

FARM DEBTS & TENURE  
IN ALBERTA (Page 2)

AN OPEN LETTER TO  
ARCHBISHOP BOOTH  
(Page 3)

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE  
DEAN CASE (Page 3)

DOUGLAS REED ON THE  
BEVERIDGE PLOT (Page 4)

# THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 2. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 14, 1944

Now, when our  
land is 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).

## An Urgent Job for Australian Democrats

### The Federal Powers Issue

Every social creditor in Australia should now be throwing his whole weight behind the nation-wide campaign to ensure that the demands by Dr. Evatt and his supporters for greater powers are effectively answered at the coming referendum. Admittedly we fight at a disadvantage in some ways, but there is much we can do to answer effectively the propaganda of the centralisers. And we can ask some very awkward questions.

For example, Dr. Evatt has stressed the fact that we are fighting for the Four Freedoms of the Atlantic Charter. As one of those freedoms is "freedom of speech," what is preventing Dr. Evatt from allowing opponents of his demands adequate time to explain their case over the radio-stations of the A.B.C.? And we know how much space we can get in the big daily papers! (Surely no one but a fool believes that we would receive any more consideration from the Government newspapers, advocated by socialists, than we now receive from Sir Keith Murdoch and his kind.)

What we are witnessing in this country is a vindictive attack on any remaining individual liberty the people still have. Dr. Evatt's proposals strike at the greatest of freedoms—freedom of action. Dr. Evatt desires power to tell farmers what they may produce, power to tell people where to work, and power to ensure that any man who refuses to work where he is told does not obtain a job. And the basis of the "new order" is that every man must be

"fully employed" before he can live! Of course, there is the bait of economic security. Cows in a well-grassed paddock have the type of security now being offered to us.

Now, in order that every man can be fully employed—i.e., kept a wage-slave for the rest of his life—the Planners desire to organise in a "big way." One wonders whether they have in mind similar projects to the building of the Pyramids—per-

One of the latest contributions from our Canberra Socialists is the statement of Mr. Dedman, who joins the "full employment" choir along with the rest of the collectivist brigade who have been giving us this theme-song for some time past. He is reported thus in the "Age" of December 14: "The Labor Government could adapt the methods used to mobilise industry for war, to achieve full employment and rising living standards. It was also necessary that labour and other resources be guided [i.e., conscripted and regimented] into those occupations where they could contribute most to the welfare of the people."

Let us examine this "full employment" dictum for what it is worth. Today we have, thanks to the efforts of science, the physical means of producing everything in abundance, yet the only reason we are not all living in comparative affluence, in peace time, lies in the artificial scarcity of a valueless medium of exchange. While science has so thoroughly solved the problem of production for us, we yet passively submit to the deprivation of the accruing benefit simply because our Governments and economists have consistently failed to devise a system for the effective distribution of costless money tokens.

If it is the object of our Socialists to force everyone to work, and not to make possible to all the enjoyment of the abundant fruits of production; if the provision of "employment," and not that of goods and services, is to be the PRIMARY aim of our economic system, then obviously we must change our line of action, and the only way to do that is to destroy all labour-saving machinery; for what is the purpose of labour-saving machinery but to save labour? Under the present financial system those who control the issue of money control not only all production, but the means by which that production may be used or consumed.

In a wartime economy there is no unemployment, and, as a consequence, no financial poverty, even though most people are unemployed in the true economic sense, since they are producing for destruction, and not for use. Despite this terrific destruction, there is less poverty in Australia than in normal times. This fact, however, is not due to the incidence of "full employment," but to the reason that money is created and paid out lavishly for destruction, and is used by the recipients to purchase consumer goods.

This income removes surplus consumer goods from the market, and even creates shortages in many commodities, but piles up national debt and taxation to terrific proportions. Major Douglas has spoken thus upon this particular question:—"There is one unchanging feature of every social and economic conflict of the last 2000 years . . . Through them all runs the dual thread of money and prices . . . The evils which

### Dietetic Dangers

Professor Harvey Sutton, a Director of Public Health and a specialist in tropical medicine, is reported as saying that "a critical time would come for Australia next year [1944] because of the rationing of meat and dairy produce, and the scarcity of fruit and vegetables." What an indictment of our theoretical socialist bunglers! Despite the fact Australia has more beef and mutton than ever before, the bureaucrats in charge have so disorganised slaughtering and transport activities that they are now attempting to cover up their blundering with rationing. It's time those responsible were "in the dock."

-B.J. GOULDING

haps that would be too obvious to the wage-slaves—but they have something just as effective. Our university economists, having persuaded the Australian people that they can only become wealthy by a big export trade, the stage is all set for those captains of industry and others who tell us that a big export trade will provide work for all. Mr. L. J. Hartnett, Director of Ordnance Production and managing-director of General Motors-Holden, on his return from a Government mission to Canada, U.S.A. and Britain, said:—

"I believe we should invite British manufacturers to establish branches of British industries in Australia. Not only would this country offer them an assured market for their products, but Australia is advantageously placed to serve enormous new markets, which we can, and should, develop in China, India, Malaya and the Netherlands East Indies."

What a dazzling prospect! Well might we throw up our hands in amazement and ask: "What is the purpose of living?" All the "education", in the world cannot obliterate the fact that, for thousands of years, man has striven to climb a little higher in the scale of life by harnessing the forces of nature in order to relieve himself of the drudgery of spending all his time producing food, clothing and shelter. He strove for leisure in which to learn to live and attain his full mental stature, Factories, machines and organisation are only means to an end. They are not an end in themselves. Does Mr. Hartnett expect us to believe that a comparatively few Australians, working without hindrance from financial or legal restrictions, cannot produce adequate food, clothing, shelter and general amenities for all the people? My idea of a fuller life is one in which I can submit voluntarily to the minimum of organisation in order to provide myself with the greatest amount of leisure. But the idea of the Planners is that we must have big collective farming, plenty of oil-driven machinery rushing up and down, farm workers housed in barracks, all farm produce controlled by centralised Government pools, and then "scientifically" treated and tinned. I don't know what harm the poor natives of the places mentioned by Mr. Hartnett have ever done to us, but we must, then, send them as much of this "food" as possible! However, even this won't keep all Australians slaving eight

hours a day, so the remainder must work in factories producing gadgets to send to the natives. Perhaps the Planners think it will improve a man spiritually if he works in a factory producing radios for the natives of Borneo. Personally, I have the greatest objection to slaving to produce exports merely for the sake of exporting.

It is time this work-or-starve doctrine was attacked with every weapon we possess. One of the main powers sought by Dr. Evatt relates to employment. If we give Evatt this power, we have given the New Ruling Class—the Bureaucratic Planners—a deadly weapon. And they will use it, make no mistake. They are already giving us a taste of things to come.

You won't even be able to say, "To hell with this state; of society; I will go back into the virgin bush, hew myself a rough home from the wilderness and, although my life may be primitive, I will at least live as a free man." No; Dr. Evatt says that no man can buy land or do anything at all without the permission of the Planners. In fact, I doubt whether a man could even leave the country if he decided that he had experienced enough of the "new order!"

Someone is sure to say: "But surely we will never submit to that sort of thing?" Well, four years ago there weren't many people who believed that they would ever see individual liberties being trampled on in this country as they are being trampled on today. What will be the position in another two years?

NOW is the time to fight tyranny. Do all in your power to ensure that, at the conclusion of this war, we haven't lost the very thing we are fighting for. (Mr. Menzies please note.)

Make sure that an emphatic NO is given to Dr. Evatt's proposals. Get the facts to your fellow Australians. And don't forget the members of the armed forces. Dr. Evatt has admitted that it is hard to define just what he will be able to do under his proposed new powers. I doubt if one person in a thousand advocating greater powers for Canberra could state what will be the position if they are granted. How, then, can men, in the Armed Forces be expected to vote intelligently on the issue. There is only one safe course for them—an emphatic refusal to hand over powers until they have time to study them more closely.

—ERIC D. BUTLER.

## NOTES on the NEWS

Tasmanian railwaymen have written to the State Governor (Sir Ernest Clark), the President of the Legislative Council, and the Speaker of the House of Assembly, asking them to support the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into the affairs of the Australian Railways Union. The letter states that attempts have been made to FORCE railwaymen to join the Union, which had NOT issued an audited BALANCE SHEET for years, and DEBARRED 80% of its members from holding office. They allege that Union officials have introduced a vicious system into the Government railways known as "industrial discipline." Apparently the net is being drawn around the Red Fascists.

TRUSTEES TRIALS: In a free write-up advertisement in the Melbourne "Herald" of December 17, Sir Harry Lawson, Chairman of the Perpetual Executors and Trustees of Australia, stresses the difficulties of such concerns in the matter of investing their clients' money. He points out that advances totalling £12,000,000 have been repaid—which doesn't suit the institution, of course, because it eliminates a lot of interest rake-off. These dealers in money, along with banks and insurance companies, live on the debt system; they do not like prosperous times when money is freely available.

CLOTHES COUPONS: Extra coupons are now available for those whose occupations cause excessive wear on clothes; this belated recognition of individual needs as distinct from "mass grouping" is all to the good, but, as usual, there's a nigger in the woodpile. The proposal is that "Union secretaries are to be the dispensers." Here we see an attempt to interpose Union officials between the individual and the handout. It is to be hoped that workers will refuse to recognise these intermediaries and thus avoid the possibility of graft.

TAXATION TABLES: Commonwealth statisticians' analysis of 1942-43 figures show Federal and State taxation as £283,471,099—nearly £40 a head. State collections were £30,900,000 lower, while Federal taxation was £77,700,000 greater. Main revenue items (all of which increase living costs) are: Companies' tax, £148,711,823; Excise, £44,071,799; Sales-tax, £28,846,255; Customs, £20,806,321; Pay-roll tax, £10,450,667; Entertainment tax, over £4 millions; and Liquor taxes, £1,251,191. That's partly how our living costs are inflated, and it should be noted that it is Government action, which does the trick.

ASYLUM ARRANGEMENTS: The proposed trials of war criminals has raised the question of the real culprits finding asylum in neutral countries. Commenting on this, Viscount Simpson (House of Lords) pointed out "distinction must be made between the inner ring of political leaders and their numerous agents." If this "inner ring" means the financial gangsters and not the dummy so-called dictators, the question of asylum will be indeed difficult. The Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Brietungs, the Morgans, Guggenheims and their counterparts will take some catching. As a matter of fact, these men will be "hunting with the hounds"—they may even be "on the bench" handing out the sentences to their dupes!

MILITANTS' MISTAKE: The result of the Transport Union's ballot for executive positions, held in December, discloses that the only two defeated men were "militants," who apparently made the mistake of thinking that they could fool the workers all the (Continued on page 2.)

### Housewives v. Boards

On the casting vote of Mrs. J. Downing, the Federation of Australian Housewives passed this motion: "Because their administration had raised a storm of opposition from consumers, and had not benefited producers or consumers, Conference resolves to urge abolition of all Marketing Boards." It has taken some time for the Housewives' Association to become wise to the increased living costs due to hordes of bureaucrats battenning and fattening on producers and consumers; it is to be hoped they will be wise enough to direct their members' strength at their political representatives—and not let up until these Board plagues are exterminated.

**A recent outspoken broadcast by the Hon. E. C. Manning, Premier of Alberta, again made it clear that the problems of farm debts and land tenure, which he vividly reviewed, have been realistically and democratically faced up to by the Government of that Canadian Province; but Federal authorities, under pressure from financial institutions, have so far managed to block every major move to actually deal with these problems. Mr. Manning said: —**

I would like to discuss an aspect of agriculture to which the Government has given and continues to give prior consideration because of its dominating importance. I refer to the problem of farm debts and the security of land tenure.

While this is, very naturally, a matter which concerns all farmers very vitally, I wish to make it plain that it also concerns everybody else—professional and business men, workers in industry, public servants and all other citizens.

I feel that in the past there has been a great deal of misunderstanding on this question of farm debts and security of land tenure. There has been a tendency to treat it as a farmer's problem and not as a Provincial problem concerning everybody. I believe that before we can begin to get down to anything like a practical reconstruction of our economy, we must adjust ourselves to a realistic attitude towards agriculture.

In the first place, we must recognise clearly that the foundation of any economic structure is agriculture and the system of land holding under which it is developed.

It is impossible to have a just, stable and prosperous country unless justice, stability and prosperity are accorded to agriculture.

This is not theory; it is fact, which has been proved by the experience of history all down the ages. But it is truer here in Alberta than in many other parts of Canada. Here in our own Province the prosperity and well being of manufacturing industries, merchants, lawyers, doctors, teachers—everybody, in fact—is bound up with the condition of the farmers.

I know that plenty of lip service has been given to this point of view, but I am now pleading that we go further and recognise its truth as a basis for united action by all sections of the people.

Nobody realises better than the farmers of the West what an unjust and unfair deal they have had. Thousands of them came west and put all they possessed into clearing land and developing it. They knew nothing about business trickery or compound interest. They eagerly accepted the loans they were offered, thinking that, with the added income from the machinery and stock they could buy with the money, they could pay off the loans together with the extortionate 8, 9, and 10 per cent, interest which was demanded by the lending institutions.

I hear thoughtless persons condemning farmers who, during those few years when prices were good and conditions looked reasonably prosperous, went away on vacations or bought good cars. I have no time for such criticisms. Farming is not an easy occupation. It demands long hours, hard work, and knowledge, which can be acquired only by experience. It needs a great deal of capital. And always hanging over the farmer is the constant worry of sudden calamity due to weather conditions, destruction by pests, and the other hazards beyond his control. If after a hard season which proved successful, if after paying off his obligations, if after making provision for the coming season's requirements, some of our farmers felt the need for a little relaxation and took a vacation, who will blame them? Remember, everything looked stable. Our economists and financiers in those days were talking of the future in the most optimistic terms.

But those few years of comparatively prosperous conditions were short-lived. Drought and depression suddenly plunged agriculture into a desperate plight. Prices for farm products slumped away below production costs. Farm debts doubled and trebled. It took two and three bushels of grain to pay debt obligations where it required but one before. As prices were less than the cost of producing the grain, farmers found it impossible to meet even the interest charges.

Added to this, the people found that interest was added to principal and interest was charged on the whole. Year after year this went on. Farm buildings became shabby. Machinery wore out. A terrible blight descended upon our rural population. The producers of the nations' food found it difficult to feed and clothe themselves. Land values sank to lower and lower levels. The farmer saw all the capital invested in his land disappear. His debts exceeded the reduced value of all his assets.

The mortgage companies, instead of helping farmers to tide over the crisis, had apparently selected Shylock as their patron saint. They began a systematic campaign of dispossession . . .

Every Provincial Government in the West was obliged to introduce legislation to protect farmers against the avaricious actions of the lending institutions.

That was before the present Alberta Government was first elected in 1935 with a definite mandate to afford more effective protection for our farmers. With our knowledge of the fraudulent nature of our debt-creating financial system, this Government was able to carry out its mandate in this sphere—at the same time doing its best to ensure that such legislation could not be abused by unscrupulous debtors.

Debt Act after Debt Act passed by the Provincial Legislature of Alberta was attacked by the lending institutions. Act

"New Times," January 14, 1944—Page 2.

**after Act was either disallowed by the Federal Government or declared ultra vires by the courts. The reasons for their annulment were analysed by some of the best legal minds and the Government brought forward new legislation to replace the acts rendered inoperative. But these, in turn, were attacked, with equal success, by the mortgage companies.**

And may I point out that Alberta alone had been singled out for this offensive action, by these concerns. After the outbreak of war the attack was intensified.

Then came the final attempt to remove the last barriers to the right of action to dispossess debtor-farmers. The judgment obtained had the effect of making illegal all similar debt legislation in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Immediately the Alberta Government took the lead in bringing together the Government and farmer organisations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and our own Province. A united and unanimous request was made to Ottawa to pass legislation to give farmers the necessary protection from unjust dispossession by the mortgage and other lending corporations and to provide for some kind of equitable settlement of farm debts.

Remember, the war had been in progress for some time. The importance of agriculture as an essential war industry was recognised. Farmers were being urged to produce more and more. Yet farmers continued to get inadequate and inequitable prices for their products. They were still denied proper credit facilities. They were being systematically divested of their manpower. They could not obtain machinery. Their debt obligations had accumulated to unmanageable proportions. And, on top of all this, they were living under the constant threat of dispossession by institutions whose existence is no more essential to the national war effort than a Zulu war dance is to Canadian culture.

Naturally, prompt action by Ottawa was confidently expected. But for some reason such action has been delayed. Now, if help from Ottawa comes at all, there is an element of doubt as to whether it will be effective.

Now, that is the situation. Surely this matter constitutes a problem, which should concern everyone of us very vitally.

**First, it should concern us, because if there is anything we can do provincially to give the farmer security of tenure on his land during the war, we must do it. As a vital war industry the efficiency of agriculture should not be jeopardised because a few financial institutions want to get control of the land. Actually their actions are a detriment to the war effort—because you cannot expect farmers to seed the land and build up their livestock when they do not know from month to month whether they are going to be thrown out on the highway.**

Secondly, it concerns us all on the grounds of equity and justice. Should the property

**The Dean Case was tried in Sydney on December 16 1943 by Justice Starke and the case was dismissed with £10/10/- costs against Dean.**

[Mr. Dean is one of those citizens who have sought, by legal proceedings, to have tax-collecting or rates-collecting officials restrained from collecting taxes or rates to pay interest on public borrowings of privately manufactured money.]

Previously a writ had been served on Justice Starke, and this was tried by Chief Justice Latham. Failing to receive any consideration, Dean then issued a writ against Chief Justice Latham, and then Justice Starke comes back and tries the case—a somewhat strange proceeding.

Moreover, the counter-summons applying to have the case heard in Full High Court, and in Hobart submitted by Dean against Latham, was disallowed owing to a Regulation issued by Justice Latham, Justice Starke and others, that no legal proceedings can be constituted without leave of the Court or a Justice thereof.

It should be remembered that this Rule of Court was introduced after the Dean writ had been filed, and it was seemingly designed to prevent the Dean Case being taken to its logical conclusion.

This demonstrates in a rather spectacular manner the statement already made in the pamphlet on the Dean Case, "The New Despotism," that the machinery of justice can only be used one way: for the persecution of the taxpayer by Government officials. [The pamphlet is issued by P. Partington, 349 Main-road, Glenorchy, Tasmania, and is priced at 1/- per copy, posted.]

**VICTORY FOR "PRESSURE POLITICS": ATTORNEY-GENERAL ORDERS ENQUIRY.**

**Tribunal To Include Senator Darcey**

Many electors (and some organisations) wrote or telegraphed representatives in the Federal Parliament, complaining about the obstacles, as they saw it, that were being placed in Dean's way. Members of Parliament pursued the matter with the Attorney general (Dr. Evatt). The

rights, the homes and the happiness of our citizens be subjected to the kind of law which operates only in favour of one section of the nation—namely, the large money-manipulating corporations?

Thirdly, it concerns us vitally because, unless we can solve the problems of agriculture, we will not be able to deal effectively with any of the other problems of the post-war period. The reconstruction of the basis of our economy is essential as the foundation for all other post-war reconstruction.

In the short time at my disposal I have endeavoured to outline the most important facts regarding farm debts. At a later date I propose to deal with the kind of constructive action, which must be taken to meet the grave situation, which has developed. However, before doing so, I feel we should wait a little longer, to see what action Ottawa intends to take in the matter. I would like to hear from our farmers, farmers' organisations and others what their views are in this connection.

Already we have received a representation from one farmers' organisation in the form of the following resolution: I quote:

"Whereas land is the greatest asset of any community, as it provides practically all the raw products for the satisfaction of their material wants; and

"Whereas the development of the land to produce the maximum benefit to the largest number of persons can be carried out best under a system of private ownership which makes the individual responsible for the land under his care, combined with a proper system of rewards for those using the land to the best purpose; and

"Whereas ownership of land involves acceptance by the owner of all responsibilities of trusteeship on behalf of the people; and, as such, he should be assured of security of tenure so long as his stewardship is satisfactory; and

"Whereas the people should be protected from unrestricted exploitation of land, gambling in land values, monopoly control of land, the evils of irresponsible absentee landlordism and other abuses inherent in the present system;

"Therefore be it resolved by the delegates of the Alberta Farmers' Union in regular convention assembled that the Provincial Government be requested, as an essential and basic measure of post-war reconstruction, to take the necessary steps for changing the Constitution of the Province to provide for a system of land tenure which will:

"(1) Assure security of tenure to all owners and tenants of land.

"(2) Institute a proper control of land titles to prevent gambling in land values, unrestricted exploitation of land by financial manipulation, and the control of land by persons or corporations having no intention of using it for the public benefit.

"(3) Protect debtor tenants against dispossession owing to circumstances over which they have no control.

"(4) Ensure that owners will receive the benefit of all improvements they make and discourage the abuse of land or property by allowing it to deteriorate.

"And be it further resolved that before any legislative enactment to establish such system of land tenure becomes effective it shall be submitted to a vote of the people by referendum."

**I shall be interested to know to what extent that represents the views of the majority of our farmers and other citizens.**

immediate result is indicated by the following reply (one of many such communications from Members) received by a Sydney elector:—

Commonwealth of Australia, Minister for Transport and External Territories, Sydney, N.S.W., 31st December 1943. Dear Mr. Hand,

I refer to the correspondence you forwarded to me concerning Mr. A. R. Dean, of Hobart, and Mr. Justice Latham.

In this regard I desire to advise that your communication was referred to my colleague, the Attorney-General, who has now advised me as follows:—

"In view of many enquiries and representations relating to recent High Court action, Dean versus Latham, I have decided that a full investigation shall take place into all aspects of the litigation, including the statement made in circulars dealing with the matter. Until very recently I had no personal knowledge of the case, and, of course, I have no control whatever over the High Court, either in relation to its decisions or its internal arrangements or administration. The tribunal of investigation will hear evidence from all persons who may desire to present it. For that purpose it will sit in Hobart as well as elsewhere, its personnel will be Mr. Justice Reed, of the Supreme Court of South Australia, Hon. J. A. Guy, M.H.R., and Senator Darcey."

—Yours sincerely, E. J. WARD

**"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.**

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

tune. This is a happy note for the closing chapter of 1943. The "Commos." exerted all their power to pack the meeting and influence decisions for the militants.

**FINANCIAL FALLACIES:** The New York "Times" and the National City Bank are strongly attacking the idea, of peacetime Government spending to prevent depressions; they say such theories are bound to combat the "stop-spending programme." These financial wizards even suggest doubts as to providing finance for the "full employment" plan, and they doubt the theory of turning expenditure on and drawing it off as required via taxation. All this is propaganda against the idea, now firmly rooted in the people's minds, that "if we can find millions for war, we can also find millions for peace." Another idea that should soon take root in the people's minds is that all these millions, whether for war or peace, can be provided without debt charges, which are the major cause of excessive taxation.

**SOCIALISED SCANDALS:** Following the recently disclosed appalling ill-treatment of inmates at the "Lidecombe (N.S.W.) State Institution, the press of December 7 again reports the executive committee of the Mothers' Clubs reporting to their conference "the appalling, unclean, ill-fitting and dilapidated mixture of uniforms which serve as clothing at the boys' mental home at Kew (Vic.)." Previous reports of this socialised institution also indicated, callous disregard for these victims of our financial system. These de-humanising dens truly symbolise socialism. And to think that they are described as "homes"!

**SLY STATEMENTS:** Strong resentment is being shown in U.S. at the practice of anonymous sharpshooters featured in the daily press insulting sections of the public by utterances reported to emanate from "high officials" or "a Government spokesman." In this instance General Marshall is suspected as the person who accused certain U.S. citizens of "providing the enemy with propaganda, prolonging the war and causing the loss of Allied soldiers' lives." Roosevelt is also accused of speaking along the same lines as an anonymous "high official," and the clamour is to have the guilty person's identity made known. Here in Australia similar snipers are featured by the daily press, and very often press magnates themselves are the culprits, hiding behind the "freedom of the press." It is time the searchlight was also turned on these local snipers.

**PALESTINE PROBLEMS:** The recent A.L.P. Conference rejected a motion from the Victorian executive seeking recognition of the Jews as a nation. It was resolved that "this was no concern of the Labor Party." The Premier of Queensland (Mr. Cooper) said: "For centuries Jews had had the opportunity to build a nation for themselves, but they apparently preferred to live with other people." "Fancy me telling Sir Otto Niemeyer to go to Palestine," said Mr. Cooper, amid applause. Continuing, he said: "Rich Jews did not desire to live in Palestine, they only desired to settle their surplus there. If Jews could play such a prominent part in financial and other circles, surely they could settle this thing for themselves." That's that, but it would be interesting to learn the connections of the individuals in the Victorian executive who guided the motion on to the agenda. Apparently the Australian workers' problems are of secondary importance to them.

**NEEDY NAPLES:** Following the press propaganda of the growing difficulties and hardships of our enemies, the following report from the Melbourne "Herald" of December 11 is rather interesting: "British and American soldiers in Naples can buy nearly all the things they could not buy at home—anything from a pram to silk stockings, from a watch to a camera, from a razor to a hairbrush, from an envelope to a ream of paper." Assuming that this report is true, the only explanation for this amazing statement of abundant supplies is that Mussolini must have "bumped off" the economists in Italy.

**POLISH PROBLEM:** A Washington report featured in the press of December 23 says: "Polish sources declare that the Russian Army must enter Poland as an ally, not as a conqueror, or else face desperate resistance by the Poles themselves." (The same report quotes Congresswoman Jessie Summer thus: "The Moscow conference would result only in a transfer of Europe from Hitler to Stalin.") This indicates that the Poles have strong objections to both German and Russian socialistic domination. Presumably they need not fear either, as Great Britain is pledged to restore Poland's 1939 status.

—O.B.H.

**ILLNESS OF MR. W. H. RHYS**

It is with regret that we announce the illness of Mr. W. H. Rhys, Kenmore, Brisbane (previously of Melbourne), author of "Real Wealth and Financial Poverty." This stalwart pioneer of social credit thought in Australia came through an operation successfully, and is now convalescent and slowly regaining strength. His friends and readers in Australia and overseas, inspired by his writings in their efforts to shape events, will join with us in wishing him a speedy recovery.

## OPEN LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP BOOTH

The Most Reverend J. J. Booth, D.D.: Your Grace, —In my open letter of last week I endeavoured to focus public attention on certain viewpoints put forward by you in connection with your recently launched appeal for 500,000 shillings for purposes of Church Reconstruction and Extension after the war. I paid particular attention to the statement wherein you declared that victory in the war would result in the conferring upon us of "obligations," not of rewards; and, I made it clear that I regard the arts of "leaders" who, at secret "conferences," and without consultation, commit the people whom they were elected to serve, to "obligations," the precise nature and effect of which are never disclosed in advance, as a treasonable betrayal of their people and a renunciation of those principles of democracy in defence of which, professedly, the Allied Nations have taken up arms.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that such agreements and obligations are imposed on the people by what ex-Prime Minister A. W. Fadden termed "the big unseen forces which work behind the political scenes," our "leaders" (including Mr. Fadden) being used as the instruments for the imposition of the policy.

The conditions from which the people are suffering (including the war) are, quite demonstrably, the result of deliberate policies pursued by "the big unseen forces." Therefore, an undoubted OBLIGATION (which, so far, few of them have recognised) rests upon the heads of our Churches and the clergy generally, to identify and denounce the authors of those policies which, even were all of us who have no part in their formulation to undergo "a change of heart," would make the coming of the Kingdom of God on Earth an utter impossibility.

In view of your having commended the decisions of the Princeton Conference, it would appear that you consider this Conference to have made a contribution to the remedying of those ills from which the peoples of the world are suffering; but, to me, it seems beyond doubt that sufficient evidence has been adduced in the correspondence between Dr. Wilson Macaulay and "Stirrem" in these columns, to demonstrate that the conclusions reached by the Conference are in full accord with the proposals being made by "leaders" and fuhrers in both Axis and Allied Nations for the creation of an international police force to enforce the plans of "the big unseen forces" for the complete enslavement of all peoples. In this connection, and having regard to your dogmatic statement relative to "obligations," I must make reference to your declaration of 12th December to the effect that Australia's representatives at the Princeton Conference were "qualified to speak with authority," and that as a result of the deliberations of those who met at Princeton, you understand that the Australian Government has accepted certain (unspecified) responsibilities. I should appreciate an answer to the following questions: (a) By whom were the Australian representatives appointed? (b) Just in what way were they "qualified to speak with AUTHORITY"? (c) However well they may have been "qualified," by what right did they presume to make any recommendations or suggestions to the Government involving the acceptance of "responsibilities"? (d) Assuming the correctness of your statement as to the Government having recognised the "direction" of the Conference to the extent of accepting certain "responsibilities," how does it happen that you are in a position to make a public announcement regarding such action by the Government? Even though the Australian representatives may rightly claim that they speak for the clergy, I know of nothing, which entitles them to claim that they speak for the people—even for the people of their own denominations. Is it not, therefore, the height of audacious effrontery, on the part both of the representatives and the Government, to collaborate in committing the people to "certain responsibilities"? Electors would be well advised to write to their Federal Members asking for further information regarding these unauthorised negotiations.

Having regard to the foregoing, including the letters of "Stirrem" and Dr. Wilson Macaulay, I do not think it unfair to suggest that, wittingly or unwittingly, Christian leaders are being used as the tool of the international gangster "law-givers." Thus, further emphasis is given to the gravity of "Australia's Great Post-War Peril" which is being so brilliantly and penetratingly discussed in these columns by Mr. Bruce H. Brown. But, of course, he would not be regarded by OUR "leaders" as being "qualified to speak with authority," even though his statements are fully authenticated and founded on actual FACTS. Before passing on, I would say that, although I have heard you speak on many occasions, I cannot recollect your having evinced any enthusiasm for the proposals which emanated from the Malvern (England) Conference. I may, however, be mistaken in this regard. But you have demonstrated your enthusiasm for the proposals advanced by the Princeton Conference, which, in contrast to the Malvern Conference, did not recommend any interference with the present fraudulent financial system. Further, I do recollect your averring in the course of your sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral on 8th March, 1942, that "WORK is a primary OBLIGATION of man"—a viewpoint with which, as you may remember, I indicated my disagreement on that day, because of its incompatibility with the scientific mass production methods under which modern industry is carried on. It is, however, a viewpoint which is in harmony with the philosophy of the international financial gangster "law-givers," who are being identified and specified in Mr. Brown's illuminating series of letters, as they have been also in "Programme for Third World War" by the illustrious Major C. H. Douglas, and who are forging bonds with which to fetter our people to a cart-horse post-war existence which includes the roseate promise of "certain MINIMUM standards of living."

Another of the declarations made by you on 12th December to which I desire to refer is the following: "We will be responsible for taking part in the reconstruction that

is to come in the sharing of our resources and the developing of them so that we may be able to give and not sell to those who are less fortunate than we." I fully endorse the admirable sentiment expressed in that sentence. But, it is of no avail giving utterance to noble and brotherly sentiments UNLESS ONE IS PREPARED TO TAKE ACTION WITH A VIEW TO REMOVING THE OBSTACLE WHICH PREVENTS SUCH A PROPOSAL BEING EFFECTED. So far, you have gone no further than giving utterance to the sentiment. It has very truly been said that "God's world is not the kind of world in which the mere repetition of words will get wagons out of ruts, poverty out of slums, or bring economic security with peace to all men. He who would pray with effect must do something to help achieve the object for which he is praying."

When you say, "WE will be responsible," obviously you mean Australia as a community. Likewise, "those who are less fortunate than we" to whom we are "to give and not sell," must mean other communities. Now, firstly, you should be well aware of the fact—and it IS a demonstrable FACT

—that the ability of the Australian community to do as you suggest is NOT dependent on the developing of our resources. For many years prior to the outbreak of this war, the development of our resources had been such as to easily permit of our giving to "those less fortunate than we." NOTHING OTHER THAN THE PRESENT OBSOLETE AND OPPRESSIVE FINANCIAL SYSTEM HAS PREVENTED SUCH GIVING IN THE PAST, AND, UNTIL ITS DEFECTS ARE REMEDIED, WE SHALL BE UNABLE TO ACT IN THAT NEIGHBOURLY MANNER IN THE FUTURE.

Under prevailing arrangements, the fuller development of our resources is possible only within the limits imposed by finance and financial dictators. Lest you doubt the complete truth of that statement, I would quote the Hon. B. S. Stevens in support thereof. On 21st November 1932 when U.A.P. Premier of New South Wales, this "leader" said: ". . . We are prepared as courageously as OUR BANKERS WILL ALLOW, to get out into the field of development . . ." Two years later, after the Lyons U.A.P. Commonwealth Government had been returned to "power" on a policy one of the major points of which had been the unification of our railway gauges, bankers' tool R. G. Casey announced on behalf of the "Government" that that proposal would have to be abandoned because FUNDS were not available. The resources for the development of which after the war you say, "we will be responsible," WERE available in 1934.

There is nothing either in your Cathedral address of 12th December or in your leaflet, "The VISION and the Task" (the latter stressing the NEED for money), to indicate the

## IS HITLER THE JEWISH MESSIAH?

February, 1939, in Prague: "One of our Rabbis here," said Doktor Farisy, "is preaching in the synagogues that Hitler is the Jewish Messiah, because he will cause all those countries of the world to be opened to the Jews, which now are closed to them."

"The Jewish Messiah!" At the words, a horde of vagrant thoughts, doubts and questions, that long roamed about in my mind, fell into ordered ranks, and I suddenly saw their shape and meaning.

I turned to look at Doktor Farisy's Jewish profile, sharply etched against the white streets through which we walked. A heavy coating of snow made the turrets and gables and alleyways of Prague look even more Hans Andersen-like than ever. It was a lovely picture, spoiled by the feeling of fear that infected the air (for in another month Hitler would come).

We spoke of ways and means of getting out of Czechoslovakia, of Europe. Few spoke of anything else, in those days. Doktor Farisy was born in the Hungarian part of old Austria-Hungary, now become part of Czechoslovakia, and might have argued, according to the day, that he was Austrian, Hungarian, Slovak, or Czechoslovak. He was none of these; no drop of such blood was in his veins. He was a Central European Jew. The newspaper for which he wrote, though it claimed to speak in the name of "Czechoslovakia," employed only such as he: I knew all his colleagues, and they included no Gentiles. If these men were rootless, in the place where they lived, it was because they practised exclusion.

His eyes were set on Kenya, in the British Empire. He wanted a letter of introduction from me to a friend of mine there. Knowing that he would cling, in that colony, to the method he and his fellow Jews used in Europe, I felt no duty to help him, for I saw in it the same danger to British nationhood, though in other than military form, as the one I knew in Germany. But I liked him personally and gave him the letter.

Sometimes fog suddenly lifts and reveals, in stark clarity, an object hidden before: a tree or the like. So it is on occasion, I find, with things that others say to me. As a knife needs a grindstone, so a mind needs the touch of another mind. This was the result of Doktor Farisy's

words. My disordered thoughts fell into pattern, like the pieces of a kaleidoscope. In the years that followed Hitler's coming, I knew something about the Jews, but did not realise it. The clamour raised by the Nazis against the Jews, which much exceeded the things the Nazis did, and the far louder echo of this in the world, blinded people to the truth of what happened, and for a time even confused me, though I was a close observer. Now, in Doktor Farisy's words, I suddenly saw something, which I long looked at without perceiving.

"One of our Rabbis," he said, "is preaching in the synagogues that Hitler is the Jewish Messiah . . ."

Was this to be the final epitaph on Hitler: that he was the Jewish Messiah?

If so, how would the interests of my own country fare? I turned to Doktor Farisy with a whetted interest.

"Say that again," I said, "I didn't quite understand."

"One of our Rabbis here," he repeated, "is preaching in the synagogues that Hitler is the Jewish Messiah, because he will cause all those countries of the world to be opened to the Jews, which are closed to them now."

Thoughts which long wandered at random through my mind suddenly fell into ordered procession.

"Do you know, Herr Doktor," I said, "I've known that for a long time without realising it. Thank you for putting it into words. But my country will have to look after its own interests."

"Why?" he said.

"You know very well that you haven't a single non-Jew on the staff of your newspaper," I said, "and you'll do the very same thing in England, or Kenya, or wherever you go."

He looked at me warily, with veiled eyes, opened his mouth, and then shut it, without comment.

We walked on together. —DOUGLAS REED, in his latest book, "Lest We Regret." (Jonathan Cape, London.)

## THE WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

The following letter has been sent to an agricultural expert who gave a radio talk through an A.B.C. station on Boxing Day. It is self-explanatory:—

Dear Mr. Kelly, —I listened with some amazement to your address at 8.30 a.m. Sunday, 26/12/43 over 2FC. I had hoped to hear from you, an expert, matter relating to your subject, i.e., Agriculture. But it soon became obvious you were to speak, not on the subject in which you are an expert, but on a subject to which you had, obviously, given only surface attention, i.e., finance and price-fixing.

I am sure you, as a practical agriculturist, will agree, that there are no problems in production which present any scientific difficulty; that it is only in marketing, in buying and selling, in distribution, that difficulties are found. Therefore, on reflection, I am sure it must seem strange to you, that you, an agriculturist, have been chosen to present as a difficult, or well-nigh insoluble, problem, the problem of finance. Why was it that a financial expert was not chosen to present these problems? Do you know that it is contrary to high policy for a financial expert thus to be chosen; that it has been laid down by the highest financial authority that the financial expert shall, never discuss or explain financial policy?

This policy of reticence no doubt has great advantages to those who adopt it. But it is not without grave disadvantage.

In the absence of explanations freely given, rational human beings of necessity formulate their own explanations. The following is an explanation, which is accepted by many people:—

(a) Money may be regarded as a medium of exchange. In this aspect money is innocent, benign, and a useful servant of man.

(b) But control of money may become centralised in a high degree. It may then be used as a supreme mechanism of control. By its withdrawal it may be used to frustrate its benign operation as a medium of exchange, and become a great barrier against distribution, causing want in the midst of abundance, as it did in the depression.

Reginald McKenna, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Chairman of the Midland Bank, said those who control it direct the policy of Governments, and hold in their hands the destiny of the people.

In these two aspects of money we have the factors, which produce a wolf in sheep's clothing. Under cover of (a), an innocent medium of exchange, we have (b), a sinister wolf aiming all the time at the intensification of CENTRALISED CONTROL.

A wise wolf does not speak, for his voice might be detected; he does not broadcast;

slightest recognition of the FACT that, under the present FRAUDULENT and TREASONABLE money system, "the Glory of God," to which "The VISION and the Task" says lip service, CANNOT be fully set forth.

By giving utterance to noble and lofty principles founded on the belief "that we are children of God and brothers of each other" while at least acquiescing in, if not defending, the conditions and policies which render such principles positively abortive, you are, I submit, so debasing those principles that they become mere platitudes. You have, I would remind you, been guilty of disparaging as "theorists," men who have publicly denounced the debt and taxation system, which "lades men with burdens (obligations) grievous to be borne."

It should also be mentioned in this connection that you have permitted to speak at one of the "people's services" in St. Paul's Cathedral, Mr. R. G. Menzies, whose past actions and recent statements stamp him as no friend of the people. The Wesley Church "Pleasant Sunday Afternoon" platform is also readily made accessible to opponents of the people such as that "great statesman."

At this point I think it fitting to quote a few words from a letter written by Carlyle to Emerson: "May the Lord deliver us from all cant: may the Lord, whatever else He do or forbear, teach us to look facts honestly in the face, and to beware (with a kind of shudder) of smearing them over with our despicable and damnable palaver into irrecongnisability. . . ."

In what I have already written, I have, I believe, justified the concluding sentence of my first letter wherein I opined that "the vision" is no more than a mirage. If space can be made available in next week's issue, I shall deal with two other aspects of your proclamation regarding the developing of our resources "so that we may be able to give and not sell to those who are less fortunate than we."

Please accept my assurance that you are not being personally singled out for this course of critical examination. Your public statements made in connection with the 500,000 shillings appeal has evoked these letters; and, in so far as they are critical, the criticism is equally applicable to many other "Christian leaders."

—I am, very truly yours,

J. BRADSHAW.

he does not discuss, and he does not explain. On a number of occasions he has found himself very hard pressed, and he has given vent to utterances, which he is very anxious we should forget. At times he has unwisely said such things as were said by Rothschild: "Let me make the money of a country, I care not who makes its laws."

Now, sir, do you understand why an Agriculturist recently broadcast on Prices, Finance and Markets?

There is a persistent endeavour at this time to bombard the public mind with unending propaganda to induce it to accept as an axiom a false belief that the problem of supply to the individual must first be gathered into a great mass and be considered as a world problem before it can be solved.

But everyone (and particularly you, sir, as a scientist) knows that the only practical approach to any problem is to break it down into its component smaller problems. Common sense ordains that if anyone persists in the opposite approach towards the solution of any problem, then either his intelligence or his motives will become questioned.

As this avalanche of propaganda to create this false belief gathers weight and momentum, ordinary people are questioning, not the intelligence but the MOTIVE. The question frequently becomes articulated, "What are they attempting?" and the answer is not far behind, "They are endeavouring by this means to do what Hitler has failed to do by force of arms—they are attempting to achieve the centralisation of power."

Now, SOCIAL POWER is the most dangerous force in the world, and the more it becomes accumulated at one point the greater the danger. This principle has always been recognised by the sound common sense of British people, who have never failed to detect and destroy in the past schemers and plotters and planners who were so foolish as to attempt to establish centralised points of power—in other days called tyrannies.

As the aforesaid propaganda proceeds, advocating the centralising of control, it arouses in British people only a sense of distrust of the advocates; and with true instinct this distrust is felt in relation to centralised control of the world food-supply (signed by delegates on behalf of Australia at Hot Springs, Virginia, on 3/6/43), or the proposals by Dr. Evatt to centralise all over-riding power at Canberra. All the problems mentioned in your broadcast may be classified as problems of distribution, or problems of production. The bounty of the Almighty, fertilised by man's inventive genius, has solved all the problems of production. Problems of distribution are all problems of finance. These can be solved with ease as soon as we determine that the Big Bad Wolf concealed behind financial policy and aiming at centralising of power shall be recognised and destroyed.

The source of all difficulty in marketing, in buying and selling, in the fixing of a price which will permit the producer to sell at a profit, so that he may continue thus to serve the community, a price at the same time within the capacity of the consumer to pay—the "source of all this difficulty is the PRICE-GAP."

When the Wolf, aiming at centralised

(Continued on page 4.)



## DOUGLAS REED ON BEVERIDGE PLOT

I smelt danger in the section of the Beveridge Report, which deals with unemployment insurance. If a nigger was in the woodpile, it would be there. And, indeed, I found this:—

"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 . . .

"Men and women who have been unemployed for a certain period SHOULD BE REQUIRED AS A CONDITION OF CONTINUED BENEFIT TO ATTEND A WORK OR TRAINING CENTRE . . . the period after which attendance should be required might be extended in times of high unemployment and reduced in times of good employment; six months for adults would perhaps be a reasonable average period of benefit without conditions. But for young persons who have not yet the habit of continuous work, the period should be shorter; FOR BOYS AND GIRLS THERE SHOULD REALLY BE NO UNCONDITIONAL BENEFIT AT ALL; THEIR ENFORCED ABSTENTION FROM WORK SHOULD BE MADE AN OCCASION OF FURTHER TRAINING . . .

"CONDITIONS IMPOSED ON BENEFIT MUST BE ENFORCED WHERE NECESSARY BY SUITABLE PENALTIES."

That is compulsion and forced labour, as we now have it, introduced under pretext of the war and ostensibly only for the duration of the war. It existed in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. It is one of The Things we supposedly fight against. Young lads and girls must take what employment they are told to take, even far away from home; "suitable penalties" will be imposed if they demur. "Suitable penalties" can only mean imprisonment.

And this is Social Security! This is what the politicians mean when they speak of "the continuance of control after the war!"

How many enthusiasts knew that this was in the Beveridge Report? It appears in Part II, on page 58. When the Report was issued, the public was benevolently advised, on account of its great length and complexity, to read a summary, "The Beveridge Report In Brief," which contains 63 pages instead of 300, and costs 3d instead of 2s.

Part II of the 2s "Beveridge Report," containing the proposals I have quoted above, does not appear in the three-penny "Report In Brief."

In the great parliamentary and newspaper controversy about the Report, I have not seen these vital proposals mentioned, though they are the most important things in it. They would impair our last remnants of liberty. Here are but compulsion, labour camps, the abolition of free choice of employment and the threat of force.

Strange, that the people of this country, having been hoaxed so often, from the Zinovieff letter to the Gold Standard election, from the "Save Abyssinia" election to the Munich Agreement, do not become a little wary and examine what they are told before applauding. Their newspapers, without explaining this part of the Report, lauded it as a model of "advanced thinking." Do people believe this? They were given a picture of a few Tory diehards implacably setting out to wreck a report, which might be England's salvation. Did they not observe, then, that the Government itself called for this report, and "publicised it all over the world in a way that no report has ever been publicised" (Sir William Beveridge, on March 3, 1943). The Government broadcast the beauties of this Report in scores of languages. Do people, then, really believe that the Government is opposed to the Report drawn up by a very old crony of Mr. Churchill? Do they imagine that the Government gave such vast publicity to the Report, merely in order to make itself unpopular?

The gullibility of the public is frightening. Nose-led by the Press, millions of people seemingly go about saying, "the vested interests and the old men are trying to wreck this wonderful scheme of social security, which would ensure our future. We will force the Government to give us the whole Report and nothing but."

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From The United Democrats, of 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide.)

**Pensions Campaign:** The Prospect branch of the Invalid and Old Age Pensioners' Association, on December 21, launched a campaign to obtain by pressure politics £3 a week instead of the paltry pittance of 27/- now given out by a Labor Government that claims to be in office to obtain economic security and social justice. The meeting was addressed by Mr. M. E. Dodd on the effectiveness of pressure politics, and it was a credit to the old folk that they could accept a new idea so readily. A well set up handbill and request-form for three signatures has been printed. Anyone interested is invited to send to us for a supply at 1/3 per 100. Will you help make this a Commonwealth-wide campaign? Many forms have already gone to other States.

**Quarterly Rally:** Members are advised that the next Rally will be held on Saturday, February 5, at 8 pm.

—F. Bawden, Hon. Secretary.

"New Times," January 14 1944 — Page 4.

"They" want the Beveridge Report, or at any rate the proposals, which I have quoted and which were omitted from the popular edition. What "vested interest" would oppose forced labour, backed by imprisonment? (For that matter, you will find the same idea in Lord Salisbury's "Post-War Conservative Policy.")

If this, the hidden barb in the Report, is swallowed with the bait that surrounds it, the people of this island will find themselves hooked. For this is Social Insecurity at its worst. This is the thing the blaring radio has implored us for over three years to overcome at the cost of everything we have: dragooning, regimentation, surrender to petty officials, and trades union tyranny. Do not believe that one party in Parliament is for and the other against these proposals. Both are avid for them.

Let any man or woman in this country who has been "directed" to leave an employment, surrender it to another, often enough to an alien, and to take some worse-paid employment in some other place, on pain of imprisonment, consider whether that is social security. "Social Security" offers them that after the war.

Let any man or woman who has known the fear of unemployment consider whether, after the war, that fear will be greater or less, if he or she knows that the loss of a job will render them liable to compulsion to enter another trade, at lower wages, and to remove to another part of the country, on penalty of imprisonment. Let them consider whether they would then feel themselves socially secure.

This would be the end of personal freedom, and it is buried deep in the 200,000 words of the full edition of the Beveridge Report (which you, gentle reader, have not read, I wager). It is not contained in the popular three penny summary, which our paternal rulers prepared for your benefit. Think of this, before you yield to the enthusiasm of newspapers, whose proprietors you do not know, about "Social Security." If you swallow "Social Security" before this hook has been taken out of it, you are caught. You throw away what is probably the last hope for the future.

—DOUGLAS REED, author of "Insanity Fair," "All Our Tomorrows," etc., in his latest book, "Lest We Regret" (His emphasis.)

## AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

(A letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN. Continued from last issue.)

Sir, —Once again we have had a deluge of New Year "messages" from so-called "leaders." Almost without exception these messages are as unrealistic as they have been in all the years gone by. Indeed, they seem to be nothing more than the repetition, parrot fashion, of the old ideas of discredited economists, or the same old platitudes by which we and those before us have been deceived for generations.

Even Mr. Beasley, from whom we had the right to expect something better, has allowed himself to become the mouthpiece for the notions of Professor Giblin. This ancient professor regards claims to goods as more important than the goods themselves. He thinks that money should continue to be used to control the community, whereas unless it is used to SERVE the community the pledges made to our fighting men can never be redeemed. For some unexplained reason this old man is being retained as a Government "Adviser," and the result of his bad advice is to be seen in nearly everything issued and said in the name of the Government. He and those whose vision is similarly clouded cannot see beyond what is called "investment." Mr. Beasley either had his New Year message prepared for him, and said what he was told to say, or has become quite hopeless so far as any improvement on the old conditions is concerned. He is reported in the Melbourne "Argus" of 31/12/43 to have said this:—

"Mr. Chifley, Minister for Post-War Reconstruction, already had indicated that it would be necessary, after the war, to harmonise programmes of private and public investment to prevent unregulated bidding for available materials and skilled labour."

Is he, one wonders, the same Mr. Beasley who led the attack on Mr. Scullin in 1931 over the Premiers' Plan? Mr. Chifley is, of course, also Commonwealth Treasurer, and Professor Giblin is the Economic Adviser to the Treasury!

So everything is to be controlled by "investment." That precisely is the intention of international finance, irrespective of what any politician may say. The London "Daily Mirror" put it nicely in the form of a cartoon, which may be seen in the "Argus Supplement" of 1/1/44. A drawing of the head of General Smuts appears with these words, "Let it be our will and firm resolve that this war shall be the last." Immediately underneath are three fat men, representing "Private Arms Manufacturers and International Financiers," saying, "As long as they; only TALK like that we're O.K." That's exactly how it is, Mr. Editor, and that's exactly how it will continue to be unless we change our ideas on this question of "investment" and re-arrange the financial system.

And after all, what is it that we invest? We do not invest human beings, or goods, or natural resources. What we invest is money. And what is money? Money is nothing but a claim to goods, a mere symbol or ticket. So the idea of the great men behind the scenes doing the planning is that we are to continue to "invest" claims to get the goods distributed. Not only so,

To the Editor: Sir, —"There seems to be some wobbliness of opinion among "social crediters" here as to whether they, ought to oppose the renewed attempt by the Federal Government to obtain additional powers via a referendum. Some have friends in the Labor camp whom they are loath to offend by opposing the Government they put so much faith in, "Give Curtin a chance," they say, "he can't give us money reform with a hostile Senate; wait till June." Again, there are those who, while agreeing vaguely that "something ought to be done about it," incline to the "wait and see" policy, as if we did not already see, sticking out a mile in advance, the ominous portents of nationalisation and centralisation, should the vote favour the Government

Many of us, however, are fully alive to the dangers of socialisation and are already planning to frustrate the Planners, yet we feel that our small efforts unaided amount only to a trickle, whereas a full tide of opposition must be brought to bear if we can to avert catastrophe.

This points to the need for unity of purpose within our movement and wide organising to achieve a definite end in a very short time. Be sure the Planners are not idle; before long we shall no doubt feel the full impact of their propaganda.

Once agreed on the need for action, what is the best course to pursue? Shall we take our stand, for example, against holding a referendum in war-time as grossly unfair to the forces on active service, besides taking advantage of the people's preoccupation with war matters to put over legislation of which they are quite unable at present to grasp the full significance? A blizzard campaign on this issue alone might at least stave off the danger till after the war. Or shall we decide to give battle to the bureaucrats and planners now in such manner that they will not dare to raise the issue again? Whichever course we take, we must organise the campaign thoroughly; nothing less than all hands to the pumps will be enough.

A few tactical suggestions may be helpful in promoting the discussion, which must precede action. They are not novel; here they are:—

(1) Co-operative action throughout all branches of the movement.

(2) A pressure campaign, with suitable demand forms and propaganda leaflets (as simple as possible).

(3) Invite other organisations who oppose nationalisation—for example, Henry George League—to participate.

(4) Individual letters to local M.P.s.

(5) Wide distribution of leaflets by volunteers. These must be short and pithy, putting the main arguments in a nutshell.

(6) Approach businessmen and their organisations with a view to mutual assistance, also shopkeepers and all who stand

to lose by socialisation.

(7) All who can write letters or articles to magazines and newspapers, city and country, begin at once a press fusillade. (A list of periodicals likely to accept such contributions would be help—trade and other journals included.)

(8) If funds permit, a few telling broad casts in reply to Government propaganda would, be invaluable at the right moment. Screen advertisements are not to be despised, and are not very expensive.

To all social crediters I appeal: "Are we going to funk this job, which has plainly been laid on our doorstep, or will we rise to meet it as one man and show our mettle as in the past? What say you?"

—I am, sir, yours faithfully, MARY H. GRAY, 68 Findon Rd., Woodville, Adelaide.

Government of Britain not free to spend the money required! Why were they not free? WHO stopped them? The answer is that they were stopped by the financial policy IMPOSED upon them by traitors within and enemies without. The traitors within were the controllers of the Bank of "England," and the enemies without were the Wall Street financiers.

The same speaker went on to say this:

"At the time of Munich, in 1938, Britain had only three modern, types of military aeroplanes, and only enough of one of those three, types to make up two squadrons of fighters. I think that many who wondered why Britain didn't feel competent to back up her guarantee to Czechoslovakia and stop Hitler, can now rightly judge from these facts the untenable position in which her Government was then placed."

Again we should ask: WHO placed her in such a position, and what sort of a Government was it that allowed them to do it? Do you remember what Montagu Norman said when asked the difference between the British Treasury and the Bank of "England"? He said:

"The difference between the Bank of England and the British Treasury is the same as the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee."

The Bank of "England" controls the supply of money in Britain, and controls the amount that may be "spent" by the so-called Sovereign Government. Who were the members of the Government and the Parliament who allowed such treason to be practised? There were too many of them to be named in this letter, but they are easily ascertainable. Suffice it to say just here that Mr. Churchill, Mr. Anthony Eden, and Lord Halifax were among the number. Can it be that the war was planned for 1938, and that by gaining a further 12 months Mr. Chamberlain tricked the Planners? More can be said of this aspect after the war ends.

The other extract to which I particularly want to draw attention is taken from an article by Hallett Abend, entitled "Millions Must Starve," in "The Saturday Evening Post" of 23/10/43. Here is the extract:

"The State Department contends that it must have a controlling hand in relief activities in liberated areas. This means that the State Department does not want any organisation giving out food to or through native political factions which do not enjoy the approval of State Department policy-makers!"

WHO are the policy-makers? They are the "leading" men with whom President Roosevelt has surrounded himself: four of the most prominent being Bernard Baruch, Henry Morgenthau, Samuel Rosenman, and Felix Frankfurter. These men or their lineal predecessors were in similar positions of control during and after the last war, and our greatest peril is that they are likely to be permitted to continue thus.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2. 9th January 1944. (To be continued.)

### THE WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

(Continued from page 3.)

control, has been identified and destroyed, it will be a simple matter to close the price-gap. Britain has already done it in relation to many essential common commodities during wartime. The closing of the price-gap will solve all problems of distribution and of marketing. It is well known that the struggle for markets is the origin of all wars.

The Wolf, aiming at centralised control, has already advanced towards his objective through wars. It is he who has produced the price-gap to produce war. It is he who has always benefited. When the Wolf has been identified and destroyed, nations will not be driven to destroy each other. We will not have to surrender individual liberty to preserve peace. The closing of the price-gap will enable us to enjoy the bounty of the earth and the fullness thereof. Peace and Plenty are inseparable.

With the destruction of the Wolf aiming at centralised power and concealed behind financial policy, it will become obvious that "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof."

—JOHN M. MACARA, 69 Lucas-road, Burwood, N.S.W.