

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).

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

"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.

Vol. 11. No. 25 MELBOURNE FRIDAY JUNE 29 1945

Confusion Helps the Enemies of Democracy

The Menace of Mass Mesmerism

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

Those of us who, for many years, have made an earnest study of social and political affairs have come to the conclusion that one of the greatest difficulties we have had to face is the prostitution of the English language. Yet the use of words can, and should, be one of the most powerful and scientific of instruments for raising men and women from ignorance and despair to a world of enlightenment.

Words should be used to make clear what appears difficult and unintelligible; they should be used to help people to help themselves to act with confidence in the protection of themselves and of their families. But unfortunately, perhaps, no generation has been so bemused, so befuddled, as our generation, by words carefully used to trap the unwary.

We have been brought up in a veritable battle of words, and large numbers of people are using words which either have no meaning or have a meaning entirely different to what they suppose.

And when we come to the field of politics, the ground is so strewn with booby traps and with other devices of the devil that few but old and experienced campaigners can feel their way through the tragic mess.

Few words are more abused and more misunderstood than the words Democracy, Monetary Reform, Socialism and profit. There are quite a lot of stupid people who have been induced to believe that profit is an evil thing and that any person who works for profit is evil. Actually the only people who do not work for profit are found in lunatic asylums.

Profit is the natural reason for successful effort. When some people rail at the profit system what they are really attacking is the system of exploitation by monopoly—which is a very evil thing, and should be attacked and destroyed by all decent people. But this confusion of words has caused a lot of human tragedy, and probably the useless slaughter of millions of lives.

But to leave it there is not sufficient.

There are good grounds for believing that this confusion of thought has been deliberately engendered by wealthy and powerful men in order to disrupt the community and to prevent long overdue reforms being carried out.

A great deal of confusion exists about Money, and Monetary Reform. Money is not an evil thing; it is no more evil than food or drink. But, like every good thing, it can be abused, and it should be noticed that the more valuable and essential a thing is the more easily is it abused.

A man with money in reserve has more freedom than has a man without it; he has a greater choice of alternatives—except, of course, when commodities are rationed. A man with spare cash can choose the schools his children shall go to; he can choose his own doctor; he can decide where he shall live and where he shall buy. That is a very great thing; it may not be complete freedom, but it is nearer to it than could otherwise be reached.

But it should be noticed very carefully that it has been the policy of all Governments of the Left to strip men of any surplus cash and to prevent them accumulating a nest-egg to carry them through a crisis, or to be able to decide for themselves what they shall do.

If there were any need to establish the fact that there has been a deliberate policy enforced on this country to destroy the independence and security of the ordinary man and woman, then here is sufficient proof: The fact that this policy has been ruthlessly imposed on Australia, Europe and Russia shows that there is either an

organised gang enforcing this policy, or that a nation of independent people is considered dangerous to the type of Government we have been accustomed to.

The idea that the amount of money we should have, the amount of food we should eat, and the severity of the taxes imposed upon us should be controlled and decided entirely by a small political clique in Canberra—a clique whom the people of Australia have been unable to control—this idea, to me, seems so preposterous that I cannot imagine any adult blind enough not to see the danger signals.

Few people in Australia have spent more time and money than I have advocating reform of the financial system. I have written and spoken a great deal about it, and I still think the control of the financial system is one of the keys to Economic Democracy. But I advocate control by the people of their own money.

Control by a Party who never even by accident did anything to free this country from debt and taxation, is not Monetary Reform—it is merely securing for years to come the bonds of serfdom.

The less money the Government handles the more there will be for you to handle. The fewer Government servants there are to pay the more chance you and your family have of paying your way. That

should be clear enough to anyone, surely. If there had been a Government in this country looking after the interests of the people, would the price of practically every commodity have risen year by year with monotonous regularity? Is this rise in prices the result of democratic control? Is not the governmental system of debt and taxation the cause of much of the rise in prices? Aren't the interest rates dictated by the Government? Are the 4 per cent. loans by the Commonwealth Mortgage Bank a sign of Monetary Reform? Is the link-up of the Labor Party with the Communist Party a sign of Monetary Reform?

I am quite satisfied that there is very little hope of worthwhile Monetary Reform, or of any other vital reform, until the people of this country learn to control their Members of Parliament.

That control will have to be live and effective—very much more effective than anything so far in sight. Meanwhile, those Monetary Reformers who harp on the desire for technical improvements of administration when there are other more vital battles to be fought are a nuisance, and a dangerous nuisance. While they prattle political democracy is breaking down in most countries. It never has been very effective except in small countries. In large

(Continued on page 4)

NOTES on the NEWS

According to delegate Mr. Forde, Australia will be asked to ratify U.N.C.I.O. decisions IMMEDIATELY; but it is not the Australian people that is to decide this issue—oh dear, no!—it is only a political Party which obtained at the last election, approximately a mere 55% majority of total votes, and one that has to face the electors in a few more months. Surely such an important and dangerous issue should await the result of such a near election, or, better still, should be submitted at a referendum in conjunction with the election. Or would that be too democratic? There is a strong demand in U.S. that this ratification be left until after the Peace Conference. What's all the hurry? This is a suggestion that YOU could convey to your Federal Member—NOW.

BOGUS BODIES: A move to black-list Communist auxiliary bodies was made at the N.S.W. State conference of the A.L.P. The bodies named were: the Sydney University Labor Club, the Eureka Youth League, the Society for Cultural Relations with the U.S.S.R., Friends of the Soviet Union, Women For Freedom, New Theatre League, and the Friendship with Russia League. The matter was cleverly left to the decision of the incoming executive, which, according to press reports, will have a larger sprinkling of Communists. However, the move is a sign of awakening, that these Bodies have been recognised for what they are. Probably some of the innocent members of these organisations will realise that where there's smoke there's fire, and will be wise enough to locate the nearest exit.

HITLER HIATUS: The many conflicting reports as to the death of Hitler provide a considerable fill-up for Press spaces; the latest comes from an "American" publication, the Milwaukee "Deutsche Zeitung," which suggests that "Hitler has not been killed, but has been taken to Moscow to instruct 'Joe' in liquidating political adversaries." It is not of much consequence whether Hitler is alive or not. What really matters is that all the vile things that Hitler personified shall die, and die quickly. Chief of these is the idea that "the State" is an all-seeing and all-providing Deity, and that political servants are the God-sent masters of the people. Unfortunately, this communistic concept is deeply rooted among our local politicians and planners—and worse still, hordes of bureaucrats are entrenched for the purpose of imposing it. Unless this concept and those who accept it and administer it are promptly dealt with, the death of Hitler will be meaningless. So, on with the fight to Banish the Bureaucrats!

DISTURBING DISBURSEMENTS: The report of the Commonwealth Auditor-General draws attention to "unsatisfactory features of a serious character" in connection with the use of taxpayers' money, especially in the matter of an item of £2462 described as "transport for the Speaker, Mr. Rosevear." The matter of £5256 relating to publicising the Referendum, "yes" case, under the title of "post-war education," is also criticised. This is distinct from the estimate of £50,000 "Government publicity" for this purpose, and neither amount includes the salaries of bureaucrats touring the country urging a "yes" vote, which the people emphatically rejected—a verdict since defied in many ways. This misappropriation of the people's money, taken from them in taxes, is an appalling indication of the tactics of those responsible.

CANADIAN CONTROL'S: Mr. Howe was reported in the daily press as saying that

"eighty per cent, of Canada's war-time controls on business and industry would be removed in the next few weeks; however, price control would remain." There was, of course, a Federal election (since held) in the offing in Canada; but, nevertheless, it's a fair start, and a reasonable time limit which could be followed here, if the present Government could overcome its power-lust. But the power of fixing prices (not "compensating" them) is far too dangerous to leave in the hands of political opportunists of any Party colour. Workers should be able to see that price fixers in the last analysis also control wages, because wages are costs which have to be passed on in prices. Retaining this power is a cunning trick, which incidentally is approved by all Parties. Experience has shown that it is merely a weapon for bestowing political favours. It has certainly not reduced living costs (ask any housewife).

LABOR LOSS: The overwhelming defeat of the Labor Member for Hobart in the recent Legislative Council election is causing much concern among Labor leaders. A Hobart report of May 25 states that executive of the State Parliamentary Party attributed the defeat to the Federal Government's controls, high taxation and the housing shortage, and expressed the opinion that if the Federal elections were held to-morrow it is doubtful whether Labor would secure one seat in Tasmania. If this is a correct diagnosis, Labor will have to work overtime to retain office: they will have to remove taxation and manpower tyrannies, abandon restriction of production, and demobilise bureaucratic parasites battenning on the workers. Promising to do these things after the election will not be acceptable—they must be done before the elections.

CLOTHES-CONSCIOUS: London fashion experts are reported as saying that their "big post-war job will be to make teenage girls clothes-conscious." This is admitted to be, in part, a sales boosting plan, but it sounds mighty like teaching babies to cry. Observant people will have noticed a recent barrage, from the Press and the Radio, advising people how to cook and sew, and asking them to send all their problems to the oracles, "Jane" or "Sister Sue," who seem able to solve every problem—excepting their own, and, of course, the financial problem. In this campaign there is a subtle inference that the people are morons who are quite incapable of managing their own affairs. The boosted experts also endeavour to "soften-up" the people to accept governmental rationing and regimentation. It's an innocent-looking practice, but none the less demoralising.

—O. B. H.

Significant Political Pointers

In "The Brief for the Prosecution" C. H. Douglas writes that "the coalition of Germany and Russia is logical." This viewpoint has, of course, been held by every competent student of European affairs for a long time. The war between Russia and Germany was almost inevitable; having two highly centralised totalitarian States so close together had to result in an explosion. If the policy of organising peoples into bigger and more highly centralised groups continues, we can expect explosion after explosion until only one centralised group remains.

The international Jew, who is concerned with ensuring that conditions always exist which will inevitably cause events which he can then exploit for his own ends, is not interested in the German or Russian nationals as such; they only interest him so far as he can use them.

The local bemused Communists, who not so long ago were telling us what the Russians would do to the Germans when they arrived in Germany, will, no doubt, be able to assure us before long that the Germans are the most democratic people in the world. While the British and the Americans are attempting a policy of sternness towards the Germans, the Russians are treating them with every consideration. While Red radio commentators howl about Goering (not about Dr. Schacht or any of the individuals responsible for financing Germany under Hitler!), von Paulus and all the other prominent Germans in the "Free German Committee" are given every facility for propaganda.

And, of course, Stalin insists that Germany must not be broken down into decentralised units.

We can expect to see further interesting developments as the new super-centralised Russo-German organisation grows. German technical efficiency is going to be harnessed to another part of the programme to create the world Slave State. And it would appear that many members of the Great German General Staff are going to carry on with business as usual. Goebbels was probably looking to the future when he said just prior to his death that Germany would still win. Unfortunately Goebbels has yet to be proved wrong.

Wasn't it touching to learn that in Germany the Ford Motor Works at Cologne are intact, and that the plant is already being used for production of motor lorries!

And that the Americans are recommending that the great German chemical combine, I. G. Farben-Industrie, which had close contact with the Jew Mond's Imperial Chemical Industries and Standard Oil in America, be managed by special commission.

Dear, oh dear, it is all so confusing, isn't it? We could hardly suspect that any representatives of I.C.I. or Standard Oil would have anything to do with this special commission. After all, we did win the war, didn't we? Or did we?

The average person who has given the matter any thought at all, would suggest that the only way in which to make a reality of Local Government is to localise government—i.e., to decentralise it.

But Queensland planners, who apparently believe in the formula of doing with your hands what you are denying with your lips, have produced a big plan for the amalgamation of all local authorities in Queensland into twenty-five regional groups—all in the name of more Local Government!

When their report is read closely, we observe that the main purpose . . . would be to strengthen and increase local government efficiency. . . providing regional centres for State administration . . . In other words, these regional groups are expected to be merely efficient administrators of a centrally devised policy.

If Queensland electors allow this proposal to pass unchallenged, they are passively accepting another liberal dose of State socialism.

Delegates to the Burnett District Local Authorities' Association challenged the scheme as soon as it was mooted.

Here is a job for Queensland social crediters. Show local government bodies how to fight the centralisers. Bring to their notice the menace confronting them.

A torrent of words is being poured out concerning "full employment," "technical efficiency," "State planning," "high taxation" and "Government control."

We are living in a madhouse in which words and phrases are shouted glibly without any consideration of whether they make sense or are self-contradictory.

The industrialists, who assure us that they are the friends of individual freedom, are loud in their praise of "technical efficiency" (Continued on page 3)

ACTING PRIME MINISTER'S NONSENSE

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

Sir,—It is reported in the Melbourne "Argus" of 18/6/45 that Mr. Chifley, as Acting Prime Minister, spoke to the A.L.P. Conference at Sydney the previous day, and referred to several items of national importance. The part of the report that seemed more incredible than others was that in which he is said to have spoken "bluntly" about liberty and cash, as follows:

"He wished to tell the Conference bluntly, however, that Australians could not expect to fight for their liberty and retain their liberty unless they were prepared to pay cash for it."

Mr. Chifley is supposed to be a servant, not a master.

Servants do not as a rule talk bluntly to their employers, and those who do choose to do that sort of thing usually find their opportunity quickly curtailed by dismissal. If the A.L.P. Conference submitted to blunt talk from one of its alleged representatives, then the political prospects for the rank-and-file of the Labour supporters are indeed bleak, and their economic prospects almost nil. Indeed, if the members of the Conference accepted such nonsense then their own understanding is pathetically limited.

If the words quoted mean anything at all they mean that the soldier who fights in the front line must pay himself for fighting.

Mr. Chifley evidently believes that, because he is maintaining the system under which part of my son's military pay is taken, from his father and the balance charged against himself as national debt. Every fighting man who survives the battles will be required to pay interest on the "debt" incurred for war purposes; and as this debt under present conditions is quite irredeemable, the interest demands will be perpetual. Fathers are groaning under taxation which has been imposed on a vicious and confiscatory scale, allegedly to "pay" for the war. Speaking generally, however, the taxation receipts are not nearly sufficient to "pay" for the war, and so the Government "borrows" as well.

My son will not be required to re-pay what has been stolen from his father, but he will be required to submit to heavy taxation to meet the interest charges on the money borrowed. And so, "in the long range view" (to use the jargon of the learned professors), the soldier has not only to pay himself through the national debt for doing the fighting, but also to see his parents impoverished in the process.

That, surely, is bad enough, but when we hear it seriously said that Australians cannot retain their liberty unless they are prepared to pay "cash" for it, we must have reached the limit of absurdity.

If we have to pay "cash" for our liberty then obviously someone has it for sale. Who ARE these liberty sellers and who determines the purchase price? And who has decreed that it can only be purchased by "cash"?

What is "cash"? Apparently Mr. Chifley meant money, and used the word cash in error. But in the ordinary acceptation of the term, "cash" means the legal tender portion of the money in use. In the whole of Australia there is only £200 millions of cash in existence, and this sort of money is used for less than one-tenth of community activities. Even our taxes cannot all be paid in cash, and Governments never borrow it. More than nine-tenths of what we do is covered by credit-money, and this is the sort of money that reaches the Treasury as the result of loan campaigns. Clearly, therefore, it is impossible for the war, to say nothing of our liberty, to be "paid for" in cash, and it is high time the Treasurer made himself better informed on the subject.

We, the people, are not permitted to produce "cash," and anyone even attempting to do so is goaled as a counterfeiter. Therefore, according to Mr. Chifley, liberty can be paid for only with something over the production of which the Australian citizens have no control.

As credit-money is now produced exclusively by the banks, we are thus obliged to obtain the banker's product before we can purchase liberty! Logically, the more of the banker's product we can get the more liberty we shall be able to buy. We know that this has been the case, and that it came about because of the world dictatorship of international finance; but for a so-called Labour leader to bluntly tell Union representatives that that is to be continued as a proper thing is an outrage.

As indicated above, the bulk of the money in use is credit money, and credit money is created by the trading banks mainly by the simple process of permitting certain people to write cheques. This is

done by granting overdrafts, under which certain persons are allowed to "overdraw" on their account to an amount agreed upon. The cheques written by these people find their way into various accounts as deposits and when deposited the bank is liable to pay in cash if called upon. So few people call for cash, however, that the banker finds it safe to create credit money far in excess of the legal tender in his tills, and that is why the total deposits to-day exceed a thousand million pounds whereas the banks are holding less than £20 millions in cash. If the Labor Government faithfully fol-

In the light of these FACTS what more sense it is for Mr. Chifley to give utterance to such rubbish as that reported. In the Melbourne "Argus" and quoted above. Instead of behaving in that way he should be setting up a Royal Commission to investigate the validity of the National Dividend and to expose the fraudulence of the present monetary arrangements. At present the law is being used to force us to pay interest on counterfeit money.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN.
189 North Street, East Melbourne.

FEDERAL POWER-LUSTERS' TACTICS

The following extracts from a report in the Melbourne "Sun" of June 2 provides further indications of the gangster mentalities and tactics of Federal power-lusters and yet another indication of the Labor Fuehrers' cynical abandonment of a financial unorthodoxy so loudly voiced before getting power. In the latter connection note the approving hopeful anticipation that the Labor Government may "faithfully" (faithfully to whom?) "follow its profession of financial orthodoxy in the White Paper, and not succumb to the temptation to"—as the Murdoch Press terms it—"inflate the currency with bank credit." The emphasis hereunder is, of course, our own:—

lows its profession of financial orthodoxy in the White Paper, and does not succumb to the temptation to inflate the currency with bank credit, the picture of a permanently heavy millstone of taxation is inescapable.

Robbed by the Referendum of hoped-for powers to "control the post-war economy, the Federal Government will be forced to rely upon the co-operation of State Governments. Federal Ministers frankly loathe this system, which forces them to consider State viewpoints, but in the White Paper the Government bows to the inevitable by announcing its intention to invite the States to participate in more frequent conferences of Premiers and of Commonwealth and State Ministers.

Because agreement of the States is essential to its objectives, the Government has in mind steps to improve—from its point of view—the Commonwealth-State machinery.

It will try to arrange frequent meetings of officials to clarify proposals for later decision by the Premiers, to work out details of proposals accepted in principle at Premiers' Conferences, and to co-ordinate administrative arrangements for carrying out agreed plans. This is being done with housing and soldier settlement.

Some form of permanent joint Commonwealth-State secretariat at Canberra to give continuity to these machinery objectives is considered necessary by

some Federal officials. At present this function is performed by the Department of Post-War Re-construction, although it is staffed only with Federal officials.

Past experience of what the Commonwealth brands as the "selfish parochial attitude" of some State Premiers has strengthened its belief in the necessity to retain permanent control over the most powerful of all Government weapons—FINANCE.

The Income Tax Wartime Arrangement Act, which established uniform taxation, will continue to give the Commonwealth that power for a complete financial year after the war ends.

Then it can be expected that the Commonwealth will try to persuade the State to cede this right permanently.

CONTROL OF PROJECTS

Failing agreement by the States, the Commonwealth would probably use the fact that Commonwealth law overrides State laws to impose taxation rates so high that it would be impossible for the States to levy their own-taxes.

With the main source of revenue in its hands the Federal Government would be able to "persuade" the States to accept its ideas on development of major projects by allocating funds only for the objects of which it approved.

The Victorian Government, which has suffered most from wartime legislation because it was the lowest-taxed before the war, will certainly fight the Commonwealth on this.

A CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM LOVERS

By BEATRICE C. BEST. (Concluded from last issue.)

The facts of the case should be examined in the light of the statement that the truth shall make us free. What are they? They are (1) that the power of industry to-day to produce increasing wealth with decreasing labour is an inheritance due to men's work in the past, their inventions, their researches, their discoveries and scientific achievements down the ages, resulting in what we know as the Power Age. (2) That this "cultural inheritance" is, in reality, an "unearned increment of association" deriving from this past.

It would not be necessary to draw attention to these obvious truisms if their implication was not entirely ignored. This neglect is a sin against the Holy Ghost. For can it be denied that this heritage is the fruit of the spirit operating in man to help and inspire him—whether he has been directly conscious of it or not—to throw off the yoke of bondage to purely material ends? Or is it contended that the object of this process has been for the sake of ever expanding trade, the struggle for markets, the development of "backward" countries, the endless multiplication of gadgets, full employment, and in the end, again, and inevitably, war?

One might draw this conclusion from a notice of Sir William Beveridge's "Full Employment in a Free Society" that appeared in a contemporary monthly Christian Review. In this the reviewer, referring to unemployment, states that "the main cause is that effective demand for the products of industry is not large enough to employ all available man power."† And he goes on to point out that to ensure full employment "a policy must be designed to maintain a total outlay of purchasing power so that the demands for the products of industry is so high that it cannot be satisfied without using all the available man-power."‡ It takes one's breath to find a Christian body endorsing a policy so grossly materialistic, and so subversive of the natural order, as to insist on a surfeit of consumer demand, not for need or desire, but solely in order that industry may maintain full employment. It is a dreadful witness to the misleading, corrupt and degrading influence exercised by the fetish, or "idee fixe" of "full employment."

But what have the devotees of freedom to offer as an alternative to this materialistic aim?

Are they prepared to remain silent while this age-old inheritance continues, as heretofore, to be held back or wantonly

destroyed; or (as appears to be the plan now) perverted from its true and righteous end of implementing freedom, to that of establishing a work-slave State? If not, are they prepared to demand its distribution in the only way an inheritance can be distributed: by means of a dividend? And because this inheritance is national (and in the nature of the case cannot be specifically assigned to particular persons, or group of persons) to distribute it through a National Dividend to every individual by right, and not by favour? Or do they, after all, agree with Mr. Orwell that—with certain exceptions—an unearned income is, or should be, regarded as a somewhat shameful burden, instead of what it really is—a guarantee of freedom—freedom to choose, to act, to say "no," to contract out?

Does their love of freedom fall short of faith in its efficacy? Are they held back by fear of its results?

In all this it is not ignored that the plot was well and truly laid. First, the contrivance of years of depression, and needless and wanton unemployment, and the degradation of the means test and the dole. Thus a paid job could be made to seem the be-all and end-all of existence, and full employment to have a prior call on all political aims. Then war again, and relief from unemployment and prospects of post-war employment to repair the damage, wastage and losses of war. ‡ Furthermore, the situation thus created has also been exploited to attack and throw discredit on private enterprise. With the aim of full employment placed well to the fore, along with the tacit assumption that its provision is the function of industry, we are now being told that private enterprise has failed because it cannot employ "the whole available man-power." Therefore it must be taken over, or controlled by the State, which has the means and the power to provide full employment, such means and power being inaccessible and denied to private enterprise.

Thus it may be seen how the final phase—perhaps—of a long term policy, the diabolical ingenuity of which could hardly have been greater, has first fostered, by satanic means, and then utilised the belief in full employment to serve as an occasion, an excuse, and a means whereby man's

†Though certain statements made by Mr. Maxton in the House of Commons on June 22, 1944, and quoted in "The Social Creditor" of July 8, 1944, throw certain doubts on this prospect.

HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEMES AND T.V.A.

The following letter from Major C. H. Douglas which we reproduce because of its general application appeared in the "Dundee Courier and Advertiser" (Scotland) of April 21, 1945:—

Sir,—The letter of Mr. F. E. Geddes will render a valuable public service if it awakens a general consciousness that the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board is part of a considered scheme to utilise the war psychology for the permanent enslavement not merely of Scotsmen, but of the world.

It may not have escaped attention that the T.V.A. (Tennessee Valley Authority) is frequently adduced as an example which is to be copied by the board. Physically, there is no resemblance whatever. The T.V.A. purports to be a flood control and land reclamation scheme, and it is typical of what can only be described as the cynical disregard of political morality which seems inseparable from the partnership of Socialism and international cartellism, which is the force behind it, that the area permanently flooded by the dams greatly exceeds the biggest area ever temporarily flooded before the dams were built. Nevertheless, 58 per cent. of the capital cost up to 1943 was charged to navigation and flood control in order to make the apparent cost of power generation appear low. There is a loss to the taxpayer of 12,789,000 dollars, say, £3,200,000 [sterling], for 1943.

The real objective of the T.V.A. is, however, quite probably that of the Hydro-Electric Board, and that is to bring an area under complete economic and administra-

activities may increasingly be brought under the direction and control of the State.

It may, then, in conclusion, be justly asked what the non-Social-Credit lovers and defenders of freedom are doing to oppose the forces which, in the name of freedom itself, "Freedom in Security," are working to complete man's regimentation and condition him to fit the place assigned him in the World Work State that is being so carefully planned?

So far as one can see their attempts at opposition are confined to the exposure and denunciation of what one may call the end results of a system expressly designed to implement a policy inimical to the welfare, and destructive of the freedom

†An interesting analogy may be drawn here between Social Credit and P. Mathias Alexander's discovery that the physical ills afflicting us are due in the main to the wrong use of the mechanism of the self. Until the right use of this mechanism has replaced the wrong one, doctors will continue to fight a losing battle in their efforts to cure what are, in effect, the end results of the wrong use. In a corresponding sense Social Credit has revealed the wrong use of the mechanism of money, and the appalling results of this misdirection, and the futility of the efforts of social reformers to eradicate these evil results while continuing to ignore their initial cause. A further correspondence can be seen in the fact that, as Mr. Alexander shows, this wrong use of the

tive dictatorship. The ground has been prepared by skilful propaganda to the effect that the miseries of the Armistice years show that the "old system" was completely obsolete and must be replaced. In fact the depression of 1929-34 was an essential part of the propaganda, and the same forces which are now creating world monopolies were implacably and successfully opposed to any action which would have weakened its effect. The intention of the policy is world-wide, and the New Zealand Socialist Labour Party, the C.C.F. (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) in Canada, the Australian Labour Party, the American New Dealers, "P.E.P." (the planners) in Great Britain, and in fact, organisations in every country draw their inspiration and support from the same source, which was originally located in Germany.

One of the individuals closely concerned with the inter-war stages of this activity was asked whether there was anything in "this nonsense" that a certain group aspires to the domination of the world. The reply was: "Of course there is. In a very few years we shall have achieved it, and nothing can stop us."

There are 27 objectors, covering most of the genuine interests of the district to the Tummel-Garry project. We shall see what consideration they will receive.

—I am etc., C. H. DOUGLAS.

of mankind. This serves the purpose of the designers of that policy well, for, if people can be kept busy in this way, the odds are the attention will be diverted from the primary cause of the several evils they fight to counteract. For the rest, they confine themselves to lamenting our lost freedoms, and some cast nostalgic backwards glances to what "The Times" has been pleased to call "19th century prosperity."

But the true way to freedom is known and there is still a chance for those who really love freedom to help in the defence of the powers that would enslave us. Only there is not much time left now before the prison gates close finally upon us.

mechanism, owing to long persistence in it feels "right" and any effort to use this mechanism currently feels "wrong." In the same way our wrong use of the mechanism of money feels "right," i.e. it is "right" to have to earn a living, it is "right" to expect industry to give full employment. Equally the right use would be felt "wrong," i.e. the idea of national dividends is regarded with disapproval, even scorn as "money for nothing" and the absolute displacement of men in industry by progress in the application of scientific methods is felt as a calamity. It is easy to see how useful this "right" feeling attached to the wrong use of money is to the "powers that be," and how important it is to them to foster it.

CANADIAN M.P. ON PEACE PROBLEMS

(Continued from last issue.)

Mr. Norman Jaques, the Social Credit member for Wetaskiwin in the Canadian House of Commons, made a notable speech in the House recently when impending San Francisco Conference was debated. Here is a second extract, taken from the "Hansard" report:

I hold in my hand a White Paper respecting the Greek crisis, issued by the British Government. While I do not wish to go into detail I shall quote from this White Paper a telegram from the British Ambassador to Greece, to Mr. Eden. This is dated at Athens, January, 15, 1945 and is the text of a resolution passed at a mass meeting held in Constitution Square, Athens, 1945. It is as follows:—
"The people of Athens, the Piraeus and the surrounding country is now breathing in the air of liberty after four years of slavery under three barbarous invaders and after the recent unjustifiable revolution, which has thrown the country into chaos, anarchy, destruction and slaughter. Coming together in a mass meeting, called on the initiative of the working classes of the country, with the collaboration both of its professional societies and of its intellectual foundations, the people of Greece declare:

Their eternal gratitude to Great Britain, the friend and defender of Greece throughout two centuries, for the unstinting and noble assistance given by her to our country, for the restoration of her liberties, which were torn to shreds by the recent anti-national revolt.

"They pay homage to the heroic British Army, whose precious sons have sacrificed themselves in this sacred struggle for our liberties.

"They denounce the criminals of this revolutionary movement to the public opinion of the whole world for the unprecedented and hair-raising crimes, the looting and the destruction, which they have wrought at the expense of the unarmed population of town and country, and which they stigmatise as entirely foreign to the noble soul and gentle customs of Greece; and they entirely endorse the measures taken by our allies to put down the revolt.

"They demand that every means be used to secure the immediate release of the thousands of hostages who have been inhumanly arrested and are still suffering torments. They resolve to lay a wreath on the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in memory of the British and Greek heroes who have laid down their lives for liberties of the Greek people and the resurrection of our nation.

While I cannot pronounce the names of those who signed, it is indicated that this document was signed by the general secretary of the general confederation of workers of Greece, the vice-rector of the university and the president of the Athens federations of professional men and industrial craftsmen.

That I think, should answer the Greek question. Since we have had several opinions from enlightened "liberals" in the House and elsewhere, I should like to quote an American labour leader, who is now vice-president of the American Federation of labour and chairman of the international labour relations section of the American

Federation of Labour. This is a quotation from his speech as delivered to the American Labour conference on international affairs on December 16, 1944. It states:

"The prophets of neo-imperialism accept without murmur and even with lively approval the open annexation of the Baltic States by Soviet Russia, the transformation of Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and perhaps also of Hungary and Austria, into satellites of Russia as a progressive process.

"The very same people are violently opposed to any intervention by Great Britain in the affairs of western or southern Europe, as in Greece, Belgium, Holland, Italy.

"It is contrary to the principles of international democracy, these liberal 'realists' claim, to intervene in the internal policies of liberated countries.

"However, these same liberals' have never uttered a word in opposition to the intervention

EVATT'S EVASION OF REFERENDUM

According to Minister for External Affairs, and Attorney-General, Doc. Evatt, the inclusion of "Full Employment" in the World Security Pact to emerge from the San Francisco Conference will not only be binding on the Australian Commonwealth, but can also over-ride constitutional difficulties in the path of Commonwealth Government control of employment.

That is a most dangerous position. The Australian people rejected the referendum of August, 1944, because they refused to have economic conscription after the war.

Now Evatt is trying to find a way around that decision.

If his contention is upheld, then it would mean that any Government, not only a Labour, but also a Menzies' Government, could take to itself wide powers on the grounds that we were committed to some international agreement.

It would mean the entire waiving of the Australian Constitution, whenever the Constitution conflicted with some international agreement.

It would mean that an Australian Prime Minister only had to cross the Tasman and enter into some agreement with the New Zealand Prime Minister, in order to overcome the provisions of the Australian Constitution.

All the safeguards and protection of the Commonwealth Constitution would disappear overnight.

The employment powers would be interpreted in peace, in exactly the same way as the defence powers are interpreted during the war.

It would mean that Professor Copland and all the experts could realise their objectives in absolute defiance of the popular will as expressed at the referendum.

It would mean that all the regulations controlling manpower at present being operated under the defence clause of the

of Russia in the internal affairs of Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria. More than that, every word of criticism on Russia issued by anyone is regarded as a major crime and the culprit is systematically smeared and labelled as a pro-Fascist and pro-Nazi. Why this difference?

"I hold no brief for the British Empire or for British policies. Yet it cannot be denied that Communist policy in the liberated countries has been divisive, provocative and dangerous to the cause of the United Nations.

"Those American 'liberals' who do not see this connection of events and personalities are hopeless. Those who praise the fighting Communists in Greece as a 'democratic movement' are blind—or worse."

MR. ROSE: Who said that? Give us his name.

MR. JAQUES: Matthew Woll. He is vice-president of the American Federation of Labour. There is an American. Now I am going to quote an Australian Labour leader. I am quoting labour leaders only, so that I cannot be accused of quoting "reactionaries" or "Tories." I am going to quote now J. T. Lang, one of the foremost labour leaders in Australia, and formerly the Premier of the Labour Government of the State of New South Wales.

(To be continued.)

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

ciency." If it means anything at all, technical efficiency means increased production with less man-power; it means an increase in the number of people we term the "unemployed." And, while chanting their "technical efficiency" slogan, the same people are "also chanting about 'full employment'!" They cannot have both. If "technical efficiency" is the policy, then "full employment" can only be achieved by "State planning," which the "technical efficiency" advocates say they oppose! What, then, is their solution? They should be pressed to say clearly what they propose to do.

Surprisingly enough, they have so far ignored or resisted the only sane solution—maximum "technical efficiency" PLUS NATIONAL DIVIDENDS.

But, strangely enough, they have a bias against "unearned income." It is strange, because the same people defend the principle that they should have the freedom which goes with an inherited sum of money or a property.

The Socialists, of course, don't believe in any inheritances; they believe in the Work State, and no nonsense about it. They are, therefore, able to drive ahead without trying to do much reconciling of ideas; but those non-Social-Crediters who believe in "technical efficiency," "lower taxation," less "State planning," and no "Government control," should be pressed on every possible occasion to tell us how they are going to achieve all this, and "full employment" without becoming advocates of Socialism! The demand for "full employment," in this modern power-age, is a demand for Socialism. The sooner that fact is more widely appreciated the better.

—E.D.B.

RETURN OF PREMIUMS ON WAR DAMAGE INSURANCE?

We have received the following letter from The United Democrats, 17 Weymouth Street, Adelaide:—

Sir,—The suggestion has been made to us that ratepayers should write to their Councillors in the Local Governing bodies and ask for information regarding the money which was collected on behalf of the Federal Government for war-risk insurance on house property, etc. The payments were compulsory, and only a very small percentage of the money collected could have been expended in meeting claims for war damage.

As the Councils made themselves responsible for collecting the money, ought they not now to take the responsibility of watching the interest of ratepayers by demanding a repayment of any monies which may stand to the credit of this special insurance fund?

We pass this suggestion on to you in the hope that you can see your way clear to give it publicity.

—Yours, etc., F. Bawden, Hon. Secretary.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA?

(Continued from last issue.)

Beverley Nichols' new book, "Verdict on India," is the result of a recently completed first-hand investigation. It presents conclusions in striking contrast to some current views on India. Here is another interesting extract:—

Perhaps the most singular feature of British rule is the fact it is the rule of a mere handful. In peace-time (apart from the tiny standing army) the ratio was about ten thousand British subjects to 400 million Indians.

Many persons seem to think of a British withdrawal as a mass exodus, a sort of transfer of population, spread over many months and involving an immense disruption of transport. Actually, it could all be accomplished over a week-end, and every man, woman and child could be removed from the country in a single convoy, of modest proportions.

What if we attempt to assess the British as frankly as we have assessed the Indians, to inquire what sort of people they really are, and how far they are worthy of their responsibilities?

Those ancient figures of comedy—the pukka sahib and his memsahib—do they really exist? Do they yell for chota pegs at sundown, in the manner of E. M. Forster? Do they "go out in the midday sun," in the manner of Noel Coward? Do they indulge in illicit passions against a background of tamarind and sandalwood, in the manner of Somerset Maugham?

In some of the larger cities, yes. Fortunately they are by no means typical. The average British men and women are a "pretty decent lot," particularly those who live in remote districts.

Whatever else you may deny to this tiny handful, scattered over the country like a pinch of alien dust on a gigantic desert, you must grant them courage.

You must grant it to the little garrisons of the North-West Frontier, living in the perpetual shadow of the sniper; to the judges, steering a straight furrow through a jungle of falsehood, trickery and vituperation; to the doctors, sticking to their principles in an enervating atmosphere of superstition and hostility; above all, to the women, nurses, missionaries, wives of country officials, to whom such things as the sound of music and laughter and the swish of crepe-de-chine are to be found only in the pages of a magazine.

Yet we cannot deny that there are a number of criticisms to be made of the British in India, if we consider them as individuals rather than as cogs in the Imperial machine.

Riding in my first Indian tram, from Gwalior to Delhi, I asked a very red-faced colonel the Indian for "thank you." The coolies who had carried the luggage were waiting to be paid; it was very hot and they had worked quickly and well; it seemed ungracious merely to tip them and send them off.

"Thank you?" ejaculated the colonel.

"Thank you?"

"Yes," I repeated. "Thank you."

"But, my dear fellow," he spluttered, "you don't."

"Don't say thank you?"

"Certainly not. Nevah. It isn't done."

Again, it sometimes seems that the British who live in India do not live in India at all. Their heart is in the Highlands—or in Kensington High Street. What can you know about India, if after 20 or 30 years you have never seen an Indian film, never heard of the Bhagavad-Gita (which is as though an Indian coming to England had never heard of the New Testament), never spent even one night in an Indian village?

Admittedly, I did not do it often, but even a short experience taught me more than a dozen books.

I learned, for instance, the strange sense of oneness which the Indians have with the animals; it seemed quite natural that four little goats should be sleeping in one corner of the hut, that a cluster of hens should be brooding in another, and that from time to time a bullock should push a solemn head through the door. It was not possible to get much sleep, and the bites were legion, but there were many compensations. The wail of the flute as the dusk was falling; the lovely silhouettes of the women at the well, charcoal-black against a jade-green sky; the bowl of curds and fresh fruit which they brought me before going to bed; and the wreath of frangipani that they placed around my neck.

And then—the sudden dawn, very rich and red, a regular blood-orange of a dawn; and the singing of the peasants, as they set off to the paddy fields. . . .

(To be continued.)

POLITICS OF OUTWITTING THE PEOPLE

By G. A. MARSDEN.

From October, 1942, when Dr. Evatt introduced the Bill to alter the Constitution, to June, 1945, when he successfully moved to have "full employment" included in the U.N.C.I.O. Charter, we have witnessed a sustained attempt to over-ride the will of the electors.

The average mis-informed voter becomes a victim of policies imposed on him by sectional interests; because the real issues are purposely obscured by a barrage of propaganda. This is especially the case in war-time, when "full employment" absorbs his mental and his physical output, and leaves neither energy nor time to examine the results of the policies imposed on him. He is thus induced to accept things which are designed to enslave him. A review of the tactics adopted during the period mentioned above reveal that the will of the electors has been perverted by means of a "two-pronged" drive. The nature of the attack during this period may be summed up as:—

1. The Political drive in the form of four Bills to alter the Constitution, and the Referendum. All of which were rejected.

2. The application of the legal process in an attempt to subvert the spirit of the Constitution of the Commonwealth, and to place decisions on policy outside the control of the representatives of the people.

We are now witnessing the consolidation of gains in the latter field. This takes the form of a possible extended use of the external affairs' power of the Commonwealth Government. In this drive to overcome the will of the people the elector is at a disadvantage, for he has no training in legalistic finesse. The achievements in this field were aptly described in Parliament last November as a "major, but silent revolution in the constitutional structure." (See "Hansard," No. 24, page 1905, et seq.)

The projected use of external affairs power to gain legislative authority refused to the Government at the recent Referendum is palpably the "other ways" referred to by Dr. Evatt and Prof. Copland when the "NO" verdict of the Referendum was announced.

The contention is that under external affairs the Commonwealth Government has power to make treaties and agreements with other countries and to implement such treaties under the same power.

The framers of the Constitution never envisaged the making of treaties which would involve domestic policy in all aspects, affecting the lives of all citizens and invading the domestic policies of the States.

Consideration of these facts gives a clue to the nature of the Agreements hastily assented to by the Government, in many instances without reference to Parliament; e.g., the Australia-New Zealand Agreement, U.N.R.R.A. and the Food and Agricultural Organisation Acts. To make the centralised power of the Government doubly secure and all-embracing, Dr. Evatt secured the inclusion of "full employment" in the Charter formulated by U.N.C.I.O. This envisages the legislative control by Canberra of a comprehensive area of the citizens life.

Thus have been laid the foundations of the World Slave State. By misdirection of his thinking, the elector has been induced to ask for things he does not want and which will ultimately deprive him of his liberty.

By means of Press and Radio, and by the bitter experience of depressions, he has been taught to identify "employment" with "income," and habit has fixed employment as his goal—it has become an end in itself.

But what does "full employment" mean to the enemies of freedom, who consciously nurture this false idea in the minds of men? To them it is a perfect instrument by which to obtain control over the individual in order to establish the Servile World State.

The full employment programme must increasingly fail if scientific advance is to remain a factor in production, but such failure will be used as an excuse for further control and regimentation of the individual in a vain attempt against realities.

In the pursuit of this totalitarian objective, we find strange agents bringing their specific qualifications to the task: Cartel-monopolists, specialists, idealists, statesmen, economists, and publicists; Conservative-Liberal and Labour leaders; Unionists, workers and men of leisure—all rushing headlong down the Gardarene slope which ends in the annihilation of human freedom.

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

By ERIC D. BUTLER. (Continued from last issue.)

Let us now return again to the actual text of these mysterious documents called "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion":—

PROTOCOL NO. 8

"We must arm ourselves with all the weapons which our opponents might employ against us. We must search out, in the very finest shades of expression and the knotty points of the lexicon of law, justification for those cases where we shall have to pronounce judgements that might appear abnormally audacious and unjust, for it is important that these resolutions should be set forth in expressions that shall seem to be the most exalted moral principles cast into legal form. Our directorate must surround itself with all these forces of civilisation among which it will have to work. It will surround itself with publicists, practical jurists, administrators, diplomats, and, finally, with persons prepared by a special super-educational training in our special schools. These persons will have cognisance of all the secrets of the social structure, they will know all the languages that can be made up by political alphabets and words; they will be made acquainted with the whole underside of human nature, with all its sensitive chords on which they will have to play. These chords are the cast of mind of the goyim, their tendencies, shortcomings, vices and qualities, the particularities of classes and conditions. Needless to say that the talented assistants of authority, of whom I speak, will be taken not from among the goyim, who are accustomed to perform their administrative work without giving themselves the trouble to think what its aim is, and never consider what it is needed for. The administrators of the goyim sign papers without reading them, and they serve either for mercenary reasons or from ambition.

"We shall surround our government with a whole world of economists. That is the reason why economic sciences form the principal subject of the teaching given to the Jews. Around us again will be a whole constellation of bankers, industrialists, capitalists and—the main thing—millionaires, because in substance everything will be settled by the question of figures."

COMMENT:—

All those who have seen through the greatest confidence trick of all time, the creation of the community's financial credit by the writing of figures in bank ledgers and the lending of this financial credit to the people as a perpetual interest-bearing debt-against their assets, will appreciate the fact that everything is "settled by the question of figures." The amount of figures made available by those controlling the financial system decides everything—poverty, war, depressions. This control through figures has only been possible through the teachings of those in control of our "economic sciences," as the Protocols term them.

Mr. Cecil Roth, the Jewish historian, states in his "Jewish Contribution to Civilisation":—

"Orthodox economics are to a large extent the creation of David Ricardo, the most illustrious English (!) economist of the 19th century and founder of the science of Political Economy."

Mr. Roth would appear to agree with the claim made by the Protocols. He goes further. Quoting Joseph Jacobs:—

"This, the economic form of the modern State, was due to the activities of the Jews as purveyors and financiers, in providing the State with capital for war and development."

Note carefully the juxtaposition of the words "war" and "development."

The economic education of the British people has been increasingly carried out by products of the London School of Economics, an institution largely staffed by Jews. This institution was started by the Fabian Socialists and largely financed by the German-Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, a friend of the Jacob Schiff whom we mentioned in regard to the financing of Japan. Professor J. H. Morgan, K.C., writing in "The Quarterly Review" of January, 1929, stated:

"When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums on the London School of Economics, he replied, 'One object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State.'"

Lord Haldane said Germany was his spiritual home!

The originator of the notorious scheme designed to turn British people into slaves governed by regulations and bureaucrats, Sir William Beveridge, was one of the principals at the London School of Economics for many years. Beveridge's scheme promises to take us "half way to Moscow." Its similarity to the Prussian "security" scheme originally devised by Bismarck has been mentioned by Douglas Reed and others. When the two German financiers, Guggenheimer and Niemeyer visited Australia early in the Great Depression to tell us there were insufficient figures for us to consume our bountiful production, they were vigorously supported by Sir Keith Murdoch and his newspapers. Sir Keith was educated at the "Old School," and at the last Referendum did his best to introduce the Socialist State in collaboration with other "Old School" men. Guggenheimer was a teacher at the London School of Economics.

Our Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction, Dr. H. C. Coombs, was educated at the London School of Economics. His deputy, Dr. Lloyd Ross, is a pro-Communist.

Canada's principal planner, Dr. Marsh, is a product of the London School of Eco-

nomics. The head of the Canadian Federal Government's Consulting Committee of Post-War Reconstruction, Dr. Cyril James, also wears the "Old School Tie." The Governor of the Bank of Canada, Graham Towers, has as his right-hand man, Louis Ramkisky, a Jew, another product of the same nursery for "German" ideas. The American Plan of "Social Security" for National Recovery has been drawn up by a Dr. Burns, another one of the elite. And the list could be greatly extended.

But possibly one of the most notorious figures connected with the London School of Economics is the Jew, Professor Harold Laski who is an advocate of revolution. He has also stated that Socialism can never be introduced in Britain until the Monarchy is removed.

Laski was a close friend of President Roosevelt; also of our own leading internationalist and socialist planner, Dr. H. V. Evatt, who has placed on record his admiration for Laski. Mr. Laski has many friends in strange places. In his book,

"Faith, Reason and Civilisation," Mr. Laski assures us that:

"Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality. The Old Testament is the Gospel of hard work, while in the New Testament the central figure of Jesus shows no deep concern for the workaday world. The trouble with Christianity is that it is subdued to nationalism."

Laski and other Jews don't like the ideas of Christ because they stand for the sanctity of the individual. Christians world do well to examine carefully the background of the men who are conducting the "education" of our children to-day. Particularly in the "economic sciences," Jewish ideas are being increasingly paraded everywhere especially in the universities.

Protocol No. 8 concludes as follows:—

"For a time, until there will no longer be any risk in entrusting responsible posts in our State to our brother-Jews, we shall put them in the hands of persons whose past and reputation are such that between them and the people lies an abyss, persons who, in case of disobedience to our instructions, must face criminal charges or disappear—this in order to make them defend our interests to their last gasp." (To be continued.)

MY CAREER AS A BIG BUREAUCRAT

By "MAC."

It all started when I was in a Melbourne Army Depot. High officials inspecting the establishment selected me as a suitable person to be placed in charge of a proposed new Government Department. I feel sure that my undernourished appearance, and ability to carry out orders without questioning their wisdom, were deemed sufficient to qualify me for my task.

Before starting to organise my Department I was given a course in the latest bureaucratic technique. The art of being a good bureaucrat is the result of a thorough study of the well-known bureaucratic principle of "passing the buck." Having been in the Army for some time, I had no difficulty in grasping the importance of this principle. In the course of my studies I noticed that many of my fellow-students were also smitten with the urge to get on, even if it meant a little more subjection of our fellow-citizens. "If we don't do it, someone else will," was our motto.

After a period of strenuous training, we were all given the task of forming different Departments. I had to organise a Department for the Prevention of Excessive Eating. Accommodation for my Department was delayed for a few days while members of a small firm were ordered to vacate their offices. Another Department attended to this matter for me in a very efficient manner. And then we moved in. Renovations were speedily effected, and on my office door I had painted: "Senior Controller, Dept. For the Prevention of Excessive Eating." A staff of ten persons was provided for a start.

Having settled in, I called my Deputy and proceeded to outline our plan of procedure. "How can we best prevent excessive eating?" I asked. "Dunno!" he replied intelligently. Being democratic in outlook, I decided to conduct a Gallup Poll among members of my staff on the vital question. Six members suggested more severe rationing, while three favoured a method of making people record their weight once a week, severe penalties to be imposed on all those registering an increase in weight. My brilliant Deputy did not pass an opinion. I understand that my Deputy was a really outstanding student when doing his course in bureaucratic technique. His thesis on "How Not to Commit

Yourself was regarded as a masterpiece.

After some consideration, I rejected the idea of more severe rationing, as there was already a Department for rationing. I decided that compulsory weighing of civilians should be enforced. After a big press campaign and intensive radio propaganda, the scheme was announced in detail. The Departmental staff was increased. Munition factories began producing thousands of weighing machines. Billions of forms for progress reports of the people's weights were required. A huge filing system was installed. The Department occupied another block of offices. Branches were formed in suitable centres. Civilians were issued with instructions: "Weighing machines are the property of the Government. All persons must ensure that they are weighed weekly and that their cards are stamped. The official attendant at each machine will attend to this. . . ." And so on.

The scheme was started, and after a few weeks we had a flow of figures coming in from all our branches. Graphs were drawn, charts made out, records filed. But it was not until a few months had elapsed that any reasonable idea of the effectiveness of the scheme could be gained. Figures don't lie, and it soon became apparent that a section of the population were failing to keep down their weight. Public warnings were issued, but it made no difference. I decided that I must take the necessary action to penalise the offenders. "How can this country be saved for the Common Man if these people refuse to face up to their patriotic responsibilities?" I asked. I demanded that a detailed list of the names and occupations of all these fifth-columnists be prepared and placed before me. But, as I looked through the list I shuddered and turned pale. Every one of them was a member of my staff—all fellow-bureaucrats.

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:—

Russia has the most rigid political censorship in the civilised world. My first experience with the censor is when I submit a news story on my trip to Leningrad, which includes the sentence: "The Finns were fighting hard for Viipuri, which prior to 1939 was Finland's second largest city." The censor struck out the emphasised words. Yet they contain no military information—nothing which is not in every child's geography.

The foreign reporters explain to me why this cut in my copy was made. When the Soviet Union claims territory, no Moscow story may mention the fact that this territory once belonged to another nation. For example, the Baltic States—Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia—are now parts of the Soviet Union, and no hint can be cabled from Moscow that they were ever independent republics.

You cannot argue with the censors or give them your reason, nor will they give you theirs when they hand back a mutilated cable. Their reply is always, "We can't discuss this with you. It's been decided."

The censorship, of course, excludes everything which might give the outside world an unfavourable impression of conditions within Russia. A correspondent may not give the size of the monthly bread or meat ration allotted to each citizen, nor may he say that favoured classes get special rations. He may not say that outside the meagre scope of rationing, prices for the necessities of life bought on the free market have become widely inflationary, sur-

passing anything dreamed of in the American black market.

Likewise, authorities conceal exactly how many hundreds of thousands of Leningraders starved during the siege. The result is that the world has little knowledge of the sacrifices the Russian people are making.

A minor bureaucrat in the censor's office will occasionally strike out a whole paragraph from a story written by an experienced correspondent, explaining that he found it uninteresting, or considered it unimportant.

Correspondents would not mind the bleak living conditions of war-time Russia if they were not treated as tolerated spies—cut off from any real human contact with a people they admire, herded into the institutionalised life of the Hotel Metropole, talking only with one another or with the small diplomatic colony, reading only the controlled Russian press, and then having their daily work messed up by a rigid political censorship in the hands of men who are often mediocre.

While correspondents may never visit the front, they are occasionally taken en masse on visits to recently liberated cities or to rear-area military headquarters. They are always escorted by an assistant censor, one of whose duties is to verify everything which happens. If the censor fails to see or hear something on the trip the reporters are not allowed to report it. It didn't happen! Even in routine stories from Moscow, the censors usually blue-

Confusion Helps the Enemies of Democracy

(Continued from page 1.)

countries not only does it not work, but it is being used as a smoke-screen to impose laws and regulations on people who are so far, helpless to protect themselves.

Parliament, whether in Canberra or London, has not been able to score one single victory over the ruling clique. The fact that political democracy appears to operate better in British countries than in others is not due to Parliament itself, but to the various organisations throughout the country which have been able to bring pressure to bear on their representatives. But here again there has been rapid and vital deterioration. There is hardly an organisation in this country, from the Chamber of Commerce to the smallest Trade Union that is not being white-anted by groups allied with the ruling clique.

Those who impose their policy on this country know that the various democratic organisations play a big part in government, a more vital part perhaps than Parliament and they have wasted no time in putting the right men into key positions.

I cannot believe that the leaders of the old U.A.P. were quite so incompetent as they pretended to be; I believe the destruction of that Party was deliberate. The Labor Party now appears to be deliberately committing suicide. I believe the Labor Party supporters are very sincere, and that they really believe their beliefs—and, of course, they are very annoyed, but they seem quite helpless to do anything.

It seems, therefore, that each Party in turn is sent into the Government benches to do the dirty work for the permanent and unseen government. Since the present function of the Party in power is to impose a policy on the people which is very much resented, it is only a matter of time before it is found out, the reaction takes place, and in goes the next dummy Government. Most political publicity and propaganda is designed for one purpose—to prevent the people from finding out that the policy of both parties is imposed by a permanent government, not elected, by the people.

A CONTEMPORARY COMMENT

From the English "Social Creditor":—

Yes, Clarence, life is going to be very difficult, now we've beaten Germany. In order that we may again live on our exports, railway fares will go up, postage will be increased, whisky will be scarcer, houses will be smaller, there won't be any domestic service, and the "B.B.C. will tell how marvellous is the life of the Russian proletariat.

In the meantime, the first and perhaps most superficially repellent of the Socialist dictators, Mussolini, has been "executed"; we have, as we foresaw, Herr Hitler-Schicklegruber-Rothschild with us no longer; and we shall be surprised if the Red Czar dies a natural death. We have no objection to these happenings, but it does irk us that the bumpings-off are confined to the exhibits in the shop window, while the instigators, together with the numerous oily little plotters and planners in Government Departments and international cartels, look round for a new driver for the repainted band-wagon.

GOVERNMENTAL GANGSTERISM?

The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane, writes to us as follows—

Sir—We have received reliable information to the effect that the Commonwealth Government has established a Social Service Department in each State, with branches in country districts. This department will operate under secret Regulations, which are we understand, definitely inimical to the public interest.

Personally, I have written to my Federal Representative asking him to obtain for me a copy of the Regulations under which this new department will operate. It is our intention to issue a leaflet exposing this rotten state of affairs if we can obtain sufficient evidence on which to do so.

We suggest that you make every endeavour to get information on this racket and expose it through your paper. This new department should not be allowed to function under secret Regulations.

—Yours, etc., A. W. Noakes, Hon. Secretary.

DEATH OF MRS. J. JOHNSTONE

With profound regret we record the death, on June 16, of Mrs. J. Johnstone late of Durham-road, Surrey Hills, Melbourne. Mrs. Johnstone had been ill for some time, but the news of her death will come as a shock to many Social Crediters, who were not in close and continuous touch with the family.

We who know her will feel the loss of a very rare character. To many folk her delightful home was an oasis of intelligent living where one could move in an atmosphere of freedom and friendship that words are inadequate to describe.

The finest tribute that can be offered to the memory of Mrs. Johnstone is to press on with increased vigour to obtain the better way of life which she exemplified.

pencil anything which has not appeared in the Russian press, hence there is no such thing as a news beat or an exclusive story. A reporter can work for weeks gathering material for an article, only to have it killed because it has not appeared in "Pravda". They view his independent activity bordering on espionage. (To be continued.)

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