

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

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 11. No. 7. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEB. 23, 1945.

"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.

The "Watchman" as a Bankers' Watchdog

Radio Attacks on Social Credit

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

Sir, —Many times I have listened with interest to the radio session conducted by "The Watchman," and have often wondered whether he really understood the difference between the meaning of the word "news" and the word "views." His session is described as "The news behind the news"! It cannot be denied that occasionally he has said some excellent things, but it should not be concealed that he has far more frequently said foolish things.

Why he chose the pseudonym "Watchman" has not been explained, but on consulting the contents of "Who's Who," as published by the Melbourne "Herald," it may be that we will at least find a pointer. His full name is Edward Alexander Mann; he was born on 11th August 1874, and is an ex-member of the House of Representatives. We thus see that he is in his 71st year, and this should be taken into account in extenuation for that part of his activities, which may justly be denominated, as reprehensible. It seems much more difficult for an old man to discard false conceptions than for a young man to embrace

new ideas. Mr. Mann is described in the "Who's Who" as "News commentator for chain of commercial stations, but until September, 1940, Principal Commentator for the A.B.C. under the name of 'The Watchman.'"

On Monday, 12th February, I received many telephone inquiries asking whether I had heard "The Watchman" the previous night, and telling me what a dreadful affair it was, and how utterly false.

I had to confess that I had been unable to listen to his session, but that I knew of his intention "to deal with the subject of Social Credit" on that occasion. Naturally, I would expect his criticism to be strong

provided it was straightforward and the result of conviction based on known FACTS. I did not expect a man of his reputation to indulge in falsehood, whether of his own arrangement or by repetition from others, and consequently could offer no opinion or advice on the subject of his broadcast until I had an opportunity to read exactly what had been said, but promised to look into it.

His intention to deal with the subject was mentioned to me by my esteemed and capable friend, Norman Worrall, who had already been in communication with "The Watchman" in connection with an earlier broadcast. He permitted me to read the correspondence, and after doing so I gained the impression that Mr. Worrall's letter had stung somewhat. Subsequent events strengthen that impression.

The letter from Mr. Worrall was important, and it seemed to me that readers of "The New Times" would welcome an opportunity to read it. I therefore asked Mr. Worrall for his permission to include it in these columns, and he readily consented. His letter was dated 25th January, and I quote the bulk of it as follows:—

"Your inspired attack on Social Credit, delivered from 3UZ on Sunday, demonstrates clearly that your mental outlook has remained static since the depression. Neither the logic of events nor the impingement of facts has succeeded in disturbing that blind adherence to an outmoded financial orthodoxy which, in 1931, characterised your refusal publicly to comment upon Maurice Colbourn's 'Economic Nationalism'—though prior to my forwarding the book for your criticism your radio talks had monotonously and dogmatically reiterated your conviction that the depression was caused by economic nationalism.

"In his recent thought-provoking book, 'The Road to Serfdom,' F. A. Hayek, Professor of Economic Science and Statistics in the University of London, deplores the accelerated drift in Britain and America towards collectivism and the consequent surrender of the rights of the individual to the State. He demonstrates that the ideas which twenty-five years ago induced frustrated Germany to swing towards totalitarianism and the consequent horrors of National Socialism, are rapidly gaining force and momentum in Great Britain and America.

"Hayek offers no solution to the problem which he poses, but utters an impassioned

and despairing appeal for the preservation of that free enterprise and individual liberty which is the basis of western civilisation. . . .

"Your inference that Douglas is but little heard of now implies that his influence is waning. On the contrary, the recent Alberta elections demonstrated very convincingly that after nine years of office the Social Credit Government of Alberta was preferred by an overwhelming majority of the people of that Province to any other political party. Fifty-one out of fifty-seven seats were won by Government candidates, despite the fact that every attempt made in nine years to implement Social Credit legislation had been frustrated by the Canadian Federal Parliament and the High Court of Canada, in the interests, and doubtless at the behest, of the Financial Hege-

mony. "Yet within the framework of the existing orthodox debt system of finance under which it was compiled to operate, this Government had established the unique distinction of being the only one in the British Empire which had progressively reduced taxation, together with the public and private indebtedness which are inseparable from high taxation.

"Might I respectfully suggest that before you again venture to publicise your views on this subject you should, in fairness to listeners, endeavour to familiarise yourself with Social Credit philosophy and principles, and the technique whereby it may be implemented. Had you done this in the first place, you would not have made the absurd statement that Social Credit would bring about inflation.

"I understand, of course, that even if you were intellectually convinced that Social Credit could save humanity from atavism and ultimate complete annihilation, you would not be permitted to speak in its favour over the national or commercial network. I submit, however, that your position as a commentator requires you to confine yourself to facts—fiction is already abundantly catered for by specialists in that sphere."

That was a strongly worded communication, and the man to whom it was sent might be excused for being provoked by it, as undoubtedly he was. His reply, dated 5th February, was as follows:—

"I regret that pressure of work has ren-

(Continued on page 2.)

Significant Political Pointers

It appears certain that the British peoples are going to emerge from this war much stronger than the internationalists thought possible. In spite of the attempts by the revolutionaries of Greece and Belgium, British prestige is probably higher now than at any period since the conclusion of World War, Part One.

British spokesmen are starting to deal the British people's detractors some hard verbal knocks, and some revealing facts about Britain's contribution to war effort are appearing amidst the continual ballyhoo poured out by press, screen and radio.

Those people who succumbed to the "Britain-let-us-down" poison should have the great accomplishments of the British Army in Burma brought to their notice. It has been reported that the British had engaged in battle and killed more Japanese than all the American forces put together. And the Sydney "Daily Mirror" reports that a British General, Martel, was primarily responsible for Russian strategy at the Battle of Stalingrad. When shown the Russian General's plans, Martel disagreed with them and was successful in having his own implemented.

The real test for British prestige will come in the Battle for the Peace. Every effort must be made now to ensure that we win that battle; that the resource, courage and example displayed by our people during the darkest days of the war are displayed again in demonstrating to the world that sovereign peoples controlling their own policies can contribute more to world peace than the imposition of world tyrannies backed by international armed forces.

At a recent public meeting in his electorate, Mr. Ward, M.H.R., vigorously attacked the private banks. Significantly enough, he was given a good press. In the course of his remarks he mentioned the paltry income of the old-age pensioners. Perhaps Mr. Ward would be good enough to tell us why his "progressive" Government has never raised old-age pensions to at least the basic wage. There is no necessity for a lot of abstract talk about the banks; all the Federal Government has to do is use the powers it already possesses in order to ensure that INDIVIDUALS obtain adequate "money-votes" in order that they may indicate to industry what they require. But the socialists are de-

termined that Government departments are much more capable of spending the people's money than the people are. If the people had access to their own credit, immediately the war finished they would undoubtedly "vote" for an immediate increase in food, clothing and houses; all individual requirements. Mr. Dedman, one of the most dangerous doctrinaires in the present Government, is busy increasing the scope of his Department in order that the credit of the community is utilised in unifying the railway system and other comparatively unimportant works. The insidious campaign to plan the people into producing capital goods to the detriment of the production of consumable goods, thus maintaining conditions suitable for the control of the individual by coupons, is one of the greatest dangers confronting us. A vigorous exposure of Mr. Dedman and the Department he controls—or does it control him?—would appear to be a major task before the next Federal elections.

It is encouraging to note that there is a growing recognition of the fact often stressed in these columns, that monopoly and socialism are synonymous terms. The following appeared in the Sydney "Telegraph" of February 10:

"Since 1939 the number of employers and self-employed has fallen from 677,000 to 475,000. Wartime controls have been the principal assassin. . . . It (Labor) bombinates about 'monopoly capitalism' while plotting to establish State-capitalistic monopolies in every field. . . . what is quite undebatable is the fact that monopoly and socialism go far more inevitably together than monopoly and free capitalism. Try to sack your milkman in the Soviet Union!

"Monopoly is an evil thing. It is evil because it is wasteful, because it is tyrannical, and because it is impudent and careless of public welfare, choice and convenience. If you have had an opportunity to compare America's competitive railways or competitive telephone services with your own you will have no doubt about this."

And the socialists are determined that all standards of comparison shall be obliterated by refusing to make financial credit directly available to individuals, while making it available to Departments in almost unlimited quantities. One of the greatest obstacles to Social Credit ideas in this country is the unfortunate fact that Government Departments have done so many things which private enterprise has done much better in other countries. People who have never experienced a privately run telephone system are thereby encouraged to believe that only Government Departments can run telephone systems. There are far too many people working in Government Departments in this country, a fact that has encouraged a certain degree of State-worship. Government Departments are not notorious for the production of sturdy, independent individuals. Look at our State schoolteachers! — E.D.B.

Another Briey Basin?

"On Friday, December 15 more than five years after the declaration of war, the R.A.F. bombed the chemical works of the I. G. Farben, the cartel-colleague of Imperial Chemical Industries (the creation of Alfred Moritz Mond) and Du Pont de Nemours. The 'B.B.C.', in announcing the fact, had the effrontery (oh, yes, Clarence, we know the 'B.B.C.' is not responsible—it never is) to remark that although the synthetic oil plant had previously been put out of action, the chemical works, producing large quantities of nitric acid and other materials of which the Germans are in short supply, was still operating. Is this another Briey Basin racket, and if it is, are we going to tolerate it?"

—The Social Crediter (Eng.), 30/12/44.

NOTES on the NEWS

U.N.R.R.A.: London reports contained in the Melbourne "Herald" of February 19 feature charges that food and services supplied by U.N.R.R.A. are being used as a political weapon. As an example it is pointed out that the Italian bread ration was increased when the votes of Americans of Italian origin in the American Presidential Election had to be considered, and that AFTER the election the ration was REDUCED again. Other examples were also given. Events have justified the warnings uttered through these columns against this and other international set-ups. More will be heard of this later, but meanwhile strenuous opposition should be maintained against pending international plots such as the World Bank and Police Force. If our independence is to be preserved Australia must be kept out of these dangerous entanglements.

WOOL WORRIES: A London report expresses concern because Britain now owns the largest store of wool ever known: 4,000,000,000 lbs., or more than the whole world's annual production. Commenting on this, the London "Daily Mail" points out "Britain is going without new clothes and becoming threadbare." Here we see the old story of poverty amidst plenty, and the goods must be exported because certified economists say so! On no account must the wool be converted into clothes for Britons! As a matter of fact, some time ago very heavy fines were imposed on traders who diverted materials earmarked for export, to the local market. Seemingly there is manpower available to produce clothes for "liberated" countries, "starving Europe," etc., but none for the long-suffering British people. It should not be long before Britishers insist on liberating themselves.

CAUCUS CONCERN: A committee from the Labor Caucus has been appointed to endeavour to "soften-up" the Government's attitude of preventing house building. The reason for this is said to be that members of Caucus are greatly perturbed about the housing problem, not because of the homelessness (Oh dear, No!), but because "they believe it is the rock on which the Government could be wrecked at the next elections." Well, that's honestly if somewhat brutally put; but the election is too close for the people to forget, unless the building restrictions are immediately removed in their entirety. Maybe the committee could concoct a suitable "face-saving" story to explain such a move, and to prevent such a soursault being regarded as an election bribe. Messrs. Menzies, Fadden and Co. could do no more than promise similar

bribes. Such is the game of Party Politics, in which the Electors can only play one Party against the other!

WISFUL WITHALL: The Director of the Chamber of Manufacturers (Mr. Withall) is reported as saying that "Dr. Evatt, Professor Copland, Dr. Lloyd Ross and others rehearsed the policy of regimentation which was to be the Government's blue-print for the post-war years." But he also stated that Mr. Curtin and senior Ministers had, now rejected the blueprint and would accept the people's Referendum decision! It is not reported whether this is the outcome of "inside information" or wishful thinking, but, so far, we haven't heard of the resignation of Copland and (Continued on page 4).

National Socialism Opposed

"Taking as his topic, Should Doctors Be Socialised? the president of the Victorian branch of the British Medical Association (Dr. John Dale), in a talk at the Legacy Club luncheon yesterday, made it clear that the majority of doctors did not want to be socialised. The medical profession, he said, was a very important part of the community. It was a great profession, with a wonderful record of achievement, and doctors did not look forward to being regimented into the civil service. If it did occur, doctors would cease to be the servants of their patients, but would be servants of the State. The objections were manifold. Doctors objected to the loss of freedom. It meant heading straight for a totalitarian regime."

—Melbourne "Age," 14/2/45.

THEY CALLED IT "RECONSTRUCTION"

Hereunder we conclude a condensation of an article appearing under the above title in the "Reader's Digest" U.S.A., of November 1944. The writer is Edwin Muller, a Roving Editor of the "Digest." He describes the "reconstruction" imposed on the Southern States after the American Civil War, and some of the consequences: —

This sorry mess was not the fault of the Negroes. How could they be expected to move in one step from slavery to self-government? Indeed, the wonder is that they did as well as they did. There were a few able and honest Negro legislators. In the welter of corruption they managed somehow to put through an occasional constructive act—for example, to promote the education of their race.

But the net result was catastrophic. The money that was stolen came out of the taxpayers. IN ONE YEAR 2000 PIECES OF REAL ESTATE WERE FORFEITED FOR TAXES IN A SINGLE COUNTY. And the white men of the South had no redress.

There were other aspects of "Reconstruction" that embittered them even more than the financial losses.

A part of the Radical plan was to "re-educate" the South, forcibly. There was an influx of Yankee schoolteachers, burning to show the South "the error of its ways." The schoolbooks came from the North.

They taught that Lincoln was murdered by men hired by Confederate leaders, that Robert E. Lee was a perjurer, traitor, that Sherman's march to the sea was a glorious crusade.

Worse, perhaps, in its lasting effect, was the occasional physical violence of black against white. The average Southerner was so constituted that he would rather have his home taxed away from him than be pushed off the sidewalk by a Negro.

It cannot be said that there was universal or organised violence on the part of the Negroes. The vast majority of them, then as now, was inclined to be peaceable and unoffending. But it was inevitable that there should be some outrages.

By carpetbagger politicians and Northern schoolteachers, it had been dimmed into blacks that they were as good as the whites and ought to prove it. Thousands of them had whisky to drink for the first time in their lives.

And so there were incidents—of bands of Negroes roaming the streets insulting any whites they met, forcing their way into houses, ordering the inhabitants about. White men were taken out and whipped. There were cases when whites were murdered by blacks who went unpunished.

Worst of all, in their long-enduring effects, were the crimes against women. Before the Civil War, the assault of a black on a white woman was almost unknown. During the war, when the white men were away from home, there was hardly a case.

But during "Reconstruction" it was different. Between whisky and the irresponsible agitation of carpetbaggers, who preached that white women were none too good for Negroes, the crime of rape sharply increased.

It isn't true that nowhere in the South was an unprotected woman safe, but it was true in enough places to poison for generations the relations between whites and Negroes. It would have taken only a few cases to generate the fog of fear and horror that still hangs over parts of the South.

White men felt that they were living under a reign of terror. In despair they talked of taking up arms again in a hopeless cause.

Violence gave birth to violence. There were the Ku Klux Klan, the Knights of the White Camellia, lynchings, burnings at the stake. Then retaliation by the North—Federal troops marching in, mass trials, more violence.

The nightmare ended at last.

The South escaped from "Reconstruction" when the cult of hate and vengeance in the North lost its driving force. In the 1870's the North was in a period of boom and prosperity not unlike that of the 1920's. People were making more money than they had ever dreamed of. With that came a relaxing of standards. Soon in the headlines were the financial scandals of the Grant Administration, involving Representatives, Senators, Cabinet members. Then the crash of 1873.

The people of the North were in no mood to keep hot a righteous wrath against the South.

Without the support of Northern bayonets the carpetbagger regimes buckled and collapsed.

It was a process partly of law and partly of force. The "ironclad oath" was gradually relaxed and circumvented. The white electorate organised, under the Democratic Party, to oust the Radical-carpetbagger regimes in the elections. In some cases the threat of force was used to keep Negroes and white Republicans from voting, or to "persuade" them to vote Democratic. In State after State a Democratic ticket was elected.

South Carolina was one of the last of the Southern States to escape. As late as 1874 one of the slickest of the carpetbaggers, "Honest John" Patterson, was opening to his colleagues that there were "five years more of good stealing in South Carolina." He miscalculated, for 1876 was the year of deliverance, the 100th anniversary of Independence.

Wade Hampton was the George Washington of South Carolina. He led the State

in a desperate do-or-die struggle that was more like a crusade than a political campaign of Democrats against Republicans.

D. C. Chamberlain was the Radical-Republican candidate for Governor, running against Hampton. He was a modified breed of carpetbagger, a man of culture, who wanted to reform the worst abuses in the State. But he could never control or reform his own following.

It was not a gentle, peaceful campaign. The Democrats organised in armed group their uniform a red shirt. They rode through the State in great armies. They would ride up to a Radical political meeting; demand the right for one of their speakers to address it. Usually the meeting would break up. As a rule, the Red Shirts could avoid actual violence. It was intimidation by the threat of force.

Hampton himself tried to make it a campaign of reason and persuasion. He urged Negroes as well as whites to vote Democratic, appealing to their good sense to end their exploitation by the carpetbaggers.

In the election he swept the State. Some thousands of the Negroes voted for him. Incidentally, they received and exercised the right to vote in the Democratic Party in South Carolina as long as they lived.

The Radicals tried to "cook" the returns, to keep Hampton out of office. But he told the throngs that gathered in Columbia: "You have made me your Governor and by the eternal God I will be your Governor!"

The opposition backed down. On April 11, 1877, Hampton led his men into the State House. "Reconstruction" in the South was over.

But it was too late.

Old Thad Stevens had died in 1868—his end hastened perhaps by his fury at the

failure of Andrew Johnson's impeachment. By his own instruction he was buried in a Lancaster cemetery patronised by Negroes. No doubt he believed that he and his colleagues had brought about the equality of the races. Events have proved him wrong.

The antagonism between the races, which the Radicals had fostered for political profit, took deep root.

There was no more talk of the liberal principles, which Wade Hampton had advocated, of giving the Negro the vote as soon as he qualified for it by education and experience. Instead, as soon as the white men of the South had wrested their government away from Negro-carpetbagger rule, they began to take the vote away from Negroes, tried to make it sure that most of them would never vote again. They set up a barrier of poll taxes, literacy qualifications, "grandfather clauses" by which the restrictions were relaxed in favour of whites whose grandfathers had voted. The system was backed by the threat of force. Moreover, they prevented the Negro from attaining economic equality.

And so the matter stands today.

The Governor of South Carolina states: "We will maintain white supremacy, let the chips fall where they may." The junior Senator from that State says: "Regardless of any Supreme Court decision and any law that may be passed by Congress, we of the South will maintain our political and social institutions as we believe to be in the best interests of our people." And the senior Senator puts it: "I'm still for white supremacy, and those who don't like it... can go to hell."

As a result of Stevens' plan the Democratic Party in the South became the whole white race militantly organised. In the Deep South "Republican" and "rascal" still mean about the same thing.

These problems can be solved. Their solution will be easier if both sides, North and South, whites and Negroes, approach the solution in the spirit of Wade Hampton rather than that of Thad Stevens.

NEW EROSION MENACE

(To the Editor.)

Sir—In the Melbourne "Herald" of 14/2/1945, Professor Wadhams is reported to have told the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science that:

"The morale of Australian farmers is at its lowest conceivable ebb, or almost so. The black marketing and the wangling they have to do to get things have undermined their respect for authority and administration in a way that is becoming alarming. This is partly due to war conditions, but it is also due to bad administration, and the adoption of policies, which are ill conceived. The farmers' disrespect for authority is very unfortunate, and a change in policy is called for."

So it seems that erosion is attacking not only his farm, but his morale, i.e., his moral condition, but we can hardly blame bad farming, drought, and wind for the erosion of morale. Professor Wadhams' first shot (war conditions) is a doubtful outer, almost a miss; the second (bad administration) is a bad miss, for there can be no good administration of bad policy; whilst his third shot (ill-conceived policy) scores a clean bull's eye.

Poor old farmers! Their respect for "authority," which resides far beyond their own fences, is waning fast. The learned Professor appears to think that "respect for authority" and "morale" mean the same thing.

Erosion of the farm itself is caused by bad farming, drought, and wind, the first only being within the direct control of the farmer—nominally, if not actually. In the case of his morale, however, erosion can be considered as due to similar causes only by fancifully substituting bad administration of bad policy, financial drought, and external regulation, respectively, for bad farming, drought, and wind—none of the substitutions being even remotely under his control at present. Let us hope he will soon wake up to the need for demanding, and getting, a larger share in the minding of his own business.

—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, East Kew.

TWO INDIVIDUALS MADE VICTORY POSSIBLE

"When Winston Churchill signalled the victory of the R.A.F. in the Battle of Britain with the tribute—'Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few'—he was referring to the few hundred young fighter pilots and their machines, who beat back the Nazi Luftwaffe, gave Britain the chance to fight again another day, and gave America time to make up its mind.

The world will long remember what those young Britons did in the awful months of 1940, but it little noted the TWO MEN who made that victory for civilisation possible.

In the years to come, all over the free world men should stand in reverence when the names of Sydney Camm and the late Reginald Joseph Mitchell are mentioned. They designed the Hurricane and the Spitfire.

Without them, Britain would now be a province of Germany's Europe, and the United States would be living under threats from Berlin's Wilhelmstrasse.

Camm, who designed in the Typhoon and the Tempest worthy successors of his Hurricane, has had the supreme satisfaction of seeing his creations win mastery in the air, but Mitchell, who died at the tragically early age of 42, did not live to witness the role of his Spitfire in the Second German War, nor to receive from a grateful Britain and the rest of the free world the honours that were his due.

In designing the Spitfire, Mitchell was fighting against death. Stricken with cancer of the stomach, he knew his time was limited, and he drove himself to an early end by furious overwork to get his Spitfire into the air. On June 11, 1937, a year after his Spitfire had made its first public appearance, he died at Southampton.

It is up to those of us who have been spared the supreme sacrifice to make certain that his contribution to our freedom shall never be forgotten.

—ALLAN A. MICHIE, War Correspondent, Roving Editor of the American "Reader's Digest." (Condensed from "Reader's Digest," November, 1944)

CHURCHILL AND THE JEWS

From the "Social Creditor" (Eng.), 23/12/44 We have not had long to wait for the reply to Mr. Churchill's strong warning to the Jews on the murder of Lord Moyne. Our foreign policy is attacked by Mr. Stettinius; Jewish Labor Members' view with alarm; and the New York press warns up its bilge pumps. Perhaps the most dangerous incident is the arrival of Mr. Sidney Hillman, of the C.I.O. and other activities, in this country, ostensibly in connection with the International Trades Union Congress to be held early in the New Year.

There are many signs that Mr. Churchill has given warning that enough is enough, and it may be that we are about to see a calling of the bluff. We hope so. There will be no peace until this bluff is called.

IF YOU HAVE HAD ENOUGH—

of the erstwhile "Nationalist" Party, with its attempts to emulate the chameleon—of the Labor Party, with its oscillations between Communism and private enterprise—of the banking sham-fight—of the centralisation of power, and real government by remote control—

READ THE "PROGRAMME OF THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT." Obtainable at city booksellers or Hon. Secretary, Melbourne Branch, 203 Tooronga Road, E. Hawthorn.

AUSTRALIAN WORKERS AND TAXATION

By J. T. LANG, in the Sydney "Century," 2/2/45.

According to newspaper reports of the proceedings at a Summer School President of the A.C.T.U. has promised to support a suggestion that some research be done on industrial matters. In England they have a Nuffield Institute where the representatives of the workers and the employers encourage research on these matters. It is proposed that there should be something like that here. It is all done to help the workers! It is a long time since so many people have spoken of their determination to help the workers. Union leaders, employers, Governments, are preparing plans to help the workers. All the plans are undoubtedly going to cost money. What isn't stressed is that the workers themselves are going to pay for these plans out of their own pay envelopes.

Until this iniquitous system of taxation is abolished nothing that is beneficial can be done for the workers. There is no sign that it is going to be abolished. There is no sign that those who should be fighting for the workers are doing anything to have it abolished.

During the depression Mr. Bruce earned fame from his infamous phrase, "The workers must become accustomed to unemployment."

No one has said it yet, but what is happening is that the workers are being taught to become accustomed to paying heavy taxation.

If the workers can be made to accept penal taxation as the usual custom they will provide the money for all the grandiose schemes that are being prepared for them.

At the moment, the Federal Government is talking of free unemployment insurance, free doctors and free dentists. All is being paid for by the taxpayer, but the taxpayer is the worker himself.

If a levy of a few shillings a week was put on the workers to pay for these things there would be an outcry from union officials that such a levy was opposed to Labor principles.

Instead of imposing a levy the Government widens the taxation field to take in all the workers. The impost under taxation is far heavier than it would be if a direct levy was imposed.

But because the money is taken as taxation the worker is led to believe that he is not paying for all these things himself. It's all very well to say that the tax will be removed after the war. The tax is imposed as part of the plan to control the financial position. Most Ministers, all the bureaucrats and all the private banks agree that financial controls are even more essential in the post-war years than it is during the war years.

They say that it is the only way to prevent the dreaded inflation that is always just around the corner. Well, those controls include the current penal taxation.

The tax on lower incomes has gone on for so long now that it will be difficult to induce any Government to remove it. It is an old and true saying that a tax once imposed is never removed. After the war we will have splendid plans of reconstruction. All the arguments that have been used to have the tax accepted in wartime will be used in the peace. And they will be just as valid in peacetime as in war.

In wartime the workers are told that they must be prepared to put up with anything so that the war can be won. In peacetime they will be told they must put up with almost any sacrifice, so that the country can be reconstructed and rehabilitated after the war.

Everybody says they want to do something for the worker. But the worker's attitude is that IF HE WAS ONLY AL-

LOWED TO HAVE THE MONEY HE EARNED HE COULD DO MOST THINGS FOR HIMSELF, and do them better than all the new Santa Clauses that have sprung up.

A repeal of penal taxation on the lower incomes is the first test to be applied to anybody who says he is anxious to do something for the people after the war.

The workers who suffer under this system are not only the piece-workers in industry. In many cases it is the people on comparatively small incomes, whose incomes and commitments are fixed, who are suffering the most. It is time the workers' leaders dropped the window dressing and got down to the real business of having the taxes removed and allowing the worker to keep for his own use the money that he earns.

It must be remembered that the worker can only become accustomed to heavy taxation in the same way as he can become accustomed to unemployment. That is, by putting up with a greatly reduced standard of living.

Conditions and wages don't matter if the taxation commissioner is going to arbitrarily take away a portion of the pay envelope each week. It would be a healthy sign to see the unions now demanding that this taxation be removed.

It may be too late after the war because the bureaucrats may then decide that the workers have become accustomed to it.

The "Watchman" as a Bankers' Watchdog

(Continued from page 1)

dered the answer to your letter of the 25th January somewhat delayed.

"With your discourteous references to myself and the accompanying insinuations, which do not reflect any great credit upon your own outlook, I do not propose to deal, but you are quite mistaken when you suggest that I have not read or studied Social Credit, and your failure to recognise that anybody else could know anything about the subject except yourself is self-condemnationary.

"I propose to deal with the subject in my broadcast talk next Sunday night."

It is important, I think, that we should have this little bit of background in our minds before we commence consideration of the infamous broadcast given by "The Watchman" on Sunday, 11th February 1945. It WAS infamous, and I propose to quote the full text next week. Apparently Mr. Mann was not able to send an effective reply to Mr. Worrall's criticism, and so decided to take it out of his trusting listeners.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2, 18th February 1945.

(To be continued.)

" Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

With Commentary by ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

PROTOCOL NO. 3.

"Today I may tell you that our goal is now only a few steps off. There remains a small space to cross and the whole long path we have trodden is ready now to close its cycle of the Symbolic Snake, by which we symbolise our people. When this ring closes, all the States of Europe will be locked in its coil as in a powerful vice.

"The constitution scales of these days will shortly break down, for we have established them with a certain lack of accurate balance in order that they may oscillate incessantly until they wear through the pivot on which they turn. The goyim are under the impression that they have welded them sufficiently strong, and they have all along kept on expecting that the scales would come into equilibrium. But the pivots—the kings on their thrones—are hemmed in by their representatives, who play the fool, distraught with their own uncontrolled and irresponsible power. This power they owe to the terror, which has been breathed into the palaces. As they have no means of getting at their people, into their very midst, the kings on their thrones are no longer able to come to terms with them and so strengthen themselves against seekers after power. We have made a gulf between the far-seeing Sovereign Power and the blind force of the people so that both have lost all meaning, for like the blind man and his stick, both are powerless apart.

"In order to incite seekers after power to a misuse of power we have set all forces in opposition one to another, breaking up their liberal tendencies towards independence.

"To this end we have stirred up every form of enterprise, we have armed all parties, we have set up authority as a target for every ambition. Of States we have made gladiatorial arenas where a host of confused issues contend. . . . A little more, and disorders and bankruptcy will be universal. . . .

"Babblers inexhaustible have turned into oratorical contests the sittings of Parliament and Administrative Boards. Bold journalists and unscrupulous pamphleteers daily fall upon executive officials. Abuses of power will put the final touch in preparing all institutions for their overthrow, and everything will fly skyward under the blows of the maddened mob.

"All people are chained down to heavy toil by poverty more firmly than ever they were chained by slavery and serfdom; from these, one way and another, they might free themselves, these could be settled with, but from want they will never get away.

"We have included in the constitution such rights as to the masses appear fictitious and not actual rights. All these so-called "People's Rights" can exist only in idea, an idea that can never be realised in practical life. What is it to the proletariat labourer, bowed double over his heavy toil, crushed by his lot in life, if talkers get the right to babble, if journalists get the right to scribble any nonsense side by side with good stuff, once the proletariat has no other profit out of the constitution save only those pitiful crumbs which we fling them from our table in return for their voting in favour of what we dictate, in favour of the men we place in power, the servants of our agentur

"Republican rights for a poor man are no more than a bitter piece of irony, for the necessity he is under of toiling almost all day gives him no present use of them, but on the other hand robs him of all guarantee of regular and certain earnings by making him dependent on strikes by his comrades or lockouts by his masters.

"The people under our guidance have annihilated the aristocracy, who were their one and only defence and foster-mother for the sake of their own advantage, which is inseparably bound up with the well-being of the people. Nowadays, with the destruction of the aristocracy, the people have fallen into the grips of merciless money-grinding scoundrels, who have laid a pitiless and cruel yoke upon the necks of the workers.

"We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists—to whom we always give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly rule (of the solidarity of all humanity) of our social masonry.

"The aristocracy, which enjoyed by law the labour of the workers, was interested in seeing that the workers were well fed, healthy and strong. We are interested in just the opposite—in the diminution, the killing out of the Goyim. Our power is in the chronic shortness of food and physical weakness of the worker, because by all that this implies he is made the slave of our will, and he will not find in his own authorities either strength or energy to set against our will. Hunger creates the right of capital to rule the worker more surely than it was given to the aristocracy by the legal authority of kings.

"By want and the envy and hatred which it engenders we shall move the mobs, and with their hands we shall wipe out all those who hinder us on our way.

"When the hour strikes for our Sovereign Lord of all the World to be crowned it is these same hands which will sweep away everything that might be a hindrance thereto."

COMMENT: —

We have only to look at what is happening in society today to realise that the financial dictators have deliberately disposed many people who are ready to have their minds inflamed against those still fortunate enough to own a little property "Class struggle" is created and each section is eventually destroyed, leaving the controllers of finance supreme. The Jewish

writer, Erberlin, in his book, "Les Juifs d'aujourd'hui," says:

"The more thorough a revolution is, the more liberty and equality are gained—for the Jews."

It was Benjamin Disraeli who said, on September 20, 1873:

"I can assure you, gentlemen, that those who govern must count with new elements! We have to deal not with emperors and cabinets only. We must take into consideration secret societies, which can disconcert all measures at the last moment, who have agents everywhere, determined men, encouraging assassinations, and capable of bringing about a massacre at any moment."

The massacre in Russia under Jewish rulers is well-known history. The part played by the German-Jewish bankers in helping the Russian Revolution has been proved beyond dispute, and will be dealt with in detail later. The following quotation from the "Jewish Chronicle," London, published in 1919, speaks for itself:

"There is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism."

Karl Marx was a German-Jew, whose real name was Mordecai. He came from a long line of Jewish Rabbis. While working at his writings in the London Museum he was financed by his German friend, Engels,

EXPORT MANIA QUERIED IN COMMONS

During the Debate on the Address in the British House of Commons on December 6, 1944, many Members spoke of export markets as if sending production out of the country were a desirable end in itself, over and above paying for necessary imports! But one Member in particular directly challenged this absurd attitude, stressed the primary importance of the home market, and indicated that a post-war struggle for excessive export markets would mean fresh inter-national strife. We record the following relevant extracts from his speech, as reported in the British "Hansard," but we do not endorse his suggestion that a Government Department should actually control exports and imports: —

Mr. Bowles (Nunclaton): . . . I have listened to a good deal of this Debate, and one of the thoughts that came to my mind when I was wondering whether to take part in it was one which came to my mind last year. It was in the words, slightly paraphrased, of a well-known concert artist in this country. Ronald Frankau—"Do we export because we have to, or because we think it is the right thing to do?" I am not quite sure in my own mind, having heard the speeches made by hon. Members on the other side of the House, and even the statement of the Prime Minister last week, when all this emphasis is placed on the need for exports, whether it has not just become a fetish in this country, or whether there is something behind it, to which I will refer in a few minutes.

I am very glad to see my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade on the Front Bench. . . . I remember asking him a Supplementary Question a few days ago, when he was assuring some hon. Gentleman that he, the President of the Board of Trade, would do all he possibly could to see that as much cotton goods as possible were exported. I had the impudence to ask whether he thought it a good idea to export cotton goods from this country until everybody in this country had a sufficiency of them, and he said that I had better come and see him afterwards.

I put this to my right hon. Friend: He or some other Minister should make up his mind what this country, by the very

IRGUN ZVAI LEUMI

In the British House of Commons on December 6, 1944, Squadron-Leader Fleming asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Irgun Zvai Leumi is controlled in any way by the New Zionist Organisation, or by any other Jewish body in Palestine or elsewhere; or whether it is an entirely independent association deriving its membership from all the other Jewish parties and organisations.

Colonel Stanley: "The Irgun Zvai Leumi was formed in 1937 by the late Vladimir Jabotinsky, the leader of the New Zionist Organisation. A representative of this body has recently stated that the Irgun does not accept its discipline and does not consult it as to its activities. I should prefer not to specify its exact affiliations, but it is certainly not controlled by any reputable or responsible Jewish body."

SOIL AND CIVILISATION

"The fundamental history of civilisation is the history of the soil. The understanding of this is vital to all peoples who stand at the gateway of death. The whole white civilisation stands there today. In any civilisation there comes a moment, when, if it is to continue, civilisation must become ruralisation. All its economics, all its amenities, its armies, and its splendour, depend on one thing: the reverent use of its soil. The writing on the wall is there; we are being weighed in the balance and found wanting—in ruralisation."

—From "Alternative to Death," by the Earl of Portsmouth.

who made a fortune out of exploiting the Lancashire working girls. The best comment on Marx's work is a letter written to him by Baruch Levy: —

"In the new organisation of mankind, the children of Israel will spread over the whole surface of the earth and will become everywhere, without any opposition, the leading element, especially if they can impose upon the working class the control of some of them. The Government of the nations forming the Universal Republic will pass without effort into the hands of the Jews, under cover of the victory of the proletariat. Private property will then be suppressed by the rulers of the Jewish race, who will everywhere control public funds. Thus will be realised the Talmudic promise that, when come the times of the Messiah, Jews will possess the wealth of the people's of the world."—(From the French journal, "Le Revue de Paris.")

To support the contention that the aristocracy had to be destroyed in order that slavery-by-hunger ("wage-slavery") could be brought about, it is only necessary to examine briefly the American Civil War. Every unbiased historian knows that the conditions of the Negroes became worse after the Civil War than before it. The real objective of the war was to firmly centralise the government of America, with supreme power centred in New York, and crush the aristocratic South. The "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" obligingly tells us that the Jewish banking firm of Messrs. Seligmann, of New York, financed the Civil War and "obtained all the American and European finance available for the Civil War." Towards the end of the Civil War one of the Jewish bankers wrote as follows in a letter to a fellow banker:

" Chattel slavery will be abolished by the war, and this we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour, and involves the care of the slave. We can obtain the same result with less trouble by controlling the money."

The "Protocols" couldn't put it better!
(To be continued.)

situation in which it finds itself, has to import in the way of rubber, oil, citrus fruits, and so on. I do not propose to enumerate them; I do not suppose I know them all. Surely the Board of Trade or some central Department can estimate what it is necessary for us to import and then, having decided that, they should decide to export a more or less equivalent value of commodities to pay for the imports, and then go on to develop the standard of life of our people. . . .

I very much regret to say that the right hon. Gentleman, the Minister of Labour, said that this country is broke. I think that ought to be denied. I do not believe it at all. It is to my mind completely untrue. The wealth of this country depends on its man-power and woman-power, on its natural resources, on creative ability, on its skilled workmen, and so on. I think we should make it quite clear that we are not broke, that our ability depends upon the skill with which the men and women and the natural resources of this country are organised. I think a great deal of the wealth that is produced should be retained in this country for the purpose of maintaining the standard of life. . . .

All I should like to say in conclusion is, that having heard the speeches of hon. Members for Birmingham and others, I think it is obvious that they are visualising a period of the most angry competition with those who are our closest Allies at the present moment. . . .

THE PEA-AND-THIMBLE TRICK

We are alleged to have entered the war on behalf of the rights of Poland. If our victory means that the boundaries of Poland are to be dictated by Russia, and its social and economic condition by a quisling Bolshevik organisation, the Lublin Committee, which is the opposite number of P.E.P. and Zionism, then it is quite time we did some extensive thinking for the purpose of identifying our real enemy. The pea seems to have got out from under our chosen thimble. How did the E.L.A.S. troops come into possession of field artillery, and why are they so enthusiastic about the Archbishop of Athens? Does it explain the reinstatement of the (Greek) Russian Orthodox Church by Mr. Stalin and the holier-than-thou attitude of Washington and Wall Street?

— "The Social Crediter" (Eng.), 30/12/44.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

"FREEDOM FROM WANT" CAMPAIGN:

It is interesting to note that this campaign is still being pushed by the Prospect Branch of the Pensioners' Association, which was responsible for its inauguration a little over twelve months ago, and that the pension rate is likely to come up for discussion by Parliament in the near future. In view of this fact we suggest that the time is now appropriate to bombard Federal Members with more Demand Letters. Forms can be obtained from this office for 1/3 per hundred. This campaign aims to secure for pensioners a minimum of £3 per week without the Means Test.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AGREEMENT: The "second batch of request letter forms, entitled "Awake Australians," which we have had printed, are not going out as fast as we would like. They are an instruction to Federal representatives to see that the Bretton Woods agreement is not ratified when it comes before Parliament for this purpose.

The ostensible object of this agreement is to promote world trade and stabilise currencies, but we see much that is sinister in and behind the proposals. For example, if the agreement is ratified, Australia will be once again tied to the gold standard, and consequently our post-war trade would be arbitrarily regulated by the controllers of the world gold supply. From the realistic point of view the nation's money supply should be governed by the productivity of the people.

Do not let Australia's destiny be controlled by a bunch of international swindlers. Obtain a supply of request letterforms without delay and do your share in this fight for liberty. Forms obtainable for 1/6 per hundred.

MEANS TEST ABOLITION CAMPAIGN: We are rather disappointed that this campaign, which was started by the committee responsible for the management of the South Australian Superannuation Fund, does not appear to have made very much progress up to date. However, we understand that a sub-committee for action has recently been appointed. We trust that this committee will live up to its name.

It is interesting to note that the South Australian branch of the Australian Railways Union, which is a member organisation in this campaign, has not waited for action by the central body, but has had its own request letter forms printed and circulated. The State Secretary of this Union stated at a committee meeting, when he heard that Mr. Chifley had refused to accede to a request to abolish the Means Test, that Mr. Chifley or any other member of Parliament would have to give way if sufficient public opinion was mobilised.

BOOKS TO READ: We have available and can recommend the following: — "The Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket," by C. H. Douglas; price 2/-. "The Tragedy of Human Effort" by C. H. Douglas. An outline of the principles of association which, according to Douglas, are capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building. Price 6d. (Both plus 1d postage.)

— F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THE MONEY QUESTION

From the "Social Crediter" (Eng.), 23/12/44
A good deal of play is being made in certain monetary reform circles with Abraham Lincoln and his alleged views on money. Lincoln was the tool of Big Business and International Banking, and his statement that "money is the creature of law," if he ever made it, was merely a Lincolnian, spellbinding, form of Mr. Montagu Norman's "Nationalisation? We welcome it." It contains about as much intrinsic sense as a statement that a hat-check given you in a restaurant cloak-room for your hat, is a creature of law. It is a convenience whose utility depends entirely on whether and how quickly you get your hat, and all the laws in the universe are powerless to give you your hat if it isn't there, no matter how many hat checks the law prints for you. Whenever someone endeavours to enlist your support for a monetary system, which is going to do this, that, or the other, considers whether its principles are based on law and politics, or whether they are based on "hats" [i.e., goods]. And remember the remark of the early Rothschild "Permit me to control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws."

There is no aspect of the monetary problem, which the financiers are so anxious to confuse as this of the actual nature of money. While the great majority can be induced to believe that money is a thing in itself—that even if there were no hats, hat-checks would still be valuable—the arguments as to the number of hat-checks, who is to have them, and the supreme importance of a world hat-check emporium, can be carried on from one health resort to another.

NO CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

Temperance Hall, Russell Street, Melbourne, Sunday, February 25, at 7.45 p.m.

MR. J. BRADSHAW

Speaks on;

"THE BANKING PROPOSALS—SUBSTANCE OR SHADOW?" Don't Miss Hearing This Vital Topic Debated!

PLANNING AND THE POWER OF THE DIVIDEND

By BEATRICE C BEST, in the "Social Creditor," England

In chapter 7 of part 2 of "Social Credit" Major Douglas, after pointing out some of the major anomalies of the present money system, says: "A science of finance and economics which will permit absurdities of this description to pass almost unnoticed, can hardly fail to produce chaos in the world."

One calls to mind this passage when reading recent-works on Social Reconstruction. Their perusal arouses the kind of bored and academic interest such as might be felt when watching a mechanic engaged in overhauling a car, knowing all the while that, either from malice or stupidity, a spanner, that is the cause of the breakdown, will be overlooked and left in the works at the finish.

Dr. Karl Manheim's book, "Diagnosis of Our Times," * is, in this respect, no exception, and his argument arouses a conviction that the "spanner" will escape detection, and form no part of the diagnosis. This follows, in general, the more familiar lines of most intelligentist leftist diagnosis and propaganda. There is the usual indictment of "laissez faire," while apparently ignoring the fact that the only real "laissez faire" was in the hands of, and therefore exclusively operated by, the private controllers of credit. We have the attack on the "profit motive," and the false antitheses advanced in justification of this, i.e., production for use or service and not for profit, with its assumption that profit is incompatible, or irreconcilable with use or service. We have, also, the call to sacrifice, in this case linked with the clarion call to Youth (with a capital "Y"). For instance, on page 37, "... without the help of the pioneering spirit of Youth, neither the subjugated peoples of Europe nor the more dynamic masses in the U.S.A. will be ready to sacrifice everything they possess, their labour, their wealth, and their lives." We are not told, however, who will be left to benefit from this all-round sacrifice, nor why it is necessary!

Dr. Manheim's suggested reforms for establishing a New Order also follow familiar lines. We already have, he tells us, "the existing means of reform—through taxation, control of investment, through public works, and the radical extension of social services..." Also: "It will, for instance, somehow be settled in advance at what speed we shall spend or invest, where we shall invest, and, by implication, decisions will be taken as to how much should be spent on social services, religion, education, art, science, and so forth."

It is unfortunate for those who make use of the democratic label for purposes of their own that the Totalitarian States cashed in on the idea of Planning first. It has made it more difficult to persuade the "democracies" that "democratic" planning is merely for war-time purposes, and has no relationship with Totalitarianism—especially as fresh plans are being produced daily to regulate our lives in the post-war period!

Dr. Manheim has attempted to get over this difficulty, and put our doubts at rest by trying to show us how we may plan for freedom. The phrase, "Planning for Freedom," occurs so many times in the course of his treatise that one half suspects him of employing suggestion to reinforce his argument. One happy example of this "Planning for Freedom" may be given: "If there is a man with prophetic vision, we are told, 'he should be given his proper opportunity...' " It is true the author hastens to add that: "In this sphere the removal of specific forces of frustration... is more important than general regulations." Nevertheless it conjures up a vision of a "Ministry of Prophecy," and its army of bureaucrats, complete with filing cabinets, forms, schedules, etc.

But it would be a waste of time to examine further, and in detail, Dr. Manheim's proposals, for the all-embracing reason that he has undertaken an impossible task. He has therefore involved himself in the shifts and devices, the inconsistencies and absurdities, and, indeed, imbecilities, that a persistent attempt to compass the impossible must entail.

For, in fact, you cannot plan for freedom; you can only plan safely—i.e., without fear of an overriding dictatorship—in freedom, that is, within the framework of a society every member of which is already free. The characteristic of planning "for" freedom is coercion, however benevolent the intention of the planner may be, and Dr. Manheim shows every sign of benevolence. The characteristic of planning in freedom is co-operation. Between the one and the other there exists no possibility of compromise.

There will always be planners, people with ideas, and with the necessary initiative and ability prompting them to carry out these ideas. There will also be willing to co-operate, people with the necessary judgment to appraise the ideas of the planners, and the enthusiasm necessary to help carry them out. And there will be the beneficiaries, those seeing the excellence of the plans and wishing to enjoy the fruits thereof. This is planning at its best, a trinity of co-operation from which all may derive good. Of course the roles are interchangeable, beneficiaries in one plan may be the planners or co-operators in another, as the planners may be beneficiaries and so forth.

The virtue of such free planning lies in the willing co-operation that makes it possible. This exercise of the will of all concerned, and the exercise of judgment and initiative that goes with it is precisely what is lacking in State Planning, and must be

*Kejian Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company Ltd.; London.

lacking in all so-called "Planning for Freedom." For unless the individuals for whom the plan is intended are in a position to accept or reject it, that is, are already free, then the will of the planners prevails, and the will of the planned is annihilated.

The sanction, therefore, upon which State Planning must rely is that of force, exercised through the police (Gestapo, ogpu), and ultimately of the military. But planning within a State of free individuals requires the sanction of the willing co-operation of all concerned; perhaps one might sum it up in the word fellowship. This sanction is a great safeguard, for a bad plan would ultimately fail precisely for want of it. It also admits of fruitful experimentation by means of trial and error.

What, then, we must enquire, is that instrument or power that will deliver us from the thralldom of the planned State, and purchase or secure for us that State within which we may be free to plan and exercise responsibility for our own lives?

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

Co. (although they have been "in smoke" for a while), and no totalitarian regulations have been repealed yet, to justify Mr. Withall's optimism. It is wise in the light of experience to extend a preference for actions rather than fair words.

"ISOLATIONIST" IDEAS. In some queer quarters the most modern insult is the term "isolationist"; meaning self-reliant and self-supporting, and not minding other people's business. Strangely enough, there are persons who will say that self-reliance, etc., is a desirable objective for individuals, but not for countries. Since countries consist of individuals, this is quite an illogical attitude, but, of course, it is strongly featured by the Monopoly Press. Recently satisfaction was expressed because the State Electricity Commission expects to be quite independent of N.S.W. black coal when certain extensions are completed at Yalourn. Surely this is isolationism! But, of course, that's different—or is it? Wouldn't it be better, in order to create "trade" and "full employment," to continue to bring coal from N.S.W.—or, better still, from overseas? Incidentally, when we teach children to walk and talk, aren't we implanting in them the deadly virus of self-reliance?

PEGGING PRIVILEGES. Arising from criticism of governmental bodies mulcting individuals by increasing rates, etc., a Canberra official (un-named) explains that "pegging regulations do not apply to contractual obligations nor to Commonwealth or State Governments, although they tightly bind the individual." Here is another case of the institution versus the individual, and unfortunately the latter comes off second best. In defiance of the people's wishes rates and other charges are being increased, a situation that would not occur if public servants obeyed their employers, the citizens. There is only one remedy for this: each disobedient public servant be removed from office at the first opportunity.

MEDICINE MESMERISM. The mis-called "free medicine" Act, which is to give "benefits" paid from taxation filched in

WAR CRIMINALS BEHIND THE HITLER GANG

"He (Dr. Schacht) then acknowledged that the Hitler Party is absolutely committed to war, and the people, too, are ready and willing." Thus wrote the former American Ambassador to Germany, Mr. Dodd, in 1934. Schacht was, of course, the close friend of Montague Norman and his Wall Street masters, who could have had no doubt that they were financing war when they financed Hitler and his gang.

Lord Vansittart, one of the greatest living authorities on Germany, writes as follows in "Lessons of My Life":—

"Writing in 1929, Herr Kantorowicz foreshadowed that, by getting rid of Reparations, Germany might emerge from the First World War as ultimate victor." The scheme was a practical and cunning one; and it worked like a charm. I have said elsewhere that all great ideas are simple... Some of the very first (loans) were made to the big German armament firms—10 million dollars to Krupp, 12 million dollars to Thyssen. These good Germans had not killed enough good Europeans; so they were provided with more sinews of war. It is a good story, isn't it? And still the money poured in and the Germans pocketed everything they could get... It was certainly worth making ready for another war on the proceeds. Germany did so. Since men were dying to lend her money, others would soon be dying for their folly.

And yet the Jewish leaders and their dupes would have us believe that Adolf and his gang are the only war criminals!

The answer is that the same power that has us in thrall can also be the means of setting us free. It is an absolute power, and one that can confer life or death. Therefore it will be found in the hands of those who have the monopoly control over our access to the means of subsistence. Since money became our access to those means, that power passed into the hands of those who obtained control over money. Meyer Rothschild made this perfectly clear when in 1790 he said: "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws." Such a candid declaration of how mans right to his own personal sovereignty might be filched from him could hardly have been more neatly put.

It is as well here to consider for a moment this question of right or rights, for moralists are fond of telling us from time to time (and this is one of the times) that people think too much of their rights and not enough of their duties. Hence it seems important to point out that, in fact, priority must be given to rights. The Church gives tacit acknowledgment to this assertion when she admits that it is no good preaching to a hungry man. It is true she does nothing about this, being too busy playing ball with the powers that be, but she does at least recognise this simple religious economic fact. In an essay on "Health and Holiness" Frances Thompson says: "It is felt that the body has rights; nay, that the neglect of those rights may cause it to take guiltless vengeance on the soul... and impoverished blood—who knows?—may mean impoverished morals." Paradoxically, then, man's duty is to assert his rights. There is no virtue in neglecting them; they are, in fact, in the nature of a trust, and to allow yourself to be deprived of them amounts to compliance in an act of theft.

(To be concluded.)

WRITTEN CONSTITUTION — A SAFEGUARD

From the "Social Creditor," England, December 23, 1944:—

We are not undiluted admirers of all the attributes of the United States, but we are beginning to think that in their written Constitution, they have something. For reasons, which have never been very clear, we take pride in the fact that [in Great Britain] there is no written Constitution, which fetters the unlimited power of Parliament, or any other body delegated by Parliament, to do anything whatever. This was all very well when the country was homogeneous and the King and the House of Lords were factors making for long-term consistency. But in times such as these, with organised and heavily financed aliens working like ferrets to overturn our Constitution, a system consisting for all practical purposes of a single Chamber elected under conditions malleable by mass propaganda and transitory emotion is a terrible danger. The Constitution of the United States, The British North America Act in Canada, and the Referendum Provisions in Australia have proved themselves of real value in defeating snap legislation. We are completely sceptical of the value and the objective of the Emergency Legislation passed by the House of Commons and prepared in advance by very suspect interests, and hardly any of it would have been possible in America.

There is plenty of evidence to show that the vulnerability of British institutions has been the subject of the most careful study on the part of those forces, which see in the Empire a rich prize to be most easily won from within. On the part of the great majority, the revulsion from the carnage of 1914-18 was wholly genuine. But its political use to weaken British diplomacy was catalogued by Mr. Austin Hopkinson in the House of Commons some months ago. It is beyond dispute that behind this policy was the determination to cause a second and longer war, which could be, as it has been, utilised for revolutionary purposes. That is what von Papen means when he says Germany cannot lose.

That a Constitution embodying a Superior Law, not amenable to normal legislation (in exactly the same sense that the Articles of Association of a limited company require a purposely difficult procedure to change them) is recognised by the Dark Forces of the Left as presenting a formidable obstacle to a surprise attack on society, is evidenced by the fulsome admiration for the British lack of it, by those who wish to destroy us.

PROFESSOR HAROLD LASKI ON AUSTRALIA'S REFERENDUM

From "Social Justice Review" (U.S.), Dec. 1944

Since the Webbs have left the British scene, Professor Harold J. Laski must be considered his country's leading Socialist. His remarks regarding the reasons responsible for the defeat of the Referendum, by which the Australian Government sought special powers, for five years after the war, to deal by Federal action with the issues of reconstruction, are, therefore, of particular interest.

He attributes the outcome of this attempt not alone to "the fear of well-to-do Australians that every increase in Federal power meant a step in the direction of Socialism with a Labor Government in office..." but also to "the fear among the working class, that the retention of Federal control meant the right to direct them to jobs." A danger, let us add, we have in our country escaped by a hair's breadth.

In the end, Laski suspects—and this statement appears particularly significant—that: "All in all, the most important element in the defeat is the parochial temper which all Federal systems tend to breed. Once there has been a division of powers under a Federal system, it takes something like a political or economic earthquake to change the categories of the division."

Thus the Socialist reveals his predilection for centralisation of power as against a division of power between Federal Government and the various component Commonwealths.

COLLECTIVIST CRUELTY

The appalling consequences of collectivism are well illustrated by the proposal, in which Mr. Churchill appears to acquiesce, to transfer millions of Poles from that part of Poland east of the so-called Curzon Line to an equivalent area in East Prussia.

Mr. Raikes, M.P., very properly pointed out the inhuman barbarity of uprooting homes and their occupants to serve "State interests. Mr. Raikes is a Conservative; and it is significant that the Socialists were in the main in favour of this collective cruelty, because their beloved Russia wants it; and a Conservative opposed it because it is immoral and inhuman.

—"The Social Creditor" (Eng.), 30/12/44.

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.