

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. 29. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1945.

## "NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

## Vital New Offensive Beginning "Up North"

### The Anti-Bureaucratic Campaign in Queensland

The Queensland Voters' Policy Association has fired the first shot in the anti-bureaucrat campaign in Queensland. The following letter was recently sent to every M.H.R. and Senator in Queensland:—

Dear Sir,—My League has been formed of citizens who believe that under cover of war-emergency, great strides have been made in Australia towards the Totalitarian State.

We detest totalitarianism and all it connotes; we much prefer our former British way of life, which affords to the individual the widest opportunity to live his own life in his own way, with the minimum of interference from Government officials and other external authority; which supports the old claim that "An Englishman's home is his Castle."

We are determined that the policies imposed upon us under war-emergency shall not endure and persist as permanent features of the peace.

We believe that our well-tryed British way of life, which encourages the individual to exercise his own initiative, is not only more to our taste and more comfortable to live under, but also incomparably more efficient in accomplishing an objective; that we won the war against Germany not because of the totalitarianism which in large measure we adopted, but in spite of it—that we could have won the war against Germany more quickly and with less cost, had we not been hamstrung at every turn by bureaucratic interference. Had totalitarian methods of organisation been more efficient than ours, then Germany, who was prepared to the teeth for war, would have made short work of Britain, who had been treacherously prepared, by disarmament, for the slaughter.

We recognise in our subjection to bureaucratic control, a fundamental departure from our former way of life, to which we are determined to return. We, therefore, dedicate ourselves to the ousting of the

Bureaucrat and to his replacement by one who receives a mandate from the people, and who returns periodically to give an account of his stewardship to, and is subject to dismissal by the people—that is, by a responsible Minister of the Crown.

The characteristic of stable government is that such Government has the consent of the governed. Any other kind of government is tyranny.

The alternative to stable government is lawlessness, chaos, disorder, and revolt. These symptoms are already too prevalent in our community to escape the attention of any but the wilfully blind. They are clear indications of, and follow inevitably from, the abdication of Ministers, who instead of accepting responsibility, endeavour to evade it by the appointment of Boards, Commissions and Bureaucrats.

There is only one way to restore stable Government—i.e., to oust the Bureaucrat, and restore Responsible Ministers.

Bureaucrats are appointed by Governments, who are supported by representatives, who, finally, in their turn, are elected, and paid, by electors.

For the guidance of Electors we are asking you and all others, M's.H.R. and Senators, from this State, to classify themselves as pro-bureaucrats or anti-bureaucrats. To that end you are invited to answer the following questions:

Will you immediately and from this time forward exert yourself to the utmost—

1. To reduce to pre-war numbers the numbers of public servants?
2. To especially consider for elimination all senior appointments to the public service made since 3/9/39?
3. To oppose the appointment of any additional Boards, Commissions, or bureaucrats?

## Significant Political Pointers

Any elector who believes that there are any basic differences between the Federal Labor Government and the Opposition should read the "Hansard" reports of the "debate" on the Invalid and Old-age Pensions Bill.

Members of all parties, particularly the Labor Party, expressed great satisfaction that the old-age pensioners are to get a paltry few extra shillings per week. Not one man of any party advocated a pension equal to a reasonable living wage.

There were the usual arguments as to how the extra money should be obtained, but everyone appeared to agree that it could only be obtained from the taxpayers.

If Labor Party members would investigate the amount of taxes, direct and indirect, on every item used in living, they would not be so loud in their declarations that the old-age pensioners do not have to contribute to their own pensions. Every bite of food taken and every stitch of clothing worn carries a tax in some form. The Labor-Socialists seem to be determined to maintain this imposition.

The basic philosophy of the Socialists was expressed by Mr. Holloway, M.H.R., who, after stating what a "great" income the new Act will allow an aged married couple, said:

"The amount could not be made much higher than that; otherwise, there would be a disinclination, to work."

And so our elderly people, having served

## Government Housing Schemes

Professor Wilkinson, of the Faculty of Architecture, Sydney University, told Albany Rotary Club the Government housing schemes were "directed by ridiculous administrators."

"They know nothing of housing, and waste time in Canberra keeping files of rubbish," he said.

Professor Wilkinson said that officials often became so occupied with administration that they forgot the thing they were administering.

"Some of the difficulties attributed to shortage of materials would be cleared up if some of the controls were relaxed," he added.

—"New Era," 6/7/45.

the community, must not get too much in case they all decided to take the pension instead of being wage-slaves until the end of their days! Ye Gods!

And yet some enlightened money reformers have believed that men such as Mr. Holloway will help Social Credit with their banking "reforms." The simplicity of some people is almost past understanding.

When considering the disastrous Washington Agreement made after World War I—an agreement which was forced on a reluctant Britain by Washington, aided vigorously by McKenzie King, of Canada—it is interesting to recall that Mr. W. M. Hughes demonstrated that he appreciated just what the Washington Agreement meant: war in the Pacific if ever Britain were forced to go to war again in Europe.

Mr. Hughes had the courage of his convictions during the talks leading up to the Washington Agreement, although he was a minority of one. His outspoken views on American foreign policy are on record in his book, "The Splendid Adventure."

In 1940 he reiterated his opinion that the cause of the Pacific trouble could be traced back to the Washington Agreement.

It may also be recalled that the great stand made by Mr. Hughes against President Wilson and the Japanese at the Peace Conference allowed this country to be kept free of a coloured minority problem.

With all his faults (and this journal has pointed them out) there is little doubt that Mr. Hughes was possessed of far more statesmanship than is Dr. Evatt. Mr. Hughes made no secret of the fact that he believed that Australia's future depended on a strong British Empire; that we had everything to gain by maintenance of the Imperial link. We could feel a little happier if Dr. Evatt were to express similar sentiments.

A few figures revealing the startling growth of the number of bureaucrats in this country should shock even the most apathetic electors into action.

(Continued on page 2)

4. To abolish bureaucratic direction of policy and to insist that the responsibility for policy shall rest on a responsible Minister of the Crown?

5. To resist any further regimentation of the people?

6. To insist that all measures of regimentation shall be rapidly relaxed and repealed?

You are asked to answer each of these issues "Yes" or "No," and you will then be provisionally registered with us as pro-bureaucrat or anti-bureaucrat. If no answer is received from you within 14 days of the date of this letter, you will be classified as pro-bureaucrat.

We propose to organise in each electorate so that a flow of last preferences shall be directed to all retiring pro-bureaucrats.

—Yours faithfully, (Mrs.) M. DE MATOS, Hon. Secretary.

After two weeks had elapsed only three replies had been received. Mr. Fadden replied in general terms, stating that his opposition to bureaucracy was known, He referred to some of his statements. Mere

statements are not enough. Mr. Fadden's electors should either receive a written pledge that the reduction of the number of bureaucrats will be his Number One policy at all times, or, failing this, work to ensure that he gets last preference votes at the next elections.

Senator Cooper expressed general agreement, but said that controls cannot be done away with immediately. Mr. Adermann was in agreement with a reduction in bureaucrats "as far as practical." This is insufficient guarantee. Electors must insist on unqualified support of their policy.

Queensland electors should now be busy backing up work of the Voters' Policy Association and getting the anti-bureaucrat canvass under way. Members of Parliament must be made to realise that electors mean business.

In order to develop its work, the Queensland Voters' Association is appealing for donations. Those desirous of helping financially or of obtaining advice and information should write to: Queensland Voters' Policy Association, Box 1507N, G.P.O., Brisbane.

**CHARTER V. CONSTITUTION:** Possibly the one weakness in our Australian Constitution is that it allegedly, permits (or rather, does not expressly prevent) the overriding of the people's wishes by international agreements. So, we can appreciate that the San Francisco Charter, by including the "Full Employment" clause, might be used to flout the verdict given by the Australian people at last year's Referendum. Power over employment or unemployment has no relation to preventing war, so it is clear that this power is designed to enable totalitarian regimentation. In these circumstances ratification should be decided by a Referendum—the people should insist on that. If YOU have not taken this matter up with your Federal Member, you should do so immediately.

**TAX TRIALS:** Taxes were once paid in corn and goods, which were Nature's non-monopoly gifts. Later, taxes were demanded in the form of money. Then the trouble started, because money soon became a special kind of monopoly. Sir Robert Peel (who began the centralisation of police-power in England) first introduced income tax into England, but only at the rate of three pence in the pound on large incomes (now the tax gatherer takes 19/9 and only leaves 3d.). Coming to Australia in 1895 (before the Federal virus appeared), income tax was first introduced into Victoria following the depression, which followed the financiers' land boom. Sales tax was imposed "to meet the depression" in 1930. And so the tax-racket story goes on. One might expect taxes to be reduced during depressions—but Finance has other ideas. Maybe depressions and wars are promoted as excuses for increased taxes.

**MEAT MEDDLERS:** The extent to which bureaucratic meat planners have dislocated our meat supplies is seen in the statements of members of the Victorian meat trade and a control officer, as reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of July 13, viz.: "Hundreds of butchers are being forced to obtain their supplies on the black market . . . Butchers in many country centres will have to close their shops . . . Country hospitals and institutions may be without meat. The problem is accentuated by regulations and controls that prevent producers from sending to market." All agreed that meat rationing has become a dangerous farce. The sooner our despotic bureaucrats are disbanded and given a spot of productive work or paid leisure the sooner we will get back to sanity; so, on with the job and Buck the Bureaucrat!

**COMMUNIST CONSPIRATORS:** From a Washington source comes a report that "Congress is expected to go on a Communist hunt soon to inquire into subversive practices in several Government agencies." The Prices Administration Department is to be combed, and also the records of U.N.R.B.A. as to whether one executive is one of the top-men giving orders to Communists in the United States, (vide Melb. "Herald," June 16). A similar inquiry here also may be advisable just to make sure that our War Departments and institutions are not being used to serve political ends. If, for example, the "Security Service" is used for political purposes, or in the interest of influential aliens, it is a serious matter. Just as a precaution, a routine examination of the investigation records of this and other departments would set a good example; it would at least have a tendency to prevent misuse of power.

**SUPPLY SHORTAGE:** Despite the Government's assurance that equipment and supplies were adequate, a returned officer of the 17th brigade who fought through the recent campaign was reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of June 17 as saying that "men suffered unnecessarily and the whole

campaign was delayed, through lack of supplies and services, and the morale of the 6th Division was seriously affected because they knew they would have to fight with inferior equipment." (So much for the much-vaunted Labor Government's "war effort.") He also said: "The position generally improved after the debate on similar allegations in the House of Representatives." Here we note that pressure on Members does bring results. No wonder the high-ups endeavour to prevent servicemen sending complaints direct to their political representatives.

**BODY BRAWL:** A report from Gary (Indiana, U.S.) gives an idea as to where "full employment" may lead us; one only has to transpose the incident into all occupations to obtain a complete picture of the implications. The case cited is that of two undertakers determined to have the job of burying the one body. One undertaker claimed that his rival had removed the corpse without the consent of the relatives. The other claimed that the job should be his, because he had buried the other members of the family. The upshot was a gun duel in which one was killed and three others injured. This, of course, provided more jobs. Come to think of it, this could go on indefinitely, thus achieving the goal of Full-Employment with a vengeance! (Continued on page 4.)

## Believe It or Not!

A taxpayer received his assessment for £52/11/-. His employer had deducted £52/10/-, so he was in the very unusual but happy position of owing only a single shilling. His relief, however, made him a bit careless, and instead of handing in his certificate, plus the shilling on the 7th of the month, he forgot about it till the 12th, a lapse of a whole five days. He then went along, got his receipt, and went away smiling.

But not for long.

A few weeks later he received a letter from Mr. Chifley's Taxation Department demanding a fine of £3/1/3. This for being five days late in paying the extra shilling!

We are all familiar with the enticing slogan of the pawnbroker: "One pound lent for sixpence per month," which is really 6/- per annum, or 30 per cent. But any money-lender must surely blush at his modesty when he learns that for a loan of 1/- for five days from the Commonwealth Taxation Office, there is charged £3/1/3, which is equivalent to only 4720 per cent, per annum. Later, the office, under the taxpayer's vigorous protest, reduced the penalty to £1, or a mere 1400 per cent.

Not only is the impost grossly immoral; it appears also to be wholly illegal, as the Taxation Act's maximum penalty is 10 per cent, per annum.

—Sydney "Century," 13/7/45.

# SOVIET "GESTAPO" AND ITS VICTIMS

By PROFESSOR WATSON KIRKCONNELL

[Interest in the following article, entitled "Preface to San Francisco," by Professor Watson Kirkconnell, head of the English Department in McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, centres as much in the fact that a leading Canadian evening newspaper, the "Toronto Evening Telegram," of April 14, featured it, as in the personality of the writer, who is attracting wide attention in Canada. In addition to many other books and pamphlets, Dr. Kirkconnell wrote "The Seven Pillars of Freedom," an outstanding exposure of the Communist menace in Canada.]

The impending defeat of Hitler's evil regime is something for which we have all worked and prayed for nearly six years. Nevertheless, lest there should be any thoughtless optimism over the impending San Francisco conference on world order, it is vital for Canadians to grasp firmly a few of the political realities behind the discussions there.

The crux of our problem is the open tendency of Stalin to dictate world settlement on his own terms, and the tendency of many Canadians to regard Soviet Russia as "progressive," "democratic" and "freedom-loving."

Now a stable basis of collaboration with Stalin is most important, but such collaboration does not require groveling adulation and the mendacious praise of tyranny. Some of these Canadian hallelujah-singers will not mend their tune for any amount of evidence against their false performance, for their ambition looks forward to "blasting the foundations of the old society" and tasting the joys of power amid the wreckage.

Others, however, may merely have been misled by pro-Soviet propagandists (Harold J. Laski, the muddled Dean of Canterbury, Edgar Snow, Anna Louise Strong, Maurice Hindus, Raymond Arthur Davies, "et hoc genus omne"), and may still be open to a reasonable presentation of evidence.

For the purposes of the present article, I shall confine myself to one phase of the Soviet State and to one only: the grim reality of the Soviet political police force and its rule over millions of hapless victims. It is important to realise from the outset that the U.S.S.R. is a "Police State," and that, regardless of prettily phrased Constitutions, all ordinary democratic freedoms are automatically denied by that fact.

These police began as the "Cheka"; presently that malodorous name gave way to the initials O.G.P.U., and this in July 1934, became the N.K.V.D., "National Commissariat for Internal Affairs"). This vast organisation with a budget in 1937 as high as three billion roubles, controls all places of imprisonment in the U.S.S.R., including both gaols and concentration camps; it superintends all road-building, canal-building, and other engineering projects (regularly carried out by slave labour); and it maintains a check on the Red Army in order to purge any indication of independent thinking.

**The existence of the concentration camps, and their forced labour, crops out even in the narratives of journalists and other observers consistently favourable to the Kremlin. Here are a few samples:**

**Wendell Wilkie, in his press articles of 1943, stated:**

"We drove into Yakutsk in a heavy black Soviet limousine. Between the airfield and the town we looked for the usual concentration camp that we had seen in some other cities—half barbed wire fences, with sentry boxes at the corners."

**Quentin Reynolds, in "Only the Stars are Neutral":**

"A few miles outside of Kuibyshev we passed one of the big concentration camps reserved for political prisoners. Beyond that we saw a long line of them working on a new road . . . We winced, I think, because these 800 prisoners were women." Philip Jordan, in his "Russian Glory": "On the flat track opposite our window were perhaps thirty women guarded by a N.K.V.D. man with a tommy-gun. They were squatting like dummies there, and had not moved for hours, for against their exposed flanks the first snows of winter had driven and there they now rested. One of the women had a baby in her arms . . . There was something terrible about them." Walter Kerr, in his book, "The Russian Army," tells how men of a large American convoy with which he arrived in Murmansk had cheered the Russian dock workers and were shocked to receive no response:

"A few hours later we found out why the Russians had failed to acknowledge the cheer. They were prison labourers, far from their homes, guarded by police with rifles and fixed bayonets. I suppose they did not care whether any country sent supplies to Russia."

William L. White, in his "Report on the Russians," tells of overtaking a large column of workers on the road near Magnitogorsk: "Two things are remarkable about it. The first thing is that, marching ahead of it, behind it, and on both sides, are military guards carrying rifles with fixed bayonets. The second thing is that the column itself consists of ragged women in makeshift sandals, who glance furtively at our car."

A letter of protest against Mr. White's account, signed by sixteen pro-Soviet writers (including Raymond Arthur Davies, Jerome Davis and John Fisher), has recently been published, not in denial of the facts, but on the ground that the facts "can only be understood in terms of change and historical perspective."

**The assumption, no doubt, is that there were concentration camps and forced labour in Russia before the Bolshevik revolution,**

**and that the present regime, while carrying on traditions of slavery to which the Russians are accustomed, is gradually mitigating the system. But let us get down to figures:**

In 1900-05, under the Czar, there were only 15,000 prisoners undergoing penal servitude in Russia; in 1913, there were 32,757, with only 5,000 political prisoners. On the other hand, all estimates of the prisoners of today run to many millions. The Polish Socialist, Victor Alter, out of a good deal of personal experience, estimated numbers as high as 12,000,000. Boris Souvarine, as of 1937, states, "15,000,000 condemned in the various categories would probably be the number most in accord with the facts." In his book, "The Real Soviet Russia," David J. Dallin cites many other estimates, all high, including Alice Moats's "Blind Date With Mars" (20,000,000), and "The Nineteenth Century and After" (10,000,000 to 18,000,000).

**Hapless human beings, more numerous than the entire population of Canada, are herded by the bayonets of the N.K.V.D. into slave-tasks where the death-rate is appalling.**

**Conditions in these camps and projects are described in great detail by David J. Dallin (op. cit., pp. 189-213), based on a very wide range of reports. The following are some excerpts from accounts by former inmates:**

(a) (From a camp near Archangel): "We had to work in our own clothing. After two or three weeks, our suits were torn to pieces; the prisoners were half-naked. . . . After twelve or thirteen hours of work in the snow-covered forests, we used to return to the barracks thoroughly drenched. In the same rags we went to sleep. And after such nights we had to get up in the mornings in the same rags, cold, frozen, half dead. The prisoners could not wash. We used to work without respite. Sunday was also a working day."

(b) (From Kolyma, in Eastern Siberia): "Owing to the cold and dampness, most of them suffer from kidney trouble. They also suffer from swelling of the legs, open sores on legs, on arms, and around the ribs, as well as from scurvy. Many go blind. How high the death rate is, is difficult to ascertain, but I know from one prisoner who was in my company that in his camp he belonged to a special group whose duties consisted only in digging graves."

(c) "A sad picture: Slowly, almost invisibly the mass of silent dirty men in torn clothing moves—going to work or returning from it. Every now and then someone in the crowd slips and falls on the snow or into the mud. Nobody stretches out a hand to the fallen; you have to save your own energy."

(d) "The conditions of work for men: Twelve working hours a day. Those who do not complete their assigned tasks with in this time remain at work until they do. If the period over which someone failed to complete his task extends to over one week, he is considered guilty of deliberate sabotage. The prisoner is then locked in an isolation cell and condemned to death without trial."

Such is the state of "freedom" in the U.S.S.R.

**What happens when the Soviets take over non-Soviet territory is still less clearly understood by most Canadians. An eloquent exhibit is an order to the N.K.V.D. in Lithuania, dated November 28, 1940, and now in the possession of the international Red Cross.**

This order called for the prompt and systematic "liquidation" of all Lithuanian army officers, policemen, members of parliament, clergy, merchants, bankers, business men, higher civil servants, Red Cross workers, Polish refugees, and all other citizens of foreign countries. (I have the full text of the document on file). The sequel was thus reported to Churchill and Roosevelt by the spokesmen of these three little States: "Tens of thousands of our people were murdered without trial, and more than 100,000 were deported in cattle trucks to Siberia or to Central Asia . . . Families were torn apart—wives separated from their husbands and children from their parents."

**The situation on the return of the Soviets in 1944 was still more dreadful. On August 20, 1944, Mr. Salnais, the Minister of Latvia in Stockholm, reported to Mr. Zarins, Minister in London, by radiogram:**

"During last weeks the number of Latvian refugees here increased by more than 200 persons, amongst them women and children, all fleeing German occupants as well as Bolshevik invaders. Latvian roads are full of refugees, their situation indescribably terrible. Refugees give evidence that both occupants—Germans in still occupied districts, and Bolsheviks in newly invaded places—apply most cruel terror and criminal methods by torturing and totally exterminating local population . . . Information received directly from the underground organisation that on August 6 the Bolsheviks drove together on the field 630 inhabitants of Laudone and vi-

cinity and killed them with machine-guns, no consideration being given to children, old age or sex. Eyewitness, teacher K., escaped by simulating death and lying on ground among corpses till darkness . . . The outrageous actions are completed not so much by the intruding (Red) army, which is worn out and demands provisions, as by Cheka (N.K.V.D.) forces, who follow in the footsteps of the army."

**In Poland, the N.K.V.D. has similarly taken over, and has filled such abattoir-camps as Majdanek with the heroic officers and men of the Polish Home Army.**

Earlier, in 1939-41, the N.K.V.D. had deported 1,500,000 Polish citizens from Eastern Poland to slave-camps in Siberia and other parts of the U.S.S.R., and today the process has been resumed in full swing over the whole of Poland. Mass murder and deportation are the order of the day. Why should so many Canadians—teachers, ministers, journalists, C.B.C. commentators, citizens in many walks of life—assume that, in all this, Russia is freedom-loving, progressive and more highly civilised than the rest of the world? In the Baltic States—where the absence of the Orthodox Church removes any need for phoney propaganda—the Soviets have been exterminating with equal ruthlessness the Protestant churches and clergy of Estonia and Latvia and the Catholics of Lithuania. Rule by the N.K.V.D. means the extinction of human freedom.

**There is tragic significance in Mr. Churchill's offer of British citizenship to the 150,000 brave Polish soldiers, sailors and airmen who are fighting on Britain's side in this war.**

If a strong, free and democratic Poland were really being set up by the Yalta agreement, these gallant men, who have fought for nearly six years for the freedom of Poland, would be the first to throng happily back to it. Instead of this, scores of them are now committing suicide in despair. Apropos of the suggestion that some of them should be welcomed to Canada, the "Canadian Tribune" (Communist) of March 3, 1944, remarks: "Since when is Canada to become a garbage can for all the scum fleeing liberated Europe?" In view of the appalling record of the N.K.V.D., in view of the reign of terror that it is now extending from Russia to Russia's neighbours, and in view of the enthusiasm with which this is being greeted in the Communist press of Canada, there is significance in a news item in the "Hamilton Spectator" for November 6, 1944, reporting on a Labour Progressive [Communist] Party rally in Hamilton:

**"After a lengthy eulogy of Russian ways, Mr. Buck said that he hoped that the Russian revolution would be duplicated in Canada."**

All this has its ultimate meaning in Canadian political life, especially in view of the bastard alliance of Liberals and Communists in North Grey and in the Ontario Legislature, and in the Canadian citizenship suddenly and mysteriously bestowed this spring by Ottawa on Sam Carr alias Cohen, alias Kogan, the Dominion organiser of Tim Buck's party; but the immediate importance of it lies in the stand to be taken at San Francisco by our Canadian delegation. A world organisation for peace is vital; but shall we not insist

## Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1)

**In 1933 the number of people employed by Government authorities was 305,700. In 1939 the figure had increased to 405,000, while, today, it is approximately 521,000!**

Although the population of Great Britain is approximately six times as great as the Australian population, it is reported that the number of Government departmental employees in Great Britain is only 150,000 more than in Australia!

There is an urgent need to drastically reduce the number of bureaucrats in Great Britain, but we need the greatest "sacking" campaign yet seen in this country!

**"I am not one of those light-headed people who believe that tax rates will go back to pre-war levels immediately after the war. I do not believe that, and I do not want it."—R. G. Menzies, during debate on Banking Bill (vide Federal "Hansard," June 21).**

Isn't it strange that Mr. Chifley has expressed exactly the same ideas about taxation as Mr. Menzies? And yet some people believe that the "debate" on banking at Canberra was in some way concerned with their welfare!

**A close study of Clause 28 of the Federal Government's Banking Bill, which relates to the proposed Industrial Finance Department of the Commonwealth Bank, reveals all too clearly that another powerful weapon has been forged to introduce the complete totalitarian State.**

We can well imagine the type of "assistance" this department is going to provide for "certain classes of industry." The planners behind the scenes who drafted this legislation know what they are about. But on June 26, Mr. Chifley inadvertently admitted that he was advancing a scheme, which he did not fully understand. Replying to the previously made allegation that the term, "securities" in Clause 28 of the Bill meant that the Industrial Finance Department could actually purchase shares in industrial enterprises, Mr. Chifley said:

**"The only point I wish to make now is this: The word 'securities,' I am informed, is not deemed to cover shares."**

If only we knew the identity of the person whose information Mr. Chifley accepts, we might know who really designed the Government's Banking Legislation.

There seems to be little doubt that many Labor members have no idea of the real objectives behind the banking "reform" they are so enthusiastically supporting. One of them, Mr. Martens, related at Canberra on June 26 how he answered electors who asked him what the legislation meant:

**"I stated I was not in a position at that stage to inform them as to the nature and object of the proposed legislation . . ." (vide Federal "Hansard").**

Fancy a Labor member saying he didn't know the OBJECT of the legislation he was going to support at a later date! Readers can form their own conclusions —E.D.B.

that the system shall be built on a peace of justice, helpfulness and good will, rather than on a system in which smaller nations and their citizens shall be subjected to the "peace" of a badly run penitentiary?

## THE ARCHITECT OF DUMBARTON OAKS

(From "Smith's Weekly," Melbourne, 23/6/45.)

**Very prominent today in the American political sphere is "a bald, moustached, pipe-puffing little man," whose proper title, it is stated, is that of Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, and who is credited with being "the eyes, ears, and pen" of his chief, Edward Stettinius, in everything relating to national security and foreign affairs.**

His name? LEO PASVOLSKY.

There are a number of Assistant Secretaries of State, confirmed by the Senate; But Pasvolksy has never been officially listed among them.

"By denying Pasvolksy the title and giving him the power of an Assistant Secretary," it is explained, "the White House was spared possible wrangling in Congress through his being a Russian-born expert with a varied political past."

This past, it would appear, embraced his beginning "well to the Left in politics," then "heading towards the centre," and finally becoming a supporter of the New Deal.

Pasvolksy's duties as an Assistant Secretary, without the title, began with Cordell Hull; and the "Special" that now precedes those words is due to the present general recognition of the part it has been his lot to play in shaping the life of his adopted country.

"From the moment Stettinius took over," we are told, "he looked to Pasvolksy for advice on post-war organisation."

"Hitherto in the background, because of the skilful anonymity with which he worked, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference put him in the spotlight."

"He was photographed at the Secretary's side along with the British and Russian delegates."

"Whenever his chief would ask a question Pasvolksy had the answer from his encyclopedic knowledge."

By a writer in "The New York Herald-Tribune" he is declared to be "the principal architect behind the Dumbarton proposals."

With his father, an anti-Czarist fugitive from Russia, Pasvolksy arrived in America in 1905 at the age of 12 rapidly learnt English, and from the public schools in New York went on to win his AB degree.

Later, he studied at the University of Geneva, in Switzerland, and—returning to

America—achieved a national reputation in economics.

He covered the Versailles Conference for "The Brooklyn Eagle" and "The New York Tribune," is the joint-author of such works as "War Debts and World Prosperity," "Russian Debts and Russian Reconstruction," and "Bulgaria's Economic Position," and "it now looks as though he will be busy for some time in preparing America's part in the steps towards a lasting peace."

Reports are that Sumner Welles, when Under-Secretary of State, and Pasvolksy didn't get on too well; and that among the political prices Cordell Hull exacted for his resignation were (1) the retention of Pasvolksy in the Department, and (2) that Welles would not again be appointed to anything.

America's Russian interpreter at Dumbarton Oaks was Charles ("Chip") Bohlen, who served in a similar capacity at Tcheran and Yalta.

Bohlen did not always satisfy the Soviet delegates at Dumbarton Oaks.

During some of the discussions, when they came back with more and more questions, Pasvolksy—whose Russian is fluent and polished—chimed in with less formal and more idiomatic explanations. Soon the Soviet delegates were depending almost entirely on his explicit interpretations. Points that seemed sticklers became simple.

"Russians think like Asiatics," remarked one diplomat, "and it takes a Russian to do business with a Russian."

Only personal touch in Pasvolksy's office is a photograph of Cordell Hull, autographed "With esteem."

In summing up his hopes for a world organisation, Pasvolksy declares that an international police force seems to him more compatible with reality, adding:—

"But the key to it all is our knowledge that peace is indivisible. It is for all the world—or for none. There is no escape from another all-embracing war, if any uprising is not checked at the outset."

Here is a further interesting instalment taken from "National Regeneration and Agricultural Policy," issued by the Farmers' Action Council, Hampshire, England: —

The policy which goes by the name of "Nationalisation of the Land" is being thrust upon the community from many and various quarters. For example, the Labour Party Caucus and the Communists place it in the forefront of their proposals, while official advisers to the Government advocate it.

The terms "Nationalisation" and "Public" or "State ownership," are catchy and attractive, but ownership of the whole country cannot be more than nominally in the hands of the people collectively.

**Ownership without control is a mockery. It is a complete delusion that "The State" is the same thing as the people. "State Ownership" means centralised or "collective" ownership, with serfdom for all but a few bureaucrats.**

The alternative is the existing system of private ownership linked with responsibility to the community, with every man his own master and dependent upon his own efforts.

The clearest exposition of what "Nationalisation" would mean to farmers and all connected with the land has been given by Sir Daniel Hall, agricultural adviser to the Government. He has said that it would mean vesting the ownership of the land in a "Land Office." That is to say, a bunch of officials (Land Commissioners) would become the effective owners of Britain, and the personal relationship and understanding between landlord and tenant, or the genuine feeling of responsibility of the owner-occupier, would be destroyed.

**Remote control, or management from a distance, would be the end of real farming, which depends so much on day-to-day, or even hour-to-hour, decisions by the man on the spot. Our national gift for improvisation and initiative would be killed, with disastrous consequences to the nation.**

It is clear that "Nationalisation" of the land would simply be camouflaged monopoly in the hands of Government officials. Departmental management or control is rarely, if ever, satisfactory, because a Government department is impersonal and never suffers for its inefficiency.

**Consequently, it is a screen behind which officials can take irresponsible action. And as Sir Ernest Benn has written: "We know that neither politician or bureaucrat has ever produced an ounce of food. They have regulated, distributed, divided, diminished and destroyed, but never increased the necessities of life."**

Another advocate of "State purchase" is Dr. S. C. Orwin, Director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute of Oxford. He sets forth his argument in the Penguin Special, "Speed the Plough."

He urges the grouping of farms into large units so that each unit may be leased to a private syndicate prepared to invest £30,000 in stocking it. He proposes that a general manager with two assistants and a secretary-accountant with a small staff of clerks should be put in charge. Dr. Orwin admits that many thousands of family farms are "socially of some significance," but "he is optimistic about the benefits of getting British farming organised on big business lines." ("The Times," London.)

This may be the way to "make farming pay" from the investor's point of view, but it would reduce enormously the number of independent farmers and small holders who stand or fall by their own ability and initiative, which would be an irretrievable national disaster.

**It is no coincidence that Socialists, Communists, Bureaucrats and votaries of "Big Business" advocate the same policy for the land—"State Ownership." The common aim of all is centralisation. Politicians, bureaucrats and financiers see in this process still greater opportunities for adding to their power over other people's lives and property.**

In short, the policy, which is labelled "Nationalisation", would mean a complete social revolution.

Service men and women are realising the great danger of revolution by Government order in their absence. The Government has no mandate from the people for fundamental changes of this kind.

Who would benefit? Either financiers looking for large-scale investments now that foreign fields are so curtailed; or, our bureaucrats who, besides visualising a vast extension of autocratic power for themselves, apparently intend to take over the national credit, nominally on our behalf, and invest it in "collectivised farming."

**They would thus secure their own position as arbiters of the destiny of the nation. Their tyranny would be worse than the present tyranny of finance and more securely clamped upon us.**

It is becoming more and more obvious that centralisation by one means or another is the objective of politicians, bureaucrats and planners alike.

Agriculture has always been the great stumbling block for the centralisers, for besides their natural independence, farmers and their families can live on their own produce. It is mainly because of his determined resistance to centralisation that Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith was sacked from the Ministry of Agriculture.

**It cannot be too much emphasised that centralisation is the major issue in the world today.**

Those in power can think only of more power for themselves. They wish to make everything bigger, all the time stealthily getting control into their own hands. By unscrupulous use of every medium of propaganda disguised as "central" news, entertainment or education, the public are being led to believe that bigness is synonymous with efficiency, their only standard for as-

sessing efficiency being the false one of financial cheapness.

Small traders, manufacturers and so on are being attacked and rapidly swallowed up by the octopus of big business, chain stores, combines and "State" monopolies. Individuality and traditional skill and craftsmanship are being destroyed—a permanent loss to the community. Here are the natural allies of the farmer and the small holder in their instinctive resistance to "nationalisation." Together they can save Britain for free men and women, but because those who live on the land are alone able to snap their fingers at the octopus if they will, they must go out for the co-operation of all who would be free. Nor must those whose only assets are their own skill and willingness to work be forgotten. They must be enabled to increase their independence and secure their freedom.

**The excuse given for the threat to collectivise farms is that small units are inefficient. There is, however, ample statistical proof that crop yields per acre are highest on small farms and lowest on large, "extensive" and mechanised holdings. The best size for a farm, or unit of**

land, is that which one man can manage or supervise adequately. Since the capacity of individuals varies infinitely and no two farms or system of cropping are identical, it follows that there is no single best size for farms. The key to good farming is feeling for the land. Destroy that by large-scale agriculture on factory lines and both farmers and the land will become mere machines.

The drive for "Nationalisation" is coming to a head because the old tyranny of finance is breaking down. The people are gradually realising that money itself is costless and valueless, and that the plea that a nation cannot afford to use its own physical resources to the full is sheer humbug.

An understanding of the true nature of money at once exposes the tyrannical purposes for which it is misused.

One very important function of money is that it confers on its possessor power to act and freedom of choice. Money is a licence for action.

**Taxation, which is a transference of money from individuals to governments, is therefore a process of centralising power to act, and power to decide policy.**

The individual's hard-won licence to act on his own initiative is stolen from him under the pretext of acquiring money for "national" needs, when in reality there is no difficulty whatever in creating money to meet national liabilities.

## MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

By ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

**Remember carefully the endless arguments put forward throughout World War 2, that we must be "ready to sacrifice everything for peace"—as the "Protocols" so engagingly put it.**

As soon as Hitler and his friends got the war safely under way (don't forget that Stalin's Jewish advisers gave the "all-clear" with the Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact), Mr. Anthony Eden, close friend of the Rothschilds and other Jews, also highly regarded by the Moscow Jews, said that the "new world" was going to be built through the nation at war.

You do see how necessary the war was, don't you? How can you destroy national sovereignties and usher in Mr. Steffs' planned "new order" unless you have a war—allegedly to preserve national sovereignties? Remember Poland, Finland, the Balkans and the Baltic States? Of course, perhaps this talk about saving democracy was only a good joke. Professor Harold Laski, who gets plenty of publicity in the world's press, is quoted by the "Saturday Evening Post" (U.S.A.) of September 30, 1944:

**"It was possible to believe in the permanence of the democratic ideal in the brief hour of its triumph in 1918. Since then, events have proved that it was untrue to the conditions of our age."**

Laski's co-racialists helped the campaign against democracy very ably at Bretton Woods, San Francisco and elsewhere.

Mr. Duff-Cooper, another close associate of Jewish leaders, could hardly wait for the start of the war in 1939 before he was lecturing in America on the necessity of a Federated Europe. He spoke at a United Palestine Conference in Washington. One of the audience said: "There spoke the heart of England. Israel stands with England in this war, as in the last."

Then "The Progressive Outlook" of January 1940, came out with the challenge: "Wanted—a new, positive Jewish leadership for the new world in process."

Mr. Duff-Cooper almost read from the "Protocols" when he said he predicted, "the war would bring nations to realise that even as individuals give up liberties for the sake of common liberty, so nations must do the same thing . . ."

Isn't it strange how Mr. Cooper's "predictions" have been becoming hard facts?

Another "prediction" back in 1939 told the Canadian Club in Ottawa:

**"The plan [it was already in existence!] is expected to be very similar to the organisation of the United States. Each unit would give up its external authority, pass over complete control of its foreign relations to be ruled by this CENTRAL AUTHORITY."**

The plan advanced as the war proceeded. At the Bretton Woods Conference, which we will learn more about later, the financial plans for enslaving the world were drawn up. In appendix "C" of their Report on this Conference "our" Australian economic delegates said:

**"If international agreements are not to interfere with the sovereignty of nations, no agreements whatever are possible."**

A view to which Dr. Evatt, close friend of Laski and Baruch, subscribes.

On February 18, 1945, speaking under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Remember Toynbee: "We are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands!") Viscount Cecil openly said that the "reluctance to limit any sovereignty must not block world security." The elementary principle of INDIVIDUAL security was not even mentioned! Neither was the CAUSE of wars. The cause must be kept, as after World War 1, in case another war is necessary to condition the people!

At the San Francisco Conference, Dr. Soong, associate of Wall Street Jewry and responsible for the Reserve Bank of China, said, "China was prepared to yield, if necessary, part of her sovereignty to the new international organisation . . ." We all thought that the Chinese people fought the Japanese in order to preserve their sovereignty! But wait a while until "America" reconstructs China! "Russia" may also lend a hand.

**We must not overlook the part played by**

## "CAPITALISM," JUDAISM AND SOCIALISM

Professor Wernher Sombart was led to investigate the origin of the 'Capitalist' spirit, and in course of analysing Max Weber's theory of the relationship between Puritanism and the development of 'Capitalism,' came to the conclusion that all the elements of Puritanism which really contributed to the growth of the 'Capitalist' spirit were drawn from the Jewish religion . . . With the realism of the modern German savant, Sombart lays down the principle that the man of business can have no other object than the making of profit." [Money profit. —Editor.] "System, expediency, and calculation are his three guides. These fundamental postulates of 'Capitalism' are to be found in the Jewish religion. The relationship of the Jew to Jehovah is not a filial or a loving relationship. Judaism, in its essence, contains no trace of belief in Divine grace, and no mysticism, properly so called. The intercourse of Jews with their Deity is sober, mechanical, and business-like; all their acts are believed to be entered in a celestial ledger, the good deeds on the credit, the bad deeds on the debit side. Even interest is reckoned. The Old Testament scarcely mentions other reward for righteousness, or punishment for unrighteousness, than the gain or loss of temporal goods . . . The body of economic-political doctrine known as 'Liberalism' [capital initial] was largely built up by Jewish, crypto-Jewish, or pro-Jewish writers . . . and today (1913) half the Social Party in the German Reichstag is composed of Jews."

—"The Hapsburg Monarchy," by Wickham Steed, p. 151, et seq.

## P.E.P. ON THE JOB

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay, General Secretary of P.E.P. from 1931 to 1935, is secretary of an "all-party" European Reconstruction Committee of Members of the British Parliament, with Sir Arthur Salter (also P.E.P.) as chairman.

—"The Social Creditor," 26/5/45.

fore, that Dr. Evatt made the question of employment one of his major points at San Francisco. Reviewing the San Francisco Conference, Dr. Evatt said that the Russian delegation was responsible for "the full employment pledge that proved acceptable to ourselves . . ." How very nice!

Just why a domestic matter such as employment should be made a major issue at an international conference was not explained. But we will no doubt learn in due course!

No one wants to get the idea that the surrender to the "international Super-Government" idea at San Francisco was merely confined to our socialist delegates. Here in Australia the "capitalist" press helped things along considerably. For example, an editorial in the Melbourne "Argus" of May 12, 1945, dealt with the "sovereign weakness" of small States and lauded Russia's attack on Finland as a policy of "realism"! The "Argus" put it bluntly that the Big Powers— and Russia and America have emerged from World War 2 as the strongest powers — must have the right to violate a small nation's sovereignty if "world unity" were threatened. No doubt the writer of that "Argus" editorial would be very indignant to be told that he was merely re-hashing arguments put forward by the "Protocols" last century. (To be continued.)

## DESIGN IN THE BANKING LEGISLATION

By G. A. MARSDEN.

**Australians who wish to inform themselves of the real objectives of the recent Federal Banking legislation will find one demonstrated in the design now taking shape in New Zealand.**

For several years banking in New Zealand has been on similar lines to that envisaged in the Bank Acts of 1945 in this country—i.e., a central bank, retaining its commercial activities, with control over all other banks.

New Zealand is now passing to the second stage—i.e., the nationalisation of banking. This stage is intended to follow in Australia after a period in which the public's financial transactions have been gradually funneled through the Commonwealth Bank.

In New Zealand the agricultural and pastoral land to the extent of at least 80 per cent, is in the grip of the banks. The position in Australia is similar in this respect.

**The Government, therefore, having acquired the banks, has only to follow a dictated policy of deflation in the post-war period to become possessed of all the securities of the land, and will then have a Rural Slave State, the members of which will be told what they are to produce, and will be permitted to sell only to the Government at a price fixed by the Government.**

It is fully realised by world planners and plotters that the independence of the agriculturalist is a great obstacle to communisation, so the people must first be dispossessed. State-owned banks, plus a policy of deflation, would bring this about.

Perhaps we realise now why the economic policies of Australia and New Zealand are to be linked together in the future, as arranged for in the Australia-New Zealand Agreement, drawn up by Dr. Evatt last year, and ratified behind the back of Parliament.

**It should be noted that the POLICY of banking is in no way changed, which indi-**

**cates that the authors of the design are the same international plotters who are at the same time seeking to establish a Central World Bank, which will pursue the same plot against humanity on a universal scale.**

As a part of the design, and linked with it, is one of the most powerful machines the world has ever known—the Food and Agricultural Organisation. (The Act ratifying this machine has been passed in Australia. For this we are again indebted to Dr. Evatt.)

This worldwide economic machine is operated through the Social and Economic Council, which Dr. Evatt was so insistent on having closely linked with the force organisation of U.N.C.I.O., so that there could be no means of escape from the World Slave State.

This is how ex-Senator Macartney Abbott views the position:—

**"But during such (transition) period the concrete must not only be poured into the trenches prepared at San Francisco, but we must commence to build on it an INDISSOLUBLE structure."**

If the Federal Parliament ratifies the U.N.C.I.O. Charter then we shall have entered upon the "transition period" during which means are to be taken to prevent secession, and these will be cemented by force—an international police force.

How many Australians are aware of the trap that has been laid for them? Before it is too late each elector should find out from his M.P., whether he intends to vote for the plotters or the people, and then tell him how he must vote.

## MESMERISM AND CONFUSION ABOUND

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

Sir, —Words like "democracy," "freedom," and "loyalty" have still got the bulk of the people mesmerised.

One night last week a very active Labor supporter called to see me in connection with a private matter, and in the course of conversation he spoke often of "our wonderful democracy."

Surprisingly, however, when I asked him what he really meant by the word "democracy" he replied that surely I did not want him to produce a dictionary! Democracy to him simply meant a country in which members of Parliament are elected by the votes of the people!

This, I confess, was a shock to me, as the man was undoubtedly sincere, and believed he had been actively engaged in spreading enlightenment.

He ultimately agreed that while we are free to vote for whom we please on election day, the extent of our choice has always been severely limited by the system of pre-selection and "party" dictation. He also agreed that a better conception of democracy would be a community in which the elected representatives produce the results the people desire. On this basis he conceded that we have not yet had true democracy in Australia or, for that matter, in any other country either, and that although members of Parliament are elected by the votes of the people, the people have not yet applied any means by which the activities of such members are controlled during the period between the election dates.

Once again, it was clearly a case in which the blind has been trying to lead the blind.

The extent of this condition of mesmerism, or confusion, was further emphasised by the reports of the meeting of the so-called "Big Three" in Potsdam.

Great volumes are being written about freedom, justice, honour, straight dealing, peace, and other virtues, but all the discussions affecting the welfare of the people are being conducted in the greatest secrecy. Dictators are dictating behind closed and heavily guarded doors, and the names of the real dictators are the closest secret. All of which is going on in the sacred name of Democracy, and of "peace-loving" nations. The PEOPLE—i.e., the great bulk of mankind who will benefit or suffer from the decisions of three men—are treated with contempt: they are informed of nothing and never consulted.

Still further evidence of this condition of mesmerism, or blind acceptance of error, is to be seen in the activities of our so-called educational institutions.

A few days ago I had the opportunity to peruse the textbook on "practical banking" issued to students of the Melbourne Technical College. The contents of this textbook are in parts pathetic. Under the heading "Definition of a Bank" the students are required to assimilate the following:—

"The Oxford Dictionary gives the following as the ordinary modern use of the word:—'an establishment for the custody of money received from or on behalf of its customers. Its essential duty is payment of the orders given on it by its customers; its profits arise mainly from the investment of the money left unused by them.'" To anyone who has studied practical banking it is obvious that the compilers of the Oxford Dictionary were seriously misled, and that those responsible for the management of the Melbourne Technical College are perpetuating false conceptions without apparently being aware of it. The subject of money has them mesmerised, too. In any case, after the admission of the Archbishop of York, it is surprising that the Head of the Melbourne Technical College did not go to a more reliable source for his information than to Oxford. The Archbishop of York said:—

"I was taught some political economy at Oxford, including certain propositions about money. What is perfectly plain is that money is not what they told me it was."

It is true, of course, that most of the banks have iron bars on the windows, and the buildings are designed to create the impression of solidity and safety. That helps to mesmerise. Seeing that almost the whole of the "money" in banks is in the form of entries in ledgers, the need for the bars is not so apparent, as it is doubtful whether anyone would ever attempt to steal the ledgers. A thief would be quite content with the notes and coin he could find and would leave the "de-

posits" just as he found them—i.e., as entries in the big books.

And when the Oxford Dictionary speaks of "money received from or on behalf of its customers" it surely does not mean to imply that the customers themselves produce the stuff they deposit. It is true that deposits are made by customers, but obviously the customers must first collect the money before they can deposit it. The important question is: Who PRODUCES the money before it is deposited. The answer to this has been given by Mr. H. D. McLeod, M.A., in his text book "The Theory and Practice of Banking" as follows:—

"The essential and distinctive feature of a bank and a banker is to create and issue credit payable on demand, and this credit is intended to be put into circulation and serve all the purposes of money. A bank therefore is not an office for the borrowing

and lending of money, but is a manufactory of credit."

The Encyclopaedia Britannica confirms this in the following terms:—

"Banks create credit. It is a mistake to suppose that bank credit is created to any important extent by the payment of money into the banks. A loan made by a bank is a clear addition to the amount of money in the community."

McLeod also says:—

"A banker's profit consists exclusively in the profit he can make by creating and issuing credit in excess of the specie he holds in reserve. No bank which issues credit only in exchange for money, ever did, or by any possibility could, make profit."

Thus we see that the banks are the custodians of what they create, and that this power of creating and destroying credit-money in the form of bank deposits is far more important than the question of "profits" in the sense referred to by the text book.

Will someone kindly bring this to the notice of the Principal of the Melbourne Technical College and suggest that the textbooks be called in for thorough check and extensive correction. There is some reasonable excuse for mesmeric ignorance on the part of the rank-and-file of the people, but none at all for such ignorance on the part of those charged with the responsibilities of education.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,  
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.  
July 22, 1945.

## MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE URGED TO RESIST CENTRALISERS

At the thirty-third conference of the Municipal Association of Tasmania, held at the Town Hall, Hobart, on May 29, 1945, Councillor Partington said:

"I hold that if we are to build up a well-balanced democratic community on solid foundations, we must build up on local government under the control and guidance of local men who know the local people and the local conditions, and who have a vital stake in the district.

"We cannot get the best local men to take a pride in their districts unless they are given the power and the responsibility and the means of building up their district in an adequate manner.

"There can be little doubt that the local Councils cannot do their jobs as they wish to do because they have to take what is left over after the Federal and the State Governments have scooped the financial resources of the district.

"Up to date the people have had no power [?] to stop the State and Federal Governments levying heavy taxes on them. They are compelled by law to pay those taxes, so that when it comes to raising rates for the essential work of the local Councils the people say: 'We cannot afford it; we haven't the money.' And, therefore, the local Councils have to do without, and watch the Government officials spending the money that they cannot get.

"This has destroyed the prestige of local government.

"The State runs all the electrical undertakings and has even refused to allow Launceston to run its own electrical power station although it was one of the first in Australia. "The State also wanted to take over the tramways from Hobart and Launceston. The Transport Commission wants to run everything, which rolls on wheels.

"The State Government recently passed a Bill to take over all the Fire Brigades. The State Government also wants to take over most of the road building—but it is willing to permit us to collect rates to pay for this! "It has also been proposed that we collect rates for health services to be administered by the State. I don't think it will be long now before the State officials will demand to take over the entire water supply of the island.

"It seems, therefore, reasonable to expect that in the not very distant future Municipal Councils will be merely rate-collecting agencies for the Government; they might, of course be granted the privilege of looking after the sewerage and of seeing that the regulations passed by the various government officials in Hobart are rigorously ad-

hered to, and if they are not so adhered to—well, it would be quite easy for the Government to cut off the electrical power and the water supply to the Council.

"Nobody who has watched the growth of the various State departments and the increasing number of commissioners in this and other States, and who has watched the bullying methods that were used by the Auditor-General at the instigation of the Government, can be in doubt that Municipal Government is only allowed to live on sufferance. . . . If the arguments used to destroy the power of Municipal Government are sound, why not take them to their logical conclusions? Would it not be 'more efficient' to wipe out local Councils altogether? "But why stop there? Would it not be 'more efficient' and much cheaper to wipe out private houses and let us live in barracks under Government control? We would thus economise in fuel, also sewerage, and in the cooking of food!

"You think that is funny? Why? Because you know, and I know, that either you run your own life or you let a dictator run it for you. And we all prefer to run our own lives, and make mistakes, perhaps, and pay a little more for it, perhaps; but there is no other way for free men of British stock to live.

"I, therefore, have great pleasure in moving the following motion:—

"That this Conference resolve to resist to the utmost the continuous attack on the authority of local Councils by State and Federal Governments, and urge that a concerted effort be organised to bring back to local Councils control over local affairs. To bring this about, this Conference considers a drastic reduction in the number of civil servants, both State and Federal, could be achieved. Experience has shown that centralisation brings about a state of bureaucracy, which tends to put the people in chains."

\* \* \* \* \*

[Owing to the lateness of the hour, Councillor Partington agreed that the motion be withdrawn for submission at the next Conference after fuller consideration by the individual Councils.]

## 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:—

### HOW ABOUT TRADE UNIONS?

Eric Johnston has asked if our party may talk to the heads of the Soviet labour movement. He knows the top American labour leaders, gets along smoothly with the unions in his Washington plants, and, like me, is curious to see how free Russian labour is.

We talked to four of the leaders, but the head of the whole thing was a very smart man of 43 called Kuznetsov. He was really keen. He'd lived in America, graduated from Carnegie Institute of Technology with a master's degree in metallurgy.

Their set-up as he outlined it goes like this: All Soviet unions—representing 22,000,000 workers—send delegates to the All-Union Trades Congress. This Congress corresponds to our A.F.L. and C.I.O. national conventions rolled into one. It elects

55 of its members to something they call the Plenum. These 55 elect 18 to something called the Presidium. And these 18 have elected Kuznetsov its secretary, which makes him head of the workers.

We asked him if all the workers belonged to trade unions, and he said at least 98 or 99 per cent. The dues are one per cent, of a worker's salary. There is no initiation fee.

"Now is this a perfectly free union movement," we asked him, "or is it directed by your Government?"

It was perfectly free, he assured us. Of course, he said, anyone they elect to their Congress must be approved by the Government, but we could see he considered this a very minor detail.

It occurred to me that in America, if some carpenter's local couldn't send a dele-

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

**CASH CONCLUSIONS:** The Melbourne "Herald's" finance writer warns us in the issue of June 9 "the age of abundant money might be drawing to a close." He analyses the cash position and concludes that reduced Government spending and high taxation are the major factors in this trend. According to him "traders now find getting money quite like old times." Another sign of returning financial restriction is increasing borrowings on life insurance policies. Pre-war borrowings on policies were about £250,000 per month; that figure steadily dropped to about £40,000 early last year, but has now increased to an average of £80,000 per month. Later figures show that aggregate bank credit, which reached a peak of £826 millions in March has now declined by over 28 millions. Do we now proceed from wartime prosperity; to peacetime poverty?

**TRADE TANGLES:** Andree Vissor "Herald Tribune" foreign affairs expert, describes the Near East situation as "an even greater potential danger to the peace on the world" than Europe and the Far East from which the last two wars have sprung. He says: "Major interests of the Big Three (or those which they serve) are clashing in the Near East, and will continue to clash there. They have practically identical interests, and therefore competing interests in this area. Britain won her oil and the route to India a long time ago, and she is determined to hold them as long as there is a British Empire." He might also have added that Britain's influence and control is the best offering; that is to say, she has less blots on her proverbial copybook than any other contender for the prize.

—O. B. H.

gate to their national labour convention unless the Government approved him, our unions certainly wouldn't consider this a minor detail.

We tried another tack. "Are you a member of the Communist Party?" we asked him. He said he was. "And all the members of your staff?" He nodded.

"Since the factory managers are all Communists too, and since the Communist Party controls both labour and management under very strict discipline, I felt that would leave very little for them to argue about.

So I said, "What do the trade unions discuss?"

"Working conditions, social insurance, vacations—things like that," he answered.

"Do they talk about wages?"

"Yes," he said, "particularly the pay for piece work. The factory bargaining committees discuss rates with the management

"If they can't agree, what then?" He insisted they practically always agree. But if they didn't, they could appeal clear up to the Presidium, who could talk the dispute over with the Vice-Commissioner who managed that particular trust. In that way he said, amicable agreements always arrived at.

"Always? Aren't there ever strikes?" "Yes," he said, "in 1919 a strike in one steel mill lasted two days. And in 1923 there was another little strike out in western Russia. There have been no strikes since, and in the future there won't be any because our workers understand they are all working for each other."

"If a worker gets discharged for any reason, would it be difficult for him to get a job some place else?" "Very, very difficult," said Kuznetsov. "Well, isn't this what the workers in America call an employers' black list?"

"No," said Kuznetsov. But he didn't say why it wasn't.

"Is joining the trade union in any plant voluntary, or compulsory?" "Completely voluntary," Kuznetsov said. "How do you account, then, for the fact that practically everyone joins?"

"It is to their advantage in any country he said, "and particularly in the Soviet Union. Here a union member receives greater sick benefits than a non-union member. There is a housing shortage and most factories own apartment houses, which they rent to the workers. Union members receive first consideration. A non-union member would have trouble finding a place to sleep at night. Also, he wouldn't have access to the factory recreation centre, where they have dancing, games, movies and meetings."

"If a worker is dissatisfied with his job can he quit and go somewhere else!"

"He may put in a request," said Kuznetsov, "but the decision will be up to plant management. The head of the place is a far better judge of a worker's qualifications than he is himself."

"Will this continue after the war?" "Why change?" He said. "We must work where we are needed, to further the progress of the Soviet Union." That settled that.

We thanked him for giving us this formation. As we got up to go he said Eric, "You are the first American businessman who has ever taken the trouble to call on me, and I want you to know I appreciate it. We want you in America to understand our trade unions and realise that it is free movement here." He seemed to mean every word of it. I don't know that I can agree with him.

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

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

### DEDMAN CAMOUFLAGES W.O.I.

Dedman has just carried out a job of camouflaging War Organisation of Industry. W.O.I. now becomes S.I.D.—Secondary Industries Division, but it is still the same old set-up.

There are the same bureaucrats. Mr. Reichenbach, formerly of Allan, Allan and Hemsley, now becomes Deputy-Director of S.I.D.

There will be still the same forms to be filled in, the same publicity experts, and the same Professors.

It is merely W.O.I. making sure that it will have at least one blueprint for the peace.

That blueprint is for the extension of its own life.

If the Japs give in tomorrow, S.I.D. will be ready—to carry on.

By merely changing the name it is hoped to overcome the defeat suffered at the referendum.

—Sydney "Century," 20/7/45.