

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. 4. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1946

## "NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere every week are as follow:  
Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. HALF Rates for Members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.  
Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

## Strangling Democracy in New South Wales

### Local Government Undermined

It is no mere coincidence that in all phases of government—international, national, State and municipal—the policy now being systematically imposed is a policy of remorseless centralisation.

The aim of centralisation is to remove the source of sovereign power from the individual elector to some remote Board, not directly responsible to the elector for results. This is a cunning scheme—a way of emasculating Democracy while at the same time preserving the name, the empty husk of Democracy.

In the following article, Mr. E. S. Corr, Organising Secretary of the Social Credit Movement of New South Wales, shows how recent legislation introduced into the N.S.W. Parliament proposes to take power and initiative from municipal and shire councils and vest it in municipal mergers, "advisory" committees (whose advice is law!) and electricity authorities. The will of the people is being cunningly and quietly bypassed by the bureaucratic planners:

The voluminous Local Government Acts and their voluminous amendments are at once a triumph for an entrenched bureaucracy and an indictment of the people's representatives who made them law.

The main volume of 626 pages, the Amending Acts Nos. 19 (55 pages) and 21 (61 pages) are monumental intricacies. In essence they elevate the Minister of the day to the position of grand "Pooh Bah," nominally presiding over the home-lives of the people. This means, in effect, that the permanent heads of the Local Government Department are the hereditary rulers of the people and not their elected representatives.

Section 21 of the main Act declares, amongst many things, that the Governor (meaning again the bureaucratic advisers) may, by proclamation: "Substitute one Council for another," "Alter ridings or wards or abolish them," "Dissolve the corporate body of any area and create new corporate bodies," "Provide for any matter or thing (whether herein stated or not) which the Governor may deem necessary or expedient in the circumstances."

By an amendment of Section 54 of the main Act in 1944 the voting lists for Local Government bodies were extended to cover all on the Parliamentary Electoral Rolls.

With strange inconsistency Section 181d of Amending Act 19, 1945, takes the right

to vote from the people on the matter of loans raised by Councils representing not less than 10,000 people and having a gross income of not less than £100,000 per annum. (The amalgamating schemes contemplated now should put most Councils in this category.) This is also inconsistent with Section 81 of the main Act which says "The Council may for its information and guidance on any matter under this or any other Act take a poll of electors or rate-payers as it thinks appropriate."

Again, despite these provisions for letting the people have a say, the Amending Act No. 19 of 1945 (sub-section (b) (1) of Section 5 of Part II) eliminates sub-section 5 of Section 19 of the main Act. The sub-section eliminated made it mandatory for the Minister to direct that a poll of electors be taken if fifty electors petitioned for it, before any one Municipality could be merged with another.

Having got rid of the people's rights in this way, we find the Government by further special Amending Acts, imposing a straight-out form of State Socialism on the people.

By Amending Act No. 21 of April 1945, the bureaucrats come into their own pre-conceived reign of power. By using the "Minister" as their figurehead ("the Minister" appears on nearly all of the pages of

the Amending Acts under review up to six and eight times per page) they shelter behind elected authority. This Act is entitled "The Local Government Town and Country Planning Amendment Act 1945."

It pivots round "the Minister" who, by calling on the Governor (whose power resides in his acquiescence) appoints eight selected professional men and officials as a "Town and Country Planning Advisory Committee." The appointments are for five years at salaries and expenses to be fixed (by "the Governor"). This body is not merely advisory; if it were, no grievance would lie. It is given practically plenary powers.

#### "THE MINISTER" ASSUMES CONTROL

Without waiting for any local action, the power to create the "Cumberland County District" and delegate all local powers to a "Cumberland County Council" as provided in Amending Act No. 21, passed in April last year (342AA P30) was operated by proclamation on July 27 last year. The proclamation not only created the "Cumberland County District," but called into being the "Cumberland County Council" by dividing the "District" into nine electorates and calling on the Councils in the respective electorates to send their man along as one of nine County Councillors to be.

The proclamation gives power to borrow (of course!) to the new body and the right to levy on existing Councils for its costs, which include remuneration for all its members and its staff.

These County Councillors were elected by the participating Councils on September

20, 1945. Under the Act they have three years in which to prepare a plan cutting up and rearranging the County of Cumberland to their liking for submission to the Minister, who will submit it to his bureaucrats. (The city of Sydney remains an independent area.)

The powerful Town and Country Planning Committee of eight, before referred to, is an Authority apart from this Cumberland creation, and is a superior tribunal to it. Clause 342AM (page 53) of Amending Act No. 21/45, says that the approval of the Minister "shall not be given (to a town planning or country planning scheme) unless and until the Advisory Committee has made a report to the Minister thereon."

This Committee of eight may roam the State at will with its expert staff, and is given the protection of the "Royal Commissions Act" and of the "Justices Act." Note that this is not a body appointed to carry out the will of the people (however badly their will may be interpreted by their elected representatives) BUT A BODY AUTHORISED TO IMPOSE ITS WILL ON THE PEOPLE UNDER PAINS AND PENALTIES.

The Electricity Bill (a proposed further amendment of the Local Government Act) before the State Parliament as this is written, is the complete answer to the bureaucrats' dream. By it an "Electricity Authority" of seven is to be created to take over all electricity supply.

Councils today are responsible for 74% of the electricity supplied for public pur-

(Continued on page 2)

## NOTES on the NEWS

**Cabinet's decision on Bretton Woods has been deferred until a later full Cabinet meeting, probably on February 6. Strong opposition to ratification is expected from some Labor Ministers, but apparently there are others prepared to betray the workers and Australia. In these circumstances it is imperative that the pressure be maintained on all Members to reject the Bretton Woods proposals.**

Labor opponents of the plot say that it would mean that Labor would not be able to carry out its financial or industrial policy, and that the Government has no power to surrender such financial powers without a referendum. These points should be emphasised when contacting Labor Members. This has been a long, determined fight, and it must not be lost by easing up now. Will YOU intensify the pressure for the last round? Send that letter to your Member NOW.

**U.N.O. UNREST:** Now that Russia is called on to account for her violation of the Big Three agreement in regard to Persia's sovereignty, she is resorting to the practice of trying to divert attention elsewhere by bringing the situations in Greece and Indonesia before U.N.O. It is pointed out that British troops are in Greece at the request of the Greek Government and in Indonesia at the direction of the Allied Supreme Command in the Far East. This cannot be said of the Russian interference in Persia. Obviously the question of Poland will also come before the Council. So, it seems that Russia is in for a sticky time, and this, of course, also applies to U.N.O. But while the right of veto remains there is no chance of any real corrective action being taken: the Big Five can contract out, and the little nations are powerless.

**AGRICULTURAL ARRANGEMENTS:** The scaling down of Empire preferences—a condition attached to the recent U.S.-British loan—will mean the curtailment of certain types of primary production; food control bureaucrats will then decide just what will be grown, and who will grow it. So farmers are in for much more pushing around—unless they help to ensure that these bureaucrats are promptly demobilised. Wheat, wool and meat will be the chief industries affected: in these circumstances it behoves those engaged in these industries to get busy before this plot is full developed—this is a warning which they dare not ignore. No political Parties or major primary producers' organisations are resisting this menace. Farmers should note this significant fact, and they should get busy to see that their organisations take up this fight immediately.

**TRADE TANGLES:** Japan wants to buy all the Australian wool she can, and seeks permission to import 605,000 bales to start the ball rolling, but it is said that she will find great difficulty in paying for it. Australian woolgrowers are spending huge sums of money advertising the superior virtues of wool; meanwhile, needy Australians require blankets and woollen goods, but like the Japanese are finding paying for them the major problem. Mr. Chifley does his best to prevent them from having the

necessary cash by taxing it from them, and he seems to delight in singling out his Labor supporters in this connection. So far there has not been any outcry of "no more trade with Japan." Wonder if Japan will obtain our wool in preference to our own needy people?

**BEVIN'S BLUNDER:** While British Minister Bevin makes stirring appeals to U.N.O. for food for Europe, Dr. Nicholson, just returned to England, tells how hard Americans work—because they are well fed. Then, speaking of England, he says: "We, in this country, owing to shortage of food, have not got the same vitality, with the result that you have illness everywhere." Strangely enough both these reports appeared in the Melbourne "Herald" of January 18. It makes one wonder whether Bevin is really Britain's spokesman. On top of this we are told that most of Britain's wartime controls will be continued for another five years. Britishers might ask, "Where is the victory that we are supposed to have won?"

(Continued on page 3)

## Significant Political Pointers

**While the Planners everywhere are sedulously fostering the fatalistic idea that there is a "world trend to the Left," something similar to a natural phenomenon which defies conscious individual opposition, it is instructive and encouraging to note that in Canada, where Social Crediters are making steady progress, the Socialists are sustaining defeat after defeat in the provincial elections.**

One of the latest provincial elections was in British Columbia, where, before the dissolution of the Legislature, the Socialists held 15 seats in a House of 48 Members. After the election the Socialist representation had been reduced to 9. Something must be going wrong with the "trend" in Canada!

**The Victorian Railways Commissioners admitted last week that a railway house at Seymour had been vacant since it was built last June.**

If this house had been privately owned, what an outcry there would have been against the "selfishness" of private owners of houses!

Socialism in practice is in no way concerned about individuals.

**It is typical of the blatancy of Soviet propaganda that charges made against the Franco regime in Spain could be appropriately made against the Stalin regime in Russia.**

Most commentators on the Spanish question conveniently forget that during the crucial years of the Spanish crisis, 1937-39, Fascist Italy was building naval ships for Russia and providing nearly all the machinery for naval construction in Russia. Russia's most powerful light cruiser (Tashkent) was built in Leghorn.

Russia's demands concerning Spain, together with demands that Russia be given a foothold in North Africa, indicate that

Russian policy is directed against British interests everywhere. The sooner the British peoples everywhere realise that Soviet Russia is today playing the same role on behalf of International Finance as Nazi Germany played, the sooner they will take effective steps to join battle with the local representatives of the "enemy."

**In a speech in the United States Congress on May 3, 1945, the Hon. Alvin E. O'Konowski accused Baruch, Mellon, du Pont, Morgan, Rockefeller and Morgenthau of having arranged World War 2 and of now actively working for World War 3.**

Great Britain and the U.S.A., according to their plan, are to be weakened by exports to build up Soviet Russia," he said.

"These international 'do-gooders' will embrace anything and everything to keep going. Recently we have seen this crowd embrace and court the Communists . . . No longer do the Communists denounce profits and Big Business . . . Russia is the only ally that didn't give us even one penny of reverse lend-lease . . . Notice, we gave Russia 14,000 aeroplanes. Yet, whoever heard of Russia bombing anything except Finland? . . . The combined total that these schemers want to give Russia in the next five years is about twenty thousand million dollars of American money."

**It is to be hoped that the Socialists appreciate the many seemingly strange allies they are obtaining everywhere.**

The Governor of the Bank of "England," Lord Catto, supported the British Labor Party's Bank Nationalisation Bill in the House of Lords.

He said "the power to issue directions to other banks would be used only in extreme cases." There is no need to mention who will decide what are "extreme cases."

Montagu Norman: "Nationalisation? We'd welcome it."

(Continued on page 4)

## On the Housing Front

"SENSATION! TWO HOUSES BUILT!"—London "Sunday Express," November 25, 1945.

"Twenty-three thousand Germans are to be provided with temporary housing built with British Army materials, in Hamburg, this winter."—The "B."B.C., November 26, 1945.

## IDENTIFYING THE PROMOTERS OF WAR

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

**Sir, —Some astonishing things happened in the early years of the First World War. When we look back upon them and consider the facts dispassionately, it is difficult to avoid the feeling of amazement that responsible British men of high public repute, owing allegiance to His Majesty the King, could have been parties to what went on.**

In calling attention to some of these treasonable actions, it is not done with the idea of pointing an accusing finger at any of the so-called statesmen of those days who still survive, but for the purpose of producing further evidence that the Satanic POLICY, which is being imposed upon us is a JEWISH policy. It is because this knowledge is spreading that such frantic efforts are being made to stop what is mistakenly called anti-Semitism, and thereby prevent further exposure or criticism of individual Jews whose conduct is seriously detrimental to the welfare of Christian people everywhere.

The Marconi Scandal has already been mentioned in this series of letters. Mr. A. N. Field has described it as one of the circumstances "causing distrust and disquiet, soon to be followed as the war progressed by the increasingly wide prevalence of a belief that some impalpable, influence was at work."

**There is no longer room for doubt that such an influence WAS at work, and it is urgently necessary to identify that influence and the men responsible for it.**

After the declaration of war in 1914, the British Government (Mr. Asquith, Prime Minister) allowed enemy reservists in Great Britain some days in which to return to Germany and Austria, and one of the leading newspapers ("The Morning Post") afterwards declared editorially that "the enemy was in fact presented with an army corps from England." The Navy was forbidden to capture reservists returning to enemy countries from abroad, and not only were aliens allowed to become naturalised, but they were permitted to supplant English businessmen who had gone to the war. Munitions supplies for the Army were pathetically inadequate. Enemy businesses were very slowly, and not always effectually, wound up, and as late as July 1918, Lord Sydenham informed the House of Lords that there were three great German banks in the City not yet wound up. He went on in these words: —

**"The managers, who are free to walk about London, are extremely able Germans, who have a very great deal of very secret knowledge . . . Anyone who carefully watched what went on could not avoid the impression of a certain impalpable tenderness to German interests, which has never been explained. No reciprocal consideration was visible in Germany."**

"Impalpable" means not evident, intangible. There is no longer any mystery about this to those who have studied the international financial business, and if it was proper to exempt the vital Briey Basin in France from bombardment by either side, then surely it was not very harmful to allow the enemy to continue undisturbed in his financial depredations! Somebody arranged it, of course.

You will remember that Sir Rufus Isaacs was sworn in as Lord Chief Justice of England in October 1913. In January, 1915, he and the Appeal Court gave a ruling which meant that the German company, the Kaiser and Little William Ltd., was a good British company, capable of suing the King's own subjects in the King's own courts. Mr. Field tells us that eighteen months then elapsed before that monstrous judgment was overruled and pulverised by the House of Lords.

In August 1914, Mr. Trebitsch Lincoln, a naturalised Hungarian Jew, was appointed censor at the General Post Office, London. Later it was discovered that he had used the position to spy for the enemy. He was an ex-member of the House of Commons, and in turn had been an Anglican curate in Kent, a Quaker teacher in York, private secretary to Mr. Seeborn Rowntree, Hungarian censor, forger, in communication with Litvinoff, and writer of war and spy stories for the Jewish owned New York "World." Later it is alleged that he was working for both Communists and Fascists at one and the same time. Perhaps there is really no difference between them.

Mrs. Asquith, who later became Countess of Oxford, has written that she and

### INDIVIDUAL ACTION

We recently reported that Mr. Bert Spencer, of Colac (Vic.), had a column of excellent material on Alberta published in the Colac "Herald." Since then Mr. Spencer has had published in full in both Colac papers, the "Herald" and the "Reformer," the material on Bretton Woods published on our front page on January 11. The result has been widespread local discussion.

We appeal to all social crediters to make greater use of their local papers. Letters to the editors on all topical issues should be regularly supplied. There is unlimited scope. All that is required is a little initiative. Never mind waiting for "the movement" to do things. Individual action is the key to success.

Do you think YOU are doing as much for Social Credit as you could and should be doing?

her husband had an extensive circle of Jewish friends.

**Mr. Asquith was especially intimate with Sir Edgar Speyer, who was a prominent international financier, a naturalised German-Jew, a baronet, and a Privy Councillor.**

Speyer was closely associated with Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb and Company. Speyer and Schiff sought to impose an unsatisfactory "peace" with Germany in 1916, but it was prevented by Lloyd George and Mr. Bonar Law. The editor of the "London Financial News," Dr. Ellis Powell, is reported to have said in 1917 "Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Bonar Law had stood between Britain and defeat the previous December at the hands of 'the Speyer-Schiff clique.'"

Speyer had been publicly charged with disloyalty and there had been many charges of treachery, and on May 17, 1915, he wrote to Mr. Asquith seeking to retire from all public positions. Mr. Asquith replied that the imputations were baseless and malignant, and that he was not prepared to accept the suggestion. Sir Edgar thereupon went to the United States and remained there.

**Three years after the war ended, it was recorded in the London "Times" that Sir Edgar Speyer's certificate of naturalisation had been revoked and his name struck from the list of the Privy Council because he had shown himself by act and speech to be disaffected and disloyal to His Majesty, and during the war had unlawfully communicated with subjects of an enemy State and associated with a business which was to his knowledge carried on in such a manner as to assist the enemy.**

How does that compare with the treatment, which has been meted out to lesser fry convicted of assisting the enemy?

Lord Haldane presided over the swearing-in of Sir Rufus Isaacs as Lord Chief Justice. That was on 21/10/1913. Lord Haldane went out of his way to eulogise Sir Rufus, and this was so much overdone that an interjector called out, "Speak for yourself, Lord Haldane." This man, Lord Haldane, was Lord Chancellor in the Asquith Ministry, and it is recorded in "All These Things" that he returned

## AN OPEN LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE MELBOURNE "ARGUS"

**Dear Sir, —Your editorial of January 28 calls for strong comment. You attack Mr. McDonald, Victorian Country Party leader and Opposition leader in the Victorian Legislative Assembly, who had the good sense and the courage to say that the housing of the Victorian people should have priority over the unification of the railway system.**

Whatever may have been the position before the war there is no justification now for the spending of £200,000,000 on a system of transport already antiquated.

You say that Mr. McDonald "was not speaking for the majority of the citizens of Victoria, or even a majority of rural dwellers." We don't know how you ascertained what a majority of Victorians think about this matter. We suggest that one way in which their desires could be ascertained, is for the money intended to be spent in Victoria on unifying the railway gauge to be given instead direct to the Victorian taxpayers. They could then be asked whether they were prepared to forego spending it on consumable goods, motorcars and houses, in order that the railways could be unified. We suggest, sir, that Mr. McDonald has more accurately gauged the feelings of the Victorian people than you have.

The State railways in all States have become a monopoly restricting progress. All systems, including transport systems, exist to serve the consumer. If, under really free enterprise, the consumer desires to use his money-vote for private road service in preference to rail service those desiring to cater for his policy should be permitted to do so. Such is not the case today. The totalitarians everywhere insist that even the money-votes obtained by the people under the present financial policy shall be spent as the totalitarians think fit. They are determined that more and more of the productive resources of the community shall be used in producing things of no benefit to the individual. The supply of such things as food, clothing and shelter can then be kept to a minimum.

You, sir, apparently consider it "progressive" if the Federal Government, dominated by the bureaucracy, regiments more and more people into grandiose schemes while there is an urgent necessity to allow the people to produce the basic requirements of a secure, civilised life; but this policy is as ancient as it is reactionary. Thousands of years ago the kings of Egypt provided "full employment" without too many consumable goods being produced. They put tens of thousands to work on building pyramids.

You will no doubt answer that a unified railway system would be of more use than pyramids. We readily admit that the present railway system still has some very definite uses, even in a community with a system of free enterprise, but, because there are a few difficulties

in 1912 from a visit to Germany feeling uneasy, but publicly he did all he could to reassure the nation. The "visit" was arranged by members of the international fraternity. In December, 1913, he declared our relations with Germany to be twice as good as they were two years ago," and in January, 1914, that "there was a far greater prospect of peace than there ever was before." Within a few short months we were at war as his Jewish friends well knew was the intention.

Lord Haldane had a wide circle of influential Jewish friends, and they were residing in England, Germany, and the United States. At that time, Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of Germany reported as a partner of the Rothschilds, had in Germany as British Ambassador Sir Edward Goschen, a member of the Jewish family which conducts in London the international banking house of Goschens & Cunliffe.

**It was very convenient, too, that a partner in Goschens & Cunliffe (Lord Cunliffe) was Governor of the Bank of England during the war. It was he, as Chairman of the Treasury Committee, who in 1918 recommended deflation and restoration of the Gold Standard.**

These were among the intimate friends of Lord Haldane, as well as Sir Ernest Cassel (who helped to finance the London School of Economics and was connected with Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb & Company); Herr Walter Rathenau, German financier, who later, as German Foreign Minister, announced that Germany would recognise the Bolshevik Government in Russia (Germany was the first State in the world to do so); Professor Einstein, scientist and member of the League Against Imperialism (listed by the British Labor Party as a Communist subsidiary); Mr. Justice Brandeis the first Jew to be appointed to the United States Supreme Court Bench, and a prominent Zionist leader; Professor Felix Frankfurter, of Harvard University, and friend of our own Dr. Evatt (Frankfurter was rebuked by Theodore Roosevelt for his activity on behalf of Communist lawbreakers); and Lord Rothschild, at whose mansion house at Tring Park a bedroom was for many years kept permanently reserved for Haldane's weekend use.

What a nice set-up it was for our enemies! Their key men nicely placed in all countries with unchallenged access to all State secrets and being used as official advisers to both adversaries in the specially arranged conflict.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 27th January 1946.

in handling goods at places where there is a break in the gauges, there is no excuse for the spending of £200,000,000 of the people's money without the people's consent.

In your attack on Mr. McDonald you refer to his "parochial outburst" as being "isolationism in its worst form." The term "parochial," sir, has become a political swearword similar to the term "fascist." Your use of it indicates that the Melbourne "Argus" has become infected with the totalitarian virus. It may interest you to know that "parochial" means primary emphasis on local affairs. Victorian electors desire certain things which, if allowed, they can provide without shouting about the "big Australianism" you mention. Many of those who shout loudly about their love of "humanity" don't display much love towards their own families.

Mr. McDonald is to be heartily congratulated on his insistence that Victorians have far more important and urgent things to do than unify the rail system. A vote on the issue would prove beyond all doubt that the electors in all States are not displaying the enthusiasm for a unified railway system that you desire. In fact, reports from all over Australia reveal that many people insist on being "parochial" in spite of the Melbourne "Argus." Has it ever occurred to you, sir, that perhaps the "Argus" has itself become so "isolationist" that it has no idea what the people everywhere desire?

—Yours faithfully, "THE NEW TIMES."

### SOCIAL CREDIT STUDY COURSE

In the rooms of the Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria a Study Course comprising six weekly lectures will commence on Monday, February 11. The tutor will be Mr. P. M. Ireland, and he will deal with economics generally and all phases of Social Credit technique, the philosophy of Social Credit, the present money system, the objective of bureaucracy and the centralisation of power.

This study course is recommended by the Movement to those desirous of taking an active part in building up a genuine democracy. The course is free, and those intending to join are asked to be in the rooms at 8 p.m. sharp. The Movement's address is Room 8, 1st Floor, "The Block," Elizabeth St. entrance, Melbourne.

## STRANGLING DEMOCRACY

(Continued from page 1.)

poses. This fact is ignored. Councils are, in effect, charged with neglect of duty, because, presumably, little has been done by them during the war years. "Depression" labour will now probably help the new Authorities to justify themselves.

Such are the rigours of this assault by the bureaucracy on the self-governing rights of the people, that the Electricity Bill, as drafted, imposes a fine of £500 on any Council that does not promptly obey the directions of this proposed "Electricity" junta of seven, with £50 a day added penalty for continued defiance. What are we coming to? Who are these men who would cut the throat of Democracy?

Do they not derive their power to thus threaten us from the very privilege they would take from us, to vote for what we want and for whom we like?

Are they not of the very common people they now propose to treat as morons? By what magic does a "Labor" man when he flukes a portfolio become a superman? By what freak reasoning do they conceive it to be their duty to deprive the local electors, from whom they sprang, of the right to administer their own affairs?

Did the election of these men bankrupt the common people of any capacity to decide things for themselves?

Or, are they so self-conscious that they have determined that, in the interests of humanity Democracy must cease to function?

Now, it must be admitted that technical advice is necessary, together with the power to act, but only in regard to a POLICY APPROVED BY THE PEOPLE. Policy is for the people. They want all the amenities of life that the genius of man has made possible, and with as little dictation, domination, and regimentation of themselves as possible. In other words, "freedom in security."

The despised and ignored "common people" can at least demand this, and appreciate it when they get it.

It is admitted that the mass mentality is incoherent and indefinite; that is why it is necessary to elect a few to interpret their wants and decree the most effective way to realise them for the people. But when the chosen representatives propose to hand them over bound to the will and pleasure of an entrenched and well-provided-for civil service, they are selling their people into bondage; using their power to divest themselves of their responsibility, virtually transferring their power to men beyond the reach of the people who elected them, and therefore to men who are not responsible to the people. This creates the "absolute power that corrupts absolutely."

GIVEN THE MONEY, much that these new Acts purport to accomplish, would have been done long ago, and with the full franchise now operating, GIVEN THE MONEY, the ends desired would soon be achieved—slums cleared, parks prepared, traffic catered for, buildings and areas classified and co-ordinated, etc., etc., by local representatives under local pressure. The "Debt Authorities," however, would have none of this. Now, perforce, these things are to be conceded by the same "Debt Authorities" but, as usual, conditioned by a further surrender of independence, and increased impoverishment by taxation. This surrender is to permit of the moneylenders having better control of their investment. It facilitates the legal rights of finance by centralised control, and imposes on the people all the subordination and servitude that goes with the acceptance of loan money. Thus is Democracy strangled. We urge, indeed we plead, with all representatives of the people in what might be termed the domestic arena of self-government, to claim the right to FREE money for all public purposes while ever idle men, idle plant and materials are available for what they want done.

We urge the people to change their representatives in all constituted governments for men who are opposed to this domination of their community lives by the "money power" which demands "bureaucratic" government for its effective operations.

There can be no economic freedom without free money, and no political freedom without freedom of local initiative and freedom from bureaucratic despotism.

—The "New Era," 18/1/46.

### ANTI-UNIFORM TAX MEETINGS IN MELBOURNE

The anti-Uniform Taxation meetings held at Box Hill and Heidelberg Town Halls last week were not nearly as well attended as was expected. It is a bad time of the year for suburban meetings, and there also appears to be a certain feeling of instability in the community at present as an aftermath of the war. Families are coming together again and getting used to new jobs and new problems. Until this settling down process is over it may prove comparatively difficult to get well-attended meetings, although there is widespread opposition to the continuation of the Uniform Taxation scheme.

At both Box Hill and Heidelberg resolutions against Uniform Taxation were unanimously passed and sent to both State and Federal Members. Mr. R. Gardner, the Independent Member for Ivanhoe, was on the platform at the Heidelberg meeting, and pointed out that, in the absence of any instructions from his electors, he had to do what he thought best in the State House. He said that he was prepared to take instructions from his electors at all times. Literature was sold at both the above meetings, demand forms against Uniform Taxation were issued and back numbers of the "New Times" were distributed.

A report of the Hawthorn and Camberwell meetings will appear in our next issue.

## UNIFORM TAXATION: A TEST ISSUE

By ERIC D. BUTLER,

**The fight against Uniform Taxation must go on. Democratic government has come to such a sorry pass in Australia that six State Premiers, all declared opponents of Uniform Taxation, were told by Mr. Chifley that their views and the views of the electors were not going to be decisive.**

Fortunately, the attitude of the Canberra power-lusters has made it clear to a large number of people that the Federal Government and its controllers are ruthless in their determination to destroy local government.

The most pitiable aspect of the talks on Uniform Taxation at Canberra was the retreat of the State Premiers from their original stand.

If Uniform Taxation is to be continued permanently, the Federal Government has taken to itself even greater powers than the electors refused at the last referendum. Uniform Taxation is a test issue for democracy in Australia.

Mr. John Curtin made a definite promise that Uniform Taxation would not be a permanent measure. Mr. Curtin's promise was embodied in the Act concerning Uniform Taxation. Section 16 reads: "This Act shall continue in operation until the last day of the financial year to commence after the date on which His Majesty ceases to be engaged in the present war, and no longer."

The State Governments, if determined, can effectively thwart the demands of the Federal Government. Electors should immediately write to both their State and Federal Members demanding that Mr. Curtin's promise be honoured.

Mr. Cain's attitude calls for criticism. He has taken it on himself to say that Victoria will agree to a continuation of Uniform Taxation. He has tried to camouflage

the fact that he agreed to the destruction of Victoria's sovereignty by saying that he was able to get better concessions for Victoria from Canberra. How can he talk about "concessions" when he was merely able to get back a few more pounds of the Victorian taxpayers' own money?

It is indeed pleasing to note that both the leader of the Victorian Liberal Party and the leader of the Victorian Country Party have expressed themselves so strongly on this matter. It is to be hoped that the proposed censure motion is moved in the Victorian Parliament in order that Members may express themselves.

At present the Victorian Labor Government is depending on the two Independents to continue governing. If a censure motion is moved, these two Independents, Mr. Gardner and Mr. McLaren, will probably hold the balance of power. Mr. Gardner signed a pre-election pledge saying that he would not agree to a continuation of Uniform Taxation unless the people agreed to it at a referendum. Electors in both the Independents' electorates should immediately give them all the possible support and urge them to stand by Victoria's sovereignty. Even a few hundred letters could prove decisive.

From now on until the Victorian Parliament meets a stream of letters should flow to all Victorian State Members demanding that the will of Victorian electors must prevail.

Similar action should take place in all States. But it must take place NOW.

## SABOTAGE OF BRITISH AGRICULTURE

(From "The Social Creditor")

**It is not often, except in regard to its financial views, that we find ourselves in serious disagreement with "Truth" (London), but we could hardly be more uncompromisingly opposed to any opinion than to that expressed on agricultural policy in the article "Hardship or Injustice?" in its issue of November 9. The most charitable general criticism, which can be made of it, is that the writer of it cannot know anything of the conditions under which farming in this country can be made a success.**

The suggestion is that the War Agricultural Committees not only will be, but should be continued, with the totalitarian powers of eviction conferred upon them, on the recommendation of P.E.P. "in war or under threat of war." We really cannot imagine that anyone with a superficial acquaintance with land management, and the inevitable vagaries of weather, crops, redundant and never-ending legislation, Trade Union Labour agitation, tariffs, marketing boards and many other factors, could suppose that a farmer would carry all the risks which farmers and farm owners did carry, under the threat of dispossession and the constant supervision of an irresponsible bureaucracy, itself open to the influence of anyone with some new fad to exploit. If it be said that the risks will be taken off him, then he becomes a manager for the Agricultural Committee. That is Socialist Bureaucracy, which is of course, what P.E.P. announced we should have, but requires quite new farmers. It is nothing less than terrifying that a journal of the character of "Truth" should lend its influence to the rank materialism which cannot see that farming is a life, not a business. But, of course, it is this incredible panic, which has already obliterated the memory of the immense agricultural gluts of only fifteen years ago—a state of mind which is being sedulously fostered by "coupons," "points," waste and sabotage which seem to engender a rapturous craving for "control" in the face of the world which its policies have made. The whole article is repugnant to British ideas and is apparently an out-and-out plea for delegated legislation. The suggestion that land is held in fee simple from the King, as it is, is particularly inapposite. The essence of tenure in fee simple is stability—there is every difference in the world between either fee simple, or feudal tenure, and a never ceasing threat of eviction. The outlook in this country is black, and it is getting blacker.

## DEPRESSION THROUGH COAL HOLD-UP

**In our last issue before Christmas, under the heading "Secret Ballots On Strike Moves," we published an exemplary letter from a prominent Sydney social creditor to his State Member. He received an early reply, and wrote again as follows:**

69 Lucas-road,  
Burwood.  
December 21, 1945.

Mr. D. B. Hunter, M.L.A.,  
Parliament House, Sydney

Dear Mr. Hunter, —Thank you for your courteous reply to my previous letter to you, dated 12th instant. I would like to bring under your further notice the matters discussed herein.

During the war great volumes of money have been poured out in all directions. The great bulk of this money has been freely spent, and thus offers no difficulty to that small clique who have gathered into their hands control of finance, and, by this means, control all else.

But there have been thrifty individuals, who, profiting by the experience of World War I, have endeavoured to provide for themselves in the future, by saving instead of spending. As the result of this action, there have accumulated small pockets of savings widely distributed throughout the community.

and aggregating in the total very large amounts.

The same thing happened in World War I, but on a much smaller scale.

Now, it is essential, if control of finance is to remain centralised, that these small competitors, bidding for their own self-preservation, must be liquidated; all "FAT" must be rendered from them; and these "pockets" systematically drained.

The technique to attain this end is very fully understood, and has been worked out to the last dot. It consists primarily of three elements, i.e.:—

- (a) The halting of the flow of wages, by the closing down of industry;
- (b) The raising of the price-level;
- (c) Punitive taxation.

Measures (b) and (c) are preparatory, and are brought into operation for some time prior to the climax (a), which is held in reserve, to be applied at the psychological moment.

It might here be added parenthetically that the technique of raising the price-level has

many ramifications, ranging from the subsidising of non-production (a wheat-farmer is paid money NOT to grow wheat), to the destruction of goods or by other arrangements (such as interference with transport), whereby goods are forbidden access to market.

After World War I we experienced what we have come to call "THE DEPRESSION." Although the draining of the aforesaid "pockets" of savings is a carefully designed technique, it would not do to present it to the public as such. Therefore, there must always be prepared a background to give to this technique an appearance as though it arose naturally from circumstances over which those in authority could not reasonably be expected to exercise control. "The Depression" conformed to these requirements; it was a nice impersonal thing for which no one was responsible; but by a kind Providence it acted in the manner desired, i.e., as a "draining" device. We were then told, that although the world was never before so powerful in the realms of production, we had to suffer these privations "because there was no money."

**With the experience of two World Wars well within living memory, when money for death flowed like water, it was obviously necessary that some other background would have to be presented.**

Therefore, with the kind co-operation of our friends the Communists (it is most remarkable how often the Communist is to be observed playing into the hand of High Finance) and with the connivance of constituted authority, which declined to interfere with their unlawful acts, a COAL SHORTAGE providentially appeared. Thus was provided the best of all possible reasons why industry is held up—"There is no coal!" This is a very much more appropriate slogan for use today; much better than the old outmoded slogan, "There is no money." And the new slogan will act just as effectively in draining off all the savings which have been put by, by wicked people, intent on their own preservation; people who turn a deaf ear to all the beautiful slogans designed to divert them from, such wicked purpose.

If this technique be permitted to develop, industry will be laid in ruins, and wages will cease to flow. The secret ballot and compulsory voting by all strikers is the first step towards sanity. I am advising all to write to their M.P.'s demanding same. — Yours faithfully, JOHN M. MACARA.

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

**DEBT DELUGE:** Official figures taken from the commencement of the second world war until September 30, 1945, show that the public debt of the Commonwealth and States has increased by £1,386,778,000 (107%) to £2,685,958,000. Total debt represents £364 a head of population, of which slightly more than £292 a head is owed internally. Interest payable is £75,600,155 per annum, at an average interest rate of £2/18/2 percent. That's the burden that workers help to bear. Although it is only financial jugglers, it is real as far as they are concerned because every week a substantial amount of their wages will be taken from them in the form of taxes to meet it. Labor leaders promised faithfully to abolish this form of racketeering, but they were only making promises to win votes. They were loud in their condemnation of their political rivals operating such a wicked debt system, which prevented workers from having access to their own production—and then did likewise themselves. It's about time Labor dupes demanded better results from their mis-leaders. —O.B.H.

## BRETTON WOODS CRITICISED

(From the Melbourne "Argus," 21/1/46.) London "Daily Express" recently published the following editorial: "Events are confirming the gravity and far-reaching nature of the blunder made when Britain accepted the Bretton Woods plan. It was a blunder once because of the financial burdens and perils, which the decision involves. It was a blunder twice because of the economic and political dangers which follow it. "Australia ponders long over Bretton Woods. She has not yet ratified the plan. She may even decide to remain outside it. Now, if Australia were to take such a decision she would also be excluded from international trade organisations. We might be under the obligation to treat Australian goods less favourably than goods from outside the Empire. Unthinkable? Maybe. But it is the danger implicit in the scheme. At all costs we must prevent the Bretton Woods plan from dividing the British Empire."

## A BANKER AND "FULL EMPLOYMENT"

By "FOOTLE."

**"I never liked this Government," announced Aunt Ella severely, "with all their talk about full employment. I knew in my heart they must be wrong. And here's one banker who thinks as I do. I'm happy to say!"**

She pointed to an article in the "news"-paper headed, "Banker's Warning on Full Employment." The warning was uttered by Mr. H. D. Giddy, chairman of the Bank of Australasia, and the occasion was the annual meeting of the said bank.

I glanced through the article. It appeared to be the customary hardy annual, taking for granted that no one of an inquiring mind was likely to bother with it.

**But inquiry happens to be one of my troubles; that and getting the wrong answers.**

Mr. Giddy doesn't define "full employment" or tell us when it gets over full. Each employment appears to me to have its own dangers according to whether you happen to be an axe man, a miner, or a fisherman or what not. You might, for instance, achieve a dilated heart, silicosis, or death by drowning, by over-employment in such occupations. But Mr. Giddy is not concerned with any nonsense of that sort. Let him speak for himself:

"What might be termed the full employment school," he said, "stressed the virtues of Government spending and the redistribution of existing national income, with little consideration of what form employment took, of what it produced, or whether money incomes were related to the production of commodities and services wanted by the public."

**A little more of that sort of thing and I would have found myself almost agreeing with the man!**

I have, for instance, long held the view that money incomes should be related to goods and services wanted by the public, but I never remember a banker saying anything like that. Bankers are usually full of reasons why such a thing can't be done.

Nevertheless, I feel obliged to say that if I am not a member of what might be called the full employment school, neither am I a member of what might be termed the Giddy school, though I have to admit that so far the latter appears to be one up on the former, especially as Mr. Giddy goes on to warn us that "we had not yet found the solution of our most immediate domestic problem, which expresses itself in the shortage of many essential requirements, with, at the same time, almost an obstinate unwillingness seriously and determinedly to set about producing them."

I take this to be partly a knock at Mr. Beasley, who, as I pointed out in my last notes on the "Strange Beliefs of Australia," says Australia considers that the best thing to do when the need for making things becomes urgent is to import them.

But I feel I should point out that at last the Giddy school is able to celebrate a condition of production long awaited by it and allied schools, and it seems odd to hear it referred to as a domestic problem. For during all the time when a super-abundance of commodities could not be concealed, we had the domestic problem of unexampled financial poverty. And now the Giddy school is worried about the converse state of affairs.

**Bankers are always worried about something. Before the war they said there was too much unemployment AND too much production—and always a danger of too much money!**

I certainly think that the mouldy blighters who exhibit an "obstinate unwillingness seriously and determinedly to set about producing essential requirements" should be exposed.

Mr. Giddy can't mean the workers; they never concern themselves with anything but a job made by someone else.

Does he mean the job-makers, the people who go to banks for whacking great overdrafts after filling in official forms explaining how unnecessary and obstructive all commercial enterprise really is?

Well, perhaps he means the tax-mad bureaucratic Planners, who not only display the obstinate unwillingness referred to, but also hamper and discourage the others.

He doesn't say. Perhaps he doesn't know. Or, even more likely, perhaps he doesn't want anybody to know.

"If you've quite finished with that paper..." suggested Aunt Ella.

## A SOCIAL CREDIT M.P. ON RUSSIA'S RECORD

The following item appeared in "The Canadian Social Creditor," October 18, 1945:—

OTTAWA, Oct. 3. —(C.P.)—Rev. E. G. Hansell, Social Credit Member for the Alberta constituency of Macleod, asked yesterday in the Commons if Canada could co-operate with Russia on the basis of the Soviet Union's record within the last decade.

He broke Russia's record into the following points:

1. Russia provoked, directed and promoted civil war in Spain.
2. Russia, in 1939, concluded a non-aggression treaty with Germany, which enabled Hitler to launch his offensive.
3. Between September 1939, and June 1941, Russia supplied Germany with essential materials.
4. In September 1939, Russia committed an act of aggression against Poland, despite a treaty of non-aggression with that country.
5. Russia deported Poles to Russian concentration camps where the treatment was as bad as in German camps.
6. Following the partition of Poland, Russia committed acts of aggression against Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland.
7. In countries occupied by Russia the Russians were acting in ways that were not different from the way in which the Germans had acted.

"Can we co-operate with that?" asked Mr. Hansell.

# FULL EMPLOYMENT VERSUS FREEDOM IN AMERICA

Address by DR. VIRGIL JORDAN, President of National Industrial Conference Board, to  
Controllers' Institute of America, at St. Louis, Missouri, 11/5/45.

(Concluded from last issue.)

**Thus we arrive, by easy and familiar stages, at the final clauses of the full employment contract—the labour and management and investment clauses which cover the problem of getting the work done that may be needed to produce the groceries, gadgets or "social gains" for which the private and public income is to be spent.**

These provisions are mostly in fine print or invisible ink, legible to the naked eye only when the heat is turned on because the kind of contract we are talking about is for full employment, or full payrolls, and the political preamble makes no mention of production or work. It assumes that they are mostly superfluous synonyms or natural accompaniments of employment and payrolls. In fact, the sequence of events by which the spontaneous generation of prosperity is supposed to take place is that public plus private spending makes payrolls, which make employment, which terminates mysteriously and automatically, after a lapse of time and overtime, in the production of useful goods.

Most retail merchants, as well as government officials, seem to believe that prosperity is brought by the spending stork, but industrial management, like the midwife, has a more realistic view of the process. It knows—and this war drove the lesson home—that when government starts issuing to anybody unlimited claims to consume the product of other people's labour, and undertakes to redeem those claims, it has to provide the product, too. To do that, government has not only got to provide workers to produce the product, and manage and direct their work, but it also has to supply their tools; and that means that it must make them produce at least something more than they are permitted to consume with the money it gives them.

The difficulty of getting enough real work done, and getting enough tools built to do it with, in order to make good the claims to consume which government issues, is the ultimate dilemma that drives the Welfare State either to repudiation or to the labour camp, or both.

If we doubt the historical evidence on that, it would be easy enough to test the validity of the spending-expansion idea of prosperity and the idea of State Capitalism by having the Treasury send every individual a monthly cheque for \$100, which works out roughly at the desired national income of \$160,000,000,000. It would be interesting not only to see how many million jobs and how many man-hours we got for it, but also to hear the arguments that Marriner Eccles, Professor Hansen and Henry Wallace would make against it. Yet if anything they have been saying about the magic of consumer purchasing power in creating employment and production is true, there is no reason why it wouldn't work, except the simple fact that most people wouldn't, so long as they could buy anything with the money they got.

Any full employment or guaranteed income programme that begins with government as consumer or dispenser of spending money or purchasing power to the masses must move from the now familiar phases of forced consumption, forced saving and compulsory management—which we already have—to the final stage of forced labour, which is common to every country with total government in Europe and Asia, and has come close to us here in America during the war.

At the hands of the State, security and serfdom are ultimately and inevitably identical as economic facts, and the political forms in which they are dressed up are unimportant.

I said that forced labour was the final

## DECLINE OF SOIL'S FERTILITY

### Not Caused by Private Ownership

From "The Social Creditor," England, of December 8, 1945:—

"An outstanding instance of the steady perversion of public information by the Planner is the Empire-wide propaganda to suggest, or even in some cases to state as a fact, that the exhaustion of the soil is connected with private tenure of land.

"There is no connection whatever.

"Exhaustion of the soil is, more than to any other reason, due to systematic attacks on private tenure by taxation, by wheat speculation, and by other financial chicanery, which has made it imperative for the farmer to cut down his manure charges, and to crop land which ought to have been fallowed. For a time, this was checked by the landowner, but grinding taxation turned the chief interest of the landowner into relinquishing his land before its ownership ruined him.

"A second cause is the use of artificial chemical fertilisers.

"It will take many years to restore much English and Scottish land to health, after the 'mining' process to which it has been subjected by War Agricultural Committees under the name of 'good husbandry.' And almost identical Bills are adumbrated in Canada and this country to perpetuate bureaucratic control of agriculture!"

clause of the full employment contract, and it is perhaps enough; but it is not quite the last paragraph. Even in the labour camps of Russia or Germany men might think and talk, and thoughts and words may affect their own and other's work for the State which employs and supports them. So merely as a matter of good management and equipment, government has to see that they are provided with the proper ideas and the right words. Freedom of speech and thought are the final sacrifices to the Supreme State which are stipulated in the full employment programme, but by the time they are called for, they are rarely missed.

**So, I can sum up for you the written and unwritten conditions of the full employment contract, in these terms:**

The government will give you full employment and guarantee your income provided you will let it use your money as it pleases; if you will buy for your own use what it tells you, at the price it fixes, or let it do the buying for you; if you will save as much money as it says and let it invest it as it pleases; if you will work at whatever it says, when and where it says, and as much as it says for what it says you can be paid; and if you will hear, read and think what it tells you and keep your mouth shut. Beneath the elaborate and complex apparatus of fiscal and monetary policy, social insurance, price and wage fixing, rationing, conscription, and propaganda by which it is operated in the

## IMPRESSIONS OF A TRIP TO SYDNEY

### The Joys of Travelling on "Our" Railways

By "NAMRON."

**I met with such a lot of novel experiences before reaching this great city that perhaps I had better tell you just how I managed to get here from Melbourne in such interesting times.**

Not being a Socialist, I can scarcely say that "our" railways brought me here, although I do shoulder my portion of the debt, and I did pay £5 odd for the privilege of participating in the hopeless task of paying it off. In fact, I sort of over-subscribed, because after surviving a ten-hours' queue for a ticket almost one week previously I was still seat less for a greater part of the journey; in spite of the Melbourne "Herald's" claim that intending passengers were satisfied.

That press report showed how closely allied are the bureaucrats (1st class and no line-up) with the general scheme of things. The weather was hot and the journey long, as long as I care to remember. As far as I could gather after repeated visits to the dining-saloon and deliberately unanswered questions put to "officials," NO refreshments were being served owing to shortage of staff; it was a "skeleton" staff, so my fellow-passengers and I were "stiff" (railways dialect) albeit "skeletons" in the first stages—that is, to Albury. Mind you, those passengers "in the know" had "phoned" their dining-room bookings the day before.

The rest of us, presumably, were expected to take in refreshments like the engine did, before leaving.

I soon got to grips with the railways lingo, though. For instance, I'd heard that 2nd class passengers "got a good run for their money." That simply means that, at stopping places, whilst these under-dogs rush from the forward end of the train back to where the railway station's refreshment rooms are to be found (if any) the whistle blows (on one occasion it blew without a warning bell beforehand), and everybody "does the 440" back to his or her seat. It's quite a thrill to beat the "Spirit of Progress" by a few inches—unless one spills one's cardboard carton of tea into the lap of a lady whose needs one's chivalry has responded to.

My fellow-passengers were a good crowd, agreeable with one another—especially in denunciation of the post-war "social services."

Were the choice theirs, I believe the majority would be returning by boat or 'plane (both of which services are provided by private enterprises). In the former case to save temper; in the latter to save time and temper. At one stop my companions and I tried to buy some fruit; failing in that, we asked where cigarette papers could be obtained, and were told, "Just around the corner at the paper-stall." On reaching this, we found it closed and barred! The man in the corner with the New Year resolution "not to smoke" smiled a V-Day broadside and we sneaked into our niche; again. However, we reached Albury and we got a drink.

I haven't yet found out whether it was tea or coffee!

The amenities between the border and Moss Vale were practically nil, but we had a lot of fun looking for them and it did

modern State, the compulsory collective economy, which this contract calls for to replace the voluntary competitive economy, is a simple and primitive bargain. It means merely that if most men in any community expect or compel a master—man or government—to promise to employ, support or protect them as a matter of legal or political right, they must obey that master, do what work he makes them, live and move where he tells them; eat, wear and buy what he tells them; save what he tells them; and ultimately believe and say what he tells them. Even if they do all of that, in the end their master can guarantee support and security to them only if some of them are able and willing to produce by their work somewhat more than the master permits them to consume for themselves. And since those who are able to produce more than they consume won't keep on working forever to support the rest, the standard of living must ultimately descend to the subsistence level unless the community can beg, borrow or steal enough wealth and labour from some outside source to keep up the show.

**This is what has been happening in Europe and Russia in the past five years, and it will begin to happen in England and America if they follow the road laid down in the Full Employment Bill and the Beveridge programme.**

So, when we are told today that we must choose between full employment by this road or dictatorship and serfdom, I say you will get both and must take both, for both are stipulated in the bond of this bargain with compulsory collectivism. And if you ask me what we should do instead, I say that anything or nothing would be better than that. The colossal structure of international Statism that has been erected as a monument to the dogma of unlimited government during the past decade is already collapsing into a rubble of bankruptcy and a brutal struggle for power, and we have nothing to hope from it by way of peace or prosperity. Whatever the rest of the world may decide to do, let us in America make a stand for freedom here at home, and pay the price. It will be worth whatever it costs, and this may be our last chance to get it.

## Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

**The Australian "capitalist" press is doing little or nothing to inform the Australian people of the revolution taking place in Great Britain under the Socialists.**

It is obvious that the British people are living under a tyranny which daily grows worse.

Mr. Attlee has said: "We do not intend to be left behind in any revolution" (vide House of Commons "Official Report," October 9, 1945).

A recent editorial in the English "Sunday Times" would appear to sum up the general situation: "... The impression is conveyed that these projects are but part of a much larger and, indeed, revolutionary plan. . . . It is evident that the Government is impatient of the normal checks and balances of our constitutional process. Parliamentary procedure, we are told, is too slow. Might not the thought also be present that it is too public? . . . Some years ago Sir Stafford Cripps declared, in a book which had the blessing of Mr. Attlee, that, on achieving power a Socialist Government should at once pass an enabling Bill the central purpose of which would be to endow the Executive with wide legislative powers. The proposal was so alien to our constitutional forms that it was scarcely taken seriously. . . ."

**Here in Australia it is obviously intended that we shall have introduced the same complete totalitarian system now being rapidly introduced in Great Britain.**

But fortunately we have, as yet, our Constitution. Thus the determined and unscrupulous attempt to have it destroyed. It is an obstacle to complete tyranny.

The basic issue confronting us goes far beyond the vague talk about "money reform." We are face to face with the Totalitarian State, the concentration of all political and economic power in a few hands.

The Federal Government is merely a front for the vast bureaucracy now running this country. Unless the stranglehold of the Canberra bureaucracy can be loosened, neither "money reform" nor any other type of reform will be of much use.

\* \* \* \* \*

**It is essential to clearly grasp the fact that the controllers of the banking system regard it merely as an instrument of government.**

The administrators of the system—bank managers and bank staffs generally—would be horrified if they knew the ultimate policies of those controlling the system, and the manner in which they are being used to further these policies.

When the Socialist banking legislation was introduced at Canberra last year, the writer of these notes pointed out that the real purpose of the legislation was to control production by a much more rigid and centralised control of credit policy.

It is not without significance that the Socialist legislation to nationalise the Bank of England makes provision in Clause 4 for the nationalised Bank of England to give directions to every other bank in Great Britain on any subject and to require any information.

In Canada the Socialists in the Federal House are now urging the use of the "national credit"—but for the socialisation of industry.

Social creditors cannot entertain the dangerous idea that anyone who wants to make any alterations to the money system is therefore an advocate of liberty for the individual. Remember the late Adolf Hitler!

\* \* \* \* \*

**The following statement by the Right Rev. Mgr. Fulton Sheen, of U.S.A., is worthy of careful consideration:**

"Once the Government puts a chicken in every pot it will not be long before it puts a finger in every pie. As Molotov once said, 'Bread is a political weapon.' This means no bread unless people think the way the State wants them to think. The first temptation of Satan to Our Lord on the Mount was precisely that. . . . Too much reliance on the State can be dangerous. State services, which are made available in emergencies, can become the normal mode of society. The result would be the invasion of the area of personal choice by a central bureaucracy. When the State becomes the nurse, the citizen loses his liberty."

Debt-free, interest-free, or any other type of money is of no use unless the individual can spend his share of it on those things he desires. If "the State"—i.e., the bureaucracy—is going to introduce "full employment" to produce non-consumable goods, then we will all be slaves. Some "money reformers" still don't see this important point. —E.D.B.

## SPREAD STORY OF ALBERTA

Mr. D. McInnes, of Coburg, Melbourne, is to be congratulated on his initiative in getting an article, "Progress in Alberta," published in the Coburg and other local papers. We recommend this line of action to all social creditors who are desirous of making more widely known the story of Alberta. The Albertan experiment is news, and many editors of local papers will be only too pleased to publish material dealing with it.

## SPANISH REDS HELPED NAZIS

From "The Social Creditor," England, of December 8, 1945:—

"The Spanish Republican (i.e., Communist) prisoners who have been interned in this country were captured in German uniforms, fighting against France and Great Britain. Now laugh that off."

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Collinton-road, Hartwell for the New Times Melbourne.