

WHAT IS BEHIND MEAT RATIONING? (Page 2)
THE GROWING MENACE OF MONOPOLY. (Page 3)
THE FEDERAL POWERS REFERENDUM. (Page 3)
AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL. (Page 4)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 6. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 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).

Should Strikes be Banned for the Duration?

Coercion or Inducement?

In the Astor Forum (better known as the Heckle Hour), broadcast from Station 3DB, Melbourne, on January 14, the subject of debate was, "Should Strikes Be Banned For The Duration Of The War?" The affirmative was taken by Mr. Quihampton, Secretary of the Debaters' Association, and the negative by Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., who is well known to many of our readers.

Because the arguments advanced in justification of the many forms of compulsion and regimentation by which the people are afflicted receive more than their share of publicity in the daily press and other mediums, we do not deem it incumbent upon journal devoted to the establishment of a functioning democracy to use any of its limited space in further publicising the point of view represented by Mr. Quihampton.

Mr. Bradshaw opened the case for the negative by stressing the fact that, in periods during which their country is engaged in war, the majority of people find great difficulty in bringing to bear upon questions directly related to the war, a judgment unwarped by prejudice and unclouded by mass emotion. He appealed to listeners to elevate the discussion to a plane of thought whereon the question would be considered purely on its merits.

The following are the principal points which were made by Mr. Bradshaw in the course of his address for the negative:—

The question is one, which goes to the very root of basic human rights. Because we have all been born into the world without being consulted in advance, and the laws of society make it a criminal offence to attempt to take our own life, rights must take precedence over obligations. For that reason also, the mere fact of our existence confers a moral entitlement to certain inalienable individual rights.

The question of human rights has far-reaching implications; vast potentialities for good or evil rest upon their preservation or renunciation. By permitting them to be filched from us under cover of the exigencies of war, we are surrendering to the forces of despotism against which the war is being fought. Prior to the war, individuals who found the conditions of their employment unsatisfactory had the right to contract-out. That right having now been taken away, the strike is the only weapon

remaining by which the rectification of such injustices can be obtained.

Prominent public men ("leaders") have repeatedly declared that the war, fundamentally, is one between two conflicting ideologies—the totalitarian and the democratic. The democratic ideology, for the preservation of which the United Nations professedly are struggling, recognises the supreme value of the individual and his right to a degree of personal freedom, limited only by the boundaries beyond which liberty degenerates into oppression of others.

The methods peculiar to the two conflicting ideologies are coercion on the one hand and inducement on the other. The totalitarian States quite unabashedly stand for the ruthless and unrestricted, use of coercion, whereas the "democracies," theoretically, at least, rely upon inducement.

Therefore, to assert that the "democracies" can surrender to totalitarianism by embracing its methods of coercion, and yet triumph over totalitarianism and all it stands for, is to take up an impassible and untenable position.

The attempt to outlaw strikes is another phase of the war on the individual. This war has been going on insidiously, by a process of gradualism, ever since the military conflict of 1914-18 ended. The war on the individual has ALMOST reached its culmination in the present conflict for "the preservation of democracy."

We hear a great deal about the supposed necessity for the individual to forgo a measure of freedom in favour of "large-scale planning." As indicative of the interests responsible for the "planning" being imposed upon us ("planning" is merely a polite word substituted for "regimentation") the following words of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, quoted from "P.E.P.'s Journal" of 4th October, 1938, are significant:—"We have started from the position that only in war,

or under the threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale 'planning'." The FACT is that we are at war. And, those words of Mr. Sieff assume an added and sinister significance when considered in conjunction with an article written by Lord Vansittart, and, published in an English Sunday newspaper as recently as 1st August 1943. Lord Vansittart was Chief Diplomatic adviser to the Foreign Office, and his standing as an authority on international affairs is exceedingly high. In referring to the activities of "the dupes of those Leftist pan-Germans operating under cover of anti-Nazism," he said, "This has always been a phoney war, and we may get a phoney peace, unless, at long last, these people are put, and kept, in their place."

Can strikes be abolished by legislation? Experience seemed to prove that they cannot. Surely it is better and more in keeping with the avowed objects for which the "democracies" are fighting the war, to take adequate steps to remove the CAUSES of strikes than to attempt to suppress them by the arbitrary, exercise of National Security Regulations.

Excessive and confiscatory taxation is one of the principal causes of unrest now prevailing. Not only is it having a harmful effect on the war effort by encouraging absenteeism—a new type of strike—but also, by destroying incentive, it is having a baneful effect on economic activity generally. The resentment of these tremendous and unnecessary burdens imposed upon the people on the advice of "economic advisers" is not confined to wage and salary earners—as was evidenced by the resistance of leading business magnates, whose patriotism is never questioned, to the proposal of the Government to confiscate in taxation all profits in excess of 4 per cent. A letter

from a coal-miner published recently in one of the Sydney daily papers, showed clearly that confiscatory taxation is the cause of restricted coal production. "Do you and the Government and the general public think it fair," asks this miner, "that a man should have to cut and fill fifty tons of coal per pay—or work three and a half days—for nothing? If you and the public saw fifty tons of coal stacked up in a heap and you had to fill it to pay your taxes, you would walk around it and go for your life. You or they would not fill it, let alone cut it. . . . Well, Sir, that is what I do—stay home three days: and will do so until the Government wakes up."

The persons engaged in all occupations where prevailing conditions render long hours of work necessary are, in many cases, making inroads on their reserves of physical and mental energy. But the additional earnings which should be accruing to such persons, and which will be needed by them, if their health becomes impaired as the result of overstrain, are being confiscated in taxation. This is utterly immoral.

The arguments in opposition to the banning of strikes may be summarised as follows:—

(1) It involves the violation of a morally inviolable basic human right. There can be no democracy if the right to contract-out is surrendered.

(2) It involves the sacrifice of those principles peculiar to the democratic way of life in, defence of which the war is being waged.

(3) It involves the evacuation to the forces of retrogression and despotism of yet another theatre in which the battle for human freedom has been raging. If we fail to check the continued encroachment of successive waves of regimentation, we shall discover that their erosive force has pene-

(Continued on page 3.)

NOTES on the NEWS

The Victorian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Martin) is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of February 2 thus: "As a result of manpower muddling 1,500,000 sheep which should have been on the way to feed the people of Britain were deteriorating rapidly on dried-out pastures. These sheep could have been treated if the manpower had been made available." Continuing, he said that "it was common knowledge that thousands of men and women in base camps, munitions works, and in the organisations attached to the Allied Works Council were not doing anything like a full day's work." From this it should be quite clear that, apart from further regimenting of the people, meat rationing is designed to cover up the blunders of the bureaucrats.

POLITICAL POINTERS: A sign that the purposeful, independent British spirit still lives is seen in the following remarks of Commander R. T. Bower, British M.P., as reported in the daily press of December 12: "The Mosley issue [agitation for imprisonment without trial] revealed a Fascist virus in the purest tradition of Himmler." He described Fascism as "a political disease of the Left, and a manifestation of frustrated Socialism." He also pointed out "Fascists and Communists differ little in practice, and are merely Socialists in a hurry." It is pleasing to note that more and more people are now realising that the only notable difference between these "isms" is a mere name. Poison under any name still remains poison.

POWERS PROPAGANDA: The leading articles of both the Melbourne "Herald" of February 4 and the Melbourne "Sun" of February 5 contained the following statement (in the midst of strong propaganda barages, almost identical in argument) dealing with the post-war rehabilitation of 800,000 persons, viz.:—"Only the central Government can exercise such powers on a nation-wide scale, or can use the national credit for their implementation." Obviously these articles are the product of the same brain, and, as usual in such statements, the percentage of truth is minute. It is true that control of the national (financial) credit is within the constitutional sphere of the Federal Government—and it is also true (although not stated) that this body ALREADY has the power to make credits available to the States—WITHOUT any transfer of powers. So far as national physical resources are concerned, these reside within the States, and can be far more satisfactorily handled by each State concerned. Beware of such propaganda!

TRAIN TRAVEL: Every now and then agitation is generated for "one class" train travel, as in Tasmania. Each time this occurs, an official of the Victorian Railways raises a cry about losing revenue amounting, roughly, to a mere £200,000 p.a.—quite an insignificant argument, yet sufficient to abate the controversy for the time being. Although the socialised railways are theoretically owned by the people, the fact is that the people don't control them—and control is the really important matter, not ownership. Although the commissioners do not own the railways they do control them and

they oppose "one class" travel, even though the people favour it. Why not have "one class"—and, what's more important, first class?

SHAW'S STRUGGLE: The highly publicised writer, G. Bernard Shaw, in a recent tilt at the deadly disease of taxation, echoed the struggle against this anti-social monster when he said that the tax master "compels me to work a thundering lot harder than I did 60 years ago." He explained that he is now living on his capital because he is only permitted to retain 6d in each £ he earns. The class-struggle advocates consider this situation very desirable, and are quite unconcerned with the fact that "the workers" are also being forced down the scale of existence. Shaw says that, if he has any money left, he will found an institute for the invention of a new English alphabet with 42 letters, instead of 28, for better expression. He should have brains enough to realise that unless the taxation monster is restrained there will soon be no possible use for such a language.

PROPAGANDA PLANS: The political correspondent of the Melbourne "Sun" reported on February 3 "plans are being completed to use the Department of Information to carry the referendum." This means that the Department will not impartially (Continued on page 2)

Pensioners' Plight

The fathers and mothers of some of our 1914-18 heroes, who today are rewarded by a grateful (?) Government with a pauper's pittance described as the "old-age pension," are in a more serious plight than ever. Here's an example of one pensioner's budget: 10/- for room (hovel), 1/6 for two shaves per week, 2/10½d. for tobacco (most of this is Government tax), 1/3 per day for one good meal—which leaves (how much? you work it out!) for other meals, fares to hospital once a week, etc., etc. Oh death, where is thy sting, and where's the burial fee to avoid the pauper's grave? And, believe it or not, Curtin, Evatt and Co. are quite aware of this disgraceful state of affairs! Happily, some democrats in Adelaide have started an electoral campaign to correct this position. They have a cast-iron case, and with the help of pensioners and others should succeed.

Government's 'Free Medicine' Plan

To the Editor: Sir, —I have not yet seen any comment in your paper on this scheme, though it is something that will affect the pockets of every member of the community. Briefly, the plan is that all medicines ordered from a set formulary will be available to the public free. This sounds rosy, but on examination proves otherwise.

The proposed formulary was devised by medical and pharmaceutical representatives as a wartime expedient to conserve drugs. To make it a standard is to deprive patients of the better drugs available in peacetime. Variations of the formulae, all ethical and the newer drugs, such as sulphanilamide, vitamins, estrogens, etc., are not included, and are a direct charge on the patient by the chemist. This means that he pays twice, as he already pays per medium of his taxes. Patients must also provide their own containers, thus leading to use of second-hand bottles, with definite risk of infection from same.

The chemist is to be rewarded for his knowledge and labour to the extent of 1/- per script dispensed, and is allowed no

profit on drugs used, providing them at actual cost. Out of the shilling all overheads, etc., must be paid. This is obviously a case of sweating the chemist. No payment is made for knowledge and labour involved in ordering drugs and checking on arrival. Also, the fee is ridiculously low when pharmacy has established that 1/7 is necessary to pay wages and overheads on a basis of five scripts per hour, a safe dispensing rate.

The Government claims eight per hour. Their remuneration to the chemist can be proved inadequate as follows: Take a theoretical pharmacy, where the manager dispenses eight per hour for 44 hours. Statutory holidays, time off, etc., brings this to 42 hours per week actually worked, or 338 scripts per week or £16/16/-. A shop doing this turnover would be in a very busy centre, where rent would be, conservatively, £10 per week. Capable labour to help generally would be £2, and overheads of labels, corks, freight, etc., would be £1/10/-, leaving approx. £3 per week for skilled, responsible labour. And this is the maximum income possible! Actually, the only pharmacies that might do these figures are those in major metropolitan areas, where £10 rent would be unacceptable. Of course, the chemist could shift to the back street, but leases would be an awkward problem.

The Government prosecutes for non-observance of Prof. Copland's rulings, but, in this case, ignores its own decrees. Approval was granted to pharmacy's methods of pricing scripts, which involves a profit on drugs and container, and a labour charge, in all totalling 3/7 average per script.

In your usual fair manner I hope you will take up this matter and give it the airing it deserves.
—Yours, etc., L. J. HOMEY, Ph.C., M.P.S., MIS.Ch., Rutherglen Vic.

Monetary Magic

Although official returns disclose that the total amount of legally issued money in existence at December 31, 1943, was approximately £162 millions in notes and approximately £20 millions in metal coins, the deposits of the nine trading banks were slightly over £497 millions, and savings banks deposits were nearly £415 millions. Now this means that the banks owed their depositors £912 millions, whilst there is only £182 millions of legal money to meet their liability with (if they had the lot!). The shortage, namely, £730 millions, is, of course, represented by bankers' "cheque-money," for which there is no real or legal money "backing." This "unbacked cheque-money" is what the bankers lend, and it finally becomes deposits. Such are, the "loans" by which they acquire control of industry, land and homes, and on which they draw interest. It certainly is magic—yes black magic!

WHAT'S BEHIND RATIONING OF MEAT?

It will be remembered that, under this heading, our issue of January 28 contained a pertinent letter to Mr. Curtin from Mr. L. S. Bull, of Lane Cove, N.S.W. Hereunder we publish the Prime Minister's answer and Mr. Bull's further letter in reply:—

Prime Minister, Canberra.
19th January 1944.

P. S. Bull, Esq.,

6 Barina Road, Lane Cove, N.S.W.
Dear Sir,—I am directed by the Prime Minister to acknowledge your letter of the 10th January and to inform you he has noted your comments in regard to the Government's meat rationing proposal.

The position is that we have definite obligations to fulfill which cannot be given effect to without a measure of rationing such as is proposed. The demands this year exceed the supply, by 35%, which in terms of stock represents approximately 15 million sheep and lambs additional to those already slaughtered in Australia. Not only have we to provide meat for the civilian population, but we are also required to find meat for our troops, the U.S.A. Forces and to send a quota to Great Britain, where the people are only allowed to purchase 1/2d worth of meat per person per week.

In regard to the latter, the Government feels that under any circumstances it could not fail to supply England with the minimum quantities required by that Government to provide the very meagre ration now made available to the British people.

It is true that our flocks of sheep and herds of cattle have increased in the past few years, but our commitments have also increased to an enormous extent, and our difficulty today is one of slaughter, transport and cold storage, and in these matters we have no facilities to enable meat to be provided on a peace-time scale.

—Yours faithfully, (Sgd.) E. W. TONKIN,
Private Secretary.

6 Barina Road, Lane Cove,
2nd February 1944.

The Right Hon. John Curtin, M.H.R.,
Parliament House, Canberra.

Dear Mr. Curtin,—I wish to thank you for the courtesy of your letter of the 19th January (per medium of your private secretary), in reply to mine of the 10th idem.

I have profound respect and admiration for the people of England and Scotland, from whose soil and stock I have been privileged, by the Grace of God, to be descended, and if the rationing of meat in Australia means that my courageous kinsmen in the British Isles are to receive a per capita increase in their present meagre ration, then I not only withdraw my objection to meat rationing in Australia, but wholeheartedly urge that it shall continue.

BUT it is plainly stated in your letter that meat rationing has been imposed on Australians in order "to provide the very meagre ration now made available to the British People," so obviously there is a skeleton in the cupboard, and, in company with thousands of other Australians, I want to see its bones.

Until quite recently we have met all our commitments, and, as you frankly admit in your letter, at the same time "our flocks of sheep and herds of cattle have increased." Aye, Sir! Increased to the point of embarrassment. Now, quite suddenly, you state "the demands this year exceed supply by 35%." If this sudden and very substantial increase in our export quota to Great Britain is not going to result in an increased ration per capita to the British People, and you have stated in plain words that it is not, then the only sane answer to this sphinx-like riddle seems that it is to replace supplies that the United Kingdom hitherto has drawn from another source.

If this is correct, what is "that other source"? And why has it been cut off?

It cannot be on account of a sudden resurgence of the Atlantic U-boat campaign because, apart from the lack of newspaper reports of such resurgence, if ships from "that other source" could not get through it is hardly likely that ships sailing from Australia could get through. By the way, it seems that the problem of refrigerated shipping has been solved. Have these ships been diverted from "that other source"?

Could it be possible that for the purpose of enforcing their own policy, powerful interests somewhere have been able to bring pressure to bear on the British Government

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the United Democrats' Headquarters,
17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide)

"Freedom From Want": We are pleased to be able to report that other organisations have become so interested in this campaign to secure a better deal for pensioners that they have had their own leaflets printed. We are also pleased that the arbitrary figure of £3 has been generally accepted as the minimum amount we should strive to obtain. Have you sent for a supply of leaflets yet? If not, send your order today to Mr. J. Fitzgerald, President of the Prospect Pensioners' Association, Prospect, who commenced the campaign, or to this office. The cost is 1/3 per 100, plus postage.

Dean Case: We have published an attractive booklet entitled "The New Despotism," which sets out full details of this amazing case of a man who has been unable to obtain a hearing in the courts. Copies 6d each, plus 1d postage. Special prices for quantities.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

Page 2—"New Times," February 11, 1944.

to impose economic sanctions on "that other source"?

If so, is this procedure justifiable? Or is the British Government the victim of forces more sinister?

What part, if any, does U.N.R.R.A. play in the extraordinary mystery?

Is the Commonwealth Government an acquiescent participator in this mystery? Or are we, too, the victims of external pressure?

You are a busy man, Mr. Curtin, and no one will deny that your job is a difficult and unenviable one. Heaven forbid that I should add to your burdens by unnecessarily asking a lot of mischievous questions. But there is a growing atmosphere of suspicion and discontent among the people. They are getting tired of being pushed around and ordered about like a lot of children without knowing the reason WHY. They see clearly that there is a lot of unhealthy hedging and duplicity in official explanations of unpopular Government policy. You have just completed an agree-

EVEN THE KING MAY NOT ENTER!

It has been said that "an Englishman's home is his castle," and that no one may enter it without authority—that his person and property, are inviolate in the law. There are, alas, tendencies at large today, working subtly and insidiously, to undermine this sanctity of the person and his property. Just how precious these rights are we will never really know until they have been filched away—that is, if our vigilance is so lax as to allow that! The contrast, which the British tradition affords with that of other countries, made a great impression upon Princess Alexandra Kropotkin when in London. Recently she contributed the following to the New York "Herald Tribune":—

Many years ago, in a modest brick villa near London, we were living the unharried life for which my parents had taught me to have deep gratitude—for father was an exile from Russia, and had known what it is to be under surveillance by the Czar's secret police.

One evening we went to a political rally. The meeting lasted until nearly midnight. At our front door, when we reached home, stood an officer of the law.

I was terrified. I had believed father's freedom couldn't be threatened in this democratic land. But the sight of that constable made me certain that even here implacable tyranny had caught up with us again.

And then I learned a great lesson about England. I heard what that bobby said.

"We was walking our rounds, and we saw your front entrance open, sir. We rang the bell, but there didn't seem to be anyone at 'ome. We thought as 'ow the premises might 'ave been broken into."

"Have you searched inside?" asked father.

"Oh, no, sir!" The policeman was shocked. "We 'avent a warrant. We can't go barging into people's 'omes without a legal paper. That's against the law, sir."

"But the door wasn't locked," said father.

"Makes no difference," replied the bobby. "We aren't allowed to walk in merely on account of the door being open."

I went out and gazed at our front door. I trotted round to the garden and studied our back door. Neither appeared to be especially massive, yet I saw them now

HOW FASCISM ROBBED A PEOPLE OF INITIATIVE

Most impressive to the men who have the job of putting Sicily's paralysed cities back on their feet is the way Fascism has robbed the Sicilians of all initiative. Whole towns have been found starving with ample food stores near by—merely because the machinery of distribution broke down after Fascist officials fled.

"On one occasion we found 6000 to 8000 people had been without bread for nine days because no one had given them authority to get wheat, although it was readily obtainable less than 50 miles away," said Lieut. George Marinkov, young former police officer of St. Paul, Minn. "They had lived on hazel nuts until we came in. Within 12 hours we had food in the city and had arranged for shipments of a continuous supply."

Marinkov said the lives of the people had been so ordered by the complicated Governmental machinery of Fascism that they were afraid to make a decision of any kind themselves.

"They just have been stunned by the war and turned into automatons by the Fascists," he said. "They'll let a dead body stay in front of their homes for days until some one orders them to remove or bury it. They won't even complain. They seem able to endure anything in the way of tribulation and hardships."

—Harold V. Boyle, in A.P. despatch.

"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

ment with the Government of New Zealand, which has to be ratified when Parliament opens on the 9th February next, and already people are wondering if there are any "niggers" in any "woodpiles" there.

Much of the doubt and distrust could be cleared away by a frank statement of all the facts. To this end I would be highly appreciative of your answers to the following questions:—

1. Will meat rationing in Australia result in an increased ration per capita for the British people?

2. If not, what has suddenly caused the British supplies to fall so heavily in arrears?

3. Are economic sanctions being applied anywhere?

4. If so, where? And why?

5. Should we, at some future time, endeavour to resist repugnant policies imposed from abroad, what are the dangers of this same weapon—economic sanctions—being used against Australia?

6. What part does U.N.R.R.A. play in this intrigue?

7. Has any external pressure been brought to bear on the Commonwealth Government to impose and maintain meat rationing?

8. If so, by whom?—and under what threat?

Your answers to these questions are awaited with interest.

—Very sincerely yours, L. S. BULL.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

present both sides of the Federal Powers question; it will be just another case of public institutions, maintained at the people's expense, being used to gloss over the dangers of centralising power in the hands of politicians, over whom the people have no reasonable control. The German people were subjected to a similar propaganda bombardment, to which they foolishly yielded, with results that are now history. It is to be hoped that the Australian people will not be stamped, too.

TAXATION TANGLES: The vocal organs of all the "isms" (according to press reports) are unanimous in approving the "pay-as-you-go" taxation proposals; and so we find Capitalists, Communists, Socialists and Bankers united as to the method of depriving the people of their purchasing power. The only question of importance relative to taxation proposals is, will it mean more or less loss of purchasing power? It is rather idle to be concerned with the method by which you will be "soaked." It's almost like arguing with the burglar as to the manner in which he will carry out the burglary. How the bankers (who normally receive half the proceeds of taxation as interest payments) must laugh to see the victims more concerned with the method of extraction than with the extraction.

PEACE PLANS: Germany's barons of industry and finance are reported to have submitted another peace plan to British and American bankers. (As one set of bankers to another, so to speak!) The plan is known as the "Schacht Plan," under which British and American industrialist interests would gain joint ownership of German industry with the present owners. Financiers and industrialists would get a free hand in choosing the leaders of post-war Germany—and the right to maintain an armed force "to keep order." This would mean, of course, that the control set-up would actually be unaltered, excepting that the dupe, Hitler, would conveniently disappear, as Mussolini did. It will be noted that the people of Germany are to have no say in the matter. Anyway, it does show that the world-planners have the matter well in hand.

BENT RACKETS: Much publicity is being given by the Prices Commission to alleged rent racketeering, and it is said that some landlords preferred to rent premises to Allied servicemen at exorbitant rates, which Australians could not afford to meet. So the issue is quickly reduced to a money problem: if you have the money, you can obtain accommodation. Advertisements from Allied servicemen seeking furnished houses and flats on a "rent no object" basis have been shown to the authorities, which indicate that our visitors are not short of money-votes for houses. No doubt there are many skilled builders among our visitors, and as we have an abundant supply of building materials, what's wrong with building some houses?

—O.B.H.

THE FUNDAMENTAL CHOICE

Sound judgment consists in, the placing of things in the correct order of priority or value, that is, in the correct relation to one another. By "things" are meant events, emotions, conclusions. And in the final analysis—because, in time, we can only do one thing at a time—sound judgment boils down to right decision as between alternatives, this or that line of action; to the correct exercising of our inalienable right "to choose or refuse one thing at a time."

Now the first choice we are called on to make is concerning the value, the reality of this visible, tangible existence we lead in time, i.e., the physical universe. You may ask: What part has choice got in that? There is no alternative—unless you call death an alternative. We had no choice in our birth, or as to the plane on which it occurred.

Yet there is a choice, and a very vital one. One way in which it might be expressed would be to say that it is between alternative assumptions regarding reality, life: The choice between setting an absolute value upon the events and emotions that go to make our conscious existence here, and setting a relative value only upon them. That statement needs some elaboration. For instance, it amounts to setting an absolute value on existence, as we are able to see and hear and touch it, to conclude and act as though it were everything. Or (equally absolute) to regard it as nothing—at the best a vale of tears.

In reality, there is no difference whatsoever between those two superficially opposed assumptions; their apparent opposition and all action arising out of it, have no positive value and can lead to no positive results. And yet it is just over their supposedly real "difference" in value and importance and sequence that nations can be persuaded, no doubt by interested parties, to go to the extremes of war. What are these assumptions in their widest differentiation? At one end of the stick the hedonist (so-called materialist), and at the other, the "religionist" (moralist)—both, equally ideological and abstract; the creeds of both are absolute assertion and therefore amount to the same thing as regards this fundamental and all-important choice that life presents, which essentially does not lie between two absolutes, but between placing an absolute value, or else a relative value only on everything that presents itself to our judgment.

The attribution to natural phenomena, and our deductions from them, of absolute value is the basis of all ideological contention, which is not only end-

less but also far worse—meaningless. It is, in fact, a substitute for the true employment of individual judgment, as well as a subconscious evasion of the dreaded responsibility involved in making a real and unqualified choice, not between the labelled dogmas, such as asceticism and hedonism, or individualism and collectivism, or, for that matter, Nazism and Communism, but between openly declaring ourselves for absolutism of any kind, or else adopting, and making an active stand for, the relative view of life, as the closest to reality and the facts as so far revealed.

Within the ranks of ideology, that is, the realm of abstraction, no one thing is more vital than another (it might be called the realm of six-of-one-and-half-a-dozen-of-the-other, or heads-I-win and tails-you-lose; what Chesterton described as progress in all directions at once) because ideologies, as such, all represent static (absolute) concepts of an obviously dynamic situation. Life, consciousness, is a moving, fluid condition; no final, absolute pigeonholed conclusion, but a flow—a ceaseless, insistent demand for judgments and valuations. In that movement itself, in that unending need for the exercise of responsible choice and decision as to the relative value or importance of one of two lines of action, or of alternative interpretations of phenomena, lies Reality—which might be defined as the maximum degree of consciousness that each and every individual is capable of.

The reason that factuality experiences such heavy going in this world (as anyone who attempts to make a stand for it must admit it does), must be due surely to the dread that exists of this relative view of life and of our own nature, which this relative view entails—just of that quality of fluidity, of ceaseless, never-ending movement. Something in us, with which we have to contend, seems to long for an existence containing no more responsible activity than that of "pushing up the daisies," an existence where every anxious question is finally settled and pigeonholed. We find it next to impossible to

(Continued at foot of page 3)

THE GROWING MENACE OF MONOPOLY

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

Historians of the future may be sorely perplexed to explain why the people of today, having the "benefit" of "free-and-compulsory" education, allow themselves to be organised into regimented masses while at the same time shouting themselves hoarse about "liberty," "democracy" and "progress." The fact of the matter is, of course, that people everywhere are mouthing slogans divorced from reality. We have entered an era in which important words are almost meaningless to many who use them. The prevailing philosophy running right throughout our society is one of death—death of the individual. Most individuals are becoming mere pawns in the strategies of a few men controlling powerfully organised groups.

It has been shown time and time again in these columns that the financial policy pursued by those who control the present banking system has crushed private enterprise and produced monopolies in industry. As the same financial policy has been pursued in every country, it is not surprising that industry has been rapidly centralised into fewer and bigger monopolies in every country.

Now we come to a very important point—a point which many people don't appear capable of grasping: This monopoly in industry paves the way for socialism. Without monopoly and the results of it, socialism would have little appeal. Quite rightly, the socialists point out the harm the monopolies are doing. And, of course, all reasonable people must agree that monopoly in industry is bad.

But, when it comes to a solution of the problem, we see how thousands of people are being tricked. The socialists DON'T suggest the BREAKING DOWN of monopoly and the reversal of the financial policy responsible for monopoly. No; they glibly suggest that the "State" should TAKE OVER the monopolies and see that they are run "on behalf of the people." In theory the people are said to be the "State"; but, in actual fact, as evidenced by what has happened in such countries as Russia, Germany and Italy, the "State" becomes the Supreme Monopoly!

Admittedly there are fights to see who is going to run the "State." Mr. Ernie Thornton, Communist secretary of the Federated Ironworkers' Association of Australia, in a recent pamphlet urging the centralised control of all trade unions in Australia, says that B.H.P. has strengthened its industrial monopoly by centralised control of policy, and that what is good enough for B.H.P. is good enough for him. This is a very significant admission. Thornton's philosophy is fundamentally the same as men such as Mr. Essington Lewis, of B.H.P.

Students of German history will recall how the German trade union movement was, prior to Hitler, highly centralised. The result was the easy destruction of the unions by Hitler when he obtained power. Hitler, of course, claimed to represent the "State." And, as a matter of interest, it is said by many with first-hand experience of Nazi Germany, that many Communists and Socialists became members of Hitler's party. Some readers may recall a photograph, which appeared in the Melbourne press not long after France's capitulation, showing a former leader of the French Fascist Party talking with the French Communist leader in England. The Fascist was reported as saying that he was changing his views, and was now friendly towards the Communists! I don't think any comment is required.

It is obvious that Australians have little control over industrial monopolies in this country. But it is equally obvious that, if the Government takes the monopolies over, Australians will have the same control over them as they have over their railways and the post office. Exactly nil. Mr. Essington Lewis and other "capitalists" will be placed on the Government pay roll, and be in a better position than ever. And, of course, Mr. Thornton and his colleagues will also be Government officials.

Monopoly is essentially Jewish in origin. Prior to the arrival of Hitler—or Rothschild, as some people prefer to call him—reputable historians of all nationalities had pointed out that the banking system was Jewish in origin and control, that monopoly in industry was the result of it and must lead inevitably to socialism. The Jews in general have never been in favour of genuine

The Fundamental Choice

(Continued from page 2.)

face the fact that life is not like that; that in reality, as far as our understanding goes, we know nothing and nothing is settled, and that to be really true to ourselves we can afford to be wholly (absolutely) identified with no camp but, inhabiting a sort of mental no-man's-land, must accept no discipline but that of our own judgment.

We shrink from the necessity of facing up to each moment, and every moment, as it comes along, looking it squarely in the eye and accepting it for what it is, its "badness" along with its "goodness," and being able to rejoice in the mere fact that life still has a kick in it, and is capable of imparting it to us.

Rather than accept those conditions—conditions of reality, they might be called—which our reason must tell us are the only possible conditions of anything vital; rather than make that choice, we prefer to construct dogmas and absolute, one-dimensional formulas of and for life, and to go to war with one another respecting their rival and abstract value, heedless of the fact that in the process all the relative (real) values created by society, instinctively mostly, and with infinite toil, throughout the centuries, are being blasted to bits.

—NFW in the "Social Creditor."

SOIL, AGRICULTURE & FOOD VALUES

Hereunder we publish the fourth and final 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 Warwick: . . . the attitude of the general public to this particular subject is really staggering. The ordinary man in the street seems to believe that he can go on year after year; that he belongs to a particular civilisation unlike any of those, which have preceded it, a civilisation, which nothing can stop, and which, apparently, is going eventually to reach Utopia. That may be possible, but I think your Lordships will agree that it is also, possibly, unlikely. In any case the enormous industrialisation that has taken place in our world, in what is really a minute of time, has created huge sections of the population who are totally ignorant of the soil from which we are sprung, and unless they are taught to know and understand it and to love and cherish it, then, to my mind, there is no question but that the fate of our civilisation will be exactly the same as that which befell Babylon, Egypt, and Rome.

We must possess self-knowledge and we must practice a humble and really statesmanlike method of approach to this subject if we are to get anywhere. It is no use continuing with these charming theories and political devices, which are today perplexing the world with ideas for our post-war fashion of living. Man is made up of two things—his body and his soul, which comes from God. It therefore follows that unless he can do away with nature, unless he can invent some methods of maintaining and reproducing life without recourse to nature, then surely he must try to marry the laws of God and the laws of nature instead of perpetually trying, as he does today, to keep them at variance. Scientific knowledge, as was pointed out by Lord Geddes, may be a very dangerous thing. I am afraid that our generation has been inclined to lack the wisdom necessary to apply scientific knowledge . . .

Scientific proof rests upon a series of experiments prolonged into infinity. There is really no such thing as scientific proof; there is only scientific probability. In dealing with all these subjects, which concern dietetics for men, beast and soil, any experiment must perforce take a long time and, because we are concerned principally with the human body, any experiment will be very difficult to do. The noble Viscount, Lord Bledisloe, discussed the passing of phosphates through milk into the human body. Apart from our old friend the white

rat, it is very difficult to do experiments except with the human body, which is apt to object to being treated in that way, so that our knowledge must perforce come slowly. I think, however, that if we take the whole cycle of nature, and then add those man-made discoveries which are most probably proven, always remembering their possible fallibility, we have a reasonable chance of continuing to exist, together with all those other organic bodies that are in the world; but, if we do not, I am sure—and I know that many of your Lordships are of the same opinion—that we are committing ourselves to a form of race suicide.

We know the history of agricultural England, from the days of the Saxons and the Normans up through the village lands to the enclosures of the eighteenth century and the perfection of the rotation of crops introduced by Coke and Townsend. I suppose that that system exists today almost in the same form as it existed a hundred and fifty years ago, with the exception that probably since 1846 and the repeal of the Corn Laws it has not always been permitted to be properly carried out. I do not suppose that any really serious effects on our soil, although they existed, became noticeable until the twentieth century; but with the enormous strain, which we have put on our soil in the last war, and to an even greater extent in this war, those effects are becoming very apparent. I am certain that at the end of this war the soil of this country will not resemble at all the soil of the country in the time of our Saxon forbears. That soil was an accumulation of the composting of thousands of years. It was rich in fibre, in lime, in nitrogen, and, above all, in vegetable humus. I do not suppose that the Englishman has ever put back into the soil as much as he took out. If, like the Chinese, he were to do so, I do not believe there is any reason why we should not continue to grow the straw crops, which we have grown in the present war for an almost indefinite period. However, this is not, and has not been, the case, and we are faced today with the possibility of those difficulties, which have so seriously affected the United States of America with their "dustbowls." The very short history of that country should enable us to realise the enormous speed with which such a catastrophe can occur once it has started . . . Sir Robert McCarrison, who has been referred to several times today, made a remark about that straw, which has always fascinated me. He said he had seen on many occasions that straw grown on soil rich in humus lasted ten years or longer in the thatch, but if grown on a similar soil which had been treated only with artificial it was rotten at the end of five years. We have heard all about the white rats, and how they can exist on potted vitamins, but cannot breed, and how the minute they go back to absorbing those same vitamins from their natural sources they automatically regain their powers of growth and of reproduction. This must surely make it quite evident that there is some quality of the soil, both for beast and for man, which is not accounted for by the ordinary chemical ingredients—the proteins, fats, carbohydrates, minerals and vitamins—and that without that quality we are all doomed to sterility. It would be an awful thing that if through the few discoveries and inventions of our modern world this race was to condemn itself to extinction.

We keep on hearing today of these awful dehydrating plants being put up all over the country, and of some new vitamin having been discovered. We hear of the constant spraying of vegetables—tomatoes, fruit, and, in the last four or five years, ordinary beans. If these plants were grown on soil, which was rich in humus, they would not need any poison sprays at all. I should

(Continued on page 4.)

THE FEDERAL POWERS REFERENDUM

Vote "NO" because under wartime strain citizens are not in the mood, nor have they the leisure necessary, to thoroughly criticise the proposals.

Vote "NO" because no real reason has ever been put forward why-ever-increasing prosperity, leading to ever-increasing individual freedom, cannot be arranged for within the framework of Governmental machinery, as it now exists.

Vote "NO" because when Constitutional arrangements are fully and carefully reviewed, it may be found that the case for a larger number of States, smaller in area, and each with greater, and not less, power of self-determination, is a more attractive proposition than the idea of having nearly all power centralised at Canberra.

Vote "NO" because the promises of the past about the "advantages" of Federation have been notably belied. Remember that the solemn compact that a railway line would be built to link Adelaide to Port Darwin has not been fulfilled. Again, we are now suffering from an over-dose of taxation under the new "unified" code.

Vote "NO" because Constitutional safeguards, which should operate to protect the individual against excessive interference and tyranny by executive agencies, should be revived. These safeguards can again become effective instead of being lost under a load of petty-fogging statutes and regulations. These traditional British safeguards come to us under the original States' Constitutions, and we should consider them all the more valuable in that they are flexible and not settled by legal phraseology. These precious safeguards may disappear almost completely if the present trends by which power is centralised at Canberra are not reversed.

Vote "NO" because the few shillings per head per year which we pay towards the upkeep of the State Parliaments will certainly be exceeded in maintaining the highly paid staffs of Commonwealth intermediaries and bureaucrats necessary to police affairs in the various States according to the dictates of boards of control, dignitaries, theorists and statisticians in far-away Canberra.

Vote "NO" because of the desperately dangerous condition, which will arise if Federal oversight and direction should be exercised regarding "EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT." If we allow these abstract and elusive, and indefinable words, "employment and unemployment," to become part of the language by which we indicate the scope of Federal power, then we will surely make for ourselves a strait-jacket from which it will be difficult to wriggle. How could one possibly define or interpret or limit the words "employment and unemployment" in any concrete case where one wanted to invoke the protection of an independent Law Court in retaining the only freedom worth calling freedom, i.e., the freedom to choose or to refuse one thing at a time, including the right to seek employment, or to seek employees, according to one's own choice?

Vote "NO" because the proposed Constitutional alterations do not deal with the stupid and false policies of finance which now cause such important bars to freedom in our social intercourse. These bars to

freedom could be removed by the Australian Federal authorities without any alteration in the Constitution. Moreover, when these bars to freedom are removed, then every programme of desired works (whether it is concerned with housing, transport, water supply, or educational and industrial development) would easily and willingly be carried out by existing agencies without any oversight or interference from Canberra, and with a minimum of "State" control.

—C. H. ALLEN.

[Any citizen who thinks that these suggestions—might be profitably distributed as a printed leaflet is asked to notify his support to Hon. Sec., United Democrats, 17 Weymouth St, Adelaide.]

THE MOTHERS OF TO-MORROW?

On a recent Sunday in the city of Glasgow a review was held of women and girls in military uniform. It was a tranquil and beautiful morning, with a radiant sky and the earth glowing in the sunlight. Before a background of trees the girls stood stiff and taut. Long, lean rows of petrified figures, garbed in a hideous greenish colour, drab as the dried earth, held their pallid faces rigid as death-masks, and looked with an hypnotic stare straight out at nothing.

Down the lines ambled uniformed males, most of them elderly? Chests splashed with ribbons, trousers accurately creased, shoes ashine, canes aswagger, their ruddy, fleshy faces were not stiff, though masked, nor their eyes immobilised, though calculating. The procession of inspection was painfully deliberate, and, long, long, the stiffened figures stood compressed, strained by the intangible agency, which had set them to this inhuman posing.

At the pull of invisible strings the automats drew breath again. Somewhere a band blared out, and the statuesque motionlessness of the girls swiftly became the grotesque activity of jointed-puppets. Out and in arms flashed in a fantastic staccato, legs moved like piston rods, and feet hit the ground with monotonous, flat slappings. Borne along by these straining limbs were curiously inanimate bodies, from the stiffened heads of which perplexed eyes strove to keep staring ahead at nothing.

So they marched on—to Church!

—A. N., in the "Free Man" (Edinburgh).

Should Strikes Be Banned for the Duration?

(Continued from page 1.)

trated so far into the terrain of liberty and personal freedom—that the terrain cannot escape being engulfed.

(4) It involves the use of coercion: which is not only a poor and inadequate substitute for inducement, but also conflicts with the deepest urges of the spirit of man.

(5) It cannot be really effective, as is shown by the evidence given bearing upon the growth of absenteeism.

(6) Finally, it stands condemned in the light of the profound and fundamentally righteous principle of human association that, "if any condition can be shown to be oppressive to the individual, no appeal to its desirability in the interests of external organisation can be pleaded in extenuation; and, while co-operation is the note of the coming age, it must be the co-operation of reasoned assent, not regimentation in the interests of any system, however superficially attractive. SYSTEMS WERE MADE FOR MEN, AND NOT MEN FOR SYSTEMS, and the interest of man, which is SELF-DEVELOPMENT, IS ABOVE ALL SYSTEMS, WHETHER THEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL OR ECONOMIC."

(A letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN. Continued from last issue.)
AN UNOFFICIAL JOURNAL FOR THE PEOPLE
Sir,—A few weeks ago attention was called to the meeting of 62 persons of "great importance and influence" which had "recommended the stabilisation of foreign exchange on the basis of gold with a view to the establishment of a world gold standard." I promised to get, if I could, the names of the sixty-two persons "of great importance and influence" and to publish them for general information. No less than 45 of them were "representatives" of Great Britain, and the meeting was held at Chatham House, in London, on March 5-7, 1935. What the gold standard had done to the PEOPLE of England should have been obvious to everyone present, but these men "of great importance and influence" were not concerned with THAT. They had a plan, or a policy to impose, and nothing else mattered.

This meeting was described as "an unofficial international conference on economic and monetary matters," and was held under the joint auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Both of these institutions are agencies of International Finance, and readers of "The New Times" will recall that it was a prominent member of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Arnold Toynbee) who had declared that "we" were working strenuously to wrest SOVEREIGNTY from the nations of the world. He, of course, was at the meeting, and had been asked to explain to whom he had referred by the use of the word "we" he would not have included the people of the British Empire or Christian people in general. He is the "Director of Studies" at the Institute, and this is what he said: "I will merely repeat that we are at present working discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or publicist can be, perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracised and discredited." (Part of a speech at Copenhagen in 1931, and quoted from the "Social Creditor" of 11/11/39.) He is the sort of fellow who says one thing but does an entirely different thing. In other words, a nice boy, and just the sort to direct the "studies" in such an institution.

This meeting was all part of a long-standing plan, the objective of which is nothing less than the enslavement of humanity in a servile world State. The "recommendations" of the meeting were just as might have been expected from the sort of persons who attended it.

Could you guess the names of some of them? Among the "representatives" of Great Britain were Sir Alan Anderson, Director

of the Bank of "England"; Professor Henry Clay, Economic Adviser to the Bank of "England"; the Right Hon. Lord Dickinson, President of the WORLD ALLIANCE for promoting International Friendship through the Churches (they got the churches in right enough); Professor Teodor Emanuel Guggenheim Gregory, Professor of Banking in the University of London, and travelling companion of Sir Otto Niemeyer (he is now Sir Teodor!); Sir George Paish, Adviser to the British Government on Financial and Economic questions, 1914-1916; J. Beaumont Pease, Chairman of Lloyd's Bank; Sir Percival Perry, Director of National Provincial Bank; Sir Henry Strakosch, "Member of the Financial Committee of the League of Nations, Member of the Royal Commission on Indian Currency and Finance, 1925-26, Delegate of India to Monetary and Economic Conference, 1933"; Arnold J. Toynbee, Director of Studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and his father-in-law, Professor Gilbert Murray (connected with Oxford University and the League of Nations); Professor Lionel Robbins, Professor of Economics at the University of London; J. A. de Rothschild, M.P.; Sir Arthur Salter, Gladstone Professor of Political Theory and Institutions in the University of Oxford (and connected with Israel Moses Sieff and P.E.P.); the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Samuel; Commander Stephen King-Hall, connected with Israel Moses Sieff and P.E.P.; Francis W. Hirst, Editor of "The Economist," 1907-16; Hartley Withers, Editor of "The Economist," 1916-21; Sir Walter Layton, Editor of "The Economist" (recently toured Australia as leader of a press delegation); Professor Arnold Zimmern; Montague Burton, Professor of International Relations in the University of Oxford.

Representatives of other "countries" were mostly "bankers," and included M. Paul van Zeeland, vice-Governor of the Bank of Belgium (whose remedy for poverty in the midst of plenty was to destroy the plenty!); Dr. Ernst Trendelenburg, Vice-President of the

Economic Chamber of the Reich; Dr. E. Hellding, Director of the Netherlands Bank; Sir Karl Knudsen, Director of Hambros Bank Ltd. (C. J. Hambro of this bank was prominently connected with the Oxford Group Movement!). The American representatives were Professor W. A. Mackintosh; Professor of Economics in Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario; Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University; Philip C. Jessup, Associate Professor of International Law in Columbia University; Malcolm W. Davis, Representative of the Carnegie Endowment at Geneva; the Hon. Frederic M. Sackett, U.S. Senator, 1925-30, U.S. Ambassador to Germany, 1930-33.

With such a nice union between the bankers, the universities, the churches, and "The Economist" (the financial mouthpiece for the press at large) it is not surprising that the plot has come almost to the point of success. In the face of the declaration

from Mr. Churchill that "the gold standard is a grossly unfair standard which had caused a monetary convulsion to the point of becoming a hideous oppression" ("New Era," 14/1/44), and the evidence before their very eyes of the painful experience of the British PEOPLE, what is to be said of men who gathered unofficially but internationally to plot for the re-imposition on a permanent basis of the HIDEOUS OPPRESSION? And what is to be said of men like Mr. Churchill, Field Marshall Smuts, Brenden Bracken, Anthony Eden, R. G. Casey, R. G. Menzies, J. G. Chifley, and many others in the political limelight, who are helping the plotters to achieve their treasonable ends? The most charitable thing we can say for the latter group is: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do."

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN.
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
6th February, 1944. (To be continued.)

FRANKER BANKERS, & BUREAUCRATS

The Melbourne "Herald" of 19/1/44 gave some interesting extracts from statements issued by the chairmen of two of the "Big Five" British banks. Mr. R. E. Beckett (Westminster Bank), said that "Post-war credit on a large scale would be needed to re-start trade and commerce. Endeavours were being made to find a token or denominator upon which this edifice could be based; and the idea of making gold the token, either directly or remotely, must be seriously considered. Gold presented possibilities not apparent in other media, but the rigidity of the former gold standard must be avoided . . . Goods and services were better exchange for exports than gold, which immediately passes into sterility."

Although still paying allegiance to the idea of gold as the basis of the credit "edifice," it is apparent that modern bankers recognise, somewhat belatedly, some aspects of reality so stoutly denied by their predecessors—with the possible exception of that oddly plain-spoken exponent of the banking system, Reginald McKenna. Judging from their past behaviour one may reasonably assume that even such meagre concessions to reality have been forced from the bankers by a widespread exposure of the "golden legend" at the hands of monetary reformers. It is good to learn from a banker that gold "passes into sterility," but better to be told something of its reproductive stages, such as the sowing of the seed and the harvesting of the increase by the gold farmers, and, more interesting still, who these gold farmers are.

Strange that at this particular time endeavours are being made to find a "token" (or shadow) upon which to base the issue of post-war or any other credit when nearly everyone knows that the only real basis is the production of goods and services, i.e., the capacity and will of people to produce wealth. Considering the education and position of a bank chairman, one conclusion only is possible, and it is that deliberate intent, not ignorance, is responsible for the propagation of an obviously false idea.

Mr. Stanley Cristopherson, Chairman of the Midland Bank, was much nearer the mark, for he is quoted by the "Herald" as saying that the "economic progress of Britain was dependent on the enterprise and resourcefulness of small business undertakings and individuals. These qualities were too often stultified and misdirected through the inadequacy of their financial resources." Now, who has been, is, and perhaps will continue to be responsible for that inadequacy? There is no doubt that bank chairmen cherish and foster the idea of retaining control, of all "financial resources," but are shrewd enough to recognise the danger of openly supporting monopoly production in British communities.

In marked contrast to the moderation of the bankers' projection of the "shape of things to come" is the order appearing in the "Argus" of 29/1/44, as issued by the local Civil (?) Commandant, commonly known as the Deputy Director-General of Man Power (Victoria). This order is given to ex-dairy farmers and ex-dairy farm workers, the largest and blackest type be-

or sympathies belong to any other country, but because he carries his Ghetto with him, a Ghetto whose gates enclose a life which we neither know nor are capable of understanding."

The Jewish community in this country before the war was not large enough to imperil national interests. While the great core, of any Jewish population, remains armoured in its racial exclusiveness, some always find the possibility to retain their fierce tribal faith and yet to love the land they live in. This is practical compromise, a plant that flourishes in our soil. They keep their self-made Ghetto, but in the daily walks of life are able to adapt themselves sufficiently to the needs and beliefs of the people among whom it is built, for them to be able to say, "I am a Jew, and yet feel for England."

These are the Jews, of long sojourn here, whom most of us know. I served with one in the trenches, lay next to another in hospital, and flew with a third. They were different, because they would not be the same, but I would have fought, and still would fight, against any third party who sought to make any differentiation between them and us.

These people come to a painful conflict of mind when some happening in the world starts a new mass-movement of Jews. Some (those who may rightly claim to be "British Jews") know the immemorial trouble that will follow, and refrain from clamouring for the new immigration. But those at the hard core of organised world Jewry, the high priests of the fiercely exclusive and inflexible tribal faith, use all their power (and their power is great) to promote it. It may be laudable in them, but it affects our interests, and we need to discuss it.

JEWISH PROBLEM IN BRITISH EMPIRE

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

Those who lead public opinion often seem to wish the people of this country [Great Britain] to think that they regard this as a war fought chiefly for Jewish ends. The confusion is increased by the astonishing factor that in many of the countries involved in this war the Jews ALONE are exempt from military service; for instance, the Jews IN Germany and the German-occupied countries, and Jews FROM Germany in this country. (Poles and Czechs IN Germany are conscribed for the German army; Poles, Czechs, and many more in this country, by their own exiled Governments; Englishmen in America for the American army, and so on.)

How many such Jews have come here? Public statements vary so much that they bewilder. Mr. Churchill, on April 7, 1943, spoke of 150,000, up to the present. The "Times" of April 3, 1943, spoke of 250,000 before the war, claimed that by taking employment here they were "making a valuable contribution to the war effort," and recommended that all who "desire it should be given naturalisation. According to Lord Cranborne, in the House of Lords on March 23, 1943, they are still coming at the rate of 10,000 a year. (In March 1943, Mr. Bevin reported 100,000 British

unemployed.) Sir Herbert Emerson, chairman of the Central Committee for Refugees in Britain, said, in September 1942, "54,000 German and Austrian refugees are doing war work in British war factories and on the land." (This takes no account of those who have entered the Ministries, the B.B.C., the theatrical, medical, dental, and other professions, and business and industry.)

No British figures have been given for the Jewish migration to the Dominions; but South Africa announced in November, 1942, that 53,000 refugees reached the Union in 1941 and 1942 alone; 10,000 were given Government-assisted passages to Australia in the last pre-war year alone, and large numbers have gone to Canada. As to the Colonies, Mr. Churchill stated that 21,000 "refugees from Poland" were being distributed between Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland. (The figure is large enough entirely to alter the structure of the white populations of these British Colonies.) Even in August 1939, Sir Abe Bailey, a life-long friend of the Jews, expressed deep misgiving about the displacement of British stock in South Africa by Jewish immigrants—and this was before the new influx began and South Africans went off to the war!

According to the reference books, which in this matter are poor guides, the United Kingdom contained 300,000 Jews in 1938. The figure gives as little picture of Jewish activity and influence, even at that time, as an acorn gives of an oak. A fair inference is, that the Jewish population of this country and the Empire is well on the way to being doubled. The newcomers are, in the bulk, Central European Jews; that is, those of the most marked racial and religious characteristics.

If this were an influx of Icelanders, no problem would arise; we should absorb them and the new blood would do us good. But these people will not allow themselves to be assimilated. Their religion outlaws them if they marry non-Jews, and in the main they cling to this law, usually disinheriting disobedient children. British courts of law have upheld this disinheritance clause of Jewish wills.

The refusal to inter-marry is their law, not ours. The Jew, not the Gentile, builds the Ghetto wall. In 1911, one Steinie Morrison was tried for a murder, the scene of which lay in the Jewish immigrant quarter of London; of the fantastic figures, which appeared in the witness box, the author of the story of the trial, Mr. H. Fletcher Moulton, said:

"Truly the Russian Jew lives here as an alien—not in the sense that his interests

SOIL, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD VALUES

(Continued from page 3)

like to quote what Sir Albert Howard has said on that subject:

"Insects and fungus are not the real causes of plant disease, and only attack unsuitable varieties of crops improperly grown. Their true role in agriculture is that of censors for pointing out the crops, which are imperfectly nourished. Disease resistance seems to be the natural reward of a healthy and well nourished protoplasm."

I would . . . like to draw your Lordships' attention to what I suppose is the longest-term proof in our experience which I have been able to discover, which is the case of the Island of Barbados. I think about the turn of the century they were still renewing the fertility of their soil by the use of a system known as pen manuring, which was simply the use of vegetation with the waste from the live stock—oxen and mules and horses—on the island. When the West Indian Agricultural Commission came along they suggested that this process should be suspended, and that instead they should put on potash, nitrogen, and phosphates in chemical form. The first thing that happened was that the old variety of sugar cane, called the Bourbon variety, which they had used until then, began to suffer from a fungus disease and died out.

Since then none of the seedlings, which have been used, have proved entirely satisfactory. More and more artificial fertilisers have been used in the soil, and more and more virus diseases have manifested themselves. And, if that is not enough, the actual population of the island just before this war was showing signs of malnutrition, there was a great deal of unrest and rioting prevalent—all things which have never happened in the history of the island before. And yet, forty-two years ago one of our greatest agricultural experts warned the West Indian Agricultural Commission of that day exactly what would occur, and every one of the prophecies he made at that time has come true. That is a fairly long-term proof, which we have to hand of what can take place when the soil loses its fertility . . . The first bulwark of our national safety here is our land. The first certain guarantee of the continuation of the great quality which has made the British nation what it is depends on our land, and I am sure that, if only we can keep the soil fertile, disease can and will disappear in plant, in beast, and in man.

[The Joint Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (The Duke of Norfolk) agreed to bring Lord Teviot's request for an inquiry or Royal Commission on the subject to the notice of the departments concerned.]

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