

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. 16. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1944

Now, when our land to ruin's brink is verging.

In God's name, let us speak while there is time!

Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging, Silence is crime. Whittier (1807-1892).

Beware of Giving Canberra Greater Power

Fundamental Dangers Involved

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

A Bill has been passed through Federal Parliament to give power to hold a Referendum. The Referendum is to be held to ask the people whether or no they are willing to give Canberra greater powers to control and order the lives of the people of this country.

In this issue, as in every large political issue, there is the apparent, or formal, reason for a piece of legislation, and the real reason—which is usually not obvious until long afterwards.

Our history books give us plenty of reasons for the important political events of recent times, but the real reasons come to light slowly and painfully, as a few painstaking men and women delve under the surface of things and expose the main driving spring.

Whatever may be the real, or apparent, reason for the Referendum for further powers for Canberra, the fact remains that there is demanded a large change in the Constitution of Australia, which will make permanent alterations in the structure of this country, and those who are going to vote for this change should know exactly what they are voting for.

The first important fact that is necessary to understand is that you cannot give other people power over your life and property without you yourself losing that power. If you give a Government power to order you about, then, obviously, you must obey that Government. In other words, you have no power to resist; you have lost that power, lost it more effectively, than if it had been taken from you by force of arms.

There are certain powers, which you gladly give to Governments; such powers as are necessary for cleaning the streets or supplying water and electricity and other services requiring community effort. These powers do not permanently affect the basis of your own authority and initiative.

But the powers taken by modern Governments, and by the large armies of Government officials, go much further now than was thought possible even a few years ago. When the Government takes a large part of a man's income by taxation, then, of course, the Government has the spending of that money—not the man. The man earns the money, but he does not spend it—he has lost control over it.

The vast sums of money collected each year give great powers to those in charge of the spending departments. A large army of officials has to be recruited to spend the money. Gradually Government spending dominates the economics of the State, so that few people are strong enough to resist the powers of Government officials.

The great difficulty involved in handing powers to another man is that that other man is never as interested in your welfare and interests as you are yourself. For example, nobody will look after your own house as well as you will. This is easily seen in the amount of damage done to "public" property, which is regarded as nobody's property.

Usually, however, when you go away from the district, you appoint an agent to look after your house; the agent, being on the spot, can be useful when you are away.

But when you give the Government powers over your affairs, the position is reversed: you are on the spot and can look after the property, but you are not permitted to do so. The Government official is a thousand miles away, and has all the powers, and either won't use them or uses them in a way you dislike.

We thus introduce the tragic irresponsibility and callousness of central Government, with all the inefficiency of absentee management.

We have already delegated powers to our Representatives in Canberra, which they are quite incapable of handling, and a tremendous amount of important business is rushed through in a short space of time; in the sleepy hours of the early morning Representatives and Senators cast their votes on questions which many have neither had the time nor the inclination nor the capacity to consider. They cast their votes

imposing millions of pounds of new taxes on the country, dash into their trains and leave Canberra for their respective States—and leave their electors to carry the baby.

It doesn't seem to strike the Representatives in Parliament that electors should have a say in what goes on in Canberra.

The Federal Members of Parliament are supposed to be the servants of the electors, and are paid a £1000 a year to look after the interests of their masters—the electors.

Sometimes in wartime we are forced to give great powers to our servants, but we should have the satisfaction of knowing that when peace is declared we have automatic relief from our many wartime restrictions, and our Representatives must return to the people the power and initiative taken from the people.

In order that a small and powerful political clique shall not gain control over Parliament, it is essential that the people in each electorate should have power to recall their representative and demand an account of his stewardship; and if that account is not satisfactory, the electors should have powers to dismiss their Representative.

Until electors have this power of recall and the will to use it, it is sheer madness and the essence of political stupidity to hand over more of their powers to Canberra.

I wonder how many of the Representatives who voted for the 25 per cent, extra taxes consulted their electors on this matter. I wonder how many were forced to vote against their own wishes and their own better judgment.

There is no harm handing over great powers to a friend as long as you do so with open eyes, and know exactly what the consequences will be; but most of the younger voters have not the remotest idea what is entailed.

When the British Government declared on Germany it knew what the consequences would be; it knew that many of its towns would be reduced to ruins. Its people also knew that they would have a long, grim struggle, but they were prepared to suffer so that those who survived might live their lives in their own way, without interference from the arbitrary decrees of self-appointed dictators.

That is not the position we face when we are asked to decide the question of granting extra powers for post-war reconstruction.

We are being asked to grant to Canberra those self-same powers of regimentation, which makes the Nazi regime so abhorrent to British people.

During this last year many people have begun to realise exactly what these powers mean, and public opinion has moved steadily against granting these powers to Canberra.

During wartime there has been a vast

interference with the rights of the private individual; some of this interference has been necessary, and most people have willingly acquiesced in such curtailment of their liberties. But that does not mean that we like it, or that we are anxious for more of it, or willing to extend the reign of the bureaucrat one day longer than is absolutely necessary.

This is a war against Fascism, not a war to erect a complete Fascist State in this country; but if we are not careful that is what we are going to do.

We are told by Mr. Chifley and others that a degree of regimentation is necessary, but what they don't tell you is that they are determined that no person shall be allowed to escape from this regimentation. In our daily lives we have all got to submit to discipline in some sphere of activity, but not in all spheres.

The discipline and regimentation of a mass-production factory is hell-upon-earth to some men, but then, in peacetime, men are not compelled to go into a mass-production factory—they have a way of escape. Some people cannot tolerate city life; it means a slow death to them; in ordinary times these people have means of escape.

In peace-time the doctor, the engineer and the soldier have to submit to discipline, each one to a different type; but each has voluntarily, accepted that discipline, and he can voluntarily throw it off. If he can't, and desires to, then, of course, he is merely a slave, end is in much the same position as a man in gaol.

The tragedy of modern life is not the hard work or the discipline, but the inability to escape even for a few months from a position, which has become impossible. This lack of choice has made men feel that they are not masters of their own destiny; they feel that they are puppets in a vast and soulless machine; they are losing all sense of responsibility. When confronted with an impossible and intolerable situation, the usual reaction of the ordinary man is the remark: "What can I do?"

That is the remark of regimented masses, who have lost all power of initiative and all faith in their political future. It is not the remark of a freeborn human being, who has any faith in himself. We are up against something, therefore, which transcends in importance the granting of powers demanded by Canberra. The voice of the people has not yet been heard. If it could be heard, I am sure it would be the same as has been heard for centuries:

"Leave us to live our own lives in our own way. You live as you want to live, and leave me alone."

If our civilisation cannot grant this simple request, the white race will die out because it will refuse to co-operate.

Some Highlights from "Hansard"

Prepared by ERIC D. BUTLER

In answer to a question by Mr. Archie Cameron (Barker, S.A.), on October 7, 1943, asking how many Members of the British House of Lords and the House of Commons were on active service and how many had been killed, Mr. Curtin replied as follows on February 9: "On active service: House of Commons, 153; House of Lords, 167. Twelve members of the House of Commons and seventeen members of the House of Lords have been killed in action."

Although I disagree with the idea of a Member of Parliament being in the armed forces — they can hardly represent their electors' policies there — I suggest that the figures above should be carefully observed by the ranting "anti-Tories," particularly the Communist brand. Apparently there are quite a few "Tories" in England, who, although under thumb of the International Jew without really realising it, are prepared to fight and die to defeat Hitler. Funny thing that I thought it was only the Communists and other "second"-front urgers! But there is still time for leading Communists and others to be in the opening of the "second"-front!

Senator Darcey's speech in the Senate on February 10 contained some splendid material on international finance and proposed return to the gold standard. After dealing with Churchill's admissions on how he made a mistake in advocating a return to the gold standard in 1925, Senator Darcey said:

"Who holds the gold of the world? It is held by the Federal Reserve Bank of the

United States of America. Many people believe that the gold is held by the American Government, but that is not so. It is in the hands of the Federal Reserve Bank, which is a private institution like the Bank of England. Private financial institutions, including the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States of America, have succeeded in increasing the price of gold from approximately £4 an ounce to more than £10 an ounce. When gold once more becomes the purchasing medium of the world, who will have all the advantages? The whole world will be in pawn to the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States of America, and to other private financial institutions, which hold large reserves of gold. The Federal Reserve Bank has already loaned £300,000,000 gold dollars to China, and is offering now to rehabilitate the conquered countries of Europe once they return to the gold standard after the war. This is a most serious matter that we cannot overlook . . ."

"After the war we shall have plenty of man-power available for reconstruction work. Already our national production has increased to an enormous degree, and, after all, the only real wealth of a country is what its people can produce. Unfortunately, under the present financial system, bankers have power to say how much money shall be in circulation.

"I remember well concluding my first speech in this chamber—it was during the depression—with these words, 'The present monetary system has brought the world to poverty and chaos and is rapidly edging us into a war which will destroy our civilisation.' I was laughed at by many honorable senators opposite. One honorable senator said that mine was a

(Continued on page 4.)

Strange Transaction

"Authorisation and licences have been granted by Germans to Swiss industries for the sale to the British of machine tools without which certain parts for 'planes could not have been manufactured in England. . . These sales were made with the express condition that payment should be made in REFINED COPPER." (Emphasis in original.)

— "Switzerland: Foster-mother of Cartels," in "Harper's Magazine," September, 1943, p. 310

DICTATORIAL DUNSTAN: Following the action of the Victorian Public Service Association in bringing pressure to bear on State Members with a view to correcting the many grievances they labour under, Mr. Dunstan accuses them of intimidation and mob tactics. That is the attitude of most politicians when their employers (electors) take the only logical course of demanding results. One of the main grievances is that civil servants who were prevented from going on active service are denied promotion as a result of the Soldiers' Preference Bill. It's about time Mr. Dunstan realised that he is merely a servant of the people.

RARE REALISM: It is so rare to find realistic items in the daily press, that the following points from the Melbourne "Sun" of April 13 are worth recording. Dealing with a wordy statement on the population question from Mr. Forde, M.H.R., the "Sun" advocated "beginning right here at home," and urged action (not words) along the lines of releasing manpower and materials to house our homeless hundreds, so that our fighting man can anticipate coming back home. In the same issue, on the question of erecting monuments (which has cropped up again), the "Sun" urged that they should take the form of schools, hospital equipment and "model centres" to eliminate our ugly slums.

REPUDIATED REDS: The A.L.P. Easter Conference agreed to a resolution repudiating

affiliation with the Communist Party on the grounds that "the Communist Party throughout the world was thoroughly unreliable and incapable of basic loyalties. In every country the Communist Party was parasites on working-class organisations." That is a sign of realism in so far as the conference rejected the principle of dictatorship advocated by Communists, but Labor members have to be careful that the same form of totalitarianism is not handed out to them under a different label, namely, "Labor." The way events are being shaped the rank-and-file of workers will have to repudiate their union executives and councils if they desire to preserve their hard-won rights from Evatt, Curtin and Co.

POPULATION PLAN: A correspondent in the "Age" of April 4 states that in 1898 the British Government was reported to be (Continued on page 3.)

Impending Shortage of Essential Raw Material

Despite all this, talk about planning. There's an aspect I don't understand: Will the number of bureaucrats needed Leave a big enough herd to be planned? For with too many blokes playing planners The plannees could soon peter out; And there isn't much point to a planner With no one to badger about. -W. P. I.

(Continued from last issue.)

MR. B. FITZPATRICK, THE SECOND SPEAKER in support of the Referendum proposals, commenced by saying: that, with all the drawbacks admittedly contingent on their being carried, "if we don't vote 'yes' our situation will be parlous." In referring to the stress laid by Mr. Paice on an individual's right to choose his own job, he asked what the value of that theoretical right was to the 500,000 unemployed in 1931. They had wanted a job of any kind, but no one was able to accommodate them.

In the opinion of Mr. Fitzpatrick it was unfair of Mr. Paice to accuse the present Federal Government of attempting to obtain the powers behind the backs of the people. In October 1942, Dr. Evatt had introduced a Bill for a Referendum, which had been so howled down by employers' organisations that it was withdrawn in favour of the Convention. At the Convention all leaders had agreed to the transfer of the powers sought by the Federal Government, but only two States had kept the solemn undertaking given to the Convention.

The efforts of the States in the rehabilitation of soldiers after the last war had been deplorable.

Private enterprise had shown itself incapable of coping with problems and conditions such as we will be confronted with at the termination of the war. Private enterprise and monopolies will not give any hope for the future; and, unless these powers are granted to the Federal Government there will be no power to control monopolies.

COMMENT: Mr. Fitzpatrick did not advance one valid argument in support of his contention that our condition will be parlous if we don't vote "yes."

His contention that the "theoretical" right to choose their own job was of little or no value to the 500,000 "unemployed" in 1931, when no one had been able to provide a job of any kind, and that therefore acceptance of the planned conditions involved in the Referendum proposals is desirable, disregards the realities of the situation.

Like Mr. Milner, Mr. Fitzpatrick made no mention of the FINANCIAL causes of the conditions of depression, which produced the 500,000 "unemployed." Nor did he tell his audience of the part played in the production of such conditions by the international financiers, including the anti-British directors of the traitorous Bank of "England." His description of the plight of the "unemployed" is alike divorced from reality and an affront to reason. The 500,000 "unemployed" were NOT looking for a JOB. There were innumerable jobs waiting to be done. They were looking for someone who could PAY them for doing a job. The inability of the 500,000 to find employers who could pay them was the effect of the banker's policy of deflation in pursuance of which the money which otherwise would have been available to pay the "unemployed" for performing the jobs waiting to be done, was deliberately withdrawn from circulation by the bankers and cancelled. In the face of the undeniable fact that in those countries where the Central Government had all the political power (e.g., Great Britain, New Zealand, South Africa), the conditions of depression (referred to by Mr. Fitzpatrick as well as by Mr. Milner) were just as severe as those experienced in Australia, one feels justified in questioning either the intelligence or intellectual honesty of people who never tire of repeating the catch-cry that the transfer of the powers sought by the Federal Government is essential to the prevention of future depressions.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's charge of unfairness against Mr. Paice in accusing the Government of having attempted to obtain the powers behind the backs of the people cannot be sustained in face of what actually has occurred. If it be true, as stated by Mr. Fitzpatrick that the Bill for a referendum introduced by Dr. Evatt was withdrawn "in favour of a Convention" because the Bill was "howled down by employers' organisations," we can only conclude that the present "Labor" Government represents not "the workers," but employers' organisations.

That Mr. Paice's accusation is fully justified is proven by (amongst much other conclusive evidence), a news item published in the Melbourne "Herald" of 15/4/44. The news item says "the referendum on the granting of extra powers to the Commonwealth might be unnecessary IF ATTEMPTS BY SENIOR FEDERAL MINISTERS TO WIN OVER THE THREE OPPOSING STATES ARE SUCCESSFUL." Dr. Evatt also stated, subsequent to the passage through the Senate of the Bill for a Referendum, that the door is still open for the transfer of the powers from the States by reference (that means behind the backs of the people). THE FACTS THEREFORE, CONCLUSIVELY DEMONSTRATE THE TIMELINESS OF MR. PAICE'S

A PUBLIC MEETING

TEMPERANCE HALL, RUSSELL ST., MELBOURNE.

Sunday, April 23, at 8 p.m.

DR JOHN DALE will speak on the subject of "LIBERTY."

Don't miss hearing this great democrat!
(Arranged by No-Conscription Campaign.)

Page 2 — "New Times," April 21, 1944

WARNING. Have YOU written that letter to your State Member voicing your opposition to the transfer of powers behind the backs of the people?

In his complaint that, notwithstanding all the "leaders" at the Convention having agreed to the transfer of powers, only two States had kept the "solemn undertaking" given to the Convention, Mr. Fitzpatrick displayed the adulation of the Fuehrer (leader) principle, and the contempt for individual freedom of choice which is so typical of those afflicted by the planner complex. The idea that THE INDIVIDUAL PERSONS of whom the "leaders" were representatives might not endorse so gross a breach of trust evidently does not enter into Mr. Fitzpatrick's reckoning. But who are the people that THEIR wishes should be considered or respected? As Mr. Paice so aptly put it, they are thought of as cattle to be pushed and driven about as planners endowed with super-wisdom may decree.

Furthermore, Mr. Fitzpatrick is quite incorrect in stating that the Premiers of the States at the Canberra Convention on the "transfer and EXTENSION of powers," entered into a "solemn undertaking" to accept the proposed Constitutional changes. They had no power to commit their States to the proposals, and agreed merely to submit them to their respective Governments and Parliaments. Even if the Premiers had had the authority necessary to commit their States, his association of a term such as "solemn undertaking" with a plot to sign away a trust of which they (the Premiers) were (and are) the custodians, indicates the capacity of the legalistic mind for inventing novel forms of play upon words. The legal term for the supposed "solemn undertaking" spoken of by Mr. Fitzpatrick (had it been carried out) we had understood to be "malfeasance."

GEN. GIRAUD & THE JEWISH QUESTION

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

In November 1942, British and American troops, superbly conveyed and convoyed by our Navy, landed in French North Africa, after secret talks with French leaders, which ensured that little resistance would be offered, or none. This was a rare moment of glory in the war. Who can picture the resurrection of France without deep emotion?

The British people, for two years before this, were confused by much drivel about "The men of Vichy" (among whom the only first-class professional traitor was our accomplice of the Hoare-Laval Pact, Laval). This was seemingly meant to divert their attention from their own Men of Munich, and from the dark omissions of what Mr. Churchill called "the astonishing seven months of the phoney war" and of the astonishing seven years before.

The men who were left with a prostrate France on their hands, and no Channel to save it, while its manhood was held hostage by the enemy, possessed one last hope: to temporise during the further development of the war, to hold the French fleet and French African armies as a threat over the German head, and to re-enter the war, with those weapons, if and when this became possible.

In November 1942, this happened. Darlan, a French admiral who never forgot the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935, made behind the French back, saw the golden chance, facilitated our landing, and prepared to fight with us. He was shot, and died, a much-defamed man in this country.

General Giraud succeeded him, and, under his leadership, France re-entered the war. Giraud was violently belittled in our Parliament and Press. Here, misinformation reached a new peak.

Giraud is knightly in appearance and noble in deed. Few men can boast such a record. He may be compared with Bayard, and in the last war would have been a public hero with us. In this, misleaders of opinion bedaub his picture with dirt, for their own ends.

But for his French troops, who held the Germans while the British and Americans moved up, and suffered heavy losses, our men would not, as I write, be in a position to drive the last enemies from Africa.

Henri Honore Giraud is 63. Three of his sons now fight in Africa, for France and us. He belongs to the French officers, who, like British officers, ambassadors and journalists, for years before this war vainly implored their Government to make known the warlike intentions of Germany and to hasten their armaments. In this country the men who thwarted them are still in power; and our policy towards France is seemingly bent on effecting the restoration of similar men there.

Giraud was captured in the last war and escaped to fight again. His renown was born then. In this war he FOUGHT; he was not of those who surrendered. He was taken, fighting in an armoured car, in the forefront of the fight by Rommel himself. He was imprisoned in a German fortress, Koeningstein, on the edge of a precipice 150 feet high. The story of his escape, by means of a rope made from pieces of string and cord, belongs to the

efforts of the States to rehabilitate soldiers after the last war were inadequate not because the men of whom the State Governments were comprised were less capable than those from whom Federal Governments were selected. Nor is there any valid reason for supposing that our State Governments at the present time will be less capable than the Federal Government of meeting the demands of the immediate post-war years IF NECESSARY FUNDS ARE MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM. The Federal Government already has power to control financial policy under Section 51 of the Constitution. Seeing that it has not so far exercised such power in order to assert its sovereignty over FINANCE, there are no grounds for believing the statement that one purpose for which the additional powers are sought is to enable the Government to control monopolies. How the evils arising from the growth of monopolies are to be banished by the building up of an uncontrollable monopoly (the modern power State) is something which Mr. Fitzpatrick evidently did not think it worth while explaining.

His combination of "private enterprise and monopolies" as offering no hope for the future betrays an all too common failure to distinguish between private enterprise and monopoly. They are not one and the same. Further, the progressive development of monopolies is undoubtedly killing genuine private enterprise, which has not shown incapacity for coping with the problem of production. The conditions produced by a defective financial system are too readily attributed to the supposed failure of private enterprise. By the making of statements of the character dealt with in these comments, men such as Mr. Fitzpatrick are covering over the demonstrable incapacity of the prevailing financial system to distribute the fruits of an age of abundance.

The growth of monopoly, which, in other words, means centralisation of control, is inseparable from the operation of the financial system; and, the evils due to such growth cannot, in the nature of things, be removed by the extension and ultimate complete entrenchment of monopoly. A greater and wiser mind than that of Mr. Fitzpatrick said, "Beelzebub cannot cast out Beelzebub."

else must give way, he says, to the need to mobilise the resources of France against Germany. Not so. The Allies are fighting for the validity of certain principles. One such principle is the right of the Jews to the privileges accorded to their fellow-citizens. To deny them that right is to accept the assumptions of Fascism. MILITARY ACTION MUST CONFORM TO THIS ACCEPTANCE OF BASIC RIGHTS." Here, again, is the subtle perversion of the truth, by means of which the British people are deluded: that "Fascism" means not terror and war, but solely: measures to restrict Jewish influence—and that we light chiefly against this. It is not true.

"Fascism" and "National Socialism" are but "Bolshevism" under other names. The enemy is TYRANNY AND TERROR, sometimes used by all-Jewish regimes, sometimes by regimes which profess to be anti-Jewish, sometimes by regimes which ignore this question altogether. The "thing" we should fight against is terror, as » means of usurping and holding power.

Thus another danger awaits us in Civvy Street: It is this stealthy elevation, by every means of public delusion, of Jewish claims to the forefront of our war aims, where they do not belong, and the consequent threat, which this produces, to our foreign policy, on which our island safety depends, and our domestic liberties.

We shall not produce a happy breed, here, by giving paramountcy to a cause which is not ours, but an international one: and we shall imperil our safety by it, for we shall produce greater hatred of ourselves than ever before, in the countries which after victory must become either our friends or enemies, if everywhere we go we use the might of our arms to enforce Jewish aims and claims.

If these were only "equal rights with other citizens," none could demur. That is the high and yet modest measure of human dignity which we ALL claim, which Tyranny denies. But Jewish aims go beyond that (witness the preferential treatment, over British citizens, given to Jews from Germany in this island during this war). They conflict with that unchallengeable statement of the rights of man.

YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED

Great emphasis is being laid on the desire of the Curtin Government to acquire, by means of a Referendum, increased powers over the people "for reconstruction" in the post-war years. The whole question of whether these powers shall or shall not be granted is being widely discussed—on the simple assumption that the final decision is to be made by the electors at the forthcoming Referendum. This comforting assumption is dangerous wishful thinking.

Evatt and Co. are fully determined to obtain these additional powers by whatever means are within their power. Should they fail to get them by transfer from State Parliaments or by putting the question to the people, there is not the slightest doubt that they will adopt different tactics and use "back-door" methods to secure such powers as they consider necessary for imposing THEIR "New Order" on US.

That they do not intend to be stopped, should a Referendum fail to give them the powers they seek, was indicated by the Hon. F. Brennan, M.H.R., Labor member for Batman. Speaking in the debates on the Constitution Alteration Bill he stated:

"I think that sooner or later, through the process of taxation and other processes that are available to this Commonwealth Parliament, alteration of the Constitution will be forced upon the people, whether they are willing or not. The tendency will be to so strain the powers that the Commonwealth possesses as to make local government, as at present employed, impossible."

We have been warned. We know what to expect. We are dealing with a Government that believes that it alone knows what is "good" for US, and is determined to override the expressed will of the people if that should not coincide with plans for us.

What do YOU think about that? Say it, by letter, at frequent intervals, to your State and Federal parliamentary representatives.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The next meeting of the S.C.M. of S.A. will be held in the United Democrats' rooms, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, April 27, at 8 p.m. After the conclusion of general business a lecture on "Post-War Policy" will be given by Mr. J. Guerin. All members are requested to bring any interested friends.

—J. E. Burgess, Hon. Sec.

An American magazine announces that a well-known American Aircraft Company helped the R.A.F. to win the Battle of Britain. Well, you can't say they didn't mention the R.A.F.

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 British Minister sent to Africa said: "Our broad policy is that France shall be free to choose its own form of Government. . . . The attitude towards the Jews must be changed because the present attitude will never be acceptable to the British and American peoples." What more blatant contradiction could be uttered, in two sentences? Are we to use our armed strength, everywhere we go, among friends or enemies, only in THIS cause?

Such a demand was made in the "News-Chronicle" of February 2, 1943. It said: "General Giraud claims that 'the Jewish problem in North Africa is a matter that concerns only France. . . . Everything

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

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

Sir, —While suitable "public men" have been provided with facilities on platforms, in pulpits, in the Press, over the radio and on the cinema to foster the idea of never-ending toil, the carefully "selected" representatives of the London School of Economics, working for the imposition of the policy of International Finance, have been placed in positions from which they can influence, direct, and supervise. Some of these carefully selected men have already been mentioned, and two of the latest moves in this direction are of more than passing interest.

Professor L. G. Melville, who is an F.I.A. of London, who was Professor of Economics at the Adelaide University between 1929 and 1931 (a significant period!), who has been associated with Professors Copland, Giblin, and Mills, and who, like them, has been an absolute failure so far as the welfare of the people is concerned, has been "selected" to represent "Australia" in the discussions taking place abroad relating to an international currency system. As explained last week, this international currency system fits in with the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," and is intended to give control of the world to non-Christians.

Professor Melville has given plenty of evidence that he stands for the perpetuation of debt, taxation, and wage-slavery. His own conduct provides eloquent testimony of his incompetence and unsuitability to speak for the people of Australia so far as the FUTURE is concerned. He may be fully qualified and thoroughly suitable to speak with shame about the past, but our sons are fighting for the future, and they want something far better than Professor Melville is apparently capable of visualising.

The other significant move is the "selection" of Dr. Burton to accompany our delegation to the International Labour Conference in Philadelphia. Mr. Beasley, the leader of the delegation, has already arrived in the United States for that purpose, and on the basis of his present attitude one would hardly think he is the same man who led an attack on Mr. Scullin in 1931 because of the weakness of the Government's financial policy!

Dr. Burton is another London School of Economics man, and just as he has been helping to keep Dr. Evatt on the right track, so is he to see that Mr. Beasley does not get astray in Philadelphia. John W. Burton is a B.A. of the Sydney University and a Ph.D. of London.

Because their efforts have been directed towards the perpetuation of a fraudulent system of finance, these men have accomplished nothing so far as our true welfare is concerned, and so long as they are permitted to influence national policy or to be used for the implementation of policy dictated from outside Australia, our true welfare will not be beneficially served.

When I recently wrote to the Attorney-General on an important matter, it was Dr. Burton who replied! Here is the correspondence:—

"6/11/43. Dear Dr. Evatt, —On 19/11/42, I despatched to you, through my personal representative, Mr. Arthur Calwell, an important letter relating to the attitude of the Security Authorities towards financial reform, but did not receive a reply. A copy of the letter is attached.

"Since writing that letter, one of my sons has been killed.

"In view of the measures already taken without the knowledge or consent of the Australian people, to have us committed to an 'international' monetary system which will control or adversely influence our domestic financial arrangements, I now propose to have copies of my letter of 19/11/42 circulated as widely as practicable throughout the Commonwealth, and send this communication to inform you of my intention. —Yours faithfully."

The letter-dated 19/11/42 was as follows:—

"Dear Dr. Evatt, —At a meeting last night of the Executive of the New World Reconstruction Movement, of which I am a member, the Chairman reported that he had recently been called to the office of the National Security Authorities, and that in the course of the interview, Colonel Whittington inferred that persons connected with the 'New Times' and the United Electors of Australia were infiltrating the N.W.R.M., and he advised the Movement to check up on its membership and rid itself of such connections. This was a clear indication that the Deputy Director of the Security Service looked upon the 'New Times' and the U.E.A. as objectionable organisations, and considered the members of such bodies were undesirable persons to have in the N.W.R.M.

"As I am a shareholder in the paper referred to, and a contributor to its columns, and further, as I was also at one time Chairman of the U.E.A., it came as a surprise for me to hear that such a high authority had seen fit to cast doubts upon the bona fides of such organisations, and had directly inferred that it would be in the best interests of the N.W.R.M. to have nothing to do with me or anyone else similarly interested. That, you will agree, is very close to defamation.

"I am fully aware of the enormous powers which have been delegated to our National Security Authorities, and readily acknowledge the need for stringent measures under existing conditions of national emergency, but this is still Australia, and Australian citizens still expect power to be exercised intelligently, impartially and honourably. In this instance, however, the gratuitous remarks of Colonel Whittington suggest rather than the powers delegated are perhaps greater than the fitness to exercise them.

"The policy of the U.E.A. is to work for the establishment of a functioning demo-

cracy, i.e., a condition in which we will have Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In other words, to secure Parliaments giving effect to the will of the people instead of being subject to a financial dictatorship.

"The 'New Times' is a weekly newspaper advocating political and economic democracy and exposing the causes, the institutions, and the individuals that keep the common people poor in the midst of material plenty. Its main feature is to inform the public regarding the anti-social effects of the present financial system and, at the same time, to advocate necessary reforms. It has been doing this since 1935.

"As a law abiding and loyal Australian citizen, I should like to know from you whether the advocacy of monetary reform is contrary to any of the following:—

"(i) The National Security Regulations;
"(ii) The Commonwealth Constitution;
"(iii) The provisions of the Atlantic Charter;

"(iv) The intention of the proposed constitutional alterations;

"(v) The policy of the Government.
"If it is not contrary to any Commonwealth law, will you please inform me at whose instigation the National Security Authorities have adopted such an antagon-

INDEPENDENCE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND?

(Continued from last issue.)

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, Major Sir Dennis Gunston and Petty Officer A. P. Herbert—recently returned from Newfoundland, which they had visited on a goodwill mission from Parliament. On December 16, 1943, they told the House the result of the mission, and put before it suggestions for steps towards the restoration of self-government in that country.

In the ensuing debate, Mr. Beverley Baxter commented as follows:

... What was the financial crisis that let Newfoundland down? ... It is not a pleasant story. It starts with the Squires Government. The Squires Government did many good things, but they became terribly corrupt. In 1933, Newfoundland owed, all told, about £20,000,000. Of that, 26,000,000 dollars were owed to the bankers of New York in gold bonds payable at the gold price. Another 6,000,000 dollars had been loaned by the Canadian banks to help to pay the interest. The Canadian banks charged on that five and even five-and-a-half percent—a very heavy rate of interest, indicating that they took a certain risk. The rest was owed here.

Newfoundland tried to pay her interest. When she could not, we took the debt over. Her interest charts on her external loans were over £1,000,000 a year. Had she not had to pay that on the year when she went bankrupt, she would have had 3,000,000 dollars surplus in her Treasury to meet the cost of the social services. ... They would have been able to raise the employment dole and so on and pay for those health services which they wanted to create at that time.

We helped Newfoundland out; there is no denying that. We converted the loan to 3½ per cent., and we guaranteed it here. Then we paid back New York and the Canadian banks. The British investor, whose bonds had fallen to 25, had the satisfaction of seeing them rise to 85. Newfoundland owed us £20,000,000 when that conversion started. At the end she still owed us £20,000,000, but New York had enjoyed the rather unusual experience of having had a debt paid by this country for Newfoundland, and the Canadian banks, which had gambled a bit on the loan, got their money back. The British people had secured their investment. Then we decided to turn back the clock, and to bring to our oldest possession the institution of taxation without representation, something, which one would have thought we had dropped from the time of the American rebellion.

These were the first three things we promised: We agreed to put Newfoundland on her feet as speedily as possible; secondly, to promote the political education of her people; and, thirdly, to restore the Constitution—which we had never revoked, but merely suspended—as soon as the island was self-supporting again.

In that Act itself there is no mention of a request from the Newfoundland people; that is in the Commission's recommendations, but not in the Act itself. [Interruption.] I am sorry; the Minister says that it is in the Appendix to the Act. In the actual Clauses it does not appear.

The fact is that the Newfoundland Commission of Government have governed as civil servants always will: honestly, without imagination. To promote the political education of the Newfoundland people is our second pledge. Instead, we have deprived the people of their political education.

We are pledged to restore the Constitution when Newfoundland is solvent. You have heard that Newfoundland has been lending us money. She has been solvent for nearly three years; she has considerable cash reserves now. But we have decided that we must not honour our pledge to restore her independence—I grant the Minister the point—unless the people ask for it. ... When Newfoundland owed us money we put in the Commissioners. You have

heard how Newfoundland is now paying us money: I should say that we have had on deposit about 10,000,000 dollars. Suppose we cannot pay it when the war is over. Will Newfoundland be entitled to send three Commissioners to Britain and close this House? It sounds absurd, certainly, but the principle is the same.

I should like to put one further question. Do you think it proper for men entirely uninformed as to the operation of the financial system to assume the role of judges of men who have made a close study of the subject, and whose public actions, which are the direct result of that careful study, have as their sole object the liberation of both the Government and the people from the bondage of a fraudulent system? In other words, is it proper that Ignorance should be set up as the judge of Knowledge?

"My attitude is this: If the Government informs me that it is wrong to expose a demonstrable fraud and instructs me to discontinue doing so, I shall obey; but as an Australian citizen with two sons in the fighting line I am not willing voluntarily to surrender my civil rights and privileges at the dictation of ill-informed men who have been vested with temporary authority but who have no responsibility to the sovereign people. —Yours respectfully."

On 11/11/43, Dr. Burton telephoned to say that we had not been committed to anything, and that he knew from personal experience that Australia's representatives were fighting hard to ensure that our sovereignty was not interfered with. He did not name any of the people who were endeavouring to interfere with our sovereignty. He said he knew nothing of the announcement by Mr. Morgenthau of 27/10/43 that the "World Plan" was so advanced that only technical points remained to be settled.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
16/4/44. (To be continued.)

heard how Newfoundland is now paying us money: I should say that we have had on deposit about 10,000,000 dollars. Suppose we cannot pay it when the war is over. Will Newfoundland be entitled to send three Commissioners to Britain and close this House? It sounds absurd, certainly, but the principle is the same.

I will not touch on the point about the bases, because that has been dealt with, but I suggest that to give a 99 years' lease to Canada or to the United States on Newfoundland territory without the people of Newfoundland being consulted, is a very dangerous thing. Suppose that when they get self-government they repudiate it. What in the charge that will be made against us by the nations with which we entered into the arrangements in the first place? This is storing up serious trouble.

Earl Winterton: It is just as bad with the West Indies.

Mr. Baxter: Yes. After all, we have bases in Iceland, but Iceland takes them back when the war is over. The Prime Minister of Canada has laid it down that any territorial concessions to other nations by Canada will return to Canada when the war is over. Newfoundland has no voice: Newfoundland is run by the Dominions Office here, Can Newfoundland's High Commissioner raise his voice at the daily conference of High Commissioners in London? He cannot because he is not allowed to attend. ...

There comes a point in the history of every country of this Empire when self-government comes as a challenge and a command, and in that tradition we should say to Newfoundland: "Now, call your leaders together, arrange to govern yourselves, and we will stand by you through bad times and good times, not rating less high your democratic rights than your financial solvency; govern yourselves, come side by side with us into the future." And let us end our own shame here for having closed a Parliament that had governed for a hundred years.

(To be concluded. Next week: A. P. Herbert's comment.)

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

(Report from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne.)

The following letters from two realists to the Campaign Director should stimulate greater interest in the fight, and we hope will also encourage a greater response to our appeal for funds. The first letter says, "I am in full sympathy with your efforts and am doing my best to influence my neighbours to vote 'No.' Please let me have your literature as soon as possible to enlighten the people of the danger ahead. Enclosed find 10/- to help the fight. —Yours faithfully, Arthur W. Truscott." The next reads thus: "I saw your appeal, and herewith forward a £5 note, which I trust will reach you safely and help in the struggle for our liberty. —Sincerely yours, R. Vanderway." The following is the progressive list of donations to the referendum campaign: (Previously acknowledged, £28/15/-) S. W. Butler, 10/-; J. Gerrard, £1; C. C. Raymond, £2; J. Stewart, 10/-; Mrs. Starrick, 10/-; A. Sandow, 10/-; A. Truscott, 10/-; R. Vanderway, £5; J. Taylor, £1. (Total, £41/5/-.) The United Electors of Australia will be pleased to add your name to the list. What about it?

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

negotiating with Japan to alienate 4000 square miles of the Victoria River in the Northern Territory of Australia, on condition that five persons to the square mile were settled on the land within five years, i.e., 20,000 Japanese. The Charles Kingston Government of South Australia made such representation that the proposal was abandoned, so, the "White Australia" Policy was preserved. Having regard to the Japanese reproduction rate, had this proposal been implemented Australia would not today be governed by Australians; and yet there are people in our midst today seeking to revive the peril we so narrowly escaped. Such persons need close watching.

"HOME-FRONT HITLERISM": Another sign of resistance to "Home-Front Hitlerism" is the fact that strong opposition has been aroused by the action of taxation snoopers interrogating two Sydney men who invested £500 and £200 in the Victory Loan. (It appears that the money was paid in cash, which prompted the investigation.) Both victims were naturally indignant at this Gestapo-like action, and brought criticism on the deputy tax-gatherer, who said, "investigations on loan investors were purely routine." In other words, in addition to paying taxes for bond investors' pensions, taxpayers are also compelled to pay for the upkeep of a special "Gestapo" bureau for espionage purposes.

RABBITS' RUSES: Brer Rabbit appears to be conspiring to defeat the Planners, judging from the following report from Mr. Dedman, as spokesman for the C.S.I.R., viz.: "Large-scale tests to destroy rabbits by infecting them with a disease known as Myxomatosis have been carried out, but the plan has been upset because when the rabbits get sick they prevent spreading the disease by leaving the warren and wandering off alone"—such to the disgust of the Planners, who seem determined to destroy our abundant meat supplies. Fancy the Planners not knowing that sick animals (when free) always leave the herd.

FRENZIED FINANCE: Treasury figures show war expenditure equals £411,509,000 to March 31; of this total only £109,662,000 was met from taxation, while £301,847,000 was obtained from loan funds. So we see that even the present crippling taxation only pays for just a little over one-third of the war. Imagine the position if, as some people suggest, the war was financed from taxation exclusively. Nobody would have any money left. Then, if the war became more costly, we would have to "call it a day"—or else simply manufacture more money, as is being done right now. Which would YOU prefer?

WARNING WORDS: Addressing the Constitutional Club (reports the Melbourne Herald of March 27) economist Coombs, defending the "Powers Plot," said: "Restrictions to be imposed after the war may mean freedom." So, as the Russians were told 25 years ago, we must have regimentation and restriction in order to have freedom! Surely that form of trickery will not register here. Another suspicious phrase he used was, "in the past the people had the right to choose their own job," and please note the past tense, "had." Now, Evatt, Coombs and Ross have let the cat out of the bag, and there's no longer any doubt that a "yes" vote at the referendum would mean stark industrial conscription. —O.B.H.

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 !!

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.

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere every week are as follows:

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"New Times," April 21, 1944----- Page 3

U.N.R.R.A. & NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

"It would be supreme irony for us to win victory, and then to inherit world chaos simply because we were unprepared to meet what we know we shall have to meet. We know the human wants which will follow liberation," said President Roosevelt, "sending" the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration last November, and Mr. Roosevelt's speeches are reputed to be supervised by Mr. Robert Sherwood, the playwright, whose works are a persuasive combination of uplift with popular appeal.

But DO we know these human wants? And if we may discern them at the good common level of food and medical supplies which Mr. Roosevelt instances in his speech rather than the complete economic replanning which the disgruntled "Economist" would prefer to read into the name, is this necessarily a reason for over-riding fundamental national sovereignties and interests by a supra-national body over which the people of both liberating and liberated countries have no control?

U.N.R.R.A. is claimed as "democratic" because it works by Committees. So it does—by a coven of committees which to attain any efficiency must eventually hand back the power of direction either to one of themselves or to the executive!

The machinery set up consists of firstly, a Council on which all the member nations of U.N.R.R.A. are represented (at present they number 44). The function of this Council is to "make" policy. Secondly, a standing Central Committee, comprising representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Soviet Russia and China, with the Director-General of U.N.R.R.A. as Chairman (without a vote). The business of this Committee is to make decisions—which must be unanimous—and to report to the Council, which may by a majority vote reverse these decisions, the Central Committee is responsible for the appointment of executive personnel. It will initiate schemes, call for supplies and engage such transport facilities as may seem possible. The Director-General, head Executive, reports to the Central Committee and to the Council. There are also the Supplies Committee; Regional Committees to advise the General Council on activities in different zones of operation; the Technical Standing Committee on Repatriation, and others.

All these committees are not so much international as supra national.

At present there are two Regional Committees, the European Committee, which will sit in London under the Chairmanship of Colonel Llewellyn, Minister of Food, and the Far Eastern Committee. Within the European zone, the decisions of the European Regional Committee as to the needs and allocations of supplies to each country override the decisions of all countries (member or otherwise) within that zone. Similarly, the Supplies Committee works closely with the Combined Boards—the Combined Food Board, the Combined Raw Materials Board and the Combined Production and Resources Board—the bodies at present handling the pooled resources of the Allies and allocating them according to the needs of war.

Now the agreement signed by members of U.N.R.R.A. in Washington expressly stipulates that "all purchases by any of the member Governments to be made outside their own territories during the war . . . shall be made only after consultation with the Director-General, and shall, so far as is practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency."

Hence, this powerful supra-national body controls the access to all available supplies of food and raw materials throughout a great part of the world. That, at least, is

how the blue-print runs. It is a mechanism designed specifically for the purpose of coming between the production of food and raw materials, and its consumption, a function previously reserved (on the grand scale) for the money-mechanism. It is a bankers' trick, which perhaps accounts for the fact that a one-time banker is at its head, and the assertion that it is for the good of all concerned is one that will only be assured by the results attained.

The possibility that this mechanism is devised to achieve other objects than those accepted by its members is suggested by the appointment as Director-General of Mr. Herbert Lehman, Jew, Zionist, banker, Governor of New York, and member of Mr. Roosevelt's 'Brains Trust,' in whom wide powers have been vested.

Does not such an appointment smack more than a little of the melodrama of a Hollywood film? Sir Arthur Salter, who from the school of P.E.P. planning has graduated through the Ministry of War Transport, will be able to show his capacity in a wider field now as he has accepted Mr. Lehman's invitation to join the staff of U.N.R.R.A. at Washington.

The two most powerful sanctions to order and control the people of the world are food and armaments. Hitler is using both: he starves those with whom he disagrees (if he does not shoot them). In wartime both sanctions are under close and centralised control, and the hand, which exercises that control, enjoys stupendous power. In peace-time armaments are outside the rules, and while hitherto food has been controlled indirectly by money, the money trick is now almost played out. Coincidentally there developed this supra-national organisation claiming a broad monopoly of the most vital sanction of peace, undermining national independence, and in practice using the economic difficulties of war to build a false unity, which has been repudiated by the peoples concerned.

U.N.R.R.A. is a powerful weapon which can be turned against its own members and used not only to maintain the continued subservience of Europe (to masters no less unwelcome than Hitler) but the practical fusion of the Allies into a United Nation. In this way it does indeed bridge the gap between war and peace, preserving in peace, by methods of war, the ultimate control of life usually only resigned to the State in times of war. Wars may be fought for life, but what they bring is death; and the methods apt in waging war are not successful in fostering life.

But the individuals ("representatives" of nations) who compose U.N.R.R.A. are fortunately more human than the instrument put into their hands, and the organisation

has deviated somewhat from the rigid blue-print laid down for it, which would have led the 'policy-makers' to an unwelcome policy.

A British representative at the conference suggested that nations with the money and the shipping should be allowed to buy for their own use outside U.N.R.R.A.—thus preserving their right to do the best they could for their own people and to define and negotiate that best. The Director-General of U.N.R.R.A., no doubt seeing his last sanction over the members vanishing, remarked that the adoption of this suggestion would turn U.N.R.R.A. into a mere debating society.

Finally a compromise was reached and these countries (e.g., France and Holland) are to be entitled to approach the Combined Boards direct, but U.N.R.R.A. is to have the right of veto if this results in unfair distribution of supplies.

National sovereignty, in fact, is still alive, and seems to be kicking the planners harder than they bargained for.

The "Economist" observed of the plans laid down at Atlantic City:—

"As far as can be gathered from the published reports, nothing in the plans laid down at Atlantic City foreshadows a more constructive, co-operative and unified European economy. At every point, the emphasis has been laid on national sovereignty, on sovereign independence, on the authority of Governments each in its own circumscribed territorial sphere. A suggestion was put forward by one of the British delegates that all inland transport of supplies in Europe should be put under an international authority, for the experience of the last war had shown that, without some unified control, it was impossible to distribute goods according to the most immediate need. It does not appear that any such authority is envisaged. Similarly, the provision of medical relief—the sphere in which, above all, immediate need should determine the method of operation—may be made dependent on the consent of the local authority.

"Much more serious is the reported decision, to take the second 'R' out of U.N.R.R.A. Rehabilitation is not to be the concern of the Administration. It will have no power to consider or initiate long-term schemes of recovery. It will have no word to say about their financing or their dovetailing with other schemes in neighbouring areas . . . Obviously local Governments must continue to exercise proper authority. But what is 'proper authority' in this sphere? Has nothing been learnt from the chaotic economic nationalism of the twenties and thirties? It may be said that U.N.R.R.A. is not a fit instrument for building up international institutions in Europe. To this the only answer is that it could have been, if the goal of international collaboration had been properly envisaged from the start."

The Atlantic City meeting was poorly reported in this country, and it seems as if the silence was intended to muffle the shock of other more revolutionary conclusions than those which have yet been made known. That is not to say that U.N.R.R.A. is not still a dangerous weapon against national, and so individual, sovereignty; but the task to which it is set has been modified, and other agencies must be developed to achieve the drastic, extreme "underpinning of greater (political) unity" by economic means, advocated by the planners.

—Elizabeth Edwards, in the "Social Creditor," England, January 8, 1944.

THE GOLD CLIQUE

(To the Editor)

Sir,—The survey of the post-war position of gold recently issued by Mr. M. F. Toy reveals the United States, as the dominant holder of gold, and the gold-producing countries, as a clique more than likely to endeavour to control the world's "mode of exchange" in the near future.

Some years ago I had a quite unique opportunity of most thoroughly discussing matters financial with Lord Stamp. He candidly admitted that the fearful business slump in the '90's, when it was said that grass would grow in the streets of Bradford, was entirely due to the shortage of gold. This slump disappeared when gold became abundant. A little later I travelled to South Africa with Professor Henry Clay, who quite candidly admitted the same influence, but equally candidly admitted that he preferred, the defects of the gold standard to the probable defects of Government control of credit. Today, however, if we candidly investigate into whose hands "gold credit" drifts and the discreditable use made of this credit we must come to the conclusion that nothing can be worse.

Surely we have come to the time when democratic governments must take into their own hands the "credit to live," in the interests of their own people. Japan, either intentionally or accidentally, did this years ago with the result of which we are all familiar—notwithstanding the endeavour of our financiers to attribute this to cheap wages. Whatever may have to be done with reference to international finance, it is to be hoped that Australia will be strong enough at least to guard her own internal credit.

—Yours, etc., ALDRED F. BARKER, Melbourne, April 13, 1944.

The best Scotch whisky is being sold in the United States at less than half the price paid by the consumer in Great Britain. This is called Lease-Lend in reverse, and is the basis of the New Order.

Some Highlights from "Hansard"

(Continued from page 1.)

voice crying in the wilderness, and I replied that so long as this chamber was a wilderness so far as knowledge of finance was concerned, my voice would be heard. All these years, I have been trying to hammer into the heads of honorable senators opposite the necessity to understand our present financial system, because it is the greatest racket in the world. . . .

"A new order will be brought about by the people themselves. I remember telling an audience of 3000 people in the Melbourne Town Hall that if they thought that the politicians who got the world into this mess could get it out again without any effort on the part of the people themselves, they were due for sad disillusionment.

"The destiny of the people is in the hands of their governments. If we cannot charge world conditions, dreadful as they are, to world governments, to whom can these conditions be charged? We have the most responsible job of anybody on earth, and I am sorry indeed to see this chamber so empty at the present moment. . . ."

"I have quoted Mr. Churchill's statement of what occurred after the last war. It appears now that he favours a return to the gold standard after this war. I ask honorable senators to think seriously about what I have said in regard to gold reserves. I repeat that those reserves are in the hands of private banking institutions.

"Of the huge 'Liberty Loan' which was floated in the United States of America upon the entry of that country into the war in 1917, only 5 per cent, was subscribed by the public. The rest was manufactured in Wall Street by financiers. These are the people to whom the money was owed.

"We have been informed by the press that conferences have been held between the Governments of the United States of America and Great Britain in regard to post-war currency. That is not quite true. It is not the governments that have been conferring, but the private financiers of the two countries. They have decided that we shall return to the gold standard, despite the disastrous results, which followed it after the last war. . . ."

"We have been committed to the same old financial system by the Atlantic Charter and Allied conferences, including the recent conference at Cairo. Unless something is done, events at the end of this war will be a repetition of what happened after the last war."

* * * *

The following on meat rationing, on February 10, is interesting:

Mr. Harrison: "I ask the Prime Minister whether or not his attention has been drawn to the statement by Mr. Hudson, Deputy Director of Rationing in New South Wales, that he proposed to launch a number of prosecutions against certain butchers for having made surplus meat available without the receipt of coupons? Will the right honorable gentleman also state how many thousands of carcasses of mutton fit for human consumption have been sent to boiling-down works instead of finding their way into the homes of the people, because of the fear of such prosecutions being instituted?"

Mr. Curtin: "The statement of the honorable member is, in part, not accurate. As to whether or not Mr. Hudson has made the statement mentioned, I cannot say; but I assure the honorable gentleman that no person in Australia is entitled to be supplied with meat without the presentation of a coupon, unless he or she is resident in an exempt area. That is the law, and it will stand. No butcher is entitled to obtain supplies of meat in excess of what would be a reasonable quota for him to have in order to conform to the reasonable anticipations of his trade. In view of all that has happened, I suggest that those interested parties who seek to destroy meat rationing in this country had better give the matter further thought."

Mr. Curtin's reply is a typical "politician's reply"----- evasive and dishonest. He evades the point about good meat being sent to boiling-down works, and finishes with a threat. Mr. Curtin's attitude on the Rule of Law brings to mind Shylock in Shakespeare's "Merchant of Venice." Shylock "craved the law," even though the enforcement of the law meant the death of a man. Mr. Curtin also craves the law, even if people cannot obtain good meat that is otherwise destroyed.

Some people, of course don't worry about the law, and buy the meat and other food if it is obtainable. Mr. Curtin's Government then sends its snoopers around to catch these "black-marketers" and fine them. We are told that the "new order" is to be based on the "rule of law"—no matter how tyrannical and stupid the law may be.

THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE AT ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS

A DOCTOR ON FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The following are passages from two letters by Dr. C. G. Dobbs in "The Times Educational Supplement" for November 27 and December 11, 1943:—

"An allowance is a money payment made by one individual to another on certain conditions of living, which are not the conditions of a contract of employment freely entered into. It is directed towards controlling the life of the recipient, and is in fact a definite step towards slavery (using the word in the technical rather than the emotional sense). I have never yet met a university teacher, or indeed anyone, who would choose to have his income in conditional rather than unconditional form, although unfortunately the world abounds in people who are anxious to impose conditions upon others.

"The family allowance in particular is intended to encourage the breeding rate of the class of people to whom it is offered. It is a gross insult and impertinence on the part of those who propose to control and dispense this breeding-bribe. Evidently they suffer from an acute Jehovah-complex, imagining that because they have the disposal of other people's money, in their hands they are qualified to control the mode of life and breeding habits of their fellow men.

As applied to university teachers below professorial rank, it is a double insult, since the rate of pay for the majority of these has been notoriously below the minimum necessary for maintaining a family, as well as the cultural amenities necessary if they are to do their work properly.

"Either the work of a university teacher is worth a livelihood, which is therefore owing, or, if it is not, the universities are remarkably worthless institutions and should be closed."

"My dictionary says to bribe is 'to offer or give reward or price to a person in order to influence his conduct in a particular way.' It is beyond cavil that family allowances are intended to 'influence conduct in a particular way'—namely, the pro-

duction of families, or more shortly, breeding. I submit, therefore, that if the society of which Mrs. Hubback* is vice-chairman, exists chiefly to support family allowances, it would be less misleading, though certainly also less persuasive, for it to be called the Breeding Bribe Society, rather than the Family Endowment Society.

"To endow is 'to bestow property upon,' and there is no suggestion of conditions about it. Hitherto families have been built up with no small success on the basis of 'with all my worldly goods I thee endow,' and it is because men are becoming less and less able to endow a family that families are ceasing to exist. In future, if Mrs. Hubback and her friends have their way, it will be 'some of my worldly goods, first confiscated by taxation, will be "allowed" to you, in carefully regulated amount, to the extent that you fulfill the State's requirements in the matter of child-bearing."

"This is no way to treat men and women! And furthermore, it will not work. Few people are susceptible to bribery in such a matter. What is required is the restoration of the free choice provided by an unconditional income adequate to support a family, but capable of being spent in other ways. . . ."

"This free choice has got to be restored if we are to survive as a nation, and no system of bullying and bribery can form a substitute for it. If the people then choose to be sterile, no power on earth can save the community, which they constitute, but I do not believe for a moment that the rot has gone so far. Finally, the suggestion that it is impracticable to pay salaries comparable in purchasing power to those on which families were reared 50 years ago, though it is practicable to wage the most expensive war in history, does not make sense to me."

*Mrs. Hubback, vice-chairman of the Family Endowment Society, had replied in "The Times Educational Supplement" of December 4 to Dr Dobbs first letter.