

BEHIND THE SCENES IN  
SOVIET RUSSIA (Page 2)

CONTROL OF THE WORLD  
THROUGH FOOD? (Page 3)

MECHANISATION OF THE  
COAL MINES (Page 3)

WHY PICK ON THE BRITISH  
EMPIRE? (Page 4)

# THE NEW TIMES

Vol.9. No.50. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1941

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).

## Reorganisation of "United Australia" Party

### Preserving Pernicious Policies?

Since the defeat of the U.A.P. at the last Federal elections there has been much criticism, among the rank-and-file, of the management and the policy of the Party. Meetings have been held in the various States seeking to find ways and means to bring the Party back to power. Suggestions have been made that new leaders are required, that the name of the Party be changed, and that other organisations should be asked to join with the U.A.P.

In other words, the followers of the U.A.P. are taking their defeat seriously—and well they might, for if ever a political group has been badly let down it was that group which pinned its faith to Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden.

[Strictly speaking, Mr. Fadden is a member of the U.C.P., but as it is, in effect, merely the rural off-shoot of the U.A.P., the latter term is used in this article to cover the U.A.P.-U.C.P. combination in Federal politics.]

It has been apparent for a good many years that the trouble with the U.A.P. has been at the top, and that the Party had no policy to hold its members together and no centre of loyalty.

All action, political or otherwise, must grow out of what we think about things. Looking through the speeches of the leaders of the U.A.P., and trying to follow

up any process of thought which may be revealed, one hunts in vain for any discernible principle on which useful political action might be based. Looking back over the history of the Party over the last two decades, one cannot see how the Party can make claim to have protected the interests of its own supporters. The financial policy of the Party—if we can call it such—in simple language, means more debts and therefore more taxes. This, of course, is exactly the same policy as the Labor Party. The "Nationalist" Party, however, hopes to put most of the taxes onto the lower wage groups, whereas the Labor Party hopes to put in onto the higher wage groups. In a battle of this nature the Labor Party must win, because it can appeal to the numbers.

Confronted with a problem like this, which concerns the whole future of their

Party, Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden and Mr. Baker have nothing to say; nor do they show any signs of having given any serious thought to the subject, or even to have consulted those who have thought about it.

The fact that the Labor Party is in power and not the U.A.P. does not make much difference to Australia, because Mr. Menzies is just as much a "Socialist" as Dr. Evatt. But what we are concerned with is the lack of a suitable opposition in Parliament to criticise the Government and so form an effective check to abuses of power.

Neither in the States nor in the Federal sphere is the Opposition Party doing its job. The Party Machines, by virtue of an ancient tradition and of lazy electors, have established a virtual monopoly in the control and operation of Parliament. Not only has the Opposition accepted the responsibility of holding the Government to its task and failed to do it, but it has been largely responsible in preventing other people from doing this job; and in particular when any independent Member has had the temerity to challenge the supremacy of the Party Machine, the Opposition gladly joins with the Government in disposing of the intruder.

In Tasmania, it is hard to tell whether the "Nationalist" Party leaders just cannot be bothered fighting, or whether they have become merely a junior section of the Labor Party. Whatever the causes, the results are obvious: the leaders of the Labor Party do just as they please; they do many things they would not dare do if the Opposition had been doing its job.

The fact that there have been attempts made to challenge the name of the "Nationalist" or U.A.P., Party is an open recognition of the fact that the leaders of the Party wish to break away from their past records and past associations—and who can blame them!

In Tasmania, the "Nationalist" Party was blamed for the tragedies produced by the Depression of 1930-36, and although this criticism was not altogether fair, the ridiculous statements made at that time by leaders of the U.A.P. brought into being an active hostile majority, which left little for the Labor Party to do but walk over the remains of the debunked and deflated leaders of the U.A.P.

The Melbourne "Herald" of December 4 shows a picture of ten tons or so of beans being DUMPED. It also features an army of spokesmen explaining HOW it happened. The Army is involved—that means a few hundred thousand persons—and the Department of Commerce (production and sabotage brain trust)—and there's a few thousand persons in that bunch also—but up to now no INDIVIDUAL has been nailed down as the CULPRIT responsible for SABOTAGING our food supply. While we wait for the guilty person or persons to stand trial, bureaucrats can spend a few more thousand (of the other fellows' money) on advertising the slogan, "Grow More Vegetables"—for the dump!

COMPANY CABAL: Mr. H. D. Giddy has now replaced Sir James Elder as chairman and spokesman for the National Bank. Informed observers will be familiar with the frequent free press publicity, especially through the Murdoch Press, given periodically to these spruikers. Two days after Giddy's diatribe on "no monetary miracles," on behalf of the National Bank, he also presided at the annual meeting of the Herald and Weekly Times (in the absence of Messiah Murdoch through illness). This shows a tie-up between the National Bank and the "Herald," and helps to explain the policy of either the "Herald" or National

which cannot be introduced without the transfer of these powers. There is much confusion of thought about unemployment. Unemployment does not necessarily mean poverty and degradation. Loss of income is the real cause of poverty. No Federal Government has exercised its constitutional power over finance. But it already has the power to make adequate finance available to State Governments and Municipalities, who could undoubtedly solve this so-called problem of unemployment. Mr. Bryson had stated that the Federal Government had complete power at present, and yet we find returned soldiers of this war getting a raw deal and old age pensioners being compelled to exist on 27/- per week. Why is not something being done about this now, as an indication of their intentions for post-war reconstruction? Britain had centralised control after the last war, but still had poverty and unemployment. In his concluding remarks Mr. Paice said that the ability to choose or refuse is the measure of individual freedom. The closer the legislator is to his electors the more control they have over him, and the State legislator is closer than the Federal.

### DEBATE ON FEDERAL POWERS

A large and attentive audience gathered in the Coburg Town Hall last Friday night to hear a debate on the Federal Government's proposal to have more powers transferred to itself. In opening the meeting, the Mayor (Cr. J. Gillies) stated that the Coburg City Council had made the hall available on receiving a petition from a number of citizens.

Presenting the case for the transfer of powers, Mr. W. G. Bryson, the local Federal M.P. (Labor), said that the present powers held by the Federal Government over the lives and activities of citizens were necessary for the safety of the people and the successful prosecution of the war, and that the powers asked for were necessary for post-war reconstruction. As we were one people there must be one complete plan for the whole Commonwealth. He said that there was no intention of taking away any of the people's liberties. In time of war, the Federal Government has sovereign powers for a total war effort—man-power, prices, wages, clothing, etc.—control of life and limb under one central authority. Plans for post-war reconstruction are as important as planning for war. Planning for transferring people to peacetime occupations must be centralised and uniform. The Federal Government cannot exercise its wartime powers for post-war reconstruction. A Convention consisting of representatives of Government and Opposition Federal Members, and States' representatives, was held a year ago. A decision was reached by the Convention, and a Bill was introduced and passed in each State House with the exception of the Upper House in Tasmania. Therefore there was no attempt to filch the powers from the States. As we organise for successful defence so must we organise for peace. The electors were not being asked to vote away their rights, they were merely transferring their State rights to the

Federal sphere. The States cannot legislate on Commonwealth matters; each State only controls a certain section of the people, resulting in wastage of manpower and clashes between the people. Mr. Bryson then enumerated and commented on the "14 Points" covering the powers at present sought by the Federal Government.

In opening the case against the transfer of powers, Mr. F. C. Paice said that this was not an attack on one speaker by another, nor was it a Party political issue. Previous attempts by other Federal Governments to obtain these powers have been refused by the people. Dr. Evatt, in his book, "Post-War Re-Construction," quotes as authorities for the transfer of these powers Messrs. Menzies, Page, Bruce, Winant, W. M. Hughes and Sir Kingsley Wood. Sir Keith Murdoch also favours the transfer of these powers. In this book no reference whatever is made to increased powers for the electors, per medium of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. The proposals mean complete centralised control, the same as in war-time (page 78). Power to penetrate deeply and intimately into the lives of the people (page 8). Power to intervene in industrial disputes, without reference to either side (page 10). Power to restrict production (page 27). Power to override State legislation (page 80). Power to control you and send you anywhere, at any time, with or without your consent, per medium of the manpower organisation (page 8), which means post-war industrial conscription. Power to do the same things in peace as in war (page 141), which would include imprisonment without trial. In short, power to do anything or everything that those in power for the time being (irrespective of Party labels) consider to come under the broad description of Post-War Re-Construction. Even if the present Government does not abuse these powers, are they immortal? Will the same Party remain in office forever and ever? When previous anti-Labor Governments sought similar powers, members of the present Labor Government bitterly opposed them. For example, Mr. J. H. Scullin (14/6/26, "Federal Hansard") said: "But if we give the Bill before us our support, it would mean our endorsement of the Crimes Act and of recent deportation proceedings." Powers are wanted because it is intended to preserve the present financial system. We have been told that the same amount of money will not be available for peace as for war. This means that financial credit will be withheld from State Governments, Municipalities and Private Enterprise, thus preventing them from providing employment in the post-war period. This would lead to a huge army of unemployed, with resultant industrial unrest. The only way that employment can be found under such circumstances is by industrial conscription,

### Russia and the Gold Standard

"According to the special representative of the A.A.P. in London, the outstanding financial news of last week was the first semi-official expression of Russian views on post-war currency plans, Professor Varga, leading Soviet economist, declaring that Russia favoured a return to a world gold standard. This stand is completely in line with City expectations. "Russia's conception of a gold standard, the correspondent adds, differs fundamentally from that of free economies. Russia apparently has no intention of allowing her gold stocks to influence either her currency or her credit structure. The rouble's fixed external value has never borne close relation to its internal purchasing power. Even with her closed economy, Russia needs stability of exchanges for her foreign trade, and as the world's second largest gold producer she desires a fixed world price. Nevertheless, expression of authoritative Russian opinion in favour of the return to the gold standard has strengthened confidence in gold's assured place in the post-war world."

—Melbourne "Age," Dec. 13, 1943.

There can, be little doubt, I think, that the Labor Party climbed to power on the incompetence of the U.A.P. leaders. In the last election I don't think the people really voted Labor—they voted against the U.A.P.

Ten years is not a long time to remember a crisis in your life, and the depression years proved a crisis and a disaster in the lives of many an Australian family. Many families paid very heavily for that special disease of centralised Government: the organised destruction of wealth and the production of artificial scarcity—and those families still carry the marks.

Many of the officials who were responsible for carrying out the infamous Premiers' Plan—which imposed poverty on an entire nation, in the face of abundant production—many of those officials were quite ignorant of what they were doing, others had sufficient decency to bow their heads in shame; but U.A.P. leaders thought that the Premiers' Plan was quite a good one and used to sing its praises from the roof-tops on all possible occasions.

There is no doubt that the hostile criticism and ridicule which U.A.P. leaders drew on their Party by those, misguided remarks were instrumental in destroying all opposition to the Labor Party in Tasmania. The Labor Party owes a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Baker and his friends. But in spite of that political defeat of ten years ago, there is no sign that anything has been learnt by it. Who knows yet what the U.A.P. stands for?

Mr. Menzies boasts that he is more of a "practical Socialist" than Mr. Curtin; Mr. Fadden never tires of loudly demanding heavier and heavier taxes. When Mr. Fadden made the attractive offer of promising to pay back some of our taxes after the war—as they are going to do in England—Mr. Menzies immediately challenged Mr. Fadden, and this on the eve of the elections. Even the very excellent idea of keeping down food prices by Government subsidies—which is proving so effective in other countries—this idea has received very little encouragement from Members of the U.A.P.

As I said before, one hunts in vain for any discernible principle on which the U.A.P. leaders base their thoughts, and therefore their actions. They have no

(Continued on page 4.)

Bank. It's a bad error, timing those two events so close together.

RUSSIAN REALISM: It was reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of December 8 that Stalin went to the Teheran conference "only on condition that the British and American war leaders came prepared to discuss concrete plans for second and third fronts." The report also states that, "Stalin would never have gone to Teheran unless the Allies were prepared to strike in Europe, and soon." Although it was not stated, it is reasonable to assume that Stalin was equally prepared to discuss another Russian front—against the Japanese—or at least to make Russian bases available to the Allies for this purpose, and soon. It is unlikely that one-sided coercion would be tolerated.

CENSORED CONFERENCES: U.S. press reports devote much space to criticism of the secrecy and censorship imposed by officials. One says: "If barbed wire is figured" (Continued on page 2.)

### SPECIAL NOTICE

TO NEWSAGENTS AND READERS

The "New Times" will NOT be published on Christmas Eve (December 24) and New Year's Eve (December 31).

The next issue of the "New Times" will be published on Friday, January 7, 1944.

## DR. MACAULAY AND HIS NEW GOSPEL

To the Editor: Sir, —Temporary absence from my home base has prevented my furnishing an earlier reply to Dr. Macaulay's letter, which appeared in your issue of 26th ult. From his reference to an alleged "insinuation" of mine, it seems clear that he has misunderstood, or misread, a paragraph in my first article. He states that I have not yet withdrawn a "suggestion" that I (allegedly) made, to the effect that the expenses of the Australian delegates to the Princeton Conference were paid from an American source. As I neither "insinuated" nor "suggested" that such was the case, I have nothing to withdraw. His charge seems to be based on a somewhat mutilated paragraph, to which I made reference in my previous letter, but that paragraph clearly refers to "conference," and not to "delegates'" expenses.

With regard to my (alleged) "insinuations," might I suggest that "inferences" would be a much better definition. As Dr. Macaulay rightly states, "insinuation is not argument," yet it could be shown, if required, that "insinuations" have not been inconspicuous in his own letters. However, it seems that the space required for this could be used to better purpose in discussing more important matters, on which, he states, "there is a real difference of opinion" between us.

He claims "the old way of independent, rival States has ceased to be tolerable in the modern world. It means anarchy and war. Some better way has to be found, even if it has ills of its own." . . . "Some kind of World Association of nations must come, if we are to avoid further and bigger wars." In regard to these statements, it is desirable to drop generalities and consider the actual facts. What proof can Dr. Macaulay give to prove that the existence of independent (and allegedly) rival States, per se, means anarchy and war? Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Australia, South Africa, Portugal (not to mention others) are independent States, and that their independent status has NOT been the cause of anarchy and war is a simple, undeniable fact!

Nor in actual truth can it be claimed that the independent status of Great Britain, Germany, U.S.A., France, was the sole cause of the World War of 1914-18. It is generally agreed today, that that upheaval was largely due to trade rivalry—a rivalry due to the machinations of a financial system that involves nations in financial chaos, and forces them to fight like wolves for a mere modicum of an inadequate supply of money. So long as private companies—such as the misnamed BANK "OF ENGLAND"—are allowed to create, issue and control the money supply of nations—for the sole benefit of the private banking companies—war, anarchy and chaos will continue. It has been conclusively shown that Hitler's rise to power was made possible only through Germany's economic tribulations—and, he was, of course, aided by the £50,000,000 from the patriotic Bank of England! Such notable public men as Lincoln, Gladstone, Lord Bryce and Lloyd George, have exposed the evil influences of the present financial system, but Princeton Conference seems to have studiously avoided any reference to them. Instead it condemns national isolationism and high tariffs, all of which are EFFECTS, and not PRIMARY CAUSES. The Malvern (Eng.) Church Conference, with sounder vision, condemns the monetary system and affirms the right of nations to their independence. It may be remembered that the Presbyterian Assembly here once passed a resolution to the effect that the existing monetary system is opposed to the will of God. As control of the money system means control of Governments, it seems remarkable that Princeton appeared to ignore a matter, consideration of which is essential, not only at present, but in connection with post-war reconstruction.

In view of actual facts, the claim that the existence of independent States is the real cause of anarchy and war seems absolutely preposterous.

The "better way" to ensure international amity, which should, and can be, found, is to change the present iniquitous money system, which Lord Bryce declared to be "a danger to good government everywhere."

Dr. Macaulay claims that the remedy for the world ills he refers to is the setting up of a World Order—a Super-Government, which will rule the nations with a rod of iron, guns and bombs—if it thinks fit.

In this, he is in line with the advocates of "Federal Union," and it is significant that, according to current press reports, he voices their views and claims. (Probably he will

### SYDNEY NOTES

The "no coupon-rationing of meat" campaign is going extremely well here. A press reporter was sent out to see one active campaigner who is a butcher, to elicit what "big organisation" was behind it. The reporter was told "Just a few people." "What?" said the reporter, "just a few people in Dulwich Hill?" (where the butcher lives.) "No," came the reply; "a few people all over Australia."

### TRAILER FOR SALE

Motor trailer, well-shod, good order, immediate delivery. Inspect, 2 Bent St., Bentleigh (Mr. F. Robinson), close to Bentleigh railway station.

### "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 (he 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.

again protest that I am "insinuating," but I am merely stating a fact.)

The vital question in regard to these proposals is—where are the men to be found who are capable of implementing a World Order? Up to the present, no nation has produced a statesman who has been able to solve the problems of economic insecurity, unemployment and trade. Yet, it is to such incapables and muddlers, that Federal Unionists would entrust the mighty task of World Rulership. While temporary co-operation in many matters will be necessary after the war that does not prove that a permanent amalgamation of nations is either necessary or desirable. Such a union would be more likely to produce irritation, friction and rebellion than to ensure peace.

One of the inconsistencies the Federal Unionists commit themselves to, is shown in their proposal to establish a World Police and Air Force. They propose to ensure "the abandonment of the use of force," by establishing the mightiest military force the world has ever known—and so establish the ABANDONMENT OF THE USE OF FORCE! Could contradiction go further? Surely some better way could be found!

With the view to diverting the attention of the people from the real evil, they have set up a new "bogey-man"—"Isolationism." In their deceitful propaganda, they attempt to cast the blame for all the evils the present financial system brings in its train, on "National Isolationism," which is really one of the EFFECTS of a rotten system of finance.

Dr. Macaulay objects to what he terms the "insinuation" conveyed in my statement about Princeton's "evident intention to abolish democracy." This, I claim, was no "in-

sinuation," but a statement of actual fact, and I am amazed that a delegate to that Conference should object to it. The Princeton Conference—according to Dr. Macaulay—advocated "the limitation of [national] independence and submission to some international authority." Democracy means that the people of any nation have the right to rule themselves, not that they should be ruled by some outside authority.

If a World Order such as Princeton envisages should ever come into being, Democracy will have vanished from the earth. To claim that this is not the case is to assert a logical and factual absurdity.

Another "insinuation" to which he refers is my reference to the presence of an economist "who was not there to lead their devotions," and whose "mere presence would tend to quell any possible unseemly allusions to the god of finance."

Does Dr. Macaulay think that people are simple enough to believe that the economist was not there for a definite purpose. The function of "orthodox" economists is to act as apologists and defenders of the Money Monopolists. Whether the Princeton economist took any actual part has not been disclosed, but in his speech at the Melbourne Town Hall, Dr. Moyes, a co-delegate, referred to a statement made by an economist at another Church Conference at which he was present. That the Financial Overlords in America have on more than one occasion sought the assistance of the Churches, in "putting over" their nefarious schemes is a well-known fact. It was sought by them in opposing Lincoln's financial proposals. In the published "Intimate Papers of Colonel House" an instance is quoted where, when a financial measure was before the U.S.A. Senate, an interview sought by interested financiers was preceded by "a munificent donation to the funds of the Y.M.C.A." This gift was the more remarkable because the donors were not believers in Christianity.

Because of their suggestion to reform the present money system, the Malvern (Eng.) Church findings must have been disturbing to the Money Monopolists, but the Princeton recommendations would give them no cause for anxiety.

—Yours, etc., "STIRREM."

## BEHIND SCENES IN SOVIET RUSSIA

An interesting article on recent political developments in Soviet-Russia appears in the "Review of World Affairs," England, dated August 31. Under the heading, "Behind the Scenes in Russia," the paper says:

"The course of political events in the Soviet Union is most interesting. Important developments have recently occurred apart from the growth of military influence, which is only one factor in a situation about which little is known outside a very small group of highly expert observers. Amongst those who do know something of contemporary Russian affairs is the United States Ambassador. His informatory sources are said by other observers to be good. This fact accounts for the self-confidence with which the State Department handles Russo-American relations; There is a certain ease and boldness in the American policy which is notable. This is also strongly reflected in the press.

"Beneath the outward growth of the Red Army's influence an entirely new general policy is evolving. Moreover, Marshal Stalin is at present by no means a dictator in the sense of being able to impose his unbridled will upon a government of sycophants. On the contrary, the Government consists of two main groups, which hold strong views on different aspects of policy, and quite boldly press those views.

"These two main groups became quite clearly defined about six months ago. The first, and by far the more important, comprises Zhdanov, Beria, Stomonyakov, Vishinski and Dekanossov. These represent what is being called the 'New European Policy School of Thought.' The second group has Kaganovitch at its head and stands for an older fundamentalist view-rather in the Litvinov line.

"The alliance between Beria and Zhdanov is a new and interesting development. Zhdanov is one of Stalin's oldest associates and a possible successor. Like Dekanossov, he was a strong advocate of the 1939 foreign policy. In those days, however, Beria was never closely associated with him. Beria has long been another of the main and most powerful forces in support of and behind Marshal Stalin. He controls the whole OGPU and all its affiliated and subsidiary bodies. His alliance with Zhdanov, therefore, brings immense influence and power to that very important man. Beria now has the rank of general in the army and a very large number of his assistants now have military rank.

"At the beginning of the war, Zhdanov, Dekanossov and several of their friends were seen in Moscow but seldom. Now they are amongst the most prominent active political forces in the Russian capital. Vishinski is the most powerful man in the Foreign Office and he, therefore, adds immense prestige and influence to this inner governmental group, the power of which, therefore, extends to the Army, the OGPU and the Foreign Ministry.

"Zhdanov and his friends are largely responsible for the recall of M. Maisky and M. Litvinov. They consider that Russian interests would be better served by the appointment of functionaries to these two diplomatic posts. They do not think that in future it is desirable to have Ambassa-

dors in London and Washington of such exalted prestige as MM. Maisky and Litvinov undoubtedly enjoyed in many circles.

"The Zhdanov Group considers that less conspicuous and more aloof officials would be more likely to convey the desired impression. It is very interesting to notice that Marshal Stalin eventually agreed to the views of Zhdanov about the replacement of MM. Litvinov and Maisky.

"Zhdanov is, above all, a Russian nationalist. He stands first, last, and all the way, for what he conceives to be the interests of his country. His signature stands on the Decree dissolving the Comintern. He is a man of extraordinary intelligence and shrewdness. We must recognise that he occupies a key position in Russia today. He has distinct and lucid views on war aims, the conduct of war, and foreign policy, of which we have had a most interesting account from an observer watching the inner events of the Soviet Union.

"This Group believes that Russia's position is such that a more determined policy could and should be followed in the sphere of strategy and foreign policy. It believes that whatever happens the Soviet Union holds trump cards which if properly played (without weakness) will produce handsome results. It has the clearest conception of what should be done in the varying conditions, which the next phase of the war itself may create. It is utterly opposed to any policy of drift or compromise with Britain and America, where such a compromise would involve the sacrifice of what it conceives to be a Russian interest. Finally, it considers that whenever its views have been over-ruled, events have proved this over-ruling to have been disastrous. Hence Zhdanov's growing self-confidence.

"There can be no doubt that every problem which arises in the relations between Russia on the one hand, and Britain and America on the other, increases the strength and prestige of this Group and strengthens the possibility of its policies being adopted. Its influence is probably already nearly predominant. All this represents one of the most vitally important developments in modern history."

### D.C.M. WOMEN'S MEETING

The Women's Study Group of the Douglas Credit Movement of Victoria, conducted by Miss G. F. Grieg, M.A., LL.B., will meet this Friday afternoon (Dec. 17), at 3 o'clock, at the movement's headquarters, room 8, first floor, "The Block," Elizabeth St., Melbourne. Members are asked to bring a friend. All welcome.

### NO CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN Sunday Night Meetings, Temperance Hall, Russell Street, Melbourne:

December 19. —Miss E. Pace (Independent candidate for St. Kilda at recent State elections) will speak on "Freedom of the Individual."

Questions and discussion are invited.

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

lively and literally placed round conferences now, how about those in which an attempt will be made to settle the future lives of millions of people?" One correspondent, recalling censorship of the peace conference after the last war, expresses the fear that "Washington has similar plans," and asks, "will we make a practice of the 'free speech' we preach?" Apart from wartime leaders' conferences, which are largely propaganda stunts, the people should see to it that there is no censorship of the final conference—the peace conference. Progress discussions of this should be printed and distributed in all countries concerned, and ratified by each country before being adopted.

**GARNISHEE GESTAPO:** As a result of the garnishee action against miners, which caused the loss of millions of tons of coal production, in order to save face with the local Hitlers responsible for this violation of British justice, and to preserve the peace, the Miners' Federation is to pay the fines—and recover them from the miners concerned. So the infringement against the liberty of the subject and the violation of justice remains. In addition to this the Miners' Federation now assumes the position of the "Garnishee Gestapo."

**WAR WHOOPEE:** New York's "Broadway," according to the Melbourne "Herald," of October 1, is enjoying a prosperity unequalled even in the hectic days of the 1929 boom. The report says: "The crowd's only thought is to get rid of dollars; they wait patiently for hours for cafe seats, and fill New York's dozen mammoth cinemas months ahead. There are 53 licensed night clubs within a mile of Times Square, catering for 226,000 people weekly." Perhaps this situation has some connection with the proposed visit of Mr. Curtin to U.S. However, it may be that even he might need the particular skill of Mr. Dedman to quell this revelry. Even this dour pair might need the help of the international police force!

**TRADE TANGLES:** The ramifications of international trade, and the difficulty of controlling it in war-time, are seen from the following report (Melbourne "Herald," Nov. 15): "A correspondent from Barcelona reports hundreds of bales of American cotton on rail-cars labelled 'Swiss Red Cross' and shipped to Nazi-occupied France. Spanish factories are also turning out German uniforms undoubtedly from U.S. cotton. Cuban sugar is also re-shipped in Vichy French ships to Germany. This method was also used to get Argentine wheat to Germany." Perhaps much the same means are being used in reverse to get German and Japanese goods to the Allies; so there may be an even break, after all.

**TSARIST TRADITIONS:** Press reports of November 12 tell us "the Russian Army has fallen back upon Tsarist military standards for building up a strong traditional sense." Although that would be a shattering blow to our local babbling Communists, it is not surprising to those who understand that Communism or Socialism has nothing to do with the valour of the Russian soldiers. Their valour and capacity was world-famous even under the Tsarist regime, especially under "Peter the Great."

**WHEAT WISDOM:** Judging from the following comments by Senator Gibson, which appeared in the "Countryman," October 29, the misdemeanours of our socialistic food bunglers is being realised at last. Senator Gibson said that, "having regard to manpower and fertiliser shortage [due to meddlers], it is possible that next year Australia may not have sufficient wheat for her own requirements. It is a criminal act to restrict wheat production." He then urged, "Farmers should be allowed to produce as much wheat as they could." He might have also urged that the bunglers responsible for the restrictive sabotage be dealt with as public enemies.

**AUSTRALIAN AUSTERITY:** Official lease-lend figures quoted by Mr. Roosevelt, showing that goods supplied by Australia to June, 1943, comprise, meat, 61,480,000 lbs.; bread, biscuits and cereals, 48,110,000 lbs.; potatoes, 29,762,000 lbs.; vegetables and fruit, 49,931,000 lbs.; canned foods, 28,340,000 lbs.; emergency rations, 2,231,000 lbs.; sugar, 11,782,000 lbs.; butter, 6,628,000 lbs.; condensed milk, 8,711,000 pints; fresh milk [not pasteurised], 11,500,000 pints; fresh eggs, 22,000,000 dozen." In addition to producing these gigantic quantities of war essentials, our skeleton civilian production staffs have provided for our own soldiers and themselves—not to mention enormous quantities of food dumped and restricted through bureaucratic bungling. And yet we hear politicians and planners talking of postwar food problems. How typical of theorists!

**GOLD GOSSIP:** The Melbourne "Sun" of December 7 quotes a Russian "economist" as urging a World Plan. This indicates two things. Firstly, that Russia has the same encumbrances in the form of "certified" economists as the capitalistic countries, and secondly, that the international bankers have well-trained advocates of their "Gold Plot" in all countries.

**COMMUNITY CENTRES:** Mrs. A. E. Mackenzie, supervisor of the Fisherman's Bend community centre, is reported in the "Age" of December 12 as saying: "Families resented new ideas being imposed on them, and were capable of making decisions for themselves." That's a nasty crack for the Planners! Continuing, she said: "Members of the council should convey to the executive of the centre the wishes of the people." It's heartening to notice the rapidity with which the idea of planners being told what to do, instead of

(Continued on page 3)

By ERIC D. BUTLER,

**MECHANISATION OF THE COAL MINES**  
In dealing with the subject of the coal-mining industry in these columns two weeks ago, I neglected to mention one important aspect, which also has a direct relationship to the question of how we are going to regard our economic system after the war. The "important aspect" concerns the increasing mechanisation of production.

The greatest delusion ever foisted on the "civilised" peoples of the world is the carefully fostered belief that the main objective of our productive system is to provide work. The rather elementary fact that every improvement in production methods has been designed TO PRODUCE MORE WITH THE USE OF LESS MEN has been overlooked by most people.

Long before the outbreak of the present war, some remarkable facts were published in these columns concerning the coal-mining industry. It was shown that it was physically possible to introduce electrically-driven coal-cutting and filling machinery in all suitable coal-mines, thus relieving the great majority of coal-miners from a dangerous; dirty job, while actually increasing coal production. But it was also pointed out that the main opposition to this mechanisation came from the coal-miners themselves. And no wonder. Their "leaders" have never once supported the sane suggestion that, if a new machine does the work of a hundred or more men, these men should thus be permitted to draw a monetary claim to goods without being forced to work. Fancy labour leaders talking about "progress," when they support ideas which make men believe that the only way they can obtain a money-license-to-live is by spending their lives doing the most ungenial work —although it isn't physically necessary!

If all coal mining in Australia had been fully mechanised before the war, and the coal-miners thus displaced had been given a decent income by the Government we would have had a far greater war-effort today. The only "problem" was one of finance, and Labor leaders are as horrified as "Conservative" leaders at the suggestion that, as more and more production takes place with less and less men, those displaced by machines should receive "the wages of the machine." All party leaders are unanimous that "work must be found" after the war, even if only digging holes and filling them in again. A policy of servile slavery is being introduced. The central Government at Canberra wants life-and-death control over us all after the

**Mr. Frank Devlin, tailor, 340 Little Collins St., Melbourne,** who has been a frequent advertiser in these columns, extends Christmas and New Year greetings to "New Times" readers, and expresses sincere appreciation of the valued patronage of a large number of subscribers during 1943.—Adv.

#### NOTES ON THE NEWS (Continued).

them telling the people what to do, is gaining ground.

**POWER-LUSTERS' PRESS:** Leading and featured articles in the daily press are denouncing people who logically and constitutionally lodge complaints with their paid political representatives against meat rationing. Much space is devoted to bureaucratic spokesmen to insult the public with charges of being unpatriotic, mean and paltry—simply because they disagree with these official blunders. So much for the freedom of the press! It seems that the butchers are making available to the public petition forms through which John Citizen can express his views to the appropriate Federal Member. Since it is John Citizen who has to suffer, surely it is he who should decide what he wants—without being abused by the daily press.

**REFERENDUM RIDDLES:** Among the many proposals to be covered under the transfer of powers, the following (part of Item 8), dealing with finance for undertakings, is most illuminating: "Shall be approved by a majority of the members of the Australian Loan Council." This makes it perfectly clear that the debt-finance structure is to be preserved. Anyway, the fight is now on in earnest, and we can expect a sustained and heavy press-barrage designed to mesmerise the people into acceptance. The fact that the "capitalist" press is behind the campaign should be of special interest to Labor followers. Beware of those or that which the daily press supports.

—O.B.H.

#### "POWER POLITICS AND PEOPLE'S PRESSURE"

By L. S. BULL.

THIS NEW BOOKLET TELLS. . .

- HOW dictatorship in Australia was narrowly averted.
- WHY the Constitution will again be attacked.
- WHO are the planners.
- HOW you can help defend Australian freedom.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW.

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

war. Our instinctive and healthy opposition to this policy is being deadened by the most insidious campaign ever seen in this country. Even "Conservative" members seem to have adopted a resigned attitude. I hope business men and those who look to their so-called representatives to save them from Government control after the war appreciate the following statement by Mr. Harold Holt, made at Canberra on October 13:

"I think we all share the view that we have ahead of us for a long time, **probably for all time**, a high measure of control by the Government over our lives as private individuals and as productive citizens in the Commonwealth economy." (My emphasis.)

I hope that a large number of red-blooded Australians tell Mr. Holt and his colleagues that they do not all share the above views.

Not only did this policy of "work-or starve" prevent the complete mechanisation of coal mining before the war; it is still dominating the minds of coal-miners. The following statement by Mr. Harrison, at Canberra on October 13, was not denied by any Labor Member:

"The coal-mining regulations in New South Wales, as amended in 1941, provide that no colliery owner may introduce

mechanisation into his mine for the extraction of pillars without the consent of the Minister. The present Minister is Mr. Baddeley, who represents a northern coal-field constituency in the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales. From time to time the mine-owners have submitted to Mr. Baddeley applications for permission to introduce machinery into the pillar workings, and on every occasion he has refused to grant it. **The reason is that he knows that the introduction of the machinery will reduce the number of miners employed in the workings.**" (My emphasis.)

Undoubtedly coal-miners have developed a psychology all of their own as a result of the conditions they lived under in the years of "peace." But surely a Government which allegedly represents the workers could, by concrete financial assistance now, demonstrate to coal-miners that their security would be certain after the war if mechanisation were introduced to the utmost and those men no longer required allowed to volunteer for other war industries, thus helping our national effort considerably. Once their suspicions were overcome, I am sure that coal-miners would co-operate. The main problem is one of finance. But—in spite of Labor's great majority, and all the "blah" by Labor Members—Labor leaders, to put it crudely, haven't the stomach to stand up to the men operating the banking swindle in this country.

In conclusion, perhaps I could make one suggestion to Dr. Coombs and others who say that reconstruction must be based on "full employment": Destroy all machinery in coal-mines and give the miners teaspoons for shovels. There would then be plenty of work for all!

## CONTROL OF WORLD THROUGH FOOD?

The following letter was sent to Mr. A. Mair, member of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly, by a well-known electoral campaigner of that State. It speaks for itself:—

Dear Mr. Mair,—It is very gratifying to read your criticism of the Federal Government's meat-rationing scheme. These proposals assume an even more sinister aspect when one considers figures supplied by the Commonwealth Statistician, as quoted by Mr. Dun, of the Condobolin Branch of the Graziers' Association:—

**"After four years of war the producers had stocked the Commonwealth with no fewer than 13½ million more sheep, one million more cattle, and nearly half a million more pigs than were grazed in Australia in, January, 1939."**

When the Government has determined to impose upon us harsh and fantastic measures, it is never deterred by a lack of fine words and noble objectives. When it has worked to a standstill that most useful slogan, "This is to enable us to win the war," it changes the key and harps on the new tune, "This is to enable us to feed the people of Britain." But on occasion it is not so happy in its choice of tunes and then the real motives become discernible. Councillor Harding pointed this out, as reported in "Sydney Morning Herald," of 24/11/43:—

**The Controller emphasised that the Government was not so much concerned with the saving of coal, as it was with creating an atmosphere of austerity."**

But despite all the cunning variations of the theme, the real motive plainly underlies the whole, and the Government has woefully failed to obscure it. In all its fantastic actions there is one motive, which is plainly discernible. That motive is CONTROL.

Unhappily for the continued success of the Government in moving towards its supreme objective of CONTROL, many people are becoming very concerned as to the identity of those in whose interests this ubiquitous policy of control is exercised; they are so ungracious as to believe that at the dictates of a hidden interest there is being pursued by the Government a policy of CONTROL FOR THE SAKE OF CONTROL.

These ungracious ones have witnessed a great fanfare of trumpets advocating the establishment of a fantastic Federal Union; a union in which it was hoped to enmesh the unwary peoples of the British Empire, and to gull them into surrendering the power to order their own affairs, into renouncing their sovereignty, and into debasing their Monarch. All that it was hoped to achieve in the sacred name of INTERNATIONAL CONTROL. To this new god was to be yielded, on the sacrificial altar, our dearly beloved dream of a WHITE AUSTRALIA, our aspiration for a homogeneous people from one end of our Continent to the other. We were to surrender our wicked desire to tread our own path; this wickedness was to be known by a new name, "ISOLATIONISM," and every one was to abhor it.

The advocacy of Federal Union has strangely subsided, and the aforesaid ungracious ones are closely scrutinising all Government action, believing that those behind Federal Union, though they appear to have been defeated in relation to CONTROL through outright Federal Union, are not likely to abandon their hope of achieving control by OTHER means. These ungracious ones ask these questions of themselves:—

Is it that those who have for so long

exercised supreme control of the world through control of money and credit have become doubtful of their power effectively to use this instrument in the future? Is it that the gaff has been blown on their old technique of ascribing to an allegedly unavoidable shortage of money an "inability" to make available those physical resources, food, clothing, and shelter, which they WISHED to withhold from the people? Is it that the plenitude of money for war purposes has blown that gaff?

Is it that the people have not risen to the bait of Federal Union?

Is it that these same interests, forestalling failure of their previous efforts, now propose to maintain control of the people of the world, by centralising in their own hands control of all food supplies?

Is it that meat rationing is an ambitious and essential step towards their supreme goal?

—Yours faithfully, K. W. MARLOW, 48 Dean St., Enfield, N.S.W., 24/11/43.

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

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

### 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, . . . . .

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Weymouth Street, Adelaide.)

Meat Rationing: Doubtless Social Crediters have picked the flaw in the method the local butchers have adopted to oppose meat rationing. Mr. Curtin is only responsible to electors of his own electorate, so he need not take notice of a petition signed by persons outside that electorate. We have written to the Master Butchers' Association pointing out this fact and suggesting that they should use the demand or request letter idea, which has been so successful in the past. Anyone feeling strongly enough on this issue could perhaps generate some steam by putting our ideas up to their local butcher.

Dean Case: Readers of the "New Era" will probably remember this case, which was the subject of an article headed "How Courts Are Used to Defeat the Course of Justice," in the issue of October 22.

Dean, a Tasmanian, has at last forced the court to hear his case; but, apparently with the object of putting as many obstacles in Dean's way as possible, the hearing is set down for hearing at Darlinghurst, Sydney. Acting on information from Tasmania, Mr. C. Goode, a past president of this movement, wired the following protest to his Federal Representative, Cabinet Minister N. Makin: "Dean versus Latham High Court Taxation case set for hearing in Sydney 16th inst. Will you urge Attorney-General transfer hearing to Hobart? Sydney grossly unfair to Dean." As an organisation we have also written to each South Australian Federal Representative acquainting him with the details of this amazing case as we see them. Anyone wishing to know these details may obtain them from our office.

Christmas and New Year: We take this opportunity of extending Seasonal Greetings to our many friends.

—F. Bawden, Hon. Secretary.

### C. H. DOUGLAS WRITES ON "INDIVIDUALISM"

The following letter appeared in "The Scotsman" of September 18, 1943:—

Sir,—There is, I think, a certain congruity in the appearance in the pages of "The Scotsman" of a discussion on the merits and place of individualism, and there must be a considerable body of readers, not only in these islands but overseas, who would be well satisfied to see the subject pursued to a definite and helpful conclusion.

It is not necessary to invoke the authority of the Christian philosophy (although that is unequivocal on the point) to realise that the relationship of the individual to the group is not arguable. The group exists for the benefit of the individual, in the same sense that the field exists for the benefit of the flower, or the tree for the fruit. Groups of any kind, whether called nations, business systems, or any other associative label, inevitably decay and disappear if they fail to foster a sufficient number of excellent individuals, using those words in their precise significance. It is also true that excellence involves exercise—a man does not become a good cricketer by reading books on cricket.

But not everyone wants to play cricket, and not every cricketer wants to play seven days a week. If the M.C.C. becomes so all pervasive that, in place of being a group for the encouragement and progress of cricketers who freely choose cricket as their game, it becomes an organisation directed to the abasement of non-cricketers, then it is a field which has not been farmed with proper understanding.

The individualism, which is justifiable and necessary, is not that which insists on making the rules of every game, and at the same time devises methods of compulsion to provide players.

It is obvious that advantage is being taken of the orgy of waste through which we are passing to stampede us into mere units in an industrial-financial group. The case which the Society of Individualists has to make for itself, I think, less concerned with the value of individualism than with the methods by which it proposes to restore to the individual the opportunity of becoming excellent by the exercise of his possibly unique talent rather than by the life-long performance of a mechanical task.

I have read many of the attractive writings of Sir Ernest Benn, who is prominent in the Individualist movement, and they never fail to amuse and delight me. But I notice that Sir Ernest is a stalwart supporter of the orthodox financial system. And there is no more future for the genuine individualist if the pre-war financial system is not radically modified in the interest of the individual than there is for the deluded victims of Karl Marx.

—I am, etc., C. H. DOUGLAS, Sept. 14.

### BEVERIDGE PLOT EXPOSED

Owing to pressure on our space, we have had to hold over until next issue (January 7, 1944), a very special article from England, which specifically exposes some particularly damning aspects of the Beveridge Plan, previously concealed from the general public in Great Britain, here, and elsewhere. Don't miss it! Make sure you get our next issue—remember the date—January 7—the first Friday in the New Year.

We should therefore now ascertain whose policy has been imposed ever since the last war, and whose policy is shaping the "reconstruction" measures, which are to give us another "competitive scramble." This policy, which is one and the same, has been most disastrous in every way, and even led almost to the disintegration of the British Empire. It was well summed up by the Economic Crisis Committee of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce in the following words:—

"The last thirty years have been the most disastrous in the age-long period of recorded history. This fact cannot be dismissed lightly by superficial reasoning, such as the will of God, the instability of human nature, or the transit of Venus. That the world has staggered from crisis to crisis during this period is due to a very deep-seated cause. All the major economic and social ills of the world have their origin in this basic cause. What is it?"

That statement is absolutely correct, and until we identify this basic CAUSE and REMOVE it, the world will continue to stagger from crisis to crisis.

Always bearing in mind the remarkable admission of the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George regarding the international bankers at the Peace Conference ("The International Bankers swept statesmen, politicians, journalists, and jurists 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"), it will be found more than interesting to take a look into the doings of the period between the two wars.

One of the purposes of the last war was to bring about the financial subjugation of the British Empire, and to force us back on to the Gold Standard. The idea was that the nations were to be forced to pay back in gold the numerous war debts, which had been contracted in paper. To the International Financiers this was fundamental to the maintenance of their power. Mr. Montagu Norman explained it nicely in his evidence before the MacMillan Committee in 1929. (Mr. Norman is the Governor of the Bank of "England." He was appointed to that position with the approval of, if not at the instigation of, Wall Street financiers, and is maintained in that position at their wish). These were his words:—

"As far as the legislation position goes, we are a free agent; but as far as the International position goes, we are not at all a free agent. The whole of the International machinery is bound together and necessarily works as a whole. What is called the Gold Standard is the cement."

You see from this that the Bank of England is "a free agent" so far as legislation is concerned. That's a pretty favourable position for a private corporation, and when we add that this private corporation also controls the Note Issue in England, it is at once obvious that no other private company is comparable with it in regard to "privilege." The so-called "Mother of Parliaments" apparently just falls into line as required, and the British Government has

merely been the executive of the Wall Street financiers. Despite this, most of us still delude ourselves with the belief that the British Empire is a Commonwealth of Nations in all of which the will of the PEOPLE prevails!

Just as happened in the last war, there is again a plot afoot to get us back to the Gold Standard, and some of the very same men are doing the plotting. Norman Jaques called attention to it in the Canadian House of Commons, and I quote him from "The New Times" of 16/10/42 as follows:—

"In the 1941 report of the Carnegie Institute for International Peace mention is made of 'a meeting attended by 62 persons of great importance and influence.' One section of the Resolution passed read: 'We recommend the stabilisation of foreign exchange on the basis of gold—with a view to the establishment of a world gold standard.' And the report continues: 'The Atlantic Charter is an endorsement of and a supplement to the principles expressed by the Conference.'"

Is it any wonder that the rendezvous from which the Atlantic Charter was released has been described as "a reunion with the Warburgs"! I am endeavouring to get the names and business interests of the 62 men who attended that conference, so that they can be published.

In view of what is going on, it is important that we should get some reasonably clear grasp of what the Gold Standard has done for us in the past. In countries that are properly ON the Gold Standard every person who has a money claim on another person can demand payment in gold. At the end of 1929 there was about £2000 million worth of monetary gold in the world. Practically the whole of this, or at any rate by far the greater part of it, was private property. The gold holding in Britain was about £150 millions. At the same date the British National Debt, PAYABLE IN GOLD, totalled about £7500 million! That is to say, the British Government alone owed 3½ times as much gold as there was in the whole world, and 50 times as much as was held in Britain. And the British debt was but a mere drop in the bucket of the total debts then payable in gold. We borrowed goods made by the people, but had to pay back gold controlled by financiers. We could not do without the goods, and so had to come under the control of the gold owners. That was why the amount of the dole to be paid to the unemployed of England was fixed not by the Government, but by Wall Street!

From what has already been published in "The New Times," it is clear that the maintenance of the present financial arrangements is the keystone of the arch in the Jewish edifice of usury—i.e., an edifice in which the Jews can continue to be lenders, not borrowers; rulers, not subjects; possessors, not tenants. They regard return to the Gold Standard as one of the important necessities towards this objective, as it keeps the people in a state of irredeemable debt and thus under easy

## WHY PICK ON THE BRITISH EMPIRE?

Why is it that the British Empire (so-called) is the only empire subjected to calumny, contempt, indignation, abuse and bewildering controversy both from within and without? Is there no other union of peoples either loosely or tightly bound under a single nominal rule that might be criticised from time to time?

I have in front of me (it is a little out of date now) a manifesto addressed "To the People of England" by the American magazine called "Life." This magazine may not have known that any manifesto addressed to the People of England would leave almost entirely unperturbed (if any of them should happen to read it) the people of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. But I will let that pass. What the manifesto says in brief is that America is not fighting to keep the British Empire together. "Our side," it says, "is the side of Liberty. It is the big side. It has always been big. It is much bigger than the British Raj. It is much bigger than the British Empire."

Maybe. Yet I consider the statement not only unkind but unfair. No manifesto is likely to be sent by "Punch" to the People of New England pointing out that we are not going to fight for the American Raj. If there is any separatist tendency in Kentucky, any desire for self-determination in Louisiana or Texas or Vermont, no Cornishman, no Manxman, no New Zealander is going to lay down his arms because these appetites are unappeased.

The American Raj (leaving out many other and more peculiar acquisitions) bought Alaska for 7,200,000 dollars in 1867 from the Russian Raj. Did I ever complain? I am in fact rather glad. I will fight with the last drop of ink in my pen to keep Alaska part of the U.S.A. whatever the Alaskans may think about it.

It is the same with the French Raj. Here are the Americans and people of Mercia and Wessex (for all I know) sitting in great pieces of the French Raj, and promising to give the whole of it back, when we have

finished fighting for it, to France. Nobody has asked whether any desire for autonomy exists in any part of the French—or for that matter of the Dutch, the Belgian or the Portuguese Raj. If there is anything crystal-clear in the global war, it is that all grumblers assume the prismatic perfection of every Allied empire except our own.

When one considers the Soviet Russian Raj, the absence of any acrimonious debate is more remarkable still. There are a hundred and sixty-nine ethnographical groups in the U.S.S.R. There are six Republics. One of these consists of twenty-seven provinces, five areas, six autonomous areas and eleven autonomous republics. But how autonomous? More autonomous than Eire or less? Does even Mr. Harold Laski know?

If you lead me on a little further I shall begin to tell you about podzol, chernozom and loess. They are only a few pages further on in the encyclopedia. They are kinds of soil. But how can I tell whether all the peoples who live on the podzol are quite as politically content as the peoples who live on the loess? I don't ask. I just let them live and fight there without bothering.

Suppose that somewhere in the far, far East there is a wild Turkoman or Mongolian nomadic tribe which is pining to secede from the U.S.S.R. and live under its own chieftains in a state of oligarchic tyranny and serfdom, or a pacific community, which says "We are not fighting to keep Moscow Raj intact," should I be able to raise a violent agitation in the Yorkshire press to give this tribe or this community Swaraj?

No sir. Would not, in fact, the U.S.S.R. take very good care that this incipient revolution was calmly (but firmly) suppressed and that nobody in Europe heard anything about it at all?

—"Punch," London. (Our heading.)

control. You know of course what one of the Rothschilds said: "Permit me to control the money of a country and I care not who makes its laws." That is why, immediately upon the termination of hostilities, strong pressure was exerted by the Wall Street financiers to prevent the people of Britain from having finance after the last war on the scale they had experienced during the war, and the way is now being prepared for precisely the same thing to happen again upon the termination of the present hostilities. Even here in Australia traitors are already at work fostering the idea that money is too plentiful and must necessarily be curtailed when the war ends. After the last war we were fortunate enough to have Sir Denison Miller in charge of the Commonwealth Bank, and he it was who saved us from the immediate effects of the appointment of Mr. Montagu Norman as Governor of the Bank of "England." At the moment we are not so favourably placed, for Sir Denison has gone, while Montagu Norman remains, and the present "Board" controlling the Commonwealth Bank has shown itself a willing tool of the international financiers. There is great peril in allowing this to continue.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham St., East Melbourne, C2, December 12, 1943. (To be continued.)

## THE CASE AGAINST NATIONALISATION

(From the "Social Creditor," England.)  
(Concluded from last issue.)

What can be done by those who are not convinced in favour of nationalisation? Anything? Surely. The machinery of Representative Government still exists and is at hand. Besides, is it not in Parliament that pressure for the big unit has been, and is being so successfully applied? Certainly action can be taken—the advocacy of the opposite to the centralising process that has been going on for so long. We can begin to press for decentralisation both of control and administration—to have it divorced from the unfruitful pavements of Whitehall, and pushed out into the County Administrations; still further even, out into the rural areas.

Where we have been progressively making matters more and more complex and rigid, we can advocate a simplification and loosening-up. Where we have been more and more subjecting the individual farmer and landowner to external, applied discipline, we should be able to contrive things that the farmer would tend to apply discipline to himself and his neighbours. If regulations were realistic, and their benefits obvious to common intelligence, no one could better ensure their being carried out than the farmer himself, and his local organisations—and speaking comparatively, for no remuneration, "Deus est Daemon inversus."

Here, then, "Stripped of all abstractions, 'rights,' moralities, and other complications which make any problem permanently insoluble," as their preamble states, follow eight points in connection with the land that have been put up to me as basic. Perhaps at first sight they may appear rather startling; but I feel sure it is only because in a complex and arbitrary world—one, that is, dominated largely by figures rather than facts, nothing seems so startling (almost indecently so) as simplicity, nor so revolutionary as constitutionalism:—

(1) Absolute security of tenure for life, including complete abolition of land taxation of every description. The imposition of a land tax shall be 'ultra vires.'

(2) Abolition of land sales between individuals as of right. Registration of sale to take place five years after payment of purchase price, on petition by purchaser supported by six adjacent neighbours, who are landowners.

(3) County Council Authority to be obliged to purchase at valuation (see 6 below) all land offered for sale, and to advertise for resale only to approved purchasers who must obtain support of six adjacent landowners.

(4) No State or Public Body to hold land for which a properly supported application from a private individual is made at the valuation price.

(5) Where a legatee is non-resident on land which he inherits, he shall be given twelve months to take up the occupation of it. If he decides to reside, his title shall be confirmed after five years. If not, his land shall be acquired by the County Authority for resale as in (3) above.

(6) All land to be classed as A, Amenity Land, B, Agricultural Land, C, Industrial Land. All land titles shall restrict the land to which title is given, to the class in which it was placed on the grant of first title. No change of Class shall be permitted without the offer of sale as in (3) above.

(7) The initial valuation of land to be that shown in the last conveyance as consideration. Every five years, a landowner shall be entitled to make a claim, properly substantiated by accounts, in which his own activities shall be included as manager, for increased value. On the admission of this claim by a properly constituted County Authority against whose adverse decision appeal to a Committee appointed by the Land Agents' Society shall lie, seventy-five per cent, of the cost of this increased value shall be refunded to the landowner in County Bonds bearing interest at three per cent, and twenty per cent, of the increased valuation shall be added to the transfer value of the land.

(8) No public official shall have any right of entry whatsoever, without magistrate's Warrant.

Logic is the mechanism of thought. When we say of this industrial age, as we

## REORGANISATION OF U.A.P.

(Continued from page 1.)

financial policy and no educational policy; nor do they display any curiosity in such things.

Take the housing problem: The question of providing decent houses for the people is largely a question of price. A rental equal to one day's pay a week, or, say, a fifth of a man's wages, is considered a fair maximum rent to be aimed at—although personally I think that is too high. But how is this to be achieved? The Mortgage Bank, established by the Labor Party, supplies money at 4 per cent; but the working man cannot afford to pay this rate of interest.

High financial authorities have stated that the cost of making money available for loans is not more than ½ percent. Under such conditions working men could obtain houses and pay off the loans at about 15/- a week. If people are to obtain houses in which they can rear three or four children, surely they are entitled to first claim on the financial resources of the country. Why is the U.A.P. afraid to come forward with a constructive policy on the housing question?

My answer is that Mr. Menzies is tied to what he calls "Sound Finance" and which I call "Debt Finance," that is, financial methods which are especially designed to keep people in perpetual debt.

The day I wrote this, a young man told me he paid off one of the mortgages on his home, and the bank manager was quite annoyed about it. The young man had flung off some of his chains, he had freed himself to that extent; he was not playing the game according to "Sound Finance!" The Labor Party's financial policy is the same as that of the U.A.P., because it is decided by the same people. Nevertheless, the Labor Party can get away with it. But the U.A.P. are suspect—thanks to Mr. Menzies, Mr. Fadden, Mr. Casey and Sir Earle Page, who have consistently sacrificed their Party to satisfy the dictates of the Financial Monopolies.

There is one thing for which the evidence is official, documental and monumental, and that is that the international money monopoly is no friend of the British Empire. That the British Empire was starved of the necessary finances to defend itself from being almost completely wiped out is now a matter of history. Yet we find a political body which claims to be patriotic and British in sentiment actively associated with the same financial policy, which brought nothing but tragedy and almost irrevocable ruin to our people. Ignorance of the mighty implications of such a policy is no excuse for those who profess to be leading other people. Aldous Huxley, in his book, "Ends and Means," states: "Which only shows yet once more how right the Buddha was in classing 'unawareness' and 'stupidity' among the deadly sins." And if we are to judge by results we must admit he was right.

There is no doubt that the financial monopoly used the U.A.P. as a convenient political instrument to impose its policy upon the people. The great blunder the leaders of the U.A.P. made was to think that the financial monopoly had the slightest interest in private enterprise or individual initiative, or in the British Empire, or in Australia. The financial monopoly used the U.A.P. to do its dirty work just as it has used many other organisations, and having fulfilled its prescribed role, the U.A.P. has been cast aside.

Large and powerful organisations are always handy and convenient tools for ambitious men to use; in a vast continent like Australia the question of control becomes intensely difficult. Unless the rank-and-file are prepared to devote their time and energy to exerting continuous pressure and watchfulness, they must be prepared to see control taken away from them. The game of politics is not a game for indolent men and women; it is not something you can delegate to other people; it is like freedom, you can't buy it—you have got to fight for it, and each generation has to fight all over again, or become slaves.

—JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

continually do, that the machine is dominating society, we have a false mental picture of the facts. What is "getting us down" is our own uncompensated mechanical thought process. The public mind, as in the case of our Governmental machinery and our sources of information, has been captured by a one-sided, unbalanced interest, which, particularly because the necessities of the war have effectively removed serious opposition to it, is able to swing everything its own way.

But there are signs even among the figure-men themselves that indicate that they begin to suspect they may be the victims, rather than the masters of their own logic. The demands for nationalisation were never more insistent than just today, and yet there is a hesitancy discernible, even a toying with decentralising formulae. And none too soon; for look at it how you will, State Ownership is the last stage of centralised control, which is totalitarianism—the elevation of the Collective, the "General Good" to the supreme place reserved for God. Surely that is a most dangerous philosophy to listen to? And was it not one of the greatest of the great English poets and visionaries, William Blake, who said, "General Good is the plea of the scoundrel . . .?"

—N. F. WEBB.