

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. 43. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1944

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

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.

A Plot to Sabotage Post-War Prosperity!

M.L.A. Warns Victorian Parliament

The Victorian Legislative Assembly has been urgently warned that Australia's independence and post-war prosperity will be sabotaged if the Gold Standard is re-imposed on this country by means of the proposed International Monetary Agreement, which is to be considered very soon by Federal Parliament.

This grave warning was given by the Independent Member for Hawthorn, Mr. L. H. Hollins during the Budget Debate on October 4. He urged the State Government to take up the matter. The following extracts from his speech are taken from the "Hansard" report: —

MR. HOLLINS (Hawthorn): . . . I sound a note of warning at this time about the attempt that is being made to re-impose the gold standard on this country. Unless members of this House and of every Parliament in the Commonwealth are seized of their responsibility as representatives of the people, we may have this most iniquitous standard re-imposed on us . . .

In recent times honourable members have received copies of the "Western Australian Mining and Commercial Review," advocating a return to the gold standard.

Mr. Holland: And the payment of an increased price for gold.

MR. HOLLINS: Yes . . . The gold-mining industry would benefit, but all other industries would suffer . . .

The following comments, which appeared in the Melbourne "Herald" of December 11 last, make clear what Russia intends to do—

"RUSSIA FAVOURS RETURN TO WORLD GOLD STANDARD."

"London, Friday.—The week's outstanding financial news was the first semi-official expression of Russian views on post-war

currency plans. Professor Varga, leading Soviet economist, declaring that Russia favours a return to a world gold standard, takes a stand completely in line with City expectations! . . . Russia, . . . as the world's second largest gold producer, desires a fixed world price."

. . . The last annual report issued by the Commonwealth Bank Board indicates its approval of an International Monetary Fund and a World Bank, despite the fact that two members of the Board are Labor nominees, in the persons of Mr. M. B. Duffy and Mr. Taylor. It will be remembered that Mr. Taylor was responsible for putting Mr. J. T. Lang, M.L.A., out of the Australian Labor Party. So far as I know, these gentlemen have not raised any protest against the proposal to re-impose the gold standard on this country . . .

I feel that we should protest emphatically at any suggestion to re-impose the gold standard. That will mean that currency will be limited by the amount of gold held. If currency is limited by gold, we can have imposed upon us great restrictions money supplies, possibly at times when we need an increase in them . . .

I view with alarm the propaganda to re-introduce the gold standard in this country. As the bulk of the world's gold is held by a few individuals, most of whom are in America, they would have absolute control of the industries of the world.

Great Britain is not keen on the re-introduction of the gold standard. That was made clear in an article, which appeared in the Melbourne "Sun News-Pictorial" on April 13, 1943. It was as follows:—

"U.S. CURRENCY PLAN CRITICISED IN LONDON."

"London, Monday.—The American 'White Plan' to control world trade after the war has not received a good reception in Britain . . . A special correspondent of the 'Sunday Observer' says the main criticism is that the American proposal does not offer anything substantially different from the old gold standard.

"The 'White Plan' provides for an international authority, which will be able to force every single country to keep in step with the rest of the world, descending into the depression when the rest of the world is depressed and reviving when the rest of the world revives."

Senator Aylett is reported ("Hansard," Sept. 13, p. 672), as saying that General Blamey has issued a routine order-forbidding members of the fighting forces, under penalty of court-martial, to approach Members of Parliament in regard to any complaints. Senator Fraser denied this, and asked for the names of the men concerned. Senator Aylett replied: "I dare not give their names, because I do not want any man who has offered his life in the service of his country to be persecuted. On other occasions I have given names of members of the forces who have complained, and they have suffered because of it." If General Blamey or any other officer has interfered in any way with soldiers or others exercising their democratic rights through their parliamentary representatives, then any such officer (General or not) should be court-martialed—and the sooner the better.

That clearly indicates great hostility in the Old Country to the re-introduction of the gold standard.

Nevertheless, there are tremendous forces behind the advocacy of its re-introduction. Russia wants it, as has been made clear by the newspaper report I quoted. She is the second largest gold producer in the world, and . . . will be only too ready to sell gold at an enhanced price to the rest of the world if it is fool enough to buy it. Considerable forces are at work in South Africa and Australia to persuade Governments, and here the Commonwealth Bank Board, to support the re-introduction of the gold standard. In Western Australia, the gold-mining industry is fairly extensive, and it is not an unimportant industry in Victoria. The people interested in the re-introduction of the gold standard in Australia are merely looking to the prosperity of the gold-mining industry rather than to the prosperity of the nation. The United States of America holds the great bulk of the world's gold, and, obviously, wants the re-introduction of the gold standard. Otherwise, the great quantity of gold, which is locked up at Fort Knox, will be of no value, and for (Continued on page 2.)

Can a Leopard Change Its Spots?

Some non-Labor Parties form "Liberal" Party

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

Sir,—In the Melbourne "Argus" of 17th October, we were informed that the Liberal Party of Australia came into being the previous day at Canberra, and that it had adopted a "10-point policy of democratic aims." According to Mr. Menzies, "the Conference was remarkably successful" and great steps had been taken towards what he believed could be revolutionary changes in the Australian political scene."

It is therefore desirable that we should look closely into the actual proposals and consider to what extent they differ from proposals previously put forward by the organisations concerned, and also in what way these organisations propose to achieve in future what they have been unable to achieve in the past.

An analysis of the 10-point programme will show that although the objectives" are being paraded in more up-to-date costume, they are nevertheless the same old ashes under the sackcloth. In the space available for this letter, it is quite impracticable to deal fully with each of the ten points, but brief references may be helpful.

The first "objective" is a country safe from external aggression as a unit in "a world security order, which maintains the necessary force to defend the peace." It is impossible for Australia to be safe from aggression so long as it continues to be one of the belligerents in the economic war for world markets, and a peace, which has to be defended by force, is not a peace at all. It will not be "peace" that will be defended by a "world security" force, but the force will be used to impose a financial policy dictated outside Australia.

Point No. 2 deals with compulsory military training, the fostering of patriotism, and service to our country. If patriotism means to the framers of this new programme what it meant to the framers of the programmes which preceded it, then it will mean fidelity to the same old order and to the dictates of the controllers of the same old system; and if service to our country means the same as the phrase has meant in the years gone by, then it will

mean readiness to accept conditions of servitude in a slave State.

We do not serve a country at all. We either serve the people who rule the country or we fight for the people who have been improperly ruled. In other words, it is the people of a country who are all important, not the country as such.

Point No. 3 has been carefully prepared to make a good impression, and tells us that what we want is an intelligent, free and liberal Australian democracy, in which Parliament controls the Executive and the law controls all. Unless there is a fundamental change in the financial system, Parliament can only control within the limits permitted by the Budget, and the Budget is a financial instrument for controlling the actions of Parliament. The programme makes no provision for the Commonwealth Parliament to exercise financial sovereignty, without which it will be impossible for any Government to do what the PEOPLE want done. Democracy cannot function under financial autocracy.

Point No. 4 talks of honour, security, preference and generous repatriation benefits for all men and women who have been members of the Fighting Forces, and their dependants. All these things are quite impossible of achievement so long as the men and women who have been members of the Forces return to take part in a never-ending struggle for what is called "a job." Preference in the allocation of jobs must inevitably lead to personal antagonisms civil disruption, and a condition of chaos.

The simple method by which members of the Forces CAN be given that consideration to which they are so well entitled is by guaranteeing them an adequate INCOME irrespective of whether they can get a job or not.

But this can only be done if there is a fundamental alteration in the financial system, and this, of course, is not viewed favourably by the sponsors of the new party; indeed, they are opposed to it. So in this important matter they talk with their tongue in their cheek.

Point No. 5 speaks of the promotion and stabilisation of primary industries, the de-

(Continued on page 4.)

LABOR LOGIC: Having regard to the Labor Party's present attitude, the following statement by Mr. Guy, M.H.R., makes interesting reading: "If the Minister for Information (Mr. Calwell) reads 'Hansard' he will see that the Labor Party voted against the defence proposals of the Lyons Government. The Scullin Government closed down the Royal Military College at Duntroon. Do honourable Members deny that? It closed down the Royal Naval College at Jervis Bay, it practically sacked the Navy, it did not train one airman, it abolished universal training, it reduced the defence vote to a record low level." ("Hansard," Sept. 14, p. 852.) However, repentance overtook the Labor Party—and the Communist Party—when Russia was attacked by Germany and thereby became our gallant ally.

LEADER LEGEND: The Melbourne "Age" of October 10, reporting a gathering of the Australian Women's National League, quotes Mr. Menzies as emulating Hitler and Mussolini in the following words: "So they (the A.W.N.L.) and others should all unite in one concerted force. There should be one political Army, prepared to follow one Leader, and one General Staff, to work for one great Plan." (Applause.) This is also the cry of Menzies' professed opponents, the Communists, and also of Herr Curtin and Co. So it is obvious that the only bone of contention is: Who is to be the one. However, the evils of one-ness, illustrated by Hitlerism, should be sufficiently visible to prevent even the A.W.N.L. from swallowing this brand of political poison.

BUILDING BLOCKS: During the past 12 months the Victorian Housing Commission has engaged in large-scale land buying in Melbourne, and, of course, the Treasury has given the necessary consent. This means that individuals desirous of obtaining building blocks reasonably close to the city have been forestalled, thus making it difficult to build their OWN homes in preference to the Housing Commission's dog-boxes. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Commission has only built 1215 houses in town and country, and that its loan liability at the end of June 1943, was £1,444,018, and that it had an accumulated deficit of £115,752 on its operations. So this socialised, land-grabbing, jerry-built concern is also a bankers debt institution. No wonder it gets so much publicity!

SERVANTS' SALARIES: Labor and U.A.P.-U.C.P. Members of Victorian Parliament are seeking increased pay with the guarantee that it will not be made an issue at elections or in the House. Only four Members objected on the grounds that they had no mandate from their constituents. The names of those taking part in this underhand practice are not disclosed; therefore electors should make it a point of finding

out if their Member is one of the guilty persons. This is the sort of action by politicians that brings Parliament into disrepute. The matter of increased pay should be referred to the employers (the electors).

HOUSING HOLD-UP: Not even the evils of disease and pestilence have shaken the stubbornness of our Planning maniacs in the matter of removing the restrictions preventing house building. Yet blitzed London, the hub of the war, is attending to this matter in a big way: workmen are accommodated in the best London hotels so that they can get on with the job. So the war cannot be accepted as an alibi for preventing house building in this country. Very few of the war-time Government Departments, with their huge staffs, are required today, and, as Mr. Oswald Barnett, of the Victorian Housing Commission, has pointed out, these parasitic armies could be more usefully employed; but the most important issue is the removal of the restrictions on materials, which the Planners are holding onto to protect their jobs. These Planners must be swept aside so that the people can get on with the job.

HITLER'S HELPERS: According to Mr. S. F. Ferguson, a British businessman, "democracy's gift to Hitler was the depression of the early 'thirties, which caused the war." Why he should blame "democracy is hard to understand. One would think from this that "democracy" was a person or persons, whereas it is merely a descriptive term. It was undoubtedly the banker gangsters who gave Hitler his chance — not "democracy." The same gangsters created depressions in so-called democratic countries, thus paving the way for Communism (another name for Hitlerism), but because of public awareness it had to be called off. The same gangsters made millions available to Hitler to build up his socialistic slave-

(Continued on page 4.)

Bob's Brother Ben

"Speaking on the Budget, Mr. Menzies, Opposition leader, said he had found the Treasurer's financial theories impeccable. He had, he said, read Mr. Chifley's financial statement, and, after comparing it with one he himself had made, he had almost instinctively got out of his chair to embrace the Treasurer and call him 'Brother.' 'You had better look out, Ben,' a Labor member called out, as Mr. Chifley sat with an embarrassed smile on his face, and Opposition members enjoyed the spectacle of the Treasurer — the financial spokesman of a Party which is in theory financially unorthodox — being praised for prim, grim orthodoxy." — Canberra Commentary, by J. D. Corbett, Melbourne "Argus," September 16, 1944.

Canadian Capers

In the recent "sweeping victory" of the Socialist C.C.F. Party over the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan (no Social Credit candidates stood for election, for reasons which will eventually become apparent) only about half the electorate voted, and only 52 per cent, of this 50 per cent, voted for the C.C.F. A fantastic example of ballot-box politics!

THE "DEAN INQUIRY" AND DR. EVATT

More Correspondence and a Protest in Parl.

Our regular readers will recall that in our issue of September 22 we published a letter from Mr. Eric D. Butler to Mr. Curtin, concerning a letter previously sent by Mr. Butler to Dr. Evatt in regard to the "Dean Case" Inquiry. (The letter to Dr. Evatt was published in our issue of September 15.) In the letter to Mr. Curtin, it was pointed out that no reply had been received from Dr. Evatt, and that a telegram from the Solicitor-General, Sir George Knowles, appeared to indicate that Dr. Evatt was not the Minister responsible for the Attorney General's Department. Mr. Curtin replied that Dr. Evatt was the responsible Minister. Dr. Evatt then replied to Mr. Butler's original letter.

On September 21, Mr. Butler's Federal parliamentary representative, Mr. W. M. Hutchinson, M.H.R., raised the issue in Parliament, forcing Dr. Evatt to make some significant admissions—of which, more anon! Further interesting developments can be expected in the near future.

Hereunder we publish the above-mentioned letter from Dr. Evatt, and Mr. Butler's reply:—

Canberra, 20th September 1944.

E. D. Butler, Esq.,
22 Bellevue Avenue,
Rosanna, N.22, Vic.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 7th September, I desire to inform you that the Inquiry resulted from complaints in circular letters that certain legal proceedings instituted in the High Court by Mr. Dean had resulted in unnecessary delay and oppression. At the request of Security Service, it also covered the question whether any part of the agitation in connection therewith was a deliberate attempt to bring into contempt the judicial and taxation system for a purpose, which was inimical to the war effort.

An independent and impartial tribunal was established. In the normal way counsel was appointed to assist the tribunal. No instructions whatever were given by myself either as to the conduct of the case or as to any witnesses who might be called. The Board of Inquiry has complete charge of the calling of witnesses.

As for yourself, I never knew you would be called or had been called as a witness. I know no fact implying or suggesting that you are a disloyal person. Nor have I seen any report of the proceedings of the Inquiry. Still less do I know anything as

"YOUR TAXES PAY THE INTEREST ON GOVERNMENT BONDS."

"Are You Getting Some Part of Your Taxes Back?"

"Smart people put all they've got into Government bonds. Other people carry their money around in their pockets or hide it in teapots and mattresses. If they put that money into bonds, they would get interest on it. But they don't, so they help to pay interest to these smart investors who do."

—Second Victory Loan advertisement, Melbourne "Radio Times," October 22-28, 1944.

A Plot to Sabotage Post-War Prosperity!

(Continued from page 1.)

vast quantities of goods America will have received "payment" which will be merely dross. There is something like 22,000,000,000 dollars' worth of gold held in America, the great bulk of which was received during and after the last war.

I wish to quote a report, which appeared in the Melbourne "Herald" in 1940, as follows:—

"U.S. CORNERS WORLD'S GOLD."

"Gold, ever more gold, is pouring into the United States, as the warring nations come buying guns, munitions, and aeroplanes on the cash-and-carry plan. Down at Fort Knox the gold is stored in vast vaults guarded by a concrete and steel Maginot Line. It is now being called the 'Fort Knox Folly.' America now owns 60 per cent. of the world's gold. By the end of the war, she may own 80 per cent. or more."

In the Melbourne "Herald" of July 5, 1944, an article appeared, headed—

"WORLD'S DESTINY IS IN AMERICA'S HANDS."

It was the report of a speech given to members of the Melbourne Rotary Club, by Dr. G. L. Wood, Dean of the Faculty of Commerce at the Melbourne University. He indicated that the hoard in the hands of America at that time would represent 80 per cent. of the world's gold, bearing out the earlier prediction that America would hold that proportion at the end of the war . . . The article to which I am referring proceeds—

"If the gold is to remain buried in its fortress completely unusable, the position would seem to be that America is producing goods for no tangible payment. Washington believes that this is indeed the position."

Again—

"This week two financial authorities, Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the Chase National Bank (the world's largest commercial bank), and Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, research director of the Federal Reserve System, have voiced anxiety about the value of the gold hoard. Dr. Goldenweiser admits that the accumulation of gold is 'an asset that is of little value now, and whose value in the future is unpredictable.'"

.... What is the incentive behind the

to the nature of your cross-examination. For your information, it is the practice that Counsel before all such Boards of Inquiry have the assistance of one of the staff of the Commonwealth Legal Department.

Owing to the lamented death of Senator Darcey the Inquiry had to be postponed. If what you say is correct, the report of the Board will, no doubt, vindicate you. But it would be quite irregular for me to intervene in any way at the present moment.

—Yours faithfully, (Sgd.) H. V. EVATT.

22 Bellevue Avenue,
Rosanna, Victoria.
4th October 1944.

Rt. Hon. H. V. Evatt, LL.D., D.Litt.,
K.C., M.P., Attorney-General and
Minister for External Affairs, Canberra,
A.C.T.

Sir,—Please accept my thanks for your letter dated 20th Sept. I quite understand the reason for the Inquiry as given in the first sentence of your communication, but apparently you had no power to set up a Board of Inquiry for that purpose under the National Security Act, for delays and irregularities in the High Court have nothing to do with public safety and the defence of the Commonwealth. Moreover, it is quite probable that this particular question will be an important issue even after the National Security legislation has lapsed. As a K.C. you could hardly have been unaware of this.

The second sentence of your communication makes it clear that it was the Security Service which instigated the scandalous proceedings under the National Security Act, as conducted by Mr. Alderman, and I now ask you kindly to give me the name of the Minister responsible for the administration of that Service, so that, I may pursue that aspect with him.

In the House of Representatives you informed Mr. Hutchinson that you had answered my letter to the best of your ability, but I respectfully point out that you have

Money Power of America to re-impose this gold standard on the world? . . . at present gold is worth 35 dollars an ounce in America. But . . . if the gold standard could be re-imposed, there is reason to believe that the price of gold in the world may reach as much as 70 dollars, or approximately £15 an ounce. That would indeed show a fabulous profit to those who hold the bulk of the gold now lodged at Fort Knox . . . Actually, if the gold standard were re-imposed and the price rose to £15 an ounce, the profit alone would amount to something like 22,000,000,000 dollars. That provides the incentive to re-impose the gold standard on the rest of the world . . .

The amount of gold lodged at Fort Knox is controlled by a few individuals and would give them power to govern not only the financial world, but also the industrial world. One has only to examine the position that would result from the introduction of this International Currency Agreement and the amount that would have to be lodged by various countries which, by the way, would almost certainly have to borrow their share of gold from America—and, as it became exhausted, 're-borrow it from the same source! . . .

On page 133 of a book entitled "This Age of Plenty," by C. Marshall Hattersley, M.A., LL.B., excellent reasons are given why America wanted the introduction of the gold standard after the last war. American interests . . . were served by the so-called return to the gold standard. The "Review" of the National City Bank, New York, for March, 1925, contained the following passage:—

"We want the other countries back on the gold basis . . . We live on an island of gold surrounded by a world of paper currencies, and there has been some question whether the other countries might not establish closer relations with each other than with the United States."

Mr. J. F. Darling, a director of the Midland Bank, wrote in the "Spectator," on January 10, 1925, as follows:—

"Obviously it was of the first importance to the United States to induce England to resume the gold standard as early as possible . . . An American-controlled gold standard must inevitably result in the United States becoming the world's supreme financial power, with England their tributary and satellite, and New York their world's Financial Centre."

(To be concluded next week.)

not answered my question at all. I therefore repeat them as follows:—

(1) Do you associate yourself with the views expressed by Sir George Knowles in his letter to Mr. Holt? If you do not, then what authority did Sir George Knowles have for doing so, and on what EVIDENCE were such views based?

(2) Was the Board of Inquiry established by you personally or was it the result of a GOVERNMENT decision?

(3) Who drew up the terms of reference of the Inquiry?

(4) Who appointed Mr. Alderman, K.C.? How was he appointed? What instructions, if any, was he given? Was the newspaper report that he had been instructed by an officer of your Department incorrect?

(5) Who decided the names of the witnesses to be called in Melbourne? What instructions, if any, were given to the Board as to how witnesses were to be obtained? Did the "Board" actually nominate any of the witnesses?

(6) Has your DEPARTMENT any EVIDENCE, from Commonwealth Security or other official authorities, that I have ever engaged in any activities which endangered the security of the Commonwealth, or in any activities which could be termed disloyal?

There was no suggestion in my letter that you should intervene with the Inquiry, and I am at a loss to understand what gave rise to such an idea in your mind.

—Yours faithfully, ERIC D. BUTLER.

CENTRALISATION OF ELECTRIC SUPPLY

According to the "Liverpool Daily Post" for July 19, Liverpool [England] was brought "to a dead stop" the day before between 11 a.m. and the middle of the afternoon by a fault, not in itself serious, "at a place which affected both the city's own electricity supply and that carried into the station by the Grid system."

The whole city was affected almost at once. Trams stopped. The Overhead Railway stopped. Machinery stopped. Lifts stopped. Cooking equipment stopped. Cinema performances stopped. Women's hairdressing stopped. Lights went out. X-ray and other hospital plant failed, and examination of battle casualties from Normandy had to be postponed.

—"The Social Creditor," July 29.

A mechanical break-down at the Pinkston Electricity Station, which supplies power for the Glasgow Corporation Tramways and the Glasgow Underground, brought both these services to a standstill on August 9, the effects of which lasted from tea-time until late in the evening, according to a Glasgow newspaper. The City Transport Department published an apology to the public for the inconvenience caused.

—"The Social Creditor," Aug. 19.

"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.)

It is difficult to write patiently of the stream of abuse directed at the Munich policy. The scurrilous attacks of the American press are understandable. The collectivist New Deal was already a failure. The German-speaking Jew control in Washington was even stronger than in the time of President Wilson. No one outside a few technical experts believed that the United States could be harmed even by a fully victorious Hitler, and a large body of commercial opinion was already mobilised around the slogan, "We can do business with Hitler." The prospect of another war in which America would keep out and again rise to fantastic prosperity on a war boom was too alluring to be relinquished.

The situation is explained with engaging candour by Mr. A. D. H. Smith, in his biography of Colonel House, President Wilson's adviser:

"It may not be to our credit, idealistically, but the fact is we used the European democracies and their Allies for our purposes; they did not use us, except incidentally. And if Mr. House were alive today (1943), he would say that is exactly what the United States has been doing since Britain (sic) and France declared war on Germany in 1939." ("Mr. House of Texas," p. 172.)

But the spate of synthetic bilge regarding our unpreparedness, which was poured out from domestic quarters, which had done everything possible to encourage Germany and to hinder re-armament in this country is only explicable on the assumption that a well-known technique of the Communist Party was in operation—to accuse your opponents of what you have done, or intend to do, yourself. Not a single word of this abuse was directed to the Money Power, the Press or the B.B.C. It must be remembered that the internationalist policy was interlocked with such institutions as the League of Nations, the International Labour Office, and the Bank of International Settlements, inaugurated with the assistance and blessing of Viscount Snowden. The same group of noisy Socialist journalists, most of them deriving such ideas as they possessed from alien sources, who shouted "Down with the Men of Munich," had worked and talked against re-armament and extolled collective security, while demanding intervention in favour of Abyssinia and Communist Spain. Their assumption of the right to a moral attitude, for which they were not prepared either to work or fight, is perhaps the only palliation of Mr. Stanley Baldwin's foreign policy, or the lack of it.

But there can be no doubt that the internal economic system of Great Britain underwent a radical change for the worse in 1931—that, without the spectacular incidents which marked the inauguration of the "New Deal," a carefully-prepared system of controls running parallel to it was imposed, specifically designed to accelerate monopoly.

The complete story of the forces brought to bear will probably never be told; the formation of the great cartels and the financial control of British industry during the American boom in the interests of American investors were certainly preparatory; but in that year Britain, no longer great, adopted the beginnings of a new theory of life completely alien to her genius—the conception of the country as a single factory having many departments, the head office and control-room being the Bank "of England." The London School of Economics, endowed by the German-speaking Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, and largely staffed by Socialist aliens, "to train the bureaucracy" (much of it temporarily in "private" employ) "of the coming Socialist State," had come into its own. How much of the responsibility for Dunkirk rests on this hastily imposed bureaucracy will never be known.

It must be insisted that the tragic history of the armistice years was neither adventitious nor inescapable. It is quite true that the number of individuals who are capable of estimating the consequences of an economic policy is not large. But the moulders of socialist-cartelist policy knew exactly where they were going, and they were going in the same direction in every country.

The objective was a rigid, comprehensive military-industrial framework in which the individual would disappear except as a tool of high policy.

It was the complete antithesis of everything the Englishman had built upon the foundation of Magna Charta and Habeas Corpus, and it led us straight to the beaches of Dunkirk and the arrest and imprisonment of nearly seventeen hundred persons without trial and without the formulation of a charge, under Regulation 18B.

The history of the last few years of peace will probably not be told, if at all, for many years. It is obvious that, even if the re-organisation policy to which Chamberlain had obviously committed himself had been intrinsically sound, which is highly debatable; it offered the perfect opportunity to hamper the re-armament. Re-armament was hampered; and it is certain that such success as was achieved was the result of cutting adrift to a considerable extent from the advisers who surrounded Baldwin, and that Chamberlain's unpopularity had far more to do with that than with any reasonable grounds for criticism, under circumstances for which he was not responsible, of the successful efforts which delayed the resumption of military war.

The bureaucratic State, however, demanded war for its final enthronement, and not only war, but a long war.

It must be observed that the productivity of the modern power-tool system had brought out into strong relief the effect of the monopoly of money by the banks, and the abnormal consumption of war was needed to force back into the factories the balance of the populations not engaged in mutual destruction, so that "Plans" might be matured to keep them there. It is hoped that the memory of the ordinary citizen, doped with Hollywood films, monopoly broadcasting and defective education, will be short enough to permit the contradiction between the "poverty amidst plenty" of the 1930's and the "full employment" aspirations of the bureaucratic State in the immediate post-war years, to escape notice.

(To be continued.)

WORDS OF WISDOM

"The insatiable appetite to control other men's affairs is often evinced by those whose capacity to manage their own is in inverse proportion to their desires."

—Mr. Justice Eve.

FOOD FOR MOLOCH

"One of the curious developments in recent years has been the amount of tub-thumping that has gone on about the need for using wheat for everything else except eating it. . . . That we should take all these ludicrous suggestions seriously is surely an indication that we in the West are becoming just a little soft in the head."

—J. H. Gray in "The Edmonton Bulletin."

RE-EDUCATION MOVEMENT

(Political Science)

Announcing a Series of Four Lecture-Discussions dealing with Overseas Trade, Exchange, Banking, Bretton Woods.

On Mondays, in the Assembly Hall, (Room 3, Floor 1), commencing October 30th. All welcome. Speaker, C. A. A. Ellis.

—ADVT.

STATE GOVTS. SHOULD INVESTIGATE ALBERTA

Letter to Queensland M.L.A. Urges Inquiry

Brisbane social crediters have sent copies of a letter on Alberta (from Mr. Eric Butler to Mr. Power, M.L.A.), to every Member in the Queensland State Parliament. Arrangements have been made to have questions asked in the House concerning the possibility of an official inquiry into what has been accomplished in Alberta.

This line of activity has, we believe, possibilities of bringing the subject of Alberta and Social Credit before all State Parliaments if all social crediters will get in touch with their State Members and suggest that they should at least support an inquiry on how Alberta has achieved results. Queensland social crediters should immediately write to their State Members, pointing out that they have seen a copy of Mr. Butler's letter sent to Members, and asking them whether they will support any move for an investigation on Alberta. Those who refuse to support an investigation should be immediately asked for their reasons. Mr. A. W. Noakes, The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide St., Brisbane, would be pleased to have any correspondence, which Queensland social crediters have with their State Members on this matter.

The following is a copy of Mr. Butler's letter to Mr. Power:—

C/o "The New Times,"
Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, Vic.
7th October, 1944.

Mr. W. Power, M.L.A.,
Parliament House, Brisbane, Qld.

Dear Mr. Power,—While in Brisbane recently, my attention was directed to portion of a speech which you made in the Queensland Parliament on August 25 of last year. Although it is now over twelve months since you made this speech, recent events in Canada, particularly in Alberta, have prompted me to make some observations on the question of Social Credit, which subject you mentioned. You are reported in "Hansard" as follows:—

"We have people who are generally known as currency cranks who spring up everywhere and talk about subjects they know nothing about. . . . The Hon. Member for Bundaberg is an ardent advocate, for the Douglas Credit system. It is interesting to know what took place in Alberta, in Canada, when that province was controlled by a Douglas Credit Government."

I agree with you that it is very interesting to learn what has been happening in Alberta. Because I presume that you are a representative of the people who would not knowingly make an incorrect statement, might I be permitted to tell you briefly about Alberta? I take it that you are a man honestly trying to help better the conditions of the people, and that you are prepared to take notice of verifiable facts which may help you. Before submitting the facts about Alberta, I think I should point out that it is not correct to say that the Hon. Member for Bundaberg, Mr. Frank Barnes, "is an ardent advocate of the Douglas Credit system." Major Douglas has put forward certain technical proposals for correcting flaws in the present financial system. While I agree entirely with much of what Mr. Frank Barnes has had to say concerning the present control of financial policy, I am not aware that he has set himself up as a technical expert, suggesting how, for example, Douglas's "just price" idea should be applied or how "national dividends" should be introduced.

When you speak of how Alberta "was controlled by a Douglas Credit Government," the inference is that a Social Credit Government in Alberta is a thing of the past. But perhaps you did not mean this? In case you have not heard, at the recent elections in Alberta on August 8 the Social Crediters won 51 out of 57 seats.

I think you will agree that this is a very thought-provoking result, a result that I must emphasise, has been suppressed by the daily press in this country. But perhaps this is not very surprising in view of the fact that the progress made by the Social Credit Government in Alberta is without parallel in any other part of the world. You may recall that Alberta electors first elected a Social Credit Government on August 22, 1935. Social Crediters won 56 out of 63 seats. From then on for some time there was an inspired campaign all over the world to discredit the Albertan Government. It was periodically stated that social credit had failed in spite of the fact that social credit proposals were not being applied. But, in spite of the fact that legislation designed to give effect to the policy of the electors was effectively blocked by the financial interests who have had the support of the Mackenzie King Government at Ottawa, ways were found of partially circumventing the obstacles raised. The technical methods used were the responsibility of Mr. L. D. Byrne, sent out from England by Major Douglas.

The purpose of this letter is not to deal with what technical methods were employed by the Albertan Government, but to draw your attention to incontrovertible FACTS concerning RESULTS achieved. When it became obvious that Alberta was getting results, all news about the province was boycotted. In 1940, in spite of a campaign in which Socialists, Communists and representatives of the financiers joined forces and spent huge sums of money in a desperate attempt to stamper the Albertan electors, the Social Credit Government was returned with another overwhelming majority. You cannot fool people who are getting results. Needless to say, the results of this second victory were suppressed by the press. The latest election has further demonstrated beyond all doubt that the time has arrived when all progressive people must examine what is being done in Alberta. Surely all people who are concerned with our post-war problems must try and have the facts about Alberta investigated. The following are only a few of the RESULTS achieved:—

Prior to the war, easily the lowest unemployment figures in Canada. The only State in the world which has reduced its debt and

taxation. Splendid new roads and bridges have been built without financial debt. Farmers are getting out of debt. Alberta is producing 97 per cent. of Canada's oil. Prior to the Social Credit Government practically nothing was done to develop the province's great oil deposits.

In the first three years of the Social Credit Government the provincial debt was reduced by three million dollars.

Many more outstanding results could be quoted, but I think I have stated sufficient for now. Well might you say, "Well, even if we have heard little about these results in Australia, surely the rest of the people of Canada must be hearing about them?"

Let me assure you that the example of Alberta is having a tremendous effect in other parts of Canada, particularly in Quebec. The Social Credit Movement in Canada is making rapid progress, and, if you so desire, I am prepared to supply you with the facts concerning what is taking place. It is a great tragedy that we here in Australia are not being told of the manner in which all sections of the Canadian people are increasingly supporting the ideas pioneered by social crediters.

The political position here in Australia is as follows:—The result of the recent Referendum has thrown the responsibility of post-war reconstruction back on to the State Governments. The old policies have failed; we must look to new ideas. In a sister Dominion we have progressive RESULTS,

achieved in the provincial sphere. The very least that our State Governments can do is to investigate. I don't ask you or anyone else to approve of social credit, but I do suggest that, having heard some FACTS, members of all parties should investigate.

Those who oppose investigation cannot be honest in their protestations that they are determined to bring in a "New Order."

I am making arrangements for copies of this letter to be sent to every member in the Queensland Parliament. Should you or other Members be prepared to support an inquiry into what has been done in Alberta, I would be pleased to ensure that you are assisted in every way. I would be very pleased to have any comment, which you may care to make on this letter.

—Sincerely yours, ERIC D. BUTLER.

In recommending social crediters in all States to take action along the lines suggested above, we would like to emphasise the point that there are many Members in the State Houses who are becoming increasingly aware that the past failures of the State Governments have been the result of centralised financial policy. These Members should be given a lead. In asking Members to support an inquiry on how Alberta has achieved results—and every effort should be made to bring these results to the notice of every State Member—it is not suggested that Members would be committing themselves on social credit in any way. Members of all parties could support an inquiry. Needless to say, the issue depends entirely upon social crediters taking action in all States. Our view that there is potential support for an inquiry in the State Parliaments is supported by the following interesting item from the West Australian "Hansard" for September 6, 1944:—

"Alberta—Particulars of Financial Policy of Province of:

"Mr. North, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

"(1) Has he seen the returns at the recent Alberta Province election, wherein the Social Credit Government was elected for the third time and obtained 51 seats out of 57?"

"(2) Is the Government in possession of any data showing where and how this Government differs from orthodox financial practice?"

"(3) If not, will he arrange for the Treasury to get in touch with the Treasury at Edmonton to obtain full particulars of their experiments?"

Mr. Willock replied—(1) No. (2) No. (3) Yes."

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION POLICIES

Hereunder we publish a third instalment from the Report of the Post-war Policy Committee of the Vancouver Board of Trade. This instalment concludes the section devoted to Basic Principles:—

(d.) THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION (continued):

(iv.) Sanctions.—Authority without the means to enforce it is non-existent. As the supreme authority the people must be able to enforce obedience to their wishes by all individuals or groups of individuals within the community in which they are sovereign, and to have the means for resisting any individual or group, within or outside their sphere of sovereignty, from effectively challenging their authority.

(v.) Inducements and Compulsion.—The dual social objectives being the acquisition of the maximum personal security combined with the greatest possible measure of personal freedom compatible with social life, the basis of organised effort in all spheres must necessarily be freedom of the individual to associate in any activity of his choosing. A sovereign people must be a free people within limitations upon their individual freedom only to the extent that it represents the collective will. Therefore the motivating impulse of social organisation should be inducement and not compulsion. Compulsion should be confined to carrying through the obligations entailed in freely accepting responsibility for a function under a properly accredited authority, and in the over-riding obligation of conforming to the popular will.

(vi.) Freedom.—In order to preclude any possibility of ambiguity it is necessary to define this term. Freedom under organised community life is the right to choose or refuse any course of action without infringing upon the same right of any other person.

(vii.) Centralisation and Decentralisation.—It follows from the foregoing considerations that all questions of policy must be decided by the people, and, therefore, must be subject to the greatest possible decentralisation of authority. However, questions of administration (devising and applying method to give effect to the will of the people), being a function entailing personal responsibility, centralisation of authority—subject to withdrawal by the people—is necessary.

(e) SPHERES OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION:

There are three distinct and separate, though interdependent, spheres of social organisation, each having its own purpose and function. These are:—

(i.) Government or Political.—Concerned with the making and enforcement of the rules (laws) governing the rights and relationship of the individuals within the community and the relationship of the community with other communities.

(ii.) Economic.—Concerned with the satisfaction of the material wants of the people. The sole function of the economic system should be to deliver goods and services as, when and where they are wanted.

(iii.) Cultural.—The sphere in which the individual can find free expression for his personality.

(f.) SOCIAL SYSTEMS:

There are only two types of social organisations: namely, democratic, under which the collective will is supreme; and authoritarian, under which power is concentrated in a central authority. All social systems fall under one or other of these headings.

(i.) Democracy.—This type of social organisation can be defined as "management of the people's affairs, to give them the results they want." Therefore it conforms to the purpose of society and it is the natural social order, the organisation of which must of necessity be based upon the fundamental principles already stated above.

(ii.) Authoritarianism.—Society organised in this form is the antithesis of democracy. It involves the centralisation of power and subservience of the people to the will of a ruling group.

(g.) MECHANISMS OF ORGANISATION:

While the foregoing principles of social organisation could be applied without undue difficulty to a small primitive community, their application to modern nations comprising several millions of persons scattered over a wide area would present a formidable problem but for the mechanisms that have been evolved over a period of centuries as an integral part of our social structure.

The key to social organisation is to be found in the means by which the people can make their sovereignty effective, and it is these mechanisms of control in both the political and economic spheres to which your Committee has directed its attention.

In order to be effective such mechanisms must, firstly, enable the people to state in definite terms the results they want, and, secondly, enable the people to enforce obedience to their wishes.

The necessary mechanisms already exist in the form of the "voting systems" which serve the political and economic spheres of our social system.

(i) Political Voting System.—The operation of this in its present form is generally familiar. Its purpose should be to enable the electorate to specify policy and to choose representatives to give effect to their collective will in the sphere of government.

(ii) Economic Voting System.—Though much more extensively used than the political mechanism, the economic voting system is not generally recognised as such.

The monetary system's primary, and by far its most important, function in a democracy is its operation as the economic voting system—the mechanism of control by means of which the people can express the results they want and enforce obedience of their wishes.

When a person enters a store, places a five dollar bill on the counter and purchases a pair of brown Oxford shoes, manu-

"A SMUTS-WEIZMANN MOVE"

The issue for December 17, 1943, of "Aufbau," a journal published by German refugees in the U.S.A., which describes itself as "An Independent Weekly Journal (in German and English) to Serve the Americanisation and the Interests of all Immigrants," bears on its front page the headline (in German): "A Smuts-Weizmann Move: Palestine Solution or a 'Free Europe,'" writes S.E.F. in the "Patriot" (London) of June 15. According to the article, Dr. Weizmann, the Zionist leader, has invited the principal Zionists in Palestine, U.S.A., and South Africa to important meetings in London.

"Secrecy is being maintained about the motive and subject of these conferences. One can only presume that events have taken place that have led to them, which will bring Zionist politics from the long period of ebb to a state of movement and flood. One learns that Weizmann has at last had a meeting with Prime Minister Churchill before his journey to the historic conferences at Cairo and Teheran, for which he had waited several months in vain, and which General Smuts, the South African Premier, had arranged and attended. General Smuts had represented Churchill in the Cabinet during his absence. Later, Smuts, on his way back to Pretoria, met President Roosevelt at Cairo. There is reason to believe that he also seized this opportunity to break a lance for a Palestine solution of the Jewish question, as he had sent cheering cables from Cairo to his Zionist friends in South Africa. That is an encouraging sign."

After discussing the Jewish question, as it has existed since 1917, the writer in "Aufbau" again refers to the Smuts-Weizmann negotiations, adding:

"What solution should they seek? Influential Jewish individuals and circles in America and England, together with their powerful non-Jewish friends, have worked with increased effort towards the Jewish question being considered at the end of the war, both publicly and in the Cabinets, and a solution will be sought in the direction of a renewal of the era of emancipation. The solution of a 'Free Europe' will be put forward instead of that of a 'Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.' High State officials, diplomats, and statesmen are charmed with the idea."

A study of the names of the members of the Advisory Board of "Aufbau" shows that they are largely Jewish.

The "Evening Standard" (London) for September 21, 1942, recalled that when Rabbi Herz was expelled from the Transvaal Republic by President Kruger he was escorted to the frontier by Smuts, who was then a young State Attorney. "There have been a number of changes since those days," concludes S.E.F. in his above-mentioned article in the "Patriot."

GET THESE BOOKLETS!

New readers in particular are recommended to read the following booklets if they desire to fully grasp and more clearly follow the articles appearing in the "New Times."

"COMMUNISM, WHY NOT?" Gives the low-down on Communism. Price: 2/7d, posted.

"THE ANSWER TO SOCIALISM." An excellent realistic analysis of Socialism. Price: 2/7d, posted.

"RED GLOWS THE DAWN." Inside "information about the white-anting tactics of local Communists. Price: 7d, posted.

"THE BIG IDEA." A comprehensive survey of the plot to enslave the people. Price: 2/7d, posted.

"FEDERAL UNION EXPOSED." Revelations of the plot to impose the World Police State. Price: 1/1d, posted.

"THE ANSWER TO TAX SLAVERY." A clear exposition of the cause of excessive taxation, and the way out. Price: 1/1d, posted.

"MONEY." A simple and complete analysis of the money swindle. Price: 1/1d, posted.

"THE NEW DESPOTISM." The story of the "Dean Case." Price: 7d, posted.

"STOP THAT THIEF." A most interesting collection of historical and recent facts about finance. Price: 1/7d, posted.

The above booklets are obtainable from the (United) Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

factured by the Pelican Shoe Company, he is performing several very important functions:

In the first place, he is demanding, and obtaining, a result he wants from the economic sphere. Secondly, he is voting for the production of brown Oxford shoes. Thirdly, he is casting his economic vote in favour of the Pelican Shoe Company in preference to any other concern as giving him satisfactory service.

Now to the extent an individual citizen has money in relation to the prices of available goods for sale, he has economic voting power, they will control the nature assurance of economic voting power, he enjoys economic security. And to the extent that he obtains this under conditions over which HE has control, he has freedom in the economic sphere.

Furthermore, to the extent that the people collectively have effective economic voting power, they will control the nature and volume of production.

(To be continued.)

M.L.A. ATTACKS ORTHODOX FINANCE

It is apparent that many State Members are starting to realise that centralised financial domination is the main factor State Governments must take into consideration when considering post-war reconstruction. Many of these State Members do not as yet fully understand the subject of financial domination, but we believe that social creditors should be giving direction and encouragement to those who are searching for a solution. The following extracts from a speech, by Mr. L. J. Barnes, Independent Member for Cairns, Queensland, made in Parliament on September 27, should prove of interest to readers, and to Queensland electors in particular:—

"When analysing the surplus, we must ask the question where it came from, and the answer is that it came from all over Queensland. The policy of Governments is too centralised and, shall I say, cityfied. I make bold to say that this Government during the past three years made £100,000 from the Cairns electorate, but unfortunately they were not able to spend such a sum because of the manpower shortage brought about by the war. We must see to it that in the allocation of moneys for post-war reconstruction every district gets a share.... "This Government took £100,000 from the Cairns district, and that is after allowing for the cost of administration, therefore that amount should be put back into the area free of debt and interest."

An Hon. Member: "One of the best-treated towns on the coast"

Mr. L. J. Barnes: "As a matter of fact, if it is one of the best-treated towns on the coast, I raise my lid because I am the member representing that town. I realise that Cairns must receive better treatment because during the war the depreciation in North Queensland, especially in Townsville and Cairns, has been at least 10 to 15 per cent, greater than in any other provincial town in Queensland. Because of its relation to the war-zone, roads and everything else have deteriorated at a greater rate than in any other provincial town in this State."

"We have not heard much of our national debt during this debate. We speak of a surplus, but we still owe £2,000,000,000. I have not heard any accountant or any hon. member in this Chamber show how we can pay £2,000,000,000. Furthermore, I have not heard anybody speak of where we shall get the finance for post-war reconstruction. Certainly we can float loans to provide the wherewithal to kill people, but it is a totally different matter trying to float a loan to get money to keep people alive. It is not forthcoming then. I do not agree with loans. For most of our loans the money has been subscribed in Australia, but a portion has come from overseas. If one is bitten by a dog, what does it matter if the dog was a neighbour's dog or the person's own dog? The only difference is that if it was your own dog that bit you, you could chain him up, whereas you cannot chain up your neighbour's dog. Either dog could give one hydrophobia, and it is political hydrophobia that we are getting at the present time"

"The private banks do create credit and by that I mean that they manufacture money. To say that they create credit is not simplifying it—they manufacture money. I mentioned in this Chamber before that on one occasion the London Chamber of Commerce threw out a challenge to the world. It said, 'We will assume for a moment that there are five people in the community and one banker. That one banker has £500 and he lends each of the five people in the community £100 each. At the end of the year they are expected to pay the bank the £100 each, which is £500 in all, plus 5 per cent in interest, which is £25.' Now the Chamber of Commerce, London, wanted to know how these five persons could pay back £525 when only £500 had been issued to them. I know that there are hon. members here who will say, 'I can pay my interest back.' Yes, they can, but it is only because I cannot pay mine. That is the only reason why some of us can pay our interest and that is why we have a debt of £2,000,000,000 today—because the interest has never been created. YOU cannot pay the interest back because the money is never created to pay it back. In connection with the creation of deposits, we will assume that you go to a bank tomorrow and get an overdraft of £3000. It is granted to you as the borrower, and so you write a cheque for £3000, hand it to someone for goods who pays it into a bank, and so the deposits are increased from £1000 to £4000. 'If any accountant can deny that, it is immediately proved by the fact that the deposits increased by £3000. That being so, it is the banks that create the deposits. When you get a loan from a bank it immediately creates a deposit.'"

Mr. Aiken: "They can restrict them, too?"

Mr. L. J. Barnes: "They can either restrict them or do what they like with them Great men in the Empire have proved that I am not talking rot. The men I call stand-patters say there is nothing wrong with the present financial system. Of course, I do not wish to put the fire out because the milk is boiling over; all I want to do is rectify the trouble, and if we do not take steps to do that you can believe me that this system will be wrecked by revolution, I remind all these stand-patters who say that it will not happen here, that it has happened in Russia, Spain and other parts of the world."

"The present system does not need much patching up. The position is not as serious as some would imagine. The only thing wrong with it is our financial economy. Of course, the Communists say that we must have common ownership not only of production, but also of the means of production, but we know that . . . you cannot expect private enterprise to give in without a revolution. Private enterprise will not sign on the dotted line, saying that it passes

over to the Soviet State of Australia the whole of its possessions. It has not been done as easily as that in any country, and so long as we continue to stand pat in this Parliament we run the risk of speedy revolution, but we still have time to avert that catastrophe. I claim to be as strong a fighter for the interests of all and for the benefit of the worker as any man in this Parliament, including the hon. member for Bowen, who is sincere in his belief in Communism, but we must not confuse sincerity with logic"

"You cannot eat money, use money, or wear it or sleep on it, unless you are abnormal, but I quite admit that we cannot wear without it, sleep without it, eat without it or live without it. What I am getting at is that our Governments do control the King's coinage and legal tender, the chicken feed that comes from the caucus table. I want to know where the difference between the King's coinage and legal tender—which it is the prerogative of the Government to create—and that which is in existence comes from"

"I fully realise that our trouble is not production but distribution. The Commun-

FITZPATRICK'S SIGNIFICANT SILENCE

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—The enclosed copies of letters I sent to Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick will no doubt prove of interest to your readers. I think that all social creditors should make it a rigid rule never to allow any false statements made by opponents of social credit to be left unanswered. Instant exposure is our most powerful weapon. Although Mr. Fitzpatrick did not answer my letters, I noticed the following paragraph in his "replies" to correspondents in "Smith's Weekly" of September 23: "Eric D. Butler (Melbourne): I've seen all three letters from you. You know the answer." Thus this "learned" University product waves aside objections to his false statements!—Yours, etc., Eric D.

c/o Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

August 13, 1944.

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick, c/o "Smith's Weekly," Sydney, N.S.W.

Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick,—In your article in "Smith's" of August 12 the following statement appears:

"I may mention, by the way, that the other night Dr. Evatt addressed in Melbourne Town Hall, for Yes, by far the biggest Referendum meeting yet held in Victoria. From the platform I noticed that almost only hecklers, among 3000 listeners, were money cranks, some of whose foremost representatives are spending Big Business's and the hated Banks' money for No."

Would you please be good enough to answer the following questions:

(1.) Who are these "foremost representatives" of the "money cranks"? What are their names?

(2.) In what manner did these "foremost representatives" obtain this money from the "hated Banks," and just how did they spend it?

I know that you are a busy man, but, as one of the "money cranks" in this country, I would be much obliged if you could answer the above questions at your earliest convenience.

—Yours faithfully, ERIC D. BUTLER.

CAN A LEOPARD CHANGE ITS SPOTS?

(Continued from page 1)

velopment of new and adequate markets, and general improvement in rural amenities. Here again the people who prepared the new programme have done so without regard to the realities of the situation. It is one thing to talk about new markets, but it is a far more sensible thing to get the maximum benefit from the market on the spot, namely, the home market. If the home market is fully developed and there is production to spare after this has been done, then we would be in the position to give the surplus away to the needy people of other countries if we so wished. Obviously, this would be a far better arrangement than joining in a scramble to force our surplus into other lands, whether it is wanted there or not. It is all a matter of "paying" the producers, and Australian money is the solution for this problem.

Point No. 6 contemplates constant employment at good wages for all who are willing and able to work.

The absurdity of the work-for-all idea is apparent when regard is had to the fact that even before the war, one hour's work per person per day in conjunction with the mechanical power available to us would have been sufficient to meet the needs of all.

Since then, however, our productive potentialities have been revolutionised and we have actually reached the stage when we can release great numbers of the community from taking any part at all in industrial activity. Here again, it is not possible to give the people the benefit of these wonderful improvements and increased solar power unless we make a fundamental change in the financial system.

Point No. 7 requires employer and employees to share as co-operators in all advances of prosperity, with rising living standards as physical resources expand and ingenuity grows. Nice words, but quite meaningless under the present system. Employer and employee can co-operate at pre-

ists say that it is production that we must have collective ownership, but during the depression of 1929 to 1932 2,000,000 people died of starvation and 1,000,000 committed suicide, according to League of Nations statistics. Those same statistics show that 5,000,000,000 wagonloads of food were dumped or destroyed—enough food to feed 3,000,000 persons for 300 years was destroyed. We have never had a shortage of food in this country in peacetime, and we have reached the stage with our ultra-modern machinery and irrigation at which we can over-produce. If we are going to produce food just for the sake of working, and if we are then going to dump it into the sea it will be a lasting disgrace to the Government who will not face up to the facts of finance. The only way by which the goods that are produced can be distributed is to see that the Government controls finance"

"Mr. Chifley has brought forward a Commonwealth housing scheme that is just as obsolete as this Government's workers' dwellings scheme. Houses will be approximately 25 per cent, dearer, and there will be the usurious interest rate of 4 per cent. He will have to live 70 years to pay for his home. A Local Authorities' Conference that met in Brisbane a few weeks ago questioned the Commonwealth Government about finance, and Mr. Chifley told them that they would have to get their money through the orthodox channels of loan funds and general revenue. Neither this Government nor the local authority nor I can borrow ourselves out of debt. We must face the facts."

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

State. The "democracies" are being converted, under the pretext of "war-time necessity," into similar socialistic States. That is what the people have to guard against.

FADDEN'S FLOP: "Hansard" for September 15 (p. 896) reports Mr. Arty Fadden in a windy diatribe on the illegality of certain Budget manipulations. Mr. Chifley countered with—"all of these existed when the right honourable Member was Treasurer." To which Artful Arty weakly replied, "but I was never advised of the illegality." That's the sort of piffle these fully paid political servants engage in at the taxpayers' expense; and, of course, Labor adopts the same tactics when the other gang is in the box seat. Such buffoonery is, of course, the very essence of Party politics, which lowers the dignity of Parliament and undermines the people's confidence in politicians.

DIGGERS DUMPED: While the Planners hatch more plans, and the Labor Government speaks in terms of high praise of our fighting men, this is the way they act: A returned soldier who served in both wars, and has a family of seven, bought a small cafe. He then applied for ration tickets for stock, but the answer was—nothing doing! Note the difference between words and actions. "Smith's Weekly" for October 4 quotes other cases also, so it is not an isolated example of official "gratitude."

CITY CIRCUSES: Criticism by Wing-Commander White, of the diversion of manpower, etc., from the war-effort to the printing and sending of war-loan appeal letters to householders, is reported in the Melbourne daily press; also a strong objection from Mr. Cameron to the disturbing sights in the city of "travelling circuses for the loan." It is indeed a strange spectacle to see able-bodied men and women begging for money when they could be doing war-work; because the Federal Government has sovereign authority to create its own money.

FREEDOM FIGHT: All Britain is said to be laughing over police proceedings, which resulted in a judge and two comedians being fined 5/- each for having bathed in defiance of regulations. The learned judge took the lead in the "battle of the beaches," in which thousands of holidaymakers swarmed through barbed wire entanglements to their beaches. It is regarded everywhere as a traditional British assertion of their rights, and a sign of unrest against irksome regimentation. Anyway, as a result the beaches were opened once more. Bravo, Britain! —OBH.

less anxiety for better conditions while they go on supporting the very thing that prevents us from having better conditions.

Every political party already makes a feature of its intention to expand and improve educational facilities, but whenever this has been urged by deputations to the Government or by teachers, the reply has always been the same, irrespective of the label of the party in office, viz., where is the MONEY to come from?

Will this aspect of the matter be any different in the future? If the "new" Liberal Party will be freed from this financial limitation, then that will be good news, but everything connected with the organisation shows that that is the one thing that will NOT happen.

Point No. 10 is another high-sounding platitude. Family life is to be recognised as fundamental to the well-being of society, and every family is to be enabled to live in a comfortable home at reasonable cost, with adequate community amenities. The family IS the basis of society, but no family can have the proper atmosphere of happy contentment where the parents are faced with the never-ending struggle to pay their way on insufficient income, and with an ever-present apprehension that ill luck or ill health may bring them below the breadline. These apprehensions are not present in the comparatively few homes where the income is assured on a basis more than sufficient for immediate needs. In any case, who will determine what is a "comfortable" home and "reasonable cost"? The parents should be the best judges of that, but their judgment would be conditioned by the "expense" involved and their ability or inability to meet the expense.

So it all comes back to a matter of income, and income is a matter of MONEY. The controllers of the MONEY supply are therefore the controllers of INCOMES, and the Liberal Party proposes that these controllers shall continue to control as at present.

Some housing official will evidently tell the fathers and mothers the sort of home they will be permitted to have for the rearing of their families. And who would decide as to the adequacy of "community amenities"? Would that be determined by some unknown official according to their so-called "economic value," or by our desire (if any) for more and our physical ability to provide them? * * *

On the basis of reality it is thus very clear that these men and women who met at Canberra and received such generous publicity are deceiving themselves and humbugging the great bulk of the people who form the nation. They have formulated what purports to be a new programme, but which consists of the same old ideas, which have been responsible for the sufferings of the past. The leopard has not changed his spots, and many decent people are destined for disillusionment and disappointment.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C2. 22nd October, 1944.