

THE NEW TIMES

VOL. 18, No. 3.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1952.

ONE SHILLING FORTNIGHTLY.

Treacherous Decisions at London More Sacrifices for Australians

The decisions made at the recent British Commonwealth Ministers' Conference in London must, if implemented in Australia, further reduce the already falling standard of living of the majority of the Australian people. Mr. Richard Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Churchill Government, has openly proclaimed the necessity for all peoples of the British Empire to make sacrifices for the purpose of solving "the dollar problem." He has given a lead by immediately imposing upon the unfortunate British people further doses of the very austerity, which the Conservatives promised to abolish when they were in the Opposition. Mr. Butler is continuing the treacherous policies followed by Mr. Atlee and his pro-Communists.

While in London, Sir Arthur Fadden has been advised by the Canberra Socialist planners, who convinced him that it was necessary to continue and extend the Socialist financial policies of the Chifley Government. As all the Finance Ministers at the London Conference were advised by economic "experts" who all advocate totalitarian policies, it is not surprising that there was unanimous agreement that all sterling countries must make further sacrifices. The Australian people are already being prepared for what is to come.

In a statement issued on January 30, the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, said that when Sir Arthur Fadden reported to Cabinet on the London Conference, it would be decided what steps were necessary to implement the decisions of the Conference. "It is not to be taken that this will mean further credit restriction in Australia. We will not know until the Treasurer returns." We ask readers to ponder carefully the significance of Mr. Menzies' statement. He admits that the credit policy of this country has been decided by a meeting of economic "experts," most of them known Socialists, who are doing their utmost to complete the destruction of the British Empire. The programme decided upon at the London Conference must weaken further sovereignty of the British countries and, as Mr. Churchill has already discovered, make them more subservient to "dollar diplomacy."

Step by step, the destruction of the British Empire has taken place. The sudden cessation of lease-lend assistance after the war, the imposition of the dollar loans and the Bretton Woods Financial Agreement, devaluation, the fantastic policy of sacrificing the British people so that they could increase exports, to earn dollars in

order that they could import raw materials to make into further exports, have been all part of the strategy of eliminating the British Empire as a major force in world affairs. The attack has been directed by the Zionist Jews in the U.S.A., and their chief allies have been the Socialist advisers to Governments of all labels in all parts of the British Empire.

What is this "dollar crisis" which necessitates the British people and the Australian people making sacrifices? Suppose the United States were to sink beneath the sea immediately. Do we really believe that this would mean the end of the British peoples, because they could no longer export goods to America and thus earn dollars? Does any sane and honest person suggest that the peoples of the British Empire are not easily capable of adequately feeding, clothing and housing themselves? There are a few things — although comparatively few — which the British people can more easily obtain from America than elsewhere. In order to earn the dollars to pay for these goods, it is essential for some exports to be sent to America. But a fantastic export policy at the expense of the local consumer, while, as is now proposed as a result of the London Conference, a drastic reduction in importations of dollar goods, can only mean deliberate treachery. If the Canberra Government is going to implement this policy, further doses of Socialism can be now predicted. Socialism and sacrifice are synonymous terms.

Even with the present "threat of war" being carefully maintained, it is becoming increasingly obvious that all the highly industrialised countries are, because of their internal financial policies, being compelled to resort to the pre-war war struggle for a "favourable balance of trade" — exporting

more than is imported. This is how the London Conference decided the British countries should meet the "dollar crisis." But, as even the Finance Editor of the Melbourne "Herald" has pointed out, it is impossible for every country to export more than it imports. The economic "experts" and the interests they serve are well aware of this fact. They know that the British countries cannot solve the "dollar crisis." But they also know that the "solution" they propose must inevitably weaken all British countries internally. And then, of course, there is the final step, which Sir Douglas Copland has been advocating for some time:

(Continued on page 5)

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,

TO THE POINT

Continuing the Chifley Policy

The following are extracts from Budget address by Labor Senator Willesee on November 1:

The Minister (Senator Spicer) has defended Mr. Chifley's views about inflation. It is most refreshing to hear supporters of the Government admit that our late leader was a great man, in view of the misrepresentation that they indulged in during the 1949 and 1951 general election campaigns. It is very good to know that, at long last, they recognise his worth.

Senator Spicer: Does the honourable senator agree with what Mr. Chifley said?

Senator Willesee: I agree with a great deal that our late leader said, and I am glad that a born dyed-in-the-wool conservative like the Minister should now also agree with Mr. Chifley's views. This proves that one is never too old to learn. The Minister has now agreed, in effect, that Mr. Chifley was right, but, when the right honourable gentleman introduced his last budget, he was accused of seeking to impose excessive taxation, and it was contended by the opponents of Labor that the then Government wanted to take too much money out of the hands of the people. Now that this Government has budgeted for a surplus, it claims that that is what Mr. Chifley said should be done . . .

The only way in which this Government can achieve some degree of equality of prices and wages is to swallow every word spoken by its supporters during the general election campaign in 1949. When that is done, and when the Government decides to follow the advice of the late Mr. Chifley even more closely, equilibrium will be achieved. However, because the members of the Government are proud men who do not wish to swallow their pride and the unfortunate and silly statements that they made when they were attacking the very man whom they now praise, that equilibrium may be a long time coming. I trust that, in accepting the advice of Mr. Chifley, this deviation from the party line will be followed further.

* * * *

Subsidies Urged

"Cabinet would be better advised to concentrate its attention on the need for subsidising the cost of living and amending its policy of higher taxation." Mounting wages and higher taxation are forcing industry into a dangerous corner." — "Sydney Morning Herald's" Financial Review, December 6, 1951.

* * * *

Increased Production and Inflation

From the National Bank's Monthly Summary, November 12, 1951:

"While production from the primary industries is in the short term influenced by seasonal variations, and recently by the distraction, probably temporary, of high wool prices, output of most important products has shown an expansion over the years. In the basic and secondary industries too, evidence of growth is not wanting. Black coal production for the current

calendar year promises to exceed last year's record, while, except for a brief though serious stoppage in October, recent output of steel has been much closer to capacity than in earlier years. In spite of obvious shortages, the quantity of electricity generated during the current calendar year has been the highest on record. Production of bricks and timber and house construction are also on the rise, while increased numbers of automobiles, farm implements and other machines are coming from the assembly lines. In manufacturing, material and labour shortages continue, especially in the metal trades, but many large manufacturers have recently reported a notable fall in the rate of labour turnover which hitherto has been one of the most serious obstacles to productive efficiency. Further marked increases in output of basic and secondary products should appear in the next two or three years, when plant extensions, now being installed, come into production. Not only does it appear that the performance of secondary industry is lately showing some small improvement, but it is certain that the stature of industry generally in Australia is steadily growing."

We note with interest that this increase in production has not borne out the popular argument that increased production automatically reduces prices.

* * * *

Coombs and the Budget

The charge, which has been made by the Labour Party that Professor Copland is the architect of the budget, is, I believe, untrue, although he has agreed with many of its principles. As a private member, I am capable of making only a guess at those persons who assisted in formulating the budget, but if I had to nominate one man who would be disposed to recommend the lines of socialism, I should be inclined to favour the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, Dr. Coombs, who was appointed to that position by the Chifley Labour Government. I sincerely trust that the newly appointed Commonwealth Bank Board will have some influence in restraining that gentleman from implementing within the Commonwealth Bank the ideas that prevailed when the Labour Party was in office. Therefore, for the time being, the Treasurer must follow the unpleasant and unsatisfactory path of high taxation in order to curb inflation. But it must not be followed for long. Cynics say that taxation, once imposed, is never removed. The Government is going to tackle the Communists, and if the public, including the workers will co-operate with it in this and in the production drive, we shall soon have no need of budgets like the present one.

* * * *

Communism and "Anti-Semitism"

"So widespread throughout America has become the knowledge that the mainspring behind world Communism is a small group of Zionist-Jews, that their leaders have now launched a full-scale propaganda offensive (unfortunately with the co-operation of many of our left-wing and 'liberal' newspapers) that the Kremlin is 'anti-Semitic.' This Marxist 'line' is meant for the uninformed sections of the West. It is designed to confuse and confound the people of the

NEW TIMES BOOK SERVICE

Reconstruction on Christian Principles 8d.

R. 6. Menzies and the Socialist Menace..... 1/6 per dozen

FEDERAL UNION EXPOSED

By C. Barclay Smith.....2/9
A complete expose of Federal Union and its promoters.

THE ROAD FROM TAXATION AND NATIONALISATION

By F. J. Tuckfield 1/3
The solution to our present ills, written in simple question and answer form.

STOP THAT THIEF

By Stanley F. Allen1/9
This book illustrates how the financial system has been used in the plan to enslave the peoples of the world.

THE ANSWER TO TAX SLAVERY

By C. Barclay Smith 1/3
Facts and figures on the Taxation System, its Use in destroying the Independence of the Individual, and some practical suggestions for dealing with this menace.

The Life of a Policeman2/3

By A. W. Noakes. A firsthand story of conditions in the Inland. Plenty of good humour. Also much factual information.

Water For The Inland1/3

By A. W. Noakes. A vivid outline of conditions in the outback of Queensland, in which is embodied the Reid and Dr. Bradfield water schemes.

OUR MONEY, THE WAY TO FREEDOM

By Peta7/9
A remarkably well documented and indexed book showing the domination of humanity by those who manipulate the Money System. A "must" for every student.

Obtainable from

NEW TIMES LTD.

Box 1226L, 6.P.O., Melbourne.

West, while the very authors of world revolution and treason hide behind their propaganda screen. When viewed in the light of the cold facts and evidence, this propaganda is to put it mildly, ludicrous. "Gerhardt Eisler, the Jew master-spy apparently had no fear of this mythical 'anti-Semitism' when he fled back behind the Iron Curtain to safety and power! Leopold Infeld, the Jewish physio-mathematician who fled from the University of Toronto back to Poland, where he was given a key post by the Communist regime, apparently had no fear of this propagandised 'anti-Semitism' behind the Iron Curtain!"

—*The Architects Behind The World Communist Conspiracy*, by Ron Gostick.

The "Scientists"

By Geoffrey Dobbs

Although the controversy between the Soviet and "western" geneticists has now been in progress for some years, and has been much reviewed and commented upon from the points of view of both sides of the arguments, the technicalities involved have somewhat obscured the limited nature of the disagreement, and the significance of the situation revealed.

It is a curious fact that in recent years geneticists have been notorious among biologists for the uniformity of their left-progressivist-materialist outlook. 'Evolutionary humanism' is, I believe, the preferred name for it. At any rate, no considerable disagreement can be found within their ranks on the general thesis that it is the purpose, or task, or maybe destiny, of Man to hoist himself higher and ever higher in the path of Progress by means of his own bootlaces (as well as the rest of his material environment) making for himself larger and ever more magnificent Boots as he grows too big for each pair in succession, until the Whole Universe lies beneath his feet. (And then? Well, it is a long time ahead!) Meanwhile the only possibility of disagreement is about the facts; just what sort of hereditary bootlaces is Man provided with, and how can they best be used to bring about this remarkable effect of evolutionary levitation?

It must be conceded that they do not, perhaps, express their beliefs in exactly this way, but such an excellent expositor as Dr. Julian Huxley, in his popular book on the subject*, makes it abundantly clear that the quarrel is fratricidal within the ideological fold, between the Soviet geneticists on the one hand, who will not submit to the limitations of any real mechanism of heredity, but maintain that what seems to be largely imaginary boot-laces will do the job much quicker, and the 'western' geneticists (Mendelist-Morganist-Weissmannite-bourgeois deviationists) on the other, who insist in their reactionary way that the real mechanism of the chromosomes laboriously discovered, and so suggestively shaped and adapted to being pulled about and tied into knots, is the only thing for the purpose!

Of course, it is a serious matter, and one at which Dr. Huxley is rightly perturbed, that scientists should be able to ignore, or deny, a fairly well-established body of facts, and particularly that they should be forced to do so by political pressure. But his protests would be a good deal more convincing if they were not directed exclusively against the end-term in the process of progressive Governmental interference with science; that in which people like Dr. Huxley, and, in his humbler way, the present writer, are told what facts they may and may not take account of, and what interpretation they may, and may not, put upon them, and are punished by deprivation of livelihood, of freedom, and even of life, for any signs of hesitation in toeing the prescribed line.

We western scientists heartily agree that this is going just a little too far, though it is unlikely that our feelings in the matter are quite as deep as those of our opposite numbers in Russia; but we are also unanimous, if we are to believe Dr. Hux-

* *Soviet Genetics and World Science*, Chatto and Windus, 1949.

ley, in agreeing that it is only this last step which is so objectionable, and, until they committed this deplorable blunder, the Soviets were merely pursuing the admirable, and indeed inevitable, path of increasing social control of science, in which we should make haste to follow them, if we do not want to be left far, far behind in the Path of Progress. After all, it is only the end-stage of a fall which does any damage, and it is merely reactionary to refuse to jump over an attractive, and indeed inevitable, precipice when one has been given an assurance (or perhaps even a Charter!) that one will be allowed to stop the journey a couple of inches from the ground, and on no account ever be forced to complete it.

Just how far Dr. Huxley is prepared to go is made clear on page 199:

"Can they (men of science) accept the existence of an official scientific policy? Can they accept the possibility that the majority of men of science will be paid by the State and that the major cost of scientific work will be borne by government funds? Can they accept official direction as to what subjects shall be investigated?"

"I think that they can (indeed, that they must)—but with certain clearly formulated provisos. A government is at perfect liberty to embark on a large-scale and comprehensive official scientific policy. It can legitimately decide that that policy shall be predominantly practical—designed to raise the standard of life, to improve health, to increase production, or to promote military efficiency. It can legitimately demand that the scientific curriculum throughout all stages of education should be adequate and should be framed so as to give the best possible understanding of nature and man's place in nature, of the social functions of science and of its intellectual and practical importance. It can legitimately insist on large-scale educational campaigns outside the school and university system to help the general population to understand the value and importance of science as a whole or of this or that branch of scientific work, or to make people feel that they are actively and intelligently participating in the nation's scientific effort. It can legitimately do everything in its power to check superstition, to combat unscientific or anti-scientific attitudes of mind, and to promote an understanding of scientific method, of its value and importance.

"Probably all men of science would agree that it is legitimate, and most of them that it is desirable, for a Government to embark on such a policy. But they would assuredly only agree on certain conditions."

Anything more fatuous than this it is difficult to imagine, and the contempt, which the author must have for his readers is abysmal. Government scientific employees, working on a Government scientific policy under Government direction, after being

Government educated at all stages, and Government propagandised out of school, so as to achieve the Government's understanding of the scientific method, of nature and of man's place in nature; not to mention having had what the Government regards as superstition or chooses to call unscientific or anti-scientific attitudes of mind, checked by every Government-legitimised means; these people are to lay down provisos and conditions to the Government about the autonomy of science, and the exerting of pressure regarding the acceptance or rejection of "scientific facts, laws or theories":

"It must not subordinate the intellectual autonomy of science to any other criteria, whether religious, philosophical, or political, nor seek to impose upon scientific truth standards other than its own, nor relate scientific activity to any orthodoxy or authoritarian principle, nor, most of all, impose a scientific orthodoxy."

This sentence, so easily acceptable along the lines of current thought, has implications, which are obvious the moment they are looked for. To use the words 'truth' and 'facts' is meaningless unless the writer believes that truth should prevail over error, facts take precedence over non-facts. To say, therefore, that other standards must not be imposed upon 'scientific' truth is merely to say that 'scientific' truth is truth, and other 'truth' is untruth; 'scientific' criteria and standards are those which enable men to arrive at the truth, and those of religion; philosophy and politics do not. Or if we admit that these things have a valid place in life at all, then science is claimed to be in itself the only true religion, philosophy and policy.

In fact it is a matter of general knowledge that this is the view copiously set forth in the writings of Dr. Huxley and others of what, if we wished to insult them, we might call the Wellsian School. What is relatively new and dangerous is the increasing centralisation of science, and the prevalence of this view among holders of high official positions in the 'scientific' world. The disapproval expressed of the imposition of a 'scientific orthodoxy' does not include the views of the disapprover, which are, as usual, felt to be purely impartial, merely the truth; but the amount of Government control envisaged surely must involve the application of some accepted principles, standards and criteria, which will inevitably constitute what is regarded as an orthodoxy. The insistence on the autonomy of science is in fact an insistence that this shall be the '*scientific*' orthodoxy, which is just the sort, which, thinking of Lysenkoism, Dr. Huxley says 'most of all' must not be imposed. What in fact he means is that the Government ought to impose scientific orthodoxy but must not impose a scientific heresy, i.e., any view not held by most important scientists, and particularly by its chief scientific advisers.

But since the Government appoints its own scientific advisers, and increasingly controls all those appointments the tenure of which makes a man an 'important' scientist whose views it is advisable for his juniors to treat with respect, it can, and inevitably will, select and encourage the 'scientific' opinions which best suit its policy, and these will naturally tend to be—
(Continued on page 4)

THE SCIENTISTS

(Continued from page 3)

come a 'scientific orthodoxy' within a short time, though the thing need not always be done as crudely as the Soviet Government has done it in the Lysenko case. But to expect scientific opinions to remain independent of the official view in any country where the Government pays the majority of men of science, and finances the major part of scientific work, is not reasonable.

If science is to be autonomous, especially as regards political considerations, and yet is to be under State control to the extent that Dr. Huxley regards as inevitable and desirable, it can only mean that policies must be determined by scientists, and we are back again at H. G. Well's open conspiracy of scientists to rule the world. The official view and the scientific view will then coincide, and it is quite clear that that is what is intended, and that any unofficial competition can then be combated as unscientific or anti-scientific.

Just to make it all quite clear, it is explained that the coherent system of evolutionary theory based on neo-Mendelism and neo-Darwinism, in fact the orthodox genetics of the Western World, rejected as the Morganist-Mendelist etc., etc., heresy in the Soviet political Hemisphere, is the great unifying concept which ought to be made the basis of State biological education in the west. In a footnote on p. 207 we read:

"It should be pointed out that the Russians do insist on a unified point of view in biological education. Michurinism is now to be taught in all schools and universities . . . The west needs to consolidate its own scientific position through its educational system."

Obviously it is not the imposition of scientific theories or beliefs by the State, which is objected to, but merely the imposition of theories, which are regarded as untrue.

If ever a theory was purely a matter of philosophical speculation, impossible, owing to the time-scale of human life, to put to the test of critical experiment, it is the theory of evolution. Twenty years ago orthodox neo-Darwinism was moribund. It was beginning to be recognised by many of the younger scientists that the diversion of biological science into fruitless speculations about phylogeny had largely sterilized it, and with some notable exceptions their interest had very largely departed from the subject which had so enthralled the minds of their elders. The philosophic battle between the evolutionists and the spiritual descendants of Archbishop Usher had ended in a famous victory for the former. The world was not created in 4004 B.C., nor peopled by a species of divine conjuring in six days of 24 hours each. Continuity was restored to life and to the Universe after a temporary and rather absurd aberration of the human mind; but the suspicion was already beginning to arise that it had been replaced by another aberration, which was capable of absurdities quite as extreme.

The idea that the conflict had been between fact and fancy, between science and religion, even between one scientific theory and one particular cult of religion, is of course, nonsense. It was a conflict

between two faiths, neither of which was much concerned with the mere facts beyond the necessity of using as many as possible to justify itself. The evolution theory was no lightly held scientific working hypothesis; if it had been so it would have been lightly and easily discarded when Darwin's simple explanation of the mechanism of evolution fell to the ground, and again when the Mutation Theory failed to provide a convincing alternative. If the theory of the Descent of Man from an Ape-like ancestor had been a scientific hypothesis it would have been discarded when most of the proofs convincing to an earlier generation turned out to be compounded of an unalterable faith in the theory, a vivid imagination and a few selected bits of bone. But as fast as one set of 'proofs' becomes valueless another set is erected in their place.

The revival of the flagging interest in evolution in recent years has been very largely the work of the "Mendelist-Morganist" school of geneticists, of which Dr. Huxley is a protagonist. There is no scientific reason why the study of genetics need be developed in relation to the theory of evolution, and used to prove that a satisfactory mechanism of evolution exists; the necessity is psychological; the process is assumed to occur, and therefore a mechanism must be found for it. The use of the word "evolution" with two meanings helps to cover this up. In recent years a good deal of light has been thrown on the ways in which new forms of life may arise and perpetuate themselves in nature, and the mere process of gradual change so brought about is commonly referred to as "evolution" by scientists who hope to avoid being drawn into the philosophical arguments which raged so furiously in the past on the subject. In this sense, of course, "evolution" is merely a word describing a fact; but this is not the "great sweep of evolution," the "major unifying concept" which is the basis of evolutionary humanism, and which Dr. Huxley wants to see made the basis of biological education, and which would "consolidate the scientific position" of the west as against the Michurinism of the east.

The general effect of the selection-pressure of the changing physical world on variations in the mechanism of heredity provides a scientific explanation of that broad trend in the living world which parallels the increasing entropy of the physical world; the general mixing up and sorting out and selective elimination and extinction of genes, and of the kinds or organisms bearing them. It provides no explanation whatever of the alleged grand advance from the first animated molecule to man, continued in the progress of human society, which is the big idea providing the enthusiasm and driving force behind the philosophy of scientific humanism shared by both Huxley and Lysenko.

When Dr. Huxley writes (p. 206): —

"Life is a process, the process that is technically styled organic evolution. The course of the process follows certain rules and laws, and it is operated by certain mechanisms (notably Natural Selection working' by way of neo-Mendelian inheritance). Thus the over-all aim of

biology is to understand the process of evolution."

He is expressing a fervid conviction very natural in a Huxley, but in support of which the scientific evidence is, on the whole and always has been, negative.

A statement of this sort in a popular book slurs over the fact that science has been abandoned here for philosophy, ignores the philosophical arguments which have been going on for half a century until they have reached an impasse, and merely advances the philosophically unconvincing views of the writer, under the cloak of science. What is so dangerous is the attempt to erect this particular philosophy of evolutionary humanism into a scientific orthodoxy by identifying it with "science." To agree with it is called "scientific," to disagree with it "unscientific." To produce evidence in its favour which later turns out to be in error is still "scientific," to adduce evidence against it the factual nature of which is never challenged is still "unscientific." It is still "scientific" to believe that the mechanism of heredity accounts for "progressive" evolution, and to seek ever more complex proofs of it, although the great bulk of the facts point in the opposite direction; it is still "scientific" to believe in the spontaneous generation of living from non-living matter, provided the date and the scale of the thing are pushed back beyond the possibility of the disproof which has always attended thorough investigation of this supposition; these things are "scientific" only because they are logically necessary to the Huxleyite philosophy, which, being fundamentally too weak to fight under its own colours, depends now for its survival on the sanctions of the State and the Super-State in the indoctrination of the young, and of the "lay" public.

Fratricidal strife is usually the most bitter, and the violence of the acrimony which has developed between the upholders of Soviet and Western "genetics" need not obscure the fact that the bifurcation is a very recent one, and seems to be a minor by-product of the sharpening of the struggle for power between the eastern and western socialists. A few years ago they all graded imperceptibly into each other and were very matey together in their general opposition to superstition (meaning religion) reaction (meaning opposition) and so on. The Soviet was the Great Progressive Example of Scientific Government, and anybody who doubted it was a reactionary. Certain people, notably Professor Haldane, must

(Continued on page 11)

"Science, Liberty, and Peace"

By Aldous Huxley.

The central theme of this important book by a great writer and thinker, is to show how every increase in technological development has been exploited to concentrate increased power into the hands of a small minority of power lusters. Huxley clearly postulates the basic problem confronting modern industrial civilisation.

Price 7/2d., post free, from *New Times Ltd.*, Box 1226L., G.P.O., Melbourne.

C. H. Douglas' 1920 Analysis of Inflation

In his second book, "Economic Democracy," published in 1920, C. H. Douglas analysed the present credit system and revealed how it was inherently inflationary. When certified economists and other "experts" are drooling their nonsense about rising prices, their "cause" and the "cure," it is instructive to read what Douglas wrote in 1920. Subsequent events have fully confirmed the analysis he made over 30 years ago.

The following extracts from "Credit Power and Democracy" indicate that Douglas is the one man who has diagnosed the cause of rising prices in every country of the world:

"... the first thing to note is that all these concerns (manufacturing enterprises) are distributing purchasing-power to individuals, in the form of wages and salaries, ahead of production, which causes a rise in the price of existing ultimate commodities, the only commodities that individuals buy; or, to put it in the way described above, all money existing is diluted. Secondly, they are distributing this purchasing power obtained out of 'credit' largely (and this is increasingly true) in respect of capital production — i.e., things which in themselves are of no use to consumers: Tools, factories, etc. The community as a whole, therefore, is producing and being paid for real capital as well as ultimate products, and much of the real capital is permanent and survives the lifetime of its producers.

"Now consider these points in connection with the proposition . . . that the current flow of wages, salaries, and dividends is less than the current flow of price values of articles produced — bearing in mind the fact that prices vary between a lower limit represented by cost of production and an upper limit defined by 'what they will fetch' — i.e., effective demand. It will be seen . . . that the wages and salaries (already insufficient to buy the whole of production) tend to be diluted in value until they represent the subsistence allowance of the persons concerned — in other words, total prices of ultimate commodities barely necessary for the accepted standard of life tend to equate themselves to the total effective purchasing-power of individuals, and this is true, even if dividends to individuals are included and widespread.

"Consequently, and this is the all-important point we wish to make, although the unregulated system of credit-issue and price-making distributes purchasing power both in respect of capital-production (tools, factories, intermediate products), and ultimate products (necessaries, services, amenities), it takes back in the prices of

ultimate products only, practically the whole of this purchasing power, leaving the community, considered as a permanent institution, in the position of having bought both the plant and the product, but having only got delivery — i.e., control of the product. Such a state of affairs, so long as it continues, makes the control of the policy of the world in the interest of the community a mere sentimental chimera — no nationalisation, guildisation or any other administrative manipulation can affect the existing control otherwise than to introduce friction into it (at the cost of everyone concerned) so long as the prices of ultimate products — the taking back of purchasing power derived from credit — are equal to or greater than 'costs' — the dispensation of purchasing-power derived from credit. Further, the existing control is semi-automatic; every increase of credit expansion on these terms means a greater capital production and a proportionately smaller use of that capital to deliver ultimate products."

"... To understand the trend of the present system from the standpoint of policy, in the light of the above analysis, we must notice that it results in keeping the majority of persons employed approximately eight hours per day, either in producing, distributing, or safeguarding what is admittedly a deficient supply of ultimate commodities, and this in spite of the advancement of science and its application to Production. We see also that whatever the amount of these ultimate commodities produced, and however much cash the community earns, the aggregate prices of mere consumption goods can be made to equal the aggregate earnings in respect of the production of both capital goods and consumption goods, either by keeping the articles in short supply or making monopoly arrangements to set prices at a 'suitable' level; but, in any case, prices of capital goods plus prices of consumption goods are in excess of available cash demands because of the credit factor in the prices; a relation which results in the control of plant and improved process passing from the producers, as fast as produced, into the hands of the credit-mongers and the price-makers, rather than into the hands of the community, to whom it belongs in the nature of things. This concentration of control being assisted by a short supply of ultimate products until competition is finally eliminated those having control have every inducement to deliver the minimum quantity of goods at the highest obtainable prices, so long as these, in the aggregate, absorb the distributed purchasing-power."

FROM ADMIRAL TO CABIN BOY By Admiral Sir Barry Domville 13/4

This book may be described as a biographical history of international affairs from the end of World War 1 to 1943. Admiral Domville has an excellent knowledge of the part played in world affairs by the Jews; this knowledge caused him to be imprisoned for three years.

Financial Support for Expansion Programme

We are pleased to report, as we go to Press, that there has been an encouraging response to our financial appeal for our proposed 1952 expansion programme. We have been deeply touched by the sincerity of many who have obviously made genuine sacrifices to ensure that our cause does not fail because of lack of finance. But comparatively few have yet contributed. We therefore appeal to the majority who have not yet done so, to hurry their donations along so that we can speed up our organisational programme.

Send donations TO-DAY to New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

TREACHEROUS DECISIONS AT LONDON CONFERENCE

(Continued from page 1)

The virtual abolition of the sterling group of nations mainly comprised of British Empire countries, and the development of Australia and other parts of the Empire by large dollar investments. This would, of course, permit the controllers of the financial system in the U.S.A. to keep the Americans on the road to Socialism under the guise of developing other parts of the world, while at the same time making British Empire countries directly subservient to Wall Street and Washington policies. That this would make impossible the continuance of British traditions and political sovereignty is obvious. Sir Douglas Copland admits this, and states that "economic union" would eventually lead to "political union." Loyal Australians can resist this treacherous programme if they but stir themselves and arouse their fellows to the danger. Such action would be most appropriate in a year when Australia's next Queen is visiting the country. Let Australians demonstrate that their loyalty to their own traditions and way of life is not merely of the lip-service variety. Red-blooded action is what is required.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF N.S.W.

have issued a Manifesto in Booklet Form, entitled

"SOCIAL CREDIT'S ANSWER TO CHAOS"

It is a challenge to the people regarding AUSTRALIA'S future . . . 7/- per dozen, posted, or 6d. each, plus 3d. post. . . Write Hon. Secretary, Room 9, 2nd Floor, 333 George St., Sydney.

"New Times," February 8, 1952—Page 5

THE NEW TIMES

Established 1935.

Published every alternate 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.

Subscription Rates: 25/- Yearly; 13A Half Yearly; 7/- Quarter.

VOL. 18.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1952.

No. 3.

The Latest Basic Wage Increase

Because the latest adjustment of the Basic Wage is not as great as many had believed, the idea has been fostered that the inflation problem is being solved. Mr. Menzies, Sir Douglas Copland, and other "leaders" have stated that the Government's last Budget and credit restriction policies are now starting to produce "beneficial" results. A Federal election held at the present would, in our opinion, prove conclusively that the majority of the Australian electors are not at all impressed with the inflation "solution" being imposed by Mr. Menzies on behalf of his Socialist planners. At a time when the "experts" are starting to be "cautiously optimistic" about the results of their anti-inflationary policies, we repeat what we said in our editorial of January 11:

"Several months ago, claims were being made by some financial writers that 'financial stability' would be attained early this year. Supporters of the Government's Budget claimed that it would help stem inflation. We repeat what we said when we commented upon suggestions that inflation would be checked this year: That the present financial rules are inherently inflationary, and that prices must continue to rise progressively faster if the economic system is to continue functioning." The credit restriction and higher taxation policies of the Government have undoubtedly made it much more difficult for those operating the economic system to make it function satisfactorily. Financial pressure on retailers has forced them to reduce their profits and, in some cases, to sell at a loss. Clothing prices in particular have been either reduced or prevented from rising by what amounts to subsidisation by the retailer. This undoubtedly helped prevent the February Basic Wage increase from being much greater. But there is a limit to the practice of business organisations subsidising prices by accepting lower profits and by using reserves. All costs must be recovered in prices. This means that increased costs can only be recovered by increased prices. Not only are wage costs increasing, but, so are all other costs. Prices must therefore continue to increase, Mr. Menzies and the "experts" notwithstanding.

There are many, of course, who argue that it is the automatic quarterly adjustment of the Basic Wage, which is one of the main causes of inflation in Australia. These people are apparently unaware that inflation is a major problem in every country in the world... Even if there were no automatic wage increases, prices would still rise while present financial rules are followed, so slavishly. Although the rate of credit expansion has been deliberately slowed down in recent months, the total volume of credit has been progressively expanded, as an examination of banking figures reveals. Orthodox financial rules make it imperative that there be a continuous expansion of new credit — otherwise the economic system would collapse. But this expansion of new credits is at present inflationary. If, however, new credits were used to reduce prices, by subsidisation, instead of increasing them, growing economic stability would be the major result. Unless a policy of price-subsidies is implemented, prices must continue to increase.

TAX STRIKE SUGGESTED

Mr. C. H. Allen, of Adelaide, has sent the following excellent letter to a number of South Australian provincial papers: —

"Even Professor Murdoch ('The Advertiser,' 26/1/52) has joined in the jeremiad now swelling to a howl about the threat of food shortage, due to high taxation. Belated as is this indignation, there is little to show that the efforts for redress will be properly focussed and directed.

"As an example, a pastoralist in the S.E. complained bitterly about the confiscatory taxation, but advised his hearers not to strike. To strike by reducing production would be faulty; but there is urgent need for a strike against payment of taxes as now inflicted. If in a few solid and representative districts there can be a solid block of worthy citizens ready to issue an ultimatum to the State and Federal Governments, it would be effective.

"Let them say that, if there is no adequate redress within, say, three months, they will contract out from any correspondence to and from the Commissioner of Taxes. Don't let it be thought that the Government will go short of money; a hundred million pounds is just as easily produced as a £1 note.

"We must hold on to our money until we are assured that our supposed parliamentary servants are our servants indeed. On these lines relations can be resumed, but not before."

HOW TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM BOOKLETS

The second booklet in this important series entitled *Communism can be Defeated without a Third World War*, by the Campaign Director of the Victorian League of Rights, Mr. Eric Butler is now available.

This booklet points out that Russia can be defeated in both the moral and physical fields of war, and if the defeat is in the former field a third World War is not inevitable.

This booklet stresses the support given to Communist plans by Western subordination of principle to expediency in the Second World War. The Western world must state what it stands for, enunciate its principles and remain true to its Christian traditions if Communism is to be defeated. The thesis put forward by this booklet is well substantiated with documentary evidence, and concludes with a practical programme for the defeat of Communism.

Obtain your copy of this valuable booklet from: —

New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O.

1/3 per copy posted, discount given for quantity.

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.

In Search of Democracy

By Foogle

I can't help feeling worried about myself, particularly about that part of me which seems unable to adjust itself to popular ideologies, or, more particularly, to the terms in which these are often expressed.

Unfortunately, none of these terms have any precise meaning today, except perhaps "kingship," which he declares good and "tyranny" which he declares bad, and both of which are capable of being found embodied in the same person. So I resumed my inquiry.

President Abe. Lincoln made an oratorical shot at a definition of democracy in his much-quoted "Government of the" people, for the people, by the people," which, if practised, would simply mean the government of the minority by the majority — not a very bright scheme if you are "looking for wisdom in your government. Meanwhile, all these schemes of government are merely of academic interest to us, since not even the majority has any say whatever in the matter of policy. The utmost we are able to do is to choose which of two lots of people shall administer the same policy.

What started all this? Oh, yes! I remember. It all started with a report in my newspaper, which read: "Canberra. Nov. 20. The Federal executive of the A.L.P. today rebuked by resolution, members of the party who failed to co-operate in the party's NO campaign against the recent referendum on the anti-Communist powers. The executive carried a resolution declaring that it would not in future tolerate unjustifiable disregard of Federal Conference decisions on democratic principles."

I have more than sympathy for the NO protagonists, but what I am after at the moment is an enunciation of the democratic principle involved. And it is evident that, in the view of the Federal executive, it is undemocratic to ignore the decisions of the Big Boys; whence I deduce Democracy means obedience in spite of your own convictions. On the face of things, this view of "democracy" appears to be similar to the Russian view, for I understand that the Soviet also "will not tolerate unjustifiable disregard" of the central ukase. So far, the sum of my researches does not appear to be either imposing or fruitful.

In order, the components run: —

Aristotle: Bad, because of participation by ignorant elements.

Lincoln: impracticability, undesirable in attempted practice.

Federal Executive: Obedience against one's convictions.

I can't see anything in that little lot to go to war about. And, worst of all, I still don't know what this democracy stuff is, unless it is a sort of mesmeric incantation, such as "Open, Sesame," used by our rulers to get our signature on an open cheque.

When I was a schoolboy, I always seemed to be able to give the answers expected of me — on which I congratulated myself, as I was thus enabled to elude the corporal punishment, which usually followed the wrong answers. But, since that halcyon period, I have discovered grave deficiencies in my understanding. Terms in common use among my fellow men have a way of

bringing corrugations to the old brow, which should, I feel, remain serene. Expressions like "Red," "Fascist," "Bolshie," "Scab" and "Ratbag," to name a few, do not make impressions with exact boundaries upon my mind. There is only one element I can identify in them, and that only from the manner in which they are uttered. That element is Opprobrium. You never encounter a man who thumps his chest and proudly asserts that he is any of these things. There are, of course, terms which people will use about themselves, but which, are, to me, equally unsatisfactory. And the one over which I have most difficulty is "Democrat." My researches concerning this word have not brought me the enlightenment I had hoped for.

For instance, Russia during the last war was usually referred to as a "democracy." From this I deduced that a democracy is a civil state of being in which no one is permitted to say what he wants, and would not be allowed to get it, anyhow. On the other hand, everyone seems to be agreed

that Britain, America and most of Europe are also "democracies." From this I deduced that anyone could say what he wants, provided he doesn't mind being told that he can't have it. He is not entirely prohibited by ukase from getting what he is after, but his progress is turned into an obstacle race — fate and goodness knows what else being responsible for the obstructions.

The disparity between these two conceptions of "democracy" is so painfully apparent that even I couldn't miss it. So I hunted further afield for information on this question, for which everybody but myself seemed to have the answer.

I then found I was in distinguished company. I also found that, from the beginning, the word has been a troublemaker. Its origin being Greek, I appealed to a very celebrated Greek — the long since departed Aristotle — a big noise in politics in his day. He distinguished six types of government, three good and three bad. The three good types were "Constitutional," "Aristocracy," and "Kingship." The three bad types were "Democracy," "Oligarchy" and "Tyranny."

The Mysterious Protocols . 3/3

Full text of "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion."

Jewish Influence in U.N.O.

In a letter dated October 24, 1946, Morris A. Levy, Secretary of the World League of Liberal Jews, said: "The promise of Jehovah for the Jewish people to rule the world, and for the Jews to hold high places in the World Government has arrived."

The following list of key positions in the "United" Nations Organisation which are held by Jews, confirms Mr. Levy's statement: —Special Adviser to Department of Economic Affairs, A. Rosenberg; Director, Division of Economic Stability and Development, D. Weintraub; Assistant Secretary General, Department of Public Information, B. A. Cohen; Director, Films Division, J. Benoit-Levy; Director, Legal Department, A. H. Feller; Director, Printing Division, Bureau of Documents, D. Zablodowsky; Director of Interpreters, G. Rabinovitch; Director of U.N. Information Centre, Geneva, J. Shapiro; Deputy Director, Administrative Department, M. Abramovitz; Executive Officer, Personnel, M. Bergmann; Director General, International Labour Office, Geneva, D. A. Morse (real name, Mascovitch).

Jews hold the following positions in U.N.E.S.C.O.: Director, Educational Reconstruction, J. Eisenhart; Director, Education for International Understanding, M. F. Luffman; Director, Tension Department (Social Sciences), Dr. O. Klinberg; Director, Bureau of Public Information, H. Kaplan; Director, Bureau of Administrative Management, C. H. Weitz; Director, Bureau of Personnel, S. G. Selsky; Director, Division of Housing, M. B. Abramski.

At the International Bank, M. M. Mendels is the Secretary. On the International Monetary Fund, Camille Gutt is Managing Director; Oscar Altman is Administrative Assistant to Managing Director; E. M. Bernstein is Director of Research; while the

Senior Counsellors are Joseph Gold and Leo Levanthal.

Z. Deutschmann is Director of the Technological Section of the World Health Organisation. G. Meyer is Director of the Translation Section. In the International Refugee Organisation, the Director General of the Department of Health is Meyer Cohen; the Director General of the Department of Repatriation is P. Jacobsen; the Director of the Division of Repatriation is R. J. Youden. The U.N.O. Observer in Korea is Col. A. G. Katzin, and the U.N. Information Officer in Korea is George Movshon.

It will be recalled that the U.N. Charter was drawn up by the Jew, Leo Pasvolosky, special assistant to the American Secretary of State.

The International Jew . . . 3/3

By Eric D. Butler.

The most detailed commentary on the Protocols yet written. Packed full of explosive factual material

Does It Fit The Facts? . . . 6/6

C. H. Douglas's correspondence the Rev. Dr. Sallis Daiches concerning the "authenticity" of The Protocols.

"New Times," February 8, 1952 Page 7



High Taxation and Food Production

In the Melbourne journal, "News-Weekly," the following revealing item appeared on January 30: "I was talking to a Federal politician over the phone last week. Apparently, like thousands of others, he had discovered a crisis on the rural front, and was anxious to write a letter to the Press about it. He was keen to check up on a few points . . . That particular Member of Parliament is an excellent man of undoubted capabilities. He represents a crowded suburban electorate. As far as I know, he doesn't know a bee from a bull's foot. Yet he was obviously anxious to break into print setting forth points of policy designed to provide a solution to the rural crisis."

We can well imagine the politician referred to as being a pliable tool in the hands of the planners who at present are urging that bigger and more centralised planning is essential for adequate food production. Centralised and, of course, "scientific" planning is also being strongly urged by the editors of some city newspapers. The Melbourne "Sun" is shouting for a "Five year plan." Why not a four year plan? Or a six-year plan? Perhaps the "Sun's" editorial writer, who also might find it difficult to distinguish between a bee and a bull's foot, settled upon a five year plan because he thought that five year plans are the fashion. They are — Soviet Russia has had a number of them. And the total result has been a lowering of the individual's standard of living.

What is urgently required for increased food production is not a plan but a new financial policy, which will provide farmers with adequate incentive to increase their efforts. Completely ignoring the crippling effects of high taxation, the Melbourne "Sun" editorial writer in his leading article on January 29, clearly indicates his sympathy with the Socialist "solution" of the food problem: ". . . manpower is but one of a number of needs which must be met if primary production is to be re-established on a sound basis. Realisation of this is inherent in the A.L.P. plan, which envisages building up of the basic coal, iron and steel industries, curtailment of non-essential and uneconomic industries, and a nation-wide scheme of public works directly related to rural development." We are becoming increasingly convinced that the food crisis has been deliberately developed for the purpose of furthering the policy of Sovietisation in this country.

While the office "experts" are busy drafting their plans, practical farmers and their spokesmen are bluntly stating one of the major reasons why food production is

not keeping pace with growing demands. Mr. T. C. Stott, Secretary of the Australian Wheat Growers' Federation, said at the recent wheat growers' conference in Melbourne, "Vicious taxation may easily cause a decline in the area sown to wheat in Australia in the coming season. If the Federal Government refuses to modify its taxes on farmers and the wheat acreage as a result decreases by a further one-fifth, national disaster is possible."

Mr. Stott went on to give an example of how present high taxation is affecting a wheat farmer in South Australia: —

"A farmer at Balaklava (S.A.) has six sons. Three of them are returned servicemen, and, to get them established on farms, he purchased more land with an £8,000 mortgage from the bank.

"The farmer then received his income tax assessment for his 1950-51 income of £8,702. The ordinary tax was £4,669, but the provisional tax of £5,136 took the total to £9,806.

"The provisional tax he paid the previous year was £893, and his 20 percent, wool deduction amounted to £954. Subtracting these amounts, the farmer worked out the tax he still had to pay at £7,959.

"The farmer had hoped to pay off part of the £8,000 mortgage this year, but, because of the terrific tax bill, it looked more like increasing his overdraft. He could not do this, however, because of the Federal Government's foolish policy on credit restriction.

"This same farmer — who is typical of hundreds in Australia — ordered a diesel tractor, to cost £1,500, four years ago. Now he could not afford it, and would have to make do with his "worn out" tractor — another blow to wheat acreages."

Commenting upon the Federal Government's proposed inquiry into reasons for Australia's rapidly declining wheat acreage, Mr. C. T. Dodds, secretary of the Wimmera District Council of the Victorian Wheat and Wool Growers' Association,

ORGANIC FARMING AND GARDENING BOOKS

Watch this list for the latest books.

"Feeding Ourselves" .. 16/9

By Philip Oyler. Mr. Oyler, with his wide knowledge of farming practice, proves beyond doubt that the British islands can make themselves completely independent of any external food supply.

"The Generous Earth" .. 23/7

By Philip Oyler. A fascinating book, dealing with the life of the peasants of the Dordogne Valley in France, where farming practice is the same as it was centuries ago. An interesting study of a truly organic way of living.

"The Weed Problem" .. 15/3

By F. C. King. By the author of "Is Digging Necessary?", this book is an extension of the no-digging idea, and points out the vital relationship of weeds to the organic health of the garden.

"Organic Husbandry" .. 5/6

This book is a symposium of the works of the most advanced writers on organic farming, and provides a very useful introduction to the subject for the beginner, and provides new avenues of interest for those who are already well versed in organic principles and practice.

Prices Subject to Alteration without notice.

Order now from
NEW TIMES LIMITED

Subscribers Please Note

Subscribers, when paying subscriptions by cheque are requested not to cross out the word "bearer," as this necessitates the payment of duty before the cheque can be cleared.

PLEASE ADD EXCHANGE TO
COUNTRY AND INTERSTATE
CHEQUES.

HUSBANDRY

"... husbandry has nothing to do with reversion to a past regarded as old-fashioned and obsolete. The way the past comes into it is an illustration, simply because, with all their shortcomings, our forefathers practised it. Husbandry is a means of recovering a certain order and mode of being which is timeless and universal, which is, in fact, a portion of man's nature. It is therefore the most practical thing in the world, since, in acting contrary to his own nature, man is destroying himself. There is plenty of evil in man in any period of the world's history. But there is all the difference in the world between trying and failing to live in accordance with the natural law, and substituting for it a gimcrack system of our own making which has no validity outside power-politics, industrialism, and the money market. This is exactly what modern civilisation is trying to do; a return to husbandry is the way out.

"... a return to husbandry is bound, sooner or later, to be achieved... the real arbiter will be necessity. Whether we like it or not, the issue of adequate food supplies and of proper nutrition can only be settled by the fullest development of home production on the one hand and by intensive husbandry on the other. "That world (of the nineteenth century) is dead, and only politicians, economists, and financiers are unaware of it. The health of the nation has been half poisoned by preserved and doctored foods, imported over vast distances, and the soils where they came from exhausted by the big-business agriculture producing them. Health-giving foods can only be consumed fresh by a system of local marketing and produced with all their food value intact by a 'loving management' of the soil. The foreign markets, which were the lure of the nineteenth century economics, have gone. It is not 'export or die,' but cultivate our own land or die. It can only be so cultivated by husbandry, by the intensive methods that peasants and yeomen practise where they are not crippled by finance. Large-scale industrial farming is by its very nature extensive, and will fail simply because it has not the capacity to produce enough food per acre. Only enough men on the

land skilled in the arts of husbandry can produce enough food to safeguard the nation against a world shortage in food. This will not be scarcity artificially induced by the modern economic system, but a real one. A return to husbandry is a double wisdom, that of right values, but also of self-preservation."

"Unless we can bring men back to enjoying the daily life which moderns call a dull life, our whole civilisation will be in ruins... Unless we can make daybreak and daily bread and the creative secrets of labour interesting in themselves, there will fall on our entire civilisation a fatigue, which is the one disease from which civilisations do not recover. So died the great pagan civilisation; of bread and circuses and forgetfulness of the household gods."

—G. K. Chesterton.

"The present century has seen a consistent drive for a world totalitarian system, of which the vast wartime extension of bureaucratic control is a part. Centralisation has become the policy and monopoly the objective. Farming, being a way of life, is offering an encouraging degree of resistance to these dehumanising influences. But constantly increasing taxation and other State-imposed burdens.... have

forced greater and greater consideration to be given to the financial or book-figure side of farming. This has had several evil consequences. It has led to a very dangerous bias to all cropping and farm-management questions. It has led to the gradual replacement of the most traditionally minded by 'business' farmers, who give cash crops a place of too great importance in their planning, and who cut out many sound but not obviously lucrative customs.

"Under this finance-dictated farm policy, with capital drained more and more by taxation and replaced by bank overdraft at high rates of interest, the great urge is to increase financial turnover and to reduce 'overhead' charges. This was the main cause of the disastrous trend to fantastically high milk yields, egg records, and rate of growth in pigs and other livestock... The chief need is for the removal of all unreal restrictions, in particular financial restrictions, upon production and consumption. The chief danger is the terms upon which agriculture is to be allowed to prosper, for those terms threaten to destroy what remains of individual responsibility for the national heritage. But farming is sound at heart, and, through a return to husbandry, may yet be the means of a national return to a 'right' economy."

—C. Howard Jones, in "The Natural Order."

"SUICIDAL" WHEAT EXPORTS

Speaking at Canberra on October 23, 1951, Government Member Wheeler made the following observations on Australia's wheat export policy: —

It is time that we abandoned our suicidal policy of shipping all our wheat overseas. I look forward to the time when our entire wheat crop will be converted into meat, other animal products, or flour, before it is exported. Every shipload of wheat that we send overseas takes with it some of the fertility of our soil, and that precious fertility is lost forever. Many of Australia's wheat districts are marching steadily towards the dust bowl under the present agricultural policy. We need some change of policy that will strike at the root of the food shortages and high prices that plague the housewife. My particular interest in this subject, of course, lies in the fact that the division that I represent is a large producer of dairy products, pig meats, poultry and eggs. Within a few months, New South Wales will certainly be threatened with an egg shortage that will add to all its other troubles. This is because we have exported too much of our wheat, and poultry flocks must be killed off so that they will not starve to death. The over-export of wheat is also having its effect upon the number of cattle and pigs.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the quality of soil when it is used for one-crop farming such as is practised in many wheat districts. It is an elementary maxim of farming that a certain animal population is necessary if a proper routine is to be preserved. I draw attention to the following warning recently issued by Mr. W. Webster, Director of the Division of Animal Husbandry in the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Stock:

"It has been pointed out by specialists,

who view Australian agriculture broadly, that the continued export of agricultural products must seriously affect the chemical and physical properties of Australian soils. It has been recommended that, to prevent this state of affairs continuing, and to protect the fertility and structure of the soils, stock should be used in association with agriculture and that export should be in the form of animal products rather than the agricultural products to be consumed by animals in other countries."

Of course, we have obligations to the nations overseas, which depend upon us for part of their food supply, but it would be far better for them if we turned our wheat into meat and eggs and dairy products before we sent it overseas. Those foods contain the precious proteins, which are lacking in the diet of many peoples, and they are far more valuable than wheat.

Flight From The City

By Ralph Borsodi

"Men and women who desire to escape from dependence upon the present industrial system and who have no desire to substitute for it dependence upon a state-controlled system are beginning to experiment with a way of life which is neither city life nor farm life, but which is an effort to combine the advantages and to escape the disadvantages of both."

Flight From The City is the story of an experiment, which will stimulate the reader. Price 2/11, post-free. Order from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement

By E. Cahill. 13/6, post-free.

This remarkably well-documented book proves beyond doubt the Jewish origin and domination of Freemasonry as indicated in the Protocols of Zion. Quotes extensively from Masonic writings.

Available from:
NEW TIMES LTD.,
Box 1226L - - Melbourne.

Mechanisation and Farming

In the Melbourne "Leader" of January 30, that journal's Canberra correspondent writes: "Signs of some definite divisions over Government policy have appeared on the political surface as the Government has encountered strong opposition from some of its powerful outside supporters through its decision to give farmers first preference in allotting migrant labour. Manufacturing interests have bluntly declared that farmers should produce more through greater mechanisation."

While we agree that mechanisation can help the farmer in various ways, we dispute the suggestion that mechanisation by itself can solve the growing food problem. We are not impressed with references to the quantity of food produced per man as a result of mechanisation. The only realistic reference to farming is how much food per acre is being produced, the quality of the food produced, and whether soil fertility is being maintained and increased. Our opinion is that more labour is required on the farms if genuine soil husbandry is to be practised. The suggestion that farming can be completely mechanised like a factory indicates a lack of genuine understanding of the nature of farming. Manufacturers can help the farmer, but most of them must develop a different approach to the subject. Few have given much thought to the designing and manufacture of equipment suitable for organic farming methods.

The present food problem is merely one of the effects of the evil policies, which are destroying all Western nations. Certain long-term policies are required to correct the present situation. It is most difficult, for example, to have any immediate large-scale increase in the labour force on farms for the simple reason that many farmers could not at present provide adequate accommodation. But it is possible to obtain increased food production almost immediately if adequate financial inducement is offered to those who are farming at present. This is a short-term policy, which would assist while long-term policies are being evolved.

On Planning the Earth

BY Dr. GEOFFREY DOBBS

This brilliant work not only exposes completely the falsity of the propaganda issued by the advocates of the Tennessee Valley Authority and similar large-scale land planning and hydroelectric schemes, but reveals them as part of a world-wide conspiracy designed to drive the individual down the scale of human existence. Foreword by Major C. H. Douglas.

Price, 9/- Including Postage.

Farming is more than a mere business; it is a way of life. Mechanism and labour-saving devices, particularly for the farmer's wife, who usually helps considerably with the farm work, would help ensure that the country dweller has all the amenities that many city dwellers have. And if the population became, over a period, more decentralised, with every country town possessing adequate educational and other facilities, there would be no question of people going to the big, over-populated cities in order "to give children a chance."

Progressive decentralisation of political, financial, and economic policies would soon start a flow of beneficial and stimulating results that would enable the question of farming and food production to be realistically handled.

MR. WENTWORTH, M.H.R., MAKES AN ADMISSION

At last, some of the backbench Members are expressing their doubts about the effect of high taxation on food production. Speaking at the recent summer school of the Institute of Political Science, Mr. W. C. Wentworth, N.S.W. Liberal M.H.R., admitted that high taxation was affecting food production. He was particularly critical of the effects of the Government's decision to abolish the averaging system for farmers.

While the belated admissions about taxation sabotage are welcome as an indication that there is hope of compelling the Government to stop the sabotage, Mr. Wentworth and his colleagues should be reminded that during the Budget debates last year, they blindly accepted the theories put forward by Sir Arthur Fadden and his Socialist advisers. They are responsible for the big reduction in production which they are now concerned about.

Unless all sections of the Australian people unite in a demand that the present policy of taxation sabotage cease, the present shadow of totalitarianism must continue to lengthen. The threat of food rationing becomes more menacing every day . . .

High Taxation and Food Production

(Continued from page 8)

states that it is a waste of time and taxpayers' money. "You only have to ask a dozen farmers the reason for the decline, and they will all give the same answer: 'Crippling taxation.' Farmers don't want to add to their taxation worries with big wheat returns at present."

In a special statement on the subject of food production, the Federal Minister for Labor, Mr. H. Holt, provides further evidence that the Canberra planners - - for whom Mr. Holt is merely a public relations officer - - are deliberately working towards the Sovietisation of Australian farming. Mr. Holt's statement completely ignores the effect of his Government's financial policy and mentions the labor shortage as the major problem. The labor question is important, but not the most important. Mr. Holt makes it clear that the Government is going to continue its fantastic immigration policy, which is adding to every problem the Australian people have, and that immigrants will be directed to work on farms. If food production in Australia is to be made dependent upon directed labor, then the thin edge of the wedge has been introduced for further Government direction and control. Australian primary producers must immediately face the fact that their independence is being whittled away. If they desire to fight effectively, they must join forces with the consumers in resisting the policies, which must ultimately lead to control of every individual, via centralised control of food. A general campaign against high taxation would be an effective start in the right direction.

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria

ROOM 8, THE BLOCK,

Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.

Books, Pamphlets, Periodicals on Social Credit Available. Send for List. Enquiries Invited.

IS DIGGING NECESSARY?

This important booklet must be in the hands of every organic farmer and gardener. The author, one of England's most famous gardeners, has proved over a long period that better and healthier vegetables can be grown without digging. He outlines the methods he has used.

Mr. King also demonstrates how weeds can be effectively controlled to assist in building soil fertility.

Is Digging Necessary? contains an excellent section on compost making, and a complete list of literature dealing with soil fertility as the basis of high level health in plant, animal and man.

Order now from *New Times Ltd.*, Box 1226 L., G.P.O., Melbourne, C.I.

Price 1/5 (Post Free)

THE SCIENTISTS

(Continued from page 4)

have been subjected to a very painful form of the mental "splits" through being situated at the exact point of the developing dichotomy. Altogether, the division is very much less radical than anyone might suppose who reads the diatribes on one side or the other. It is merely that the Soviet Government has taken that logical last step which is possible only to totalitarian regimes. Mendelism never did provide much justification for the progressivist philosophy, which is the basis of socialism, either in the biological or the sociological field, but the facts it deals with are rather complex, and their significance can very easily be inverted under cover of a cloud of occult statistical symbolism. Nevertheless, the very idea of relatively determined hereditary differences, apparently harmless at the non-human level, is liable to come into conflict with the revolutionary doctrine of the fraternity and equality of Man and the Unity of Mankind which lies at the basis of humanism. The attitude of even the most orthodox "Mendelist-Morganists" towards racial or hereditary differences among men reveals that many of them have already begun to move towards the Lysenkoist attitude in their stress on the importance of environment rather than heredity in human affairs. The fact that the Nazi reaction went to the opposite extreme is supporting evidence.

But to maintain (implicitly, never, of course, explicitly) one position for man, and another for the rest of the animals is an unstable position for those who believe that Man is merely an "advanced" animal. The only stable and logical position is to extend the fraternity, equality and educability of Man to cover the rest of life; and if Mendelism gets in the way, Mendelism must go. Anyway, Mendel was a monk, and therefore a reactionary, and the preliminary "debunking" of his work, by the assertion that

his results were "cooked" even if his conclusions were a lucky guess, has already started among "western" geneticists.

It seems very unlikely that western geneticists will be able successfully to defend the integrity of their science unless they abandon the philosophy which, when all opposition to it is removed, has shown itself incompatible with that integrity. The following extract from a statement by the Praesidium of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, quoted by Dr. Huxley, (p. 89) shows the end-point towards which, despite his protesting kicks and struggles, the "trend" of scientific humanism is inexorably carrying him:

"Michurin's materialist direction in biology is the only acceptable form of science, because it is based . . . on the revolutionary principle of changing Nature for the benefit of the people. Weissmannite-Morganist idealist teaching is pseudo-scientific, because it is founded on the notion of the divine origin of the world and assumes eternal and unalterable scientific laws. The struggle between the two ideas has taken the form of the ideological class struggle between socialism and capitalism."

To accuse the western geneticists, such as Messrs. Morgan, Muller, Haldane, Huxley, Darlington, Harland, Hogben, of being believers in divine origin and eternal laws (not to mention capitalism!) is a piece of naughtiness well calculated to make them dance with rage, and outdo each other in proving their innocence, and their superiority to the Michurinists as materialists, Nature-changers, socialists, etc. . . . But, in fact, if we disinfect the word "divine," and re-invert it so that it means what it always has meant to those who use it legitimately; something concerned with reality, not with unreality, with a reasonable faith, and not with an unreasonable superstition; then we find the modern Mendelists hanging on to the divine origin of things (in other words, reality) by those extremely slender threads called chromosomes, which carry a good deal of the material basis of heredity, and which, though mutable, are mutable only according to their nature, and not entirely as human beings may wish. Let us hope that their grip holds, or perhaps one should say that non-disjunction occurs.

Meanwhile, it is difficult not to enjoy the sight of people who have succeeded so considerably in establishing their own philosophy as "scientific" by throwing "pejorative adjectives" such as "unscientific," "superstitious," and so on, at anyone who disagrees with them, now subjected to a hail of similar adjectives from those who have carried their beliefs just a shade further, and who have got rid of that "limit feeling" due to "denial of man's capacity to remake the nature of animals and plants"* which has such a suffocating effect on the really progressive humanist in the later stages of his affliction.

The bewilderment of Dr. Huxley at finding his own evolutionary views stigmatised as "a veiled form of clericalism" and as a belief in "the divine origin of the world" and even in a sort of special creation, is

*Y. Zhdanov's letter to Stalin, "Pravda," Aug. 7, 1948, quoted by Dr. Huxley, Postscript II, p. 233.

Earthworms

"Darwin on Humus and the Earthworm" 17/7

A description of the original investigation of the habits of earthworms and the role they play in soil building.

obviously genuine, for he cannot maintain his opinions and at the same time admit to himself that adherence to any form of "nature" or "reality" not subject to human control ultimately lays itself open to these charges.

But the accusation is perfectly logical. If Man is the ultimate product of the unrolling of the potentialities of the physical world, he must be of a consistent nature with the rest, and has power over it by reason of his knowing mind. Knowledge is power; science is knowledge; scientific man is the boss of mankind and of all lower forms of being. There can be no exceptions to this, for to admit exceptions is to admit the super-natural. The nature of things is the nature of man, or something lower and less than and comprised within the nature of man, something which he has passed on his way up. To admit that things have their own nature which must be observed and yielded to, which is distinct from and not entirely subject to and malleable by the nature of man is to open the door to the admission of powers equal or superior to the power of man, powers which are not on the ladder of evolution, and which are beyond the purview of science. But in practice every admission of a fact is an admission of the limitation of man, and introduces that dreadful "limit feeling" which is the basis of all humility, worship, and religion, and which is rejected by the cult of scientific humanism. There must be no limits, not even the sky.

The result is paradoxical. It has now been forgotten that modern science grew out of Christendom, although it has been diverging from its origin with immense

(Continued on page 12)

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.

DENHAM ST., ROCKHAMPTON, C.Q.

Phone 3768.

After Hours 3199 and 2161.

"THE COMPOST HEAP"

Published by the
Victorian Compost Society.

THE COMPLETE GUIDE TO COMPOST MAKING

Written by experts, and containing results of all the latest research in this field.

All Composters, experienced or beginners, will find this booklet of inestimable benefit.

Price, 1/9, including postage.

NEW TIMES LTD.,
Box 1226L, G.P.O.
Melbourne.

"New Times," February 8, 1952—Page 11

THE SCIENTISTS

(Continued from page 11)

acceleration. But the great difference between classical and modern science, which has made the latter so relatively mighty in works, whether good or bad, was just that humble adherence to facts — to the nature of other things and other creatures than man and his ideas — which arose from a Christian view of the world.

With the progressive abandonment of this attitude and the return to an anthropocentric point of view, appropriately enough under the synonym of "humanism," science, as we know it, is on the way out, and magic and superstition and the occult "sciences" (or rather "arts," or techniques, or technologies) are on the way in again. There is a great deal in common between the practices of mediaeval witchcraft and those of many modern scientists, but, unfortunately, the great capital of knowledge bequeather by the real science of humble faith has armed the modern occultist with a power many times multiplied as compared with that of his predecessor, and the prestige and credit of science has been to a very large extent appropriated by its modern magical counterpart.

For instance, the development of the "atomic" bomb has been the outstanding example in recent years of the exercise of the occult arts; artificial insemination (a.i.d.) appears to have been also a practice of mediaeval witchcraft (incubi and succubi); the modern attitude to drugs, vitamins, hormones and biochemistry generally surpasses in superstition that which was attached to the use of herbs and simples in the days of the doctrine of signatures. Dr. Huxley appears to disapprove of the fact that the work of the physiologist Lena Stern (artificial resuscitation of electrocuted dogs) is "out of favour" even in Soviet Russia (see addendum, p. 195); and there seems to be no reason of faith or morals for disbelieving the allegation that certain human physiologists are interested in the effecting of an ape-human cross. An Act was passed by the last Parliament to repeal the Witchcraft Act 1735 and to

legalise necromancy provided it is genuine and in good faith, while increasing the penalties on the "fraudulent" medium; that is, if a medium honestly believes that he or she is calling up spirits from the vasty deep and holding converse with them, and can convince others that this is genuinely occurring, then it is legal, but if he or she is merely practising a little conjuring, then it is punishable more heavily than before. But indeed, when that "limit feeling" is got rid of, there appear to be no limits.

MR. COLIN CLARK

"I believe that the salvation of Australia will not be found in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide — and least of all in Canberra.

"It will be found in hundreds of small, vigorous country towns like Dalby; towns of citizens who can think for themselves and can strike out an independent line in national affairs."

— Mr. Colin Clark, former economic adviser to Queensland Government, at public meeting in Dalby on January 18.

While agreeing with much of what Mr. Clark has had to say on food production, we are interested to note that he has been "taken up" by Sir Keith Murdoch's chain of newspapers. The policy of these papers is a totalitarian five-year plan to meet the food situation. A few years ago Mr. Clark attacked the threat of direction of labor. But he now apparently advocates the direction of labor from secondary to primary industries. We will watch with the closest interest Mr. Clark's writings and activities.

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

(VIC)

Now Meets on

THE THIRD THURSDAY
of Every Month.

All interested are invited

COMPOST

For Garden Plot Or Thousand Acre Farm

By F. H. Billington, N.D.A., N.D.D).

Here is the very book for the gardener or farmer who has had no previous introduction to the subject of compost making. It is a most comprehensive survey of the whole subject of organic farming and gardening. Price 9/1, post-free. Order from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

USE ENWITE specialities

TEXIT waterproofing compound.

SOLVIT paint remover. No difficult neutralization.

AQUALAC wood putty. For good class cabinetwork.

BRYNAC. The enamel for resisting water, acids and alkalis.

FERROSOL Rust killing paint. In all colours.

RUSTEX. For removing rust from motor bodies and metal work.

THERMEX. Silver paint. Can be made red hot without discolouring or coming off.

Manufactured by:

ENWITE PTY. LTD.

84-86 Cromwell Street.
Collingwood, Vic.

PHONE: JA5967

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To THE MANAGER, NEW
TIMES LTD., Box 1226L;
G.P.O., Melbourne

Please enrol me as a subscriber to "The New Times" from issue of.....

Quarter
for Half-Year
Year

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Cheque
I enclose Money Order to the value of.....
Postal Note

SUBSCRIPTION RATES are: —25/- Yearly, 13/- Half-Yearly, 7/- Quarterly.
Post Free.

CODNER BROS.

**Builders
and Hardware
Merchants**

**CALL AND SEE US FOR
YOUR HARDWARE
REQUIREMENTS**

Wheatsheaf Rd
GLENROY
FX1130