

OUR SHAM DEMOCRACY OR THE MAJORITY VOTE RACKET by James Guthrie

INTRODUCTION TO 1977 EDITION

All Truth is eternal. Although first published over thirty years ago, James Guthrie's on the truths concerning the relationship of the individual to government is more appropriate than ever. Warnings concerning the shape of things to come have been graphically confirmed by the shattering events which have taken place since the end of the Second World War. The mass media of the world is full of references to "democracy," which allegedly is more widespread than ever. The voting age has been reduced to eighteen; but the individual has less control over governments than he had 50 years ago. The central theme of James Guthrie's book was stated by the distinguished British constitutional authority, Professor G. W. Keeton, in his prophetic work, (The Passing of Parliament (1952): "The history of modern political society is in large measure the history of the struggle of the ordinary citizen to exercise some influence upon government and of his repeated failure to achieve that modest ambition."

One chapter in Keeton's work carried the chilling heading, "On The Road To Moscow." The peoples living under the Soviet tyranny have the "right" to put a mark on a piece of paper periodically. But they can only select from candidates chosen for them by the Soviet totalitarians. In countries like Canada, Australia, and Britain, electors have been brainwashed into passively accepting the view that democracy is functioning because they can select members of Parliament only from amongst candidates presented to them by the party machines. Parliaments of today in the English-speaking world are no longer the type of representative institutions originally evolved. A tyrannical party system has increasingly excluded men and women of independent spirit from Parliament. But only because many electors blindly support the party game.

Of Scottish background, James Guthrie was an electrical engineer whose training is reflected in his extremely lucid and precise literary style. Although Our Sham Democracy is dated in the sense that it refers to Australian affairs towards the end of the Second World War, the truths and principles enunciated are relevant to all countries where at least the shell of constitutional government still remains. The examples of electoral action suggested by James Guthrie indicate what is so desperately required today: initiative by electors, associating to use their social power to bring their elected, paid political servants under their effective control. The development of Voters' Policy Associations, Electors' Associations, and greater attention to the value of Municipal Government to resist the drive towards even greater centralization of power, were all foreshadowed by James Guthrie. The truths of

the Christian Gospels are just as valid today as when first enunciated. But they must be applied in present circumstances. I was privileged to know the late James Guthrie over many years. He was a scholar who spent much time in studying the lessons of history. He believed that "practical Christianity" was essential if a society were to be developed in which the natural rights of all individuals are protected and the human personality can flower to the full. I commend a careful study, and then the application, of the truths outlined in Our Sham Democracy. *Eric D. Butler* [Melbourne, Australia]

PREFACE.

In this book I have collected together a few of the broadcasts delivered, during the past two years, over Station 7HO, Hobart. Most of those selected have been published separately in Australia and in England, but this is the first time they have been brought together under one cover. This publication is the second of a series; the third is in process of preparation. The plans for post-war reconstruction are legion, and this mania for planning is being stimulated from official quarters; governmental agencies are organising listening groups and discussion groups, and are pouring out rivers of literature - all this as a diversion to hide the real plans and the real planners behind the scenes. Those who wish to know what is the nature of the official plans for the future should read "The Third World War," and "The Brief for the Prosecution," by Major C. H. Douglas. Today, there are two, and only two, political alternatives offered to the people. The one is Rule by Gangsters, and the other is escape from gangsterdom. Social Credit is escape from gangsterdom, or escape from that evil thing which called itself National Socialism in Germany, International Socialism in Russia, and Nationalisation in the British Empire. It is important that the Social Credit point of view, as outlined in this book, should be presented as quickly as possible to those who can use it.

JAS. GUTHRIE

INTRODUCTION

Today, political democracy exists only in name, and largely because of the existence of this name we are thereby unaware of what is actually happening behind that very effective, if very thin, smokescreen called Democratic Government; and suddenly we may be confronted with an accomplished fact when the screen is rudely swept aside and, in all its stark reality, is revealed the grinning totalitarian monster, armed to the teeth, who will mock us and say: "Now tell us what you are going to do about it."

There is a great amount of evidence to show that even among the politically active there is an amazing lack

of awareness of the real significance of the political situation. These people know well enough what is going on; they know that parliament has failed to control the executive, or to achieve any important reform, and they know that anything which has been done of benefit to the people (and it is difficult to find) has been forced on parliament by pressure groups. These people, however, have an idea that if they get the "right" persons into parliament all will be changed. They don't realise that long before they get what they call the "right" people elected, parliament, as we know it, in a few months' time, may not exist.

The Majority Vote

WHAT IS DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT?

The words "Democracy" and "Democratic Government," in the mouths of public men, have come to mean practically anything but democracy or democratic government. Whether this abuse of words is intentional or otherwise, is hard to say, but the results have been disastrous. A democratic country is a country where the people can exercise effective control over their government's actions. If the people cannot exercise effective control, then the country is in the hands of a dictatorship. Democratic government is the only alternative to a dictatorship, and this is probably its only justification for existence, albeit an all-sufficient one. There is no need to surround the word democracy with unnecessary glamour. The value of a functioning political democracy is mostly negative, its value arising purely as an antidote to a virulent poison - dictatorship. The value of a democracy increases, as you realise the soul destroying nature of a dictatorship; and those of the extreme Left or Right who realise that their ideas can only be imposed upon the people by a dictatorship are, therefore, supremely contemptuous of democratic methods. Here I must emphasise the need for always discriminating between effective democracies as I have defined them and the sham democracies as they have developed since World War One. The actual formation of a democratic government doesn't matter very much so long as the people can exercise effective control over that government. A democratic country can give its government full powers - dictatorial powers - to wage war for its protection, always provided it retains the right to take those powers away again; but where the war is a long one a danger lies in such powers being used to perpetuate the dictatorial power of the governing clique. It seems reasonable, on the face of things, to give a government full powers to do a job adequately, these powers being similar in scope to those given to a managing director of a large organisation. Most men who have done a job of work know very well that it is impossible to carry it out by means of a committee; willy nilly one man must be made responsible.

Executives, therefore, have dictatorial powers. What, we may ask, is wrong with the government having similar powers? There are here three points of vital importance: Firstly, the managing director of a factory or other organisation can only exercise authority in his own special sphere; outside the factory, his authority is limited. Also, the employees are not compelled to remain in his employment -- there is usually some means of escape; and it is the existence of this means of escape which differentiates a real political democracy from a dictatorship. Unless the people can protect themselves from a group of men who have captured the law-making machinery then they are not living in a democratic country. Besides this, non-governmental executives who exercise great powers have to operate within a legal framework fixed by the government. But governmental executives, who make their own regulations, are not likely to be over fastidious in limiting their own powers; in practice, they have been concerned only in removing all limits to their powers. Separation of powers in a State has always been held necessary for the maintenance of elementary justice; the union of all power in a central executive has always meant rule by gangsters. How can it be otherwise?

THE PARTY SYSTEM

Before a political party can obtain control over the machinery of government it has first to place its nominees in front of the people at elections to obtain a majority vote. It is commonly said that electors have a free choice of candidates, but they have not owing to a variety of reasons, chief among which are that few of the electors know the candidates personally; that very few know what lies behind the election talk; and that, except in small electorates, few candidates can afford the time and the money required to organise a campaign as an independent candidate. In practice, therefore, the choice at election time has been restricted to the nominees of the two main parties - Labour and Conservative. If the parties had been what they pretended to be, the Labour Party representative of the lower income groups and the Conservative Party representative of the middle income groups, the choice would have been more reasonable. But Labour, if it had done away with poverty and insecurity, as it professed to do, would have done away with the need to represent poverty and insecurity; it would have done away with its chief power of appeal to the people, and in so doing would automatically have filled the ranks of the Conservatives. And if the Conservatives, being in power, had protected the people, especially owners of property, against the raids of the tax collectors and against other monopolies, they thus would have secured the people in their new won freedom and made them free of both parties. But, in practice, nothing like this has happened.

Both parties have helped and encouraged the growth of monopolies and cartels, and large trade unions wherein the individual has become a mere cog in the machine having practically no say in the policy of those vast organisations. The determined policy of both parties has been to deprive individuals of any chance of establishing their independence and to force them to be dependent on the charity of the State as administered by the party boss and his henchmen.

One of the means by which both parties have destroyed the independence of the people has been their failure to reduce prices and taxation, or rather their encouragement of high prices and high taxes. The largest portion of the taxes has, of necessity, had to be collected from the middle income group where the swing vote lies; the failure of the two parties to give relief to this vital group shows either, that the party bosses are very stupid, or that they have no control over the national policy. That both parties should make the same mistake is interesting. The apparent detachment of the party leaders from the needs and wishes of the people is astonishing; and the inability of the people to get any relief from the simplest of political ailments is a matter of history. Accordingly, the sigh of relief when one government is voted out of office is only equalled when its successor shares the same fate. Modern governments handle a great deal of money, one way and another; they control a large number of officials of all kinds, not to mention the army and the police force. The power modern governments wield is enormous, yet in the last thirty-one years we have had ten years of war and five years of depression, and no signs of that security and freedom for which the ordinary man has paid such a heavy price. Out of the confusion of thought and opinions on things political one thing is clear: the party system is too costly a "luxury" even for the wealthiest country. That we have been able to carry it so long shows that we must have mighty reserves of wealth and endurance, for the waste of human effort has been gigantic.

THE LEGAL ASPECT

It is usual to say that in a democratic country political sovereignty rests in the people, and that legal sovereignty rests in parliament. In other words, the power to make laws, to tax, and, if need be, to use the armed forces, rests, not with the people, but with the majority party in parliament; or, to be more precise it rests with a small group of men who control the "Caucus." Therefore, the supreme legal power over a country rests with a few men. and not with the people. In theory, the people are supposed to have free choice of candidates, and candidates, when elected, are supposed to represent the people in parliament. These representatives are supposed to discuss problems in open debate in parliament, and then to vote on them as

their electorates wish them to vote. That is the theory. In practice, of course, nothing like this happens. What does happen is that the party candidates are selected before elections, and they depend on the backing of the party machine for their success. When elected, they also depend on their party bosses for promotion, for the right to sit on committees, and for other perquisites of office. For any representative to vote against his party would be, in all but a minority of cases, to commit political suicide. Armed with these powers of coercion, the party bosses experience little trouble from rebels, and decide beforehand how the voting shall go in parliament. Parliament, therefore, is no longer the place where the laws of the country are made; even the debates therein are unheard and unread by the public. For all effective purposes, parliament has almost ceased to exist. Parliament is used merely to give legal formality to decisions made by a few men, in just the same way as elections are used to give legal status to candidates nominated by the party. All that is left of our political democracy is the legal formalities. These legal formalities are important. but they should not be allowed to obscure the ruthless spirit behind them, the contempt for the public, and the contempt for parliament.

MAJORITY RULE

That the present method of voting governments into power is a very thin democratic veneer, hiding totalitarian methods, was made evident by the eagerness and the glee with which our so-called representatives clutched at the tremendous power of authority which war brought to them. No one, who has not come into contact with the arrogance and ruthlessness with which this power was used, can imagine just what dangers are facing the whole civilised world today. There was a time when kings of England ruled by what was called "Divine Right"; they were the Chosen of God - the king could do no wrong - his word was law. Many thought that this doctrine had died a natural death, but in our time we have seen it resurrected under various guises. The divine right of the king has become the divine right of the "State" - the State being those who by various means have captured the machinery for manufacturing laws and regulations, and who, by control of the armed forces, are able to enforce obedience to those laws. In so-called democratic countries, the small group in control of the State has actually more powers than kings had, because kings who attempted to extract heavy taxes, or to meddle with the private affairs of citizens, to the extent practised by modern governments, would quickly have found themselves without their heads.

Those in control of the modern State can, and do, penalise minorities, because they claim that they represent a majority - the fact being overlooked that we are all, at one time or another, a member of a minority.

Parents are in a minority; farmers are in a minority; the country dwellers are in a minority; skilled men are in a minority; the politically wise are very much in a minority. But so-called democratic governments demand the right - and they continually exercise this right - to over-rule every minority, which together make the majority. In other words, in practice we are witnessing governments using the technique of the manipulated mass-vote to disfranchise successive minorities, and transfer their rights to the manipulators. This, of course, is exactly what "nationalisation" does. The party system has destroyed democratic government, and this is being slowly recognised as the taxpayer finds that each new government takes a fiendish delight in giving another turn to that modern instrument of torture - the tax-collecting machine. The whole legal - or illegal - system on which a government bases its right to penalise minorities must be dragged out into the light of day, and examined in the light of political realities. We shall have to rid ourselves of the modern jargon and high-sounding emotional phrases designed to trap well-meaning but immature young men and women. It is important, therefore, that we examine carefully just what is meant by majority rule. If we can obtain a knowledge of what it can do and what it can't do, then we are in a better position to face our political future; we shall be in possession of some standards by which to judge those who claim the right to rule this country.

In deciding the men who are to look after the general affairs of our district, an election is held to choose representatives of the various groups. This method works tolerably well under certain very definite conditions, and those essential conditions are :-

1. That the district be small.
2. That the people have a free choice of independent candidates.
3. That the people know exactly who and what they are voting for.

In Federal elections, none of these essential conditions has applied, and nowhere is there in existence today a large State which can call itself democratic, or has any possibility of so calling itself. Just previous to a general election, the people are deluged with floods of propaganda of a most confusing nature; often as not the questions involved are highly technical, with ramifications and consequences barely understood even by a very small minority. A large number of the voters have learnt that nothing of value will come out of this avalanche of words; a great many more are not even interested. But it would be disastrous to the illusion of the legal authority of the party bosses if the people refused to go to the polling booths, or were to realise that this voting business was only a trap. Therefore, the party

bosses have been forced to compel the people to go to the booths by threat of fines. They have also had to hold out bribes to the voters in the form of various alleged gifts - gifts which, if received, are in reality paid for by the voter himself, plus, of course, the added expense of maintaining (1) an army of officials to extract the money from him; (2) an army of officials to cross-examine him to see if he should receive part of his money back; (3) an army of officials to explain to him why he did not get his money back. We see, therefore, that at a general election the people have not had a free choice of candidates, and that they have been forced, by means of threats, bribes, and misrepresentation, into taking part in a legal contract by which they have been compelled not only to hand over their estate to strangers, but to hand it over to men who are determined to dispossess the people of all ownership and control (nationalisation). This is the legal basis on which the party in power exercises the right to penalise every minority in this country. It seems to me that the legality of this contract is suspect. The contract appears to be very one-sided. The representative seems to be able to do just as he pleases; he can do exactly the opposite to what his electors want him to do, and can draw his salary just the same; and the electors have no power to stop him until the next election comes along. At the next election, the other party goes into power - but the taxpayer gets no relief. The same old game is carried on in the same old way. We find, too, that the one-time opposition, when in power, does exactly the same things on account of which it had bitterly attacked the previous government for doing. In fact, the same speeches would do for both parties, all that is required is to change the name of the speaker and the date.

The change-round of parties, however, serves a very definite purpose. When it is decided to tax and to regiment the lower income groups, a "Labour" government, or labour leaders, can do this much more easily than a "Conservative" government; when the whole social structure is to be undermined by so-called socialistic legislation, the country accepts it less painfully from a "Conservative" government. Probably no "Labour" government in existence brought in more socialistic legislation of a destructive character than did the so-called conservative government in England. It seems, therefore, that the two names conservative and labour are all part and parcel of the great game of politics; they are used merely to deceive. Which party the people vote for at election time makes very little difference to the course of events. The polling booth has become merely a device to legalise a policy already decided upon by a small group of men. The last Referendum in Australia is proof of this; the majority of voters voted "No" in this referendum, but the government went on as if nothing had happened. The sanction of the majority would have made things

easier for the government, but the government can find other ways of “legalising” its illegal actions. If the word democratic has any real meaning then a democratic country must mean a country in which the people can control the actions of their government, but it has come to mean a country in which the government has obtained power by collecting a majority vote. Do you notice the distinction .

A government, once elected, proceeds to penalise every minority, and it does so because it claims to represent the majority. The fact that it has had no mandate from the people to do what it has done doesn't seem to matter very much: the government calls itself democratic - and the “popular” writers acquiesce in this view. The governments in office today take a rather peculiar view of their powers; they not only claim the right of kings and emperors of old, they claim more rights. And because, by low cunning and subterfuge, they have managed to acquire a majority vote, they say they are exercising the tyrannical rights of kings democratically. This “counting of noses” is used as an excuse by a small group of men to do things which would not be tolerated under any other guise. Such horrible prostitution of the democratic method has got to be exposed by all thinking men who have the welfare of their country at heart, and it has got to be done quickly. It is necessary, therefore, that we should realise very carefully what a majority vote can do, and what it can't.

THE USE OF COERCION

When a majority vote is used to destroy or to victimise a minority then that vote cannot by any stretch of imagination be called democratic; it is merely a trick to use brute force on a group of people you dislike. For example, take the case of India: to bring the Moslems and Hindus under one government by a majority vote of Hindus is not democratic - it is merely the road to bloodshed and revolution. And the concentration of power in larger and larger areas is definite proof that those in power today have not the slightest interest in democratic government. When temperance workers demand that a law be enforced to prevent anyone drinking beer, what they are actually demanding is that brute force be used to prevent their neighbours drinking beer. These people are not only destroying the democratic method, and bringing it into contempt, they would if successful breed a nation of law-breakers, as they did in America during the period of “prohibition.” The fact that so many of our laws and government regulations can only be enforced by threat of heavy penalties shows that government today is government by coercion, and not government by popular will. That, in times of national emergency, governments take unto themselves dictatorial powers does not prove that dictatorial regimes are efficient or effective; it only

proves that national emergencies are a godsend to those who lust after power. And it suggests that we make some detailed inquiries as to who starts national emergencies. In a similar manner, probably it will be found that the disrupted state of society is largely due to the actions of those who are asking for sweeping powers to deal with this disrupted state. In America, in 1913, business was stagnant and bread queues were everywhere, but when the war in Europe started American industry went full steam ahead to reach unheard of prosperity; very little of the money for this industrial expansion came from outside America. It seems rather a costly business if Europe has to start up a war before the people in America are permitted to have enough money to buy American bread, but that's how governments run their business - if we let them!

CENTRAL GOVERNMENTS OVERWORKED

Our representatives in Parliament have been very busy; the number of new laws and regulations which have been imposed on the hapless taxpayer in our lifetime has been enormous. These new laws have not been placed on the Statute Book for nothing; there is some purpose behind them. All of them have been used to try to force some change on this country. By now we should be able to distinguish, if not a pattern, at least a general direction, a general policy. If no general design emerges then we can say that our parliamentarians are not going anywhere in particular, and that the various governments are merely undoing the work of the previous governments. If we examine the work of governments, not only in Australia, but in Great Britain, New Zealand and America, we find that the foundation stone of democratic government, that is, local government, is being viciously attacked, and that everywhere its power and prestige are being whittled away with monotonous regularity. The power and effectiveness of State Governments are consistently being undermined by executives of the Federal Government, and the Federal and Central Parliaments, in turn, are having their power of initiative and their sovereignty undermined by international controlling bodies and international treaties (Bretton Woods Agreement). For a good many years now it has been fairly obvious that the contents of the bills rushed through parliament have been little read and hardly understood by members of parliament, and that even the Ministers themselves appeared hazy about their contents. The vast amount of business which the Central Government takes upon itself, and the ever-increasing desire to take on more business, makes the consideration and drafting of bills an impossibility for Cabinet Ministers. Also the technical ramifications of a large department, and the increasing administrative complexities, place the department outside the control of most politicians who take temporary charge of

a department of State. The inevitable result is that government is largely the work of the permanent heads of the Civil Service. I hear a number of people saying, "And a good job, too". Well, perhaps it might be a good job, under certain conditions, to have our affairs run by experts; it all depends on who picks the experts, and where they have been trained, and what those experts attempt to do to us.

The Army of Occupation

KEY MEN OF GOVERNMENTS

It has been known for quite a long time that the chief work of government is carried out by permanent chiefs of the government departments and by high officials in key positions; also that parliament passes more or less blank cheques to the government departments to make their own laws and regulations. The powers of the Australian Federal bureaucracy have increased enormously of recent years, and they keep on increasing. The policy pursued by government departments does not vary in important matters, even with a change of government. We find also that the policy of government departments varies very little even in different countries. As these government policies have been increasingly disastrous in every country, and are much resented by the taxpayers, it would be interesting to find out where these key bureaucrats come from and who inflicts them upon the government. Fortunately for us we have little difficulty in seeking the source of our troubles; we find, for example, an important man anticipated the needs of governments, and took it upon himself to subsidise a school for training directors of government departments. This was Sir Ernest Cassel, millionaire and international financier, who financed the London School of Economics. According to the Quarterly Review for January, 1929, the London School of Economics was founded by Mr. Sydney Webb and his Socialist Fabian Society with money obtained through Lord Haldane from Sir Ernest Cassel. This endowment, Lord Haldane told J. M. Morgan, K.C., had been provided "to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State." Well, there it is - the bureaucracy of the present Socialist State! One of our principal bureaucrats is Dr. H. C. Coombs, Director-General of Post-war Reconstruction in Australia, recently graduated from the London School of Economics. His assistant, another Socialist, Dr. Lloyd Ross, also graduated from the London School of Economics. Then we find that when Otto Niemeyer came to Australia to advise us to have a depression, Dr. Guggenheim Gregory, Professor of the London School of Economics, came with him to help do the dirty work. We find too that in nearly every university in Australia, our future administrators are having their young minds doped with the poisonous rubbish pumped out by the London School of Economics for the training

of the Socialist Bureaucracy. That Australia is not the only country that suffers from the attention of specially trained super-planners is seen by the fact that the architect of the post-war scheme for organised poverty for England was Sir William Beveridge, the Principal of the London School of Economics; the "Beveridge" Plan for Canada was designed by Dr. Marsh, from the London School of Economics; the "Beveridge" Plan for the United States of America was designed by Dr. Burns of the London School of Economics, and, according to the American "Mercury," June, 1943, Mrs. Burns wrote a pamphlet entitled "Socialist Planning and a Socialist Program," and "she had been a student under Laski at the London School of Economics." We see, therefore, that the millionaire armament king, who planned to inflict socialist bureaucrats on all countries, has had his plans carried out very precisely. It is one thing, however, to train socialist bureaucrats; it is another thing to get them placed in key positions in every country. How was this done? Another wealthy internationalist throws some light on this subject: Israel Moses Sieff, chairman of Political and Economic Planning, a research committee of the London School of Economics, declared, in 1932. "that only in war, or under threat of war, would the British Government embark on large-scale planning." Interesting, isn't it! But this statement of Israel Moses Sieff becomes more interesting if it is re-written in the light of what millionaire Uassel said and did, and of what has actually taken place. The statement could be re-written thus: "If another war COULD be arranged, Great Britain threatened with annihilation, and Europe reduced to starvation and chaos, then the main bulwarks of Western civilisation would be removed; no obstacle would then remain to our plans, and we could thus force our terms upon the world and place our own men in every key position." Well, haven't they? The above statement is important because it is in the nature of what the army calls "intelligence"; in other words, it is information which enables action to be taken, and future events. to be anticipated with reasonable accuracy. This linking together of cause and effect is important because people not only can see that the statement fits the facts, they can check the accuracy of it from week to week and year to year; this enables them to take an interest in what is happening and to unite to ward off disaster. This type of "intelligence" is the direct anti-thesis of the vast catalogues of disconnected events given to the tired and bewildered public by the big city dailies; and in case a few readers might link together into an intelligible pattern the passing stream of events, highly paid writers and A.B.C. commentators are employed, whose chief task appears to be the drawing of red herrings across useful avenues of thought. The dense fog of silence which surrounds useful ideas and important men, and the colossal amount of publicity

given to public men who should never have been allowed outside a Borstal Institute; the monotonous regularity with which valuable information, when it does get through the cables by accident is never followed up: these things happening regularly over a period of twenty-five years are all too vitally important to the schemes of such men as Israel Moses Sieif and millionaire Cassel to be considered fortuitous, and the collection of statements from the lips of this fraternity are too comprehensive and conclusive to leave any doubt about the deliberateness of the scheme for the organised deception of the public. The powerful socialist bureaucrats who have been carefully placed near the vitals of every country are not only a deadly menace to the safety of the people they are supposed to serve, they are a complete obstacle to the simplest and most obvious reforms. That the government has ceased to be able to control this bureaucracy is obvious enough - and bad enough - but when this bureaucracy is indoctrinated from abroad, and when, by every trick of the underworld, attempts are made to impose on the native population alien doctrines and methods of control repulsive to, and destructive of, the native culture, then we come up against something which has become known as "fifth column activity." It is obvious that parliament, for all practical purposes, has ceased to exist; each country can be looked upon as being under the control of an army of occupation, an army that is commanded by bureaucrats trained and directed from one centre. And it is very obvious that the commanders of this army of occupation look upon the natives of the country as beings of an inferior race to be moulded and shaped under the direction of the "Chosen People." The contempt and the ruthlessness with which the bureaucrats treat the taxpayers is ample proof of this statement. When you look at the records of the socialist-planned States of the world. and when you get behind the tissue of lies and the expensive propaganda, you will discover a record of militarisation such as the world has not previously known; a record of bloodshed and cruelty that would fill Ghengis Khan with envy: a record of bribery, corruption, and inefficiency that has rocked civilisation to its very foundations. And after millions have been killed and tortured, we are still left without one single problem solved. Today there is a large body of honest and sincere men and women who wish to see a great variety of reforms instituted in this country, reforms which are long overdue; but this move for reform has been canalised and controlled by a small group of men who are using the occasion to impose surreptitiously the very brand of national socialism which so many young men have given their lives to destroy. In the name of freedom and of democracy we are having the foundations of freedom and democracy permanently removed. This devilish attack on the foundations of civilisation has been aptly described

by Lord Tweedsmuir (John Buchan) when he said that we are witnessing a "World-wide pseudo-intellectual attack in every department of art and letters, on the fundamental principles of ethics and religion, as well as on the most elementary codes of good faith and decency in ordinary human life; and this attack had preceded and prepared the way for the new savagery in the political world. There is a real and vital connection between these phenomena. The European tradition has been confronted with an Asiatic revolt, with its historic accompaniment of janissaries and assassins. There is in it all, too, an ugly pathological savour, as if a mature society were being assailed by diseased and vicious children". Unless men of experience in this country are prepared to exert themselves to tame and curtail the activities of the impudent and arrogant bureaucracy which has grown up, then they must be prepared to see the power of those bureaucrats grow so great that no person will be able to challenge it.

THE ARMY OF OCCUPATION

The regimented State, and the desire for organising other people's lives, are largely products of the German Socialists. In the "Road to Serfdom," Hayek has shown that in the Socialists' worship of the State lie the roots of dictatorship and tyranny, and that no socialist country has been able to escape this brutal fact. Centralised party management and centralised control of finance must produce the centralisation of everything else. No one who wants permission to do a job can afford to live away from the political capital; gradually those living away from the capital are looked upon and treated as provincials and barbarians, and gradually the concentration of all power within a small group saps the initiative of the rest of the country. The disease of centralisation, once started, must grow. The apparent efficiency obtained from centralised control fascinates those of the military type of mind. But this so-called "efficiency" is not confirmed by any careful investigation. It is doubtful if any large organisation would last very long if it were not protected from competition by the Government, and given preferential treatment in the form of cheap money, etc. What makes over-centralised organisations so expensive, so wasteful and so autocratic, is the vast bureaucracy they must employ. Where there is effective competition the attitude of a shop-keeper must be: "The customer is always right"; with the bureaucracy the attitude is: "The customer is always wrong." Any person who has attempted to get a grievance righted by a Federal Government official knows how difficult the task is; even when that person is skilled in finding his way around town he still has to use a ruthless determination and an oriental persistence before he can obtain a hearing. The local bureaucrat always has a complete

alibi; he abides by his book of rules; he disclaims all responsibility. Soon you find that in your own town nothing can be done to get redress; all power has been taken from your town and centred in Canberra. Canberra, of course, is a long way away, and so is your so-called representative. If perchance you make contact with your representative, he probably will tell you that he will place the case before the Minister; the Minister, struggling under an avalanche of correspondence, has little time to look at your case and will send the letter to one of his bureaucrats, who, in the course of time, will tell you that everything has been conducted according to rule - the rule having been made in the first place by the bureaucrat himself. You may go to Court to appeal against the decision of the Canberra bureaucrat, but again you will find that the judge has to base his verdict on the rules made by the same bureaucrat of whom you are complaining.

This bureaucracy, this great army of occupation which lives on the natives, is becoming stronger and more deeply entrenched every day. This bureaucracy is the mechanism by which a small clique in control of it - the general staff of the bureaucracy - imposes its will on every town and village in the country. Unless we do something soon we shall find ourselves working for the rest of our lives to maintain this army of occupation. Mr. Chifley, himself, has warned us that he is going to keep taxes high after the war; his own estimates come to close on £300 million. You will have to pay these taxes. At present there are only about one and a half million taxpayers to carry this burden, which represents an average tax of £200 per year. Considering that the majority of taxpayers will not pay one half the average amount, and that those in the higher income group are unlikely to contribute much more in taxation than at present, it appears certain that the tax burden of the future must fall on those earning from £6 to £12 a week. A married man earning £7 a week, apart from his other taxes, will have to pay 10/- a week (1945) in social service contributions alone; and this contribution does not entitle him to the old age pension unless he can prove that he is destitute. (Means Test.)

TRENDS

By means of power-driven machinery, modern transport, the telephone and the radio, goods can be mass-produced in one part of the world and shipped to and sold in other parts. (Various brands of soaps and of motor cars are household names in all corners of the earth.) Alongside this export of cheap, mass-produced goods there has been an export of cheap, mass-produced political ideas, and our highly publicised "intelligentsia" are retailers of these cheap mass-produced ideas - ideas which were exported from Europe many years ago. Synthetically-

produced public men mouth political catch-phrases which will not bear analysis. But the fact that these ideas have been backed by continuous and expensive sales talk has made them acceptable to young people who, of necessity, have no power to analyse them; such ideas are accepted by youth as facts of the same category as two and two make four. The desire of dictators to get hold of the educational system is the desire to indoctrinate young minds and to condition them into docile acceptance of the type of system it is wished to impose. Accompanying this long-term planning for the processing of the minds of youth is an equally insidious shorter-term plan to capture the minds of adults by back-door methods. Here, it is necessary to give a warning about expressions used by superficial observers and by international salesmen of mass-produced political ideas. These men speak of there being a "trend" towards this and that; a trend towards a "centralisation of power into the hands of a few men," which, in vulgar language, really means the need of dictators to liquidate their rivals. Those of us who have taken the trouble to look behind the scenes know that to speak of a "trend towards centralisation of control" is a deliberate attempt to hypnotise the people into accepting something they very much dislike, and which, if they understood it, they would fight against to the bitter end. To take one example, the centralisation of electrical power in the various States is not justifiable from an engineering point of view; it is very dangerous from a military point of view. It is resulting in higher costs and in poorer service. Yet the so-called trend goes on because one or two men force it to go on, and are prepared to use, and are in a position to use, the entire force of the State to impose their will on the majority. Anyone who speaks of a trend towards the centralisation of electric power is not only carefully choosing words designed to misrepresent the truth, but he is taking part in a vast attempt to destroy the whole basis of society by one of the most despicable methods known. If people knew the immense amount of energy employed, knew of the wire-pulling and the intimidation behind some of those so-called "trends" they might perhaps find a more apt expression for them. Words are important, and this word "trend" is important because it shows the nature of the forces at work and the subtle methods used to gradually condition the minds of the people into accepting something they would otherwise refuse.

The Essentials of Democratic Control PRINCIPLES OF BRITISH DEMOCRACY

There has been a prolonged and powerful attack on local government everywhere; this has been carried out mainly by a centralised bureaucracy which has pursued a policy of intimidation and centralisation irrespective of which political party occupied the Government benches. Just as the Federal bureaucracy has so

undermined the power of local and state governments that they cannot carry out their duties properly, so the international bureaucracy is destroying the power of central governments to help their own people. The Bretton Woods conference decision, if ratified, will prevent Australia protecting her own trade and industry, and prevent her from ever getting out of the control of foreign creditors. The London Chamber of Commerce Report on Bretton Woods makes that crystal clear. Also, international agreements can give the power to the Federal Government to brush aside any constitutional protection the people may have had. Kings of old relied on wars to frighten their subjects into obedience, and to divert their attention from the kings' misrule. That still seems to be the primary object of wars. The chaos and destruction in Europe, which is bringing untold misery and shame to millions, will, no doubt, prove very convenient to the international gangsters who batten on wars and revolutions. "Only in war, or under threat of war will the British people submit to large-scale planning." The British people's rugged desire to run their own affairs, and their strange objection to being pushed around by officials, is no doubt the reason why the international gang are so anxious to liquidate the British Empire. A strong, versatile race like the British people, with their superabundance of resources and of inventive genius, and with their historic inability to accept defeat, is definitely considered a stumbling block to the introduction of a universal totalitarian regime. It is natural, therefore, that we should be witnessing a continuous attempt to undermine the political strength and prestige of the British people. That political strength has rested on three fundamental principles of freedom:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The first is local government, that is, the control of local affairs by local men living on the spot, and drawing their sustenance from the locality, and who are known to and are accessible to the people in the locality.

The very opposite to local government is, of course, central government controlled by absentee managers living hundreds of miles away and quite independent of the praise, censure or disaster of the people they are supposed to represent.

VOLUNTARY BASIS

The second fundamental principle of democratic co-operation is that it should be on a voluntary basis. Where coercion has to be used, as it is used by modern governments, on decent citizens in a large variety of spheres of activities, it is a sure sign that a regime is being enforced on the people from the top, and not by consent. Our educational institutions do nothing but harm when they hide the real nature of these coercive methods. Many of the laws and regulations are imposed

on the people of so-called democracies by brute force, or the threat of brute force, by a minority on the majority. Yet in every Socialist country not only has brute force failed to obtain obedience to the flood of laws - and this in face of unbelievable cruelty and severity of punishment - but a vast army of spies, pimps and informers has had to be employed to maintain obedience to the laws.

PROTECTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The third principle is that, in his dealings with private individuals, the power of the monarch. (or ruling clique) should be clearly defined and strictly circumscribed. Magna Carta, Habeas Corpus and the Bill of Rights are the monuments marking the struggles of the British people to establish this very essential protection of the individual. It should be obvious by now that rulers of a modern State find in their hands powers of coercion so tremendous that the individual cannot possibly protect himself because the State, in order to obtain those powers, must take them from the private individual. When the people give the State great power in order that it may wage war, that power does not come out of the air; it comes from the people. If the State is given the sole power to make decisions the people obviously lose that power. It seems, therefore, that we shall have to fight the old battles all over again, and force our rulers to sign a new Magna Carta. Unless the private individual can secure for himself some protection for his wife and family against the confiscation of their home, and can obtain an opportunity to acquire some culture and leisure, then I cannot see what advantage we are getting from our much proclaimed "advances" in science, invention and education. It appears too that the vast amount of mechanical skill and encyclopaedic knowledge we are acquiring has no connection with what was once known as wisdom.

COMPULSION AND THE RIGHT OF CHOICE

Those things which differentiate one man from another are the things a man chooses to do of his own free will. What one man chooses to do of his own free will is impossible to make some other man do under the severest forms of compulsion, or, as the saying goes, what is one man's meat is another man's poison. The hallmark of a slave is not hard work, nor lack of food, nor brutal treatment; the hallmark of servitude is lack of freedom of choice. A great deal of trouble in industry is due to men working at jobs in which they haven't the slightest interest; these men are a nuisance to themselves and to everybody else, and to all intents and purposes they are practically in gaol. It would be profitable to the community to allow these men to get into their proper jobs, or else pay them to keep out of the way. A tremendous amount of friction, nervous

irritation, and ill-will is created in industry, through the presence of men who obviously do not belong to that industry, and who are merely there because they have been unable to find a source of income elsewhere. When the management or the employees are unable to terminate a disagreeable contract, then the whole tone and atmosphere of industry suffers severely. Lack of choice is one of the most disruptive elements of society, and only by giving as great a freedom of choice as possible to every individual can we prevent the strains and tensions which otherwise develop, with explosive results. If a man or woman is deprived of the right of choice in matters he or she considers vital, then, for them, the nature of those matters must take on an importance and an urgency which they would not possess had there been alternatives. Immediately compulsion, in whatever form, is used, then the whole nature of a problem changes; and it is the introduction of unnecessary compulsions into so many spheres of modern life which has created that harsh, bitter, nervous attitude in social and political problems. The fact that those who wish some theatrical entertainment are invariably forced to attend a cinema may not appear important; the fact that most of the films they see come from Hollywood may hardly be noticed; but the fact that we have permitted the emotional life of the young people of the British Commonwealth to be nurtured and stimulated by a small group of vicious and mentally immature aliens who have prostituted every art of the stage, seems, to me, suicidal. Never in history has such a large number of people been submitted to such a vicious attack on art and morals by such a small number of people - a people who intellectually and culturally are definitely diseased. This attack could not be possible unless, for many, the right of choice had been virtually removed. If the lack of choice is so obviously disastrous in the realm of entertainment, what must be the results in those spheres where a man must spend eight hours a day for close on half a century! The would-be reformer is always demanding a law against drinking beer, or a law against owning land, or against anyone being allowed to make a profit, or against anyone being allowed to live unless he punches a clock in a factory. Actually, such reformers are demanding the use of brute force to compel their neighbours to do what they don't want to do, and what they have no intention of doing. These reformers are the raw material out of which Hitler and Stalin built their police state (rule by gangsters) ; they prepare the ground for the tax-collectors. The Australian people could not be persuaded to pay the heaviest taxes in the world unless the ground were well-prepared beforehand by extensive propaganda by so-called reformers; temperance workers are more helpful in collecting millions of pounds worth of excise duties than is the police force; the tax on land was made politically

practicable of collection by the work of the followers of Henry George; and so on. It is therefore important to realise that although the extensive propaganda against the liberty of the individual may not be originated by the government groups, nevertheless it certainly is encouraged by them and exploited to the utmost, and men holding views such as those expressed here are rigidly excluded from the A.B.C., no matter which party is in power.

It is of the very nature of things that man must cut the links which impede his development; he must break away from his mother's apron-strings, break away from his school, and then from his father's home to build his own home; he may have to break away from the trade at which he was apprenticed. To arrest that process at any point, if it could be arrested, would be to destroy the growth of a human being. And what else can we offer a human being but the growth of personality and character? Take that away and all you are left with is a community of dumb animals-the society of the ant-heap. The centrally planned State may look attractive on paper, especially to the "mechanical" type of mind (simple minded), but the accumulating mass of information coming from the centrally organised States of Germany and Russia are so damning as to put the matter beyond discussion. The totalitarian State, the bureaucratic socialist State, is admirably designed for dumb animals; it cannot adapt itself to changing conditions, it can only be brought under control by becoming static. It is no accident that all the old Bolsheviks of Russia were wiped out to make room for the bureaucrats.

THE VOTING MANIA

There is no great harm in groups of people meeting together and passing resolutions, but as soon as those people pass resolutions which affect people other than themselves then we must all sit up and take notice. Neither does it matter very much if a large group of people find themselves in a minority when a vote is taken at a meeting, provided nothing very vital is being discussed. Even if the vote is vital, and is resented by a minority, there is no great harm done, provided the minority are able to escape, or can withdraw from an unprofitable association. Where this is not possible the minority is caught like a rat in a trap; it has been caught by a trick. And this is the trick which I am trying to expose in this booklet. Action sanctioned by the taking of a vote, if it is not to produce a bitter and antagonistic minority, must be circumscribed and limited to certain spheres of activity. Where the result of a vote taken on a vital issue is likely to affect some voters not at all, and to affect others very adversely, then there is usually something wrong with the basis of the franchise and with the subject under discussion, and usually there is something wrong with both together. It

is lamentably easy to vote for the expenditure of large sums of money if you believe none of the money will come out of your own pocket; it was noticeable that an organised howl came from America when Great Britain refused to dash into War in 1938, but if a vote had been taken of the “howlers” they would no doubt have resolutely voted for America staying out of the war, which she did for another three years. The shocking dishonesty and impudence of this cowardly action has passed with little comment in the press. The idea that anyone should have a right to vote on any question irrespective of their responsibilities, or their willingness to accept responsibility for their action, is fundamentally dishonest, and by no stretch of the imagination can such a vote be called democratic, just, or reasonable. A group of tennis players has every right to draw up rules for tennis provided they have no power to compel other people to play tennis who don't want to, and provided they have no right to compel others to pay their expenses; anyone in a football team who objects to taking orders from his captain can always resign; no one who plays cricket is victimised because he scores more runs than his team-mates. But when we come to so-called democratic government we find rules made which the majority of the people took no part in forming; we find rules under which no game could be played and no business run. We find also that neither the minority nor the majority like the rules which have been forced upon them, and, too, that they have to submit to those rules whether they like them or not; they have no choice and no means of escape, except by low cunning and subterfuge. They are following step by step the same inevitable process evolved in Germany and Russia where to live at all one must break the law and thereby fall into the clutches of official black-mailers. And under these conditions the scum of the earth must come on top.

PRINCIPLES OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

In attacking the abuses of the present pseudo-democratic system of government, and in offering constructive ideas for reform, it is essential to reach some agreement on, and to adhere to, certain broad principles, even if such principles take some time to work out in terms of practical politics. Still, we must make a start, and we must have some general direction if we are not to be knocked around by every charlatan who cares to use the ignorant voter. Accordingly, we take our stand on the following tenets of democratic procedure, culled from the bitter experience of centuries :

1. Self-government is better than “good” government;
2. Only in freedom can the best elements in society develop to their full stature;
3. “Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely,” and special legal machinery will have to be devised to protect the individual taxpayer against the

ruthless acts of bureaucrats;

4. Community effort should, as far as possible, be placed on a voluntary basis;
5. In order that men and women should be free from fear and free from coercion by powerful groups, every man and woman who has served the community for, say, ten years, should be guaranteed a minimum income below which he cannot fall;
6. Local government, local enterprise, and local initiative should be encouraged, even at the alleged sacrifice of so-called “mechanical” efficiency;
7. Central governments, both State and Federal, should vacate all spheres of activity which can possibly be managed by other agencies, and should concentrate on their legitimate tasks of co-ordination, the collection of information, the provision of a legal framework for community activities, and the prevention of exploitation by monopolies.

An experienced political thinker, reading these seven tenets of self-government, might say: “Very good, very desirable; but how utterly fatuous to expect their fulfilment.” And he might go on to explain that men in power reach positions of power because they desire power; and why expect these men to legislate for their own elimination? Well, we must still try. And when a sufficient number are acquainted with these principles, I think they can do the job if they so desire. For democratic conditions, however, the election of members and the making of laws will have to be placed on quite a different basis from that existing at present. The mass hypnotism, misrepresentation, and bribery, and the compulsion which drives young and inexperienced, and therefore irresponsible, people to the polling booths, is sheer mockery of “popular” selection.

The “right” of a small caucus to indulge in “legalised” robbery, which goes on under the name of taxation, can by no stretch of the imagination be called democratic government, or democratic control. It can only be called rule by gangsters. However, I am not going to waste your time and mine by devising a new and ideal franchise; we have some pretty hectic battles ahead of us to hold our present ground without looking further ahead into new territory.

Those conversant with the very dangerous political situation as it exists now, are not large in number, although, thank God, the number appears to be growing; those with the knowledge and the will to fight are still smaller in number; and those capable and willing, and who are in a position to fight, are in number smaller still. But that need not deter us. Perhaps the most insidious propaganda which has destroyed the fibre of young men has been the “collectivist” idea - the idea that no man can do anything on his own; that he must collect a

mob before he can achieve effective action. No doubt this idea has been strengthened, especially amongst the politically minded, by the power of the "majority vote," or rather, the legal power obtainable by manipulating the majority vote. Nevertheless, power to do things and to move things is still essentially a personal matter, and individual initiative is still the most dynamic thing in this world. A few men in each State who know what they are about, and who are willing to fight for their beliefs, would, I believe, transform any State - and do so in a very short time.

What is necessary is exact knowledge, competence, and the will to fight.

We make a very grave mistake if we look upon the ordinary professional politician as ignorant and incompetent; in his own sphere he is neither. On the contrary, he works pretty hard for his salary, and he knows his electorate and all the tricks of the trade. That the politician fails to protect his electorate, or to eliminate the many unnecessary restrictions that plague the man trying to do an honest job, is not entirely his fault; it is neither fair nor reasonable to expect a representative to fight for his electorate against his party bosses unless his electorate will stand by him at election time. As things are at present, a representative in a safe party seat can ignore his electorate and still get back into power again if he does as his party boss tells him; on the other hand, if he defies his party boss, his chances of re-election are negligible. As the late President Roosevelt said: It was his job to submit to pressure. And the "representative" submits to those who exert the greatest pressure. Electors, therefore, are quite powerless unless they can bring pressure to bear on their representative; in other words, guarantee him his seat in parliament if he does as they tell him, and remove him from parliament if he refuses to carry out the wishes of his "masters," his electors. In order to do this, there must be some unanimity among the more intelligent groups of electors. Bearing in mind that the politically active section of the community is probably much less than one per cent. of the voters, and that probably less than one-tenth of that one per cent. is capable of dissecting a political problem with any accuracy, the question of devising a local policy before election time should not then be difficult to arrange as far as consultation between members of a community is concerned. There is no great selection of politically active members of the community available; policy groups at present exist, although mostly organised along vocational lines - unions, chambers of commerce, etc.; there are also the various party organisations. These organisations, however, are infected with the disease which has made the "counting of noses" so ineffectual as far as the taxpayer is concerned; the disease of ignorance and apathy. Unionists refuse to attend their union

meetings, with the result that communists, skilled in the technique of committee management, have captured the key positions in nearly every trades hall in Australia; and as their avowed intentions are to prevent any society functioning successfully, except the Moscow brand, you can understand where many of our troubles come from. Chambers of commerce have also been signally unfortunate in "electing" their alleged spokesmen: too often have the legitimate trader and manufacturer been pushed aside by the speculator and the purely financial agent, with disastrous results to themselves.

THE POWER OF THE MINORITY

The disastrous results produced by the modern party system and by the use of the mass vote to destroy and eliminate the more intelligent vote, have influenced political thinking to such an extent that certain factors vital to the control of governments have escaped their proper emphasis. Democratic government has come to mean, in common parlance, the "counting of noses", and hence it is assumed that if the "counting of noses" is introduced into a country like India or China, a democratic government has been installed. This is a major fallacy. The British parliamentary system of government, in the day of its greatest success, that is, before the rigid party system came into force, rested on the power of independent members; also, parliamentary systems of government are maintained within bounds mostly by outside criticism and by pressure exerted by a large number of different types of voluntary organisations, which have had long experience in self-government, and whose executives have had the necessary training in the complicated business of the political and semi-political worlds. It should be remembered, too, that few other countries have had the intensive and the long experience in local government as has Great Britain.

All governments, even dictatorships, must submit to the pressure of public opinion; that is "why dictators and would-be dictators consider propaganda so important. Dictators go further than this; they consider it not only necessary to "condition" the minds of the majority, but they consider it essential that the minority, even if it be but a minority of one, which thinks differently, should be silenced. In doing this, they rightly discern that all new ideas and all new movements must start with a minority of one. What people do depends upon what they think about things, and it is cheaper and more effective to make people believe that heavy taxes are necessary than to collect taxes by means of brute force. Ideas, therefore, are powerful, and that is why only men with certain chosen ideas are selected to speak regularly over the National Broadcasting Stations. Most of the population is not seriously interested in politics.

A large section of the male population of the city accepts little responsibility, even in their own domestic affairs; all their problems are handed to someone else to solve. Only the women and a small percentage of the male population are experienced in the acceptance of responsibility. Yet society is organised on the basis of this acceptance; this can easily be seen in any workshop, union, or home.

Faced with a crisis or a problem, the majority say: "What are THEY going to do about it?" and wait to see. The responsible minority say: "What can I do about it?" and then do it. In the latter case the link between thought and action is born of self-assurance, and has become automatic through use. These are the men on whom, instinctively, all rely.

In a political crisis, the members of each little group go to their active member for advice and guidance. They probably have not the slightest idea what all the bother is about; Bill, the foreman, knows, so they ask Bill. And what Bill says goes. It is a matter of trust and integrity - Bill's integrity - established over a good many years. So that, given the facts, and a fair chance to discuss and decide the matter, public opinion will be largely the result of what responsible men think - what Bill thinks.

Political propaganda is designed to confuse Bill so that he is not sure where he is. If the scale of political problems can be enlarged so that they concern vast multitudes, and if the power of decision can be taken away from Bill's locality, then taken away from his State to Canberra, and then from Canberra to Washington, Bill, and everybody else, is in complete confusion. Bill doesn't know where he is. If, on the top of that, you can confuse him with talks about Russia (which Bill has never seen, nor is likely to see), and swamp him with books on dialectic materialism and other pseudo-scientific nonsense, then Bill begins to feel that the world he knew has passed away. The link between thought and action has been severed; the forces of evil have captured the fortress.

That is why it is so desperately necessary that we should control as much as possible our own lives locally. Everywhere the "internationalists" have been the enemies of society.

GOVERNMENT

However strong may be the sinister international forces putting pressure on governments, and however reluctant those governments may be to impose alien policies on the people, the fact remains that party governments are doing the work of the devil, and are being used to enslave entire populations. Wars, depressions, the destruction of wealth, and the ever-increasing taxes are the direct results of government actions; and the constant

and ruthless attack on the freedom and security of the individual appears to be the main objective of most governmental bodies. We have got to realise, therefore, that, as governments are elected and controlled today, they constitute the greatest menace facing mankind, and no realistic political action is possible until the nature of this menace is understood.

"Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely," and the power taken from millions of people and placed in the hands of a few men has been a source of tremendous evil which has permeated society from top to bottom and caused the breakdown of effective resistance to wholesale corruption. Large modern governments are essentially evil things, and the larger they become the more evil they become. Governments may be an essential evil, but they are not nearly so essential as continuous propaganda would make us believe. It is interesting to notice too that no man receives any publicity who does not advocate more power being given to governments.

Centuries of hard fighting have gone into the production of the "Common Law," the legal structure which our fathers built to protect the people against the arbitrary acts of rulers drunk with power. Through the acts of governments, very little of the common law remains effective, and today the common man is almost helpless when he is victimised by a government official. Everything that can be done to strip the ordinary man of power to protect himself is being done now by "your" government. The nature of this devilish plan of destruction is no longer in doubt; it is the prevention of any individual acquiring access to wealth and freedom without the permission of the governing clique. To this end the colossal task of preventing the vast output of modern machinery and of productive genius reaching the people has been accomplished. War is a perfect instrument for producing the perfect serf State. In war people are kept in "Full Employment" making goods none of which is of any use to them. The limiting power of money and prices which restrict the production of goods in peace-time doesn't exist in war-time, because the goods are given to the enemy for nothing, in the form of high explosives. Any useful goods such as motor-cars (for which the people had paid) were carefully destroyed after the 1914-18 war, and an attempt is being made to destroy usable material left over from the last war.

Another method by which the people are prevented from obtaining the benefits of the assets they have built up, and from obtaining some freedom and security by virtue of the tremendous flow of goods and services made possible by modern power machinery, is by means of financial depressions. As the ordinary citizen obtains

access to the wealth produced by the community by means of “tickets” called money, so, by the simple process of restricting the supply of tickets, or money, or credit, the Commonwealth government can, and did, prevent the people from obtaining goods which were abundantly available. And this artificially restricted demand for goods caused industry to close down, or to curtail its production; and not only were many people unable to get the barest essentials of life during these years of depression, but many more were stripped of their homes, farms, and savings.

At the present time there is no war and no shortage of money, and new techniques are being used to strip the people of surplus cash and to prevent them building up reserves; these methods require a fuller description than I can give in this booklet, the following, however, is an outline of the main lines of attack:

By punitive taxation all attempts to increase production are made inordinately difficult;

the key men of industry are strictly limited in number, and when these hard pressed men are victimised by the tax collector the activities of the entire nation suffer.

And when, added to this, we have the maddening delays, uncertainties, and humiliations of being dependent on an irresponsible bureaucracy, untrained in industrial needs, we can see that “our” Government can still emulate the destructiveness of war in their efforts to prevent the people producing wealth for themselves, or anybody else.

The Communist trade union bosses have lent a willing hand in this game of destruction. Coal being the basic requirement of secondary production, the hold-up of this industry paralyses nearly every other activity; and the centralisation of electrical power based on coal is the complete answer to the communists’ prayer. It should be noted, too, that bureaucrats have a vested interest in scarcity because without scarcity there is no need for rationing, i.e., no need for bureaucrats.

In the speech by Councillor P. Partington of Glenorchy Council, found in Appendix B, there is an indication of how local government is destroyed, and the means are indicated for counteracting the process. Modern governments have too much power; how little that power is used for good can be seen in the world we live in today. Any person who suggests handing more power to the gang in charge of governments today can have little knowledge of what happened in Germany and Russia nor have had any contact with the “Chosen People” in Canberra. The plain facts of the case are these:

Governments are a very convenient means of taking power from the individual and handing it to a legal abstraction called the “State.” This tremendous accretion of power is then used by a small gang to impoverish

and destroy any section of society which manages to raise its head above the serf state, or which refuses to punch a clock in a factory run by the labour-trade union-financial cartel. The way to fight this ungodly power is to expose it wherever possible, and personally to resist its illegitimate demands. The inefficiency and the incompetence of government organisations, and the impossibility of any group of planners being able to regulate the multitude of activities of a civilised community are bringing the bureaucrats into conflict with the people. It is important that you should be able to explain to the victims of the bureaucrats why they have been hurt.

As the plan for the destruction of the Australian Constitution, and the destruction of the British Empire, unfolds, more and more people will see what is happening; and a little guidance from you may help to forestall the sell-out of one of the last bulwarks of freedom .

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

The government, as it penalises each minority, claims that it is doing so on behalf of the majority; each minority, therefore, finds itself quite helpless, and without legal protection. When Launceston had its efficient and profitable electric power supply taken from it by the “State,” and its citizens protested, the State Premier told the victims that he was not going to listen to a minority of the people of Tasmania.

The fact that the majority of Tasmanians were not interested in Launceston’s troubles, nor ‘benefited by the victimisation of the minority, didn’t seem to worry anyone but the Launceston minority. When Tasmanian representatives in Canberra vote against the wishes of Tasmanians they tell us it is for the benefit of Australia; we are told to think big, and widen our horizons.

Thinking big appears to make inevitable bigger wars, bigger taxes, and bigger strikes, none of which has brought much happiness or security to the majority of voters in the great “democracies.”

The fact is that the bigger an organisation becomes, whether it is a State or a trade union, the less say the individual member has in its policy; this is well known to those who run States and trade unions. An organisation has only to be made big enough for all control by members to be effectively eliminated. An international organisation like that which was devised by the Bretton Woods Conference can not only effectively eliminate control by the majority of voters, but it can eliminate control by the majority of governments. Such an organisation has been set up which can now dictate the policy of the British Empire from New York. From a logical analysis of the position, from the experiences of Germany and Russia, and from what is happening in our

own country, we can see that there is no such thing as an effective political democracy possible unless there is local control of most of the important factors of life, and those who wish to lend a hand in bringing a reasonable political life back to Australia should fight to maintain this local control wherever possible.

The framers of the Australian Constitution created a means whereby the varied needs of the different parts of Australia could be looked after by the men on the spot; everything that the States could do was left to them, and the Commonwealth Government was given the necessary powers to organise those things requiring some uniformity and co-ordination over large areas, such as defence, customs, coinage, and posts and telegraphs - the Australian Constitution was an admirable piece of work and contained among other things the means for its own change and alteration, where necessary.

Those interested should read that very valuable book by Drummond, "Australia's Changing Constitution"; the knowledge contained in this book is very necessary to combat the vicious attacks now being made on one of Australia's greatest assets. The value of the Australian Constitution is that it has given protection to the people against the arbitrary acts of temporary governments lusting after more power. The fact that any change has to be placed in front of the people and openly discussed has been a valuable protection against back-door methods; the people, too, have felt that the Constitution was devised as a protection for themselves, and have consistently refused to give more power to the central bureaucracy. However, unification of taxation has well-nigh destroyed the Constitution because it effectively prevents the State Governments collecting the means for their own existence. Unless unification of taxation, as at present used, can be resisted by the States political democracy in Australia is likely to be a thing unknown to the men who fought in this war. The Australian Constitution is a protection bequeathed to us from the past. Just as our father's house gives us protection in the days of our immaturity, so the Constitution stands as a guard until such times as the people have time to gather together to devise a change. Such a protection is vitally necessary at present, and the fact that Canberra politicians are so eager to get rid of the Constitution should be a warning to all those who believe in democratic control.

THE COMMON LAW

As the Constitution was designed to protect the States against over-centralised control, and against the arbitrary acts of men drunk with power and far out of reach of their resentful victims, so the Common Law was designed to protect the common man against a clique which found itself in temporary charge of all the armed forces of the State. The late Lord Chief Justice

of England, Lord-Hewart, in his book, "The New Despotism," stated: "A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well contrived system intended to produce, and in practice producing, a despotic power which, at one and the same time, places Government Departments above the sovereignty of Parliament, and beyond the jurisdiction of Courts." In other words, this statement by the late Lord Chief Justice, means that most of our laws and regulations are no longer made by parliament, but by a few bureaucrats, and our "Courts of Justice" have degenerated into automatic machines for placing the stamp of legality upon the actions of those bureaucrats. When the victim of a bureaucrat protests in Court, the judge does not consult the Common Law, which has given the common man protection for centuries, and which many believe is still part of the structure of our Constitution; the judge does not consult the Law of Equity; the Law of God, of course, is a thing of the past. All that happens is that the government spokesman hands the judge the latest regulation produced by the bureaucrat and "justice" is satisfied. That so few of our public men have protested against this systematic destruction of the only protection left to the taxpayer against the ruthless and unscrupulous acts of rulers shows how useless it is to depend on them for any protection. Obviously these public men are found convenient for the maintenance of the system. The word Law is one of those delightfully vague words which public men delight to play with, to the confusion of their listeners. What we are interested in here are the fundamental laws of society, or "Laws of God," as they were called. These laws of human behaviour were accepted more or less universally, and they embodied the minimum standard of behaviour permissible to ensure the survival of the tribe. They represented negative laws: Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal. They represented laws which reasonable individuals would police or enforce themselves.

It is interesting to notice that those who have made a study of primitive tribes and of the development of civilisation believe that stealing, killing and wars only started with the dawn of civilisation, that is, when men became organised and "controlled"; it is also interesting to note that society will not tolerate killing and stealing by its private members. The wilful destruction of a human life is considered a heinous and cowardly offence, but the destruction of half a million lives by an atom bomb is considered quite an achievement, even though it was done obviously as an experiment - and quite an unnecessary experiment. Society has long recognised the disruptive action of even casual stealing; systematic stealing by threats of brute force has usually ensured prompt protective action. Yet we find

actions which are considered immoral and inexcusable in private individual have become acceptable in governments.

‘The Moral Law has ceased to apply to governments. Governments recognise the laws neither of God nor man; they make their own laws; they are a law unto themselves. Governments hold that the “voice of the people is the voice of God,” and the voice of the party boss, being the “voice of the people,” is the voice of God. And so stealing and killing not only become “legal” and moral; they become something divine, something worthy of the greatest admiration, when done at the behest of the party boss. Thus we progress, helplessly, to bigger and better wars run by governments, and to more and more stealing of the people’s money and property by governments.

Having one set of laws for private individuals and another for government officials is sufficient to disrupt any society; the terrible menace of this is seen when we examine the actions of men in our community who hide behind the anonymity of some organisation, thus escaping the consequences of their misdeeds. A British Prime Minister aptly described the actions of these gentlemen when he rebuked a section of the Press with these words: “They exercise the ancient prerogative of the harlot - Power without responsibility.”

THE REIGN OF LAW

The prestige which once surrounded the law, and which firmly established the “Reign of Law,” was derived from the fact that the law was above the king, and was administered by judges who were elected for life. There was a continuous body of constitutional law and precedent, originally invoked against the king himself, and designed to protect the private citizen against him; judges, therefore, sometimes ignored statutes enacted by the king and by parliament if those statutes were repugnant to the main body of constitutional law. In other words, judges very naturally recognised that neither kings nor parliaments were gods, and that no body of intelligent and independent men were going to permit their community to be destroyed by larrikins, even though they professed to rule by the divine right of the king, or by the divine right of the “majority.” Modern governments, however, although more powerful than ancient kings, and although they exercise all the prerogatives of kings, do not permit to the people any protection through constitutional law; and today tax-collectors can enter houses without a warrant, take money without permission from wage-earners’ envelopes, mercilessly penalise and victimise minorities, and permit men to be robbed of their very means of livelihood - and against all this there is no protection under the law.

A new Petition of Rights, backed by all the best elements in the community, will have to be presented to parliament, and whether parliament accepts or rejects it will not make much difference; the fact that people will begin to see clearly the nature of modern parliaments will be a liberal education helping them to move towards the next step.

THE FORCES OF DESTRUCTION

The forces which are destroying democratic government and the “Reign of Law” as we knew it, and which are feverishly building up a totalitarian police State along the lines of National Socialist Germany, are very powerful. These forces can be identified under the following headings: The International Financial Houses, especially those of German origin operating from New York; Leaders of the large political parties, especially the Labour Party; The Communist Party, especially the Communist union bosses; Graduates of the London School of Economics; Many of the large daily papers, especially those least suspected, such as the “Times,” of London; Most of the regular commentators on the A.B.C.; The Federal Government Bureaucracy.

In the face of this overwhelming and well-organised attack, the reader may well ask; “What am I expected to do against such odds?” Well, that question has to be answered, but before I answer it I wish to reduce such questions to manageable proportions; also I feel that certain explanations are necessary.

I do not think any dictator can make serfs out of free men. but I do believe that serfs make dictators; this then throws back on to you some of the onus for the behaviour of arrogant bureaucrats, and it indicates very clearly that the only way to avoid being a serf is not to be one. After all, you are not alone in this community, and there is an organisation in every State willing to help you. Those who are continually doing shady things hate publicity, and publicity can always be arranged.

The mighty totalitarian structures of Germany and Russia looked impressive, but they were very brittle; they had no flexibility, and must crack. Where the central government assumes control over everything, they also gather to themselves the blame for everything which goes wrong. And things are always going wrong. Gradually the capital city is looked upon as a foreign city - as the headquarters of an army of occupation living on, and extracting taxes from, the natives. An army of occupation has proved impossible to maintain for any length of time unless the natives are practically exterminated. The Soviet Government is said to have slaughtered about thirty million of its people in trying to force them to live as they had no intention of living. But even with such tyrannical power the Soviet Government

has been forced to change its methods, and to keep on changing them, merely to survive. Vast and "efficient" organisations are quite useless without men of genius, and men of genius cannot be bought nor intimidated. Even if it were possible to exterminate them in one generation they would grow up again next generation, and 180 million men are not much use against one man of genius, or one atomic bomb.

There are certain things which are impossible even for dictators to do. If, in any State, the active minded men have no scope for their initiative, there will be trouble; to provide scope for such men, there must be change, constant change. In a totalitarian regime run by bureaucrats this is almost impossible; constant trouble must arise or there will be an exodus of talent from the country, and in either of which circumstances there must come a day of reckoning. It is stupid, therefore, to consider the present political set up as permanent or stable, or that it must last because 90 per cent. of the people are apathetic or politically ineffectual; the government depends ultimately on the goodwill of the minority of active and responsible men. True, it has been able to ignore such men in the immediate past, but only because of the ferocious blitz which has been waged on their sources of information; the minority were unable to believe that the corruption had gone so deep, or that the enemy were so well organised; they were in the position of Great Britain facing Germany in 1940: The position was hopeless as far as the government was concerned, but there happened to be a few men of genius in the country; they saved the people, who responded magnificently.

The people were let down again immediately after the war, but it appears the housewives of England are not afraid to speak even if the menfolk are. The government is still forced to deliver the goods, even though the goods may be cheap and nasty. Governments who take everything on their own shoulders are in a more

awkward position than a woman who tries to run another woman's house. Now, Reader, will you answer your own question, "What do I do?" If you can't answer that question now, I am afraid you are not the man for whom this book was written. But, in case of any doubt, I suggest to you that, if you belong to an organisation, do not permit it to use any power of compulsion upon you; do not permit the power you have given it to be transferred from your town, or from your State; if any resolution is moved at a meeting, which you do not clearly understand, vote against it, and so help to hold it up until you do understand it; do everything in your power to prevent the Federal bureaucracy obtaining a further strangle-hold upon you - this can be done by joining in a demand for reduced taxation and for a reduction in the number of bureaucrats. Cut down the supply of money with which the bureaucrats play, and cut down the number of bureaucrats who play with your money.

POLITICAL DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Those whose political ideas are centred round parliament can do some very good work of an educational and practical nature by distributing Demand Forms similar to that shown in Appendix A. These forms can be arranged so that one elector, or several electors, can sign. The forms can then be collected and sent to the sitting candidate, or presented to him at a public meeting. A member of the Government Party, especially if he is in an electorate with a big swing vote, is a very suitable member to operate on; if he does nothing about it before election time, then cast aside his promises as valueless, and use your influence to unseat him. The next man you put in may be just as bad, but you have shown your strength; your vote has had power to reprimand; the next member will see that you are determined, and will begin to see that his own electorate has more power than his party boss. Then political democracy will begin to function as it is supposed to function.

ELECTORS' DEMAND FORM

To. M.H.R.
Representative for the electorate of

Dear Sir,

I am sending this letter to you, my representative in Parliament, with the hope that you will take some action to protect the people of your electorate. I am greatly concerned about the destructive effect of taxation, especially increased taxation on extra effort. Because of heavy taxation, and because of government interference, only the privileged few can get a job done in this community. And because of the heavy penalties imposed on all increase of human effort, there is no inducement to expand activities, thereby making it difficult to absorb returned servicemen; and there is no inducement to give additional service to lighten the burdens of the harassed housewife. Such discouragement of effort is making a farce of the housing programme.

The Federal Government knows very well the destructive effect of this policy of taxation, and we must assume that it is carrying it out deliberately. I therefore call upon you to vote for an immediate reduction of taxes by 50 per cent., and also the reduction of the Federal Public Service to the 1938 level.

I would point out to you that the army of Federal bureaucrats has a vested interest in the maintenance of scarcity and of controls. Bureaucrats depend on the maintenance of scarcity for their positions, and I am certain that there never will be plenty in this land until we dismiss the new army of public service bureaucrats raised during this last war.

Unless a guarantee is made in writing, and lodged with someone acceptable to me, I am going to use my vote and my influence to keep you out of parliament, and failing satisfaction from other candidates, I am going to vote against the sitting member.

(Signed)...
Address...

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTION

COUNCILLOR PARTINGTON'S MOTION
MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION OF TASMANIA

At the Thirty-Third Conference of the Municipal Association of Tasmania, held at the Town Hall, Hobart, on 29th May, 1945, Councillor Partington said: I hold that if we are to build up a well-balanced democratic community on solid foundations we must build up on local government under the control and guidance of local men who know the local people and the local conditions, and who have a vital stake in the district. We cannot get the best local men to take a pride in their districts unless they are given the power and the responsibility and the means of building up their district in an adequate manner.

There can be little doubt that the local councils cannot do their jobs as they wish to do because they have to take what is left over after the Federal and the State Governments have scooped the financial resources of the district.

Up to date the people have had no power to stop the State and Federal Governments levying heavy taxes on them. They are compelled by law to pay those taxes so that when it comes to raising rates for the essential work of the local councils the people say: We cannot afford it; we haven't the money. And, therefore, the local councils have to do without, and watch government officials spending the money that they cannot get. This has destroyed the prestige of local government.

The State runs all the electrical undertakings, and has even refused to allow Launceston to run its own electrical power station, although it had one of the first in Australia.

The State also wanted to take over the Tramways from Hobart and Launceston. The Transport Commission wants to run everything which rolls on wheels.

The State Government recently passed a Bill to take over all the Fire Brigades. The State Government also wants to take over most of the road building, but it is willing to permit us to collect rates to pay for this! It has also been proposed that we collect rates for health services to be administered by the State. I don't think it will be long now before the State officials will demand to take over the entire water supply of the Island.

It seems, therefore, reasonable to expect that in the not very distant future municipal councils will be merely rate-collecting agencies for the Government; they might, of course, be granted the privilege of looking after the sewerage and of seeing that the regulations passed by the various government officials in Hobart are rigorously adhered to, and if they are not so adhered to - well, it would be quite easy for the Government to cut off the electric power and the water supply to the council.

Nobody who has watched the growth of the various State departments, and the increasing number of commissioners in this and other States, and who has watched the bullying methods that were used by the Auditor-General at the instigation of the Government, can be in doubt that Municipal Government is only allowed to live on sufferance.

We know that good reasons can be educed for setting up every new government department; we know in many cases the greater resources of the State enable better jobs to be done, but if the arguments used to destroy the power of municipal government are sound, why not take them to their logical conclusion?

Would it not be more efficient to wipe out local councils altogether? But why stop there? Would it not be more efficient and much cheaper to wipe out private houses and let us live in barracks under government control? We would economise in fuel, also sewerage, and in the cooking of food.

You think that is funny - Why? Because you know, and I know, that either you run your own life or you let a dictator run it for you. And we all prefer to run our own lives, and make mistakes, perhaps, and pay a little more for it, perhaps; but there is no other way for free men of British stock to live.

I, therefore, have great pleasure in moving the following motion :

That this Conference resolve to resist to the utmost the continuous attack on the authority of local councils by State and Federal Governments, and urge that a concerted effort be organised to bring back to local councils control over local affairs.

To bring this about this Conference considers a drastic reduction in the number of civil servants, both State and Federal, could be achieved. Experience has shown that centralisation brings about a state of bureaucracy which tends to usurp all power.

Appendix C.

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM requires :-

That every individual should have the right to choose his own way of life and to be able to refuse to co-operate in any undertaking which he finds unprofitable to himself and his family.

The right of each small community to control its local affairs without interference from absentee managers; this is the only democratic control ever known, or ever likely to be known.

The formation of policy groups by men and women of responsibility to prepare the voters for intelligent control over their representative.

That each representative should be confronted with a demand for an immediate reduction in number of bureaucrats to that existing before the war.

A steady and consistent demand for heavy reduction in taxation.

That the practice of taking money out of pay envelopes to pay taxes should immediately cease.

That the present methods of "Uniform Taxation" (the destruction of the financial sovereignty of the State) should be abolished.

THE ROAD TO SERFDOM is found in :-

Monopolies of any kind, "private" or "governmental."

The party system of government.

Centralised governments of the National Socialist type.

A large bureaucratic army of occupation, controlled by absentee managers.

Small groups of men controlling a large number of jobs.

Centralised control of the essentials of modern life - food, coal, electricity, finance, and education, large trade unions controlled by union bosses in their States.

International "Agreements" imposed upon nations without the consent of the people; for example, the Bretton Woods' "Agreement".