

The "New Times" is a really independent, non-party, non-class, non-sectarian weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and opposing totalitarianism in all its forms.

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 NEW TIMES

VOL. 11, No. 19. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 18 1945.

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. HALF Rates for Members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Totalitarianism Threatens on Home Front

The Menace of Centralisation

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

The "Labor" Government at Canberra has decided not to give permission to the commercial broadcasting stations to use telephone lines for news relays unless they take such news from the A.B.C. Service. This means that most of the news services broadcast throughout Australia are to come through one channel, and one channel only. It doesn't require much experience to realise that this is political dynamite.

A news service is vital to the maintenance of a democratic community, and as most of our information is second-hand, it is essential that at least the thinking minority should have alternate means of obtaining news.

The selection, too, of the commentators for the A.B.C. is very unsatisfactory, and not even by accident does any commentator come on the air who thinks that the taxpayer should have any protection against the Central Government, or that the power taken from the taxpayer should ever be given back to the people.

The collecting of news for the people is becoming of more importance every day, and a great deal of the tragic misconceptions which have cost so much in blood and treasure can be traced to strange "weaknesses" in the news-gathering agencies.

The international news services have been suspect for some years now, and the very poor publicity given to British and Australian troops seems to indicate that few of these news agencies are in British hands.

In the troubled times which lie ahead

few can see clearly through the complicated network of conflicting interests, but because we do not know exactly what lies ahead of us that doesn't mean we have no compass or principles to guide us.

The danger signals have been flying for some time now for all to see who can see; there is not the slightest doubt about them, and no argument is possible about the terrible danger. The supreme danger today is the all-powerful centralised government from which the people have no protection.

Consider the Government at Canberra: The caucus selects the Commander in Chief of the Army; it selects the High Court Judges; it selects the Manager of the Australian Broadcasting Commission; it selects the Director of the Post Office; it selects the Chief Commissar of Taxes; it selects the men responsible for handing out millions of pounds in pensions; it selects the man-power directors. But it doesn't stop there: the Government is seeking to appoint its man in charge of Banking and puts the Party nominee in charge of all Air-transport.

The Social Services, administered in Tas-

mania by the State, are to be forced under Commonwealth control to be run from a bottleneck in Canberra.

Any person who can look with complacency upon this alarming concentration of power in the hands of a few men at Canberra must be made of the same intellectual material that turned Germany's young men into cannon fodder.

With the extension of Canberra's powers over most of the important services of this country, and with the manipulation of banking and taxation so that no one may live, in future, unless he has a job in one of these services, who would then dare to criticise the men who held supreme power? We are not left in doubt about what happens in such cases; the word "liquidate" has been coined to politely cover the remains of those who question the supreme authority.

Everywhere the ordinary man and woman is losing more and more control over his own life, over his choice of news, his choice of entertainment, his choice of education. He is not even allowed to spend his own wages—the Government does most of that for him. And as the freedom of the individual disappears we see the private man, his property and his means of income, being attacked from all sides; we see local government being destroyed; we see State government being destroyed; and in the Bretton Woods Plan we see the perfect mechanism for destroying national government being forged, thus preventing any country by law from protecting itself from the same gang that forced the last depression, on Australia.

The reduction of the individual to a wage-slave in a large soulless organisation, the destruction of the small State, the small farm, and the small business, is NOT natural, inevitable, scientific, nor democratic; it is NOT a "trend" of modern times. It is the DELIBERATE POLICY of a few men who know exactly what they are doing. And no politician or technician attains to high public position who does not subscribe to this devil's policy of de-

struction. There is no need to take my word for it; just keep your eyes open.

I don't think it matters so much what power you give to Parliament, always provided that you have some way of escape. But if you have no way of escape from the vicious acts of the men temporarily in power in Canberra, then, of course, it doesn't make much difference by what name the Government calls itself—it is a Monopoly. And monopolies are always run by gangsters. And the supreme problem) facing people today is how to escape from-gangsterdom.

It was suggested recently in the Hobart "Mercury" that the people would be able to exercise some control over their representatives if the electors had power to recall their Members from Parliament when they refused to represent the needs of the community. When I asked how this could be done, it was suggested that the Electoral Office could receive cards at stated intervals from voters who wanted their Member recalled from Parliament, and when the total reached a stated figure the Member would be forced to face the public again.

There is no doubt that the Party System has robbed the people of effective control over Parliament, and until local people develop some means of controlling their own Member of Parliament this so-called Majority Vote is going to be used to destroy everything of value in this country.

When you are rejoicing at the military victory in Europe you should remember that the National Socialist Government in Germany was centralised power concentrated in the hands of a few men; and that they were put there by a popular vote mesmerised by false information. And this war will have merely been a preparation for the next war unless we reverse the whole process which built up Hitler Germany in other words, we must decentralise power in all its aspects, and return it back to the people from whom it has been stolen by the Party System.

Significant Political Pointers

When the Curtin Government introduced its Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act, this journal exposed the clauses in this legislation designed to give the man-power bureaucrats sweeping powers to dictate terms and place of employment to those seeking work. On March 23, the Curtin Government introduced legislation allegedly designed to give preference to returned soldiers. In an obscure portion of the Bill, Part II, Division 5, entitled "Commonwealth Employment Service," the following appears: "The (Commonwealth Employment) Service is also to assist in administering the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act . . ."

Did someone say there is no conscious plot to establish a permanent dictatorship by manpower bureaucrats? The forging of our chains of slavery is proceeding rapidly. No time is to be lost in helping to mobilise public opinion against the power-lusters' policy of supplementing control-through-money by direct manpower controls. There can be no real advance in our fight for economic democracy until the bureaucrats are dealt with. The electors must decide the major issue for the next Federal elections: a drastic reduction of the number of bureaucrats. Those Members favouring retention of the present number of bureaucrats should receive a stream of last-preference votes when they next appear before their masters. Social creditors should be hard at work on this issue NOW.

It is high time that something was done about the A.B.C. As with all socialistic creations, it is merely a political tool for which the taxpayers are compelled to pay. The "A.B.C. Weekly" is a mediocre publication, and has only been maintained by heavy subsidies from the Government. Over the past few years this journal has been notorious for its Left-wing propaganda, while well known Communists have had access to the A.B.C. national stations. The appointment of Mr. Boyer to preside over the affairs of the A.B.C. is very significant. Mr. Boyer is noted for his puritanical views, and a desire to have mankind organised on an international scale.

The recent moves by the commercial broadcasting stations to supply their own news services and the actions of the socialist Government at Canberra to thwart their efforts, are worthy of the closest attention by all those who believe in democratic Government.

Churchill's Admission

Here is rather an illuminating snippet from the recent House of Commons debate on the Yalta decisions:

Mr. Rhys Davies said that while these envisaged action to prevent aggression by small powers, it was not clear that similar action could be invoked to prevent aggression by the Great Powers.

Mr. Churchill said he was sorry that there should be such a high degree of axiomatic truth in the facts as set out by Mr. Rhys Davies.

All the Canberra power-lusters, irrespective of their political label have found the temptation of the A.B.C.'s radio network as a propaganda medium too much for them. This temptation should be removed.

There is no reason to believe that the internationalists in America will have any trouble with President Truman. His background has been just "right." His appointment to the position of Vice-President was the result of action by the powerful Jewish Labor leader, Hillman, who controlled the vital Labor vote, which returned Roosevelt to office at the last Presidential elections. These votes were given in exchange for certain important considerations. Truman was one of those considerations.

A recent press report from Cologne tells how "democracy" is now working in that city: Germans are digging trenches while Jews have the administrative positions. You do understand what "democracy" really means, don't you? It is a state of society in which Jews order everyone else about. Should the Jews feel disinclined to do the direct ordering themselves, they have plenty of stooges prepared to lend a hand. All the stooges crave is a little power; they are prepared to sell their very souls for it

"Investigation Branch of the Taxation Department in N.S.W. started off a couple of years ago with a room or two in the City Mutual Building, Hunter Street, Sydney. Now it has extended until it takes in a couple of floors—and big floors, too. That's the way all Government Departments expand. Start a man off with a desk and a typist, and come back in a month or so, and you'll find he has built a whole department around himself."—"Smith's Weekly," of April 28.

The Gestapo activities of the various Investigation Branches of Taxation Departments, both State and Federal, call for the strongest condemnation. The number of taxation bureaucrats should be reduced by at least 50 per cent.

The remaining 50 per cent should be more than sufficient for handling the administration of distributing money to the people in the form of national dividends! The difference between taxation and dividends is the difference between slavery and freedom.

—E.D.B.

COPLAND'S CONTROLS: Ace-bureaucrat Copland is very busy these days, defending the retention of bureaucratic controls. Just recently he was reported as telling the National Council of Women "it makes me sick when I hear people in this country talking about getting rid of these things as quickly as we can." He then plugged the theme that our overseas obligations are sufficient excuse for retaining controls and bureaucrats such as himself, but he did not point out that he and his policy of strangling controls and unremunerative prices are stifling our production, while others of his ilk sabotage a considerable portion of what production we have. Incidentally, the Professor's propaganda is getting every assistance from most units of the Monopoly Press.

BISHOP'S BUNGLE: Dr. Moyes, Anglican Bishop of Armadale (N.S.W.), if reported correctly in the Melbourne "Sun," of May 1, made certain comments on the dangers of Communism, but some of his remarks were rather contradictory. He was reported as having said: "To escape nationalism [?] Australia might turn to Communism—out of Hades into Hell, Communism and nationalism are not just economic systems; they are substitute religions. Communism has more moral insight [!] than nationalism, which is utterly pagan—the deification of power." Whatever the Bishop means by "nationalism," it could not possibly deify power more than Communism does, and it could not be more pagan than Communism, despite the alleged restoration of religious freedom in Soviet Russia, which is merely war-time opportunism to induce solidarity for the purpose of retaining Communist Power as the deity. This point should be noted even if the Bishop was not reported accurately. If the Bishop had actually said "internationalism" wherever he is quoted as saying "nationalism" then his remarks would appear much more sensible. World Government would be the supreme deification and enthronement of Naked Power. The San Francisco Conference is a step in that direction.

FOOD FRONT: Big headlines in the Melbourne "Sun" of April 18, informed us that new demands would require Australian food production to the limit. A small news-item on the same page said that "the vegetable-canning firm of Garthside Bros, had £70,000 worth of canned food for the Forces stored at its factory, and had to close its factory because Food Control would not take delivery, or give the company a reasonable amount of money against storage warrants. There had been no deliveries from the factory since last December, and 100 employees had been made idle. Mr. Garthside said, 'we have had a terrific amount of trouble with Food Control, and so has every other vegetable-processing factory. We have been given no reason why they will not take delivery.'" The

enemy is certainly well served by our blundering bureaucrats.

PROPAGANDA PLOT: A New York report states that "the Supreme Court is hearing charges that the publication of the 'Institute of Pacific Relations' follow the Communist Party lines and have given aid and comfort to the enemy by tending to create disunity between China and America, besides constituting an effective Communist propaganda." One of the members of the Institute has originated the action, and has set out his case in an 80-page pamphlet containing quotations from publications of the Institute's Council and from Communist publications, to support his charges. There are about 1500 members on that Council, including the Leftist writer, Pearl Buck. Thus it would appear that watchful eyes are now focussed on the wily Communists.

(Continued on page 2.)

"Peace on Earth"

At San Francisco, 44 nations are to be allowed to attend and at least LISTEN to the BIG FOUR. These have graciously decided that even a SMALL nation is going to have the right to bring charges against any one of the Sacred Four and have them heard by the proposed World Security Council. (Also composed of the Big Four?)

But if the SMALL NATION is silly enough to show a real case against one of the Sacred Ones, then any one of them can rise in his wrath and VETO any action being taken.

And so the peace, prosperity and obedience of a troubled world is to be assured. The Big Four have said so and don't you dare contradict them. They have screamed it in Teheran, yodelled it in Yalta, and are going to croon it in San Francisco.

Peace on Earth by Force of Arms!

—N. B. James, in the "Canadian Social Creditor" 15/3/MR

THE "BLACK HAND" APPEARS AGAIN!

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)

Sir, —Hardly had the ink dried on the signature of the instrument of surrender before the international "news" agencies were again bringing a dangerous German into the limelight. I refer to Dr. Schacht, who collaborated with other international financiers in providing Germany with the "funds" for war preparation.

The Governor of the so-called Bank of England was a party to that treason, but instead of being punished he was raised to the peerage! (. . . Mr. Montagu Norman has retired with a peerage after collaborating with Dr. Schacht to build up Hitler."—The "Social Creditor," 27/1/45.) Evidently Dr. Schacht is to be regarded now as an innocent victim of "Nazi" aggression, and thus entitled to special consideration.

If we are not to be fooled again we must speak now, and we must speak so that our meaning will be clear. As things stand at the moment we have won the war against Germany but already lost the peace. That is not an irresponsible statement, and unless a far greater number of Australians become understandingly aware of it, and quickly, the loss of the Peace so far as Australia is concerned will be irreparable.

In the Melbourne "Sun" of 9/5/45 there is a report from London dated 8th May, which includes the following:—

"Dr. Schacht, former German Finance Minister to Hitler and president of the Reichsbank, who was captured yesterday in an Italian frontier town, does not believe that Hitler is dead. 'I wouldn't believe it if he told me so himself,' Schacht said.

"Schacht, who was dressed in his usual high starched collar, was puffing a cigar between sips of schnapps. He is the latest German to disown Nazism. 'I have never been a Nazi. Hitler never took my advice, and he never understood money or the power of money,' he said."

I have quoted this extract from the newspaper report for two reasons. The first is (because it provides additional evidence that whoever wins or loses the bloody struggle on a battlefield, the international financiers are able to bob up again safe and sound immediately afterwards to assume command. The second reason is because of the significance of the statement that Herr Hitler "never understood money or the power of money." In this latter regard it would be reasonable to ask whether any of the other national "leaders" are any better informed than the late leader of the defeated Germans? Does Mr. Churchill understand money or the power of money? Does Mr. Truman, Mr. Stalin, Chiang Kai-Shek, or General de Gaulle? If they do, why have we lost the Peace? If they do not, how can they possibly lead us out of the present chaos?

Last October, when the people were being encouraged by an irresponsible press to expect the war in Europe to end long before Christmas, it was pointed out in this paper that as things then stood the Peace was again lost. Nothing has occurred during the intervening period to alter the truth of that statement, but on the contrary the march of events has emphasised its accuracy. This matter is so important to all of us that we who know must never become tired of declaring it, even though it may be necessary to indulge in repetition.

Evidence of the loss of the Peace is plentiful. For example, a terrific struggle for overseas "markets" is already developing.

This struggle comes about because the supply of money is usually so regulated in the various countries that producers can only get a price for their goods if they can export some of them, over and above paying for imports, etc. This need to export excessively comes about because the people in each country are not supplied with sufficient purchasing power to cover the value of their own production. And so the struggle for markets is a struggle for money, and the controllers of MONEY dictate the conditions of the struggle for markets. When the struggle for markets culminates in a struggle of arms it is but an inevitable effect of the POLICY imposed by the controllers of money. The controllers of MONEY are therefore the war criminals who always escape punishment for their crimes. These men are to remain in control of post-war activity, which means continuation of the same old conditions.

Unemployment (so-called) is already manifesting itself on an increasing scale in Allied countries. Newspaper reports show that many thousands have been put on the dole in England. In the United States it is reported that the number of "idle" men is reaching serious proportions.

Only a few days ago a "dad" (member of the Fathers' Association) wrote to the local papers deploring the fact that although physically fit and well below the retiring age he had found it impossible to get a "job." He wondered what was to become of the "boys" when they returned.

Unemployment is NOT a disability when the unemployed are receiving good INCOME. In that case they are not called unemployed. They are called INDEPENDENT! Unemployment is only a problem when the unemployed get no "wages." It is a matter of income, i.e., MONEY; and here again it is the MONEY CONTROLLERS who dictate the conditions. But the great industrial leaders never look into the doings and methods of those people. Only the "monetary cranks" would bother about that!

When the personnel of the Forces return home they will have to fight as never before against the non-combatants in the artificial struggle for a "job." Indeed, the fight is already on.

At one stage it would have been thought that the men of the A.M.F. were a different breed from the men of the A.I.F. There has been great argument as to "eligibility" for membership of the R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. by the former, and the intention is that a fight is to be waged for "absolute preference" only for the members of the A.I.F. in the matter of jobs.

What all of these gallant men want is an adequate and assured INCOME. If there is necessary work in which their assistance is needed, then they will be ready to do their share; but if there is no necessary work to be done by them, then they want INCOME just the same. Whether they will get INCOME without working depends upon the policy of the money controllers; and whether money will be made available to enable us to carry out all the things that need to be done, also depends upon the policy dictated by the money controllers. Whichever way we consider it, the question is one of FINANCE. Do the members of the Executive of the R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. understand money or the power of money? Do they?

As has been said so many times in recent years, governmental activities are determined by the BUDGET, which is a financial instrument for keeping Parliaments under control.

Whoever fixes the conditions, which govern the preparation of the Budget fixes PARLIAMENT. Under the demands of war, the Commonwealth Government has been spending at the rate of more than £500 MILLIONS a year. Because of war, loan after loan has been "floated" and all the wiles known to the boosters have been used to achieve the objective each time. We have had spectacular parades of personnel of the various Services and all sorts of other demonstrations to "ginger" us to action. Those incentives will not be here when the war ends. People will not approve of such extensive "borrowing," and they will also object to such extortionate taxation. Obviously, therefore, UNLESS

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

"Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

By ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

PROTOCOL NO. 6.

"We shall soon begin to establish huge monopolies, reservoirs of colossal riches, upon which even large fortunes of the goyim will depend to such an extent that they will go to the bottom together with the credit of the States on the day after the political smash . . .

"You gentlemen here present who are economists, just strike an estimate of the significance of this combination! . . .

"In every possible way we must develop the significance of our Super-Government by representing it as the Protector and Benefactor of all those who voluntarily submit to us."

COMMENT:—

Isn't this exactly the argument, which has been cleverly developed over the past few years?

Peace between nations can never become a reality until men of all nations can control their own institutions. The further institutions are away from people—i.e., the more centralised they are—the less control the people have over them.

In Germany the central Government destroyed the various States and "imposed peace" as a result of controlling all the armed forces.

The British Empire has been based successfully on the principle of decentralised Government. We Britishers should fight vigorously for the principles our forefathers successfully established.

An international armed force can be used to impose the policy of the World Government on any small nation desirous of pursuing, say, a different financial policy. The whole idea is merely a magnification of the policy of the totalitarian countries.

The specious argument is put forward that anything is better than war. If we succumb to this treasonable idea, we are saying that all those who fought to preserve our sovereignty against Germany, Italy and Japan have died in vain. Our sovereignty can never be a reality unless we have complete control of our own armed forces in order to defend ourselves. Protocol No. 6 continues as follows:—

"The aristocracy of the goyim, as a political force, is dead—we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential, therefore, for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens upon landed property—in loading land with debts. These measures will check land-holding and keep it in a state of humble and unconditional submission."

COMMENT:— Possibly the best comment on the above is a few extracts from a publication issued by the Zionist, Israel Moses Sieff, namely, "Freedom and Planning," which we have already mentioned:—

PARLIAMENT DETERMINES TO ADOPT SOME NEW METHOD OF OBTAINING MONEY FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES, Government disbursements cannot be continued on a scale similar to that which has applied during the currency of the war.

Notwithstanding this, nothing whatever has been done to alter the financial methods, which were in operation before the war, and which brought such degradation and suffering to mankind.

What sort of a VICTORY will it be if it leaves us in FINANCIAL BONDAGE? Who can visualise the POWER that can be wielded against all Governments through DEBT BONDS? These bonds are in the hands of less than 3 per cent of the population, and the great bulk of them are held by FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. Not only so, but these selfsame institutions control the production and distribution of money—the only stuff with which the debts can be paid!

Try to think what a national debt of £30,000 MILLIONS means under these conditions. Bonds to that extent will shortly be held against the Government and people of the United Kingdom, and yet the otherwise very great Mr. Churchill has apparently done nothing to free his people from that terrible bondage. The same applies to all the other men who at the moment are receiving the plaudits of the crowd.

Up to now, there is no evidence of any intention to depart from that treasonable method of finance, and the bringing forward of the notorious member of the Black Hand Gang (Dr. Schacht) at this particular time presages no good for ordinary people.

It may be quite true that Herr Hitler did not understand money or the power of money, and that very fact should be a serious warning to other so-called "leaders." It should also imprint indelibly on our minds the strange situation that whilst the spokesmen for the Christian people appear to lack this vital understanding, non-Christian men with the names of Rothschild, Warburg, Meyer, Baruch, Schiff, Kahn, Frankfurter, Morgenthau, Schuster, Sassoon, Isaacs, Mocatte, Laski, Sieff, Strakosch, Niemeyer, Guggenheim, Levy, Cohen, and the like, apparently do understand it.

It has been said that the last great battle for Christ will be over the MONEY question and the sooner we realise it and join with Christ in whipping the moneychangers from the Temple the sooner will it be possible for His Will to be done and His Kingdom to come, as we now so regularly pray for.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 13th May 1945.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

INTEREST INJUSTICE: Complaints are becoming more numerous against the practice of the Taxation Department inflicting interest penalties of 6 per cent, on taxation arrears, especially where taxpayers are unable to meet the present crippling demands. The Department says it is really very lenient in this matter, because it could make the penalty up to 10 per cent, if it so desired. But, of course, the real point is not the rate percent; it is the principle of Departments or persons other than Courts or Judges assuming the functions of our judicial system. If any infringement of the present taxation laws is alleged, it should be decided by a property constituted Court, and not by the Taxation Department; it is a question of power being wrongly invested. This is just another step along the road to internal Hitlerism, which should be retraced immediately.

SOVIET SOLDIERS: Following the link-up between Russian and Allied forces, information obtained from Russian officers, as reported in the "Age" of May 1, is interesting. For example: "Russian soldiers as individuals have no private views to offer, but have infinite faith in the decisions of the State." And this: "So deeply ingrained has that faith become that there is apparently no questioning by officers or men expressing disagreement with any Soviet decisions." All the Russian soldiers interviewed expressed a very deep-seated hatred towards German soldiers—who when interviewed, also said that they had "no private views to offer, but infinite faith in the decisions of the State." This significant similarity, indicating the mental complex engendered under totalitarian dictatorships, contrasts with the very opposite outlook as yet existing in the democracies. There was no criticism of the Soviet Government for having permitted Germany to train troops in Russia, nor against the "British" and other bankers who financed Nazi equipment for this and other Hitlerite purposes.

—O. B. H.

AN EXEMPLARY LETTER

Protest Against Compulsory Signing of Occupation Survey Card to Get Ration Book

Mr. George Lawson, M.H.R., Canberra.

Dear Sir,—I am very perturbed in relation to the proposals about to be put into practice, requiring people to supply certain information on an OCCUPATION SURVEY CARD issued under National Security (General) regulations, as an essential condition before a RATION CARD will be issued.

This action is an attempt to regiment the people of Australia in a manner similar to that practised in Germany in the establishment of Nazism. It contains in itself the essence of Totalitarianism. The very attempt to apply it to the Australian people can only be regarded as bureaucratic insolence, and is an indication showing the contempt in which we are held by the bureaucrat, from whom these proposals obviously emanate.

Control is manifestly the predominating policy, and to use FOOD as a medium of that control can only be described as diabolical. It contains a veiled threat, to STARVE into subjugation those who will not submit.

Hostilities in Europe have ceased, and this is a time when regimentation should surely be slackening, and not increasing. To perpetrate this crime behind the backs of our boys who are still giving their lives—and at a time when we are overcoming the enemy, which can be seen—is the essence of TREACHERY.

Finally, I request, that as my Representative, you will take immediate action to have this Occupation Survey Card withdrawn, and that you will resist, to your utmost, any further attempt to regiment the people.

—Yours faithfully, E. D. MADGWICK, 25 Enoggera Terrace, Red Hill, Qld., 10/5/45.

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England Price 9d Postage 1d (6/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price. 9d. Postage 1d (6/- per dozen, post free.)

THE LANG LABOR PARTY

The following resolution was carried at the Easter conference of the Australian Labour Party led by J. T. Lang:

"That conference endorses the principle of interest and debt-free credit for governmental purposes."

in the East End of London, of non-British descent and never having made or grown anything but figures, he, of course, knows all about the land!"

It is certain that, unless the farmers realise their danger and the real cause of it, they will be kept in "a state of humble and unconditional submission" for all time.

(To be continued.)

VIII. "AVAILABLE TO ALL."

If you want to organise the medical profession under a Central Authority, there are dozens of ways of doing it. If you want to liquidate Mr. Smith, you can appoint Mr. Brown to boil him in oil, or Mr. Jones to hang him, or Mr. Popimoff to shoot him. Your methods may differ, your administrative personnel may differ, but your policy remains the same.

The Ministry of Health can appoint a Central Medical Board ("from the profession itself"), or the B.M.A. can create a Corporate Body, or the L.C.C. no doubt would be prepared to run the profession.

Everybody is encouraged to air their views on administration and personnel—the more views the better, because they keep the profession divided on every issue except that change is "inevitable." In the long run, the scheme to go through would be the one with the biggest sanctions behind it, and that scheme would be intended to totalitarianise the profession, in the interests of those controlling those sanctions.

The Medical Policy Association [London] has frequently been urged to put forward an "alternative" plan. Nothing would suit the planners better, except the total cessation of the Association's activities. A specific plan will never attract more than a handful of supporters unless it is supported by the "official" Press and other organs of centralised propaganda, though that Press can soon tear to pieces any plan that threatens its controllers.

But tearing policy to pieces is another matter; that attracts attention to just the aspect of affairs which must be kept beyond controversy (the "inevitable" aspect) if totalitarianism is to succeed.

So the only thing left, then, is to try to discredit personnel—as by encouraging a suitable type of Member of Parliament to call individuals "medical rats." Men can be found for any purpose.

The first prerequisite of any "plan" is a clear and agreed policy, and it is hoped that the preceding pages have made clear the nature of the possible opposed policies. The second prerequisite of a plan is control of whatever sanctions are necessary in the particular circumstances to put it into effect. The most powerful sanctions reside originally, and ultimately, in individuals as such; and general agreement on a clear policy is itself a powerful sanction. If all doctors were to agree on policy, as distinct from method, that in itself would ensure that the B.M.A. Executive would act in accordance with that policy; and the Executive would then be the proper body either to produce the required method ("plan"), or to employ a suitable expert to devise the method. But planning is a simple matter, and much less important than either policy or sanctions. The struggle in the world is a struggle between opposed policies—freedom against servitude—and opposed sanctions—individual initiative against centralised power.

The true problem of the medical profession (as with other threatened groups in the community) lies in the sphere of policy. Policy, in turn, derives from philosophy, because what you choose to do depends on what you believe in.

Now the whole tradition of Great Britain has its roots in the belief in the liberty and rights of the individual; it is a philosophy of individuality (not individualism, which has an aggressive connotation)—a belief that the individual exists in his own right, that association should be free association, freedom guaranteed by the right to contract-out; that each man has the inalienable right to pursue his own individual self-development, so far as he does not do so at the expense of others. It is to prevent such trespass that the Common Law is framed. But Regulation Law is a very different matter; that is framed to force the individual into conformity with a pattern.

The political system, which is derived from this philosophy, which expresses belief through action, is the system we discussed as true democracy. And because democracy is a way of living more than a system, it is difficult to define it within a form of words. We approached its concept through a consideration rather of what it is not, as the negation of totalitarianism, which is much more easily defined. It is evident that democracy is not synonymous with any such limited method as, for example, a method of voting.

Voting, either for personnel or for methods, may as easily defeat as implement democracy.

On the other hand, some method of voting for results (and several methods are possible) is essential for its implementation. You can, for example, vote for certain results by voting for individuals standing for those results, provided that you retain the sanctions necessary to ensure that they adhere to the policy for which you voted, and so long as the results are practicable. Again, you may separate personnel from policy, and elect men simply as experts in methods, and subsequently instruct them as to what results you require. In that case you must ensure that you have the necessary mechanism for conveying to your Executive the specification of the results you require from them, as well as the sanctions to ensure that they adhere to your instructions. The important sanction here is the right and the determination to dismiss them if they fail to produce the result you require within a reasonable time. And always you must exercise the sanction of understanding; so that you are not given a result you don't want under a name you don't recognise.

But perhaps the most perfect mechanism of democracy is money, because a unit of money may quite properly be regarded as a vote for a result. The money system is in fact, an order system—but everything

depends on whose orders it implements.

The possession of money both enables the traveller to choose where he will go, and acts as an order to the railway company for the necessary service. And so long as the company obeys these demands—that is, so long as it depends on the travellers for the money it requires—transport schedules reflect the aggregate of the wishes of the travellers. The variations in public demand will be reflected in a changed distribution of transport facilities. This relation between money and the democratic implementation of the wishes of individuals is quite general, and a thorough appreciation of it is of great assistance to the understanding of democracy. It should be noted that there is no implication of a majority being used to deprive a minority of its rights. If twice as many people want to go to Brighton as to Bournemouth, that only means that twice as much transport is required for one destination as the other.

All these general considerations bear on the solution of the problem of the medical profession. Now, just as medical practice is based on a two-party contract, so the problem has two sides, and the democratic solution two aspects—the patient's and the doctor's.

On the patient's side it must surely be clear now that the real problem is one of availability, and that "organisation"—i.e., re-organisation, or revolution—is only one possible solution, if it is a solution at all.

With organisation the public can have nothing to do. Organisation is a matter of method, and it is really quite ridiculous to submit a White Paper on such a subject to the public, except as a warning. To doctors, it is simply one plan by which they may lose their freedom as individuals; the B.M.A. [in England] has another. The real "public" demand is simply the aggregate of individual demands for individually satisfactory results in respect of particular personal health problems. Those demands have to be met by individual doctors on a unique basis, and any medical "service" will be the aggregate of all the personal services, and the satisfaction it yields will be the aggregate of individual satisfactions. But to go to the doctor requires money, sometimes much more than the individual possesses. If he has the money he can get what he wants, if that is medically possible. Rich men don't die for the lack of an "organised" medical service! Anyone who can pay his expenses can choose the results he wants, under conditions of free choice, privacy, and confidence. So that availability is primarily a matter of making suitable financial arrangements.

It is in any case proposed to establish a central fund to meet medical expenses, because although the "service" is to be "free," nobody even pretends that it hasn't to be paid for. Now, the "primary interest" of patients is that this fund should be applied in such a way that they retain control over their own policy, whereas the "primary interest" of the Ministry of Social Security lies in "careful certification," and in those other aspects of "positive" health which we examined in Chapter III. Whoever controls the spending of the funds will control the policy of the organisation, and it is quite as practicable to make such arrangements as will enable the individual patient to remain in control of his own policy as to concentrate still more power over doctors and patients in the hands of Ministers.

The democratic solution is to decentralise money power. And just as there is more than one method of centralising power, so there are many methods of decentralising it.

Medical care naturally falls into four types—personal attention within the framework of the doctor-patient relationship, hospital services, technical services, such as laboratory facilities, and Public Health, which is a community function and properly falls to the care of the Ministry of Health.

The democratic solution of the medical problem from the patient's side involves a method of putting him in possession of the necessary "general tickets" to make his individual demands on medical services. If the patient is to control the doctor, it is essential that he should pay him direct. There is a very simple way of doing this—by subsidising private medical fees from the general fund, just as certain food prices are now being subsidised. The patient, and not the Central Authority, should have the power to spend the money, and then he will get what he wants instead of what the Central Authority thinks he ought to have. The fund can be safeguarded from unreasonable demands by requiring patients to pay some proportion of the fees incurred if they are in receipt of an income, up to some maximum in any one year.

Thus, for example, they might pay 50 percent, of the first fee, and 25 percent, of subsequent fees, until they had spent, say, £2 in a given year—an arrangement that would increase the purchasing power of their own money eight times; any additional expenses would be met completely from the fund.

Hospitals, just as doctors, are to be judged by the satisfaction of those to whom they render their services. There is no need to centralise control over them under a Central Authority. Their problem too, is financial, and the fact that there are in-

sufficient of them. In any case, it is proposed to build more; let these be built, but control over them be vested in local managements on the same principle as the Voluntary Hospitals. Judged by satisfaction, the London Voluntary Hospitals win every time over the centrally controlled public hospitals. A hospital, like an individual, develops a personality, a prestige, and a tradition, if it is allowed to develop freely in accordance with the demands made on it, instead of being centrally controlled on the principle of uniformity. There is not much personality about a Post Office. There is hardly a more shocking passage in the White Paper than the one, which looks forward to the seizure of the proud Voluntary Hospitals so soon as their financial resources become inadequate, which the proposals of the White Paper would render inevitable sooner or later.

The principle of subsidy is applicable to the problem of hospital costs, and should be combined with such local control as will lead to the development of pride in tradition and service.

Technical facilities are the one thing that might well be provided free by the Ministry of Health, because they are quite impersonal. The Ministry might see that laboratory and other facilities are well distributed geographically, giving their services efficiently as required by doctors in the interests of their patients.

The funds on which "plans" depend are, of course, to be raised by taxation in its various forms, and thus the proposal is simply for the spreading of the present cost of medical care. It is, perhaps, worth noting that since the war has demonstrated that money can be provided for war at least thirty times the rate at which it is available in peace-time, and since only a fraction of that increase comes from taxation or genuine subscriptions by the public to loans, there is no reason why the central fund should not be augmented by money from the same source as provides the additional money for war, with a corresponding diminution of taxation. But that would be an attack on the issuers of that money, as distinct from merely preventing the greater concentration of their power.

The practical step for patients to take at this juncture, however, is to insist that their Parliamentary representatives make it clear to their Parliamentary Executive that arrangements for making medical facilities fully available to everyone shall be such that control of medical policy shall be in the hands of the individual patients who want the services. Any other sort of "public control" is a pure fiction to cover transfer of control to an authority whose interest is in tight control of certification and the imposition of "positive" health.

If the Ministry of Social Security wants certificates, let it pay for them at the usual rate.

The first necessity is that the people should have a clear comprehension of what they really want: which may be summarised as availability, privacy, and the direct responsibility of doctor to patient. And the second necessity is that they should refuse to be forced to choose the method of getting what they don't want. It is the responsibility of Members of Parliament to convey the wishes of the people to their Executive, and the responsibility of the Executive to see that they are implemented. The third necessity is that they should be conscious of their real policy and of their sanctions, including their right to dismiss Representatives if these fail. The politically unconscious majority can always be dominated by the politically conscious minority.

From the doctor's side, the solution involves first and foremost controlling their own Executive. They have the sanctions to do it, if they will but exercise them—understanding, and the right to contract-out. That Executive should be the agent, not of the planners and totalitarians, but of those who support it. The power of the Executive is derived from the members, and should be exercised in accordance with their wishes, just as the Executives in America, Australia, and New Zealand have fought, successfully, the profession's fight.

The proper function of doctors, as we saw in Chapter IV, is to be at the service of individuals, responsible to individuals, and free within the Common Law—not slaves to Regulations framed to "fit" the citizen for employment and to control certification.

If all patients were placed in a position to demand all the medical attention they want, the natural organisation of the profession would grow and evolve with all the richness, variety, and delicacy of organic growth, the adaptation of structure to function, evolution in response to all the varied and unpredictable demands made on it by individuals choosing freely. Supported by sufficient hospitals and adequate technical facilities, it is certain that the profession would rise to its opportunities; and, by its determination to be free and responsible and true to its tradition, become an example of that real democracy which should be the destiny of this country of the Free.

(The End.)

(Editor's Note: The foregoing is reprinted from an outstanding booklet published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., Liverpool, England, now re-published in Australia and available from our office at 1/- per copy, plus 1d if posted.)

COMMUNISM & BUREAUCRACY VERSUS TRADES UNION DEMOCRACY

By J. T. LANG in the Sydney "CENTURY," May 4

Appearing before the Coal Inquiry Board this week, the Communist President, H. Wells, asked for the right to get rid of what he described as "the troublemakers and whisperers" in the industry. He wanted the right of the union to discipline its own members. The Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Justice Davidson, appeared to be attracted by the idea, and thought that something might be done about giving the organisation the right to discipline members for a certain period. All of that fits into the Communist blueprint for control of trade unions by a Communist bureaucracy. It all depends on who is responsible for the discipline. In some unions the Communists call it collective bargaining. In others they call it enforcement of trade union discipline.

What they really mean is that the old system of arbitration, and the normal law machine of the country is discarded, and in its place, courts are set up under the control of Communist officials.

Members of the rank and file are tried by the Communist bureaucracy. The cardinal sin, of course, is opposition to Communist orders.

If a working unionist actively opposed the Communists, then he is attempting to disrupt the union, and is expelled. That means that he receives a life term of banishment from the industry.

That is the new code by which the Communists are out to control the Trade Unions. They intend to purge the Unions of every element of opposition.

Unless a member subscribes to the Communist policy, and obeys the directions of the Communist bureaucracy, then he must be purged.

Through control of the trade unions, the Communist bureaucrats hope to be able to seek control of the machinery of Government, and also complete control of industry.

These Communist courts have already been established on the waterfront. Men with a lifetime experience of loyal membership in the Labour movement find themselves arraigned before Communist judges. In some cases they are not even told of the nature of their alleged offences, and are provided with no opportunity of defence.

The Mort's Dock dispute has demonstrated to what lengths the Communist bureaucrats will go in their attempt to evade the Democratic process of rank and file decision.

Whenever the Communists are challenged they always fall back on the lame excuse that the accused has the right of appeal to his trade union officials. That means he has the right of appeal from a Communist official to the central control of Communist officials. There is always a National Council, or some other equally remote body, ready to sit in judgment on them.

The Australian way, of course, is that every member should have the right to appeal to his equals. The Democratic way is for the rank and file of trade Unions to reach their own decisions.

In the old days of trade unions, the officials carried out the orders of the rank and file. When they disobeyed instructions they were fired.

Today, the rank and file are under the domination of the officials. That is the meaning of the present system of Communist Trade Union Bureaucracy.

It can only be challenged by the rank and file.

In the past, the Communists have clung to power because they were always able to muster sufficient stooges to pack skeleton meetings. They have never had to face mass meetings representing the majority of the members.

That state of affairs is altering rapidly. The Australian instinct for fair play, and democracy, are bringing together a true rank and file movement. That movement finds expression in the demands that the bureaucracy should carry out the wishes of the majority.

The days of minority dictatorships are rapidly coming to an end.

The next step must be insistence that the mass membership should be consulted on all major questions of trade union policy.

There must be machinery for secret ballots on all vital questions of union policy.

Those ballots must be carried out under the directions of completely trustworthy returning officers.

Those who pay the union dues must have the right to say what the union intends to do.

MARSHAL TITO'S BANQUET

The orgy provided by Marshal Tito at a party to meet the Commander of the Mediterranean Air Force, General Eaker, makes sour reading in view of the prospect of protracted rationing to assist countries in the war zone. Marshal Tito's banquet consisted, it is reported, of chicken, turkey, sucking pig, a boar's head, ten different kinds of salads, confections like silver and gold, fresh fruit, and cakes with thick, real cream—100 dishes, and as much as the guests wanted! There are thousands starving in Yugoslavia, and many more permanently incapacitated through years of malnutrition, but Tito at his feast was "happy as a schoolboy!"

—"Democracy," N.Z., 18/4/45.

THE POLISH PROBLEM AND "UNITY"

The Polish problem confronting the San Francisco delegates is one fraught with danger, and one, which might easily develop into the ha'porth of tar, lack of which will sink the ship of "permanent world stability." As usual, in cases of this nature, the entire affair has been passed over with only the briefest of references by the daily papers. The dominating motive appears to be the maintaining of "Unity"; a unity, which appears, in the main, to be restricted to the preservation of the Big Four's unanimity.

The principle of unity, like regulations for directing traffic, is good only so long as the majority (at least) benefits by its observance without penalising the minority. Once let it go beyond that point and it rapidly degenerates into tyranny. And a tyranny imposed by a majority on a minority is all the more terrible by reason of its alleged inevitability as one of the so-called weaknesses of democracy.

In order to preserve the unity of the Third Reich, Hitler crushed opposition both within and, later, beyond the borders of Germany. In order to achieve unity in Europe, the fury of the blitzkrieg was loosed upon those recalcitrant nations, which could not see the uplifting qualities of unity with the Reich.

Unity is not sufficient reason for overriding the rights of others.

It would be a sorry thing, after surviving six years of one of the greatest upheavals known to history, in order (inter alia) to preserve the sovereignty of Poland, if we were to allow this nation to come under the domination of the Red Empire which has sprung up across its borders. It would be a betrayal, not only of the Polish people, but also of the people of England, who have endured so much, ostensibly to protect the rights of these people, and others like them.

For the leaders of a nation's struggle for freedom to be carried away by force of arms, from their own country by an alien invader, is a direct affront to that nation's sovereignty, and the pretext which has been offered in defence of this action cannot be regarded as anything else but frivolous. Bearing in mind the reasons advanced by Hitler in defence of his occupation of surrounding countries, and the extremely suspicious nature of the many convenient purges and sabotage trials held in the Soviet, this reason cannot but be regarded as suspect in the highest degree. To attempt to explain away as a coincidence the fact that these men (who were, we are officially informed, favourably considered by both England and America as possible representatives of the Polish people) were arrested and removed to Soviet territory almost immediately following the refusal of these two powers to recognise the "Polish" Lublin Committee, so strongly supported by Stalin, is taxing our credulity too far.

Nor can the statements accredited to Stalin—not, let it be noted, to the Polish people—that the arrested Poles cannot be regarded [by him] as democratic representatives of the Polish people, and that the Poles have undergone deep changes and are inspired by new trends today, be looked at in any different manner from his earlier explanations. There was certainly no evidence of the Polish people undergoing these sudden changes or being influ-

enced by any such new trends prior to the over-running of their country by the Red Army!

The employment of these tactics by the Soviet in the occupation of smaller nations grouped along its borders in the developing of its new Empire is becoming increasingly frequent, and with always the same result—incorporation within the Soviet Union.

It is because stratagems such as these have been all too frequently employed in the past that most people hope to see them relegated to the past, and not adopted as the mode of conduct of larger nations in the future. In the solution to the Polish question lies the key to the conducting of affairs between nations in post-war years.

Acceptance by the Anglo-American allies of the case presented to them by Stalin, backed as it is by the implied threat that he is prepared to back his words with action—in effect, the Red Army is already in possession and can only be removed by a display of superior force on the part of the Western Allies—means the implicit understanding by the members of the Big Four that the world is regarded as being divided into spheres of influence, defined by power politics. So long as no major issue endangers the fabric of any particular bloc arises the Big Four's future is clear. Once such a major issue does arise, it can and will be settled by recourse to force of arms.

The alternative is one, which apparently has not been very fully considered by either side. The real solution lies not in the hands of either the Russians or the Anglo-American allies, but—if it is allowed to—in the hands of the Poles themselves. They, and they alone, can determine who shall represent the Polish nation, and in what manner. Only when they are free from all alien influence can the people of this sorely tried country effectively exert their will towards the end of democratically appointing representatives to speak for them. The solution must be one based on principles of reason and common sense, and not on the imperialistic aspirations of a larger neighbour.

We have seen another example of the presentation of wrong alternatives; of the incorrect statement of the facts of the case. Properly, it is not whether Mr. Eden, Mr. Stettinius, or Mr. Stalin, is right or wrong in the cases they have presented. Basically they have no case, certainly no right to a case or even a hearing. They are intruding into a field into which they have no right to tread. The fate of the Polish people, individually and as a nation, should, and must, if we are to accept the sovereignty of small nations as having any real worth, lie in their own hands.

The rights of small nations can only be respected by acknowledging the fact that they have rights. —A. F.

FIRST-HAND REPORT ON THE SOVIET

(Continued from last issue.)

When Eric Johnston, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, was invited to visit Russia last year, his party included William L. White, one of the war's most realistic and entertaining reporters. Mr. White here recounts his observations of the way of life of the Soviet people and their masters:—

I spent an evening with the American reporters Almost all the foreign reporters now working in Moscow have come here since the war. The old crowd, of which Walter Duranty was dean, are gone. Perhaps they were glad to go; after all, the Russian friends they had made over 20 years were either shot or exiled, many for the crime of associating with foreigners, so that the few who were left were afraid to see their foreign friends except officially and at large functions.

This afternoon our host, Commissar Mikoyan, gives a big luncheon at which he welcomes us officially to the Soviet Union. Next to me at the table is a fox-faced Russian who fills my vodka glass and then his own.

"Come, Mr. White, we drink to the second front. There will perhaps some day be one?" (This was shortly before the invasion of Normandy.)

"There has already been a second front," I answered. "The first one when Poland fell. You remember that. The second front was in 1940 when France fell. Surely that is not forgotten in Russia, even though you were then neutral. The third front was the invasion of Yugoslavia and Greece. In that case, too, you were neutral, but you remember it. The next front was when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in 1941. We were very sorry to learn it. For us that was the fourth front. The fifth front was when Japan attacked America and England. Here again you are neutral. The sixth front was when England and America landed in North Africa to chase the Germans and Italians out. The seventh front was when we landed in Italy-----"

He interrupts; now he is laughing. "But, anyway, drink to the new front—for you the eighth, to me the second front."

Now comes the usual preliminary course of butter, caviar and pastry, during which we are supposed to nibble, also the cold

smoked and jellied meats. Then the meal, course by course, wine by wine. A soup with sherry. Sturgeon with a sauterne from the Crimea. After it, broiled grouse with a chilled white hock from the Caucasus.

The meal pauses for grilled filet mignon and then comes the climax of all Russian State banquets: cold, shaved, boiled sucking pigs—four of them, each on its platter. With the pig we are given a rich purplish burgundy from the Ukraine.

WE INSPECT AN IMPORTANT FACTORY.

A day or so later we are shown our first Soviet factory. It is in Moscow's industrial suburbs, and it makes the famous Stormovik plane for the Red Air Force. Approaching it we see enormous sign boards at the entrance, on which are the most recent production figures, the names of workers who have over fulfilled their quota (here the word is "norm"), and big pictures of Lenin and Stalin. We later discover that these are standard in all Soviet factories.

The director, Vasili Smornov, who in America might correspond to the president of the company, is a man of 37. He tells us that he has worked in aviation 24 years—eight years as director. His office has the same standard luxury and comfort as that of a comparable American concern.

Eric immediately plunges into a series of questions on labour, wages and hours, from which the following picture emerges. It proves to be true of most Soviet war factories. Sixty-five percent, of the employees are women. Hours are the regular eight-hour day, plus three daily hours of overtime, for which workers are paid time and a half, as in most American factories. But they work six days a week, which makes a working week of 66 hours. Boys and girls under 18, however, work only eight hours a day, five days a week.

For a predetermined quota, or "norm," of work, the worker receives 750 roubles per month. Then, if he over fulfils this norm (and they usually do) his pay goes up on a sliding scale, so the true average would be 1000 roubles a month. Since the

rouble has a purchasing power, in terms of rationed Soviet goods, of about eight cents in America, the Soviet war worker gets in terms of American purchasing power, between 20 dollars and 40 dollars for his 66-hour week.

However, other factors brighten the picture. The worker may buy his meals in the factory's restaurant; if he chooses to eat all three there it costs him only five roubles a day. The factory also maintains nurseries and kindergartens.

Eric turns to the director. What does he get, if he doesn't mind telling us? He replies that he receives a basic salary of 3000 roubles a month (in rationed purchasing power, about 240 dollars), except that if the plant wins a production banner (this one, like most Soviet war plants, has) he gets 150 per cent, more, up to a maximum of 10,000 roubles a month (about 800 dollars). However, he tells us with a wry smile, he has no time to spend all this money.

Eric now asks about workers' grievances. Well, says the director, they take them up with the trade-union committee for their department of the plant. The director himself hears complaints twice a week. If they don't like his decision, they have the right of appeal. To whom? Even clear up to Stalin? Even to Stalin.

Now we start trudging through the factory. It is poorly lit and unbelievably dirty. It has no production line in the American sense, but rather a series of connected piles between bottlenecks, with women waiting idle at their machines for the line to start moving again.

It is jammed full of the best American machine tools; but seems to lack proper organisation. At one point, the assembly belt is a makeshift canvas affair. The floors throughout are uneven because of holes in the concrete. Piles of metal shavings are everywhere. No one bothers to clean up. Many of the girls wear gunnysacks tied around their feet. Others have crude wooden sandals with an iron nail sticking up between the great and second toes. The girls are moving (by wheelbarrow) a load of unfinished parts, which spill when the barrow encounters a bump in the floor. The girls must stop to pick them up.

Johnston whispers, "Back in the States the best rough test I know of the efficiency of a factory is its cleanliness. A dirty shop is sure to be an inefficient one."

Maybe these people figure there are 200 million Russians and that it matters little if a few are inconvenienced. But this floor could be repaired at the cost of just one of the expensive lend-lease automatic drills of which this factory has such a profusion, and then its efficiency might rise as much as 25 per cent. A hard-boiled American production man, trying to squeeze the utmost from his workers, would start by making them comfortable with good light and tidy floors, in order to increase the man-hour production rate.

The front of the Stormovik fighter-bomber has a sheath of thick armour, which covers both pilot and motor. This must cut down its cruising range and make it cumbersome. I'm amazed that the heavy structural parts of the plane are made not of aluminium but of steel. It is explained that the wings were, formerly made of wood, but that now a certain amount of aluminium is used.

—"Reader's Digest," January. (Condensed from the book, "Report on the Russians.") (To be continued.)

FURTHER RETREAT FROM DEMOCRACY

An interesting news item the local "news" papers omitted to print was published in the Adelaide "Advertiser" some time ago, dealing with a British Labour Party Conference:—

... the Labour Party conference, by a large majority yesterday, carried a resolution asking the Executive to make it clear that the Party's programme at the next election would include the transfer to public ownership of land, large-scale building, heavy industry and all forms of banking, transport, fuel and power.

"The conference also passed a resolution declaring the continuation of Government control, especially in regard to finance, raw materials, prices, and the safeguarding of labour conditions was essential in the post-war period.

"The closing session of the conference unanimously adopted an Executive resolution urging State powers to acquire as rapidly as possible all agricultural land, and laying down a basis of compensation for the owners.

"Another resolution urging the provision for the settlement of ex-servicemen into agriculture on a large scale was heavily defeated."

* * * * *

And so the attack on the struggle by the people for independence goes on without pause. At every turn the small man is confronted by obstacles, or sees new barriers raised, between him and the freedom from government regulation and control that he desires; between him and his desire to be his own master and to control his own destiny.

Knowing how closely the Australian Labor Party follows in the steps of its brother planners overseas, the only point left in doubt after having read this choice item of news, is when we can expect to see this latest form of blitzkrieg practised on the Australian farmer.

Despite the windy assurances by Government spokesmen promising relaxation of the innumerable forms of controls that have been inflicted upon us, one cannot help noticing how the length of time this process is going to take has gradually grown longer and longer as the end of the war

"NEW TIMES" ANNUAL MEETING

At the annual meeting of shareholders in New Times Ltd., held on April 27, a matter of interest was the policy of Social Creditors. The strategic action required to bring freedom and security to every individual met with enthusiastic discussion. Mr. Paice, chairman, observed that some monetary reformers might allow themselves to be sidetracked by proposals in the Government's Banking Bill. The opposing forces saw in the Bill means, which would make the way easy towards a system of State control in which everything—except the individual—would be "free." He had actually read in a journal purporting to expound the Social Credit policy in another State, that the function of Parliament was to determine policy; whereas such function belongs to the electors.

It was encouraging, said Mr. Paice, to read in "The Social Crediter," official journal of the Social Credit Secretariat (Major C. H. Douglas, chairman), that the "New Times" was pursuing a sound and effective policy.

Appreciative remarks were made by various speakers, and suggestions were made for the enlistment of the help of readers towards expansion of circulation of the "New Times." It was agreed that readers should be urged to send to the "New Times" Office the addresses of persons who might like to read copies of the paper of past dates. Members of the fighting services and editors of country papers might also be listed. The editor (Mr. Allsop) said that copies of past issues would be posted to groups or individuals if supporters would kindly forward their lists of addresses to the office, c/o Box 1226, Melbourne. Such co-operation would be heartily appreciated; as such assistance would undoubtedly help in promoting a wider understanding of our great message.

A shareholder proposed that, in future, fees should be paid to the Directors for their services. This proposal was unanimously declined by the Directors, who declared their preference for an honorary basis.

PART OF THE BIG IDEA

From the "Social Crediter" (Eng.), 27/1/45:—

It is becoming increasingly clear that British coal is not far from the centre of the Great Racket. It is rumoured that Trades Union officials are advising miners to go slow to reinforce the policy of "nationalisation," and that when the mines are nationalised, they will be paid almost anything they ask.

Behind all this is the Ministry of Fuel and Power, which is merely concerned to centralise light, heat, and power, and the by-products of fuel combustion—where the chemicals come from. There is absolutely nothing in the situation to guard the native population of these islands against finding themselves in the position of tenants-at-will, who can be expropriated by a bureaucracy composed of "refugees from Hitler's tyranny." We do not say it will happen just yet. But it could happen. You don't think so? Then consider Eastern Poland And why was the Coal Report unavailable to Parliament until "the Americans" agreed?

"BROTHERHOOD WEEK"

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—Although the good intentions of many people who have been lending their names and voices to Brotherhood Week cannot be doubted, our returning men and women will be puzzled by it. They will find that many opportunities denied to them for the past six years have gone to alien, and in some cases, enemy "brothers."

Do the same principles of Brotherhood Week also apply in Palestine, where the prominent Zionist, Jabotinsky, asks for a merciless suppression of the Arab population, and where land held by Jews must never, under any circumstances, be "alienated" to non-Jews?

Further, are the discriminatory clauses in Jewish wills, disinheriting him or her who would marry a Gentile, conducive to Brotherhood?

Yours, etc., "EX-SERVICEMAN," St. Kilda

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road, Hartwell for the New Times Ltd. Melbourne.