons. From the earliest times interest was known to result in unpayable debt and finally in the destruction of any free society.

The only alternative to planning by persuasion and private enterprise is planning by force. Free enterprise assumes that

men and women, as individuals, are the best judges of what they want, and when and why they want it. Planning denies this competence to judge, and in a "planned" economy the individuals would obtain not what they know they want but what someone thinks they ought to want. It is true that decreasing numbers of people have been obtaining what they want. But this frustration is not the result, but the denial of free enterprise, production for profit, and individual freedom of choice. These things have become more and more limited in scope, and harder to come by. In their place we have had idle millions barred from any enterprise, depressions, bankruptcies, and ever-increasing bonded debt and taxation. These conditions finally culminated in war which denounces profits, denies freedom of enterprise and liberty of choice, but which sanctifies interest and bonded security, imposes confiscatory taxation, and creates work for all. And these are precisely the results promised for the "planned new world." For the "planners" war must be the ideal state, but for everybody else "war is hell."

BRITISH EDUCATIONIST OPPOSES CENTRALISED EDUCATION

Mr. John Murray, Principal of the University College of the South-West, Exeter, speaking at the resumed annual meeting of the Incorporated Association of Head Masters at County Hall, London, on January 6, said the method of the proposed "new order" in education was administrative simplicity and uniformity in unit areas of considerable size. Educational effort within those areas was to be bureaucratically subordinated to local committees and their officials.

Strong central control with hierarchical subordination of staff and labour would not suit English education or the English. It was the German system long before the Nazis came into power, and it had lent itself admirably to their purposes. The crisis extended far beyond the sphere of education, for it might be said to have reached that sphere from general politics. The challenge to lovers of freedom was no momentary or local diversion, and Mr. Murray suggested that the headmasters might take a lead in forming a strong opposition by linking forces with other organisations and individuals now nursing their fears and their courage in isolation.

Local Government

In the British House of Commons, on December 17, 1942, Mr. Hannah asked the Minister of Health whether he could give an undertaking that rural district councils will not be abolished without giving local-government electors an opportunity of expressing their opinion?

The Minister of Health (Mr. Ernest Brown): "While I am aware that in some quarters there have been suggestions for an alteration in the present system of local government which would involve abolishing rural district councils, I can assure my hon. Friend that no such suggestions will be adopted by the Government for submission to Parliament without the fullest opportunity for those councils and the communities they represent to make their views felt."

Mr. Hannah: "While thanking my right hon. Friend very much for that reply, do the Government realise the very great importance of local government to our institutions?"

Mr. Brown: "Yes, Sir, and of all democratic institutions."

Merely Transplanted

"A small legal change will be necessary to eradicate [our emphasis] the word 'planning' from the title of the Ministry of Works and Planning, which will become simply the Ministry of Works."

—"Scotsman," December 31, 1942

"Won't it be fun to see all the little Fabians, 'friendly aliens,' and 'refugees from Hitler's tyranny,' scuttling across the road from the Ministry of Works to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning?"

—"Social Creditor," January 9, 1943

Brow-Beaten Britons

"Look out, boys! The OGPU-Gestapo (Ministry of Fuel and Power Branch) is coming round to read your gas and electricity meters. The fuel and power used by the useless officials of the various Ministries, and their OGPU detachments, mostly of military age, would, if distributed, obviate the need for rationing."—"The Social Creditor" (England).

The "B."B.C.

Over a period of ten days, quite representative the time given by the "B."B.C. to, in effect, recounting the alleged capture by our Russian Allies of villages not shown on any map available to the average listener, is roughly eighty per cent of the war news.

—"The Social Creditor" (England), Jan 9, 1943

The State

When you think of the State, You think of something great, Of Kings and their Counsellors, Admirals of the Fleet, Field Marshals, Air Marshals; Not of some little clerk Working in the half-dark Implementing your frustration Or regimentation; But who is REALLY the State for you? —"Excalibur," in the "Social Creditor."

Text from "The Times" (London), December 14, 1942 "Now therefore why speak ye not a word of bringing the king back?"—II, Samuel, xix., 10

WARNING TO FARMERS

The "Farmer and Stockbreeder" (England), of January 5, 1943, reports the speech of Lord Cornwallis, chairman of the Kent War Agriculture Committee, at the annual meeting of the Kent Farmers' Union. Lord Cornwallis said:

"We are rather proud that the White Horse of Kent is still rampant; but there are a good many others who are also rampant. There is a breed called planners' who are extremely rampant: planners in all walks of life as well as agriculture, and so I issue this warning:—

"Although you have put the soil back on the map by your efforts in war-time, unless you as farmers and as an industry speak with an absolutely united force, and are prepared to put people at the top of your organisation to use that voice, you are going to have a struggle to keep yourselves from being planned out of existence."

FOOD CONTROL IN NEW ZEALAND

A New Zealand correspondent writes in the "Social Creditor" of February 13 1943—

"Potatoes are practically unobtainable for civilians . . . the latest 'Hansard' to hand gives a statement by the Minister of Supply, the Hon. D. G. Sullivan, to the effect that the tons of potatoes that have rotted have not been due to the Internal Marketing Board's control, but to other causes such as rough handling. So Clarence must be more careful with his fork. Anyway, we are being pretty roughly handled, and I suppose the same could be said of apples, oranges, etc. . . . A wide variety of subsidies is given, but they appear to be applied where they will safeguard the issuers of credit rather than where they will benefit the consumer of the ultimate product. It is interesting to note in what a wide variety of ways a simple proposition like, say, the Just Price can be perverted so that those consumers who should benefit are frustrated and made to pay."

"We have just concluded a Christian Crusade week with the usual spate of words about New Orders, etc., but with mighty little information as to who is going to give the orders and whose job it will be to obey them. That point appears to me to be fundamental to any consideration of the matter, Christian or otherwise."

You've Been Warned!

"We shall see everything without the aid of official police, which, in that scope of its rights which we elaborated for the use of the goyim, hinders government from seeing. In our programme, one third of our subjects will keep the rest under observation from a sense of duty [emphasis in original] on the principle of volunteer service to the State. It will then be no disgrace to be a spy and an informer, but a merit."

You can guess where that extract came from.

OFFICE OF "BALLYHOO"

The following is a cable from Washington:

Fourteen writers have resigned from the Office of War Information. They have issued the following statement:

"It is no longer possible to tell the full truth in the O.W.I., which is now dominated by high-pressure promoters, who prefer slick salesmanship to honest information and have turned the O.W.I. into the Office of War Ballyhoo."

The statement is signed by Henry Pringle, Pulitzer Prize winner; Philip Hamburger, author of "Tale of a City"; Eleanor Darnton, widow of a "New York Times" correspondent who was killed in Australia, and others.

A BALANCE-SHEET FOR GREAT BRITAIN

In the British House of Commons on February 2, 1943, Mr. Mathers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in presenting his next Annual Budget and the usual Statements of Income and Expenditure, he will also furnish information regarding national assets, so that his statements, taken as a whole, may more nearly represent a proper national balance-sheet?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Kingsley Wood): "As I indicated during the Debate on the Vote of Credit on January 26, I will consider this suggestion in connection with my next budget, although the matter is not without its difficulties."

Mr. Mathers: "Could not the right hon. gentleman go a little further than that, in view of the nebulous nature of the statement he made?"

Sir K. Wood: "I think that I have gone some considerable way towards meeting the hon. gentleman."

Mr. Thorne: "Will the right hon. gentleman consider the advisability of telling the country in his Budget Statement the national income during the war?"

Sir K. Wood: "I will certainly consider that."

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