

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.

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.)

EVERY FRIDAY

# THE NEW TIMES

PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 10. No. 32.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 11, 1944

Registered at the G. P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

## "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.

# How Canberra Uses Power It Has Already

## Blue-Print For Brave New World?

By W. J. CARRUTHERS

The great hall was filled with the new rulers from all parts of the country. They were gathered there to discuss with the official Government the new 5-year plan to be imposed on the people. A speaker with a thin nasal voice was addressing the concluding remarks of his speech to them, and his words were as follows:

"It might be as well to be realistic about this great programme, as it might happen that when provision is made for these works they might not be a form of employment acceptable to some people. We are not going to develop this country if every man thinks he has to see the Town Hall clock every day and hold the hand of his wife every night." (Loud applause.)

No readers, you are wrong; that was not Comrade Stalin addressing the Council of Soviets, but Comrade Chifley, Commissar for Post-War Reconstruction, speaking at the Trades Union Conference in Melbourne, in June, 1944. Note his words, if they do not mean industrial conscription, then plain English words have ceased to have a definite meaning.

Now for a little past history of Comrade Chifley. He was a member of the whitewashing expedition commonly known as the

Royal Commission on Banking (1935-6). He was therefore one of the gentlemen chiefly responsible for confirming the terrible and tragic financial policy which forced hundreds of thousands of Australians to bankruptcy and the dole during the depression. Neither by word or action, as far as I am aware, has he given any clue that he disagreed with the fundamentals of that policy. In 1940 he again became a Member of Federal Parliament. When Curtin assumed office in 1941 he was made

Treasurer of the Commonwealth, presumably on the grounds of his experience of questions of financial policy whilst a member of the Royal Commission on Banking. As could be expected from his past associations, his policy as Treasurer has been one of further enslaving the community to the debt and taxation system. In fact, after his prototype in New Zealand, he has the "honour" of imposing the highest taxation, among Allied nations, on the lower income groups!

He now also holds the portfolio of Minister for Post-War Reconstruction. Unlike most politicians (on his own say-so) he shuns publicity. This puts him in line with most of the really big boys in power politics and high finance.

We are therefore justified, by an examination of his past and a recent utterance (Nov., 1943: "After the war we must have heavy tax rates and more direct and positive controls"). In saying that here we have a gentleman in a key position who will look at all problems from the point of view of orthodox finance. Now, realising that "finance is government and government is finance," the important part to be played by Mr. Chifley and his Treasury in the establishment of the Brave New World will be appreciated.

I have deliberately gone into some detail about Mr. Chifley because I wish to show in unmistakable terms the true meaning and the significance of his remarks to the Trade Union Conference. Because of Mr. Chifley's position they are a most important guide to the post-war policy of the present Government.

Now, the corner-stone of that policy revolves around the two words "employment and unemployment." In regard to employment and unemployment there is a factor which must not be overlooked. Let me give just one example within my own experience as a production manager. It is my function to produce goods required by the community with the least possible expenditure of energy, both human and mechanical.

One process line we are now doing would have required the labour of 60 persons be-

fore the war. We are now doing it with 23 persons! But that is not all. I have plans and specifications drawn up by an industrial engineer to DOUBLE the present output with only 11 persons employed!

I therefore state as a fact that unemployment will be a permanent feature of our society, and further, that it will progressively increase in proportion to the degree that we apply science and mechanism to our productive processes. In the light of this vital fact we must judge the goodness or otherwise of Government policy. Have we any evidence of the present Curtin Labor Government's policy in this matter? We have. On the 5th of April this year, 1944, assent was given to the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act, to take effect in July, 1945. In this Act we have a clear-cut statement of Government policy which has actually become the law of our land. Remember, what men have done is far more important than what they say they are going to do.

Now let us look at some of the provisions of that Act:

SECTION 8: "(1) The Director-General may, by writing under his hand, delegate to the Assistant Director-General, to a Deputy Director, to a Registrar, or to any other person all or any of his powers and functions under this Act, except this power of delegation, so that the delegate may exercise the powers and functions specified in the instrument of delegation." This simply means the Director-General can delegate his authority to any other person.

SECTION 12: "(1) The Director-General, the Assistant Director-General, a Deputy Director or a Registrar may, for the purposes of the Act—(a) summon witnesses; (b) receive evidence on oath; and (c) require the production of documents. (2) A person who has been summoned to appear before the Director-General, the Assistant Director-General, a Deputy Director or a Registrar shall not without lawful excuse and after tender of reasonable expenses fail to appear in obedience to the summons. Penalty: £20. (3) A person, whether summoned

(Continued on page 2.)

## A Significant Statement by Dr. Evatt

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

Sir,—For some years we have been trying to show the people that unless we get away from control of the world by International Finance we will never be allowed to enjoy any of those improvements we all hope for when the military part of the fighting has been successfully completed.

It has been pointed out repeatedly that it is just foolishness to expect peace and prosperity while we continue to accept conditions which inevitably produce war and poverty. We have now had official word that such conditions are to be continued.

Some of us had hoped that the awakening of the people to the fraudulent nature of the financial system would be sufficiently widespread by now to prevent the calamity, but so far the enemies of humanity SEEM to have beaten us. I use the word "seem" advisedly, because there is a definite stirring which will become more pronounced as time goes on. Even Mr. Dunstan, the Premier of Victoria, shows signs of its influence, for in the "Argus" of 5/8/44 he is reported as follows:—"If ever another depression did come, all the Commonwealth would have to do would be to get rid of the professors who gave unsound advice in the last one and make finance available."

That admission, from a State Premier, is worth noting, and shows that when the fraudulent practices now being indulged

in by the controllers of finance are recognised sufficiently for what they are, the pressure of the people will be such that men in responsible positions will have the fraudulent practices eliminated or will themselves be removed from positions of authority.

So far as those in authority at present are concerned, the Peace is already lost. At Mildura on July 29 Dr. Evatt said this: "We could not possibly hope to cope with the fierce competition for markets for primary produce after the war unless we had unity."

Here is the clearest possible announcement, from one of the senior Ministers of the Commonwealth Government, that instead of having a new and better order as promised, we are to get only a terrific intensification of the pre-war economic struggle—a continuance of the very conditions which produced the present war. In plain language, the statement of Dr. Evatt (which is taken from the Melbourne "Argus" of 31/7/44), means that even though our gallant sons will have won the conflict on the battlefield, those who survive will return to their homeland to find that they have been sabotaged by men in whom they had mistakenly put their trust.

If Dr. Evatt knew the meaning of the words he used, and understood their true implications he has merely admitted in public that the International Financiers have won the war, and suggested that there is nothing we can do about it. His statement means that all the loss of life, all the suffering of the maimed who still live, and all the destruction of material has been in vain. If there is to be fierce competition for markets the war is lost so far as the general multitude are concerned, and this provides further evidence that our criticism of the fooling professors who have been "advising" the Governments for years past has been only too well founded. What is the need for even trying "to cope with the fierce competition for markets for primary produce after the war"? Why are we interested in foreign markets at all? There can be only three legitimate reasons for it and they are—

- (i) to obtain things we need but cannot ourselves produce;
- (ii) to enable us to pay our overseas debts;
- (iii) to assist countries in need of the things we can supply.

None of these reasons calls for "fierce competition." They call only for reasonable

(Continued on page 3)

## A "Spanking" Needed

The "Launceston Examiner" (Tasmania) published the following item on July 22 in its feature, "Stories from Here and There: From a Reporter's Notebook," under the sub-heading, "Tell Tale":—

My dad, like a lot of other dads have done, once reprimanded and spanked me when I was a small boy for "telling tales." My brothers and my sister tore around the house chanting "tell-tale."

My one and only lapse into this despicable habit was well and truly cured.

Few creatures are meaner than the tale carrier, who richly deserves that odious name, "pimp." Now I see that the admonishment of our mothers and fathers, teachers and big brothers are to be counted as nought. Apparently unable to catch tax evaders with the swarms of officials, detectives, special investigators and what not at his disposal, Federal Taxation Commissioner Jackson, has lifted something from the Nazi technique and is urging people to pimp on anyone they know, or think, has evaded the law. And what is worse, to do it anonymously. In this he is aided and abetted by Treasurer Ben Chifley.

I'm surprised at you, Ben. You, who are now asking us to vote "Yes" in a referendum which you say is to consolidate our democratic rights.

I am afraid that the dads of Messrs. Jackson and Chifley failed in their parental duty and that Masters Jackson and Chifley did not know what it was to be soundly spanked. Someone should do it now.

## NOTES on the NEWS

The following statements by Dr. Evatt appear in Federal "Hansard" for February 11, 1944 (No. 2, pages 148 and 151):—"No additional powers are required to make grants to the States for housing purposes. . . Under Section 96 of the Constitution the Commonwealth can, of course, make grants to the States for carrying out national works on conditions laid down by this Parliament."

**CURTIN'S CONTRADICTION:** In his radio speech on July 25, Mr. Curtin said that (A) the great post-war task would be to find employment, and (B) there would be such a post-war demand for goods that rationing would have to be continued. Here's a poser! Which of these statements (if either) is true? Both certainly cannot be correct: "demand," if backed with purchasing power (money), will automatically provide employment. (Employment without wages would, of course, be useless, since the production could not be exchanged. If the said employment produced adequate consumable goods, the need for rationing would also disappear—and, of course, the "need" for planners.)

**BUILDING BUNGLE:** The secretary of the Carpenters' Union (Mr. Frank), according to the Melbourne "Herald" of July 23, alleges that one of the Housing Commission's types of houses "set a standard in jerry-building that endangers the post-war building programme." As a consequence, the Union threatened they would not go beyond building the frames according to the "approved" specifications. The Housing Commission "experts" refused to comment on the dispute. What uproar there would be if such jerry-building was carried out by private enterprise!

**HOBART HOVELS:** The Hobart City Health Officer (Dr. C. N. Atkin) is reported in the Press of July 15 as saying that "Hobart was experiencing its worst housing shortage; baths and kitchens are being used as sleeping quarters." A canvass among 500 munition employees showed that 28 were living in houses with no baths and 45 were living where kitchens were used for bedrooms. If this continues the position will be as bad as in Russia, where, even before the war, whole families were normally housed in one room—without bath or washing facilities. That's socialism de-luxe, which awaits us unless an emphatic "NO" vote is recorded, on August 19.

**COMMO. CAPERS:** The Sydney "Century" of July 21 says that "an insidious plan has been drawn up by the Commo.

leaders of Marx House to capture the post-war discussion groups being sponsored by the Ministry of Post-War Reconstruction." The paper explains that a secret directive has been issued by the Commo. chiefs to all their followers that they must link up with these discussion groups to (a) capture

(Continued on page 2.)

## Demos in Blunderland

(With apologies to Lewis Carroll.)

"Twas War-Time, and the Expert Boards  
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe;  
All formsy were the Ration Lords,  
And the Yes Men outgrabe.

"Beware the Bureaucrat, my son!  
The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!  
Beware the Evatt bird, and shun  
The Copland Bandersnatch!"

His ballot-paper in his hand:  
Long time the dreaded foe he sought  
So rested he by the Coupon Tree,  
And stood awhile in thought.

And as in uffish thought he stood,  
The Bureaucrat, with eyes of flame,  
Came burbling through the Manpower  
Wood  
Conscripting as it came!

Vote No! Vote No! Down goes the foe  
And Freedom's blade goes snicker-snack!  
Power-Luster's dead, and with its head  
He went rejoicing back.

"And hast thou slain the Bureaucrat?  
Come to my arms, my beamish boy!  
O Coombless day! Lloyd Ross away!"  
He chortled in his joy.

"Twas Peace-Time, and the Canberra boys  
Had learned to do the people's will;  
All powerless were the Professors,  
And the Bureaucrats were still."  
—JUNTUS,  
Melbourne, 5/8/44.

# THAT "FULL EMPLOYMENT" FALLACY

The Doctrine of "Full Employment" was the subject of an address broadcast in March by the Hon. E. C. Manning, Premier of Alberta. His remarks are of special interest in view of the forthcoming Referendum in this country. He said:

To-night I want to discuss a matter of national importance that is fraught with grave consequences for the people of Canada if they blindly accept it as the foundation on which to build their hopes of social and economic security after the war. I refer to the doctrine of "full employment" that is being preached in so many quarters to-day.

## SOME FACTS AND FALLACIES.

I do not think that there will be any disagreement about what is meant by the term "full employment." It simply means a job for everybody who can work, and the absence of unemployment among the employable section of the nation. The doctrine of "full employment" is endorsed without question by the majority simply because throughout the years their experience under our present system has imbued them with the idea that a job and a meal ticket are inseparably bound up together.

In fact, under the present economic system, there is usually no way in which a man can obtain an income other than by "earning a living" and by means of employment through which he receives a wage, a salary or a profit for his services.

Then, again, many take it for granted that it is necessary for everybody to be fully employed in order to produce abundantly and provide the means of ensuring economic security for all. Therefore, they argue, the thing for which we must aim is "full employment."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, neither of these contentions bears any relation to the facts of the situation which we shall have to face after this war.

IN THE FIRST PLACE, "FULL EMPLOYMENT" IN THE ORDINARY SENSE OF THE TERM IS AN ABSOLUTE IMPOSSIBILITY IN PEACE-TIME UNDER OUR PRESENT FINANCIAL SYSTEM. IN THE SECOND PLACE, EMPLOYMENT AS THE SOLE MEANS OF DISTRIBUTING INCOMES IS IN ITSELF A SYSTEM OF ECONOMIC SERFDOM. AND, FINALLY, THE IDEA THAT WE CAN PRODUCE ABUNDANTLY ONLY IF EVERYBODY IS FULLY EMPLOYED IS A COMPLETE FALLACY IN THIS AGE OF SCIENCE AND INVENTION.

I want to deal briefly with these three points, not from any theoretical viewpoint, but rather in the light of our actual experience.

## SHORTAGE OF PURCHASING-POWER.

The years of mass unemployment, "poverty amidst plenty" and restricted production which preceded this war, were, on the evidence of facts, due to and caused by a shortage of purchasing-power. The facts of our experience have proved beyond any doubt the contention of Social Creditors for the past twenty-five years that the present financial system does not, and cannot, distribute sufficient purchasing-power in peacetime to enable the people to buy the goods they can produce.

This being the case, if our present money system is retained, when, after the war, we concentrate our productive resources on producing goods for public consumption, primary producers and manufacturers shortly will again find that they are unable to sell many of their products because the people will have insufficient purchasing-power to buy them. As in pre-war years they will be forced to curtail production. This will cause unemployment, which, in turn, will result in a further reduction of purchasing-power. Consequently, consumption will be restricted still further and unemployment will increase—and we shall enter upon a vicious spiral of depression just as we have experienced in the past and will continue to experience as long as we foolishly permit the present money system to remain the one great bottleneck in our whole economy.

## PUBLIC WORKS NOT A SOLUTION.

If Governments attempt to solve this problem merely by vast public works schemes for the purpose of creating work—but without changing the monetary system—they are doomed to failure before they start. Under our present financial system governments have to obtain the money to finance works projects from taxes levied on the people or by borrowing newly-created money from the banking corporations.

To the extent that the government uses taxation, the purchasing-power of the people generally will be reduced and the proceeds redistributed to those engaged on the public works schemes, but the aggregate purchasing-power of the people will not be increased by one red cent.

To the extent that the government obtains newly-created money by borrowing from the private banking institutions, the incomes paid out through public work schemes will be additional purchasing-power. This will help to "bridge the gap," and enable the people, temporarily, to buy more of the national production.

But it is surely obvious that this does not solve the problem. It merely pushes it into the future, for government debt is merely deferred taxation. Under our present monetary system such debt carries interest charges in addition to provision for the repayment of the principle sum. Obviously, a government can go on piling up debt only for a limited time.

When the interest and redemption of principal exceeds the amount which can be borrowed to keep the system going, the whole financial and economic structure will come crashing down in ruins.

That is but one of the dangerous features of this erroneous idea that unemployment can be permanently eliminated by the State providing employment through vast public works schemes to be paid for with borrowed money.

## DO YOU WANT NATIONAL SOCIALISM?

Consider also this fact: If a man is faced with the alternative of destitution or having to work under conditions imposed upon him by a State authority, he, in effect, becomes a creature of the State. Such a condition carried to its logical conclusion leads to the Supreme State of totalitarianism.

Nazi-Germany is a horrible example of a country in which unemployment was eliminated in peace-time by a system of State employment. It was done by the simple process of making every citizen the slave of the State and by forcing him to do the bidding of State officials operating a vast scheme of planned production, public works and preparation for war. The outcome was to make the German people a nation of abject slaves to "the lords of the Nazi party."

Now consider the second point I mentioned a few moments ago. If the primary purpose of work is to provide a meal ticket for the workman rather than to produce needed goods and services, then our system of work and wages becomes a means whereby the individual is forced to submit to the standard of life and working conditions imposed on him as a condition of being allowed to exist. In other words, if the average citizen is forced to accept the work, wages and conditions imposed upon him as an alternative to economic destitution, he is in reality a SLAVE, however fervently he may sing, "O Canada, Glorious and Free."

My second point, therefore, is that work and wages as the sole means of obtaining a meal ticket or the right to live is simply a system of economic mass slavery.

## ABUNDANCE FOR ALL WITHOUT FULL EMPLOYMENT

The third point I mentioned earlier was that it is a complete fallacy to imagine that optimum production necessarily means "full employment" as we know it. The outstanding feature of our modern power-driven industrial system is that it is an "unemployment-creating system." With each advance in technical knowledge and scientific discovery, newer and better methods are devised for using huge power-driven machines to replace man-power in the various processes of production. The following figures, given by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as long ago as 1926, are typical of industry as a whole:

- 1 man, with 1 bottle-making machine, replaces 54 men.
- 1 girl, with 6 rib-cutting machines, replaces 25 girls.
- 2 men, with 1 coal conveyer, replace 50 men.
- 1 man, with 1 window-glass machine, replaces 20 men.
- 1 man, with 1 cigarette-wrapping machine, replaces 100 men.

Under the stimulus of war, tremendous progress has been made in improving power-driven production methods. In fact, here in Canada, we have MORE THAN DOUBLED our pre-war production—with the cream of man-power in the fighting forces! It is just fantastic nonsense to imagine that after the war industry and commerce can begin to provide "full employment" for the nation.

What then is the answer to this problem? I suggest that there is a very simple answer—if we only approach the matter from a common-sense point of view.

## THE REAL OBJECTIVES WE WANT.

We must keep clearly in mind the real objectives we wish to achieve—namely, the maximum personal security AND the maximum personal freedom for all. This means that we must produce all the goods and services people want up to the limit of our productive resources, and distribute these equitably and in a manner which will ensure full economic security and the greatest freedom for all. If we use improved methods and vast power-driven machines to replace man-power in the fields of production and distribution, we will have provided all the physical requisites for economic security for all, while at the same time leaving men and women free to follow those pursuits which make for the greatest possible measure of human happiness, culture and development.

This goal can be attained only if we make it possible for all to share in the benefits of mechanised production. Only thus can the shifting of the burden of toil from the backs of men to machines be made a blessing and not a curse.

In other words, if 100 men are displaced by machines and then are left to face destitution because they have no income with which to buy the products of the machines that displaced them, they are worse off than before. On the other hand, if they were provided with purchasing-power by the State, sufficient to enable them to buy the products of the machines that displaced them, then the machines would be to them a blessing instead of a curse. Surely when we are able to produce an

abundance of goods to assure a high standard of living for all, it is not beyond our ability to rearrange the distribution of our national income in such a way as to ensure an adequate supply of purchasing-power to each and every one of our people.

## THE SOCIAL CREDIT PROPOSALS.

The Social Credit proposals are designed to accomplish this objective and to do so without any violent dislocation of our national life.

First, by providing adequate money or credit to enable primary producers, manufacturers and distributors to produce all the goods required by the people.

Second, by supplementing the national income to ensure that the people will always have sufficient purchasing-power to buy all the goods available for their use. And:

Third, by distributing this additional purchasing power through a system of national dividends which will supplement wages and salaries and ensure economic security AND INDEPENDENCE to all.

This will enable the people themselves to control their wages, working conditions, economic policy and all the other essential features of their economic life.

## ERIC BUTLER TO GIVE SPECIAL TALK IN SYDNEY

Mr. Eric B. Butler will give a special pre-Referendum address to campaigners at the Electoral Campaign Centre, 296 Pitt Street, Sydney, on Wednesday next, August 16, at 8 p.m. This will be his last opportunity before leaving Sydney to speak to a meeting of actionists in that city, so he will also be taking the opportunity of saying farewell. Those who have arranged the meeting cordially invite all Sydney supporters of the "New Times" to be present on this special occasion.

## PAMPHLET BY BRUCE BROWN ON REFERENDUM PROPOSALS

Mr. Bruce H. Brown's recent series of letters to the editor, dealing with the Referendum proposals has been re-printed, after some unavoidable delays, in the form of a large 8-page pamphlet. Advance orders, especially those from inter-State and country readers, are being quickly fulfilled, and all parcels should be in the post by to-morrow (Sat. August 12) when those Melbourne readers who have not arranged for a supply to be posted to them may expect to have their first opportunity of buying copies of this very potent pamphlet at the "New Times" Office.

## "NO" CAMPAIGN MEETINGS

The following four public meetings will be addressed by Mr. F. C. Paice:—

Coburg Town Hall (Concert Hall), Friday, August 11, 8 p.m.

Chelsea Theatre, Sunday, August 13, 8 p.m.

Prahran Town Hall, Tuesday, August 15, 8 p.m.

Gardenvale, Murphy Street Hall, Thursday, August 17, 8 p.m. (Debate with G. L.

# How Canberra Uses Power It Already Has

(Continued from page 1.)

Dethridge.)

or not, who appears before the Director-General, the Assistant Director-General, a Deputy Director, or a Registrar shall not—(a) refuse to be sworn as a witness or to make an affirmation; (b) fail to answer any question which he is lawfully required to answer; or (c) fail to produce any document which he is lawfully required to produce. Penalty: £50." This Section gives the Director-General the authority of an established court of law. Remember the warning of Lord Hewart (English Chief Justice) about this in his "New Despotism."

SECTION 15: "Subject to this Act every person (not being a person in receipt of, or qualified to receive, a pension) who—(c) satisfies the Director-General that he—(i) is unemployed and that his unemployment is not due to his being a direct participant in a strike; (ii) is capable of undertaking and is willing to undertake, work which in the opinion of the Director-General, is suitable to be undertaken by that person—shall be qualified to receive unemployment benefit." Trade unionists please note Clause (i). Here is a further social penalty against an individual who strikes to rectify a just grievance. Comment on Clause (ii) will be left until we consider Section 45.

SECTION 20: The scale of benefits under Section 20 are £1/5/- per week for a single person, and £2/5/- per week for a man and wife, plus 5/- per week if they have one or more children under the age of 16 years. Please note the munificence of this hand-out! Would YOU care to exist on it? Perhaps you begin to see the importance of Mr. Chifley and the Treasury.

SECTION 45: "If, in the opinion of the Director-General any claimant or beneficiary should—(a) undergo a course of training in any occupation; (b) submit himself for examination at any medical, psychological or other like institution; (c) receive any medical or other treatment; (d) undergo any course of training for the improvement of his physical or mental capabilities; or (e) do any work required of him, the Director-General may direct that payment of benefit to that person shall be subject to the condition that he shall comply with the requirements of the Director-General in respect of any such matter." Read and re-read this Section. Never in my wide experience of politics have I ever seen so much control over the life of a human being written in so few words. This is complete control, body and soul, by an official over any individual who is unfortunate

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

them outright, (b) use them as channels for disseminating Communist propaganda. Strict instructions have been issued to Commos, that they must disguise and submerge their Party membership for this purpose. It is to be hoped that those who realise the evils of Communism also join these groups and help to save the innocent members from being duped.

**POWERS PERIOD:** The "Powers" proposal is supposed to be for a period of five years after the war, but the question is, "When does the war end?" The 1914-18 war did not officially end until 1920, the Government could withhold the declaration ending the war indefinitely; in turn such action would delay the commencement of the Powers period, and thus make it operative for even twenty or more years. The more the Referendum proposals are studied the more dangerous they are found to be and if they are passed, the end of freedom may well arrive before the official end of the war for freedom.

**COURT CENSURE:** A recent decision given by Mr. J. L. Kent, P.M., at the Mildura court of petty sessions, arising from "national security" regulations, brought the following comment from Mr. Justice Gavan Duffy: "The decision was a violent departure from settled principles of common law by changing the burden of proof." Justice Gavan Duffy upset the decision, which was another illustration of administrative lawlessness so often met in the lower courts.

**CANBERRA CRAZE:** Mr. Lewis C. Burns is reported in the Press as having struck a true and appropriate note when he made the following observations: "The prevailing craze seems to be for economists and scientists; we have managed to survive from Bolsheviks, Fascists and Nazis, so perhaps we may be able to do the same from these other 'ists.'" Well, let's hope we will escape these "ists," which are behind the plot to trick the people into a "Yes" vote on "D" day (Democracy, day), and may all the "ists" be confounded—especially the bureaucratic and financial sadists.

**BARTER BLUFF:** Lord Keynes was reported to have warned the U.S. bankers that if the world bank fund were rejected Britain might have resorted to barter agreements (as Germany did) to, protect her world trade position. That's the only real bluff to throw at the money riggers. Whereas barter is not practicable on a small internal basis, it is quite practicable with large-scale commodity transactions, either between countries or between individuals within nations. Barter would cut right across the bankers' racket. Needless to say Keynes was not really serious.

## HOW VERY CONDESCENDING

"Dr. Levisstein said he was sure that the various powerful interests which controlled the processes from coal or oil to the finished product would be broad and tolerant in their views."

—London "Times" report.

There, there, Clarence; didn't we tell you to trust the kind gentlemen?

enough to be dependent on this miserable hand-out. Read it in conjunction with Clause (ii) of Section 15 and you can see how Mr. Chifley intends to get the workmen, for "these works which might not be a form of employment acceptable to some people."

SECTION 46: "The Director-General may require any person whom he believes to be in a position to do so to furnish to him a confidential report relating to any matter which might affect the payment of benefit to any other person, and a person so required shall not fail to furnish a report accordingly within a reasonable time, and shall not furnish a report which is false or misleading in any particular. Penalty: £50 or imprisonment for 3 months." This is the "compulsory snooping" Section. Parents could be compelled to make a report on their own son or daughter—any refusal involving a penalty of £50 or 3 months imprisonment! Do you see any connection between this Section and one of Mr. Chifley's chief officers (Mr. Jackson, Taxation Commissioner) in a national broadcast telling listeners to snoop on people whom they believed to be tax dodgers? Howlike the Gestapo!

Fellow Australians, this thing smells to high heaven, it stinks with the stench of the Servile State. What are we going to do about it? First of all vote NO on August 19. Don't give more power to these gentlemen, already corrupted by power. Secondly, we must in the very near future organise a campaign to force Federal Parliament to repeal this offensive Act and replace it with one which will provide for payment of a basic income as a right to every adult, whether employed or not. This threat of the Servile State is a challenge to all of us. We must fight it with all we have. We have the technique of the Electoral Campaign, if we will only use it. In conclusion, I leave you with William Cobbett's definition of Freedom: "Freedom is not an empty sound; it is not an abstract idea; it is not a thing that nobody can feel. It means . . . the full and quite enjoyment of your own property. If you have not this, if this be not well secured to you, you may call yourself what will, but you are a slave."

[Editor's Note: Copies of the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act (No. 10 of 1944) can be obtained at 8d. per copy from the Government Printer, Canberra, A.C.T. Melbourne readers can also obtain copies from The Law Book Co. 475 Little Collins-street Melbourne.

# "THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION"

By C. H. DOUGLAS (Continued from last issue.)

In view of the urgency of the situation with which they deal, chapters from Major Douglas's forthcoming book are being printed in abridged form in the "Social Creditor," whose publisher's Australian representative has given special permission to reprint them in this country. Below is the second part of Chapter 2:

Perhaps the most useful phrase in the lexicon of the world-planner or planner is "common ownership." To the simple man "common ownership" means ownership divided amongst common men, of whom he counts himself. But any lawyer would tell him that common ownership means transfer of control to an administrator, who, in theory, distributes the usufruct (not the thing commonly owned, which must on no account be touched by any one of the common owners). You, reader, are a common owner of the Post Office, which is nationalised. Go into the nearest branch and remark that you will take your share of office pens, collect all the pens in sight, and move for the door. You will receive a lesson in common ownership.

You may now observe that as you are a common owner, either you ought to be served by the Post Office free of charge, or alternatively, obtain your share of the usufruct in the form of a handsome dividend. The shareholders of the Bell Telephone Companies of America, which are not nationalised, do obtain such a dividend. The service is better, cheaper, and more flexible. There is an underground attack on the Bell Telephone system exactly similar to the attack on dividends in this country. If successful, which is unlikely, the American public will pay more for its telephones, receive no dividends, and get worse service. But they will be "common owners."

The distinction between joint shareholders and "common owners" should be noted. You will be told, not merely by large "capitalists," but by their ostensible antagonists, the Labour-Socialists, that monopolies are inevitable, competition is wasteful, and industry demands large units on the score of efficiency. You will be perhaps puzzled to find that the conflict in the economic world is not so much between cartels, monopolies and nationalised industry and property, as between all three and small businesses and privately owned property.

Let us not jump to conclusions. It is not difficult, as we shall see, to identify monopolisation, in its varying forms of cartel, "public corporation" on the model of the "B.B.C.", the London Transport Board, or the Tennessee Valley Authority, or outright State ownership of the Russian type, as being a policy, not an automatic and inevitable process, as we are asked to believe. That by itself does not condemn it although it does put it on the defensive. We are concerned to know whether the New Order is better, for the majority, than the Old. Let us begin by examining its claim to "efficiency."

In the days when London Clubs enjoyed a certain prestige, it used to be said of one of them that it was highly thought of by those who didn't belong to it. The word "efficiency" appears to have the same fascination to those numerous people who don't know its meaning, and believe it to be an adjective, rather than an abstract noun.

Efficiency, contrary to this widespread idea, is something capable of exact definition under certain circumstances, and completely meaningless in the absence of them. Generalised in a form suitable for application to political economy, it means the measure of success in exchanging something which you are prepared to sacrifice, for something which you prefer. It is clear that to have a meaning in political economy, you must have a unit common to "sacrifice" and "preference."

For example, fifty years ago, the British Railways were the finest in the world. It would be almost impossible to decide how efficient they were, but if your "preference" was rapid, frequent and comfortable travel, and your "sacrifice"

was monetary, you obtained a high degree of "preference" for a small amount of "sacrifice." To say that all their conditions of employment were ideal would be absurd. Yet employment by them was highly coveted.

Nowadays, the British Railways are "rationalised," i.e., approaching an absolute monopoly, and there is scarcely a graduate or professor of the London School of Economics who would not explain to you how much more efficient they are (we are considering, for the moment, pre-war conditions. The fares and rates were nearly double and the railways were agitating for more, the speeds were in the main lower than at the beginning of the century, and the service was less frequent, more congested, and was definitely deteriorating. The restaurant services were expensive and inferior in contrast to the high standard and low charges of the old companies).

It is not difficult to see that the flat contradiction between the opinion of the man in the street, or the morning train, and that of the London School of Economics is due to a failure to agree on the object for which railways exist, and, more subtly, whether that object can be pursued without incommensurate loss. From the point of view of the traveller, the consumer, policy has been consciously and continuously directed to lower efficiency. From the point of view of the London School of Economics since monopoly is the objective, the efficiency has gone up in proportion to the centralisation of control and the expropriation of the shareholders. The average railway employee is now more concerned with politics than with railways.

Notice that this call for "efficiency" is pursued in the face of many contradictions and without definition of objectives.

Superficially, the contradictions appear almost naive. It is not twelve years ago since the whole world was ringing with the cry of "over-production," and sabotage and destruction of almost every description was in progress. But it should be remembered that ALL THE EFFICIENCIES SPONSORED BY THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND ITS FABIAN-PLANNING ASSOCIATES AIM AT RESTRICTION OF PRODUCTION FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE CONSUMER, in precisely the same manner that the grouped railways have restricted production (services) under the stress of propaganda for efficiency.

It may be convenient at this point to clarify an important factor which is often overlooked. The modern world in which we live derives its material character from technological advance in the industrial arts. It derives its social and political character to an increasing extent, from Socialist-Communist propaganda in the State schools and the Universities deriving their funds through endowments from shadowy "benefactors" whose policy is the complement of the Marxian Socialist. Nothing could be further from the truth than to imagine that such advance as has been made in civilised life has any connection with social and political progress. On the contrary, the prime objective of Socialism and Cartelism is to batten on the technological advance to which it has contributed nothing, and to prevent this advance from achieving, as unrestricted it would have achieved, the emancipation of the human race from bondage. The more completely centralised in political organisation such countries as Germany and Russia have become, the more obviously technological advance has, firstly, failed to benefit the general public, next, shown clear signs of itself coming under the law of diminishing returns, and finally, like a powerful drug misused, has plunged the world into convulsions of war and revolution.

## A WARNING TO DOCTORS & PATIENTS

(Concluded from last issue.)

Here is the concluding portion of the tenth bulletin issued by the Medical Policy Association (London), preceding parts of which embody an analysis of the White Paper published earlier this year by authority of the British Minister of Health:

### THE DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

The real difficulty in medical services lies in the matter of availability, and this, in turn, is fundamentally a financial question. What the individual patient wants is to be able to go to his own doctor privately and of his own choice. There is no need to impose "positive" health on a well-fed properly housed, normal, happy human being; he will go to his own doctor soon enough if he has the money. It cannot be supposed that the desire for what private practice offers is confined to those who can pay for it.

The problem, therefore, is to combine the advantages of private practice with such increased hospital and technical facilities as may be necessary, and to make them as widely available as possible. This is primarily a matter of making suitable financial arrangements, and has nothing to do with the creation of a Central Authority with dictatorial powers. Financial stringency is simply the excuse for that seizure of power by the

bureaucracy anticipated in "Freedom and Planning." As we have seen in the case of the voluntary hospitals, financial stringency can be created.

Democracy begins at home: the first necessity for the Profession is to secure a democratic decision on policy, not method. The profession and the people must control the policies of their respective Executives and the only fundamental question is FREEDOM OR SERVITUDE. The White Paper is merely one of the possible plans to implement the policy of servitude; the Executive had a different one. It is not democracy to be forced to choose between alternative methods of entering into servitude. Since the M.P.A. plebiscite has definitely revealed the true policy of the Profession it is on that policy that the executive must base its further actions.

The principles underlying the policy of freedom for both doctor and patient may be simply stated; but a full plan would require another White Paper. The B.M.A. should produce one. The M.P.A. is willing to provide every assistance to the Execu-

tive when it is willing to change its policy from advocating a Central Authority to a democratic policy of freedom. Some principles are—

(1) Individual doctors to be responsible directly and only to their individual patients within the frame-work of the Common Law and under the traditional surveillance of the General Medical Council.

(2) Private fees to be paid by patients in receipt of an income, but a system of subsidy from the insurance fund to be applied so as to limit the total fees to be paid in any year to a maximum varying with income.

(3) Voluntary hospitals to be subsidised from insurance funds, and control to be vested absolutely in their individual managements.

(4) New hospitals contemplated in the White Paper to be built and handed over to democratically elected local management, thus securing control of the hospital's policy to the local citizens; the voluntary principle, and local pride in the hospital in the tradition of the great Voluntary Hospitals to be encouraged.

(5) Voluntary contributory schemes entitling participants to free hospital accommodation to be encouraged.

(6) Consultants to be subsidised to take up practice in areas where they are required, and to be appointed to the hospitals on the honorary system.

(7) Impersonal services, such as laboratory and technical facilities, to be provided by the Ministry of Health, financed out of public funds, and giving their services free.

(8) "Positive" health not to be imposed, but normal health and pride in health encouraged by educational policy, good housing, adequate nutrition, and the encouragement of active participation in sport and recreation.

### CONCLUSION

It may be that some members of the Executive of the B.M.A. can not reverse their policy in accordance with the ma-

majority wish of the profession without too great a loss of face. In that case they should resign.

The policy of the majority of doctors is now clearly revealed as "Freedom for doctors as individuals," and it is the duty of the Executive to give effect to that policy for the Executive is the proper body to formulate the details of a plan based on such a policy. A plan for fully available medical services based on an extension of the essentials of private practice to everyone, with access to full hospital accommodation and backed by freely available laboratory and technical resources would be welcomed by the public, and backed by the great majority of the Profession, and especially by the men in the Forces. The true alternative to the White Paper proposals is not merely a different plan for organisation under a Central Authority, any form of which is simply that totalitarian organisation against which we are fighting. The true alternative is a plan to make privacy and freedom of contact available to the greatest possible number. Not levelling down, but raising up.

FINALLY: Doctors who wish to retain their freedom, their personal responsibility and their individual initiative, must make it clear to the Executive that such is their policy, and see that they are given or if necessary make, an opportunity to vote unambiguously on the only fundamental question FOR OR AGAINST CENTRAL AUTHORITY.

The bulletin ends with the following note:—

"It would be of great assistance if those wishing to receive any further bulletins would forward a stamped and addressed envelope, as our secretarial assistance is meagre. A contribution, which need not be large, to our funds would be appreciated and acknowledged."

The address of the Medical Policy Association is 18, Harley Street, London, W.1.

## IS THE PEACE ALREADY LOST?

(Continued from Page 1.)

negotiation and Christian kindness. That our learned Attorney-General could allow himself to express such definite views to the contrary must be due either to his unquestioning acceptance of advice from incompetent advisers, or to his inexplicable readiness to play the game of the international financiers at the expense of his trusting compatriots. This insensate competition for markets hurts all of us except the controllers of finance, but apparently that fact has not yet pierced the skulls of our "professors" and our so-called "leaders." And if we do have "unity," what difference will that make? Does it mean the unity to allow some central authority to impose such working conditions on the men on the land that "costs" will be so reduced that our products can "compete" with the products of countries with slave standards? A lot is being said about employment after the war, but the question of paying for the employment is never mentioned. If wage standards are to be raised and maintained at a higher level, how in the name of all that's reasonable can the costs of primary production be reduced? If costs cannot be reduced, how can we "compete" with other countries unless the Federal Government provides export subsidies? And as the Government can subsidise exports whether we alter the Constitution or not, what is the purpose of this irresponsible talk of Dr. Evatt about "unity"?

There are only four approved ways by which we can obtain things we need from another country, and they may be stated simply as follows:—

(1) By exchanging goods for goods, which is called "barter";

(2) By selling our goods in the other country and using the money obtained for them to purchase the things we want;

(3) By finding gold and sending it to the country from which we desire to obtain goods; and

(4) If our goods are not admitted and we cannot find gold, we may pledge our assets to the foreign financier for some "credit," which we may then use for the purchase of the goods we want.

Barter does not require the use of money, and as it excludes the financier it is frowned upon. This explains why barter is practised to such a very small extent. The other three methods are clearly financial, and if the financial policy of the other country is not favourable to large "imports," then the tariff is manipulated to keep the goods out. Our actual requirements from other countries are so small that whatever quantity of goods may be required as a fair exchange should not have any appreciable effect on the internal economy of those countries. In any case, if our goods are not wanted in another country it is impertinence on our part to try to force them in.

As to making payments on overseas debts, there are only three ways by which this can be done, viz., by shipment of goods, by supplying gold, or by surrendering sovereignty over our territory. Our debts are limited to two countries, the United Kingdom and the United States. We have never received any MONEY from those countries; they have supplied us only with goods. This being so, we should pay back in goods, which we are fully capable of doing and very anxious to do. If our goods will not be accepted, then the debt should be cancelled. If those to whom we are indebted must have gold, then we should do our best to find more gold, offering the highest inducement to our goldminers to increase their output. Beyond this it would not be reasonable to go, and it should be made clear to the

United States that we will not voluntarily surrender our sovereignty in any respect whatever in consideration of debts which we are ready and willing to meet in the normal way.

It should also be made known to the world that we do not wish to join in any fierce competition for markets after the war; that all we seek is (i) an opportunity to obtain bare essentials which we cannot produce locally, in fair exchange for things we can supply; (ii) every facility for clearing our debts as early as possible by the shipment of goods; and (iii) the right to make gifts to countries whose people are in need and who wish to accept such gifts.

The matter is urgent, and two things should be done. Those who agree with the foregoing should so inform their Federal Parliamentary representatives immediately, and efforts to secure a "No" vote on the 19th should be doubled to prevent the imposition on the people of a plan prepared by phoney economists based on false conceptions regarding international relationships.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne C2 6th August, 1944.

### DEBATES AT MALVERN

Returned Soldiers' Hall, High St., Malvern, Monday, August 14, 8 p.m. "No" speaker: Mr. F. A. Parker, B.A., Dip. Ed. "Yes" speaker: Nominee of "Yes" Campaign. "Bambalina," Cr. Glenferrie and Wattle-tree Roads, Malvern, Wednesday, August 16. "No" speaker: Mr. Fred W. Elliott. "Yes" speaker: Mr. Murphy (Communist).

All matter in this issue dealing with the forthcoming Referendum, and not bearing the name and address of the writer, is written to express the editorial view of the "New Times," and legal responsibility for its publication is accepted by H. F. Allsop, McEwan House, Melbourne, C.I.

### PUBLIC LECTURE

"Education for a New Democracy, the Need for a New Spiritual and Philosophical Outlook," will be the title of a Lecture by the Rev. Dr. E. Swan at the New Church, Albert Street, East Melbourne (opp. St. Patrick's Cathedral), on Tuesday evening, August 15 at 8 o'clock. All welcome.

—Adv't

### BANKING EXPERT TO LECTURE ON THE GOLD STANDARD

On Thursday, August 17, at 8 p.m., at the Assembly Hall, 156 Collins Street, Melbourne, the Club of Political Thought has arranged for a well-known banking authority to discuss, "What Is the Gold Standard?"

At the conclusion of the address the audience will have the opportunity of thoroughly questioning the lecturer, Mr. James Murray.

(On and after August 24 the Club will be known as the Forum of National Affairs, this change takes place as it is felt that the name "Political" frightens many people, who would otherwise be interested.)

—Adv't

# INSIDE SOVIET RUSSIA IN PEACE-TIME

(Continued from last issue.)

**"To anyone who wishes to obtain an unbiased and objective view of Soviet Russia, I can recommend the Russian section of 'Looking For Trouble' by the American journalist, Virginia Cowles, who took considerable risks to get away from the spoon-feeding which is the usual treatment of investigators." — C. H. Douglas, in The Big Idea.**

**Here is a fourth instalment from the above-mentioned book: —**

From then on my education began. Every morning, punctually at eleven, a Soviet car (American make), with a middle-aged Russian woman as interpreter appeared, to take me around the city. Not being an economic expert, the figures and statistics showered upon me made little mark; but I was left with vivid impressions—unconnected vignettes that don't fit in anywhere the two peasant women crossing themselves fearfully before riding down the escalator of the Moscow subway; the factory radios blaring propaganda eight hours a day the number of women bending over heavy machines; the doctor at the Railway Workers' Hospital hurrying me past the squalid rooms to show me the magnificent electric baths built by Soviet engineers; the matron in the candy factory leading me across an alleyway, where garbage had been dumped and left to rot, into the packing-room where she called attention to the fact that the workers wore hygienic aprons; the wretched group of peasants waiting in the cold to see the director of a collective farm who was busy compiling statistics for me on the record production of hot-house vegetables.

I saw nothing new. The factories, club-houses and schools I was shown were third-rate imitations of Western progress. All this I had expected; but what I hadn't expected was that I should be asked to marvel at the most commonplace conveniences, as though I had come from a jungle, where even the tick of a clock was an unknown miracle.

For instance, when I visited the Railway Workers' Hospital I was shown a committee room where the doctors met. It was a room with grey and green wallpaper and a long, polished, wooden table, with eight or nine chairs around it. There was nothing to distinguish it from an ordinary committee room anywhere. But the doctor, who was conducting me round, pushed open the door and gazed in rapturously. "Isn't it marvellous!" he exclaimed. "It was decorated entirely by Soviet architects."

It wasn't the enthusiasm for Soviet achievements that surprised me; but the fact that these achievements were presented as unique. I found that misinformation and ignorance of conditions in the outside world grotesque. When I went to the Kaganovitch Bali-Bearing Works, I was shown a shabby canteen where workers could buy snack lunches. One of the women foremen, a twenty-five-year-old Stakonovite, exclaimed over it and gave me a short lecture:

"I suppose you have never seen anything like this before. You see, here in Russia, we believe in the happiness of our workers. First of all, they must be well fed, so we have organised this wonderful canteen. Of course, I know people in capitalist countries laugh at such ideas. But one day they will advance to our way of thinking."

On another occasion, I visited the Modern Art Museums in Moscow. The corridors were swarming with people; groups of soldiers, factory workers and school-children, who were being lectured on the paintings—(carefully interpreted in terms of the "economic conditions" that flourished at the time). My guide, a young woman in her late twenties, commented proudly on the visitors.

"Here in the Soviet Union the museums are open to the workers."

I remarked that in America we, too, had museums and libraries open to the public. "But just for the bourgeois classes."

## PURPOSE OF VOTERS' POLICY ASSNS.

**To the Editor: Sir,—In my letter on V.P.A.'s (June 23) I pointed out that if we have not a clear idea of where we want to go we are likely to go astray. This is of fundamental importance. Those who want to go to, say, Denmark, are at liberty to go there as far as I am concerned, and if I happen to see them well on their way—well, so far so good; but if I happen to know, that they don't want to go to Denmark but heartily desire to go elsewhere, then at least I have a responsibility to indicate the wrongness of their direction. Admittedly, my responsibility ends there.**

Now, I do not for one minute suppose that there is space in your pages, or in the minds of your readers, for idle controversy, and I do not intend to be beguiled into it, but whereas in my letter I stated that "Voters Policy Associations are not Institutes of Public Opinion . . . and we should be well advised to work it out in our own minds exactly what the difference is . . . nor are they Representatives," I see that a correspondent (your issue of July 14) states that "this idea of having local groups for no other purpose than that of conveying the wishes of electors on to the Parliamentarians is fundamentally essential."

In my opinion those statements are contradictory, and I suggest that they should be examined. I may say that I have not reached my conclusions regarding V.P.A.'s in a hurry, and that action taken has proven their validity. I speak not as a theorist I speak of what I know—through my own experience and the experience of my associates—to be correct.

"Oh no. They are open to the public. That means everyone."

"Perhaps you're not sure of your facts," she said gently. "We have studied the problem closely and the Soviet Union is the only country which allows its working people the advantages of culture."

I said no more, and a few minutes later she asked me how long I was staying in Moscow. When I replied only a week or so, she gave me a pitying look. It must be sad for you."

"In what way?"

"Oh I always feel sorry for people who have to return to a bourgeois world. After seeing the comradeship of Russia, it must be difficult to adjust oneself to the greed of capitalist life again. Everything here is an inspiration."

During all these trips I wondered what went through the mind of my interpreter. She was an educated woman who had travelled abroad before the revolution, and much of what we saw and heard must have seemed as naive to her as it did to me. However, I never had any indication of her reactions. She was Madame X—not because she was fascinating in any way—she was just an ordinary, plain, middle-aged woman—but because of the mystery behind her drab life. She shivered in the cold in a cloth coat and a pair of patched gloves. When she appeared in the morning, I always wondered what sort of house she had left, and what kind of life she had led before the revolution. But aside from the fact that she spoke English with an American accent, and told me she had once spent a year or two in Chicago, I never learned anything further about her. She made no attempt to sound my impressions nor to give me propaganda lectures. In fact, she registered nothing: neither surprise, disapproval nor enthusiasm. She talked in a flat mechanical voice that never varied, and to the bitter end remained an enigma.

Only once did she show any interest. That was when I decided to send a telegram to Stalin.

For a brief moment, astonishment crossed her face, then she recovered herself and told the chauffeur to drive to the telegraph station. (When I had asked Mr. Schmidt to make my request through the Press Bureau he had laughed self-consciously and suggested I make the application direct.)

I wrote out my telegram in English and asked Madame X to put it into Russian, but she drew back alarmed, and said it would be better to send it in English. The telegram said:

"Joseph Stalin The Kremlin I wish to call your attention to the fact that you have never been interviewed by a woman journalist since the Soviet Union professes equality between the sexes I should be grateful if I might have the honour to correct the illogical precedent you comma no doubt inadvertently comma have set up."

When I handed the telegram to the girl behind the counter there was a moment of awful silence. She got up and went into consultation with her colleagues. Whispered conferences went on for some time; at last, the manager appeared at the window. "Your telegram," he said stiffly, "will be delivered at the Kremlin in twenty-two-and-a-half minutes."

Why twenty-two-and-a-half I never discovered. And whether twenty-two-and-a-half, or just twenty-two, it didn't matter—for I never got an answer.

(To be continued.)

Your correspondent suggests that V.P.A. groups should exist for no other purpose than to convey the wishes of electors to Parliamentarians. Surely this is a departure from what we have been about? Have we not for years been busy encouraging the idea that people, as individuals should approach their Representatives DIRECT? And have we not succeeded to a remarkable extent? Are we now to abandon all we have achieved; nay, not only abandon it, but root it out, and advocate that they now express their desires (policy) to a go-between centralised (though local) body which will transmit it in turn to the Representatives (who may not take any notice of it after all)? No, Sir, the formation of V.P.A.'s does not imply the abandonment of what we have striven for: it indicates instead A FURTHER DEVELOPMENT; justified by practical experience as well as by consciousness of what we are aiming at: the development of a mechanism for the benefit of those who have not yet learned how to get representation. It is a link between policy holders (electors) and their agents (Representatives); it is in no sense intended that V.P.A.'s should usurp the

function of Representatives nor relieve the policy holders of the necessary activity involved in expressing their policy and having it put into effect.

The very best I can say of Institutes of Public Opinion is that they are susceptible to perversion, and, apart from intention, (and you will agree that mere intention, no matter how "good" is valueless unless linked with appropriate methods) I can see no difference between what your correspondent advocates, and what is practised by the "Institutes."

It may be said in defence, "Oh, but we are honest!" Admittedly, But can you convince the public of the superiority of your claims? Which of you (i.e., the Institutes or yourselves) is likely to command the greatest publicity?

No, it is not our function to ape the Institutes: we could do something that the Institutes will never do. We could invite electors to indicate to us their desire—not in the sense that your correspondent thinks necessary, but in order that we can put them in touch with others having similar desires, so that they can, if they wish, be enabled to associate for a given purpose (and not have to associate with those who haven't the same aims, which is the bane of public meetings, "progress" and other associations) and in association prove AND JUSTIFY their Social Credit (i.e., faith in association). — Yours, etc., W. PRESCOTT, Associate of the Social Credit Secretariat, "Grevillea" The Boulevard, Sutherland, N.S.W.

## E.C. ACTIVITIES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

(Report from The United Democrats, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

**THE ANNUAL CONVENTION was held on Saturday, July 29. It was generally conceded by those present that the meeting was a most successful one. Mr. M. E. Dodd, the vice-president opened the meeting by expressing regret that the president, Mr. C. H. Allen was unable to occupy the chair, as it would have been the first time he had presided at an Annual Convention. Mr. Dodd reported that Mr. Allen was in hospital for the purpose of having an operation. The report of the secretariat revealed that despite the abnormal times and the limited means at our disposal, we have reason to feel satisfied with our endeavours.**

Several demand-forms about current political issues have been widely circulated and signed and we feel sure that we are thus arousing people to take up their democratic responsibilities, thus undermining the grip which keeps citizens in subjection.

By sending letters, pamphlets, leaflets, etc., to responsible officials of various kinds we have endeavoured to establish a reputation as reliable commentators on current political events.

The Referendum issue has, of course, received more attention, than any other. We have published a special leaflet on this question. It is significant and very cheering that several prominent people have come to us for advice.

The financial report was somewhat disappointing when compared with last years. The main reason for this difference was the drop in donations.

The following persons were elected to the selection committee—Mr. M. E. Dodd, president; Mr. C. H. Allen and Mr. H. B. Harvey, vice-presidents; Mr. F. Bawden, secretary; Mr. F. J. Day, treasurer.

The following persons were invited to make up the secretariat—Messrs. C. D. Brock, R. K. Menzies, A. J. Munyard, L. W. Randall and Misses Gray and Baid.

Policy for Ensuing Year. After considerable discussion it was decided that our policy for the ensuing year would be:— "To emphasise the preciousness of the individual in all social contracts whenever an opportunity presents itself, to follow the advice of the Secretariat in England, having regard to our own peculiar conditions, and in particular to establish a fund to enable us to secure the services of a paid organiser with a view to the formation of Voters' Policy Associations."

Votes of thanks were passed to a number of persons as an acknowledgment of their outstanding services to our organisation, and to the movement generally.

An attractive tea was served by the ladies, and in the evening consideration was given to the chapter, "After This, What?" from Douglas Reed's book, "All Our Tomorrows," the focal point being Voters' Policy Associations. This was followed by the screening of some most interesting colour films of Australia and Malaya, with a commentary by Mrs. Bath.

CITIZENS VOTE-NO LEAGUE: As recently mentioned in these notes, this League has issued a manifesto on post-war reconstruction. This is a constructive alternative to the specious promises of the Government. The manifesto calls for true democracy after the war, and, as the Constitution is our safeguard in this respect, that it shall not be destroyed by hasty, vague or ill-considered amendments; before any alterations are made that a competent body should examine them and advise electors as to their meaning, and that citizens should be permitted to vote on each point separately. Until the need for further powers is demonstrated by such means the manifesto requires the Government to give immediate effect to the following ten points—

- (1) Produce immediately a comprehensive plan for repatriation and rehabilitation
- (2) Promote full employment for all without job-pegging or conscription.
- (3) Provide for the primary producer greater measure of security with freedom.
- (4) Preserve our fundamental British freedoms and liberty.
- (5) Impel at once the provisions of adequate housing.
- (6) Remove all unnecessary restrictions now.
- (7) Disband all war-time departments immediately the need for their existence ceases.
- (8) Undertake to relieve crippling taxation.
- (9) Uphold the rights of the State of South Australia as a self-governing community.
- (10) Protect our South Australian industries."

In view of the fact that the League composed of people from all walks of life, of all creeds and of all political beliefs, most of the material in this document is good. However, no mention is made as to what should be done to mobilise public feeling to give effect to the demand, of the League

This is where Electoral Campaigners can come into the picture. We urge all our members and supporters to make a special point of joining their local branch of

the League, and if possible to offer to fill positions on the committees. They can then advise their fellow members regarding the Electoral Campaign technique for getting a desired result. To assist in this direction we have issued a leaflet entitled—

**"YOUR PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIVES JOB."**

This sets out and explains precisely what should be the function of a Parliamentary representative, which is "To find out what the people want, without arguing over methods, and get the experts to bring about the desired result."

— F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary

## AUSTRALIA'S PERIL

The following extracts are quoted from the book, "Waltzing Matilda," by Arnold I. Haskell—

"It is not the politician who dominates Canberra, but the super-bureaucrat, the petty jack-in-office.

"It has been said by an Australian that Canberra is a city of eight million trees and not a single idea. Its administrators have the type of mind that makes them plan roads that lead nowhere in particular, frame elaborate traffic regulations when there is no traffic, but they lack the imagination to rid themselves of the worst slum area that I saw in the whole of Australia; dirty hovels of packing-cases and tin cans that would disgrace a Kaffir kraal. The inhabitants of these death-traps pay 7s. 6d. a week for rent, and they are still paying a further 7s. 6d. for back rent, legacy of the slump. The War Memorial cost a quarter of a million and is still unfinished.

"The citizens of Canberra are disenfranchised. They can, it is true, elect a representative to the Advisory Council, which is as great a farce as a Fascist or Soviet election, for the three elected representatives can be out-voted by the four departmental representatives, and, in any case, the council itself is merely an advisory body, which makes the farce complete. The Federal Territory is a Fascist State in the midst of a great Democracy. This does not seem to preoccupy its inhabitants unduly. The average Australian, so long as his pleasures are left intact, does not worry much about politics.

"This apathy constitutes a very real danger, and a liberty-loving people may find themselves subjected to the prejudices of a small and ignorant minority.

"Wisely governed, this should remain a happy country, but there is, and it is worth repeating, the ever-present danger that an energetic minority can impose their will on the apathetic majority, making a cause where none exists. Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane inspire one with confidence; at Canberra one may have doubts."

## CHURCHILL'S WARNING

"We must beware of trying to build a society, in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official—a society where enterprise gains no reward."

—Winston Churchill

## MANPOWER MOLOCHS

The Sydney "Century" of July 21 points out that despite denials of industrial conscription, it is already in operation in respect of N.Z. returned soldiers and that a similar plan is ready for Australia, viz. "When a soldier is demobilised for industrial duty (not discharged) he will be instructed (ordered) to report to a placement centre (workers' compound.) No effective appeal is possible under the N.Z. plan. The important part of the plan is that the soldier will not automatically be allowed to go back into his old job—but of course, this is not called conscription that would never do!

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