

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. 38. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, SEPT. 28, 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.

More Light on the Great Anti-British Plot

Latest Blow at Great Britain

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

Sir, —Last Friday (21/9/45) there was a meeting in the Melbourne Town Hall to start a campaign for getting food to the people of Great Britain. The meeting was called by the Lord Mayor, and suburban mayors were specially invited. Members of the general public were also admitted.

A start was made at 4.10 p.m., 45 minutes were occupied by a tedious address from a "Food Control" official explaining the "wonderful" job that organisation has been doing, three resolutions were submitted and declared carried, and the meeting closed at 5.30 p.m. It was pathetic.

The three resolutions were to the following effect:

Firstly, that the citizens of Melbourne are anxious to send food to the people of Britain. Secondly, that a representative committee be formed to organise collection and despatch; and, Thirdly, that the Commonwealth Government be requested to lower the coupon value of rationing in Australia, especially for meat and butter.

Incredible though it may seem, this programme was decided upon despite the fact that the Australian people have no say whatever in the matter of bulk supplies or of what may be IMPORTED into the United Kingdom.

According to the address given by the representative of the Food Control organisation, the simple fact is that the British Ministry of Food is merely the executive of a World Control body with headquarters at Washington, and the British Empire has no control over the food that shall come to it or go from it!

It was clearly stated that even though we may have plenty of food to spare we could not decide that we would send it, to England! We would have to send it where we were told to send it!

To my way of thinking, that is a very serious matter, and makes talk of the Empire's sovereignty so much nonsense.

Can it be mere coincidence that Sir Ben Smith is in charge of the British Ministry of Food, and is his name Benjamin? Is it mere coincidence that Lend-Lease arrangements were cancelled at a time when Bri-

tain's civilian need was greater than ever? Is it mere coincidence that the dictators of U.S. policy are using their financial weapon to put the British Empire out of action as a world power? Is it mere coincidence that this very result was one of the objects of the war just concluded, and that this economic pressure should be put on England immediately after failure of our military enemies to achieve that result on the battlefield? Is it mere coincidence that the man who was the most powerful individual in the United States during the last war, and again during this war, should be leading the financial "attack on England"?

The Melbourne "Herald" of 20/9/45 contained the following:—

"The unkindest cut of all came from Mr. Bernard Baruch last week when, hiding behind the anonymity of 'an eminent citizen and elder statesman,' he came out vehemently against the British case. This man has the reputation of being a lifelong friend of Britain and an intimate friend of Winston Churchill and his views startled the British delegation. Baruch is revered here, and his word is almost gospel. He is very close to President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes, and has the ear of the leaders of Congress. As soon as his views were in print, Britain should have issued a statement on the highest level answering the Baruch argument point by point. But even days afterward nothing has been done. Britain has had a depressing press lately, and unless tongues and tempers are kept better on both sides of the Atlantic

there could be an Anglo-American estrangement."

So, apparently Baruch, perhaps the most influential Jew in the world, is behind the unnecessary embarrassment of our people in the United Kingdom. And he has been pushing that embarrassment "hiding behind the anonymity of an eminent citizen and elder statesman"! That is how sneaks usually work. Apparently, too, he has been able to make the press depressing—i.e., more depressing than usual. Not only is he very close to Truman and Byrnes, but evidence indicates that he was instrumental in having them placed in the positions they occupy. Whoever controls finance controls food, and the identity of these, who in my view are the master war criminals, is a subject of the greatest importance. Apparently also the opinion is held that when he speaks the rest of us are automatically on the defensive.

In Douglas Reed's book, "A Prophet At Home," he says he was too young to understand the why and wherefore of the 1914 war, but in March 1939, when he returned to England after a period of twelve years' absence touring and learning, his understanding had been improved. He knew then that England was on the very eve of war, and writing after the war had actually started, he said this:—

"I knew this time, as I had not known before 1914, that the war could have been prevented; I knew, indeed, that more skill

and effort had been needed to allow it to happen, THROUGH THE DELUSION OF THE PEOPLES, than would have been needed to hinder it."

Note specially the words I have written in capital letters. The people were deliberately deluded about the war, just as they are still being deliberately deluded today about food. They were deluded then by those who control international news agencies, the film industry, radio stations, and all main channels of publicity, just as they are being similarly deluded by the same people today.

Here is another striking statement by Mr. Reed about his first discoveries upon returning home:—

"The thing that struck deepest into my mind was the enormous difference, so little realised, that the coming of the film has made in the industry of entertainment, and even in the outlook of the nation. The picture theatre, and the things it offered, I discovered, affected the speech, the looks, the habits, and the very minds of the people. The women, in increasing numbers, made-up, dressed, behaved, and talked like the marionettes that were manipulated in some distant Californian studio, puppets whose every expression and word were formed, not by the impulse of their own feeling, but by the command of some off screen producer with uplifted finger and instructions chalked on a slate. The ma-

(Continued on page 2)

An encouraging item was the somewhat surprising report that Lord Keynes refused to adopt a cop-in-hand attitude at the Economic Conference. Keynes is said to have made it clear that the British Empire, which fought the war alone for so long, was also prepared to fight the peace alone—as a last resort within a sterling bloc—and that Britishers were standing together against the new blitz as they did during the Battle of Britain.

SYNAGOGUE SLUMP: The Australian "Jewish Herald," of September 14, expresses concern at the future of Judaism in this continent; it speaks of empty synagogues, increase of mixed marriages, and general indifference of the young towards Judaism. From this it would appear that it is really remarkable how a mere handful of professional Rabbis manage to obtain so much propaganda for what is called the Jewish cause. Maybe if this small group were less noisy there would be less so-called anti-Semitism. Meanwhile, as stated in the "Protocols," anti-Semitism is used to stimulate Judaic fervour—just a trick of the trade, so to speak.

LOAN LOGIC: The Federal Labor Government has taken full control over the Commonwealth Bank, but a fourth "victory loan" is being boosted with even less convincing arguments than those used previously. We are now told that the money is required to provide transport to Australia for liberated prisoners of war, and to care for the sick and wounded. The "reasons" for continuing the loan racket seem endless. The returning prisoners of war and the sick and wounded will, of course, have to toil and sweat in the future to pay their share of interest on the latest loan—and all the previous ones! Those innocent people who thought that the Federal Government intended to use the Commonwealth Bank to free returning soldiers and others from the octopus of debt will surely understand by this time that we have been betrayed again. In practice, the new banking set-up now leaves the people worse off than when Sir Robert Gibson was the dictator of finance; so we progress like the crayfish—backwards.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM: Doctors in the Argentine have been conducting a partial strike as a protest against restrictions of liberty. The Argentine Medical Association, in a statement, says: "An atmosphere of liberty, tranquility, confidence and security is indispensable to scientific progress." A similar protest and action by lawyers has caused a virtual standstill in the courts. This stand against Government tyranny is all to the good, and it should inspire the Australian people to greater efforts in the same direction. Although the return of some of our pre-war freedoms has been forced on the Government, we have still a long way to go. Our everyday activities are still regulated by bureaucratic economists in many fields. We will not be reasonably safe until these bureaucrats are removed.

SOVIET SERFDOM: Mr. G. Mooney, delegate from the American Federation of Labour, caused a sensation at the Trade

Union Congress at Blackpool (England) when he said: "Russian Trade Unions are merely instruments of the State which actually support the Soviet system of labour blacklists and deportments to compulsory camps, resulting in virtual enslavement for millions of workers" (Melbourne "Herald," September 13). This is further corroboration of statements by other Trade Unionists and liberal writers who have had first-hand experiences in Russia to guide them. Slowly but surely the facts of Soviet serfdom are becoming known; the so-called proletarian dictatorship has proved to be much more ruthless than the so-called capitalist dictatorship. It should demonstrate to workers and Unionists that centralised power in the hands of Left or Right political adventurers are extremely dangerous. It should also illustrate the fact that organisation executives should not have the power to determine policy.

EUROPE'S ECLIPSE: The "Washington Star" was quoted as follows in the local daily press of August 7: "If U.S. Government Departments released one-tenth of the reports about Europe in their secret files, the American people would be horrified beyond words." The "Star" says that Europeans in the Soviet spheres of influence are suffering a total eclipse of the elementary freedoms and justice, which the Atlantic Charter and the San Francisco Charter promised. The "Star" also points out that America's failure to intervene contrasts with the fact that "before the first world war U.S. threatened to break off diplomatic relations with Czarist Russia unless Jewish pogroms ceased." (And U.S. recently went to war against Germany in similar circumstances.) This is interesting in view of the fact that the Russian Revolution was largely promoted from U.S. by Jewish financiers, and the fact that the revolutionary regime set up in Russia was overwhelmingly dominated by Jews—not Russians. No doubt the above-mentioned Europeans are mere Gentiles!

PURCHASING POWER: We were recently informed by a daily paper that "economists (Continued on page 2.)

Significant Political Pointers

It is high time Australian taxpayers took a more active interest in the War Disposal Commission. Time and time again during the war the taxpayers were told that the increased taxation they were called upon to pay was necessary for the obtaining of war materials. It naturally follows, therefore, that all surpluses of war materials being sold by the War Disposal Commission belong to the taxpayers, who should be GIVEN the monetary proceeds of sales.

Here is an issue on which the "common-ownership" advocates might inform the taxpayers how they can control the funds from the sale of their own property.

The Federal Government's intention of taking no further responsibility for trouble in the coal-mining industry is part of a very pretty plan to force the State Governments to accept responsibility for the immediate post-war chaos which the planners are determined to create and aggravate for their own ends.

The Federal Government had full powers over coalmining during the war. Judged by results, it would be a gross impertinence on its part to ask for similar peacetime powers in order to plan the coalmining industry or any other industry.

Incidentally, Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick has recently been telling his "Smith's Weekly" readers that Australians will be sorry they did not vote "yes" at the Referendum. Mr. Fitzpatrick would appear to know the Planners' game, which he again says was spoilt by the Social Crediters at the time of the Referendum. Social Crediters are indeed appreciative of his continued complimentary remarks about them.

First-hand reports from Queensland reveal that there are hundreds of millions of feet of first-class building timber waiting

Big Financiers' Plot Supported

"A new pamphlet in support of the Bretton Woods proposals is the first in a pamphlet-a-month series to be issued by the C.I.O. Political Action Committee. A quarter of a million copies of 'Bretton Woods Is No Mystery' are now being distributed."

—"New Republic" (U.S.A.).

The boss of the C.I.O. (a Socialist labour organisation) is the Jew, Sidney Hillman.

to be cut, but that millers and others connected with the timber industry are being held up by lack of permits.

Although some of the political marionettes at Canberra may not know it, the housing position in this country is part of the strategy to have as much turmoil in the community as possible. It will also permit the planners to herd a large section of the population into the "homes" they think they should have. Could there possibly be a more diabolic idea for turning us into a servile race—renting, on terms, of course, our very "homes" from the bureaucracy?

The taxation bureaucracy will, of course, ensure that as few people as possible are left with sufficient money to own a real home of their own.

Controversies between the Communists and some of their so-called opponents are merely differences of opinion between different sects of the one religion.

A weekly journal in Melbourne, which, peculiarly enough, is entitled "Freedom," has on occasions published some excellent anti-Communist material. But its own basic policy may be judged by the fact that it supported the Referendum proposals and later published some terrifying drivel about Beveridge's "Social Security" scheme, which Sir William assured us would take us half way to Moscow. This would take British citizens approximately to Prussia, where, of course, the original scheme of "social security," as visualised by Beveridge, was drafted by Bismarck and his advisers.

"Freedom" deplors the creation of class friction, as preached by the Communists, but in its issue of September 12 comments as follows on the fact that very few soldiers supported the Brigadier who stood as a Liberal in the recent Fremantle election: "If the Liberals want to get the vote of soldiers, they might try putting up a returned soldier for election instead of one of their stock of returned brigadiers." Apparently (Continued on page 3.)

UNDERMINING OF THE STATES' RIGHTS

Use of Canberra's External Affairs Power

Hereunder we continue publication of the full text of the important speech by the Hon. R. J. Rudall, M.L.C., Minister of Lands, delivered in the South Australian Legislative Council on July 31, 1945, as reported by "Hansard": —

I propose to give a very short analysis of the judgments that were delivered [in the Goya Henry case], but I am sure that any Member who reads them in the reports [Commonwealth Law reports, 55, pages 608 et seq.] will be well repaid for his trouble. The question the Chief Justice (Latham) sets himself is to be found on page 636—"The Commonwealth being bound by the convention, can the Commonwealth Parliament legislate to carry out and give effect to the convention and any amendment of the convention which has been duly made?" The Chief Justice points out that this power to legislate with regard to external affairs is a power expressly given by the Constitution, and no question of interference with the rights of the States arises. The Chief Justice rejects the argument that section 51 (29) should be construed as giving powers to make laws only with respect to some external aspect of the other subject matters mentioned in section 51. "There is no reason whatever," he says, "why placitum 29 should not be given its natural and proper meaning, whatever that may be, as an independent express legislative power." He rejects the argument that the power to legislate with regard to external affairs is limited to matters which in themselves concern external relations or to matters which may properly be the subject matter of international agreement. "It is very difficult," he states, "to say that any matter is incapable of affecting international relations so as properly to become the subject matter of international agreement."

He quotes on page 641 the very wide range of subjects that up to August 1935 had been the subject of international agreement. Then comes the following most important passage: —

"If, however, it should be thought that before a subject can legitimately be dealt with under this heading, it should possess some characteristics which make it specially proper to be dealt with on an international basis, there can be little room for doubt that aviation is such a subject. . . . The suggestion that a Commonwealth Government might make an international agreement in bad faith simply with the object of extending Federal powers cannot be applied in this case. If such a case should ever arise, it can then be considered."

The Chief Justice then proceeds to the meaning to be given to external affairs and state what the regulation of relations between Australia and other countries, including other countries within the Empire, is the substantial subject matter of foreign affairs" and that "such regulation includes negotiations which may lead to an agreement binding the Commonwealth in relation to other countries, the actual making of such an agreement as a treaty or convention or in some other form and the carrying out of such an agreement."

Justice Starke, in his judgment, is quite definite that section 51 (29) gives full authority to the Commonwealth Parliament to give full effect by legislation to the terms of the convention, but he does not attempt to define the limits of the power. He says: — "The convention is made with Powers and States external to Australia and involves international obligations. But what else are the external affairs of a State—or to use the more common expression, the foreign affairs or foreign relations of a State—but matters which concern its relations and intercourse with other Powers or States and the consequent rights and obligations? The powers conferred by the Constitution upon the Commonwealth to make laws with respect to external affairs must be exercised with regard to the various constitutional limitations expressed or implied in this Constitution, which restrain generally the exercise of Federal powers. The Commonwealth cannot do what the Constitution forbids. But, otherwise, the power is comprehensive in terms and must be commensurate with the obligations that the Commonwealth may properly assume in its relation with other Powers or States. It is impossible, I think, to define more accurately at present the precise limits of the power. It may be as Willoughby suggests in connection with the treaty-making power in the United States, that the laws will be within power 'only if the matter is of sufficient international significance to make it a legitimate subject for international co-operation and agreement.'"

In his judgment Justice Dixon refuses to accept the argument that this power must be confined to conduct outside the Commonwealth and not within it. He said: —

"WHY THIS TAXATION?"

Hear—

MR. C. H. ALLEN

one of Australia's earliest Social Credit writers and lecturers,

Thursday, October 4, at 8 p.m.

at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, "The Block," Melbourne (Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)

"I think it is evident that its purpose was to authorise the Parliament to make laws governing the conduct of Australians in and perhaps out of the Commonwealth in reference to matters affecting the external relations of the Commonwealth. . . . If a treaty were made which bound the Commonwealth in reference to some matter indisputably international in character, a law might be made to secure observance of its obligations if they were of a nature affecting the conduct of Australian citizens. On the other hand, it seems an extreme view that, merely because the Executive Government undertakes with some other country that the conduct of persons in Australia shall be regulated in a particular way, the Legislature thereby obtains a power to enact that regulation, although it relates to a matter of internal concern, which, apart from the obligation undertaken by the executive, could not be considered as a matter of external affairs. The limits of the power can only be ascertained authoritatively by a course of decision in which the application of general statement is illustrated by example. . . . It is perhaps wise to leave less formal arrangements with other countries and international agreements relating only to matters otherwise only of internal concern until questions arise under them."

Justice Evatt and Justice McTiernan delivered a joint judgment in which they give an interpretation of this power of the most far-reaching significance. They quote the view of Professor Harrison Moore, which I have previously given, and their criticism of it is well worthy of study. They say: —

"It will be noticed that Harrison Moore's comment was made at a time when it was not fully appreciated that the Commonwealth's powers under sections 51 and 52 of the Constitution must first be recognised and interpreted before it is possible to determine the extent of 'the exclusive powers of the States.' That this is the proper method of approach to the construction of the Constitution was recognised in portion of the judgment in the much-discussed Engineers' Case. * Accordingly, it is wrong to prejudice the examination of the content of the subject 'external affairs' by assuming or asserting in advance that there are certain matters such as conditions and terms of employment which are necessarily excluded from Commonwealth legislation in exercise of the power."

Later in their judgment they state: "It is no longer possible to assert that there is any subject matter which must

*In a later part of his speech Mr. Rudall says that "the views of Justice Isaacs prevailed in the Engineers' Case in 1929." — Editor.

U.E.A. STARTS TAX-LIMIT CAMPAIGN

(Report from the United Electors of Australia.)

After weeks of careful consideration we have decided to launch a campaign against the present crippling taxation. Now that military hostilities have ceased, the "reason" for wartime taxation has disappeared. We feel that such a campaign will meet with solid support from the public and many other organisations. Here is a copy of the printed "Letter Form": —

TAX-LIMIT CAMPAIGN.

Date.....

Mr..... M.H.R.,

Parliament House, Canberra

Dear Sir,

I desire to record my apprehension at the present rate of crippling taxation, and the fact that, despite the ending of the war, these taxes remain.

It is obvious that taxation is undermining public morale, is destroying incentive, lowering the living standards of workers, primary producers, manufacturers and professional men; moreover, it is creating an unbearable burden for returned servicemen.

Further to this, people are being driven to tax evasion and black market operations as a means of self-defence, whilst strikes, absenteeism and loss of production are largely attributable to excessive taxation.

In these circumstances, taxation, far from helping peacetime reconstruction, is, in my opinion, definitely retarding it; therefore, as a means to correct this dangerous situation, I desire, you, as my Federal Representative, to take immediate action to give effect to the following tax-limit proposals:

1. DIRECT TAXATION shall be reduced immediately by not less than 25 per cent.
2. INDIRECT TAXATION shall be reduced immediately by not less than 50 per cent.
3. SUBSEQUENT TAXATION: All additional taxation subsequently required shall be submitted to electors by way of Referendum.

Kindly advise me if you are unwilling to give effect to my wishes in this matter, so that I may seek a more suitable political representative.

Yours in earnest,

Signed.....

Address

necessarily be excluded from the list of possible subjects of international negotiation, international dispute, or international agreement. . . . In our view, the fact of an international convention having been duly made about a subject brings that subject within the field of international relations so far as such subject is dealt with by agreement. Accordingly, Australia is not a Federal State the power of which to enter into conventions on labour matters is subject to limitations. A contrary view has apparently governed the practice of the Commonwealth authorities in relation to the ratification of the draft convention of the International Labour Office. In our opinion such view is wrong."

At page 687 they extend the power of legislation under this heading to the fullest limit. They say: —

"It would seem clear, therefore, that the legislative power of the Commonwealth over external affairs certainly includes the power to execute within the Commonwealth treaties and conventions entered into with foreign Powers. The legislative power in section 51 is granted 'subject to this Constitution,' so that such treaties and conventions could not be used to enable the Parliament to set at nought constitutional guarantees elsewhere contained, such, for instance, as sections 6, 28, 41, 80, 92, 100, 116, or 117. But it is not to be assumed that the legislative power over external affairs is limited to the execution of treaties or conventions and the Parliament may well be deemed competent to legislate for the carrying out of 'recommendations' as well as the 'draft international conventions' resolved upon by the International Labour Organisation or of other international recommendations or requests upon other subject matters of concern to Australia as a member of the family of nations. The power is a great and important one."

Before I proceed to the effect of this judgment it may be of interest if I comment shortly on the term "method of approach" used in the judgment of Justices Evatt and McTiernan with regard to the interpretation of the Constitution Act.

It is that method of approach which has made such a tremendous difference between the protection that was afforded to the powers of the States by the original High Court, and the extension of the powers of the Commonwealth by judicial interpretation which has been so much in evidence in recent years and has, from the States' point of view, assumed such alarming proportions. I drew attention to this in the first speech that I had the honour to make in Parliament. It is not easy to explain, but it is my opinion that under the former method of approach the emphasis was based upon the federal nature of the Constitution and the duty of the Court in its interpretation of it to hold a proper balance between the powers of the Commonwealth on the one hand and the powers of the States on the other. In order that this could be done the original High Court applied what is called the principle of implied prohibition and in a long line of cases prevented the Commonwealth from encroaching on the powers of the States.

(To be concluded.)

Notes On The New

(Continued from page 1.)

Treasury officials, bankers and others have learnt from two wars and a depression how to sustain purchasing power and employment." If that is true it must be one of the best kept secrets of the war; and, if this lesson has been learnt by the species of humans mentioned first, it would be interesting to know who let them into the secret—because, obviously, economists would not be capable of discovering even such a simple thing as that. Anyway, it's good to hear that they have learnt something. The next important point is—will they use this knowledge and power, and will they use it in such a manner that, in addition to providing us with adequate purchasing power, we also obtain greater leisure and individual freedom? Or will they follow the Hitler method? An ominous indication is the press report's close coupling of "purchasing power and employment."

BATTLE BUDGET: Australia's known war cost in terms of money, to July 31, was £2,279,000,000. Of this amount £2,142,000,000 had been paid. Taxation provided £645 millions of the amount paid, while £1054 millions was obtained from public loans, and £343 millions from the central bank. The total works out at about £306 per head of Australia's population. It's certainly a slick bit of work, because even when the note issue was at its peak it was only about £30 per head. There must be some of Mandrake's magic behind this!

DEMOCRATIC DESIGNS: Some reports say that Germany is to be given a brand-new democratic set-up: the political structure to be decentralised and local responsibility to be developed. That makes strange reading for Australians, who are suffering a highly centralised government tyranny like that recently overthrown in Germany. It may also astound the Russians; if they are allowed to hear of it they may even "liquidate" dictator Stalin and attempt democracy in Russia. Such a new German set-up might cause tremendous complications—especially if it placed the politicians effectively under the control of electors! But, surely the Planners will be cunning enough not to let it go that far.

—O.B.H.

MORE LIGHT ON THE ANTI-BRITISH PLOT

(Continued from page 1)

Majority of young men and women of the country, I found, spent several hours each week in the picture-theatres, and their minds, unquestioning and plastic as mine had been, were moulded by ANONYMOUS MEN FAR AWAY WHO WERE OF ALIEN BLOOD AND ALIEN THOUGHT."

Note again the words I have written in capital letters.

Now the purpose of all this is to point to the fact that the same people, or the hired servants of the same people, are again employing the same methods to continue the delusion, so that local sovereignty may be taken away as by a thief in the night and replaced by carefully-chosen committees or boards having WORLD SOVEREIGNTY. Accidentally or otherwise, Jews are to be found taking a leading part in these WORLD CONTROL plans, and it seems to me that the Jewish leaders knew what was afoot in 1939, just as they know what is afoot now, for when Douglas Reed returned to England in 1939 he "passed down the gang-plank with some hundreds of Polish Jews who had come to England in the same ship."

The people of Australia wish to send parcels of food to this people of Great Britain. They should send them by post to individuals. The contents of such parcels are shared widely. We know this from personal experience. It would be foolish to agree to further rationing, as such a course would merely enable the alien controllers to order the local controllers to send the food somewhere else. Parcels for individuals DO go to England, and it is an easy matter for small groups of persons to send parcels to several different individuals.

Get this going first, and then let us proceed to identify and deal with the traitors who have brought about the surrender of the control of our affairs to foreigners.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 23rd September 1945.

LEST WE FORGET

Date, Midsummer, 1938. Scene, the garden of an English country house in which a tea party "to meet refugees from Hitler's tyranny" is in progress.

Native (to refugee): "What is your opinion of the state of affairs on the Continent?"

Refugee: "We have great hopes."

Native: "Yes, of what?"

Refugee: "That there will be a war, of course."

Native: "Why should there be a war?"

Refugee: "How else can we get our property back?"

So now they've had their war. Clarence, a six years' war at £12,000,000 a day and a million casualties, and they've got their property back, most of yours, and, if Professor Laski has his way, the rest of yours. Do you feel you've had your money's worth?

—"The Social Creditor," 7/7/45.

HOW TO PICK THEM

"If you wish to know the affiliations of a writer on international affairs, notice whether he calls these islands Britain or Great Britain. — "The Social Creditor," England.

— "The Social Creditor," August 4.

A PSEUDO-REALIST AND A MUDDLED MORALIST

The following article takes the form of a critical review of two contributions in an English periodical. That might seem a trifle academic and remote from urgent realities in Australia. But it is not. It incorporates a clear and realistic analysis of certain vital issues that Australians must quickly face up to and deal with correctly—or lose the peace!

Beatrice C. Best is the writer of the article, which we take the liberty of reprinting from "The Social Creditor," England, of July 28: —.

The first number of "The New English Review," which appeared in May of this year, is disappointing. Granted that it is an old review with a new name* one expected, or hoped any way, to find in it a greater sense of reality and regard for fact than characterises most current publications. Indeed one may say that such a sense, and such regard constitute the only excuse today for bringing out a new publication, or refurbishing up an old one.

Unfortunately, one is bound to say that, judging by the first number, "The New English Review" can offer no such excuse. Two of its articles cancel each other out; one by Mr. D. R. Davies entitled "The Peril of Secularism,"—the other by Mr. Quintin Hogg entitled "British Industry After the War." This fact alone challenges any claim to integrity and consistency of editorial outlook or policy.

Briefly, Mr. Quintin Hogg is all out for expansion—increased efficiency—increased productivity, resulting in the multiplication of "things."

Within the framework of the present monstrous and unrealistic† system, Mr. Quintin Hogg is a realist, for the system demands endless proliferation as the price of its continued existence. His contemptuous dismissal of Social Credit as a quack panacea can therefore be contemptuously be ignored, since he nowhere questions the validity of the system, nor of the expansionist policy it demands. His indictment is a "practical" one based on the "need" for increased efficiency in production, and our "failure" to achieve it.

Mr. Davies' indictment is a moral one, and based on a contrary contention, for he accuses modern man of an OBSESSION with "things"; an accusation which, by implication, refutes the charge and deplores the aim of Mr. Quintin Hogg.

He speaks of "the contemporary obsession with things," of "modern man's obsession with expanding consumption," of "this obsession with material aims," of "greedy appetite," and says: "there can be no doubt that our Society regards the consumption of 'things' as the supreme end," and much more to the same effect. His indictment might, perhaps, be summed up as an arraignment of the "Greedy Consumer."

The first objection to be raised against Mr. Davies' complaint is the simple and obvious one that man has always been obsessed—if "obsessed" is the right word—with "things"; there is nothing new or contemporary about this "obsession." Our museums bear striking and incontestable witness to man's interest in, and love for "things," both useful and ornamental. So far, however, as contemporary man is concerned, the evidence shows that, in regard to some things at least, his taste has moved towards a greater simplification. A comparison between the Victorian taste in clothes and furniture and our own should convince us of this.

The second objection concerns the reason given for this "obsession," in so far as it may be said to exist, and characterise, in particular, contemporary man.

From the extracts quoted above it is evident that Mr. Davies blames the greedy consumer, and the "supremacy," as he calls it, of "expanding appetite." It must be said at once that it is difficult to understand how anyone who sets out to instruct and advise on the "Peril of Secularism" can so misunderstand and misread the nature of the peril, and its underlying cause. Mr. Davies accuses the Daily Press of being characterised by an almost "complete absence of any discussion of fundamental assumptions." But what can one say about Mr. Davies' fundamental assumption, which he neither examines nor questions, namely that it is the consumer with his "expanding appetite," his "unlimited needs," who is the cause of "the contemporary obsession with 'things,'" of the "modern religion of material progress." Surely a superficial examination of his assumption would have led him to see that this "modern obsession with things" can—

* Formerly published under the title of "Home and Empire."

† That is unrealistic in the sense of failing to reflect reality; but realistic from the point of view of those who find in it a perfect instrument for our enslavement.

BARUCH'S "SHOP WINDOW"

"The constant insertion of Mr. James Byrnes, the "shop window" for Mr. Bernard Baruch, into any situation of international importance is carried a step further by the announcement that President Truman will take him to Berlin. It would be interesting to know the connection, if any, between Professor Laski's orders to Mr. Attlee on his association with Mr. Churchill in regard to this meeting, and Mr. Baruch's alleged message to the Prime Minister that he'd "see him later—he was too busy just now." Busy with Professor Laski?

"There is a persistent rumour that Mr. Byrnes will replace Mr. Stettinius as Secretary of State." [He did!]

—"The Social Creditor," 30/6/45.

not be attributed to the consumer as such, that it is man as producer who is responsible, and even then only because he is the victim of a policy that forces this obsession upon him.

"How can you satisfy unlimited needs with limited material resources?" asks Mr. Davies. The picture suggested here of industry panting to keep up with the insatiable demands of the consumer would be funny, if such distortion and misrepresentation of the facts involved were not too seriously misleading. ‡ How does Mr. Davies' picture square with destruction, sabotage, restriction, rationalisation, and all the various devices resorted to between the wars to keep production down to a level that could be reached by the consumer? How does it square with hire-purchase, and endless advertising efforts all with the object of getting this "greedy" consumer to purchase the "things" the producer has to sell, and indeed must sell if he is to live?

These facts should make it plain to the most obtuse that it is not the consumer who forces, or tries to force, the pace.

It is a mistake, Mr. Davies contends, to think of this "obsession with material consumption" in terms of a "struggle for mere existence." He also says that: "In the modern man's obsession with expanding consumption . . . physical necessity has become entangled with social and moral values." But from the point of view of the producer the "obsession with material consumption" IS a struggle for existence, and often for mere existence, being a struggle to sell, in competition with others, the "things" he is able to offer to a consumer with insufficient purchasing power to buy them. Hence the desperate attempts at adjustment already alluded to, "hire-purchase," "rationalisation," etc. As for entanglement with moral values, Mr. Davies omits to mention the one over-riding entanglement with the moral value attached to work; work here meaning a paid job, an obligation to earn your living. But as

‡ At one point, however, Mr. Davies appears to contradict himself, for he says: — "To multiply the powers of production one must likewise multiply the capacities of which suggests a contrary picture of industry trying to ginger up the consumer!"

SOME ADVICE TO SOCIAL CREDITERS

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —An ominous note of gloom pervades the bulk of Social Credit literature. The majority of writers on the subject create the impression that the position is hopeless; and that, in spite of all efforts. The Hidden Hand must prevail. In the mind of the reader there is built up a sense of helplessness and futility, and even something of fear.

THE WHOLE ATTITUDE IS WRONG! Social Crediters hold the key to the future well being of the human race. They are the only champions of true Democracy, and the sole defenders of real Christianity. Amid a vast welter of propaganda-fed superstition and prejudice, they KNOW—while others grope and fumble, misled by platitudes and catch-cries. "The Douglas" has shown them a glimpse of reality through the mists of sham, and they are armed with knowledge where others stand defenceless and unprepared.

Right thinking means right living, which is cheery, hopeful and healthy living, untroubled by doubt and gloom. "The Douglas," with his clear vision, has discovered the snares and pitfalls set, has pointed out the plague-spots, given sight to the blind, and directed their path; and Social Crediters may face the future undaunted by the vast array of power wielded at present by the forces against which they strive. By keeping fast hold upon reality they must eventually prevail, in spite of the opposition's control over the means of distortion and wholesale lying. The seed of knowledge has been too widely scattered and too firmly set to fail in future growth and fruit bearing. The absolute absurdity of the present system, with its results in direct opposition to individual desires, and its increasing enslavement of humanity, must become increasingly apparent at time passes.

"The Douglas," with his essays, "Economic Democracy" and "Social Credit," has opened up a new world where reality and plain common sense replace greed and graft, meanness, cruelty, superstition and prejudice. His more recent and shorter writings have accurately portrayed the march of events, and exposed the plots of the power-lusters; and his "Brief for the Prosecution" has named many of the enemies of mankind. The result is that Social Crediters KNOW—and Knowledge is Power! Why be morose and glum about it?

A bridgehead has been established in Alberta, and results are forthcoming which cannot longer be kept hidden. Against this bridgehead the world controllers have used every weapon short of military war; in vain. Their mightiest efforts at falsification and suppression of news are daily becoming feeble; and the infiltration tactics now being tried will also fail, because the Al-

industry, owing to technical improvements (efficiency), is increasingly able to dispense with human labour, this "moral" obligation becomes increasingly difficult to fulfill, and the whole struggle is intensified. Efforts must be made to make more "things," or devise more services to employ the displaced labour. § The final result is the making of "things" in the guise of bigger and better bombs; then all have "work," and the first phase of the struggle is over, for a time.

It is surprising the moralist cannot see that if "things" were easily accessible an "obsession" with them would decline and cease.

This accessibility, or its possibility, exists today. The fact, however, is denied or obscured by those who have control over the claims to "things," ("the terrible power of the purse") and who, in order to use this power to control the lives of people must maintain an illusion of scarcity, or even by the destruction of war, contrive its actuality. It is nevertheless a deplorable fact that the power maniac finds, in the moralist, one of the chief supports for his diabolical policy. The reason for this is the moralist's fear of the corrupting influence of wealth, of possessions, and belief in the discipline of having to do without. But what the "moralist" fails to see—or admit—is that this corrupting effect is due, when it occurs, to the power, the prestige, the privilege that exclusive possession bestows. This gives to "things" an undue importance, and a false glamour to the thought of possessing them. "To the modern man," says Mr. Davies, "the pursuit of material wealth . . . embodies the will to self-affirmation, to excess, to glory." The pursuit of wealth for these ends has always existed; but in a society where an ample sufficiency for all was possible, in which to be "rich" or "poor" was a matter of choice and taste, the pursuit of wealth for "self-affirmation," for "excess," for "glory" would become meaningless and absurd. In such a society, it might be the "poor" man who would gain distinction, being recognised as one who had ample resources within himself, and thus was more independent of "things." Indeed voluntary poverty has always conferred a certain distinction.

(To be concluded.)

§ A good example of the needless multiplication of goods and services is that a business started with the object of placing automatic cigarette machines in private houses. The person who placed them served them regularly with cigarettes, and remunerated himself with the difference between the wholesale and retail price. The consumer neither demanded nor particularly wanted the machine; the hardest part of the work was canvassing to induce him to accept it. The whole business, from the making of the machines, to the placing and servicing them, was concerned in it to earn a living, albeit in many cases a meagre one. So the struggle to get hold of the means of existence was accompanied by the further one of trying to make ends meet.

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1)

brigadiers, even if they have a distinguished record, are not returned soldiers—or are all ranks above that of lieutenant to be regarded with suspicion? As a result of deadly propaganda over a long period, it is unfortunately true that many Australians think they are being democratic by being hostile to rank of any description.

"Freedom's" comment prompts one to remark concerning "Labour" and Communism: "They are not the same thing, but they have the same father,"

* * * * *

There are some peculiar features about the plan to unify the Australian railway system.

A unified railway system would have been a great benefit to our defence system during the war, but there are now far more important matters confronting the Australian people. Mr. Ward and other Canberra planners no doubt consider it desirable that a great number of Australians should be kept busy on comparatively unimportant public works, which will seriously interfere with the production of consumable goods. This is all part of the Big Idea.

There is not the slightest doubt that, under really competitive conditions, road transport would soon give services with which no railway system could compete. And we are only on the verge of aerial transport. Even before the war all Governments endeavoured to maintain a monopoly in transport by refusing to allow road transport to compete directly against the railways. Financial policy was the underlying cause of this policy.

Director-General of Land Transport, Sir Harold Clapp, has joined forces with planner "Eddie" Ward and is getting a little ahead of himself by telling those who pay him (the public) what they must do. At a recent address in Adelaide he bitterly criticised the State Governments and "State insularity." He also said that "the Jews have made a success of settlement in Palestine, and we must open our arms to them all."

According to Sir Harold, "we are, of course, going to have another war, and this is the time to start thinking about it." Now, isn't that interesting! And, of course, in order to plan to meet the war, which Sir Harold predicts, we must be prepared to be "unified" a little more and be planned by Mr. Ward and others.

It is about time that Sir Harold was told very clearly that it is the prerogative of the Australian electors to indicate what they desire to produce, and in what priority, after the war. We venture to predict that first and foremost they want the entire population decently housed and with access to an abundance of consumable goods. We can assure Sir Harold that after the people had sufficient houses and food and clothes, if the £300,000,000 he and others suggest we spend on unifying the railways were given to Australian families without motor-cars, they would "vote" overwhelmingly in favour of owning individual independent means of transport. And that is one example of what science has made physically possible—greater and greater freedom for the individual.

The foregoing does not mean that we should take no interest at all in improving rail transport.

It is a warning that a centralised monopoly in transport is part of the Planners' campaign to kill all independence.

* * * * *

"A session or two ago, we had before us a Bill to deal with certain details connected with the policy of converting cheap wheat into dear petrol or motor spirit—I do not know whether it was dignified by the name of petrol. What happened? Something like £2,000,000 has been spent on the erection of four plants and now no wheat is available. In any case, the plants could not be operated unless wheat was very cheap and motor spirit extremely dear. This is a small instance, but it is one of many of the planning gone awry."

—Sir Hal Colebatch, in West Australian Legislative Council on August 1.

* * * * *

A considerable amount of staff work has been done in preparation for the Canberra bureaucracy eventually taking control of all "education" in Australia.

The Federal Government's appointment of Professor R. C. Mills as Federal Director-General of Education is a definite indication of things to come. Start work to defeat the bureaucracy immediately. Our very civilisation depends on our ability to defeat the totalitarian planners.

—E.D.B.

AND THEY CALL IT "SOUND" FINANCE!

The following news item appeared in the Natal (South Africa) "Daily News" (9/12/44):

In a letter to the Durban Town Clerk, Senator Sidney J. Smith, Chairman of the Finance Committee, said: "Durban is still paying interest on its horse trams. The trams originally cost £212,804, and by 1951 the capital and interest paid will amount to £750,000. The interest already paid on the horse trams amounts to £430,000—twice the capital cost! Yet the City only used these trams from 1893 to 1904—approximately 11 years." The horse trams, says Senator Smith, is an example of this generation paying for what they never had, and posterity paying for what it has hardly ever heard of, much less seen or used.

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

The Promoters of the Russian Revolution

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

Let me now quote from the "American Official Services Report." The particular report dealing with the financing of the Russian Revolution was filed in the files of the French General Staff as follows: 7-618-6 np 912 S.R. 11. Transmis. Par l'Etat Major del. Armee Deuxieme Bureau. (Vide "Le Figaro," a former big Paris daily.)

Section 1 states: "In February, 1916, it was first discovered that a revolution was being fomented in Russia. It was found out that the following persons as well as the banking house mentioned were engaged in this work of destruction: Jacob Schiff, Guggenheim, Max Breitung; Kuhn, Loeb and Co., of which the following are the directors: Jacob Schiff, Felix Warburg, Otto Kahn, Mortimer Schiff, S. M. Hanauer."

In a document published by the United States Department of State, entitled, "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States—1917—Supplement 2—The World War—Volume 1, page 25," the following confirming evidence appears:

"File No. 763,72119/563a.

"The Secretary of State to the Ambassador in Russia (Francis),

"(Telegram.)

"Washington, April 16, 1917. "1321. Please deliver following telegram: "Mileukov, Petrograd (or Baron Gunzburg): . . . We are confident Russian Jewry are ready for the greatest sacrifices in support of the present democratic Government, as the only hope for the future of Russia and all its people. American Jewry holds itself ready to co-operate with their Russian brethren in this great movement. — Marshall, Morgenthau, Schiff, Strauss, Rosenwald."

"(If sent to Baron Gunzburg, add: May we ask you to submit this to your Government.) —Lansing."

According to (he "Jewish Communal Register," 1917 edition, page 1019: "Mr. Schiff has always used his wealth and his influence in the best interests of his people. He financed the enemies of autocratic Russia . . ."

The "New York Times" (March 24, 1917) described a celebration meeting of Russian sympathisers in New York: Mr. George Kennan said that as early as 1905 the revolutionary movement was "financed by a New York Banker you all know and love."

A Mr. Parsons read the following telegram to the above meeting:

"Will you say for me to those present at to night's meeting how deeply I regret my inability to celebrate with the Friends of Russian Freedom the actual reward of what we had hoped and striven for these long years . . ."

"(Sgd.) Jacob H. Schiff."

In the late Francois Coty's paper, "Figaro," in June, 1931, the following item concerning Mrs. Otto Kahn (her husband was an associate of Warburg and Schiff) appeared:—

"She was officially received by the Soviet Government, which gave in her honour a grand diplomatic dinner and several brilliant receptions. The ceremonial displayed exceeded in pomp and solemnity the jour-

THE UNTEACHABLES

"Out of this war, a deep revolutionary crisis is growing. It is possible that I may be mistaken; but I seem to sense in this country the same atmosphere that was in Russia in 1916, and in Germany in 1917 to 1921. In many ways, Great Britain now resembles the Russia of 1916 . . . my friend forwarded (this) to one of the most prominent men amongst the Conservative MP's, who replied: 'I do not think that the Continental people can teach us anything.' Oh, my dear Sir, it is not only the Continental people who cannot teach you anything — it is your own people also." — "Centropress Bulletin," July 12, 1945.

There are (according to various estimators from Max Eastman to Dr. Dallin), from seven to twenty million native slaves in Russia. To these must be added probably three to four million German prisoners and other "displaced" persons. France expects to "employ" about two million German prisoners, who will be paid for to the French State, but only as State property, i.e., the slaves themselves will merely be kept alive.

Between the years 1914 and 1945, Europe (under the influence of the Darwinian theory of automatic progress and the action of forces set in operation by the French Revolution, checked for a time by the failure of the attempts of 1848, and again reinforced by the Bolshevik success of 1917), has regressed materially, morally and spiritually by an amount which represents the laborious ascent of a thousand years.

It is true that, for the moment, the blue-prints of our lost achievements remain; but signs are not wanting to suggest that we are losing the ability to read them. The housing difficulty, with its concomitant of tin-can miniature dwellings, is only one example; we are reconciled to, and almost glory in, a general entropy which we do not recognise for what it is — the stampede of the Gadarene swine.

— "The Social Creditor," 28/7/45.

ney of Amanullah, when King of Afghanistan. The Red Army lined the roads at the present arms. . . . It was the least that the heads of the 'Proletarian Dictatorship' could do in order to honour the wife of one of their sovereigns."

The London "Star," of July 23, 1935, published an announcement that Mrs. Otto Kahn was again visiting Russia:—

"After her visit to the U.S.S.R. a few years ago, a sinister political significance was alleged by a French newspaper. The truth is that Mrs. Kahn is interested in Russia, and when she goes to Leningrad is officially welcomed by the great Stalin himself. Incidentally, there is something amusing in the fact that as her travelling companion to visit the Soviet, Mrs. Kahn has Lady Ravensdale—Sir Oswald Mosley's sister-in-law."

In his book, "The Coming War," General Ludendorff wrote: "Soviet Russia has not yet got rid of her origin, which she owed to the Grand Orient."

There are many people who, because they think in terms of labels instead of ideas, cannot understand why High Finance should wish to foster Socialism.

Possibly the best comment on this matter has been made by a Jew. In his book, "Geneva versus Peace," the former French Ambassador to Great Britain, Comte de Saint-Aulape, whom we have previously quoted, relates an experience at a dinner of influential international personages just after the last war. A former Jewish revolutionary from Hungary, who had subse-

quently become a director of a New York bank, was asked at the dinner why Jewish Finance should be interested in Bolshevism. His answer was as follows:—

"Too much salt corrodes meat, too little lets it rot. The precept can with justice be applied both to the human mind and to the peoples of the earth. We Jews apply it wisely, as it should be applied, salt being the emblem of wisdom. We mingle it discreetly with the bread men consume. We administer it with corrosive doses only in exceptional cases, as in the case of Czarist Russia. That gives you a partial explanation why Bolshevism finds favour in our eyes; it is an admirable salting tub in which to corrode and destroy, and not to preserve. . . . You will say that Marxism is the very antithesis of capitalism, which is equally sacred to us. It is precisely for the reason that they are direct opposites to one another, that they put into our hands the two poles of this planet and allow us to be its axis. These two contraries, like Bolshevism and ourselves, find their identity in the International. These opposites which are as the antipodes to one another in society and in their doctrines, meet again in the identity of their purpose and in their end: THE REMAKING OF THE WORLD FROM ABOVE BY THE CONTROL OF RICHES AND FROM BELOW BY REVOLUTION. . . ."

In the Encyclopedia Britannica, under the heading, "Russia, New Financial Policies," we read: "The State Bank was established in 1921, and given authority to issue bank notes as well as to serve as a credit institution. . . . THE ROUBLE WAS THUS GIVEN ITS PRE-WAR GOLD EQUIVALENT." (Writer's emphasis.) The Jewish system of finance, credit based on gold, was thus maintained. Business connections between America and Russia were maintained right from the inception of the Soviet State. In 1933 the Russian Jew, Litvinoff, was welcomed by President Roosevelt, then embarking on the Jewish "New Deal." Litvinoff met Warburg at the World Economic Conference in the same year, and the result of their meeting was the raising of a big loan for Russia.

(To be continued.)

PAKISTAN: A MUSLIM PLAN FOR INDIA

Hereunder we conclude the article commenced under this heading in our issue of September 14. It is condensed from "The Fortnightly," London, and the writer is Sirdar Akbal Ali Shah:—

The Muslim Leaguers draw attention to the fact that the Congress governments were unjust to the Muslims. It has been shown that under the Hindu Congress ministries in the Presidency of Madras the representation that was granted to them was below their population figures; for instance, in Kumool their population was 13.2 per cent, and representation was given on the basis as if they were only 7.7.

Moreover, the Muslims were pushed out of the Debt Conciliation Boards, which meant a great hardship to them since they are the greatest victims of the Hindu moneylenders.

The Hindu religious hymn "Bande Matram," which the Muslims consider as being supplication to an idol, was made obligatory as the prayer to be sung before starting a meeting of the Legislature. And much else has further served to embitter feeling between the Hindus and the Pakistanis.

It is claimed that, if Muslim zones were detached from the rest of India, the economic cohesion of the entire country would be disturbed; for both the North-west Frontier province and Sindh are subsidised provinces, and without contribution from the central government they would not be able to meet their budgets.

Those who are in favour of Pakistan assert that the economy of the scheme will balance itself because the defence expenses of the Frontier Province must be cut down, since there is really no danger of the Russians attacking India, nor are the Afghans inclined to invade.

Also, with the economy of those regions in the hands of the Muslims, more employment will be found for the people there by exploiting the natural resources of such regions, especially Sindh and the Frontier, where oil and other potentialities are known to exist.

In the question of the Indian States the promoters of the Pakistan scheme have not interfered. In a recent address of Mr. Jinnah it was made a special point to advise the Kashmiri population to be loyal to their Maharaja, and the Sikhs of the Punjab have been assured by Mr. Jinnah that they need not have any apprehensions regarding their minority rights under a Pakistan government.

Pakistan agitation has quite positively created a reawakening in the Indian Muslims; and they will not go back to any older conception of Swaraj, because that is considered as Hindu-inspired, and genuine concern is now felt in every Muslim mind regarding the political strategy of anything savouring of Congress.

Equally it is true that a definite programme of government has not so far been projected by Mr. Jinnah for reconstruction after the war, and more especially rural reconstruction. This latter question is bound to raise its head, for 70 per cent, of India's population being rural and its basic industry being agriculture, no political plan will be workable without an effective appeal to the cultivator, who wishes to sow and reap, in peace and leave political wrangling to city-dwellers. The lack of some concrete plan in this direction has undoubtedly contributed to the success of the Zamindar Party of the landlords in the Punjab against the Muslim's League

predominance there. The Punjab peasant might know of the Pakistan movement, and might even be attracted by it, yet being a realist, he wants to know by actions what benefits might accrue to him from a change of the system of government. In like manner, the Hindu Congress might not have the same success again in the United Provinces, as, during the three years of the Congress ministries' rule the petty farmers did not consider themselves any better off than before.

The real issue of India cannot be solved either by the Congress, or even the Muslim League despite Pakistan being written large upon its banners, unless Mr. Jinnah's economic advisors can offer a village improvement plan and until some party or amalgamation of parties can better the lot of the cultivators who are the majority in India.

Many close observers believe that ultimately the whole problem may again devolve upon England, when Round Table Conferences may again be convened in London to project their conflicting programmes; and, finally, agreeing to differ, Indians might accept that which England might once again hammer out for them. Meantime, of course, there might be the recrudescence of communal riots, because employment in war industries in India would have gone. The one hope is that as soon as the war is over, wiser heads in Britain and India will quickly examine the whole Pakistan issue and endeavour to do what it with what the Congress wants.

—Reprinted from "World Digest," June 1945.)

SOVIET RUSSIA'S POLICY OF GRAB

The London "Patriot" reported on May 24 that the Czech Press Service had issued the following, under date of May 11, on the distressful state of East Central Europe:—

"Regardless of all the political games and tricks which are going on at the present moment, nine European States, which were independent before the war, have already been incorporated in the Russian Soviet Union. They are: Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Roumania, Slovakia and Yugoslavia. Altogether they cover 507,390 square miles of territory, and their aggregate populations number 87 million souls. In every one of these States, at the time of Soviet occupation, a so-called National Government has been nominated in which the chief and executive power is in the hands of the Communists.

"All these countries are agrarian States, where the Soviet regime must be installed in the same manner as adopted in Russia after 1917. According to the directives given by Lenin to the Communists in 1917-1920, the policy of the victorious Bolsheviks in agrarian countries has two periods. In the first period, the Bolsheviks lead all the farmers against the owners of big estates with the promise of partitioning the estates and giving the land to the working farmers. In the second period, when the power of the big landowner is destroyed and the power of the Communists strengthened, all the farmers must be deprived of their private possessions and collectivised.

END OF NATIONAL SECURITY REGULATIONS

"It is not for the Parliament, the Australian Government, or the Attorney-General to interpret the meaning of the National Security Act; it is a matter for the High Court alone," said Mr. David Maughan, K.C., the noted Constitutional authority last week.

He was commenting on a Canberra report that until the Australian Government declares that a state of war with Japan has ceased to exist no time limit can be fixed for the duration of the National Security Act, and its regulations.

"The Act does not say that it will continue for six months after a Government declaration that a state of war has ceased to exist," he added.

"The Act provides that it, and, of course, the regulations made under it, shall not continue in operation more than six months after his Majesty 'ceases to be engaged in war.'"

"The question when his Majesty ceases to be engaged in war is a pure question of fact."

"When a belligerent nation, such as Japan, unconditionally surrenders to its opponents, and signifies that surrender by the signing of a formal instrument by the sovereign Government of the nation, it is absolutely clear that those nations cease to be engaged in war."

"This is both law and common sense. As a matter of fact, if any Japanese now bears arms against the Allies he will not be a soldier, sailor, or airman of the Japanese nation, but will be an outlaw, and will be liable to be treated as such."

"Nations do not make war on outlaws, but only on nations."

"If any other construction of the Act be open, then it would be possible for the Australian Government, by postponing the making of what it calls a peace treaty indefinitely, to cause the regulations under the National Security Act to continue indefinitely in force."

"I think it is clear that the courts would refuse to adopt this construction, but if this construction be open the section of the Act containing it would seem to be unconstitutional."

"In my opinion, the regulations will cease to operate on March 2, 1946."

— "New Era," Sydney, Sept. 14.

THE MASTER CRIMINALS

The following letter appeared in the London "Patriot," May 24, 1945:—

Sir,—The reports of Buchenwald, with its wanton and sadistic horrors, have been shocking all those who still retain civilised sensibilities; but, in the extent of its imposition of mental and physical misery and racial damage throughout the nations of the world and of the—long period of its activity, a far more terrible force has been at work than the cruelty and sadism of Germans released under their war psychosis—a force more subtly organised and coldly calculated, more ruthlessly sustained and always stealthily hidden. This force lies embedded in the power of the creation of money of the different nations, which has been usurped by a small minority of "Internationals" during the past three centuries, who, for their own ends, have imposed scarcity on the nations in an age of plenty, engineered wars and destruction, and now control all national activities and their way of life.

When this fact breaks through the press or radio smoke screens to the public it will see more clearly how to act and how to solve its varied problems for its own benefit and happiness. The lesser and more transient evil must not be allowed to obscure the greater, which has been established by three hundred years of practice, Yours sincerely,

(Signed)—

Norman A. Thompson, B.A., A.M.I.E.E.
Frederick Soddy, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.
Buchan (the Rt. Hon. the Earl of).