

THE BEVERIDGE PLOT
EXPOSED! (Page 2.)

AN OPEN LETTER TO
ARCHBISHOP BOOTH.
(Page 3.)

TREASURY BRANCHES IN
ALBERTA. (Page 3.)

THE "SECOND FRONT"
AND SEA POWER.
(Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 1. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 1944

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).

The Bungling of Australia's Food Supply

The Government's Responsibility

Various members of the Federal Cabinet are becoming irritated by the growing criticism of the food position in Australia. But there can be little doubt that the whole of the food position wants thorough investigation, and wants placing in the hands of men who know something about it.

Hobart is going to face a milk shortage in the autumn—probably in February—and that is mostly due to Government action, and in particular to the operations of Professor Copland, the Prices Commissioner.

The control of prices is one of the most important controls operating today; it is vital and fundamental to the whole economic structure of the country.

If farmers are not given prices for milk to cover their living expenses, they are not going to produce milk. Professor Copland knows that as well as you and I, but he is apparently not interested. Girls making munitions are given £5/5/- a week, but dairymen getting up at four o'clock in the morning are not considered worthy of a living wage.

Professor Copland, along with members of the Federal Government, seems to have forgotten that people who make shells and guns have to be fed.

The facts are these: The Australian Government has stripped this country of its manpower to a greater degree than any of the Allies fighting in this war. The war effort is horribly unbalanced, and the war effort of the Federal Government has been carried along only by the amazing efforts of the older farmers and their women folk, struggling along at all hours of the day against the ridiculous difficulties, which have mostly been caused by Government officials and the centralised bottleneck at Canberra. A great deal of this trouble in the farming industry is caused by Professor Copland the same prices for the whole of Australia, as if the costs of producing milk in Tasmania were the same as in Queensland. A price which is profitable in Queensland can be unprofitable in Tasmania, yet bureaucrats, sitting in Canberra, legislate for the entire continent as if there were no difference in climate and seasons, no difference in cost of feed and no difference in size of pastures.

There appears to be a desire—one might say, a religious fervour—for uniformity among the bureaucrats of Canberra, and

it is this which causes so much needless trouble.

A bounty of 2d a gallon was given to the milk producers in the off season to help with the extra costs of feeding, but at the same time new wage regulations were enforced which not only wiped out the extra 2d, but wiped out any possibility of paying expenses.

Dairymen estimate that it takes the profit from about 24 cows to pay the wages of one man, and as one man looks after about 24 cows, you can understand that dairymen are not keen to employ any men even if they can get them. And they are not going to keep on milking cows at a loss!

The only people who can keep milch cows and pay expenses are those with large families; that is, those who have unpaid labour. But as the Government has called up most of the young men, and sometimes left only one old man in charge of a farm, even this unpaid labour force has been depleted very badly. And, strangely enough, the girls find working eight hours a day in a munition factory at £5/5/- a week more acceptable than getting up at four o'clock in the morning and working for fourteen hours a day for a few shillings.

The dairy farmers work long hours, and they have been denied labour; they are short of fertilisers, and they cannot get enough to pay expenses, and they are fed up—how fed up they are the people of Hobart will find out to their cost this winter, when they find they are short of milk for their children.

To give you an example of the results of fixing ridiculous prices for goods, let us take the case of second-hand motor cars: Professor Copland made a list of prices at which second-hand cars were to be sold. A Ford car, five years old, for example, had to sell at a definite price; no more, no less. It didn't make any difference if the car had done 5000 miles or 100,000 miles; it didn't make any difference to Professor Copland if the car had been kept as good as new or had been driven to death—the

price at which it was to be sold remained the same.

The result was that those who had a badly used car to sell demanded the full price through the proper agents, and those who had good cars sold them in the black market.

The result of this, of course, was that trade was diverted from the traders who stuck to the law, and was pushed underground into the hands of those who were not so fussy.

And I submit to you that most of the black marketing has been produced by the stupidity of Government regulations. It is bad enough for the Government, by its ridiculous and unreasonable actions, to create black markets, thus encouraging citizens to break the law, but it doesn't stop at that: the Government is building up an army of snoopers going round town trying to persuade neighbours to tell and inform about each other.

The same thing happened with butter rationing and the prohibition of the sale of cream. With butter rationing the small farmers found the market for dairy butter closed to them; they could not sell their butter, nor their cream. The extra cream they had on their hands they were not allowed to sell or give away, and the cream

which the law refused to allow any human being to have was fed to the pigs. The ridiculousness of the position soon caused resentment among the people, with the result that most people ignored the law altogether.

Thus the law makers at Canberra, by their zeal in turning out hundreds of regulations to prevent people doing this and that, are producing a nation of law breakers; they are bringing law into contempt and building up an army of inspectors and snoopers and police to try and enforce upon the people stupid regulations by heavy fines.

The idea behind butter rationing—so it is alleged—was to make more butter available for export. The scheme has failed because, according to the Government's own figures, the production of butter has dropped 30 per cent. When it was pointed out to the Government that the small farmer who made butter for himself and sold the rest to the local storekeeper, could no longer sell his butter, the Government said: "Well, let him send his cream to the butter factories."

Now in Southern Tasmania there are only, I think, three butter factories, so that you can imagine the hopelessness of the (Continued on page 4.)

Before Christmas nearly, all the daily papers gave big headlines and substantial space to an attack on THE PEOPLE by Senator Keane. He was complaining against the DEMOCRATIC action, of citizens writing to him (and to other paid political servants) saying that they objected to the imposition of meat rationing. Just because his employers (electors) insist on removal of the stupid, Government-made "bottleneck" in the meat industry, this upstart has the outrageous audacity to describe them as "squealers." His outburst can only be described as dictatorial impertinence of the worst kind. The fact that daily papers ally themselves with such tactics amounts anti-democratic attitudes. Senator Keane's electors should remember these INSULTS, and readers of the daily press should naturally prefer publications that do not FEATURE insolent political servants.

TOWNSVILLE'S TROUBLES: Food Commissioner Murphy, who quite recently denied that our food supply was in a dangerous state, changed his tune considerably (according to the Melbourne "Herald" of December 22) after a visit to Townsville, the scene of a serious food shortage, which could no longer be hidden by our socialistic bunglers. Australia can no longer afford to have these proven incompetents in charge of food, supplies, and the sooner they are fired the safer we will be. The saying that "the people win wars in spite of Governments" seems especially true in the present circumstances.

SHINWELL'S SENSE: An alternative to the bankers' dangerous Federal Union scheme is proposed by Mr. Shinwell, British M.P., in the form of an extension of the British Commonwealth of Nations on a voluntary basis without any sacrifice of political independence by self-governing units. This association would be open to such countries as Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Spain and France, and presumably other bigger but younger nations who desired to join. The special virtue of this proposal is that if these countries became dissatisfied they could withdraw; meanwhile they would manage their own affairs. It is the opposite of a compulsory "world government," backed by a "World Police" Gestapo.

PEACE PROBLEMS: Mr. N. Makin, Minister for Munitions (depressed industry), suggests that Government-owned munition factories may be used to make-work by producing refrigerators, washing machines and other work saving devices. This proposal assumes (among other things) that men and materials are available for this form of production—in which case they should be available for private manufacturers. Mr. Makin apparently presumes that, simply because these goods would be produced "by the Government," the public would automatically be able to obtain them. But, no matter who produced the goods, the people would require sufficient effective money with which to purchase all of them. There was no pre-war shortage of these amenities; all that was short was the cash to pay for enough of them. If the Government simply ensured sufficient purchasing power, the people would produce and obtain all the goods they wanted.

CREDIT CONTROL: U.S. "Treasury experts" are reported to be considering "cracking-down" (shutting the purse) against Argentina, following certain actions of Argentina's governing military clique, which has strong Nazi leanings. Such credit control is the financiers' "secret weapon." No doubt the financiers used this weapon in the first place to permit the setting-up of this dictatorship, in much the same way as Montagu Norman and other financiers made Hitler's set-up possible.

TAYLOR'S TASK: The A.L.P. Conference, which was held in secret, illustrated the manner in which our local money-riggers "plant" suitable men in order to get the inside story, and at the same time have somebody to plead their cause. Mr. W. C. Taylor, the recent Labor appointee to the Commonwealth Bank Board, by the strangest coincidence (?) happened to be one of the 36 delegates to the conference. Incidentally, this handpicked, secret "democracy" of 36 delegates (who would not really represent one in a hundred of "the workers," much less of electors as a whole) are reported to have approved certain international policies, which could threaten the right of Australia to manage her own affairs. It is a dangerous situation.

BRIGHTER BRITAIN: The heading, "Britain will soon start exporting," which appeared in the daily press of December 16, was doubtless intended to strike a note of cheer, presumably to Brazil and other countries, which were mentioned as the likely recipients of the exports. Having regard to the regimentation and deprivation for the British themselves in the way of clothes and general merchandise one would have expected the exportable goods to have been made available to the British people who made them; but apparently that's "not done" according to the Planners. Heil the "new order" of planned economy!

REVENUE RESULT: The expected revenue from, indirect taxation for 1943-4 shows the extent to which the Federal Government intends to go on inflating the cost-of-living. Here are the figures: Cus- (Continued on page 4.)

Plain Speaking to a Labor M.P.

The following letter, dated November 22, 1943, was sent to Mr. J. Langtry, M.H.R., by Sgt. Eric D. Butler. It speaks for itself:—

Dear Mr. Langtry, — This letter is the result of my reading your budget speech of October 7 (vide "Hansard" No. 17, pp. 270-71-72). While I understand your reticence in advocating the financial policy you have often mentioned before entering Parliament — after all, I don't suppose that you can be expected to challenge your party bosses unless your electors are united behind you — I feel nothing but disgust with statements which you know to be deliberate distortions of fact.

You say: "During the depression, anti-Labor Governments could not provide sufficient money to feed many of the fine men who today are driving the enemy out of New Guinea." Must I remind you, Mr. Langtry, that a Federal Labor Government was in office when Niemeyer came to this country? A Premier's Conference dominated by Labor "leaders," accepted Niemeyer's dictates. The cause of financial reform is being discredited by the hypocrisy to which many Labor Members appear to be permanently wedded. The only Labor Member ever to put up even a semblance of a fight on the financial question at Canberra, Dick Darcey, was defeated by Labor bosses.

The Rubber Front

In a recent talk on rubber in war and peace at a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, Mr. John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Company, estimated the potential production of natural and man-made rubber after the war at about 2,700,000 tons a year, which includes a figure of about 1,000,000 tons a year of synthetic rubber manufactured in the United States. The average yearly consumption of rubber throughout the world in 1939, 1940, and 1941 was about 1,100,000 tons. No plant for the manufacture of synthetic rubber has been set up in Great Britain, supplies being imported from the United States.

Let me quote another of your statements: "During the election campaign, financial experts from the Commonwealth Bank informed the public that bank credit could not be used in peace-time to the same degree as in war-time . . ." But, in your campaign of whitewashing the Labor Party, you "forgot" to point out the important fact that two of the "financial experts" you mention, Mr. Duffy and Mr. Taylor, are Labor appointees on the Bank Board. Mr. Taylor is connected with that section of the New South Wales Labor Party so loved by the Communists, and was one of those mainly instrumental in having Lang expelled from the Labor Party. Another of the "financial experts" is Dr. Coombs, who is Labor's "reconstruction" chief. Rather ironical, don't you think?

Your statement that "The Labor Party was returned to office with such an overwhelming majority because the people endorsed its financial policy" is sheer nonsense. I don't believe that the great majority of your colleagues understand Labor's financial policy, still less Labor voters. The only people doing any real educating on the subject of money in this country are social crediters, and Labor Members, with their distortion of facts in order to prove that they are the saviours of the nation, are as much the enemies of political and economic democracy as members of other parties.

In conclusion, Mr. Langtry, I would suggest that in future, if you cannot say all you would like to on financial reform, don't make statements which you know are untrue; and don't try and tell the people that Menzies and Fadden are the only Prime Ministers who were controlled by those men you personally know all about; John Curtin is doing his best with increasing debt and taxation.

—Sincerely yours, ERIC D. BUTLER.

P.S.—I am forwarding a copy of this letter to the "New Times" for publication. — E.D.B.

Will Dr. Schacht Succeed Hitler?

Douglas Reed, in the London "Daily Mail" of August 12, discusses four men who may step into Hitler's shoes. Of these he spends most space on Schacht. Readers will remember that this was a tip in "Reality" some months ago. Reed's article is worth reading throughout. Among other things he recalls that in 1923 Schacht was planted on the Reichsbank against the opposition of the officials thereof. He does not speculate about who had the power to plant him there or how or why it was done.

He does not write sympathetically of Schacht — indeed, he refers to him as being "as slippery as a soaped eel," and hints that he will have to be watched. Both the description and warning are sound — more so than Reed imagines. They are equally applicable to Montagu Norman himself, particularly in his role as Professor Skinner, with his eel-like vanishing tricks.

— "Reality" (Eng.).

THE BIG BEVERIDGE PLOT EXPOSED!

By "C.G.D." in the "Social Creditor," England

An impartial analysis of the proposals contained in the Beveridge Report reveals them in broad outline as a plan, simple enough in essence, though vastly complicated in detail, for taking money away from everyone, and returning some of it under special conditions, the chief of which is the acceptance of a continuation, and increase, of controls and restrictions now tolerated only under stress of war.

The manner of presentation of these proposals to the public forms a useful subject of study for anyone interested in understanding, and counteracting, the technique of mass mind control which is at present being practised on us; for it provides probably the most blatant example to date in this country, of the methods, familiar enough in Russia and Germany, whereby whole populations are induced by means of massive propaganda and misrepresentation of the facts, not merely to accept, but to clamour for and "demand" oppressive and restrictive legislation which they would not think of tolerating if presented to them in a form they could understand.

It will be noticed that, except for the very small proportion of people who can afford the money to buy, and the time and energy to study in detail the full Report, the public has been given no access through the press, radio and abridged versions published, to the restrictive proposals actually contained in it — proposals which if carried into effect, will affect their lives more closely than those which have been given publicity. The vast attention focussed upon the "benefits" to the exclusion of other features clearly indicates the determination of those responsible for it to secure acceptance of the whole Plan without revealing its less acceptable parts. This speciousness of presentation is not the least obvious in the official Report in Brief, which was alleged to contain "all that anyone needs to know about the Beveridge Report," and which contains no hint of the extent of the restrictive and oppressive regulations contained in the full version.

For instance, merely as one example, the following paragraph (p. 142, ¶ 371 b, in the full Report) is not to be found in the Brief version: —

"Persons failing to fulfill conditions for benefit. The most important of these are likely to be (i) men disqualified for unconditional unemployment benefit through refusal of suitable employment, through leaving work without just cause, through dismissal for misconduct, and (ii) those who are disqualified for conditional unemployment benefit by failure to attend a work or training centre."

The full implications of this paragraph, thrown in as it is as a minor item under the heading "National Assistance," take a little while to sink in. They are then seen to constitute a meticulous provision against freedom of choice of occupation in the Work State of the future. The next paragraph (372) on the proposed Unified Means Test — Abased on estimates of what is necessary for subsistence" — is also worthy of more attention than it has received. The omission of all reference to matter of this obvious importance in the popular presentation of the Report provides some measure of the integrity of those responsible for its presentation to the public.

Another, and slightly more subtle aspect of this presentation is worth drawing attention to here, since it has been little appreciated. The Report has been rather cunningly represented as constituting an attack upon the "vested interest" of the Insurance Companies, which are now so unpopular that any opponent of them is sure of majority approval. So successful has this "line" been that a letter of the writer's in a local newspaper, criticising the Report, was discounted by the allegation that all such criticism necessarily emanated from the Insurance Companies. "Prudential Threatened" is an example of a headline, referring to the Beveridge Report, in the same paper a short time afterwards.

Now, if we look carefully at the facts, we find that the only vocal opposition to the Report from Insurance sources concerns itself solely with the Industrial Assurance proposals which are not an essential part of the Report, and that the whole gist of the Report, which is to make Insurance universal and compulsory, places the personnel of the Insurance trade in an exceptionally favourable position as regards power and employment.

Quite apart from this general consideration, however, we find in ¶ 239 the following statement: "direct encouragement of voluntary insurance . . . is an essential part of the Plan for Social Security proposed in this Report." The conditions for receipt of a pension, to be found in ¶ 248, also included only in the full

"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.

Report, provide a further somewhat appalling insight into the means by which this "direct encouragement" is to be given. First, it must be realised that it is proposed to replace unconditional pensions by pensions conditional on giving up regular earnings. "No fresh unconditional pensions should be granted after the day appointed for beginning the new scheme." (¶ 249.)

The conditions in ¶ 248 include the following: —

"Every person receiving a pension will be required to sign a periodic declaration either that he has earned no more than, say, £3 in each of the preceding three months or how much he has earned if he has earned more. From one-half to two-thirds of the excess above £3 a month will be deducted from his pension for the ensuing quarter."

"Enforcement and detection of fraud presents no difficulties in the case of earnings by way of employment"—but there are "greater difficulties" "in the case of gainful occupation otherwise than by way of employment."

"Provisionally it is suggested that no person retired on pension would be permitted to hold an occupation card in respect of a shop, small holding, fishing boat, etc." However, "the shop-keeper, or small holder of advancing years will be able freely to do odd jobs and help in the shop."

It was an experienced insurance manager in one of the big companies who drew my attention to these provisions, and explained that his Head Office well appreciated the fact that they are calculated to drive all those capable of saving, and desiring to escape the barest penury in their old age, into the hands of the Insurance Companies for additional annuities. This is seen more clearly when we remember that High Financial Policy has, by the reduction of interest rates in recent years, almost eliminated ordinary investment as a means of providing adequately for retirement. Since a deferred annuity involves living on capital, the effect of these proposals on inheritance should be obvious.

An exposition of the above facts has, in my experience, a salutary effect upon those simple-minded people who believe that any deep-seated opposition to the Plan can arise from Insurance Interests.

A further point, of importance to those who are already included in some pension scheme, is that the Beveridge Plan is not intended to be additional, but to incorporate such schemes, which would be expected to "re-adjust" pensions "in the light of the basic provision being made for all" (¶ 149), i.e., you would get the same pension, plus—not the State Pension—but the State restrictions and compulsions.

Space allows but a few more illustrations of Beveridge's attitude to his fellow men, e.g.:—

¶ 128: "With the limitation of scope hitherto, it was felt necessary to allow persons to qualify for pensions by a relatively short period of contribution of five years as employees; this gave temptation to the making of factitious contracts of employment with relatives for the last five years of working age. Extension in the scope of insurance makes it possible and desirable to insist on contributions covering the whole of working life as a condition of pensions."

Change 13: "Making of disability benefit at full rate indefinite in duration, subject to imposition of special behaviour conditions."

¶ 130: ". . . new classes not hitherto accustomed to industrial discipline."

¶ 131: "Men, and women in receipt of unemployment benefit cannot be allowed to hold out indefinitely for work of the type to which they are used or in their present places of residence, if there is work which they could do available at the standard wage for that work."

"Conditions imposed on benefit must be enforced where necessary by suitable penalties."

¶ 340: "This [marriage] grant is desirable both as compensation . . . and also in order to obtain prompt notification of marriage."

¶ 346: "If she [a widow] does go out to work, a reduction of the full guardian benefit will be made, of a proportion of her earnings." This is one of the conditions under Change 17: "Replacement of unconditional inadequate widows' pensions by provision suited to the varied needs of widows."

¶ 347: ". . . if the marriage ends otherwise than by widowhood, she [the wife] is entitled to the same provision as for widowhood, unless the marriage maintenance has ended through her fault or voluntary action without just cause."

". . . while making it clear that she can in all cases of need get assistance and that the Ministry of Social Security will then proceed against the husband for recoupment of its expenditure."

¶ 348: "The decision in regard to maternity grant may depend on whether or not it is thought to be practicable and desirable administratively to require previous registration of an adult dependant. In that case a man who had an unmarried woman living with him as his wife, on registering

this, would be qualified to obtain dependant allowance for her during unemployment and disability and maternity grant also."

¶ 358: "Every person not holding an employment book, occupation card or housewife's policy will be required to hold a security card and to affix to this an insurance stamp . . . for each week . . ."

¶ "those who get unpaid domestic service from daughters or sisters . . . should pay the security contributions for these persons,"

¶ 423: "The [children's] allowances should continue so long as the child is in approved full time education, up to the age of 16."

¶ 373 I quote in full as it provides a clear statement of the basis of this or any similar Plan:—

"CASES OF SPECIAL DIFFICULTY: At the basis of any system of Social Security covering all those who comply with reasonable just conditions for insurance and assistance, there must be provision for a limited class of men or women who through weakness or badness of character fail to comply. In the last resort the man who fails to comply with the conditions for obtaining benefit or assistance and leaves his family without resources must be subject to penal treatment."

These quotations are sufficient to show the spirit of the thing, though inadequate

to demonstrate the full extent of the network of Talmudic regulation and Prussian bureaucracy which is being prepared for us. We are impudently to be bribed with our own earnings (confiscated in taxation, prices and compulsory contributions) to accept control by officials over every phase of life, even the most intimate. Not one single benefit is to be given except at the price of freedom, and those who object are to be treated as criminals.

The point to which I wish to draw attention is the gross treachery of the presentation of this Prison Plan to a people at war as the Gateway to the Life More Abundant. The Official "Report in Brief" consists of some 30,000 words of argument and exposition of the "benefits" to be obtained with at most 100 words of incidental reference to a few of the vast number of oppressive restrictions which would accompany them, chiefly included in the list of proposed "Changes" on page 14. Apart from these, not one of the quotations used above is to be found in the 3d Report or in the newspapers.

The suppression of all criticism in the Press, other than that from Insurance Companies, Capitalists or other sources easily represented, as "vested interests" is a further example of the technique by which we are governed.

"UNDER WAR OR THE THREAT OF WAR"

Not long before the outbreak of the war, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff and his fellow-planners in Britain openly said that they had agreed that only under war or the threat of war would the British peoples submit to large-scale planning. Mr. Sieffs opposite numbers in Australia obviously have the same outlook.

In spite of all the platitudes of Cabinet Ministers, practically every restriction introduced into this country under the excuse of war emergency has strengthened the monopolies at the expense of genuine private enterprise. Meat rationing, the result of Government bungling, is our latest monstrosity. Evidence has already been produced to show that the big meat monopolies are going to benefit. In fact, the head of the Vestey monopoly in Australia, Mr. E. J. Bowater, has been a member of the Commonwealth Meat Board since its inception. The Curtin Government also appointed Mr. Bowater to Boards under the Department of Supply. As believers in the greatest monopoly of all (the State), perhaps the Labor Government is only running true to form.

The food position in this country continues to deteriorate, in spite of all official pronouncements. On one hand, we have the Government spending tens of thousands of pounds in the papers urging people to try to grow their own vegetables, while on the other hand we have example, after example being brought forward of vegetables being dumped or ploughed back into the ground because of an insufficient price, and of other vegetables and food-stuffs not reaching markets because of transport bungling. In the last session at Canberra, members of Parliament from country electorates brought forward damning facts about food production which every Australian should know about.

A miserable subsidy was given to dairy farmers, but it has been completely wiped out by the farmers' higher costs of living. Dairy farmers continue to walk off their farms rather than slave for so little financial return. Butter production has declined even further, and together with Australia's commitments to feed Allied troops, brings the suggestion that there may be a further reduction in the butter ration before much longer.

Every time another Board or rationing commission is established, it automatically means further control of producers. The traditional British method of voluntary inducement for getting things done is being replaced by brutal compulsion. We now read advertisements for men to police the various schemes of control. Yes, Hitler will soon have nothing on us!

Pressure of events has forced the Government to allow some men to return to their farms from the Forces. But this is not enough. Primary producers must be paid prices for their produce sufficient to induce them to work long hours; sufficient to allow them to get out of debt and face the post-war period as free men. But nothing but continual prodding by public opinion will force members of Parliament to fight on the matter. The present insane financial policy is like a heavy weight on our war effort. At times I wonder if we are completely given over to some form of general madness. We have thousands and thousands of people performing like clowns in the streets in an endeavour to persuade us that unless figures in the bank accounts of private citizens are transferred to the Government's account, the war effort will, in some miraculous way, come to a stop. There are thousands more sending forms to business men and farmers—worrying them to death, instead of letting them get on with their jobs. Thousands more are engaged in taking more and more money from us, via taxation. This is one of those forms of control, which we are told must continue after the war.

Whatever the Government touches, it seems to bungle. And still we hear the cry that more and more control must be given to a Central Government at Canberra!

Yes, "under war or the threat of war" some very remarkable things can be done. But perhaps Mr. Sieff and his fellow Jews have underestimated the Anglo-Saxon peoples. We Australians are, I hope,

determined to wrest control of policy from the hands of anonymous groups and formulate it ourselves. We must expose bureaucracy wherever we find it, and oppose the extension of it via an alteration of the Australian Constitution, even if Sir Isaac Isaacs, the first "Australian" Governor-General, thinks we need one centralised Government.

In concluding this article, I would like to ask all readers throughout Australia who possess any authentic facts demonstrating how bureaucracy and financial policy are destroying private enterprise—particularly in primary production—to forward these facts on to me. Every effort must be made to show the Australian people what is really taking place. Unless we do, private enterprise is going to be so discredited that the people will submit to every totalitarian socialistic plan held out to them.

—ERIC D. BUTLER.

THE PROPOSED REFERENDUM

(To the Editor)

Sir, —Discussing the Federal Government Referendum proposals dispassionately, one is justified in asking certain questions: —

Will the central control involved facilitate the handling of employment and marketing? These are two of the functions, which it is sought to divest the States of in peacetime. Is it to be assumed that local appointees will be more effective because they will have to refer all their problems to some bureaucratic head at Canberra? Is it to be assumed that because a man happens to be elected to the Federal Parliament, greater wisdom resides in him than in most members of the rank-and-file from whom he sprang?

These assumptions are obviously absurd, yet they must be conceded if we are to accept the dicta that "employment" and "marketing" can best be regulated throughout Australia from Canberra. As a matter of fact it is only the stress of war that makes the present control tolerable and only military discipline (absolute in the army, and qualified in civil life) that makes it possible.

Self-government, which is the very essence of democracy, is surely more nearly achieved when such matters as touch the daily lives of the people are administered by a final authority within at least a day's range of the people who are supposed to govern themselves. Government should be under the very eyes of the people governed. Will it be contended that we who send men to our Federal Parliament are less able to select local administrators? Or that those selected will not know our wants and wishes better than our far-off Federal representatives? What is more to the point, will they not be more amenable to our wants and wishes?

National matters are easily defined. All other administrative affairs should be managed by local governing bodies, controlling areas certainly no larger than Victoria, having regard to a minimum population of course.

Finance is the vital factor in all Governments, as it is the dominating factor in our daily lives. Finance for all that such suggested "Provincial" governing bodies demand, as directed by their electors, should be furnished as their sovereign right, by the Commonwealth Bank, for public purposes, debt free; provided always that said provinces have the resources, in men and material, to accomplish their desires.

An advisory body, for statistical and research purposes, is the only centralised "authority" required as an adjunct to the provincial governments indicated, other than the recognised Federal authority already provided for under the Constitution.

—Yours etc., E. S. CARR (ex-M.P.), 25Argyle Street, Parramatta, N.S.W.

To the Most Reverend J. J. Booth, D.D.: Your Grace, —Just as the last issue of this journal prior to the holidays went to press, you launched an appeal to Anglicans for 500,000 shillings for Church Reconstruction and Extension after the war. A leaflet has been distributed containing a message from you, and a statement under the heading, "The Vision and the Task," sets forth the considerations by which you are actuated in asking for the provision of the sum of 500,000 shillings for the aforementioned purpose.

Perusal of the leaflet and contemplation of certain pronouncements made in the course of your address at St. Paul's Cathedral on the evening of December 12, when you formally launched your appeal, constrain me to focus public attention thereon. For the reasons given herein, I deem it fitting to ask that you be good enough to give a more clearly defined outline of "the vision" than your address and the leaflet contained. Failing this, although I would not wish to impute to you any other than good intentions (such as were recently pleaded by the Right Reverend Wilson Macaulay in these columns in extenuation of HIS activities), I should feel disposed to believe that there are channels other than your special appeal into which the people could more safely and wisely direct their "surplus purchasing power." Good intentions, incidentally, do not of themselves warrant "our leaders" asking for the confidence and co-operation of the people. If, as is frequently the case, such good intentions are based on false and erroneous premises, the results are certain to be anything but good.

You may or may not be the author of "The Vision and the Task"; but, since it is issued as part of the leaflet containing your appeal, it is only reasonable to assume that this portion of the document is concurred in by you. It opens by stating, "The thoughts of everyone are turning to post-war problems, but no one has any very clear idea of what the new world order will be like." NO ONE? If you had been reading the illuminating and FACTUAL series of letters to the "New Times" on the subject of "Australia's Great Post-War Peril," by that indefatigable worker in the cause of truth and justice, Mr. Bruce H. Brown, you would have learned that there ARE certain groups of powerful men who were identified and named by Mr. Brown, and who, if any credence can be given to somewhat inconspicuous though highly significant news items appearing from time to time in the daily press, HAVE a "very clear idea of what the new world order will be like." (I refer, in particular, to the quotations given in the "New Times" of December 10, 1943.)

Many THEORIES have been propounded, all sorts of PLANS have been enunciated . . . continues the leaflet. (My emphasis.) It appears to be assumed by those who resist, either by active opposition or acquiescence in the existing order, the effecting of any fundamental alterations in the present economic and social system, that ALL recommendations offered as the basis for a new and better state of society are mere theories. This point of view apparently fails to take into account the fact that the existing order is built upon theories, some of which have been clearly demonstrated to be false theories. The "welter of plans and theories" has been liberally contributed to by ecclesiastical "leaders"; and, in the main, their contributions have been equally as sterile and barren of hope for the peoples of the world as have been those of others of "our leaders, politicians and economists." In referring to "our economists," it is, I think, strictly accurate to describe them as CERTIFIED economists.

Limitations of space preclude any more detailed treatment of the leaflet, beyond reflecting that the growth of the Anglican Church in Victoria since 1843, which is referred to in the leaflet, and which has been side by side with the growth of other denominations, might reasonably have been expected to have brought about a progressively improving state of affairs wherein the need for "chains" of "Social Service Institutions" would be diminishing rather than increasing, as has been the case. But the conditions which these institutions are designed to mitigate are merely effects—effects of causes with which, with a few notable exceptions, religious "leaders" appear disinclined seriously to grapple. I shall mention the outstanding cause of social evils before concluding.

In the course of your Cathedral address on December 12 you declared, "The reward of victory WILL not be rewards but obligations." It was not clear to me whether you were putting that view forward as a principle to which effect should be given, or as a statement of fact indicating that you are one of the chosen few

who have a "very clear idea," based on definite information, "of what the new world order will be like"—assuming that the people are prepared to take what "leaders" find it expedient to impose upon them. Even if, however, that declaration represents purely your own idealistic point of view, it carries implications, which require careful examination. An obligation unavoidably involves at least two parties—one who is under the obligation, and one to whom the obligation is due. If, therefore, the gaining of "victory" is to involve our people in obligations, it surely is pertinent to enquire as to the precise identity of those to whom we will be under obligation, and the considerations in respect of which the obligations are due. The leaflet declares the victory of the Allied Nations to be certain. With "victory" won, "democracy," for the preservation of which the peoples of the Allied Nations have been told they are fighting, will have triumphed (we hope). Now, a democracy is a society in which the will of the people prevails. That being so, the practice of democracy necessarily requires the FREE and OPEN discussion, as well as the submission to the people of all major proposals, involving questions of policy in respect of political relationships and economic status. Instead of this we find that such proposals are discussed in SECRET; decisions affecting the existence of millions of people are made by power-lusters whom the corruption of party politics has elevated to positions of "leadership"; and the puppet daily press comes out with prominent headlines such as "WORLD acclaims Teheran Conference." The truth is that the political leaders who meet at such conferences sometimes betray their people to unscrupulous men whose only gods are gold and power, and who have no more regard than Hitler for human lives and values.

That the statement contained in the preceding sentence does not exaggerate the position is evidenced by the following words spoken by the Hon. A. W. Fadden at the Constitution Convention held in 1942: "The people of Australia at the present time distrust THE BIG UNSEEN FORCES WHICH WORK BEHIND THE POLITICAL SCENES."

The fact that such unseen forces use our "leaders" to impose upon us "obligations" which you recommend as "the reward of victory," should, I submit, cause you to refrain from making such vague and undefined statements. I contend that the values for which the peoples of the Allied Nations hope they are fighting will be lost, even though the conflict be won, if the practice of committing the people to "obligations" regarding which they have not been consulted be allowed to continue.

That perfidious and pernicious practice is diametrically opposed to the true principles of democracy: it is a practice derived from the Fuhrer prinzip: the prinzip is unaltered whether the Fuhrer be Herr Adolf Hitler, Herr Bernard Baruch, Herr Curtin—or an Archbishop or Presbyterian Moderator.

It is singularly interesting to note the way in which ecclesiastical leaders are re-echoing the note which is being struck by political and economic "authorities" as to the necessity for submission to "some international authority" and our acceptance of "obligations." The Canberra conspirators are working with those ends in view, and one might reasonably expect that Archbishops and Moderators, who should have due regard for the material as well as the spiritual well-being of their people, would declaim rather than acclaim the political "leaders," who are the conscious and willing instruments of what Mr. Fadden very aptly termed, "the big unseen forces which work behind the political scenes."

Having written at greater length than I had thought would be necessary on your advocacy of "obligations" as the "reward" of "victory," I must defer until next week the consideration of one or two other points relative to the new venture on which you have embarked. I shall then indicate the reasons, which, much as I dislike saying it, lead me to conclude that "the vision" is no more than a mirage.

With best personal wishes —Very truly,
yours,

J. BRADSHAW.

TREASURY BRANCHES IN ALBERTA

Social Crediters will be interested in the following developments in Alberta's Treasury Branch Service, which were officially announced recently:

(1) To simplify the administration of the Treasury Branches and the use of Treasury Branch transfer vouchers, thereby reducing administrative costs, and making it more convenient for individuals and firms to make full use of the Treasury Branch services.

To this end all of the restrictions as between cash accounts and trade claim accounts have been removed, and the purchase of Alberta trademarked goods as a basis of the consumers' bonus is being eliminated. Commencing September 15, each depositor will require but one account irrespective of whether he makes a deposit by cash, cheque, or transfer voucher. Against

this one account he will be free to issue either cheques or transfer vouchers, or to make cash withdrawals without any restrictions.

The elimination of Alberta trade-marked goods as a basis of the consumers' bonus, in addition to simplifying the use of transfer vouchers, has been considered expedient in view of the complete change which has taken place in the field of the manufacturing and distribution of consumer goods under existing war-time restrictions. The stimulus to the purchase of Alberta trademarked goods in pre-war times, resulting from such goods being made the basis of the consumer's bonus, is no

longer effective under war-time rationing and the general shortage of the manufactured products.

(2) To increase the scope of the services available to the public through the Treasury Branch offices.

Steps are being taken to make every Treasury Branch a local government service office, through which the public will be able to obtain many of the services, which, in the past, have been available only through the central government offices, or through the facilities of private financial institutions. This step is being taken in accordance with the Government's policy of decentralising public services by taking the administration of public affairs directly to the people.

The Treasury Branches will, in the future, provide increased public services in such lines as government fire and life insurance, the issuing of various licenses and permits, in addition to serving as local agents for the various major government departments. Steps are also being taken to enable the

Branches to serve the public in the administration of estates, in addition to rendering other services for which the people must, at the present time, depend upon the facilities of trust companies or other private financial institutions.

(3) To make the entire Treasury Branch services self-supporting.

Much unwarranted criticism has been voiced in opposition political quarters regarding the cost of Treasury Branch services, without any recognition of the offsetting Treasury Branch earnings, or the direct and indirect benefits to the public.

The present re-organisation of the Treasury Branch services is being carried out to the end that the entire overhead costs of the Treasury Branches may be offset by their investments and other earnings, while, at the same time, providing increased governmental and financial services at costs which will represent substantial savings to the general public who make use of the facilities.

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. Continued from last issue.) Sir, — Immediately upon the termination of hostilities in the last war strong pressure was exerted by Wall Street financiers (Warburg, Baruch, Schiff, and the like) to force Britain back to peace-time methods of finance. There had been a great release of purchasing power during the war, and a continuance of that policy was necessary if the promises to the fighting men were to be redeemed. Progressive development was impossible without it. Behind the backs of the people, however, the financiers who had taken charge of the "Peace" negotiations had laid their plans well, and not only did they prevent the people of Britain from having the benefit of an expanding supply of money, but they went so far as to enforce a REDUCTION in the supply. This was why, instead of getting the new world for which they thought they had been fighting, the heroes who survived the perils of the battlefield merely got a continuation of the old world in an even worse form.

As the result of this pressure from the Wall Street gangsters, and acting on the "advice" of British financiers, the British Government set up a special committee to report on the demand for return to the Gold Standard as put forward by the international financiers. This committee was known as the Cunliffe Committee, being presided over by Lord Cunliffe, then Governor of the Bank of "England," and consisted almost entirely of bankers. Producers and manufacturers, with whose destinies these bankers were playing, were given no voice whatever in the deliberations, and, as intended by the money controllers, the Committee duly recommended return to the Gold Standard. In 1920, a conference of international bankers was held in Brussels, and notwithstanding solemn warnings that such a course would lead to world-wide suffering and distress, the conference callously decided to press the governments of all countries to return to the same standard. In the same year, Mr. Montagu Norman, of the American banking firm of Brown, Shipley and Co., was appointed Governor of the Bank of "England," and his re-appointment from year to year has been subject to the approval of Wall Street.

An idea of the nature of the 1919-1920 crime can be gathered from a few simple figures. The bankers assessed Germany's liability at £24000 millions PAYABLE IN GOLD: Goods were refused. Germany's gold holding was only £200 millions, and no one explained how she was to get more gold or to acquire foreign credits except in exchange for her goods. International finance was the ultimate negotiator, and showed clearly that the last thing it wanted was the paying off of the debt. While the DEBTS remained it could maintain what it called "sound finance" and sound taxation, thus keeping the people so busy trying to get an inadequate share of an insufficient supply of money that they have no time to examine the swindle which places them in that position. That, then, was one of the reasons for the German Inflation which has been so dishonourably used here as a bogey to frighten us against financial reform, no mention being made of the fact that that inflation enabled Germany to secure a definite advantage in the struggle for foreign "credits".

The same sort of thing is afoot again. Even spokesmen for the A.B.C. continue to foster the idea that our progress here depends on the ability of other countries "to pay" for our "surplus" production. Pay what? They never explain exactly what it is that has to be paid. If they have no goods, why cannot we GIVE them some? If they have goods to spare and we could do with them, then let them exchange goods for goods. But no, that would be too sensible; and so the struggle for "foreign credit" is to go on as before, and the controllers of the financial credit will continue to be controllers of the world. In this respect I invite special attention to the words of the late Mr. Arthur Kitson, as follows:—

"Having created these national gold debts, the conspirators were still fearful lest their hoards of gold might turn to dross if Europe should stick to its paper money and refuse to employ their metal for its internal currencies. This fear was particularly intense so far as England was concerned. The Treasury notes had performed all the functions of money perfectly—far better than gold. There had been no legal tender inflation. Whatever inflation there had been was due entirely to the vast issues of credit by the Treasury and the bankers themselves. These notes formed the basis of what might have become a perfect elastic currency, admirably adapted to the commercial and industrial needs of the British public, who had grown accustomed to them and liked them. Where gold had failed the Treasury notes succeeded. Moreover,

these notes admitted of expansion without disturbing international affairs and without the aid of international financiers. Hence their destruction became a necessity to the conspirators."

"Conspirators" is a strong term to use, but does any other better fit the facts? These men did conspire against us, and they used "public men" of all types to achieve their ends. They are conspiring again and doing it behind our backs. The men who allowed themselves to be so used have all been rewarded in one way or another. I regret to say that Mr. Churchill was one of them. Mr. R. G. Casey was another. So far as Australia is concerned, faithful servants of international finance were found in men like Sir John Latham, Sir Walter Massey Greene, Sir George Pearce, Sir Earle Page, and Sir Frederick Stewart. Why else were they knighted? Can anyone truthfully point to anything any one of them has done that has brought better living conditions for the men, women, and children of Australia, or relieved Australian parents of one of the greatest causes of human unhappiness, viz., financial anxiety? The fact is that every one of them has consistently helped to increase our financial burdens. They have served Mammon, and the great peril of today lies in the fact that men of similar type are still in positions of great influence and power, and are seeking to impose the same old financial policy, which has brought about such havoc for humanity in the past.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
26/12/43.

D.C.M. WOMEN'S GROUP

The second monthly meeting of the Women's Group of the Douglas Credit Movement of Victoria was held on Friday afternoon, December 17, at room 8, "The Block," Elizabeth St., Melbourne.

Miss Greig continued the subject of Centralisation of Power, showing that Major Douglas, as early as 1919, in "Economic Democracy," pointed out: "The danger which threatens individual liberty is the servile State; the creation of an irresistible and impersonal organisation, through which the ambition of able men, animated consciously or unconsciously by the lust of domination, may operate to the enslavement of their fellows." Miss Greig's final quotation was from "The Big Idea," published last year: "I am confident that there is an attempt to drive man down the scale of existence, so that he becomes primarily a number in a card index, by taking away as far as possible any recognisable initiative, his potentially divine attribute."

Other activities for the month included the sending of 99 copies of "Power Politics and People's Pressure," one to each member of both Houses of the State Parliament, as well as 29 other copies, distributed to mayors of country towns and presidents of shires.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, January 14, at 3 p.m. All interested are invited to come and help in extending activities.

NOT SO DAFT

The following appeared in the November issue of the "A.L.P. Debaters' Journal" edited by Senator Gordon Browne

"A lot of people laughed at the Social Crediters when they advocated a National Dividend. They thought they were daft. Well, the day is not far distant when everyone will have a dividend.

"No person should starve. In a Christian community everyone is entitled to life, and to live properly one must have good food, warm clothes, and shelter. Well, in order to procure these, why not guarantee to each sufficient money to purchase them?"

THE "SECOND FRONT" AND SEA-POWER

What is known as the Second Front, besides being a one-way idea (it works from West to East, but not from East to West), did not originate in the strategy of the present struggle. This fact is brought out with great clearness in "Sea Power,"* one of the few really first-class books published during the war. Cannot the Dean of Canterbury and his co-agitators of Trafalgar Square be induced to rest from their Penguin Specials for a time to study it?

In it is to be found not only the suggestion, but strong evidence of a corrosive influence at work—particularly over the last fifty years or so—and through individuals probably quite as well-intentioned as the Dean, to deflect England from her traditional and cultural policies. The book is throughout a brilliant piece of exposition, tinged, no doubt, to some extent by the associations of its author's naval calling, but none the less convincing.

"Sea Power" begins with the publication, in Boston, in 1890, of Mahan's "Influence of Sea Power on History"—a book, which underlined in the clearest manner the importance to the British Empire, and to the modern world-structure, of England's naval supremacy. Incidentally, it is to be noticed that Walter Lipmann, the American columnist, has discovered the same fact in his latest book. All the evidence Mahan accumulated went to show the soundness of England's policy of a Big Navy, and no military commitments on the Continent.

"England," said Napoleon on St. Helena, when he had no longer any need to hide his real convictions, "can never be a Continental Power, and in the attempt she must be ruined. Let her stick to the sovereignty of the seas and she may send her ambassadors to the courts of Europe and demand what she likes."

Mahan's book, once it became known, created a wide stir. "I am just now," wrote the exuberant Kaiser Wilhelm, "not reading but devouring Captain Mahan's book. It is on board all my ships." Here was proof of what he and Herr Ballin and his other Jewish advisers were convinced of: that command of the sea was command ultimately of the world situation. He issued a direct challenge to grandmamma and the realm she ruled when he announced: "Germany's future lies in the water," and inaugurated a new European set-up, with Britain and France closing their ranks under the persuasive influence of Edward VII and his Rothschild advisers.

This was a natural reaction in the circumstances; but what was not so natural was that British statesmen, under a threat dramatically and unmistakably associated with a publication that proved the wisdom of the traditional English policy, which kept her a sea power governing almost without an army, should have applied themselves so directly to alter it.

Not thus the Elizabethans, who plainly saw their country, as Shakespeare put it, a "precious stone set in a silver sea, which serves it in the office of a wall . . . Against the envy of less happier lands." Yet in the great reaction following the sweeping Liberal victory of the Campbell-Bannerman Government in 1905, when Lloyd George began his introduction of Prussian State Socialism (Insurance), Sir Edward Grey, along with Lord Haldane (whose spiritual home was Germany!), and later Sir Henry Wilson, carried through negotiations with the French authorities that committed Britain to "large-scale land operations, with all the Continental accompaniments of conscription and bureaucracy and regimentation." And when, in August, 1911, the Agadir incident set all Europe by the ears, Mr. McKenna, as First Lord of the Admiralty, was presented, at a hastily summoned meeting of the Imperial Defence Committee, with what amounted to a complete turn-round in national strategy, arrived at without any general discussion whatsoever.

As a result, in the war, which broke out three years later (to quote the author of "Sea Power"), "Three-quarters of a million British and Dominion lives were lost in the Continental fighting, and the result was a bankrupt victory which found the British nation in a state of grave physical and moral exhaustion, which had the most serious after-effects. Financially, the country was heavily mortgaged to the United States of America and was thereby forced into a long subservience to the tortuous eccentricities of American politics, to the great detriment of distinctively British interests. . . . So far from the shattered warriors of the recent fighting being regarded as the saviours of their country, it was the conscientious objectors of the war period who became the heroes of the peace. And under their irresponsible and sentimental inspiration, the country made haste to throw away its arms and demolish its defences, so that when a foreign menace sharply challenged it again twenty years after, it found itself woefully unprepared and scandalously weak. . . . The Bloomsbury mind appeared unconscious of the possibility that the British Government might have a duty to the British people, and especially the youth of military age, not to squander their lives unnecessarily; or that there might be something, after all, to be said for the attitude of Sir Robert Walpole, who, in conversation with Queen Caroline in 1734, regarding his refusal to commit Britain to participation in the war of the Polish Succession, took credit for the fact that 'there are 30,000 men killed in Europe this year, and not one single Englishman.'"

No one could deny the realism of that statement of the facts of the last war and after, even if it might not meet with the

*"Sea Power," by T. 124. Jonathan Cape, 1943.

approval of the Moscow press. But the lesson and the implication of it are not that Great Britain should be out of this war, and leaving the Continent to "fight it out" among themselves; but just that her real value to the struggle lies in preserving her political identity and in contributing what it is in her nature to contribute, and in her own, and not in an alien, fashion. If Britain had, quite literally, "stuck to her guns" in the inter-war period and had not given way before the Bloomsbury bombardment, affairs in 1938-39 might have shaped differently.

To those who do not think naturally in terms of great maneuvering numbers—generally of one's fellow men—there is something very persuasive in the author's comparisons of the relative "cost" of land, as distinct from sea and air, operations, computed from the Army and Navy estimates for 1912-13. As strategic argument they are greatly strengthened by the subsequent course of the war—this book must have been actually in the press before Dunkirk and the Battle of Britain. Worked out on these estimates, the cost per head of the Army was £125, against £321 for the Navy. Assuming the number of men in France in 1917 at two million, on the above money basis its naval equivalent was 750,000 personnel. With 1200 officers and men to a battleship, or, alternatively 100 to a destroyer, the financial equivalent to the Flanders army was 625 battleships, or, 7500 destroyers. Consumption of ammunition in the Navy in actual warfare is about half what it is in the Army. Admittedly, the figures with which we are dealing are arbitrary—fleets can't be built up as quickly as armies—nevertheless, their bearing on broad, long-term policy is very considerable.

As the author points out, the British military dead in the last war would have served to man the 1914 fleet three times over!

And in the air—the 1939 Army estimate works out at £440 per man, the Air Force at £564. On this basis the equivalent in cost of an Army division of 24,000 would be 300 planes, and of the 1939-40 Expeditionary Force, 6000 planes.

The implications of all that, in the light of Dunkirk and Britain's deadly peril in August-September, 1940, seems plain enough. Every phase of the war, then and since, appears like a direct confirmation of our traditional policy.

Bloomsbury intellectualism, along with Chatham House and the Bank of England, has failed. And yet, in spite of it, we have prominent ecclesiastics still under its influence, deserting their Deaneries and Palaces to stump-speech the country, so that they may tell us, amidst rapturous applause, what a poor show we make of it compared with the Russians, and to warn us against a resurgence of Britain's harsh and "perfidious tradition," so calculated to confuse the limp simplicity of continental politics, and bruise the delicate, clinging tendrils of the Third International. What is this mesmeric influence that leads them to decry their native wares? It must be the same as that recounted in this book, which swept the country in the first decade of this century and induced men of such diverse views and backgrounds as Mr. Lloyd George, Sir Edward Grey and Lord Haldane, to press policies on the country all tending in the same direction, and all alien to, and destructive of the tradition and policies of the past.

Again, why, it is pertinent to ask, has the British traditionalism typified in the Senior Service, as one of the main factors in the situation, not been allowed due weight, or, indeed, any influence at all in shaping recent British policy? The Big Navy represents the obvious strategy of defence as distinct from the aggressive nature of the Big Land Army; of preservation rather than acquisition. The British fleet has in practice proved a method of "policing" civilisation in the least offensive manner, so that the trying process of technical world-development might be got over with a certain degree of decency. Neither in operation, nor in results, has this instrument been perfection; but, like the so-abused theory of the "balance of power," it has served none too badly; at least, it has grown out of the facts of the situation.

One of the most hopeful signs to be observed at the moment is the growth, particularly in America, of a rather naive appreciation of the fact that there are worse things than British "Imperialism." To be effective, however, it needs to remain relatively untrammelled, as those influences behind the present parrot-cry for a Second Front no doubt realise; for it is obvious that the agitation arises quite as much, if not more, from a desire to have Britain well and truly committed to mass slaughter as to relieve pressure on any body or thing.

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

"HECKLE HOUR"

Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., who is well known to many of our Melbourne readers, will take part in the "Hekkle Hour" broadcast from 3DB on Friday, January 14, at 9.30 p.m. "Should All Strikes Be Banned For The Duration Of The War?" is the question to be debated. The negative case will be argued by Mr. Bradshaw, and Mr. Quhampton will take the affirmative.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

toms, £17 millions; Excise, £46 millions; Sales-tax, £25 millions; Flour-tax, £1 million; Pay-roll tax, £10 millions; Land-tax, £3 millions. These taxes have to be passed on as production costs, and therefore must be included in the prices which consumers have to pay. Direct taxation is at least above-board and visible, but these indirect taxes should be abolished forthwith.

CHURCHILL'S CRISIS: Whilst one's natural sympathy extends to all in ill health, it was rather distressing and unwarranted for the press screamers to convey the idea that the British Empire rests on Churchill. Britain existed long before Churchill was thought of, and will continue long after him. The daily press sought advertising value from the crisis by declaring that "an improvement was indicated because Churchill now insisted on reading the daily press news"—whereas in truth this would seem to be a sign of relapse—especially as Churchill is supposed to be the source of news. And of course the big chemical groups used Churchill's illness to boost the sulphanimide and penicillin dopes. It is an ill wind that blows nobody any good.

ANTHEM AMENDMENT: Commenting on G. B. Shaw's suggested amendments to eliminate the "blood and gore" from the "Internationale," Mr. William Rust, of the British Communist executive, said that "the Internationale" would continue to be used in Britain because it expressed the objectives achieved, in Russia but not yet achieved in Britain and other countries." One gathers from Mr. Rust's remarks that even Germany and Italy have not yet reached the pinnacle of totalitarianism. It is to be hoped that the British people save themselves from this fate.

TRIALS AND TACTICS: During a recent debate in the British House of Commons, at which a British trial for Sir Oswald Mosley was urged in keeping with the principles of British justice, Mr. Hopkins asked: "Will you also consider the case of prominent members of a Fascist body who are now equally prominent with the Communists, and who are responsible in some districts for running a 'Gaol Mosley' stunt." Slowly but surely Communist tactics are becoming apparent and suspect.

PLANNING PERILS: Following the disastrous conscription of food producers and the mishandling of civilian manpower and transport, it is little wonder that a conference of Federal and State health ministers found that "an alarming civilian: food situation existed." That has, of course, been obvious for a considerable time. Obviously, this body has not yet discovered the cause, because they advocate "more rigid government controls." Since this very government control got us into the mess, surely the answer is to eliminate the cause (government control), not to increase it. The results of bureaucratic bungling should surely ensure an emphatic "NO" vote when the Federal Government asks the people for more powers.

STALINS STRENGTH: The New York "Herald-Tribune" recently featured strongman Stalin, high priest of Communism, as the world's biggest businessman, who carried out the greatest industrial mergers in history in converting Russia into one big corporation. Here's an extract that should make our local Soviet-worshippers cheer: "It is a paradoxical truth, that the world's most successful revolutionary leader speaks the language of a great captain of industry, such as Averill Harriman, Donald Nelson and Ralf Budd." From this it seems rather clear that Communism, Socialism and Monopoly Capitalism all lead along one major road.

LEADER LEGENDS: Arising from the question of selecting the commander for the British-American "invasion force," Colonel F. Palmer, an American military correspondent, says: "The chosen man must be content with the honour (?) of being a figurehead who has responsibility without authority." He also pointed out as a parallel that General Eisenhower held such a position without any previous combat experience. From this we get a realistic picture of press-boostered leaders, who do not lead and therefore, presumably, must be led by a hidden power. If these qualifications are applicable to Stalin, Roosevelt, Churchill, Hitler, Tojo, and our local Fuhrer, the question arises: Who makes the "bullets" for them to fire? —O.B.H.

MEAT RATIONING, WHY?

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —With Federal Statisticians' figures showing that producers have stocked the Commonwealth with no fewer than "13½ million more sheep, 1 million more cattle, and nearly ½ million more pigs, than in January, 1939," while at the same time supplying Britain and American Pacific Forces, Canberra orders meat restriction!

In this regard, are we to take Councillor Hardings' remarks seriously? "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." (Sydney "Morning Herald," 24/1/43.)

Apparently the Canberra god, "Austerity," is demanding more and more sacrifices. Its appetite grows with feeding, and is as insatiable as the power-lust of its prophets. Nothing gives greater control of individuals than control of their food supply.

Is bread next on the list? Meanwhile the public service (?) is bloated with new Departments, Circulars, Forms, Checkers, Snoopers, and other parasitic personnel.

Rackets are rampant! We must challenge this monster "Control" while air remains free to breathe! —Yours, etc., J.N.KIDMAN Brisbane.

The Bungling of Australia's food Supply

(Continued from page 1.)

small farmers scattered far and wide, who could not find transport or containers to send their cream to the few factories in existence.

It is the intention of Mr. Scully, the Minister of Commerce, to force all small producers to stop making their own butter and to send their cream to factories; he has said this quite definitely. This would mean that the farmer's wife, who usually supplies each isolated district with fresh butter, is no longer able to do so, and those who don't make their own butter have to get factory butter from miles away.

The Federal Government says that we must decentralise industry after the war, but the same Government is doing everything in its power to centralise it. Meat rationing is going to centralise the meat industry. I am told that tinned meat is not going to be rationed; if this is true it will mean the big international meat monopoly will reap the harvest while the small butcher will be pushed out of existence.

More centralisation, more regulations, more planning, and more third class meat at first-class prices!

Senator Keane, Minister for Trade and Customs, says people are squealing about the proposed meat rationing. I haven't heard anybody squealing about the meat rationing, and I don't think anybody is likely to squeal. If the need arises I am quite willing to go without meat, and I don't think I shall do any squealing about it.

But after the muddle over the butter rationing and the muddle over the milk, I would like to know, and a great many other people would like to know, something about the need for meat rationing. The Government has said that the meat would go to England. This seems very strange to me, as the Argentine, which produces more meat than Australia, is very much nearer to England than Australia is; and as ships are still in very great demand, I cannot see the force of this argument.

The people in England have been severely rationed; they have had a very hard time, and the Australian Government argues that therefore we also should be severely rationed. This type of argument must not be tolerated under any circumstances, because if we do tolerate it we shall find ourselves competing with those on the lowest standard of living in the world. That's where that kind of argument leads.

The United Kingdom is small in area, and into it is packed forty-five million people; and much of its small agricultural area has been covered with factories, vast military camps and an enormous number of aerodromes, so that the question of food supply is very different.

In Australia the question is entirely different; there are only seven million people in this vast continent, and there is not the labour force or the collecting facilities to draw the meat from every district. The result will be the same as with the butter rationing.

Meat in the outback districts will not be sold, and a huge black market will be created; the small farmer and butcher will be badly hit, and more Government inspectors will be enlisted to snoop around to see who is eating meat—and all for what purpose?

Lamb has already been taken off the Tasmanian market, and pork and bacon are rapidly disappearing. The Government asked the farmers to breed more pigs and they responded. McShanes, outside Hobart, were breeding 300 pigs, and feeding them on the refuse from the camps, which they carted away and paid for. An order came from Canberra that the pig feed must be boiled; McShanes refused to do this because it caused serious stomach trouble with the pigs. The contract was cancelled, although it was admitted that the regulation did not apply to Tasmania. The pigs were killed; no more were bred, and all the equipment and cement runs became a dead loss. How many other pig farms went out of production? And who was responsible for this order? It looks like bacon being a thing of the past for Tasmania.

The Government at this late hour realises that far too many men have been taken off the land, and is now taking men out of the army to put back in the dairying industry; but the damage has been done, as a great many milch cows have been slaughtered as unprofitable, and even if the cows were available the dairy farmers are not likely to take on labour they cannot afford to pay. The dairy farmers are getting 1/2 a gallon for milk at the farm and 2d subsidy in the winter months; they say they cannot produce milk at that price, and they are not going to, and they want the price raised to 1/6 a gallon all the year round to cover increased cost of production. It is the Government's job to see that the position is investigated quickly. It doesn't require a mathematical genius to enquire into the economics of the industry.

—JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., in a broadcast from 7HO on December 19.

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 1Jd. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

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