

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. 12. No. 3. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1946

## "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 Burning Question of Uniform Taxation

### The Centralisers versus Self Government

By ERIC D BUTLER

The Melbourne "Herald" of last Tuesday, January 22, reports as follows on the preliminary discussions on Uniform Taxation between the State Premiers and the Federal Government:

'The State Premiers met the Commonwealth Government at the Premiers' Conference today bitterly opposed to the continuation of Uniform Taxation, but convinced that they will be coerced into acquiescing in its re-enactment on a permanent basis.'

There is no need for the State Premiers to do any acquiescing.

It may be true that the Federal Government has the constitutional powers to continue Uniform Taxation permanently.

But the Premiers can take a firm stand and refuse to co-operate in any way with the Federal Government.

What is urgently required is a stream of letters from electors to both State and Federal Members of Parliament, protesting against the continuation of Uniform Taxation in any shape or form.

#### "LIBERALS" HELP SOCIALISTS

The Liberal Party has had a wonderful opportunity on this issue to make a firm stand in favour of democratic principles; but, as usual, it has made a miserable retreat and is making it perfectly clear that it stands for greater and greater power for the central Government.

The following report from the Melbourne "Herald" of Monday, January 21, was indicative of the fact that there is no fundamental "difference between the Federal Party groups.

"It is believed that in deciding to limit the number of questions [for proposed Referendum] Cabinet was influenced by statements of the Opposition leader (Mr. Menzies) and other Opposition members

supporting wider Federal powers. As far as possible the questions will conform to principles which Mr. Menzies and others have already endorsed."

No wonder the Liberal Party has not denounced Uniform Taxation!

#### CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION

Whatever might be said about the High Court decision, which Evatt and Menzies interpret as favouring the Federal Government on the Uniform Taxation issue, there can be no disputing the fact that one centralised taxation system is contrary to the very spirit of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution believed that the States should preserve their sovereignty in the Federal system.

Uniform Taxation makes State sovereignty a farce.

It is also contrary to the decision of the electors as given at the last Referendum.

All Federal Members should be reminded of these facts immediately, and told that, if they are so keen on Referendums, a chance for the people to decide whether they would like Uniform Taxation to continue would be much appreciated.

Why cannot the State Premiers, if they are really concerned about State sovereignties, press the Federal Government to have a Referendum to decide whether the

Constitution should be altered to give THE STATES exclusive power over taxation?

If the electors said, "Yes," the States could then allocate to the Federal Government whatever they thought necessary.

#### WRITE TO POLITICIANS

All democratic electors should get busy on this issue immediately.

It is just as important to contact Federal Members as State Members.

Nothing but strong public opinion will compel the centralisers to forego their plans.

In contacting Federal Members electors should attempt to try and get Liberal Party Members in particular to declare where they stand.

It is important that the electors have it made clear to them that the Parties all work for the same bosses.

#### DISHONEST ARGUMENTS

The so-called arguments in favour of Uniform Taxation, as advanced by certain Federal politicians and others, reveal all too clearly the dishonesty of the power-lusters.

For example, it is claimed that Uniform Taxation is the most "economical" way of raising taxation.

There is not the slightest evidence to support this contention.

There has been Uniform Taxation for years now, but the Taxation Octopus has continued to grow alarmingly.

If there was any genuine desire to effect economies in collecting taxes, the Federal Government would abolish the multiplicity of taxes causing so much confusion and chaos in industry and replace them with one direct tax.

But such a policy would, of course, bring the entire taxation structure tumbling down, as even the most apathetic elector would revolt when he saw just how much the Taxation Department deprives him of his purchasing power.

It is claimed that some economy is effected by the Federal Government collecting taxation and handing a certain proportion of it to the States.

If this argument is sound, why cannot the States be the sole tax collectors and hand over a certain proportion to the Federal Government?

#### THE BASIC ISSUE

Even if any of the arguments put forward by the Federal Government had any validity (which they haven't), they all obscure the basic issue:

Are the electors in any one State to have self-government or aren't they?

Electors who believe in self-government have the solution in their own hands.

## NOTES on the NEWS

Intense activity has been going on behind the scenes to keep the Persian-Russian dispute from coming before U.N.O., because it would constitute a test case of the clearest and most explicit kind. This is where U.N.O. will be called on to leave generalities and windy orations behind, and get down to specifics.

Russia has violated the Big Three agreements and is interfering with Persian sovereignty, and the question is, what will the mighty world government do about it? Russia, as one of the Big Five, has the right to veto any sanction being used against her, whilst Persia, as one of the "little" powers, has no veto. It will be interesting to observe how the virtual collapse of U.N.O. is averted.

**MANPOWER MUDDLERS:** Several hundred ex-servicemen crowded the manpower rehabilitation office seeking employment or the re-employment allowance. (Melbourne "Sun," 10/1/46.) The crowd filled the building and the stairs, and so the manpower bureaucrats are looking for larger premises in order to more securely entrench themselves. So far as jobs are concerned, it is clear that if they are available servicemen can locate them for themselves; if jobs are not available, then manpower bureaucrats cannot conjure them from the air. As for the training and rehabilitation schemes, recent published comments from soldiers refer to them as a joke. Needless to say, no adequate arrangements have been made to ensure satisfactory financial security for servicemen until such time as they can find suitable employment of their own choosing.

**ARTFUL ARABS:** The Associated Press correspondent in Cairo says, "The Iraq Parliament passed a resolution containing a proposal for the establishment of an Arab homeland in California. The resolution suggests that California be detached from the United States and opened to Arab immigration." That is a cute way of ridiculing the intervention of U.S. in Arab affairs; the inference or hint is, of course, that if U.S. is really concerned with the welfare of the Jews she might offer California as their homeland. In this connection a recent Gallup Poll disclosed that 76% of Americans favoured allowing more Jews to settle in Palestine. Wonder how they will react to the proposal to hand over California to the Arabs?

**PREFERENCE PROTESTS:** Welcome news of opposition to the "American" loan to Great Britain is to hand. Lord Croft, chair man of the Empire Industries Association, is arranging a series of meetings in Great Britain to protest against the attack on Empire Preferences, which are part of the loan conditions. He says: "It is for the nation to make it clear we are not prepared to surrender this policy so vital to British, Dominion and colonial prosperity." And so the world planners endeavouring to dismember the British Empire have aroused the British fighting spirit, which Germany could not extinguish with bombs and other military terrors. Britain withstood all this and now has to overcome the "Wall Street" plot to starve her out and destroy her trade power. Good luck to Lord Croft in this fight.

**VICTORIAN VISTA:** Senator McKenna of Tasmania made the following observation during the Parliamentary session late last year: "The continual rattling of collection boxes under the noses of people in Victoria is an undesirable feature of Melbourne life." He deserves marks for pointing out that. He also said: "Victorians are more disposed to send their children to private schools than perhaps any other State." But that's a commendable feature. He then remarked that heavy taxation was placing a great strain on State services, because people were now forced to use them due to financial pressure. The latter is the result of Federal Government action—in any case, it is an unintended argument against taxation. It illustrates the point that if our money was not taken from us by taxes we could buy our own "social services."

**WORKERS' WAKE-UP:** A London press report in pointing out that the dockers had lost faith in their Unions, said: "There (Continued on page 2)

## Decision on "Bretton Woods" Deferred

The Melbourne "Sun" of January 19 published a report, from a Canberra political correspondent, which said that "... Cabinet deferred a decision until a later meeting ... majority of Ministers have persuaded the Government to await the outcome of the current U.K. and U.S.A. financial debate and the clarification of the sterling-dollar position before making a decision."

In the Melbourne "Argus" of January 21, its Canberra correspondent, Crayton Burns, reported, "Australia has deferred indefinitely any action to ratify the Bretton Woods international monetary agreement."

Although social crediters and others who have played a leading part in exposing Bretton Woods will feel heartened by the above reports, they should not relax their efforts to maintain Australia's independence.

The same "Sun" report said: "Australia's ratification of the Bretton Woods agreement is being sought unofficially by the United States before the March-April international trade talks in America."

In any case, the international planners are using other than direct financial controls to impose their policies on the peoples of the world. This will become more and more obvious as the controllers of the "United" Nations Organisation get down to serious work.

## Significant Political Pointers

In its issue of January 10, Melbourne's leading socialist daily, the "Herald," has an editorial which provides further evidence that all the monopolists are agreed that local government must be destroyed in order that political and economic control can be further centralised.

The editorial says: "It is not merely a matter for party disappointment that powers which the Federal Government hoped to gain, or assumed it could exercise, have been denied to it."

Exactly. Sir Keith Murdoch, a product of the London School of Economics, is just as disappointed about the denial of powers to the Federal Government, as are the Labor Party bosses.

The "Herald's" editorial continues: "Few people do not agree that an extension of Federal powers is necessary for a better order of economy and for post-war tasks of national development. But there can be no stability for planning unless such powers are established on a sound and unchallengeable basis. At present even the continuance of existing social services, which it is unthinkable, should be abandoned, is constitutionally in doubt. . . ."

Notice how the inevitability theory is carefully put forward: Increasing centralisation is inevitable — "Few people do not agree," etc. — and all that is necessary is a suitable formula to trick the people into handing over powers, which will then be "unchallengeable."

Social crediters can render a valuable service to their fellow-electors at present by making it perfectly clear that the monopolists controlling the big newspapers have the same objectives as the socialist and all other monopolists. They want a society in which there will be no freedom for the individual.

While our ears are being filled with considerable talk about "progress," it is instructive to remember that we are accepting today political and economic gangsterism, which our forefathers would not have tolerated for five minutes. There are many still living who recall the tremendous agi-

## Mixed Parentage

"The proposal [to nationalise Cable and Wireless] is of extremely mixed parentage involving the Coalition, Caretaker, and Socialist Governments here, and many of the Dominion Governments abroad."

"The Economist," London

tation when taxation was a mere sixpence in the pound.

Some years before the second World War, a prominent banker in Great Britain, Sir Josiah Stamp, said: "Direct taxation thirty years ago seemed to reach a breaking point, and was regarded as psychologically unbearable at levels which today are merely amusing. But there can be little doubt that, with the right application of experimental psychology and adjusted education, the mind of man would be still more adaptable."

The "adjusted education" has been so excellent that we have young people growing up in a society in which many consider it inevitable that an increasing army of government bureaucrats must continue to take more and more of the citizen's money from him and spend it as the bureaucrats think fit.

During the debates on the "American" dollar loan agreement, Lord Beaverbrook said: "We will, perhaps be defeated because the Government has the bankers on its side. It is a new phase to have Socialists and bankers united against us." It is interesting to have this admission from Beaverbrook, as he himself has given the socialists the use of his "capitalist" journals to attack the Conservatives, whose interests he allegedly represents. The Conservatives everywhere are being betrayed by their own "leaders," who appear to have blindly accepted the carefully fostered theory that there is a "world trend to the Left" and that, unless they are prepared to go half-way to Moscow, they will be compelled to go all the way.

Mr. Shinwell, British Minister for Fuel and Power, has placed it on record that the worldwide troubles of the coal-mining industry, which are being carefully exploited by the nationalisation advocates, are regarded favourably by the power-lusters. The Melbourne "Age" of January 19 contains the following: "He (Mr. Shinwell) added significantly that nationalisation was not intended primarily to benefit the miner." It is interesting to have confirmation of what

(Continued on page 4)

## IDENTIFYING THE PROMOTERS OF WAR

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

Sir, —Keeping in mind that the purpose of the long-range plot or POLICY is to secure control of the people of the world through FINANCE and LAW, and remembering that the people of Great Britain have consistently been opposed to dictatorships, the significance of the treatment meted out to those people will become immediately apparent.

There can be no world totalitarianism so long as the people of that great country insist on exercising their own initiative and refuse to bow the knee to the alien. As the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" admit, it is individual initiative that stands between the plotters and their evil objective.

After the "outbreak of war" in 1914, the Federal Reserve Board lost no time in doing its deadly work for the enemies of the British Empire, Mr. A. N. Field, in his two books, "The Truth About the Slump" and "All These Things," gives a lot of most valuable information which should be read and studied by every loyal citizen. Only a few samples can be given in these letters. It has already been explained that the Jew, Lord Reading (Rufus Isaacs), was sent to Washington as British Ambassador in 1917 to replace Sir Cecil Spring-Rice. This was part of the plot.

At the commencement of the war, some large German liners were interned in New York, and an attempt was made to have their sailings resumed under the American flag. On August 25, 1914, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice reported to the British Foreign Secretary (Sir Edward Grey) as follows:

"Another matter is the question of the transfer of the flag to the Hamburg-America ships. It is not a very pleasant business. The company is practically a German Government affair. The ships are used for government purposes, the Emperor himself is a large shareholder, and so is the great banking house of Kuhn and Loeb, New York. A member of that house has been appointed to a very responsible post in New York, although only just naturalised. He is connected in business with the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the President's son-in-law. It is he who is negotiating on behalf of the Hamburg-America Company."

The man referred to was, of course, Paul Warburg, the German-Jew, who sponsored, and was put in charge of, the Federal Reserve Board. The Secretary of the Treasury was Mr. McAdoo. The Hamburg-America Shipping Line was financed by the German banking house of M. Warburg and Company (Paul's brothers).

A few weeks later, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, writing to Sir Valentine Chirol, stated that Warburg "practically controls the financial policy of the Administration. . . . Of course, it was exactly like negotiating with Germany. Everything that was said was German property. The result was that such arrangements were made as were thought to be for the advantage of the German banks, and the Christian banks were jealous and irritated."

Up to the time that the United States entered the war (1917—note the year particularly), Great Britain put her American transactions through the financial firm of J. P. Morgan and Company, the only one of the leading financiers whose sympathies were with us. Morgan Senior died in March 1913, and the business was then carried on by Pierpont Morgan, junior. While Sir Cecil Spring-Rice was staying with Mr. Morgan an attempt was made on 5/7/1915 to assassinate the financier. The assailant was arrested, and later found dead in his cell. He had been shot, and it was officially reported as a case of suicide. How he got the gun is left to the imagination, but Sir Cecil Spring-Rice wrote:

"It is most likely that he was shot by order, as he had promised my informant a full confession the day after he died. It was known in German circles that an attempt was to be made on Morgan."

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice also wrote that since the death of Morgan, senior, "the Jewish bankers are supreme. . . ." Increasing difficulty was experienced by British agents in getting money in the United States, and in July 1917 Lord

### THE BANKS CREATE MONEY OUT OF NOTHING

Speaking on the Bank of England Bill in the British House of Commons on October 29, 1945, Lieut.-Colonel Hamilton (Sudbury) said: ". . . An inquisitive mind led me to inquire into the processes of banking. I used to regard banks as very useful institutions for safeguarding a man's money and for saving him the trouble of handling large quantities of cash himself. I knew also that they were agencies for large-scale borrowing and lending transactions. I had a subconscious feeling that money was a commodity limited in extent, like potatoes. You either had it or did not have it, and if you did not have it you certainly could not create it out of thin air. For us private individuals that are only too true, and painfully true sometimes. But I found that in the case of banks the situation was entirely different. Money was a medium of exchange, and could easily be created out of nothing. When a bank made a loan, it was not a loan in the ordinary sense of the word, not the transferring of purchasing power from one party to another. For the greater part, the money was created in the act of making a loan, and, similarly, when a bank purchased securities, the purchase money was created in the very act of purchase. I realise also that this process of creating money, and, at other times, the converse process of destroying it, is far and away the most important function of our banking system. . . ."

Northcliffe, who was then in the U.S.A. as a British representative, telegraphed this message to London:

"They are complete masters of the situation as regards ourselves, Canada, France, Italy, and Russia. . . . If loan stops, war stops."

This was when Lord Reading went over to negotiate with his kinsmen and put the United Kingdom into a position of financial serfdom from which it was intended she should never escape. This situation was used to force Great Britain back to the Gold Standard, which, by force of circumstances, she was obliged to abandon in 1931.

An exactly similar thing is happening again today. Because of her remarkable war effort, Great Britain is in heavy financial arrears for materials obtained for war purposes, and this notwithstanding the disposal of all her overseas investments. She is thus stripped of her possessions and heavily in financial debt; so the same interests, which forced her back to Gold before, are doing it again through the Bretton Woods so-called "agreement." Bernard Baruch, the most powerful man in America during the last war, is still the most powerful man in America, and it was he who recently visited London to "hold the big stick over the big boys", as he himself so charmingly put it.

In 1915, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice wrote: "The German-Jewish bankers are toiling in a solid phalanx to compass our destruction."

And it was at their instigation that a fellow-Jew was subsequently sent from the United Kingdom to arrange matters in the

## OPEN LETTER TO MR. MENZIES

Sir, —You have again displayed that legal brilliance which once earned you a worthwhile number of guineas, contributed by the Australian taxpayers, for trying to prove to the Privy Council that the framers of the Australian Constitution did not mean that there should be complete freedom of trade between the States when they used the term "absolutely free."

Your views on Uniform Taxation, as published in the Melbourne "Herald" of last Saturday, January 19, are indicative of a desire to give, the impression that you are a champion of the Victorian taxpayers, whereas you really agree with Mr. Chifley that the Federal Government should permanently control all taxation.

There is only one vital issue involved in the question of Uniform Taxation. It is this: Are the taxpayers of any particular State going to have the sovereign right to instruct their State parliamentary representatives to regulate and spend the taxes as those taxpayers think fit?

According to a statement of yours in the Melbourne "Herald" of January 19, you favour the establishment of "a body whose permanent business should be to examine the Budgets of all States, weigh their commitments, estimate their other resources, and, accordingly apportion the tax revenue among them."

What an idea! Another Federal bureaucratic body to dictate to taxpayers in every State!

## A COMMENT ON "CONTEMPORARY ART"

In a recent issue of "Smith's Weekly," under the heading, "Raspberries At Midnight With Rampant Camels," L. W. Lower gave the following description of an exhibition of what some people call "contemporary art": —

The Contemporary Art Society of Australia has put on a show at the Education Department's Galleries, Sydney.

I went twice because I didn't believe it the first time.

Mind you, I was cold sober the first time, although I admit I had a couple of brandies the second time. It was necessary.

There's a block of wood in the exhibition. It's too big for a doorstep and too small for a dog-kennel.

It's called "Gossip."

Nice bit of wood, though.

Ought to come in handy for the winter.

To appreciate this exhibition you should not look at the catalogue until you've looked at the picture.

For instance, there is a picture of two people sitting on a sofa with five legs between them. This is "Man and Wife," by C. S. Gould. Eight guineas to you!

C. S. Gould is not the mug you think he is.

Hanging alongside "Man and Wife" is what I took to be two men with only three legs wrestling in the street.

However, the title of that picture is "Man Rowing."

"Catani Gardens, St. Kilda," is—er—well—I suppose it's Catani Gardens, St. Kilda. The intriguing thing about this is that among the swarms of couples sitting on park benches not one of them has a nose.

The artist has missed out on an eye or two here and there, but this is understandable in a rush job.

But no noses! I think this is carrying anti-Semitism too far.

loan business. Remember the words of the "Protocols" that it is in the international loan realm that the influence of the Jewish financiers predominates.

Lloyd George, in his "War Memoirs," states, that in 1917 President Wilson and his son-in-law, Mr. McAdoo (former partner of Paul Warburg), kept asking that someone in authority should be sent over to discuss, finance. This was also strongly urged by Sir Wm. Wiseman, who at the time was an important go-between in Anglo-American relations, and who later became a partner in the Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb and Company. Lord Northcliffe reported that unless something was done "I think we shall have a sharp conflict with McAdoo (Secretary of the U.S. Treasury)," and he suggested that Reading be sent.

As previously mentioned, Reading was the man who "assisted in the drafting and administration of those measures. The most sensational of these was the granting of the British guarantee to the great accepting houses to bills amounting to many hundreds of millions" (Encyclopedia Britannica).

These accepting houses were clearing houses for international bills of exchange and were mostly conducted by Jews of German origin. "Throughout these conferences," said Lloyd George, "I found Lord Reading's aid invaluable. His knowledge of finance, his mastery of figures, and his calm and sure judgment helped at many turns. . . ."

We guaranteed about £500,000,000 of securities in respect of debts overseas—some of it on enemy security. . . . Among those whose advice I sought was Lord Rothschild."

Lord Reading was duly sent "to arrange matters." He arrived in the United States in September 1917, and in January 1918, replaced Sir Cecil Spring-Rice as British Ambassador at Washington. A month later, suddenly and unexpectedly, Sir Cecil died in Ottawa on his way back to England. His death may have been perfectly natural, but one can't help feeling that he knew so much of the work of the "Hidden Hand" that he would have been dangerous had he lived.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2, January 20, 1946.

(To be continued.)

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

is a widespread feeling among the men that their Union leaders have become just part of the whole set-up of employers and Government." That description also describes the situation in Australia, especially in respect of Communists who dominate Union policy. Here we have a chorus of Union leaders urging the workers to support a Government that has broken all pledges on military and industrial conscription, has increased living costs by vicious indirect taxation, and has robbed them by direct taxes. Why workers should support or vote for men who betray them is very difficult to understand. The time is overdue for the workers to realise that, like the London dockers, they are being well and truly betrayed.

**SNAPPY SHORTS:** (1) Figures said to be taken from an average mechanised mine in Maitland, N.S.W., show that the labour cost at surface would be a fraction under 3/8 per ton of coal; but the selling price is 25/- to 30/- per ton. It would be interesting to know the proportion of interest charges and taxes in the selling price. (2) Several men were recently fined in N.S.W. for buying and selling tyres without the consent of the Rubber Board. Others who merely borrowed tyres and lent the seller a "tenner" or so were acquitted. So much for stupid regulations. (3) Communist controlled Ironworkers Federation, which paid many thousands of pounds for Nock & Kirby's Sydney building, were short of funds when strike pay was involved, but so far the duped iron-workers are still following their capitalistic Union leaders.

**ZIONISTS' ZEAL:** The training of young "American" men and women to join a militant movement in Palestine is being conducted by an affiliate of the new Zionist organisation of America. This body is known as Brith Trumpeldor of America Inc. and it is described by the Melbourne "Age" of January 15 as anti-British. The New York "Times," exposing the movement, says that it is not connected with the Zionist Organisation of America, which is nationwide. These repeated statements that the Zionist movement disowns such extremists are wearing, rather thin. The same issue of the "Age" refers to General Morgan, of U.N.R.R.A., who was asked to resign because he disclosed that international Jewry has been organising and financing illegal entry into Palestine, and the paper says that the agitation against him was artificially stimulated, whilst his accusations were not denied.

**BRITAIN'S BURDENS:** Back in 1941 Hitler declared: "Our aim is to attack the British Isles." Of course, he meant a military attack; not an economic or a financial onslaught, which came later, not from Germany, but from "Wall Street." Commenting on this latest attack, "The Economist" says: "The new Loan agreement, the Bretton Woods agreement, and the contractions of commercial policy, together, make up a bitter pill to swallow." And so it seems that the Wall Street financiers have nearly accomplished what all Hitler's military might failed to do. The penetration of their attack indicates the presence of fifth columnists aided and abetted by spineless politicians. Similar subversive groups are hard at work in Australia to further this plot by adopting the Bretton Woods scheme. Pressure on Federal Members to resist this should be intensified.

—O.B.H.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

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

Tax Reduction Campaign: The campaign launched some time ago is taking more definite shape, with positive action along Voters' Policy lines. The following resolution was passed at the inaugural meeting:

"(1) That a campaign entitled the "Tax Reduction Campaign" be initiated to mobilise a public demand for a drastic reduction in taxation as wanted by citizens. Such reduction to take the form of:

"(a) Direct taxation on income to be reduced immediately by not less than 25 per cent.

"(b) Where a wage-earner works overtime, the income-tax rate to remain as if no overtime had been worked.

"(c) Total abolition of Sales Tax.

"(2) That there shall be no increase in any other form of tax, nor new taxes, nor shall there be any increase in the National Debt."

Any reader of the "New Times" who is prepared to assist on action lines is asked to contact the organiser, Mr. E. C. Finn, or the secretary, Mr. C. H. Allen, care of above address.

"Social Credit Can Help You": Supplies of our booklet with this title have at last come from the printer. The price is 3d per copy, or 2/3 per dozen, post-free in dozen lots. Social Crediters will find this booklet very useful at the present time, as it contains a simple, concise statement of Social Credit, which will assist people who are confused by the complicated state of world affairs to clarify their ideas. Send for a supply today and help spread the Social Credit message.

Quarterly Rally: Members are notified that our next rally will be held at the above address on Saturday evening, February 16, and are asked to keep the night free and come along with their friends.

—F. Bawden, Hon Secretary.

## TREND OF "EDUCATION" IN BRITAIN

A few days ago the "capitalist" Melbourne "Herald" featured an article, by a local "educationist," praising the system of "education" in Great Britain under the new Education Act and the Socialist Government.

Enthusiasm does not appear to be widespread in Great Britain itself, whence a spate of condemnation from the most diverse sources has reached us in recent months. We lack the space for more than a small fraction of such criticisms, but one important aspect is indicated by the following extracts from a House of Commons debate on November 9, 1945, in which, as will be seen, grave concern was expressed, even by a Socialist ex-schoolteacher in his maiden speech:—

**Mrs. Nichol (Bradford North):** "... I consider that the people have been fooled. They expected the kind of secondary education with which they have always been familiar, but now there have been clamped down—and I think 'clamped down' is the right term—on all the State schools in this country a set of restrictions and degradations which have made of this Act the apotheosis of mediocrity, because these restrictions have deprived the grammar schools, which have done such excellent work, of that freedom, of that variety and of the chances to experiment which have made them so good in the past. We have now got what is called a grammar school dispute . . ."

**Mr. King (Penryn and Falmouth):** "... On the other hand, economic circumstances have made me accept very many children who had not the brains to benefit from the education we tried to give them, but whose parents had got the money. It was perhaps that experience more than any other which first led me to membership of the Party to which I have the honour to belong, and ultimately to my place in this House. I was faced throughout that time with what seemed to me a tragic waste of ability and brain, because boys of high intelligence and capacity were robbed of what ought to have been their birthright. I think we are at one on all sides in this House in demanding that that waste shall cease and that there shall be equality of opportunity for all. I am sure, at least, that behind me there is no divergence of opinion on that subject.

"It is when we come to apply that principle that we fall into disagreement. Equality of opportunity is not the same as equality of education. I want to refer to what I believe is not based upon theories or opinions, but on facts.

**"The first fact we have to face is that all men, despite what may have been said to the contrary, are not born equal.**

"Every child, even whilst 'mewling and puking in the nurse's arms,' is different, from its very inception, in brains, character, physique, and potentiality from any other child. We have to make our education fit the child, and not make the child fit our education, if we are to achieve anything. There is a widespread illusion, embodied in the Debates on the Education Act passed by Parliament many months ago, that this House can create an educated nation by laying brick upon brick, and exuding teachers from training colleges . . ."

"The Party to which I have the honour to belong states in its initial charter that it represents workers by brain as well as workers by hand. I cannot help thinking that there is a danger that this may sometimes be forgotten. We have heard much about the phrase 'parity of esteem.' I cannot help thinking that there rests in many people's minds the idea that all places of education must be held in parity of esteem in the sense that their intellectual content is equal. I believe that to be a complete illusion. Every individual soul

should indeed be held in parity of esteem, but when we apply this phrase to educational institutions I believe we are suggesting something wildly impracticable. I do not think anyone honestly believes that the University of Oxford and a village school can ever be held in parity of esteem in intellectual content. They are worthy of it, in the sense that you give to each of them its maximum attention, but that is not always what is meant by that phrase . . ."

### "LIKE MARKS AND SPENCER'S CHAIN STORES"

"... I earnestly ask the Minister to consider this question afresh. I am a little nervous, and I think any normal person must be, of the temptation to treat the chain of schools which exists throughout Great Britain like a chain of Marks and Spencer's stores. I believe it is true that in France 20 years ago it was possible for the French Minister of Education to ask his secretary what the schools in France were doing that day, and he could be told in reply that at 10.25 every school in France was studying the geographical configuration of North Western Europe. God forbid that that situation should ever arise in England. I have already heard of a local director of education who can say—and did say—I am giving all my schools a half holiday on such and such a date. The point I wish to make is that, if we are to make progress, the centre of gravity of the school must be in the school itself and not in any outside body.

"I am nervous, and I think any good thoughtful Socialist must be nervous, of the degree of uniformity which can be attained under unimaginative administration. I am certain that Socialism is practicable without proceeding to the extreme limits, which I have tried to indicate, and if there is one sphere in which uniformity is undesirable and impracticable. I believe it is education. That is why I have tried in this my first speech to deal with that subject. I feel with all sincerity that in the question of "these direct grant schools we are in danger of killing something that is really worthwhile. I do not like killing. I appeal to the Minister to try at least in some cases to reconsider these matters."

Lieut. -Colonel Amory (Tiverton): "... One reason why I am not a Socialist—there may be others—is that I am frankly afraid that the logical application of Socialist principles will lead to over-standardisation, excessive uniformity, and a danger—I put it no higher—of reduced standards. Equality is a very laudable objective in many matters, but in education there is something which is even more important than equality, and that is quality. . . . I feel that if we deal harshly with the direct grant schools we are in danger of losing something in quality, without gaining anything in equality of opportunity. . . . I am one of those who feel that some rigidity is inevitable within the scope of the State educational system . . ."

## A DEMOCRATIC M.P. IN NEW ZEALAND

By F.H.R. (Auckland)

**New Zealand today possesses one Member of Parliament whose career should be of interest to all who understand the meaning of "Social Credit"**

At the last general elections in 1943 the electorate of Remuera—a suburb of Auckland, long regarded as the most conservative in the Dominion—elected with the largest single vote in New Zealand, Mr. E. M. Algie, late Professor of Law at Auckland University College.

In 1937 Mr. Algie resigned to establish the Freedom League, in whose service he wielded an able pen, and spoke with a polished and convincing style, for several years.

Soon after his election to Parliament Mr. Algie announced that he conceived it as his business to try to carry out the wishes of his electors, and expressed a desire that committees should be formed throughout his constituency to keep him acquainted with the electors' instructions.

The "free and enlightened" electors of the superior suburb of Remuera either failed immediately to appreciate the possibilities in this situation, or else they had no material problems. One could hardly imagine an attitude on the part of a Member of Parliament more impeccable from the Social Credit point of view than that taken up by Mr. Algie.

In recent months, however, the initiative has been taken on behalf of Remuera electors by Mrs. Gertrude Brooks—a lady of considerable energy and with a refreshing capacity for knowing what she wants and determination to get it.

### ELECTORS DEMAND RESULTS AND HE GETS THEM

As a resident of the new government-housing suburb of East Orakei, Mrs. Brooks has successfully organised her neighbours into a local association for the purpose of

stimulating official activity in providing such necessary facilities as street lighting and shops placed conveniently for the residents and not where some government official thought would be a good place for them. Similarly a much-needed bus service was demanded, despite official petrol shortage. To the surprise and delight of the tenants concerned, Mr. Algie promptly and energetically responded, and his activities have already brought about the desired results. In reply to a recent letter from the tenants' association thanking him for his excellent work on their behalf, Mr. Algie has expressed pleasure in being able to serve a community which has shown itself so capable of deciding its wants and making them clearly known. He also expresses an intention to use much of the forthcoming Parliamentary recess to get more closely into touch with this particular part of his electorate and its problems.

This seems to be a working model of how to set domestic machinery in motion, with the job made easier by the democratic attitude adopted by the new Member for Auckland's most "Conservative" suburb, plus the fact that Mrs. Brooks has for many years been a close student of the philosophy and tactical advice of Major Douglas.

That Mr. Algie's conception of democratic principles is sound has also been well illustrated in other directions, and on subjects of wider interest during his brief period in the House of Representatives. As one example I quote his attitude towards the Socialist Government's action in setting up an official Commissioner to take control of the liquor business in the city of Invercargill that had voted itself "dry"

more than thirty years ago and had remained good and parched ever since, until reversing the vote at the last general elections. Mr. Algie drew attention to this undemocratic action on the part of the Socialist Government who could claim no mandate to alter the system which had been in operation before the long drought set in.

### MADE A NOTABLE STAND ON SAN FRANCISCO "CHARTER"

But it was in respect of the ratification of the so-called San Francisco "Charter" that Mr. Algie made his most notable stand. When, early in August, and soon after the return of the Prime Minister, Parliament was suddenly and urgently asked to ratify this "Charter." Mr. Algie alone opposed the request on the grounds that they were being asked, in effect, to sign a blank cheque. The people, he pointed out, had been told nothing of its contents and to what obligations they were being committed. Mr. Algie said he did not feel justified in thus blindly committing the people whom he represented. He also drew attention to the misnomer of "charter" as applied to what was really better described as a "treaty," since "charter" implied a benefit conferred. The San Francisco "Charter," on the other hand, would involve the Dominion in obligations financially and in military commitments the extent of which were entirely unknown. The "Auckland Star" editorially supported this attitude and pointed out that, ironically, the one possible safeguard to the Dominion might be the right of veto, which Great Britain had maintained despite the almost passionate opposition of New Zealand's Prime Minister.

The "charter" was of course, ratified, Mr. Algie alone refusing to vote.

Naturally this unusual exponent of democratic principles has been the target for some bitter attacks by the more rabid of the Socialist Members, but after some of them had discovered how sharp and polished are the shafts of wit and irony, which the newcomer can direct against them, they have become more cautious. Mr. Algie, at least, is likely to improve the standard of debate in the House.

—"The Social Crediter."

### MR ERIC BUTLER INCREASES ACTIVITIES

Mr. Butler is rapidly settling down to hard campaigning, and he reports that he is very pleased with results being obtained. In spite of very bad weather, a well-attended and representative meeting of Warrnambool and district citizens gave Mr. Butler an attentive hearing on Thursday evening, January 17. Mr. C. L. Burgess, secretary of the Warrnambool Ratepayers' Association, is to be highly complimented on his initiative in arranging such a successful meeting in a big centre, where Social Credit has had little support. Cr. J. D. Walter, prominent and much-respected local citizen, took the chair, and, after the meeting, expressed his agreement with what Mr. Butler had said.

Six new readers of the "New Times" were signed up and a large quantity of books was sold.

The Warrnambool daily paper, "The Standard," gave Mr. Butler every co-operation, a column and a quarter being devoted to an excellent report of his address. The democratic and liberal policy of most local country papers is very different from the policies of the big city dailies.

Mr. Butler predicts that Warrnambool social crediters will now rapidly increase their influence, and that another meeting in a few months' time will result in a packed hall. He left for Colac on Friday, January 18, to give his weekly radio talk over the local radio station.

On Sunday afternoon, January 20, Mr. Butler addressed a meeting of Geelong social crediters and sympathisers. All those present signified their desire to take action to bring Social Credit ideas more prominently to the notice of Geelong citizens. It was agreed that at a date yet to be arranged a big public meeting, to be addressed by Mr. Butler, would be held.

Mr. Butler arrived back in Melbourne early this week to prepare for the Box Hill and Heidelberg Town Hall meetings, reports of which will appear in our next issue.

Victorian country supporters who can co-operate with Mr. Butler are again urged to contact him, care of Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

## ATOMIC BOMB AND INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

By A. V. McNEILL (Vancouver).

**Everybody knows now that the war began and ended with the use of overwhelming destructive power to force nations to surrender their sovereignty; exercised at the beginning by Hitler and at the end by the Allies.**

**"The villainies that you teach me I will execute and it will go hard but I will better the instruction."**

"Bettering the instruction" of villains can obviously be justified only if it is restricted to purely defensive measures against villains, i.e., against such aggression, as we have suffered from Germany and Japan, and that after the event. But many of the comments on atomic bombing reported in our daily press make no restrictions in this sense. Several suggest that the threat of atomic bombing can be used to force free nations, not aggressors, "to come to their senses," i.e., to give up their sovereignty and join a sort of World Federal Union. And a World Security Council is to be set up, endowed by us, at their sole and undisputed discretion, with the power to administer this typical Nazi policy. That is what Mr. J. M. Coldwell calls "socialising" it! Ye gods and little fishes! As if any group of human beings should be entrusted with such exclusive destructive power over their fellows.

The situation demands that some voice make it plain to Messrs. Truman, Attlee, Coldwell, aye, and perhaps to Churchill, too, to all who have not publicly repudiated this extended use of atomic bombing to justify the policy underlying Nazi atrocities, that, whatever the war meant for them, it meant something more for the average British subject than a mere squabble with the Nazis over an infringement of copyright.

**The voice, which will make this plain, must be an authoritative voice, and, in a democracy, there is only one voice, which carries this authority, and only one, which our representatives must obey.**

Under these circumstances the following statements describing the aims of the various Institutes of International Affairs made by their spokesman, Dr. Arnold Toynbee, in 1931, deserve a far wider publicity than they have been given by the various publications or branches of that organisation. A comparison of dates shows that their formal and official adoption of Nazi philosophy anticipated Hitler's rise to power by a few years and Quisling by nine. I am quoting from pp. 808-809 of their Journal, "International Affairs," of November 1931. Dr. Toynbee is speaking:

"If we are frank with ourselves, we shall admit that we are engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States which at present partition the habitable surface of the earth. . . . It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon this idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise, lapped in a false sense of security, which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence . . ."

**"And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands." It is unknown to me whether the members of this organisation, as such, have ever identified themselves publicly with Nazism, as**

**such, or whether they claim a closer affinity than that assured them by the possession of common aims and common methods.**

The fact that their spokesmen on the radio and in the press, in this country and throughout the Empire, have seemed to find it necessary to be, perhaps unnecessarily loud in their public denunciations of Hitler, Quisling and Co., suggests that the real ground of their resentment against these specimens—and it can be a real one—is based rather upon what they feel to be an infringement of copyright than upon any spiritual difference. What other grounds of disagreement could they have against people who, like themselves, were "engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign States which at present partition the habitable surface of the earth," (aims), and, of course, "denying with their lips what they are doing with their hands," (methods).

The coining of new words, "Quisling," "Fifth Columnist," etc., widely used by them, if not actually coined by sympathisers with the Institutions of International Affairs, is significant, and significant because it is unnecessary. It must obviously be done to shield somebody.

**"Treachery to humanity," the older expression, would surely fill the bill quite adequately, and, as the above quotations become better known, people may perhaps suggest new expressions of their own.**

The headquarters of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs is at Toronto.

The issues before the Anglo-Saxon peoples everywhere, and especially before the peoples of the British Empire, have become increasingly grave for years. Luckily, the wide publicity given the first atomic bombs is making them increasingly clear. These issues are, whether we, admittedly nominally Christian peoples only, are to be committed behind our backs, i.e., through the suppression by the daily press, or by other means, of the issues involved, to an acceptance of pagan, Nazi philosophies? Are we to allow the war, which has just ended to be treated as a mere squabble with the Nazis over an infringement of copyright? The fine, unforgettable words which Churchill used so aptly to describe the magnificent heroism of the R.A.F. in the Battle of Britain can be used, unfortunately, just as aptly, to describe our own case now, though in a very different sense from that in which they were first used. "When did so many (the peoples of the British Empire) owe so much to so few" (the various Institutes of International Affairs and their financial backers)?

—"The Social Crediter."



**First, of course, there are the fiscal clauses, since the whole full employment programme centres in the power of the purse, now enlarged to the control not only of the public SPENDING, which is the basic idea, it must obviously begin by determining not only total income, but its distribution, and end by determining individual income after taxes and savings.**

Citizens might save more or less than is necessary, so they cannot be permitted to earn or spend as much as they please without upsetting the political appercart. The State must have complete control of the net disposable private income, and a prior lien on it. The withholding tax, borrowed from Europe, and sold here with the Greek gift of "forgiveness" attached as a premium, is a device perfectly adapted to this purpose. It not only converts the income tax into an excise, and collects it under anesthesia in advance of spending, but makes it completely flexible so that it can be applied specifically to the spending of groups and individuals as the political conditions may demand, without any regard to constitutional considerations of equity or equality. When it is further improved, as its energetic merchandiser, Beardsley Ruml, proposes, by abolishing the corporation income tax, or converting it into a nominal dog license, the individual citizen becomes merely a tax-bearing animal thoroughly domesticated to growing continuous crops of fiscal fleece for the State to shear. There is no other way to control the total private spending necessary to provide full employment. Under this section of the contract, when the State borrows from citizens and spends on a large scale to provide full employment in war or peace, it can even make the large bond buyers pay the principal and interest on the debt held by the small income brackets, by graduating interest rates and income taxes accordingly, and you will find this stipulation for selective repudiation of the public debt in the last budget message of the late President.

**Next in the contract is the consumption clause. After you have determined through your fiscal machinery what the net disposable private income of the community is to be, and who is to have it, you cannot let people spend it as they please if you are to guarantee full employment.**

They might save it or hoard it, though you can probably prevent that somewhat as France did the day before yesterday by calling in all fifty franc bills, or larger, and replacing them by a new issue; or they might waste it in many undesirable ways, as on liquor or on women who should be otherwise employed. In any case, you can't be sure that they will spend it so as to purchase the service of everybody to whom you have promised a satisfactory job, at the wages and kind of work he wants, where he happens to prefer to live. A free competitive market for consumers or producers is an insuperable hazard to a full employment policy, because consumers do not spend intelligently according to any national plan, workers don't change their occupations, skills or locations easily or freely, and investors and enterprisers have their own peculiar notions as to what they want to do with their money, according to what consumers want to do with theirs.

**So, to fulfill the full employment contract you have to stipulate that control of consumption may be necessary "in the national interest" by establishing a system of priorities in the production or purchase of consumer goods, as the Beveridge Plan calls for, as well as rationing and price controls, and some kind of allocation of new investment or control of the development of new competitive products.**

Since the jobs to be filled are not always likely especially after this war, to be in the same places as the people who want to work at them, or to buy the products, the government must also be able to move industries, labour or markets about (here or abroad) if it is to balance spending with employment. So the disposal of surplus war plants and their voting populations, as well as government control of foreign trade, will probably prove to be important footnotes to the full employment contract.

Beyond all this there is a much more crucial stipulation in the consumption clauses of the contract to which very little attention has been given. Even with

#### MAKE THESE MEETINGS A SUCCESS

Hawthorn Town Hall, Wednesday, January 30.

Camberwell Town Hall, Thursday, January 31.

Subject: "Uniform Taxation."

Principal Speaker: Eric D. Butler.

Mr. Bruce H. Brown will be Chairman at the Hawthorn Meeting. Actionists, to deliver handbills and help generally with advertising the meetings, are urgently required.

Those who can assist are urged to contact Mr. Norman Baker, WF 1382, immediately.

complete government management of private income, the control of private spending and consumption is so hard at best, and individual citizens are so stubbornly bent on saving or wasting their money in their own way, that it will be impossible for government to make good on its promise of full employment unless it spends more of their money for them, and makes them buy and consume what is "good" for them whether they want it or not.

**Besides, the capacity for private consumption is inevitably limited by time or boredom, but the possibilities of public consumption are boundless. They include not only the traditional pyramids, post offices, parks, playgrounds, public works and domestic or foreign T.V.A.'s, but medicinal, dental, manicure and chiropodist services, nurseries, communal feeding, food stamp plans, "homes of rest and culture," travel for "strength through joy," better meals for Melanesians, more vitamins for Hot-tentots, rebuilding the ruined antiquities of Florence, planting trees in Italy, and whatever—including continuous war for peace—**

## STRANGE BELIEFS OF AUSTRALIA

By "FOOTLE"

**"Education" is a marvellous thing: it enables the modern to know when he is well off, to tell whether he is at war or peace, and in a general way to accept, without actually being certified as a lunatic, a lot of information about what isn't really so.**

But I find my old-fashioned upbringing a severe handicap: indeed, if there were a Society for the Prevention of Commonsense I should feel much tempted to join it

The latest occasion for this pessimistic view of my own mentality is the recent expression by Mr. Beasley of Australia's view of foreign policy, as outlined by my "news"-paper. Thus Mr. Beasley:—

"Because Australia believes that her future progress depends on full employment, she must increase her imports to satisfy the increasing demand for goods, and to enable many essential development works to proceed."

Translated into personal terms, this means (correct me at once if I am wrong): **"Because Mr. Footle wishes to MAKE things he should therefore proceed to BUY them."**

I don't remember when I was as cussed as that, but let us be generous and paraphrase a little:—

"Mr. Footle being somewhat eccentric, is prepared to ignore materials at hand, and thus, instead of making things for himself, allows other persons to make them and bring them long distances. No doubt he grins uncomfortably and acknowledges receipt by saying: 'Thanks very much! I was thinking about making them myself, as you might deduce from the materials surrounding me but of course I wouldn't owe you anything that way. Thoughtless of me! What would you fellows like.'

"These others, entering into the spirit of the game, say: **"We don't want anything, really. We have to make things and bring them to you. We should starve if we concentrated on ourselves."**

"Footle: 'But you must have something. I can't go on accepting things; it's demoralising. Besides, it makes me worse off or something, if anybody gives me anything. That's what nations fight over, isn't it? How about some nice food, now?'

"The Others: 'Well, just this once, seeing there's been a war. Bye and bye you'll have to stop, of course, because we have investments elsewhere: our economists have told us so.'

"F.: Then, of course, you'll stop sending me things——"

**"T.O.: 'Indeed, no! You really are most subversive!'"**

\* \* \* \* \*

That's as far as I get, usually. I always used to think that if you lived in a place that had everything, you could manage somehow to live if people would leave you alone. But they don't want to leave you alone; they want to leave you a loan. (Oh, I say!)

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Beasley proceeds: "Our foreign policy must be in accord with domestic policy and must preserve the rights of national development."

I am not prepared to quarrel violently over this assimilation of foreign and domestic policy, although I must confess that its meaning, if any is inclined to elude me. I mean to say, I would like elucidation on the foreign policy to be pursued in the following hypothetical cases:

(1) **When we don't want anything from foreigners.**

(2) **When we still don't want anything, but say we do for the sake of peace, being threatened with rape and murder unless we do say so.**

(3) **When we stop producing anything at all and let 'em all come.**

**an ingenious and ambitious government can imagine might make employment if it spent your money for you on something you wouldn't buy yourself.**

So we come in the full employment contract to the compulsory consumption clause, which is perhaps the key provision in the whole programme, for by it unlimited government can outflank and bypass the perpetual peril of the competitive marketplace and the hazards of the consumer's choice. And for the same reason it has a great appeal to many businessmen. It is always much easier to do your marketing through a government which can make the ultimate consumer take the product whether he wants it or not, whether it be pyramids or patent medicine. War is essentially and almost completely a compulsory consumption economy, where the unwilling customer merely happens to be your foreign enemy. The full employment contract simply applies the same principle and the same method to peace and to the domestic consumer. Those who made it said as much in plain terms many times when they asked the world "ad nauseam" the trick question, "If you can have full employment in war, why not in peace?" The answer is that you certainly can, if you are willing to have the government spend your money to buy goods and services you don't choose and can't use.

But when it does that it is merely putting a lot of your spending money into other people's pockets, and it must take it back again in taxes or it must make sure that enough of the kinds of things that citizens choose to buy are available, else even your own spending money won't buy much groceries, gadgets or government before you are through.

(To be continued.)

## Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

social creditors have been saying for years.

The "right" people in America are supporting the dollar loan to Great Britain. The Melbourne "Age" of January 19 contained the following: "The executive committee of the United States Associated International Chamber of Commerce announced its support for the 3,750,000,000 dollar loan to Britain, and recommended Congressional approval. Membership of the association includes individual business concerns and leading American business organisations, such as the National Foreign Trade Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Bankers' Association, and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States."

During the war, taxpayers were told they were paying for the war. All surplus war materials therefore belong to the taxpayers. But the owners are finding that they don't control their own property. Within the last few days, some £7,500,000 worth of British taxpayers' property, in the form of carrier-based aeroplanes, was dumped into the sea off the coast of New South Wales. This is only one little example of wholesale post-war sabotage of useful surplus war equipment. Those who say that the aeroplanes mentioned were of no use, because the war is over, should have tried the experiment of offering them, or the engines and other parts, to taxpayers for nothing! A few letters to Federal Members of Parliament about wanton destruction of Australian taxpayers' property would be very opportune.

—E. D. B.

"THE UNKNOWN CITIZEN"

TO JS/07/M/378

**THIS MARBLE MONUMENT IS ERECTED BY THE STATE**

He was found by the Bureau of Statistics to be

One against whom there was no official complaint,

And all the reports on his conduct agree That, in the modern sense of an old-fashioned word, he was a saint,

For in everything he did he served the Greater Community.

Except for the War, till the day he retired He worked in a factory and never got fired, But satisfied his employers, Fudge Motors Inc.

Yet he wasn't a scab or odd in his views, For his Union reports that he paid his dues, (Our report on his Union shows it was sound)

And our Social Psychology workers found That he was popular with his mates and liked a drink.

The Press are convinced that he bought a paper every day

And that his reactions to advertisements were normal in every way.

Policies taken out in his name prove that he was fully insured,

And his Health-card shows he was once in hospital but left it cured.

Both Producer Research and High-Grade Living declare

He was fully sensible to the advantages of the Instalment Plan

And had everything necessary to the Modern Man,

A gramophone, a radio, a car and a frigid-air.

Our researches into Public Opinion are content

That he held the proper opinions for the time of year:

When there was peace, he was for peace, when there was war, he went.

He was married and added five children to the population,

Which our Eugenist says was the right number for a parent of his generation,

And our teachers report that he never interfered with their education.

Was he free? Was he happy? The question is absurd.

Had anything been wrong, we should certainly have heard.

— W. H. Auden in "Another Time."

**"THE FORCES THREATENING THE PEACE"**

Hear—

**MR. BRUCE H. BROWN**  
**Thursday, January 31, at 8 p.m.,**

at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, **"The Block," Melbourne**

(Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)

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