

ON OTHER PAGES:

FOOD MARKETING
BOARDS (Page 2)

COMMON-SENSE ON
THE SECOND FRONT
(Page 2)

DOUGLAS REED'S
LATEST BOOK (Page 3)

SEN. AYLETT SUPPORTS
SEN. DARCEY (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE NEW TIMES** PRICE—FOURPENCE

Vol. 8. No. 42 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCT. 23, 1942 Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

Now, when our
land to ruin's
brink is verging,
In God's name,
let us speak while
there is time!
Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime.
Whittier (1807-1892).

The "England-Let-Us-Down" Myth Exploded

Decadence Delusion Debunked

"You don't think much of the British Empire? No? Well, brother, if Britain goes, write finis over Western civilisation. Or do you think, perhaps, that America can carry it alone? You don't know what England means, my friends . . . though it slays me, I tell you this, England is the last refuge of the civilised soul."—Dorothy Thompson, world famous American writer on international affairs.

"British propaganda can no longer deny that the British Empire is breaking up. History records several such instances, and in each the cause was the same. Fatness caused weakness and carelessness, and the ability to defend the Empire was lost. Issuing fresh propaganda will not alter the fact, even if it prevents the citizens of the Empire from finding it out for a few months."—Dr. Goebbels? No. An anonymous writer in an Australian weekly paper.

The trouble with this war is that it is too big. No one, or scarcely anyone, can see it whole; few of us even attempt to get a bird's-eye view before passing judgment on the conduct of the war, or the performances of a particular country. Before we decide who is right—Dorothy Thompson or the anonymous writer quoted above—let us try for once to get that elusive bird's-eye view. And let us remember this is what Einstein would call a "four-dimensional war." It is being fought in three dimensions of space and one of time. The past is just as much a part of it as the present. Our view must include outstanding events of the past, not only because human memories are fallible, but because such events often take added significance when viewed in retrospect. The shape of a mountain is more clearly discernable from a distance than from its own slopes.

First we must recall the scene of June, 1940. France had collapsed. The British army had evacuated Dunkirk, leaving the whole of its equipment behind. Russia was still an interested spectator, apparently content to rely on her non-aggression pact with Germany. America was a benevolent neutral and showed little disposition to be anything else. The R.A.F. was vastly out numbered by the Luftwaffe. England was thus completely unprepared for fighting

on land. Her only strength, apparently, lay in her incomparable Navy; but this would not be of much avail once the Panzer divisions and dive bombers crossed the twenty two miles of water between Calais and Dover.

England's prospects looked pretty grim. What was not realised at the time, especially by observers in countries then neutral, was that the ultimate fate of the whole non-Axis world depended on what happened to England in 1940. This may sound a bold statement; but read on.

For our purpose, it is not enough to recall what did happen. We must also consider what might have happened. If England had caved in, the whole of her vast potential capacity for war production and all her strategic advantages would have become part of the German war machine. Consider the effect on the war situation if Hitler had acquired the British ship-building industry and all the docks, harbours, aerodromes, arsenals, factories and other resources throughout the British Isles! With no one left to carry on the fight in Western Europe, what we now know as Vichy France would have gone the same way. The French Fleet would certainly have been taken over. The British Fleet, of course, would have escaped—or would it?

When the Nazis had finally swallowed France and England, and digested that rich meal, it would have been Russia's turn. What hope would the Soviet have had? Compare the circumstances in which the Russians would then have fought, with those in which they did fight in 1941-42. On the one hand, an immensely stronger Germany, with a powerful Navy and merchant

shipping roving the seas with no one to hinder them, bringing back the oil, food-stuffs, and other materials that Hitler needed (and still needs) so desperately. And on the other hand, a far weaker Russia than the one which only just succeeded in stopping the Germans in 1941. For, if England had fallen, there would have been no Beaverbrook-Harriman Mission to gladden Stalin's heart by answering "Yes" to every single request he made for munitions and materials; no British Navy to convoy supplies to Russia and maintain the blockade of Germany; no devastating raids by the R.A.F. on German war industries.

The superb courage, stamina, and skill of the Russians could not then, have availed against the overwhelming forces that would have been massed against them. With Russia's resources added to those of all the rest of Europe, including the British Isles, and eventually all Asia as well (for the German junction with Japan would have been effected through Siberia), could America have withstood the avalanche which would, in due course, have descended upon her? Her chances certainly could not have been put any higher than England's were in 1940.

As for Australia. . . .
It was a narrow escape for us all. And

by what means was such a universal catastrophe averted? Largely, it would seem our escape was due to that queer, illogic, stubbornness of the English people. We are told by many foreign authorities that the English are not only effete, but have always been strangers to clear and realistic thought. They are said to be "capable of entertaining two conflicting hypotheses at the same time without being aware of it!" So it may have been their mental "woolliness" that prevented them from seeing what all the rest of the world could see so clearly; that they were down and out at last. If so, the whole world should thank its stars for that curious "defect" in the mental equipment of the English.

Of course, there is another school of thought which does not accept the popular view of English mentality. The late A. C. MacDonell, for instance. He was a Scot among Scots. Yet in his book, "My Scotland," he discounted the idea (fostered by the English themselves, he said) that it was the Scots, the Irish, and the Welsh who "ran" England. His view was that the English were "the most diabolically clever people the world had ever seen! He regarded their ability to conceal their ability; as one of their assets. Another, he considered, was their refusal ever, in any (Continued on page 3)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

The traditions of British Democracy are being flouted by prolonging the life at the British Parliaments yet another year without consulting the people. The London "Evening Standard" says: "We again protest against this indecent procedure." Beware of all those who sponsor or encourage this anti-democratic move in Australia. War (or any other pretext) does not justify this proposal.

BABY CRECHES: Following the proposal to conscript women into industry, comes the advocacy of baby creches amidst the dirt and din of factories. Much of the defence work done by women in factories could be decentralised—even by sending it out to private homes if necessary. In any case, there is no need for conscription which implies unwillingness to back up husbands, sons and brothers. Such conscription can only be regarded as an insult to the people's intelligence and patriotism.

ALIEN PROBLEM: The Lilydale Shire Council has protested strongly to the Federal Government against the alarming rate at which aliens are acquiring farms in the shire. It is believed that in a number of cases naturalised aliens are acting as "dummies" for unnaturalised compatriots. Another aspect of this alien question is the number of persons of non-British origin wielding authority in Government Departments, Boards, Committees, etc. Surely such positions should be confined to those of pure British stock.

ABSENTEEISM: Mr. H. P. Zwar, M.L.A., is reported as saying that at the recent session of the Victorian Legislative Assembly 61% of the Members were absent. If we examine the record of the Federal Parliament, from, whence comes most of the talk about absenteeism, it will be found that for about six months of the year 100% of the Members are absent. Meanwhile, the affairs of the country are being mismanaged by bureaucratic Boards and Committees. The same report states that Senator Spicer and Mr. Hutchinson, M.H.R., urged more "Canberra interest" in the community and intimated how the public could assist the Government by "pressure politics."

AGED AUSTERITY: The Pensioners League have decided to postpone their annual picnic for the duration and purchase war bonds with the money saved. They have already subscribed £100 interest free, and given £30 to the Red Cross cigarette fund. What an example to bankers and other financial shysters who insist on their pound of flesh. And what a complete answer to those irresponsible public men who, in order to cover up their own bungling, castigate and insult citizens (including the pensioners) with accusations of slackness and apathy. It is a very old political trick to blame the other fellow—before he blames you.

BLACK MARKETS: Furthering the bankers' inflation-bogey propaganda, the "Manchester Guardian" says that "people with plenty of money and little to buy may burst through the price controls and create really large black markets or barter trade." The bankers' answer to this is of course, "Tax the money off them! It would never do to let the people pay off their debts, and so gain their freedom; they can be trusted to fight and die, but not to have any spare cash."

TRANSPORT MONOPOLY: Another

example of "rationalisation" (kicking the small man out) is found in the following statement from the Melbourne "Herald" of September 9, relative to a deputation to the Fuel Board by members of the Carriers' Pool: "The bigger members of the Carriers' Pool, many of whom had substantially increased their motor fleets in the past twelve months, were working overtime while dozens of vehicles belonging to smaller carriers were standing idle week after week." This bankers' policy of centralisation can be discerned in all industries. All political parties pursue this same policy.

HOUSING PLANS: The London Housing Committee intends to issue a housing manual to all local authorities immediately after the war to show them how houses should be built! It is stated that selling price will depend, on demand, but it is not stated that money will determine effective demand. It has not dawned on the crazy planners that if the people are given sufficient money they can and will more effectively do their own planning. Centralised planning can only result in total destruction of individual initiative. It should be shunned like the plague.

MILK BOOST: A news item of special interest comes in the form of an announcement that "New York's milk supply will be sold at 1/2 per cwt. below cost." The loss in money terms will be 5000 dollars per day, and the stated purpose is to stimulate production, without raising cost to the public. This coincides with the new subsidy here on butter. The snag is, of course, that the so-called loss is paid from taxation, which could be avoided. However, it is an indication of a wider vision in economic theory, and an appreciation of the fact that inducement is a far better war-effort stimulant than compulsion. Mr. Curtin please note.

SUCCESS OF WAR LOANS

ANTI-BORROWING VIEWS NOT DETRIMENTAL

"The Government is aware that a section of the community hold views adverse to the issuing of public loans. The expression of those views has not in the past militated against the success of war loans, and the Government does not believe that it will do so in the future."

—The Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Chifley), replying to questions by Senator Gibson, September 30, 1942.

(See full "Hansard" report, headed "COMPULSORY LOANS." Statement of Mr. Wilson, M.P. in this issue.)

DEBT FREE WAR FINANCE URGED BY RAILWAYS OFFICERS' CONFERENCE

According to the "Railways Officer" for September, the Annual Conference of the Victorian division of the Federation of Salaried Officers of Railways Commissioners, held in Melbourne on August 28, passed the following resolution:—

"In the report of the Royal Commission on Banking, sections 503 and 504, it is stated—

"The Central Bank in the Australian system of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia. This bank is a public institution managed in the discharge of a public trust. Its special function is to regulate the volume of credit in the National interest, and its distinctive attribute is its control of the note issue . . . it can lend to Governments and to others in a variety of ways and it can even make money available to Governments or others free of any charge."

"These are the heavily weighed findings of a Commonwealth Royal

EAT MORE SPUDS!

"Just as I was moodily contemplating a potatoless dinner, Howard Marshall piped up in the B.B.C. newsreel suggesting that people should eat more potatoes than they do, and should even use them as a substitute for bread. Then he went on to tell us just how we could learn to make all the daintiest potato dishes in creation.

"Well! Here was the tight little island of 40,000,000 people, that normally has to import most of its food, almost gloating over a surplus of potatoes, while this great Australia many times larger and with a population of only 7,000,000, is unable to produce one miserable spud for the dinner table—and this is a primary producing country, too!

"For the next hour I was speechless, and so was the wireless which was switched off savagely. Into what further fields of unnecessary deprivation is this muddling bottleneck control going to lead us." —"The Roustabout," Melb. "Herald" October 14.

Commission comprised mostly of Conservatives, after taking voluminous evidence on the subject. Therefore, we call upon the Federal Parliament to take the following action:—

"(1) To convert the Commonwealth Bank into a genuine People's Bank, instead of a Bankers' Bank, in accordance with the original intention of the Fisher Labor Government, who established the Bank.

"(2) To use the National Credit, by means of the Commonwealth Bank interest free, in accordance with the Royal Commission's Finding, for the purpose of winning the war and for post war reconstruction: instead of using National Debt, carrying interest charges.

"(3) The immense advantages to be derived from the use of the National Credit are—

"(a) The borrowing of credits from private banks and financial institutions becomes unnecessary.

"(b) Further increase in the national debt is avoided.

"(c) Further increase in the annual national interest bill is also avoided.

"(d) Increase in taxation of the people, including the fighting forces, to meet consequent increase in national interest bill is avoided.

"(e) What is physically possible in the war effort could be proceeded with immediately, without waiting to 'find the money.'

"(f) Finance ceases to be a problem, and becomes the National Accounting System, measuring the war effort in terms of money.

"(4) The machinery of war has been revolutionised since the war began. Why not revolutionise the privately owned, decrepit machinery of finance?

"(5) Let us fight the people's war with the aid of the people's credit, interest free.

The New Times

A non-party, non-sectarian, non-sectional weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and exposing the causes, the institutions and the individuals that keep us poor in the midst of plenty.

Published every Friday by New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Streets, Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address; Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834.

Vol. 8

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1942

No. 42

Food-Marketing Boards

The pass to which bureaucratic Boards and Committees are reducing Australia's food supplies must be rectified. Almost every week further instances come to hand of the unrealistic activities of these autocratic bodies. They employ too many officials, who should be doing something more useful. They use up substantial amounts of the 'taxpayers' hard-earned money—e.g., the losses of the Apple and Pear Board. They impose unnecessary and irritating regimentation. All that, and much more that could be mentioned, is bad enough. But the crowning indictment is that they DON'T GET RESULTS—they don't get the fruit, etc., to the people.

War-time conditions do NOT provide an adequate excuse. Take the potato situation, for example. England has had the war right on her doorstep ever since it began—frequently the air war has gone far over her threshold, with results never experienced in Australia. Yet, Englishmen and their families are enjoying an abundance of potatoes (see the item "Eat More Spuds!" on our front page). The out-break of war stopped Australia's exports of apples, thereby increasing the quantity of apples available for the home market. Australians as a whole had the digestive capacity and the desire to consume more apples. But they didn't! Millions of bushels of apples rotted in Australian orchards while most Australians ate no more than usual and many went very short indeed, as usual.

Australia entered this war with abundant food supplies—a wonderful basis for a sustained war effort. That basis, the very foundation of our war effort, must be preserved to an adequate extent at any cost. The recent trend must be arrested and, to a great extent, reversed. Boards, such as the Apple and Pear Board, have had a fair trial and have proved that they stand in the way. They must be abolished.

Next week we propose to give a resume of the overwhelming indictment against these Boards, and indicate the democratic, constitutional action that electors should take.

COMMONSENSE ON SECOND FRONT

Stalin's recent blunt declaration on the Second Front is reported to have had a "disturbing" effect on England; but, despite the efforts of Leftish propaganda, the effect, it seems, is not quite what men like Lord Strabolgi might have hoped. Very many of the people, it is clear, are displeased at the fashion in which the huge Allied aid which has gone to the Soviet Union is waved aside as inconsiderable, and they cannot but remember at how terrible a cost of shipping and gallant merchant seamen the road to Murmansk and Archangel has been kept open.

I notice that Mr. A. A. Milne has had the courage and honesty to express in writing what many people have been thinking, who have memories which extend beyond the news of the last six months. He pays a fervent tribute to Russia—as all true men must do—but he does not hesitate to speak bluntly to Stalin in answer to his own plain speaking. He has ventured to recall that it was Russia's partnership with Germany which led to the crucifixion of Poland—a thing so completely forgotten in certain quarters that one of our own trades union leaders wrote recently of Italy as Hitler's ally in that crime! Continuing, he recalls her quiescence during the attack on Norway, on the Western neutrals, on Yugoslavia. He does not indict this policy; he accepts the explanation that Russia was "gaining time" to meet an attack which she knew was preparing. But the fact remains that she

became our ally only when she was invaded, and that when a "second front" would have been most welcome—in 1940—it was not forthcoming.

But, if Stalin was wise—as Mr. Milne thinks—to wait, and secure another year for preparation, how can he blame Britain for her caution, now that the situation is reversed? "If there is one country in the world against whom a sentimental reproach cannot be made, that country is Britain; if there is one country which cannot make it, that country is Russia. So let's be done with it."

Yes, it is high time to be done with press appeals, reporters' enthusiasms, Left Wing politicians' desire for a Red Europe, and Mr. Wendell Willkie's honest emotional responses. This question must be decided on one basis alone—that of strategical realities as known to those who will have to carry out one of the hardest, most dangerous tasks in the history of war,

—Sulla, in the "Advocate," Melbourne, October 15.

Riverina Monetary Council

The Hon. Secretary (W. Ridley, Box 333 Griffith, N.S.W.), reports that the following resolutions were passed at a recent executive meeting:

"The Riverina Monetary Reform Council Executive urge the Government to prevent the drift towards inflation which is inevitable under the present system of Interest, Taxation and Debt. This can be prevented by a scientific application of price control coupled with a subsidy to certain primary industries, financed by national debt-free credits. This will save the Government and people from disaster, now, and when peace returns."

"While we approve the principle of a Mortgage Bank, we deplore the fact that interest of 4% and over is to be imposed on the mortgagors, perpetuating the existing evil which has enslaved Primary Producers, Industry and Home Builders to the debt system of finance. To avoid this, such credit be made available at cost of issuance only."

"That the secretary write to Federal member in reference to personnel and activities of the Post-War Reconstruction Committee, enquiring if it is the Government's intention to co-opt the services of other organisations to assist them."

U.E.A. HOME MEETING

Furthering the idea of forming groups in metropolitan electorates, supporters and their friends are invited to attend a meeting at the home of Mr. O. B. Heatley, on Friday night, October 30. The address is 32 Paxton-street, East Malvern—about half-way between Wattle-tree-road and Waverly-road. Mr. Elliott, who is arranging these meetings, expects other groups to be formed from this point, and invites you to come along and assist him in this work.

SENATOR DARCEY'S BUDGET SPEECH

(Continued from last issue)

In November, 1920, the private banks applied, to the Commonwealth Bank Board, which represented the private banking institutions, for what is known as "the right to draw." The first "application for the 'right to draw' was for £5,000,000 worth of notes, and the agreement made with the Commonwealth Bank board was that when these notes were presented they would be taken up by the banks at 4 per cent, interest. However, when they were printed and ready for issue the private banks notified the Commonwealth Bank Board that they refused to take any of the money. In October, 1924, the Commonwealth Bank Act was proclaimed, and a conference was held between the Bruce-Page Government, the Associated Banks and the Commonwealth Bank Board. The banks were given the right to draw another £10,000,000, and interest at 4 per cent, to be paid only on the amount actually drawn. One naturally asks why it was that the Commonwealth Bank yielded to the demands of the private banks for these "rights to draw" in order to finance the wool sales, when the Commonwealth Bank could so easily have financed the transaction itself. That question has never been answered; but the following facts may, or may not throw some light upon the subject. Mr. Kell, who succeeded Sir Denison Miller, was only acting governor of the bank before the directorate was appointed, and so had neither the status nor the power of his predecessor. After the appointment of the directorate, the governor of the bank was merely an executive officer. In effect, he was under the power of members of the board, who represented the big financial institutions. Moreover, he personally was in a rather precarious position, for previously he had made things so unpleasant for Mr. M. B. Young, a leading official of the bank, that the latter resigned and brought serious accusations against Mr. Kell. The Bruce-Page Administration supported Mr. Kell, refused to appoint an independent tribunal to deal with the accusations, and upon Mr. Kell's retirement in 1926, granted him a pension of £1000 per annum. The trouble for the primary producers began with the setting up of a new Commonwealth Bank Board which, in addition to the governor of the bank and the secretary to the Treasury, was composed of certain commercial magnates who were appointed to control the destinies of the people's bank, although they might themselves be shareholders in private banks, and in spite of the fact that such institutions as those of which they were directors, were normally lenders on a very large scale of money at interest. The commercial magnates to whom I have referred were:—John J. Garvan, managing-director, Mutual Life and Citizens Assurance Company Limited, pastoralist, Rochdale Station, Queensland; Sir Robert Gibson, K.B.E., vice-president Associated Chambers of Manufactures, Victorian representative Central Coal Board, director Austral Manufacturing Company, the Lux Foundry, National Mutual Life Insurance Company, Union Trustee Company, Robert Harper and Company Limited, merchants and manufacturers, and the Chamber of Manufactures Insurance Company; Sir Samuel Hordern, director, Anthony Hordern and Sons, universal providers, Australian Mutual Provident Society, and the Royal Insurance Company; Mr. Robert Bond W. McComas, president of various wool-buyers' associations, proprietor of William Haughton and Company, wool-brokers; Mr. John McKenzie Lees, Fellow of the Institute of Bankers, London, and formerly chairman of Associated Banks in Queensland, and general manager of the Bank of Queensland, and of the Bank of North Queensland; Mr. Richard S. Drummond, an inconspicuous gentleman, appointed for inconspicuous reasons. The rates charged for financing primary produce began to rise at once, until they had more than doubled. Primary producers had to pay £7,000,000 in bank charges during the 1924-25 season, as against £3,000,000 during the previous year. When the farmers in Western Australia formed a voluntary pool, they applied confidently to the Commonwealth Bank to finance it, as had been done for similar pools in previous years; but it was no longer the same bank, and both it and the private banks alike imposed conditions which were intolerable. Obviously, if it cost twice as much in 1924 to ship produce to the London market as it did in 1923, the position was intolerable and unjust. Finally, when the farmers, finding themselves unable to secure the necessary money in Australia, obtained it from the Co-operative Wholesale Society in Great Britain, the concerted action of the private banks and their new ally, the Commonwealth Bank, frustrated the scheme. When the Co-operative Wholesale Society paid the money in to the London branch of the Commonwealth Bank, that institution, instead of transferring the money to its Perth branch transferred it in quotas on one-fifth to each of the five associated banks operating in Perth, so that each bank was enabled to exploit the farmers by means of transfer charges. The transportation of 4,000,000 bushels of wheat from Australia to Great Britain cost the Co-operative Wholesale Society 1s. a bushel, but for merely transmitting

the money the banks charged the farmers practically 3/4d. a bushel, amounting in all to £60,000. Had that money been treated properly by the Commonwealth Bank the transmitting charge of £60,000 would not have been incurred.

Senator Collett.—Who dictates the policy of the Commonwealth Bank?

Senator Darcey.—The Commonwealth Bank Board, of course. Who else could do it? Had Sir Dennison Miller lived that would not have happened. The attempt made in 1924 by the Bruce-Page Government to strangle the Commonwealth Bank would have been consummated a few years ago had the amending Bill passed by the then Treasurer (Mr. Casey) been passed. As it was, there was a public outcry against it, and Mr. Casey received tens of thousands of letters demanding that the Bill be dropped. He told me that in one week it cost him £64 in stamps to reply to people who had written protesting against the Bill. That, of course is called pressure politics, and the result was that the Bill was dropped. Also, some years ago a mortgage bank Bill was introduced at the instigation of the private banks. Under that bill it was proposed to raise £30,000,000 by selling inscribed stock and debentures, in order to raise the capital for the new mortgage bank. Had that been done the private banks would have purchased the inscribed stock and debentures, and, of course have drawn the profits. Also, under company law, if debenture-holders are not satisfied with the manner in which the company is being conducted, they can take over.

Sir Earnest Harvey, of the Bank of England, arrived in Australia early in 1927 "for the purpose of advising the Commonwealth Bank as to certain phases of central banking." We have never had a central bank in Australia, but much has been done against the interest of the people. The object of the visit by Sir Ernest Harvey was to make the Commonwealth Bank, which was supposed to be a national bank operating for the good of the people, a central bank operating for the benefit of private banks. Until last year the policy of the Bank of England was to send Sir Earnest Harvey and Sir Otto Niemeyer to various parts of the Empire to establish central banks. Sir Otto Niemeyer secured the establishment of the Central Bank of New Zealand, but it was never used, although it was founded under a Labor Administration.

(To be continued.)

THE CONTROL OF POWER

A Book Review Broadcast from 7HO Hobart, on Sunday, September 27, by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

The author goes on to discuss the various forms of power used to coerce or control human beings. Bertrand Russell says:

"Power over human beings may be classified by the manner of influencing individuals, or by the type of organisation involved."

"These forms of power are most nakedly and simply displayed in our dealings with animals, where disguises and pretences are not thought necessary. When a pig with a rope round its middle is hoisted squealing into a ship, it is subject to a direct physical power over its body. On the other hand, when the proverbial donkey follows the proverbial carrot, we induce him to act as we wish by persuading him that it is to his interest to do so. Intermediate between these two cases is that of performing animals, in whom habits have been formed by rewards and punishments; also in a different way, that of sheep induced to embark on a ship, when the leader has to be dragged across the gangway by force, and the rest then follow willingly."

"All these forms of power are exemplified among human beings."

"The case of the pig illustrates military and police power. The donkey with the carrot typifies the power of propaganda. Performing animals show the power of 'education'. The sheep following their unwilling leader are illustrative of party politics, whenever, as is usual, a revered leader is in bondage to a clique or to party bosses."

"Let us apply these Aesopian analogies to the rise of Hitler. The carrot was the Nazi programme (involving e.g. the abolition of interest); the donkey was the middle class. The sheep and their leader were the Social Democrats and Hindenburg. The pigs (only so far as their misfortunes are concerned), were the victims in concentration camps, and the performing animals are the millions who make the Nazi salute."

"The most important organisations are approximately distinguishable by the kind of power that they exert. The army and the police exercise coercive power over the body; economic organisations, in the main use rewards and punishment as incentives, and deterrents; schools churches and political parties aim at influencing opinion; but these distinctions are not very clear cut, since every organisation uses other forms of power in addition to the one which is most characteristic."

It is obvious that in a modern community certain men must be given power to do things; to make roads, build hospitals and issue our currency. In a small community the task of controlling the activities of these men is not simple, and not easy. But in a large State the task of controlling the ruling group is almost impossible. But that is the task that we have to face, and it will be the supreme problem after this war.

COMPULSORY LOANS

Statement by Mr. Wilson, M.P.

Senator GIBSON asked the Minister representing the Treasurer, upon notice—

1. Has the honorable member for Wimmera in the House of Representatives (Mr. Wilson), who supports the Government, made a statement to the effect that he does not believe in compulsory loans or voluntary loans?

2. If so, what action does the Government propose to take to curb such statements?

3. Does the Treasurer not think that statements of this kind militate against the war loan effort?

Senator KEANE.—The Treasurer has supplied the following answers:

1 and 2 During the course of recent debate the honorable member for Wimmera in the House of Representatives expressed his views in regard to government loans. Members of Parliament are entitled to state their opinions freely, subject, of course, to the Standing Orders of the chamber to which they are members, and it is not for the Government to limit their rights of speech.

3 The Government is aware that a section of the community hold views adverse to the issuing of public loans. The expression of those views has not in the past militated against the success of war loans, and the Government does not believe that it will do so in the future.

—"Hansard" report for September 30, 1942.

DOUGLAS REED'S LATEST BOOK

REVIEWED BY ERIC D. BUTLER.

Douglas Reed former "London Times" European correspondent startled the British people several years ago when he wrote his first book, "Insanity Fair". He tried to warn them in his own characteristic, forceful style. "Insanity Fair" was followed by three other books, the last of these, "A Prophet at Home," containing a forthright attack on the alien influx and impression on the British way of life.

Although Mr. Reed gives little indication that he understands the amazing ramifications of International Banking his books have revealed him as an uncompromising opponent of international financial domination. "A Prophet at Home" was given scant recognition by the big papers. Almost complete silence has been maintained about his latest, and in my opinion, his best book, "All Our Tomorrows." This is not surprising. Mr. Reed's answer to those who said in the past that he had no constructive policy is as follows:-

"But what could women have done? What can they do? 'Oh lor, that eternal question,' I said. 'Well let me try to answer it simply. It's a long story, but I'll try to tell it briefly. I think, perhaps, the best answer I could give in one sentence is that this war, which is costing and will cost who knows how many men and how many millions a day, could probably have been averted at the cost of 100,000 three-ha'penny stamps. That is how much it would have cost 100,000 women or 100,000 men and women to write to their Members of Parliament. Our British Parliament, an organism essentially sound and efficient, HAS NOW BECOME IRRESPONSIBLE, DIVORCED FROM THE PEOPLE.'" (My emphasis.)

Mr. Reed complains that, if the British electors had applied pressure to their members of Parliament over the past twenty years and demanded accurate knowledge about Germany's rearmament

Britain would not have drifted into her present plight. Although Mr. Reed may not realise it he has grasped the philosophy of social credit—the belief that people in association can get what they want. His chapter on how electors should form electors' groups to keep the local M.P. in touch with his electors is splendid. He grasps the truth that M.P.'s should only be the representatives of the people's policy, and he advocates the application of pressure politics. This, in itself, is enough to damn the book in the eyes of High Finance.

THE PARTY SYSTEM

Mr. Reed hits the party tyranny in a devastating manner. I must quote this gem: "This party system, as it has been perfected inside our Parliament, acts as a filter through which only lesser and frailer men may pass and rise to the top; for what staunch patriot would accept the regime of the piece of sugar, the muzzle and the whip?"

And further: "I have been astounded, when I have talked with Members of Parliament, by the awe in which they hold the .lefme of the Whip's hand. Many detest it; but they feel, as one said to me, that concerted action by Members to end it is about as likely as 'a successful revolt in a German concentration camp.' Their greatest handicap, they say, is the lack of interest in the country. Given clear signs of indignant protest against it from the constituencies, enough members with enough spirit to have it checked

TAXES AND USURY

(A Letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN.)

Sir,—It has been suggested to me that I should not obnoxious to many God-fearing people whose incomes are derived from the "investment" of money.

But the position as I see it is that there is no law in existence compelling Australian citizens to accept something they know to be wrong or say Yes when they know the correct answer is No. I am convinced the Government is being badly advised on questions of finance, and that so long as the Government continues to accept that bad advice the people of Australia will not be able to put forward the maximum war effort. That being so, there is a duty upon me to expose what I know to be wrong, and even His Majesty the King must submit to criticism when citizens believe he is mistaken in his counsels. We are aware of concentrated opposition to our activities, but the opposition is not coming from the Government or the people. It is coming from those e who have been exploiting governments and peoples; those who are afraid to reveal their identity or to meet us face to face on public platforms. These subversive men have been imposing a financial dictatorship, and what they dislike most is open discussion or any attempt to bring about real democracy.

Those who regard money, which is merely the means to the end of distribution and consumption, as a thing desirable in itself, AND AS THE CONTROLLER OF ALL OTHER THINGS, are the nation's enemies. Men of this type are a menace to both our war effort and our reconstruction after the war. The FACT is that money is merely an accounting ticket or token having value ONLY WHEN IT IS BEING USED AS A DISTRIBUTING AND ACCOUNTING MEDIUM. Without production it is absolutely worthless, and consequently it should be relegated to meet the demands of production.

Evidence is available that taxation was practiced 4500 years ago, but it was levied in those days on subject peoples. It was round about the same period, so we may read that the leading ancestors of Colonel Cohen, Sir Otto Niemeyer, Jacob Schiff, Paul Warburg, Israel Moses Sieff, and hosts of others, established the Jehovah cult with its laws of rewards and punishments, legally limiting, coercing and exacting obedience from their people in general. It was the law of the Jewish leaders not the law of nature. We see from this that the two swindles TAXES AND USURY, had their inception at that time, and that representatives of the same fraternity are prominent in all opposition to

to financial reform. Money is the medium through which they exercise their power. It has also been pointed out in these columns that it was not so much for His religious utterances that Jesus was attacked by these same lineal leaders as for the economic reforms He demanded. Jesus preached the natural law of personal freedom and the inalienable birthright of all people to the use and enjoyment of nature's bounty. That He was against usury is supported by the fact that the early Christian Fathers strongly denounced it and suffered persecution by the money controllers for having done so. To-day, Colonel Cohen and those for whom he speaks would have nothing whatever done unless it could first satisfy the demands of the usurers, and the pity is that they have deluded so many otherwise estimable people into becoming their unwitting tools to that nefarious end.

Unfortunately, our churches, with a few notable exceptions, have had little to say about Usury, Taxes, or Money, and in reward for this silence have not been greatly troubled by the Money Power. We are forced into the position in which we have to fight for MONEY in order to live, and it follows that those who control the supply of MONEY control our conditions of living.—Yours faithfully, Bruce H. Brown, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2, October 18, 1942 (To be continued.)

MAX EASTMAN REPENTS

Max Eastman, of New York, has generally been considered as a typical political Left-winger, and, according to "Who's Who?" he is married to a Russian from Moscow. Until lately he openly favoured Marxism and the Russian experiment; but in his recent book, "Stalin's Russia and the Crisis in Socialism," he candidly admits that he has radically changed his ideas about methods of community management.

The following passages do not pretend to give the gist of the book as a whole, but they are a welcome encouragement to those who are pledged to work in the cause of political and economic democracy. "The political institutions, and still more important, the social habits of democracy, are in danger now, and I am defending them on all fronts . . . they should be regarded as a foundation to build upon. I am no longer willing to throw away my own liberty on the theory that I haven't any." (p. 10.) "The problem is to find some method by which society can induce with a continuous rhythm and on a basis of increased production, an adjustment between production and purchasing power. . . ." "Once it (this problem) is clearly defined" it should not transcend the inventive genius of mankind. (p. 253.)

I should like to bring to the notice of Mr. Eastman, and all similar defenders of democratic ways of life, that by the genius of Major Douglas the problem has been solved on paper. It remains in a country like Australia to find sufficient popular power (i.e. sanctions) to force those in democratic office to recognise this fact.

—C. H. Allen

would soon appear. But this is the eternal gap in all forethoughtful discussion about the future of this country, the point at which all constructive debate comes to a sudden dead end: the dull apathy in the country. As long as they lack the stimulus of eager public interest in public affairs, members will fear the chilly, unfriendly silence that may fall when a 'critic' enters the Commons smoking-room. Some of them have admitted as much to me. It is a sad picture of Democracy, but the final fault undoubtedly lies with demos, with the people. If the people are indifferent to the way they are governed and the way they are led, they are themselves to blame if they are misgoverned or misled. The remedy is theirs."

THE NEW DESPOTISM

Mr. Reed attacks the bureaucratic Socialists and the Tories with the same unrelenting pen. He draws a harrowing picture of the soulless bureaucracy being introduced into Britain under "war emergency." We all know what is happening under a Socialist Government in this country. In his chapter, "After This, What?" Mr. Reed first disposes of the popular delusion that any physical revolution has ever benefited the people, and then offers the following observations on "State control." I hope that every Federal Member at Canberra is given an opportunity of reading it:—

"Many unthinking people in this country, because they do not trouble to picture to themselves how a theory would appear in practice, assume, for instance, that if the coalmines or the railways were 'nationalised,' made the property of 'the State,' they would become the property of 'the people;' that Jack Robinson, travelling third-class to town in the nine-fifteen, would be able to say to himself, 'Well, at all events, this train belongs to me.'"

"I do assure them, they are wrong. 'The State' is not a benevolent, white-bearded old gentleman at present sitting on some cloud and waiting to be fetched down to earth. 'The State' is Mr. Theobald Pension, who lives next door to Jack Robinson, a man whose ambition is to sit at an official desk, with a pile of forms before him, dressed in a little brief authority, and there to thwart and harass and bully his fellow-citizens by every means in his power, which is unlimited. 'The State' is officialdom, the implacable enemy of all human freedom and dignity. 'The State' is that great army of exclusive and exempt and privileged and mutually back-scratching officials which we already have multiplied by a thousand. 'The State' is not the community of all citizens, all of equal rights and duties. 'The State' is a new ruling class of officials, great and petty, far more immune, immutable and immovable than our present rulers. They can be curbed or spurred, abased or elevated, by the people."

"The people still have this power, though from apathy they have ceased to use it. It is still theirs. But once surrender that power to 'the State,' in the illusion that 'the State' means 'the people' and the last means of redress is gone. If that should ever happen in England, the ideal of freedom, and human dignity, of the inherent right of any man to share in shaping his own destinies, for which the centuries have fought, is gone for ever. We should have withstood one alien domination to enthrone another—for this tyranny would not even be a native one. . . . I find it the most abhorrent of all prospects."

"Our 'democracy' is a blunt and rusted weapon. It still contains enough strength to cleave a way through corruption and misgovernment, through privileged incompetency and nepotism, to a clearer future. The result depends on the arm that wields it, and the arm belongs to the people."

Mr. Reed has, unfortunately, allowed himself to become very bitter and pessimistic in parts, although I can easily understand his cynicism. The people refused to heed his warnings of the dangers which now threaten to destroy them.

Mr. Reed makes no secret of the fact that those responsible for the war must be tried and dealt with. And he includes the financiers who brought Hitler to power. An excellent suggestion.

He has obviously lost his former admiration for Mr. Churchill, who, he states, is becoming a dictator. Some of his opinions,

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the United Democrats, 17 Weymouth Street, Adelaide.)

Quarterly Meeting.—We are hoping to have a good gathering at this meeting, to be held at Headquarters on Wednesday, November 4, at 8 p.m. On at least two previous occasions we have converted these general meetings into happy social gatherings after the necessary business has been put through. We hope to do this on November 4 also; and, for the social part, it has been suggested that we have an "Amateur Hour." If you have any "turn" you can put on, let us know, and we will see if this idea could be put into effect. But even if you do not feel confident of your powers to entertain, do not let that keep you away. We will be pleased to see you. Members are invited to bring friends.

Lunch. Hour Addresses: On Friday, October 30, Mr. J. F. Hills will speak on "Dangers of Federal Union." On Friday, November 6, Mrs. B. Mountford, of League of Women Voters, will speak on "Equal Pay." On Friday, November 13, Mr. F. J. Day, A.F.L.A., will speak on "Cancellation of Credit."

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

"New Times" Subscription

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home every week are as follows:—

Three months, 5/-; Six Months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. (HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., A.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.)

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1228, G.P.O., Melbourne.

The "England-Let-Us-Down" Myth Exploded

(Continued from page 1.)

conceivable circumstances, to accept any defeat as final.

Whatever the explanation, the fact is that the "effete" English managed to gain for the rest of the world the long breathing space it needed to collect its scattered wits, marshal its resources and eventually form a common front against World Public Enemy No. 1.

. . . Their decision [to carry on] was followed by two miracles. The first was wrought by the R.A.F., when it proved that quality in pilots and aircraft could compensate for an apparently fatal inferiority in numbers. The decisive defeat of the Luftwaffe, in the first Battle for Britain, frustrated the intended invasion. The second miracle was wrought by the whole of the people of England, who were the victors in the second Battle for Britain. Never before had a near-conqueror tried to defeat a great nation by the wholesale murder of its civil population. Never before had flesh and blood been so sorely tried. If the people's morale had cracked, Hitler would have had his victory; but it did not.

It was the defeat of Hitler in the two Battles for Britain that made British-American aid to Russia possible in 1941-42. It was that, and that alone, which gave America the opportunity of joining powerful Allies when she was attacked in December, 1941, instead of facing without Allies a conquering horde with three-quarters of the world's resources at its disposal.

(Condensed from a leaflet entitled, "This Riddle, This Paradox, This ENGLAND! Indomitable, Defiant—Or Effete, Decadent?" prepared and published by the Federal Council of the Australian Association of British Manufacturers, Melbourne.)

(To be concluded next week. Don't miss it!)

and they are only opinions, about the reason for Hess coming to Britain, the length of the war, and the Russian military effort, have not been borne out by demonstrable facts. But, apart from these lapses, Mr. Reed's latest book is undoubtedly a great contribution to the problems confronting the British peoples to-day.

Your VICTORY SUIT Hand-Tailored to Order



FOR BETTER TAILORING

All Wool Worsteds from 7/7/- (30 Coupons)

ELIZABETH HOUSE,
2nd Floor.
340 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE
Phone: M 5177

"For STYLE and EASE: FRANK DEVLIN PLEASE!"

SEN. AYLETT SUPPORTS SENATOR DARCEY

On September 30, during the debate in the Senate on the Loan Bill (No. 3), Senator Darcey made a characteristic speech, along lines similar to his Budget speech, Senator Aylett was the next speaker, and his opening remarks, as reported by "Hansard," were as follows:

I am in agreement with 90 per cent, of what Senator Darcey has said. The policy of borrowing that has been adopted by governments in the past is responsible for war and the destruction accompanying it. The time is rapidly approaching when, if we are to avoid a succession of wars, we must depart from the orthodox system of finance that has operated for centuries. Germany's strength was built up by the use of borrowed money. The only reason why money is lent is that those who lend it want to make profits and earn interest. No money would be lent otherwise. I should not criticise this bill if the money was to be raised interest-free. Many Australians are freely offering their lives in the service of their country."

Senator McLeay: "Would the honourable senator lend money interest free?"

Senator Aylett: "Yes, if I had it to lend. I am not so fortunate in that respect as is the honourable senator and some of his colleagues."

Senator McLeay: "How much of the £200,000,000 does the honourable senator think would be raised on an interest-free basis?"

Senator Aylett: "Wars are fought with materials and man-power, not with money. All that has gone into fighting this war, or any other war, has been materials and men. The position would be the same if honourable senators opposite were in office. In 1929, however, when thousands of people in this country were starving, there was no money available to provide work and food for them, because there was no profit to be gained by lending it. Those days have passed; we are now more enlightened. I am concerned that the policy of borrowing millions of pounds, and paying interest is piling up debts which will be a burden on future generations. The principal moneys borrowed will never be repaid, even though, as in the past, the interest may be paid. Even that interest has been paid only by adopting a policy of further borrowing."

The burden of interest on the people is growing year by year."

Senator Aylett then went on to criticise the private banks at some length because, he said, quoting a bank circular and certain bank spokesmen's remarks as evidence, they resisted Mr. Dedman's "rationalisation" plan. He concluded his speech as follows:—

"Owing to lack of co-operation and the grip that the associated banks have had and wish to retain, and their merciless treatment of the people, it is the responsibility of whatever Government is in office to see that the Commonwealth Bank functions so as to control the whole of the banking institutions, and all the credit required for the development of the country, the prosecution of the war, or for any other necessary purpose. The most vital factor in the nation's welfare is the token which is a go-between between production and consumption, which is described as money and which controls production, the quantity that can be consumed, and the standard at which the nation should live. Yet the money is in the hands of private enterprise and not, as it should be, in the hands of the Government, which is supposed to control the destinies of the country. At present it is still in the hands of private individuals. The Government would use its powers for the successful prosecution of the war, and the defence of Australia would be carried on just the same, because we would find some token as a go-between. Whether the associated banks, which operate only for profits, agree with us or not, or try to restrict us, they will not impede the war effort. They need not think for a moment, nor need honourable senators on the other side believe, that in a time of war we should allow any private section of the community to bring Australia down to the condition which it reached between 1929 and 1934. That state of affairs was definitely brought about by private vested interests, which controlled the private banking institutions, not only of Australia, but also of all other countries."

"ANTI-SEMITISM AND TREACHERY"

By COLLIN BROOKS, in "Truth," England.

(Concluded from last issue.)

No community of the British is more truly patriotic than that which inhabits the Province of Ontario. In 1937 there swept Toronto a wave of resentment against the growing number of Jews and their deportment. One morning the wall of one of the bathing beaches was found painted in large letters with the words, "We've given you Palestine, for God's sake leave us this beach." This was a spontaneous exhibition of a similar resentment before there was any question of treachery or pro-Hitlerism, and in a Province without any signs of organised Fascism. In his article, Mr. Israel Cohen quotes from the "Deutsche Afrika-Post" which reads: "In the interests of South Africa Jewry must be put energetically in its place, and here Hitler could help the true patriots. . . . One cannot get rid of the Jews as long as one is bound to England." This extract he prefaces by the statement that "South Africa has also been afflicted for some years by anti-Jewish organisations." Since the policy of the Party behind "Deutsche Afrika-Post" is "one of extreme nationalism, of Africa for the Afrikanders, the only fair inference is that the growth of Jewry in South Africa, and its deportment, must have been galling indeed if Hitler himself is preferred to its continued presence. Surely what Mr. Israel Cohen calls "anti-Semitism" is not a sign of treachery or moral delinquency in those who exhibit it, but a cold, inescapable criticism of the race which has aroused it.

A normal Englishman, Scotsman, Welshman, Canadian, South African would say: "If we give the hospitality and shelter of our land to this unfortunate and homeless race, noble as so many of its members are, pitiable as all are in their landlessness, surely they should comport themselves like guests and not try to wrest from us either by luck or cunning the control of our affairs, whether political, social or industrial. This is our land, these are our traditions, and we wish neither to be orientalised. Let the Jew take shelter here from the persecutions and afflictions which have injured him elsewhere, but let him remember that he is still a tolerated guest, and let him not be the usurper

of that place and power which for the spiritual health of our own race should be occupied by men of our own breed and past."

What Mr. Israel Cohen says, with the good-will of the "New Statesman," is something startlingly different, and something extremely sinister. He says: "When the war is over and Hitlerism is crushed, anti-Semitism will presumably no longer be serviceable as an instrument of treachery, but it will possess an infinite capacity for generating political discord and social unrest. It will therefore be necessary, in the interests of peace, not only of Jewry but of the world in general, that the most effective means should be adopted for its suppression. . . . The task will not be easy, but unless it is boldly and intelligently tackled and satisfactorily accomplished the world will be troubled for generations to come."

When the war is over, in short, if you as a Briton dare to express any anxiety about the hold which Jewry is taking over your national institutions, you will be effectively suppressed, presumably by Regulation 18b or some similar means. It will no longer be possible for Mr. Israel Cohen to say: "That man is an anti-Semite, therefore he is a traitor," but he will be able to say: "That man is an anti-Semite, therefore he is a troublemaker of the peace not only of Israel but of the world in general; suppress him." Before such an attitude becomes general or official it is, of course, possible that the British may suddenly realise that the root cause of anti-Semitism is Semites. Mr. Israel Cohen's suggested method of dealing with Britons who may not relish the numbers or influence of the race to which they have hitherto given tolerant shelter is suppression. That is brutal. Expulsion would be more kind. The question of who is to expel might be left to the majority voice of the race which happens to be native to this land, and whose fathers between the days of Edward the First and Oliver Cromwell first made it great.

"ECONOMIC TRIBULATIONS"

By VINCENT VICKERS

(Late Director, Bank of England.)

Australian edition of this important book now available at 3/6; postage 3d.

Obtainable from F. M. Stapleton (Social Credit Bookshop),

190 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

"OUT OF THE PEOPLE"

The following are quotations, taken in sequence, from the book, "Out of the People," by J. B. Priestley. No comment is added; but in a few places words in brackets, or a few conjunctive words, are added, to show the relation of the sentences to the context.

From Section 1: "When the real test came (under war conditions), the people rose to meet it," and they are "still ready, if appealed to sincerely, and not merely nagged at by some harassed Minister."

From Section 2: Considering ourselves as people, and not as members of classes, "our responsibility lags behind our inventiveness, and our chief problem is—how to catch up."

From Section 3: "The people are not masses. Hitler, thinking of masses, uproots people by the hundred thousand, and moves them like pieces on a chessboard." But the same evil "is all around us, sneering, and snarling, and plotting." "Whenever the link with real persons has been broken, the evil lives, and knowledge and love begin to fade."

From Section 4: Since the real aristocratic system disappeared, "we have had a plutocratic system pretending to be an aristocratic one, a dishonest and dangerous masquerade, worse than open plutocracy." "Titles had a cash value, and one could discover 'a vast suffocating silliness.' Under war conditions we have developed 'a social conscience. If we ignore the promptings of this conscience—then we are beginning to tread the same road as the very persons we are now fighting."

From Section 5: "We are now within sight of democracy"—i.e., if "the people insist upon maintaining an independent spirit." "We must first decide what we want and why we want it. . . . There must of necessity be more writing and talking in order that we can understand what it is we want, and why we want it."

From Section 6: "Britain is the home of British people. Whatever can be done to make it a better home is right, and whatever makes it a worse home is wrong."

From Section 7: "The early democrats, even when not religious men were always insisting upon the fundamental dignity of the human being."

Too many "are used to being a cog or

lever in a gigantic mysterious machine. . . . They lose that eager but critical perception which is an essential part of the living."

From Section 8: "Some changes will bring us nearer to a true and vital democracy, and instantly enlarge and vitalize our war effort." "The popular English eye for character still exists. It is realised, as it is not elsewhere, that individuality and character are more important than function."

From Section 9: "The ambitious men who have made a career out of politics can't lead because they lack wisdom. . . . They cannot truly represent because they have cut themselves off from the ordinary people of the country, and live behind a --- of party activity." "I do not want to have the people's lives arranged for them—but what I want is to see the people re-creating their own society. The creative effort is an essential part of the new life."

From section 10: "It is the essence of democracy that no one person should have enormous power, and clearly this applies to economic as well as political power." "The only profit a country can show is in the quality of life lived by its people." "One way of changing the game (of community management) is to realise sharply that what matters are the persons, and not institutions, organisations and mechanisms."

From section 11: "Freeing the people from what remains of a decayed system, old barriers and entanglements, will release a vast store of creative energy." "Two mighty obstacles will be swept away. . . . fear. . . . and misdirected effort. . . . The new society must have a Christian basis," by which is meant "that the fundamental values of the new society must be spiritual values."

From the Appendix: The financial system has become a super industry dominating all other industries." "And unless the supreme racket is smashed, we shall all be plunged again into the same poverty, revolution and war." "There should be established a basic minimum standard of living for every man, woman and child. Inequalities above this standard do not matter very much, but inequalities that reach far below it are intolerable."

ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA

(Reprinted from the book of that name, by Eugene Lyons, formerly the United Press correspondent in Moscow, etc.)

(Continued from last issue.)

BOOK I. PRELUDE TO MOSCOW.

V. Working for the Soviets.

In August, 1927, it was my professional duty to report in cable dispatches the tragic climax of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. Russia followed the details of the impending executions more anxiously than any other nation, and we were under instructions to report every move. There was the tense night of August 10 when the doomed men were prepared for death, while the rotund, smiling Governor Fuller, of Massachusetts, considered the plea for a reprieve. Hour after hour I hovered over the Associated Press wires. By eleven p.m.—one hour before the scheduled electrocutions—he was still withholding his decision; he was squeezing the last drop of sadistic relish out of his cat-and-mouse game while the whole world looked on in horror.

In a daze I typed out two messages ready for "flashing" to Moscow: "SACCO DEAD"—"VANZETTI DEAD." These were not names in the headlines; in a deep sense they were members of my family, but close as few blood relations can be. At 11.24—thirty-six minutes before the hour set for the official killings—Fuller announced a twelve days' reprieve.

Then came the day and the night of August 22. In my memory they have a nightmare quality. My role was so gruesomely routine—the preparation of "flash" cables, the vigil at the A.P. wires, the falling in of the exact minute of Sacco's death, then of Vanzetti's death—all so businesslike. . . . The case, which was integrated with my own existence, intimate as few things in life ever become intimate, was over, finished. Nothing to do but go

home to bed. . . . I remember wondering why I could not weep and shriek with the hurt of it, just as I was to wonder why years later at my father's coffin.

A few weeks later I shut myself in a room in Kenneth Durant's home for privacy day after day for over two weeks, and wrote the story of two simple peasant boys, born in Italy to die in America in full view of all the nations of the globe. Or rather, the book wrote itself. -----through the "Life and Death of Sacco and Vanzetti," I am astonished to find -----so eloquent in their passionate restraint that they seem to have been written by another person. At points in the terse narrative I find a poetic vein that transcends my normal literary powers. It was an alchemy of feelings too deep for-----precipitating a style of their own. Except for minor editorial revisions, my first draft, copied by Margaret Larkin, went to the printers. The book was subsequently translated into German, Italian, Russian and Yiddish, and widely read in those languages. Two Russian editions published while I was in Moscow, sold some 130,000 copies. Only the original English version never reached more than a few thousand readers. In 1933 the Nazi paid the -----the compliment of immolation on -----funeral pyre to German culture. It-----in as fine a literary company as was ever assembled outside a library.

ROAD-WEAR: The Chairman of the Country Roads Board has informed -----gates of the Municipal association-----"many Victorian roads were within -----an inch of failure, due to man-power and materials being seriously curtailed -----former sixty-miles-an-hour roads-----not to be traversed without chains." The situation should surely convince -----that the theoretical socialistic planning responsible should be curbed immediately.

IN BRITAIN'S PARLIAMENT

Mr. Stephen (Camlachie, Lab.):

When the hon. Gentleman, the Member for South Croydon, was speaking from the opposition Front Bench, what appeared to me to be a cold shudder passed through members on the other side at his remarks about the terrible position we shall be in at the end of the war, when we shall have to face the problem of demobilizing millions of men and getting them back into ordinary industry again.

"I cannot see why there should be all this dismay about the future. The land on which we live will, at the close of the war, be more valuable and more capable of production than ever it was before; we shall have far greater industrial potential than this country has ever had in its existence, and while it is quite true there will be a tremendously increased debt-

---debt had already increased by -----£6,000,000,000 during the years of war---myself will have no sort of worry as to what may happen to the money-lenders in the days to come.

"I should say that the first responsibility after the war will be for us to use the tremendous industrial potential and the -----of our country to provide for the needs of the ordinary citizens, and quite obviously we will be able to do that more effectively than at any period of our history, because our industrial potential is so much greater and the land at least can be used as profitably in the future as it has been in the past.

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS