

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. 22. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 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.

Growing Menace of Centralised Government

Mass Production off Legislation

(A Broadcast by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, May 27.)

During this last week the Federal Parliament has been debating the Bill for preference for returned soldiers. After the Bill had been discussed for some time the Government introduced thirty-four amendments to the Bill.

According to the Hobart "Mercury," Mr. Fadden said that two months had been available for drafting amendments, yet they had not been circulated until Mr. Dedman rose to close the debate. Mr. Chifley said: "The amendments have been delayed by congestion in the printing office."

Mr. Chifley also asked the Members, on Tuesday, to be prepared to sit late the next two nights, and asked the private members not to take up the time allotted to them on Thursday.

Not so long ago the Prime Minister asked that, owing to the congestion of business in the House, debates should be limited to the Leaders of the Parties.

I mention these things because I think it is important that what goes on at Canberra should be known and discussed, and that an attempt should be made to find out if there is any connection between the bad laws being turned out and the methods used to turn them out.

It seems to me wrong that a Government should suddenly spring 34 amendments to an important Bill on the House with the intention of giving it no time to read them, let alone consider them. I don't consider a Government has any right at all to consider any important Bill until it is printed and circulated amongst those people who are interested. This idea of shoving an important Bill through Parliament, asking private Members not to speak, then clamping on the gag, and then turning in the yes-men of the party to register the majority vote—this kind of thing has got to stop. And, unless the people of this country pull the Government up with a jerk, they are going to find themselves and their families working for the rest of their lives for a vast army of occupation—an army of incompetent and interfering bureaucrats.

We have got to break down this idea that Parliament is a mass-production factory for turning out laws and regulations for which the people have never asked, and which they very much resent.

Either Members of Parliament represent their electors, or they don't. If they don't, they are taking money under false pretences, and the people should have power to deal with such men, and should be able to recall them and dismiss them.

Mr. Chifley, the Labour Treasurer, the man responsible for enforcing on this country the highest taxation in the world, stands up in public and says he is not going to reduce the present high taxation. I wonder who gave him permission to say that? Certainly not the people of this country. Is it not time, therefore, that our public servants should realise that they are servants and not the masters of the people? Have we not fought a bloody and expensive war for this very principle—to prevent public servants using their high office to impose their will on millions of people?

The principle involved is this: Has a Government, because it has gone through the legal formality of obtaining a majority of votes, got the right to do anything it pleases? And if it has that right, who gave it to it? And if the people gave the Government that right—which I don't believe—why cannot the people give themselves the right to protect themselves against snap votes and against Government officials?

The people have the political power to bring Parliament to a sense of its duties; they can exercise that power by mobilising public opinion. You can help by writing to your Member and telling him what you intend to do, and by using your vote intelligently at election time. We have most of the machinery for democratic control over Parliament, but that control has functioned very poorly in the past, mainly because the political parties have captured the voting power of the people, and handed it over to a small group of men. There is a good deal of evidence to show that the electors are beginning to see the farce, or rather the tragedy, of party politics, and are rebelling against it.

It is quite obvious that a Parliament cannot handle intelligently the vast flood of Bills passing through the Federal House, and not only the Members, but the Ministers themselves, don't seem to have time to read them. But we, the poor taxpayers,

have got to foot the bill and suffer for the rest of our lives. The fact that electors cannot get any relief, no matter which party is in power, shows that the Bills are drafted by a permanent organisation, which doesn't take the slightest notice of Parliament, nor the people.

But the fact that neither the Ministers nor Parliament have sufficient time to do their job properly does not deter them from seeking more and more jobs. In spite of the fact that the Premiers of the States protested against the Federal Government putting up duplicate offices in all towns to run its Social Services, the Federal Government still goes ahead and does a job already done by the States, thus adding still further to its work and producing another bureaucratic and administrative bottle-neck. This State has its own Social Service offices for the administration of unemployment relief, etc.; the Municipal Councils and the police help in this work. But the Federal Government wants to do everything itself, and so is going to set up another set of offices and appoint more bureaucrats run from Canberra. No wonder Mr. Chifley can't reduce our taxes. It is obvious he doesn't want to. It is up to the electors to see that he does want to.

The National Parliament at Canberra has got a big job to do, but it can't do it because it has no time; it is doing a thousand and one jobs, which it should leave severely alone and which can be better done by other organisations. The Federal Government's job is to co-ordinate the work of the States, to look after foreign policy, the Army and the Navy, and to watch that the money system runs smoothly. The Federal Government has failed in all these

jobs because it hasn't time to do them properly; it is being too busy minding other people's business.

The Centralised Government in Canberra, if it is going to give its time and brains to things of national importance, must have its hands free of everything that can be done by anybody else. That should be clear enough to anyone. The fact, too, that the Federal Government has superior and over-riding powers over finance enables it to see that the money made available to the States is used in the proper manner.

The States are the proper instruments for running the various social services; they have all the organisation in being now. The fact that the Federal Government is going to install its own organisation in spite of the protests of all the State Governments shows that it intends not only to control everything, but to run the lot with its own yes-men.

In other words, we are seeing installed in this country the over-centralised, over-staffed and incompetent political bureaucracy, which has brought so much tragedy to the dictator countries of Europe.

We must take up this challenge before it is too late, and every candidate who stands for Parliament will have to sign on the dotted line, and state clearly whether or no he intends to reduce the bureaucrats in number to the pre-war level, and, reduce taxation at least 50 per cent.

In this way you help to break the Party machine, to re-establish democratic control over Parliament, and to obtain the opportunity to lead your own life and spend your own wages. This is the best advice we can offer you; nobody can do the job for you—you must decide for yourself.

GENEROUS GENERAL: An insight into the curious mentality of Russian leaders, and the low value they place on human life, even the lives of their own men, is obtained from an item in the Melbourne "Sun" of May 31. It appears that some U.S. soldiers were accidentally shot by Soviet troops. The Russian General concerned was deeply grieved, and promptly offered to have thirty of his own men shot as compensation! The report also contains the following observations: Compared with British and American soldiery "individual Russians do not seem to have the same level of intelligence or discipline, and have no feeling for motorised vehicles, whilst they have a total disregard for human life, their own or their enemy's." In these circumstances it becomes easier to understand how Soviet Generals were able to throw in millions of Russians to be annihilated by the Germans.

HOUSING HOLD-UP: The prolonged determination of Labor leaders to prevent sufficient houses being built is likely to wreck them at the next elections. Labor Members who won doubtful seats in 1943 are said to be especially alarmed, because they are being deluged with letters from electors: which is a very healthy sign because it shows that electors know where to lay the blame for the regulations and restrictions that prevent the houses from being built. Mr. Chifley is said to be devoting much time to the problem, but this can only be lip service to appease the alarmed Members and the indignant public. If he is really sincere, all he and his colleagues need to do is to remove the unnecessary restrictions (financial and otherwise) and release sufficient suitable manpower and materials. If houses are not forthcoming then—well, that lets the Labor Party out. That's a simple test that anyone should be prepared to make.

PROPAGANDA PICTURES: Admissions by the Department of "Information" regarding a faked photograph featuring "an Australian soldier" well equipped with American gear to counteract the charges of inadequate equipment in forward areas, led to the punishing of those who actually did the faking; but so far the "higher-ups" have escaped, and there is no indication that the practice of faking pictures will cease. In a recent letter to the editor of the Melbourne "Herald," an angry citizen declared, "my boy and the rest of his unit 'up North' were ranged-up to be photographed—eating ice cream, a treat not previously enjoyed in the jungle! The photo was taken by an official war photographer, apparently for the Victory Loan." The propaganda Planners have featured many other pictures of the troops in such situations as to convey certain false impressions. These incidents indicate a low level of intellectual honesty (if any).

FRISCO FIASCO: The "Catholic Worker" for April, commenting on the San Francisco Conference, said that "the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta agreements have not helped the cause of peace," and pointed out that "at Yalta, Britain and U.S.A. agreed to the dismemberment of Poland, while at Dumbarton Oaks it was agreed that if one of the Big Three were guilty of aggression it could veto any action of the Security Council." The article concluded thus: "The little criminals will be firmly dealt with, while the big ones will be above the law." It is

encouraging to note that some other journals now realise that the real objective of the World Planners is to impose a new overriding form of tyranny on unsuspecting peoples.

COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY: A London "Times" correspondent was quoted in the local daily press of May 23 as saying: "Developments in the Balkans point to the existence of a carefully conceived plot to establish a Communist regime, or a similar one, in every country in the Peninsula." The procedure was described thus: "Firstly, to secure such key positions as the Minister of Justice and the Interior, with control of the police and the gendarmerie. Secondly, to exterminate political opponents and break up kindred Parties which might become rivals." This line of action is that which followed the Russian revolution, after which official executive positions were taken over by revolutionary Jews. Will this occur again?

MEAT MYSTERY: You may not easily believe it, but 1250 tons of meat was recently shipped to South Africa, and the Commonwealth Food Control has said so, according to the Melbourne "Herald" of May 25. It is said that despite the desperate shortage in Britain, these shipments were ordered to South Africa by the British Ministry of Food; if that is so, the British people are not likely to be amused. It is also reported that an unnamed South African commentator remarked: "But it (Continued on page 3.)"

Significant Political Pointers

Further bad news for the centralisers comes to hand from North Queensland. No doubt impressed by the proposal of West Queenslanders to form a new State, Councils in North Queensland are now advocating that North Queensland also should become a new State.

A strong antipathy to Government from Brisbane, 1000 miles from the North, has always been evident among North Queenslanders.

Any move for decentralisation of Government in Australia should be given active support by social crediters.

Having experienced centralised government, people naturally tend to resist it, because of the harsh effects. The totalitarians cannot attack Reality forever and be successful. Reality is our best ally in the fight to save our civilisation.

* * * * *
"Approval of the 'Full Employment' clause by the U.N.C.I.O. Economic and Social Co-operation Committee marks one of the Australian Delegation's biggest conference successes, the Australian Minister for External Affairs (Dr. Evatt) said today." — Australian Associated Press, May 19.
Any "success" achieved by Dr. Evatt can

be regarded with the utmost suspicion. This demand for "full employment," in the twentieth century, is merely a demand for a perpetuation of wage-slavery. The main point to bear in mind is: "Why should Dr. Evatt be stressing at an International Conference a matter which should be one for Australians to decide for themselves? The economic arrangements in Australia are vitally connected with our sovereignty. Dr. Evatt is advocating interference with that sovereignty. If Australians decide that employment of only 25 per cent. of our employable citizens is sufficient to provide an abundance of goods for the entire population, and that monetary arrangements shall be made for the distribution of the abundance to everyone, what concern is that of the Russians, South Americans, or anyone else? Dr. Evatt should be asked to tell us as soon as possible.

* * * * *
Mr. C. A. Macartney, a former British Vice-Consul in Vienna, and later a member of the Intelligence Department of the League of Nations Union, writes in his book, "Problems of the Danube Basin," as follows:—

"Once they had gained a sure foothold, Jewish influence and wealth grew apace, and by the opening years of the twentieth century the Jews were easily the most influential and the richest people of the Habsburg Monarchy. They controlled practically all its finance, in all its regions; most of its important commerce, again in all regions; most of its industry, outside German Austria; and the vast majority of all its free professions, except the Church . . . On paper, the Jews were not large landowners, but they rented many estates, usually subleasing them to the actual

(Continued on page 2)

The Housing Front

A woman, aged 72, and her daughter, aged 52, were recently found sleeping in a lane at St. Kilda amongst their household belongings, having been dumped out of the house they rented because it was wanted by the owner, and having nowhere better than the lane to go to. The mother has an old age and a military pension, a son having been killed in this war. The next Federal election is only 16 months off, and the Labor Government is concerned about its prospects in the light of the housing shortage. It will no doubt appoint another committee, there being no shortage of accommodation for committees.

—Sydney "Bulletin," 20/5/45.

High Taxes for Social Services Opposed

"Post-war social services would not be supported by the people if it meant maintaining present taxation levels, according to a recent Australian Gallup Poll.

"Asked for an opinion if the Government's plan for improved social services after the war meant keeping taxes about the present level, the result was:—

Opposed.....	53 per cent.
In favour.....	36 per cent.
Undecided.....	11 per cent.

"Among men and women interviewed only 1 in 3 was in favour of the proposition, and there were opposition majorities in all occupational groups."

—Melbourne "Sun," June 1.

At the annual general meeting of the Paint Manufacturers and Allied Trades Association Ltd., held in London on March 21, the President (Mr. R. F. B. Gaudin) delivered an outstanding speech, which was not merely of vital interest to the section of English manufacturers to whom it was addressed, but might well receive the most earnest consideration of democrats of all occupations in all British countries. The following is the substance of Mr. Gaudin's address:—

It was said by Clausewitz "war is the pursuit of policy by other means." We would be very foolish, therefore, to suppose that the winning of the war, while saving us from direct German domination, will be a victory for our policy, which may perhaps be epitomised as "the sabbath for man" as opposed to "man for the sabbath." The war will still go on, but fought with other tools. For example, I view with grave suspicion the Bretton Woods and San Francisco Conferences. Will the former, in effect, saddle us with a Gold Standard, and will the one at San Francisco set up a World Police Force to bomb and blast those who revolt under its rule?

It is the purpose of this address to try and lift the curtain and piece some of the evidence together so as to warn you, if you need warning, of the ultimate results of this policy, not only on our future as independent manufacturers, but on each one of us as a private individual, and to suggest what can be done about it.

If the purpose of industry is to produce and deliver goods and services—of which leisure is by no means the least—up to the sum of the requirements of individuals, accompanied by improving technique and decreasing trouble, it follows that members of industry can facilitate this aim by co-operating through a trade association such as ours. It is, in fact, our job to get results.

If we look back to the period before the war, we shall recollect the existence of the well-known paradox of "poverty in the midst of plenty." In our own industry the shabbiness of buildings such as railway stations, houses and factories, for example, was particularly irritating when there was neither shortage of labour, plant nor materials to make the paint to protect and smarten, them up. The "paint more save more" campaign increased sales by diverting purchasing power to buy paint instead of, let us suppose, new curtains. So if we got business the curtain manufacturers went short. Clearly industry, as exemplified by this homely illustration, was not delivering the goods.

Nevertheless, I want to emphasise that this non-delivery was not the fault of our productive organisation. It was neither the inefficiency of private enterprise nor the profit motive that caused the breakdown—though the "Leftists" are at pains to tell us otherwise—but a question of buying power.

No manufacturer, who was worth his salt, would, in pre-war days, fail to deliver the goods if you paid him his price. The cause of the failure lies elsewhere, and the remedy is neither rationalisation (i.e., concentration) nor nationalisation. The main cause is an artificially produced state of affairs where money—that ticket to live—is kept in an unrelated supply in regard to prices, and the consequent scramble for these tickets within the ambit of our present financial system is inevitable. Further, by a process too long to relate here it will lead to wars at more frequently recurring intervals.

Unfortunately, owing to propaganda emanating from a small but immensely powerful minority generally hidden in anonymity, the majority believe that our money system is operated by natural and immutable laws, and "the world slump," "the fall in prices," etc., are due to "inexorable" laws, as if they were the outcome of little understood natural phenomena. It does not seem to occur to anyone that it is the result of deliberate action by the "man for the sabbath" school—those seekers after absolute world power culminating in a totalitarian world State. But some of that majority, like members of this association, who instinctively keep "their eye on the ball" rebel against the consequences of the working of these rules, although they may fail to see what has hit them. Their possible lack of knowledge prevents them from taking the first step to resolve the dilemma.

The growth of Socialism is the inevitable outcome of finance capitalism in its present form, so it is not surprising to find that the controllers of it, e.g., financiers, are "Left" in sympathy, though for motives poles apart from those of the well moaning but misguided socialist who has sympathy for the underdog.

Socialism in its German form of National Socialism is (according to General Dittmar, the German commentator), merely militarism carried into daily life. We should be fools to think that British National Socialism would be a bed of roses. Are members of this association going to be willing partners to a future of this sort? You can see, surely, that our independence would be lost and the small manufacturer liquidated. If I sense your feeling rightly, you would, each one of you, answer "only over my dead body," as our forthright vice-chairman so frequently puts it.

Attempts to concentrate power have gone on apace and not altogether unsuccessfully during the war. I see, for example, that 17,794 retail licences have been cancelled between April 17 last year and January 15 this year. As far as I am aware no chain stores have been closed down!

The planners said quite definitely that war would be their opportunity. Thus P.E.P.'s Journal, "Planning" (October 4,

1938, just after Munich), said: "We have started from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning."

Planning means the encouragement of monopoly, ultimately State Monopoly or Socialism. In the case of paint, the concentration scheme would have eliminated many small firms. Later, I think it not unlikely that the remaining firms would have been further concentrated in a conveniently organised post-war slump under the term of "rationalisation" (as in the cotton and ship-building industries). Then the attempt to set up a trade association which was to be legally THE (only) Association, with trade union status, which every paint manufacturer would virtually be compelled to join would have resulted in a further concentration of power. I am almost certain that the ultimate aim was, and probably is, a very few large paint manufacturers associated through an employers' trade union. How easy for Socialist Government to nationalise such an organisation and make the trade union the administrative head on behalf of the State! I don't think this by any means a far-fetched picture. The complete enthronement of bureaucracy brought about by such means would make this country a hell—that kind of hell described by Maurice Hindus in his book, "Russia Fights On"—resulting from "the stupidities and brutalities of the bureaucracy—the chief curse of the Soviets." Do we want to emulate this? If not, let us be warned by the words of the late Ronald Cartland, that gallant young M.P. who, with so very many others, died fighting for our freedom in 1940. He said:—

"Whatever you do to make a superb economic State, if you are going to do this at the loss of human personality, then you destroy civilisation, the very thing you want to preserve."

In my opinion the concepts of the Utopians, the would be makers of "the superb economic State" of this kind are primitive. It is not that they lack any desire to make a better world, far from it, but it must always be a world where we, the people, who have to live in it must do what they think best for us. They would force us by any means at their command to comply, believing that the means justifies the end, but they forget that vital condition, the preservation of human personality, which expresses itself in every action of free men.

We must do something about it. So with your permission I will attempt to make a few constructive suggestions leading, I hope, to action by this association.

We are a young and vigorous trade association, and although only one of some 2500 in this country, we have been pioneers from the first. This association moreover, has power to consider, discuss and deal with any rules or regulations imposed

"OUT WITH BUREAUCRATS" CAMPAIGN URGED BY TRADE JOURNAL

The Anti-Bureaucracy Campaign is growing—as witness the following extracts from the editorial in the May 25 issue of "The Australasian Confectioner," official organ of the confectioners' associations in Victoria and New South Wales:—

Business people are assured of the community's positive agreement with them on the necessity for stamping out bureaucratic government, wiping off the Coplands and their kind with all their "plans" for the regimentation of everything, and reducing taxation to less than it was before the war. So they should now be bending their energies to a nation-wide campaign with such objectives.

They cannot afford to stand aside, as usual, and let the political flood pass them by. They must get into . . . organisations, the object of which is to save Australia from the Nazi-ism which (under various fair-sounding names, such as the ingenious "public ownership") is being fastened upon the nation by self-seeking demagogues, tin-pot politicians miraculously wafted into Ministerial power, and ponderous academicians intent upon transforming the people into a race of "Kordies." The fierce resentment of any criticism, the desperate attempts to suborn or suppress newspapers, the audacious misuse of a public facility (the Postal Department) in an effort to force Ministerial "blah" down the necks of country people in the guise of "news"—these alone are proof enough of the reality of this menace.

It is not a question of Party politics, so the businessman need not be afraid of throwing his weight into the fight. It does not matter which Party label is worn; the important, the essential, thing is that the majority of men elected to the next Parliament must be pledged to root out this Nazi canker . . . and slash taxation to the bone.

Let not the resolve of the business community to bring this about be weakened by the flood of mushy propaganda, which may be expected to pour out from Canberra in the coming months.

Let the businessman be warned in advance against having his suspicions lulled and his activity deferred by the specious

by any other body which frustrate or hamper the achievement of our aims.

It is the present financial policy which is making Socialism, and through it a more ruthless method of government than by finance alone. The two together would complete our slavery for years to come.

Nevertheless, the control of money yields the more subtle power, and Meyer Rothschild spoke nothing less than the truth when he declared in 1790, "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws."

To use a "Bevinism," we must insist on an "unwinding" action; we must by democratic means insist on a reversal of financial policy which will by its beneficent results dissolve the socialism which threatens to wreck our civilisation. We, the people, must decide on the policy—not the hidden oligarchy.

As a first step we must press for financial provisions to be made so that reasonably organised firms producing the kind of goods people want can sell their products. It is not within our province to say how this can be done—that is for the experts who have been provided with a full specification. Nevertheless, in case we are met with a "non possumus" attitude, it would not be out of place to remark that the technique which has been used to control the prices of foodstuffs might be used with advantage to lower the prices of many more products of industry than at the present time. To put it another way, as a first step Industry—guided by this association—should press the Government for the introduction of the "compensated price" of all those articles which are bought and used by individuals from day to day, and without any increase in taxation. This would enable Industry to meet the multiple requirements of the people of this country and eliminate all danger of inflation. Further, such a policy would obviously stimulate employment, not as an end in itself, but as a result of the increased demand. It would also mean a steady reduction of prices, which would enhance the value of the pound and our ability to buy from overseas.

Another condition, I would add, is that all this must be implemented so as to give us freedom to manage our own businesses in the way we think best, free from regimentation and unnecessary Government interference.

To ensure this I would demand a very large decrease in the bureaucracy. It would pay us to pay them so that they could live without hardship provided they stood down, at the very earliest moment, and pursued some hobby, minding their own business instead of being compelled to throw spanners into ours; for you must never forget that even they are victims of the system.

Such a policy would give us freedom with security, not security at the price of freedom as with the Beveridge and like schemes.

Unless we can eventually attain the economic democracy, which this policy would foster, then the outlook for the small manufacturer will be grave indeed. Monopoly in the form of State Socialism is the definite outcome of present financial policy and the only remedy consists in reversing that policy and demanding in its place one that would give us real economic democracy. The choice is in your hands.

plea that unless he gives blind adherence to Curtinism, Coplandism, Calwellism, Wardism, Dedmanism and all their works he will be stabbing in the backs his fellow Australians fighting the Japs or lying in Jap prison camps.

The Canberra propaganda mills are particularly good at this sort of thing. They can prove, if you care to follow them, that the slightest breath of criticism directed against the Vice-Deputy Controller of Mangel Wurzels or the Sub-Commissioner for Dog Soap is an act of foul treason to Australia which will send waves of public rejoicing throughout Japan.

Expect much more of such nauseous rubbish, now that the European war is over, than before. Entrenched bureaucracy realises that it has now still less excuse for existence, and it will fight all the harder. Expect to find new restrictions and rules being issued by Officialdom frantically seeking ways and means of justifying its retention. There are plenty of examples of this already. Questionnaires, returns, controls, inspections, conferences, panels, and a hundred other time and money-wasting devices are being trumped up for no real purpose other than to make a lot of job-scared Departmental dead-heads appear to be busy.

Let the business community, through organisations established for that purpose, show the public and Parliament that these miserable frauds on the people are seen through and their motives understood. Let business people also "emit an offensive noise through the pursed lips" when sobs rack the body of Mr. Curtin and pious tears drop on to his boots as he contemplates the naughtiness of the people who are helping the Japs by whistling at their work and failing to worship, in sepulchral gloom, his Divinely-inspired Government and all its bureaucrats and their pups!

The best way Australia can help to exterminate the Japs is to get rid of the mass of dead wood in the Government service,

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

leasing them to the actual cultivators, and they held mortgages on who shall say how many more." They "exercised an immense influence on all political life through their control of the press, which was in large part both owned and written by the Jews."

The late and unlamented Adolf Hitler and his advisers were responsible for "the most influential and the richest people of the Habsburg Monarchy" being "persecuted to" all parts of the British Empire, where they are undoubtedly attempting to repeat their Central European performances. It would be extremely interesting to see a complete list of Jewish refugees who have arrived in this country since 1938, where they came from and what position they held in the countries from which they came.

Recent items of news indicate that powerful moves are being made to restore to Jews their dominating position in Central Europe—the Soviet Government will see to this—while any criticism of Jews by nationals such as Australians is to be termed "anti-Semitism," and made illegal if possible.

Major Douglas has said that the solving of the "Jewish Question" is going to be one of the big issues of the twentieth century. Australians should watch the position carefully. Dr. Evatt, who was given special attention by the Russian delegation at San Francisco, may try to introduce more Rule by Law if his Jewish admirers find public criticism becoming too intense.

Hitler made war on Poland because the Poles refused demands for access through to the Russian frontier—in order to safeguard Germany's "security"!—and the handing over of Danzig.

In fighting to preserve her sovereignty, Poland was overwhelmed by Germany, while Russia moved in for the finish. (While everyone is busy applauding M. Molotov, how many remember his laudatory remarks about Germany when the Russo-German Pact was signed?)

During the period when Poland was partitioned between Germany and Russia, upwards of a million Poles were uprooted from their homes by the Russians and sent to the slave camps of Siberia and elsewhere.

No accounts of these atrocities were published in the capitalist daily press, which appears to be determined to prove that Germany is the only totalitarian country in which atrocities have occurred.

The English "Nineteenth Century," in dealing with the Russian treatment of the Poles, said that the facts were known to the "British" daily press, but that one of the most shocking conspiracies of silence in the history of British journalism was being perpetrated. The groveling attitude towards Russia reached such a state that even the "Nineteenth Century's" statement already published in England, was not allowed to be published in Australia.

After all their tribulations, the Poles find that the sovereignty they went to war to defend has been destroyed—by Russia! And SHE says that SHE must have portion of Poland in order to safeguard HER "security"!

What do our "capitalist" papers say about all this? They laud Russia's "realism," a recent editorial in the Melbourne "Argus" even supporting Russia's attack on Finland, while correspondents in Russia such as Alaric Jacob—note the name!—declare that the Soviet-controlled Lublin gang is doing an excellent job! Special articles in all Australian dailies tell us what a wonderful chap "Tito" is—neglecting, of course, to deal with the atrocities of his Communist gangs. The Serbian patriot, Mihailovich, who was resisting the Germans when the Communists everywhere were actively sabotaging the war effort, is to be "tried" and shot. What a "trial" it will be, when the sentence has already been announced! But mob-rule is being extolled by our "capitalist" journals. Even the strongest advocates of a suitable sentence for Mussolini must have been nauseated by the shocking bestialities of a berserk mob. All in the name of justice, too! If there were any justice, those responsible for the death of Mussolini's mistress, who has been charged with no crimes, should be tried for murder. Then there was the delightful example of "justice" given in one of Sydney's papers: the rape of a German girl by a Russian prisoner. Revenge, perhaps; but justice, never.

Australians are being treated to a surfeit of lies, suppression of facts, groveling to one set of totalitarians while denouncing another set, and the featuring of news designed to break down civilised standards and introduce mob-rule.

We democratic Australians must make it clear that our liberties and our national sovereignty are precious to us, and that we are not going to tolerate totalitarianism in this country, irrespective of the "realism" being extolled by the Melbourne "Argus" and other papers. It is becoming more evident every day that the war set in motion by Hitler in 1939 was designed to create conditions suitable for the destruction of Anglo-Saxon culture. Our biggest fight is still ahead.

—E. D. B.

abandon the mawkishness and hypocrisy that have come to pass for government, throw off every single regulation and restriction which is not absolutely necessary (in the exact meaning of the term) for the whacking of the Japs, and get down to the job of DOING something to clean up the ghastly mess that bureaucracy has made in Australia's primary, secondary and distributive industries.

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

"Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

By ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

The following brief description of the activities of Jewish financiers in regard to both China and Japan—we must not overlook the fact that the "Protocols" also mention China—is based principally on the biography of Jacob Schiff, whom we have already mentioned, written by Dr. Cyrus Adler in collaboration with Mortimer Schiff, and published in 1929:—

Taking Japan first, we find that he was "attracted by the new spirit of Japan." Why? Because it was essentially docile, uncritical and malleable. Mr. Schiff said: "The impression I have formed of the people is that they are possessed of great intelligence, industry and modesty. The Government appears to be perfectly organised, to be proceeding conscientiously in all departments, and not to be greatly influenced by public opinion."

Under the heading of "Schiff," the following appears in the "Jewish Encyclopedia":—

"Kuhn, Loeb and Co. subscribed for and floated the large war loans in 1904 and 1905, in recognition of which the Mikado conferred on Schiff the Second Order of the Treasure of Japan."

The answer to the question of why Mr. Schiff should engage in the rather risky business of lending to a distant Government was supplied by his Excellency, Korekivo Takahashi, at that time vice-president of the Bank of Japan, Financial Commissioner of the Japanese Government to London and New York, and later president of the Yokohama Specie Bank. He said:

"Mr. Schiff's move to throw in his lot with Japan was taken before her first decisive victory (at the battle of the Yatu). Schiff had a grudge against Russia because of his race. He was justly indignant at the unfair treatment of the Jewish population (in Russia) . . . and for this it was deemed fit to admonish the ruling class of Russia by an object lesson. Mr. Schiff saw in the war a welcome opportunity to give effect to his cherished idea, and he decided to exercise whatever influence he had for playing the might of American resources on the side of Japan. Schiff continued to be unfailing in meeting the needs of the Japanese Government in respect of the sinews of war."

Schiff and Ernest Cassel (pay particular attention to the name of Cassel; we will have more to say about him later) floated the first two Imperial Japanese Government War Loans of 10 and 12 million pounds respectively, but a new feature arose during the flotation of the third loan. To quote Takahashi, ". . . the opening of a channel for receiving subscriptions in Germany . . . the means of distributing our bonds in Germany, was arranged through the connection of Mr. Schiff with Messrs. M. M. Warburg, of Hamburg, who acted as agents of the issuing banks."

At the time of the fourth loan, the Japanese statesmen found the British participants rather hesitant, but Schiff "definitely assented to the view of the Japanese Government. He thought it desirable that the German interests should be included. . . the German group consisted of the Deutsch-Asiatische Bank, with whom eleven leading banks were connected, and Messrs. M. M. Warburg, of Hamburg. The Russian Government must have been influenced by the announcement."

Commenting on this financing (note: principally by sterling, not dollar, loans) C. H. Douglas writes as follows in "The Big Idea": "It should be realised that the effect of his (Schiff's) initiative on this occasion was to set the British to work (it was a Sterling Loan) to build up the Japanese Navy . . . The object is clearly stated—an American, or German . . . Jew, he 'deemed fit' to put the British to war against 'the ruling class of Russia' as 'an object lesson. . . 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 . . ."

Then there was the tragic Washington Conference of 1920, an event that should be remembered by all Australians, when the German-Jews of New York worked feverishly to destroy the Anglo-Japanese naval agreement, an agreement that was honoured by both sides during the last war, when the Japanese Navy effectively looked after British interests in the Pacific. In spite of the fact that British naval leaders deplored the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Naval Agreement, which, apart from insulting the Japanese and destroying a growing pro-British feeling in Japan, left Britain in a weak position in the Pacific in the event of another war. Just to make certain that the Japanese militarists were given plenty of excuses to take Japan to war, International Finance was responsible for a world tariff embargo against Japanese trade—except, significantly enough, war materials!—which the militarists replied to by saying they would have to fight for markets. Isn't it remarkable how we are never told anything about the Washington Agreement? And what a strange thing that Japan took the plunge shortly after it was publicly announced in America by a prominent Jewish financier, that Japanese credits were to be "frozen." American citizens must remember these incidents when they examine the underlying causes of the war in the Pacific. They then won't feel as "touchy" as they did when a British Minister in U.S.A. during 1944 caused a storm when he tactfully spoke of Japan being "provoked" into going to war!

Since the Japanese went to war the American people have been asking some hard questions concerning the financing of

colossal amounts of war material, oil, rubber, steel, etc., for years before Pearl Harbour.

And, as a result of the Pacific war, China is being "developed" by huge loans from Jewish financiers in America, working in close collaboration with their agents, the Soong family, which was educated in America and believes in most Jewish ideas.

As early as 1892, Jacob Schiff was in communication with the Americans in China concerning the possibilities of loans to the Chinese Government. At the time of the Sino-Japanese war one of the leading American diplomats, John W. Forster, approached Kuhn, Loeb and Co. for a Chinese Government loan of £1,000,000, while the following year Schiff had succeeded in interesting Sir Ernest Cassel in Chinese railway financing. However, the financiers found China a very different proposition to Japan. In 1900 the Boxer Rebellion broke out, and was the first of anti-foreign demonstrations. Schiff wrote to Max Warburg, financial adviser to the German Government during the Great War, and said: "I am sorry that China is giving you so much trouble. Goodness knows, there is enough space

and there are enough people in the Chinese Empire to require different kinds of financing for years to come."

In February, 1901, Schiff also wrote to the American General Wilson in China: "To obtain the large loan China will have to raise in order to enable her to pay the indemnity which is to be demanded from her by the Powers, an entirely new system of taxation will have to be created . . . and the revenue from this must be made sufficient for the Government's internal needs . . . as well as for its enlarged indebtedness."

To create such a revenue will take time, and its management will probably have to be placed under the control of a mixed commission of representatives of the Powers. In such an arrangement our Government can, and should, take a leading part."

In 1913 the first international consortium was set up, an event which led directly to the downfall of the Manchu dynasty and the entrance of China into the World War, AT THE INVITATION OF "U.S.A."

After the war the old "spheres of influence" were abolished by international agreement. The agreement constituting the new consortium was signed on October 15, 1920. The result of this agreement meant that in actual fact China has become a preserve for American-Jewish High Finance. Kuhn, Loeb and Co. used Japan to "modernise" China. The introduction of Communism, via Moscow, took place, while the establishment of one of International Jewish Finance's famous chain of worldwide Central Banks was established. There is little doubt that China, with her teeming millions and largely unexploited resources, is ideal for the Jewish-inspired planners to build up into a powerful force in world affairs. The last has not been heard of China.

(To be continued.)

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA?

(Continued from last issue.)

Beverley Nichols' new book, "Verdict on India," is the result of a recently completed tour by one of England's most provocative journalists. It presents conclusions in striking contrast to some current views on the fateful problem of Indian independence. The following extracts are interesting:—

BELOW THE BOTTOM RUNG

"A man of about 50. Waiting for me in a wicker chair on the verandah of his house. Bulky, dynamic. Very charming manners, but nervous, inclined to fiddle with his shoelaces. Seemed to be on his guard, as though ready to parry taunts from all directions."

So runs an extract from my diary. The man is Dr. Ambedkar, labour member in the Government of India, and one of the best brains in India. Then why this nervousness, this suggestion that he would be ready to take offence?

Because Dr. Ambedkar (M.A. London, high honours at Columbia University, special distinction at Heidelberg) is in the eyes of orthodox caste Hindus, "untouchable." A person to bring pollution if his Mayfair dinner jacket should happen to brush against their dhotis.

A large number of people in England and America seem to imagine that untouchability is on the wane. They have read with approval Gandhi's denunciations of it, they have seen photographs of him with his arm round the shoulders of the outcasts. "Surely," they say to themselves, "such a powerful example, in these enlightened days, must be having some effect?" It is not.

Admittedly, one or two dramatic gestures have been made in the past few years. Certain temples, for example, have been thrown open to the untouchables. But what happens? As soon as the untouchables flock in, the orthodox flock out. The temple becomes an "untouchable" temple, it is tainted, unholy, and as such it ceases to be an object of reverence even to the untouchables themselves.

The life of the untouchables is largely a matter of negatives. They may not use the public wells, which means that they are often condemned to drink impure water. Their children may not enter the schools; they must sit outside. They may not go near the bathing places. Hence they are usually filthy.

One evening I was talking with a British subaltern in charge of a training camp for young Indian engineers who was having trouble with recruiting.

"They come in fast enough," he said. "But I have to send 'em away again. Look over there."

We saw two fine-looking young Indians standing in the shadow of a eucalyptus tree, staring at the dust.

"Those chaps are two of the best who've ever come my way, physically and mentally. They want to join my lot; I want to have them; and I can't."

"Why on earth not?"

"Untouchable. Sweeper class."

"But that's preposterous!"

"Of course it is. But it's India. My men would just down tools if I took 'em on."

As for Gandhi being the untouchables' friend, let us listen to Dr. Ambedkar, who is their undisputed leader.

"Gandhi," he said to me, "is the greatest enemy the untouchables have ever had in India."

This will come as a violent shock to most people. Gandhi has ceaselessly proclaimed his detestation of untouchability. He has untouchables in his ashram, and has even adopted an untouchable child.

What most people, however, do not know, is that Gandhi has fiercely opposed any

attempt to give the untouchables an independent voice in Indian affairs.

"Give the untouchables separate electorates," he said "and you only perpetuate their status for all time."

It is a queer argument, and those who are not bemused by the Mahatma's charm consider it a phony one.

They suspect that Gandhi is a little afraid that 60 million untouchables may join up with the 92 million Muslims—as they nearly did—and challenge the dictatorship of the 180 million orthodox Hindus.

The future of the untouchables depends largely on the British. To leave their fate in the hands of a Congress dominated by the Brahmins, as we would have under the Cripps proposals, Ambedkar declared, "would deal a death blow to our interests."

Some people challenge Ambedkar's right to leadership. They would not do so if they had ever attended any of his meetings, such as the great rally at Nagpur, where 75,000 untouchables acclaimed him with a fervour that even Gandhi might have envied.

"The keynote of my policy," said Ambedkar, "is that we are NOT a sub-section of the Hindus, but a separate element in the national life. In every village there is a tiny minority of untouchables. I want to gather those minorities together and make them into majorities. This means a tremendous work of organisation—transferring populations, building new villages. But we can do it, if only we are allowed."

"We are as staunchly nationalist as any of the Congress. But we do not want the British to quit India till our rights are safeguarded. If they do, our fate will be more terrible than the fate of any of the oppressed peoples of Europe."

(To be continued.)

MR. MACKENZIE KING

From the "Social Creditor," April 21:—A man's worst foes are those of his own household, and it is perhaps fitting, and not unfortunate, that Mr. Mackenzie King's declaration that Canadian troops used in the Pacific theatre of war would fight with the United States Army and not with their British comrades should be made within a few months of what will undoubtedly be the end of his long reign.

We have never seen the slightest reason to alter the belief that this war—and, of course, we include its 1914-18 stage—has one primary objective, and one only—to destroy the culture which had its roots in these islands and the bonds of association which have grown from it. There are further objectives, but they are unattainable until this is achieved. Mr. King has, of course, only been a minor agent; but the enthusiasm of the C.C.F., the Communist Party ("Progressive Labour") and the Canadian "Chatham House" organisations for him would suggest that what he can do to break us up he has done. The end is not yet, however.

ACCIDENT OR DESIGN?

"Much of Europe is a heap of rubble, with a dispossessed mass of a hurt, despairing humanity aimlessly picking over the ruins. . . . So chaotic is continental Europe that it is uncertain whether any of the great political forces now in existence will succeed in controlling . . ."

—Review of World Affairs, March 28.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

comes from a country that has had to cut its own meat ration to help the Allies, and if we had not taken it, it would have gone to other countries which are experiencing shortages such as we never dreamed of. We have no moral right to it." The position is all the more mysterious because there is no meat rationing in South Africa. The published "explanations" of this incident are very unconvincing, and it seems that the Bureaucrats have been obliged to admit a transaction that is less savoury than the meat involved.

APING ADOLF: Before any claim under the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits (?) Act is approved; Manpower snooters will determine whether or not "suitable" work is available for the applicant! This is intended to be the main post-war function of Manpower bureaucrats (multiplied threefold!), seemingly for all time, and despite the electors' Referendum decision! The dangerous far-reaching powers conferred by this Act make the Man-power Molochs nearly as powerful as Adolf Hitler in his hey-day. They can order an applicant to work anywhere in Australia, at any sort of work they decree—"or else." They can also compel an applicant's relatives or friends to be pimps, under threat of heavy penalties. It is a wicked Act, which any decent Labor Member should be ashamed of. A successful "Demobilise the Bureaucrats" Campaign would make it impossible to carry out the Fascist clauses of the Act.

MORTGAGE METHODS: After seventeen months operation up to February 28, only 814 applications have been approved throughout Australia, and approximately the same number have been declined, by the Federal Government's Mortgage Bank. The interest rate charged works out at about 1% lower than the trading banks, or about £16 per year less for each of the borrowers (who are carefully selected good risks), provided they have immediate use for the full amount of the loan. But the catch about this Government undertaking is that borrowers pay the 4% rate on the full sum for the full period of twenty years. On the other hand, private bank interest, although a little higher, is only paid on the fluctuating daily balance; so that in the long run it would work out less than paying on the full sum for the full period.

Once again, the people have been "sold a pup" by political magmen pretending to confer a benefit. —O.B.H.

THE ORGANISATION FETISH

By HERBERT N. CASSON.

(Condensed from "Efficiency," March, 1945.)

The two greatest dangers to Business are Dictatorship and Bureaucracy. The one is power carried too far and the other is system carried too far.

We are fighting a five-years war to destroy Dictatorship, and we'll need a bloodless Revolution to escape from the control of Bureaucracy.

Both are found more or less in the business world, as well as in Politics and Government. Both tend to destroy freedom and self-help and efficiency.

No business firm should be organised like a regiment. Business is vastly different from war. Everyone in a firm should be given as much liberty as he needs, in order to be efficient.

My own opinion is that Organisation has been carried too far, all along the line. We have made a fetish of Organisation. Years ago, I was asked to prepare an "Organisation Chart" for a big manufacturing firm in the Midlands. It was a family firm, run by a competent man and his two competent sons.

I studied the firm and then reported that it did not need an "Organisation Chart." It was organised in family fashion.

Every worker had three or four bosses. The managers helped in the work and the workers helped in the management.

According to the rules of Organisation, this was all wrong, but it gave wonderfully good results. The firm was making £60,000 a year net.

There was a spirit of equality and freedom and comradeship in the firm. In a word, it was an ideal business, running with as little control as possible.

Every Government and every business system must be judged by the quality of people it produces, as well as by £ s. d.

When there is too much control, the people are dwarfed. They become less intelligent. They drop down to a lower level.

All supervision is costly. A large percentage of workers can be trained to be self-supervising. There is far too much superstructure in management.

Better take a loss several times a year than have a system of Accuracy that costs much more than the possible losses. Super-accuracy is never worth what it costs.

We are told that unless we are harnessed and controlled there would be "chaos." There might be in some countries, but not in Britain.

A "chaos" of useful activity is much better than the stagnation and bankruptcy that comes when control is carried too far.

There are big business firms that suffer from Dictatorship and a bureaucratic form of organisation. They are too centralised. There is more system than self-reliance.

QUEER IDEAS OF NATIONAL FINANCE

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

Sir, —Mr. Frank Fitzgerald is a Canberra correspondent for the Melbourne "Argus," and is apparently substituting for Mr. Crayton Burns during his absence in San Francisco. On 30/5/45 he commented on what was termed the "Growing Demand for Tax Relief," and gave some good material in support.

What he said in the latter regard is worth repeating here. He told us that the public pays in taxation no less than 6½d on a ten penny packet of cigarettes; 1/9 on a packet of tobacco priced at 2/10½d; 3d on a seven penny glass of beer; and 5d on a 1/6 seat at the pictures.

It was a timely reminder of these things, but he did not even mention the names of the barmy professors who "advised" the Government to impose upon us in that way.

The "Government" must take responsibility for the "advisers" it employs, but, as these professors get far more publicity than they actually merit, it is necessary for public attention to be focussed on the deplorable results of their bad advice. This is where Mr. Frank Fitzgerald and his fellow journalists fail lamentably. They shield the culprits.

There is no justification whatever for such high taxes on the "poor man's main form of enjoyment," and it is high time we joined together not only to secure the removal of the taxes, but also to have the present incompetent advisers replaced by competent men having the welfare of the community really at heart.

There are two statements in the "Argus" report, which call for more than passing notice. They are these:

1. "Mr. Chifley is regarded as a sound national financier. . . . He is not a financial juggler or wizard."

2. The Treasurer has to rely upon taxation and loans."

By whom is Mr. Chifley regarded as a "sound national financier"? Is he really a financier at all? What part does he play in the production and ownership of money? So far as I have been able to find out the most that can be truthfully said of him in that regard is that at present he is temporarily the chief COLLECTOR of money, and his methods differ from ours and those employed by most other collectors in that he is legally empowered to steal it from us, notwithstanding the very great difficulty some of us have had in collecting the little we have.

For whom, then, did Mr. Fitzgerald speak when he referred to the present Treasurer as a "sound" financier? If putting the people further and further into irredeemable debt is "sound," then that is properly applied to Mr. Chifley.

Whenever suggested that Mr. Chifley WAS a financial juggler or wizard, and what exactly did Mr. Fitzgerald mean by the terms? Was it not financial juggling that deprived us of money in the depression, but produced plenty for war? No one would suggest that Mr. Chifley ever indulged in that sort of thing; but then, of course, he is not a financier.

And in what way is wizardry connected with his job as Treasurer? The conditions under which the people struggle to live show very clearly that the Treasury is the last place to look for wizards. The wizards are to be found amongst the farmers, and other producers, the scientists, the doctors, the nurses, the wives, and the mothers, and if it were not for these our community life would have broken down long ago in the face of the obstacles and difficulties brought about by the policy of the Treasury.

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: —

Slowly I am beginning to understand this place and its people.

Suppose you had been born and had spent all your life in a moderately well run penitentiary, which kept you working hard, and provided a bunk to sleep in, three daily meals, and enough clothes to keep you warm.

Suppose the walls were covered with posters explaining that freedom and justice could be found only within its walls; that outside there were only disorder, strikes, uncertainty, unemployment, and exploitation of workers, while this place was being run only for your benefit.

Suppose it was explained that the wardens and the guards were there largely to protect you from the malevolent outside world.

Needless to say, if anyone tried to release you, or menaced you with a parole, you would fight like a tiger.

There is, however, one marked difference between inmates of the Soviet Union and of the Kansas State penitentiary at Lansing, where I have often visited an old friend. Food and clothing in both places are about the same, maybe a little better in Lansing. But should my Kansas friend decide that his penitentiary was not well run, and express the hope that there might be a change of wardens, he would run no danger of being shot if he were overheard by a stool-pigeon.

Public opinion in Russia is handled with the consummate skill of an artist on a great cathedral organ, whose hands run deftly over many keys.

For instance, the Russian people were

Have I not read previously where this same Mr. Fitzgerald has written about Democracy and in favour of the things for which the armed forces have been led to believe they are fighting? If I have, how does that sort of stuff line up with the statement he now makes that "the Treasurer has to rely upon taxation and loans"? When he speaks of the Treasurer he means, of course, the Government. If the Government has to depend upon the money it can COLLECT, regardless of the doings of those who PRODUCE it, why go on with the nonsense of calling it a SOVEREIGN BODY? Mr. Fitzgerald cannot have it both ways. If the Federal Parliament is really sovereign, it does NOT have to depend upon what it can collect, for it has the power to produce its own; but if it does have to depend upon what it can collect, then it must be at the mercy of the controllers of the stuff it has to scrounge for. That being so, Parliament must have surrendered its sovereignty to those controllers.

Without intending to do so, Mr. Fitzgerald has placed his hand on the main switch. Is it not amazing that he could so easily write as he did without appreciating the scandalous nature of the position he revealed? Who could have told him the yarn that the Commonwealth Treasurer HAS TO rely upon taxation and loans?

Even the Monetary and Banking Commission, consisting of men specially selected to whitewash the present financial system, were obliged to admit that the Commonwealth Bank could make money available to the Government without any charge at all. In the face of this FACT, who has placed the Treasurer of the Commonwealth in the position in which he HAS TO rely upon taxation and loans for the finance to conduct the public affairs of the people of Australia? I repeat the question—WHO has placed the Treasurer in that position? You, gentle reader, did not. I certainly did not. Who did?

And can Mr. Fitzgerald explain why it is that the great National Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, with specific powers over Australian finance, HAS TO depend on loans when the Provincial Parliament of Alberta, without specific powers over finance, has been able to conduct the affairs of the Province for ten years WITHOUT BORROWING MONEY and at the same time actually reducing taxation?

If he cannot explain that situation, then that is the subject calling for his immediate and honest attention. When he does understand how it is being done, and the implications of the treasonable campaign to prevent the Alberta Government from functioning on a debtless basis, his own self-respect will restrain him from repeating the queer ideas he put forward in the article referred to.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 3rd June 1943.

deliriously happy over the news of the Tehran conference. At last Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt had sat down together. Finally, Soviet Russia had powerful allies she could trust! No longer was she the outcast pariah nation of the world.

The bureaucracy was equally pleased, but not with this wave of internationalism and good feeling toward the Western World. As experts in the field of the management of public sentiment, they distrust any public emotion, which they do not instigate, or which threatens to get beyond their control. Suppose, for instance, that the Soviet Union might presently find good reason to change its attitude toward its current allies?

They therefore printed in "Pravda" a little story reputedly cabled by "Pravda's" special correspondent (although no such story passed the censors at Cairo) to the effect that the British were negotiating with high German officials in neutral territory for a separate peace.

Of course, the story was not broadcast in any of the numerous radio news programmes from Moscow to the outside world, because it was needed purely for domestic consumption.

The story caused an indignant explosion of denials in the Western World, some of which the Russian Government complacently printed in "Pravda," after pressure had been brought to bear. But the desired effect on Russian public opinion had been achieved.

Inter-Allied good will had been dampened down to the point where public opinion could easily be switched, should the need arise.

They did not then see such a need; nor, as I write this, do they see it now. But they again have freedom of action to move

either way with the complete backing of their people.

WHAT'S NEWS IN RUSSIA

Russian newspapers and newsreels carry only small amounts of news about the outside world, and never anything, which might arouse internal discontent with the Party's rule or the Soviet Union's standard of living.

Now and then, of course, there is a slight miscalculation. For instance, Soviet newsreels, which specialise in pictures of strikes or other disorders in the Western countries, showed the Detroit race riots, including a vivid close-up of a cop beating a Negro.

The effect on the Soviet audience, according to American correspondents who were there, was electric. Some Russians even stood up. "Look," they cried, "at that wonderful pair of shoes the Negro is wearing!"

Few American films are shown in Moscow, and those are picked with the greatest care. The American films best known are Chaplin's "Gold Rush" and "The Dictator," Sonja Henie's skating pictures, and Deanna Durbin's "One Hundred Men and a Girl" (after the Russian sub-titles were written in to bring out a heavy class-exploitation angle).

All nations tend to play up their own battle exploits and to neglect their allies, and America is in this respect a frequent offender. But certainly Red Army advances are decently covered by stories maps and pictures in American newspapers and newsreels.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, almost never shows picture's of foreign battlefronts in its popular theatres.

At the time of the Anglo-American landings in Normandy we rushed the first films to Moscow. They were dramatic pictures of the great fleet moving into position, of American and British boys being ripped by machine-gun fire on the beaches.

They were shown to the intelligentsia and to high Red Army officers, who might have a technical interest in how we handle landing operations, but were not released to the general public. Similarly, Russian newsreels have shown almost nothing of the Libyan desert campaign, the North African landings, the Tunisian, Sicilian and Italian campaigns, or of the war at sea in the Pacific and Atlantic. These campaigns have been dismissed with a few lines in "Pravda" or "Izvestia."

ONE-SIDED WAR NEWS

As a result, the average Russian firmly believes that his Government has until recently borne not most of the war burden, but ALL of it. And it is convenient for Soviet leaders that he should continue to believe this.

From time to time Stalin makes statements, which are both realistic and generous to his allies. Rather recently, he predicted that Soviet soil would soon be cleared of the invader and the armies could then proceed to follow the Fascist beast and crush him in his lair, adding that this would not be possible without the combined efforts of all the Allies.

This was, of course, printed in "Pravda," but the average Russian reader, over-burdened with personal war problems, saturated with news of the Red Army and completely ignorant of the extent of Anglo-American sea, air and land effort, dismissed it as the kind of perfunctory gesture which all statesmen occasionally make. —"Reader's Digest," January. (Condensed from the book, "Report on the Russians.") (To be continued.)

DEMOBILISE-THE BUREAUCRATS CAMPAIGN

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —I hasten to give my support to the suggestion of Mr. Paice, put forward in your last issue, that a campaign to reduce the number of bureaucrats be initiated at once.

Mr. Paice appears to pin, his faith to leaflets; but, in addition to this form of publicity, I would suggest that public meetings be held in the various electorates, for my experience has shown that Members of Parliament are very touchy about meetings being held in their own preserves.

Whether Mr. Paice suffers from modesty or not I do not know, but his suggestion that the bureaucrats be reduced to only pre-war figures would appear to indicate a weakness in this direction.

I would go further than this, and campaign for a reduction of at least 66% in the strength of the bureaucracy. In case it should be thought that this is an original idea, I hasten to disclose the source of my inspiration. In a description of the life of Salazar, Prime Minister of Portugal, I find that Salazar won his first election campaign on a plank of anti-bureaucracy. He promised that if elected he would reduce the number of bureaucrats by 66% the first year, and then by a further 66% in the following year. Needless to say, he "romped home."

Everybody by now has "had a stomach-ful" of the bureaucrats, and their bungling. Even the workers are beginning to wake up to their machinations, and it takes a long time for the worker to wake up, so the position can be considered bad.

Let's have the first meeting in the Assembly Hall as soon as possible, and deal the first blow in an Australia-wide campaign to rid this country of one of its greatest menaces.

—Yours, etc., V. JAMES, 150 Cashmere Street, Ascot Vale, Vic.

COLLECTIVISM

"Collectivism—the argument from the particular to the general. Brown has flat feet; Brown is a man; therefore all men have flat feet. Passed to you, please, for necessary action."

—"The Social Crediter."

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide:

"ALBERTA—NOW!" Our new publication by this name has so far received an excellent reception, upward of 2000 having gone out from our rooms. As complimentary copies have been sent to all Local Government bodies, all State Members of Parliament, and also to the S.A. Federal Representatives, each with a covering letter, we suggest that as many people as possible should contact their political representatives in the various spheres, drawing attention to "Alberta—Now!" and pointing out that the Government of Alberta has given a valuable lead to the rest of the democratic world, and that what has been done in that Province could very well be investigated and followed in Australia. If you would like any help or detailed advice, please do not hesitate to get into touch with us. Our prices for this most interesting booklet are 9d per copy, 5/6 per dozen, or 4/6 per dozen in five dozen lots, post free.

A TRIBUTE. We wish to pay tribute to Miss Jose, of Adelaide, an old age pensioner in her 84th year, for her remarkable spirit in still being one of the comparatively small army of democrats who are actively fighting to try to stem the advancing tide of totalitarianism. Miss Jose has twice recently visited our rooms to discuss current phases of the fight, and has insisted upon making us donations. If only a few more people forty to sixty years her junior would display the same spirit of rugged independence we would soon get out of the mess that we are in today. We take off our hats to Miss Jose.

BOOKS TO READ: We have available and can recommend the following: "Federal Union Exposed," by C. Barclay-Smith; price 1/-; "Power Politics and People's Pressure," by L. S. Bull; price 1/-; "The Land for the (Chosen) People's Racket," by C. H. Douglas; price 2/-. (All plus 1d postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

FREEDOM IN RETROSPECT

There is more talk of freedom and less of it in these days than is realised by the present generation. A discussion arose in Melbourne on nationality, naturalisation and similar subjects—it, was a polyglot collection of people. I said that I had travelled most of the world, lived in several countries and never come up against any State restrictions or any interference with my personal liberty except Customs examinations, which were usually perfunctory. "What!" said a Scottish-Canadian, "Do you mean to tell me that you didn't have to have a visa when you passed from one country to another?" "I didn't even have to have a passport," I said, "except when I wanted to enter Vladivostok." When I further asserted that I had never heard income tax mentioned in my parents' home, because, if it existed at all, it was so tiny as not to occasion my hard-working father any inconvenience; never met a person who was worried about the necessity to become naturalised so that he could get employment; never heard of compulsory vaccination, compulsory flag-saluting nor compulsory military service, and never heard the dulcet tones of a barmaid saying, "Time, please, gentlemen," they thought I was romancing. They were so accustomed to being bullied and ordered about and insulted by bureaucrats of all descriptions that they were as unaware of all this regimentation as they were of their digestion. Yet they firmly believed that their own was an age of freedom and that all previous ages were ages of tyranny and oppression.

—"Feng-Shui," in Sydney "Bulletin," 23/5/45.

PRIMARY-PRODUCER PROBLEMS

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —In answer to a widespread demand for reliable information on matters relating to Primary Industries, the N.S.W. Electoral Campaign, of 296 Pitt Street, Sydney, has brought into being a department to service that want. It will be known as the Department of Primary Industries. On request, the Department will supply solutions to problems both of practical farming and the political economy of practical farming.

The Chairman of the N.S.W. Electoral Campaign, Mr. John Macara, has invited me to conduct this department. In accepting this position I do so fully aware of the fact that upon the efficiency of this department may rest the future welfare of this country. I take comfort in the knowledge that associating with me in this work are men of integrity and ability, whose services will enable this department to meet all future commitments.

To fill any need that may exist of the department in Sydney I have asked Mr. R. Cornish to act as my assistant and City officer. He has indicated his acceptance, and as Assistant Director of Primary Industries, will carry out that function.

—Yours, etc., N. S. KELLIE-McCALLUM, Director of Primary Industries, N.S.W. Electoral Campaign, "Mailoor," Coorabell Creek, via Bangalow, N.S.W.

WANTED TO BUY

One to five acres within 15 miles radius of Melbourne. Water available, but other facilities unnecessary. Orchard soil preferred but not essential. Condition not important. Write to "A.F." c/o "New Times," Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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