

Dictatorship in the
Munitions Union?
(Page 2.)

Australia's Post-war
Peril. (Page 3.)

The Case Against
Nationalisation.
(Page 3.)

The Plot to Socialise
Australia. (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9, No. 48. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1943

Now, when our
land to ruin's
brink is verging,
In God's name,
let us speak while
there is time!
Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime.

Whittier (1807-1892).

What's-the Real Cause of the Coal Crisis?

Wrong Persons Get the Blame

The position of the coal-mining industry in Australia is such that we are about to submit to another dose of regimentation and National Socialism unless the major cause of the crisis is clearly understood and acted upon. As usual, the general public has only the haziest idea of the trouble. Relying, as they do, upon their daily papers and the A.B.C. for their "information," this is not surprising.

They merely feel the results of the trouble and are encouraged to either (a) abuse the coal-miners and suggest that they are an unpatriotic section, or (b) abuse the mine-owners and urge nationalisation. They are encouraged to do everything except look for the real cause of the trouble. They never ask: "Who is benefiting?"

There is no doubting the fact that, if our maximum war effort is to be maintained, more coal must be mined. There are two ways in which this can be attempted. (1) By inducement, and (2) by compulsion. I don't think that any real British citizen would deny that inducement is the far better method. We can safely leave the compulsion to Germany and Japan.

It is no use saying that coal-miners are

any less patriotic than other sections of the community; if they are, then the results of a financial system which degraded the miners during the depression years are now obvious, and it is the responsibility of the Government to stop talking and act.

Are the miners being offered insufficient inducement? All those competent to speak say that the major cause of the decline in production is EXCESSIVE

TAXATION of the miners' wages. Mr. James, M.H.R., speaking at Canberra on October 12, brought forward indisputable evidence of this and showed how, on the present basis of taxation, the harder miners worked the worse off, relatively, they became. One Lithgow miner, in a letter to the Sydney press, put the matter clearly:

"Do you and the Government and the general public think it fair that a man should have to cut and fill fifty tons of coal per pay—or work three and a half days—for nothing? If you and the public saw fifty tons of coal stacked up in a heap and you had to fill it to pay your taxes, you would walk around it and go for your life. You or they would not fill it, let alone cut it. Well, sir, that is what I do—stay home three days; and will do so until the Government wakes up."

Well there's the crux of the position stated frankly enough. It will be noticed that the writer of the above letter, a miner for twenty-five years, is not waiting for the mine-owners to wake up. He is waiting for the Government to wake up. Yes, a Labor Government, which prefers to tax excessively at the behest, consciously or otherwise, of the controllers of the banking system. A Government, which apparently believes that the financial system is more important than production. And it is not only in the coal industry that production and efficiency have been impaired by excessive taxation. If such taxation were in some peculiar way unavoidable, the people would accept it as they willingly accept necessary sacrifices. But when it is becoming more widely known that the Government's financial advisers—all orthodox economists who were connected with the depression—advocate higher taxation in order to drain "surplus" funds away from the public and to meet the heavy interest charges on costless "fountain-pen money" borrowed from the banking system, there is a growing opposition to this type of sabotage. Some would term it worse than sabotage.

Mr. James, M.H.R., in his speech mentioned above, also made many accusations against mine-owners. He points out that the mine-owners are adopting a get-rich-quick attitude, thus losing millions of tons

of coal to the nation. I have no doubt that this is so. But the coal monopoly, like all other monopolies, is the result of a financial system, which drives even so-called wealthy men on and on, because there is a general lack of security and even the wealthiest feels that he must continue to crush all opposition. He can never feel secure.

The State-controlled coalmines in Australia stand as an example for all to see. They, too, have their absenteeism, etc.—and they work at a loss. Probably Mr. Curtin realises that straight-out nationalisation of all coalmines would only make his Government directly responsible. Then "the gaff would be blown." The financial causes would become obvious. The "big idea" seems to be to discredit private ownership and control of all forms of private property; then for the Government to have control without responsibility.

It is significant to note that in the debate at Canberra on the coal-mining issue, both the opponents of the coal-miners and the opponents of the coal-owners advocated more Government control. Senator Wilson, a man who strongly upholds the present financial policy, said at Canberra on October 14:

"If (he cause of the trouble be that the industry should be nationalised, I ask why the Government has not nationalised it."

Isn't it remarkable how every crisis caused by the present financial policy is used to further centralise economic control! "Opponents" stage a great argument on effects. While the public barracks vigorously for one side or the other, the men behind the scenes quietly gather a little more power into their hands.

The main solution of the coal-mining crisis is for the Government to ensure that miners receive reasonable taxation reductions in order that they will be induced to work a maximum number of hours. Then the Government can, if necessary, remove the small minority of Communist and other agitators who seem to be more concerned with grabbing control of unions and sending "second front" resolutions to Britain than with doing any useful work for the community.

—ERIC D. BUTLER.

J. H. Scullin and the Bankers

In the course of a speech on the Budget, in the Federal Parliament on October 12, Mr. J. H. Scullin, M.H.R., and former Prime Minister, displayed acute symptoms of work-mania and an incomplete understanding of the nature of credit. But he commendably attacked the dangerous doctrine of the inevitability of post-war money-scarcity, and he gave some important reminders about certain pre-war events. Intel alia, he said:—

"We have heard in this place and from alleged authorities outside that we cannot hope to get for peace as much money as we get for war, and that there will be less money for employment when the war is over than there is when the war is on. Well, I say that is a dangerous doctrine to preach.

"If the people who return from this war are offered the dole and told that there is no money for employment we can look for revolution. They will have learned that one lesson of the depression. It was burned into the souls of men. There are boys returning from this war who, when called up, were emaciated and ill fed. Only because they have been well fed in the Army have they blossomed into men and played the part of men.

"During the depression I gave work to a man digging in the garden. When I took him into lunch he was amazed to see butter on the table—amazed to see butter in Australia: I said, 'What have you had?' and he said, 'Margarine sometimes, jam sometimes, and when I had to buy a pair of boots for the kid, nothing at all; only dry bread.'

"From 1929 to 1939, the average number of unemployed was 250,000. Not until the war broke out, not until the guns thundered, was money made available. And

when they cease thundering we are told we shall get less money! Those 250,000 men, would have wives, children or dependent parents, and all would represent close on 1,000,000 people on the dole—1,000,000 on the dole in a country with a population of 7,000,000! The cry was 'No money!'

"I was told that when I was Prime Minister. No money to relieve the sufferings of men, women and children. Yet I have lived to see £1,100,000,000 expended on war in four years. Well, the people will not be fooled again, and of that amount £259,000,000 was Commonwealth Bank credit.

"I put to a conference of bankers the proposition that private enterprise could not employ the workless because there was no market for their products—that was true—and that the only way to employ them was on government works.

"I put forward the proposition that if we put 50,000 men from the unemployed army on full-time work—new work financed by new money which Keynes had always advocated—they would create a demand for food, clothing and furniture and that another 50,000 would get jobs as the result. The employment of those additional 50,000 men would create further demands, and so the snowball would gain size. We should gather strength and go up hill instead of down.

"I was told by shrewd, intelligent bankers that I was only painting pictures—dreaming pipe-dreams, one said. Yet I have lived to see the dream come true. Employment has been found, not for construction, but for destruction. We have found £1,100,000,000 in four years to wage war.

"But we could not get the banks even to see the solution. We then said, 'We will take it into our own hands and issue £18,000,000 without gold backing.' The rafters of this chamber and in the Senate, and in all the banks and stock exchanges were lifted by protests that such inflation would bring ruin to the country.

"It was proposed to utilise £6,000,000 to keep the wheat-farmers on the land! £12,000,000 to put 50,000 men to work! That proposal was met with cries of 'Ruin! Inflation!'; and the non-government majority in the Senate threw it out because we proposed to raise £18,000,000 for those purposes we were told that Australia would go bankrupt.

"When we proposed to export our gold in order to turn it into a live asset we were told that if we did so the last vestige of our security would be gone; but that was done a few months afterwards by the very people who opposed us.

"They condemned our proposal on the ground that it meant a fiduciary currency; but all our notes today are fiduciary in the sense that there is no gold behind them. I raise these matters not in any spirit of recrimination—although God knows my experience has been sufficient to make me bitter I raise them as a warning that we should

(Continued on page 4)

NOTES on the NEWS

The Victorian Wheat and Wool Growers' Association is reported in the "Countryman," of October 29, as submitting the following proposal to the Rural Reconstruction Commission: "The first essential in any scheme of post-war reconstruction is the writing down of debts to a sum which individual debtors can carry under reasonable circumstances." It is pleasing to note the frequency with which money problems are being projected into the news by rural bodies. Living closer to nature, and therefore being more realistic—and being more affected by the bankers' racket—most country folk understand the folly of confusing physical problems with financial problems.

ARGENTINE AFFAIRS: According to the Melbourne "Herald" of October 29, "the secret power in Argentina, known as the 'Lodge,' gives dictator General Ramirez his orders." It also stated that "the secret power" behind the Spanish revolutionaries was a "Masonic Lodge" founded by General San Martin, Argentina's "liberator." The "Lodge" includes "a group of army officers who admire Germany, and two civilians and two army chaplains who are known to be under the influence of Germany." If these key men are checked far enough back, doubtless they would be found to connect up with the big bankers' world-wide plot to impose Socialism, Fascism or Communism—any descriptive name will serve, it's the results that count with them. The people's best answer is to forget the "isms" and demand the results that they require.

POST-WAR PROBLEMS: A New York report quotes Sir Owen Dixon, Australian Minister to U.S., suggesting "America should be content to receive wool from Australia in payment for U.S. exports after the war." Yes, surplus Australian wool for genuinely surplus U.S. goods, by all means; but what will the bankers say? Continuing, Sir Owen said: "Australia will be entitled to remain a bastion of democracy in her particular area with industrial equipment and production for that purpose." Well, we will have to go hard, not to remain, but to attain, to the "bastion of democracy." There are a lot of obstacles, and a lot of totalitarian regimentation, to be removed before that is possible.

"SUN" SYMPATHY: Concerning the Mosley storm, the Melbourne "Sun" of November 23 gives considerable free publicity to Mr. Harry Pollitt, of the Communist Party in Britain, in his demand for re-imprisonment of Mosley—without trial.

It seems that Mosley's chief crime is that he drew public attention to the posi-

tions of power and control held by Jews in Britain, and we find the Communists, the Jews and the "Capitalist" Press united in a campaign for the perpetuation of "imprisonment without trial"—truly a strange situation (to those who do not understand the tie-up between this trio).

(Continued on page 2.)

Debate on Greater Power for Canberra

A public debate is to be held at the Coburg Town Hall (in Bell St., Coburg, near Sydney Rd.), on Friday evening next, December 10, on the very vital question of the proposed transfer of powers to the Federal Parliament.

Those citizens responsible for arranging the debate feel that this is a matter of primary importance to each elector, who may be called upon by referendum early in the New Year to cast his or her vote for or against the proposals. It is considered, therefore, that wide public knowledge of the pros and cons is essential to ensure an informed vote.

Mr. W. G. Bryson, the Federal Representative for Bourke, has willingly agreed to present the case in favour of the transfer of powers; and, as he sincerely believes in such transfer, the affirmative will be in very capable hands. The case against more power for Canberra will be presented by Mr. F. C. Paice, who needs no introduction as his work in helping to bring about the defeat of the National Insurance Bill (1937) is known throughout the Commonwealth. The Mayor of Coburg (Cr. J. Gillies) will be the chairman, and a liberal amount of time will be devoted to questions from those present.

Taxpayers' Protest

The following letterform, for signature by electors and despatch to members of Parliament, is being circulated by workers in some industrial establishments in Melbourne. To assist this spontaneous move to guide electors who wish to democratically express their will, in this way, to their servants at Canberra, the United Electors of Australia, 343 Lit. Collins St., Melbourne, are making printed copies available at 1/6 per 100, post free:—

"OPPRESSIVE TAXATION PROTEST."

"Mr. M.H.R.,

"Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T.

"Dear Sir,—

"The Taxation Department is asking now for the payment of income tax for 1943-44 on or before 31/3/44.

"Tax payers who pay their tax through deductions from pay envelopes would thus have to find an additional amount equivalent to about six or seven months' taxes, on top of normal tax instalments, to meet their assessments by that date.

"This is unreasonable and unnecessary, and is unacceptable to me.

"I therefore call upon you as my representative in Parliament to see that this further imposition is cancelled immediately.

"Yours faithfully,

Signed)

Address

FED. ELECTORATE

Date

DICTATORSHIP IN MUNITIONS UNION?

To the Editor: Sir, —At the meeting of the Arms, Explosives and Munition Workers' Union, held on Tuesday, October 12, three pages of closely-typed amendments to the rules were read out to the meeting, which was informed that it had to adopt the amendments as read out. Since the executive had packed the meeting and had refused admittance to financial members who they knew were opposed to the executive, those members of the rank-and-file who attempted to get information as to the effect of these amendments were quickly silenced and the whole of the alterations to the rules adopted in globo.

Because of the far-reaching effect of these amendments, some of the members who were present at the meeting, and who desired to examine the alterations subsequently requested that they be given a copy of them. Several requests were made per 'phone to this effect, but they were refused. A request was then made in writing, and in a letter dated November 2, signed by Miss N. James on behalf of the secretary, a statement was made that "the Management Committee could not accede to the request for a copy of the new rules."

However, despite the efforts of the Executive to prevent the rank-and-file from learning what they proposed to do with the union and its funds and assets, we have now learned exactly what it is proposed to do with the rules. In view of what these amendments propose to do, it is no wonder that the executive attempted to deprive members of an opportunity of examining them!

Rule 2, dealing with the objects for which the union exists, is amended to make one of the objects to affiliate, federate, or amalgamate with not only any trade union, but any organisation, and to establish joint finances and joint organisation with any other body. This means that the union could not only amalgamate or affiliate with Thornton's Ironworkers, but establish joint finances, or, in other words, hand over all the funds and assets of the union to the Ironworkers or the Communist Party.

"Very well," you might say, "if the rank-and-file want to give away their assets and make their union simply a section of the Communist Party, it is their own look out." But don't delude yourself: the last person to have any say would be the ordinary rank-and-file member.

Rule 7, Sub-clause K, is amended to extend the powers of the Federal Council to enable them, to take any action they think fit to carry out the objects, including the expenditure of any moneys they think fit. But, of course, even the Federal Council, consisting of some twenty members, is in some way answerable to the rank-and-file of the union who might conceivably be able to exercise a restraining influence upon it. So as to avoid any possibility of such a thing happening, Rule 23, which provides for the election of Federal Council delegates and the basis of representation from the various States, is cut out completely. This means that the Federal Council would be no longer an elected body, but would hold office for as long as it pleased. There is no provision for the removal or the recall of any member of the Federal Council by the rank and file. The Federal Council, therefore, would become a permanent body responsible to no one and able to do exactly what it pleased. That is bad enough, but a new sub-clause is added to Rule 7 giving this dictatorial Federal Council the right to delegate all of its functions, including, of course, the disposal of the union's funds and assets, and decisions regarding amalgamation or affiliation with any other organisation.

So, we get the set-up! The Federal Council, already composed of a majority of Communists, makes itself a permanent body, takes to itself power to call in "representatives" of the Ironworkers, and,

PLENTY OF MONEY FOR WAR, BUT NOT FOR PEACE?

(To the Editor)

Sir, — Addressing the A.W.N.L., Canterbury branch, recently, Mr. R. G. Menzies said that a majority of the people of Australia today shared the "fallacious belief" that if the nation could find hundreds of millions for war it could also find hundreds of millions for peace. Mr. Menzies further stated: "If hundreds of millions were raised for peace, as for war, it would mean the inflation and destruction of our currency within a year."

Our present system of finance stands fully condemned by Mr. Menzies' statement that in times of war, and therefore of destruction, hundreds of millions can be spent — but not in times of peace, to distribute the plenty to the people, without destroying our currency. This is a most significant admission and one, which clearly shows that social justice is unattainable while such a barbarous and iniquitous weapon, is used for the enslavement of the people.

It is sheer blasphemy to suggest that the preservation of our present financial system is of more importance than the welfare of the Australian people, thousands of whom, while not owning even an inch of their native soil, have had to part with their loved ones, many for ever, to keep Australia free. Do men in our fighting forces give their lives and services to preserve an antiquated money machine which has always deprived them of the things that make life worth living: namely, peace, happiness and security?

I appeal to all social reformers to redouble their efforts to achieve this vital reform, so that the "blood, sweat and tears" promised us by Mr. Churchill will

say, the Communist Party, to do exactly what they want to do with the union, its funds and the members.

But wait! Even now it is possible that some deluded member of the union might think that the union and its funds really belonged to the members and make himself troublesome. Poor chap! It would be just too bad. Rule 8 is amended to give the Federal Council (and/or "representatives" of the Ironworkers or the Communist Party), power to appoint a management committee, the members of which will not be elected by the rank-and-file and will not come up for re-election. This committee is empowered by the next amendment to deal with any member who might make the mistake of thinking that the rank-and-file should have the slightest say in the affairs of their union. Such delusions, however, would soon be removed, for the amended Rule 9 gives the management committee power "to suspend or expel any member of the organisation for any breach or infringement of the rules of the organisation . . . or for non-compliance with, or disobedience of, any order contained in any resolution of management committee, or the Federal Council, or for any conduct, in its opinion, unworthy of a member, and to inflict a fine not exceeding £5."

Even with the Gestapo set up and functioning, our friends are still doubtful about those funds! It is just possible that they might not be able to get their hands on the money, so Rule 15 is amended and officers appointed by the joint body (that is, the Council set up by all of the affiliated or amalgamated organisations) may without limit draw on the funds of the union.

PRIME MINISTER ON FEDERAL POWERS

A copy of a most interesting epistle bearing the coat-of-arms of the Commonwealth of Australia and originating from the Prime Minister's Office has just fallen into our hands. It appears that it was drafted with a view to sending it, later on, to Australian citizens. By publishing its contents, at this date, we will not increase our popularity with the powers-that-be, but we think that our readers are entitled to know about it now. Here are the more important passages: —

"Following many months of industrial warfare, during which industry in this country was partially paralysed, my Government was returned to power on a clear issue with a definite mission. We were commanded by the expressed will of one of the greatest majority votes in the history of the country, in the greatest poll ever recorded, to introduce measures for the preservation of industrial peace. Every section of the community united in the demand that internal strife should cease.

"As you know, I immediately endeavoured to redeem my promise, but found myself hemmed in by constitutional limitations. Such a position is contrary to every fundamental principle of democracy.

"In the circumstances I could either ignore the mission with which I was entrusted, or appeal, as I had definitely promised, by means of a Referendum, for increased powers. I chose the latter course, and with the fullest appreciation of my responsibilities, ask you to support me in the action I have taken.

"I pledge my word as your Prime Minister that the powers for which I now ask are necessary to promote industrial peace. That is not my own opinion. It has the

Rule 20, of course, is amended to abolish those troublesome people, the clerical sub-branch. Out they go—lock, stock and barrel! What a nerve they had, actually opposing the amalgamation and the handing over of the funds of the union to Thornton until the rank-and-file had been consulted!

Just so there will be no more of any such nonsense, Rule 26 is amended to obviate the necessity for a ballot on amalgamation with any other trade union.

Then, just to make certain and fasten the last chains upon the poor slaves in the union, Rule 28 is amended to give the Federal Council (which is not to be elected and can't be removed under any of the amended rules) power to join in a joint council with any other union, the decision of which joint council will be binding as though it was a decision of the union itself.

The Branch Rules are all suitably amended to enable the same dictatorship to be set up in the branches, thus enabling the disposal of the funds and property of the branches and the complete elimination of the possibility of the rank-and-file having any say whatsoever.

The dictators on the management committee (who may not even be members of the union, but members of the bodies with which the union has been affiliated or amalgamated) are empowered under these rules to do anything they like. They can hand over the funds to the Communist Party, levy members for special contributions for any and every purpose—and if you so much as open your mouth about them, out you go! Then, having expelled you from the union, they demand your dismissal from the industry on the grounds that you are not a member of the union!

Of course, it is just possible that they might be in a generous mood and only fine you a "fiver."

—Yours, etc., MARGARET BAXTER.

[The actual text of the amendments referred to was published in our last issue, copies of which may be obtained by calling at our business office (Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I., or by writing to "New Times," Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)]

overwhelming endorsement of your selected representatives. "I ask you to support these proposals in order that your expressed wish may be made effective, and industrial peace and harmony, so essential to the development of this young country, and so vital to the interest of every section, be made possible of attainment.

"Vote 'Yes' and help to promote the happiness and prosperity of all your fellow-citizens and the coming generation."

[Editor's Note: Looking back on our heading and introductory remarks (taken in conjunction with certain omissions from the letter) we realise that, although they are quite correct as far as they go, they could have been a little more explicit. The letter is NOT as you may have supposed, an advance draft of an appeal from Mr. Curtin, to be circulated in the near future. The letter was sent out in due course, by a former Prime Minister—Mr. S. M. Bruce! It was dated August 1926. It is really touching, though, to see that Mr. Curtin is following in the great Mr. Bruce's footsteps, isn't it? Makes you think a bit, doesn't it?]

LABOR MP.'s ON FED. POWERS—IN 1926

In 1926 Prime Minister S. M. Bruce introduced a Bill in the House of Representatives for the purpose of holding a Referendum to secure the electors' consent to proposed alterations to the Australian Constitution. The alterations were designed to give greater powers to the Federal Government, under the pretext of "protecting the interest of the public," etc. The following extracts from speeches by Labor members of the House during debates on that Bill, make interesting reading in view of the present moves to centralise power at Canberra—where, incidentally, there may not ALWAYS be a Labor Government in office: —

Hon. H. Lazzarini (11/6/26): "This measure is submitted because what the Government desires to do cannot now be done in five out of six States where Labor Governments are in power . . .

" . . . So long as the sovereignty of the State is admitted, their rights in industrial matters must be recognised, and I shall not consent to put the State Governments at the mercy of a central Government that is hostile to every principle for which the majority of them stand . . ."

Hon. F. Brennan (14/6/26): "It is designed

not be in vain, and that a new world, with justice and freedom for all, will be born upon the ruins of the old. We on the home front have a sacred duty to perform, for by depriving our youth of the right to live and reach maturity, we rob them of their greatest treasure, and their supreme sacrifices can only, to a small, degree, be justified by our firm determination to demand that a saner and more just method be established for distributing the real wealth of the nation to all its inhabitants.

—Yours etc., (Mrs. TINDLE, Balwyn.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

CURRENCY CAPERS: The World Bank negotiations seem to have developed in such a way as to provide a risk of the Bank being under the control of Treasuries, instead of direct control by the money gangsters; which may explain the following from the Melbourne "Herald" of November 24: "If the U.S. bankers have their way, the machinery will be under the control of the central banks—not the Treasuries." And note this: "American bankers will not allow the new institution any power to create credit for purposes of international trade." Once again the question arises, Who's the boss, and do Parliaments govern? Fancy bankers not allowing Governments to do this or that! And fancy any Government tolerating these bandits, who dare to dictate to them in this way!

HOARDING HORRORS: The latest fascist move (not by Hitler), the Melbourne "Herald" of November 18 says (without protest), may be to empower price investigators or similar snoopers "to inspect all safe deposits or other receptacles where hoarded notes may be found." Such places could be your pocket, your purse, your home, your child's moneybox—in fact, anything, anywhere, any place. Wouldn't that make Hitler green with envy!

MUSSOLINI'S MALADY: Press reports quote Marshal Badoglio as saying that "Mussolini is suffering from a disease which has affected his brain," and that he intends to dedicate himself to the Church. Symptoms of the disease are not mentioned, but judging from Mussolini's actions—and those of many other men being paraded by the world press agencies as leaders—he is suffering from "powermania," which is fed by bankers and press mesmerism, under which the puffed-up dupes believe they are God-sent agencies to direct the lives of the peoples of the world. There are many cases of this malady in this country, in the political, religious, medical, educational and industrial spheres—and orthodox economists deserve a special mention. Beware of all of them!

INTERESTS AND INTEREST: A New Delhi report says that Ramakrishna Delamia, a big Indian industrialist, has made an investment of £3 millions in the local war loan. A Washington report states, "the Senate Banking Committee has authorised an annual expenditure of £10 millions for war-loan advertising." How nice for the Press and Radio interests! The interest arising from these actions will, of course, have to be met by the people of the countries concerned by extra taxation.

LOWER LIVING LEVELS: London reports state that the people of Britain are being warned by financial authorities that "it will be difficult to maintain anything like her standard of living after the war." This sort of patter is being handed out to all nations by financial (banking) interests—not by practical men who know that natural resources are abundant, and that mechanical industrial processes have been improved beyond calculation. If the financiers were correct (and they never have been), what have the people to gain by victory? The only acceptable excuse for a lowered living standard is lack of physical and natural resources—not finance. Statements such as those above from financial quacks are a menace to our morale, which must be refuted and defeated.

FOOD FRONT: Although the Federal Parliament, so far as is known, has not sanctioned or even discussed being committed to the World Food Bank idea, the daily press informs us that "Australia and Argentina are expected to provide 4,500,000 tons of food to the bank." So, after enduring years of depression, when Australians could not get food, and years of sacrifice in the form of war, we are to continue the sacrificial role. This lone-view planning, involving the people without consulting them, throws some light on food rationing to get them in training to do without adequate food after the war. The soldiers will be happy to know that the Planners have ordained continued sacrifice for them and their children!

INDIA'S INDEPENDENCE: Clare Booth Luce, Republican Congresswoman and apostle for American imperialism, is carrying on a high-pressure campaign for India's "freedom." It is significant that she and others expressing concern for the peoples of distant lands appear to have no concern for the people of U.S., one-third of whom, according to President Roosevelt on the eve of his second Presidential election (but not mentioned since), were "ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed." From this it would seem that women politicians, as well as men, become quite unrealistic and develop world-mania. This applies to the Press-boosted personalities of all countries. Beware of this dread disease of meddling with the other fellow's affairs—it is the big deadly peril confronting the world.

RAILWAY REFRESHMENTS: Following Melbourne reports that the Victorian Railways refreshment rooms had been charging high prices for oranges, Mr. McCarthy, of the price-fixing bureau, is reported as saying that "fixed prices are not binding on Government departments." So, once again we find the State socialised departments exempting themselves from their own tyrannies, and we also find them exploiting the soldiers through canteen prices, and exploiting the public through transport fares and food supplies. Of course, they eliminate all competition, and then, when they have established their monopoly, they put the screws on—and at the same time denounce

(Continued on page 3)

AUS (A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. Continued from last issue.)
TRALIA'S GREAT UNWARRANTED
Sir,—A country reader has written to tell me that the Jews have been appointed by God to rule the world, and that "we are on the wrong trail when we try to frustrate that which God has given them." If that is the case, then, of course, we are doomed, and the stories about God's Love and all that are mere deceptions. It is true that MOSES did say something to the effect indicated, and this has been accepted and acted upon by the leaders of Jewry in all subsequent generations. But it should be remembered that equally important people have had equally important things to say—and, equally important, they, too, may be found, recorded in the Bible.

My country friend bases his conclusion on what MOSES wrote in the book of Deuteronomy, as follows:

"For the Lord thy God blesseth thee, as He promised thee; and thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow; and thou shalt reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over thee." (Ch. 15, v. 6.)

"Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury, but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury, that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to in the land whither thou goest to possess it." (Ch. 23, v. 19-20.)

You will see from this how very nicely everything has been fixed for the Jews. The rest of humanity may be regarded as "strangers," and may therefore be imposed upon. If these words of MOSES are to be accepted as commands from GOD, then we should accept wars, depressions, and almost everything evil without complaint, for they come from the system of usury which the Jews claim to have been authorised to put on us. In simple terms, the Jews were to be lenders, not borrowers; they were to rule and not to be ruled; possessors, not tenants. God was to favour them for all time at the expense of all other people. With a slight modification they admit that they believe this to be the intention, for, as I have already pointed out, the "Jewish Chronicle," published in England, said:

"The Israelites did, it is true, regard themselves as the 'chosen people,' as many other peoples have done or still do. But they used the words in the sense that they had been the chosen medium for the proclamation of the Divine law."

Some of us, however, are not so easily satisfied, and if we accept this version as right, the important question immediately arises: Which of them was to be the "medium"—Moses, Jesus, or the Jewish financiers? If we try to follow all three of them we will soon reach a mental condition of hopeless confusion. Perhaps that is what is intended.

Other questions also come to mind. Are we to accept the writings of MOSES as final, or are we to have regard to subsequent writings? If the former, then Christianity simply goes by the board, and those who profess it are poor, silly dupes. These are the poor things who believe that God is no respecter of persons; that He is LOVE; that all of us are His Sons and Daughters; that every human being is one of His temples; that He is even concerned with the fall of a sparrow; and that His bounty is for all mankind without any favours.

If what MOSES said is to apply for all time, then it is madness to continue saying the Lord's Prayer. God's Kingdom simply CANNOT come under the Jewish system of usury. That is a demonstrable FACT. So long as money comes into existence only as an interest-bearing DEBT, so long will our debts be greater than our ability to pay them; and a people overburdened with the weight of irredeemable debt could hardly be said to be enjoying the Kingdom of Heaven. A more appropriate term would be the Kingdom of Hell! While debts grow faster than the ability to pay, man has to fight man in a never-ending struggle to obtain MONEY, and this comes about because the extent to which he and his loved ones can share in the bounty of God depends not upon individual virtue but upon the quantity of money that can be gathered. This means that MONEY supplants God in order of priority and becomes the most-sought-after thing in the world. Remember what St. Paul said? "The love (need) of money is the root of

NOTES ON THE NEWS (Continued)

monopolies and profiteering! It's safe to say that there are no bigger or more oppressive monopolies than State monopolies.

DEBT DATA: "Hansard" for October shows the total national debt at June 1939, as £1,205,022,972, and the amount at June 1943, as £2,005,738,281. The table also shows the annual interest bill at June 1943, as £61,843,203. From this it will be seen that in four years the Government has borrowed £800,715,309, largely from private financial institutions, in preference to manufacturing its own money requirements. Isn't it strange how Governments—Labor, U.A.P., or C.P.—carry out the bankers' debt-and-interest policy? Excessive taxation is the misbegotten child of that policy.

MENZIES' MOANS: In the course of a diatribe reported in the daily press of September 9, Bob Menzies made the following point: "We of the Opposition no longer hope to influence legislation by direction, motion, or amendment, since we have not the numbers." When Menzies and Co. were in office (not power) the same argument applied to the Labor Party. What an indictment of the Party racket—since the "Opposition's" representatives are useless! They continue to accept their salaries, but would it not be more honourable to resign as a means of illustrating the stupidity of the Party system of bankers' control?

-O.B.H.

ALL evil." The controllers of the most-sought-after thing in the world automatically become the MOST POWERFUL PEOPLE in the world. Up to now the most powerful people in the world have been the Jewish financiers, no part of whose purpose is the application of Christian principles. Hence we see why proposals for converting money from master to servant are so intensely opposed.

And if God did issue such commands through MOSES, what a strange thing it is that He never confirms it by His own example. Whatever He does is universally beneficial. Air, sunshine and rain are distributed to the just and the unjust, the Jew and the non-Jew, the rich and the poor, without any favours for His "chosen." But how different the picture in the case of the things we can get only through MONEY! And God has nothing to do with the MONEY SUPPLY.

If God did intend the Jews to impose their system of usury on everyone but themselves, what could have come over the Psalmist to cause him to write this:

"Lord, who shall abide in Thy tabernacle? . . . He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent." (Ps. 15.)

Something similar must have come over the prophet Ezekiel, for he wrote:

"He that hath oppressed the poor and needy, hath given forth upon usury, and hath taken increase, shall not live."

THE CASE AGAINST NATIONALISATION

By NORMAN F. WEBB, in the "Social Creditor," England.

The case against State ownership of land and State control of agriculture is essentially a simple one; it is just that as a claim it is unbalanced. State ownership has other serious defects of a practical kind, of which lack of space precludes mention; but that one should suffice to cover the whole situation.

What is wanted in this world above everything else, and in every situation, is a just balance. And the great virtue of British Constitutionalism in the past, its claim to universal respect, rests on just that particular faculty. As a nation we do not tend either to "raw individualism" or to servitude. The Anglo-Saxon stock represents and organic culture, which in itself implies stability and continuity. Under the British Constitution the function of Government is understood to cover the co-ordination, and even regulation of the activities of the community, but not their control. These activities (interests) require a central authority to hold them in equilibrium. That is the obligation of government. When one interest predominates unduly it seeks to exercise controlling power over the others through Government; in other words, it seeks to establish its own control in the name of the State. The symptom of this condition of overbalance is what may be termed centralisation; to say which is not to suggest that individuals can associate without some degree of centralisation, or nations exist without a central authority. But common sense can, as British commonsense in the past always has, quite easily distinguish the point at which government co-ordination becomes unbalanced and degenerates into government (departmental) control—although, like the British constitution itself, the point may not be legally definable. Where the term centralisation is used here it refers not to legitimate government, but to that degeneration.

The reasoned case for what we term Private Ownership of land must be largely philosophic. It cannot be satisfactorily proved by statistics. In fact, nothing can. But all centralising schemes of their nature, which is statistical, are advanced under cover of a dumbfounding flight of figures, before which it is essential the plain man should endeavour to keep his head and his balance, otherwise he either capitulates, or finds himself compelled to adopt a false position of blind, negative opposition to every sort of change.

That there is a proper place for everyone and everything constitutes our faith. The industrialist (and the farmer is the first and original of the species) knows that the proper place in his business for figures and figure-men is in their own department—that of accounting and statistics. The agriculturist needs what the figure-man can give him—a comprehensive, but necessarily rather one-sided picture of what has been done, in the light of which he can check up, and to some extent regulate what he proposes to do. He is a fool who imagines there is no place for centralised research and co-ordination of activity in his industry. But the practical man knows that when the figure-man comes out of his legitimate sphere and proceeds to lay his hands on process, all enterprise and science (acquired skill), and finally all self-confidence tend rapidly to disintegrate—along with many other essential elements.

We are passing through violently shifting times—hasty action, followed quickly by reaction. What we need to remember in this present case of agriculture is that as in this present case of agriculture is that, as in the matter of trimming a boat, a list to starboard is no better than a list

Nothing in this world oppresses the poor and needy more than the Jewish system of usury, and our greatest peril for after the war is the obvious intention of the "powers that be" that this system will be continued.

Why did men of other days speak as they did if the leaders of Jewry are so innocent of harmful intent? Listen to some of them:

"They are hated by all mankind . . . The Jews were behind all the persecutions of the Christians." (St. Justin, A.D. 166.) "The Jews should not be allowed to keep what they have obtained from others by usury." (St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274.) "No folk under the sun is more greedy than they are, than they have been, and always will be, as one can see from their accursed usury . . . One should destroy all prayer books and copies of the Talmud, in which they learn such godlessness, lies, curses, and blasphemies." (Martin Luther, 1546.) "All the world suffers from the usury of the Jews, their monopolies, and their deceptions. They have brought many unfortunate people to a state of poverty, especially farmers, working-class people, and the very poor." (Pope Clement VIII., 1605.) "In whatever country Jews have settled in great numbers, they have lowered its moral tone and commercial integrity . . . have built up a State within a State, and when opposed have tried to strangle the country to death financially." (Benjamin Franklin.) "If it were possible to eject the Jew monopolists from this country without incurring war with Great Britain, then the problem of everlasting peace would be settled in South Africa." (Paul Kruger, 1900.)

It comes to this: If Moses was right, then Jesus is wrong; and if Jesus is right, then Moses was wrong. Christians must therefore choose between the two.

—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2, November 28, 1943. (To be continued.)

TOWN AND COUNTRY RELATIONSHIP

The following from "The Scotsman" of August 21, is published for information:

Sir,—Our rulers are acting on the assumption that the methods of conducting war and peace are essentially the same, and hitherto their assumption has not been seriously challenged. They take for granted that super-centralisation accompanied by ever-increasing subordination of man to machinery (of the individual to the system) must rule in peace making as it undoubtedly does, and must, in war. A direct denial of this assumption now comes from the sister Isle. There a parish priest of Tipperary has recently set going a movement, under the Gaelic name of Muintir na Tire (People of the Land), claiming that national, and therefore ultimately world, stability, can be attained only if first the people of each and every small locality (parish) in each country have learned the art of co-operation among themselves. This apparently includes to a large extent economic co-operation.

The movement seems to have caught on in Ireland, and to be spreading, and one is particularly interested to learn that it is in no way checked by the political frontiers which at present exist in that island, but appeals to North as well as to South.

Is it not possible, then, that this scheme might be practicable in what is commonly called "this country," viz., the island of Great Britain? Or, alternatively, why should it not now be tried out in "our own Scotland, a country which, at least in the past, has shown itself not entirely incapable of initiative, and among some of whose present-day inhabitants there are signs of growing weariness with the assumptions of pre-eminence made by metropolitan or international bodies?

That such a proposal has not received any general publicity before is probably due to the fact that most people now live in big cities, and thinkers cannot see how any "good-neighbourhood" idea would work in a city (where necessarily few people are in real personal touch with one another). Here in Lewis, however, whence I write these lines, and where remains of the old village-community system still exist, the practicability is plain enough. In any case, is it not obvious that the present world war is going to alter radically the relationship between town and country? Does anyone still seriously imagine that all these bomb-and-famine-produced mass evacuations of cities are going to end, and even be reversed by the "signing of peace"?

The Muintir na Tire movement might be expected to appeal to those among us who think there is still some future for the Christian tradition. A short description of the scheme by its initiator appears in the current number of the "New Alliance," an Edinburgh publication.

—I am, etc., A. J. BROCK, Borve, Isle of Lewis, August 18, 1943.

"A ROSE BY ANY OTHER NAME"

"In the U.S.A., the authorities announce that no coupons are required for the purchase of Alemtejo, Bgug-Panir, Daralag, Eriwani, Gex, Isigny, Laguiole, Quacheg, Schafzzieger, Tali, Tworog and Vlasic. In case any reader should be so ignorant as not to know what the darned things are, we explain that they're kinds of cheese."

—"The Australasian Confectioner," September 1943.

Analysis in England have recently been much exercised over the nature of the material contained in two nineteenth century loaves found in an old country house, the vitamin content of which is far in excess of anything with which they are familiar. One theory is that they are an old-fashioned predecessor of what Lord Woolton laughingly calls bread.

STRATEGY

"It will also be noticed that in countries where freemasonry is subversive, Jews are usually less conspicuous in the revolutionary movement than in countries where freemasonry is either non-existent or constitutional. Thus in France the Masonic peril is much more generally recognised than the Jewish peril . . . in England, Germany and America, where freemasonry is not subversive, the Jewish question is more apparent. All this would suggest that . . . freemasonry is the cover under which the Jews, like the Illuminati, prefer to work, so that where the cover is not available they are obliged to come out more into the open . . ."

—N. Webster, "Secret Societies," p. 383.

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere 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.

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

—Robert G. Ingersoll, famous rationalist.

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

THE PLOT TO SOCIALISE AUSTRALIA

A comparatively few virile and wide-awake electors, mobilising concrete support behind their local Members of State Parliaments, were responsible for the defeat of Evatt's first attempt to centralise economic and political control at Canberra. Many of those State Members rendered an incalculable service to democratic government in this country. We have seen the manner in which Evatt and his fellow-socialists used trickery and evasion. They are continuing to use it.

No sooner was Evatt certain that the Labor Party had had a victory at the polls on August 21 than he started to work for a referendum to obtain the powers that the State Governments wisely refused to give him. He continued to make the same inaccurate statements. He talks about the "necessity" of the Federal Government having power to prevent profiteering—but not a word about the private banks and the money system! As a matter of fact, even while Evatt was urging a referendum to obtain the powers he wants, the Commonwealth Bank Board issued a report saying that credit must NOT be made available for peace purposes as it has been made available for war purposes. Did Dr. Evatt challenge this treasonable report? He did not. Perhaps Labor Party supporters can tell us why the Labor appointees 'on the Bank Board endorsed this report.

Why didn't Dr. Coombs, a socialist and a product of the London School of Economics, and Director-General of Reconstruction, challenge this report? Dr. Coombs should, if he is honest, retire from the Bank Board immediately. But no; orthodox finance and socialism go together. That's why Dr. Evatt always has the little-known Mr. Robinson, financier and B.H.P. representative, to advise him when travelling abroad. Australians should look into these matters before pawning their very souls for the promise of a miserly measure of carthorse security.

The argument is now being put forward that Evatt and Co. didn't want socialism. But we aren't concerned with what politicians SAY; we are vitally concerned with what they DO. Government control of industry and manpower, no matter what it is called, is socialism. In Britain, even while Churchill was saying that he opposed socialism in war-time (he is probably sincere), his socialist Minister Cripps took control of the famous aeroplane builders, Short Bros., and, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, would give no assurance that shareholders in Short Bros. would obtain control again after the war.

In urging an alteration in the Australian Constitution, Labor Senator Large, on September 30, 1943, "blew the gaff" a little. He was objecting to the apologies being made that the Labor Government wasn't trying to introduce socialism:—

"Whenever we have engaged in war, the inevitable result has been the breakdown of the capitalist system, and the Government, in order to obtain a total war effort, has resorted to State or national control of industry. IF THAT IS NOT SOCIALISM, I HAVE YET TO HEAR THE MEANING OF THE WORD." (My emphasis.) In passing, it might be appropriate to ask Senator Large how it is that Britain, most of whose war equipment is still being produced by private enterprise, has had to send vast quantities of equipment to Russia, who is allegedly working a socialist economy?

No matter in what guise Dr. Evatt and the forces behind him present their scheme, no matter what they call it, we must ensure that it is rejected. We can have nothing to do with trickery.

We now come to the question of what we can DO about defeating the plan for the centralisation of power. The first thing to be done is to make the people aware of what is being planned for them. We face the mighty barrage of press and radio, practically all pouring out the poisonous doctrine of centralisation in one form or another. Hardly a day goes past now but some spokesman in favour of curtailment of national sovereignties, advocating international government and "peace by overwhelming force," is given considerable publicity in the papers. It is the urgent responsibility of those who understand the tremendous issues at stake, to spare no effort in an attempt to warn their fellows. Truth will always win against lies—providing we get the truth to the people. This job is an INDIVIDUAL matter. YOU must act.

I have shown that we can place little faith in political parties on this issue. What is essential is the control of individual Members, State and Federal, by electors.

Every elector should write a personal letter to his Federal and State Members of Parliament, urging them to oppose every move to centralise further political and economic control at Canberra, Every Member of Parliament should be asked to state clearly where he stands in this matter. Letters should be sent to all papers. Everyone, irrespective of party, who desires to fight centralisation, should be helped to fight.

One of the greatest dangers is that soldiers and other members of our armed forces may be tricked by an avalanche of cunning, one-sided propaganda. Hundreds of thousands of men have no idea of the real issue at stake; they haven't the time to clearly study the subject. And, of course, boys under twenty-one in the forces will also record a vote, and probably, unless their parents advise them, give their futures away. The weapon of fear will no doubt be the most potent to be used against soldiers. The idea has been carefully fostered that, unless Evatt and Co. have power of life-and-death after

the war, returned soldiers will face chaos. This idea must be countered and revealed in all its falsity. There is absolutely no necessity for chaos after the war. The main problem that concerns every individual Australian is whether, after the war, he will have security of the main essentials of life: food, clothing and shelter.

Does any sane person mean to say that, if Canberra and every State with the exception of, say, Victoria, sank beneath the sea after the war, Victorians couldn't produce their own food on their own farms, mill and use their own timber for building houses, and manufacture clothing, etc., without the great brains of Canberra? The very idea is an insult to our intelligence!

Although there are over 800,000 able-bodied men in the forces, the remainder of our population has not only continued to produce sufficient food for everyone—and our American allies—but has produced hundreds of millions of pounds worth of war equipment which is sheer waste from the point of view of production for consumption. If we can pay and feed 800,000 men while they are in the army producing nothing, why cannot we pay

WORKER'S VIEW ON UNIONS MERGER

To the Editor: Sir, —Behind the agitation for a merger of trade unions, initiated by Communists now that they have been able to gain office in sufficient numbers, is merely a demand for monopoly of industrial power to be transferred to the Communist Party. For many years these same people have railed against the "Trades Hall bureaucrats" because they allegedly had centred sufficient power at the top to be able to disregard the mass of members below. But now that the Communists have reached similar high places they have suddenly become afflicted with loss of memory—only the workers remember.

Exactly what is this merger that they talk of?

Between unity of action and unity of organisation there is an important difference. Rank-and-file control of policy and democratic union expression die, as control becomes vested more and more in bodies that are increasingly remote from memberships. On a small scale this was demonstrated in the recent tramways dispute. When members decided to rectify that grievance by positive action, the executive sowed confusion and strike-breaking by disowning the section involved, on the plea that the whole of the industry was not participating in precisely the same action. It did not admit the fact that overwhelmingly the membership entertained the same grievance.

Thus, in the merger contemplated, the rank-and-file would find itself entirely dependent, in the rectification of particular grievances, upon two things: Firstly, the attitude of Communist officials in the executive monopoly at the top; secondly, in its ability to persuade wide sections of workers in the allied trades, who probably would not be affected by the particular grievance at all, to give practical support.

If the "unity" was directed merely to the general policy of industrialism, leaving local union autonomy intact, objection would be lessened. Such is not the case.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide.)

A debate on the proposed Federal Powers referendum was held in Stow Hall on Wednesday, November 24, before an audience of approximately 80 people. Mr. Lloyd Brown ably chaired the meeting. Strict debating procedure was not followed; in fact, it was more in the nature of an "Information Please."

Mr. A. W. Saint put the case for giving extra power to Canberra, and used the usual specious arguments. He claimed that unless his opponent could show satisfactorily why the power should not be given in respect of each of the fourteen points, then the power should be granted!

Rev. C. D. Brock then put the case against, and stressed the points familiar to Social Crediters. He did not attempt to break down each of the points separately, but stated that unless a State or a Council found it impossible to do a certain thing no higher authority should be called in—illustrating his remarks with the housing question. If we have the manpower and the material available, all the Federal Government has to do is to make the necessary credit available.

Each speaker was allowed 35 minutes to present his case. As Mr. Saint spoke first he was allowed five minutes in which to reply. Then the audience was invited to ask either speaker questions. No attempt was made to judge the debate, the audience being left to decide this for themselves.

It was fairly obvious that most of those who did attend came along with their minds already made up. Therefore, despite the time and trouble and funds we put into advertising the meeting, it seems clear that the people we thought we could help are not sufficiently interested to make it worth our while repeating the debate.

them and feed them if they come home and do nothing? The question of transport would be much easier. Soldiers might think this question over. Why this great concern by the central Government to keep control of them after the war? I have already given the answer. Socialism, backed by big finance, stands for the external control of every aspect of human activity.

If money can be found to pay a man and his dependents, apart from sending food, clothing and weapons to him up in New Guinea, money can also be found for him to purchase food, clothing and shelter after the war until such time as he finds a job, which suits him.

There need be no chaos. If Evatt and Co. cannot prevent chaos, without having Hitlerian powers; they should be removed as incompetents.

In conclusion, let me emphasise the fact that we will have to tackle many economic reforms after this war. But we must first win the military war and allow our fighting men to come home and be in a position to contribute to whatever solutions are decided upon. They are not in the position to contribute at present. To trick our fighting men as certain people in this country desire is even worse than the trickery being used against the civilians.

If Evatt and his socialist and financial backers seek the vast powers they are asking for at a referendum, democratic Australians should vote emphatically—NO. We can beat the plot to socialise Australia if we go to work immediately. Our case is invincible.

COMMONWEALTH PARTY

The tactics of the Commonwealth Party in England are identical with those being practised in Alberta, and vigorously supported by the Southern Chain paper, the "Edmonton Journal." In Alberta a vicious attack on Mr. L. D. Byrne is combined with advice to vote for any party, which will oppose Social Credit. In order to provide for the voter who has prejudices against the existing opposition parties an "Independent" candidate is provided, with a programme to catch the unattached vote. Once elected, he coalesces with the Socialist opposition to Social Credit. Even if not elected, he splits the electorate.

Where the Commonwealth Party, which stands out a mile as being a Jewish party, cannot elect a candidate, its adherents are advised to vote for a Socialist or pro-Jew Liberal.

This does not mean, of course, that the Commonwealth horse will carry all the money. It does suggest, and other indications confirm, that balance-of-power tactics will be carefully prepared to enable the Communist-Socialist minority to 'black-mail every party.

It is a matter of primary importance to expose the affiliations of the C.C.F. (Communist-Socialist) Party in Canada. It may be a pure coincidence that its Parliamentary Leader, Mr. Coldwell, comes from Devon, and might be expected to know Sir Richard Acland, who we do not regard as a person of any importance apart from his function as a shop-window.

The usual pro-Jew, anti-landowning, nationalised (and consequently omnipotent) banking system, and discreet silence on the gold standard, are common features of both branches of the movement, of which, incidentally, the Canadian C.C.F. is the older, and possibly closer to its headquarters. —The "Social Creditor," England, Sept. 18.

CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS

(To the Editor)

Christianity is founded upon the assumption that "he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house"; that men excel institutions.

Is not Socialism founded upon the very opposite idea? In deifying the herd, it crucifies the individual. Jesus came and lived and died for the individual—He esteemed the individual worth His Life. In the parables of the lost coin, lost sheep, prodigal son, etc., it was not the mob that was sought, nor a serial number as impersonal as a bathtub, but an individual soul.

If this can be kept uppermost in the minds of Australians, our philosophy will certainly triumph.

—Yours, etc., (Pte.) W. A. ALLEN.

NO CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

Sunday night meetings, Temperance Hall, Russell street, Melbourne:

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS

December 5. — Mr. Bruce Brown: "Why Remain A Wage Slave?"

December 12. — Mr. R. A. Gardner (Opportunity Club): "Why Don't The People Think."

December 19. — Miss E. Pace (Independent candidate for St. Kilda at recent State Elections): "Freedom of the Individual."

December 26. — Mr. R. Powell (Proportional Representation Society): "The Case for Proportional Representation."

It is the aim of this Campaign to secure and maintain Liberty and Democracy, and the various lectures, from different aspects, have that end in view.

Questions and discussions are invited.

SCULLIN AND THE BANKERS

(Continued from page 1.)

not repeat that experience in the future.

"Even if it be repeated, I may not live to see it; but I hope that no honourable members will ever see it again. I do not say, as some will accuse me, as they accuse others of saying—people who speak on the money question with more enthusiasm than judgment—that there is no limit to the money that the banks can create.

"I draw a distinction between the creation of credit and the creation of bank credit. I do not agree that banks create credit. They create bank credit on the basis of the other fellow's credit. A man by hard work acquires a farm, property or business, and uses it as security with the bank.

"That is his credit, and on it the banks issue bank credit by a stroke of the pen, charging interest at the rate of 5, 6, 7, or 8 per cent. I do not say that there is no limit to the creation of credit; but the limit to the money that can be made available for post-war reconstruction is the limit of our manpower and materials.

"No one will convince me that if we put men to the production of real wealth—exchangeable and useful goods—that will create an inflation of prices. Immediately a rise takes place, when there is plenty of men and material, it is corrected by an increase of the supply.

"I shall not be convinced that we can create bank credit for destruction, and cannot create it for production. That is the first point. I shall not agree that we have anything like the same degree of danger of inflation in peace-time production as exists in war time."

—Yours, etc., J. C. NIELSEN, North Fitzroy.