

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL (Page 2)
 CANADIAN M.P. DENIES "JEW-BAITING" (Page 3)
 WHAT REALLY HAPPENED IN ALBERTA (Page 3)
 MILK PASTEURISATION BLUFF! (Page 4)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 7. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 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).

Power-Lusting Planners' Post-War Plot!

Fascistic Scheming at Canberra

The recent gathering at Canberra of Planners and would-be Planners, held under the nominal auspices of the so-called Australian Institute of Political Science, was reported, after a fashion, with a great fanfare of typographical trumpets, by the monopoly press. Even these inadequate and largely uncritical reports, of selected highlights from the pontifical pronouncements of the featured "big shots," were quite sufficient to cause angry misgivings among real democrats.

Such misgivings, particularly in regard to the general nature and underlying purpose of the threatened post-war "planning," are confirmed and clarified by a perusal of reports and critical comment in several independent metropolitan weeklies and provincial papers—notably, among those we have so far seen, the Sydney weeklies, "Truth" and "Century," of February 6 and February 4 respectively. The articles in the two papers mentioned are so important that we are taking the liberty of reprinting them—one this week and the other next week. We feel sure that, when you have read these articles, you will not fail to write to the editors concerned and thank them, as we do. Here, then, is the article by "Truth's" Canberra correspondent:—

PROFESSORS' PICNIC EXTOLLED THE GLORIES OF BUREAUCRACY.

"Scientists" Hatch Fascist Theories

Canberra, Saturday.—A hundred thousand words, many of them DELIVERED IN BROKEN ACCENTS, made a memorable gathering of the Professors' Picnic, or as it

called itself, the Australian Institute of Political Science Summer School.

In at least two ways, the official title was accurate. The discussions were political, and it was certainly summer at the time.

Whether the school was Australian, whether it was scientific, and whether it was

Sunday Dinner to Garbage Tip!

By J. T. LANG, in Sydney "Century," January 28.

Choice sirloin of beef was sent to the boiling down works in Melbourne to be turned into soap and fertiliser. That was only one of the many amazing statements and occurrences in connection with meat rationing this week. Mr. Hudson, the State Director of Rationing, told the newspapers that it was infinitely better that the meat should go bad and be discarded, than it should be sold to people without coupons. Selling without coupons, said Hudson, would destroy the whole system of rationing.

Mr. Hudson's statement is the key to the whole thing. The system of rationing must be preserved irrespective of what happens to the meat or the people.

It is the system that is important, nothing else.

The Rationing Director was merely confirming a statement made by Professor Copland in his New Year message to the people. The Professor said that rationing was a "control" employed to preserve the economic and financial structure and to defeat inflation.

As in 1930-31, the people must be deprived of the necessities of life in order that the financial and economic system may be maintained and those who are drawing the plans today are the same as drew them ten years ago.

What are the authentic statements we have had on meat rationing?

First of all, there is the Government case that we are committed to supply meat to England, to the Armed Forces of all Allies in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, to our civil armed Forces and to the civil population.

The Government says that to do this we must ration the meat consumption of our own people.

The miners at Broken Hill protested against meat rationing, because, owing to dry weather in that district, the sheep were dying because they could not be shifted to better pastures.

Graziers, generally, complain that fat sheep are getting into an unmarketable condition because they are unable to transport them to market in time.

The retail butchers were complaining that their shops were full of meat they could not sell because of rationing, and that much of it would go bad.

The authorities at the abattoirs announced that the meat was accumulating there so fast that there was no more freezing accommodation for it.

Finally, there was the statement that any surplus meat should be sent to Vestey's meat works at Riverstone,

Federation Failure

The move in U.S. reported some time ago for the protection of State-rights against Federal encroachments has been brought to a head, and fourteen States have adopted resolutions calling for the necessary amendment to the Constitution to restore powers to the States. After years of trial of centralised Federal control, which has resulted in general dissatisfaction plus greatly increased taxation to maintain the centralised juggernaut, the States are fed-up. This should be a body blow to the Referendum, which seeks to perpetuate the error here. This development should mean a big swelling of "No" votes.

even a school, are matters which are open to question.

For instance, the count with a monocle was hardly Australian.

AND HARDLY AUSTRALIAN, IN THE FULLEST SENSE OF THE WORD, WERE THE SOLID PHALANX OF "RECENT" AUSTRALIANS—"LATTERLY CITIZENS OF EUROPEAN AXIS COUNTRIES—WHO ADVISED US TO ABANDON WHITE AUSTRALIA, CODIFY OUR LAWS, AND PULL OUR SOCKS UP GENERALLY.

Hardly Australian were the very noble sentiments expressed by the scholarly departmental heads who demanded that for our own sake we should perpetuate them in office, that we should submit to a loss of liberty out of which, as Dr. Lloyd Ross put it, a fuller liberty would emerge.

How one gets liberty by losing liberty is a question in dialectical hypnosis, which, generally speaking, appears far more comprehensible to learned professors than to laymen.

Four of the five lecturers were solidly behind the Federal Government's thirst for constitutional "reform," and put the case for added powers with all the impartiality of men who stand to lose their jobs if the added powers are not obtained.

Three of the four—two doctors and a professor—are bigwigs in the bureaucracy that has sprung up to control Australia's war effort. If the bureaucracy is whittled down after the war, they will be amongst the first tall poppies to be lopped. The fourth lecturer was the Attorney-General (Dr. Evatt).

So much for the "scientific" aspect of the Professors' Picnic.

Out of the welter of words with which the intellectual Quixotes tilted at their imaginary windmills and pronounced Utopias to their hearts' content, there emerged one significant thing—the real aims and objectives of the people who are planning peace-time Australia.

PUSHING US AROUND.

As the discussions progressed it became clear that those who do their thinking in the detached, sylvan solitude of Canberra, have made up their minds that they so like the job of pushing the rest of us around that they propose to continue the process after the war.

The refrain was that Governmental control should continue in peacetime; that there must be more socialisation of industry; that

Behind the threat of the Powers Referendum, pressure from hidden sources appears to be impelling State Premiers to make another attempt to surrender their State Powers without the people's consent and without the risk of the Referendum. Irrespective of whether or not such a move is likely to be successful, this loophole must be guarded. With this in mind electors should take up this matter (every day if necessary) with their State Members, forbidding them to allow the Premiers to surrender any further power. Remember there's at least a good chance of retaining 'our freedom via the Referendum, but none if the Premiers assist the plot by surrendering the powers.

WOOL WORRIES: Huge stocks of wool, probably totalling 3,000,000 lbs., are said to be in storage, whilst theoretical experts describe this situation as "threatening the whole post-war marketing, unless prompt action is taken." Intelligent persons would regard this abundance as a happy position—but not the "experts." The said "prompt action" in the past has been to dump the abundance to keep up prices. Will it be the same now? How is it that economists and planners regard abundance as a curse?

FOOD FADS: Fourteen or more large vegetable dehydration plants have been installed throughout the Commonwealth, which are intended to operate also after the war. In our simple days, food experts advised consuming the juice of the vegetable and throwing the roughage down the sink, or else eating them quite raw. Now, the idea of dehydration is to extract the juice, pour it down the drain, and consume the almost useless roughage! Even this roughage may be better than nothing for front-line troops, but to continue this crazy processing mania into the peace years is surely nothing but the brainchild of "certified" economists.

FINANCIER'S FRIENDS: A somewhat rare and frank account of the strong friendships existing between financiers and public men is given in the Melbourne "Age" of February 7. In his will, the late Sir Henry Strakosch, described as "one of Britain's foremost financiers, and an authority on currency and economics," bequeathed £20,000 to Mr. Churchill, £10,000 to Marshall Smuts, £5,000 to Sir John Simon, and £2,500 each to Mr. Brendan Bracken (Minister for Information) and Sir Findlater Stewart, the permanent

the State should take over important monopolies; that the professors know best.

What will happen if we don't grant the professors power to order our peacetime lives? The Utopians of the Summer School were unanimous that there would be chaos, starvation, misery, depression, the law of the jungle, a world gone mad, horror, and fear.

The fact that all these terrible things did not occur after the last war, and that in fact what did occur was a period of unprecedented prosperity, makes no difference to the professors.

"Never mind about that," they say. "Remember the depression!"

The fact that the depression was worldwide, affected every country, and appeared to have the same basic economic causes everywhere, doesn't matter to the professors.

In Australia (they, implied), it was due to the fact that there weren't enough professors with enough power, which is another way of saying that Australians were not prepared to see the foundations upon which their whole way of life is constructed—individual liberty—destroyed.

Dr. Evatt, who spoke last, really stole the show. The picture he painted of post-war Australia without professors was gruesome.

He showed the perils which beset a people who insist upon the preservation of their liberties, a people who might be willful enough to want to choose their own jobs and determine their own future; and who are anxious to see the end of the regimentation they have accepted as necessary to win the war.

The professors seemed to forget that this war is partly ideological—that in a sense Liberty is fighting Tyranny for very, existence.

Why fight at all if we are to conquer Fascism only to find that in its elements we have become a Fascist State—a professors' State, but nevertheless Fascist?

Before the war broke out Aldous Huxley deplored the fact that the defeat of a Dictatorship by a Democracy inevitably entailed the transformation of the Democracy into a totalitarian State.

Serious-minded Australians know that. We have accepted it and watched our democracy grow into a State run by departments and bureaucrats who are beyond the anger or reproach of the people.

(Continued on page 4.)

Under-Secretary for India. The "Age" forgot to mention that Australia's darling, Sir Otto Niemeyer, was also a principal beneficiary—along with Mr. Churchill and Strakosch's other friends. This fact accidentally slipped into the Melbourne "Sun."

DEMOCRACY DECLINES: Two items in the Melbourne "Sun" of February 9 serve to show that totalitarian trends are not confined to the Axis countries. The first is that "Viceroy Lord Wavell has refused permission to the deputy president of the Central Assembly to move a motion calling a discussion on India's failure to protest against the appointment of Mr. R. G. Cases as Governor of Bengal." The second is the proposal to postpone the U.S. Presidential election for one year; "this would freeze the President, Vice-President and members of Congress in their jobs." All (Continued on page 2)

The Meat Muddle

Our bureaucratic blunderer, according to the press of February 7, have now produced a situation in which "meat storage in three States is becoming overcrowded, and the problem of finding additional space is already proving difficult." The "Planners" responsible for this mess, in an endeavour to lay the blame elsewhere, are blaming Britain for not sending sufficient ships; which is another way of saying that "Britain is deliberately imposing shortages on her own people by refusing to transport our meat." Meanwhile the meat muddlers have caused strikes and dislocation of our war effort. Hitler must be delighted with their efforts.

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —The "Unofficial International Conference on Monetary and Economic Matters," referred to last week, which took place in 1935, was held at Chatham House, in London. Chatham House is the headquarters of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and this institute has a brief but significant history.

It was a by-product of the Peace Conference of 1919. As already shown, that Conference was, in part, a family affair of the Warburgs (Paul, of the Federal Reserve Board, attending with the delegation from the United States, and his brother Max, of Warburgs' Bank Hamburg, with the delegation from Germany). Bernard Baruch, of International Finance, was also a member of the delegation from the United States. Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, of the Financial House of J. Pierpont Morgan (described in the Pujo Report as one of the leaders of the American Money Trust), was a representative of the United States Treasury on the American Commission to negotiate peace terms. Lloyd George (Prime Minister of England) and Clemenceau (Prime Minister of France), both had Jewish Secretaries, the former's being one of the Sassoon financial family, who was also Secretary to Lord Haig when he was in command of the Allied armies!

The "experts," who had assembled from the United States and Great Britain, held a joint meeting in May 1919, and decided to form an International Institute. The British group at the meeting included Lord Eustace Percy, the Fabian who has roomed with Felix Frankfurter, one of the "few men" now playing such an important part in planning OUR future. The first task of this Institute was to write a history of the Peace Conference, and it was also decided that an annual survey should be made of international affairs. In 1920, after the Peace Conference, an organising committee was set up, which included Lord Eustace Percy, the Fabian. A constitution was prepared and members of the Peace Delegation at Paris and other "suitable" people were invited to join in founding the Institute. It got started in 1920 in two rooms in Horseferry-road, but in 1923 was given the building (Chatham House), at 10 St. James Square. In 1939 it was evacuated to Balliol College, Oxford. (Oxford is the University at which Professor Arnold Toynbee's father-in-law is a member of the staff. His father-in-law has also been connected with Harvard University, in U.S.A., which prepared McKittrick for the chairmanship of the Bank for International Settlements and gave a welcome to Professor Copland, of Australia, who had helped so effectively to put the bankers' depression on us.)

In the early stages the Institute was without finance, but the funds soon came. Commander Stephen King-Hall (who was one of the 62 persons "of great importance and influence" who attended the Unofficial International Conferences, and who is connected, with Israel Moses Sieff and P.E.P.) has informed us in the book, "Chatham House," that "at this juncture the work . . . received the first of many munificent and public-spirited financial offers which have maintained it during the past 16 years. Mr. Thomas W. Lamont generously offered to advance £2000 to enable the task of writing the history to proceed." That, surely, was "public spirit" of the highest order!

The second public-spirited financial offer was from Sir Abe Bailey. Sir Abe, of course, is one of the principal Transvaal mine owners, and very interested in gold. In 1926, the late Sir Otto Beit gave to the Institute a thousand pounds, payable over two years, and this was followed by a gift from the Carnegie Trust (on one of the American Boards of which is Thomas W. Lamont) of £3000 for the purchase of books for the extension of the library. At this time, also, the Bank of "England" became a regular subscriber, contributing £200 per annum.

In 1929 Sir Abe Bailey decided that the time had come to provide £5000 per annum in perpetuity, and a number of banks became subscribers. Today the list of corporate subscribers includes most of the important banks and also Glyn Mills & Co., the Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., Prudential Assurance Co., Reuters Ltd., N. W. Rothschild and Sons, and J. H. Schroeder and Co. The Rockefeller Foundation has given £8000 per annum for the last decade to finance the extension of research. The Institute is obviously so tied up with International Finance that it is clearly part of it, and has become but another of the many instruments for securing the imposition of the subversive policy of making the people in all countries fight amongst themselves and against other peoples for that over which they have no control, namely, finance.

In the light of the facts given in this letter, to say nothing of the facts given in other letters is it not presumptuous that the men of and behind this Institute should assume the roll of advisers for all Governments on post-war reconstruction? These

'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.

very men carefully arranged the "Peace" Treaty which ended in such catastrophe, and as "The Social Creditor" of 9/12/39 said, "It may not have been knavery, but it was at least foolery." At least five of the gentlemen on the staff of the Royal Institute of International Affairs were present at that Peace Conference, and all of them served in some INTELLIGENCE Department (either Political, Admiralty, or Foreign Office) during the last war. It is also interesting that five of the members of the staff have held professorships or other positions in academic institutions in the United States and Canada. Another professor (A. G. B. Fisher) was at one time Economist to the Bank of New South Wales!

The purpose of our investigations is to discover the sort of POLICY, which was imposed upon us in the period between the two wars and the identity of those who imposed it. In this respect, I would call attention to the words of C. H. Douglas, as published in "The Social Creditor" of 9/12/39, as follows:—

"The Policy, as distinct from the Administration, of Great Britain, both domestic and foreign, between 1918 and 1936, has been so suicidal as to pass all possibility of mere stupidity or incompetence. As isolated instances, the shutting down of shipyards, so that our building capacity has been reduced by at least 40 per cent, the sale of hundreds of ships to enemies to provide them with steel, the handing over of the Treasury Note to a Bank of "England" controlled from the United States, the return to the Gold Standard in 1925 against even orthodox protest, the refusal to utilise the artificially-engineered slump and unemployment of 1929-33 to re-arm and so to forestall a continental situation which was even then patent to any informed observer,

BIG FINANCE AND THE PLANNERS

A pointer to the subtle collusion between Big Finance and the Planners, and an indication of the true source of the policies of "full employment" and "planned economy," which have been so assiduously propagated by our Socialists of late, may be gauged from the following statement by the chairman of Barclays Bank (Mr. Edwin Fisher):—"Full employment must be our declared policy and ardent desire, but we must achieve and maintain maximum efficiency in every department of national life" (Melbourne "Herald," January 22, 1944.) The pending attack upon our Federal Constitution is a necessary part of the Big Idea, since the mutilation of this bulwark of liberty is essential to the full implementation of the Work State.

The obvious object of the Planners' plot is plain, unvarnished National Socialism—a society of wage-slaves, denuded of all individual rights and dignity, either employed directly by the State, or subject in all things to State control, through a bureaucratic facade screening the power-lusters and financial manipulators behind it.

As the "Weekly Review" says, "The norm of the future will be a wage-earning population subject to a considerable degree of State control. This wage system will be incapable of providing—except in its highest categories—the wherewithal for a man to pay for the full needs of a family; consequently, it will be taken as normal that such a man should have provision made to him by the State for the expenses entailed by a large family, the education of his children, the periods during which work is denied to him, medical attendance, and even many of his physical recreations and intellectual pursuits."

In the post-war period, instead of individuals being given a guarantee of economic INDEPENDENCE through sufficient INCOME, in a land of actual and potential plenty, the powers-that-be intend to compel us to be dependent upon the State for the right to live. Hence the Beveridge Plan and our own Australian Social Service scheme—bankers' plots for the distribution of scarcity, not of plenty. This bribe of bogus "economic security"—financed, of course, through TAXATION, thus lowering living standards still further—is to be the quid pro quo for the renunciation of our individual freedom.

Since the wages system, even with everyone employed, is mathematically incapable of providing sufficient income to consume all production, it is useless as a means for the realisation of the fuller life to which human beings are naturally lawful heirs. War, while being the inevitable outcome of the present financial order, is also the means whereby a continuance of this order is rendered possible.

"In times of war," says the Rotary Research Committee, "the canons of sound finance become silent before the guns of the enemy, and if we are physically able to produce what we require, the necessary money is created, either by the printing press or by the less obvious methods of the Banking System. The result is a remarkable increase in production and a temporary prosperity. For the time being the question of consumption is solved. New money is created as and when required, and Industry, untrammelled, performs miracles. Though the greater part of the goods produced be made for destruction only, yet even that small proportion which consists of goods needed by the people is sufficient to keep them in comparative comfort, because they have the necessary money with which to purchase. It is a ghastly paradox that war—orgy of waste and destruction—brings to many people a material prosperity unknown to them in times of peace. It is again somewhat of a paradox that the creation of new money necessitated by war-time exigencies, by wiping out the existing market-top-heaviness, gives a further lease of life to that system of which war itself is the inevitable outcome."

If civilisation is to be saved, then a new method of distributing the fruits of production must be adopted. Science is emancipating mankind from the necessity of long hours of manual toil, and is furnishing the opportunity of tile leisure needed for higher pursuits than, the mere struggle to secure a livelihood.

The present iniquitous financial system must be replaced by one based upon modern scientific principles, for it is to the money system that we must look for the cause of Australia's and the world's troubles. To seek elsewhere is useless.

The indifference, ignorance, and socialism of most of our political representatives in regard to this prime matter are only too obvious. Pressure must be brought to bear upon them through the Electoral Campaign methods.

In addition, in keeping with the recent exhortation of Eric Butler, we should strive to effect the widest possible circulation of the "New Times," which is doing such invaluable work in the matter of public education upon the New Economics.

the transfer of loans made or guaranteed by the Bank of "England" to Germany to the debit of the Exchange Equalisation Fund so that the British tax-payer provided the money to build the German submarines to sink British ships, are unfortunately far from comprehensive. During this period, Mr. Stanley Baldwin ("Honest Stan") was at all material times Prime Minister and allegedly in control of Policy. But, of course, this cannot have been the case, because when it became impossible any longer to disguise the impending catastrophe, Mr. Baldwin ("Honest Stan"), instead of being impeached and shot, was given an Earldom, the control of a fund of £250,000, and put to raising more money for the Jews. We must assume, therefore, that Mr. Baldwin had carried on a meritorious if not very successful struggle against forces which discreetly, but with all their might, were working to bring about the situation which they have in fact brought to pass, both in the attack on individual and national liberties."

It was Arnold Toynbee, of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, you will remember, who said:—

"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 the world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands . . ."

And even though "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" have been declared bogus, how they seem to fit in with what is being done before our very eyes! Protocol No. 5 reads as follows:—

"We shall create an intensified centralisation of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences and liberties which have been allowed the Goyim."

Our peril lies in the fact that the men responsible for the reasonable conditions outlined are still permitted to dictate national and international policy.

—Yours, etc., BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 13th February 1944.

(To be continued.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

the party bosses are said to see merit of the proposal. Quite so!

ELECTION ECHOES: An analysis of the recent New Zealand election results shows that although the Labour Party still has a majority following in the urban areas, the trend away from Labour in country districts was very marked. From this it would seem that the practical farmers have not been fooled by the "fixed price" scheme for their products, which has, of course, been more than offset by increased costs. Excluding the Services vote, Labour lost ground heavily throughout the Dominion by comparison with the 1938 figures. Labour secured 47.66 per cent of what are described as valid votes, while the Nationalists secure 43.53 per cent. Apparently the Socialists' instalments of "planned economy" has not registered favourably with the victims!

BIG BREADBASKETS: Harry Hopkins, U.S. Lend-Lease big chief, in an article in the "Atlantic Monthly," predicts that U.S. will emerge from the war as the richest and the most powerful nation, "with the breadbasket filled to overflowing," and the greatest navy and merchant fleet on the seven seas. He also opines that the Lease-Lend plan for the rehabilitation of Europe, Russia, China and the British Empire (not America) is good sound business, because these areas will become huge markets for U.S. after the war. Won't the American citizens be delighted to work like coolies so that their production can be exported to the other fellow! Well, the other fellow should be able to "take it," provided, of course, that he has the money tickets (and gets them without borrowing.)

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENTS: U.S. Treasury releases published in the Melbourne "Herald" of December 29 show that U.S. private investors have 1070 million dollars invested in the six Axis countries, compared with 450 million dollars of Axis investments in U.S. American financial interests in Canada are 3112 million dollars; in Germany, 769 million dollars; in the United Kingdom, 622 million dollars; in Cuba, 614 million dollars; in Brazil, 337 million dollars; in Argentina, 310 million dollars. It should be noted that these overseas investments are not held by the U.S. Government, nor by a large proportion of U.S. citizens; they are mainly held by a handful of private financiers who can promote war by the manner of operating these interests.

REFERENDUM REFLECTIONS: Section 128 of the Commonwealth Constitution provides that a Bill for a Referendum must be passed by an absolute majority before it can be put to the people. It further provides that, if passed by both Houses, the Referendum must be submitted to the people not earlier than two months, and not later than six months after it becomes law. Now, if the Bill authorising the Referendum is passed at the February session, it must be held before the end of August—two months after the impending Labor majority of 6 votes in the Senate becomes effective. However, the present Senate, with a Labor minority, will have to authorise the holding of the Referendum.

SOCIALIST SCHOLARS: Russian scholars are said to be now eagerly studying the British Commonwealth constitution. Taking at its face value the reported move to de-centralise power among the 16 (1) Soviet republics, it may be that Russia has profited from a study of British ideas on voluntary co-operation. Maybe, this is the "new order" that many dissatisfied Russians are fighting for. Incidentally, our local Communists can hardly support the Referendum to centralise power in the Federal Government if dear Uncle Joe favours the opposite idea—namely, de-centralisation of power!

—O.B.H.

CAULFIELD CAMPAIGN

Actionists only, in and around Caulfield, desirous of getting busy to defeat the "Powers Plot," are invited to the home of Mr. W. J. Murray, 36 Langdon-road, Caulfield, on Tuesday evening, February 22. The purpose of the meeting is to organise a public meeting, and to gather local campaigners together for sustained action. Take Hawthorn-road tram to Crotonhurst-avenue (between Balaclava-road and Glenora-road). Langdon-road runs off Crotonhurst-avenue, a few minutes' walk from Hawthorn-road. If you are an actionist, be sure to be there.

ern scientific principles, for it is to the money system that we must look for the cause of Australia's and the world's troubles. To seek elsewhere is useless.

The indifference, ignorance, and socialism of most of our political representatives in regard to this prime matter are only too obvious. Pressure must be brought to bear upon them through the Electoral Campaign methods.

In addition, in keeping with the recent exhortation of Eric Butler, we should strive to effect the widest possible circulation of the "New Times," which is doing such invaluable work in the matter of public education upon the New Economics.

— B. J. GOULDING.

CANADIAN M.P. DENIES "JEW-BAITING"

The following speech by Mr. Norman Jaques, one of the group of Social Credit members of the Canadian House of Commons, was delivered during the debate on external affairs on July 9, 1943. We quote from the Official Report:

Mr. Norman Jaques (Wetaskiwin): I do not propose to make my remarks of any length tonight, but I would refer to certain statements made this morning in committee. I have here a cutting from today's Ottawa "Journal" in which I am charged with hating the Jews. I will not read the whole thing, but this is not the first time that my name has been bandied about the country and has appeared in the press as a Jew-baiter by some, and a Jew-hater by others.

It seems to be taken for granted that merely to criticise, in fact merely to mention a Jew, is to lay oneself open to the charge of being a Jew-baiter, and coming from the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation group, as it did this morning, I think that only adds to the offence. Surely if there is a group in this House the members of which are wont to express their hatred for this person or that person, whenever they rise in their places, it is the group — not all of them, but some of the group — of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation party, as I believe the Minister of Finance remarked the other night. Apparently anybody who manages to make more than an average success of his affairs is attacked, or at least is regarded with hatred by some of the members of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation group [Socialists].

On another occasion I was speaking on the Budget, and I read a list of the leading international financiers whose names were all household words. I merely read the list. Everybody knows them, and I merely asked, how many are British names, how many French names, and for that matter how many Christian? At once I was assailed. In fact, the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) immediately rose to his feet and said, "No Jew baiting."

That got out into the press. Later on, the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was speaking in the House and he referred to my criticism of the address that Mr. Sandwell gave some months ago on the League of Nations, in which he advocated that the Canadian people should surrender their loyalty to the Crown and hand it over to international control.

I have here a copy of an editorial in the Winnipeg "Free Press." It says:

"Mr. Jaques raised the question of whether the views of B. K. Sandwell, the Toronto editor, on a supra-national world order were seditious. When M. J. Coldwell, the C.C.F. leader, who is a member of the League of Nations Society, sought to reply, Mr. Jaques interrupted by muttering, 'Jewish bankers,' and 'gold standard.' Mr. Coldwell said, 'I am afraid my hon. friend has the gold standard on his brain.'"

I will challenge anybody in this House to find those words on "Hansard." I never said that.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

REPORT ON QUARTERLY RALLY: Our second quarterly meeting was held under very trying weather conditions on Saturday, February 5. Despite the small attendance the meeting was considered by those present to be quite a success. Probably the most interesting item was a paper written by Mr. R. K. Menzies and read by Mr. C. D. Brock, which had for its theme "The Small Idea as Opposed to The Big Idea." Mr. Menzies' inspiration for his paper was a series of articles by L. D. Byrne, which he made good use of to develop a discussion on the Referendum issue. Mr. White entertained the gathering, in between business items, with several songs. He was accompanied at the piano by Mrs. Chappell. Supper was served by the ladies.

BOOKS: Have you read the following? "Why Big Finance Backs Socialism," by James Guthrie, B.Sc. Price 6d plus 1d postage. "The New Despotism" (How the Courts are used to Defeat the Course of Justice). Price 6d each, 3/- doz. "Call the Churches to Action Against Debt and Taxes." Price 2d each, plus 1d postage, or 1/8 doz.

—F. Bawden, Hon. Secretary.

GOVERNMENT BY REGULATION

In reply to a recent question in the British Parliament as to the total number of Orders in Council that the Government had introduced in the period September 3, 1939, to November 1, 1943, the Prime Minister said that the total number was 2,757.

Mr. De la Bere: Will the Prime Minister endeavour in the future to limit their number, and will he also review the very large numbers which have been made, as some of them are rather indigestible and require further thought?

The Prime Minister: I certainly do not desire to take such a laborious task upon myself

Mr. Coldwell: Not on "Hansard," because you always mutter them and some people cannot hear them.

Mr. Jaques: I never said that, and the hon. member will have to take my word for it. I said the gold standard, and I say it again. That is what they are working for.

Mr. Reid: That is nothing to what they say about me regarding the Japanese.

Mr. Jaques: More than that, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to stand on my reputation in this House, and out of the House, too, as a loyal citizen of Canada, and I will challenge anybody in this House, or out of it, to find one authentic quotation of mine in which I have showed in any way that I am either a Jew-baiter or in favour of Jew persecution. I will say more. I happen to be one of the few members of this House who, in September, 1939, demanded, in the name of this group, that Canada should wage total war against the German Nazi gangsters.

I could quote those views if necessary, but I think that is remembered by those who were present in the House. As the Montreal "Gazette" in an editorial recently said, the Social Credit group was the only group in the House at that time who stood and demanded total war against the Nazi gangsters.

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED IN ALBERTA

(From a Broadcast Talk by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., over 7HO, December 12, 1943.) We have seen, since the last war, that a few men in charge of the finances of the country can bring ruin and destitution to the people by the simple process of shutting off the supply of money. In more primitive days, people could live without money; they grew their own food, made their own clothes and cut their own firewood. The people of the towns do none of these things, and if they have no money they simply starve. Farmers, when they grow potatoes, do not grow the money to buy the potatoes. The money is issued by the banking system — and if the people have not the money to buy the potatoes, the potatoes must be left to rot in the ground.

In Alberta, Canada, the people there, during the last depression, were bankrupt; business was at a standstill; roads and schools were in a shocking condition. And, although the Province of Alberta is one of the richest spots on earth as far as the natural resources of oil, coal, timber and cereals are concerned, the people had not enough money to buy the simplest needs of life—although surrounded by potential plenty, they were stricken with poverty, degradation and bankruptcy.

In Alberta it is very cold in winter and hot in summer. In other words, it is not a good place for a poor man to live with little protection against the elements. The people, therefore, were in a unique position to realise the cruelty and injustice of their position, and when Aberhart, a man with a dynamic personality, promised to pull them out of their desperate plight, they rallied round him, and voted his group to power with a large majority.

At that time Aberhart was not a Social Creditor, although he used some of the language of Major Douglas; his lack of knowledge of the problems he was up against soon got him into difficulties, and he fell into the hands of advisors wished on to him by the Big Banking Interests.

However, after he saw the futility of his position he accepted the help of Major Douglas, and from then on things began to move.

Every law passed by the Social Credit Government of Alberta for the control of the finances of the Province has been blocked by the Central Government or its Supreme Court. (Now you know what powerful central Governments are for, and perhaps this gives you an insight into the troubles existing in Australia with the High Court!)

The Albertan Government made application for a Bank Charter, but it was refused under amazing circumstances, as it was said that neither the Central Government nor the Provincial Government has any power to give a Bank Charter!

The Albertan Government passed a Bill for the settlement of the farmers' debts, but it was disallowed by the Courts. Alberta passed a Bill to give security to owners of homes, but it was disallowed by the Central Government of Canada; and so were other Bills of great importance. The advisors sent out by Major Douglas had achieved something; they had forced the enemy out into the open for the whole of North America to see. That was very important.

Then, since they were not permitted to run the usual Credit Banks, they did the next best thing: they ran what they call Treasury Branches, whereby people in Alberta could transfer debts and credits from one account to another. Since these Treasury Branches opened, about 250 banks have gone out of business, and Alberta is the only State in the world, which has reduced its debts and its taxation.

Not only has Alberta reduced taxes, but it has built new roads right across the Province; it has rebuilt its schools; it has given its farmers help, advice and scientific service, so that (for example) any farmer can have access to the best pedigree stock without heavy charges, and is given assistance to buy seed and machinery. Today Alberta is producing 97 per cent. of Canada's oil and it is the largest T.B.-free area in the Empire.

The previous Government had no money to build bridges; but the Social Credit

I am not saying, "I told you so." I am not making the statement in that sense; I am merely saying that actions speak louder than words. What was the attitude of those members, and especially the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation who is now such a champion of the persecuted Jews? I quote from "Hansard" of September 9, 1939, at page 55, as follows:

"Canada should be prepared to defend her own shores, but her assistance overseas should be limited to economic aid and must not include conscription of manpower or the sending of any expeditionary force."

I do not wish to rub that in at all; I am merely stating it. Perhaps I had better address it to the Jews and ask them who are their best friends. Suppose Britain had received no aid and had gone down, as she was within an ace of doing. The result might have been that Hitler would have controlled the western hemisphere as well as the eastern hemisphere, and the granting of aid to all persecuted minorities would have been impossible.

The cause of the little flare-up this morning was a remark I made which was not heard by "Hansard." The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) was speaking as usual in a sort of global way, although I have never accepted his global authority. My own private opinion is that it is "globaloney," but when he claimed that his memory goes back two thousand years I found that a little too much to swallow.

The hon. gentleman told the old story, or fable if you like, about Joseph and the

Jewish refugees going into Egypt and becoming the parents of the Founder of our Christian religion. I merely said that the only thing wrong with that story was that He was NOT a Jew. My authority for saying that is the Dean of St. Paul's, who, I take it, is an eminent authority on the subject. I do not profess to be an authority at all.

Those who are so solicitous at the present time for the fortunes of the Jews in Europe are precisely those who opposed any preparation or rearmament against the growing threat of Hitler. I make that statement without fear of challenge.

All minorities, including Jews, have enjoyed greater protection and justice and have received fairer treatment under British rule, under the British Crown, or even, if you like, under British imperialism than under any other control. I say that without fear of contradiction.

But it is precisely those people who profess such sympathy for these wretched, persecuted minorities who are working and have been working tooth and nail to destroy that very British protection.

That is the stand I take. I think I can say for the party to which I belong for that matter for the whole Social Credit movement throughout the British Empire, that we anchor ourselves absolutely to the British Crown. We believe that that is the best guarantee of peace and justice for the minorities and, if you like, for the majorities as well. We are utterly opposed to any scheme or any proposal or any plan that would surrender any part of that control to any international organisation for any reason whatever. We believe in co-operation as there has been co-operation for the last hundred years with our neighbour to the south [U.S.A.]. Why interfere with relations, which have been so peaceful and pleasant in the past?

I think most hon. members will realise that I am not likely to rise and talk merely for the sake of talking. I am talking tonight because I feel it is my duty to do so. I think that is realised by every hon. member. And I say to those outside the House that although the flesh may be weak, I can assure them that the spirit is as strong as ever. I realise the charges that will be made in the press after this morning to the effect that I am a Jew-baiter or a Jew-hater.

Let me say that since the session of two years ago I have faced the "grim reaper," not for a few minutes, but for many months. As I lay in hospital I thought deeply and long. I do not think I need to assure hon. members that I have no axe to grind. I have no ambitions in this world other than to establish the truth as I see it and to make conditions better for those who follow me.

As I say, I have no ambitions, and, if I had, they would be out of the question, of ever leading a party or planning the order of this country, let alone of the universe. That is not for me. Perhaps I have an advantage to make up for that. I have no fear of any individual or any group of individuals. Why should I have? I have nothing to lose.

The idea which is prevalent and which seems to be growing, that the Jews are above criticism, or that to criticise a Jew or even to mention the fact that anybody is a Jew is to lay oneself open to the charge of Jew-baiting, is preposterous nonsense, and I do not propose to take the slightest notice of it.

I am not afraid of any man, whether he has a hooked nose or a forked tail. Why should I be?

Immediately the Jew is criticised, somebody takes the attitude that nobody has any right to do it and, if he does it, he is indulging in sacrilege.

That is a most dangerous idea, and it is a warning, if I may say so, of what might happen were this minority to achieve the control which some people believe, and perhaps for good reason, that they hope to acquire throughout the world.

For that reason, if for no other, I and the group to which I belong are utterly opposed to any surrender of the sovereignty of the British Empire or of Canada. We are all part of the British Empire. We believe in it. Within the British Empire all peoples, including minorities, have had better and fairer treatment than under any other that has existed on earth.

I do not feel able to continue tonight, but I hope to make a few more remarks later on in this debate.

MONOPOLIES AND THE LITTLE MAN

A press-cable from London states: "While nearly 20,000 small shopkeepers have been forced to close since the beginning of the war, large combines are increasing their branches," says the "Daily Express."

"One combine has opened 25 new branches in two years, and another 53. A number of new branches of the Co-operative Union have been opened recently, and the Union has bought up a still larger number of little businesses."

"The Board of Trade's official register of small shopkeepers who have been forced to close since January, 1943, contain 9000 names. This figure does not include little grocers, dairies, or businesses of men who are prisoners. It is estimated there are at least another 10,000 of these."

Strange that the socialistic bureaucrat fulminates against the big monopoly and then pursues a policy that creates bigger and better monopolies!

THIS MILK PASTEURISATION BLUFF!

By CHARLES TINGLE, 21 years Inspector under the Milk and Dairies Orders, in "World Review" (London), August 1943.

Doctors are fighting hard for the Government to introduce legislation ensuring the compulsory pasteurisation of the whole of our milk supply, in order to combat the spread of tuberculosis. They have got the support of a body called the "People's League of Health," whoever they may be or represent. But they have not got the support of anyone who has properly studied the problem. A number of Medical Officers of Health are pressing for it with all their might. It would be better if they studied milk, its bacteria and nutrient properties, instead of playing at "follow my leader" with a few of their number who are calling out for this interference with the people's food.

Of course, the National Farmers' Union is fighting against it tooth and nail; but if the public does not add its voice to that of the N.F.U. and win the fight, the answer to pasteurisation will be in the clinics and hospitals. That the farmers are not wholly free from blame is a pity. Even so, when the matter is considered in all its aspects, there is absolutely no case for pasteurisation.

The question first arose after the bacteria or "germ" theory was proved. Doctors then advised people to boil all milk. This advice "was given, in ignorance; and because the majority of infants were fed on milk only, great numbers of them died."

The general practice of pasteurisation was adopted when it became known that the tubercle bacillus or "germ" could be killed at a temperature under boiling point. The milk combines and large firms have laid down expensive plant and are already pasteurising nearly all the milk used in cities.

What is milk pasteurisation? It is simply heating up milk to a temperature a little under boiling point for a short time in order to kill the tubercle bacillus. There is no secret about it; it can be done at home.

All milk is not infected with tuberculosis; even the sponsors of the movement say that only from five to ten per cent. of the farms are sending out tubercular milk. But yet they want to pasteurise it all. Why? The Government pays milk producers more per gallon to produce clean, tubercle-free milk; but in the factory, ALL milk, clean, dirty, infected and non-infected, is mixed, thereby contaminating the lot, then put through the process.

Is it any wonder that foreigners call us the "mad English."

The Government is just waking up to the fact that clean milk is being treated like this, and Lord Woolton is to make a statement about it.

Doctors give various reasons in favour of pasteurisation: I have some before me as I write. It is said that 2000 deaths a year occur from tuberculosis of bovine origin. But they do not say that these deaths are the direct result of bovine tuberculosis contracted by drinking infected milk. No! they dare not; but they leave us to think that it is what they mean.

The chairman of the N.F.U.'s milk committee points out that a leading character among the doctors has failed to prove a single case of tuberculosis or any other disease being caused by drinking fresh milk which has been produced and handled according to the Milk and Dairies' Orders.

HALF-TRUTHS.

The bluff lies in the stating of half-truths, and insinuating that terrible consequences follow the drinking of raw milk. But the greatest plank in their platform is the implication—mind, they do not say it—that people who drink milk containing the tubercle bacillus will, as a matter of course, contract the disease. This is sheer rubbish; medical testimony proves otherwise.

Although there is a difference between human and bovine tuberculosis, when figures are mentioned respecting deaths it is not stated whether the human type or the bovine is responsible. Therefore figures may convey a wrong impression.

It should be understood that bovine tuberculosis is that which affects the glands and bones. This type does not spread from person to person. If investigation is made, these cases are very rare. Human tuberculosis is the pulmonary type, or tuberculosis of the lung. This type spreads from person to person, and is the type, which is spreading. It is not got from drinking milk.

The age of tubercular deaths rises rapidly from the age of fifteen upwards. Yet these people, on the whole, are not milk drinkers; these figures alone prove that it is the human type and not the bovine type, which is spreading.

It is said that outbreaks of scarlet fever, diphtheria and typhoid fever have been traced to milk. That is so, but they do not come from the cow! They come from the people who handle the milk. Surely the logical way to prevent this is to make these people submit to frequent medical examination and then to remove the "carriers" and those who are sick.

That practically sums up the case for pasteurisation. Now let us see what other doctors and research workers say against it. A good deal of this has appeared in the "British Medical Journal."

All doctors agree that some of the properties of vitamins "B" and "C" are destroyed. Vitamin "C" is vital for health.

A child was accidentally fed for some time on raw milk from a tubercular cow, without contracting the disease.

Dr. A. H. Macdonald, Chief Medical Officer to Dr. Barnado's Homes, in his letter to the "British Medical Journal," says, "The child on raw milk is very fit. Chilblains are practically eliminated. Dr. E. Sprawson has shown that teeth are less likely to decay owing to better dentine formation. Our experience shows that tubercle is not the result of drinking raw milk." Well, the doctor should know; he is perhaps the only one of so great an experience.

LORD MOYNIHAN SURPRISED.

Evidently this surprised Lord Moynihan, because he asked for proof. Dr. Macdonald then wrote to the "Journal" saying that in a special home 750 delicate boys were given a pint of raw milk daily for five years, and only one case of non-pulmonary tuberculosis occurred. Yet during the previous five years, amongst the same number of delicate children who got pasteurised milk, fourteen cases occurred.

Dr. Macdonald also said;—

"While the tubercle germ is killed, the beneficial ones are also destroyed. Among them are the lactic acid group, which cause the souring of milk, which, according to Metchnikoff, is so beneficial for us."

"The resistant or spore-forming germs are not killed. These turn milk putrid, and because they, have no opposition, multiply at a greater rate than in raw milk. Professor Beattie and Mr. Lewis proved this."

"It eliminates calcium, that vital mineral which builds bones and teeth."

"It eliminates much of the iodine and phosphorus, and is conducive to bad teeth, scurvy, rickets and irritability in children. Dr. Saleby wrote that he believed that an adequate supply of iodine would probably reduce the number of our backward children by half. 'It affords facilities for germs to pass through the naturally bacteria resistant lining of the mouth.'"

"The great majority of germs are destroyed in the stomach. Some germs are harder than others, but, given a healthy body, these germs will not all survive."

Given the above facts, why should we be

dragooned into drinking this masked and denatured concoction? Have we no choice in the matter? Are we fighting for freedom? If the public remains apathetic toward the matter, theirs will be the blame.

But there are four other sources of infection from bovine tuberculosis,

(1) Research workers tell us that butter contains more tubercle bacilli than milk.

(2) Whole milk cheese contains as many tubercle bacilli as milk.

(3) Meat from tubercular animals contains enormous numbers.

(4) Live tubercle bacilli have been recovered from the fields after a space of two years. These are voided by the animals and blown about in the air.

These facts are well known; then why do we not hear a great outcry for the pasteurisation of butter, cheese, and meat?

When properly cooled, clean milk will keep sweet for four days. It does not take three days for the milk to get from the farms to the home. If it does, then the organisation is at fault, and not the milk.

There is sufficient legislation in force at the present time to ensure clean, tubercle-free milk; but it is not enforced.

The fact remains, and it is admitted by all doctors, that pasteurised milk is not by itself a sufficient food for children. There are children whose sole food consists of bought milk. It is these children who will suffer if this legislation is brought about.

A recent letter in the "British Medical Journal" states that nearly all doctors agree that pasteurisation is essential. Essential for what? For filling our clinics with myopic, rickety, stunted, knock-kneed children with bad teeth? They do not say, "Read the report of any School Medical Officer of a city or large town and see how many visits are paid to the clinics by children."

If pasteurisation is enforced, it will be a pitiful confession of failure on the part of the Government, and everyone connected with Public Health, to pass on to us the best food, which Nature has given to man in the form in which she intended us to have it.

Furthermore, it is an unwarrantable and impertinent attempt at interference with the liberty of the subject.

THE GREAT BATTLE FOR FREEDOM

By L. D. BYRNE, Technical Adviser to the Alberta Government. (An Address to the Rocky Mountain House Board of Trade on Monday, May 10, 1943.)

Let me make it plain at the outset that what I have to say is not concerned with party politics. The issues, which I wish to discuss with you, are above all party and sectional interests. We are facing a world crisis in which not only the fate of us all, not only the fate of our country and Empire, but the future of humanity for centuries to come is at stake.

As leaders in your community I am sure that you recognise the extreme gravity of the terrific situation into which we are heading. I take it, therefore, that you will not expect me to mince my words; and I make no apology for bringing to your attention in the plainest language, which I can use, the challenge that faces every one of us. It is a challenge, which we cannot ignore.

In the first place, in order to understand what is going on in the world at the present time we must have a clear idea of what this war is about—of the basic issues involved in the universal conflict—as well as the background of the pre-war conditions leading up to the war. In the limited time at my disposal I cannot hope to do more than draw attention to some of the more important aspects of these matters.

THE NATURE OF THE CONFLICT

The Hypnotism of Labels

The view is expressed in certain quarters, with all seriousness, that this war is being fought to get rid of Hitler. It seems to me sheer nonsense to suggest that if we can dispose of an upstart Austrian paperhanger the world would at once resolve itself into a scene of peace, harmony and progress. Hitler, Hitlerism and Nazi-ism are merely labels, and the important thing is not these labels, but what these labels stand for.

For example, there is no essential difference between the present Nazi regime in Germany and the Prussian Militarism, which flourished under a monarchy and was the curse of Europe for more than a century. Whether the adulation of the people is rendered to a Kaiser or to a Feuhrer seems of little consequence, if the nature of the thing these men represent remains the same—namely, an all-powerful State, imposing its dictates on its citizens by the use of stark force and terrorist tactics; and its rulers, having subjugated their own people and got them into uniforms, goose-stepping up and down to the strains of Deutschland Uber Alles, proceed to send them forth to impose the domination of their monstrous system on other people by brute force.

We talk of Nazi-ism and other brands of totalitarianism as though they were something entirely new in human experience. Actually there is nothing new, original or unique about them except their labels. They are but the present manifestations of an evil which humanity has been afflicted for thousands of years.

The Abuse of Power

Dictatorship in any form—whether it be an autocracy, a plutocracy or anything else—develops into a tyranny by a natural process. Rule by force, terrorism and aggression are inseparable from that type of social organisation. It is ludicrous to suppose that the disposal of Hitler and his satellites would eradicate the cause of the plight in which humanity is floundering. So long as the essential features of the type of social organisation we term totalitarianism persist, just as a Hitler came to replace the Kaiser, so somebody else would push his way to the top to take the place of the present Nazi leader.

Under that type of social organisation—involving the concentration of power in a central authority and the manipulation of

the many by the few—by a natural process power maniacs with the mentality of gangsters and the manners of polished actors, automatically gravitate to the top in the role of saviours of their country.

The British Empire was forced into this war, inadequately prepared, because it was plain that unless the Nazi war machine was stopped, it would continue its systematic career of aggression and conquest of one country after another until it imposed what its masters were pleased to call "The New Order" on the entire continent of Europe, as a prelude to making a bid for world domination. Fantastic as this seemed at one time, the events of the war have proved how real was our peril.

However, there is a more fundamental aspect of the matter. Inherent in the challenge of Nazi-ism is the threat of world domination by the social system we term totalitarianism, of which it is the product. And the doctrine of totalitarianism being the antithesis of the traditional British concept of democracy, a clash was inevitable. In order to appreciate the full significance of this it is necessary to examine these two irreconcilable social philosophies, and to do so we have to get down to first principles.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION.

Two Social Systems

Notwithstanding the variety of labels which are being bandied about—such as Fascism, National Socialism, Social Democracy, New Deals, Communism, Co-operation, Democracy, and so forth—there are two, and only two, types of social organisation:

(1) That under which the people constitute the supreme authority and which is organised to enable the people to get the results they want from their association as a community or nation. This is the type of organisation, which can be properly termed democratic.

(2) That under which the many are manipulated by the few, in whose hands supreme power is centralised, enabling them to impose their dictates on a subservient people and usually operating in the name of "the State." This form of organisation, inherent in the "Supreme State" doctrine of which we hear so much, is usually called "dictatorship" or "totalitarianism."

Now, in spite of the vague definitions and the nebulous explanations of democracy, which seem so popular among some of our academic theorists, the social system that goes by that name is a very definite form of organisation. In fact, it is the natural social order, as a moment's reflection will show.

The reason individuals associate in groups is to gain objectives, which they want in common, and which would other-

wise be impossible to attain. That is the motivating influence in any association and it is as true of society as a whole as, for instance, your own organisation.

Therefore, the natural social system is one, which is organised to enable the people comprising the community to obtain the results they want. This entails the people being the supreme authority that decides the results, which shall accrue to them from their activities. Only democracy in its fullness provides for this.

Democracy v. Totalitarianism.

Now, in order for the people to be the supreme authority they must be organised to specify the results they want in definite terms and to enforce obedience to their wishes. Authority without the means to enforce it is non-existent in actual practice.

Thus we find that the basis of democracy is the absolute sovereignty of the people. This means that they must have complete and effective control of all aspects of their social life, and that those in positions of administrative authority must be subservient to the will of the people at all times in regard to the results their management shall yield.

Without going into the matter more fully, it should be apparent that in every respect the social concept of democracy is the opposite of dictatorship or totalitarianism.

Whereas democracy involves organisation of the community or nation to enable its individual members to get the results they want from the management of their affairs, the totalitarian State is organised to enable the ruling group to manipulate the people and to impose upon them the results, which the rulers decide they shall get.

Whereas in a democracy the people constitute the supreme authority (and the administrators of their affairs, being responsible to the people for the results accruing to them, are subservient to them), under a totalitarian society a central group exercises supreme power in the name of the State and the people are subservient to its authority.

Whereas in a democracy the people exercise control over all aspects of their social life, under totalitarianism this control is centralised in the hands of the State authority, and is used to control and manipulate the people.

Whereas the freedom of the individual is the corner stone of democracy, under totalitarianism the individual is merely the creature of the State authority, existing to obey its dictates.

This comparison could be extended, but it would only emphasise the irreconcilable difference between these two social philosophies. The one is the antithesis of the other.

It is the inevitable clash between these two irreconcilable social philosophies which is the focus of not only the war, but likewise of the much wider conflict that is being fought out in the world today.

(To be continued.)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The next meeting of the S.C.M. of S.A. will be held in the United Democrats' rooms, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, February 24, at 8 p.m. Following general business, an address will be given by the chairman, Mr. D. J. Amos, on "Europe and Australia's Future." All interested are cordially invited to attend.

— J. E. BURGESS, Hon. Sec.

POWER-LUSTING PLANNERS' POST-WAR PLOT

(Continued from page 1.)

ESSENTIAL FREEDOM.

But we differ from the professors in that we see beyond the war and look forward to the return of those fundamental freedoms for which we are fighting. We see our "totalitarianism" as temporary; they see it as permanent.

IT COULD WELL BE THAT THE FRAMERS OF OUR CONSTITUTION SAW ALL THESE DANGERS, AND MADE PROVISION FOR THEM. CERTAINLY PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS TO INVEST THE DEPARTMENTS WITH EXTRAORDINARY POWERS HAVE FAILED.

Introducing his Bill for added powers in October 1918, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) said: "The war is over, and with it the war-time powers of the Commonwealth are disappearing. We are brought back to our pre-war limits of authority, and we have to deal with the aftermath of the war—a condition as difficult and full of dangers as the war itself."

Mr. Hughes' proposals were defeated. There followed a period of great prosperity!

Towards the beginning of this century the great English novelist, D. H. Lawrence, visited Australia. Shortly before he left he said that he believed we were a great people, but warned us that we appeared to be peculiarly in danger of falling for dictatorship.

If the ghost of Lawrence were at the Processors' Picnic last weekend, he might have well indulged in the epic, "I told you so." For it would seem that the tyranny of the "leftist" professors is to be the logical successor of the tyranny, of Fascist control.

The only real difference lies in the fact that Axis Fascism has been identified with individual names, while the professorial Fascism remains largely anonymous.