

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).

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No. 41. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 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.

Australia's Independence in Grave Danger!

The World-Gov. Plot and Dr. Evatt

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

"By all these means we shall so wear down the Goyim [non-Jews] that they will be compelled to offer us international power of a nature that will enable us without any violence gradually to absorb all the Stare Forces of the world and to form a Super-Government. Its hands will reach out in all directions like nippers, and its organisation will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world."

The above is an extract from those remarkable documents called "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," which, although denounced as "forgeries," appear to be the blueprint for the "New World Order." Events have certainly followed the programme outlined in "The Protocols" in a most significant manner.

One of the groups that have been used for disseminating propaganda urging the destruction of national sovereignties and the building of a "Super-Government," is the Institute for the Scientific Study of International Relations. Referring to these efforts, a most prominent member of that Institute, Professor Arnold Toynbee, said in 1931:

"And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands . . ."

Bearing this statement in mind we can now proceed to examine our own Attorney General's attitude toward "Super-Government."

When the present war broke out the "Super-Government" idea was put forward under the title of Federal Union. Dr. Evatt is on record as having verbally opposed Federal Union. But time has passed since then, and Dr. Evatt emerges as our leading protagonist of the Super-Government idea! In the Federal Parliament on September 8 he delivered a lengthy address, which contains statements that should be analysed closely by all thinking Australian electors immediately.

Sir Keith Murdoch, a product of that German-Jewish socialist institution, the London School of Economics, directs the policy of the Melbourne socialist daily, "The Herald," and it was therefore only

fitting that nearly a page of that paper should be devoted to reporting the major part of Dr. Evatt's address on the alleged necessity for a World Government backed up by a World Police Force.

Dr. Evatt makes it perfectly clear that his advocacy is based on the ideas of the men primarily responsible for the establishment of the League of Nations after the last war. It is a well-established historical fact that the League of Nations was a Jewish idea and that President Wilson was a helpless tool in the hands of such financiers as Jacob Schiff and Bernard Baruch.

The League of Nations not only did not stop war; it helped enormously to bring about the present war, because it was one of the means used to reduce Britain to a third-rate power while Germany was frantically re-arming.

It is to be hoped that never again will any of the British peoples allow themselves to be deluded by abstract talk about "collective security."

Dr. Evatt, friend of Baruch and other powerful Jews, seeks to persuade us that only by an International Government can further wars be avoided. Perhaps military war between nations would be avoided, but the state of affairs would be even worse than such war. For one thing, we would be in the same sort of position, greatly intensified, as the German people have been in—under one strong Central Government controlling all the armed forces, etc. Only men with the slave-mentality would desire to live under such conditions.

Now, in order to stampede us into accepting the "Super-Government" idea, it is deemed essential to threaten that a Third World War will be brought about if we

don't heed Dr. Evatt and his friends. Dr. Evatt puts it clearly:

"But the Allies must seize this second opportunity—probably the last opportunity for the democracies—of preventing another world war."

It is obvious that the International Planners are in a hurry. Dr. Evatt wasn't successful with his first effort to alter our internal economic and political set-up. So it is not surprising to learn that he is likely to visit America again.

There is one question, which these "Super-Government" advocates always ignore:

Which nation is likely to be the aggressor to threaten the peace after this war is over?

Germany has been used to start two wars in this century, and all realists such as Vansittart have pointed out that Germany must not only be defeated militarily; she must be dealt with in such a manner that never again can the German General Staff and the men behind the Staff, start another conflict. Germany must be de-centralised, etc.

In his speech of September 8, Dr. Evatt paid lip service to the de-centralisation argument, but went on to say:

"As against this it is necessary to consider the strains and stresses which the partition of Germany might set up in other directions. . . ."

Just what mysterious "strains and stresses" might be created, Dr. Evatt did not mention. But he went on to say that

Germany must be integrated with the rest of Europe:

"This is a question which I think is best approached from the angle of the maximum degree of European unity which is attainable, making a beginning in such practical ways as European-wide control of certain public utilities, for example, transport and communications."

Just how the peoples of Europe are going to control public utilities organised on a European-wide scale, when they cannot even control their own national Governments effectively, is not explained. But I can well imagine certain Germans and German-Jews quickly obtaining key positions in such proposed unified organisations.

The Socialists in all countries were the agents mainly responsible for the sabotage of the Allied military victory in 1918, and they still refuse to face the German problem. Bernard Shaw has recently expressed himself strongly against the proposal to de-centralise Germany. Mr. Shaw reveals just what he and other Socialists believe:

"There is no power in the world more completely imbued with the idea of dominance than the British Empire."

Mr. Shaw goes on to say: "WITHOUT A GOOD DEAL OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM NO MODERN STATE COULD EXIST FOR A WEEK."

This pernicious anti-democratic and anti-British talk was, of course, given prominently (Continued on page 4.)

Clergymen and others endeavouring to break down the White Australia policy should be interested in the following report in the "Sun" of October 3 of a statement by an Indian, Sir Oliver Goonediya (Civil Defence and Food Commissioner of Ceylon), viz.: "We think it is the inherent right of a free country to decide on the composition of its own nationals." And this: "The people of Ceylon never had occasion to complain about the White Australia policy." And this: "Undeveloped land still keeps and is always available for the expansion of future generations. In Ceylon the permanent population is now faced with the problem that the best lands have already gone." Let's hope the anti-White Australians read that—and heed it.

U.N.R.R.A.: The representatives of this body have indicated that they require from Australia, food, clothing, shelter, medical supplies, agricultural materials, industrial equipment and their materials in that priority. It should be noted that the first four items have hitherto been distributed by the "Red Cross," which is an international body, so that to extent the U.N.R.R.A. is superfluous. Agricultural and industrial equipment is produced in abundance, and always has been readily available; as a matter of fact, it is so abundant that the manufacturers spend millions annually inviting customers—so, U.N.R.R.A. seems to have a very limited use. In any case Australia or other countries can, and would, willingly exchange or give required goods or services to needy nations direct, without the intervention of this impersonal body. It would be better for all concerned to negotiate direct and maintain the personal relationship: Canada has given a lead in this direction. This idea would interest your Federal Member.

PARATROOPS' PLEAS: The Melbourne "Sun" of October 4 reports that "Britain has been shocked by a report of uniformed paratroops 'begging' for money, so that the men might fight without anxiety regarding the future of their homes and families." Official organisers say the collection was unauthorised, but admit they are planning to launch a £1,000,000 appeal. This is an admission of the insecurity the paratroops labour under, and an admission that the Government are failing in their duty in not providing financial security for these heroic men.

MONEY MOLOCHS. Further evidence of the financiers' secret methods of war-mongering was disclosed (also in the "Sun" of October 4), in a report to the effect that the German Government had obtained 20,000,000, to 35,000,000 dollars from American bankers before Pearl Harbour. The banks were sympathetic to the Nazis, and received 7% commission on sales. The banks concerned were, Chase-National, J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation of New York, New York Overseas Corporation, Robert C. Mayer and Co., and Deutsche Handels und Wirtschaftsdienst. It will also be recalled that the Bank of England (Montagu Norman since retired with a baronetcy) also presented Germany with many millions just before the present war, as well as £12 millions of Czechoslovakian gold.

QUEER QUIZ: A full-page advertisement in the "Woman's Weekly" for September 23 features a "Quiz" which asks, "What is the difference between a bank-note under the mattress and a bond

in the bank?" The answer given is: "A £100 bond, in sixteen years brings you £52 in interest, without having to work for it." Fancy the bankers' men trying to put over the "some-thing-for-nothing" story! But, of course, it isn't true: the small bondholder pays himself his interest, through taxation, and, of course, he pays more in taxation than he receives in interest—the surplus pays the banker his rake-off on book-entries lent to the Government. (Banks don't lend hard-earned cash like the small bondholder.)

BEAN'S BOMB: During the Inquiry into the Australia First Movement, extracts dealing with Communist activities were quoted from Dr. Bean's book, "War Aims of a Plain Australian." For example: "The Communists, who gave much more real (Continued on page 2.)

Chifley's Misleading Statements

To the Editor: Sir,—In his recent Budget speech Federal Treasurer Chifley is quoted as saying: "It is no use thinking we can give all the people social security by use of bank credit, because that is the road to madness. Only 16% of England's National Insurance Fund was paid by contributors." (Melbourne "Sun," Sept. 22, 1944.)

In my opinion such statements call for pointed comment. It is obvious that in making the first statement Mr. Chifley was thinking solely in terms of MONEY, and overlooked any consideration of actual REAL WEALTH. "Bank Credit," as referred to, is not NATIONAL Credit, which is a different matter, and which has never been used by the Curtin Government, despite misleading implications that it has done so. The former is simply Government finance through the issue of Treasury Bills, which are discounted by the private Banking System, and added on to the National Debt. To date the Curtin Government has raised roughly £400,000,000 by this method. Thus it is, in reality, not credit, but DEBT.

Inasmuch as the Treasurer implies that the use of this form of debt for the financing of social benefits is "the road to madness" he is quite correct. But the alternative method which he has proposed, i.e., the financing of the Government's Benefit Scheme by TAXATION, is likewise "the road to madness." Taxation is loaded into prices, which the recipients of any "benefit" scheme still have to pay. Whether any

scheme is regarded as "contributory," i.e., paid by subscriptions from employees, employers, and the Government, or is financed entirely from taxation revenue, the result is practically the same.

The Curtin Government's Scheme is financed in the latter way, and the Beveridge Plan by the former method. In addition to denying individual freedom, both are swindles, simply being "sops" designed to placate a growing demand for the abolition of the atrocious insecurity to which people have been subjected at the hands of the manipulators of finance. In both cases the burden of financing these plots is borne by the "beneficiary"—wage and salary earner. Mr. Chifley's statement that only 16% of the English Scheme is borne by the contributors is false.

The contributions paid by employers are recovered in prices; the amount paid by the Government is raised through taxation. The taxation paid by employers is mostly loaded into prices, so it is quite obvious that the employee practically carries the lot.

In an age of plenty due to mechanised production, the full and equitable distribution of real wealth and provision of social services and other amenities constitute no problem. They are simply a matter of provision of adequate FINANCE—without debt and without taxation. It is not, as Mr. Chifley says, a matter of "hard cash out of someone's pocket." It is a matter of whether the productivity of the nation will allow it. If the answer to the latter be "yes" (which it is), then what is PHYSICALLY possible can be made FINANCIALLY possible.

Australians should not allow themselves to be side-tracked in the matter of needed services by the "bankers' boloney," served up to them by "certified" economists and prattling politicians. Further, they would be wise to write and tell their Federal Members what they think.

Yours, etc., B.J. GOULDING, Elwood

Russia and America

Referring in a speech at Seattle to his visit to Russia, Eric Johnston, U.S. Chamber of Commerce president, after praising Russia as a nation of indomitable courage, described it as a land where "civil liberties are only a vague promise," and where, "if there is any religion, it is the worship of Stalin."

"In my travels I have re-discovered America," he said. Never before did I realise the importance of our freedom, our standard of living, our right of habeas corpus, our Bill of Rights."

—New York "World Telegram."

Guard Australia's Independence

SEND THIS LETTER TO YOUR FEDERAL M.P.

Mr. M.H.R.,

Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T.

Dear Sir,—I respectfully request you, as my representative in the Commonwealth Parliament, to OPPOSE by all means in your power ANY move that might, in the slightest degree, hand over Australia's sovereignty, freedom-of action and independence, in regard to financial or other matters, domestic or external, to ANY sort of international authority.

I have in mind, particularly, recently-announced proposals for an International Monetary Scheme (possibly based on gold), the U.N.R.R.A. Bill, and proposals for an international "police force."

Yours faithfully,

(Signature)

(Address)

GUILTY MAN ACCUSES THE INNOCENT!

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

Sir, —A lot of prominence is again being given to Dr. G. L. Wood, Acting Professor of Commerce at the Melbourne University. Three times within the past week he has been featured by the "Argus":

He was featured as a signatory to a long statement on World Security (without, of course, even mentioning the thing that prevents us from having world security, i.e., private control of WORLD FINANCIAL POLICY), then in a report of an "outspoken address" he gave at the University as the John Smyth memorial lecture, and again as a reviewer of a "plan" issued by the Australian Institute of Public Affairs (Sir Keith Murdoch).

When a man is being pushed forward by the press it is advisable to look behind the scenes, for it is not the habit of the daily press to give prominence to anyone who is genuinely seeking to liberate the PEOPLE from their chains.

Dr. G. L. Wood has been no exception to this, for instead of working for the release of the PEOPLE from the chains of DEBT and TAXATION he has taken a prominent part in having those chains more firmly fitted. Debt and Taxation bring no benefit to the People and have never been asked for by the People. These burdens have been IMPOSED on the People by the controllers of financial policy, and it is these controllers who have been so faithfully served in the past by Dr. Wood.

On the basis of the "Argus" report, his address at the University entitled, "The Purchasing Power of a Pedagogue," was nothing more than a gratuitous attack by a guilty man on a long-suffering innocent community, whose members have been deliberately kept uninformed on matters of vital concern. The very ignorance against which he fulminates is partly the product of his own behaviour, and is the very evidence to prove his own incompetence as an educator.

Before commenting on his remarks at the University, let us refresh our memories by reference to public records of his activities. He is Dean of the Faculty of Commerce, and has worked for many years in close association with Professors Copland and Giblin. The Faculty consists of the Dean and thirteen members. Prof. Copland has life tenure in the office of Dean, but the members are appointed annually as follows:

Two by the University Council; three by the Faculty; and one each by the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Agriculture, the Associated Banks, the Stock Exchange, the Insurance Institute, the Joint Council of Accounting Bodies, and the Trades Hall Council.

Everyone, you see, of the right financial outlook!

Looking at the University Calendar for 1925 we find that the original members were carefully selected to ensure that there would be no departure from established custom, and included such men as Sir Robert Gibson (who, later as Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board, delivered the ultimatum to the supposedly sovereign Government in 1931 that unless it carried out the dictum of the Bank Board it could have no funds with which to carry on the Government of Australia — the dictum of the Board being the dictum of the International Financiers, as issued through Niemeyer and Guggenheim); E. V. Nixon (who later became a member of the Monetary and Banking Commission); and M. B. Duffy, from the Trades Hall Council (who, though supposed to be representing the rank-and-file of us, stood dumbly by as a member of the Bank Board, while the Scullin Government and his fellow Australians who trusted him were betrayed and crucified).

In the following year, Dr. Wood appeared in the list of lecturers, apparently having been O.K.'d by the members of the Faculty as one who would stick to the track prescribed, and he has lived up to their expectations regardless of truth. A little later Sir Lennon Raws, of the Metal Monopoly, and attorney in Australasia for Imperial Chemical Industries, was elected by the University Council.

No truthful person would deny that, in association with the members of the Faculty and the other professors mentioned, Dr. Wood has taken more than his reasonable share not only in maintaining an inadequate and obsolescent monetary system, but also, through the infamous Premiers' Plan, in imposing hardship and poverty on hundreds of thousands of people merely to fit in with financial conditions deliberately engineered to bring about deflation.

Dr. Wood has never lacked publicity. All the monopolistic newspapers have quoted him as an authority, and have even adopted the pabulum uttered by him as the basis of editorials.

Until now, they have succeeded in keeping a large section of the people under the combined hypnotism of unintelligible technical phrases and inspired fear of change. In this respect, note the wording of his subject—"The Purchasing Power of a Pedagogue." It may be claimed that he has

not received so much publicity as other "experts," or that he has not been so well rewarded, but the fact remains that he is still quoted as an authority and is still in charge of the Faculty "teaching" the students.

On May 17, 1934, he told us "progress could be measured by the volume of insolvency," and that "the amount of progress of which a country was capable could be gauged by the amount of bankruptcy it could stand." (Quoted from Melbourne "Age" of 18/5/34.) He said that at a time when bankruptcies were high in consequence of the policy of deflation he had helped to impose, and he knows that the bankruptcies became fewer and fewer as the supply of money was increased. He also knows that bankruptcies are fewest of all when great volumes of purchasing power are being used as at present. A few years ago he had no compunction at all in advocating conditions under which teachers were overworked and underpaid, and did not hesitate to advise the cutting of expenditure in order to "balance the Budget." Balancing the Budget was more important to his befuddled brain than feeding or educating the children.

In the light of this, what are we to think of his outburst last week entitled in the "Argus" report, "Lip Service to Education"? Here is a bit of it:

"After the best part of a working lifetime spent in education, I am convinced that the Australian community gives little more than lip-service to education, and that is about all it is prepared to give. . . . The policy of Governments was a faithful reflection of the demands of the majority of the people, and if there was anything wrong with education on its material side, it was due to the ignorance and apathy of voters, and to little else, . . . Australia's State education system was as good as it was because a devoted, under-trained, and under-paid profession had refused to let the nation's children down. . . . The teacher had become the most significant factor in modern life, but the financial provision for his task was unbelievably mean. . . . Most Australians had been convinced, perhaps, that crime did not pay, but they still had to be convinced that education did."

On his own admission he has been a colossal failure as an educator, and that

THOSE VOTERS' POLICY ASSOCIATIONS

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —Your esteemed correspondent, Mr. Bowden, of the United Democrats, Adelaide, has invited Social Crediters generally to submit constructive criticism of a plan for setting up organised, stereotyped Voters' Policy Associations. ("N.T.," 22/9/44.)

I know that it will be realised at once that the present writer is by no means the sole repository of knowledge in the field embraced by such associations, or the only person who could possibly be expected to have anything of use to say in the matter, and perhaps I shall be credited with sufficient awareness of the fact; but, in view of the (sometimes incorrect) attempts I have made and the sum of my small researches, I have to say, without wishing to be in the least rude or discouraging, that it would have been better for the proposer of the plan to try it first in a practical way before submitting it as a proposal to be either acted upon or amended.

To submit a plan to a democracy is to damn it immediately! The mob will tear it to pieces. Far better to test it; ascertain its shortcomings; prove its worth—or its worthlessness—amend it or adapt it if necessary (in private or in conference with a few capable collaborators), and then—having confidence in it because it works (if it works), and then only—exhibit it to those capable of appreciating it; telling them what it can be expected to achieve if used according to directions, and resolutely refusing to be drawn into debate as to proposals for its amendment; letting those who consider they have a better method go ahead and demonstrate their method, if they like to.

It is timely, also, to draw attention to the fact that there are as many varieties of "Social Creditor" (and how many can give a definition of the term?) as there are individuals, and that these varieties embrace not only differences of philosophy, but differences—or degrees—of competence as well, and that it is hardly fair or reasonable that the "competent" (necessarily small in number) should be called upon to compete in debate or in voting power on a per capita basis with those—greater in number—not yet so competent.

While on the subject of competence I must say—as an excuse for insistence on degrees of competence—that while, admittedly, there are just as many—even more—among the as yet officially unrecognised who have attained a suitable degree of competence to give sound advice, and while, admittedly, there are those who hold no diplomas who are possibly more competent than those who do—nevertheless the diffi-

has come about because he has identified himself with hocus pocus instead of reality. So far as I have been able to find out, never at any time has he exposed to his students the greatest confidence trick ever put over mankind—the financial system—and yet everything he condemns is the direct result of the operation of that system. The Education Department is financed from taxation, and the Australian people have submitted to outrageous burdens in that direction. So long as that method of finance is continued so long must education be something of a joke. Even the University in which the great man spoke has been hamstrung for years by lack of finance, and can only provide "chairs" when private interests supply funds! And yet the idea is fondly cherished that this and similarly financed institutions can give education pure and undefiled!

To say that the policy of Governments is a faithful reflection of the demands of the majority of the people is to show an utter lack of appreciation of the facts. Government policies are formulated by a mere handful of people, and none of them depart from financial orthodoxy. These pre-arranged policies are then placed before the people for them to express their preference. The people have not been provided with the facilities for stating their OWN policy. Governments yield to pressure, and hitherto the pressure has come from vested interests. It has not come from the people.

There is plenty wrong with education on its material side, and the ignorance and apathy of voters are further evidence of the failure of education as conducted by men of the type of Dr. G. L. Wood. Classes of 60 instead of 30 or less are the result of the economics preached by Dr. Wood and his associates, under which schools and their equipment must be fitted into finance, instead of finance being fitted into the people's requirements. And the ignorance of voters is due to the fact that they have never been taught the facts of finance. For this, Dr. Wood is one of the guilty men.

It is all clearly a matter of "financial provision," but apparently this "doctor" knows only quack remedies. Before he again poses as an authority it would be advisable for him to study the subject of the production and control of the money supply. There will be no need to convince the people that education pays when once they know that true education is being practised. The results they see round about them show only too clearly that education of the type known to Dr. Wood is not much good.

Is it to be wondered at that in 1935 the then Secretary of State for the Dominions (Rt. Hon. J. H. Thomas) said: "For the past four years I have listened to the greatest professors, economists, and financiers, and have come to the conclusion they are not worth a damn."

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, CL2-8th October 1944.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

help to Hitler, would have been the first to be exterminated." A peculiar aspect of this Inquiry is the number of "accused" who have strongly denounced Communism and International Jewry—which makes Dr. Bean's quotations significant. It is also worthy of note that many public trials and inquiries here and in other countries appear to be substantially concerned with investigating critics of Communists and Jews—a recent "sedition trial" in U.S. also showed this similarity, which seems to point to an affinity between the two, and further that the machinery of State and Law is readily available for this end.

TURKISH TANGLES: John Hightower, Associated Press correspondent, says that "Russia is believed to be making her intentions clear to deal with Turkey in her own way when the time for settlement of war problems arises." He also says, "free access to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles has been the historical objective of Russia." Considerable importance is also attached in Washington to an article in "Pravda" accusing Turkey of harbouring Nazi spies. For reasons such as these, it may well be that Russia may also undertake the task of liberating the Turks from the Turks, and perhaps from British influence. The cause of Freedom appears to be served in many strange ways.

STATES' SOVEREIGNTY: Another brief Federal Session may be held before the end of the year to consider legislation to amend the Financial Agreement Act between the Commonwealth and the States. Here is an opportunity for electors to encourage State Members to rescue State Parliaments from that financiers' trap. Your State Member should be asked to endeavour to terminate the Agreement. This would in some measure restore the States' sovereignty. It is a good opportunity to point out how State Parliaments are hamstrung and brought into disrepute through this centralised financial scheme. (Later reports indicate that the proposed amendments consist of the substitution of debentures for treasury bills owed by the States, in order to place a further stranglehold on the States. This makes the matter more urgent.)

CHINESE CONFLICT: Diplomatic sources are now being permitted to give some inside information, through the press, on the delicate position in China. The Melbourne "Sun" of September 21 gives some inkling of the problem by pointing out that Chinese Communists have been well armed by the Soviet, and that the Chinese central Government is afraid of these forces—in effect, it is confronted by two armies, the Japanese on the one hand, and the Communists on the other. It is not explained why the Soviet made war equipment available to Communist forces instead of to the Chinese Government. Meanwhile the Japanese are overpowering ill-equipped Chinese regular forces.

LEADER LOGIC: In U.S. the Republican presidential candidate (Mr. Dewey) has been debunking the leader-mania, viz.: "No man is indispensable to America or the world." His remarks are taken to refer to President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin. He added that "world peace must not hang on the slender thread of the life-span and continued friendship of two or three individuals." In reporting this, the Melbourne "Sun" of September 21 stated that Mr. Dewey had two narrow escapes from death, first when a train was wrecked, and again when his speeding car nearly hit a furniture van. Politics doesn't seem to be quite the gentle game it used to be! Incidentally, a recent "Gallup Poll" on Roosevelt indicates that his popularity has declined about eight points.

—O.B.H.

ERIC BUTLER IN BRISBANE

While temporarily stationed in Brisbane, Mr. Eric D. Butler has been taking the opportunity of contacting as many social crediters as possible.

On Wednesday, September 27, he addressed a small group of the Brisbane Voters' Policy Association, and emphasised the necessity for electors to pay far more attention to their State Members in future. He said: "Here in Queensland, where the Labor Government voted in favour of the infamous Powers Bill without consulting the people, electors should be now asking State Members who voted in favour of the Powers Bill, where they stand, because there was a 'No' majority in nearly every Queensland electorate at the Referendum."

Mr. Butler also said that he was going to approach Mr. Frank Barnes, M.L.A., and ascertain whether he would ask in the State House if an official inquiry into what the Government of the Canadian province of Alberta had accomplished would be possible. He suggested that, if the issue were raised in the House, social crediters throughout Queensland should write immediately to their State Members urging them to support an inquiry.

PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENTS

Gentleman of wide experience, commercial and pastoral, is open for engagement. Full qualifications. Personal interview. —"7568," c/o the "New Times."

A PUBLIC DEBATE

"SOCIAL CREDIT or SOCIALISM?"

Mr. J. McKellar (Douglas Credit Movement)

versus

Mr. G. A. Dawson (Socialist League),
Temperance Hall, Sunday, 15th October,
7.30 p.m.

Arranged by the No Conscription Campaign.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION POLICIES

Valuable Report by Vancouver Board of Trade

In February 1943, a Post-War Policy Committee was set up by the Vancouver Board of Trade. At the end of September 1943, it issued an admirable Report, which, among other things, told the truth about the banking system. The Report was very favourably received, though very inadequately reported. But then—in the words of Harold L. Weir's "feature" article, "The Dark Mystery of Vancouver's Forgotten Report," published in the "Edmonton Bulletin"—

"... The situation suddenly changed. Copies of the Report began to disappear. They were withdrawn from circulation and called in wherever possible. An atmosphere of dark mystery began to overhang the whole affair. What happened no one knows. But it seems to be clear that this excellent and intelligent and far-seeing Report was in process of being done to death by men who had been told to do it to death."

Nevertheless, the "New Times" has obtained one of the official, printed copies of this remarkable Report, and we are reprinting the full text in these columns. (Readers are strongly urged to get extra copies of our issues in which the Report appears—direct from our office if necessary—and circulate them as widely as possible among businessmen, etc.) Here is the first instalment:—

PART I—ANALYTICAL

(1) NATIONAL ECONOMY

During the period of little more than the decade, which has passed, a far-reaching revolution has taken place in the attitude of people towards the economic affairs of the country. This is true not only of Canada, but of most other nations. Whereas previously the majority of people took the economic system for granted and accepted the established tenets of economics, today there exists an almost general interest in all matters relating to the national economy and a widespread doubt regarding its soundness. Doctrines challenging the established and hitherto accepted axioms of orthodoxy in the economic field continue to gain increasing support. There is a growing conviction that the old economic order is now obsolete and that mankind must step forth boldly to explore new ideas on which to build the future economy.

This startling change in thought has been brought about by the sheer pressure of events. The economic crisis of 1929 and the years, which followed, brought home to millions of people the fact that the system lacked stability. Whatever the seemingly plausible reasons put forward, it was apparent that no reliance could be placed in an economic organisation which could, within a matter of weeks, divest millions of people of every vestige of economic security and plunge the entire national economy of one country after another into a chaotic state of acute depression.

Emphasis was given to this by the paradox of "poverty in the midst of plenty" which stood out as a challenge to human intelligence. That widespread want and general insecurity could exist side by side with the unused resources to produce abundantly, required a great deal more explanation than was proffered by the economic experts.

As years of depression brought home to people the stark realisation that the economic malady which was afflicting the world was more than a mere passing phase due to an unfortunate combination of factors unlikely to recur—when, in fact, it was apparent that their economic plight was chronic in nature and due to causes inherent in the system—increasing attention became centred in the fact that while the capacity to produce was never greater, the mechanism of distributing the products of industry was inadequate. Money being the main instrument for organising distribution, more and more attention was directed towards a critical examination of the monetary system.

In this also it was the evidence of events that brought the monetary question to the forefront. With idle men available and an abundance of materials, it seemed a travesty of common sense that much-needed highways, hospitals and homes could not be built because there was said to be no money available. The growing pressure of taxation and the piling up of debt—both features of our financial arrangements—likewise directed attention to the monetary system.

With the outbreak of war a complete transformation took place in our economy—and, for that matter, in the economies of other countries. The cry of "where is the money to come from?" or "there is no money to do this and that" was no longer heard. Whereas previously millions of dollars "could not be found" to feed the hungry, clothe the ill-clad and provide decent homes for the poverty-stricken, billions of dollars were forthcoming for the mass-production of the destructive weapons of war.

Within the space of months, industry was expanding with increasing momentum, and after three years of the stress and wastage of war. WITH THE CREAM OF THE NATION'S MANPOWER IN THE FIGHTING FORCES, production had been MORE THAN DOUBLED and continued to increase.

As people's thoughts were carried beyond the war to the kind of world, which would be created out of its havoc, the conditions of the pre-war years of depression stood out in a new light. The disillusionment was complete.

It was argued that if we could produce such abundance, with our manpower depleted, for purposes of war we could produce an even greater abundance, when our fighting forces return, to provide security for all in peace-time. Again, if we can

organise our economy to produce and "give away" billions of dollars' worth of manufactured goods to Canada's enemies, in the form of high explosives, we could organise our peace-time economy to produce and, if necessary, to give away goods to ensure the security and well-being of our Canadian people.

Similarly, in regard to many of the major problems, which confronted Canadians before the war, these were viewed in a new light against the achievements of a wartime economy.

Thus a growing conviction that a drastic reconstruction of our national economy would be inevitable after the war, and that preparation for this should be made in advance, found expression in the widespread interest that has developed regard-

ing Post-War Reconstruction. In fact, so strong has this become that the focus of the war is rapidly becoming centred in this dominant issue. In directing their attention to this question, governments and various organised bodies alike are but responding to public opinion.

However, there is a real danger that the multitude of counsels and opinions, which are being expressed on Post-War Reconstruction problems, will serve merely to cause widespread argument and confusion, with disastrous results to the future of the country. Change which is born out of social conflict and confusion carries with it the danger of revolution and chaos, with the resulting plight of the nation being worse than before. Viewing the ominous trend of events in this country and elsewhere, it would be a lack of realism to ignore this danger.

Accordingly, in dealing with the task conferred upon us, your Committee considered that no recommendations, which it could make, would be of any practical value unless they were the product of a careful analysis of our social structure and were grounded on a foundation which would bear the most thorough and critical examination.

Moreover, it is essential that any such recommendations should be acceptable to the overwhelming majority of Canadians if we are to achieve the united and enthusiastic co-operation of the nation, which will be essential to any orderly and progressive reconstruction of our social structure.

Therefore your committee has found it necessary to approach its task without any pre-conceived acceptance of current premises regarding our social system in either its economic or political fields, and to get down to an examination of basic principles for the purpose of establishing a firm foundation upon which to work. Our findings on this preliminary but fundamentally important aspect of our work are summarised in the chapter, which follows.

(To be continued.)

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 thirteenth instalment from the above-mentioned book:

The next forty-eight hours in Odessa were slightly disconcerting, for although we had a telegram from Chip Bohlen [of the American Embassy] saying he would do his best, we heard nothing from Mr. Schmidt [of the Soviet Foreign Office]. No further messages came from the police, but each time we went out of the hotel I expected to arrive back to find a posse waiting for us.

The day finally came for Frank to leave for Moscow and for me to leave for Roumania. The trip to the frontier town of Tirsopol was a three-hour journey, and although Frank assured me I would be all right, I feared I might be intercepted on the way. On the train I noticed a plain-clothes man obviously following me. This was not out of the ordinary, but my heart sank when I reached Tiraspol and found the G.P.U. man that Frank had quarrelled with waiting for me in the customs house. He gave me a look that seemed filled with meaning, told me to leave my bags and identification papers and to wait in the restaurant while he examined them.

I sat down at a table and ordered some tea and a bun. Suddenly I looked up to see the plain-clothes man standing over me, a smile on his face. "I speak English," he said. I thought this was the prelude to an arrest, but he pulled up a chair and I discovered he was only seeking an opportunity to practise his English. In Russia, languages are evidently taught with an eye on propaganda, for although he spoke only pidgin English his vocabulary was sufficient to express the party line. This is the conversation we had:

"Russia good country. You English?"

"No, American."

"Unemployment in America?"

"Yes. Some." (Not wishing to let the home team down.)

"Bourgeois government." (Pause.) "Unemployment in England, too?"

"Yes, Some."

"Bourgeois government." (Pause.) "Bourgeois government, always unemployment. In Russia, workers' government, no unemployment."

I asked him if he considered Germany's government a bourgeois one, and he said that he did.

"Well, they haven't any unemployment. How do you explain that?"

He lifted his hands in consternation. "Oh, mustn't talk about Germany. Germany very bad country. Many concentration camps." He shook his head gloomily, got up, bowed, and left.

My worries were needless, for after an hour I was called back to the customs office and my papers and bags were politely handed back. Evidently Mr. Schmidt had intervened. Most surprising of all was the G.P.U. man, who shook my hand and bade me return to the Soviet Union again!

I left on a musical comedy train. It was painted bright green with chintz curtains and flowerpots in the windows. It was used only to run back and forth across the frontier, and especially designed to

impress the Roumanians. I was the only passenger on the train, and when we reached the frontier the guards got off and only the engineer and an assistant remained—the Soviet Union trusted few of its people on foreign soil.

Under ordinary circumstances, Tighina would probably seem a drab little town, but on that particular afternoon it had a glamour all its own. Everything was so bright: the bowls of fruit in the restaurant; the waitress's green earrings; the red ribbon round the cat's neck; the gaudy photograph of King Carol on the wall; the blue and white check tablecloth. The windows were shining, the floors were clean, and everybody looked plump and cheerful. The Kremlin was a long way off.

On the way back to England I travelled across Roumania, Poland, Germany, Belgium and France.

During that long trip I thought a good deal about the misery and inhumanity I had seen under totalitarian regimes. I had seen the extremists on both sides of the war in Spain; I had seen Nazism in Germany, Communism in Russia. I knew more than ever that I believed in democracy.

In America I had believed in democracy because I had been taught to, but now I believed in it because I had learned what it meant.

It meant the right of the majority to rule and the right of the minority to exist. This last seemed to me the most important of all, for wherever the minority has the right to exist, men can think and speak according to their conscience.

I had heard people argue that "freedom of speech" was a misused privilege; that on the whole it was a small deprivation to be forbidden to criticise the government. But "the government" was not an abstract term. The government was the clothes you wore; the cigarettes you smoked; the food you ate; the schools you went to; the books you read; the streets you walked along. It conditioned your thoughts and fashioned your ambitions.

When you surrendered your right to oppose the government, you surrendered your right to live as a human being.

I had also heard it argued that the mass of people were not fit to guide their own destiny and it was therefore proper for the State to be unobstructed in directing the lives of their people for the common good. Those words "the State" were always misleading. The State was a group of men.

And I knew I didn't believe any group of men infallible enough to be awarded powers that could not be checked.

The totalitarian regimes boasted of the swiftness of their administration; when they plunged into war, I thought, that would be swift, too.

War seemed a certainty, and I knew the forces gathering to oppose each other were not merely the forces of Imperialism. It was man versus the ant-heap.

(Concluded.)

LEST WE FORGET

(From the "Social Creditor," July 1, 1944.)

The U.S. casualties in the First World War were less than two per cent, of the total of French and British casualties. She paid no war debts and received payment from every combatant. In February, 1918, when air-power was vital, General Pershing cabled Woodrow Wilson protesting against "bombastic claims" and stating: "There is not today a single American-made plane in Europe."—Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters"; Baker, Vol. VII, p. 572.

Yet, in October, Wilson entered into direct negotiations with Germany for an armistice, on his single responsibility and without reference to France or Great Britain. In 1917, he had written to Colonel House a plan "to force them (France and Great Britain). They need to be coerced"

His instructions would have left the Germans military victors. Colonel House advised: "I would suggest that you quietly diminish the transport of troops, giving as an excuse the prevalence of influenza or any other reason but the real one." ("Foreign Relations of the U.S.A. 1918": Supplement 1, Vol. I, p. 424). He was blocked by the American Generals after stating that he wanted a peace which would leave a powerful German Army "because it is certain that too much success or security on the part of the Allies will make a genuine peace settlement difficult, if not impossible."—Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters"; Baker, Vol. VIII p. 523.

The German Army was to be made too weak to stand against its combined adversaries, but strong enough to threaten the Allies without the United States. On October 30 Clemenceau asked House if he was threatening the Allies that if they did not accept Wilson's terms to Germany, America would stop fighting. "That would amount to a separate peace between the United States and the Central Powers." "It might," said Colonel House. ("Intimate Papers of Colonel House," Vol. IV p. 165.)

On December 11, 1918, the (Prussian) Guards Regiment returned to Berlin, and President Wilson's ship was approaching the European coast. Ebert, the Socialist Chancellor of the new German Republic, made a speech celebrating the return of "our undefeated army."—"Schultess Europaischer Geschichtskalender," 1918. Vol. I p. 33.

When Sir Otto Niemeyer Invaded Australia

When Sir Otto came to this country and gave us "excellent advice," I, like many other young Australians of that period, had just left school. After waiting my turn in endless job queues and squandering much boot leather on the streets of Melbourne, I hoisted Matilda and made for the bush.

My first job consisted in loading portion of a perfectly good apple crop on a cart and conveying as much of it as could be so used to adjacent pig-farms. The balance was ploughed in.

Next I assisted a neighbour to plough in his potato crop; perfect, but unmarketable at a profit. City or country, wherever I strayed, there was no dearth of production or the fruits thereof.

I have often wished Sir Otto could have accompanied me on my unwilling pilgrimage. It would have been a pleasure to introduce him to fellow-beings, ranging from laborers to university graduates, who camped with me under bridges and in recreation-ground pavilions.

The problem we faced at the time Sir Otto favoured us with a visit we shall undoubtedly face again unless our economic system is overhauled and attention is focussed on methods of ensuring consumption and adequate distribution of purchasing power.

—"A.G.A.," in Sydney "Bulletin," Sept. 27.

COMMONWEALTH BANK MUST BECOME A PEOPLE'S BANK

A Mass Protest Meeting

The Federal Government, having a major obstacle exists to prevent the reinstatement of the Commonwealth Bank, and because the support of the people of Australia could at this time gain through combined pressure the first step to a true democracy, the New World Movement will launch a nationwide campaign from the Melbourne Town Hall on Tuesday, October 24, to demand:—

- (1) TRANSFORMATION OF COMMONWEALTH BANK TO PEOPLE'S BANK.
- (2) REJECTION OF PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL AGREEMENT.
- (3) REDUCTION OF TAXATION.
- (4) REDEMPTION OF NATIONAL DEBT.

Sign Petition and obtain Request Forms from the New World Movement, Room 1, 7th Floor, 300 Little Collins St., Melbourne.

Funds urgently needed for this Australia-wide campaign.

—ADVT.

"New Times," October 13, 1944----- Page 3

The tactics and objects of Mr. H. G. Alderman, K.C., at the "Dean Case" Inquiry, together with some questions arising from them, form the subject matter of two recent letters from Mr. Bruce H. Brown to his Federal parliamentary representative, Mr. A. Calwell. The letters are published hereunder, together with Mr. Calwell's replies:—

189 Hotham Street,
East Melbourne, C.2. 7
September 1944.

The Honourable Arthur Calwell, M.P.,
Department of Information,
Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Dear Mr. Calwell,—On the 29th August, by Summons, I had to appear before the Board of Inquiry appointed by the Attorney General to inquire, "into matters relating to certain legal proceedings by Angus Dean the High Court of Australia." The summons was issued under the National Security Act 1939-1943, the National Security (General) Regulations, and the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations, all of which apply only to matters affecting public safety and the defence of the Commonwealth. Nothing touched upon at the "Inquiry" could even remotely be regarded as a threat to public safety or to the effective defence of the Commonwealth, and the abuse of our legal processes, in such a way, can only be calculated to bring discredit upon the Parliamentary Labour Party and to undermine confidence in our judicial system.

Without at this stage challenging the validity of the proceedings, I want, through you, to register the strongest possible condemnation of the manner in which they were conducted by a Mr. Alderman, described as "a King's Counsel assisting the Board." In my opinion, this man is no ornament to the legal profession, and so far as this particular "Inquiry" is concerned, he revealed himself as an ignorant, ill-mannered, and intimidatory bluffer. According to newspaper report, he received his instructions from an officer of the Attorney General's Department, and if his conduct had the personal approval of Dr. Evatt, then, when the facts become more widely known, it will do irreparable harm to the reputation and prestige of the Australian Labor Party.

I feel satisfied that the "plan of campaign" was not the work of Mr. Justice Reed, or the Honourable J. Allan Guy, but could come only from mentality of the type to be found in the "Security" Service, and apparently, I regret to think, in the Attorney-General's Department. The witnesses were called at the direction of Mr. Alderman, not at the request of the Chairman of the Board, and the names were "supplied" by the Security Service. To me, it seemed to be an attempt at a sort of frame-up to provide an opportunity for an inquisition into the beliefs and lawful activities of responsible citizens of good standing; conduct of the type we vehemently denounce when observed in our enemies. The official records of the proceedings will confirm that the King's Counsel "assisting the Board" was much more anxious to discredit Social Credit and the people loosely described as "Monetary Reformers" than to deal with the merits or otherwise of the High Court action instituted by Angus Dean. Documentary evidence available to me suggests that Sir George Knowles is not free from responsibility for this improper conduct, and I respectfully submit that instead of condoning or being a party to this sort of thing, it is about time the Government took sensible notice of the fact that when the public understand Social Credit they will not be bothered with anything else. The recent election results in Alberta give strong support to this opinion.

Will you, as my personal representative in the Commonwealth Parliament, kindly bring this objection to the personal notice of the Prime Minister, the Attorney-General, and the Treasurer? For this purpose I am sending three copies of the letter. With best personal wishes,
Yours sincerely, BRUCE H. BROWN.

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

Minister for Information,
Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T.,
13th September, 1944.

Mr. Bruce H. Brown,
189 Hotham St.,
East Melbourne.

Dear Mr. Brown,—I am in receipt of your letter of 7th September, with enclosures, regarding the Board of Enquiry appointed by the Attorney-General to inquire "into matters relating to certain legal proceedings by Angus Dean in the High Court of Australia."

In compliance with your request, I am forwarding on a copy of your letter to the Hon. the Prime Minister, the Hon. the Attorney General and the Hon. the Treasurer.

Yours sincerely, ARTHUR A. CALWELL,
Minister for Information.

189 Hotham Street,
East Melbourne, C.2.
17th September 1944.

Dear Mr. Calwell,—Thank you for your letter dated 13th September, and for sending copies of mine to the Prime Minister, the Attorney General and the Treasurer respectively. I am sorry to be troubling you again, but the importance of the matter necessitates it.

One of the other witnesses at the "Inquiry" has sent me copy of a telegram he has received from Sir George Knowles. The telegram contains the following:—

"In reply to your letter dated 7th September, the question of calling witnesses is exclusively a matter for the discretion of the Commission, and no direction whatever comes from the Attorney-General."

This is an extraordinary statement for Sir George to make in view of the facts as we know them.

At the opening of the Melbourne sitting, Mr. Alderman announced that the witnesses had been called at his instigation, and he is not a member of the Commission. He also admitted that the selection was made by him from a list of names supplied by the Security Service. In addition, Security officials were present with great quantities of material, gathered over a number of years and extending back to the period before the war, showing clearly that the plan of attack against the citizens "selected" to be put on the stand was prepared in the Security Offices, and not in the discretion of the Commission at all. The gentlemanly attitude of the Chairman and of Mr. Guy left no room for doubt that much of what took place was IMPOSED upon the Commission, and was even repugnant to the members of it.

In view of the statement of Sir George Knowles that "no direction whatever comes from the Attorney-General, it is clear that the directions must have come from someone else, and I therefore ask you kindly to ascertain and inform me—

(1) Whether Mr. Alderman is employed by the Security Service or any other Commonwealth instrumentality, and, if so, since when.

(2) What were the circumstances of his selection and appointment as the "K.C. assisting the Board," and at whose instigation was it done.

(3) As at one stage he told the Board he was seeking to show that certain activities were of a 5th-Column nature, and that some

"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 us special permission to reprint them in this country.)

Once again, there is a tendency to assume that we are witnessing an automatic, and to that extent, inevitable development. So far from this being true, it is possible to indicate exactly where, and by what steps the present situation has been reached, and in so doing, to place the conscious nature of the policy beyond dispute. One clue can be found in the nature, transformation, and mechanism of taxation.

The fundamental idea of taxation can be discerned in the maxim "inter arma silent leges." Taxation was originally a war measure; it was not law, it was not legal. It was simply a recognition of the fact that when the house is burning down, the millrace may have to be tapped to put the fire out. The income tax, introduced by Sir Robert Peel, was a temporary tax to replace the revenue lost by the abolition of import taxes on various articles, and, like Peel's Bank Charter Act, Police Legislation, and general policy, can be seen to have been a portion of a definite plan to familiarise permanent taxation, of which it is most improbable that his was the creative brain.

During the whole of the nineteenth century we can see the conception of taxation as being a device to finance specific ends, changing into something entirely different—a political weapon, in the main aimed at agriculture but in general intended to make Finance the Supreme Government. The core of the plan was the National Debt and the Balanced Budget working in conjunction with the Bank "of England."

(In order to avoid repetition, the reader who is not familiar with the technique of Government Finance may be referred to "The Monopoly of Credit," Chap. V, for further detail.)

Knowledge of finance was confined to a select few, and the general public was gradually trained to believe that in some unexplained way, life was becoming much more expensive. In actual fact, the general population was receiving a decreasing share of wealth produced. It never seems to have been generally observed that the "social services," which were often given as a reason for higher taxation, were almost wholly due to the inability of the individual to get by purchase what was physically obtainable, since public bodies did in fact obtain it, paying by loans which further increased taxation. The individual was not to be allowed to spend his own money. It seems so obvious to anyone who is completely ignorant of the subject that the poor are poor because the rich were rich, that no decent-minded person could object to make the rich poor by taxation even if in some curious way the general body of the well-to-do became poor without the poor becoming perceptibly more well-to-do.

It has been proved repeatedly, by the most orthodox economists, that the distribution of surplus money income over the bare subsistence level would be quite inadequate to raise the general standard of living to any tolerable stage, and would kill any but elementary industries.

Over twenty years ago, Dr. Bowley stated that the confiscation of all incomes over

of us were being used for subversive purposes, did he undertake that duty at the request of a member of the Board, and if not, at whose request was it done.

(4) Was it merely coincidence that Mr. Alderman's conduct was closely in line with the sentiments contained in a letter signed by Sir George Knowles as follows;—

"In particular, the suggestion is that bona fide believers in Douglas Credit or social reform are being misled by persons who are either enemy agents or doing the work of the enemy in this country. Whether this is so or not is obviously a matter of great concern to Security."

(5) From whom did the suggestion come that I was being misled in that way. If from an alien, I should like to have his full name, the date of his arrival in Australia, and information as to how he came to have contact with the Solicitor-General.

(6) My records indicate that in the course of his recent official visits abroad: Dr. Evatt had conversations with Bernard Baruch, Felix Frankfurter and Professor Laski. Can it be stated definitely that there is no connection between these conversations and the pro-Jewish, anti-Gentile attitude of the Security Service and "the K.C. assisting the Board."

(7) Why did the Attorney General not furnish any reply to the letter forwarded in November 1942, regarding an earlier improper attack by Security officials on the "New Times" and myself as a person connected with it.

With best personal wishes,
Yours sincerely, BRUCE H. BROWN.

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

Minister for Information,
Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T.
27th September 1944.

Mr. Bruce H. Brown,
189 Hotham St., East Melbourne.

Dear Mr. Brown,—With reference to your further letter of 17th September, I wish to advise you that in compliance with your request I have forwarded on a copy to the Prime Minister, the Attorney General, and the Treasurer.

Yours sincerely, ARTHUR A. CALWELL,
Minister for Information.

Australia's Independence in Grave Danger!

(Continued from page 1.)

ence in Sir Keith Murdoch's socialist daily, which paper can always find space to report Socialists, but none to report, for example, what is happening in Alberta and certain other parts of Canada.

There is not the slightest doubt that there can be no real peace until the CAUSES of war are removed and the individuals primarily responsible for the present war are suitably dealt with. (But Dr. Evatt and his fellow internationalists do not propose this. If, as in the case of Germany, Government has become so centralised that power-lusters can use it to start big wars, it is surely obvious that a policy of de-centralisation of Government should be progressively implemented in order that all peoples can more effectively control their own policies.)

Considerable evidence has been brought forward in these columns that wars and depressions, having been deliberately engineered, are then used to persuade the people to accept serfdom in the guise of nice-sounding schemes which it is alleged will make wars and depressions impossible. The following statement in "The Protocols" is particularly appropriate on this point:

"By these acts all States are in torture; they exhort to tranquility, are ready to sacrifice everything for peace; but we will not give them peace until they openly acknowledge our international Super-Government, and with submissiveness."

It is clear that Dr. Evatt expects us to "sacrifice everything for peace," even our national sovereignty. Australians would be well advised to write to their Federal Members immediately and urge them to resist all proposed surrendering of Australian sovereignty, particularly over financial policy. (In dealing with existing organisations, which would be incorporated in the new world organisation, Dr. Evatt mentioned the Financial and Economic Section of the League of Nations. This Section was connected with the Bank of International Settlements.) There is little doubt that the present Government will do what the International Financiers demand unless there is determined opposition.

After stressing the alleged necessity of an agreement on full employment all over the world, Dr. Evatt said:

"In this connection, I direct special attention to the efforts of the Australian officials at the Monetary Conference to put forward the desirability of obtaining an international agreement on employment."

Just why our internal economic arrangements should depend upon what bankers' yes-men are doing at an International Monetary Conference in America was not explained. In answer to a question on the Monetary Conference, asked by Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., on July 19, Mr. Curtin made the following alarming statement:

"Among the things which the world needs in order to have stable conditions after the war is international concert in regard to credit and the provision of the capital necessary to enable countries which have been over-run or where resources have been exhausted to have purchasing-power so that producers in those countries capable of supplying them shall be paid."

A Niemeyer, a Schiff, or a Baruch couldn't have done better!

Lack of space prevents further examination of Dr. Evatt's ideas this week, but I hope to deal further with them next week. In the meantime, all democrats would do well to urge their Federal Members to ensure that there is no further surrendering of Australia's financial sovereignty to the International Financiers. And State Members should also be instructed on this issue and asked to initiate action to restore financial sovereignty to the States.

Centralisation of political and economic power must be attacked everywhere.

TRIBUTES TO ERIC BUTLER IN QUEENSLAND PARLIAMENT

"I suggest that this book, 'The Enemy Within The Empire,' be bought and put in the library at Parliament House, so that hon. members may make themselves conversant with the enormous power of the Bank of England. . . . A book that tells us of the power of a man like that (Niemeyer) should be in this library so that hon. members might do something to counteract that power."

—Mr. Moorhouse, M.L.A.

(Readers are reminded that there are still adequate stocks of Mr. Butler's book available.)

"I think there is present in the gallery a man who knows something about finance, Mr. Eric Butler. No doubt hon. members have read a number of his books. He is one of the stalwart fighters for freedom in this country at the present time."

—Mr. L. J. Barnes, M.L.A., September 27, 1944.

**THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS**

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