

"EMPLOYMENT FOR ALL"
PROPAGANDA. (Page 2.)

SOIL, AGRICULTURE AND
FOOD VALUES.
(Page 3.)

MR. J. B. PRIESTLEY AND
THE PLANNERS.
(Page 3.)

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-
WAR PERIL. (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 3. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 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).

How Post-War Problems Are Misrepresented

Dr. Bean on Post-War Planning

By ERIC D. BUTLER

Books and pamphlets advocating socialistic planning "to avoid post-war chaos" continue to pour from the presses. It is quite impossible to read all this material; but I recently purchased and read Dr. Bean's book, "War Aims of a Plain Australian." I felt mentally sick after reading so many distortions, contradictions and untruths from an allegedly well-informed "historian."

I don't question Dr. Bean's sincerity; but I regard it as pathetic that he should write such nonsense as the following:

"Although at that time (of the depression) our Australian Governments and people were probably living above their means, and undoubtedly contributed their full share towards precipitating the world crisis, nevertheless, nothing that we in Australia could have done would have averted it."

Just how Australians who were producing more butter, eggs, wheat, fruit, etc., than they had ever produced before, could have been "living above their means," is not explained. We were not, for example,

eating more butter than we were producing—which is what Dr. Bean's words mean. We were actually exporting great quantities overseas, and restricting production, while Australians who desired it were going short. They were going short because they had insufficient purchasing power. And not once in the whole of his book does Dr. Bean explain why purchasing power has been short.

Time and time again he berates private enterprise, and openly implies that the great "co-operation" we have in a nation at war is the result of "planning," which we must continue after the war.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that

our war-effort has been greater than our peace-efforts, because more money has been made available by the banks. I am not aware of one instance where, in peace time, any man with an economic vote (i.e., sufficient money) couldn't get quicker and better results from private enterprise than he could from a Government department. Men weren't prevented from living in decent houses before the war because there was a lack of "planning." These people suffered from a lack of MONEY.

If people had had sufficient money, they could have lived in the types of houses they desired—not houses built for them by Government departments. Private enterprise could have built those houses. Surely Dr. Bean and his fellow-planners don't really think that builders sacked their workmen and, in many cases, went bankrupt themselves, because they were "irresponsible"? People who are dependent on a Government for the houses they live in are serfs.

Dr. Bean makes a major point about "unrestricted private enterprise." There has never been a period of unrestricted private enterprise—not even in periods of economic expansion. All such expansion has been controlled by a financial system, which has never allowed any community—except in wartime—to produce at anywhere near the maximum of its ability. Strange though it may seem to theorists like Dr. Bean, most "capitalists" fear their bankers more than anything else. The ugly features of our industrial system have been the results of the crazy fight to sell goods to people while distributing less and less purchasing power to buy them. Greater and greater monopoly is the inevitable result of this policy.

If six men in a boat on Lake Superior (the greatest fresh-water lake in the world) allow themselves to be mesmerised by a seventh man who persuades them that he alone should dispense water, and he deliberately keeps them on short rations of water, thirst will drive the stronger ones among the six to combine and take all such rations. Here we would have a simple example of monopoly.

But what is the solution? The idea of the socialists and other theorists—including some who call themselves "Christians"

—is that human nature is "bad" and that everyone should share the shortage. In the analogy above, this would suit the man issuing the water. And that explains why the men who, by means of the money system, control the trickle of goods to the people while holding back the great reservoir of wealth which could make every man really independent, simply love the socialist planners. The bankers couldn't have bettered Dr. Bean's book.

The chapter on "education" is really frightening. Dr. Bean thinks that we want, labour camps! "The false values of snobbery are broken down." Ye Gods! The Vice-Chancellor of the Melbourne University, Dr. Medley, is quoted with approval as saying that "we should take a leaf out of the Nazi educational system by adopting the admirable plan of labour camps." I wonder what happens to parents who have no desire for their children to attend labour camps?

Dr. Medley's fellow-"educationalist" in Sydney, Sir Charles Blackburn, Chancellor of Sydney University, is also quoted with warm approval:

"Other important items were baby clinics, crèches and the extension of kindergartens . . . attention to physical fitness of children by concentration on nutrition and suitable physical exercises, and then the encouragement of the community spirit through Boy Scout and Girl Guide movements or similar organisations. Sir Charles felt the State should frankly accept the guardianship of every child in an unsuitable home. It was not only a question of food but of the foolish way many people brought up their children."

Here I believe we have an open expression of the fundamental philosophy of these planners: The "State"—a bunch of bureaucrats—should decide which of your homes are "unsuitable" for your own children! I hope parents like the insults offered to them. The "big idea" is to get control of the child early, put him in a collectivised crèche, then a kindergarten, all the while planning his mind for him, send him to a State-controlled school until he is sixteen (keep him there longer if you can) and ruin his thinking faculties by teaching him pernicious nonsense—and (Continued on page 4.)

BIG MOVE TO OUST ALBERTA'S S.C. GOVT. AT NEXT ELECTION

Mr. J. Brownlee, K.C., ex-Premier of Alberta, has been appointed Leader of the "Independent" party in Alberta—the coalition of all Parties against Social Credit. It is scarcely denied that unlimited funds have been placed at the disposal of this coalition by the financial interests. Mr. Brownlee, who is probably the ablest lawyer-politician in the West of Canada, is being paid a salary and allowance greater than the salary of the Premier.

The "Edmonton Bulletin" (Liberal paper) of August 21 last gave publicity to the steps, which have been taken, with the backing of financial institutions, to supersede all existing parties by an "Independent" Party opposed to Social Credit. The article says:—

A vigorous programme of reorganising the Independent party is now in full swing. Plans for the province-wide convention, to elect a party leader, have been completed according to information from reliable sources.

Ample funds are in hand and will be released on a basis of \$3008 a month to provide a new leader with a yearly salary of \$8000 and \$4000 travelling expenses. The head office will be maintained in Calgary, with a branch office in Edmonton. Four organisers will be placed in the field at an early date, to organise the rural ridings. Two organisers will work out of Calgary, covering Red Deer and south, while two organisers will operate out of the Edmonton branch office covering all the territory north of Red Deer.

It was pointed out that the wasteful hit-and-miss method used by the Canadian Bankers' Association and the mortgage companies, in the 1940 general elections on behalf of the Independents, will not be repeated. More than \$250,000 is alleged to have been spent in the "Throw Aberhart Out" campaign, which backfired in the rural constituencies.

Little money will be spent in Calgary and Edmonton. Proportional voting in these five-member ridings makes it impossible for the Independents to gain more than two seats each. Social Credit also cannot gain more than two seats each and it is conceded the C.C.F. will win one in each city and a bare possibility of two in Calgary.

The work and money will be spent in the 44 ridings, which make and change Alberta Governments.

New Secret Alloy

According to advices from Denver, remarkable claims are made for a new metal alloy. This alloy, which has been named Nu-Lite, is said to be 40 per cent, lighter than aluminium, and not liable to rust or corrode, of great tensile strength (up to 185,000 lb. to the square inch), and can be produced either in a malleable form or hard enough to cut glass, and not subject to embrittlement or crystallisation. A sheet one-eighth-inch thick proved to be bulletproof. The cost of manufacture is claimed to be 5 cents to 30 cents per lb. Patents on the process are pending, but the metallurgical formula is known only to the inventor.

"TheTimes" London August 27 1943

It is considered that former Premier J. E. Brownlee, K.C., will be the choice of the Independent Party convention. His old riding of Ponoka is considered certain for the Independents, which would leave Mr. Brownlee free to devote all his speaking time in the other rural ridings, where he still has great personal strength with the old U.F.A. locals.

The men behind the scenes admit the growing strength of the C.C.F. will make it impossible for either the present Social Credit Government to win an over-all majority or the Independents, with the C.C.F. certain to win eight to ten seats.

The most the Independents can hope to win is 23 seats, giving them the largest group. According to some political experts, the Manning Government cannot win more than 21 seats.

The Independents can then, with the largest group, put through the Bond Dealers' Association programme of refunding the £140,000,000 Albert debt on their own terms, similar to the Fortin Plan of debt extension, but restoring the back unpaid interest on a basis of 3½ per cent, to date from 1935, when the cut was made. New bonds, amounting to about \$30,000,000 will be necessary by 1945 to cover the interest cut. This will mean a total debt of \$170,000,000 at 3½ per cent.

The mortgage companies are vitally interested in no interference with their contract rights of foreclosure and are said to be prepared to go the limit in support of the reorganised Independents.

Some bitter comment has been made on the statement made by Gerald O'Connor, K.C., at a recent meeting of the Edmonton Liberal Association, that for the joining of the Edmonton Liberal Association with the Independents, members of the Liberal executive would be given a 75 per cent, membership on the executive of the Independent party. They say the deal was for a fifty-fifty basis with the Progressive Conservatives and point to the fact that on the inner governing executive announced by Chairman J. Percy Page, M.L.A., of 14 members, it is divided fifty-fifty, and will be maintained on that basis by the convention, when the general executive is formed, plus former U.F.A. and defeated Social Credit* members are included.

* * * * *

One thing that is said to be certain (the newspaper concludes) is that Independents will not lack campaign funds for their drive to defeat the present Alberta Social Credit Government.

*The "handful" ("To-day and To-morrow") of former Social Credit men who changed sides.

The Melbourne "Sun" of January 13 reported an impertinent outburst by Senator Keane against democratic citizens (his employers), merely because they are selling their paid political servants (Members of Parliament) that they don't want meat rationing, and are encouraging and assisting fellow-citizens to democratically express their will on the same issue. In a typical fascist manner this arrogant Senator described such democratic action as "a conspiracy against Commonwealth law," and said that he might "recommend certain action to the Attorney-General." Here is a case of a Minister of the Crown abusing his trust and exceeding his functions. It is a situation in which electors would be justified in seeking his removal, NOW. Mr. Lang was dismissed from the N.S.W. Premiership for far less than this.

CAPITALIST COMMUNISTS: The secretary of the U.S. Communist Party (Mr. E. Browder) was given prominence in the daily press the other day, when he announced, "the Communist Party had abandoned its traditional objective of establishing socialism, and will support the capitalistic system now and after the war." Well, well! That candid admission of the close affinity of the "isms" may stagger the local followers of Communism for a while, but they will doubtless recover and develop a suitable alibi to meet the situation. The next step probably will be to effect a merger of all the "isms" under the banner of "planned economy," which has already been ushered in by the bankers. It might be more correct to describe this system of rigid controls as "Talmudism."

BETTING BAN: An indication of vested betting interests attempting to maintain the monopoly granted to them by Governments, and maintained by the publicly-paid police force, was contained in the Melbourne "Herald" of November 25, wherein the South Australian Premier (Mr. Playford) was reported to have said that he "would not take action to prohibit betting beyond the course." This drew a sharp comment from Mr. Curtin, because it appears that in September 1942, "a deputation of race clubs agreed that betting at one course on races held on another course be prohibited." Governments receive huge taxation rake-offs from privileged race clubs, which explains their interest in maintaining the vested interest. Of course, they tell the world that they are merely protecting the public against the gambling evil.

SCHOOL SLACKS: A New York report states "Minnesota High School Board has started a minor war controversy by banning slacks for girl students." Mothers have taken up the challenge, and "are going to employ an attorney" to challenge the board's ruling. They say "We

are going to fight to the last ditch for liberty," and declare "that's what this war is about." These are rousing words for 1944, but "employing an attorney" indicates that they have yet to learn how to use their political servants—by direct contact to compel such servants to obtain the results the people require.

BUTTER BEANO: The U.S. wartime food administration announces a treat for the Red Army in the form of 90,000,000 lbs. of butter sent to Russia last month. A further 90,000,000 lbs. is awaiting shipment. It is gratifying to learn that the gallant Russian soldiers will receive such a beano in the present circumstances—it will do more to maintain their morale than all Stalin's "orders of the day." Moreover, if they once get a taste of butter as an everyday item of diet, they will remember it after the war. As a consequence, a tre-

(Continued on page 2.)

Planned Agriculture

The insanity of the Comprehensive Planning idea, as apart from its singularly vicious politics, is well illustrated by the researches of Edward Faulkner, the American agricultural expert, whose report, entitled "Ploughman's Folly," may well prove to be one of the epoch-making books of the century. Faulkner appears to have demonstrated that the plough is the enemy both of agriculture and the soil, and that chemical fertilisers are wasteful and harmful. If his contentions are correct, all the premises of the agricultural Planners are worthless, and a Planned Agriculture would be as useless, if based upon them, as a certain expensive bridge over an Indian river, which was barely completed before the river, by an alteration of course, left it two miles from the bank.

—"The Social Creditor," November 6, 1943.

(A Broadcast Talk by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, December 5, 1943.)

EVER SINCE THE END OF THE WAR appeared to be in sight—that was when Germany definitely lost supremacy in the air—the international propaganda machine has been going full blast supplying us with slogans for the post-war world. The international propaganda machine supplied us with a slogan for the war: "Sacrifice, plenty of it; the more the better, one could not have too much. The slogan for the post-war world is: "Work for All."

The latest to join in the international chorus is Mr. Chifley, the Federal Treasurer. Mr. Chifley, along with the other boys of the male choir, has made up his mind what kind of world you are going to have after this war. Perhaps you might have had some idea that you were going to decide for yourself what kind of world you would like to live in after the war, but you are too late; Mr. Chifley has decided for you, and he knows and he feels quite sure that what you want is work, and more of it, and plenty of it.

Now, behind these vast publicity campaigns that spread right across the world there is a definite idea and purpose, and it is very important that that purpose should be understood.

The first step in our analysis of this new campaign, which is being thrust upon us, is to have a look at this thing they call "work."

One of the most important things to remember among some facts about work is that it is a form of laziness. The engineer has a name for this; he calls it "Inertia," and an inert mass is very hard to move—one has to exert a great deal of force to get it moving.

But it is also important to remember that a large inert mass, once it starts moving tends to continue moving; it is very difficult to stop.

Some of our men sitting in offices have been taught to write in school, and they have been writing ever since. A great deal of the stuff is not worth writing, but each day they write from 9 o'clock to 6 o'clock. A great deal of the stuff does not mean anything, but there they have been writing for thirty or forty years, and on they go. You can't stop them; they are like machines. They are machines.

Throughout the town you will find large numbers of people working hard all day; their work is not only useless, but it is holding up the progress of the community. You will find a lot of these people in the Taxation Department, working for Mr. Chifley. No doubt Mr. Chifley will find room for a great many more if he gets his way.

Men will work all day and every day, but ask them to stop and think for five minutes and watch the pained expression on their faces. Thinking is hard work—that is why people prefer employment.

Remember the reproach of the Unknown Soldier: "Because you would not think we had to die." Yes, millions of them died.

And, yes, our employment, our daily work, can become a dope, an anesthetic, to prevent us from thinking. That is one of the Big Ideas behind this slogan, "Full Employment." Full employment is not necessary in this world of "over-production"; it is not only unnecessary—it is dangerous. But it is good dope for ignorant people.

I have never met so many people who were so ridiculously busy as some of the people in Hobart. They are so busy that they have no time to think, no time to look to see where they are going. They are so busy they have no time to do any work.

The amount of really constructive thinking that is going on is very small. When men with good brains, men capable of useful, constructive thought, are cluttered up with so much routine work—work that could be done by boys—our administrative machinery is colossally inefficient, and the most ridiculous things happen.

But Mr. Chifley says that we must make work for people—more work.

If Mr. Chifley had seen, as I have seen, some of the places of this world where

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Dean Case: We have published full details of this amazing case in a small twelve-page booklet, entitled "THE NEW DESPOTISM." As many people as possible should know how the courts have been used to defeat the course of justice. High Court judges, to protect themselves, have ruled that actions by taxpayers are "vexatious and frivolous," and High Court Rules have been amended so that all such actions would be dealt with by a lower court. Read all about it! 6d per copy, plus postage. Id. Special prices for quantities. Give copies to your friends.

Subscriptions: Our treasurer reports that many past members have not renewed their subscriptions for the current year. How about it, you laggards! Don't procrastinate any longer; we can assure you the money will be put to good use. If you cannot spare the full amount (£1/1/-) we would be pleased to receive a half-year's subscription.

Quarterly Rally: Members are reminded that the next Rally will be held on Saturday, February 5, at 8 p.m. Come along and help make this night, when business and pleasure are combined, a big success.

"Freedom From Want" Campaign: This democratic action to get pensioners a better deal is gaining strength. We thank enquirers for their letters, and hope they have now received the request forms, which have gone to all States. Further supplies are available at 1/3 per hundred from J. T. Fitzgerald, president, Prospect Pensioners' Association—or from this office. Send for some and do your bit.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

people work day and night all the year round, where the women go out to work too, he would not speak as he does. And a great deal of the work performed today is monotonous, ungenial, unproductive and destructive of character and intelligence, and the sooner we face up to these facts the better.

England paid a colossal price in the destruction of her people and of her beautiful countryside when the factory system of enforced labour was thrust upon her.

Mass-production as we know it today is merely production with the soul taken out of it. Machines attended by human machines. A lot of the human machines are quite unnecessary, but "jobs" have to be found for them—according to Mr. Chifley. And so they are pushed into factories to stand by a machine pushing a lever for eight hours a day for fifty years.

The result of this, of course, can be seen all around you.

Mr. Chifley says (I quote the "Mercury," December 1, 1943): "Before the war too many lives were dominated by fear of unemployment. During the war that fear has been absent. In winning the war we are learning ways of controlling our affairs by which we can put an end to enforced idleness."

Now, this statement requires some examination because it is not a direct statement. It is not one of those statements that help us in our thinking. As a matter of fact, it is a confusing statement; it is so confusing that it will lead to endless trouble if many people fall into the mistake made by Mr. Chifley.

When Mr. Chifley says, "Before the war too many lives were dominated by fear of unemployment," I disagree with him. Actually, very few people were afraid of unemployment; in fact, they were not even afraid of starvation. What they were afraid of was that, having been robbed of all access to the land, and having been prevented from owning any property and of building up any reserves, at any time their families could be reduced to penury and degradation by men who had captured control of the finances of the country.

And this penury and degradation could be enforced in spite of the fact that apples were rotting in the Huon; oranges were being buried in Queensland; and milkmen could not sell their milk. That is not fear of unemployment; it is fear of a shocking and dastardly crime against civilisation by a crowd of gangsters. I refuse to accept Mr. Chifley's statement as adequate or

BISMARCK AND THE BEVERIDGE PLOT

December, 1942: I sat in a train, bound for Reading and opposite sat a newspaper with two legs; the upper half of the forked radish was hidden behind those outspread pages. My eyes were unseeing fixed on the football results thus displayed before me, and I came out of my reverie with a start when these columns suddenly collapsed, as if Samson pulled them down, and revealed a red face that wore a smile of foolish bliss.

"Social Security," it said, "that's what we want and we'll get it. They won't be able to play about with us after this war. The people will see to that. Social Security!"

"Social Security," I said, absent-mindedly. "Ah, you speak of Bismarck's invention."

"Bismarck!" he said, staring. "What's Bismarck got to do with it?"

"Don't you remember," I said, "after the 1870 war against the French, when Bismarck was getting Germany ready for the first World War, the German people grew restless, from an intuition of what was coming, and the German Socialist Party increased rapidly? Bismarck saw that they would have to be kept quiet, if the preparations for the next war were not to be disturbed, so he threw them a ball to play with. He called it 'Social Security.' Or, rather, he called it 'The Social Service State.' But it was the same thing; you know—health and unemployment insurance, pensions, 'freedom from want'—the whole bag of tricks. After Bismarck was sacked, the Kaiser took up the game, and the Socialists greatly enjoyed themselves, throwing the ball to him and having it thrown back to them. Meanwhile, the war simmered nicely on the hob, and was served up, piping hot, in 1914. The German Socialists voted for it. They stood up with all the others, when three cheers were called for the Kaiser, though they didn't actually cheer. The distinction was most important! Our own Socialists are good at the same kind of thing. Ah, dearie, dearie, me," I said, wagging my head sagely, "that was a famous victory."

"What are you talking about?" said red-face.

"Bismarck," I said.

"But I'm talking about the Beveridge Report," he said.

"I thought it was the same thing," said I. He glanced at the communication cord.

"I get out here," he said, hurriedly. "That's what they always say," said I.

His head appeared again, through the window.

reasonable. He is only misleading the people.

Even today, with the threat of meat rationing, everything possible that could be done to drive the farmer off the land has been done. Some of the best milk herds and prize egg-laying fowls have been slaughtered from one end of Australia to the other because of the regulations of Mr. Chifley's Government.

Butter production in Tasmania has dropped enormously, and all over Australia butter production has dropped 30 per cent, since butter rationing was introduced.

This is what is called by the Socialists "scientific organisation of food production," and what I call the scientific production of scarcity.

Mr. Chifley says "we are learning ways of controlling our affairs by which we can put an end to fear of enforced idleness." Mr. Chifley did not say that Adolf Hitler had done more than any other man to do away with unemployment.

Hitler's policy has brought work to millions, and, what is more important; it has brought a regular income to millions of people.

These millions are producing bombs and shells and guns and countless other munitions of war. We can't eat those things; we can't wear them. They are of no personal value to us, but people are being paid, and well paid, to make them.

Why should the incomes of these people cease as soon as they stop producing weapons of destruction? I challenge Mr. Chifley to answer that question—if he can. If we can feed and clothe a million-and-a-half people doing nothing but destructive work, how cannot we give these people the same standard of living when they return and help us in our work?

And what about me, Mr. Chifley? Can't I have a rest for a bit? I have been working a long time. I am an engineer, Mr. Chifley; I have been training engineers how to do away with useless labour for a long time. I would like a rest for a little while, while I still have strength to enjoy life. I would like to have a look round and visit the Old Country for a while.

No, Mr. Guthrie, you must work; you must work until your hair grows grey and your teeth drop out. You must work, Mr. Chifley says so, and he knows what is good for you. You must work and when you die Mr. Chifley will give you a nice polished coffin—with knobs on—free of taxation.

Whether you like it or not, the fact remains that there is no possibility of building up a Christian civilisation on the old system of wage-slavery. We must either build up a system of voluntary co-operation of free men, or a system of national conscription with forced labour—and most of it useless labour.

Voluntary co-operation has "failed" because it has been white-anted and sabotaged from the top. In other words, there is plenty of money available for some ideas, but not for others. Some of the very greatest brains in the British Empire have no financial backing at all except in wartime. Think it over, and I shall prove this to you next Sunday.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

menous market may be created for Western butter in Russia. As time goes on, and Russian industries are developed, it is possible that they may have some surplus production to exchange for butter.

COLD CURES: Every now and then reports come to hand, which provide an opportunity for research workers to comment, thus letting the public know that they exist. The latest claim is from Professor Gye, of London, who claims to cure colds with "Petulin," a new drug similar to the allegedly miraculous "Pencilin." Dr. Beveridge, of Melbourne, then comes on the scene and disclaims knowledge of this development or its application to colds—and, of course, doubts its efficacy. It is curious how these half-baked theories obtain such publicity; if one-tenth of these reports had any truth, all disease—even the virus of press-dope—would be conquered.

MASS MIGRATION: The question of the White Australia policy and our population problem is expected to loom largely in pending international discussions. Some unspecified persons are reported to have set a population goal of 20 millions, and, of course, the idea of mass migration is being discussed—without reference to the victims to be transported. Press reports say that the unnamed planners behind this scheme claim that "special inducements to migrants will not be necessary, and that adequate numbers will be ready and anxious to come." It is thought that such people will be glad to escape from regimented, totalitarian countries. Having regard to the rapid development of totalitarianism here, it is more likely that many potential settlers will prefer the devil they know. It would be a good thing if our local planners were transported to the older totalitarian countries, where they would be perfectly at home.

PRICE PROBLEMS: Economist Copland is experiencing some real problems associated with "planned economy" (socialism), and finds that the present formulas cannot work equitably. The Melbourne "Herald" of November 11 says: "Professor Copland pointed out that small individual traders could not operate successfully if present margins were severely cut." This is supposed to be argument for big corporations; but the real point is that small shops supplying goods—plus a substantial amount of convenient service—say with a turnover £50 per week, could not operate on a 10% basis, whereas the larger store, with a turnover of, say, £1000, could do quite well. So, by fixing the margin, the small trader could be compelled to shut-up shop and join the ranks of employees at the big stores. By lowering the margins sufficiently, only the big monopolies would remain—just one step from the Socialists' goal of one all-embracing monopoly.

PERSONAL PARS: The Melbourne "Herald" of January 8 (personal column) stated that Mr. Justice Reed arrived from Sydney on Friday, January 7, and would leave for Adelaide on Saturday night, January 8. No mention was made of the fact that Mr. Justice Reed had been appointed to preside at the investigation into matters arising from the Dean versus Latham anti-taxation case. Perhaps the social notes writer was unaware of this fact, or perhaps he did not regard it as news. These scribes often quite unknowingly handle delicate situations. For example, had Justice Reed's visit been connected in any way with Sir John Latham it might have led to curious speculation and rumour. So we see that even writing social notes has its problems.

INDIAN INFLATION: The bankers' inflation bogey is being presented in India in the following curious manner: "In general to curb inflation, and in particular to tempt peasants to sell their grain, thereby inducing farmers to hoard gold, which is harmless, instead of hoarding food, which causes famine, gold is being sold on the Bombay market." Please note the encouragement to hoard money—whilst in Australia dire threats are being handed out against doing so, and bureaucratic bungling discourages production so that there's no food to hoard.

—O.B.H.

"POWER POLITICS AND PEOPLE'S PRESSURE"

By L S BULL

THIS NEW BOOKLET TELLS. . .

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

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW.

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

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

SOIL, AGRICULTURE & FOOD VALUES

In this issue we commence the publication, under the above heading, of a series of extracts from four extremely important and interesting speeches made in the House of Lords during the debate on October 26, 1943, as reported in the British "Hansard." This week we quote Lord Teviot:—

Lord Teviot rose to call attention to food values in relation to agricultural methods in view of their importance to the health of man, animal and plant; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, before I begin to deal with the Motion, which stands on the Paper in my name, I wish to make a few general remarks. Your Lordships are well aware that the hospitals and similar institutions are full to overflowing, and this has been the case for many years; in fact, I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that all such organisations have a waiting list . . . Then take the animals of our country, I do not think any of us who are connected in any way with agriculture can be other than perturbed at the number of diseases there are among farm stocks. Take foot-and-mouth disease, John's disease, mastitis, abortion, swine fever and many others that one could mention. Lastly, I come to the crops. We are well aware that the diseases among our crops are legion. Yet it seems to me that we accept all these afflictions as part of our existence; and while immense sums are expended in trying to cure them, I am afraid there is no doubt whatever that disease is increasing.

Every day we hear a great deal about planning. The real object behind this Motion is to see that we put planning for the health of our people, the animals, the plants and the crops of our country, first . . . [An American authority says] that every year among the population of the United States there are about 100,000,000 illnesses, serious or slight, and in the hospitals 700,000 beds are occupied every day in the year. The care of these patients requires the efforts of 145,000 doctors, 280,000 nurses or student-nurses, 60,000 dentists, and 150,000 pharmacists. It also necessitates 700 hospitals, 8000 clinics, and 60,000 pharmacies. The public spends annually £143,000,000 on medicines, and medical care in all its forms costs about £700,000,000 per annum. Obviously, disease is a very heavy burden, not only here but in the rest of the civilised world.

Now I come to my Motion. What is the cause of this terrible tragedy? From the

Perhaps novelists are so concerned with

evidence of very well-known authorities who have for years carried out extensive tests and experiments, the conclusion is that food is largely responsible. We hear a great deal about a balanced diet, with this naturally I am in entire agreement, but unless the components come from a healthy soil rich in humus, life-giving and disease-resisting properties must be deficient. This reminds me of a friend of mine who is a pharmacist, a man with whom I often talk on this subject. I asked him the other day, when I went into his shop, "Do you think that all of these tabloids that I see with their Vitamin A, Vitamin B, and so on, do any good?" He replied, "I suppose they may, but I like to take my vitamins and my proteins with my knife, spoon, and fork." I thought that was a very good way of putting it. But he is not done with the question then if the food which he is going to eat with his knife, spoon and fork is not grown from healthy soil . . . the soil is our most precious asset and it has far too long been exploited for gain.

Throughout the world food has been sold a great deal too cheaply, and the soil, suffering from the strain upon it, has had to be boosted up with stimulants. We all know how long we should last if we boosted up ourselves with stimulants. Thereby the soil has been robbed of its fertility without anything being put back. Over vast areas in the United States and in Canada there has been erosion. We all know about that. Where there has been an attempt by artificial means to combat this, the result has been worse still. . . . It is obvious in this, as in everything else, that quality means a great deal, and if we can eat food that is of good quality, and if the protein of that food is of good quality, then we are healthy . . .

We all suffer from wrong nutrition on occasions, but even right nutrition and the proper diet must depend upon the component parts being grown in a healthy soil which will impart to the crops health and power to resist the disease that I have already shown your Lordships is prevalent

all over the country. Surely crops doped with stimulants, dressings or sprays cannot impart to those who partake of them resistance to disease if they have to be, if I may use the term, so much gingered up in order to exist. We know quite well that the soil which is impregnated in many cases with artificial means of keeping it going destroys the greatest friend of man in agriculture, and the greatest friend of mankind generally, and that is the earth-worm. You put on some of these strong artificial manures and it means death to that worm straight away. So we have a sort of cycle—a healthy soil, a healthy plant, a healthy animal and then a healthy man, and it is the integrity of that life cycle which is so important. In fact, so far as I can see, it is the only hope, not only of this country, but of all the world in the future . . .

I have just had sent to me this morning a short passage from a very distinguished man. If your Lordships will permit me to read it, he says this:

"While recognising the value of 'artificial' in crop production, the great reliance on artificial manures in common use insidiously impairs the health of the soil, pre-disposes to disease in the plants, with the resulting unfavourable influence on animal nutrition and the resistance of animals to disease, with in sequence a similar impairment in human nutrition and resistance."

What does medicine do about this? Medicine seems to me to be just a pallia-

tive. So far as I know, research is greatly concentrated on how to cure and not on how to prevent all this happening. There was suggested some time ago a Council of Nutrition. I hope it will be set up, and I am sincerely hoping, too, that such a Nutrition Council will take into very serious consideration, not what we shall all eat, but from whence it comes and how it is cultivated. If it does not, then, in my view, and in the view of a great many others, it is just a waste of time.

I beg the Minister who is to reply to put forward to the Government a request that a Royal Commission or a Committee of Inquiry shall be set up to deal with these matters in order that we may somehow or other combat this really tragic state of affairs. I would respectfully suggest that the Ministry of Agriculture, and, of course, the Ministries of Health and Food, must be represented, and I would also very earnestly plead for the representation of many men who have been studying this subject for a good many years. I give as an instance Sir Robert McCarrison, Dr. Lionel Picton (of the County of Chester Local Medical and Panel Committee), Sir Albert Howard, and also a Lady, Lady Eve Balfour, who has just written a most admirable book called "The Living Soil." What I have been talking about is not happening here only; it is happening also in all parts of the world such as New Zealand, South Africa, the United States, India and Assam . . .

OPEN LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP BOOTH

To The Most Reverend J. J. Booth, D.D.: Your Grace, —In my second letter to you (published last week) I dealt with one aspect of your recent declaration that "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 less fortunate than we." I showed as fully as the space available permitted, that nothing other than the present absurd and antiquated financial system has prevented the application of that very excellent principle in the past. I also stressed the futility of giving utterance to noble and brotherly sentiments whilst at the same time acquiescing in, if not actually defending, the continuance of the policy which must, in the future, just as it has done in the past, impose unwarranted restrictions on the fuller development of our resources.

It is now my purpose to indicate to you that even were our resources developed to the limits of physical possibility, were "we" ever so willing "to give and not sell to those less fortunate than we," because the prevailing financial system contradicts physical facts, our gifts would not be acceptable to them, except as a temporary measure to relieve dire necessity resulting from the devastation of war. Have you not overlooked the fact that by GIVING to other communities we would be "creating unemployment" in such communities? That, of course, would never do! "Work is a primary obligation of man"—did you not say that on March 8 1942?

Because of the criminal stupidity of the policy and philosophy underlying the financial system, the Allied Nations, after the 1914-18 war, found that they could not continue to accept reparations from Germany without "ruining" themselves! Coal, for instance, was dear in England; so dear, that many people, BECAUSE OF INSUFFICIENT PURCHASING POWER, had to do without it. Yet the reception of German coal FOR NOTHING was regarded as a calamity! To the recipient, the economic effect of a gift freely given, as advocated by you, is exactly the same as that resulting from the receipt of reparations. In referring to the question of reparations, an English newspaper said, "the problem before us is, how are we to secure payment of what is lawfully due to us without throwing our own people out of employment." Similarly, during the depression years, the English newspapers raised an outcry against the swamping of the English market with cheap fruit from the Continent and cheap wheat from Russia. What a disaster it was to have a plentiful supply of fruit and wheat available to the people at low prices! And, seeing that the sale of those commodities at low prices evoked an outcry which could hardly have been more violent if the country had been swamped with poison gas, what kind of outburst can be expected if we actually "give and not sell"?

The following two quotations are also useful as showing the mental attitude of supposed financial and economic EXPERTS toward an abundant supply of wheat: "With two months of the wheat year past, the probabilities for the rest of the season can now be seen more clearly. They are distinctly encouraging. The weather over most of Northern Europe during August and September has been as BAD as it could be for the harvest . . . Reports have come in at one time or another since the beginning of August announcing LOSS and

situation looks like slavery, it really isn't! In Britain, men like Captain Ramsay who fought in the first round of the World War for "freedom," and have been thrown into prison without proper charges or trial, would surely appreciate Mr. Priestley's words on slavery! Members of the Australia First Movement might also appreciate them!

It seems to me that word-symbols can, in our "new order," be used to prove anything. Any person who believes that we are now living "in a far better society" than we did before the war started, has succumbed to the evil forces of mesmerism. Logical discussion with such a person is hopeless; he must first be de-hypnotised. This journal exists for that purpose. Are YOU using it?

DETERIORATION of crops" (—"Financial News," September 29, 1931.) "Only a serious FAILURE of the wheat harvest can save America from a great FINANCIAL disaster." (—"New York Herald Tribune.") It is highly improbable that the "experts" who were responsible for those incredibly ridiculous statements would view with favour your proposal to "give and not sell"—it would be more in keeping with the tenets of the "sound" financial system they serve to beg that you set apart a day of prayer for famine!

And, believe it or not, during that same period, when the lavish bounty of God was being deliberately destroyed on a prodigious scale while millions of those whom you describe as "children of God" were starving and destitute, the Anglican Archbishops and Bishops of England actually authorised, in December, 1932, a prayer for use in the churches which contained the following invocation: "by the restoration of commerce in the CONFIDENCE OF RESTORED CREDIT and mutual goodwill: GIVE US OUR DAILY BREAD." After God HAD given richly bountiful harvests, which had been criminally destroyed with the approval of "OUR LEADERS, POLITICIANS, AND ECONOMISTS" (again using the description given them in "the Vision and the Task") those who represent themselves as His Ministers, coolly directed Him to accommodate His gifts to the requirements of a ridiculous, antiquated financial system! It was not sufficient for God to "give us our daily bread." He had to be told HOW to do it. Just giving it freely and UNCONDITIONALLY was too simple and sensible. So, His "unworthy servants" had to direct Him to do it by restoring "CONFIDENCE." Apparently, if God had ever heard of "sound" finance. He did not realise how sacred it is! Therefore, these "godly and well-learned" men felt obliged to inform Him that they really knew better than He, that "confidence" and not His bounty is the thing by which men live, that the idiotic principles of "sound" finance must be adhered to at all costs, even at the cost of utter destitution and degradation for millions, and death for thousands, of those to whom you referred on December 12 as "children of God." And, Sir, as recently as November, 1942, in a broadcast address, YOU had the temerity to belittle as "theorists," men who have publicly denounced this monstrous, iniquitous system! Other "Christian leaders" in Melbourne and elsewhere have, unfortunately, been guilty of similar errors and derelictions of duty.

There is one other point. It is all very well to urge that "WE give and not sell to those less fortunate than we," and I am in agreement with the idea, though I have

(Continued on page 4.)

"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.

"New Times," January 21, 1944—Page 3.

J. B. PRIESTLEY AND THE PLANNERS

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

For many years I have read and enjoyed the novels of Mr. J. B. Priestley, the English novelist; but, upon reading a recent article of his, "Britain Now More Democratic," in the "Pocket Book Weekly" of November 13, I realise more than ever how men who have shown some faint conception of reality can be mesmerised by the tremendous barrage of propaganda in favour of centralised planning.

word-symbols that they sometimes lose sight of the fact that their symbols are obscuring reality. Mr. Priestley writes about our "old laissez-faire Democracy" and "constructive democracy." What confusion! Democracy has to do with control of policy BY THE INDIVIDUAL. If Mr. Priestley and other word-symbol manipulators believe that individuals have more control of policy at the present time than they had before this war started, then I can only say that such beliefs are opposed to all commonsense.

Once a nation goes to war it is practically finished with policy; the implementing of that policy of war then takes place. This is administration, and administration is essentially totalitarian. I know that there has been a lot of nonsense about "democratic" armies, but no one with any practical experience of military organisation believes that. Men relinquish their control of policies temporarily and do as told by superior officers. Ever since the Russians started to run their Army on this basis and sent the political commissars about their business, they have been beating the Germans. I have been in the Australian Army for nearly three years, and it will take more than Mr. Priestley to convince me that I have more control of policy than I had prior to the war. Most men in the Army don't mind this situation as long as they believe that they will regain and extend control of policy once the military war is won.

But this is just what the planners of all descriptions are opposing. In all British countries they have set themselves up into what is virtually a new ruling class. Their power is being used for activities, which have, in most cases, little or nothing to do with the successful prosecution of the war. They have tasted power for the first time in their lives; and they are determined that they are going to keep that power after the war. They have told us so.

Mr. Priestley treats us to a classic example of what can be done with words when, after writing that he and others believe that "we should go on breaking down the whole class system and aim at a classless society," he is forced to admit in the very next paragraph that a classless society may not be possible "because it may be necessary for the common good that new classes should emerge." Apparently this abstract, indefinable "common good" can produce some peculiar results!

According to Mr. Priestley there is more democracy in Britain now because "the rich are far worse off and the poor are far better off." Here he implies that typical

socialist falsehood that the poor can only become better off by the rich being worse off. Mr. Priestley knows enough about the banking system to know that the reason for the great majority of the British people (and Australian people, too), being better off now is that the controllers of the banking system have been forced by war demands to make money available on a scale never even dreamt about in pre-war years.

The attack on the rich is not only unnecessary; it is, I believe, a deliberate and vicious attack on that decreasing minority of the people who may still be economically independent. Admittedly these people may have done little to uplift the rest of the people; but that is a result of ignorance—the same ignorance that misleads the poorer sections into attacking those better off than themselves. The ultimate benefactors are the gangsters who desire to make everyone dependent on their wishes—the new ruling class—far more vindictive, less tolerant and less cultured than any previous "ruling class" ever seen in British countries.

The following is surely Mr. Priestley's greatest gem:

"Our sons and daughters are called up, our houses are requisitioned, we are so heavily taxed that often we have to live out of our savings—and we cannot buy what we like or eat what we like or go where we please. One must admit that the situation looks like slavery. It looks like slavery. But only in theory . . . We feel as if we were living in a far better society."

Perhaps Mr. Priestley is right and the British people only imagine that hordes of bureaucrats are seizing power and pushing citizens around as if they were slaves! Judging from the growing volume of protest against centralised bureaucracy everywhere throughout British countries, it would appear that an increasing number of people don't believe they are "living in a far better society." They are prepared to put up with the present state of affairs merely as a means to an end. As soon as the end is achieved—i.e., military victory—they desire to regain control over their own policies. But this is just what the "planners" are working to prevent. The issue is going to be the most important of the immediate post-war period, and Mr. Priestley does the people a grave disservice by twisting words and confusing the realities of the situation. He knows enough about history to realise that men who obtain powers in emergencies are loath to give them up. But perhaps he will console us by telling us that although the

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —We have seen that the "peace" after the last war was a failure because it was the product of the international bankers, and that the Jewish section of the American Money Trust was at that time supreme. Three of the most prominent of this section were Jacob Schiff, Paul Warburg and Bernard Baruch.

Jacob Schiff has since died, but continues to live financially in the person of his son Mortimer, who moves in similar circles and does similar things.

Paul Warburg has also died, but his system of central banks goes on with other Warburgs behind it. The acknowledged purpose of this system is to secure worldwide financial hegemony for the fellows whose headquarters are at Wall Street. From their point of view it has succeeded, and that is why we have had wars and depressions. Paul was a member of the Warburg banking family, which had a powerful voice not only in the financial affairs of Britain and America, but also of Germany and other countries. In view of this it was but appropriate that one of them (Paul) should have represented the victors and another of them (Max) the vanquished! That's how it was at the "Peace" Conference.

Bernard Baruch (more intimately known as "Barney") was the most powerful man in America during the last war, and it has been officially admitted that he was practically a dictator. Notwithstanding the dire sufferings of the American people as the result of the "policy" he imposed he is still the most powerful person in America,

and for reasons which I have not yet been able to obtain, he is accepted as such by "representatives" of Allied countries. He, too, took a hand in the infamous "Peace" Conference!

Debt and Taxation are the weapons of these financial oppressors, and "they" apparently have no difficulty in getting plenty of willing tools in every country to help in their subversive work.

Associated with Schiff, Warburg, and Baruch are, of course, Henry Morgenthau, Samuel Rosenman and Felix Frankfurter, of whom more will be said later.

Now for a further look at the period between the two wars Montagu Norman, as the new Governor of the Bank of England, quickly set to work in 1920 to force financial poverty upon the people of the British Empire. Fortunately for us, there was at that time a loyal Australian in charge of the Commonwealth Bank. It was the greatly lamented Sir Denison Miller. As to what happened then I could not do better than quote from "The Story of the Commonwealth Bank," by Mr. D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S., thus:—

"In the latter half of 1920, the banks in other parts of the world started their policy of deflation in order to raise the value of currency to such high levels that they who possessed the monopoly of it could secure the real wealth of the nation for themselves," and in the winter of 1920-21 the price levels were falling alarmingly. "The private banks in Australia commenced to follow the example set by the banks abroad, but Sir Denison Miller brought the Commonwealth Bank with a rush to the rescue of the threatened people. Partly by purchasing Commonwealth and other Government securities, and partly by increasing his advances, he released between June and December, 1920, £23 millions of additional currency as a slight hint as to what he would do if necessary, and deflation in Australia was deferred."

The word "deferred" is very significant in the light of subsequent developments. However, Sir Denison's action provided the clearest proof that Australia is NOT obliged to follow the banking policy of other countries, and shows why the international financiers "watched the progress of the Commonwealth Bank with ill-concealed rage and fear."

It is easy to understand now why it was that Sir Denison Miller earned the enmity of the private banking interests, and why it was that a campaign was immediately commenced suggesting to the general public that it was dangerous for so much power to rest in the control of one man, and demanding that such power should be taken from the Governor of the Bank and transferred to a Board of specially selected persons. While Sir Denison lived the results of the Bank's activities gave the lie to such propaganda, but unfortunately he died in June 1923, which meant that the private banks were thus freed of their most formidable adversary. This was their great chance, and through the agency of the Bruce-Page Government, ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PRIVATE BANKERS, the Commonwealth Bank was duly handed over, the very next year, to a "Board." Since that act of treachery, the Commonwealth Bank, although still "owned" by the PEOPLE, has been consistently used in the interests of the international financiers, even to the extent of imposing the depression upon us at a time when our productive resources were greater than ever. The late Sir Robert Gibson was one of the members of the original "Board," and it was he who appeared before the Senate in 1931 and dictated the financial conditions, which brought poverty, misery, degradation, and general chaos in this country. He did this on the "advice" of Montagu Norman, Sir Otto Niemeyer, and Professor Theodor Emanuel Guggenheim Gregory!

Although the people of Australia had thus been effectively protected and safeguarded by a loyal Australian in the person of Sir Denison Miller, the people of other parts of the Empire did not fare so well. In those countries the criminal policy of credit contraction was permitted to go on and bring about a great increase in unemployment, bankruptcies, and poverty.

Soon after the wicked policy of the international bankers got going, Britain was forced into the position of coming to an "arrangement" with American financiers; and, as had been customary, "suitable" men were chosen to "represent" Britain All I would say in this particular regard

OPEN LETTER: CORRECTION

In our last issue, one line of type was accidentally omitted from the last paragraph of Mr. J. Bradshaw's open letter to Archbishop Booth. The paragraph should have read as follows (omitted line indicated by black type):—

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 have evoked these letters; and, in so far as they are critical, the criticism is equally applicable to many other "Christian leaders."

is that careful note should be made of the names of the men concerned.

Reference has been made in an earlier letter to what Lord Reading had done in 1917 (Lord Reading, of course, was formerly Sir Rufus Isaacs), and in 1923 the man chosen to go to America was none other than Sir Otto Niemeyer, of the Bank of "England." His work was so successful from the point of view of the Wall Street financiers (nominally, of course, he was representing Britain!) that a responsible American body commented upon it as follows:—

"When, by a strange combination of eagerness and financial or political ineptitude, the American so-called debt was suddenly funded on terms which astounded the astute U.S. Treasury officials themselves, this extraordinary faux pas of the British Government, acting through its representatives, not only fastened a colossal burden upon the English taxpayer for this generation and two or three more to come, but also made the load of every allied nation much harder."

This "Englishman" arranged the funding of the debt to America so that Britain was to pay an annuity for 62 years, commencing at 33 millions and rising to a much higher figure. Evidently Sir Otto was a war-monger and a peace-maker at one and the same time, for as well as being a director of the armament firm of Vickers Armstrong, he was a member of the Finance Committee of the League of Nations, being succeeded as Chairman of that Committee by Dr. Melchior, partner in Warburg's Bank of Hamburg! In addition, he was a director of the National Bank of Egypt, of the Bank of Europe in Paris, and of the Bank for International Settlements. And yet some of us still profess surprise that the League of Nations was not more successful, and think that a similar world body controlled by the same people and applying the same "policy" will bring everything right after the war!

—Yours, etc., BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2, 16/1/44. (To be continued)

"MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD"

The following letter appeared in a recent issue of the London "Daily Telegraph":—

Sir, —The pen being mightier than the sword, I am congratulating myself that, even at 61, in the quiet backwater of a country practice, I have been enabled to make no paltry contribution towards the victories in Sicily, Russia and the other far-flung battlefields of the world. During the week I have signed these 64 certificates:

Panel notes, 30; "Off work" certificates, 14; Milk and egg forms, 5; Expectant mothers: (a) Rations, 2; (b) Clothing, 3; Surgical corsets, 2; Glucose, 2; Brandy, 2; Foot supports, 2; Truss, 1; Colotomy belt, 1.

I am, however, slightly uneasy in my mind lest the temporary hold-up at Catania be due to refusing a certificate for a hot-water bottle and two milk and egg forms. One feels that no effort must be spared, no inkbottle remain uncorked, no form be overlooked, if final victory is to be assured and the world made safe for bureaucracy.

The receipt from the Ministry of Labour and National Service of a book of forms, E.D.652—a new certificate—inspires me with the certainty of Italy's collapse at an early date. The war is being won by this strenuous paper chasing across the playing fields of Eton.

—Yours faithfully, M. Lethbridge Farmer, M.B., Ch.B., Arlesey, Beds.

GET THE FACTS!

What is Democracy? What is Totalitarianism? What is Communism? What is Socialism? What is National Socialism? What is Fascism? What is the choice before us?

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE 'ISMS,'" which is available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1d.).

BOOKS TO READ

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

"Federal Union Exposed." Exposes the international bankers' plot to dominate the world through World Government. A complete analysis—and a most important reference book. Price, 1/6d. posted.

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

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

LATEST BOOKLET BY DOUGLAS

"The 'Land For The (Chosen) People' Racket."

By C. H. Douglas.

Price: Two Shillings, Plus Postage. Intending purchasers are advised that this booklet is now available. Limited supplies only. Order from:

THE DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH (A/ASIA), 296A PITT STREET SYDNEY N.S.W.

OPEN LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP BOOTH

(Continued from page 3.)

indicated that it is futile to give utterance to such principles while avoiding any mention of the obstacle which prevents their application. The words I quoted last week from Carlyle's letter to Emerson give timely warning that it can — if we are not careful — become worse than futile. But, why do you not extend so excellent a proposal so that OUR OWN PEOPLE also may benefit by it? You probably would insist that "we" should only receive a share of "our resources" by the sale of our labour (vide your declaration that "work is a primary obligation of man.") Needless to say, neither you nor I can have any voice in determining the conditions under which INDIVIDUALS in other countries shall obtain a share either of their own resources or any of ours, which we might offer as a gift. It is only by individuals that resources can be consumed and used. Doubtless, "those less fortunate than we" will have local Fuehrers to ordain "full employment" as one of the conditions under which they may share in what "we" "give" them.

You could, if you would, put forward a tangible proposal instead of a nebulous abstraction, by urging that our own people, who most surely are entitled to it, be paid a regular income whether their labour is needed or not, and as a supplement to any ordinary earnings. Our productive capacity is more than adequate to make this possible; and practical men (not mere "theorists") have proved that it is practicable WITHOUT heavier debt and taxation. In fact, a practical banker, a member of an international banking family, has been quoted as saying "it is the ONLY proposal which would save civilisation, BUT CIVILISATION IS NOT WORTH SAVING."

Do YOU think civilisation is worth saving? There is not the slightest indication, either in your spoken or written words regarding the "great challenge" of the post-war world, of any realisation that a fundamental change in the economic and social order is the ONLY alternative to further decline, disintegration, and a third world war.

If the plots of "the big unseen forces" materialise (for full particulars thereof I have already referred you to "Australia's Great Post-War Peril" and "Programme For Third World War")—we shall be so heavily burdened with taxation that, even if you succeed in collecting 500,000 shillings or more for the provision of new churches, there will be an ever harder struggle to maintain them: our spirits will be so deadened with oppressive regulations and "obligations," that the sense of spiritual values will further decline. Thus, your churches, new and old, will be attended by even less people than at present. By exerting direct pressure on their Parliamentary representatives, individual citizens should let it be known that they will not tolerate further conspiracy of "our leaders, politicians, and economists," with "the big unseen forces."

Only in the philosophy of the more abundant life is there any hope for the future. It is the antithesis of the philosophy of punishments and rewards (the Work State) which appears to be implicit in your advocacy of "obligations." Unless you do incline to the former and eschew the latter, you will be building upon the sand instead of a rock and "the Vision" will, as I have said, prove to be no more than a mirage.

—I am, very truly yours, J. BRADSHAW.

Post-War Problems Are Misrepresented

(Continued from page 1.)

then proclaim how well he is educated. Just look at the products of this sort of thing — the University men who believed that we should starve rather than increase our money supply!

Limited space precludes me from dealing fully with Dr. Bean's book; but I might add that he favours large numbers of Jews in Australia (those like myself who doubt the wisdom of this are, of course, called "fascists"). He also favours an international government and an international police force.

In fairness to Dr. Bean, it should be mentioned that he thinks that there are good points in private enterprise and bad points in the proposals of orthodox socialists. Still, his book is the "thin edge of the wedge." It is being widely circulated among soldiers and has received favourable publicity in the Army magazine, "Salt."

This subtle campaign right throughout the community, to break down our conception of the real problem confronting us, is growing. It must be fought, and fought hard. Do all you can to ensure that the "New Times" reaches the greatest possible number of your fellow-citizens. Purchase as many as you can of the excellent booklets now available for exposing the forces behind the socialists and other planners, and pass them on to your friends and acquaintances. Personally, I would like to see tens of thousands of copies of James Guthrie's excellent booklet, "Why Big Finance Backs Socialism," sold and widely read.

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

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS