

PROFESSORS' FASCIST 5-YEAR PLAN (Page 3)

COMMUNISM PERPETUATES MONOPOLY (Page 3)

ALBERTA GOVT. CANCELS MUNICIPAL RELIEF DEBTS (Page 3)

AUSTRALIA'S POST-WAR PERIL (Page 4)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 8. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1944

Now, when our land to ruin's brink to 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 We Give More Power to Canberra?

Hard Facts of Experience as Guide

"The general principles which govern association for the common good are as capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building, and departure from them is just as disastrous."

— C. H. Douglas in "The Tragedy of Human Effort."

Students of history know that the above statement is true. Example after example has been quoted in these columns, all proving that the more associations are centralised under the control of a central authority, the less control the people have over policies. They lose initiative and become a servile people. The Roman Empire eventually fell, not so much because of the military attack from without, but because of the decay caused by the centralised political and financial system within. John Buchan, in his biography of Augustus, concludes his study of the Roman Emperor by pointing out that he had to grapple with problems of organisation similar to those confronting us today.

The remarkable thing is that so many people seem to ignore what has happened in the past. Their powers of perception appear to have been blunted by the sheer weight of propaganda issued via the daily press, the radio, and the cinema. The genius of the peoples of the British Empire has been the result of de-centralised local government. Now it is proposed to alter all that!

Here in Australia every effort is being made to mesmerise the people, in order that they shall agree to greater regimentation through the granting of wide and sweeping post-war powers for the centralised Federal Government at Canberra. Buchan states that the tendency of the peoples of the modern world to accept regimentation would have astounded Augustus if he could return to earth today. But Augustus knew nothing about the influence of a centralised press, radio, and cinema! We are dealing with a partially hypnotised people and mere theoretical argument is useless. We must first de-hypnotise them by bringing unanswerable facts before their notice. This journal exists for that purpose.

Now, let us look at two examples of the actual results of centralisation in Australia.

WEST AUSTRALIA'S EXPERIENCE

We will first take Mr. Curtin's own State, West Australia.

Although Mr. Curtin believes in the government of Australia from Canberra, his fellow West Australians think so little of

Canberra that, only a comparatively short time ago, an overwhelming majority of them voted for secession. They had experienced the tragic RESULTS of centralisation. Not only is it ridiculous nonsense that men at Canberra should attempt to legislate for West Australia, thousands of miles away; but many responsible citizens in West Australia believe that the development of the State has even been retarded by too much control from PERTH!

Prior to the West Australian State Elections last year, the Country Party leader, Mr. Watts, made some pertinent observations on what centralised government of West Australia from Perth had done. Dealing with the setbacks to men attempting to develop the once-thriving Northwest, Mr. Watts said: "Under the present Income-tax Act, they (the graziers) are denied the recouping of their heavy drought losses. In effect, they are paying taxation on lost money; and to a degree the same principle applies to all other rural industries." Mr. Watts also said "over the past eleven years 3600 Agricultural Bank farms have been abandoned."

The one-port policy in West Australia is as foolish as the same idea in Victoria. Albany is the natural port of one of the finest agricultural areas in Australia, and yet it is estimated that only £131 has been spent on "improvements" to the port since 1924! Can anyone imagine it getting any better treatment from far-away Canberra? As a result of this starving of Albany,

wheat grown in the area cannot be handled effectively, because no terminals exist.

"Even Premier Willcocks' own port of Geraldton, though comparatively well-equipped, suffers, as do the farmers, from the effects of Perth policy," said Mr. Watts. "A Government railway, built in the hope of stealing trade from the company-owned Midland line, which pays taxes and makes profits, runs from Perth to Mullewa. In the result, traffic carried to and from the Murchison over the Mullewa line by-passes Geraldton, and, links between the Mullewa and Midland lines having been vetoed, there is great and unnecessary haulage—in one case amounting to 200 miles, though the actual distance between points is 21 miles."

Anomalies such as this will be multiplied enormously if Canberra takes over from Perth. What is wanted, particularly in the big States, Queensland and West Australia, is a greater de-centralisation of policy-control. The Northwest of West Aus-

tralia can never be developed by control from Perth, still less from Canberra. The distance from Canberra to Perth is nearly twice as far as the distance from Canberra to New Zealand. Has anyone suggested that Canberra should govern New Zealand? Most people would consider the idea ridiculous, yet many of the same people can be persuaded to believe that Canberra should govern places even further away!

As a second example of the results of centralised control in Australia, let us take the case of the Northern Territory.

THE NORTHERN TERRITORY

The State of South Australia controlled the Territory from 1863 to 1911. Regarding this period of forty-eight years it has been stated by a competent authority that--

"When South Australia assumed control it entered upon the task of colonisation (Continued on page 4.)"

Did He Fear More Open Letters?

Archbishop Booth Objects to Making of Notes on Sermon!

In the first three issues of this journal for 1944, we published, a series of Open Letters from Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., to the Most Reverend J. J. Booth, D.D., Anglican Archbishop of Melbourne. In these letters, Mr. Bradshaw discussed with admirable clarity of reasoning, certain public statements made by the Archbishop in connection with his recently launched appeal for 500,000 shillings.

That the Archbishop apparently fears that his public statements upon various highly important matters appertaining to Post-War Reconstruction cannot bear the focusing upon them of the searchlight of truth, that they cannot be sustained in the face of a frank, fearless, and well-informed criticism, is evidenced by the fact that HE INTERRUPTED HIS OWN SERMON ON SUNDAY LAST TO ADDRESS A REQUEST TO MR. BRADSHAW TO REFRAIN FROM TAKING NOTES THEREON!!

We think this action must be almost unprecedented. Has the Archbishop ever objected to press reporters taking notes while he has been preaching? Or is it that he objected to Mr. Bradshaw confronting him with an issue regarding which Balzac wrote a century ago the following words:—"The final battle for Christianity will be over the money problem; till that is solved there can be no universal application of Christianity"??

Hereunder we publish a letter from Mr. Bradshaw wherein he explains what took place:—

To the Editor, "The New Times." Sir, — Since my very young days I have been associated with St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne. More recently, as your readers are aware, I have become a devotee of the high ideals for which "The New Times" stands, and which have been held out by that noble torch bearer and philosopher, Major C. H. Douglas, to a racked and bleeding world as offering the ONLY possible set of principles whereby civilisation may be saved. I invite any Bishop or clergyman to demonstrate to me that what we are advocating is anything other than the practical application of Christianity.

In endeavours to further those great ideals, I have had correspondence with other Archbishops and clergymen. Since Archbishop Booth acceded to his present office, I have approached him from time to time by letter and—when opportunity has offered—in conversation. I submit, Mr. Editor that I have treated him with every courtesy, even if I have been trenchant, although quite fair, in my criticism of what I have regarded as erroneous and dangerously misleading statements. And, without immodesty, I believe I can fairly claim to have demonstrated that statements such as those with which I have dealt in your columns are either empty platitudes, or that the Archbishop is sadly misinformed.

But, the Archbishop has, unfortunately, treated me with very scant courtesy, as "acknowledgments" forwarded by him to my letters can testify. By me and others it has been suggested to him that he should have a talk with us so as to learn more regarding our point of view. He has professed lack of time for that, though he has found time to act as a War Loan propagandist!

Being of the opinion that statements such as His Grace CONTINUES to make should not be allowed to pass without critical examination, I recently addressed a series of Open Letters to him through your columns. I forwarded to the Archbishop a copy of each paper, with the first sending him a perfectly polite note setting forth the motive by which I was actuated in addressing him publicly, and advising him that space would be placed at his disposal should he desire to reply. All

that I have received from him is a bare acknowledgment of my note.

Last Sunday evening (February 20), the Archbishop was again the preacher at St Paul's Cathedral. Shortly after he commenced his sermon, he observed that I was taking some notes thereon. I have done this on previous occasions; and, of course, it is the regular practice of reporters from the daily papers to take notes on the sermons preached by clergymen, and to report same. If the Archbishop has no objection to the pressmen, why should he dislike my taking notes? But, Mr. Editor, he does! He broke off the delivery of his sermon to address a request to me to desist from writing notes thereon. He complained that it is "unsettling."

Were it my intention to make any dishonourable or improper use of the notes, his objection would be understandable. But I never have, and never intend to take any action affecting either the Archbishop or any other person that is not fair, open, and clean. I do not think he could say that my attitude toward him has been other than fair and open. Why, then, does he object to my taking notes on his sermons? Can it be that he is afraid or ashamed of what he says? Or that, despite

(Continued on page 3.)

NOTES on the NEWS

The Allied military Government in Italy is reported to have abolished the "co-operative workers' syndicates." Under this system, workers were compelled to join such "syndicates" (unions), and were compelled to pay as much as 32% of their pay towards the upkeep of Fascism. Here we see in practice the perils of compulsory unionism advocated by certain so-called democratic unionists. Their chief concert appears to be that Hitler and Mussolini beat them to the racket. Much lip service is also given by New Order advocates to co-operation, but they want to institute a form of legation or compulsion, which converts co-operation into tyranny. True cooperation is free and voluntary.

MIGRATION MUSINGS: Douglas Wilkie, Melbourne "Herald" correspondent, as a result of interviewing a large number of men and women in England, found that "none of them were interested in leaving the overcrowded island for the spacious life in the Dominions." Except in the young and adventurous, that's a natural attitude—although it seems surprising to the spacious, yet empty minds of Planners, who pour out reams of words on the questions of migration and population. Since the very roots of one's life are in one's homeland, common sense dictates the home instinct, however poor or lowly home may be. Besides, "the devil you know" is easier to handle.

FINANCE FIGURES: Treasury returns published in the Melbourne "Sun" of February 11 show that "war expenditure for the expired seven months of 1943-44 financial year is £318,693,000, of which only £79,464,000 was provided from revenue; the balance (£239,129,000) being obtained from

loans." An interesting feature of the report is that war expenditure in January had dropped to £36,899,000, compared with an average monthly expenditure approximating £50,000,000 over preceding months. This indicates that our war-finance needs are becoming less, and yet we are faced with additional taxation (and another "Victory" loan). Common sense would suggest a decrease in taxation.

FLAX FIGURES: In 1839, flax production in Australia was less than 100 tons a year, now the figure is 100 tons per week. With the aid of machines four men can equal the output of 72 men. In another process, one man can do the work of 30 men, and deliver an improved product used in the manufacture of twine, thread, canvas, fire hose, webbing and parachute harness. This is but one more illustration of post-war possibilities, for leisure. But if the policy of "full employment" is to be our peace aim, and finding work is to be the new mania—well, to be consistent these labour-saving machines will have to be destroyed. This was attempted many years ago, and apparently this complex still remains in the Labour ranks, who have yet to set up a demand, not for work, but for leisure; yes, paid leisure.

UNION UNITY: Recently more than 30 trade union officials in Victoria and N.S.W. cabled to the British Trade Union Congress a protest against the statement of Mr. Naylor (U.S. Labour Delegate), who said: "The American Federation of Labour had refused to join the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee, because Soviet Trade Unions were under the domination of the Soviet Government." The protest was not on the question of the accuracy or otherwise of the statement; no, no, nothing as important as that; it was on the grounds of possible (Continued on page 2)

Finance Had Last Say

The Catholic Rural Movement has had a setback with its insurance plans. According to Bishop Henschke, says the "Age" of February 17, "the pool insurance had failed, and the agreement was terminated by the company concerned, because of manpower difficulties." The Bishop made it clear that there was far more to it than that, and that another organisation had brought heavy pressure to bear. There is no obstacle in the way of these co-operatives growing things; but, when it comes to butting in on the realms of Finance—well, they are effectively by-passed. The openings for these co-operative groups are very limited within the present financial set up.

Alberta Production

Official figures issued recently show that wheat loadings in the Province of Alberta for the first seven months of 1943 were 4,892,115 bushels, 401 per cent higher than for the same period in 1942.

Loadings of other grains show even greater increases than the wheat, with 22 times 1942 bushelage of grains loaded in 1943.

Cattle, hogs, and sheep marketings increased in 1943, but calf marketing showed a slight decrease. Total cattle marketing for the seven-month period in 1943 was 158,297 head valued at almost 13,500,000 dollars (about £3,375,000).

Sale of hogs reached 1,320,000 head, a slight increase over the 1942 figure. Market value of the hogs was 19 per cent higher. Sheep and lamb marketing showed a 25 per cent, increase in market value.

Flour milling in the 1943 period increased 64 per cent, with a production valued at 6,785,931 dollars (about £1,696,482).

Up to the end of July, 4,484,644 tons of coal was mined for 1943 in the Province—250,000 tons more than in the same period in 1942. Petroleum production in the same period decreased 5.9 per cent, with a production of 5,684,000 barrels. Salt mining produced nearly 11,000 tons, and the amount of cement sold was 358,871 barrels.

PROFESSORS' FASCIST 5-YEAR PLAN

Last week we gave prominence to the Sydney "Truth's" excellent report and comment on the gathering of Planners at Canberra on January 29-31. As promised, we now quote what the Labor paper, "Century," also of Sydney, had to say about it. This front-page article, headed "Professors' 5-Year Plan For Fascism" in huge black type, was written by J. T. Lang: —

At Canberra this week the Professors held an orgy. Its importance to us is that they are not just professors. They are the men who are actually controlling the administration of this country today and who, on their own showing at Canberra, intend to retain that control permanently.

They set out for us what is virtually a Five Year Plan for the Government of the country after the war. They stripped their plan of all its disguises and revealed it as pure unadulterated Fascism.

It is the intention of the professors that every regulation and restriction that has been employed during the war will be carried on for the duration of the Five Year Plan.

Every vestige of liberty is to be forfeited for a professor's promise of the four freedoms.

Every form of rationing, restriction, coercion and conscription that has operated during the war is to carry over into the peace. There is to be a new altar on which a new god will be enthroned, and it will be named The Plan.

ENEMY BOTH WAYS

Winning the Peace will be used then as Winning the War is now used. Where today anyone who protests or demurs about any regulation is described as an enemy of the War Effort, in the post-war years he will be dubbed an enemy of The Plan and dealt with accordingly.

Professor Copland says a large degree of Nationalisation is necessary. He is using Nationalisation as bait to get the people to adopt The Plan.

IT IS THE ROAD TO FASCISM

In this country the railways are nationalised. Metropolitan transport is nationalised. Our telegraph service, telephone service, water system, irrigation, all are nationalised. But we did not have to call on the people to surrender their liberty in order to achieve that degree of Nationalisation.

What is there about coalmines, banks, steel and similar industries that prevents us from nationalising them without adopting a complete system of Fascism?

Mussolini said that Fascism was founded on the corporate state.

POWERS TO CONSCRIPT

Industry was organised under an industry Board, on which employers and workers had representation. That Board was given powers of conscription over the whole industry.

In practice, of course, persons representing employers and workers were persons agreeable to the Fascist party and force was used to kick everybody into line.

What have we here? A few weeks ago there was a controversy between Shipping Minister Beasley and the Secretary of the Seamen's Union. There is a Board controlling the whole shipping industry. It has representatives of the workers and the employers.

Mr. Beasley asked the seamen to elect officers who would collaborate with the Shipping Board. He said that existing officers would not attend Board meetings.

Union officials replied that the Board consisted of employers and the representatives of two small unions, who always voted against the big Seamen's Union. They said that the Shipping Board was only a means of dragooning the seamen.

In Italy and Germany force would have been used against the seamen's official, but it hasn't come to that here.

But it is not only the shipping industry that is organised that way. It is every industry.

There is a Board consisting of people concerned in the industry. Under the Board there is one person charged with full executive powers. He is invariably a high executive of the largest firm engaged in the industry. Is it any wonder that combines are growing bigger?

Prices have been fixed. Taxation is excessive. Yet there is no complaint from any combine or large business. Every well-

BOOKLETS BY CH DOUGLAS

Now on sale: "Programme for the Third World War." Price: 2/-, plus 1d postage.

Also available: "The Land for the (Chosen) People Racket." Price: 2/-, plus 1d postage.

And: "The Big Idea" (Second Edition). Price: 2/6, plus 1d postage.

Obtainable from: The Democratic Federation of Youth, 3rd Floor, 296a Pitt Street, Sydney.

"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.

established business has paid the excessive taxation and also paid a dividend equal if not exceeding its pre-war dividend.

SURRENDER YOUR LIBERTY

Like Fascism, The Plan is merely a device under which the people are asked to surrender their liberty under promise of an advance along the road to Socialism. The road leads to State-protected capitalism and nowhere else.

Under Copland's plan the professors will control our habits, our work, and our pleasures. We will be subject to exactly the same restrictions as the people of Germany and Italy suffered under Mussolini and Hitler.

The Professors say that under their system they will be able to guarantee everybody a job. That was the claim that Hitler made for his system.

There has been no mention of a press censorship, but it is as certain as night follows day that the professors' plan could not function without a press censorship.

The Plan says we will eat what is

BRITISH AUTHOR ON JEWISH INFLUX

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

The interests of those national communities which are called on to receive the newcomers in their midst, are ignored. Admission is passionately demanded, and once given, is written off as a triviality. We have accepted 150,000 or 250,000 immigrants in this country, and have helped unnumbered thousands more to go to the Dominions; we have spent millions on them, opened all employment to them, and spared them from military service. These are privileges UNIQUE IN HISTORY. Yet the foremost champions of the Jewish cause in our Parliament, Lord Wedgwood, in the Lords and Miss Rathbone in the Commons, and many others, repeatedly abuse our "ungenerous" bearing! In a current pamphlet, we are even called murderers for not transporting all the Jews of Europe to these shores!

The first Jewish influx is here. It is the first result of the war. Wiser administrators than those who promoted it should in future watch that this new section of our population does not obtain, at the cost of the sorely tried and long-enduring people of our island, an improper share of wealth, power, land and privilege.

But now something even more dangerous to our nationhood, our island and our Empire impends. This is an attempt to transplant an even larger number of Jews from Central Europe, to transfer to our backs the greatest problem of Europe. The hospitality, shelter and privileges we have already given are dismissed as of no account.

The people we are required to accept are, in the main, the Jews in Poland, that great reservoir from which world Jewry and Zionism are fed. What sort of people are they? The answer is found in the words, written before this war, of a Jew, M. Stefan Litauer, who is now closely connected with the Polish Government in London:

"There is no other country which suffers more from the burden of the social and economic consequences of the Jewish problem than Poland. No other country has such a high percentage of Jews . . . they constitute 10 per cent. of the total population of the Polish Republic. . . . At the conclusion of the Great War, when

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From The United Democrats' headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide)

PENSIONERS' CAMPAIGN: At a meeting of pensioners in South Australia recently an M.H.R. who was present agreed that the existing pension rate was inadequate and stated that he would endeavour to have the rate raised to £2 per week. This immediately caused one pensioner to interject, "We are asking for £3 per week." General acclamation ensued. We sincerely trust that this occurrence can be taken as being indicative that any attempt to compromise with this just request of the pensioners will be vigorously opposed. Bequest forms are available from our office for 1/3 per 100, plus postage 1d. Send for a bundle today and help the campaign along. If our requests are met (and they will be if we use the requisite amount of energy) every person of pensionable age will receive £3 weekly.

BOOKS: Have you read the following? "PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR," by C. H. Douglas. Price, 2/-, plus 1d postage. "THE BIG IDEA," by C. H. Douglas; 2/6, plus 1d postage. "THE NEW DESPOTISM." (The amazing case of a man who tried to obtain a hearing in Court.) Price 6d single copy, 3/- doz., plus 2d postage.

— F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

EAST MALVERN CAMPAIGN

Thanks to the initiative of Mr. T. Rowbottom, actionists in and around this area are invited to attend a meeting at the home of Mr. O. B. Heatley, 32 Paxton-street, East Malvern, on Tuesday evening, February 29. The Burke-road bus from Gardiner and Caulfield passes Paxton-street, which is about halfway between the Wattle Tree-road and Waverley-road tram lines. Come along and help Mr. Rowbottom to organise a local public meeting on the Federal Powers question.

rationed for us, we will work where we are told to work, live where we are told to live, read what the professors allow us to print, send our children to the University or the coal mines as ordered by the planners, enjoy such entertainment as the planners permit us to enjoy. We will be regimented and regulated as much as any German or Russian ever was.

When the young men return from the war they will find that the professors have erected barbed wire entanglements stronger than any they encountered at the war.

ANATHEMA TO LABOUR

The Plan is merely a device to keep The Planners in office. It is anathema to the Labour Movement. The Labour Party had its programme for the betterment of the people long before the dictators of Europe had to devise a plan to keep themselves in office. It was never part of Labour's policy that the workers and their families should be drafted and driven about like sheep.

It is the duty of the Government to make it clear that the forthcoming referendum is not intended merely to allow The Plan to be adopted. [How can they, Mr. Lang, when the referendum is so obviously intended to "allow" precisely that? —Ed., "N.T."] If the people get the impression that it is, then the vote will be overwhelmingly against the Government.

The Labour Movement must become articulate and denounce this plan for camouflaged Fascism.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

damage to "Union Unity," which is much more important than truth, of course!

LEASE-LEND: U.S. Lease-Lend representatives, who recently visited US, after visiting munition works, said "certain machines were wrongly labelled the property of the Commonwealth Government, when in reality they belonged to Lease-Lend." Will somebody tell US who Mr. Lease-Lend is, and where does he reside? Incidentally, it seems that Mr. Makin's worries about finding work for these machines is premature. It has been pointed out that these machines remain the property of Mr. Lease-Lend, and can be claimed by him or destroyed by U.S. authority; so apparently Mr. Lease-Lend resides in U.S.

VALUELESS VITAMINS: A two-years' test (not a test-tube test) of 1400 British school children and factory workers dosed with synthetic vitamins, shows that there is practically no value in these so-called miraculous pills, for they produced no significant effect on weight, hemoglobin, blood pressure, absence through illness, or production output. The synthetic vitamins were Vitamin A, Thiamin, Riboflavin (of beer fame), ascorbic acid, Nicotinamide and vitamin B.

BROWDER'S BOMBSHELL: Mr. Earl Browder, secretary of the U.S. Communist Party, has caused further consternation to our local socialists by giving his blessing to the investment of American capital in foreign markets, a practice which the Communists have denounced for more than a quarter of a century. Further, in this matter (vide Melbourne "Herald," 11/1/44), "Communists in Latin America no longer attack Dollar Diplomacy or British Imperialism." Poor old Karl!

PROTECTING PLANNERS: This complaint against misused censorship comes from the London "Sunday Express" (vide Melbourne "Sun," 14/2/44), viz.: "Censorship is a force which has a tendency to suppress facts contained in critical opinions . . . so we come to a stage in which officials [planners] try to use the censorship for their own protection . . . and to suppress any view that does not suit them."

TEXTILE TRADE TRIALS: Before the war, when practical men were in charge, Australian cloth production was comparable with imported materials of similar types—and then Government bureaucrats took charge! Immediately the quality of worsteds, woollens and blankets was lowered; apart from the regimented designs, the flimsy materials now had about one-third of their pre-war life, in addition prices increased considerably and vital manpower was wasted in producing these shoddy lines. Fortunately, the common sense of John Citizen asserted itself against this form of, subtle sabotage—as "a result of this rebellion against bureaucratic sabotage we may soon obtain some reasonably useful clothing material."

PRESS PERSONALITY: Lord Beaverbrook, chain-press newspaper magnate, despite past failures in the realms of practical production, is now reported to be in line for a higher official post, maybe Secretary for War. A daily press article of 5/1/44 sums up his career as that of "a man who by ill-judgment has disturbed the political unity." The article then describes his "hectic reign as Minister for Aircraft Production, from which post he had to be removed," admits difficulty in seeing what major contribution Beaverbrook has made towards the war, asks, "what is the secret of the Churchill-Beaverbrook friendship?" and suggests some sort of hypnotic charm—a strange explanation, since Beaverbrook's record is of such a doubtful nature.

PRESIDENTS PLAN: Recently the daily press, with pathetic solemnity, bewailed the fact that "President Roosevelt's statesman like programme for complete mobilisation was doomed by Congress." It almost seemed that the people's Congress representatives had rebuked God! The said rejected programme embraced complete conscription of every able-bodied adult in the nation (excepting technically alien Jews), which is, of course, the very antithesis of a God-like act. It is both a curious and a dangerous practice of the press throughout the world to attempt the defecation of so-called "Leaders," such as Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, Hitler, Tojo, etc. —O.B.H.

L. H. HOLLINS AT OPEN FORUM

Mr. L. H. Hollins, M.L.A., will be the speaker at the Melbourne Opportunity Club's Open Forum in the Assembly Hall, Collins-street, on Tuesday next, February 29, at 8 p.m. His subject will be "Getting Results Through Parliament."

BOOKS TO READ

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

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

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

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

ART OR ARTIFICE?

"Bob Menzies, after looking at the Archibald Prize portrait, declared portrait painting to be at a low ebb. Didn't he realise that it was a political satire on meat rationing?" —Sydney "Century," Jan., 28.

GET THE FACTS!

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

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

COMMUNISM PERPETUATES MONOPOLY

From time to time, possibly all the time, over the past few years, social crediters have been accused by the Communists of supporting Capitalism, and have even had the word "Fascism" hurled at them with that measure of venom of which only the Communist is capable. Far from this accusation being justified, it is possible to prove that monopoly capitalism would continue under Communist government.

Considered only as private enterprise in the production and distribution of goods and services, capitalism has much to recommend it, provided the people have access to the full consumable product, and supplies are adequate to their needs; but it is the monopolistic trend of finance capitalism which has earned for it well-deserved criticism in recent years. Social Credit, being concerned with the development of the individual by the preservation of his individuality, is opposed to this unhealthy and dangerous development in capitalism, under which the monopolistic organisation ever seeks to be a law unto itself, and insists that the individual should not be pre-occupied with what he wants, but should supinely accept what is given him. If this monopolistic lust for power is not checked, it eventually spills over into the political sphere, and takes the form of ruthless dictation, under which irresponsible power supersedes responsible government and steamrolls the individual under the weight of its sanctions.

What is the attitude of the Communist to this undesirable feature of capitalism? Does he condemn monopoly and offer a cure or an alternative? No, he is not opposed to monopoly, but welcomes it, as witness the recent statement of policy, or tactics, by the Communists of America. They have stated in unequivocal terms that it is their intention to help make the capitalist system work, and that its monopolistic trend will not be hindered by them. In other words, the citizens of America will be made to work harder, with a further encroachment upon their rights and liberties, and with the full approval of the Communist Party.

What can be the objective behind this apparently inconsistent attitude? Have the Communists changed their policy or their tactics? Personally, I am of the opinion that having realised the futility of expecting Americans, with their individualistic outlook, to grant them power, through the ballot box, to introduce their anti-hill system of social organisation, they have chosen to pursue their objective of political power by another means. They possibly reason that it would be better tactically to permit the concentration of power under finance capital to continue until a stage is reached where the seizure of power is relatively easier because of a numerically smaller opposition? What happens then? Does the Communist discard the capitalist system of finance? Not a bit of it. He merely assumes control, and, through his lust for bureaucratic planning, does with greater gusto that which he hitherto condemned the capitalist for doing, i.e., he gives the people what he considers is good for them without much regard for what they want.

Having progressed thus far we can now return to the beginning of our argument, and give some consideration to the word "Fascist." This has degenerated into a Communist cuss-word, to be hurled at all who recognise Communists for what they are, totalitarian wolves in democratic sheep's clothing. In reality the word has a much wider meaning than that commonly given

it. "Fascism" is the modern catchword for centralised dictatorial government. Now, since the only objection to monopoly by the Communists is on the ground that monopolies are not at present controlled by Communists, and since all social crediters are the avowed enemies of monopoly, whether economic or political, who are Fascists, the Communists or the social crediters?

If the reader doubts my word regarding the objectives of Communists, let him take a good look at Soviet Russia. And by a good look I do not mean that superficial perusal of equally superficial propaganda indulged in by many people. If we study the facts we find that the capitalist system of finance still nourishes in Russia, but that it has become largely State or party controlled. Whether the party controls capitalism or finance capitalism controls the State remains to be seen, but this much can be seen now, the financial system in operation there is similar in nature to that of Czarist days; the only difference in operation being that money now flows for investment in industrial development at a faster rate than the old regime permitted. Taxation still limits and controls the lives of the people, and debt, both private and public, still lurks in the background.

Russia's "democratic constitution" means this, as do so many similar constitutions, that the people have been so conditioned by observation and education that they can be trusted to do what is desired of them. A parallel is to be seen in the case of the cart-horse which, when freed from the

DID HE FEAR MORE OPEN LETTERS?

(Continued from page 1.)

his past contemptuous public references to people such as ourselves, he feels somewhat doubtful as to the correctness of the position he has taken up, but is not prepared to face the issue?

At the point at which the Archbishop broke off his sermon to make the above-mentioned request, he was affirming "man does not live by bread alone." Of course he does not! And, that is precisely what Social Crediters have been saying for more than twenty years. His Grace went on to say it is not a sufficiency of things to eat and drink and wear that is all that matters. Indeed, he continued, "it is struggling that has given the fortitude necessary to achieve NATIONAL GREATNESS." National greatness! Of course, a "nation" has no existence apart from the individuals of whom it is composed. The body politic, which is known as "the State", is not something with a mind and a spirit. Jesus said that "the sabbath (an institution) was made for man and not man for the sabbath. Apparently, however, this humble servant of Jesus knows better than his Lord and Master; for, implicit in his deification of "national greatness," is the doctrine that the purpose for which individuals are born is to serve their institutions—in other words, to achieve "national greatness."

In view of what the Archbishop said

at the end of the day, is often permitted to move off of its own volition, provided hunger and fatigue influence it to move in the direction desired of it. Russians, like other people, can be trusted with a measure of political freedom because the State has reserved to itself supreme power over the economic welfare of the individual, through its control of his employment. That is the threat to our liberty, which the Communist conceals in his right hands whilst he offers "democratic" government with his left.

If Communism cannot destroy monopolistic finance capital, can social credit? It can, along the following lines:—

(1) Destroy the power of finance capital by taking away its power to increase its funds by the creation by it of financial credit, and vest control of financial policy in the people through their democratically elected and controlled representatives.

(2) Increase the purchasing power of the consumer without raising prices, thus giving him power to purchase that which he desires to have, rather than that which the monopolist wishes to force upon him. Purchasing power must equate with the total of prices of goods and services for sale.

By this means we give the people true economic freedom—freedom to spend, and true economic power—power, through money, to command the goods and services they desire, to the limit of the productive system, or of their needs. Political freedom is a delusion without this ability to decide in the quietness of one's own mind and in the vastness of the modern distributive system, precisely which commodities and services, what quality, and how many, one shall have. Given this power in the hands of the people, private enterprise in production can then render its service by accepting consumers' votes (orders), backed by money, over the counter, and supplying the goods under penalty of being cast aside for more enterprising competitors.

—H. Roberts.

last Sunday evening, and his statements on earlier occasions, the fact clearly emerges that, while paying lip service to "the life more abundant" as he has done from time to time, he is resolutely opposed to the adoption of a practical proposal to make it possible. While posing as one who has maintained, in the face of contradiction by some other person, that the productive capacity of the earth is sufficient to feed all its inhabitants, he disagrees with those who urge that the people who live on the earth should have distributed to them a sufficient number of monetary claims to their rightful share of the products of the earth. But "struggling" against one another for the means of life gives them "fortitude"! The economic warfare involved in the "struggling" when, on his own admission, there is plenty for all, inevitably culminates in the kind of warfare which is now being witnessed, and which has brought death and destruction on an unparalleled scale. And, Mr. Editor, if the perverse and unrealistic mental attitude which is so strikingly exemplified in the Archbishop is still adhered to by "leaders," we shall surely be plunged into a third world war. Then,

MILLIONAIRE ROBINSON'S NEW MANSION

Mystery man, W. S. Robinson, the Collins House tycoon and partner of international financier Clive Baillieu, has bobbed up again in inner-circle Labor politics at Canberra. He accompanied Dr. Evatt in his two missions abroad in the capacity of "Adviser." Who selected him for that role was never made clear.

Now he has purchased a mansion in Canberra, in the dress circle of the national capital.

The usual test applied by the Government to anyone seeking to purchase a home these days is to ask whether or not the intending purchaser already owns a dwelling. If he does, the application is rejected by the Treasury.

BUT NOT SO IN THE CASE OF ROBINSON. He already owns a mansion in Melbourne, and is credited with having a permanent lease of a luxury suite in Sydney's swankiest pub. If he is not in town, the then suite is vacant, despite room shortage.

Now he wants a home in Canberra. The papers went through without trouble.

Renovations were called for, and the labour was found—not in Canberra—but from Broken Hill! It is estimated that the additions and renovations cost somewhere in the vicinity of £5000.

Yet Labor members have been unable to obtain permits to build small homes with just sufficient accommodation to house their families. Retired railway men have not been allowed to build at Lake Macquarie because "it is not a residential area," and the cost would exceed £25.

Labor members who protested to W.O.I. against the Department's action in permitting Mr. Robinson to make lavish alterations in his new Canberra home were quickly snubbed.

They were told that it was ESSENTIAL that Mr. Robinson should have a suitable home in Canberra in which he can ENTERTAIN DIPLOMATS!

That just about took their breath away. Where does Mystery-Man Robinson fit into the Curtin Government set-up? When did he become the accredited representative of the Labor Government?

Ministers in the present Government filled many a page of "Hansard," when in

the Archbishop if he is still with us, will pray to God to bring peace, after having so heedlessly disregarded what his Lord and Master refers to as "the things which belong unto peace." Truly, those things "are hid" from his eyes.

In conclusion, Sir, although I desisted from taking notes on this occasion, I want the Archbishop and all other clergy to take notice that, in future, I shall make a note of any of their statements from the pulpit, which, in my opinion, call either for refutation or further elucidation. It is only fair to them that I should, as otherwise, I might attribute to them statements that do not faithfully represent their views.

In my own writing and public speaking, the position I take up is that, as one who is endeavouring to apprehend and proclaim the truth regarding questions which affect so vitally and intimately the lives of the present and rising generations, I have no right to continue disseminating statements which are not in conformity with fact or which are an affront to reason. If I err in this respect, then surely, others wiser and better informed than I have a clear duty to demonstrate precisely how and where I am in error. The higher the position a man occupies, the greater is his obligation to apply some such standard to himself. In effect, however, the attitude of the Archbishop at a time of crisis in human history, when clear thinking and intellectual honesty are called for as never before, is that of one who refuses to discuss a question, who CONTINUES, even after the error of views expressed by him has been demonstrated privately and publicly, to make public statements founded on such errors, but who so deeply resents a fair and dispassionate criticism of his public statements, that he deems it fitting to interrupt his own sermon to request a man whose public criticism he evidently fears, not to take notes. Beyond doubt, the circumstances warrant one questioning the motives of His Grace.

Perhaps, however, I should be more careful. There is evidence of the existence of a local "Gestapo." And, was it not the Chief Priests who "took counsel" in order that they might destroy Him? Why did the Chief Priests of His day seek to destroy Him? Because He spoke the truth; because He penetrated the fog emitted by their abracadabra. The position in our day, Sir, is the same. We who strive to speak the truth and expose falsehood, likewise have to face the prospect of a form and degree of crucifixion.

From nothing I have ever publicly spoken or written could it be deduced that I think material things are all that matter. Until, however, the temporal needs of man are adjusted in such a way as to eliminate that "struggle" which the Archbishop regards as a desirable thing; until the amenities which make for higher and better standards of life are made accessible to men, he is not at liberty to turn his thoughts to the development and expression of those higher capacities which are latent within all men.

I regret that the Archbishop should, by what I can only term blindness of heart, have put himself in so unfortunate a position.

—Yours, etc., J. BRADSHAW.

THE ALBERTA GOVERNMENT CANCELS MUNICIPALITIES' RELIEF DEBTS

In 1931, due to the depression, unemployment and agricultural distress caused widespread need for unemployment relief and agricultural assistance. Municipalities had demands from residents for direct relief in amounts greater than the districts' financial ability to pay. To relieve municipalities, the Dominion and Province entered into an agreement and undertook to pay a municipality two-thirds of the cost of the relief given within the municipality, when such relief was issued by them and according to the terms of the agreement.

The municipality had to pay the remaining one-third share of the gross relief costs. The Dominion and the Province also agreed that sparsely settled and frontier unorganised districts that had only a limited income from direct taxation and no reserve of assets were not in a financial position to pay any portion of direct relief costs.

The senior governments arranged that they pay the municipality's share and distribute the costs equally. The portion of gross relief costs that the municipality should have paid but was financed by the senior governments became a charge against the unorganised district and a contingent liability was set up showing each local improvement district's indebtedness to the senior government.

It was further agreed that when an organised municipality was unable to pay its municipal share of direct relief it should apply to the province to be declared an insolvent municipality and paid its share of direct relief, recording a charge against the district for such municipality's share, as if it had been an unorganised district.

The Province, with the approval of the Dominion Government, is cancelling the contingent liability incurred in the years 1931-42 inclusive, that was charged against improvement districts and insolvent municipalities as a municipality's share of direct relief. The gross amount of the indebtedness to be written off is one million, two hundred and twenty thousand four hundred and ninety-four dollars and ninety-six cents (1,220,494.96).

The improvement districts and insolvent municipalities that have been relieved of

outstanding direct relief indebtedness will be required to write off the indebtedness charged against a resident for relief obtained during the years 1931-42.

Any resident who had given security by way of chattel or land mortgage or against whose land a caveat had been registered as security for direct relief received may make application and will have this security released providing the debtor or his dependents directly benefit. A caveat will not be removed when its withdrawal only benefits a person other than the debtor.

[The foregoing is a statement issued by Mr. Manning, the new Premier of Alberta, on November 7, 1943.]

"POWER POLITICS AND PEOPLE'S PRESSURE"

By L. S. BULL.

THIS NEW BOOKLET TELLS. . .

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

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

Opposition attacking Menzies as the tool of Collins House. Now they appear to have adopted Collins House's Number 1 tycoon as their Mr. Fix-It.

Robinson has his finger in most of the big Anglo-Australian financial coups. He is right on the inside of the metals combine. Now he bobs up as confidential man for the Curtin Government.

Canberra is in danger of finding itself proceeding from one diplomatic party to another. Already the Soviet Embassy has set a high standard. But why Labor Government requires a millionaire to stooge for it is beyond all comprehension.

—Sydney "Century," Feb. 4.

"WHY BIG FINANCE BACKS SOCIALISM"

By JAS. GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

This new booklet contains five broadcast talks, and it is hoped that all readers of the "New Times" will help to give it wide publicity

7d per copy or 4/6 per dozen, posted

Obtainable from

THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN

101 Collins Street, Hobart, Tasmania

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —Sir Henry Strakosch died last October. He was single and a member of the Jewish race. His name was included in the list of international financiers recently given to the Canadian House of Commons by the Hon. Norman Jaques. He left an estate valued at nearly £2½ MILLIONS although he PRODUCED NOTHING! There is not the slightest doubt that he was one of "the few men" who dictated world policy and took steps to have it IMPOSED.

In case anyone should still be doubtful about the influence and power of the man, perhaps it would be advisable to point out that he was a member of the Council of India; a member of the Finance Committee of the League of Nations; entered upon a banking career in the City of London in 1891; since 1895 was closely connected with South African industrial development, especially the GOLD MINING industry; was the author of the South African Currency and Banking Act, 1920; represented South Africa at the international FINANCIAL conference at Brussels in 1920, when it was decided to IMPOSE a policy of deflation on the world; acted as financial adviser to the South African Government at League of Nations Assemblies, the Genoa Conference, and the Imperial Conference in 1923, and as delegate for South Africa at the Assemblies of the League in 1923 and 1924; delegate of INDIA to the Imperial Economic Conference at Ottawa in 1932, and to the Monetary and Economic Conference in 1933 (our own Professor Copland was there, too!). In short, it may be said that where FINANCE was concerned he was in everything. He was, of course, a British Knight, and it was he who recently presented to the Union Parliament in South Africa, ON BEHALF OF BERNARD M. BARUCH, a portrait of GENERAL SMUTS (son of Abraham Jacob Smuts), Prime Minister of South Africa. The connection is important, for Bernard Baruch is descended from a Spanish Jewish family and is known as "The Eagle of Wall Street."

With the foregoing in mind, it is hardly surprising that Sir Henry Strakosch should have remembered certain "public men" in his will, and we must form our own conclusions as to whether it was inspired by natural love and affection. The "public men" referred to are Mr. Winston Churchill (£20,000), Field Marshal Smuts (£10,000), Sir John Simon (£5000), Sir Otto Niemeyer (£2500), and Mr. Brendan Bracken (£2500). In the case of Mr. Churchill we are told that the gift was made "as a token of friendship and gratitude for his and Mrs. Churchill's great kindness and hospitality." It is therefore clear that they were closely associated.

Taking the last-named first, we may ask: What part has Mr. Brendan Bracken played in the programme? If he played any part at all, it may have been an unconscious part, but what are the facts? It will be recalled that of "the 62 persons of great importance and influence" who attended the "Unofficial International Conference" at Chatham House in 1935 three were editors of "The Economist"—Francis Hirst, 1907-1915; Hartley Withers, 1916-1921; and Sir Walter Layton, the present editor. That paper has been one of the official mouthpieces for international finance over a long period, and the attendance of these three men is of more than passing significance, particularly in view of the fact that the managing director of the paper is none other than Mr. Brendan Bracken, Minister for Information in the British Cabinet! Sir Henry Strakosch was at the conference with them.

Mr. Brendan Bracken is also recorded as the Editor of "The Banker," and as Chairman of Financial News Ltd. HIS connections are therefore right for the international financiers, although they are not much good for the British PEOPLE.

Douglas Reed, in his latest book, "Lest We Regret," has written this:—

"A very serious statement was published in a London periodical, *The Economist*, in 1939. (It caused even Sir Abe Bailey, a warm supporter of the Jews, to utter an emphatic warning.) It was that the average refugee is more helpful to the community than the average Englishman, whether the standard is monetary, capital, industrial skill, or intellectual attainments. Hitler never said anything more hostile. This statement gained importance when

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

All supporters of Proportional Representation are asked to attend the annual meeting of the society, to be held in Sir James Barrett's rooms, 105 Collins-street, Melbourne, at 8 p.m. on Tuesday, February 29. Business: Election of officers plans for future activities, general business. A good attendance is desired, as the State Redistribution Bill is to be presented next session, and this is an opportunity to have P.R. adopted for State elections. —Royden Powell, Hon. Sec., 247 Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I.

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England. Price 6d Postage 1d (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price 3d Postage 1d. (6/- per dozen, post free)

Page 4—New Times, February 25 1944

Mr. Brendan Bracken, who was managing director of *The Economist*, became Minister for Information. No member ever asked whether he shared the view expressed in his periodical, but the Ministry of Information and the B.B.C. have been foremost among public employers in recruiting Central European Jews. I know from many sources, the bitterness this causes among qualified British subjects."

It will probably be known to readers of "The New Times" that for many years the brother of the Governor of the Bank of "England," which is controlled from America, was Chairman of the B.B.C.! All of this might, of course, be entirely fortuitous, you know—"accident or design" as in the case of Litvinoff, Blum, and Hore-Belisha (to be mentioned later).

But, like Sir Abe Bailey, Sir Henry Strakosch was deeply interested in gold, and was considerably benefited by the re-imposition of the Gold Standard in Britain in 1925. Mr. Churchill was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he was

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.) (Continued from last issue.)

Each week, as the assurance of victory in the military sphere increases, so we find a growing anxiety in regard to the kind of world, which will emerge from the carnage of this war. And it is in regard to THIS question that the clash between the two social philosophies we have been discussing is becoming the dominant issue.

War is not an end in itself, but a means to an end—and a hideously unpleasant means at that. You will recall that the last war was fought to make the world safe for democracy. The democratic nations won that war, yet never has democracy been in greater peril than during the years, which followed. Great Britain and the British Empire emerged victorious from the last war immeasurably more powerful than before, while Germany was reduced to impotence in her defeat. Yet 22 years later we were fighting for our very existence against Germany with our backs to the wall. You see it does not make sense. And if we wish to have anything like a realistic view of the situation we face, we must have a clear concept of what went wrong during those critical years between the two world wars, and the underlying reasons.

The outstanding features of those years were the economic crises, which created such havoc in all countries, and the recurring revolutions that resulted from them—as, for example, the German, Austrian, Italian and Spanish revolutions.

In the economic field one country after another was reduced to a condition bordering on chaos. With almost unlimited resources to produce abundantly, widespread poverty, general insecurity, mass unemployment, restricted production, stagnant trade and general economic impotence spread like a blight across the world—while governments everywhere proved utterly helpless to deal with the situation.

BREAKDOWN OF DEMOCRACY

As I remarked, the last war was fought to make the world safe for democracy, and democracy is government and management of the people's affairs to give them the results they want. Were poverty, insecurity, unemployment and all the other features of those pre-war years the results, which the people of the democratic countries wanted? Actually they were the opposite of the security and the freedom that people desired in this and every other constitutional democracy.

I hope you will realise the full significance of what that meant—namely, that instead of obtaining "government in accordance with the will of the people," we got government in defiance of the will of the people. It meant that the constitutionally supreme authority of the democratic countries had imposed upon them conditions they did not want.

How was this done? What was the cause? Did we lack the resources to produce the goods and services, which would have given the people the security they desired? On the contrary, as engineers assured us at the time and as the war has proved, the means were available for producing abundantly. Then was it because those in charge of our productive system refused to produce? Quite the reverse: farmers, mine operators, manufacturers, and others were anxious to produce, but they lacked markets. Yet the potential markets existed in the vast and unsatisfied wants of the people.

THE SEAT OF THE TROUBLE

Was the fault, then, with the transportation system or the merchant through whom the goods reached the people? As you gentlemen know, both the transportation concerns and the merchants were eager to handle the goods. In short, the only reasons why the people could not obtain the goods they wanted was because they lacked the thing we call money, which alone would have enabled them to go into the stores and obtain them.

Had the people possessed the necessary money claims to buy the available goods, merchants would have ordered more goods

Sir Hal Colebatch now Australian Minister to China, used some rather strong language in referring to that event, and I think his remarks are worthy of repetition. He said this:—

"You probably recall the action of the British Government, in 1925, in restoring sterling to its old gold parity. I was amazed at the indifference with which the public accepted this monstrous swindle. Several of the economists roundly condemned it and accurately forecast its inevitable results. I have called it a swindle because to my mind it was nothing but an attempt to make the spurious money lent to the Government for war purposes real money, and to cast upon British industry a burden it cannot bear."

You see it is a fair inference that Sir Henry, who was at the conference in 1920 at which it was decided to do that very thing, was not unmindful of the services thus rendered, knowingly or unknowingly, by his friend Mr. Churchill.

Sir Hal Colebatch also said, "I recognise that our present system, particularly the system that has prevailed since the war, is thoroughly dishonest and insidiously dangerous." But Mr. Churchill still supports it and helps to keep the PEOPLE of Britain enslaved by it.

And how does Field Marshal Smuts come into it? Perhaps we had better leave that till next week.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2, February 20, 1944.

DISPENSARIES THREATENED

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —I wish to place before you a few facts concerning the most successful and best organised institutions in this State. I refer to the Friendly Societies' dispensaries.

These very excellent organisations, based upon co-operative lines, have been serving members of friendly societies for the greater part of a century, and will, if permitted, continue to do so.

Unfortunately, the law of this State (Victoria) does not allow dispensaries to trade with the public; i.e., they can only trade with members of friendly societies.

Therefore, should the Commonwealth Government be successful with its "free medicine" Bill, before the State law preventing dispensaries from trading with the public is amended, all sources of dispensary income will be completely cut off, and they will be forced to close their doors.

Obviously, friendly society members will not continue to subscribe to the dispensaries when they can obtain their medicine "free" through the Commonwealth scheme.

In Victoria the dispensaries serve approximately half a million people, and I, with many others, feel that any Government, either by its actions or inactions, causing these very excellent institutions to close up, is no longer democratic, and should be removed from office at the very, first opportunity.

Knowing the very valuable work you have done, and are doing, in the interests of democracy, I appeal to you to take this matter up and work for the amendment of the Friendly Societies Act.

Yours, etc., H. R. WYATT, Ballarat Rd., Geelong West.

Should We Give More Power to Canberra?

(Continued from page 1.)

with vigour. It founded a settlement at Darwin; . . . encouraged agricultural and pastoral activities; fostered mining enterprises, built the overland telegraph line; and in 1886 commenced building the Darwin-Pine Creek railway line. The overland telegraph line from Adelaide to Darwin, which linked Australia with the cable systems of the outer world, was completed in 1872. This was for the time a gigantic task. From Adelaide to Darwin the line was more than 2000 miles, and the bulk of the stores and equipment had to be conveyed through totally unoccupied, unstocked, and mostly waterless country. The total expenditure was £338,000. . . . Work on the Pine Creek-Darwin railway was commenced in 1886 . . . was taken over from the contractors by the Government in October 1889. . . . It cost, with the original iron jetty at Darwin, £1,180,000."

When it undertook to develop the Northern Territory, South Australia's population was only 126,000. The population of the Territory was 3301 in 1911, when the Commonwealth took it over. After twenty-seven years of Commonwealth administration, the population was only 5645. (And even this figure was partly accounted for by increased military establishments.) With the whole resources of Australia behind it, the centralised Federal Government has failed miserably (especially by comparison with what 126,000 self-governing South Australians accomplished, when mechanical aids to pioneering were so much less, and when they were still pioneering South Australia itself!).

According to the Minister of Home and Territories on July 19, 1932: "Since North Australia was taken over by the Commonwealth in 1911 there had been spent on it annually about £500,000 more than had come out of it, and in some years as much as £1,000,000. The Territory had thus always been a liability to the Federal Government."

If Dr. Evatt and other advocates of centralisation could point out to us any outstanding successes resulting from centralised control and administration, they might persuade us that there was something in their arguments. But the hard facts are against Dr. Evatt.

YOU should make every possible effort to bring these facts before your fellow-Australians, and thus encourage concrete opposition to anything savouring of National Socialism in Australia.

—ERIC D. BUTLER.

but it was common to all "democratic" countries. And when we find the same policy being pursued everywhere by the same means, the possibilities of any coincidence must be dismissed. A uniform policy carried out on that scale could have been only the result of deliberate action.

When we go into the matter more fully we find that in no "democratic" country is the economic voting mechanism (which we call the monetary system) under the control of the people. It is controlled by a highly centralised private monopoly, with ultimate control concentrated on an international scale in the hands of a comparatively small group of men. And it requires no elaboration to point out that such a concentration of economic power constituted a super-government, which could override all politically elected governments.

Who are these men, and what are they up to? The answers to these questions bring to light some ugly and unpleasant facts.

(To be continued.)

ECONOMIC DICTATORSHIP

Reverting to our consideration of the pre-war years of poverty amidst plenty, it is clear, then, that the stringent economic conditions, bordering on chaos, were the result of the people having inadequate money, or economic voting power. In other words, the people—the sovereign authority in any democracy—were having imposed on them conditions they did not want, and the means used to this end was the monetary or economic voting system.

Not only was this the case in Canada,