

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

VOLUME 15, No. 42.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1949

SIXPENCE WEEKLY

## The Plot to Destroy the Empire

By Eric D. Butler

**The present tragic plight of the British Empire is either the result of a series of events which were "inevitable" and for which no individuals can be held responsible, or it has been deliberately produced by powerful groups determined to destroy the British Empire and British prestige as a necessary preliminary to the creation of a World Monopoly State. Those superior people who do not believe that there is a long-range plot against the British Empire must, of course, dismiss the late Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin as figures of perverted imaginations.**

If it is explained that the Hitlers, Stalins and other political gangsters are the result of "blind chance" or "bad luck," it is clear that there is nothing for the individual to do but hope that "luck" will be kind to him. But the events of this century have been so consistently disastrous that the ordinary individual of British stock must, in spite of the scoffing of the superior people, be excused if he starts to ask whether it is not highly probable that events which have been so disastrous for his own interests have been deliberately produced.

In order to understand how, over a period of a mere 35 years, the British Empire has been reduced to its present state, the following brief outline of events since the outbreak of the first World War in 1914 must be carefully considered:

### ***Influence of German Jews***

The first World War was the result of policies pursued by a Germany highly centralised under the domination of the German Great General Staff, the German-Jewish banks, and other powerful groups. During the early years of the war, the first British Ambassador to the U.S.A., Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, claimed that the American Government was under the domination of the German-Jewish financiers of Wall Street, who, because of their close association with their fellow-financiers in Germany, were working for a German victory.

The Russian Revolution of 1917, which resulted in Russian withdrawal from the war, was directly financed by the Wall Street German-Jewish financiers in association with their friends in Germany. The Allied Military position was so desperate by 1917 that the British Government agreed to support the Zionist claim for the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine, and the disastrous conditions attached to an "American" loan arranged by the then British Ambassador in Washington, Rufus Isaacs, later Lord Reading.

America then entered the war on the Allied side.

### ***Chamberlain, Unscrupulous Attacks***

The late Lloyd George and others have claimed that the Peace Conferences were dominated by the German-Jewish financiers, who insisted, amongst other things, that the Finnish and French demands that Germany be decentralised, be ignored. A highly centralised Germany was responsible for Hitler and the Second World War. Having worked persistently for years against British rearmament, the Socialists and Communists everywhere joined in the unscrupulous campaign against Chamberlain because he refused to take an unprepared Great Britain into war at the time of Munich. The most bitter attacks upon Chamberlain came from the U.S.A., where the Roosevelt Socialist New Deal Government was dominated by the Zionist financiers, who were agitating for Great Britain to declare war.

After the Second World War started, with the active assistance of Stalin, American neutrality was maintained until all British overseas assets had been acquired at bargain prices. When the U.S.A. was finally forced into the war, as was Soviet Russia, Lend-Lease, with its secret clauses directed against British interests, was instigated.

### ***Roosevelt, a Pawn***

At every War-time Conference between Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin, Roosevelt, a pawn in the hands of his "advisers," joined with Stalin in opposing Churchill. On one occasion, Churchill complained to Roosevelt that he thought he was trying to liquidate the British Empire. Secret arrangements made at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam were all designed to ensure that Soviet Russia dominated Eastern Europe and Asia when the war finished. It is now admitted that the policy of "unconditional surrender" prolonged the war unnecessarily in both Europe and the

Pacific. Mr. Churchill has recently explained in the House of Commons that this disastrous policy was imposed upon him by President Roosevelt.

In 1945 the British Socialists were elected to office with active Zionist support. Lord Rothschild leads the British Socialists in the House of Lords. Sir Stafford Cripps and his associates immediately went ahead with their policy of "liquidating" the British Empire. They capitulated to the Zionist demands that they get out of Palestine.

The sudden, unannounced, termination of Lease-Lend in 1945 was the prelude to

(Continued on page 2)

### **OUR POLICY**

1. The preservation of Australia's sovereignty as a part of the British Empire, and the exposure of all internal and external groups which attack that sovereignty.
2. The preservation and extension of genuine local government.
3. The preservation and strengthening of all Constitutional safeguards for the purpose of protecting fundamental individual rights.
4. The encouragement of all activities designed to bring Governments under more effective control by the electors.
5. The preservation and extension of genuine free, competitive enterprise and private ownership, and opposition to all Monopoly, whether it be "private" or State.
6. The support of a financial policy which will (a) permit free enterprise to make available to all individuals an increasing standard of living and greater leisure for cultural pursuits; (b) result in no further increase in the community's indebtedness and the sound business practice of gradually reducing existing debt.
7. Recognising that the basis of any sound economy is agriculture, the encouragement of agricultural policies which will ensure the preservation and building up of soil fertility by organic farming and gardening; and the prevention of soil erosion and the protection of forests and watersheds.

-----  
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.*

## PLOT TO DESTROY BRITISH EMPIRE

(Continued from page 1)

the first post-war dollar loan from the U.S.A., and the rigid terms attached to this loan. One of the terms was that the British Government had to accept "Bretton Woods." In spite of post-war dollar loans from the U.S.A., the "dollar crisis" continued to get progressively worse, with more and more regimentation in Great Britain in order to meet the "crisis."

### Devaluation

And then for some time there was an inspired campaign from Wall Street in favour of devaluation. As has been explained in this journal recently, devaluation simply means that the British people must export more in order to earn the same number of dollars that they earned before devaluation. And the dollars earned will buy less than previously. This means greater production by the British people with less benefit to themselves. Further inflation and the consequent results of inflation indicate even more regimentation.

Just prior to the announcement of devaluation, it was agreed in Washington that one of the solutions of the "dollar crisis" must be the "stimulation of American investment in the Colonial Empire." This means that the German-Jewish financiers, who have backed Socialism as one of their major instruments to obtain world domination, are to be assisted to take over the Colonial assets of the British Empire. Devaluation will enable them to obtain the assets at the reduced price.

The real meaning of the recent Washington "Agreement" and devaluation is that the brokers are moving in to take over the entire assets of the British Empire. Nationalisation of the assets makes the task much easier. Should the British people show any signs of revolt, there is always the threat of Soviet Russia, carefully provided by the world power-lusters, to ensure that they do as they are told.

### A "Show Down" Needed

The above events, and many others, indicate that the troubles of the British Empire will not be overcome until there is a complete "showdown" with those responsible for our present plight. Such a "showdown" must also include the Socialist traitors who have played such an active role in helping to "liquidate" an Empire, which, at the beginning of this century, was generally moving in the direction of life of genuine independence and stability for all its members.

A strong and independent British Empire, determined to pursue its own policies irrespective of pressure from Moscow or Wall Street, could save the world from the tyranny, which threatens today. This is a matter, which should be receiving the urgent attention of all those who believe that the British way of life is worth defending to the last.

## TO THE POINT

### Facing Both Ways

Speaking at Canberra on October 4, Dr. H. V. Evatt, in an answer to a specially-prepared question by Labour Member Duthie, said that the Commonwealth Parliament has no power, without a referendum of the people, to nationalise the coal, shipping, iron and steel or farming industries of Australia.

Dr. Evatt went on to say that it was very misleading for various organisations brought into being to protect the Federal Constitution, to tell the people that the Commonwealth Government has the power to nationalise all industry. The Federal Constitution certainly does limit the power of the Commonwealth to nationalise industries, but the same Dr. Evatt who stresses this point is the very man who has played a leading role in attempting to have the powers of the Commonwealth increased.

As an ardent internationalist, Dr. Evatt is no doubt aware of the famous statement by another internationalist, who said, "We are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands." While trying to placate an aroused electorate by saying that the Federal Constitution prevents nationalisation, Dr. Evatt and his associates explore every avenue for overcoming this constitutional barrier to serfdom.

### Now! Now! Mr. Chifley'

Mr. Chifley is reported as having said in an address to the Federal Executive of the A.L.P. on October 5 "It is *not* the objective of the Labour Party to go around socialising everything, but to do things for the good of the people."

Does this statement mean that socialisation is not for the good of the people?"

### According to Plan

Columnist Walter Lippman said he believes the dollar crisis will compel the British Government to reduce to vanishing point their contribution in our former Asiatic Empire.

"America will have to take over responsibility for its financial needs—particularly those of India," he says.

"When this happens, the British protected market in that part of the world will be opened to American and world competition.

"This will compel a deep readjustment, probably accompanied for the time by some unemployment in Britain. But Britain will be relieved of a burden she cannot carry, and she will be deprived of a protection, which renders her industry competitive.

"Then, with American aid continued for some years beyond 1952, she may be in a position where her currency at a new rate of exchange can be appointed by the U.S.A. and made convertible for current trade." —*The Evening Standard*, London Sept. 13, 1949.

### Devaluation, Early Results

Reports coming to hand from Great Britain emphasise the fact that devaluation means further disasters for the great majority of the British people. An increase in income tax and an extension

of manpower control are mooted, while it also suggested that the five-day week may have to be abolished. Mr. J. Jones, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Supply, and formerly a steel smelter, has claimed that he would be prepared to put up a case "for a temporary stopping of the five-day working week until more normal times returned."

How these Socialists look after the interests of the workers!

### Shall Parliament Survive

Christopher Hollis, author and publisher, sits in the British House of Commons, a promising young Conservative. In a striking book he wonders: *Shall Parliament Survive?*

With the State attempting to control all of national life, bills are so numerous and so technical that the individual member cannot form an individual opinion. Nor dare he take an individual stand, as the Party will punish him by naming a more docile candidate for his seat, and the member nowadays, especially in the Labour Party, is dependent upon his job both for income and social status.

Hollis' description of the political regime as it is cuts through the twaddle of textbooks on Constitutional Law. The Cabinet, spearhead of the victorious party, is not bothered by the House of Commons, where the subordinate officers of the party stolidly support all the measures introduced by the Administration. These measures are such as seem desirable to the small Party aristocracy, and/or are deemed necessary or acceptable by the permanent State officials, as an Administrative aristocracy. Meaningful and decisive discussions are carried on in the inner councils, of the Party, in the Cabinet, and among the Government department and public boards. These last are perhaps the most important: they are kept secret from the public, and the press is held to be highly indiscrete if it brings to light the views and arguments expressed by the various department planners.

Bertand de Jouvenal, in *European Supplement to Human Events*, July 20, 1949.

All of which refers with equal force to the Canberra totalitarians. It would be instructive to have the views of the Liberals concerning the above comment.

### Liberals Stand Up

Frankly, I am amazed that a party which is so strongly opposed to the nationalisation of banking, or of anything else, seems to have no objection to the nationalisation of education, because, in effect, that is what there is in Victoria and throughout Australia, unfortunately. So far one section of the community has strongly resisted the nationalisation of education, but with the increased expenditure, improved standards being insisted upon by the State, higher wages to teachers, and improved buildings, it is becoming more and more impossible for that section to continue its resistance. Those parents desire their children to be educated in a certain way, whether at one type

(Continued on page 3)

# Campaign Against Petrol Rationing Grows

Several weeks ago the Victorian League of Rights issued a special brochure entitled "Petrol Rationing Exposed." Already tens of thousands of these brochures have been distributed in all parts of Australia, and the League of Rights reports that the demand for them continues to grow.

An outstanding feature of the growing campaign against petrol rationing has been the action sponsored by Mr. M. J. Rose, Garage Proprietor, Newcastle, N.S.W., and a group of associates. Upon receiving

copies of "Petrol Rationing Exposed", Mr. Rose and his associates immediately circularised as many garages as possible within a radius of 100 miles of Newcastle. Apart from the brochure, they also forwarded the following Instruction Sheet:

## TO THE POINT

(Continued from page 2)

of denominational school or another, but financial pressure on the part of all Governments in Australia has resulted in the nationalization of education. Does the Government consider that it is all right for the State to take control of the mind of a child in a State school but at the same time say that it is not right that the Government should take charge of banking institutions? One of the first things that the Government should do to assist those who are resisting the development of a totalitarian State is to ensure to them freedom in education, and to relieve them of the crushing financial burden placed upon them in the implementation of the State's nationalized education system.—Mr. S. Keon, Labour M.L.A., in Victorian Parliament on August 31, 1949.

### Liberal-Socialism

Criticising the policies of his own Party in the Victorian Parliament on August 31, Mr. F. L. Edmunds, Liberal, said:

"The Minister of Housing, as one might say, wipes me off as a person out of touch with the truth. Without seeking to deal in these well-worn terms of slanderous interchange all I wish to say is that the chief statements on which the Minister of Housing represents me as being astray from the truth were made by him. About twelve months ago in the presence of some hundreds of builders in Melbourne undertaken by the Housing Commission, he stated publicly that twenty large building firms in Victoria did 50 percent of all building construction. That is the statement on which I based my allegation, which I repeat, that the Housing Commission is more like a private monopoly of big builders cloaked with public authority and fattening on public money. I make that statement as a result of research. It is shared by some thousands of small builders who, in some cases, have been almost driven out of business by these men who grew fat on Federal war contracts.

In my opinion this is not only a public scandal but unworthy of Liberal government and entirely contrary to our policy of protecting the public interest . . .

"The development of the Housing Commission affords a glaring example of the growth of Socialism with Liberal Party patronage."

In the same address, Mr. Edmunds offered some pertinent criticism of present financial policies.

## What You Must Do Make The FIGHT AGAINST PETROL RATIONING Australia-Wide

- (1) Read the pamphlet "Petrol Rationing Exposed" carefully.
- (2) Write a personal letter to your Federal member at Parliament House, Canberra, A.C.T., requesting him, in your interests to bring pressure to bear on the Government to MAKE AVAILABLE SUFFICIENT PETROL without the necessity of rationing. Tell him firmly that such action is necessary to win YOUR support at the December elections.
- (3) Write to Mr. Chifley informing him that if he does not make sufficient petrol available without rationing, you will do your best to replace him and his party at the December elections.
- (4) Send on a copy of the pamphlet to people in other parts of the Commonwealth and ask them to extend the campaign as widely as possible.
- (5) Send to the publishers for more pamphlets and distribute them as widely as possible.

In this way traders, retailers, consumers and all concerned with the petrol crisis can unite their pressure in overwhelming force against the Government's restriction plan.

### IT'S YOUR FIGHT! CARRY ON!

We strongly recommend to all our readers the action initiated by Mr. Rose and his associates. A determined campaign, particularly in "border-line" electorates, would, in view of the proximity of the Federal Elections, have a marked effect upon sitting Members.

Readers who desire to further a most important campaign against totalitarianism can obtain supplies of the brochure, "Petrol Rationing Exposed," and Instruction Sheets by writing to the Organising Secretary, the Victorian League of Rights, Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne.

## Encouraging

The October issue of *Industrial Victoria*, the official publication of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, has an excellent editorial review of Douglas Reed's book, *From Smoke to Smother*.

It also quotes approvingly *New Times* comment on the progressive depreciation of the pound sterling.

## Falstein Future

In spite of ardent and eloquent support from Evatt and Calwell, Max ("Votches") Falstein failed to gain re-endorsement as the Labour candidate for Watson. This must have been a great disappointment to more people than Maxie Falstein. You see Max was being groomed for great things — Australia's first Minister to Israel for instance. As the shrewd political observer, Frank Browne, remarked: "There is no question that the appointment would be popular in local Jewish circles, which might weigh fairly heavily in the long run with the Government, as it might help Party funds, and at the same time silence Maxie."

So Max is going to try now as an "Independent." What's wrong with that? They made "Independent" Wilson Governor of Norfolk Island and "Independent" Coles Director of T.A.A., didn't they? —J.W.

## Communist Israel

Of Palestine: "It is an amusing thought. The United States are spending huge sums to combat Communism. The Jewish kibbutzim are the nearest approach to practical Communism the world has yet seen—and most of them were founded on American money." —*Mediterranean Background*, by Bernard Newman.

No doubt the Olympic Gods will join with Mr. Newman in his amusement, but we as ordinary mortals concerned with the possible results of this "American" policy are far from amused.

The establishment of this Communist State, backed by the tremendous power of international Jewry, in the heart of the strategically important Middle East is fraught with the gravest danger to the peace and well being of all of us.

## Untrue

Since price control and the payment of subsidies have been abandoned in most instances here in Australia, as the result of the votes of the majority of the people at the referendum taken on May 29, 1948, and in America as the result of Government action in 1947, the purchasing power of wages and salaries has continued to be reduced in both countries mainly by increasing prices or inflation. —Senator Don Cameron in the *Labor Call*, Oct 7.

The above is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts in regard to this country, and Senator Cameron knows it. The referendum on May 29, 1948, was held to decide whether the Federal or State Government should control prices, not to abolish price control or subsidies. Mr. Cameron's Government deliberately removed subsidies from most goods to embarrass the State "Governments. At the moment his Government is perverting the subsidy idea to maintain unnecessary rationing of butter and tea.

For the Senator's information, increasing prices and inflation are the same thing for which his Government, with absolute control of finance, is entirely responsible.

# THE NEW TIMES

Established 1935

Published every Friday by New Times Limited, McEwan House,  
343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Postal Address: Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834,

VOL. 15

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1949.

No. 42.

---

## *The Real Socialist Menace*

*Recent Gallup Poll figures indicate that, if the Chifley Government is defeated at the Federal Elections, this result will be due largely to the fact that the Socialisation policy of the Labour Party does not commend itself to the Australian people. If the Chifley Government does win the Federal Elections, this victory will be the result of the Party "line" now being vigorously followed by Mr. Chifley, Dr. Evatt and others. The new Party "line" is that the Labour Party is not supporting a policy of complete Socialisation; that it only believes in the nationalisation of monopolies, which can be described as "public utilities."*

*Now, every realistic political observer knows that a vote for Mr. Chifley's modified version of Socialism will result eventually in policies of complete Socialisation. The basic feature of Socialism is the centralisation of all power — political, economic, and financial — into one set of hands. Once a policy of centralisation is given impetus, it gradually gathers momentum and leads to results, which even the initiators of the policy may find very different to those they expected. It is therefore clear that, irrespective of what Mr. Chifley and Dr. Evatt say about Socialism and the restriction of Commonwealth powers by the Federal Constitution, a vote for the Chifley Government is a mandate for this Government and its "advisers" to continue centralising power by the extension of the enormous powers which the Commonwealth already possesses. Uniform Taxation, Social Services, and the 1945 Banking Legislation are three major instruments which can be used to by-pass the Federal Constitution, to destroy the States and local governing bodies, and to bring all aspects of the individual's life under more and more centralised control.*

*But, will a vote for the non-Labour Parties at the Federal Elections automatically result in a defeat of the Socialist policy of centralising power? Is there any evidence to suggest that the non-Labour Parties, if successful on December 10, will immediately start to decentralise power? The non-Labour Parties have been so active in attempting to brand Mr. Chifley and his associates as full-blooded Socialists, that many people have overlooked the obvious fact that far too many of the non-Labour leaders support the very policies of centralisation — Socialism — being pursued by Mr. Chifley. And, like Mr. Chifley, they contend that they only favour a degree of centralisation. Men like Mr. R. G. Casey have made it clear that they also believe in the nationalisation of "public utilities." They favour the continuation of Uniform Taxation, which is undoubtedly the greatest menace to the sovereignty of the States. And last, but not least, they infer that they favour reduced taxation while at the same time attempting to compete with the Labour-Socialists by offering more Social Services — for example, child endowment for the first child — which can only result in increased taxation, not less.*

*It is obvious, therefore, that the mere act of voting against the Chifley Government on December 10 will not defeat Socialism. But we believe that the election of a non-Labour Government by a small majority will result in a more favourable situation for an extension of the anti-Socialist campaign.*

## More Government By Regulation

Part and parcel of the totalitarian policy of the Federal Government to endow itself with far-reaching powers without reference either to Parliament or the people are regulations that have been made under the Supply and Development Act. Under them the Minister for Supply and Development is empowered to acquire by compulsion, property, equipment, plant or anything that "he considers necessary for production of war material,"

Further, the Minister is empowered to make contracts, require any person to deliver any goods to the Commonwealth, grant financial assistance to individuals, decide who are required to advance defence research, or "enter and remain in any lands or premises or do any other act, matter or thing concerned with defence, supply or development. Under these far-reaching regulations it would be possible for the Government to label one of its pet Socialist schemes (e.g. Snowy River Project) a "defence work" and immediately proceed to compulsorily acquire from private concerns or individuals any property or equipment it required. The Opposition is, we understand, proposing to challenge these powers in Parliament. That is not enough, what is wanted is a clear undertaking that if elected to office at the next elections it will toss the whole lot out.

---

## Identical Policies

Mr. Chifley said: "What the Labor Party has said, and what I have said on behalf of the party, is that if there is some great public utility which is not serving the best interests of the community, and which has not been properly managed in their interests, or is exploiting the public it should be the subject of nationalisation, socialisation, or whatever you call it."

Mr. Chifley gave two instances of anti-Labor Governments nationalising public utilities in the interests of the community.

There were: —

\* South Australian Premier Playford's nationalisation of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company.

\* Victoria's nationalisation of the State's electricity system.

He forgot to mention that the Bruce-Page anti-Labor Government nationalised the A class radio stations.

—*The Labor Call*, Oct. 7.

Both the Labor-Socialists and the Liberal-Socialists apparently believe that the way to deal with the monopoly is to create a super-monopoly backed by all the sanctions of the State. If any gentlemen in either party can point to any State monopoly which is not exploiting the public we will be pleased to hear of it.

The important point to be taken from the above is that, despite all the propaganda to the contrary, we, the electors, are only being presented with variants on the same theme — centralisation.

---

Printed by W. and J. Barr 105-7 Brunswick Street, Fitzroy. N.6. for New Times, Ltd., McEwan House, Melbourne, on whose authority these articles appear.



# The Bacon Brings it Home

By FOOTLE.

**Broadcast item; National station, Friday, Sept. 27, 1949: "The bacon ration in Britain has been increased to four ounces owing to lack of refrigeration space."**

**It is hard to say how such an item of news became air-borne, for I doubt if it has been generally understood that the refrigerator is the appointed destination of the slaughtered pig. As a matter of fact, only this week a newly arrived Englishman was telling me, with a mystified contortion of the eyebrows, that where he came from, pigs were as plentiful as rabbits, but that the new generation knew pork chops only by hearsay.**

Strange we didn't grasp ere this what happened to the pig that went to market; we had plenty to remind us. We've been doing the same thing with gold for decades, but it just happens that no one ever wants any gold, so we don't hear anything about it except when some solemn blokes gather round the crystal and declare that it is worth a certain amount, though in the absence of popular demand—what with gold teeth being out of fashion—it is difficult to see how the conclusion is arrived at.

It is only because meat is edible—a good deal of it anyway—that we are brought into collision with scientific disposal. People don't understand economics anyway; they get it fixed in their minds that food is meant to be eaten and they simply can't conceive of any other use for it. Before the days of secret plenty, they may have permitted themselves to enjoy the spectacle of a dressed pig pretending to bite a lemon or of a whiting pretending to consume its own tail. But they knew all the time that that was by way of a joke. I don't think they will be so sure that this refrigeration business is a joke.

What I don't understand is how the refrigeration space came to be limited; the failure of the government to equip itself with the means of maintaining shortages in the midst of full employment appears to me a blunder worthy of a vote of "no confidence." Next thing we know, the English people will be getting all the bread they want for lack of silos.

Some of the people I've mentioned this bacon business to seem to think it extremely rummy; the others think I just made it up—which is rather decent of them but too flattering altogether: the credit for the wheeze belongs to someone in the Ministry of Over-production or whatever it is. I couldn't think of a thing like that all by myself, for I'm simply no good at all at economics. As a matter of fact I studied Adam Smith, Stuart Mill, Alfred Marshall, Jevons and a few others for years but none of them made any lasting impression. I still retained the patriarchal notion that the more you had of everything, the better off you were, which, of course, is quite contrary to "economics," which are mainly concerned with things called markets. Markets, as you know, simply can't stand lots and lots of things.

But I don't see why people should think this bacon business so rummy. Departments have to be consistent. What is good enough for gold, which goes straight into the vault, or machinery that goes into a stockpile, should be good enough for food. After all, the governments of the world are pledged to full employment and may now be said to control the ingredients of that—to them—desirable state. Their solution

is even better than the one I suggested ages ago of dumping all our produce out at sea in the interest of the market price, because that stock-pile wheeze keeps alive the spirit which made England great, Germany great, France great — practically everybody great, in fact. I mean, of course, the spirit of Mars.

It is possible, by careful management, to maintain a state of war by means of the stockpile, with the advantage of an almost total absence of casualties, except suicides. You can, at a pinch, bomb the stockpiles and food dumps out of existence, and start and build up all over again. That would make shortages permanent, price levels higher and higher. And everyone would be happy in consequence.

I would really like to be present at a ministerial conference on shortages — international for preference. But, of course, that is impossible. All I can do is to draw on my imagination. Still, everyone in ministerial circles is so keen on controls and shortages that it is easy to imagine the rivalry. I like to think of them all at an enormous banquet consisting almost entirely of shortage and to reconstruct in fancy the interchange of compliments or condolences as the case may be.

"That's a nice shortage you've got there, old chap — meat, I mean. I'm afraid we've nothing like that where I come from: in fact we've a most disgusting abundance. Of course, we've got a shortage of petrol going fairly well and we've even managed to keep butter on the ration; but, of course, we've nothing like you have over here. But *entre nous*, old chap, wasn't that a bit of a *faux pas* over the bacon — lack of refrigeration and all that? Bit unnecessary, what? I mean to say, if there's really a shortage of refrigerators, what about raiding the old stockpile, eh? Ought to find something there. Who's that speaking now? Premier of Nauru isn't it, shortage of phosphates there, I gather."

## Mr. Hollway and Monopoly

The Premier (Mr. Hollway) does not favor nationalisation of the bread industry as suggested by the secretary of the Trades Hall Council (Mr. J. V. Stout).

He said today that the Government objected to monopolies and this was what would happen if the industry were nationalised. — *The Herald, Melbourne*, Oct. 12

**Excellent, Mr. Hollway. Now, what about breaking up the transport monopoly, the electricity monopoly, the glass monopoly, the sugar monopoly, the Potato Board monopoly, the Egg Board monopoly, etc.?**

## THE SOCIAL SERVICE STATE IN ACTION

Mrs. G. A. Vasey, President of the Australian War Widows' Guild, is one of those rare persons in public life today who understands the principles of individual rights, has integrity and the courage of her convictions.

When she had occasion, in her official capacity, to interview the Minister for Repatriation, Mr. Barnard, for the first time, he told her that it would be wiser for her to agree with him in the future. When she enquired why she should be under such compulsion, he bluntly replied that he had the power.

The war widows are in a position to provide a grim warning of the Social Service State in action. They do not deal in pleasant theories. They are dealt with, in cold practice, by a power-drunk Minister, and his army of officials against whom there is no redress. The widows are, as Mrs. Vasey says, the toads under the harrow. If an official, after unchecked snooping, has "reason to believe" that a war widow is "undesirable" (term undefined in the Act) her pension can be cut off immediately. She has no legal comeback.

There is no full compensation for a man's life given freely in the service of his country, but the very least that can be done is that his family should be provided for *as an absolute and inalienable right*. No Minister, no bureaucrat, no authority whatsoever should have the power to take that away. It is a sad and grim commentary on the times that not one major political party can apparently see the tremendous implications of this issue. It is the dividing line between freedom and slavery, between a tolerable civilisation where individuals can control their own affairs and the all-powerful State where "the officials govern and the police keep order."

J.W.

## Boycott

While it was interesting to learn from Clive Turnbull last week that Elisabeth Schwarzkopf's recitals were boycotted by the Jewish people here, there seems very little common sense in his suggestion that impresarios should endeavour to provide the whole bang lot of us with artists who are only acceptable, politically or racially, to a minority of our population.

Speaking as a Britisher (Aryan, I am led to understand, though ancestry is a tricky question), and as an ex-member of the A.I.F., I must say that Mr. Turnbull's story opened many doors of memory.

Miss Schwarzkopf seems to be in goodly company, for only a short time ago the whole British Cabinet, and other people, prominently including Winston Churchill, were boycotted by the Jewish population throughout the world, and quite a bit of British gentile blood was shed as a result of that trouble-making boycott in Palestine. — JOHN C. SCARLETT (South Yarra). — *The Argus, Melbourne*, Oct. 5.

"New Times," October 21, 1949 — Page 5.



## Planning the Earth (VII)

By Geoffrey Dobbs

From *The Social Creditor*, Oct. 1.

In order to stress the importance of Dr. Dobb's essay, we are introducing it, this week, with an extract from a pamphlet issued by the Victorian Liberal Party, entitled, *A Plan for the Extension of the Electric Supply to Rural Areas*. The extract from page 2 reads follows: "While it is recognised that A CENTRAL BODY IS DESIRED TO CARRY OUT OVERALL PLANNING, the dangers of CENTRALISED ADMINISTRATION are all too evident in our Public Administration today. This was dealt with by David Lilienthal in a striking address entitled, *"Grass Roots Administration of Federal Functions..."*"

Democracy, then (brand Lilienthal), consists in the "DECENTRALISED ADMINISTRATION OF CENTRAL POLICIES" which in turn are decided upon by "the institution of politics," *i.e.*, by those who succeed in securing majority figures at an election. Let us pursue this idea a little further.

### *Democracy a la Lilienthal*

Let us suppose (if the idea is not too far fetched) that the central policy, supported by an over 90 percent vote of The People, involves the expropriation (for the Common Good, as defined by the Government) of all Jews, and the imprisonment and gassing of some of them. 'Democracy' will then consist in getting everybody to participate with a will, to feel Big and important, and use their brains and initiative in carrying it out. But perhaps my example is tactless. Let us suppose then that the central policy, supported by a 99.9 percent vote of The People, with brass bands, banners, cheers, songs and slogans, involves the expropriation of some other category of persons, say all farmers or peasants living in a certain area (according to the progress of the Plan for farm collectivism) who employ labour or have more than one cow or five chickens. Then, of course, Democracy (on the March) will consist in getting people to develop their individuality and initiative in carrying this out with zest and gusto. But doubtless this is unthinkable! So let us suppose (if the imagination does not boggle) that the central policy involves, among other things, a Plan for the dispossession and eviction from their homes and lands of, say, 56,000 people who live in certain valleys needed for flooding (for the Common Good, of course, and in case they might get flooded out, and to save the soil, and just incidentally, to get power for bombers and atomic bombs). Then, of course, Democracy (at the Grass Roots) consists in adopting the 'devices of management', which will 'bring the people in, and make them co-operate cheerfully.'

And that, as it happens, is precisely what Mr. Lilienthal says it is.

### *No Accountability*

As for the accountability for results, which is represented as one of the chief 'democratic' features of the autonomous (and totalitarian) Corporation, it is of a type with which we are now bitterly familiar in Great Britain, where redress for an injustice (e.g. overcharging on one's electricity bill) can be obtained only by organising a majority in Parliament, instead of, as formerly, by ringing up the local Company. The power companies, which the T.V.A. is putting out of business with its unlimited tax funds, are full of complaints that its accountability is of an unprecedented, and privileged, type. To begin with, it has complete freedom from federal taxation, and as regards local taxation is in the happy position of being able to assess its own "payments far short of the original claims of the local tax bodies," and above all it can 'allocate' whatever sums it thinks fit to various purposes such as flood control, navigation, education, and so forth. Its general 'accountability' consists in the submitting of lengthy reports and accounts to Congress, and being made the subject of debate, and investigation by Congressional Committees. One Committee sat for a year, and published a report of 7,500 printed pages, which few people can possibly have read—but let that pass. When it comes to legal liability we have already noted the P.E.P. remark that "The large funds known to be behind the T.V.A. . . . give it, however, an immensely strong bargaining position." There are also the 'real' results, such as the fact that in the drought year of 1942 the power companies had to come to the aid of T.V.A. with power from their steam plant; and there are the 'results' in the matter of flooding and dispossession, and 'atom' bombs and so forth which have been sufficiently noticed, and the poor results in respect of farm income and farm electrification, as compared with the other Southern States; but there is no accountability for this sort of result. What Lilien-

thal substitutes for genuine judgment by results, as exercised by responsible individuals, normally through the economic vote, is merely the success or otherwise of his Public Relations Department in inducing people to like what they are given. It would seem that the people have had very little choice in the matter; what with different books, pamphlets and articles, the special mobile library service, often supplying the only reading, the broadcasts, the schools, the adult education, and the special valley-wide, and nation-wide educational programmes to stimulate demand for whatever the T.V.A. has to sell; and above all the hope of jobs and a share in the seemingly inexhaustible flow of money. This is indeed management: management and control not so much at the grass roots as at the very roots of human will and intelligence.

### *A Critical Example*

Since it was the main fulcrum of the T.V.A.'s land programme, the methods used to create a demand for phosphatic fertilizer provide a critical example. It is well known that phosphate deficiency, in relation to the crops which have to be grown on agricultural soils, is so widespread as to be almost universal, and that this is notoriously acute and limiting on pasture lands which have to bear a heavy drain of phosphates in animal form. It is also apparent that this problem is too great to be solved, except locally and temporarily, by digging up the relatively few deposits of phosphate which are known to exist, and spreading them over the earth's surface.

The phosphate, and other minerals, is lost in two ways; as human food, and by leaching into the subsoil. They could be restored, together by such methods as suitable treatment of city sewage to provide an organic manure, by the introduction of deep-rooted forest into the agricultural rotation, and perhaps under suitable conditions by subsoiling. Such methods offer some hope of restoring the lost equilibrium; the supplying of one deficient mineral on a big scale in pure concentrated soluble form gives quick and spectacular results, and a virtual certainty of further disequilibrium.

The position in Tennessee, before the T.V.A., is described from the viewpoint of 'the fertilizer industry' in these terms: (p. 98): "In the past we have tried to get them to buy 'high-analysis' (*i.e.*, concentrated) fertilizer, but they don't want it; what they want is the *mixed* {my emphasis} and low-analysis fertilizer. And what the customer wants we must supply." Not so, however, the T.V.A., which concluded, "farmers could be persuaded to use concentrates." To do this it had to

(Continued on page 7)

## Planning the Earth

(Continued from page 6)

inaugurate its valley-wide and nation-wide educational programme, and to *demonstrate* by supplying superphosphate *free* to 'demonstration farms' the quick returns which can be obtained in this way. In return the farmer had to submit a new management plan for his farm, in writing, and so allow it to be used as a 'school-room' for his neighbours. As a result the sales of concentrated phosphate reached astonishing heights, which is regarded as a great achievement in unified Planning of resources; although on p. 98 we read that the "raw material — is exhaustible, and when exhausted is irreplaceable.

### Short Term or Long Term

Now you cannot 'demonstrate' anything but quick returns, lightning results, 'magic' cures; you cannot 'demonstrate' the results of long experience, or of real wisdom; because a demonstration is necessarily a set piece narrowly limited in time. Some quick returns are a valid indication of long-term results, but not many; and every wise father tries to educate his son not to judge by them, but to look further and deeper. *So here we have the process of education in reverse*, the farmer who prefers the more balanced and slower-acting fertilizer being conditioned to accept the quick acting 'concentrate' which is cheaper to transport, and conveniently uses electric power to produce. This is the process of learning by *object lessons* to which Mr. Lilienthal refers, in a less appropriate context, on page 179. We are not surprised at his familiarity with it.

Meanwhile, whatever may happen in another ten years' time, it is true that the soil needs, and responds to, phosphate, and in this, and in other ways, relating to soil conservation, the people have been permitted, under T.V.A., to do a certain amount towards arresting the decay of their uplands, which they were prevented from doing before by one thing only, the manipulation of finance. This point is more or less conceded by Lilienthal.

They knew, almost all of them, what they wanted. They knew that what was needed was to increase the productivity of their lands, to heal the gullies, to keep water on the land, and to prevent the soil from washing away.

The farm experts . . . had known most of the technical answers to the *separate* problems of soils, of fertilizer, of terracing, and had known them for a good many years. They were competent in their special fields, and devoted to their work. Nevertheless farm income in the valley, as in the whole Southeast, continued at a low ebb; in some counties the average cash income for a farm *family* was less than 150 dollars a year. Soil losses were appalling.

It is even claimed (p. 62) that these 'new' methods of farming have shown displaced people "how a better living could be made from the uplands than older methods had provided on the river-bottom farms from which they had moved."

The extraordinary thing is that this should be adduced *in favour* of what the T.V.A. has done; it shows the immense influence of false emphasis, repeated until it has a hypnotic effect, and ordinary

common sense is swamped. If this can be done to the uplands, with a small proportion of the funds found for T.V.A., what then could have been done for the valleys? It is so typical that under Planning the more fertile valley lands should be given to the fishes, and the less fertile uplands to the men displaced from them, and that we should then be invited to applaud "a thriving industry that in 1943 produced six million pounds of edible fish" (p. 23). "It all goes to show," as some wit remarked, "what God could do if He had money!"

### (VIII)

#### Credit and Faith

In the end, as it was in the beginning, it comes to be a matter of credit, that is confidence, or, to use a shorter word, faith; the credit that was not given to the people of the Tennessee Valley, but was given to the Tennessee Valley *Authority*; and the faith that did not, and did, underlie that credit. Only the very dimmest-witted comrades, the sort that actually think in terms of slogans, put into their mouths by cleverer people, imagine that they believe in the materialist interpretation of history—that is, the *initiative* in human affairs lies with the inorganic forces—and if they did with more than the surface of their rather shallow minds believe any such thing, they would at once stop trying to influence the course of events by shouting slogans, which are, after all, spiritual and non-material things.

Mr. Lilienthal's book, at any rate, is bursting with confidence; confidence in the Big Job of the Century, and in the people - all the people - from the Chairman downwards, who are carrying it out. People who visit Tennessee tend to come away sharing the same sort of confidence, and slightly dazed by the immense gleaming dams, the vast lakes, the wooded slopes, the new throbbing industries, the great 'Atomic City' (with the shadow of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and Bikini in the background); in short, immensely impressed by the great demonstration of Power. But whose Power? Not the people's Power (democracy). They can *participate* in producing it, but they have no *control* over it; that is the prerogative of their Managers, and among them, not the least, of Mr. Lilienthal in his new guise, and of his Bankers' Committee. For what he means by 'decentralisation' is that the central policy, the policy of himself and his fellow-Planners, shall be carried right down, by psychological and propagandist measures and the devices of management, until it is firmly embedded in every heart and mind; only then will it be safe from the challenge of unpredictable initiative. That, in fact, is *centralisation* carried to its logical and absolute limit.

There are two sorts of faith, and two sorts of confidence: the sort which is based on reality; and the sort which is merely a 'device of management' intended to inspire a like confidence — the confidence of the confidence trickster, the 'smart' salesman, and the 'successful' politician. This latter sort forms a cover for contempt for its victims, and pessimism as deep as Hell. A glance at the photograph of the author, which, rather rashly perhaps, forms the frontispiece of *T.V.A.—Democracy on the March*, taken in conjunction with the con-

tents of the book, and his history and affiliations, and present position, may assist the reader in coming to a judgment in the matter.

#### The Managerial Attitude

What, then, are we to make of the specific denials, at the end of the book, of any belief in the inherent wickedness of ordinary people, or the superiority of the managerial *elite*? The 'managerial' attitude declares itself from every page, verbal statements to the contrary notwithstanding, the belief in the inherent wickedness, or at least suicidal lunacy, of Man (other than Planners) is implicit in the imposition, by whatever means, of a centralised Plan, which is claimed to have a *moral* purpose (pp. 17, 189); for otherwise, why not give the billion dollars to the people of the Valley and leave them to do the planning each in his own proper sphere and property? Because that would never do! Any Planner, any socialist, any liberal, any conservative, any Progressive-minded person, almost any person of "education" nowadays will tell you that that would mean chaos, anarchy, *laissez-faire*, selfish interests would run riot, the law of the jungle would prevail and result in misery, devastation, destruction and catastrophe. The clichés mount up, but they all mean the same thing, that all natural private, individual, or even "sectional" or "parochial" interests and policies are "selfish" and, in their aggregate results fatal to the human race. At the time of writing, Sir Alexander Gray has been telling the Economics Section of the British Association at Newcastle that "If the new world into which we are moving is to work it will demand . . . in particular the suppression of self." . . . "And it is not I but Lenin who says so." And such statements from prominent people could be repeated a thousand-fold.

#### "Selfish"

Now it is nonsense to pretend that an attitude which demands the *suppression of self* (quite a different thing from "losing" the self, *i.e.*, forgetting it in its use) can deny the inherent wickedness of the self, that is, if the concepts of "good" and 'bad' are allowed to have any real relation to results. For if the belief were only in the *corruption* of a self inherently good though tainted with original sin, the course of action demanded would not be directed against the self, already sufficiently hard pressed, but against its Adversary, and the sources of its corruption which, in the modern world are becoming centralised. To pursue this far would take me beyond the scope of the subject; but it is interesting to remind ourselves that the very word "selfish" was, according to Archbishop Trench, new minted by the Puritan writers of the seventeenth century. Up to that time Christians had gone along on the injunction to love their neighbours as themselves. This becomes a little awkward to carry out when the self is "suppressed," but I suppose that when the self has reached the stage of being a statistical unit or an entry in various care indices, without "private" or "vested" interests of its own, the injunction may

(Continued on page 8)

## PLANNING THE EARTH

(Continued from page 7)

be fulfilled by showing an equally impersonal willingness to sacrifice oneself or one's neighbour to The Common Good.

On the other hand it is quite clear that this assumed wickedness of the self cannot apply to the Planners, or else their Plans might be condemned, as "selfish" and the whole idea of central Planning would fall to the ground. The idea that the managerial *elite* is of superior morality, as well as intelligence, to the selfish common man, is undeniably implicit in the whole mentality of central Planning; for to deny it would lead the Planners to the position of openly imposing their own "selfish" plans upon the world, a stage which is acknowledged only when power has become so habitually centralised that the opinions of the multitude become a matter of indifference to the rulers.

### Inversion

At present we have the obvious fact that, as always, any young man with an eye to the main chance, (*i.e.* a *suist*, or 'selfish' person) will be well advised to throw himself wholeheartedly on the side on which power, money and influence are to be obtained; and that side, it can scarcely be denied, is the side of the Planners and the Managers. On that side he can wield the word "selfish" against all who oppose him and his ideas, and if he does so with sufficient zeal and ability he may obtain a position of relative wealth, comfort and privilege in the community. Only in the unlikely event of his turning against central Planning, and giving up his chances of promotion, if nothing more, to pursue some deeper satisfaction, such as adherence to the truth may give, will he himself be accused of pursuing his "selfish" aims to the detriment of The Common Good. It is just one more case of inversion.

Another is implicit in the use of the word "Planning" itself. If by "planning" we mean the application of the mind to transforming the will into action—a process fundamental to the development of the human character, and to be found in simple form even in animals—then "Planning," in the modern sense, is the usurpation of this function by a few people by the use of power, and more especially, and most dangerously, the use of psychological power on minds in the mass, thus interfering with the development of character at its core. "Planning" therefore necessarily involves a disbelief in planning, and a reduction to a minimum of the application of the human will and intelligence to the world in which we live.

That it is able to masquerade as the opposite of this is due to the substitution of a widely diffused "pseudo-will," in fact the will of a few centrally placed persons, and the application of a widely diffused intelligence to it, for the genuine integrated action of mind and will in the individual. (Attempts to confuse this with the legitimate action of mind on mind and the diffusion of ideas by their own power, and without the use of extraneous force, must be resisted). The result, however, is not merely an immense reduction in the

amount of human will in operation (a sort of de-humanising of humanity) but a similar and devastating reduction in the amount and quality of intelligence. It is a matter of common experience that the agent of central policy is not in possession of his full powers, either of will or intelligence; indeed they are reduced in operation to a pitiful fraction of what he possesses as an individual, and often further diluted by diffusion within a collectivity, such as a committee. Consequently he will find himself acting in a way which is mentally deficient, and often sub-human, scarcely up to the standard of foresight and intelligence exhibited by the higher mammals, let alone the morality, which is the produce of integrated will and intelligence acting cumulatively over a long period.

Awareness of this leads to grave disturbance and discontent of mind in the persons concerned, a fact of which the Planners are well aware, and which they attempt to overcome by stimulating the pseudo-will to an inflated enthusiasm—so characteristic of totalitarian regimes in their early stages—which for a time effectively seals off the intelligence from the part affected, and enables the individual to co-operate with an appearance of innocent approval, in the most vicious and insane behaviour: *e.g.* taxing, dispossessing, evicting, restricting and frustrating the will and action of other people through the application of compulsion, or threats of compulsion, in every possible way. But the division of mind is only driven deeper to the unconscious level, where it can produce a neurosis tending towards Schizophrenia. The hope that this division of mind can be eliminated by the complete absorption of the individual will permanently and for the majority of mankind, into the central policy of a few men thus restoring peace, and an end to the necessity for compulsion, except against a minute "anti-social" minority, is an insane and wicked hope, impossible of fulfilment, but capable of the attainment of sufficient verisimilitude to lure us onwards into ever-increasing conflict and misery. However far we have gone, the only possible escape lies in the opposite direction, in the liberation and re-establishment of the policy and powers of the total individual.

(1) *English Past and Present*, Lecture II, Everyman Edition, 1936; p. 68. In a long footnote we read: "A passage from Hacket's *Life of Arch-bishop Williams*, Part II, p. 144, marks the first rise of the word, and the quarter from whence it arose: 'When they [the Presbyterians] saw that he was not *selfish* (it is a word of their own new mint), etc.' In Whitlock's *Zoootomia* (1654) there is another indication of it as a novelty, p. 364: 'If constancy may be tainted with this *selfishness* (to use our *new wordings* of old and general actings).—It is he who in his striking essay, *The Grand Schismatic, or Suist Anatomised*, puts forward his own words, 'suist,' and 'suicism,' in lieu of those which have ultimately been adopted."

We cannot help wondering how the course of history might have been affected if the Planners of the seventeenth century had not been allowed to provide their successors with this weapon of perversion in the word 'selfish,' and if Whitlock's far juster alternatives, with their suggestion acquired since from the still later word 'suicide,' of losing one's life through loving or saving it, had instead dominated the thinking on the subject.

(To be continued)

**Our Sham Democracy**  
AN OUTSTANDING BOOKLET  
By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.  
Price: 1/1d posted

## THE FARM EXCHANGE

(J. E. Harding & A. E. Webb)

If you should think of coming to Central Queensland to live, we shall be glad to advise upon, and assist you to find, Farming, Grazing, Business or House Property. We are Farm Specialists, both having had extensive practical farm experience. Write to us about your needs. Social Crediters will be very welcome. Central Queensland has much to commend it.

## THE FARM EXCHANGE

Real Estate Agents, Auctioneers, Valuers.

DEN HAM ST., ROCKHAMPTON, C.Q.

Phone 3768.

After Hours 3199 and 2161.

## "Free Medicine"

The recent decision of the High Court invalidating the Free Medicine Act, on the grounds that Section 7A of the Act was a form of civil conscription, once again demonstrates the importance of our Federal Constitution.

This decision is a serious blow to the Federal Government in its plans to coerce the doctors. Ironically enough, the decision was based on the Government's own amendment to Section 51, passed at the 1946 referendum.

We would like to be able to quote Dr. Evatt's innermost thoughts on this matter. Meanwhile we congratulate the doctors on their victory.

## CODNER BROS.

Builders and  
Joinery  
Manufacturers

HOMES AND  
HOME SITES  
AVAILABLE

Wheatsheaf Rd,  
GLENROY