

A DIALOGUE ABOUT THE ELECTIONS. (Page 2)

"RED FASCISTS" SHOW THEIR FANGS! (Page 3)

SET-BACK FOR THE PARTY BOSSES! (Page 3)

THE DRIFT TO IMBECILITY. (Page 4)

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

Vol. 9, No. 30

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 30, 1943

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).

Glaring Attempt to Mislead the Electors

U.A.P. and "Regulation Mania"

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

Sir,—Special attention should be called to the advertisement which appeared in the Melbourne "Argus" of July 9 on behalf of all U.A.P. candidates. The advertisement had the glaring headline, "REGULATION MANIA!", and finished with these words: "The United Australia Party is pledged to examine ALL the Curtin Government's regulations, and repeal ANY not essential for effective prosecution of the war."

There was also, of course, the usual injunction to support the U.A.P. candidates "for National Unity and Political Stability"! The example they are already setting in this respect is, to say the least, inspiring! But it is the attack on this "regulation mania" we are to consider.

Few will deny that "regulating" has been over-done, and that unless we watch out we will have conditions after the war quite out of harmony with the purposes for which we are fighting the war.

At the same time, it is one thing to generalise about them, but quite another thing to be specific. You will have noticed that the U.A.P. are going to examine "ALL" and repeal "ANY." This probably means that they will repeal NONE.

Is it to be inferred from the advertisement that up to now the regulations have NOT been examined? And if the U.A.P., which has had a majority in the Senate and could have disallowed the regulations if it wished, did not see fit to "examine" the regulations when they were before Parliament, on what grounds would they bother to have them examined after the Elections?

Every one of the regulations referred to has been brought into force with the approval of the U.A.P. Senate and even if the advertisement is genuine, it provides the

clearest admission that the U.A.P. members of the Senate seriously failed in their duty of protecting the people from the attacks of the insidious.

But the advertisement is NOT genuine. All the literature and all the speeches of U.A.P. candidates emphasise their "loyalty to the Empire" and pledge them to "100 per cent, co-operation with the Allied Nations in the conduct of the war." Anyone not blinded by partisanship can see that what has been done in Australia fits in largely with what has been done in other Allied countries, and consequently, if the U.A.P. will not do what the Planners dictate, then they are not willing to "co-operate" 100 per cent, as they profess.

In case there should be any doubt about the truth of this, readers have only to refer to the "New Times" dated July 16 for confirmation. In that issue it is reported that a member of the British House of Commons asked the Prime Minister whether he would find time for a debate on the motion already on the notice paper as follows:

NOTES on the NEWS

Well, another bankers' puppet has been hustled off the world-stage at the appropriate time! Mussolini, the "Sawdust Caesar," is finished! His "resignation"—some press messages referred to his "dismissal"—was announced on Sunday night by Rome Radio. Referring to the beginning of Mussolini's dictatorship, Major C. H. Douglas recently wrote: "The financial controllers of Italy, Counts Volpi and Pirelli, produced a 'Saviour' who had a long reputation as a Socialist."

WORK WORRIES: Following the easing down of munitions production, we are informed that some munitions plants are to be converted to the production of diesel engines. This appears to be intended to overcome the alleged unemployment of 2000 Sydney munition workers (vide Melbourne "Herald," July 7). Now, it is thus fairly clear that man-power and materials are available for producing diesel engines—which means that they are being deliberately withheld from private diesel engine manufacturers. Apart from illustrating the socialistic work-mania (for the other fellow), this shows that the war is being used as a pretext for creating more State enterprises.

GIBLIN'S GABBLE: Professor L. F. Giblin, one of the chief conspirators in the "Premiers' Plan" (the Niemeyer plot), is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" as saying, during a lecture at the Melbourne University, that "we may be short of man-power for our post-war planning; we may have to economise on man-power very carefully." Judging by his "depression" views and actions (as a result of which

hundreds of thousands of willing men were unemployed and denied incomes), his idea of economising is unemployment and starvation. Sir Keith Murdoch, as chairman, uttered similar useless gabble. It will be remembered that the Murdoch Press played its part in the Niemeyer plot to impoverish the Australian people.

C.C.C. (Curtin's Concentration Camp): The extent of the development of totalitarianism in Australia is indicated by the press report to the effect that the Allied Works Council has launched prosecutions against 200 of its conscript workers for refusing to entrain for the North because they had been refused a guarantee of payment for travelling during the week-end. This is almost like the methods employed against the workers of Germany, France, etc.—who haven't got a Labor Government to protect them!

LEASE-LEND: According to an American report, U.S. war material for Russia "is going into Iraq through the Persian Gulf in such volume that the Russians are finding it difficult to sort and carry it away." The report suggests "that the material might be transported by the U.S. Army to points well inside Russian territory; which would ease the strain on Soviet transport." Here is another illustration of one source of Russian strength. The position appears to be that they cannot handle it themselves, and are not prepared to permit Allied troops on their soil to carry the job to a successful conclusion. It is a strange situation, having regard to Russia's huge man-power capacity, to find them even unable to fully utilise the Allied resources.

CLOTHING COSTS: Among others, the election sop of reduced clothing costs is being thrown out by the Government. The extent of this political trickery is realised when it is remembered that it was the Government that imposed the 12½% tax on clothes. That is to say, they deliberately "soaked" the people to that extent through clothes prices, and now they are remitting 5% and describing it as a benefit! Naturally, they are not mentioning the other 7½%—the spoils that they still hold. At

"That this House notes the many thousands of Orders-in-Council which have been issued since the commencement of hostilities; that many of them are so framed as to be difficult of comprehension, both to those who are administering them and those who must observe them; is of the opinion that in view of the importance of the proper direction of man-power, there is a loss of efficiency directly attributable to these Orders, which add to the burden already placed on the over-strained businesses throughout the country, and urges on the Government the necessity for curtailing the number of these Orders-in-Council and inquiring into those which are already issued with a view to the more wasteful and harmful Orders being rescinded."

Mr. Churchill replied that time could NOT be made available for discussion of the matter.

What has been done in England has been done by an "All-Party" Government, which

means that the type of Government makes no difference when the actual controllers have dictated regimentation. It also means that the U.A.P. attack on the "regulation mania" of the "Curtin" Government is also an attack on the "regulation mania" of the British and American Governments, or, more probably, that it is another of their dishonourable sham attacks to take the people unawares, lead them to believe something will be done that is not intended to be done, and divert their attention from other things that really matter.

The U.A.P. managers are well-versed in that despicable behaviour, but, fortunately, more and more of the thoughtful people are becoming aware of their tricks. These controllers of the "Party" are not to be trusted, and it is our duty to keep this well in mind when exercising the important duty of voting at the forthcoming elections.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2 July 25, 1943.

"Pressure Politics" Wins Again!

South Australians have given yet another demonstration of the effectiveness of the "Electoral Campaign" technique as a mechanism by which the people can get what they want, despite obstinate and dictatorial politicians. The story of this latest victory is told as follows in the Melbourne "Sporting Globe" of July 24:—

WHAT HAPPENED BEFORE S.A. BAN WAS LIFTED.

Premier of South Australia (Mr. Playford) announced on Tuesday that he had decided to remove the ban operating in that State on Saturday afternoon racing. The decision, he said, had arisen from a review of the man-power position, relying on a report supplied by Mr. Wurth, Director-General of Man-power.

What happened before the ban was lifted is told by our South Australian representative ("Eland"):—

One hundred thousand circulars were freely distributed to electors all over the State and special means were taken to see that each Member of Parliament directly received one, signed by the elector.

The text of the circular was:—

"I consider that the ban on racing and trotting in South Australia is an injustice to many of my fellow-citizens, and that its continuance will not serve any good purpose. As my representative, please note that I desire you to do all in your power to have the ban removed, and so bring this State into conformity with all other States."

the present time the people are being "relieved of" about £16 millions per year through the sales tax. While this iniquity remains, any Party politicians professing concern about inflation and living costs can only be regarded as hypocritical humbugs.

LOST LIBERTY: The Melbourne "Herald" of July 9 reports that the City Court imposed a fine of £2 on an individual who refused to produce his identity card when requested by a policeman. It appears that the victim refused to tell the policeman his name, where he worked, or whether he had an identity card. It also transpired that he was not an undesirable or refugee alien; neither was he an A.W.L. soldier in civilian clothes—which eliminates all the alibis usually supplied for such interference with the liberty-of-the-subject. Further, it transpired that he did have an identity card; but, presumably, resented bureaucratic officialdom pestering him under regulations—NOT legislation. Doubtless it will teach him that his natural British democratic inclinations must be subdued while socialistic "Hitlerism" has the force of law.

CONGRESS CAPERS: U.S. Congressmen are reported to have thrown a few spanners among the wheels of bureaucracy during the recent session, which has been described as the most turbulent for 10 years. They have abolished several bureaucratic departments—notably the "National Resources Board" and the "New Deal Youth Administration." They have also curbed the "Office of War Information," the "Office of Price Control" the "Man-power Commission" and the "Farm Security Administration." They have also extended the life of the "Dies Committee," which hunts out disruptionists, and have dismissed several Government officials on the ground that "they entertained Communist and similar beliefs." This indicates a growing awareness of the close relationship between Bureaucracy and Communism—and the evils inherent therein.

COMRADES CURBED: Commenting on Ernie ("Czar") Thornton's statement that

The circulars flooded in in a manner which caused confusion, and certain movements indicated that they were having a marked effect.

Mainly, the circulars were directed to members who had voted against a motion in the House of Assembly that there should be uniformity of sport throughout the Commonwealth.

Liberal members in the present Government, who had stood steadfast to Premier Playford in his ban edict, were very perturbed over the trend of events, especially as the writing appeared to be on the wall in the recent Gouger by-election, when Labour came out on top. Strenuous efforts were made to this end by those endeavouring to have the ban lifted.

The sponsors of the ban removal adopted their own means in a most determined manner by circular and other methods.

Judged by the trend of events last week it was having a measure of success in political circles.

And the Premier's announcement this week that he would lift the ban wasn't surprising.

"attempts to effect a merger of the Munitions and Ironworkers' Unions would continue," the Melbourne "Sun" of July 11 reports a spokesman for the Munitions Union thus: "If Mr. Thornton appeals to the Full Court we will fight the matter there. We are determined that the fate of our Union shall rest with members, and not be decided by outside bodies such as the Ironworkers' Union or political bodies like the Communist Party." Thus another spanner has been thrown in the Communist plot to centralise industrial union machinery at a means of causing industrial and civic commotion, in anticipation of seizing political power during the melee.

SOVIET STRENGTH: "New York Times" correspondent, Arthur Krock, is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of July 19 as follows: "Lord Halifax, British Foreign Minister, on March 24, 1939, dismissed Russia's value [as an ally], because his information showed Russia's air forces were very weak, old and short-ranged, the Red Army poor and its industrial backing frightful." Whatever the position may have been in 1939 the super efforts of "capitalistic" Britain and U.S. have made good the deficiencies, and have thus made it possible for Russia's tremendous numbers

(Continued on page 2)

National Government?

The press, radio and hoardings are screaming the big abstraction—a "National Government." Accepting this inane slogan as meaning a government consisting of all Party hacks, the question arises: Would not the government be more national if all the Party hacks were replaced by Independents—that is, men free from any intimidating influence outside their electorates? If such men ascertained and represented in Parliament the wishes of their constituents wouldn't such wishes represent TRUE national thought—and hence, wouldn't such a body be a REAL National Government? Could a combined Country Party, Labor, and U.A.P. "caucus," whose policy would be dictated by a handful of men, be considered National? The answer to this propaganda barrage is to give each of the quarrelling factions the "Order of the Boot" at the forthcoming elections.

Mysterious Millions

The Melbourne "Sun" of July 22 quotes the Commonwealth Bank inventory of our money tokens (tangible paper units only). The total is £138,356,368. Of this the bank held a mere £14,491,985—the public holding the remaining £123,864,383. The odd silver and copper tokens would be about £20 millions. Now that's all the REAL LEGAL Government-money in Australia and yet the so-called bank deposits equal roughly £900 millions. Therefore, even politicians should be able to work it out that somebody has wangled over £700 millions (interest-bearing) into existence—which can only be counterfeit.

A DIALOGUE ABOUT THE ELECTIONS

In view of the impending Federal elections, the old question, "How Shall We Vote?" is being asked, once again, in Australian homes, factories and farms—and in the armed forces. In a broadcast from 7HO, on July 18, two Electoral Campaign speakers—Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., and Mrs. Barbara Guthrie—considered that question and other allied matters. This is what they said:—

B.—"In about five weeks from now we shall be asked to vote for a new Federal government. How are we to vote? How do we arrive at the decision of whom to vote for? Most of us who know so little about politics—what chance have we got of voting intelligently?"

J.—"When you speak about voting intelligently you are assuming, of course, that you have in front of you a reasonable choice of policies or candidates, and that you are going to exercise a free choice along lines which will be advantageous to you. Now what choice of candidates have you got?"

B.—"Well, in Dennison, we have three candidates: Mr. Beck; Mr. Mahoney and Dr. Gaha. How do we pick from these three?"

J.—"Has Mr. Beck done anything to help you?"

B.—"Nothing that I know of."

J.—"Well, then, rule him out. And what do you expect from Mr. Mahoney and Dr. Gaha?"

B.—"I expect more rationing, more taxation, more Government offices, more officials, and more regulations."

J.—"And you don't like the idea?"

B.—"I very strongly object to it."

J.—"Well, then, rule them out."

B.—"But that leaves nobody to vote for!"

J.—"Well, then, why vote?"

B.—"I'll be fined £2 if I don't vote."

J.—"That's your affair. Nobody can compel you to vote if you don't want to. You are better off paying £2 than taking part in a gigantic farce. As long as people vote for people they dislike they are only helping to keep alive the pretence that the Government has a majority vote; they are giving authority to a Government which is not entitled to that authority."

B.—"How many people do you suppose would vote if they were not compelled to by a fine of £2?"

J.—"I don't think half the voters would go to the polling booth."

B.—"And so the £2 fine is only a device to force people to vote, and thus make us believe that the Government represents a larger section of people than it really does."

J.—"It is just a scheme to hide the fact that half the people do not consider it worth their while to go to the polling booth."

B.—"And you don't think that either the Labor Party or the UAP can claim to represent half the people?"

J.—"I certainly don't. A small section of the people, perhaps about 10 per cent., will always vote U.A.P. or Labor, and that small section have only got the remotest idea of what they are voting for. This small, active section will take their bewildered friends with them to the polling booth."

B.—"The blind leading the blind! But what about the 'swing' vote? There are always some who may vote one way or the other. These are the real voters, the voters that count."

J.—"These are the important voters; the votes that put a Government out of power. And it is generally a very good thing to put a Government out of power."

B.—"Why is that?"

J.—"To encourage the others. The best thing we can do with most Governments is to put them out of power. It cuts down their salaries, and that helps them to take an interest in what the people want."

B.—"That certainly sounds a good idea. But something more than that is required. We can't go on with these farcical elections. We will simply get into a bigger and bigger mess. We must devise some way by which we can have some say in how the country is to be run. These snap elections, when a few candidates fling their policies at us a few weeks before the polling day is neither fair nor honest."

J.—"Of course it is neither fair nor honest, and is not likely to be when the best brains in the country take so little interest in politics."

B.—"Well, can't a nation of seven millions devise some scheme for protecting themselves against the Party System?"

J.—"I dare say they could if there were not such large vested interests behind the parties, who profit by the ignorance of the people. The maintenance of ignorance on a large scale is one of the greatest industries of this country; that is one of the chief

functions of the Labor Party, to keep the people ignorant and to take away their leaders."

B.—"Why pick on the Labor Party?"

J.—"Nobody expects anything from the U.A.P., and we are never disappointed; but the Labor Party makes promises and doesn't keep them. It pretends to be progressive, but it is not; it exploits all the catch-cries of ignorant people. That's why it is so dangerous. Labor was against conscription, but it was a Labor Government that brought in conscription. Labor was against taxing the small incomes, but it taxed those on £2 a week. Labor was against indirect taxes, which increase the cost of living, but it increased the taxes on beer and tobacco and many other things."

B.—"That's what Machiavelli said: People will suffer impositions from an elected Parliament for which they would quickly behead any king."

J.—"That is the big idea. Whenever it is required to do something particularly nasty to the workers, get a Labor Government to do it."

B.—"But when you want to hit the middle classes, get the U.A.P. to do it. Isn't it strange—everything is different to what we expect it to be? But there must be a way out of this mess."

J.—"There are only two types of Government that a country can have; that is, a socialistic dictatorship, where a small clique decides what is good for us, and a democratic Government, where the people have some say in the policy of the Government."

B.—"Would you say we have a democratic Government in Australia to-day?"

J.—"In theory we have a democratic Government, but in practice we have never had a democratic Government in this country."

B.—"What would you say was necessary in order to insure that we would have a

really democratic Government in this country? In other words, how can we prevent ourselves being taxed off the face of the earth? How can we protect ourselves from the huge army of bureaucrats that are swarming all over us, and interfering with our private affairs? How can you and I have some say in deciding the results we want from the huge army of civil servants?"

J.—"I cannot see us getting very far in deciding the policy of this country unless the question of policy is decided by the people long before the elections."

B.—"How can the people decide the policy of this country? What means have they got to do it? How do they meet, and where do they discuss it, and what guidance have they got?"

J.—"The Tasmanian Government has guaranteed £300 to maintain the League of Nations office and secretary; the money is largely wasted, of course, but if that money were guaranteed to our organisation we could maintain a permanent secretary, and imagine what a lot of useful work we could do. All people interested in their country could gather together, say, in groups of 100, and elect a chairman, who would be paid to look after their interests. These groups would discuss policy and pass resolutions on to larger groups. As soon as a sufficient number of groups had expressed a desire for the same objective, and voted for it, this motion would automatically become law."

B.—"But what would happen to other suggestions submitted?"

J.—"These other suggestions would be arranged in priority—one, two and three, etc., up to, say, six—and people would vote on these questions at election time at a national poll."

B.—"One could vote in order of preference?"

J.—"Yes, and you could also vote against a suggestion."

B.—"Voters who did not join groups would have no say in making suggestions?"

J.—"Why should they? If they are not prepared to take some interest in the Government of the country, then we are better without their assistance. There is another idea, too. Supposing our group managed to bring before the people at election time the proposal for cutting down the taxation by (say) half, and suppose the vote was

carried at the election. Then for the first few years we would make it a rule that all those who voted for no decrease in taxation should receive no deduction in taxation."

B.—"They would have to keep on paying the old tax?"

J.—"Why not? That's what they voted for. Why not let them have it?"

B.—"But we have never been asked if we would like a reduction in taxation. At least, I have never heard any politician suggest it."

J.—"No Party politician is likely to suggest it. He would probably be kicked out of the Party if he did."

B.—"Why?"

J.—"Because the chief function of our Government is to collect taxes for vested interests. The Labor Government believes in taxes; that is why it is so popular with the Big Boys and the Colonial Sugar Monopoly. The Post Office is just a tax collecting machine, so are the Tasmanian Railways and the Hydro-Electric. Launceston gets its power much cheaper than we do, but that doesn't suit the Big Boys, and so a law was passed to force Launceston to hand over its power station, and when Mr. McElwee, M.L.C., objected, an attempt was made "to bring him to heel."

B.—"Hats off to Mr. McElwee! I can see that unless responsible men in each community meet together in groups to discuss policy, years before the election, we shall continue to have snap elections sprung upon us and fake policies pushed upon a bewildered public. But these suggestions you have made—they will take time to evolve. Is there nothing we can do, say, in the next few years to gain some control over our paid servants, our Parliamentary Representatives?"

J.—"Oh, yes, a lot can be done by a few intelligent people; in fact, no matter which Government is in power, Public Opinion will always exert a very great amount of pressure on it."

B.—"Of recent years Public Opinion doesn't seem to have done much for itself; that is, judging by results."

J.—"Results have been deplorable, no doubt, but not hopeless. There is considerable evidence to show that the party system is being carefully watched, and is everywhere under suspicion. The large-scale propaganda machine can be beaten and broken down by a few men; we have proved that. Laws passed by Parliament are not necessarily law unless sanctioned by the people; we have proved that. No socialist propaganda will defeat the contempt and dislike that is growing up everywhere for centralised socialist bureaucracy. The power of resistance of the people is still great, and will become greater as the issues involved in the war become clearer, and they are rapidly becoming clearer; for example, I don't think any Government will ever have the power to stage another depression."

B.—"You appear to be very optimistic!"

J.—"Not optimistic, but I can see that our enemies' plans have failed in this war, and I see no reason why they should be any more successful after this war."

Notes On the News

(Continued from page 1)

of fearless men to be used. Even if Russia cannot drive the Nazis from her soil, she should be able to hold them until Britain gets them under control.

POPULATION PROPAGANDA: The question of population appears to be the standard subject for public-speaking practice. A recent seven-hour debate on this subject brought forth the suggestion that "raising the status of motherhood" would solve the problem. One gathers from this that the "status" has been in doubt. The fact of the matter is that would-be parents are staging the greatest strike in history. Many "populate-or-perish" advocates themselves have no children, and some of them urge larger families merely for the purpose of cannon fodder.

SICILY AND STRATEGY: Following the terrific press-barrage telling the enemy and the world that Sicily was a stepping-stone to Italy, the Melbourne "Sun" quotes a correspondent of the "Washington Star" as saying that "the question of invading Italy after Sicily has not been settled." The report, in dealing with the Balkan route to Germany, says: "Moscow has intimated to us that the Balkans belong to the Soviet sphere of influence, and that Anglo-American forces in that area might jeopardise a Russian ideological hold and cause post-war disturbances."

REMOVING RATIONING: Replying to Mr. Bruce, the Queensland M.L.A. who alleged that the Federal Government was making a profit out of tea, Senator Keane denied the charge, but at the same time gave some indication of the task facing the people in getting rid of the horde of bureaucrats who have built themselves into jobs behind these controls. It seems that the job of demobilising that army will be more difficult than that of handling the fighting forces. These departments of muddle and muddle have not only retarded the war effort, but look like wrecking the peace effort. Each one of them will put forth specious pleas for their preservation. A deaf ear and a heavy boot (metaphorically speaking) are the implements required to handle this situation.

—O.B.H.

PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor," England. (Continued from last issue.)

The practical history of Bolshevism may be said to commence with the financing of Japan in the 1904-1905 War against Russia. The Japanese Minister of Finance, Takahashi, wrote a Memorandum to the Japanese Government, in which he said: "Mr. Schiff had a grudge against Russia on account of his race . . . for this purpose it was deemed fit to admonish the ruling class by an object lesson. Mr. Schiff saw in the war a welcome opportunity to give effect to his cherished idea." ("Jacob Schiff, Life and Letters," by Cyrus Adler.)

The immediate result was the issue of the Imperial Japanese Government 6 per cent. Sterling (not dollar) Loan.

It might appear, at first sight, that this transaction was merely a routine example of financial practice, similar, for instance, to the assistance given to Hitler by the Bank of "England" under Mr. Montagu Norman, which was so helpful in enabling Germany to re-arm.

But I think that there are differences. It is true that Mr. Norman has expressed his contempt for the general population in no uncertain terms ("The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on"). On the other hand, he has also regretted that he is no economist, and does not know what to do. ("Montagu Norman: A Study in Financial Statesmanship," by Paul Einzig). So we must assume that he is only the broker's man. To know with certainty whether there really are differences between financing Hitler and financing Bolshevism, we should, of course, require to know who is the broker. But to revert to Mr. Schiff.

It should be realised that the effect of his initiative on this occasion was to set the British to work (it was a Sterling Loan) to build up the Japanese Navy, because Mr. Schiff, like all his co-racialists, dislikes culture, and prefers Kultur. The object is clearly stated—an American, or German (without reference to dates, it is difficult to say) Jew, he "deemed fit" to put the British to war against "the ruling classes of Russia" as "an object lesson."

At the same time: "The subsidies granted to the Nihilists at this period by Jacob Schiff were no longer acts of isolated generosity. A veritable Russian Terrorist organisation had been set up in the U.S.A. at his expense. It covered Russia with its emissaries, charged to assassinate Ministers, Governors, heads of police, etc. . . . and to create insurrection . . . the cost was estimated at more than fourteen millions [gold] roubles" ("Figaro," Paris, February 20, 1932). Of course, it all came back ten times over in profits from the "re-construction" of Russia. To quote the banker's hymn: "Whatever, Lord, we lend to Thee, repaid a thousandfold shall be."

Now, before briefly considering the consequences of this operation, I think it is important to be quite clear that the merits or otherwise of the Russian Imperial Government, from the point of view of the Russians, are not in question. The only point on which we can be certain is that no Russians have figured in general intercourse outside Russia since it disappeared. Whatever the results, and we are beginning to experience them now, the "ruling classes"

were to be taught a lesson because they were not willing to take orders from a German Jew resident in America. That the results to the Russians were of no consequence is demonstrated by the fact that many millions of Russians, not of "the ruling classes," perished, and millions more were reduced to poverty and exile, by the Bolshevik Revolution. But no Jews. Soviet Russia is "presented" to Europe and America and represented by two Jews, Maisky and Litvinov, who are as typically Russian as a Sassoon is typically English. Of course, the consequences were much wider. In the article in the "Ottawa Citizen," by Mr. Herdige, to which reference has already been made—an article which reads like the "rechauffe" of a conversation with an exponent of international Freemasonry—amidst a welter of what, without wishing to be offensive, I can only describe as dangerous nonsense, he remarks, "Germany attacked; a fact of only tactical significance. For if Germany had not attacked, Russia would have." In that I am sure he is right, and that the social and economic structure both of Russia and Germany make war certain.

It is not too much to say that the consequences of the activities of Mr. Schiff, his firm, and his associates, were:—

(1) The inauguration of an Asiatic war complex, accompanied by a delusion that the day of the white man was over; not merely in Asia, but everywhere. "Pearl Harbour" was conceived in New York. Trouble in India dates from the beginning of this century, and was hardly existent before, yet political reform in India has been rapid and continuous.

(2) The World War had as its fundamental idea "Drang nach Osten." A weakened Russia, like all these World Revolution movements, played straight into the hands of Germany—the Germany of Frederick the "great," who is now being idealised by Goebbels.

(Continued on page 4.)

SOCIAL SCIENCE LECTURES

"Parties, Independents and the People" is the subject to be dealt with by the lecturer, Mr. F. A. Parker, B.A., Dip.Ed., when the next of the above series of lectures is held on Wednesday evening of next week (August 4), at the rooms of the United Electors of Australia, 5th Floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne. In view of the impending elections, this lecture should be of special interest. As usual, questions and discussion will be in order.

1943 Federal Elections
**INDEPENDENT SENATE
 THREE:**
**AMES—CARR (Mrs.)—
 GOULDING**
**MONSTER PUBLIC MEETING,
 MELBOURNE TOWN HALL,
 THURSDAY, AUG. 5, 8 p.m.**
**Supporting Speaker: Bruce H.
 Brown**
**This is your fight: Bring your
 friends**
 —Advt. authorised by A. W. Bell,
 390 Mt. Alexander Rd., Ascot Vale.
 Phone: FU 6443.

SET-BACK FOR THE PARTY BOSSES!

A Melbourne Daily Paper Condemns the Party Racket

The revolt against the undemocratic Party System grows apace, and support for Independents is increasing correspondingly. "A Symptom Of Revolt" is the heading of the Melbourne "Age's" editorial of July 20, which deals with this subject. Because the "New Times" circulates in all States, few of our readers will have seen this significant article; so we take the liberty of reprinting it in full:—

Political leaders who look with active dislike at the emergence of so many independent aspirants for Federal seats should reflect a little more deeply on the origins of this manifestation. In effect, what is happening is a revolt against the notion that self-appointed organisations have the right to declare in advance who should and who should not be sent to Parliament, the former bearing a label of approval and authentication, the latter impliedly discountenanced, as though they were ambitious interlopers. In this national crisis we seem to have reached the end of an era as far as concerns concepts of party and assumptions rooted in party practices. It is true that the party system is strongly entrenched; there must be groups associated by principles held in common, by allegiance to declared purposes and aims. But the public is not prepared to accept the doctrine or the validity of practices founded on it that extra-parliamentary organisations have some superior title to hand-pick the Parliament to be. Never before have such large sections of the people been so disappointed with the results thrown up by the long-continued system of pre-selection, or so desirous of bringing about changes that would raise the standards of public life and the general calibre of representation.

It has been said that independents threaten to disorganise Parliament and to make it unworkable. The leaders of the U.A.P. seem specially concerned at the prospect. Be this as it may, if the controls exercised by party mandarins and inner coteries during the last twenty years had been less rigid and discriminatory it is doubtful whether the present revolt would have occurred. The phenomenon has assignable causes, by no means the least of which is that the wire pullers of the party machine have over-reached themselves. We witness the beginnings of a movement in which a politically experienced and mature democracy seeks to rid itself of the stranglehold of machine-managed and manipulated politics. None can tell till after the election what party changes are imminent or whether the situation is to be simple or difficult. But if there be complications, it would be scarcely reasonable to blame electors who choose independents. The basic cause must be sought further—in the arrogant pretensions and usurpations of party controllers outside Parliament, professing to act as though they were endowed with authority to control the electors' judgment in advance of the ballot and then to control the actions of those of their nominees who survive the count.

Since the first world war, the two main organisations that confront each other have been subjected to an increasing control from counterparts outside Parliament, and responsible only to themselves. At each election the rival groups, having chosen their own standard-bearers, do their utmost to foist these on the electorate, irrespective of pliancy, subservience and other characteristics of mediocrity. There is not only the open or covert pressure to secure the return of favoured nominees, but also a form of interference to discourage other aspirants, and thereby constrict narrowly the choice of electors. The aim of the whole process seems to be to drive the constituency into two pens, and bring about a result whereby, when Parliament is created, one section of members is answerable to one outside junta and the other section to another. Party customs and conventions, degenerating into an all-

Mr. Roosevelt's Mr. Phillips in India

The London "Times's" correspondent in Delhi reports that, "The disclosure . . . by Mr. Phillips, the personal representative in India of President Roosevelt, that the Viceroy had refused to grant him facilities to meet Mr. Gandhi is naturally given prominence here.

"The fact that the statement was made to the American and Indian Press, to the exclusion of British journalists, seems to have been an oversight and is probably without significance."

The report concludes with the following paragraph:

"In the military field there are undoubtedly instances in India where liaison between the British and the Americans might be closer, and Mr. Phillips has found a readiness on both sides to tackle such problems as they arise. The most apparent and thorny difference is the great disparity in the pay of the British and American troops. Mr. Phillips points out that it has always been a fundamental American conception that a man who is called on to give his life for his country should receive adequate pay and living conditions, and any suggestion by the British Government for a reduction in American rates of pay would be extremely dangerous. It is dynamic, he said, and best left alone."

—Social Creditor, May 8, 1943

pervasive tyranny, have much to do with current dissatisfactions with standards of public life and—with a few notable exceptions—the want of stature or eminent ability in public men.

Signs of a revolt are not surprising. Had the party system been worked without the blatant intrusions and usurpations that affront the people who take an intelligent interest in public affairs, and are not conscious of any incapacity to judge the worth or merit of candidates, there would probably not have been such a crop of independents now prepared to come forward. Distressing as the spectacle may be to party leaders and the elect of self-appointed coteries dispensing the ineffable comfort of endorsement and the unctious of pre-selection, the appearance of so many independents merely symbolises growing discontent with the fruits of machine politics, and with its technique, designed to narrow the electors' choice, to prejudice the poll, and to discourage those who decline to abase themselves to party wire-pullers, or whose abasement was in vain. It is still incumbent on the elector to scrutinise each aspirant, to know what he stands for, to assess his qualities. The label is but a minor clue; policy and character count for more. The independent may or may not be a better candidate than the party nominee. In coming forward so freely he is exercising an undoubted right; and those who obtrude on the electors' choice, or condone restrictive devices to bring about cut-and-dried results, have themselves to blame if the general outcome, in a party sense, is not to their liking.

"RED FASCISTS" SHOW THEIR FANGS!

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

There was a time, not very long ago, either, when well-meaning, but rather idealistic people told me not to worry about the Communists. I am sorry now that I didn't do more worrying than I did. It is time we frankly faced the fact that, while the rank-and-file of those calling themselves Communists are sincere but misled people, the chief executives in the Australian Communist Movement are ruthless men who are not squeamish about the tactics they use to gain control in this country.

The article in the "Communist Review," advocating that, "AT THE VERY LEAST," I should be interned, is indicative of the growing arrogance of these aspiring dictators.

As they appear to have selected me as one of their main enemies, perhaps I should have a little to say in my own defence. My biggest crime appears to have been the writing of "The Enemy Within The Empire." Late last year a pamphlet, "Stop This Fascist Propaganda," written by Ralph Gibson, the well-known Melbourne Communist, was widely distributed throughout Australia. It contained much bitter abuse of myself. Now, while it is impracticable and unnecessary to reply to all Communist abuse, it is possible to show the Communist writers in their true colours when they occasionally touch upon facts. For example, when Mr. Gibson, in his pamphlet, comments upon an article reprinted in the "New Times" of March 27 last year, and says that "the writer of the latter article concludes with an appeal to Australian property-owners to be ready to use armed force to defend their property," it is only necessary to quote the actual words from the article to prove Mr. Gibson a deliberate liar. Here they are: "Communism needs chaos as a preliminary to its attempts to seize power. Australian property-owners must be on their guard to ensure that, in the difficult period of exhaustion after repelling the enemy without, they do not succumb to the Enemy Within." I don't think that we need worry much more about Mr. Gibson's "arguments"; they are all similar to his above-mentioned effort.

Now for the article which demands my blood! It is an attempt to answer facts brought forward and supported by sound historical evidence. But, like Mr. Gibson, the writer prefers to distort deliberately. He writes: "Butler asserts . . . that the Jews founded the Bank of England." Anyone who has read "The Enemy Within The Empire" knows that I never asserted that. I do say, and bring forward evidence to support my statement, that International Jewish Finance controls the Bank of England. The writer of the article makes no attempt to disprove my evidence.

Dealing with Cromwell's admission of the Jews into England, the same writer says; "This admission of Jews was done in the interests of English business, and was advocated by the Puritans. It was a progressive move and no one but a Fascist could see any harm in it." Well, well! So the great majority of Englishmen in Cromwell's time were "Fascists"! Anyone with even an elementary knowledge of that

period in English history knows that most Englishmen, including Cromwell's own supporters, were opposed to the admission of the Jews.

It would be superfluous to comment on the notion that the founding of the Bank of England was "a progressive step." While social crediters have never denied that the development of the credit system helped facilitate the growth of our modern production system, they have stressed the fact that the control of the credit system has been usurped by private groups, now organised on an international scale. The tremendous machinations of the international financiers are never mentioned by the Communists. In fact, the Communists support every move made by the controllers of credit to strengthen their stranglehold on the nation. In Australia the Communists have supported:

- (1) The Uniform Tax Plan,
- (2) The Loan Racket,
- (3) The Commonwealth Powers Bill,
- (4) Industrial Conscriptioin,
- (5) Military Conscriptioin for overseas,
- (6) and Crushing Taxation.

In his pamphlet, Mr. Gibson assails me because I attack the Party System. Needless to say, he is in favour of the banker's policy of maintaining the Party Racket under the false title of "Democracy." He also attacks the Electoral Campaign: saying that social crediters "are careful to insist that electors must only declare their will on the most general objects." Mr. Gibson knows that statement to be untrue. I will go so far as to say that the Electoral Campaign is the one thing the Communists fear; because they realise that every victory gained by the electors over their institutions strikes a deadly blow at the idea of government of the people by any centralised group or Party.

Social crediters are striving to show the people how to obtain full control over all institutions. Just how I, for example, can be advocating more control by the people and yet be a Fascist, is something I cannot understand. Still, the Communist leaders say that I must be "exposed and fought!"

Judging by the outcry that my book, "The Enemy Within The Empire," has caused, I appear to have exposed a sore spot. Every effort should be made by readers of this journal to continue hitting that sore spot until it is smashed wide open. If we don't, Australians may find that those who are suggesting prison—or worse—for their opponents to-day, will be in the position to impose their demands to-morrow.

It can happen here!

LORD BIRDWOOD ON INDIA

In our last two issues we published parts of a speech, in the House of Lords on April 6, by Lord Birdwood (better known as General Birdwood, of the Gallipoli campaign), who served almost continuously for 46 years in India, and gained an intimate first-hand knowledge of the peoples and problems of that country. He concluded his speech as follows:—

of idols, for whom they have no use whatever. Then there are 50,000,000 of the Depressed Classes, those unfortunate people who are also quite unwilling to accept Congress domination unless we can give them absolute and definite guarantees for their safety.

I was not in your Lordships' House when the noble Lord, Lord Wedgwood, who I regret to see is not here to-day, mentioned the fact that out of the 400,000,000 people of India we ought to raise a very much larger Army than we have done. I gather that he is under the impression that we might enlist almost the whole manhood of India in our Armed Forces. I hardly think the noble Lord could have been aware that among those 400,000,000 there are large numbers to whom the bearing of arms and the idea of fighting are loathsome and impossible. There are, for example, the Jains, for whom the killing even of a fly is an absolute sin. There are a great many Brahmins, who loathe the idea of being asked to take up arms. It is utterly impossible, at any rate, in my opinion, to contemplate arming the whole manhood of India, even if we had the arms available for them. To try to do so would be to sink to the level of the Nazis, which I am sure is the last thing that we would wish to contemplate.

I dare say that your Lordships have often heard, as I have heard, the accusation brought against us in India that our rule there is governed by the three words, "Divide et impera." I wish that the people who make that accusation would come into the open and give definite examples of where we have shown such an attitude. I can say with absolute honesty and sincerity that on going about the districts, as I have done, with one civil officer after another, I have never found anything approaching that attitude. On the contrary, the civil officers have gone out of their way to urge people to pull together, and have done everything that they possibly could to form a united India. And, of course, there is no doubt whatever of our determination to honour our word and to grant real self-government to India when India is in a position to undertake it, as we hope that she may be at the end of this war, and when we may hope that the many minorities there may feel satisfied that their safety is assured under Congress rule.

We have no need to apologise, however, for our guardianship of that great country; rather must we have feelings of real pride and honour in the fact that for the last hundred years we have safeguarded the interests of the people of India with justice, with real and true sympathy, with care and with honesty. During all that time, in fact, we have been the sole cement which has held together those very divergent people. It would surely be cowardice for us to think of abandoning that position, unless we can feel confident that the poor and humble minorities will be safeguarded, as we hope may be the case when Indians can participate.

The noble Lord, Lord Faringdon, mentioned Pakistan. Your Lordships probably realise what is meant by that word. The Mahomedans, under the leadership of Mr. Jinnah, a very able and astute politician, have definitely decided that they are not prepared to enter a Government formed of all classes, and they demand that the Mahomedans shall have rule over the five Provinces—the North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Sind, the Punjab and Bengal—which they call Pakistan. In those five Provinces the Mahomedans are in a majority, but in each of those Provinces there are enormous numbers of Hindus, while scattered over the rest of India there are very large numbers of Mahomedans. As an example of what I can see might be the result of the Pakistan policy I will take the Punjab, a Province which I know well, and which was ably governed for many years by my noble friend, Lord Hailey. In the Punjab there is a preponderance of Mahomedans, but there are also 6,000,000 Sikhs, the people to whom I referred a short time ago, and with whom we were engaged in our great wars in 1842. The Sikhs are a very hard-fighting, virile, determined, obstreperous people, who are not for one moment going to accept Mahomedan domination, and they have said so.

We can imagine what the state of that country will be if we withdraw—absolute anarchy and chaos, and the most appalling and bloody fighting ever known, with tre-

(Continued on page 4.)

FRANK C. BARNES announces that he intends to offer himself as a non-party candidate for the electorate of Balaclava at the forthcoming Federal Elections. Advocating monetary and political reform. Anyone who would like to assist should telephone U 1898, or attend the meeting at Caulfield Town Hall on Tuesday, August 3, 8 p.m. [Advt.]

THE DRIFT TO IMBECILITY

Have We Lost Our Cultural Compass?

There are many who feel that apart from the miseries of war there is something sorely amiss with the times we live in. They see in various aspects of our cultural life a degeneracy, a lowering of taste, a debasing of standards, a deliberate reversion to the primitive even, and all manner of crudity. These should read that excellent, newly-published book by Sir Lionel Lindsay* on the causes of the decay of art in our century. There they will find ample confirmation of their uneasy suspicion that "modern" art is not only a huge hoax, but is, in the words of Sir Lionel, "a dull and pretentious imposture."

In vigorous language and apt phrases the author castigates the hollow sham of "modernism" in art and exposes its disreputable origin. In so doing he makes at the same time a devastating attack upon one flank of an insidious foe that in many different guises is creeping upon our civilisation. Whatever or whoever he is, the work of this enemy can be seen, or heard, on all hands, in debased cultural standards in art, music, literature, in wrecked moral and spiritual values, and in general confusion of thought. The culmination of the process, if unchecked, will be a race of morons and imbeciles!

Lionel Lindsay spent the years 1928 to 1935 in Europe studying the origin and history of this crazy cult in its many manifestations—cubism, Dadaism, surrealism—to name but a few of the many "isms" that sprang up at the beginning of this century. As a great Australian artist, also, he is qualified to be its judge. In the modernist movement he sees a "false art, written into existence by the hirelings of dishonourable dealers." That many of those dealers were Jewish is a fact he records at the risk of being accused of "anti-Semitism." Collectomania, combined with immense wealth in the hands of the vulgar rich, created a demand for works of art; a demand which "the shrewdest race in the world" was not slow to exploit. Fortunes were made by expert dealers assisted by hireling critics who boosted the new art in a jargon which they invented for the purpose. The Levys and the Rosenblums, among others who had never handled a brush before, invaded the galleries. Thousands of amateurs—many could not even draw—flocked to Paris from all over Europe to practise this new expressionism with its mumbo-jumbo of the abstract and the sub-conscious.

In part, the author attributes this "demented reaction" against the restraints and discipline of the art of the past to the craze for novelty, to "the spirit of the age that separates this century from all others; the age of speed, sensationalism, jazz, and the insensate adoration of money." It was the "outward and visible symptoms of a spiritual malady and a contributory cause in the decline of France."

Not all this "generation of mountebanks" were charlatans and imitators. Some, like Picasso and Matisse, were clever artists, though they wilfully debased their art.

*"Addled Art," by Sir Lionel Lindsay. (Angus and Robertson; 7/6)

A SANCTUARY FOR THE JEWS

(To the Editor.)

Sir.—Nothing would be more acceptable to the peoples of the world than that this problem should be satisfactorily solved. Not merely as a sanctuary, but a land which could become a Jewish nation. This question should not in any way be touched on lightly; but rather be brought forward for immediate solution.

A number of suggestions have been made, of which I favour Madagascar, owing to the similarity in customs, outlook, laws and religion of the Madagascy, and those of the Jews. The island is the third largest in the world, and is situated off the east coast of South Africa. A vast area, 230,000 square miles of undulating and very fertile country, sufficient to harbour the entire Jewish race without repercussions upon the people of Madagascar.

Mr. Steinberg, who was connected with the first Communist Government, is now here in Australia more or less insisting that we make the Kimberley district available to his race. Taking all facts into consideration, and viewing his much-advertised proposals from every angle, what do we find? Only a regrouping of the problem again upon our own shores. "Their laws are not our laws, neither are their ways our ways."

The situation, however, would be reversed in the case of Madagascar. Philosophy and culture would not be a deterrent to settlement as it would be in Australia. The Madagascy culture is based upon the laws and rules of the early Semitic settlers. The marked influence of the Semites upon the Madagascy can be divined by a number of words of their language. The names of the months and days of the week, those used in astrology and divination; same form of salutation; words for chess, bedding, money, musical instruments, books and writing, together with a number of miscellaneous terms. These form the enduring memorial of the influence the Semites have exerted upon the Madagascy.

The Jews must be found a land which they can convert into a nation. From every aspect, Madagascar fills the bill: a land where they will be unfettered by alien laws and customs, a land where they can follow to its logical conclusion their culture and philosophy.—Yours etc., J. W. Stirling Gynea-Bay Rd., Gynea-Bay, N.S.W.

The surrealists, however, he considers "decadent pur sang," playing to a Freudian audience.

This outstanding book will, let us hope, mark a turning-point in the history of art in Australia. At least we should be grateful for the courage and commonsense of one who in such strong terms denounces the cult of ugliness, for, as he says, "to seek wilfully after ugliness is a criminal gesture." Would that a similar enquiry might be undertaken into the devilry that seems to be at work degrading and perverting popular taste and judgment in other spheres!

—MARY H. GRAY.

U.E.A. ELECTION NOTES

The number of candidates offering for selection will doubtless cause considerable confusion, the bona-fides of many candidates, including those of some "independents," will be suspect, and the issues will likewise be numerous and equally suspect. In many cases these matters will be peculiar to each electorate, and will have to be resolved on that basis. The broad issues or principles that campaigners should keep in mind are contained in the following letter, which supporters are urged to send to each candidate in their electorate:

"Dear Sir or Madam,—In order that I may intelligently choose my representative at the forthcoming election, I shall be glad if you will kindly answer the following questions: (1) Will you, if elected, convene regular quarterly meetings of your electors to ascertain if the electors are getting the results they want? (2) Will you ascertain the will of your electors, issue by issue, as they arise? Will you vote against every measure brought before the House which can be shown to be oppressive to individual electors? (3) Will you resist all pressure brought to bear on you which does not arise from your constituents? (4) Will you make known to your electors the persons or organisations exerting such pressure?"

The answers to these questions will be most interesting, and should clarify and reduce the choice of candidates. If more than one candidate answers them satisfactorily, the background and connections of such candidates should be examined—but the final decision must reside in each electorate. If a few hundred of the above letters are received by candidates, in addition to the "Undertaking Form" sent to them from Headquarters, that will be all to the good. But remember that YOU, the individual, must take the initiative. This is a job that YOU can do, and it's worth doing.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director, United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

NATIONAL CREDIT

(To the Editor.)

Sir.—Recently the daily papers have published figures given by Mr. Chifley, Federal Treasurer, re Government expenditure. Mr. Chifley states that his Government has used more Central Bank Credit (£217 millions) than any other Government. This statement is apt to mislead the public; in fact, even some readers of the "New Times" have the idea that this credit is debt-free. I would like your readers to note that Mr. Chifley said "Bank Credit," not "National Credit." This "Bank Credit" was based on the nation's real credit, i.e., its ability to produce, but was added to the National Debt just the same as if the credit had been written up by the private banks. There will be the usual interest charge, and we will all be taxed to pay that charge, so we can look for still heavier taxation, whichever Party sits on the Treasury benches. What we should demand is that the Government instruct the Commonwealth Bank Board to issue, as required, "National Credit" (the nation's credit) based on the nation's ability to produce, but issued DEBT-FREE and INTEREST-FREE. Then the Government will be able to reduce taxation and very soon eliminate it altogether. My advice to electors is this: Attend the meetings of the different candidates and put this demand before them. If they refuse to carry out the suggestion, then let them know you are voting against them. Do not stop at this, but, whichever Government is elected, keep up the pressure by writing to both your own member and the Federal Treasurer. Action is the only way to get results, so start today.—Yours, etc., David McInnes, senr., 24 Campbell St., Moreland, Vic.

Responsibility for all unsigned election comment in these columns is accepted by H. F. Allsop, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne. C. I.

THE GREAT MYTH

"He who would do good to others must do it in Minute Particulars. General Good is the plea of the scoundrel, the hypocrite, and the flatterer. For Art and Science cannot exist but in minutely organised Particulars and not generalising Demonstrations of Rational Power."—William Blake.

Douglas has suggested in "The Big Idea" (VI.) that Socialism is the cult of the Group-soul, implying inevitably the subordination of the higher to the lower, and of variety to standardisation. In which case Socialism, or Dialectical Materialism, to give it its philosophical title, is just the forcible assertion of that subordination by means of propaganda. Now propaganda, the subject of this book*, is simply the instrument of Experimental or Objective Psychology; the application of a few observed facts of the physics of the human body to human beings regarded as an aggregate—i.e., in the mass.

This technique is what is coming to be known as Social Science (that is how the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks of it); but it would be a closer definition, I think, to call it Social Physics—the knowledge of (human) masses. What it boils down to is the application of Newtonian mathematics to abstract mass-humanity, accepting the idea of "absolute mass" (the abstract thing in itself) as a working hypothesis. No one looking round the world of mechanics today can deny that the Newtonian hypothesis, as applied to what the nineteenth century biologists called "non-living matter," has worked; that is, produced results—so far of rather a disastrous kind. And now, according to bio-chemistry and on the formulas of Professor Pavlov, we are to see (or rather, are seeing) what it can do applied to what the Victorian biologists actually named "living matter." That is, as soon as the human individual can be collectivised and manoeuvred into such a situation and so reduced to a common denominator—in short, "conditioned" that he can be mathematically dealt with in the physical mass.

But the truth about Newtonian physics is that it is a method, a technique, but not an objective; a collection of relative (related) facts, but not the truth. Einstein demonstrated its inexactitude by introducing as an additional factor into his mathematical calculations, the Observer—yours truly, who is, of course, the crux of the whole matter. Without the Observer (individual consciousness), there can be no objective, and therefore no policy—really, there can be "no nothing," which was Bishop Berkeley's contention. The assertion of the Dialectical Materialist of the predominance of conscious (living) matter or human physics implies a denial of metaphysics, which is in reality just the "little something more" that in combination with physics constitutes what we know of living reality.

Mr. Chakotin is in no doubt as to the modern origin of Experimental Psychology, which he dates from "the rise of rationalism, a movement which continued to the French Revolution, when there was a true explosion of agitation and propaganda"—the spark which, as he says, "at a distance of more than a hundred years lit the great flame of the Russian Revolution." And he quotes Lenin's advice to "young militants to rediscover the bold spirit of the Encyclopaedists." "All eyes are fixed on France," he writes (the book was first published in Paris in 1939), "the champion of Liberty a century and a half ago, the champion of human progress for decades past, and in these critical times the solid buckler of the humanitarian idea. It is often hinted that she is not united. What an error!" Have the searing events of 1940 and since had no modifying effect on Mr. Chakotin's outlook, one wonders? Or that of Mr. H. G. Wells, to whom his book is dedicated.

(To be continued.)

*"The Rape of the Masses," by Sergei Chakotin.

"B."B.C. PROPAGANDA

In the House of Commons, on March 30, Mr. Leach asked the Minister of Information whether he is aware that the British Broadcasting Corporation puts forward a large amount of propaganda for which it refuses any statements in disagreement, notably on vivisection, pasteurisation, evangelical religion, diphtheria immunisation, laudation of Pasteur, Jenner, Lister, and others whose work has been largely discredited; and will he instruct the Corporation, with a view to securing a proper presentation by qualified persons of the opposing cases on all subjects?

Mr. Bracken: "No, Sir. As the B.B.C. has quite enough undeserved troubles, I cannot ask the Governors to bring down upon them the avalanche suggested by my hon. Friend . . ."

NO HEBREW AIR FORCE

In the British House of Commons, on March 11, Mr. David Adams asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Hebrew community in Palestine are urging the creation of an Air Force for the purpose of attacking enemy territory; and whether it is intended to establish such a force?

Colonel Stanley: "The reply to the first part of this question is in the negative. It is not intended to establish a separate Air Force recruited exclusively from among the Hebrew community in Palestine, as there are ample opportunities for all who wish to do so to offer themselves for enlistment in the Royal Air Force."

SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS ON MONEY

"The creation of an exchange medium in money or credit has always been the prerogative of sovereign power—at least, when I say always, I should say, was, in its origin, the prerogative of sovereign power. Hence in almost every country in the world, the minting of money and, in many countries, the creation of paper money, has been kept in the hands of the State and the hands of the community, and that operation of the community's sovereign power, which relates to the creation of money and credit is a very vital part of its sovereignty. Owing to the expansion of industrial enterprise, we have found a growing tendency for private individuals to control the important operations of issuing credit to the nation. And with the growing importance of credit and diminishing importance of money, it is more and more a power over the life of the community, and has passed into the hands of those who control the financial machinery." (Sir Stafford Cripps in an address before the Toronto Canadian Club, in April, 1934—more than five years before the war started.)

LORD BIRDWOOD ON INDIA

(Continued from page 3.)

menous casualties on every side, because the country is inhabited by very hard-fighting people. I think that there can be no doubt that that is what would happen in the Punjab. One has only to think of what would happen in the Communal riots. Thank God, we do not know in this country what a Communal riot is. In India a Communal riot starts in some ridiculous way—a Hindu will throw a pig into a Mahomedan mosque, or Mahomedans will go past a Hindu temple playing brazen music—and before you know where you are a riot has started, like fire in dry grass. Murders take place, and then the cry is always raised: "Where are the British troops?" That cry is raised even by those who in other circumstances are demanding the withdrawal of British troops from India.

Let me conclude by saying something with which I hope most of your Lordships will agree. I am convinced that the Christian faith and Christian morals are the one and only cement which binds our civilisation together; if they go, the world will become a den of thieves. If we go to the origin of this terrible war in which we are now engaged, I believe we may feel that it arises largely from the fact that Nazi Germany dethroned Christ, and in His place set up the man Hitler as their god. I am certain that our repugnance towards Nazi ideology and Nazi methods is entirely shared by people of other faiths, who form part of our great Empire. Just as I believe that Christian faith and morals dominate the world, so in this smaller sphere of India and also, shall I say, in the sphere of Palestine, I cannot but feel that it is we of the white race, we Britishers, who have been able to hold together the Mahomedans and the Hindus in India, and the Mahomedans and the Jews in Palestine. I should feel sorry for a man who was responsible for breaking that link, unless he is definitely assured that peace will reign and that the rights of minority will be properly recognised if and when the British withdraw.

Programme for Third World War

(Continued from page 2.)

(3) The transfer of the subversive activities of international finance to France and England. The technique of flooding the country with refugees, many of them propagandists, is a repetition of the period following the French Revolution. How is it that no Socialist Party has ever attacked France? How is it that the programme of the Commonwealth Party (notice the Cromwellian touch) reads like a banker's dream? Russia is a country of nearly 200,000,000 people, with vast resources. The individual Russian has always been a brave and fatalistic soldier. For twenty years, the Soviet Government has been preparing for war. Where is all this propaganda coming from, which in quarters accustomed to denounce war as a capitalist trick, heralds as an immense military achievement derived from the Soviet system, the very desirable, but surely not very remarkable fact that 200,000,000 of people, fighting on their own soil, on short lines of communication, have held up one enemy fighting on lengthening lines of communication (if they have held them up), while an allegedly inefficient country of 45,000,000 held up three empires, and assisted the Russians? Who in their senses could argue that the most backward and illiterate country in Europe is the pattern for the rest? To anyone who will consider the evidence, I cannot see any conclusion from it but one—that the totalitarian State in all its forms is a gigantic plot against civilisation, and that only political adolescents could fail to see that it proceeds from an international source, using international bribery for the benefit of an international caste to whom all cultures and races, but one, are foreign.

The object of the various New Orders is simplicity itself—it is to prevent the rectification of the defects in the organic growth of civilisation, almost all of which proceed from the Finance which the New Order mongers never attack.

(All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)