

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOLUME 15, No. 47.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1949.

SIXPENCE WEEKLY

Centrally Planned Economy

Mr. Chifley's Policy

Mr. Chifley's statement that the Labour Party will not continue with Bank Nationalisation because it is unconstitutional, is not only designed to ensure that Labour does not lose votes at the Federal Elections, but also indicates that the Labour-Socialists are confident that they already possess adequate powers under the 1945 Banking Legislation to further their objective of the centrally-planned economy. We have persistently stressed the fact that the Labour-Socialists and the Canberra economic planners do not regard their banking legislation as an end in itself, but merely as a means to the end of central planning.

The major barrier to centralised planning in Australia is the Federal Constitution. This Constitution restricts the power of the Commonwealth Government and, therefore, the power of the Canberra economic planners. It specifically prevents the Commonwealth Government from directly nationalising industry. Mr. Chifley and some of his associates may be sincere when they say that they do not want to go around nationalising all industry. But they are only the public-relations officers for the totalitarian planners who have made it clear that they desire to control everything and everybody.

The Real Purpose

Anyone who doubts that the real purpose of 1945 Banking Legislation, which Mr. Chifley has bluntly said he is going to use to the utmost if re-elected, should note the following from clause 27 of the 1945 Banking Act:

"...the Commonwealth Bank may give direction as to the classes of purposes for which advances may or may not be made by banks and each bank shall comply with any direction given." This decentralised control of financial policy, which, unfortunately, Liberal and Country Party spokesmen have not specifically challenged, enables the controllers of the Commonwealth Bank to bypass the Federal Constitution and control production.

One of the Canberra economic planners, Professor Copland, developed this theme in an address to the Canberra branch of the Economic Society on April 4, 1949. Professor Copland frankly suggested planned control of production by "selective granting of credit by banks."

Direction of Labour

Centralised credit control will enable the planners to close down industries considered "uneconomic" and "unessential." Unemployed workers from these industries can then be directed to industries considered essential for the planned economy. Clause 45 of the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act ensures that

any worker refusing to be an economic conscript shall receive no benefits.

Policies Must Be Challenged

While we do not subscribe to the view that practically every member of the Labour Party is a conscientious villain seeking to impose serfdom, we consider it ridiculous to suggest that prominent Labour Ministers like Mr. Chifley, Dr. Evatt and others do not understand the intention of the legislation they have passed in the past and now seek to have endorsed by the electors at a Federal Election.

These men and their policies must be challenged. But even more important, it is essential for electors to understand that the drive to create the centrally planned eco-

Barefaced Untruths

What has done so much to undermine British morale has been the deliberate, bare faced untruths told to the public by Sir Stafford Cripps. Such behaviour in a Minister of the Crown (probably without parallel in history) will stand for all time as the most shameful commentary upon the present standard of public morality. On no less than nine important occasions since January 1948, has the Chancellor affirmed that under no circumstances would he lend himself to devaluation of the pound. In this outlook he persisted up to the very moment of his volte-face, pursuing what the once great Manchester Guardian curiously condones as his "Necessary Untruth." If an ability to tell lies is to be a qualification of a modern statesman, then the time has come to alter statecraft. In the present case, however, we would remind you that Sir Stafford Cripps, during his Sunday broadcast and since, went out of his way to suggest that there will be no general rise in prices. He knows perfectly well that such is not the case; in short, the nation cannot believe a word the man says.

-London Views and Tidings, Sept. 29.

onomy in all countries will eventually lead to the integration of all these centralised economies into one World Planned State. The powerful international groups working to this end are the real sponsors of the Socialist and Communist conspiracies. If this Federal Election can be used to expose these international power-lusters, it will serve a most useful purpose. These power-lusters will not be defeated until they have been thoroughly exposed. Our major policy is therefore, directed towards this important end. We appeal for active co-operation from all our readers in order to make our campaign of exposure successful.

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 extension of 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 like 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

TO THE POINT

Copland and Gibson

In giving evidence before the Victorian Commission investigating Communism, well known Victorian Communist intellectual, Ralph Gibson, said that back in 1931 Professor Copland had offered him a position as lecturer in economics at the Melbourne University. Although Gibson did not join the Communist Party until 1932, he has made it clear that he was tending towards a complete acceptance of Communism for some time prior to 1932. It is interesting to know that Professor Copland, himself a prominent advocate of the centralisation of power, thought sufficiently high of Gibson to offer him a position as lecturer, where he would have been able to influence the minds of many young people.

Communists Vote at A.L.P.

The Labour-Socialists make a great point of claiming how no Communist can become a member of the Labour Party. But Communists vote at A.L.P. Conferences and help decide Labour candidates at Elections. The Constitution of the Labour Party provides that:—

"Membership shall consist of

(a) Affiliated Unions.

(b) Persons enrolled as members of the Organisation who pledge themselves to uphold the Constitution, Platform, and Pledges of the Organisation."

Rule 31 of the Constitution of the Labour Party provides that 'each Union or Branch shall upon application contribute to the Central Executive an affiliation fee.' (Page 13 of Labour Party Constitution.)

Rule 34 of the Constitution provides that 'each Union upon application shall pay the sum of 1d. per member on female members and 3d. on male members per quarter to the Central Executive.' (Page 14 of Labour Party Constitution.)

Rule 54 of the Constitution provides that a candidate for Labour selection must be nominated in writing for selection by not less than three financial members of an A.L.P. branch and/or an affiliated Union.

Rule 63 and 65 of the Constitution provides that 'Members of affiliated Unions shall be entitled to vote in Selection Ballots.' (Page 23 of Labour Party Constitution.)

Provision is thus made in the Constitution of the Labour Party for Unions to affiliate with the Labour Party and pay affiliation fees and dues to it. All the members of an affiliated union, including Communists, then become financial members of the Labour Party and can vote to elect delegates to Labour Party Conferences, they can vote to instruct delegates how to vote on any matter, and they can vote to select Labour Party Candidates for Parliament, and they do so.

Socialism, the Police State

Most Socialists are sincere idealists being exploited by ruthless power-lusters. But it is astonishing how many of the idealists apologise for the disastrous results

produced by Socialism in practice. Whenever and wherever tried, Socialism in practice has inevitably led to the Police State. Every new Socialist control creates conditions, which are used as the pretext for imposing further controls.

Socialism in Great Britain has now reached the stage where Sir Stafford Cripps is openly promising that he will pay informers who give information about "currency smugglers." The late Doctor Goebbels claimed towards the end of the war that, irrespective of the result of the military conflict, National Socialism would prevail.

* * * *

High Treason

The latest copy of *Housewives Today*, a British journal supporting the policy of the powerful non-party British Housewives' League, reports that the following forthright statement has been sent to 69 members of the Conservative Party who voted against the Anglo-American Financial Agreements in 1945:

"WHEREAS THE DEVALUATION OF THE POUND STERLING WILL MEAN THAT:—

- (1) Great Britain who "won the war" will be drained of real wealth and valuable manufactured goods, receiving fewer and fewer dollars in return, while the prices of raw materials will rise steadily;
- (2) We shall all be compelled to work harder and harder for a lower standard of living, with nothing better to look forward to; dearer bread less food, less clothing and fewer houses;
- (3) Prices and taxes will rise, thus giving a handle to Communist conspirators to arouse sedition;
- (4) American investors will take a leading hand in the development of our Colonial assets, tantamount to buying out the BRITISH EMPIRE;
- (5) Should war follow, we may be too weakened to resist: ON THESE HEADS AND OTHERS WE ACCUSE THOSE RESPONSIBLE OF HIGH TREASON AGAINST THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE OF GREAT BRITAIN."

* * * *

This Atomic Business

The form and timing of the announcements about an "atomic explosion" in Russia were, however, such as to invite suspicion about the possibility of an ulterior motive. Why should the news not have been conveyed to the Press by the Central Office of Information or some analogous body? There seems no good reason why the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States should have turned themselves into town criers for the occasion. The only conclusion that can be drawn from the strange business is that the Baruch-Lilienthal plan for the "international control of atomic energy, through every process from the mining of raw material to the final bomb or pile", was only temporarily dropped and that by making the flesh of the Western nations creep the planners hope to bring at least the Occident and its colonial possessions completely within their power. That might explain the "top

level" announcement by Messrs. Attlee and Truman about the Soviet "explosion."

There can be no international control without international controllers. Britain should examine the records of these would-be controllers very carefully before they entrust the future of the British Empire to their mercies. It does not do to forget, for instance, that Mr. Baruch himself was, strongly opposed to Allied Aid for Greece at the time of the E.L.A.S. conspiracy, and that Mr. Lilienthal has written of the beatitudes to be expected from a world government brought about by Jewish influences. There is no reason to believe that the preservation of the British world enjoys "top priority" in the mind of either.

—*Truth*, September 30, 1949.

* * * *

Sinister Attack on Sovereignty

Mr. Paul Hoffman, chief "American" administrator of Marshall "Aid," is continuing his campaign, no doubt under instruction from his Wall Street masters, to break the sovereignty of European nations and to centralise them under one control. This is exactly what Hitler also tried to do!

Speaking in New York on November 11, Mr. Hoffman is reported as having said "he could not see how Europe would ever find military security or economic well-being until it had swept away the trade barriers that had been its curse for 50 years." If military security and economic well-being can only be achieved by the centralisation of political and economic power, then Soviet Russia must be accomplishing grand results. Why do so-called intelligent people continue to seek to ape the Russians, the Germans, and others who have surely demonstrated that centralisation of power produces nothing but tyranny and insecurity?

Mr. Hoffman may not know what he is really advocating, but those financial groups responsible for Marshall "Aid" are well aware of the benefits they will obtain from Mr. Hoffman's policies.

British Scheme Called "Rotten"

LONDON, Tuesday. —Dr. St. John Lyburn, the Kent physician who was "first in" on Britain's National Health Service and who is now "first out," says that if he ever came to Australia:

He would like to lecture "on the rottenness of the British health scheme and its wicked waste of public funds."

"I would do all I could to prevent Australia's medical services from falling into the state of utter antiquity and uselessness that ours have reached," said Dr. Lyburn today.

Dr. Lyburn claimed that £66 million spent on "useless pills and bottles of medicine" had been tragically squandered.

He urged that general practitioner should be left with the goodwill of their practices, but enabled by money supplied through the Act to have proper clinics with up-to-date apparatus for diagnosis of cancer, tuberculosis, heart diseases and other serious ailments.

Dr. Lyburn has accepted an invitation by the Missouri Medical Association to lecture in America next year.

—*The Herald* November 16.

Unconditional Blunder

By "CANUTE"

The politicians are beginning to quarrel more openly in regard to their relative responsibility for reducing the country to its present plight. This is all to the good. The truth is more likely to emerge in these circumstances as the proverb assures us. Mr. Bevin, our harassed Foreign Secretary, disclosed recently in the House of Commons that the first that he and his colleagues had heard of the expression, "Unconditional Surrender" was when they read it in their morning newspapers, like you and I. It had been agreed between the supermen located on their temporary Olympus at Casablanca, where we were represented by our International Playboy in Rompers, Winston Churchill. The latter was quick to deflect the charge levelled at him by his indiscreet ex-comrade in the House, by dexterously handing the baby to the defunct American President, whom he described as "our great friend, and august and powerful ally." This graceful tribute comes well from Mr. Churchill, whose bacon was undoubtedly saved by this unmitigated humbug and crypto-Communist, but perhaps a less involved Englishman may be permitted to doubt the reality of this friendship, quoting in his support Roosevelt's own son, Elliott, who heard the fatal slogan fall from father's lips at the luncheon table. In his book, *As He Saw It*, Elliott Roosevelt gives many examples of his parent's dislike of the British Empire and British ways, and shows clearly that "our august ally" had a much greater liking for his Red chum Stalin, than for his self-appointed "ardent lieutenant" from this country.

After Mr. Bevin had dropped his brick in the troubled waters of the Westminster pool, the American Press disclosed the fact that the late President's official advisers were quite as ready to deny foreknowledge of the Unconditional Blunder, as was poor Ernie. This is not surprising, because the words originated with the Jewish clique behind Roosevelt, to whom he was just a "Charlie McCarthy" or ventriloquist's dummy kept in office as long as he behaved well, but no longer. Churchill could not have opposed effectually orders coming from such a supreme source, and according to Elliot, he made no attempt to do so, but, after a short pause for thoughts and frowns, grinned and announced, "Perfect! And I can just see how Goebbels and the rest of 'em 'll squeal." Prophetic words, and those of us who have survived the late lamented Doctor will be squealing for a long time yet. Nevertheless this actual pronouncement of Jewish policy was not the *fons et origo* of the troubles in Europe today, as many like to aver. The trouble began long before that. Once the war had expanded sufficiently to ensure both the Big Shots under Jewish control being involved against the rebel, there was little doubt that they would insist upon seeing the matter through to the bitter end, and that we should have little voice in the direction of affairs, which would be conducted by the leaders of the two countries under the stage management of the two extremes of International Jewry. It was highly improbable that the Jews would agree to any course that would deprive

them of a full blooded Old Testament revenge upon the miscreants who had challenged their authority, irrespective of the effects of their decision upon the wretched inhabitants of Europe. Indeed, it is probable that they welcomed the chaos, which brought their plan for world Communism much nearer fruition.

I am not being wise after the event: all this was as plain as a pikestaff in 1939, when there were many people who thought that it was necessary to chastise Germany to a sufficient extent to make her more amenable to Western reason. There lay the fundamental error. Once the war became general, we could no more deflect it, much less stop it, than we could succeed where my eminent forebear Canute failed, in turning the tide before its appointed hour. War must run its course; it cannot be switched on and off like the electric light or the bath water. We had no choice whatever in the matter.

Our Playboy had become the "ardent lieutenant" of a charming rascal who was himself the puppet of the hidden forces, which direct our destinies. In this particular war their main objects comprised the dissolution of the British Empire, the rape of Palestine, and the furtherance of their plan for World Communism inaugurated in Russia. Was it likely that the directors would consent to curtail a war, which was so admirably fulfilling their aims until they were compelled to do so by force of circumstance? No wonder that the people of England are disappointed at the results of their long struggle for a "victory" which was never intended to be a victory for them, except on the field of battle. They were only required to "do and die" like the Light Brigade. I refuse to believe that any of our rulers could have known what they were about when they blithely entered the war, which terminated in the scandal at Nuremberg, the roguery of U.N.R.R.A., and all the other factors contributing to the policy of International Jewry. Nevertheless, both Roosevelt and Churchill must bear the blame for unrolling the Red carpet from the Channel to the Pacific, ready to accommodate the heavy feet of Uncle Joe, whenever he decides to march. They may both have believed that they were undertaking a crusade on behalf of Democracy, which has been well defined as government of the Mugs, by the Freemasons, for the Jews, but in reality they were furthering the world plot against Christianity. If our own interests had been the sole consideration with our leaders as they should have been, Hitler and Stalin would have been allowed to work off "the first fine careless rapture" of their mutual antipathy without interference; if, at the end, they were — unlike Browning's thrush — unable to recapture it, so much the better for the rest of the world, which would have remained strong in the interval, and ready to curb any undue ambition on the part of either antagonist.

The failure to recognise these truisms will constitute the crime for which our leaders will be arraigned at the bar of history. Churchill is the self-appointed architect of Jewish destiny, but he must realise by this time that he has only been

exercising his craft to the design of others. He may be a very good bricklayer but he will never lay the foundations of any earthly Paradise, but only those of a Mortuary for the Mugs. Unconditional Surrender was merely a logical step in the progress of the Jewish programme, and not the consummate blunder on the part of their chosen leader which so many people are anxious to believe, in order to hide their own folly in supporting a war designed to contribute to their own downfall.

—*The Patriot*, 'Eng., September.

A Dangerous Possibility

Power politics have been their first love, and may be first again. The Russians are doing all they can to create new temptations. "Only bow down and worship me," said the devil. We must be prepared for the possibility that Germany may once more worship dangerous idols.

That is what we mean when we talk of another Russo-German combination, such as that operative in the first partitions of Poland during the 18th century, repeated in 1939 for the same purpose, and foreshadowed through a sixth partition in the 1950's.

Russo-German combinations do come naturally—worse luck for mankind. Czar and Kaiser were kindred despots, Nazism and Communism are related tyrannies wherein "all things work together for evil."

TWO SCHOOLS OF POLICY

There have always been two schools of German policy, and during my lifetime the Eastern has mostly been at least as strong as the Western.

The school which looked to Russia as a natural ally and outlet has indeed outweighed any sense of a common Western civilisation, which many Germans though decadent.

This Eastern school more than held its own in the German Foreign Office: it was usually in the ascendant among the Generals. So strong was the tendency that it had a hold even on those who plotted to murder Hitler in 1944.

It is rooted in big business, the more extensively now in view of the competitive nature of Western commerce, and of the large, if illusory, markets promised by the Russian tempter.

Finally, there has never been any lack of Germans like Herr Nadolny and Professor Noack nowadays, to find some philosophic ground for the Russian line.

It makes little difference to this sort of mentality that the "line" is also Communist. That is conveniently overlooked in the gar of power politics.

Anyhow, it can always be used for blackmail. "Give us this, that, or t'other thing, or we may go Communist." All this was done under Weimar, and may be done under Bonn.

—Lord Vansittart, *The Herald*, Melbourne, October 19.

D.S.C.M. WOMEN'S GROUP

(VIC.)

Now Meets on
THE THIRD THURSDAY
of Every Month. All
interested are invited

"New Times" November 23, 1949 — Page 3

THE NEW TIMES

Established 1335

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: MU2834.

VOL. 15

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 25, 1949.

MR. MENZIES' OMISSIONS

Although we have often said that we believe that the election of a non-Labour Government by a small majority at the Federal Elections would create a more favourable position for an extension of the anti-Socialist fight, Mr. Menzies' policy speech clearly indicated that the mere election of a non-Labour Government will in itself solve none of our major problems,

Mr. Menzies has promised to continue doing a great number of things being done by the Labour-Socialists. Like his associate Mr. R. G. Casey, his central theme is that the non-Labour Parties can do these things much better than the Socialists. It is true that Mr. Menzies said a great deal about the evils of centralisation, which is the basic feature of Socialism, but a close examination of his policy speeches reveals that he does not propose to make any direct challenge against centralised power.

Anyone who doubts this should note that no reference was made to the necessity of abolishing Uniform Taxation and thus restoring a degree of financial sovereignty to the States. Mr. Menzies infers that Uniform Taxation, a basic feature of Socialist strategy in Australia, must be continued. Unfortunately for Mr. Menzies, a number of Liberal and Country Party candidates, particularly in Victoria, are at present stating in writing that they are opposed to Uniform Taxation. If the non-Labour Parties are successful on December 10, which is far from certain, those who have stated their opposition to Uniform Taxation will be called upon to honour their promises.

Another major omission from Mr. Menzies' policy is a definite promise to deal with the bureaucratic menace now strangling responsible Government. In dealing with the question of bureaucracy, which is another important aspect of Socialism, Mr. Menzies not only refused to face up to the question, but actually went out of his way to say that there would be no wholesale reduction in the bureaucracy.

On the subject of taxation Mr. Menzies was most indefinite and unconvincing. As with many other subjects, only a "review" was promised. While present financial rules are maintained, and Mr. Menzies has certainly given not even a hint that he proposes to challenge them, it will be impossible for him to carry out his numerous promises concerning child endowment and other matters without maintaining present tax levels—in fact it will be necessary for increased taxation: more Socialism. If Mr. Menzies were really desirous of getting to grips with Socialism, he would soon realise that centralised financial policies must first be abolished.

But so far from attacking centralised financial policy Mr. Menzies statements indicate that, unless his own colleagues challenge him, he proposes in the realm of banking to retain the centralised control already established by the Labour-Socialists. His promise to restore a Commonwealth Bank Board, which, incidentally, will do the Liberals more harm than good, obscures the fact that Mr. Menzies has not challenged the major power which the 1945 Banking Legislation granted the Canberra planners; the power to dictate in detail the advance policies of the trading banks. Questioned recently at Canberra about this power, the Leader of the Opposition, Senator Sullivan actually said that the power was all right so long as it was wisely used. And that is the basis of the claim made by far too many non-Socialists.

But fortunately an increasing number of non-Labour supporters are realising this danger and are likely to challenge their "leaders." This is, perhaps, the one bright aspect of the situation in Australia.

A Call to Arms

Whether the would-be dictators of the world can make good their threats is beside the point. (We very much doubt it— they're only a pack of cards). At least the answer of every true Briton to such a challenge is clear—"Britons never shall be slaves." To every freeborn Englishman, therefore, today's events are a call to-arms. The great staged crisis, which we have been predicting since the end of the war, is here. The final squeeze is on. This is an hour, which calls for the end of all political expediency and compromise. It is the test of a constitution, which was evolved over more than seven hundred years, and upon the issue, rests the fate of Christendom. To our aid we must mobilise all those spiritual forces, which sustained our nation again and again, when in the eyes of mere mortal people the future seemed hopeless. Each one of us can play a part in keeping wavering flame of hope alive. If we play that part there is no power on earth that can do us harm; and it is, after all, with earthly powers with which we have immediately to contend. We have often spoken to you of the time which might come when the safety and the future of the King's realm (and, maybe, of the King's person), would depend upon the actions of loyal men and women, who would sacrifice everything towards the preservation of the great British institutions, and the traditional British way of life. That time has arrived; and from the present obscurity of their private lives men will arise to the country's need, as they did in 1914 and again in 1939. Who they will be we cannot yet know (for which of you could have picked in advance the heroes of the two world wars?). But of this we have no doubt—men live today who through the turn of tomorrow's events will reshape the policies of England to the lasting benefit of mankind.

—London Views and Tidings, Sept. 29.

Instruction

Foremost among the dominant ideas of the present epoch is to be found the notion that instruction is capable of considerably changing men, and has for its unfailing consequence to improve them and even to make them equal. By the mere fact of its being constantly repeated, this assertion has ended by becoming one of the most steadfast democratic dogmas.

On this point, however, as on many others, democratic ideas are in profound disagreement with the results of psychology and experience. Many eminent philosophers, among them Herbert Spencer, have had no difficulty in showing that instruction neither renders a man more moral nor happier, that it changes neither his instincts nor his hereditary passions, and at times—for this to happen it need only be badly directed— it is much more pernicious than useful.

Gustave Le Bon. *The Crowd*, 1897.

For proof of the above, regard the condition of Western Europe today.

Responsibility for all election comment in this journal is taken by W. J. Caruthers, of 32 Kendall Street, Ringwood.

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 Mountbattens and the Socialists

Very, Very Interesting

These Mountbattens, the Earl, "Dicky" and his Countess Edwina, are indeed powerful people. He is the King's cousin, he has been "Supremo" in the South-East Asia, he was England's last Viceroy and Governor-General of India, and he is now a Vice-Admiral in the Royal Navy.

She is a fabulously rich heiress.

Even so, how comes it that a Socialist "soak-the-rich" Government, and at the very height of Britain's financial crisis, initiates and pushes through Parliament a bill enabling Countess Mountbatten to realise on

the £1,400,000 sterling fortune bequeathed her by her grandfather, Sir Ernest Cassell?

(Hitherto, because of the Act restraining married women and the soaring income tax, poor Countess Mountbatten's annual income has been reduced from £80,000 sterling net in the 1920's to a mere £4,500.)

Some Socialists, even some Conservatives, opposed the bill. Four hundred M.P.'s did not vote, but it got through the second reading by 180 to 47 votes.

The real story appears worthy of the history books.

This Heiress Bill, which was at first applicable only to Lady Mountbatten, but which has now been amended to embrace all married women whose control of inherited fortunes has been restricted, is, in effect, a reward to the Mountbattens for services rendered.

Those services? Earl Mountbatten's part in giving India independence and naming a date for British withdrawal. Everybody knows of the close relationships between the Mountbattens and Pandit Nehru—he always stays with them when visiting England.

And it is said that the bill is a fulfilment of a pledge made to Earl Mountbatten by Sir Stafford Cripps. Hence the Government, as distinct from many of its backbenchers, is supporting it.

—Trevor Smith, *The Herald*, Melbourne, November 14.

Further information worthy of the history books, which Mr. Smith does not mention. Sir Ernest Cassell was a German-Jew financier who was the principal benefactor of the London School of Economics, the fountainhead of the Socialist conspiracy. In view of the fact, that most of the members of the present Socialist government, including Mr. Attlee, are products of this school, perhaps the pay off is also not unconnected with this matter.

American Loan

Mr. Platts-Mills asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer in view of the devaluation of the pound, what additional amount of sterling will be required to repay the American loan granted in 1946?

Mr. Fay: £475 millions if the present rate of exchange remains unaltered.

Sir F. Sanderson asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer how the payment will be made of principal and interest on the loan given to Britain in 1946 by the United States of America, the first repayment of which falls due in 1952, the same year as Marshall Aid ends, which amounts to approximately £40 million at the pre-valuation rate of exchange, and is in excess of the indicated exports to the United States of America in 1949.

Mr. Fay: This, like other payments, can be made only by increasing our dollar earnings and reducing our dollar expenditure.

—*The House of Commons*, Oct. 20, 1949.

Some task. Further export and perish austerity for the British people to maintain full-employment and a cranky financial system. The "Americans," of course, proceeding to liquidate what is left of the Empire.

PETROL FACTS

1. There is world surplus of petroleum.
2. There was a 23 million ton surplus of sterling oil at least, in 1948, but Australia did not receive the extra one third of a million required to end rationing.
3. Australia has produced and supplied to Britain, France, Russia, Poland, etc., a far greater quantity of goods than she has received in exchange. We have contributed millions of pounds worth of goods to U.N.R.R.A., we have made gifts of £750,000 worth of wool to Poland, £250,000 to Italy, and £150,000 to Austria, Yugoslavia and Hungary.
4. Extra sterling petrol has been available from Europe but the Australian Government has not procured one extra gallon by its own efforts.
5. Sufficient petrol would have been available from sterling sources but for government interference with those willing to obtain it.
6. There is no petrol rationing whatsoever in the British Commonwealth countries of Canada, India, Pakistan, Ceylon and South Africa. Each gets approximately twice the supply per motorist per year that the Australian motorist has been getting.
7. The only British Commonwealth countries, which have petrol rationing, are Australia, New Zealand and England.
8. Continental war-devastated countries such as France, Denmark, Belgium and Luxembourg have no petrol rationing. Former enemies such as Italy supplied with British crude oils, are able to export surpluses of refined petrol to India and elsewhere.
9. Britain is supplying 1,800,000 tons of crude oil, 3,750,000 tons of fuel oil and 250,000 tons of other petroleum products, including aviation gasoline, petrol, diesel oils, etc., to the Argentine this year for meat.
10. Figures show that in Australia a relatively small proportion of petrol is expended in pleasure motoring. Reliable estimates indicate that about 90 percent of the country's petrol is used for commercial purposes.
11. IMPORTS of petroleum into Australia over the last six months have been significantly higher than they ever have been being according to the official trade statistics, and a comparatively small proportion of this Petroleum has come from dollar sources. In July and August alone we imported 125 million gallons.

L. WITHALL, *The Canberra Letter*, Nov. 5.

Ifsky

A further peep behind the iron curtain reveals that the boys in the Kremlin are now translating and re-writing the poets of the world, claiming all the best to be Russians.

Therefore, your Uncle Nat offers you "Ifsky" by Rudyardoff Kiplingovitch: —

If you can keep your head when all about you

Are losing theirs and being strung up, too,

If you can dodge the purge when all men doubt you

And see that they are purged instead of you.

If you can wait and not be tired by waiting

And hear the truth, but twist it into lies

And being hated, don't give way to hating

But bump them off with friendship in your eyes.

If you can talk to crowds with seeming virtue

Despising what is called the common touch,

If neither higher ups nor lower downs can hurt you

Unless you let them know too much.

If you can fill the unforgiving minute

With every dirty trick beneath the sun.

Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,

And which is more—you'll be a commissar, my son.

Petrol and Power

Motorists are naturally confused by extraordinary petrol situation in which famine in most parts of Australia stands contrasted with, at any rate, temporary plenty in Sydney. In this period of confusion between the destruction of one control and the imposition of another, we may realise, as citizens that the essential problem lies in the constitutional limitation of the Federal Government's powers.

In their wisdom, the framers of the Constitution, deciding to have the best of both worlds, tried to hold a balance between the rights of the new nation and those of the old colonies of the horse-and-buggy age.

The issue, in the long run, is not how much petrol the oil companies are prepared to give the citizen, but how much power the citizen is prepared to give the Commonwealth.

—*The Argus*, Melbourne, Oct. 25.

This editorial is symptomatic of the Socialistic *Daily Mirror* control of "The Argus." Note the cliché, "the horse-and-buggy age" in reference to the constitution. The inference is that because we have improved gadgets for communication, we should abandon the sound principle of the division and decentralisation of power. Finally we are not getting adequate supplies of petrol because of Canberra control of foreign exchange and import quotas.

"New Times" November 25 1949—Page 5



Planning the Earth (XI)

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

This week we conclude this important essay. Our copy is from *The Social Creditor* of November 5.

In contrast to the control of human purpose by finance—*i.e.* the manipulating of statistics representing a measure of human choice, an expression of purpose, in such a way as to limit that choice—we have the statistics of *probability, or chance*, which excludes consideration of choice, purpose, or design altogether. The application of this to human behaviour or events which have in fact been influenced or brought about by purpose, design, or Planning (*e.g.* by the manipulation of finance) provides the Planners with an immense psychological power in the suggestion of the inevitability of their Plans, and the attribution of the course of events to a multiplicity of unspecified causes beyond human control, the Planners to evade all responsibility.

A Powerful Superstition

At the present time practically the whole of the so-called 'Social Sciences' and a good deal of biological 'science' is based upon this psychological trick, which hypnotises the 'educated' even more than the uneducated. The exclusion of purpose or design from the premises is, of course, occult to most people (not the least to those who spend their time planning, elaborately 'randomised' experiments!) but the blind faith of the average scientist in the reality of the quite recently invented, mathematical concept of *probability* is one of the most powerful modern superstitions.¹ As a senior Government Research Officer said recently to the writer in the course of a discussion on this subject: "If we do not know the probability we know nothing." The absence of all knowledge before, say, Karl Pearson (or should it be Laplace's *Theorie analytique des probabilités*, 1814?) is a little staggering to contemplate.

One of the main uses to which probability statistics is put is the prediction of the course of events, which is, however, more often implicit than explicit. The power of mass-suggestion exerted by this means is quite incalculable; there is a peculiar hypnosis about it which is very difficult to resist, for it restores the ancient belief in Fate, incongruously enough, under the name Of Chance—the fall of the dice, the way things happen—undersigned, unforeseen, unforeseeable—so it is made the basis of prediction. In passing, it should be noticed that dice are very carefully designed instruments, and there is nothing like them in nature.

Free Lines

G. K. Chesterton has written some true words on the subject in his essay on Archaeology (in *Generally Speaking*. Methuen's third Edn. 1937):—

The future is dead, because all futurism must be a sort of fatalism. It cannot foresee the free part of human action: it can only foresee the servile part . . . The point of all these lines is that they must all be mathematical lines; none of them can be free lines, like the lines of a draughtsman. It is only in the past that we find the finished picture; for it is only in the past that we find the free line. In other words, when we look at what men did, we are looking at what they freely chose to do. But when we consider what men will do, we cannot consider what they will choose to do. We can only consider what they must do. Unless it be something they cannot avoid, it is something we cannot predict.

The only qualification one would add to this is that, wherever in the past, Planning, whether financial or statutory, has been in operation, the only 'free lines' discernible are those drawn by the Planners; the rest have had to toe them; except those few who have refused, and changed the course of history.

The concept of probability is of negligible value in relation to the actual events of which the real Universe is composed; they are all one-in-infinity chances. Consider, for instance, the probability of occurrence of the fusion of two particular sex cells, giving rise to a particular individual. It is only when the real Universe is replaced by 'the universe of discourse,' a pseudo-universe which may be purely ideal, or in part materially arranged, but is circumscribed deliberately by human Planning, that probabilities begin to be calculable. It is only with dice that there is a one-in-six chance of a given result. It is only in the even narrower pseudo-universe used, for instance, in the controlled scientific experiment, that even higher probabilities may be reckoned with. And the converse is also true; the higher the probability, the fewer the degrees of freedom, and the narrower the Planned limitations of 'the universe' which may be deduced. It is extraordinary how many scientists, who well understand the necessity of careful planning and strict control to ensure significant probabilities, cannot understand that significant probabilities imply the existence of careful planning and strict control, on a scale commensurate with the universe of discourse.'

All this may SEEM very theoretical until it is remembered that statistics is a

major instrument of 'scientific' Planning, and that, so long as Planned probabilities are supposed to arise from the nature of the real Universe, the will to resist is inhibited.

Statistics and Bigness

There is also a direct relationship between the use of statistics and Bigness, in the sense of large numbers, which are essential to significance in the use of statistics in proportion to the complexity and variability of the material. Even inorganic particles such as atoms or molecules, which are individually uncontrollable, change their characteristics when considered and handled in the mass. Their individual characters, such as valencies, are absorbed and cancelled out within the mass, which takes on quite other (though related) characters, and becomes liable to control and use by those understanding them. With inorganic materials the complexity of the mass is greater than that of the individual particles, but when entities such as human beings, or the soil, of a complexity far beyond the comprehension of any Planner, are handled in the mass (or mob, or region), the characteristics of the mass, approaching as they do those of inorganic materials in their simplicity and malleability, represent an appalling degradation of the quality of the individual.

An Impudent Example

The 'science' of population provides the most impudent and blatant example of this sort of treatment of human beings, particularly that aspect of it which treats men and women as functional reproductive units. The whole thing is meaningless except against the background of the assumption that we were all born and came into the world to serve the purposes of Planners, *i.e.* of those who control us as a collectivity. The increasing aggregation of people into larger masses (*e.g.* multilateral schools of 2,000) speaks of the same assumption. It is sad to see those who were brought up in a different belief lending themselves to this policy.

The Majority Vote

An important example of statistical Planning, which combines the characteristics of population statistics on the one hand, with those of finance (the control of units of choice) on the other, is the *majority vote*.

Potentially the vote, an indication of choice backed by the will and sanctions, moral and physical of an individual, is an effective means towards the decentralisation of power. In the days when the long-bow was a cheap and formidable weapon in the hands of every able-bodied man and boy the Ruling Powers found it advisable to yield to such indications of will, and even to institute a mechanism for their expression. It is important to remember that the primary function of the representatives elected by the political vote was to control the finance—*i.e.*, the economic choice—available to the central Government.

(Continued on page 7)

Planning the Earth

(Continued from page 6)

Limited as was the parliamentary franchise, it was but the expression and end-term of something far deeper and more direct and decentralised, the personal influence and pressure of man upon master in the feudal system which was sufficient, acting over the centuries and against the background of Christian thought, to liberate the villein from serfdom and to establish him in that degree of economic choice which arose from common, and later from individual rights in the land. Those were the days when the foundations of English freedom were laid, so well that some vestiges of them remain today, despite the fact that the task of, the last few centuries has been to undermine them, rather than, as is commonly supposed, to build upon them. The idea has been assiduously spread that those products of the nineteenth century, the universal adult suffrage of vast populations, hundreds of times, the size of the original electorates, and the secret ballot, constitute between them the sole safeguard and basis of true democracy, instead of being; as they manifestly are, the direct and necessary precursors of the modern totalitarian state. Many people seem to be under the impression that the secret ballot dates back to Magna Carta, rather than to the Ballot Act of 1872.

A Meaningless Symbol

An anonymous vote is, of course, a meaningless symbol backed by no sanction, except the conventions that it shall be counted, and that a majority of quite arbitrary, and manipulable, proportions shall elect. Since no one will accept responsibility for the vote there is no way of ensuring that these conventions are observed, and as a means of coercing the Power, which controls the ballot, it is quite fatuous. Equally, as a protection against intimidation by the Power, which controls the ballot, it is more than useless. If that Power can be trusted to

'play the game' according to the conventions then there is no need for secrecy; it can be trusted to hold the ring and to protect the voters from intimidation. But if not, then it is provided with information about the voter's attitude while he is deprived of the protection of publicity.

The degree of choice offered to the voter can be limited to any extent desired, even to a single official list, as in the so-called 'Eastern democracies.' There is not the slightest reason to suppose that in such cases the number of votes published bears any necessary relation to the number cast; the whole thing is merely a piece of statistical mass-suggestion involving a kind of ritual submission to the will of the Government on the part of the individual.

In the 'Western democracies' the concentration of financial power has long ago ensured that no fundamental choice of policy is available to the electors, but there remains a choice of Parties with some differences of bias and method. The separation of powers between these probably ensures that, up to the present, the Party votes are in general, more or less correctly counted and published, but there are already signs that the real opposition *vote*—the spoiled ballot paper—is manipulated at will, sometimes being redistributed among the parties so as to obscure the total.

Secrecy is, of course, not the resort of the honest man but of the underhand, and it provides the ideal cover for the 'rigging' of the results in any way desired. Some confusion of thought has been caused by the fact that the Communists, *e.g.* in France have attempted to upset the secret ballot, especially in trades unions, from which it is deduced that it provides some protection against them. In fact, they attempt to upset it only when they fear that it may be used against them by a rival power Group. Once they have got rid of rivals they restore it, as in the Stalin Constitution of 1936.

Irresponsibility

The essence of the whole business is the relieving of Government of the responsibility for its actions. With the disappearance of the open ballot the vote changed from at least potentially a responsible expression of personal will, to an irresponsible expression of anonymous opinion; and this irresponsibility underlies and corrupts the whole of modern Society from top to bottom. Every form of human weakness, laziness, bad workmanship, breach of contract, breach of faith, even fraud and dishonesty is excused and condoned by reference to the fact that the circumstances were beyond the control of the person concerned, and there is so much truth in this that the temptation is more than human nature can ordinarily withstand. In so far as individuals are, in fact, powerless, the responsibility rests with those who actually hold the power—those whom we call the Planners, whose decisions are enforced by all the powers of the State or the Super-State; but these hitherto, have been allowed to lay their burden upon the perfect scapegoat, that anonymous impersonal, unidentifiable, statistical abstraction the majority voter. It is easy to understand why a Key Planner such as Mr. Lilienthal is so strong in the defence of the present-day 'institution of politics.'

The Suppressed Alternative

The convention of propaganda is that we all, individually, must accept the responsibility for anything the Planners choose to impose in the name of the statistical majority. But anonymous responsibility is an impossibility. A response is a returning or giving back that which is due, or if we go back further to the sense found in the word 'sponsor,' it is a pledging in return. A statistical unit cannot respond; a living individual can. If the voter, is ever to accept responsibility for his vote (which is the last thing the Planners want) he must make his choice openly, and the results arising from it must return to, and be accepted by, him as an individual. Practical proposals for such a responsible ballot, which would be complementary to the responsible economic vote (the 'social' dividend), have been put forward by Major C. H. Douglas² and form a vital part of what Sydney Webb called 'the suppressed alternative' to the prevailing policy of centralisation and Planning.

In the special sense in which responsibility is due to the land—that of giving back that which is due—not only is actual association of man and land essential, but time also, if the development of a balanced response between the two is to occur. This means security of tenure and complete lack of interference. Proposals to this effect have also been made by Major Douglas and it is unnecessary to elaborate them.

Ownership of Land

Ownership, or tenure, of the land, however, does not confer the right to destroy it. Doubtless there is a point in criminal mismanagement at which a man's neighbours, or the law acting on their behalf, have a right to step in, just as there is a point where interference with a man's treatment of his own family becomes justifiable. But, that has nothing whatever to do with centralised Planning and Management: it is the negative Law, the opposite.

As for the penalising and dispossession of farmers (but never Government Departments) for alleged, or even proven, bad farming, it should be an absolute defence if it can be proved that a part of their responsibility has been taken from them. The *Estate Book and Diary* lists forty-one Government Departments with powers of interference in some aspect of agriculture and land ownership. (From *The Social Creditor*, October 29, 1949). If all the persons who have *power*, and therefore responsibility, were to appear in court as defendants, there should be quite a crowd! This may be merely a rather jolly daydream, but we can always work in that direction.

We are so far from any sane proposals with regard to the land being put into effect that it is easy to suppose that there is nothing to do about it; but there is always something to do about it; we can always start from where we are and apply integrity and responsibility to the situation! as it is. It is true that we shall not then be popular with the Planners, or in a good position for obtaining the rewards in pay, promotion, and privilege, which they are able to dispense; but with the devaluation not only of money but of practically everything they control they are now beginning to suffer from diminishing returns; and there is no satisfaction to be found in a (Continued on page 8)

THE FARM EXCHANGE

(J. E. Harding & A. L. 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 Creditors will be very welcome. Central Queensland has much to commend it.

THE FARM EXCHANGE

Real Estate Agents/ Auctioneers, Valuers.

DENHAM ST., ROCKHAMPTON, C.Q.

Phone 3768.

After Hours 3199 and 2161.

Dictator in Distress

BY FOOTLE

"Tito wants moral help," announces my newspaper. I find this very puzzling. Prepared as I am for simplicity as a co-efficient of greatness, I cannot fit this plea for moral support into any page of a dictator's diary. I have inferred from observation of dictatorship in action that it regards moral values as so very "bawshwah", morals themselves being a superstitious hangover from a religious trance out of which we are slowly but certainly emerging. Therefore, to accept this supplication for moral support is to accept the somewhat startling inference that dictators are mortal—human, in fact. There, is something weird about it—like Bumble gratuitously apologising to Oliver Twist.

I begin to see now the basis for the rift between Kremlin Joe and tottering Tito, the former having long since realised that the only noticeable attribute of people in the mass is their proletarianism, and that even assuming they possessed other attributes, how could these be made accountable in a properly run dictatorship? Why, even in our own tin-pot dictatorship, it is practically impossible to get away with a simple thing like the truth!

I don't envy anyone whose case is so weak that it needs the moral support of its victims. I can tell such a one straight away that he is treading a path, which, if not actually that of the martyrs is at best a parallel road leading to the Valhalla of lost causes. An appeal for moral support is only a shade more optimistic than an appeal for donations. And either appeal nowadays is useless without a public address system. I shouldn't wonder if that is where the rub comes in. Maybe Tito finds that the world loudspeaker has been switched off and he is consequently talking to himself.

Tito is reported as saying to the foreign editor of "Reynolds' Weekly newspaper" that, "he did not think anyone would dare to make war on Yugoslavia if the moral opinion of the whole world was with them." Isn't it rummy? D'you know, I can't think of a single war, which was prevented by moral opinion; the only national use which moral opinion has been put to in my experience is to help the work of destruction along. Gott strafe England! God save the King! Moral opinion indignantly in action!

Then comes a revealing phrase. "In any case we are not at all nervous," he, Marshal Tito, said. Most of us have made use of that line some time or another. I believe I said something like it prior to my first fight at school, hoping my adversary would not notice the peculiar behaviour of my knees. In the Marshal's case it shows a double pessimism; firstly that he does fear attack; secondly that the moral support wheeze is only a gamble anyway.

He also added, the report continues, "Yugoslavia's election to the United Nations Security Council does not mean protection from attacks... it does mean that we now have the right to state our case so that the world will know it."

The phrasing of this report may be some what loose, for it would appear that a nation has not the right to complain of injustice unless a member of the Security Council. But if the benefits are merely those stated by Marshal Tito, it would not appear to matter much. If you've got a black eye, it seems to me immaterial whether the whole street knows about it or not, unless the street is prepared to offer effective protection. I do not feel that its moral support would be a sufficient guarantee against another black eye. And, of course, neither does the Marshal, who, from his knowledge of dictatorships, democratic or otherwise, should know the political value of moral support.

So I am caused to look at this union of ideas involving the marriage of morality and sanctions, and observe that the twain are by no means soul mates: they might, in fact, be violently mismatched. Morality, like Beauty, belongs to the family of Truth; it is a state of being: it is of the essence; therefore of eternity. Help belongs to sanctions; it may be volunteer, conscript or mercenary; it is common to hero, coward, saint and bandit: it is mortal. I am not asserting for mortals to call upon immortal aid: merely that a cry for mortal help must be an invocation of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Which, in connection with Marshal Tito, is, as I said at the beginning, very puzzling.

Planning the Earth

(Continued from page 7)

life devoted to the pursuit of a policy which is known to be evil. There is a great adventure, as well as satisfaction, in opposing it.

(Concluded)

Planning the Earth—(Addendum)

The following is quoted from *The Manchester Guardian* for October 26, 1949:—

£107,000,000 MORE FOR ATOM BOMB MAKING

Oak Ridge Tennessee), Oct. 25.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission today confirmed plans for a £107,000,000 expansion of its atomic bomb-making facilities.

Of the total, £89,000,000 would be used directly for bombs, and £17,800,000 would go to the Tennessee Valley Authority to supply power for future atomic plant requirements here.—*Reuter*.

1. See H.C. Wyld's *Universal Dictionary*: "superstition... Irrational dread of the supernatural: excessive credulity with regard to what is mysterious and unexplained." See also "probability, n...3 (math). The chance of occurrence of any one of a number of possible events, some one of which is bound to occur;" and under "chance (1). n...fr. L. Lat. Cadentia, 'falling, esp. of dice' ..."

1. Events as they happen, course of events, way things occur: 'the changes and chances of this mortal life,'
2. Various senses implying happening of events without nay cause which can be ascertained, foreseen or controlled: a undersigned, unforeseen, unforeseeable occurrence, accidental circumstance, fortune, luck: to be present by the merest chance; to leave things to chance; a game of chance, reverse of one of skill. Phr. By chance, casually by accident; b probability, likelihood, of something happening.

2. Realistic Constitutionalism, K.R.P. Publications Ltd. A reprint of an address to the Constitutional Research Association. See also *A Light Horse*, Part 111 in *The Social Creditor*, March 16, 1946.
3 In "The Land for the (Chosen) People Racket", K.R.P. Publications Ltd. 1943.

Another ENWITE Speciality

SOLVIT

For Clean, Easy Stripping

of

PAINT, LACQUER, VARNISH

Etc., from Any Surface

**NO DIFFICULT NEUTRALISATION
WILL NOT HARM FABRIC OR WOOD**

**ASK YOUR HARDWARE STORE
FOR IT**

A Gross Swindle

The Chifley Social Services Tax of 1/6 in the £ is a gross swindle. Millions of pounds are being taken out of the wage envelopes of employees for which they are getting no additional benefits. The Government is putting away huge sums into reserve funds. The tax is just a device to lower the standard of living.

The wage earner has 1/6 deducted out of every £ that he earns. But the money doesn't go into consolidated revenue. It goes into the National Welfare Fund. That Fund now has an accumulated surplus of £110 millions. That means that the Government has taxed the people more than it required to meet costs.

—J. T. Lang, *The Century*, November 11.

CODNER BROS.

Builders and Joinery Manufacturers

HOMES AND HOME SITES AVAILABLE ' Wheatsheaf Rd, GLENROY