

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL (Page 2.)

ALBERTA GOVERNMENTS POLICY. (Page 3.)

WHY NOT VOLUNTARY CO-OPERATION? (Page 3.)

JEWISH AIMS & BRITISH INTERESTS. (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 4. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 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).

What is Behind this Rationing of Meat?

A Letter to the Prime Minister

What are well-informed democrats thinking, saying—and, above all, writing to Members of Federal Parliament—about Meat Rationing? As one notable example, we publish hereunder a letter, dated January 10, 1944, from Mr. L. S. Bull, of Lane Cove, N.S.W., to the Rt. Hon. John Curtin, M.H.R.:—

Dear Mr. Curtin,—It has been stated by innumerable authorities that the purpose of Government in a Democracy is to take such action, in relation to national issues, as shall give effect to the will of the people on such issues. Moreover, it is the uncompromising determination of all our democratic countrymen that the people shall obtain the results they want from the management of their national affairs (provided those results are physically possible).

Further, it is not only the privilege, but it is the duty of every enfranchised person to express to his Parliamentary Representatives the results he desires in respect of specific issues as they arise. This, Sir, is the purpose of this letter, and the specific issue is MEAT RATIONING.

IS THERE ACTUALLY A SHORTAGE OF MEAT?

Let the facts give the answer. Not only has our Pastoral Industry provided the meat requirements of all the Australian people and our armed forces, including the forces of our Allies in the South-west Pacific, but after four years of war, "has stocked the Commonwealth with no fewer than thirteen and a half million more sheep, one million more cattle and nearly half a million more

pigs than were grazed in January, 1939." (Quoted from figures supplied by the Commonwealth Statistician by Mr. Dunn, of the Condobolin branch of the Graziers' Association.)

The Hon. Alex. Mair, leader of the Opposition in the Parliament of the State of New South Wales, and a practical grazier, has warned that pastures are dangerously overstocked, and that meat rationing will cause over a million sheep to pass beyond age for human consumption.

The Federal Secretary of the Master Butchers' Federation, Mr. Kefford, reports, "thousands of sheep in Western Australia are being slaughtered and sold as pig feed as the only way of disposing of carcasses" (Sydney "Mirror," January 7, 1944).

Such is the parlous condition of our grazing industry that it would be a providential relief if you would provide the manpower for slaughtering and find enough shipping space to transport portion of our glut to some less fortunate people, who would be glad of it. Of course, I realise that apart from the shipping problem, the question of to whom we should send our surfeit of meat also presents some difficulties, as the grazing industries in America and the Argentine (Bri-

tain's chief source of supply) are also suffering from the same glutted conditions as Australia. In the United States it is reported that the cattle population has risen from sixty-six million to eighty-two million head, an all-time high record.

In the light of these facts it is understandable that our bureaucratically regimented and much-harassed people should regard Meat Rationing as wanton sabotage of their food supply, to which public reaction does not promise to be very pleasant.

Thus, from the point of view of supply, the answer to the question, "is meat rationing necessary?" is a categorical and emphatic No! Therefore it will be asked, "Then why is the Government so adamant on imposing meat rationing?" To take a charitable view it may be that you have embarked upon a mistaken policy through the people having failed to express their opposition to meat rationing. Well, let us see.

PUBLIC PROTESTS.

The Hon. W. J. McKell, the Labor Premier of a Labor Government, led a deputation to plead with you to abandon meat rationing. His effort was abortive.

Then the National Health and Nutrition Commission pointed out that unlike other countries meat is the main item of staple food in Australia. They have expressed grave fears that Meat Rationing will undermine the public health and seriously lower civilian morale.

Next comes the retail butchers, who, seeing their businesses in jeopardy, have made a vigorous protest against meat rationing. There have been the published statements of prominent and practical men such as the Hon. A. Mair and others, warning of chaos, confusion and loss that will result from meat rationing.

Then there is your own Minister for Commerce and Agriculture, Mr. Scully, also a practical farmer, who said in the House of Representatives on October 8 last: "Supplies of lamb and mutton are plentiful; definitely there is no shortage" ("Hansard," p. 283).

In the Senate on October 14 ("Hansard," p. 546), Senator James McLachlan said:—Reference has been made to the rationing of meat. That is positively ridiculous in a country such as ours. If we have failed to a certain degree to fulfill our contracts with Britain, it is due, not to a lack of meat, but

to a lack of facilities to reach the markets."

Finally, you and every other Federal Member have received thousands of letters from individual citizens protesting against the rationing of meat.

So you see, Mr. Curtin, on the evidence of facts and from the weight of public protest, meat rationing stands condemned and damned as not only lacking popular sanction, but as being a policy imposed in defiance of public protest and diametrically opposed to the expressed will of the people.

Your own statement, published in the Sydney "Morning Herald" on December 22, 1943, impresses one as a double-columned frantic endeavour to explain away meat rationing in the face of terrific public pressure against it. Now it is no less a person than President Roosevelt who has been credited with the statement that "it is the function of Government to give way to pressure."

In all the annals of Australian Government surely there is no issue which has incited so much public protest in so short a time as the one under review. Therefore it seems self-evident that meat rationing is a policy, which has been imposed upon you by pressure from a source external to Australia.

WHAT IS U.N.R.R.A.?

In the course of endeavours to trace that source I have examined very closely the United Nations' Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, signed at Hot Springs, Virginia, U.S.A., on June 3, 1943. That document is more than an agreement to bring relief to stricken areas, it is a veritable constitution and forms the basis of a permanent International Government. For instance, paragraph 9 of resolution 2 reads:—

"That the Interim Commission be deemed to have been dissolved when the permanent organisation has been established."

Among some of the authorities that it is proposed to take from Australian people and place into the hands of this, International authority are (paragraphs 6 and 7, inter alia):—

"That in considering the functions and duties to be assigned to the permanent organisation the Interim Commission take into account: Nutrition; Standards of consumption of food and other agricultural products; Agricultural credit; Problem of agricultural (Continued on page 4.)

The air is full of schemes, charters, plans and so forth for "new orders"—to be imposed upon us. Most, if not all those receiving wide publicity have the disadvantage of being a little worse than the bad old order. Their inherent unsoundness appears due to the basic misconception of realities in the outlook of their sponsors.

The problems of social reconstruction are fundamentally the problems of education. In the outside world the adult citizen, his social unit of organisation (i.e., the village, State, Nation, with their governmental machinery) are extended counterparts of the child, the school and the teacher; with the modification that infancy probably precludes the possibility of the democratic organisation of the school, such as is desirable and natural in the adult world.

Adult society, however, has become an artificial affair of highly developed mechanical and technical efficiency, populated largely by mechanically minded people—worshippers of mechanisms and mechanical efficiency. The sense of a social "organism" possessing its own inherent forces of growth or development is scarcely recognised. Society is regarded as a complex "mechanism to be controlled or adapted to some preconceived theory or plan of its operators." As observed by the Imperial Policy Group in the British Parliament, "too many cannot get beyond the doctrine that because some things are bad everything should go. A few are thinking constructively, and understand that although many things need changing yet much in our national life is very fine, and many of our foundations are a good deal more solid than we admit." To such people the picture consists of all black and pure white. They are the "flat earth" theorists, often of a high degree of specialised "education," and blissfully ignorant of the fact that the humble tiller of the soil probably has a far sounder grasp of the nature of things as a universal whole. With the confidence of superiority

Coal Conscripts

The attempt to obtain cheap, sweated boy-labour in the British coal mines has resulted in the boys going on strike until such time as they receive a satisfactory answer from Mr. Bevin re the matter of pay. It appears that after paying for lodgings, meals, insurance, deductions for clothing and travelling expenses, the boys have the paltry sum of 3/6 pocket money. Naturally enough, they figure that this is not the "new order" that their fathers and brothers are fighting and dying for. There is a humorous side-light on this; When the instructors, after explaining the intricacies of the haulage system, invite questions, cockney voices pipe up with, "What abah our pay?"

they set out to "plan" a world nearer to the heart's desire of the planners, who know nothing and care little about the longings, yearnings and strivings of the ordinary, individual humans, the potential victims of their ideas. They are the builders of a beautiful artificial mechanism, but destroyers of the natural beauty of a harmonious development of the social organism towards its ultimate unknown end.

The artificial mind loves artificiality. It sees nothing preposterous or incongruous in little men meeting in the Atlantic or elsewhere to devise ways and means of organising—or mechanising—humanity to fit into a system deliberately planned by self-assessed leaders, fuhrers, and intellectuals (and are we not partly responsible for the production of "intellectuals" instead of intelligent real people?). The artificial mind reads with approval daily press statements informing readers that their future purpose in the world is being worked out for them in Washington, Berlin, or Canberra by some individuals with a special touch of divinity. It even applauds the presumptions of impertinent people who would confer on us poor simpletons specific limits to our freedom in declarations of The Rights of Man, so that we may at least know what we shall be allowed to do. What divine grace! The so-called rights are, of course, really privileges, and the hand that gives is above the hand that takes. What is given can be taken away when expedient.

Yet we have been so "conditioned" to artificiality and the unreal that most people have apparently drifted into such mental indolence as to suppose, for some obscure reason, or for no reason at all, that given sufficient power, some benevolent external authority, some fuhrer, duce, premier or president will give us rights to freedom—which can only be won and held by our own actions. We cannot and dare not be "passive recipients" but must be "active participants" in the determination and control of our destinies.

In the main the great political and intellectual leaders are the same, or of similar kidney, to those who failed in the past to solve the simpler negative problem of removing the artificial evil which produced the strains and stresses leading to the present world anguish. Yet such schemers coolly and confidently assume the divine role of positive construction of a perfect mechanical, systematised world to be inhabited by well-tended cattle in the care of bureau- (Continued on page 4.)

NOTES on the NEWS

Two days of experience of meat rationing knocked all the elaborate planning of arrogant Senator Keane and his team of economic planners into the proverbial cocked hat. First of all, nearly 2,000,000 elaborate booklets on the simplicity of rationing were all wrong in detail, and had to be scrapped. (Of course, only taxpayer's money and manpower were involved, which don't matter two hoots to socialistic bunglers.) Then came the failure of the "change coupons," which were unworkable. And, of course, there were the thousands of "ready-reckoners" which gave the wrong answers to the "change problems." Have YOU written that letter to your Federal M.P., telling him to abolish this meat rationing fiasco, and the blithering, blundering bureaucrats responsible for it?

WAR WONDERS: A report from the Department of Information, published in the Melbourne "Sun" of January 15, points out that 1,181,000 persons were in the forces or in direct war work, and that pastoralists and farmers, despite a loss of 20% of manpower, are carrying 13,557,000 more sheep, 1,143,000 more cattle and 407,000 more pigs. Considering the obstacles in the form of government bureaucrats and regulations it is indeed a remarkable performance. The report also says that Australia's war cost to November 30, in terms of money, was £1,339,000,000—more than five times the cost of our share in the 1914-18 carnage. Public loans, on which the returned soldiers will have to pay their quota of interest to the stay-at-home "investors," amount to £396,000,000 for the year.

FOUR FREEDOMS: Mr. A. Davern, of Sydney University, commenting on the "four freedoms," wisely remarked, "such freedoms do not flow out of fine words, they only become real when men exercise them—they are to be taken, not given by rulers. We worship democracy and betray it in our actions. . . . we aim at liberty and secure a dictatorship." This chap seems to have our political humbugs very accurately summed up. Almost without exception our politicians denounce "Hitlerism"—and at the same time adopt this form of tyranny! This fact should ensure an emphatic "No" vote when these opportunists seek more power through the referendum.

PRESSURE POLITICS: The Secretary of the U.S. Treasury is reported as denouncing the Senate for yielding to pressure from certain sections of the public. He also dislikes Union pressure, and that applied by the New York policemen against working overtime. The report also deals with the virtual disfranchisement of U.S.

troops—presumably to eliminate more pressure. It will be noted that objection to pressure comes from the Treasury in particular, which has yet to learn that the function of Parliament, as even President Roosevelt said, is to "yield to pressure," not to resist it. The only function of Parliament is to ascertain what the electors require, then to stir its stumps and obtain the required results.

MOULDING MORALS: A London report says that the "Cardiff watch committee" is demanding the appointment of women police to clean up young girl streetwalkers and young drink addicts. Police-chief Wilson says that the proposed powers of interro- (Continued on page 2.)

Selling Sovereignty

Mr. Hanson Baldwin, commenting on post-war bases in the "New York Times," says that U.S. "has already assumed sovereignty over certain bases," but does not state who gave or sold the sovereignty. Also, in the "Age" of January 20 it is reported that representatives of the N.Z. and Australian Governments have agreed, "An international air authority shall control the air routes." From these two items it will be seen that hidden forces are at work committing Australians and others to arrangements, while they are engaged in the all-absorbing tasks of war. No mandate has been given by the people to enter into these agreements surrendering our sovereignty; moreover, they are matters that can and should be left for mature judgment under peacetime conditions. Readers of this paper should lose no time in getting supplies of "letter-forms" covering these matters—and getting them signed.

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —Three weeks ago it was pointed out that the international financiers have hitherto been able, apparently without difficulty, to make use of "public men," such as Politicians, University Vice-chancellors, Church Archbishops, and the like, to create a suitable atmosphere in which to mislead the people into believing that financial tyranny comes of God, and is really the "sacrificial" pathway, to the Kingdom of Heaven.

It was also mentioned that no less a person than Mr. Churchill had been used in this way, and that more information in this regard would be given later. What is said about Mr. Churchill in this letter is said merely to give readers an idea of his political and social background, and not to suggest that he has, at any time, consciously acted to the detriment of his compatriots. It seems to be a case in which bad advice has been accepted in good faith.

His political background and social associations also help to explain why it is that, despite his wonderful efforts in other directions since he succeeded Mr. Chamberlain as Prime Minister, he has done nothing to help in securing the release of the people of the Empire from the bondage of finance, but instead has actually helped to put them further into bondage and to frustrate others who have endeavoured to get them out of it.

The effects of the soulless and relentless imposition of the bankers' policy of credit contraction following the last war became more and more acute, and the position in England deteriorated so much that the greatest industrial upheaval of all time occurred in 1926. The previous year Mr. Churchill had allowed himself to be the agent through whom the British people were further betrayed to the financiers. It was he who in 1925 introduced into the House of Commons the Bill for bringing Britain back on to the Gold Standard. It is true that he subsequently recognised his mistake and admitted it, and in justice to him I quote herewith the statement he made in the British House of Commons on 21/4/32 as follows:—

"When I was moved by many arguments and forces in 1925 to return to the Gold Standard I was assured by the highest experts . . . that we were anchoring ourselves to reality and stability; and I accepted their advice.

"I take for myself and my colleagues of other days whatever degree of blame and burden there may be for having accepted their advice. But what has happened? We have no reality, no stability.

"Is the progress of the human race in this age of almost terrifying expansion to be arbitrarily, barred and regulated by fortuitous discoveries of gold mines here and there, or by the extent to which we can persuade the existing cornerers and hoarders of gold to put their hoards again into the common stock?

"Are we to be told that human civilisation and society would have been impossible if gold had not happened to be an element in the composition of the globe? Those are absurdities, but they are becoming dangerous and deadly absurdities.

"They have only to be asserted long enough, they have only to be left ungrappled with long enough, to endanger that capitalist and credit system upon which the liberties and enjoyments and prosperity, in my belief, of the vast masses depend.

"I therefore point to this evil and to the search for the methods of remedying it, as the first, the second and the third of all the problems which should command and rivet our thoughts."

How strange it seems that Mr. Churchill, after so eloquently debunking the "forces" and "highest experts" of 1925 and 1932, is apparently still allowing the very same experts to lead him again into error of the very same nature.

What can be the explanation of such conduct? Mr. Churchill has openly sneered at social credit (which means the credit of society for the benefit of society), and as an ex-Chancellor of the British Exchequer, has said that the "soundness" of financial policy was proved by the "unpleasantness" of its consequences! How has such a man come by such ideas?

Away back in 1899 Mr. Churchill was widely advertised in America as "the hero of five wars, the author of six books, and the future Prime Minister of England." In the debate on the Army Bill in 1901 he said: "I cannot view without grave apprehension the continuous growth of purely military expenditure. . . . I am glad to lift again (his father's slogan!) the tattered flag of retrenchment and economy." In 1906, Mr. N. Laski said at a political meeting that any Jew who voted against Churchill was a traitor to "the common cause." In 1912 Sir Ernest Cassel wrote: "I have known Churchill since he was quite a young man, and he never made a secret of his admiration for the Kaiser." Sir Ernest Cassel, who was the alter ego

FIRST LAW OF NATURE

"You will not allow the law of universal equality!"

"Law! If the whole world conspired to enforce falsehood they could not make it law. Level all conditions today, and you only smooth away all obstacles to tyranny tomorrow. A nation that aspires to equality is unfit for freedom. Throughout all creation, from the archangel to the worm, from Olympus to the pebble, from the radiant and completed planet to the nebula that hardens through the ages of mist and slime into the habitable world, the first law of nature is inequality."

—Lord Lytton in "Zanoni."

"New Times," January 28, 1944. —Page 2

of Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., helped to finance the London School of Economics, the object being "to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State" (Prof. J. H. Morgan, K.C., in the "Quarterly Review," January, 1929), and in 1907 he was described as an intimate friend and financial adviser of His Majesty the King and an old friend of the House of Churchill. In 1906 Sir William Beveridge (principal of the London School of Economics) advocated the establishment of Labour Exchanges to solve unemployment! In 1909 it was Mr. Churchill who introduced the legislation to give effect to it.

The following quotation is taken from "Reality" (England), of 8/10/43, page 164, namely:—

"Throughout Churchill's career, whenever strife has assumed a physical form, or has verged on the edge of it, he has been on the spot, or, like Chevy Chylye, waiting round the corner." The South African War, the Sidney Street shooting affray, the Belfast armed rebellion of 1913-14, the First World War, the General Strike in 1926, and the Second World War—on all these occasions he was prominent in some capacity or other. Like the mythical

SOIL, AGRICULTURE & FOOD VALUES

Hereunder we publish the second instalment, 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":—

The Earl of Portsmouth; My Lords, at the beginning of his speech the noble Lord [Lord Teviot] told us that planning should begin with the soil. In that I most heartily concur. . . .

. . . Vigorous, abounding health, normal health, and not merely the average freedom from disease, can come only from proper treatment of the soil in the beginning, although it may be that other things have also something to do with the matter. In our own country before this war the cost to the State of health—that does not include private patients of doctors or the people who put sixpence in the slot in the "pub" and get an aspirin tablet—was more than the total wholesale value of our home-produced foodstuffs, considerably more. If, therefore, there is complaint from time to time, when care is taken to prepare good food, that the cost of it is high, I would like to reply that the high cost of ill-health equals the low cost of food, and the low cost, of food, as my noble friend has just said, equals exploitation of the soil.

. . . With lethal sprays we are destroying the soil's power of resistance, and we are at the same time giving continuous doses of chemical food and chemical stimulants, to that the infinite complex of bacterial and mycelial life in the soil is being upset, and we are upsetting the vitamins content—that is, the capacity of the soil to produce food by destroying the humus within the soil itself. I wonder sometimes whether not only the sub-normal health from which the majority of our population suffers, and indeed the population in all the so-called civilised world, but even the birth-rate are not closely connected with this exploitation of the soil, which has been going on so long.

If your Lordships will excuse me, I would like to relate my own personal experience because I feel it is relevant to the argument. When I started to farm some twenty years ago I was thoroughly up to date with modern ideas, but gradually by trial and error—far more often, I may say, by error than by success—I revised all my previous notions. I found again and again that, despite what analysis proved, the quality of bought food was very low compared with the very genuine food value in my own homegrown foodstuffs. For instance, in a comparison between protein in beans and in oil cakes, my beans won every time. The same thing was found in homegrown oats. The old analysis showed their food value to be very low, yet practical experience in feeding home-grown oats to my cattle showed the value of the oats to be much higher than anything that could be bought, except the most expensive foods. I found that my animals had a bloom. That experience brought me back to the necessity of consulting Nature instead of trying to beat her. I have come, therefore, through the very hard force of circumstance and by practical trial on my own land, to believe that there is more in the way we treat the soil than there is in any methods of trying to get the maximum out of the soil by artificial means. . . .

. . . Though very little may have been proven positively, if there are sufficient indications that there is more than a shadow of suspicion that our methods are wrong, we cannot afford to wait. We have had 150 years of harm through the workings of the industrial revolution. We have

salamander, who lives on flames, Churchill lives on strife. The right man in the right place, of course, once agreed that strife is the unavoidable means to a necessary object; that is to say, an object which the common people would spontaneously demand by the unprompted use of their instincts and reason.

"But there comes the rub. You can't expect a man with Churchill's propensities to feel any comfortable sensation at the idea of peace. He must of necessity cling to a system in which, to use Douglas's expression, 'war is inherent.' You can easily imagine his saying, 'Good God, I hope it's not true,' when first made acquainted with Douglas's claims for Social Credit as the keystone of concord—concord all the way up, between persons, between classes, and between nations. So it is not in the least surprising that he has openly sneered at Social Credit, and listens to the advice of Norman (Bank of England), via Keynes (highest expert'), with the same attentiveness as does Roosevelt to that of Eccles (Federal Reserve Bank), via Hansen ('highest expert')."

It will thus be seen that his public behaviour had always been entirely seemly from the point of view of the controllers of international finance, and that it was but natural that the newspapers representing the financiers should have clamoured for his elevation to the Prime Ministership when Mr. Chamberlain went. It should be carefully noted that it was not the PEOPLE of England who called for Mr. Churchill. It was the Press, for the controllers of it knew that, besides being a master of the spoken word, Mr. Churchill could be depended upon to "safeguard" the interests and facilitate the plans of the financiers. To date, he has faithfully served those ends.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 23rd January, 1944. (To be continued.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

gation would affect rights and liberty. He also put it that "morality cannot be enforced by a police uniform and truncheon." Strange but wise words, coming from a police chief. Is it surprising that such unfortunate women, victims of our system of frustration, doomed to toil without opportunity to give expression to their real inner selves, sometimes take the loose and easy road? Indeed, the wonder is that so many succeed in walking the straight path. If the police and the social workers devoted their attention to making our financial system provide "easy money" these victims would not need to sell themselves for it.

BANK BANDITS: One of the world's largest banks, the Chase National Bank, has been indicted by a U.S. Federal grand jury on a charge of illegal sale and export of industrial diamonds, and violating the Trading With The Enemy Act. The bank is reported to have aided the operations by conducting regular banking credit transactions with the enemy. Now that a start has been made in rounding up the real gangsters hiding under the cloak of respectability, perhaps those "American" and "British" bankers who made big credits available to Germany to build up the Nazi war machine will also face the grand jury. Montagu Norman will be watching this move with grave apprehension.

SQUEEZING SQUIRES: A London report points out that village squires and landed gentry are being displaced all over Britain by city-dwellers interested, not in land, but in bricks-and-mortar investments. Rural properties with about three reception rooms, six bedrooms and three bathrooms, set in about three acres of land, are fetching up to £10,000. The report says that the homes were previously owned by country families for generations, who have now had to sell because they had lost the battle against heavy taxation. Here we see taxation as the instrument used to break up the family roots of rural Britain's cultural life. It is a terrible weapon to place in the hands of any Government, which can operate it to produce any situation it desires. In the fullness of time increasing taxation will dispossess all the people, who will then be at the mercy of their political servants: the Socialists' Utopia.

BEVERIDGE BOOSTER: London reports inform us that the new Archbishop of Westminster (Right Rev. B. W. Griffin) hopes that "the Government will implement the Beveridge Report." Seemingly as an excuse for using the Archbishop as propaganda for Beveridge's "benefits," which include complete surrender of personal liberty, the reports inform us that "the Archbishop is a man of the world at the age of 44, that he is approachable and courteous; physically he is thick-set, fair and of moderate height." How naive! Presumably these characteristics qualify him not only as an apostle of Christ, but also as an apostle of the satiric Beveridge brew.

CHRISTMAS CHEER: By way of contrast with the Murdoch Press campaign for more taxation on low incomes, the Melbourne "Herald" of December 10 urged contributions towards Christmas hampers for 200 families. The article assured readers that "the hampers are really, needed, and that great difficulty was found in selecting the families, there were so many in distress." It is ironically tragic when the daily press tells the world of unprecedented prosperity, then urges higher taxation to restore poverty, and then on the other hand, appeals for succour for the victims. What a madhouse!

DOCTOR'S DILEMMA: Further evidence of the incompetence of bureaucratic "planned economy" is found in the experiences of a doctor, as reported in the press of December 10, viz.: "Eighteen hospitals were 'phoned in vain for beds for urgently sick patients . . . it is doubtful if a number of them will survive . . . there are similar difficulties with maternity cases." So you see, it is the same problem from birth to death; peace-time or war-time make no difference, life is disregarded in this callous manner, whilst at the same time the press, pulpit and radio scream for more population. How inducing for potential immigrants! Our propaganda artists have fooled overseas settlers with highly coloured fairy stories in the past, but those days are gone forever.

PROPAGANDA PAGEANTS: Sir Archibald Southby, British M.P., in a speech to his Epsom constituents, made the following stinging reply to the prevailing anti-British propaganda: "Russia only came into the war because she was attacked by Germany. We organise pageants to commemorate the Russian war effort, but none to pay tribute to the British Navy and Air Force, which saved the world in 1940." Speaking of the Four Freedoms, he said: "We might well add the 'freedom from bureaucracy and from intolerance.' (Melbourne "Herald," December 11, 43.) This is just another refreshing counterblast to the anti-British hysteria.

WAR-WORKERS' WAGES: Sydney reports indicate that, as in Victoria, the munition industry is now a depressed industry. It seems that the enemy can't take any more of our munition exports. As a consequence, 25,000 N.S.W. men and women will have their pay-reduced 30/- to 40/- per week. In addition to this, the Allied Works Council is expected to release up to 5000 men for the civilian labour market. It is to be hoped that a substantial reduction of taxation and a corresponding release of civilian material will be provided to meet this development and permit the displaced individuals to make their own adjustments (Continued at foot of next column page 3)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

THE ALBERTA GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

A Recent Broadcast by the Hon. E. C. MANNING, Premier of Alberta:

Last week I dealt with the relationship, which should exist between the people and their Governments, under a properly functioning democracy. I pointed out that the people must be the supreme authority who decide what results they want from the management of their affairs and that Governments should exist for the purpose of seeing to it that they get those results.

Now, if there were no conflict of opinion on this matter there would be no fundamental political issue. We would all be in agreement on the form of social organisation under which we would co-operate to get the results we want in common. Unfortunately, there is a violent conflict of views on this question. In fact, so violent is it that, as a result, the world has been plunged into war, revolution and social strife on a scale, which is shaking the very foundations of civilisation.

In contrast to democracy there is a concept of society that is based upon the domination of the people by an all-powerful ruling group. Instead of the people being the supreme authority they are the servile puppets of their rulers, to be bossed, bullied, regimented and manipulated by those who control and plan their lives. This social system is being operated and advocated under a variety of labels such as dictatorship, bureaucracy, finance capitalism, national socialism, fascism, totalitarianism, and so forth. However, it is not the labels, which are important, but the kind of social system for which the labels stand. Yet there is a great deal of confusion on this question.

The essential difference between democracy and totalitarianism in any form lies in the relationship of the individual to the State and its institutions. Under a properly functioning democracy the State and all its institutions exist to serve the individual citizens who collectively are the supreme authority. Under totalitarianism the State and its institutions have all the power concentrated in their hands, and the individual citizen is made a mere cog in a vast machine.

A violent clash is inevitable between these two opposite and conflicting viewpoints, of Democracy and the doctrine of the Supreme State. That is the dominating issue, which is being fought out in the world today, and upon its outcome, will depend the future of civilisation for centuries. But it is not only in the military sphere that this conflict between these two opposing philosophies of life is raging. It permeates the national life of this and every other country.

And because it is the dominating issue in the world today, it is important that, if we in Alberta are to tackle the essential task of establishing a properly functioning democracy in our Province, we must have an absolutely clear understanding of this question.

At the present time we have a constitutional democracy in Canada. But unfortunately, it is not functioning properly. Consequently the people have never been able to get the results they want. They have been constantly forced to submit to the overriding control exercised by private interests—chiefly large monopolies and combines. A monopoly—whether it is financial, industrial or any other kind of monopoly—is an instrument of dictatorship. A few men, by virtue of their monopoly control, are able to impose their will upon the people generally. That is the essence of Dictatorship in any sphere.

Now, in a properly functioning democracy there are two distinct spheres of social life in which the people themselves must be supreme if they are to obtain and retain the management of their affairs to give them the results they want.

First there is that side of social life which has to do with the making and enforcement of laws governing the relationship of individuals and the relations of the province or the nation with other provinces and nations. We term this the political sphere of social life, which has to do with government.

Secondly, there is that aspect of social activity that is concerned with the production and distribution of goods and services, which we call the economic sphere. In order to have a properly functioning democracy the people must be able to demand and obtain the results they want in both the political and economic spheres.

Now in what way can the people best exercise their supreme authority and effective control both of their political and economic institutions? A simple means for doing this already exists in our political and economic voting systems.

You are all familiar with the political voting system. The only reason it is not always effective as an instrument of popular control is because the people have failed to organise themselves to use their franchise as the means of expressing their collective will. Properly organised it would be a simple matter for the electorate to

NOTES ON THE NEWS (Continued)

without hindrance from bureaucratic departmental officials.

RUSKIN'S RESULTS: Ruskin Motor Bodies' annual meeting disclosed that the parent company, Allied Motors, could not pay a dividend to shareholders because of its indebtedness to the banks, which control the shares of the Ruskin section. From this it is clear that Ruskins, like so many other firms, are merely working for the banks. Socialists argue that the proprietors of industrial firms expropriate the profits from workers, but here is a typical case showing the fallacy of this proposition, because so many employers are merely collectors for the banks. In this way the banks control policy without the responsibility of ownership—that is the philosophy behind "planned economy," the new socialism.

—O.B.H.

state in definite terms the results they want from government action, and to enforce obedience to their collective will.

However, the question of the voting system in the economic sphere is of equal, if not greater importance. Actually, in our money system we have an economic voting mechanism, which is used by all of us, but the greatest care has been taken to hide this fact from the people. The chief function of the money system under a democracy should be to operate as an effective economic voting mechanism.

Perhaps this view of money will be entirely new to some of you, so I will take a minute or two to explain more fully what I mean.

When you go into a store to buy some groceries you are performing several functions as a democratic citizen. In the first place you are demanding the results you want from the economic system. It may be so many cans of soup, so much flour, or a sack of beans. By your purchases you are telling Industry what to produce.

Bruce Brown to Debate

"Is Monetary Reform the First Necessity for Post-War Reconstruction?" That is the question to be debated at the Assembly Hall, Melbourne, on Thursday next, February 3, at 8 p.m. Mr. Bruce H. Brown will take the affirmative, and Mr. J. A. Dawson the negative.

Furthermore, if you ask for a particular brand of soup or of flour, you are casting your economic vote in favour of a particular firm that is giving satisfaction in providing you with the product you want. To the extent that the people as a whole have an adequate amount of money, and a wide range of choice in the goods they can buy, they are able to control the volume, the quality and the type of production. That is the basis of a properly functioning economic democracy.

You see, to the extent that an individual has sufficient money in relation to the prices of goods, he has economic voting power. To the extent that he is assured of adequate economic voting power he has economic security. And to the extent that he gets that economic voting power under conditions over which he has control he has economic freedom.

VOLUNTARY CO-OPERATION WANTED

(From a Broadcast Talk by JAMES GUTHRTE, B.Sc., over 7HO, December 12, 1943.)

When a group of men and women decide to co-operate to achieve a definite purpose, they have, by that decision, multiplied their powers enormously; they have, by co-operation, given themselves powers which separately they could not hope to possess.

A modern community, by virtue of its organisations such as Municipal Councils, schools, roads and telegraphs—its many and various institutions—has vast potentialities. This "Good-will" or Credit, which accrues to any community in which the members are working together in voluntary cooperation, is what we call "Social Credit."

The dividends that such a community can pay to all its members, in the ultimate form of material and spiritual well being, are exceedingly large—much larger than certain people are prepared to admit.

The achievements in the material world obtained by co-operation have been spectacular and impressive, and still the end is not in sight.

Man has not yet learnt how to control the powerful instruments that science and organisation have placed in his hands; and this war should be an object lesson illustrating what happens when the powerful machinery we have built comes under the control of ambitious and unscrupulous men. Today we see a prodigious output of machines of the most incredible intricacy and complexity; we have seen an entire working population constantly employed and paid.

More and more men and boys and women are constantly being given jobs and are being paid for doing them. For years before the present war Germany imported hundreds of thousands of men and paid them for making munitions.

In no country at war has there been a shortage of money to pay for the ever-increasing armies of workmen—and all of them have been clothed and fed and housed. The central Government of each country has the power to pay for any job to be done which it wants done. By ensuring sufficient wages it can not only INDUCE the entire population to do practically any job, but it can INDUCE people from other countries to come and help.

America, when it was developing its virgin soil, attracted people from nearly every country in the world by the simple procedure of paying higher wages than other countries.

By cutting down the prices of farm products the supply of foodstuffs can be re-

duced, and by increasing the prices the supply can be increased enormously.

These facts are well known and beyond dispute yet if we listened to the speeches of Government spokesmen we would be justified in believing that such facts were completely unknown to them.

There are two ways of getting a job done: one is INDUCEMENT and the other is COMPULSION.

Compulsion is the method used in a community which has lost faith in itself, or when men and women no longer feel it profitable to co-operate.

Where the conditions of living outrage the reasonable desires and expectations of men and women, compulsion has to be used and severe penalties inflicted to force obedience. Thus we arrive at the Police State, where all direction and initiative comes from the top and a servile and grudging obedience from the bottom.

With the growth of large States, the people have increasingly lost the initiative and the control of their fates.

The means by which a people can lose their freedom, their incomes and their property are three in number: By the manipulation of the finances of a country so that people are forced into debt, privately and communally; by a process of man-made laws which can rob a people of the protection given by the fundamental laws; and by Bureaucratic Socialism, which is a means of imposing obedience in minute details.

When it comes to the use of their economic voting power, the people will not have the wide range of choice provided by a large number of firms competing for their business. The quantity, quality and type of goods will conform, not to the will of the people as consumers, but the dictates of the State Bureaucrats, who will plan and order all production programmes.

In short, the people will have no control over the conditions under which they will obtain their economic voting power, and their economic voting power will be rendered useless as a means of controlling the volume and quality of production.

Don't you see that this business of State ownership of the means of production is the short cut to a complete destruction of democracy and the establishment of a State dictatorship, operated under a vast bureaucracy, regimenting and dominating the lives of the people? It would constitute a huge super-monopoly with all the instruments of control, both political and economic, concentrated in a few hands.

I ask what is the fundamental difference between that and the evil thing they have in Germany under Nazi-ism?

Surely it is just common sense that we cannot do away with the evils of monopolies by creating one vast State super-monopoly to take their place.

Moreover, if we are to have effective control by the people of the entire pro-

RED TAPE IN BRITAIN

In the British House of Commons, on October 20, 1943, Sir Leonard Lyle asked the Prime Minister whether, following his recent exhortation to Government Departments to cut down the length of the orders and regulations issued and to frame them in much simpler language, he has received any report as to the results achieved?

Mr. Atlee: As stated, by my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary on May 26, general guidance has been given to Departments on the drafting of this subordinate legislation, and in particular on the importance of securing that so far as practicable it is intelligible on the face of it without unnecessary reference to other enactments. I believe that these instructions are being generally observed.

Sir L. Lyle: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the Ministry of Home Security recently issued a Fire Order of approximately 70 pages, with a supplementary Memorandum of something like 700 pages, and that it took a certain town clerk on the south coast, with his assistant and the borough auditors, from 2 until 6 o'clock to find out what it all meant; and is it not a fact that 10,000 Orders have been issued to local authorities since the beginning of the war?

Mr. Atlee: I am not aware of course, about the matter of the town clerk, but my hon. Friend is trying to get two things done. He wants things made absolutely intelligible to the most uninstructed person, and he asks for the greatest amount of brevity, and these two things are not always compatible.

Mr. Levy: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these Orders are not only issued in official jargon that nobody can understand, but that, when explanations are asked for from the Departments, they reply in the same official jargon which nobody can understand? Why issue Orders at all if people cannot understand the jargon used?

Mr. Atlee: My hon. Friend is giving to the lack of understanding too great a universality.

Commander Locker-Lampson: Why not use basic American?

ductive system, combined with the freedom of the individual in the economic sphere, what we need is the maximum scope for private enterprise and individual initiative. The more scope there is for persons to use their ingenuity to produce goods to please customers, the easier it will be for individuals, with their wide range of personal tastes, to get the results they want from the economic system, provided they have adequate purchasing power.

Private enterprise under popular control and full scope for personal initiative are the very breath of democracy. What we are suffering from today is not too much private enterprise, but too much monopoly and bureaucratic control, which have all but stifled true individual initiative and private enterprise.

If the experience of State bureaucracy we are having at present does not arouse every thinking person to the menace of the socialistic doctrine of a Supreme State I don't know what will.

I have been asked, "If the Government holds these views in regard to socialisation, why did this Province enter the fields of fire and life insurance, the sale of farm machinery parts, and so on?" The answer is simple and logical. We went into those lines of business, not to create a State monopoly, but to fight and break existing private monopoly and combine control.

State enterprise for the purpose of creating beneficial competition and breaking existing monopoly control must be distinguished from the socialistic doctrine of the Supreme State under which the State ultimately takes over all industry for the purpose of eliminating competition, and establishing one Supreme State Monopoly.

I assure you that in our determination to break all forms of combines and monopoly control, we will not hesitate to use State Enterprise to create beneficial competitive conditions whenever it is in the public interest to do so.

I have endeavoured to give you some of the pertinent facts regarding the two opposite and conflicting social philosophies of Democracy and Totalitarianism in its various forms. It is self-evident that there can be no compromise on this issue, which involves the fundamental principles underlying all social and economic life.

In conclusion, I wish to make it clear that the policies of your Provincial Government are based on an uncompromising adherence to true democracy and democratic principles. We shall oppose, expose and resist by every means in our power any and every form of totalitarianism, whether it be financial, political, or economic. We shall resist all policies directed towards centralising power in the hands of either private interests or State institutions. In this I am confident that we shall have the whole-hearted and united support of all freedom-loving people.

"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 28, 1944. —Page 3

REGULATION 18B

The London "Times" parliamentary correspondent reports that Major Manningham-Buller, Mr. Spencer Summers, Squadron-Leader Donner, Commander Galbraith, Captain Cobb, Mr. Berry, Sir Douglas Thomson, Major Lloyd, Mr. Snadden and Mr. Kenneth Pickthorn have tabled the following motion:—"That this House is of opinion that the time has come for reconsideration of Regulation 18B, and of the practicability of bringing to trial those now in detention on the sole responsibility of the Home Secretary."

—"The Social Creditor," Dec. 4, 1943.

JEWISH AIMS AND BRITISH INTERESTS

(An extract from DOUGLAS REED'S latest book, "Lest We Regret.")

We British approach the climax of the Second World War and the middle of the tortured twentieth century, and strive to retrieve our future from all this misery. In soberly considering the Jews and Jewish ambitions, and the relation of these to our British interests, one great fact stands out like a mountain peak in the confusion: that a Jewish triumph is all that remains of our victory in the First World War.

When the Second World War began, German disarmament was gone and Germany was mightier in arms than ever before; Germany was mightier in territory than ever before; liberated Czechoslovakia was gone, and liberated Poland and Yugoslavia were about to go, with many other countries; reparations were gone; our security was gone; not even the faint after-taste of victory remained in our mouths. The only thing that remained from that great struggle, with its millions of dead, was, and is, the Jewish National Home in Palestine, which we promised to build in the midst of that first war. It alone survives. The Jewish spiritual centre exists, with its population of nearly half a million. A Jew may now be born in Palestine and pass through an all-Jewish kindergarten, school and university without speaking anything but Hebrew; work on a Jewish farm or in a Jewish factory; live in a great all-Jewish city; read a Hebrew newspaper and visit a Hebrew theatre.

That is the sole achievement of British arms (save for the conquest of German colonies in Africa, which we did not need) remaining from the Great War. The origins of the Greater War are mysterious enough, and our own future when we have won it still obscure enough, for this fact to lend great probability to the words of the Rabbi of Prague; and it justifies deep misgiving about the clamour raised by many public spokesmen and public prints, which, through its violence, tends to make this new war appear to be one waged primarily for Jewish aims.

For appetite grows with eating, and if the demands which are being made by or on behalf of Jewry in this war were gratified, the prophecy of Prague would be fulfilled, and ten or twenty years from now we might, looking back, see only the peak of a second Jewish victory rising from the chaotic memory of the Second World War—and we might then well be worried about the imminence of a third! In 1917, the demand for a National Home in Palestine, with which we too unconditionally associated ourselves, was a lofty one enough; but today that satisfied ambition is already contemptuously dismissed as a thing of no account, and much greater things are demanded.

Indeed, the public debate bids fair to develop into a competition among all the Powers engaged, friend and foe, to allot large portions of this planet to the Jews! Consider the fantastic stage, which this competition has reached. No longer is the aim a National Home in Palestine, but all Palestine and much more. Lord Wedgwood, the foremost non-Jewish Zionist spokesman in this country, has proposed the creation of a Greater Palestine for the Jews, existing Arab States to be destroyed and partitioned between the Jews and Turkey ("Testament to Democracy," Hutchinson, 1942.) No sooner did the Eighth Army chase the enemy from Cyrenaica, Libya and Tripolitania than Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne, M.P., proposed ("The Times," January 24, 1943) that these lands should be made available "as another home for the displaced and oppressed Jews of Europe." Goebbels announced (on March 14, 1943, while the British Press asserted that the Jews are being "exterminated") that Germany "is not opposed to the creation of a Jewish State. This world problem must be solved, but the solution may be carried out by humanitarian methods." The heads of the Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches of Australia (British emigration to that Dominion, with Government assistance, was stopped before this war) urged the Australian Prime Minister (on March 10, 1943) to "set apart a considerable area of Australia as soon as circumstances permit for refugee settlement" (they adduced "the particularly shocking German persecution of the Jews"). General Smuts, on March 17, 1943, suggested to "a deputation of South African Jewry," which waited on him, "a confederation of Semitic States in the Middle East to solve the Jewish problem."

These were but a few of the proposals which were made for Jewish territorial expansion, but at the same time a most vigorous campaign was waged to claim for them unrestricted access to other countries, and full rights of citizenship there, or rather, superior rights to native citizens there, for the invariable assumption was, that these incoming Jews should be exempt from military service, but eligible for all employment, and that the denial to them of immediate naturalisation would be intolerable cruelty. (For instance, a correspondent of "The Times," on April 8, 1943, reported that he knew of three young German Jews who came to this country and built up a business here, which became highly prosperous, through Government orders, when the war began; he described the refusal of naturalisation, while British manhood was away at the war, as an insufferable injustice.)

"New Times" January 28 1944 - Page 4

The result of all this is that, as the war approaches its fourth birthday, and we draw nearer to Civvy Street, the aims and claims of Jewry have been put on the pinnacle of public debate, and the clamour about them drowns all other. While the sufferings of our own people may have hardly begun (for the great slaughter of the last war has mercifully not yet come upon us), Jewish demands tend to monopolise discussion, and are marked by an extraordinary duality and duplicity. Unrestricted movement from country to country, and preferential treatment in each, is demanded by the vehement champions of this cause; but at the same time separate national territories, the bounds of which seem to grow from day to day and which can only be acquired through British arms, are claimed for this race, the numbers of which are given in the reference books as about 15,000,000 (or approximately the popu-

MIDDLE-CLASS ECONOMICS

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —When considering the published views of many of our "intellectual leaders" one cannot help wondering why they clutter up such pronouncements with abstract and even misleading phrases. The examples following come from men whose training and standing entitle them to be regarded as experts—the comments on the examples being in the way of pot shots at reality.

Example A: —(Dr. Coombs, Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction; "Federal Accountant," 25/9/1943). "It has become one of the aims for which the war is being fought that, in the future, economic activities will have specific social objectives." How does he know that the war aims have changed since the war began, or if, having changed once, that they may not change again before the war ends? Knowing that much, he should know also WHO changed them, and the public ought to have that information, too. There is but one social objective, quite specific, for all economic activities, and it is the "life more abundant." Other views of Dr. Coombs give the impression that his "specific social objectives" are more work and more bureaucratic control of the workers.

Example B: —(Mr. Lloyd Ross, "Age," 30/11/1943.) "A major (post-war) problem would be to see that everybody was in employment." Apparently any old kind of employment will do, so long as everybody is kept hard at it, whether or not his work is desired and necessary.

Example C: —(Prof. G. L. Wood, "Age," 29/11/1943.) "The ability of other nations to maintain full employment would be dependent on the foreign policy of America." It is obvious that "purchasing power" is

WHAT IS BEHIND THE RATIONING OF MEAT?

(Continued from page 1.)

population and farm labour; Agricultural commodity arrangements; Land tenure."

At present we enjoy supreme sovereignty in these matters. Sovereignty inherited from our Mother Country through our Dominion Status, and guaranteed to us by Great Britain in the Statute of Westminster. Now it is proposed that we should share this priceless gift of sovereignty with 43 other nations.

Interpreted into plain language, U.N.R.R.A. means that a small group of academic idealists, drawn from the universities of forty-four different countries and most of whom have never even seen Australia, will be able to say what the Australian farmer shall grow, when, where and how he shall grow it and in what quantities and to whom he may dispose of it.

Control the people's food and you will control the people. What a power! What a control!

Hence it would seem that the powerful group of internationalists, who for years endeavoured to popularise their now notorious and discredited plan for Federal Union, have succeeded at last in laying the foundations of their plans for usurping the sovereignty of the forty-four independent nations whose delegates have signed the interim agreement. If this permanent organisation comes to fruition as an authoritative body, then indeed the word "democracy" will become a sham and a hollow mockery. It is the old trick of using a noble purpose as the means of achieving an ignoble end.

This agreement cannot be accepted without impairing the sovereignty of His Majesty the King, and in the light of this fundamental and pre-eminently important factor it should be a wise precaution for you to consult the Attorney General on the laws of treason before you ratify the agreement in the name of the Commonwealth.

However, my chief purpose in mentioning the U.N.R.R.A. organisation here is that it may be the source of the pressure, which is being brought to bear on you to impose the unnecessary and unwanted policy of meat rationing on the Australian people.

But, whatever the source of that pressure, I implore you, Mr. Curtin, to take the people into

lation of a small country, far away, which we knew nothing about: Czechoslovakia.)

We witness the largest ambitions ever expressed and pursued in the history of the world. Here is something, which cannot any longer be denied open discussion: it affects every Briton's tomorrows. When the tone of the present public discussion, and the demands which are raised on behalf of Jewry, are studied, the meaning of the words uttered by the Rabbi of Prague becomes clear.

This is a matter to be examined in a spirit of the most sober objectivity. It is not a question of the goodness or badness of Jews, but of Jewish ambitions and the effect of these on British interests. Much of the blame for this war lies with those people who were blinded by a sneaking admiration for Hitlerist methods to the German danger, or by a deep fear of Communism to the indispensability of the Russian alliance. People who yield to any unreasoning animosity against the Jews are similarly misled and dangerous. They need only to know what the Jews are what they want, and how this affects our future. Our leaders have brought us to a perilous pass by supporting two conflicting Jewish aims, about which Jewry itself is divided: the claim for equal rights of citizenship and the international, territorial, even Imperialist ambition. That confusion must be ended, or we shall come through it to endless troubles.

meant where "employment" is used, for no policy, local or foreign, can deprive Australians of employment while still alive and able to chase kangaroos or dig yams with a stick.

Example D: —(Prof. Julius Stone, Religion and Life Week Convention, Newcastle, N.S.W., October 1943.) "Because of the rapid effects of totalitarian indoctrination, as compared with democratic two-way discussion, every moment of delay in producing a stable, sensitive and critical public in an adequate relationship of mutual trust with its chosen intellectual leaders was an opportunity for a 'putsch' against the freedom of the human mind." I was stumped for comment, at first, on this proposition, and inclined to suggest, "Do you get me, Steve?" as meeting the case. However, it is just possible that the learned Professor meant something like this: "Because dictatorship moves faster than democratic two-way discussion (polite, but inaccurate term for party politics?), the sooner the public becomes critical of and controls its intellectual—or political—leaders' the better for its freedom of mind, and body." To which we can say, "Hear, hear!"

Many plain-thinking folk are becoming disturbed by our intellectual "leaders'" efforts to divert attention from the real to the abstract, and because most of these "leaders" must be aware of the relative public value of reality as against abstraction, their attempts to confuse vital issues in the way they are doing at the present time must be regarded as of deliberate intent and therefore culpable.

—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, East Kew, Vic.

your confidence, tell them of your predicament, and if the moral force of all the Australian people cannot sustain us from policies imposed from abroad, then at least I have enough confidence in the native kindness of my fellow countrymen to believe they will not hold you culpable.

LAW AND LAWLESSNESS.

There is just one more aspect that I desire to emphasise. The purpose of law is to promote peace, order and good government; and to this end only that law is valid which has behind it the approval of a majority of the people. Conversely, it is inevitable that laws, which are devoid of popular sanction, will beget lawlessness, and for that reason can be correctly described as lawless-law. Thus, if a Government becomes a "law-breaker" by enacting "lawless-law" it forfeits all moral right to criticise strikers and other "law-breakers."

Now, meat rationing being as unnecessary as it is unwanted by an overwhelming majority of the people, comes into the category of "lawless-law," and for that reason it is bound to provoke strikes, black-markets and other forms of lawlessness.

Already there are ugly rumours of strikes, and there is, a distinct danger that when meat rationing starts the war stops—as far as industrial Australia is concerned. This, indeed, would be a major disaster.

You, Sir, will be in an invidious position to criticise the strikers, as you also will be a law-breaker in the first cause by being responsible for 'the promulgation of a lawless-law.'

I conclude by expressing a very profound hope that there are no forces so powerful as to prevent you, even at the eleventh hour, from abandoning this policy for the rationing of meat.

—Very sincerely yours, L. S. BULL.

CALLING WESTMEAD, N.S.W.

The "New Times" has received a remittance of 8/6 (postal notes for 7/6 and 1/-) posted from Westmead, N.S.W., on December 10, 1943. The sender failed to enclose a letter showing his or her name and address and stating the purpose of the remittance. "Please advise!"

TEACHERS AND THE "NEW ORDER"

(Continued from page 1.)

cratic robots and smug "intellectuals." There is a curious mesmerism, which leads to a belief in the efficacy of "bigness." It is, consequently, hardly surprising that having failed in the smaller national sphere, many planners favour internationalising our new order in the belief that a problem is simplified if extended on a sufficiently large scale.

To reverse the natural order of things, by fitting people into systems instead of allowing people to evolve systems to serve their needs, naturally requires compulsion and rigid control of individuals to the needs of the system. This aspect has been duly considered and the new orders consist largely of political, military or economic sanctions applicable to recalcitrant among the herd.

"Love thy neighbour" was given as a guiding principle for human progress, but it was not backed by powers of legal enforcement. Such unreality was left to the idealist to whom the world owes so much misery. For the idealists, well supplied with good intentions—the paving stones to hell—frame their theories on what "ought to be" and ride to its attainment regardless of the obstacles of reality in what "is." Their reverence for the efficacy of laws and controls inspires actions as unreal as a decree that pumpkins will in future be grown on oak trees.

In this world of unreality teachers appear to have an advantage over most of the community. They daily observe the working of a miniature society of real human beings not yet fully "conditioned" to fit into artificial systems. They have found that the best laid plans and ideals must recognise the personality, emotions, idiosyncrasies and interests of the distinctive individual, or "go agley." They recognise the individual as the basis of society, and realise that organised society can only exist rationally as it serves his needs. Teachers have had their attention repeatedly called to the truth in the preface to the syllabus, especially in paragraphs 3-6. "The progress of growth is inherent in the child" (or adult). "The active force is within himself." It urges the idea of "organic growth" and the sense of "unity" or universality in our approach to practical problems. How different from the artificial idealism of a world as it "ought to be!"

Surely we owe a special duty to society of which we are a part, to extend the benefits of such understanding as we are privileged to possess, for the well-being of that adult society: to inculcate into the adult community the realisation that their salvation (like education) is within alone; that the "Kingdom of God is within you;" to encourage them to exert their own active powers to accomplish a destiny in harmony with their own sense of purpose; to teach them not what to think, but how to think and act for themselves; to help them see through the maze of artificiality, and past a pagan reverence for external authority, to "put not their trust in princes (leaders and rulers), for in them there is no salvation."

To content ourselves with the rising generation is not enough. The tide of events will not wait for their maturity. If our present pupils are to be saved from lives of frustration, despair and incalculable suffering, in a new struggle towards attainment of human dignity and freedom it must be by the effort of their seniors now.

—(Reprinted from the "Farmer," Moonta, South Australia.)

STALIN'S REALISM

"Stalin is a realist . . . he is prepared to endure any losses . . . He is ruthless as regards the losses of his own armies as long as he can obtain his objects."

—"War Commentary" by Sir Hubert Gough.

This must be a great comfort to the "losses." Such an advance on "cannon-fodder."

POST-WAR LEISURE

The London "Times" of May 5 mentions the opening of the Domestic Front Exhibition in London on May 4. Mr. R. A. Butler is reported as saying, at this function, that "Scientific improvements would give women more leisure" and that "more leisure always meant greater opportunities for the educationist."

Shocking! This sort of thing must be fought. How often have we been told that work is the aim of all people; compulsory work, not leisure or education (unless it be compulsory) or that sort of nonsense.

These labour-saving inventions . . . ! For example, that pre-war gas cooker that was so much advertised. Remember it? It was fitted with a thermostat, which enabled the housewife to pop the joint into the oven and then clear off to the pictures whilst the cooker did the rest. That's what leisure does. Spending money. Most immoral.

How, indeed, is the complete Work State to be achieved if all these scientists are allowed to go about inventing things that obviate it? What a nuisance these fellows are; abolish them, then, smash up their inventions and let us get back to hand labour and we shall soon have "full employment," and not otherwise.

—"Reality."

Printed by M.F. Canavan for the New Times Ltd. Melbourne