

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. 33 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 18, 1944

**"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 Should We Vote at the Referendum?

## Read This Carefully Before You Vote—Don't Repent Afterwards!

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B. Sc.

**What do you know about the Referendum? How do you know which way to vote? How do you know you will vote the right way? And how does one find out the right way to vote?**

An examination of the 17 points which you are asked to accept, or reject, and chats with various people in the street show quite clearly that a large number of people don't understand what are the great issues involved. And how can they know?

Most people have not read the Australian Constitution: they don't know whether the New Powers demanded by the Federal Government already exist, or not. Many of them don't know what will happen when the Government of, say, Tasmania is transferred from Hobart to Canberra. Some of them haven't even heard of the tragedy, and the evils of Absentee Management.

But all of these people are going to vote this week-end on the Referendum. Now, is that a fair proposition?

Many people will be quite honest about it; they will say: "Here is something I don't understand. I want time to consider it. If they refuse to give me the necessary time I shall play safe, and I shall vote NO." And that is what the people have done on the occasion of nearly every previous Australian Referendum. They have voted NO. In this Referendum, we are not asked to vote on one simple question; we are asked to vote on 17 important problems, the consequences of which are likely to be very far-reaching.

The fact that these 17 points are jumbled up together and that you are not permitted to vote NO for those you dislike, and YES for those you like, but are forced

to vote YES or NO for the whole lot together—this fact alone makes one very suspicious because one can see that the trap has been carefully baited with a tit-bit to make you swallow the lot.

That is a thoroughly dishonest trick especially in view of the fact that some of the items we are asked to accept are revolutionary in character, and are strongly objected to by many people—including myself.

Even if we vote for the 17 points, we have no assurance that these points will be carried into effect, or that they can be carried into effect.

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Nobody knows how the Government is going to give us Freedom of Speech, and the Government won't tell us. But the granting of Freedom of Speech by a Gov-

also be too dangerous in the hands of Mr. Curtin and Dr. Evatt.

In reply to another question, Senator Cameron admitted that the Curtin Government had illegally used soldiers to load ships on the waterfront, but gave as an excuse the necessity for getting supplies to the troops at the fighting front. This plea of military necessity, it may be remembered, has been a favourite argument with the apologists of dictatorships.

Replying to yet another questioner, the Minister admitted that Labor had for the duration of the war put its policy into what he called "cold storage." He had said in his speech that we actually lived under three sorts of conscription—economic, industrial, and military. Under economic conscription, we worked or starved; under industrial conscription, we worked or were goaled; under military conscription we fought or were shot. The Minister said that these forms of conscription all endured because the workers were willing to accept wage-slavery. The question asked him was whether this slavery was not due to the political and economic system under which we lived, and whether the leaders of the Curtin Government had not at the last election stated that they would, if returned to office, do nothing to upset that system. The Minister admitted all this to be a fact, and gave the above-mentioned excuse that the war had caused the Labor Party to put its policy into "cold storage." The Minister did not mention that that policy included the freeing of the people from the shackles of financial exploiters by a proper use of the Commonwealth Bank.

Apparently, then, the Labor policy on this and other matters merely exists to tickle the ears of the voters, and when any crisis arises that justifies its implementation it is, in the Minister's expressive phrase, immediately "put into cold storage" instead of being put into effect. And these are the very people who are asking us to vote "Yes" to give them power to carry out measures that they claim would benefit the people and without which—according to themselves—they can do nothing. They already, in fact, have immense power to benefit the people, and in the Ministers phrase leave it in "cold storage"; and it is pretty certain that the people of Australia by voting "Yes" on August 19 would derive as little benefit from the increased powers of the Federal Government as they do from its present ones.

Yours truly, K. J. KENAFICK, Secretary, No Conscription Campaign, Temperance Hall, Russell-street, Melbourne.

ernment which opens private letters, and taps telephone lines, and urges people to spy on their neighbours, sounds very funny to me.

But many people who don't understand any of the 17 points will vote YES because the idea of Freedom of Speech appeals to them. That is why this point was inserted in the Referendum proposals.

### CHILD ENDOWMENT

Many people don't know that a State government introduced Child Endowment seventeen years ago; nor do they know that as both political parties are in favour of Child Endowment, and as there is no body of opinion against it, the Child Endowment is here to stay, whether you vote Yes or No—especially as everybody is trying to persuade parents to have large families.

If at any time, there should be any doubt about Child Endowment, a Referendum could be held on this one subject alone; this is the only honest way to do the job—and there could be no doubt as to the answer!

I consider the introduction of the Child Endowment question alongside other political questions is a scandalous trick to stampede women into voting YES, and thus give the Man-power Office and the C.C.C. power to conscript their husbands and children. However, I think that trick will fail.

Mothers should rest assured that there is no one in Australia with the slightest desire to take away Child Endowment.

### POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT

The question of Jobs for all those now in the Services, or on war work of some kind, is another clause which is arousing much discussion.

Here it should be remembered that the present Constitution gives the Federal Government full powers over everything connected with war and with the armed forces, and that, during the last thirty years, the Federal Government has spent over £300 millions in repatriation; they have paid pensions, built hospitals, and bought land for returned men. They have also had schemes for training men for the various trades and professions, and this scheme has now been started again.

The Federal Government, under the

the MONEY of the Commonwealth; it has powers to tax, to borrow money, mint money, and to create credit—and create it at no cost to itself. The State Governments have full powers to do anything at all, other than things controlled, by the Federal Government. And the Federal Government, through the Loan Council, can make monies available to the States—all they require.

### RETURNED SOLDIERS AND WAR WORKERS

If the Federal Government had wished to help the Returned Soldiers and the War Workers, and had wished to save them from any anxiety after this war, it could have come forward with one suggestion, and one suggestion only—a suggestion which would have been supported by all sections of the people:—

It could have said: "We want to see that no man or woman, who has served this country during this war in whatever manner, shall be without an INCOME when this war finishes; and we hereby guarantee to pay at least the basic wage to each person until such time as a suitable job is found."

If the Government were sincere, this is the guarantee it should have put to the people. It did not put that guarantee in the Referendum proposals, and I submit that it has no intention of giving that guarantee, because it wants its power to retain Industrial Conscription; to retain the Man-power Office, to retain the C.C.C., and to retain rationing.

### THE POWER-LUSTERS

The Federal Government, and its great army of Bureaucrats at Canberra, have tasted power—the power to push you around, to make you stand in queues, and to say: "Please, sir, can I have a permit to do this, and can I have a permit to do that."

I am against giving any man that power, and so I am going to vote NO until the boys come back, when they can decide what kind of a Referendum they want. Meanwhile, the States have full powers to do practically everything they like, and the Federal Government has sufficient financial powers for any emergency.

For these reasons I am going to Vote NO, and with confidence I recommend you also

## Senator Cameron on Referendum

To the Editor: Sir,—In a speech on the Referendum, delivered at the Temperance Hall on July 30, under the auspices of the No Conscription Campaign, Senator Cameron, Minister for Aircraft Production, made some remarkable admissions.

In answer to a question, he stated specifically that if he were in opposition, and a non-Labor, Government brought forward the same Referendum proposals that he was then advocating, he would oppose them. Yet his whole speech had been an effort to prove that these powers were vitally necessary for the welfare of Australians in the post-war period, especially for that of returned soldiers and "servicemen and women generally." In effect, he tries to persuade us that these powers must be given, and then tells us that they would not be given by him to anyone else than his own party, because they would be too dangerous in other hands. We agree with Senator Cameron that they would be too dangerous in the hands of Mr. Menzies and we go further, and consider that they would

### Evatt Evades Queries on Referendum

Dr. Evatt refused to answer the following questions which were submitted to him on two occasions by Mr. C. Chambers, Carrington Avenue, Hurstville, Sydney (in Dr. Evatt's own electorate):—

If carried, would the Constitutional changes empower any Government to legislate so as to prevent any individual, except by permission of a Public Servant from:—

1. Choosing his employment as, when, and where offering?
2. Changing his employment as, and when deemed desirable to himself?
3. Engaging and discharging employees (but subject to current arbitration laws) as deemed expedient to his business?
4. Going into business on his own account?
5. Choosing his Doctor, Dentist, Pharmacist, or Hospital as desired from time to time?
6. Choosing which butcher, baker, grocer, milk vendor or other tradesman shall serve him?
7. (a) Choosing which crops he shall grow on his farm?  
(b) And when, where and how he shall grow them?  
(c) Choosing to whom he shall dispose of his produce and at what consideration?

VOTERS will draw the obvious conclusions from EVATT'S EVASIONS.

Play safe: VOTE [1] NO.

--The Electors' Association, Sutherland Branch, J. Stirling, Hon. Secretary.

## NOTES on the NEWS

According to Mr. Cameron, M.H.R., as reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of July 3, residents of the Northern Territory have made a move to BREAK AWAY FROM FEDERAL CONTROL, and to set up a local government or a seventh State. Alice Springs and Darwin are suggested as two administrative centres. These people, after BITTER EXPERIENCE, realise the absurdity and the impossibility of satisfactory Canberra control. This is another last-minute argument for voting "NO."

present Constitution, has full powers over

**FOILING FORGERS:** Forged liquid-fuel tickets are becoming so numerous that the rationing sleuths are quite unable to catch up with the forgers. As a consequence, innocent John Citizen, who doesn't know a forged ticket from a genuine one, is being made a scapegoat, is being fined for having them in his possession. Innocent garage-men have also been fined and shut down because they accepted the forged tickets in ignorance and good faith. It is no wonder Sydney garage-men have threatened to go on strike as a protest against being the scapegoat for incompetent bureaucrats. If these blunders cannot safeguard the public against forgeries, they should be replaced by others who can.

**CURTIN'S CRUISE:** Further to earlier suggestions to watch Curtin's statements to ascertain the real purpose of his recent cruise, the following from "Hansard" for July 19 is of interest: "A Bill will be introduced for the purpose of either ratifying or authorising [not rejecting] tentative agreements made at the recent world monetary conference." Continuing, he said: "Unless any proposed agreement impinged grievously upon the interest of the country in some way, I would be quite prepared—and I say it unhesitatingly—to give the most sympathetic consideration to it." So the sell-out is on! Keep writing to your Federal M.P. to prevent this treachery.

**FREEDOM FIGHT:** The "Age" of August 11 reports that "a body of public men, peers, and members of the House of Commons has formed a 'fighting fund for freedom'; its purpose is to demand a minimum of State control and maximum of individual freedom." The appeal is for £1,000,000, which is described as no great sum compared with the issue at stake—that is, to arrest the race down the road to the totalitarian State. The money is to be used to make grants to existing organisa-

to vote "NO."

tions with expenses to support Parliamentary candidates pledged to uphold the principles of individual freedom. Irrespective of how the referendum goes, there is need for such a move here; it is an idea worth pushing along.

(Continued on page 3)

### Alberta's S.C. Govt. Re-Elected

**BIGGER MAJORITY THAN EVER!**

"Ottawa, Wednesday, A.A.P. — In the Canadian provincial elections the Liberal Government failed to gain an overall majority in Quebec and the Social Credit Government was re-elected in Alberta.

"The Quebec Liberals required 90 seats to gain a majority, but it now has fewer seats than the Union Nationale, conservatives who advocate RESTORATION OF PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY. [Our emphasis.]

"Two parties—the Independent [so called] and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation [Socialist]—opposed the Social Credit Government in Alberta.

"The Social Credit Government was returned with a greater majority than when it took office in 1935. In the previous Parliament it held 35 of 57 seats. Incomplete results show the Government has 39 seats for certain.

"Premier Manning promised to continue the social credit fight for monetary reform, and reiterated his faith in social credit principles, which include payment of a national dividend."

—Melbourne "Sun," August 10.



# AN OPEN LETTER TO DEAN LANGLEY

To the Very Rev. Dean H. T. Langley, St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne:

Dear Mr. Dean,—I read with interest the press reports of your address of Sunday, August 6, on the Referendum, and note therefrom that you are neither seeking to advise others as to how they should vote nor even to intimate the way in which you intend voting yourself as did Archbishop Mannix, who, obviously, is the "notable Ecclesiastic" to whom you made reference.

It is perfectly clear, however, although you did not actually say so, that you intend voting "Yes," even as does the "notable Ecclesiastic." It is also quite evident that, in substance, your address constituted an advice to vote "Yes." If you believe such to be the right attitude to adopt toward this vital issue, why not declare it?

## INDIVIDUALS AND THE "NATION."

You raised an objection to the "selfish considerations" of how it would affect us personally. Whilst, superficially, this might appear to be an ethical and Christian objection to such a "selfish" attitude, deeper and clearer thought will, I feel, convince one that this is not so.

How, I should like to know, are you or I or any other person to determine how the carrying of the Referendum, will affect our neighbour? Unfortunately, as you probably will agree, there are many thousands who do not know how it will affect them individually. If, then, in your own words, "they are not sufficiently equipped with knowledge to enable them to make a responsible decision," and do not KNOW how it will affect them personally, is it proper to appeal to people to attempt to judge how it will affect their neighbour and to vote accordingly?

Further, if every individual votes in accordance with his conception of what principles are the more calculated to secure and advance his own freedom and well-being, can it be denied that such a vote will, in the aggregate, reflect a "national" point of view, since "the nation" consists of the individuals of whom it is composed? A determination to mind one's own business, and—equally important—to prevent others minding it for us, is not, I submit, inconsistent with the principles enshrined in the parable of the Good Samaritan.

\* \* \* \*

"It has been made most difficult for any clergyman to speak publicly on this matter," you say. To me, however, it is quite certain that those clergymen, who have done so, have not thereby clarified the issues. The "notable Ecclesiastic," and—judged in the light of the press reports on which this letter is based—you, appear to be labouring under misconceptions just as serious as the "many people . . . not sufficiently equipped with knowledge to enable them to make a responsible decision."

## POLICY OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES

The fact that politicians are engaged in party warfare in respect of this issue should not obscure the FACT—and experience has proved it to be a fact—that all Parties have supported, and do support, the policy of centralisation of power: that the party warfare is carried on for the purpose of inducing the people to believe that there actually IS a fundamental difference in the policy of the respective parties, whereas in FACT there is not: that all the existing parties have been guilty of filching from the people their rights and liberties, of betraying the people to the evil, unscrupulous, anti-Christian forces represented by such names as Warburg, Frankfurter, Kuhn, Loeb, Schiff, etc.

In the face of FACTS and EXPERIENCE, it is fantastic to suggest that "the sovereignty of the PEOPLE" will be expressed by concentrating all effective control of their policy and destiny in "one central system of government," to be administered and controlled by politicians of parties, ALL of which have proved recreant to their responsibilities, ALL of which have consciously legislated for the achievement of ends other than "the welfare of millions."

It is equally fantastic to suppose that the right of an election once in three years, enabling one body of unfaithful stewards to be dismissed and another equally unfaithful body of stewards to be elected, is an adequate protection for the people. The present Government did NOT embody in the proposed Constitutional amendments a provision for enactment of the Initiative Referendum and Recall!

\* \* \* \*

I believe there are good grounds for taking grave exception to your statement that "the opportunity to implement the purposes for which the war is being fought—the application of the four great freedoms, and much more for the whole human brotherhood—is at hand."

That statement implies: (a) A right to speak with authority as to the purposes for which the war is being fought; (b) that "the four great freedoms" (presumably of the Atlantic Charter) embody an objective worthy of all that has been involved in the waging of this war; (c) that a "No" vote is tantamount to a refusal to accept this "opportunity."

## THE QUESTION OF OBJECTIVES

Regarding (a), I question the ability of ANY person to make an authoritative pronouncement as to the purposes for which the war is being fought. There are many who THINK they know, but how many know in reality, and whose are the purposes? Do our "leaders" consult the men actually doing the fighting before presuming to speak in their name? Concerning

(b), it has been repeatedly stressed in these columns that "the four great freedoms" are available to inmates of penal and mental institutions, none of the inmates of which are free to act and to make their own decisions. Those "freedoms" are not, therefore, an objective worthwhile going to war about. (c) I contend that it is improper to imply that the many persons who intend voting "No" are thereby declaring themselves against "human brotherhood." For Social Crediters and genuine reformers, who are all advocating a "No" vote, as distinguished from persons (such as Mr. Menzies) offering spurious opposition to the Referendum, it can be said that a constructive alternative to acceptance of the proposed Constitutional amendments is being put forward. The basis of our opposition is tangible, which is more than can be truly said of the case submitted by "Yes" advocates.

Since you have raised the question of "the purposes for which the war is being fought," and have averred that "the first feature of THE PLAN (whose?) for a new world is unity, . . . and ONE central system of government . . .", it is pertinent to recall another "leader" who has set forth such an ideology.

Did not Adolf Hitler proclaim, as the

purpose for which he was annexing Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, etc. the principle of "ONE leader, ONE people, ONE Fatherland," under ONE central Government in Berlin?

I had been under the impression that "the purpose" for which the British Commonwealth of potentially self-governing Dominions declared war on Hitler's Germany was: (a) to prevent further encroachment of the ONE authority idea on peoples who still believe themselves better fitted than those controlling ONE central system of government, to work out their salvation; (b) to RESTORE the sovereignty of those States which Hitler has taken possession of. But it appears I have been under a wrong impression!

## "WILL OF GOD" OR "WILL TO POWER"?

You say, "the great end" the Church serves is "the coming of God's kingdom on earth." If "the Church" is truly serving that end, care must be taken that nothing is said or done in the name of "the Church" which would retard that end.

Now God has endowed man with free will. God has also endowed man with mind, with conscience, so that he may reason and may apprehend what is the will of God. Man is NOT thereby conforming to the will of God if he is obliged for any reason to conform to the will of another human.

Therefore, man can only do the will of God to the extent that every individual is free to act according to his OWN conscience. In other words, if "the Church" is truly serving "the great end" of "the coming of God's kingdom on earth," it must unswervingly and fearlessly help individuals to understand and demonstrate truth, to know what are the laws of the

# FINANCE, DEPRESSION & REFERENDUM

By J. T. LANG, in the Sydney "CENTURY," August 4.

**The Federal Government is now engaged in a campaign to win a referendum. The Government propaganda says very definitely over and over again that if it secures the referendum powers it will permanently banish unemployment from the land and never again will Australia experience a depression. In view of the very positive nature of the Government's statements it is a fair question to ask is the Government deliberately deceiving the people or has it pulled its own leg?**

The Government points to the depression which followed the last war, and says it will avoid anything like that this time.

What made the depression after the last war and what steps are being taken now to prevent a recurrence of what happened then?

The man in the street knows that after the last war the financial experts said that the first thing to do was to correct the inflation that had occurred during the war. This is what that meant in terms that the ordinary person can understand.

It meant that before the previous war if you took an English pound sterling to America you would get approximately five dollars for it. After that war you could only get half that number of dollars for it.

The financiers said that the dollar was too dear and it must be made cheaper. We must get back to the position where we could get five dollars for the pound

## WHY HAVE DEPRESSIONS?

Depressions are not "acts of God." They are not caused by bad weather; they are not produced because people don't want to buy anything.

Depressions are caused by the Central Government at Canberra restricting the supply of money to the people.

The powers of the Commonwealth Government to tax, borrow or to create credit are only limited by the resources of the country.

During this war, the Federal Government has not only borrowed millions of pounds; it has also created millions of pounds out of nothing by virtue of its supreme power over the finance and currency of the country.

This supreme power over finance existed in peace time. The Commonwealth Government has power to finance State and Municipal Governments and private individuals at low rates of interest or at no rate of interest at all, if it likes.

This power enables the Commonwealth Government to make money available at low cost for the building of houses; it enables them to pay servicemen and war-workers full pay until they are permanently settled in a job of their own seeking.

But because Federal Governments have failed to use these tremendous financial powers for the benefit of the people, the people should not grant other powers until the Government shows, by its deeds, that it is willing to use its present enormous power.

We are waiting patiently for a demonstration of the use of this power.

The extra powers demanded by the Federal Government mean the retention of the man-power office, and the C.C.C.; they mean the retention of rationing after the war, and the retention of the vast army of officials, snoopers, and tax-collectors.

They, in fact, will mean the retention of all the paraphernalia of a Fascist State.

"We put up with these things in time of war, not because we like them, but because we have to.

Our Answer is a Vote of NO.

—Leaflet authorised by Barbara Guthrie Electoral Campaign, 101 Collins Street Hobart.

# Referendum Campaign

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

A FINAL MESSAGE: The zero hour is near, the hour which may well decide whether freedom or slavery is to be our future way of life. Thanks to the tremendous financial and physical efforts of individual campaigners, a splendid effort has been made to preserve our freedom of action—but the race is not yet finished.

Between now and the ballot box many thousands of votes may be won by YOU and thousands of others. The correct word or argument can yet win many thousands of "NO" votes. It is vital that YOU keep up the pressure, because every vote will count.

YOU can still put those last-minute leaflets, etc., into the hands of wavering voters and YOU can be ready to deal with those last-minute falsehoods which are almost certain to appear. Make as many contacts as you can and keep the pressure on—don't let up.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director,

universe (God's laws) and to conform thereto.

This is essentially an INDIVIDUAL matter in which NO man can make a DECISION governing his brother.

If you would agree that "the coming of God's kingdom on earth" involves the existence of conditions in which men and women are enlightened with knowledge and revealed truth regarding the world in which they live and the purpose of existence, and are FREE to ACT in conformity therewith—then you would, I believe, have to admit that "the Church" is NOT serving "the great end" in giving people the type of advice contained in your "searchlight on the referendum."

In urging "unity" as "the first feature of the PLAN for a new world" together with "ONE central system of government," you are at least implying that uniformity is an essential. By advocating a condition of uniformity, you are urging resistance to God's universal law of diversity; and to the extent that "unity" involves enforced participation in "the plan" formulated by those controlling the "one central system of government"—even though such plan to you may seem good and moral and just—you are working against "the great end," allying yourself with purposes incompatible with the conditions which, undeniably, are inseparable from "the coming of God's kingdom on earth," viz., the freedom of the individual to order his life in accordance with the will of God, as the individual (not some "Director-General" or official) understands it.

## THE STATES & THE COMMONWEALTH

It is false to assert, as you do, that the States are incapable of grappling with post-war conditions. They are just as capable of doing so as any Commonwealth Government, provided the Commonwealth Parliament does its duty in providing the necessary funds.

Unless the Commonwealth Parliament exercises the power to control financial POLICY which it ALREADY possesses, it will be in no better position than any of the States to grapple with the problems of which you speak. That is an inescapable FACT even though many "leaders" are side-tracking it.

## MORE THAN LIP-SERVICE IS NEEDED

In conclusion, I would point out that whereas many leading Churchmen pay lip-service to what you term "the searchlight of Christ and the vision of His kingdom," although they occasionally refer, as you have done, to "combines, trusts, and great unions"—by supporting, as they do, to their shame, the most powerful and evil combine and trust in existence, viz., the private monopoly of the public credit, they are making themselves active agents of those powerful and influential persons who are determined that "His kingdom" shall never come. This is particularly evident during periods when Governments are pawning the souls of the people to that monopoly to which I refer, a monopoly no Commonwealth Government has yet had the courage and honesty to challenge by using existing powers.

If "the Church" has a mandate to speak "on questions which affect the great end," it would be well for those who claim to speak for the Church to think deeply, to reason carefully, lest they associate themselves with objectives which will prevent the consummation of "the great end." Such thinking and reasoning, unfortunately, many spokesmen of "the Church" are not doing.

—Very truly yours, J. BRADSHAW.

to use it. It seems determined to leave the Bank in its present dictatorial position.

In view of that, all this propaganda from the Government about the referendum is just cruel, heartless deception. Honest citizens are searching their conscience about the vote at the referendum. Afraid to sign away their liberties, and yet loath to do anything that might mar in any way the future of the young people who want jobs after the war, many people are enduring anxiety over their vote.

They don't know, as the Government knows, that a vote on August 19 is powerless to help in the slightest degree in the solution of employment after the war.

That solution lies in the financial policy after the war. The Curtin Government already has full power over this but cynically refuses to use it.



# 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 the fifth instalment from the above-mentioned book:—

At night the red stars in the Kremlin spires gleamed through the heavy fall of the snow like gigantic fireflies. The Red Square was deserted and lonely and the sentries by the Kremlin gates stood as stiff as snowmen. One evening, Fitzroy and I were walking past the Embassy when the silence was suddenly broken by a large green Lincoln motor-car that came hurtling towards us. You knew a "big shot" was inside by the bullet-proof wind-shields and the tightly-drawn curtains. It may have been Stalin. Whoever it was, as the car swept through the Kremlin gates to a click of arms and disappeared in the darkness, my imagination was stirred; the authority of the Czars suddenly seemed pale compared with the power of the ruler of all the Soviet Socialist Republics.

This, like everything else in Russia, was paradoxical. Indeed, paradoxes were more the rule than the exception.

I was becoming used to lines queued up for milk under the shadow of bill boards that said brightly: "Drink Soviet Champagne." To the fact that although you couldn't buy a yard of cloth to make a dress the shop counters were decorated with pictures of the latest French fashions; that although the salary of the average working man was 240 roubles a month, ballet dancers earned as much as 100,000 roubles a year; that although Soviet Russia claimed to be a dictatorship of the proletariat, under the label of the "Intelligentsia" you found a class of privilege and power.

The "Intelligentsia" was not confined to the arts. Officially defined in 1938 it included technicians, police officials and bureaucrats—in fact, the white-collar class of the Soviet Union.

You saw them dining at the leading hotels; driving through the streets in their State-owned cars; flowing through the lobbies of the movie houses; sitting in the best seats at the opera and the ballet.

On the night before a "free day" they thronged the restaurant of the Metropole Hotel. I went there one evening with Walter Duranty, Harold Denny, and his wife Jean. The air was blue with smoke, and the large marble floor, with an old-fashioned fountain in the centre, was packed with dancers doing the latest American steps. Most of the women had hennaed hair and were dressed in blouses and skirts and white berets; the men wore uniforms ranging from khaki of the army to the dark blue breeches and tunic of the ordinary citizen. Vodka and champagne flowed freely; Walter told me the wooden railing round the fountain had been put up because so many people fell in. Never have I been to a more noisy party. Hundreds of balloons were distributed throughout the room and the guests amused themselves by wrapping the strings with paper, lighting them, and watching them drift up to the ceiling. They exploded midway and the noise sounded like an artillery barrage. The orchestra grew

louder in an effort to be heard, and conversation became impossible.

The Intelligentsia set the nation's standard of elegance. With the rise of this new class many ideas and customs, formerly classed as "bourgeois," were being accepted.

The severe post-revolutionary buildings were gradually giving way to more elaborate structures: Christmas trees, formerly frowned upon, had appeared under the title of Father Frost trees; and although Soviet citizens didn't wear evening clothes, except at official functions, you saw the conductor of the opera in tails and a white tie.

The energies of the Intelligentsia were bent on the acquisition of "culture." This determination was reflected in every branch of Soviet life. The main amusement park in Moscow was called "The Park of Rest and Culture," while the chief organisation that dealt with foreign tourists was labelled "The Society for Cultural Relations." The word "culture" however, was elastic. It applied as easily to a restaurant with clean tablecloths as to a man of learning. When Alfred Cholerton, the "Daily Telegraph" correspondent, refused to buy a gas range from a Soviet salesman, saying that he considered a coal stove more reliable, the latter protested with the argument: "But gas is so cultured."

The height of modern culture was symbolised by jazz—spelled "djaz." Most of the cinemas were equipped with jazz orchestras, and the salaries of the band leaders ran as high as 1500 roubles a month.

One evening Fitzroy and I went into a movie house to find the lobby packed with people listening to a jazz concert. The music was awful. The saxophones tore the air and the trumpets caterwauled in melancholy discord, but the audience sat in their chairs listening as intently as though they were hearing a symphony conducted by Sir Thomas Beecham.

We saw a film called "The Oppenheim Family." Like most Soviet pictures, it was a propaganda film. But it was an odd one. Although it dealt with the Nazi persecution of the Jews, the producer's aesthetic sense had evidently got the better of him for the young Jewish hero was portrayed by a tall blonde Nordic, while the Nazi persecutors were the most odious types of Jews!

Several scenes showing concentration camps met with an uncomfortable silence, suggesting that the director had skirted too close to reality.

Soviet "culture" had little to recommend it. However, the brilliance of the Moscow theatre and ballet, run in the old "bourgeois" manner, more than made up for the dreariness of the new art. The Soviet State spent thousands of roubles on the ballet, and the magnificence of costumes and sets, the quality of the dancing, were unsurpassed. The Opera House was

crowded nightly, and tickets had to be booked well in advance.

The stalls were filled with important Soviet officials, but the galleries were often turned over to groups of factory workers.

The shabbiness of the audience seemed curiously out of place when the lights dimmed and the great curtain swept apart on a glittering pre-revolutionary setting. Princesses and noblemen moved about against a background of luxury which was difficult to reconcile with the Soviet conception of life. The first ballet I saw was "The Prisoner of the Caucasus," in which Simyonova, the star of Russia, danced. She was small, dainty, and unbelievably graceful. The audience cheered her to the rafters.

Incidental was the fact that her husband, Mr. Karakhan, a former Ambassador to Turkey, had been one of the victims of the 1937 purge.

(To be continued.)

## LETTER TO MR. CHIFLEY

By MAX ADAMS.

(Mr. Chifley, Commonwealth Treasurer, defended the Taxation Department's appeal to the public to become anonymous informers.)

Come, citizen comrades! We'll take up the pen  
To write what we know of our snide fellow men;

Devoting our labours  
To pimp on our neighbours,  
Repeating all scandals again and again.  
Officials on high will not look at us stiffly;

Anonymous letters are welcomed by Chifley.  
Keep ears to the keyhole and eyes to the slot,  
Of dirty misdeeds you will learn such a lot!

Be ready to pander  
To all sorts of slander,  
And then send your letter by post like a shot!

After telling the street, quite primly and sniffily,  
Scratch out your anonymous letter to Chifley.

Collect back fence gossip of That and of This;  
Be ready to sneer and to snarl and to hiss;

Go forth into battle  
For all tittle-tattle,  
And a spot of blackmailing might not come amiss!

Some bits may be dirty, and some may be piffly,  
But they're all good enough for a letter to Chifley.

Sneak sly like a rat through the kitchen of Jones,  
Smell out, like a cur, where Brown buries his bones;

Consistently trying,  
Go peering and prying;  
Do all that a decent-bred fellow disowns:  
But first, second, thirdly, and fourthly, and fifthly,

DASH OFF THAT ANONYMOUS MIS-  
SIVE TO CHIFLEY!!!

—From Sydney "Truth."

## LIBERTIES IN PERIL!

There was a danger that people might become so accustomed to being "pushed about" that they would lose their capacity to resent infringements of their liberties. Professor F. A. Bland said recently.

Professor Bland, who was addressing Nock and Kirby's luncheon forum, in Sydney, said that it was asserted that security after the war depended on the continuance of controls.

"Will we have a repetition of cases like Aylward, the baker, fined for baking bread for starving children because an arrogant pressure group was defying the law of the land and holding a supine Government to ransom, or a continuance of the inept administration revealed by the Quota Sold inquiry?" he asked.

Professor Bland said if these things were to be the price of the "new order," it would be an old order of tyrannies and despotism made more insufferable because it would be bureaucratic.

Democracy had surrendered its liberty to a despotism of its own creation, and every extension of the field of Government contained a further contingent threat to that liberty.

People were being conditioned to accept what was happening as natural, and there thus emerged two possibilities. People might get accustomed to being "pushed about" and might lose the capacity to resent vital infringement of their liberties.

"On the other hand," Professor Bland continued, "people who exercise dictatorial authority may become so satisfied with their pushing people about that they may be unwilling to return our liberties in exchange for our pawn tickets."

"The belief that the individual knew his own business best is completely out of date, and, from cradle to the grave, he conforms to instructions issued by officials or pays the price," Professor Bland said.

"Parliament, which should protect him from arbitrary officialdom, is seldom sitting, and when it is, it is often content to wrap itself in its ceremonial robes of sovereignty, and see the substance of its power usurped by a party. Most of the laws under which we precariously exist have never had to face the test of public discussion and analysis."

## REMINDER FOR AUGUST 19

"The principles of a free constitution are irrecoverably lost when legislative power is nominated by the executive."

—Gibbon.

## Notes On The News

(Continued from Page 1)

**TRAINEE'S TAXES:** Complaints that discharged servicemen undergoing vocational training under the Commonwealth reconstruction scheme were drawing less than the basic wage after their tax had been deducted are reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of July 27. A request that the tax deductions be suspended brought a refusal from that Labor stalwart, Mr. Chifley, on the grounds that "the Government could not fairly differentiate between these trainees and other taxpayers." Fancy that now! And yet this same Chifley condones—and accepts—a special benefit in the form of the parliamentary deduction which in some cases amounts to approximately £250 for politicians who never saw the front line. Can you beat that for hypocrisy? And yet such men seek more power! Ye gods!

**CHURCH CULTURE:** The Rev. Ray Williams, in a special circular, makes a strong appeal for financial assistance for the kindergarten activities carried on at the Cecil-street (South Melbourne) Methodist Mission. Included in his appeal is the following: "What a lovely church Cecil-street is! But because of lack of finance it is sadly in need of repair." Note that the disrepair exists, not because of normal lack of materials or building skill, but because of a shortage of money (printed stationery, and figures in bank ledgers). But this churchman, along with others, is seemingly quite ignorant of the source of these tokens—indeed, many churchmen seem to resent discussion on MONEY, the lack and monopoly-control of which causes the said disrepair, and the decline of Church culture.

**SUBSIDY SCIENCE:** Some dairy farmers on the north coast of N.S.W. (reports the Melbourne "Sun" of August 8) are allowing part of their herds to go out of production to escape higher taxation, and some propagandists are suggesting that the subsidy is having the effect of decreasing butter production. It should be pointed out that subsidies are paid from taxation, and inevitably must cause more vicious taxation under present-day financial policy. The fact is that the Government gives an inducement, and then takes it away via taxation! This is also done with workers' wages. It is the old trick of the carrot and the donkey. To be really beneficial such subsidies must be paid from new money especially created and issued free of debt or interest—no other principle will be really successful.

**HOUSING HAPPENINGS:** Essendon Council (Melbourne) strongly opposes the type of houses and the materials used by the Housing Commission at Aberfeldie. The Council asked the Commission to build only brick houses, because timber and concrete houses would not be suitable in this area, but the Commission has refused to accede to this request. From this it will be clear that this Commission can override municipal building regulations and just build what the bureaucrats who comprise the Commission think is suitable. This is a direct blow at the principles of municipal government, and the sooner this bunch of Planners are shorn of these dictatorial powers the better for all concerned.

**WHITE AUSTRALIA POLICY:** The attack on our "White Australia Policy" was carried a stage further by Chaplain K. M. Ridgeway at the Graham-street Church, Port Melbourne. This advocate made a special plea for 100,000 Egyptian Protestant converts, which he inferred would be suitable immigrants. It is worth noting that these attacks are mainly delivered from church pulpits, but it is slightly new to advocate immigrants of a particular denomination. On this platform, according to the "Age" of July 17, were also the Rev. J. C. Kolk (a Dutch missionary) and an Indonesian choir. The local minister apparently remained discreetly in the background.

**FINANCIAL FOLKLORE:** The recent British Budget, which proposes to allow a slight rise in the cost of living, is reported to have brought favourable comment from financial quarters (bankers), presumably because it will increase the people's burdens. At the same time the same financial quarters fear that such action will bring increased pressure for higher wages (as though it could do otherwise!) It is extraordinary how much Press space is given to featuring the vapourings of bankers and their stooges—especially economists, who appear to believe that if less purchasing power is available more goods will be sold. It's about time our so-called business men refused to listen to this stupid form of financial folklore.

**DEBT DELUSION:** The New York "Times" of April 23, 1944, in an article on taxation methods, said: "There is a school of thought [crazy economists] which holds that rising national debt does not adversely affect the national economy; that on the contrary, a constantly increasing debt may be beneficial" (to whom, not stated). Answering this Planners' Phantasy, the "Times" writer said: "If this theory were true we might all borrow to the hilt from each other and be prosperous!"

—OB.H.

## WHY ARE OUR MEN FIGHTING?

They fight for the right to live like a man, to work like a man, to think like a man—NOT to be herded around and led by the nose to the trough and the bag and the stall. They fight for individual freedom. They look to us to safeguard those rights while they safeguard us.

—A Printer's Circular to his Customers.

"New Times," August 18, 1944----Page 3

## MORE NIGGERS IN EVATT'S WOODPILE!

To the Editor: Sir,—The Government pamphlet, 60 pages, compiled by Dr. Evatt, as notes on the Fourteen Powers and the Three "Safeguards," contains two warnings to electors which, as true Australians, they dare not ignore! The first warning appears on page 28, with regard to "external affairs." It reads:—

"I draw attention to the fact that the 'external affairs' power, contained in Section 51 (xxix) of the Constitution, may reasonably be expected to confer on the Parliament full power to carry out any legal obligations regarding Production which may rest upon it, or come to rest upon it by virtue of international treaties or conventions to which Australia is a party."

Here it is made clear that "international treaties" and "conventions to which Australia is a party," are at present limited as to "legal obligations" to the "Powers of Parliament" in Section 51 of the Constitution! Those who vote "Yes" on August 19, 1944 would approve a very great increase the "legal obligations" of Australia to overseas interests through "international treaties or conventions," which are at present "subject to this Constitution," as are all the "Powers of Parliament" (Federal or State)!

Instead of open and free discussion among the States, the proposed "powers" would enable the Federal Government to rely on "Treaties or Conventions" to force the hands of Parliaments, and people, with respect to the new powers asked for, and more dangerous than that, is the clear warning that "legal obligations" would have to be carried out to the full power of Parliament, whether the people repented or not of what the international interests would undoubtedly be able to impose!

The second warning is doubly subtle in that it puts into words the "legal effect" of what would be a new sub-section of the Constitution in the event of "The Proposed Law" being approved! Page 55 shows in Dr. Evatt's own words that the proposed sub-section (4) "controlling" government-by-regulation (delegated legislation) would put them beyond the reach of casual revocation by Parliament." The subtlety of the warning is made even deeper than in words, by the omission of any

Expounding by Dr. Evatt (in four-and-a-half pages on sub-section 4) of the sub-division (c) of that sub-section (4)! The wording of which is given on page 53 of Dr. Evatt's pamphlet as "(c) A regulation of a legislative character: (c) shall take effect on the date of its making or on such later date as is specified in the regulation, if the Governor-General in Council declares on specified grounds that the making of the regulation is urgently required!"

That there can be no reliance on the Acts Interpretation Act to allow Parliament to review such regulations of a legislative character as are envisaged under sub-section (4) (c) quoted above, is stated clearly enough by Dr. Evatt himself, on page 54 of the pamphlet! The words are: "the rule is only a rule of interpretation. It can be excluded."

Therefore, as sub-section (4) of the "Proposed Law" would go "beyond the reach of casual revocation by Parliament," the sub-divisions (a) and (b) go beyond the reach of the Acts Interpretation Act, and the sub-division (c) over-riding (a) and (b), would put "regulations of a legislative character" urgently required, beyond the reach of Parliament!

Thus, a "Yes" vote implies: Legislation by Treaty and Convention, instead of by Parliament: with the whole domestic economy tied by legal obligations through "external affairs." Furthermore a Yes vote through sub-section (4) would "change the Constitution" from Government by consultation with the States, to Government by dictation through regulation, without Parliamentary review! A mere change of Government by a disillusioned people would do nothing to change "legal obligations" already entered into! Let the people say "NO!"

--L. G. DeGaris, 266 Latrobe-terrace, Geelong.



# THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE PLANNERS

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

**Sir,—Some people have thought fantastic our claim that the Referendum proposals have been put forward in the interests of International Finance, but a study of the FACTS will easily confirm it.**

It is not the people of Australia who have found fault with the Constitution. The results of the Referendums already held show clearly that they are strongly opposed to having it tinkered with. It was not they who initiated the proposals now being referred to them in the 1944 Referendum. These proposals were first brought forward in 1942 by Dr. Evatt, Federal Attorney-General, in a reprehensible attempt to get the State Parliaments to accept them without reference to the people at all. Fortunately, the attempt failed. At whose instigation did Dr. Evatt embark on this course?

It has already been shown that during his perambulations abroad, our Attorney-General made personal contact with representatives of International Finance in the United States of America, and with representatives of the London School of Economics in the United Kingdom. The London School of Economics is an instrument of International Finance, and men trained in that institution have been "selected" to prepare and direct the reconstruction plans in several countries.

It may be the merest coincidence that these specially trained servants of International Finance have found the Constitution an obstacle to their plans in most of the countries in which they are planning, for strong campaigns to bring about greater centralisation of authority are proceeding concurrently in all of them.

Be that as it may, I have been interested to find out why our Commonwealth Government, professedly anxious to serve only the genuine interests of the citizens in general is so intent on pursuing a course which has been shown to be fraught with so much danger to the genuine welfare of the rank-and-file of the people. My researches in this direction leave no room for doubt that the alteration of the Constitution is being sought, not for the purpose of bringing benefit to the people, but only to enable a plan concocted by discredited professors to be IMPOSED upon us.

At present, the constitution protects the People from the Planners, but if it is altered as proposed it will protect the Planners from the People. That is the purpose of the Referendum.

In 1931, the international financiers issued their orders through Sir Otto Niemeyer, of the Bank of England, and Professor Emanuel Guggenheim, of the London School of Economics. In 1944 the connection is not to be so open. Special emissaries have not been sent, but graduates of their "instrument" have been placed in the most important key positions, from which they prepare the "plans" and "advise" the Governments.

It will be found illuminating to compare the "Yes" propaganda with the "case" as put by the local representatives of the London School of Economics. Sir Keith Murdoch, the press baron, who also had a course at the School whose avowed purpose is to train the bureaucrats for the Socialist State, has dutifully fallen into line to advocate further centralisation of POWER! How does this line up with the propaganda that all of us who are advocating a NO vote are doing so in the interests of big business?

The weekly newspaper, "Century," published in Sydney, contains the following in the issue of 21/7/44:—

The master-minds of the last Depression are to-day the intimate economic and financial advisers of the Curtin Government. Head of the Premiers' Plan brain-trust was Professor Douglas Berry Copland. To-day Professor Douglas Berry Copland is not only Prices Controller, but also a member of the Advisory Committee on Financial and Economic Policy of the Curtin Government. It was Copland who told the Scullin Government that it had to reduce wages, pensions, and social services. It was Copland's committee that formulated the policy of credit deflation.

"Treasurer J. B. Chifley was a Premiers Plan Minister in the Scullin Government. He took Copland's advice in 1931. He is swallowing it hook, line and sinker to-day...."

"Professors Mills, Giblin and Melville all signed the Wallace Bruce Report on April 12, 1932. That report started off thus: 'Wages must fall. All industry is in a precarious state. Prices have fallen below costs. An immediate reduction of cost must be made to enable industry to survive and to prevent general unemployment.' To-day Professor Mills is also a member of the Curtin Government's Advisory Committee on Financial and Economic policy...."

"Professor Giblin is Chairman of the Curtin Government's Advisory Committee on Financial and Economic policy. As Premiers' Plan Professor, he, too, is to-day in a position to determine the Curtin Government's financial policy. 'Professor Melville is to-day Economic Adviser to the Commonwealth Bank. In addition, he was selected by the Curtin Government to head its delegation to the International Monetary Conference now being held in the United States of America. Another Premiers' Planner was Professor Brigden, also representing the Curtin Government in Washington and at the International Monetary Conference.'"

And so, the shameless professors who did the bidding of International Finance in 1931 and subsequent years are still doing it. All of them shout, "Full Employment," just as it is being shouted by similar men in other countries. The fact that full employment is a physical

impossibility under the present financial arrangements doesn't trouble them a bit. The Premiers Plan gang is being helped by a few of the younger "professors," viz., Dr. H. C. Coombs, Dr. Lloyd Ross, and Dr. E. R. Walker. It is appropriate that they should be called "doctors," for if ever a people were being doctored that people is in Australia.

In connection with Post-War Reconstruction Professor Giblin speaks of "the distress of unemployment," quite overlooking the every-day fact that unemployment does not bring distress to those who receive incomes. It is the loss of income that is distressing, NOT the loss of employment.

This Professor also says:—  
"Supposing there is a factory starting up or expanding which requires 1000 men, but there are only 500 men who have volunteered for employment there. What kind of pressure is going to be brought to bear to take employment? You must try persuasion and inducement first, but at a certain point there must come a time when somebody must decide what is a suitable job for a man to do, and he must do it. That is going to be politically very difficult. So in the last resort, we shall require a power to direct labour to certain things with the penalty of being unemployed without receiving unemployment benefits on refusal."

But this, of course, could not be called industrial conscription!

He goes on to say:—  
"There will be just the same case as in war for high taxation and for big loans as well as controls so as to prevent excess spending power getting out of hand...."

And again:—  
"If you look at the whole of what we have been talking about, you will find that it means a new construction of the whole of the Australian system.... That, of necessity, implies the granting of full powers to the National Government."

Another of the Government's brain trust, in the person of Professor Copland, had similar things to say, of which the following are but samples:—

(i) "The planned construction of houses for people in the lower income groups must be a responsibility of the Government.... It would, of course, be a shame to get people out of the lower income groups! It is better to keep the incomes low and the houses suitable for low incomes!"

(ii) "Social services offer the most convenient means of achieving the redistribution of incomes...."

The same inadequate amount of money, you see, but distributed differently. Pull some people down a long way to raise others up a little way!

(iii) "The economic policy, of the Government will aim at providing useful employment for all those seeking work.... So the provision of work is to be the aim of the Government!"

(iv) "... The country will face the choice of abandoning its new faith by conceding ground to the popular cry against high taxation, or continuing strong in the faith by abandoning the popular political pastime of promising continued reductions in post-war direct taxation."

(v) "We must make a determined effort to promote mobility of labour." But don't call it industrial conscription!

(vi) "We may dislike this new breed of theorists who masquerade under the name of economists, but they will be with us for a long time.... We cannot expect to make the progress, we would like without a major political battle and a bitter economic controversy.... The biggest problem is to get this thing across."

So the Constitution must be changed to enable them to get it across!

In the discussion which followed Professor Copland's address, one of the speakers in lauding this member of the Government's brain-trust, said:—"The need is to control not only the business community, but also John Citizen." (But once again, it must not be regarded as industrial conscription!) Dr. Coombs is the Director of Post-War Reconstruction, and his ideas are in harmony with those already quoted above, but in order to leave nothing to speculation, I quote his actual words:—

(a) "There has been, in the past, a close relationship between the level of imports and the level of national income, and there is little reason to believe that this relationship will not be sustained in the post-war period...."

(b) "In many ways, people will be better prepared for drastic action...."

(c) "It has been suggested that work is not an end in itself, and that our real object should be to increase consumption or to provide greater leisure.... I would say that to the individual a job is an end to itself. It gives a real satisfaction, apart from the pay received or the goods produced."

(d) "Perhaps even the slaves who toiled and sweated in the construction of the

pyramids derived some satisfaction from their grandeur."

(e) "Employees could be persuaded to attend work regularly, to maintain production to preserve factory discipline and so on" basically because overhanging them was the threat of unemployment.... An employee in these days does not fear that if he loses his present job he will be unable to find another. Consequently, the basic sanction of labour discipline has been removed."

(f) "Decisions as to how labour... is to be used will be made increasingly by public authorities rather than by individuals...."

Dr. Lloyd Ross writes and speaks more interestingly, but means the same thing. A few actual quotations will suffice to prove this:

(i) "If liberal democracy is not compatible with full employment then it is liberal democracy that will go." (This was quoted by him from the "London Economist" of 3/10/42)

(ii) "If we lose this fight, we lose all... Anyone" who joins in the general attack on controls is an enemy of Australia, or all the righteousness of their motives and the size of their headlines."

(iii) Quoting Lord Keynes with approval he said: "Keynes has said frankly that pyramids might be preferable to houses."

(iv) "It is fantastic that we should be depressed at the possibilities before us in Australia. But we need also the recognition of the need for more State control State guidance and State ownership."

(v) "We want full employment—but this means increasing Government control." On top of all this Dr. Walker, of the Department of War Organisation of Industry, previously a University Professor, declared:—

"The first point is that these proposals for Constitutional reform must go through."

So it all goes to show that if the Constitution is altered, as proposed at the Referendum, then the Professors with their archaic ideas will be free to take charge of affairs and arrange our living conditions as they think best for us—but, if the Referendum proposals are rejected on August 19 the people will be in the position to insist that the Professors and all other Government employees shall be required to carry out the policy desired by the people. In other words, the People will continue to be protected from the Planners, and will still be able to identify and defeat the real enemies in the background.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN.  
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2  
August 13, 1944.

## MIND OF MAN TEMPORARILY UNHINGED

"Our crooked sense of values in these years will amaze historians of the 21st century, who will see that for at least a generation civilised thought has veered dangerously off its course," said Dr. Frank Louat, the Constitutional authority, in an address to the Optimists' Club in Sydney, recently.

"Probably historians will conclude that the succeeding tragedies of two world wars and a depression had the effect of temporarily unhinging the mind of humanity," he added.

"To-day we have become suspicious of all emotion, ashamed to be called idealists, careless of moral and social principles. Instead, we are obsessed with the pathetic fallacy that work and payment for it are the only important things, and that complicated economic law-making will somehow yield the secret of human happiness."

"A curious proof of this mental unbalance is the place of consequence and power to which we have lifted up the economists. They are the witch-doctors of the new superstition. We pay them homage with imposing official titles, put them in charge of spheres of government, and then call upon them to perform their magic. Alas, poor men, like the fakirs of more primitive societies, they share the belief of their devotees in their own power."

**PETROL PROBLEMS:** Press reports inform us that petrol rationing in U.S. has brought rackets into operation, similar to those in the prohibition era. Gangsters supply tickets to filling stations at 75 cents (4/7) for five gallons, and the customer pays 3/- per gallon and is quite happy about it. Government inspectors are powerless to cope with the situation, which according to the New York "Times," has produced gunplay and blackmail. It is obvious that in this case there is no shortage of petrol, and that rationing under such circumstances inevitably leads to black markets.

**MIRACLE MACHINES:** A daily press article of July 15 tells of the miraculous output of U.S. machines—under war conditions when money is freely available—but did not mention that these machines were equally miraculous, but partly idle, in the peace years when money was made scarce by the bankers. The article also stated that owing to a decline of war orders industry would now switch over to bicycles, typewriters, vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, kitchen goods, cutlery, furniture, and later on to washing-machines and refrigerators; plans are also ready for an output of 2,000,000 automobiles immediately Germany falls. Evidently U.S. intends to have production under way so that soldiers' old jobs will be waiting for them—but apparently our Government intends to prevent this so that the bureaucrats can "direct" them and boss them around.

## CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLES

The following letter was published in "Truth" (London) of June 2, 1944:—

Sir,—The matter is of such importance that I beg to be allowed to reply to my critic who signs himself "True Blue" in your issue of May 12. As to Disraeli the evidence is overwhelming. Can "True Blue" possibly be ignorant that he first stood for Parliament as an extreme Radical, that as a "Conservative" he was notorious for "educating the Party in the art of stealing the clothes of the Whigs," especially in the matter of the extension of the suffrage in 1867, and that his Suez Canal deal has been quoted by Socialists ever since as the first example of "State Enterprise"? I have produced evidence in my letter of April 21 that a contemporary Communist in Germany regarded him with "boundless admiration," but that is true also of similar people in England. H. M. Hyndman the Marxist, and leader, first of the National Social Party (significant title!) and later of the Social Democratic Federation, tells in his "Reminiscences" (Vol. 1); how he urged Disraeli to take the leadership of the Left in this country. As for the confidence of his Sovereign, I should have thought that the extraordinary charm of Disraeli, and the fact that he exerted it to the full in order to gain and retain her favour, would have been sufficiently well known. The Disraelian "principles" which "True Blue" is sure are the antithesis of Socialistic philosophy, are to be heard in one form or another on the lips of every prominent Socialist in the country. Mr. Shinwell and Mr. Morrison, for example, emit them with monotonous frequency, and I do not know a single Socialist who would disagree with them. They sound well, but can be made to mean almost anything. "To maintain our institutions," for instance, can mean to maintain Parliament as a Soviet or Reichstag, which, as at present, will "rubber stamp" all forms of State control directed against the individual without even a single dissentient vote. "To preserve the British Empire" can mean transforming it into a centralised, Stalinist Empire, or an American-type Federation, as well as it can mean preserving that independence and free co-operation which is its essence. What I am concerned about is the RESULT of this perversion of the Conservative Party into the mere Right Wing of the Socialist Party, which is to be seen to-day in a predominantly Conservative Parliament, which is pushing through, under cover of the war, a mass of National Socialist legislation to the accompaniment of hearty applause from the whole Left Wing. We get a "Conservative" Minister who hurries through, "rather as an edict than as a Bill" (to quote Lord Quickswood in "The Times," April 11), an Education Bill which interferes with our children's lives, our responsibilities as parents, with religion and with local government. And now we get Fuehrer Willink telling us (at Croydon, May 17) that there is no question of WHETHER, but only of HOW, his Human Veterinary (which he calls National Health) Service is to be imposed on us. Before the war such a proposal would have been fought tooth and nail; now the Government thinks it can rely on 100 per cent, of yes-men in the House, and so far has been justified. What on earth has happened? Are there no honest men left in Parliament with the courage to meet this challenge? If there are, in God's name let us hear from them!

—C. G. DOBBS.

## ERIC BUTLER'S WELCOME HOME

Don't forget to keep September 4 free to take part in this gathering of old friends and supporters at "The Victoria," Little Collins Street, Melbourne, at 8 p.m. Eric has advised that he has quite a lot of interesting experiences to relate, which may be pointers to future events. Supper will be served—which should round off a very enjoyable evening. Miss M. Fahey, c/o the "New Times" Office, will appreciate your early acceptance in order to attend to catering arrangements. It will help considerably if the overall charge of 3/6 accompanies acceptances.

## THE CRY ETERNAL

I'm getting weary of this eternal cry for more work. Let machines do the work they do it better and more economically And let people enjoy the fruit, as their cultural heritage. Let them cultivate the mind, the soul, the character. Leisure an honour—a blessing.

Oliver M. Thomason.

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. A. Allsop, McEwan House, Melbourne, C. 1.