

The "New Times" is a really independent, non-party, non-class, non-sectarian weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and opposing totalitarianism in all its forms.

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 14. MELBOURNE, THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 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 (or our lips are forging, Silence is crime.

Whittier (1807-1892).

Post-War Boom or Post-War Depression?

Finance Will Be Deciding Factor

(A Broadcast Talk by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, on March 12.)

Last week we tried to explain why we thought there would be a period of "prosperity" after this war. How long that period of "prosperity" would last would be difficult to say, but if our real rulers decided to have a depression it would be likely to take place, not immediately after the war, but several years later, after the reconstruction and building of factories, roads and houses was nearing completion.

The reason we gave for this was that plenty of loan monies were available wherever taxable, rateable or interest-paying assets were being built. The spending of these new monies produces what is called a period of prosperity; when that period ends we have thrust upon us what is called a depression.

For many years thinking people all over the world have asked, why have depressions? They have asked, why should people be forced into penury when all the wealth-producing apparatus is available? Why should people have to sell their souls for their daily bread when the staple foods are a glut on the market?

There can be little doubt that the complicated game of international finance and of international politics we witnessed before this war started was turning this world into a nightmare where no country was safe and no conduct was certain of success.

In countries like Australia, Canada and the United States of America, where the harvests were more than ample for their needs, there should have been no need for the poverty and humiliation and stunted

lives which we have seen all round in the great cities.

One would have thought that the average intelligent man would have wiped these things out many years ago. And I am quite sure he would have done so had he realised exactly what he was up against. But he didn't, and I don't think he does yet.

I don't think that there is any doubt now among those who can make any pretence of having given thought to the subject, that the great nations of the world can produce a great deal more than their people can purchase.

Motor manufacturers have said that even if they gave their cars away for nothing the majority of families could not, financially speaking, afford to run them. And, of course, there is no disputing that statement.

The same thing applies to houses; there is no doubt we can build plenty of houses, and will build plenty, but there is also no doubt that unless very different financial arrangements are made, the new chromium-plated flats, crammed full of gadgets, are going to be millstones round the necks of the occupants.

A modern home is a great boon to the housewife, but it is a poor comfort where the perpetual strain of debt hangs over her head. And amidst all the schemes for post-war reconstruction the experts at Canberra are strangely silent on this point of cheap money for home building. It is interesting to note, too, that the experts at Canberra object to Tasmanians having cheap electricity.

The question arises why families cannot afford to buy the goods, which their sons and daughters turn out so easily in the factories. The question is a matter of money—or, of the control of money.

In this world, money is issued by the banks in the form of credits operated upon by cheques; it is issued for certain purposes; it is always issued as a debt. If there is not sufficient money available to the people to buy the goods they make or to pay their legitimate debts, the banks are not interested; and if any politician becomes interested he soon finds this world too hot to live in.

Most of us believe that private people should pay their debts, and this most people try to do. But even when we succeed in doing this, we still have no power to prevent our Governments going into debt. The Government goes into debt, but the people have to pay the interest on it by means of taxation. And nobody believes that we will pay off that debt, since it has increased each year and is still increasing.

The fact remains that, collectively, we cannot pay our financial debts for the simple reason the money isn't issued to pay them. It should be realised immediately that those in control of the world's financial arrangements have not the slightest intention of issuing sufficient money to permit the people to liquidate their debts.

Should it ever come about that a people were able to throw off their debts and own their own houses, and have a nice little reserve in the bank, then such a people would be the only people capable of building a free world—a world fit for free men and women to bring freedom-loving children into.

The white population of this world is dying out; it is committing race suicide. Some believe that the white population will be completely swamped in less than 100 years, and it would almost seem that the things we have witnessed in our lifetime have been deliberately designed to one end—the wiping out of the white population.

We have seen the various civilised countries herd their children into factories to produce madly for what they called "overseas markets." These people produced prodigious wealth, but their health, their well being and their character deteriorated. They worked hard and long, but no one really knew for what purpose.

The populations of the world have been caught up in a vast industrial, financial, political machine that few understand. Nobody seems to have any yardstick to measure the results; we cannot tell when we are making a profit or a loss. The wizards of High Finance have got most people bamboozled with their vague phrases and their mysterious ways and their mystical symbols.

The Money Swindle has been kept so sacred for so long that those people who don't understand it cannot adjust themselves to real values.

Actually, money is merely something, which is necessary in modern life to get things done. The vast changes in war production show that clearly.

Millions of pounds of credit are created out of nothing each day and cancelled out of existence each day. Each country creates its own money supply. It is the prerogative of the people to decide what the money shall be used for.

But instead of money being used to allow the people to gain access to the goods and services provided by themselves, it has been used to keep them in debt, and therefore in servitude.

The fact that people are able to obtain some goods and services for themselves is merely an accident, and is considered by some to be a very unfortunate accident. You have only got to read the Beveridge Plan, especially those clauses concealed from the public, to realise the truth of this.

The vast new schemes to take power and control and initiative from the people and centralise it in some remote group of planners is one of the most dangerous movements in our lifetime. The schemes that are being concocted for the post-war world (Continued on page 3.)

Town Hall Debate on Fed. Powers

Under the auspices of The Club of Political Thought, a debate took place in Melbourne Town Hall on Thursday, March 30, the subject being, "Should Increased Powers be Granted to the Commonwealth Government?" Speakers for the affirmative were Messrs Ian Milner, Brian Fitzpatrick and Charles Adkins, while Messrs. F. C. Paice, Norman O'Brien and K. J. Kenafick presented the negative case. Hereunder we report some of the principal points made by the first speaker, which are followed by, our own comments thereon:—

Mr. Ian Milner stated that upon the necessity for the granting of increased powers there is no disagreement. ALL PARTIES were agreed that, in order that "Post-War Reconstruction can be made a reality," power in respect to the 14 points must be granted to the Commonwealth Government. At the Canberra Convention, held in 1942, it had been unanimously agreed, by representatives of all States and all Parties that the powers sought should be handed over. The proposal simply involved the transfer of power from the people to their National Parliament.

The people generally, and the men in New Guinea and the munition factories in particular, after the war, wanted to return to a world in which they would be able to obtain a decent JOB at decent wages, decent housing, decent schooling, PLANNED EMPLOYMENT, homes for which the people can afford to pay. A "No" vote would render impossible the securing of those objectives, and would ensure the repetition of those conditions, which obtained after the last war, when an economic crisis occurred. Without the transfer of powers, monopolies could not be controlled.

In England, where there is no conflict between rival political authorities, THE PEOPLE MAKE CLEAR WHAT THEY WANT—FOR EXAMPLE, THE BEVERIDGE PLAN—and the Government, because it has the power, then carries out what THE PEOPLE want.

Under the present POLITICAL system, we have not the necessary power to do the job of ensuring to our people conditions of happiness and security. Mr. Milner also attributes to the present distribution of power between Commonwealth and States, the economic conditions of widespread unemployment, which came with "the crash of 1920."

COMMENT: Whilst it is true that ALL PARTIES are in agreement as to the necessity for the centralisation of power, and

true also that it was UNANIMOUSLY agreed by the "representatives" of all States at the Canberra Convention, that power in respect of the 14 subjects should be transferred, it is likewise true that the people of whom these representatives are the servants have not given any mandate to their servants to carry out the nefarious proposal. To hand over ANY powers vested in them WITHOUT reference to the electors (their employers) would be a flagrant breach of trust by the State representatives.

Having regard to the alarming increase of encroachments on individual freedom, if the proposal simply involves a transfer of power "from the people to the National Parliament," the people will be most ill-advised to vote away such powers as protect them against permanent and complete enslavement.

To say, as Mr. Milner and many other planners so speciously say, that "planned employment" is one of the conditions desired by those who will return from New Guinea, is to base the entire post-war structure on a false foundation. This fact has been stressed many times in our columns. Such a viewpoint assumes that the purpose of an industrial system is primarily to provide employment rather than to produce goods and Services. No householder would dream of ordering his or her domestic affairs on such a stupid, "cart before the horse" principle. Apparently, however, pseudo-intellectuals such as Mr. Milner, expect ordinary mortals to believe that a principle which is so manifestly absurd that only a lunatic would apply it to his domestic economy, is transmuted from folly into wisdom in the process of its application to the national economy.

Implicit in Mr. Milner's demand for "homes for which the people can afford to pay" is an admission of the fact that the housing problem is basically a financial problem. But, of course, he adroitly sidesteps that issue. Perhaps a realistic approach to the problem would, in the jargon of the academic planners, be disparaged as "over-simplification."

If we can accept as a true statement that wherein Mr. Milner declared that, in England, "the people make clear what they want—for example the Beveridge Plan—and the Government, because it has the power, then carries out what the people want," we can only conclude that the people of England have consciously desired the appalling social conditions which obtained in the period between the two wars, to go back no further. Such a statement is, surely, an insult to the intelligence of the people of Britain, who so valiantly withstood the fury of the armed might of Hitler's Germany in the darkest days of the war. The TRUTH, which has often been proclaimed in these columns, is that the con-

NOTES on the NEWS

Now that the Referendum Bill has passed both Houses Dr. Evatt is again trying to encourage the Premiers to betray the people by transferring the powers; this is his cunning method of trying, among other things, to pass the responsibility for holding the Referendum in wartime on to the Premiers. It can only be described as political trickery of a low order. Meanwhile, democratic Australians must maintain pressure on State Members to withstand this form of political "blackmail. Write now—and keep writing.

GOLD GOSSIP: The shipment of £67 millions in gold to China is said to surprise "Wall St.," which had been led to believe that "gold loans" would remain in America. We are asked to believe that "Wall Street" understood that you could lend gold and yet not lend it. Reports say that the gold will be distributed (whether hired, lent or sold not stated) by the Chinese Government to Chinese merchants and others to combat "inflation." Whether the gold is sold or lent, the Chinese will find it hard work to satisfy the financial molochs.

CALWELL'S CANDOUR: In reply to a question in Federal Parliament, regarding censorship and Sir Keith Murdoch ("Hansard," Feb. 7, p. 1098), Mr. Calwell made the following comment: "I have not read the statement. I have not much time these days to read the drivel of Sir Keith Murdoch and others of his tribe . . . and if I consider that something more should be said about this anti-Australian newspaper magnate I shall say it." Messiah Murdoch appears to be coming into his own!

MANPOWER AND MONEY: In reducing a sentence of three months' imprisonment for an offence arising from manpower regulations, Judge Magennis said it would be more profitable to the Government to have £100 than to support the accused for three months; other cases were similarly treated by the same judge, presumably for the same reason. The question of "the liberty of the subject" won the day because of financial considerations. Here we see that the Government has the power to conscript the life of the subject, whilst it has on the other hand, through fines and taxation, power to rob the subject of the financial means to life.

CURTIN'S CRUISE: Although little if any interest is shown by John Citizen in Curtin's trip, the Press informs us that it is a matter of great moment. As he is not only to visit Britain, but Washington (where plots for a Gold Standard, World Government and World Police Gestapo are being hatched), his visit may well be important. In addition, the White Australia policy and the settlement of the so-called Chosen Race may be discussed. So far as John Citizen is concerned, the important thing is to see that John Curtin does not commit us to any decision regarding these matters without our approval.

WAR FINANCE: In the midst of the din and noise of the loan drive for £150 million (which will mean a further demand for approximately £4,500,000 p.a. of taxation), we learn that Treasury estimates for July-August indicate that war expenditure for 1944-45 will decline by approximately £80 millions. Under these circumstances, the major purpose of the loan would appear to be the drawing of "surplus" money from (Continued on page 2)

Depression Delusion

The major argument used in support of the "powers plot" is that "it will prevent depressions." Students of finance will know the answer on financial grounds; nevertheless the following argument is also convincing, and perhaps more easily understood:

In countries where the central Government had all the political power (e.g., Great Britain, New Zealand, South Africa etc.), the "great" depression was just as severe as in Australia, Canada, U.S.A., etc. That is a complete answer to the lying sob story about "preventing depressions."

Roads & Referendum

The Lord Mayor of Brisbane (Ald. Chandler) is reported as complaining of the difficulty in getting military roadwork done, because decisions could not be made by those on the spot. All decisions had to be referred "down South" to men unfamiliar with local conditions. It took three months and sometimes much more before a decision was given. Now that's a damning indictment against the proposal to centralise more power in the Federal Government. There is no experience in history, which shows centralisation in a favourable light. On the contrary, illustrations of frustration and failures are legion.

SOCIALISM & INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

I have never wearied of stressing the fact that Socialism, like all other Monopoly, particularly financial and industrial, is regarded by the International Financial gangsters as a useful weapon to force the introduction of their "new world order." It is not suggested that the International gangsters directly controlled the Socialist revolutions in Germany, Italy and Russia, but they brought about the conditions, which made the establishment of dictatorship possible.

If, as we have been told, their "new world order" could only be built as the result of the war, it was essential to obtain someone to start hostilities. A politically weak German people were, as in 1914, obviously regarded as suitable material. And Hitler, the National Socialist, was the ideal demagogue who, having been financed into control, could be safely left to create the conditions in which the "new world" planners could go to work.

As in the international sphere, so it is in the national sphere. When a section of a community is dispossessed of all property and reduced to poverty, it can be left to the Socialist movements to exploit the discontent and direct it against the "upper classes"—those who still own property and have a degree of economic security. As the same time small businessmen with direct control of their businesses can be crushed and bank-controlled monopolies strengthened. Dealing with the destruction of the community by deliberately encouraged class warfare, C. H. Douglas has written:

"Skillfully injected propaganda, always avoiding Finance, has fostered attacks on the 'haves' by the 'have nots' so that any economic independents, not the servants of Finance, might be stripped of their independence, under the name of Socialism. That is to say, Big Business and Socialism are the same thing, though some Socialists may not know it and the present state of servitude could never have been brought about by Big Business alone. We owe our present position to brains in Big Business, and votes in Socialism. Stated otherwise, the coming of Socialism is the triumph of Big Business."

—"The 'Land for the (Chosen) People' Racket."

For some time it has been becoming apparent to many thinking people that the objectives of the socialists and the monopoly-capitalist groups are becoming more and more openly similar as the war proceeds. Surface skirmishes between "socialists" and "capitalists" are still taking place, but do not affect the main issues.

Mr. Robinson, representative of B.H.P. and a financier with international connections, travelled with Dr. Evatt, one of our local leading socialists, on his overseas visits. We have yet to learn fully what was discussed when Mr. Robinson and Dr. Evatt met some of the members of the inner Jewish circle in New York. Mr. Robinson has recently gone to Canberra to live—no doubt in order that he can be closer to the scene of the political activities of his socialist friends. It might be of interest if, at this stage, I digress slightly and ask those Labor Party supporters who are distressed to see Evatt and Co. collaborating with the monopoly-capitalists, how "the workers" are ever going to effectively control monopolies under "public-ownership and control," when they cannot even control their own Party organisation and the activities of their own Party leaders!

Perhaps the most outstanding evidence of the fact that Socialism and International Finance have much more in common than the average person has thought is the latest somersault by the Communists in America, closely followed by the local Reds.

To those who have closely studied Communist tactics, any new somersault by the Reds is, of course, not surprising. Mr. Earl Browder, general secretary of the American Communist Party, in explaining why the Communists are now going to support "capitalism," said that this decision was the result of the Teheran Conference. It is obvious, then, that some very important decisions for the planning of the "new world order" were agreed upon at Teheran. Mr. Browder may have "inside" information. Apart from the usual "blah" by the "great leaders," we know very little of what was discussed outside general European affairs. General Smuts, who should know, has suggested that Russian and American delegates tended to dominate the Conference.

It is well to remember that International Finance has been interested in Russia since before the Revolution, and it is a well-known fact that the great industrialisation of Russia could never have been carried out without American assistance. Credits had to be arranged for this assistance. And the International Financiers never do business unless they obtain reasonable benefits, preferably in the form of CONTROL.

Russia urgently needed assistance when first attacked by Germany. A tremendous interest free loan for Russia was immediately floated in America. Did the Jewish Wall Street financiers extend this assistance without any benefit to themselves? It would be interesting to know. But we do know that Mr. Lamont, one of the big financiers in America, later

"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.

came out publicly in support of the Soviet as a beneficial influence in world affairs. It is now stated that Russian economists are favouring a return to the gold standard, while "Pravda" is quoted as saying that the Soviet has undertaken to recognise all pre-Revolution foreign debts. There is increasing evidence that the plot to establish an international bank, which will be an effective instrument in rendering "economic assistance" to distressed European countries after the war, is reaching finality.

No doubt all the points were discussed at the Teheran Conference. Mr. Browder says that, as a result of agreements reached at the Conference "a new form of capitalism would develop with a progressively rising standard of living for the workers. American Communists would fully support capitalism—even the development of monopolies..." I think that we can visualise the "capitalism" Mr. Browder believes will flourish in the "new order":

The "State" and the big monopolies will run everything and everybody. A mediocre standard of living will be organised for all; but only at the expense of the individual's Freedom of action. No doubt the socialists feel confident that they will obtain nearly

THREE JEWISH STATES IN OUR TIME

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

How many recall, amid the clamour for "A Jewish State," that our time has known THREE Jewish States! All save one vanished quickly, but the experience remains. Current events make it necessary to revive their memory, and to delineate the features of Jewish vengeance, which were common to all. We should be mad indeed to force on Europe, in the name of "retribution," conditions similar to those of 1917-20.

The early Bolsheviks, of 1917-19, were predominantly imported Jews, not Russians, and the early massacres bore the signs, not of mob violence, but of vengeance taken by imported Jewish rulers. The Netherlands Minister in St. Petersburg (in a report to London which was published in a British Government White Paper and then suppressed) testified to the overwhelmingly Jewish and non-Russian nature of the first Bolshevik Governments, the leaders of which were shipped to Russia from other countries. In a report to a United States Senate Committee in February, 1919, the Rev. George A. Simons (who was Superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Petrograd from 1907 to 1918) said that of 388 members of the Bolshevik Government 371 were Jews, and 265 of these Jews were from the Lower East Side of New York. The London "Times" of March 1919, reported that "of the 20 or 30 commissars or leaders

all the big positions of power and influence in the vast bureaucracy. And the financiers will be happy, because their system will be guaranteed by the "State."

But there are obstacles. Unfortunately for the few men who gather together at such places as Teheran and kindly draw up plans for the peoples of the world, many people, particularly the peoples of Britain and the Dominions, believe that they can work out their OWN futures. We are thankful, and have shown our gratitude to our American and Russian fighting allies for their assistance in beating the Axis, the same as we hope they are appreciative of our military efforts; but, if the American and Russian people cannot control the ambitions of their power-lusting monopoly advocates, that is no reason why we should tolerate the extension of their influence here.

Australians must wake up and realise that the sovereignty of this nation is in serious jeopardy. Labor supporters in particular would do well to ask themselves where their socialist leaders are leading them.

They should think seriously about Browder's statement and then study the aims of Dr. Evatt—not forgetting, of course, his friend, Mr. Robinson! They might, with profit, ask their "representatives" just how Lease-Lend, the Atlantic Charter, and other international commitments and agreements will affect them after the war. And they should ask whether socialism and monopoly capitalism are going to work openly hand in hand. Mr. Browder, speaking with his knowledge of the Teheran Conference, has said: "It is true that collaboration with the Soviet Union is absolutely necessary as a condition for stabilising economy in capitalist countries."—"Sydney "Sunday Telegraph," Jan. 16.)

Surely the matter is no longer in doubt! We must fight Monopoly, no matter under what LABEL it flourishes.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

the people, and placing it under the care of our political representatives, who are so much wiser than their electors (employers). It wouldn't be safe, you know, to trust Little Willie (John Citizen) with such a potent toy as money!!

MACAULAY'S MISSION: Continuing his propaganda for the bankers' dream of a World State, the Rt. Rev. R. Wilson Macaulay is reported in the "Age" of March 27 as having stated at the Malvern Congregational Church that the Princeton Conference sought "the fundamental principle of a World State." So, there's no denying that statement! In this connection, Federal "Hansard" for March 9 (p. 1191), reports that in answer to questions from Mr. Ryan, it was officially stated that the delegates to the Princeton Conference had no Government status, and that it was purely the activity of a few churchmen, without any authority even from their congregations.

SOCIAL SERVICES: Sir Frederick Stewart recently pointed out in the House that for ten pre-war years the annual Commonwealth revenue was £76 millions, and that social services now operating or immediately impending would cost £75 millions. He remarked, "By the look of things there never will be a reduction in taxation." As the annual interest bill is nearing the £75 million mark, it looks as if there will be considerably, more taxation—especially if interest-bearing loans are continued.

PETER'S PROBLEM: Some indication of the power wielded by bankers, even over Kings, is seen in the following Press comment regarding King Peter of Yugoslavia, who is said to be in financial straits: "The Government, however, is feeling the pinch, and will have to consult its bankers, thus giving rise to the question of what the Government has to pledge (pawn)." So, the King reigns, but the bankers govern.

BEASLEYS "BRIBE": Press reports of Mr. Beasley's professed concern for the future of wool, and his statements about protecting the wool industry are especially significant, because they closely followed the decision of the graziers' conference "to work for the defeat of the Referendum." In these circumstances, the verbal sop thrown out by Mr. Beasley looks like another piece of political trickery; but it is so obvious that the sheep men could hardly fall for it.

THE GOOD OIL: U.S. Senators are seeking information as to who approved the paying of £7,500,000 to King Ibn Saud for oil concessions—so it seems that the big moves are still put over secretly. Mr. Churchill requested that the sum be paid through the British Treasury, because Britain had been paying the expenses of Ibn Saud's Government for years. So the British workers were footing the bill without knowing it!

SOVIET SUPPLIES: In addition to the colossal supplies from Britain to Russia, the following were forwarded by U.S. up to October, 1943: 9,000 planes, 3,500 tanks, 195,000 motor vehicles, 1,800,000 tons of food, 5,500,000 pairs of boots, 16,000,000 yards of woollen cloth, 251,000 tons of chemicals, 144,000 tons of explosives, 1,200,000 tons of steel, 342,000 tons of non-ferrous metals, 611,000 tons of petroleum products. These figures are taken from "Hansard" of February 7 (p. 297). Furthermore, all these supplies were carried in British ships. Turkey, India and China have also drawn huge supplies of war materials from the despised capitalist countries—supplies that socialised countries were unable to produce. And yet we hear the stupid cry for socialisation!

—O.B.H.

SOLILOQUY OF A POST-WAR PLANNER

What was it the feller on the record said, What did he say?

"Hey!—

You can't go round annoying people. We're people—

Go away!"

Gawd! He's got a lot to learn!

Doesn't he know

People are just a laissez-faire petit bourgeois idea,

They're out of date; they're all washed up; it's masses now, not people, anymore.

People's the plural of person, and persons are men and women and kids. But masses—

Ah, masses are made up of units, and units don't bite.

Number them, index them, file 'em away—

Add 'em up—

Subtract 'em. Yeah, that's right—

Take away the number you first thought of and call it a blueprint for something or other. . . .

Kick them around, go on; they lap it up,

and if they don't— Well . . . there's

always plenty of penalties provided under the Act.

They're masses now— Not

people.

And any B.A. from the "Shop," or any B.F. from the Trades Hall,

(Or vice versa, if you like that better),

If he knows all the clichés, if he talks like the right brand of parrot,

Is entitled to one free kick at the masses,

And the masses'll bend over again and take it, they'll beg for more,

They'll give him a cut from their taxes.

Because after all, that's what masses are for

—W.P.I.

ANGLO-SOVIET RELATIONS

In the British House of Commons, on December 14, 1943, Wing-Commander James (Wellingborough) said: . . . The second point to which I want to make reference is the future of Anglo-Soviet relations. I believe that all of us want to see a practical working friendship with Russia and I have encouragement to believe that it is possible, encouragement not from what I read in newspapers but from what I am told by friends who have lived in—not merely visited—Russia in the inter-war period and during this war. They tell me that they found the Russians with whom they dealt to be people with whom they could live, and who were personally likeable. They tell me also that from their experience, Anglo-Russian co-operation and friendship are possible. It is very encouraging. For Russia to join with us and the United States, she has obviously to do one thing, which is to emerge from the isolation into which she plunged herself after the last war. From that isolation she must emerge. I say that because I believe it is necessary to dispel illusions and to smooth out difficulties by being frank. There are one or two points more, which I want to make. I find myself disturbed by two distinct voices with which the Russian propaganda machine speaks. Many of us can read this for ourselves in the "Soviet Daily War News" which is sent to us. On the one hand, there is a sort of leading article, containing generalities to which nobody can take exception, such as statements about the rights of individuals and of small nations, and so on—articles that might well appear in the "Times" in its saner moments. On the other hand, you get occasionally violent political partisan attacks on the Governments of not only neutrals but Allied countries, and these are very disturbing because they are political attacks. These criticisms appear to me to be outside all bounds of propriety in the circumstances. One hears nothing analogous to that in this country. I very much hope that after the Teheran and Cairo Conferences that greatest and most powerful Czar, Marshal Stalin, will give the word and stop it. . . ."

CHAINS OF FREEDOM

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—According to the Melbourne "Herald" of 27/3/1944, Dr. Coombs, Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction, seems to have added a few more bars to his (as yet unfinished) "New World Cacophony." He is reported as saying:—

"Restrictions to be imposed on the public after the war would seek to provide real freedom for the great mass of the public. The aims of his Department were to provide a high and stable level of employment—a job for everyone who needed it—and higher standards of living. In the past a person had had the right to choose his own job and his own employer, but this was merely mechanical freedom, as the fear of unemployment was always hanging over his head."

Just so—as a gaoler provides real freedom for his charges when he locks them securely in their cells, or a Red Indian binds his captive to a tree! You will note that the restrictions are to be IMPOSED on the public, but, as usual, the IMPOSER is not named—presumably he will be a public servant paid by the public to administer the policy of a Government elected by the public. Another point worth noting is that, also as usual, full employment—a job for everyone—is placed first, instead of higher standards of living. Further, it seems that a recognised RIGHT, that of choosing one's work and employer, is to be taken away.

So what we thought was a RIGHT, Dr. Coombs infers is really a WRONG. No wonder the "Herald" used the caption, "RESTRICTION MAY MEAN FREEDOM," leaving its readers the option of thinking it MAY NOT.

However, to do justice to the theme, I applied to the proper authority for a poet's licence. After due cross-examination, and the surrender of the fee with 13 mental clothing coupons, a Class C3 licence was issued to me. I proceed to immortalise, like the fly in amber, the Coombs philosophy:

Fresh from the School of Cassel's Brass*
(And Laski's† benediction),
He says real freedom for the mass
Can only now be brought to pass
By means of more Restriction!

Restrictions, then, will prove the cure
(If only we will heed 'em),
And all who suffered heretofore
From fear of unemployment, sure
Will taste the joys of Freedom!

Freedom in full our fathers knew
(But lacked appreciation),
As bars and chains and fetters grew
So Liberty advanced to view
In happy consummation!

*London School of Economics—assisted financially by Sir Ernest Cassel.
†Professor Harold Laski, of that School.

—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, 69 Strathalbyn Street, East Kew, E.5.

POST-WAR BOOM OR DEPRESSION?

(Continued from page 1)

are schemes to build pauper's institutes for a servile people; schemes to take money from the people to be spent by a chosen few.

The greatest engineers and the most up-to-date factories are of little value to the people unless the people are allowed sufficient money to buy the produce of these factories; and for many years they have not been allowed.

The Federal Government has enormous powers to help or hinder the progress of the country. Its job is a supervisory control job to remove bottlenecks—not to create bottlenecks; to assist the States, not to hinder the States; to help the people to help themselves, not to treat them as school children.

If the financial income of the people is not restricted artificially then that income will flow through the land, stimulating industry and encouraging enterprise. There will be prosperity and opportunity for all.

The Commonwealth Government has tremendous powers over soldiers and old age and invalid pensioners. If it wants to be generous to these people, then it will have plenty of scope. The States in the past have been short of funds to carry on their essential services. The Commonwealth Government has ample powers to help the States to re-equip their hospitals and schools and to build new roads. There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent this.

The States, too, have full powers to do practically anything they wish to do within their own States. In the past, the stumbling block has been finance, which is, or can be, controlled by the Federal Government. It is beyond all manner of doubt that if Canberra wishes to help the States it has enormous powers to do so. When the officials at Canberra show by their actions that they are willing to use these powers wisely and sympathetically, then I have no doubt the extension of powers will be given sympathetic consideration. But so far there is no indication that Canberra is willing to seek the help of those anxious and willing to give it, but prefers to force its will on the people by means of compulsion, backed by all the forces of a modern State. Canberra doesn't want our good will—it wants our docile obedience.

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir,—Some people still find difficulty in believing that the proposal to transfer powers to the Federal Parliament is part of a world-wide plot to rob them of sovereignty over their territorial affairs. Whatever may be the INTENTIONS of Dr. Evatt and the present Commonwealth Government THAT will be the result unless the Federal Parliament has financial sovereignty. Without financial sovereignty the Parliament will not have the power to exercise power.

Soon after Mr. Henry Morgenthau, the non-Christian Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, had announced from Cairo that "the world currency stabilisation plan has reached an advanced stage, and only technical points remain to be settled," I wrote to my Federal representative, the Hon. Arthur Calwell, as follows:—

"Dear Mr. Calwell,—It is understood that the Federal Government will shortly be seeking additional 'powers' from the people of Australia, and that these additional powers are deemed necessary for the purposes of Post-War Reconstruction. In this connection, I should like you to ascertain and inform me whether it is the Government's intention also to seek an amendment of the Constitutional Power under which, except for purposes of Defence, the Commonwealth after the war will be obliged to go to the Loan Council for funds. If the terms of the 'Financial Agreement' are to be continued, what will be the use of greater powers inside Parliament if such powers can only be exercised within a financial dictatorship imposed by people outside Parliament?—Yours sincerely,"

Mr. Calwell sent me a prompt acknowledgment and expressed a desire to discuss the subject with me. I duly presented myself at the time and place appointed, only to find Mr. Calwell engaged elsewhere and others already, waiting by appointment for interview. In these circumstances it was not convenient for me to wait indefinitely, and the interview did not take place.

On 10th February I again wrote as follows:—

"Dear Mr. Calwell,—Attached to this is copy of a letter which was forwarded to you on 9th November, 1943. To date I have had no reply. In view of the very great importance of the question of additional powers for the Commonwealth, I am particularly anxious to know whether the Government does intend to establish the financial sovereignty of Parliament. I appreciate that you are exceedingly busy in these days, and for that reason hesitate to add to your work; but as my personal representative I should be very grateful if you could obtain a reply for me within the next 14 days.—Yours sincerely,"

In a letter dated 15th February, Mr. Calwell advised me as follows:—

"Dear Mr. Brown,—I am in receipt of your letter of 10th February, 1944, in which you refer to the importance of additional powers for the Commonwealth. I have noted your request to be supplied with information regarding the Government's intention concerning the financial sovereignty of Parliament. I am giving this matter my attention, and will advise you within the next week or so in accordance with the request made in your letter.—Yours sincerely,"

The promised advice is not to hand.

Now let me invite special attention to an extract from "The Social Creditor" dated 15/1/44:—

"If any additional evidence were necessary as to the world-wide nature of the plot against the individual, it would be furnished by the simultaneous attack on local government, where it still exists, and the transfer of its powers to a centralised government en route to a world super State. In England and Scotland Parish Councils have gone, the County Councils are marked out to follow them. In Canada and Australia the war is a pretext for emasculating Provinces and States. President Roosevelt's New Deal and the various wartime boards are all directed to the obliteration of the original local supremacy"

OPEN LETTERS

Don't forget to obtain YOUR supply of copies of the first two of the series of Open Letters to the Australian People issued monthly by the Association to Defend British Culture, and distribute them amongst your friends, neighbours and fellow-workers. They must reach as many people as possible to do their job thoroughly; so, will YOU help?

The first of the series—to U.A.P. and U.C.P. Supporters—deals with the steady growth of Socialism in this country, accompanied by bureaucratic control and centralisation, and tells how in many cases U.A.P. and U.C.P. Leaders have condoned and supported these very things.

The second of the series—to Australian Farmers—is directed to the most vital section in the Commonwealth—the men who grow the food without which we could not subsist. This Open Letter shows how the independent farmer is, by virtue of his independence, a danger to the power-lusters and bureaucratic officials aiming at complete control from above. It also tells how steps have been taken, and are being taken, to bring yet another section of the Australian Community "into line."

Follow this series of Open Letters. It will deal with things that affect YOU and YOU and YOU!!!

Buy your copies each month. The price is 1/6 per dozen, plus 3d. per dozen postage. They can be obtained from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, or from the Hon. Sec., Association to Defend British Culture, 71 Jordan-street, Malvern, Victoria.

of the "States," in whom was expressly vested all power which was not conceded by them to the Federal Government. The object is simple and indisputable. It is to transfer power to a bureaucracy, the appointment and promotion of which will be completely insulated from the general population, whose role is merely that of military or industrial cannon fodder. And the amazing feature of the plot is that very large numbers of the intended victims see in it their millennium, even in the face of evidence from every totalitarian country."

Could any thoughtful and truthful person doubt the accuracy of the position as thus stated? Centralisation of "power" in one Parliament did not save the people of the United Kingdom from the horrors and sufferings of depression. The British Parliament possessed all the powers our own Federal Parliament is now seeking, but for some unexplained reason was not PERMITTED to use them.

If that secret power could prevent the "MOTHER" of Parliaments from functioning in the interests of the PEOPLE, what are we to say of the simple faith of Dr. Evatt that

WHAT'S BEHIND FED. POWERS MOVE?

The impending referendum upon the Federal Constitution involves no mere political proposals—it affects the vital liberties of workers, the fundamental rights of citizens, and concerns every form of social, industrial and religious organisation within the country.

Ostensibly to promote "economic security and social justice," the proposals of Dr. Evatt are being promulgated as an invitation to the Australian people to give the Federal Parliament absolute power to enact legislation which Parliament itself says will tend to promote "security and justice."

As submitted, Evatt's scheme makes for dictatorship. It makes for the totalitarian Slave State, and, if affirmed by the people, will, without doubt, bring about a National Socialist State in this country.

Already, beneath the guise of effecting the fullest prosecution of the war, we have witnessed the entrenchment of bureaucracy, government by regulation, meddling and excessive censorship, and the regimentation and conscription of the population. It is puerile to pretend that the Commonwealth must have absolute power to prevent a post-war depression, or to implement the desiderata outlined in the Atlantic Declaration.

The nebulous and undefinable proposals of Dr. Evatt would furnish our Socialists with a carte blanche to make themselves the untrammelled political bosses of Australia for carrying out the designs of their monopolist backers.

A pointer to the real designs involved may be gleaned from the following statements:—

"Our war effort is governed by an intention to implement the Labor platform of nationalisation and socialisation."—(Mr. Fallon, President A.L.P., Nov., 1942.)

"No Government is able to ensure that industry will comply with the demands of the State unless it is a Government of the kinds we are fighting."—(Mr. Curtin, "Hansard," June, 1943.)

"It will be impossible to deal with the legacy of war unless machinery similar to that set up for war is maintained."—(Mr. Curtin, Adelaide, Aug., 1943.)

"Stable government would be endangered if the authority of the Government for the ordering of the mind of the people is not acknowledged."—(Mr. Curtin, Perth, May, 1943.)

"Controls and restrictions on liberty, and planners, and bureaucrats will be necessary to solve post-war problems."—(Dr. Lloyd Ross, Nov., 1943.)

"After the war, we must have heavy tax rates, and more direct and positive controls."—(Mr. Chifley, Nov., 1943.)

"If you want post-war problems carried out, you must be controlled by some central authority."—(Mr. Creamean, June, 1943.)

"Socialism is the objective of the A.L.P. and of every other Labor movement throughout the world."—(Mr. Lovegrove, President Victorian Labor Party, Nov., 1943.)

"Unless Socialism is established throughout the world at the end of the war, many millions will have died in vain."—(Mr. Ward, "Hansard," Feb., 1944.)

B.H.P. directors occupy many of the key positions in the war effort, and Socialist professors occupy key posts on the planning front. Dr. Evatt's travelling companion and "adviser," Mr. W. S. Robinson, of the Inner Ring of the B.H.P. octopus, with the two other Robinsons and the Baillieus, together control £158,000,000 of investment, embracing metals, chemicals, banks, textiles, beer, rubber, pastoral companies, trustees, motor-cars, foodstuffs, insurance, gas, radio and the Press.

The line-up of Socialism and Monopoly is significant. BOTH are monopolies, and a switch from one to the other simply leaves the same financial gang in control of everything.

Simultaneous with the move for political centralisation is the drive by Red executives on the industrial front for amalgamation and centralisation of Trades Unionism, per medium of the Hitlerian technique of "mass meetings."

It is significant that nowhere in Dr.

extra power will be any good to us if we are not allowed to USE it. It is thus as clear as the sunlight that the claim being put forward that the transfer of the powers is necessary in order to prevent the development of conditions of depression alter the war is false.

Even if we all vote "Yes" at the Referendum, the Commonwealth Government will not be able to prevent another depression, because there is no proposal or apparent intention to interfere in any way with the dictatorship being exercised by the Bank Board.

And so the object of the move in Australia is the same as the object of the similar moves in Canada and the United States. In those countries also there is no apparent intention to interfere in any way with the dictatorship of finance, and surely it is not without significance that the 14 items to be submitted to the people of Australia carefully exclude reference to that vital aspect. In all the countries referred to, Government spokesmen are declaring that our material resources are to be used for providing "full employment"; whereas they should be utilised for giving us shorter working hours, earlier retiring age, later school-leaving age, higher old age and invalid pensions, better standards of living, more effective leisure, and all the other things which contribute to a more abundant life.

There is a plot afoot to keep us in slavery to debt, taxes, and work; and we must see that our Parliaments are not used to assist the plotters in their nefarious designs.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, Melbourne, C.2. 2nd April 1944. (To be continued.)

Evatt's proposal is mention made of Finance—the all-important matter that is the master key to economic security and social justice. Were our Federal Ministers sincere in their professed desire to effect justice and security, they would admit that they already possess the power to ensure these aims, and, furthermore, set about using it now, instead of piling up irredeemable debt and crippling taxation which, to use Mr. Curtin's own words BEFORE he became Prime Minister, "suck our national life-blood."

"The Commonwealth," says Mr. D. H. Drummond, M.L.A., in his book, "Australia's Changing Constitution," "can work in co-operation with the States, using its financial powers to expedite and co-ordinate, or it can attempt to fasten on Australia a bureaucratic control that will speedily destroy all local initiative and public spirit, and with these the last vestiges of the moral strength of its citizens. If it accepts the latter course . . . this war will have been fought in vain."

The Federal Government's referendum proposals follow this latter course. The ultimate result of this policy of extreme centralisation is certain dictatorship. Justice and security can never be realised if individual freedom is allowed to be banished from Australia. This threat of dictatorship is the menace against which Australians must guard if we are not to lose to internal forces what we save from the enemy outside.

A glance at the records of contemporary centralised Governments possessing full economic power should be a sufficient warning to the Australian electors, and should furnish a direction as to how to deal with this sinister legislation—i.e., to consign it to Hades.

The price of Liberty is indeed eternal vigilance.

—B. J. GOULDING.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From The UNITED DEMOCRATS' headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

At a recent executive meeting we decided to run a campaign opposing the imposition of the alleged 25% income tax lag. There has been such an enormous amount of steam generated over this question that we feel it would be a great pity not to harness it, and so demonstrate the power of pressure politics.

To illustrate what feeling there is over the matter we cite the action of one Social Creditor employed at a small industrial plant in Adelaide. On his own initiative he made out some request letters, and in 75 minutes obtained 81 signatures from his 90 workmates. He did not use any salesmanship, but simply asked them whether they would care to sign or not.

A leaflet has been drawn up, and is now in the printer's hands. We hope this will be available for distribution by the time this paper is on sale, so send for supplies right away.

If you have not already read "The Answer to Tax Slavery," by C. Barclay Smith, we recommend it to you.

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

INDEPENDENCE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND?

Newfoundland suffered severely in the economic depression of 1929-33, and became financially bankrupt. Great Britain took over her financial debts and sent out a Commission of Government, composed of civil servants, to run the country, thus depriving it of representative government

Three members of the British House of Commons—Mr. Ammon (Camberwell N., Labour), Major Sir Dennis Gunston (Thornbury, Unionist), and Petty Officer A. P. Herbert (Oxford University, Independent)—recently, returned from Newfoundland, which they had visited on a Good-will Mission from Parliament, and on December 16, 1943, they told the House the result of the Mission, and put before it suggestions for the preliminary steps towards the restoration of self-government in that country. Hereunder we quote from Mr. Ammon's speech:—

"... I propose to deal especially with the constitutional position. The difficulty we were up against was that nobody seemed to know quite what he wanted. Everybody had a vague idea—which was a good one—that he wanted to return to some form of self-government, but exactly what it was he did not know, except that he did not want to return to the position which existed just before the Commissioners were appointed

"That they expressed in no uncertain language. There were three or four alternatives, which cropped up in discussion. There can be no question of any challenge whatever to the claim for responsible and representative government. The only dispute, which might arise, is as to how it should be given, and the appropriate time... There was the question of the return to what they call responsible government, and there was the question of the continuance of the commission Government. Some people had ideas or linking up with Canada, and some people of linking up with the United States; that last suggestion found very few supporters, but it had its genesis in the fact that for the time the island is enjoying unexampled prosperity. That is largely brought about by the United States naval bases and military camps, and other places which they have built. These have brought much money to the Newfoundlanders and plentiful employment; no fewer than 20,000 persons have been engaged therein. These people, forgetting their past history, are beginning to think that if they link up with the United States that sort of thing is going to continue. The Mission was quite clear that they could dismiss that anyway as a serious proposition. Then there is the question of linking up with Canada. There is a large number of people who want that, but an overwhelming number who are against it. I think that the Mission are right—although I may speak with prejudice in saying that—in thinking that that is a matter which can be decided only by Newfoundland, not a matter which can be imposed upon Newfoundland from here in any way. That brings me to the question started by the hon. and gallant Member for Altrincham (Sir E. Grigg), of a system similar to that of Northern Ireland. It was felt that the long distances separating us and a variety of other considerations put that out of the question altogether.

"We are left with two issues, either to restore responsible Government or to try and find a middle course and to approach it in status. You cannot isolate the constitutional position from the economic position, and that is something, which I hope the House will keep clearly in mind all through these discussions. Just now Newfoundland is enjoying a period of prosperity such as it has not known since the last war, but the fact that it also enjoyed prosperity during the last war, and was afterwards plunged into the depths of misery and poverty should make us very careful how we view the position in this connection. There is more than one factor which has led to that prosperity, but the

"POWER POLITICS AND PEOPLE'S PRESSURE"

By L. S. BULL.

THIS NEW BOOKLET TELLS...

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

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

BOOKLETS BY C H 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.

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS

dominating one consists of the United States air bases and the military encampments that have been built there, and also of Canada with its air bases. We cannot ignore the fact that both Iceland and Norway have been out of business as far as fishing is concerned, and that also is bound to have its effect. We find three reasons for Newfoundland's prosperity, but as the possibility of war begins to recede from the far West, so we can see that prosperity will recede, and already the peak of the prosperity period has passed.

"Now will begin the period of defection. It is essential that steps be taken as soon as possible to prevent Newfoundland entering the terrible depths of depression experienced at the time when the people had only an allowance of 3d a day, or not more than 2s a week at the outside, to assist them over that period. A few of the clergy and priests we met out there told us how acute was the hunger. That factor has to be taken into consideration when we consider the problems concerned with regard to the Constitution. Differing only a trifle as to the period of time for development, the Mission have arrived at the idea that there must be a compromise position for a time between commission government and that of responsible government. They have suggested to the Department that Commissioners should be nominated from this side, and that those from the other side should be elected by a general franchise of the country, so that by that means we could begin to bring them into some knowledge and use of the franchise to which they have been unused for some time.

WHO OWNS THE GOLD-HOARD IN U.S.?

(An Extract from a Debate in the Canadian House of Commons, July 24, 1943.)

Mr. Isley: I should like to correct one misstatement of fact by the hon. gentleman. He said he would stake his reputation on the statement that eighty-five per cent, of all the gold at Fort Knox was owned by private interests and not by the Government of the United States. I have sent for the Federal Reserve bulletin of July 1943, and the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942. At page 638 of the Federal Reserve bulletin I find a table headed, "Analysis of Changes in Gold Stock of the United States," from which I find that in June, 1942, the gold stock of the United States of America was 22,737,000,000 dollars.

Mr. Jaques: In the United States?

Mr. Isley: Yes, in the United States.

Mr. Jaques: I do not deny that.

Mr. Isley: At page 594 of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, I find the following item: "Assets Gold, 1942. 22,736,503,160.69 dollars." This is stated to be the position as at the close of the fiscal year 1942, which would be June 30. In other words, the amount of gold owned by the Treasury and shown in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury checks almost exactly with the total gold stock of the United States of America, so that the gold there is owned 100 per cent, by the Treasury.

Mr. Jaques: May I have your permission, Mr. Chairman, to read a letter which was my authority for the statement I made:—

"Dear Mr. Jaques,—The answer to your question in your letter of June 8th is very simple, and is shown either in the Treasury statement or in the statement issued from time to time covering the condition of the Federal Reserve banks. The Federal Reserve banks hold gold certificates which

TOWN HALL DEBATE ON FEDERAL POWERS

(Continued from page 1.)

ditions suffered by the people of England, have been IMPOSED upon them by the bankers of New York and London, with whose diabolical financial policy, Mr. Milner, apparently, does not wish to have any interference.

In citing the administrative set-up of the political system of Great Britain as an argument in support of the centralisation of power in the Commonwealth Government, Mr. Milner evidently ignores the vast difference between the respective geographical conditions of Great Britain and Australia.

He also avers that under our present POLITICAL system, we have not the power to do the required job. Again he is beating the air. He either cannot or will not see that, whatever changes are effected in the political system, unless the Commonwealth Government has complete sovereignty over finance, it will be unable to do any more for the people than it can do under the prevailing distribution of power. Has Mr. Milner never heard of Section 51 of the Constitution, and of the power over finance, which the Government could exercise there under, but does not? If some influence outside Parliament prevents the Government from exercising the powers it already possesses, is there any logical reason for believing that, if given the wider powers which, according to Mr. Milner, are absolutely necessary "if post-war reconstruction is to be made a reality," the same outside influences would not still impose their policy on the Government. If he doubts the existence and the weight of those outside influences, perhaps it might be well to remind Mr. Milner of the following words

"There is strong criticism of the Commission of Government; nobody can deny that..."

[Mr. Ammon went on to detail some of the mistakes of the Commission of Government, and also some of the improvement introduced by it. He continued:—]

"... In addition to what we propose with regard to the Commission themselves, we also suggest that it is not quite in keeping with his position, nor is it fair, that the Governor should continue to be Chairman of the Commission. It places him in an invidious position in that he might seem to take sides, but, after all, he is the King's representative... Therefore we have suggested that there should be a chairman appointed by the Governor after his choice had been agreed to by the members of the new Commission we propose to set up as a half-way house. In addition we suggest that a Treasury official should go out there to advise, and that he should have power, up to whatever might be the agreed amount, to consent to expenditure on the spot rather than that every trumpery bit of expenditure should have to be referred back to London in order to obtain assent to it. We also suggest that two or three highly placed civil servants should go out from this country to advise in Newfoundland, and that similar civil servants should come over here from Newfoundland in order to obtain a training in this country, and so by that means gradually to help to build up a Civil Service. Those, in broad outline, are the main proposals we suggest with regard to the Commission government themselves.

"There should be laid down a ten years' scale of economic development, and for that purpose there should be a loan, in agriculture, education, health, roads, transport and other things. That must be backed by a development loan from this side, in order that Newfoundland may be put on her feet... My colleagues and I do not accept the view for one moment that Newfoundland cannot give a decent standard of life to an even larger population than she has now, if she is given the proper opportunity to develop."

(To be continued. Next week: Mr. Maxton's comments.)

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

The Campaign Director of the United Electors of Australia has received the following letter: Dear Sir,—This letter is being written at a northern battle station, where I have been serving for the past eighteen months. During this period I have, under very adverse circumstances, managed to write articles regularly, thereby, I hope, helping in a small way the fight against the promoters of this war and their agents in Australia. I have watched, from this far distance, the various strategies adopted to turn Australia into a Slave State under cover of war; I have seen happening all those things I was warning Australian people about even before military hostilities started over four years ago. There is no use mincing words. If Dr. Evatt and the men behind him mesmerise the Australian people into handing over increased powers, powers of a life-and-death nature, at the coming referendum, democracy in this country will be in serious jeopardy. Every effort humanly possible must be made to ensure that there is an overwhelming "No" vote.

Those of us up here who cannot actively participate in the big fight on the home front are earnestly hoping that those down South will throw everything into the campaign. You, sir, recently said in your notes in "The New Times," that money was required urgently to fight at maximum strength. I agree. As I cannot participate directly in the fight, I desire to help supply the "ammunition" for those who can and will fight. I am like every other soldier, endeavouring to save as much as possible for when "peace breaks out," but I realise that this "peace" will not be worth living in unless we not only defeat our military enemies, but also defeat the "enemy in the rear." I therefore enclose £2 for your fighting funds, and will send a further donation as the campaign develops. I suggest that a progressive total of donations to fight this specific issue of the Powers Bill be published weekly in "The New Times." Set a worthwhile objective and I am sure you will achieve it. Best wishes to all you actionists in the big job ahead. Victory must be ours!—Sincerely yours, Sgt. ERIC D. BUTLER, VX141938.

The Campaign Director reports that the following donations have already been received:—

"Mrs. A.B.," £2; Mr. Butt, £1; R. Berger, £1; Mrs. Bahrenson, 5/-; A. T. Cock, 10/-; D. G. Cunningham, 10/-; E. D. Butler, £2; Mr. Hart, 10/-; R. G. Hancock, £1; W. H. Heseltine, £1; Miss Lane, £1; L. R. Laird, £1; A. Moyle, £1/10/-; B. Mackey, £2; N. F. Rolls, 10/-; K. C. Paech, £3; J. Phillips, 10/-; J. Richardson, £1; F. Robinson, £1; W. Robinson, £1; J. R. Rainey, £1; "Sarge," £1; C. T. Stewart, £1; L. Strain, £1/10/-; Miss Taylor, £1; W. C. Wilson, £1. (Total: £28/15/-.)

WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP?

A dangerous conception of the nature of citizenship is shown in the passage from a Report on "Training for Citizenship," made by the Advisory Council on Education to Scotland, chosen for quotation by "The Times," London, of January 5. "They point out that the practical application of citizenship training in many Scottish schools," says "The Times," "is hindered by home and social conditions over which the schools have no control..." Then a quotation, is given from the Report itself:—

"No school must be allowed to relax its efforts on the ground that the home conditions make training useless or to a great extent ineffective. These conditions must rather be regarded as a challenge, and the vision of better conditions in the post-war world as an incentive, calling for increased effort. A concerted plan for training for citizenship must be evolved in which the schools, the homes, and all other agencies concerned with children play their part..."

"Citizenship" is evidently conceived as a thing to be imposed on individuals even against the grain of their own mode of living, and it seems that the Advisory Council for Education in Scotland is determined to turn Scots children into submissive citizens, well-adapted for handling by authoritarian bureaucrats.

Now, any validity, which may attach to the notion of citizenship, must be concerned, in a democracy, with the summation, conveyance and achievement of policies derived from and dependent on the policies of men who are primarily and by nature individuals and only secondarily citizens. "Citizenship" should be a varying and direct function (in the mathematical sense) of a man's independent preferences, and to teach it otherwise, to mould preferences by its use, is to pervert (if it is capable of further perversion) the whole system of Government service into Government dictatorship.

—"The Social Crediter," Jan. 15.

GET THE FACTS!

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

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

(The report and commentary on this debate will be continued in our next issue.)

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