

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL (Page 2)  
GETTING "THE RIGHT MEN" IN PARLT. (Page 3)  
INTERESTING DISCUSSION ON "WORK" (Page 3)  
THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE NEW TIMES** PRICE—FOURPENCE  
Vol. 9. No. 41. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCT. 15, 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 arc forging,  
Silence is crime.  
Whittier (1807-1892).

# Danger of Changing Australia's Constitution

## Why Give Canberra More Power?

In one of his excellent radio talks, broadcast from 7HO on October 3, Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., dealt with the burning question of Dr. Evatt's demand that after the war our lives should be controlled almost entirely from far-away Canberra. We remind our readers that this issue is of primary importance, and we publish the full text of Mr. Guthrie's broadcast hereunder:—

Dr. Evatt has stated that he intends to have a referendum to alter the Constitution of Australia; Dr. Evatt's chief Commissar in Tasmania, Dr. Gaha, has published two articles in the Hobart "Mercury," preparing the people for what is to come.

It is safe to say, I think, that not one voter in a hundred has read the Australian Constitution, and I should say still fewer understand its meaning. Yet, boys under 21 have been given power by the Curtin Government to destroy, by their vote, something they will not understand for another ten to fifteen years. It is for this reason I ask all responsible people to get ready now for the referendum, and to make sure that the young soldiers at the front are warned beforehand of what is to be attempted.

The Australian Constitution is a document written by Australians to protect the heritage of future generations against dictators and those who would introduce dictatorships surreptitiously by means too various to discuss to-night.

It should be remembered that the last

time Dr. Evatt attempted to obtain changes in the Constitution he surrounded the issue with such abstract phrases as "The Atlantic Charter," and "The Four Freedoms," in such a way that many people were quite bewildered. At the same time he attempted to obtain legislation to prevent any action of the Government being tested in a court of law by the victims of Evatt's "New Deal."

The founders of Australia realised very well that the only chance the people in, say, Tasmania, had of obtaining anything approximating fair play was to have Tasmania governed by Tasmanians in Tasmania. It was realised from the beginning that Australia had many problems and many climates, and that the great distances between the various parts made it absolutely essential for such States as West Australia and Queensland to have full powers to look after their own affairs—i.e., to have their own State Governments.

For the people in a city like Perth to have to get permission from a central office in Canberra, 2500 miles away, before they could undertake the simplest jobs is

not only stupid, it is criminal folly; because it can only bring about a nation of slaves dominated by a small clique in Canberra.

This craze for taking more and more power from the people and centralising it in Canberra is not supported by one single man who has any claim to speak with authority on this subject; on the contrary, it is condemned by every authority in every part of the world.

Fortunately for the Australian people, Mr. D. H. Drummond, M.L.A., who for many years has been a member of the State Parliament of N.S.W., has written an excellent book on this subject. It is called "Australia's Changing Constitution." This book can be obtained at your local bookshops for 3/6. I advise as many of you as possible to obtain a copy. F. A. Bland, Professor of Public Administration in the University of Sydney, has written an equally valuable foreword to the book. These two men between them have made a very excellent contribution to Australian political thought, and it is up to every one of us to

see that their work is made known to all who are capable of appreciating it.

The Government of Australia is based on Municipal Government, which looks after our roads, water supply, sewerage, tramways, etc., etc. The State Government does those jobs which are outside the districts covered by the Municipal Councils, and helps to co-ordinate their work and supply advice on matters which require greater resources than are available to Municipal Councils. The Federal Government is necessary to operate over a larger area and to co-ordinate the work of the States and supply a common currency and look after foreign affairs, shipping, etc.

Most of the work of running a community should be done by Municipal Councils, and controlled by the people in the community. It is obvious, for example, that the people in Hobart are not going to be very interested in public hospitals and public parks for Launceston; and it is also obvious that the people of Hobart have no

(Continued on page 4)

## NOTES on the NEWS

There has recently been some adverse comment on the practice of granting special travelling privileges to civil servants—at the expense of "ordinary" citizens, who often have to refrain from travelling, or stand in trains while carriages are reserved for perhaps only one civil servant. Judges in particular have been singled out as offenders in this respect. The Attorney-General defends them by saying that they usually informed the conductor that they were prepared to make spare seats available to women and their children and elderly passengers. But the point is: Why should Judges or other civil servants be exempt from the hardships which their employer (John Citizen) has to bear. It is a dangerous aspect of bureaucracy that the bureaucrats may exempt themselves from their own edicts.

**CHINESE CONUNDRUM:** Some time ago Otto Neimeyer, the "Wall St." intermediary domiciled in Britain, visited China to "advise" on financial policy. Readers will perhaps remember that as a result of this a sticky time was predicted for China. Judging from the following press report, Neimeyer's visit had a long-term relationship with the bankers' war aim to restore the gold-standard, viz.: "China will purchase 200 million dollars' worth of gold with the 500 millions loaned to her by U.S. in 1942." So, America lends China 500 millions in goods, so that China can use it to buy 200 millions of gold! It's like lending your pal a pair of boots so that he can sell them back to you for gold after he has worn them out!

**LIBERTY LIGHTS:** A hopeful note is contained in the following London report: "Sir Walter Womersley said that the British people were so sick and tired of war-time restrictions that they wanted them lifted as soon as possible. He then assured the people that the present control of personal liberty was only for the duration." Well, that's a body-blow for the "planners."

who are now openly and brazenly urging the continuation of controls alleged to be merely war-time measures.

**POWERS PLOT:** Preparatory propaganda in anticipation of the referendum to centralise power at Canberra was a much-publicised feature of the address of the retiring President of the A.N.A., Mr. J. E. Menadue, who had the audacity to commend the idea to the annual conference and the public at large—using his official capacity to sponsor the idea. The usual practice is for the branches of the A.N.A. to forward resolutions to the conference for discussion, then acceptance or rejection. It certainly is not the function of the president to intrude his personal views. Is it not peculiar how men of this calibre occupy a position of this nature and use it to propagate their personal ideas? It has been said that the executive of this allegedly democratic body has the power to veto resolutions from the branches—if the executive thinks fit. Heil democracy!

**FOOD FRONT:** Farmer H. G. R. Swan, of Southport (Queensland), has received a letter from the Director of Agriculture (Mr. McKeon) to the effect that the Rice Marketing Board would not provide any more seed rice, because of an understanding between the States that it was not advisable to encourage increased rice production. And this after he had spent £800 to prepare his farm for production! It would be hard to find a more glaring case of food sabotage than this. Sabotage seems to be the main purpose of these marketing boards. How long will these bunglers be permitted to go unpunished?

**FUEL FRONT:** Mr. Ickes, U.S. Fuel Controller, commenting on the coal crisis, is reported thus in the Melbourne "Herald" of October 1: "On balance, England is doing more for America than we are doing for our Allies, although she has neither the coal nor the machinery that we have." It is rather refreshing and somewhat ironical that even such a small measure of appreciation is handed to Britain. The more so (Continued on page 2)

## Dr. Macaulay and his New Gospel

One of the most intriguing of recent events has been the extraordinary degree of publicity given to the statements of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilson Macaulay, D.D., recently returned from the International Conference of Church Leaders at Princeton, U.S.A.

Let it be said here and now that, as the Moderator-General of a great Church, it is only right and proper that his utterances should be given due publicity and attention. The curious feature—perhaps not so curious after all—is that since Dr. Macaulay has added to his confession of faith and doctrine an additional article—we nearly wrote "principle"—far greater publicity has been accorded him than he previously received in his capacity as Moderator-General. Press space—a few weeks ago niggardly in extent—has since been given in generous measure, and the rare and exclusive privilege of broadcasting over the national network has been accorded him. This, to quote the Right Rev. Dr. in another connection, is the "price of peace," and of privilege; the price which must be paid in the quarters referred to for silence in respect to the most glaring evil of our day and generation. Judging by past experience, it can safely be said that had the recommendations of the Princeton Conference been similar to those of the Malvern (England) Church Conference, press space and radio broadcast privilege alike would have been denied him. The reason for this will be made clear later on in this article.

If the Princeton suggestions (Dr. Macaulay calls them "directions") are ever given effect to—which Heaven forbid!—the limited measure of liberty we at present possess will have to give place to the rule of a powerful and despotic tyranny. Although Dr. Macaulay states that he was "impressed with the cold common-sense attitude of the whole conference to the problems discussed," perusal of his summary indicates that its most consistent feature was its studied avoidance of many basic facts, and the further fact that it consistently confused EFFECTS with PRIMARY CAUSES, which denotes anything but sense. In its selection of alleged obstacles to world peace, and its statement of "Moral Principles," this confusion is especially apparent. What are high tariffs, intense nationalism, armaments, and, to a considerable extent, race prejudices, but EFFECTS—effects due to but one underlying primary cause: which is the working of an obsolete, tyrannical and un-

Christian financial system. In "Modern Democracies," the late Lord Bryce wrote: "Democracy has no more persistent and insidious foe than the Money Power. . . . That enemy is formidable because he works secretly, by persuasion or deceit, rather than by force, and so takes men unawares. He is a danger to good government everywhere."

It seems most remarkable that the Princeton Conference had no word of condemnation for the evil power which produces want, economic insecurity, intense nationalism and war. On the contrary, this "danger to good government everywhere" is to be blended into the foundation and walls of their earthly New Jerusalem. Any plan for world peace which does not first provide for the destruction of this vicious system has no claim for serious consideration whatever.

The Conference "directions" for achieving world peace are: Limitation of national independence, the handing over by each country of control of its finance to some international organisation, and submission to a world dictatorship.

Those who have noted the recent suggestions issued by the Wall Street and London financial gangsters will have little difficulty in recognising the source of these proposals. They are part and parcel of the International Financiers' plot for financial world domination. As this hellish scheme has been so effectively unmasked by Barclay Smith in his excellent booklet, "Federal Union Exposed," it is unnecessary to deal with it at length here. Evidently a modicum at least of this subtle propaganda was craftily "put over" the conference delegates. Perhaps the protagonists of this scheme feared that a full issue would be too strong meat for them, but such caution proved to be quite superfluous. The delegates avidly swallowed the lot, and are now prescribing it as the proper diet for their fellow-countrymen. However, it seems most improbable that Australians, who are fighting to retain their birthright of freedom and their national status, will willingly and consciously exchange it for such a "high" and "smelly" mess of pottage.

If given effect to, the "Federal Union" scheme would undoubtedly bring about—to use Mr. Churchill's phrase—"the liquidation of the British Empire" and a perpetuation of world unrest and war.

Indeed, one of the inducements offered to the Americans to gain their support for the Union proposals is, that they will always be able to out-vote the British Commonwealth of Nations.

As the World Church Conference failed to recognise the real cause of social and national antagonisms, it is useless to look to its findings for any solution of the problems of post-war reconstruction. It seems a rather curious coincidence that

the Princeton "World Conference"—which, according to Dr. Macaulay, was made possible through the generosity of some anonymous citizens of U.S.A.—should have been called just at the time when the International Finance gangsters were launching their plot for the restoration of the Gold Standard, the consequences of which have been aptly termed "the People's Hell and the Bankers' Paradise." Another very cogent reason for action was that the Malvern (Eng.) Church Conference advocated a change in the monetary system, and also asserted the right of nations to their independence. Both these proposals are as obnoxious to the Money Dictators as they seem to be to Dr. Macaulay and his confreres. The Princeton recommendations were evidently issued as a counter-blast to the Malvern resolutions, which had been receiving a good deal of attention and support in British and Australian Church circles. As the Princeton "directions" are "commended to the Governments and Churches of the Allied nations," it is evident that it is hoped that the Churches will begin a crusade to spread abroad this "New Gospel" of the banking kingdom.

Past experience should serve as a warning to the Churches that to give support to this dangerous and unsound scheme would be a disastrous step. Some years ago, some (not all) Church pulpits were used as propaganda bases for the infamous "Premiers' (Bankers') Plan, which ruined many thousands throughout Australia. The odium that this stupid action brought upon the Churches has not even yet been dissipated. Whatever their demerits, the Malvern resolutions represent the results of a sincere attempt to solve post-war problems and to achieve peace. Because of the absence of "cold common-sense," the Princeton product seems curiously like a plan for combining and co-ordinating service of God and Mammon.

—"Stirem."

## Remember France

1933 "France was rapidly becoming bureaucratic. Superimposed upon an extremely flexible political system was a caste of permanent officialdom which had one purpose in life—the exploitation of its privileges. This was true of all French civil servants. . . ." —Helen Lombard: "Washington Waltz," p. 97.

Well, we know what happened to France. Are we going to sit down and watch the same thing happen here, if not in this war, in the next?

## Undermining Morale

"With regard to the matter that was raised" (by Mr. Mackenzie King, Canadian Prime Minister.—Ed.) "if I am at all able to judge of the significance of things, I would say that the speech which was delivered the other day by Mr. Sandwell" (in Toronto, on the "necessity" for a World Government.—Ed.) "advocated the accomplishment of an object which is diametrically opposed to the object for which the United Nations are fighting. If he gains his objective, all is lost; this war will have been fought in vain. If there is anything that will deaden the enthusiasm of the people in regard to the conduct of this war, it is the discussion of such matters as this, of supra-national governments, which need not be discussed while this war is being carried on."

—Mr. Blackmore, M.P., Leader of the New Democracy (Social Credit) Party, Ottawa. [Wide "Social Creditor," July 10]

## AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir.—Almost daily we are getting more and more confirmation that the people of Australia, IF THEY DON'T WATCH OUT, will be betrayed after this war even more seriously than they were betrayed after the last war. The "fight for markets" is already taking shape, and signs of bitterness are in evidence. This increases the necessity for us to understand what happened last time. After the signing of the "Peace" Treaty in 1919 "Stead's Review" of 12/7/19 contained this:—

"We have had vivid descriptions of the signing ceremony cabled out to us, have been told in detail the sort of seals the Dominion representatives used when they affixed their names to the historic document, but not a word have we had on the immensely important subject of the economic clauses of the Treaty, which clauses were made public in Europe and America at least a week ago.... It is now pretty generally admitted that whatever the war started over, it ended in being largely a strife for commercial supremacy and for world markets."

As the men in charge of affairs to-day have similar outlook and the same objective as those who were in charge of affairs during and after the last war, it is not surprising that developments are taking an almost identical course. The British Prime Minister at the time of the 1919 Peace Conference (Rt. Hon. Lloyd George) told us that "the international bankers swept statesmen, politicians, jurists, and journalists all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees." The stage is being set for a similar thing to happen again, and for trade to be carried on under conditions dictated by the international bankers. They will issue their ruthless decrees again unless our Governments stop them. Unfortunately, up to now the indications are pointing the other way.

And so we come again to the facts we are establishing, viz:—That the objective of International Finance is the establishment of the Slave State, i.e., "work-for-all" no money unless we work for it as directed, and then we will be given the smallest amount possible; that the objective of the London School of Economics is the same, and graduates from this school are being placed in the key positions controlling post-war reconstruction plans; that the declared objective of the Australian Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction is the same as the objective of International Finance and the London School of Economics; and that the public "leaders" of the Empire and the United States are advocating the self-same thing.

Last week it was shown that Mr. Roosevelt is, or was, one of the group of men described as international financiers. This week, attention is invited to what Mrs. Roosevelt recently said in Australia, and also to an extract from a speech delivered by a United States Senator as far back as 1921. Firstly, Mrs. Roosevelt, as published in the Melbourne "Argus" of 6/9/43:

"America now has a greater production capacity than any country had ever had before. If that opportunity is not to be wasted America will have to think on a world scale, not merely from the point of view of making money, but from the point of view of finding markets, and so making it possible to improve the general standard of living. . . . Individuals must forget themselves sufficiently."

So from this we see the idea is that if the United States cannot "find" markets in other countries the poor Americans won't be able to make use of the abundant things they have and need at home! The old economic war for "markets" is to be resumed with greater intensity than ever. They cannot be given American money to buy American goods unless a lot of American wealth can also be "sold" in other countries. If other countries don't want American goods, then apparently they should be forced by threat of arms to take them. The thirteen millions who were on the verge of starvation a few years ago should forget themselves more.

### AUSTRALIA'S SOVEREIGNTY

In view of the all-too-obvious fact that the Japanese and their allies are not the only dangers to the freedom of the Australian people to govern themselves even to the customary extent, without overseas dictation, we strongly urge all Australian democrats to write, while there is yet time, to their respective representatives in the Federal Parliament. A sample letter is reproduced hereunder, and copies of it, printed in large, clear type, are available from the "New Times" office at 1/6 per 100 post free:—

Mr.....M.H.R.,  
Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T.

Dear Sir,—I respectfully request you, as my representative in the Commonwealth Parliament, to OPPOSE by all means in your power, ANY move that might, in the slightest degree, hand over Australia's sovereignty, freedom-of-action and independence, in regard to financial or other matters, domestic or external, to ANY sort of international authority.

I have in mind, particularly, recently-announced proposals for an "international currency" (possibly based on gold), proposals for an international government or "Federal Union," and proposals for an international "police force."

I am very alarmed at the possibility that we may have been already partly committed, without the consent of Parliament or the people, to something of the kind. I shall be obliged if you will find out, as soon as possible, whether this is so, and let me know without delay.

Yours faithfully .....

Now read carefully what Senator E. F. Ladd said in 1921, as taken from U.S.A. "Congressional Record" (67th Congress, 2nd Session, 15/12/21):

"This country alone has resources more than sufficient to feed, clothe and shelter the entire population of all civilised countries. Probably it would not be too strong a statement to say that with our present man-power and material equipment properly and effectively applied to our natural resources we could furnish all the principal necessities for the economic support of all the people of the earth for years to come. It has been computed that we have standing room for all the human beings now living in the world in the State of Texas alone, giving to each individual 66 square feet of space. It has been estimated that California alone could furnish all necessities and many luxuries for one half of the present population of the United States. That section of the country usually referred to as the North-West could feed the present population of the United States, with the exception of such things as are grown in tropical countries, without any great strain upon its resources, and its surplus will be sufficient to purchase these products. Taken together with the Pacific North-West, it could furnish all the bread-stuffs, meat products, dairy and poultry products, wool, flax, shoes, lumber, iron, steel, coal and water-power the entire country could use in the next 500 years."

That, mark you, was the position in 1921, since when the productive potential has increased manyfold. And yet this allegedly great woman has stated that unless American production can be "sold" abroad it cannot be used at home to improve the living standards of the American people. To me it seems the sheerest insanity, but it may be that my own understanding is at fault. She apparently spoke on the assumption that the international financial gangsters

## LET US PRAISE COURAGEOUS MEN

I have to thank no less a personality than the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Winston Churchill, for drawing my attention to a phenomenon I might easily have overlooked. I quote my newspaper: It informs me that Mr. Churchill told Mr. Morgenthau (Secretary to the U.S. Treasury): "You must be one of the bravest men in the world. You ought to have the Congressional Medal and the Victoria Cross for being able to lie down at night and sleep quietly amongst these astronomical figures of modern finance."

Once again that fatal modesty and reverence which Mr. Churchill appears to entertain for that spell-binding abstraction, finance, sends shivers of apprehension down our spines for the safety of the Atlantic Charter—and for the safety of Magna Carta and all the other charters, for the matter of that.

It would appear that to the Prime Minister the outstanding characteristic of Mr. Morgenthau is courage. Admittedly Mr. Churchill is a courageous man himself, and, no doubt, might be relied upon to recognise a kindred soul. Or perhaps not quite kindred, as Mr. Morgenthau has never confessed, so far as I know, to any weakness in the matter of high finance. I think it may be safely presumed that Mr. M. knows more about finance than is good for us.

But it has never occurred to me that it required courage to go to bed with figures more or less of your own creation, friendly ghosts, as one might say, conceived as they are in soberest and most watchful of moments. Anyhow, they're not in the least like pink elephants.

Superficially, it would seem that if Mr. M. were really afraid to sleep with them, all he would have to do would be to stop inventing them, and tell all his friends to stop also. He would lose his job most likely, of course, but if he still found himself unable to sleep his friends would probably rally round and see to it.

However, he has taken the path of courage. After all, any fool can lose his job and stay poor. I have been told that it really doesn't take so much courage to do that. Certainly I have heard of men who have been said to welcome death through poverty, but I maintain that it can't take courage to face anything that is welcome.

This probably chance observation of the P.M. has jolted me into thoughtfulness. Maybe I've misjudged many people in my time. Maybe I've been over hasty to condemn them for small, obvious flaws in their make up, such as greed, sadism, perjury and graft, when all the time the fact that they were the possessors of courage had entirely escaped my observation.

The trouble is you never know quite how to take these Parliamentarians. They keep you and me guessing by being coy about what they know and what they don't know. There is always the possibility that Mr. Churchill mightn't have meant it when he said he didn't know much about finance. I mean to say, he was Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time, and a knowledge of finance might have come in handy to

would still be permitted to dictate to the world, and it cannot be denied that the gangsters have got things going their way at this stage of the game.

Sir Victor Sassoon, described as a "British" banker, but who is really one of a family of Baghdad Jews, and a member of the international financial oligarchy, arrived at Los Angeles on 18/6/41, en route to Shanghai. He said there was no other way to stop Hitler but to form a world federation of democracies, with Britain, Canada, and Australia becoming a part of the United States! He went on: "The United States needs Britain, Australia, and Canada to consume the exports of South America. It is now obvious to business men of the world that the federal alliance with Britain is so necessary that it hardly" bears discussion. Britain must come into the democracy of the United States with full right of Statehood. It is also obvious that such an arrangement would mean that Britain would relinquish her traditions and institutions of Government."

Just like that! All cut and dried. And the once-Great Britain would be granted-FULL RIGHT OF STATEHOOD! There's magnanimity par excellence. And all in the blessed name of Democracy! Was it wrong to say that the subjugation of the British Empire was one of the purposes for which the present war was arranged, and that this subjugation is one of the first necessities in securing the establishment of the Slave State within its territories? You remember the words of the "Research Committee" of the London School of Economics (P.E.P.):—

"We have started, from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning."

Apropos of the last Peace Conference, it is interesting to recall an extract from a letter written by James Buell, official representative of the International Association, as published by the Monetary Education Bureau, Washington, D.C., in 1919 (page 34 of "No Plutocratic Peace"):—

"We are careful to conceal the ugly fact that by our iniquitous monetary system we have nationalised a system of oppression more refined but none the less cruel than the old system of chattel slavery."

And it is the intention not only that that system of oppression shall be maintained, but that our own servants shall be used to trick us into accepting it.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,  
180 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2,  
10th October, 1943

(To be continued.)

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

since it comes from a highly-placed American, who is apparently not mesmerised into the widespread delusion that Roosevelt and Stalin are sustaining the universe. "On balance," Mr. Ickes appears to have retained some of the cultural niceties so peculiar to the refined Britisher.

**BUSINESS BRAINS:** Millionaire Beaverbrook, the British press magnate whose mishandling of aircraft production caused him to be removed from the Ministry, is now to lead a mission to Washington—and later may go to Russia. It is also announced that Mr. E. Stettinius, of U.S.A. (record unknown), is to be entrusted with the delicate negotiations with Russia. He will lead a team of hard-boiled business men, who will take precedence over professional diplomats or persons "whose views on Russia are based on ideological instead of realistic considerations." From this it seems that Trade and Business are to be the be-all and end-all of negotiations. It is certainly time that orthodox diplomats, bankers, lawyers, and economists were dumped, but these new nominees will also require close attention.

**BRITISH BURDEN:** A weekly journal, "British Ally," published in Russian, gives some idea of Britain's war burden: "She has contributed 23 million people, working full time, from her effective population of slightly over 33 million between the ages of 14 to 64. These figures do not take into account any form of voluntary work." What an effort from a country with less than a quarter of Russia's population! Another aspect of this is that nearly two out of every three Britons are wholly engaged in non-productive work—"exporting" weapons of death and destruction to the enemy, free of charge. What an indefatigable case for post-war leisure for cultural advancement—if only finance is made available for this purpose as it is for war. This idea must be kept before the people.

**COMMON CAUSE:** Commenting on the common Allied war aim, the London "Daily Mail" says, "The Russians and the Americans will resolutely defend their vital national interests. Britain also has vital interests which must be defended also; they include her national honour, which was pledged to the restoration of all Poland—not one half of Poland." Present indications are that, although the people of Russia may have little or no interest outside their own soil, their leaders have designs on Poland which appear to be in conflict with British aims. It looks like a ticklish problem; but doubtless Russia will see the wisdom of Britain's viewpoint, especially if, "when the whistle blows," Britain and the U.S.A. have sufficient military forces on the spot to take proper care of the situation.

**SLATER'S SECRET:** In reply to some (unpublished) criticisms of the advocacy of the surrender of State Powers, Mr. W. Slater, M.L.A. (who, possibly as a result of his very brief stay in Russia, is seemingly infected with the vicious virus of centralisation-mania) made the following alarming comment: "The present controls would not be removed immediately after the war." Who are we to believe—the Government, which declares that the controls are only war measures, or Mr. Slater? The only safe way is not to believe either, but to insist that these totalitarian, antidemocratic measures be removed progressively—commencing NOW. —O.B.H.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide)

**OUR NEW NEIGHBOURS:** Doubtless some of our supporters have noted that the "Common Cause" movement has rented rooms in the same building as our headquarters, and are wondering whether there is any connection between the two organisations. There is definitely no connection. Without going into detail, we would point out that whilst some of their ostensible objectives are similar to ours, they do not appear to have a definite plan of campaign for attaining such objectives. When this is known we will be better able to gauge the merit of the movement. Possibly the "price" to be paid to attain the goal would be out of proportion to the result. We are, however, quite in accord with their endeavours to arouse the public out of their apathy and to get citizens to take that interest in public and national affairs which is so vitally necessary to make Democracy a functioning reality.

**BOOKS:** Have you read the following books?—"ALBERTA'S ROAD TO FREEDOM." (The record of seven years of government without borrowing money). 8d. "THE STORY OF THE COMMONWEALTH BANK," by D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S. 1/3. "RED GLOWS THE DAWN," by Michael Lamb. (A revealing history of the Australian Communist Party.) 6d. (All plus 1/4d. postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

### "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.

—Footle.

## GETTING "THE RIGHT MEN" IN PARLT.

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

**This week let us analyse a question which appears to be uppermost in the minds of some social crediters at present: "Should social crediters attempt to have social credit implemented by party-political action?"**

To me this question is a contradiction in itself. No person, or groups of persons, can GIVE us social credit. Social credit is a philosophy, based on the belief that individuals in association can get what they want, providing it is physically possible. Social crediters believe that man is greater than institutions, the people in association should be able to force their will on all institutions. It can never be sufficiently stressed that social credit is something which individuals can only develop by actually working in association, thus proving to themselves their own power.

Our major job is to show our fellow-electors how they can develop their power; and I, personally, detest the idea that we should encourage people to believe that all they have to do is to vote for the "right" man and everything will be all right. This is only pandering to the very weakness we are attempting to overcome: the political inertia of the electors. I know that the idea of political party action sounds easy. But there is no easy road to the salvation of our civilisation. We must be realists and face facts.

The main fact we must face is the necessity for the electors to take action to control their political representatives. The electors must also be supplied with information. Do we need a party political organisation to supply this information? We do not. A tremendous amount of incalculable educational work has been done in this country by a comparatively small number of INDIVIDUALS. I recently received a letter from a Victorian country actionist who is regularly supplying fourteen country papers with material, most of which is being published. What this one actionist is doing, thousands more could and should be doing, instead of waiting for some organisation or party to do things for them.

We must start with the electors and work up. No one, except, of course, a dictator, will deny that a majority of electors, united on an issue that they clearly understand, can force their political representative to do as they desire. This has been proved time and time again. At this point someone may ask: "But don't you think that we should try and get the right men into Parliament."

I am as keen as any social creditor to see the right sort of men in Parliament. But what is a "right" man? We now come to the crux of the matter:

**A "right" man is one who is prepared to act at all times as a servant of the electors; a man who believes that he should ascertain the wishes of his electors and represent them in Parliament; a man who would expose any interests which oppose the policy of the electors; a man who believes that all institutions exist to serve the electors.**

Clearly, our first job is to ascertain which of the present Members are unalterably opposed to the above ideas. There is only one way to do this—the use of the "Electoral Campaign" technique, the association of electors to demand, in black-and-white, specific results. Two weeks ago, in these columns, I outlined how social crediters in all electorates could go to work. Policy Groups should be formed to help electors with advice. We cannot escape the fact that the electors must be educated. Education doesn't mean doing nothing for three years and then spending hundreds or thousands of pounds in a few weeks in a futile endeavour to get the "right" man in.

If all the tens of thousands of pounds which monetary reformers, many of whom call themselves social crediters, have wasted—yes, wasted!—over the past years had been carefully used between elections to educate the electors concerning real democracy, we would have been very much nearer to our main objective than we are. If social crediters in every electorate work conscientiously along the lines I suggested a fortnight ago, they will accomplish the following:

- (1) An arousing of the electors to their own power.
- (2) The thorough education of the electors on fundamental problems.
- (3) Encourage an inquiring minority to learn more about all aspects of our work, thus providing more "social engineers" to help electors with advice.

If any Member of Parliament has proved over a period of three years that he will not do as the electors desire, the electors can easily vote him out. This will have a salutary effect on other Members. Elections should be regarded as primarily for the purpose of removing undemocratic Members. But what of the electorates where an undemocratic Member had to be removed? The answer is obvious: If the electors are so politically alert as to vote out a Member who refuses to represent their policies, all that is required is the selection of some man who will undertake to carry out the wishes of the electors. This man won't even need to conduct a campaign (and waste hundreds of pounds) to be elected.

The "Electoral Campaign" will thus do, much more effectively, what party-political actionists advocate. The putting into operation of social credit will gradually eliminate undemocratic Members from Parli-

ment and replace them with democratic Members. Decentralised control of Members by electors will grow and democracy will be purified. The "Electoral Campaign" will ensure that we get "right" men and "right" results.

What about it, social crediters? Have you written that letter to the local press yet? And what about your political representatives? Then there is . . . but why go on? There are dozens of things you can do. Form a Policy Group this coming week. Doing things is ever so much more important than talking about them—or waiting for some centralised organisation to do it for you. And a final thought: Centralised organisations are easily captured and perverted by anti-social groups. The less "organisation" we have the better.

## INTERESTING DISCUSSION ON "WORK"

Twenty men and women met in a Bristol hotel room and answered questions about post-war employment. In age and occupation they were a representative cross-section of the life of the city. The youngest was a 17-years-old architectural pupil, the eldest an insurance man between 50 and 55. There were three shopkeepers, a railwayman, a policeman, and a woman Civil Servant among them. About half were between 40 and 50 years old, six or seven were about 30 years of age, and there was a sprinkling of younger people.

Organisers were the Bristol Voters' Policy Association, an off-shoot of the Bristol Ratepayers' League, and the object of the meeting, explained by Mr. N. Corradine, the Director, was to find out what views a cross-section of voters held about post-war employment. "Only if people confine themselves to saying what they want for themselves, and not what they think others ought to want or do, can agreement and united action become possible," he said. The Voters' Policy Association's technical adviser put a series of questions to people at the meeting. Here are some extracts from the discussion, and the conclusions reached:

Chairman: "Do you want work?"  
Shopkeeper, aged 50: "What do you mean by work?"

Chairman: "Wyd's Dictionary says: 'Any form of physical or intellectual activity engaged in for the purpose of accomplishing a desired end.'"

Shopkeeper: "Yes."

Young Architect's Clerk: "Yes, definitely."

Chairman: "I mean quite apart from pay. If your money income would be the same whether you worked or not, would you work?"

Elderly Insurance Man: "Everyone ought to work."

Chairman: "Yes, but would you?"

Insurance Man: "Of course, you can't live without work."

War Reserve P.C.: "A tramp can."

Others: "Some people do."

## COMPULSORY PASTEURISATION

The resumed second-reading debate on this matter in the Victorian Parliament discloses that quite a few Members are becoming aware of the dangers inherent in this measure, which would prevent people from obtaining pure raw milk. This is all to the good, and illustrates that the informative leaflet issued by the Consumers' Protection League is penetrating. This should encourage those engaged in this educative activity to greater action, and if YOU have not played your part in this campaign NOW is the best time to commence. Supplies of leaflets incorporating appropriate letter-forms are available at 1/- per 100 from the Consumers' Protection League, Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne. Many new actionists have been contacted through this campaign, and the secretary urges YOU to keep the idea snowballing.

## PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor," England. (Continued from last issue.)

If I have conveyed my conception of the nature and powers of the myth with any success, it will be clear that a wide distance separates disbelief in such matters as "British Israel Truth," "Pyramidology," and Dr. Grattan Guinness's views on the Book of Daniel, from the assumption that it is a matter of no importance that millions of people do believe them.

So far as the veridical aspect of these "theories," or whatever one likes to call them, is concerned, the fundamental proposition they involve is, to put it mildly, comprehensive.

If the people who designed and built the pyramids five thousand years ago knew that there would be a war in A.D. 1914, then obviously nothing could be done to stop it, and our political efforts are, and always have been, a waste of time. This inference is of importance when we come to consider a second theory—that the object of all these movements is to paralyse action against revolution.

So far as the Book of Daniel is concerned, Porphyry, and since him many others, have regarded the whole work as a fabrication of a Palestinian Jew who lived in the time of Antiochus, and that its express purpose was to bolster up the "Chosen Race" idea.

If we are to take the authenticity aspect seriously, this criticism has a considerable bearing on the British Israel cult, since the Stone Kingdom supposed to be Britain is that mentioned in the Book of Daniel.

It may be said at once that there can be no doubt that these Pyramid myths have

## PERNICIOUS PRECEDENT

"The leading idea of his [Diocletian's] system was an absolute centralisation, the suppression of all local political life, of every vestige of ancient liberties: in one word, Autocracy. Diocletian is the founder of the Byzantine regime. It was indeed no very considerable change. The reformer did but consecrate by appropriate institutions the tendencies of the situation and usages which were already established. Such a system had the same results that it always has: the centralising organ was developed at the expense of the body which it was supposed to direct: the fiscal system at the expense of general prosperity; and management at the expense of energy. The Empire was soon a prey to the malady of its government; the time was to come when it died of it"—Abbe Duchesne: "The Early History of the Christian Church," vol. II., chapter 1.

employment by someone else, to be free to leave it without suffering extreme penalties of poverty and compulsory idleness, hitherto the fate of the unemployed. It was agreed, also, that employers wanted freedom to discharge employees without having at the same time to inflict ruinous economic penalties on them. The continued suppression of these freedoms after the war was not viewed with favour by anyone.

About half of those present wanted to work for themselves, the others were ready to accept employment by others.

Some of the prevalent confusion about "employment" and "leisure" was cleared up by further questions, which showed that leisure—the use of one's own time and energies—would be used partly for purposeful activity by all those present, while employment—the use of one's time and energies by someone else—might also include idleness as well as work, for a good or bad, useful or useless purpose.

**The difference between employment and leisure is therefore not that one is work and the other idleness: it lies in the control of purpose.**

The issue has been much confused by the fact that unemployment has hitherto been distinguished from leisure by extreme poverty or financial stress, and exclusion from most useful or satisfying activities.

The meeting's conclusion was that if the policy of "full employment," advocated unanimously by men of power and influence in every country of the world, means the maximum control by a minority of the purpose of human endeavour, and the minimum number of people at leisure, or working for themselves, THEN IT IS THE DIRECT OPPOSITE OF WHAT THE VOTERS WANT.

—"Bristol Evening World," June 24, 1943

## BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from The United Electors of Australia, Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.)

"The Tragedy of Human Effort." By C. H. Douglas. Indicates how to make democracy work. Specially recommended for distribution at the present time. Price, 7d. posted.

"Federal Union Exposed." Exposes the international bankers' plot to dominate the world through a World Government. A complete analysis—and a most important reference book. Price, 1/1/4d. posted.

"Alberta's Road to Freedom" is the answer to false statements about Alberta's attempt to overthrow the bankers' tyranny. Describes the Treasury Branches scheme. Price, 9/4d. posted.

"Red Glows The Dawn." A well-documented record of the disruptive anti-British activities of Communists in Australia. Price, 7/4d. posted.

"Banks and Facts." A remarkable presentation of the banking swindle. The banker states his own case—and is answered paragraph by paragraph. Price, 7/4d. posted.

"The Story of the Commonwealth Bank." By D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S. Price, 1/4/4d. posted.

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

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1/4d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

## IMPORTANT NEW BOOKLET

"Power Politics and People's Pressure"

A timely exposure of the conspiracy for international control of your country.

This booklet is fully documented, with some disquieting information.

To work effectively, social crediters must keep abreast of the facts. "Power Politics and People's Pressure" is a valuable contribution to this end.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW.

Price, 1/1, post free, from The United Electors of Australia, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

## "WHY BIG FINANCE BACKS SOCIALISM"

By JAS. GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

This new booklet contains five broadcast talks, and it is hoped that all readers of the "New Times" will help to give it wide publicity

7d. per copy or 4/6 per dozen, posted

Obtainable from  
THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN  
101 Collins Street, Hobart, Tasmania

(Continued on page 4.)

## THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA

By ERIC D. BUTLER. (Continued from last issue.)

Although there was a great outcry against Evatt's first Powers Bill, by politicians of all parties, a lot of this opposition eventually subsided. Anyone reading through the debates in the State Houses cannot help noticing how many men who had spoken against the Constitutional proposals previously, and advanced good arguments for so doing, voted for the proposals when the real test came. Undoubtedly the two most remarkable examples of Party hacks talking one way and voting another were provided by two Labor men, Mr. Cooper, Premier of Queensland, and Mr. Cain of Victoria. In a speech on the proposed increase of power for Canberra, Mr. Cooper said:

"Dictatorship exists in many forms and not only in one or two forms, as we are apt to believe. There is such a thing, for example, as too much centralisation. Centralisation becomes a bad thing if the benefits of political policies are not as widespread as they should be. The great point about democracy is that it is disseminating power; and in disseminating power we disseminate interest and encourage the whole of the populace to co-operate. There can be no co-operation if all the power and all the interest be centred in one spot. The wider the spread of power, the wider will be the incentive, the initiative, and the earnest desire to do things for the whole of the Commonwealth. . . . I know my own State particularly well. I know the development that has taken place in Queensland because of the delegation of power and authority throughout the length and breadth of that State. It may interest many of you to know that we have an eastern coastline of 1200 or 1300 miles. Along that coastline we have seven deep-sea ports, not little mouths of rivers with a bit of a wharf some distance up stream, but seven deep-sea ports to which overseas ships can go. . . . How have they been developed? By Brisbane—a place stuck at the corner of the State, holding the whole of the power? Not at all. The whole of Queensland has been developed by the different portions having delegated power to effect their own development."

Having uttered these sound sentiments, Mr. Cooper, as a good Labor Party man, later supported and voted for Evatt's centralisation Bill!

Now let us examine some of Mr. Cain's statements. The following is from the report of the Constitutional Convention:

"Mr. Cain: Australia should never have got into the depression. The reason for the depression becoming so acute in this country was that between 1928 and 1933 public expenditure was permitted to fall by many millions of pounds. . . . The time when public expenditure should expand is when private expenditure begins to shrink."

"Mr. Menzies: Forgetting for the moment matters of policy, do you say that what happened then was due to any weakness in the Constitution?"

"Mr. Cain: No. It was due to lack of decision on the part of the Government of the day."

After pointing out clearly that the Commonwealth Government ALREADY had the necessary power to deal with economic depression, Mr. Cain remembered that he was a Labor Party man, returned to Melbourne and persuaded the Members of the Victorian Assembly that the Federal Government must have INCREASED power to solve the unemployment and other problems after the war!

Perhaps I should also mention Mr. McKell, Premier of New South Wales. Before and after the Canberra Convention, Mr. McKell critically analysed the growth of bureaucracy in Australia as the result of growing centralisation. And yet he voted for still greater powers for Canberra! However, as one speaker pointed out in the New South Wales Assembly debate, it was the same Mr. McKell who was going to challenge Curtin's Uniform Tax Plan until the Labor Party made him realise that he was a mere cog in the vast machine. When, on, when, will the electors ever realise what a farce the Party Racket is?

Evatt's first Bill was introduced into Federal Parliament in October of 1942. Among other platitudes, we were told that one of the reasons why the Federal Government had to have increased powers was because of Australia's agreement to the Atlantic Charter. And who committed us to the Atlantic Charter, a vague document which no public man in this country has been able to understand completely? We do know that Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, was present at the conference at which the Charter was framed. Mr. Norman was the man who crushed Britain through the power of finance after the last war. The activities of men like Montagu Norman are now becoming better known to the British people. In the New South Wales Assembly on December 16, 1942, Major Shand, a man who could hardly be termed an irresponsible radical, said:

"I merely want to repeat a matter of history—the visit to the United States of America by the Federal Attorney-General. During that visit he had the opportunity of meeting some of the high lights of that land, one of them being a great financier. In London, also, he met one of the greatest financiers that visited Australia during the period of the depression, Sir Otto Niemeyer, who exercised an undoubted influence over the affairs not only of Australia, but of the world generally. Therefore, under this camouflage of asking for greater powers, there is the power of finance."

The powers sought by Evatt in his first Bill were such that, once granted, a few men at Canberra would have as much power as Hitler. Evatt knew this, but was

with." While disagreeing on many points raised by Evatt, men like Mr. Menzies agreed that Canberra must have greater powers. And, of course, the Melbourne "Herald" agreed also!

There was also widespread criticism of the Bill, although most opponents neglected to mention the vital question of finance.

One of the very few State politicians to point out that the governing factor in post-war reconstruction will be finance, and that the Commonwealth Government ALREADY has sovereign power over financial policy, was Mr. L. H. Hollins, Victorian Independent M.L.A. At a joint meeting of the Victorian Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council on November 11, 1942 Mr. Hollins said:

"We cannot deny that the whole programme laid down in the proposed alteration of the Constitution is impressive, yet I fear there is a nigger in the wood-pile. There is something fundamentally wrong with the whole thing. If it be true, as I contend, that the Commonwealth Government possesses adequate powers to deal with these problems now, then why should it suggest at this time an alteration of the Constitution? The problem that concerns me, as well as hundreds of thousands of people throughout Australia, is that the power which controls everything—money—has not been mentioned. There is not one suggestion throughout the whole of the constitutional proposals that has any reference to money. . . . Part V. of the Constitution Act relates to the powers of the

Parliament. Section 51 sets out that the Parliament shall have power to make laws in respect of various subjects, among which is paragraph XIII. —

"Banking, other than State banking; also State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money."

Having clearly shown that State Governments, Councils and private enterprise can look after all the problems mentioned by Dr. Evatt—IF FINANCE IS MADE AVAILABLE—Mr. Hollins said:

"Frankly, I cannot accept the view of some persons that the members of the Federal Cabinet, who have been responsible for the suggested alteration of the Constitution, believe that their proposals will solve the problem. The public utterances over the last ten years of the Prime Minister, the Commonwealth Treasurer, the Commonwealth Attorney-General, and many of their colleagues, indicate that they agree with me in what I have been saying, and for that reason I am justified in feeling considerable alarm that they should put forward their proposals when the Commonwealth Parliament already has sufficient power in the Constitution to carry out its programme. . . . I do not suggest that the present Federal Government would attempt to introduce Socialism, but it seems to me that if the State Parliaments are abolished and powers to implement the policy of socialism are granted to the Federal Parliament, a system of government will result which will be perilously near to National Socialism. If the Federal authorities, and particularly the Federal Ministers, would show the same degree of zeal for taking control of money power as they have shown towards bringing about a change in the Constitution, we should be very proud of them."

When the general criticism was at its height, it was announced that Dr. Evatt had arranged a Convention at Canberra to discuss the matter with representatives of the States. The second phase of the fight was about to start.

(To be continued.)

## PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

(Continued from page 3)

correspond with these prophetic dates, AND WE KNOW THAT THEY WERE CONSCIOUSLY TIMED TO CORRESPOND.

For instance, the "great economic blizzard" (notice the suggestion that it was a phenomenon of nature), struck the world in 1929, and if ever there was a conscious and deliberately produced catastrophe it was the five-year depression. And May, 1928, was one of the Pyramid dates. On the day predicted for a momentous event, the Act of Parliament handing the British Currency over to the Bank of "England" became law. There are other instances known to me, and I am satisfied that the dates were consciously arranged. I was informed in 1920, from a source closely approximating to that which initiated the "blizzard," that it would occur about 1928. Viewed in the light of subsequent events, the Currency Act of 1928 can be seen, and I think can only be seen, as a conscious preparation for an arranged depression, together with the best possible defence against any interference with the depression by relieving its cause. It is a damning piece of evidence which ought to hang its perpetrators even yet.

For obvious reasons I refrain from enlarging on the anticipatory emphasis placed on King Edward VIII., "exactly one hundred generations from King David" and known in the family circle as David.

August, 1938 was to be the date of the outbreak of war culminating in Armageddon. AND IT WOULD HAVE BEEN, IF IT HAD NOT BEEN FOR THE EFFORTS OF MR. CHAMBERLAIN, who was apparently stronger than the pyramid. There is nothing in all history more astounding than the contrast, on the one hand, of the relief both in England and Germany, at the subsequently abortive compromise of Munich, and the hysterical rage at it of the American press—notably the same press which fought tooth and nail to keep the U.S.A. out of the war, but which has now turned its attention to making sure that once Great Britain loses the Peace.

Mark the Editorial views of a widely read "American" review:—

## DANGER OF CHANGING AUSTRALIA'S CONSTITUTION

(Continued from page 1)

moral right, or any other right, to interfere with the affairs of Launceston. And nobody in Hobart wants to do so, except certain politicians and officials, who want to increase their power at the expense of everybody else.

The desire for centralisation comes from the officials, not from the people. The State Governments have very much more on their hands than they can tackle; few of our important affairs get proper attention in the State Parliament owing to the vast amount of work which the State Government places on its own shoulders.

The Federal Government is in even a worse position. It is impossible for Members of the Federal House of Parliament to

"Among international agencies of a more political character which ought to be functioning now, or all ready to function, might be mentioned:

"A colonial administration to act as receiver for defunct colonial empires (it would be folly to try to return the East Indies to Britain (sic) and the Netherlands).

"A European Federal Judicial system, perhaps under the World Court, to try cases of war criminals and to lay down standards for adjudicating the tangled property rights left over from the war.

"A European Police Force or International Army."

Compare this with the views of Dr. Arnold Toynbee.

It should not escape notice that these "prophetic" theories, whether pyramidologist, "lost ten Tribes" or interpretations of the prophet Daniel, came into currency much about the same time—i.e., just after the Franco-Prussian War, which was the event marking the emergence of the "United States of Europe" policy of Freemasonry, sponsored by Frederick the "Great" and pursued by Bismarck and Hitler.

The pyramidologists refer to the final chamber of the Pyramid, which marks the "end of the age," as the Hall of the Grand Orient.

It may be objected that the inference is pro-British. To which the answer is that just to the extent that they are a factor in policy (certain British Ministers, Mr. Baldwin's "white-haired boys," resigned at the time of Munich, and rushed off to New York for further instructions) they are firstly, pro-war, and finally pro-German-American-Jew, since they all hint at the Federal Union of the British Empire and the U.S.A.—a Union in which the British Empire would disappear in a slave world ruled by Jews, including, no doubt, a few German-British Jews.

The accessible officials of the organisations propagating the British-American myth are probably sincere, and are of minor importance. Who is behind them?

(To be continued.) (All rights reserved.)

it cannot, and doesn't, and has no possibility of doing so.

In his book, Drummond says: "The Western Australian leader of the Opposition has posed the question, Can a Government and Parliament situated at Canberra, 2500 miles from Perth, govern Western Australia as wisely in the ordinary concerns of life as similar bodies in Perth itself?"

I don't think there is any doubt about the answer, but those who are anxious to destroy the Australian Constitution don't discuss this question except in the most cursory manner.

Here is another passage from Drummond's book:

"It is sometimes stated that lack of constitutional power prevented the Commonwealth from effectively handling problems arising from the depression. Such an assumption can arise only from ignorance of the facts. The spending power and taxing power of the Commonwealth is unlimited. Actually, what prevented the Commonwealth from doing other than make doles to the States was not lack of power, but failure to perceive the real nature of the depression until it was too late.

"It was not entirely singular in this. There was a time lag in the States also; but, fortunately, not to the same extent. The Commonwealth could have made money available for power development, unification of railway gauges, schools, technical institutions and housing, on terms and conditions laid down by the Federal Government. It could have instituted long-range schemes. However, it did not, and so missed a great opportunity for leadership and sound policy."

"Yet a reasonable deduction from this experience is that there can be no successful post-war reconstruction unless the financial power of the Commonwealth is harnessed to the States. Had the necessity for such Federal co-operation and leadership been fully recognised at the beginning of the 1930-36 depression, much misery and waste could have been avoided. Moreover, it is certain this war would have found Australia better equipped materially and spiritually."

"That the Commonwealth failed fully to use its powers in the economic crisis is a reason of doubtful value for scrapping the Constitution and granting further powers."

Australia's great tragedy has been—and is—that the control of finance is in the hands of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government was largely responsible for the depression, which reduced this country to chaos.

The State and the Municipal Governments have always been short of the money necessary to carry out their proper functions, and it appears to be part of the policy of the 'Personal Interests' at Canberra to keep the States short of money, so that State Governments could be kept in the position of mendicants going cap in hand to the officials at Canberra.

This is all part of a carefully worked out technique, which is: Starve the Municipal Councils and the State Governments of the necessary funds to carry on their work. Then step in and say, "We shall find the funds if you give me and my friends complete control."

This trick has been played for a long time, and it explains the growth of the great monopolies which are corrupting and destroying enterprise and initiative, and which are found behind every disruptive organisation in every part of the world.

The founders of the Australian Constitution were not the fools Dr. Evatt would have us believe; they planned carefully and well, and allowed for alterations with changing conditions. All responsible people are willing to make alterations to meet the progress of the country; but for the Federal Government to collect all the taxes, and control all credit, and for the States to crawl on their hands and knees for a dole is not my idea of progress. That is stepping backwards in history to something worse than anything we have known.

It is all very well for Dr. Evatt to tell us that the Federal Government only wants to control affairs, and that the States can carry out the task of administration. But, as Drummond says: "The mere conferring of delegated powers is weak for two reasons: First, the power to delegate is the power to take away. It is not right that at the whim of some temporary dictator or party clique the true process of self-government should be filched away or arbitrarily reduced. Second, it is a physical impossibility that the whole legislation of Australia should be carried out speedily and efficiently at Canberra."

We must face the fact that only in self-governing communities have people any chance of growing up in Freedom and Security to their full stature, and the greatest enemies of freedom-loving people have been the great centralised Governments of the world.

Centralised Government is only another name for tyranny and dictatorship; and if Dr. Evatt and his friend, Dr. Gaha, refuse to give this country a fair deal because they are not given powers to do just what they like, then they must be told there are others who can permit us to produce our own prosperity in our own freedom without introducing the methods of Germany and Russia.

The fact that Tasmanians are not permitted to eat their own apples; that milk has to be fed to the pigs, and that farmers are slaughtering their dairy cattle because of Federal Government control, should give you some idea of what happens when you hand over the Government of your country to strangers hundreds of miles away.