

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. 47. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1945

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

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

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

Will National Socialism Conquer Us Yet?

Grave Warning in Canadian House of Commons

"We whipped Germany completely in a military way. In fighting her we were fighting totalitarianism, which is centralisation of power maintained by force. But though the combined military might of the United Nations did vanquish Germany, yet there is still grave danger that Nazism—what we fought Germany for—may win. For while we have been busy fighting centralisation of power maintained by force abroad, more than a vestige of the evil has crept in at our back door here at home."

Thus spoke the Hon. Solon E. Low, leading Social Credit member, in the Canadian Federal Parliament on September 10. The appalling and very real danger to which he referred is not, of course, confined to Canada, but is at least equally acute in Australia (and elsewhere) and reveals itself here in suspiciously similar ways, despite the different Party-label worn by "our" Federal Government. Therefore, the rest of Mr. Low's remarks on some aspects of the subject are doubly significant. Continuing, he said:

"Its cunning subversive propaganda has found ready response in the hearts of many unsuspecting Canadians, among whom I fear we must class the Liberal Government. I do not believe it has been through malevolence on their part, nor do I like to think it is through stupidity.

"But the fact remains that the Government has been drifting into totalitarian centralisation, and we now even hear much about maintaining it 'by force.'

"Considerable space is given in the Throne Speech to what the Government has done. Claims are made there to great progress for Canada during the war years under the leadership of the Liberal Government. But splendid as Canada's war effort has been, in many ways the general situation in Canada and in the world is infinitely worse than it was in 1939.

"I find widespread among the people of Canada today a feeling that centralisation within our country as well as on a world scale is inevitable. This 'inevitability' psychology has resulted from the persistent and subtle propaganda of the enemies of true democracy over the years. It planted its roots deep in the frustration of the

hungry thirties and it has fed on the bitterness engendered among Canadians by that sense of futility. It has made such great inroads among our people during the war years that I feel we face a dangerous situation as a result of it.

"What has this Liberal Party and its Government done about it? It has fought valiantly against the spreading fire by throwing gasoline on the flames!

"It has blundered into the position actually of a tool in the hands of the enemies of democracy by adopting a policy of centralisation of power, and by its actions of helping to establish firmly among Canadians the feeling of the inevitability of centralisation. Social Crediters in and out of the House have repeatedly warned the Government about its dangerous rift.

"In the first place the Liberal Government itself was a victim of the psychology of futility during the period of 1935-39. This the Prime Minister admitted in his answers to the thirty-three questions in 'Maclean's' magazine last spring.

"When the war broke out they began seriously to flirt with the centralisation idea, as a result of which they called the Dominion-Provincial Conference in Janu-

ary, 1941, to consider the Rowel-Sirois Report.

"When that conference failed, under the stress of wartime needs this Government began a surreptitious attack on the Provinces to force transfer of taxation powers from the Provinces to the Dominion.

"They called the attack 'taxation transfer agreements,' but actually the Provinces were put into the position of having to accept the Dominion's proposal, 'or else.'

"Many of us said at that time that we would bet our shirts there would be a serious effort made by Ottawa to render the so-called temporary arrangement a permanent one, for we recognised the centralisation policy which the Government was following.

"... Each Finance Minister in his turn preferred to juggle taxation fields, as if that could possibly by itself make available more money with which the various governments could run their business. Surely it must have been obvious all these years that it is the same people who are taxed, whether by Province or Dominion alone or by both in their own spheres, and it must also have been obvious that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in heaping tax burdens upon our people.

"However, in spite of all that has been said about it, we now behold another attempt by this Government to arrogate, to the Dominion, taxation authorities which belong by right to the Provinces.

"This is another step toward centralisa-

tion of power, which, if carried into effect, will topple and destroy the last remaining columns of true democracy.

"I need only mention such things as selective service, compulsory unemployment insurance, compulsory health insurance schemes, Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods, to further impress upon the people of Canada additional evidences of the trend of this Government's mental drift.

"And I say with all the gravity at my command that centralisation is not inevitable.

"Centralisation is the very antithesis of true democracy. There are better ways of solving our problems, ways that will preserve the individual freedom of Canadians.

"I come of English stock on my mother's side and of stubborn Scottish in my father's line. One of my direct ancestors was among those who dipped quills and signed with their own blood a document resisting the centralising encroachments of King Charles I. Perhaps that explains why I am a reformer. And now every drop of the blood of my ancestors cries out in me to resist to the utmost extent of my strength the Liberal Government's policy of centralisation of powers.

"I call upon all Canadians who are determined to preserve and apply in Canada the principles of Christian democracy, to contend against this dangerous policy of totalitarian centralisation and to root it out of our national life forever."

NOTES on the NEWS

Irrespective of the pending decision on the legality of the Commonwealth's misnamed "Free Medicine" Act, it should be borne in mind that any State can institute such a scheme—if it so desires. This being the case, it is really of no consequence to those who want "free" medicine, if the verdict goes against the Federal Government. There is no doubt about the States having the power, and (from an orthodox viewpoint) it is only necessary for the Federal Government to stop collecting State taxes, so that the States can finance the scheme themselves. Of course, the situation will be used by Canberra power-lusters as an argument for another Powers Referendum, but the fact is that we need not be dependent on the Federal Government for "social services." Actually, the situation illustrates the urgent need for the States to fight the Uniform Taxation swindle, and go on to regain all their former sovereign rights in financial affairs. Having done so, the States could, when necessary, make funds available to the Federal Government.

SOVIET SECRETS: The backward conditions of Russian workers are once more illustrated by a report from delegates of the British Steel Trades who visited the Soviet. The report says, inter alia: "It is illegal to strike . . . workers leave their fate in the hands of the Government. The standard of living of iron and steel workers, apart from war shortages, was considerably lower than the British. Generally speaking, the Russian workers had a long way to go before reaching British standards. . . The Russians were completely ignorant about the outside world . . . [this ignorance] was being somewhat dispelled by those who travelled outside the Soviet in war-time." That should steady Communists' dupes who advocate emulating the Soviet way of life; but perhaps they will now say that the British Steel Trade delegates were capitalistic agents!

BROADCAST BUNGLE: The storm caused by the National Short-Wave Station broadcast on the Indonesian situation brings an important principle up for examination. It appears that two individuals, Mr. Geoffrey Sawyer and Mr. Michael Keen, sponsored the script as their own viewpoint, and that Mr. Chifley has denied that it represents Government policy. Mr. Calwell (Minister for Information) and Dr. Evatt (Minister for External Affairs) keep discreetly in the background while the scapegoats are featured. It is a dangerous situation when Ministers evade their responsibility and allow bureaucratic subordinates to make broadcast statements that are likely to be construed as Government policy. This sort of thing is rife in the present irresponsible political administration.

ARAB ALARM: Crowds of Arabic Semites are reported to have demonstrated in Damascus, shouting "the curse of God on the Zionists" and "we are ready to die that Palestine may live." Further mass marching and a general strike was to follow. Riots against the usurpation of Palestine by Jewish Semites broke out at Tripolitania (Libya), where attacks were carried out on synagogues and considerable casualties and deaths were reported. And so Semite fights Semite while British troops in Palestine endeavour to keep the peace—which, of course, makes them unpopular with all concerned. It is unfortunate that Britain risks losing the good-will of millions of Moslems in order to protect a mere handful of scheming Zionists pretending to represent some 15 millions Jews throughout the world, few of

whom are really interested in Palestine as a home.

CABBAGE CROPS: Although the military war is ended the menace of the Food Control Board is still with us, and also the Transport Board. Between them, they have been trying to ruin £10,000 of food. In this case, the Transport Board insisted on cabbages from Gippsland being sent by rail (State Monopoly). As a result, the food would have been unusable when it reached Melbourne. (Just the same, the Food Board has to pay the growers with the taxpayers' money—not their own.) Private road transport had been arranged for by the growers, and was operating successfully until the Board threatened prosecution. Good old Socialism! Then a train carrying the cabbages was intercepted at Bairnsdale and the spoil vegetables were dumped in a garbage tip. What a pity the members of these two Boards were not dumped with the cabbages!

BANKERS' BONDS: Following the delayed filling of the Fourth Victory Loan came the news that the ban on banks buying bonds had been lifted. Isn't it curious how situations can be created to produce an alibi for certain actions? (Of course, it is pointed out that they will not be permitted to buy unlimited quantities!) Trading and manufacturing companies have been buyers of bonds during the war, but now they require liquid funds for business purposes; so they are quitting bonds, thus saving the banks are buying up. One might have expected the Commonwealth Bank to have

(Continued on page 2)

Significant Political Pointers

Although the controllers of the Victorian Liberal Party, together with the Melbourne "Herald," have stated that the "rebel" Liberals were suitably dealt with by the electors at the Victorian elections, it is interesting and encouraging to note that three of the rebels were so suitably dealt with that they were re-elected.

Furthermore, in several other cases the rebels were only defeated by a comparatively few votes. Mr. Macfarlan, for example, was only defeated by a few hundred votes. There were many thousands of Liberal voters who refused to be regimented by the dictators of Collins Street.

Mr. Hollway doesn't like the references of Mr. Maltby, Liberal Member for Barwon, to the "four Francos of Collins Street," but Mr. Hollway should take his mind back a few years to when he was also bitterly criticising what he termed the "Collins Street junta."

Those thousands of Liberal voters who refused to be dictated to by the "junta" at the recent Victorian elections are to be congratulated on their democratic attitude. May the revolt against the centralisers continue to grow!

Compulsory voting can never be justified in any community, which believes in democratic principles.

It is very possible that the compelling of uninterested voters to go to the polls cost Mr. L. H. Hollins, Independent, his seat in Hawthorn at the recent Victorian elections. He failed by a little more than 100 votes. His belief that a non-party candidate could not support one of the opposing party candidates against the other also proved fatal. Mr. Hollins refused to indicate how those voting for him should cast their second and third preferences. He believed that the electors should use their own intelligence

Abolish Means Test

In last week's issue we reported the recent formation in Sydney of "The Citizens' League for the Abolition of the Means Test."

It is interesting, and encouraging, to record that the N.S.W. General Synod of the Church of England is asking the Federal Government to abolish the means test for old-age and invalid pensions.

and cast their second preference for the party candidate they preferred. Apparently more than 400 voters did not even understand preferential voting, thus making their ballot papers invalid. It is reported that the majority of these informal votes gave Mr. Hollins first preference.

The Victorian socialist railway monopoly is attempting to prevent privately owned road transport from competing against the railways.

Some weeks ago there was an outcry from vegetable growers in Gippsland, who complained that the railways would not allow them to use road transport to get their produce to the Melbourne markets. They claimed that road transport was quicker and more efficient, and that their produce was in better condition when it reached the markets. But socialist enterprises are not concerned about service to producers or consumers.

Properly speaking, all economic organisations exist to serve the individual consumers. If, under genuinely free competition, individuals prefer to use privately owned road transport services instead of the socialist railways, then they should be free to do so—even if this means that Mr. Clapp and his fellow-planners are thus deprived of any excuse for spending hundreds of millions of pounds on unifying the Australian railways. Mr. Ward please notice.

Dr. Evatt once wrote about the "audacity" of the elected representatives of the people. That was, of course, before Dr. Evatt obtained a position where he himself could show overwhelming audacity.

Prior to the last State elections in Queensland, the Labor leaders of that State decided that, even with the State electoral boundaries favouring them in a most exaggerated manner, a little matter they attended to many years ago, there was a possibility of defeat. So it was decided to abolish preferential voting and to (Continued on page 4.)

IDENTIFYING THE PROMOTERS OF WAR

A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. Continued from last issue.)

Sir, —Between the end of the South African War and the beginning of the Great War many significant things occurred about which the general public has been uninformed. This lack of understanding is due to the fact that the instruments of propaganda have been controlled internationally by the few whose identity we are establishing, and whose policy has been systematically supported by most of the "educational" institutions.

With very few exceptions, the great dailies throughout the world are ever ready to espouse the cause of the International financiers and to suppress information, which would be to their detriment, even though it would be highly beneficial to the general population. An uninformed people is much easier to control than an informed community, and so it is vital to the continuance of the existing set-up that all channels of publicity be controlled in order to prevent the spread of knowledge and understanding. But light is continuing to break through, and the present glimmering ray will soon become a shining beacon. Four occurrences were of great importance. They were the financing of the Japanese in the 1904-05 war against Russia; the Knickerbocker failure and financial panic of 1907; the Marconi Scandal in 1911; and the establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York in 1913.

In the war of 1904-05 the Japanese defeated the Russians, and according to the Jewish Encyclopedia, published in 1906, the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Company "subscribed for and floated the large Japanese war loans in 1904 and 1905, in recognition of which the Mikado conferred on Schiff the Second Order of the Sacred Treasure of Japan. He was also received in private audience in 1904 by King Edward VII of England."

Why was it that the international Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, with Jacob Schiff, the leader of the Jews, as its head, wanted the Japanese to succeed against the Russians?

In the book, "Expansion of Russia," published in 1904, Mr. E. A. Skrine wrote that "Russia, rather than Palestine, is the Jewry of the modern world; for out of six and a half millions of the chosen people, four-fifths are to be found within that Empire." If this was a fact, and I accept it as one, C. H. Douglas has good ground for his opinion that the practical history of Bolshevism may be regarded as having commenced with the financing of Japan in the 1904-1905 war against Russia. He quoted from "Jacob Schiff, Life and Letters," by Cyrus Adler, the following extract from a memorandum written by the Japanese Minister of Finance, Takahashi, to the Japanese Government, viz.:—

"Mr. Schiff had a grudge against Russia on account of his race.... for this purpose it was deemed fit to admonish the ruling class by an object lesson. Mr. Schiff saw in the war a welcome opportunity to give effect to his cherished idea."

It should be specially noted that the immediate result was the issue of the Imperial Japanese Government 6 per cent

STERLING Loan. It was NOT a DOLLAR Loan! The effect of the initiative of Mr. Jacob Schiff on that occasion was to set the slaves of Great Britain to work to build up the Japanese Navy, and, as Major Douglas has put it, Mr. Schiff, an American or German Jew, "deemed fit" to virtually put the British to war against "the ruling classes of Russia" as "an object lesson." Does it not say in the allegedly forged "Protocols" that the guns of China, Japan, and other countries would be used if their will could not be imposed in another way?

It was also reported in the Paris "Figaro" of 20/2/1932, that, at the time referred to, "The subsidies granted to the Nihilists by Jacob Schiff were no longer acts of isolated generosity. A veritable Russian Terrorist organisation had been set up in the United States at his expense. It covered Russia with its emissaries charged to assassinate Ministers, governors, heads of police, etc. . . . and to create insurrection . . . the cost was estimated at more than fourteen million roubles." Nice work, what! Evidently the Russians were to be taught a lesson because they would not take orders from a German Jew residing in America!

Perhaps an even more serious aspect was the inauguration, as C. H. Douglas puts it, of an Asiatic war complex, accompanied by a delusion that the day of the white man was over, not merely in Asia, but everywhere.

The Jewish leaders continued to have Russia "in the gun," and when it was proposed that the treaty with the United States for the settlement of international disputes by arbitration without recourse to war should be renewed, they took steps to prevent it. President Woodrow Wilson had proposed a new treaty with Russia, and this is what happened (as stated in a letter written in January, 1914, by Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to the United States):—

"No sooner was the President's statement made than a Jewish deputation came down from New York, and in two days 'fixed' the two Houses so that the President had to renounce the idea of making a new treaty with Russia. They are far better organised than the Irish and far more formidable."

This shows that they not only hated Tsarist Russia but, more important, also controlled the Government of the United States.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2, November 25, 1945.

LOCAL GOVT. VERSUS THE PLANNERS

Centralised Electricity Control Opposed

The publication, "Electricity Control—The Case for Local Government," issued by the Association for Electrical Development of Australia, Sydney, contains some realistic comment on the planners' efforts to centralise Australia's electricity supplies:—

Events in other States of the Commonwealth provide definite evidence that "Electricity Control" means what it says—the removal of control from the hands of Local Government. Local Government must decide whether to allow this.

This is not the first time that A.E.D. has found it necessary to oppose such proposals. A previous Government, back in 1941, had similar ideas. Schemes were promulgated by senior officers of certain Government departments, which would have had the effect of taking away Local Government Control of electricity undertakings by introducing a drastic increase of departmental supervision.

Senior Government servants seem to have certain definite ambitions in regard to electricity control and do not propose to let the matter drop until they have made every possible effort to get things into their hands.

Here is what the Chief Electrical Engineer of the N.S.W. Railways had to say in 1929, when discussing proposed legislation:

"Whether the ultimate decision is to deal with this question by appointing a Commission or Power Board or by other means suggested from time to time, it is quite apparent that some authoritative body is urgently required to deal with this and other questions of a general character."

Is the meaning clear? Local Government is not regarded as "authoritative"—the object is CENTRALISED CONTROL.

Bureaucracy leaves no room for misunderstanding in the 1944 Report of the Queensland State Electricity Commission:

"We consider that the responsibility devolving on regional authorities [meaning control of electricity in this respect] warrants their constitution as bodies entirely separate from Local Authorities."

Local Government saw the danger in 1941 and averted it. The Conference of that year was attended by over three hundred Local Government representatives from all parts of the State of N.S.W. Proposals put forward by a Government servant for the establishment of a Commission were rejected in no uncertain manner.

* * * * *

An expert and well-informed committee appointed by A.E.D.—representative of city and country Local Government Authorities, as well as franchise holders, examined the matter very carefully and drew up the following resolutions, which the Conference adopted by an overwhelming majority:—

"(a.) That the electricity interests concerned are entirely opposed to the appointment of any Board or Commission and reject the proposal of Mr. W. H. Myers for the formation of an Electricity Power Board or Commission for the development and control of electrical supply, being satisfied that such is unnecessary and unsuited to conditions in N.S.W.

"(b.) That the electricity interests concerned endorse the principle of Local Government control of generation and transmission and the gradual extension of such control and management by Local Government, and approve of the recommendations of the Electricity Advisory Committee for the creation of a State Electricity Committee, subject to majority Local Government representation, and to the proposed legislation prepared by the Electricity Advisory Committee being submitted to the Local Government Association, Shires' Association and Electricity authorities for their consideration.

"(c.) That the electricity interests concerned agree to a levy not exceeding £25,000 per annum, to provide a fund for rural development, being made on all generating authorities in proportion to the electricity generated by them for public supply, pro-

vided that the fund so created is administered by the proposed State Electricity Committee."

These resolutions and the opinions they express hold good today as they did in 1941. No fresh evidence has been put forward by the Government to support its proposals for bureaucratic control—nor could any valid evidence be adduced.

Local Government has done a good job—it has built up the present system to a high standard of efficiency and service without the aid of Boards or Commissions.

Local Government is competent to operate still better if given relief from certain restrictions contained in the obsolete Local Government Act of 1919. Such relief would ensure that the people, especially the country people, would get better service from Local Government than the most optimistic would expect of a newly constituted Central Control with everything to learn and hampered by red tape. Moreover, the people are vitally concerned with costs, and have had some experience—especially during the war period—of how expensive Bureaucracy can be.

Experience definitely confirms that centralised control means new administrative problems and costly administration.

TRUTH ABOUT THE POLITICAL GAME

(A Broadcast by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, November 25.)

Today the game of politics stinks to high heaven; few people today trust our principal politicians. Yet those same politicians are the men who select our High Court Judges, our Chiefs of Police, our heads of Departments; they are the men who take from 1½ million people about £200 million each year in taxes, and they are the men who spend these vast sums of money.

The game of politics has cost us fabulous sums in treasure, in suffering, and in human lives. War is merely the game of politics taken to its logical conclusion; wars are not conducted by peoples, they are conducted by governments—that is, by politicians.

In trying to drive home the blame for these particularly nasty and dangerous times we live in, we have to understand where lies the responsibility for public crimes. A crime not only requires a criminal to commit it; it also requires a society which will permit it, or encourage it. Sydney might be just unlucky in having more than its fair share of criminals, but it is quite obvious that there is something more in Sydney than just bad luck. I should think the Sydney daily press is sufficient to disintegrate any society.

It should be remembered, too, that New South Wales dominates Federal politics and has more voting strength than Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania put together.

Every corrupt politician from Hitler downwards has found his path to success and power and wealth made easy for him once he set out to bring an entire population under the domination of the voting strength of the big city mobs.

Those who would take away power from the small town and from the small State, and hand it over to the Sydney politicians and their financial backers must be marked down as enemies of the people; they must be watched because they are dangerous men; they are the type of men who make wars.

Politics is a costly and dangerous business, and it would seem reasonable, therefore, for a few men and women with a sense of responsibility to find out a little more about what is happening. And here it is worth taking notice of those simple methods, which have been used from time immemorial to produce success or chaos in any community or organisation.

Success in administering a home, a business or a regiment lies largely in removing sources of irritation; this, of course, is a constant job, but one that pays big dividends in good-will and happiness.

On the other hand there is a technique employed by governments, especially in the East, known as the "unpopular Baboo." He is the ancient equivalent of the modern bureaucrat, sent to administer some district against which the government wishes to find an excuse for repressive action. The unpopular Baboo causes so much irritation that the natives, stung into fury, rise in revolt. The Government then marches in and takes over the territory with the usual reprisals.

I believe that everything that can be done to produce chaos and division among the people, to destroy the best and most enduring parts of Christian civilisation, has been done and is being done. I believe, too, that countries like Great Britain, France and Austria had been specially selected for a complete wipeout—and the party politicians have lent themselves constantly to this devilish policy of destruction. America and the Argentine have vast quantities of food and goods of all kinds, which they cannot get rid of, and Europe is in a horrible state of chaos and famine and ready for any foul thing to take possession. Yet what is being done? The people of Great Britain are worn out with six years of feverish activity and semi-starvation, and yet what is the Australian Government doing? It pays Western Australia a million pounds to not grow wheat! The technique of disruption is now easily discernible. Nobody is permitted to remove any of the easily removable irritations; nobody is permitted to bring to a successful finish the simplest job unless he works for and believes in a central and authorised gang in each country.

Work the local municipal councils could easily do for themselves the State stops by numerous devices well known to the controllers of bottlenecks; work this State

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1)

bought and retired these bonds, thus saving the interest rake-off which must be paid from taxation; but, as previously mentioned, the recent Bank Bill was not intended to take the financial load off the workers.

COMMUNIST CANKER: The national Docks group of the Transport and General Workers' Union, in a statement contained in the press of October 13 said: "There was definite evidence that the revolutionary Communist Party was encouraging and maintaining the action of the strikers. Before the strike broke out, halls were hired, loud-speaker vans and motor cars were obtained for establishing contact with other ports." This makes it rather clear that the Communist leaders were "wise" before the event, and that they were confident that their stooges would be able to induce the duped workers to play the Communists' game of creating industrial upheavals as a prelude to an attempt to seize power during a state of civil war. There is no shadow of doubt about this plan, and there is a rude shock coming to those innocents who regard this menace lightly. —O.B.H.

Could easily do for itself the Federal Government will not permit unless its own commissars are put in control; work the Federal Government could and should do is mysteriously stopped.

The financial gang, which dominated Germany during the last century and used Germany to disrupt the world, has been busy in New York since the last war; they are now using the financial resources of America to carry on their nefarious game. The principal "German" firm is Kuhn, Loeb and Co., of New York, and this firm a few years ago bought up the House of Morgan. This firm of gangsters who are violently anti-British have their fingers in Russia, Japan, Germany and Czechoslovakia. Their political agent, Bernard Baruch, strides the world like a colossus; Kings and Presidents have to bow the knee to His Satanic Majesty. Churchill protested at the work of this gang when he said he refused to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. Churchill no longer presides!

Isn't it strange that the Communists and Socialists never mention Kuhn, Loeb and Co., one of the wealthiest and most powerful organisations in the world?

Professor Julius Stone talks a lot about wealthy organisations, but he is strangely silent about this one. I wonder why? Perhaps he has a soft side for it because it financed the Russian revolution. Professor Julius Stone is going to tell us a lot about guilty men. I wonder if he will mention the names of the really big shots. It would be interesting, too, to find out how Professor Stone got into the Sydney University, and why the Chancellor of that University resigned because of his appointment. As soon as a man like Julius Stone gets pushed into a university he acquires the right to speak over the National network, on anything under the sun—except, of course, Kuhn, Loeb and Co. and Russian imperialism.

Tasmania is a tight little island. In its hydroelectric system it has power; with power-driven machinery wealth in many forms can be produced. We have food and timber; with food men have the energy to do many things; with timber they can build houses. It is time, therefore, that Tasmanians banded themselves together to show the rest of Australia what men CAN do when they try.

It is up to every man with a sense of responsibility to strive to clarify his own mind on the subject, and then to help those who are doing the fighting. The Electoral Campaign, 101 Collins-street, Hobart, is at your disposal for that purpose.

COUNTRY MEETINGS

Mr. Eric Butler reports that he is very pleased with the number of letters he has received from Victorian country social crediters, offering to help to arrange lecturing tours. But there are still many country centres from which he would like to hear, in order that organisation can be proceeded with.

He does not expect to address many country meetings until the New Year.

All social crediters desirous of arranging such meetings are requested to communicate with Mr. Butler, care of Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, immediately.

PARENTS OF WAR-DEAD TO MEET

Parents of deceased ex-service men and women will hold a meeting in Melbourne on Thursday, December 6, at the Railway Institute, room 92, at 8 p.m., with the object of forming an association, so that such parents may meet and form a lasting friendship; also to look after the welfare of children, widows and parents, should need be. All such parents are requested to attend. The convener is Mr. J. J. Stanley, 150 Tooronga-road, Glen Iris, S.E.6. Country parents are invited to communicate with Mr. Stanley.

Press reports last week stated that Mr. Chifley has written to the State Governments suggesting a conference in Canberra late in January "to consider the adoption of a permanent system of uniform taxes." Mr. Chifley has asked each of the States to indicate its views in advance.

As the Members of both the Government and the Opposition in Tasmania recently passed a resolution condemning the continuance of Uniform Taxation as a permanent measure, Mr. Chifley should already have some idea of the Tasmanian Government's attitude. Electors in other States must insist that their State Governments follow Tasmania's lead.

Running true to form, the Melbourne "Herald" of November 22 writes of Mr. Chifley's proposed conference:

"It is believed that whatever the result of the Conference, the Federal Government will continue the basic Acts on which the present uniform tax system depends. These have been upheld by the High Court, and the Commonwealth Government's constitutional authority to continue them is undoubted.

"The Conference, rather than consider whether uniform taxes should continue, is expected to deal with the terms upon which it should continue."

The "Herald" appears to be determined to propagate the inevitability idea: the acceptance of the fallacy that increasing centralisation is, like some law of nature, inevitable, that electors should accept it as something beyond their control and passively try and make the best of a bad job.

Centralisation is the result of deliberate policies by individuals. These individuals and their policies can be defeated if electors realise their own power in association. Uniform taxation can be abolished if sufficient electors demand that it be abolished. All taxation is anti-social, but the control of the people by a highly centralised taxing machine at Canberra is simply an integral part of National Socialism, which we allegedly went to war to destroy.

Many unthinking people accept the centralisers' main argument that the Federal Government is elected by the people, and is therefore thoroughly democratic. As has been shown in the "New Times" time and time again in the past, the more centralised government becomes, the less control the electors have. Social crediters should never lose an opportunity of asking the advocates of centralisation this question: "If the Federal Government is to control all taxation in Australia, how can the electors of any one State, say, Victoria, who may desire greatly reduced taxation, obtain that result?"

Really progressive reforms are usually the result of example by a minority. But centralisation means the virtual disfranchisement of minorities and the stultification of reforms.

So far from the electors effectively controlling the policies of the Federal Government, Federal Members themselves have little control over the men who decide most

major policies. These men are the big bureaucrats. It is not hard to show the great influence these bureaucrats have. One example will suffice to demonstrate the truth of this. Prior to the Federal Government's last Budget, many Labor Members were restless because of the taxation of basic wage earners. Some relief was demanded. But Chifley's Budget offered none. Why? The following extract from the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" of October 27 gives the answer:

"Every man on the basic wage pays income-tax chiefly because Copland is a super salesman. At the Labor Party Caucus meeting, which thrashed out the last Budget, a lot of members wanted to free the small-wage earner of tax altogether.

"Copland was called in. At the end of a debate lasting four hours, Copland had talked Caucus into agreeing that the Government must have the little man's tax to carry on."

Perhaps the workers would now care to tell us whether they still believe that a Labor Government represents their wishes!

Mr. A. W. Fadden is quoted as follows in his speech to the Constitutional Convention in 1943:

Constitutional reform is "not a matter for political parties or for professional politicians, all of whom are subject to some kind of vested interest. The people of Australia at the present time distrust the big, unseen forces which work behind the political scenes."

Perhaps Mr. Fadden and his friend Mr. Menzies will attempt to get their prospective political groups to lead a campaign against the "big unseen forces" on the Uniform Taxation issue? Perhaps! Where do the Victorian Liberals stand on this all-important question? Victorian electors should be now asking whether the alleged representatives of the conservatives are really going to put up a fight against National Socialism, or, like Mr. Menzies, they are merely the right wing of the Socialists.

Mere negative criticism of Socialist planning is of no practical use particularly by "opponents" such as the "Liberals," whose fundamental policy is merely a re-hash of socialist policy. Constructive, democratic proposals are what the people want today.

Social crediters must not only expose the menace of Uniform Taxation and other centralised planning schemes; they must bring to the attention of electors the fact that there are many important improvements in economic and financial policies which they can obtain by making greater use of their local Governments.

Start today on this important work. Write to your State Member about Uniform Taxation. Write to your local paper. Contact your friends. Start to fight NOW. Time is desperately short. —E.D.B.

strikes were few in Alberta, and those that did occur were of short duration.

Those are the opinions of an Australian—one who is not a student of Social Credit, but one who has spent considerable time either in Alberta or next door to it. Do you know any Empire Air Scheme trainee, or an Albertan bride, now in Australia? If so, why not talk to him or her along the same lines, and send a report of your interview to the "New Times"?

(The above-mentioned visitor does not wish to have his name disclosed by publication, but the opinions reported in this article are definitely authentic.)

ON THE RECORD

"On October 2, 1934, Mr. Attlee, the Parliamentary leader of the Labour Party, propounded the new doctrine as follows: we have absolutely abandoned any idea of a nationalist loyalty. We are deliberately putting a world order before our loyalty to our own country. We say we want to see put on the statute book something which will make our people citizens of the world before they are citizens of this country."

—The "National Review," Vol. 125, No. 750, August, 1945, page 121, article entitled "San Fiasco: Cui Bono?" by Arthur Page.

OPEN LETTER TO BRIGADIER CREMOR

Dear Brigadier, —You have recently been contributing special articles to the Melbourne "Argus" on the subject of the post-war rehabilitation of our fighting men. We applaud many of your sentiments, your views on the smart young planners from our universities being particularly refreshing; but, as yet, you don't appear to understand the real issues involved in post-war reconstruction.

Basically, it is simply a question of whether there is going to be increasing centralisation of government, the taking of the control of policies away from the people and vesting it in bureaucratic planners, OR the decentralisation of government to the stage where the people can effectively govern themselves. Really self-governing people can effectively solve their own problems.

We have for some time maintained that "Liberal" leaders in Australia, as in other countries, offer no genuine alternative to Socialism, that they have, in fact, become infected with the deadly virus of the basic Socialist proposition: that centralised government should have more powers. Today, the "Liberals" are, apparently, merely the rightwing of the Socialists; they merely re-hash Socialist policy—while talking about freedom (and, no doubt, genuinely believing in it).

We understand that you sought a "Liberal" Party nomination at the recent Victorian elections, yet you attack State Governments in your article in the Melbourne "Argus" of November 23.

You say that soldiers have learnt "what neglect of the nation's interests by State Governments has led to." Also: "Control of erosion. Having a national as distinct from a parochial outlook, they realise that no State Government has yet tackled this problem . . ."

The British idea of local, decentralised Government is based on the belief that the whole is not greater than parts making up the whole. If the various parts effectively solve their own problems, then it automatically follows that there is no need to worry about the whole. If the States of Australia look after their own affairs effectively, there will be no need to worry about the "nation's interests." Victorian electors should be primarily concerned

about minding their own affairs, the electors of other States doing likewise. This does not preclude the States, as a result of the Federal system of Government in Australia, from associating with one another on matters of common interest.

The States have not been allowed to mind their own affairs, primarily because the deadly disease of National Socialism is rampant in Australia. This disease undermines the people's confidence in governing themselves in small political units and it encourages the idea that electors should passively leave everything to the Federal Government.

State Governments have not been PERMITTED to do many of the things that you and other critics of State Governments have mentioned. Control of financial policy is the keystone of the modern economic structure. If the Federal Government has its way, the States will never again be allowed even to assess and collect taxation.

We would suggest to you, Sir, that you give some attention to this question of centralised financial domination. If you desire to know how the only truly liberal British Government in the modern world is fighting centralised financial domination, we can recommend the story of the Albertan Government, which, since 1935, has been progressively reducing debt and taxation. The Social Credit Government of Alberta has a rehabilitation scheme for its returned men which shames anything yet put forward by public men in this country.

Why not investigate what a successful local government has done in Canada, instead of helping the Socialists by encouraging the idea that local government is a failure? Or have even you been affected by the "reddish" young Army Education personnel whom you mention in one of your articles? We can hardly believe that.

—Yours faithfully, "THE NEW TIMES."

BUREAUCRATS' ELECTRICITY PLAN IN NEW SOUTH WALES

Democracy and Decentralisation in Danger

In this forthright article condensed from "Century" of November 16, Mrs. Lilian Fowler, M.L.A., who has been an Alderman for eighteen years and Mayor on two occasions, exposes the increase in Bureaucratic Dictatorship, the circumvention of State Parliament, and the emasculation of Local Government, threatened by the recently-introduced Bill to set up one central electricity authority:

This Bill reaches an all-time high in bureaucratic audacity. Taking as their text Lenin's famous saying that "Communism is Soviet Power plus Electrification," the bureaucrats of Bridge Street [Sydney] are reaching out for more and more power, and not only electric power at that.

Right from the very beginning the Bill is so designed that it excludes practically all but public servants from being appointed to the "Commission."

But the most astounding feature of it is the "bureaucratic preservation" clause, which enables a member of the public service to return to his job if he doesn't like being a bigger bureaucrat. The amazing part of this provision is that the little bureaucrat could sit on the "Commission," disrupt and cause chaos in the electricity supply in New South Wales and then blithely return to his public service job.

One extraordinary feature of the Bill is the complete abrogation of Parliamentary Responsibility.

Under the provisions of the Local Government Act as it now stands no new power stations may be erected, or existing ones extended without approval of the Governor.

But under Section 28 of the Bill, Parliament surrenders completely its powers of government to the "Commission." The old democratic approach to the Minister and Parliament for the Governor's approval has been eliminated. Nothing can be done except with the approval of the "authority." This completely negates the principles of democratic government and delegates it to the bureaucrats. It is the totalitarian approach.

Another astonishing feature is in Section 27, which gives the Minister for Public Works power to spend money in an unlimited manner without reference to Parliament. These works are carried out at the request of the "Commission." Bearing in mind the bureaucratic attitude to expendi-

ture generally, the Comrades should be well pleased if this little move should survive the examination the Bill will surely receive.

In a statement on "Reconstruction and Development," of April 13, 1944, Mr. McKell said: "Whilst the active co-operation of members of Local Government bodies will be sought, there is no intention to interfere with Local Government."

Surely this Bill gives the lie direct to the Premier's own statement. Nearly all its provisions have been extracted from the Local Government Act, for handing over to the bureaucrats. If the Premier can reconcile his actions with his statements, he makes Houdini look like an amateur. On the one hand he says "no interference with Local Government," on the other he repeals many sections of the Local Government Act, where they are administered in a democratic manner by the people themselves, and vests them in a bureaucratic Board.

We have had enough of these Boards and Commissions during the war. We know what happens when bureaucrats assume control. Apart from their "dehumanised" approach to the problems, the subsequent rise in price of every commodity they handle is sufficient warning to us of what will happen to electricity charges.

The Government will try to bludgeon the Bill through on the political appeal of "rural electrification." If the Government were sincere in this ideal and in the Premier's "no interference with Local Government," they can both be made effective by using Local Government, not abusing and emasculating it. A few simple amendments to the Local Government Act will secure all the co-ordination and rural electrification that is necessary without the need of setting

(Continued on page 4)

AN AUSTRALIAN'S IMPRESSIONS OF ALBERTA

"The Watchman's" Propaganda Not Confirmed

By E.J.G.

Earlier this year, "The Watchman" (3UZ) devoted a considerable portion of one of his broadcast sessions to attacking the Social Credit Government of Alberta, and made statements, which would convey to a listener the impression that conditions in that Canadian Province were far from good.

In giving his explanation for the return of the same Government at the recent provincial elections, "The Watchman" suggested that the electors were faced with one of two alternatives: On the one hand they had the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party, and on the other Social Credit. In his opinion, they selected Social Credit as "the lesser of the two evils!"

I have before me as I write, a booklet entitled "Progress in Alberta, 1935-1943," an official Government publication issued by the Alberta Publicity and Travel Bureau.

The story contained therein is in striking contrast to the picture painted by "The Watchman."

Three and a half years ago a native of Melbourne went to Canada and took up residence in the Province of Saskatchewan (next door to Alberta). During this period he has travelled Canada—from East to West. He is now on a brief visit to his native city, and, when he was visiting certain scenes of his early youth, a few days ago, I was introduced to him.

Yes, he had been in Alberta—in fact, he had spent seven months in that Province.

I began to question him—"Are you a Social Crediter?"

His reply indicated to me that he was not interested in politics as such—Social Credit or otherwise.

(Throughout the interview it was clearly understood that when I used the term, Social Credit, I meant a student or exponent of technique.)

"During the period of your residence in Alberta what were your impressions of its Government?"

He replied that the Government was doing a good job and that the people were well contented. He added that in his opinion the people of Alberta were better off than the people in the other Provinces, which he had visited.

Having in mind a theory which is put forward in this country by a school of thought

which aims at "educating" the people to understand the details of Social Credit monetary technique, I put this question: "During your stay in Alberta, did you have Social Credit 'blown down your ear.' Did you find the people politically interested?" In reply he assured me that the answer to my double-barreled question was "No," he did not get Social Credit for breakfast, dinner and tea (supper as he called it). In his opinion, the people were not unusually politically minded—with the exception that during an election period Albertans are politically wide awake, and he thought that polling figures would show a good percentage of total voting strength (voting is voluntary in Canada).

I then asked him, "You say that to the best of your knowledge the people of Alberta are not mostly Social Crediters; then why is it that since it was first elected in 1935 the Social Credit Government has been returned to office on two consecutive occasions." His reply was:

"The people are judging the Government by the RESULTS it produces, and not by the label it bears."

I told him that an Australian trainee in the Empire Air Training Scheme, who was stationed in Alberta, had expressed the opinion (by letter), that the Social Credit Government was popular with farmers and workers, but not with "Big Business"—would he agree or disagree with that opinion? He said that from his own observations he would agree.

Before we parted company our visitor mentioned the series of strikes, etc., that are rife in this country. He said that

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

The Power of the International Financiers

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

On February 13, 1945 President Roosevelt sent to Congress a message urging prompt action to carry out the Bretton Woods agreements for an international bank; also urging the repeal of the Johnson Act, which prohibited loans to nations in default on debts to the United States. A hint of things to come—the implementation of the financial policy outlined in Protocol 20!

Early in 1945, even before the Allied armies had liberated Holland, the press reported that fourteen "American" banks had advanced the first loan extended outside Lease-Lend—400,000,000 dollars!

The London "Daily Telegraph" of January 23, 1945, reported:

"President Roosevelt has appointed Judge Sam Rosenman as his personal representative, with the rank of Minister, to make an economic survey in England, France, Belgium and Holland."

Mr. Truman, who became President of America as a result of the Jew, Hillman, using his control of the American Labour vote in support of Roosevelt at the 1944 presidential elections on condition that Truman became Vice-President, has retained Mr. Rosenman, who started at about the time of the San Francisco Conference to draw up plans for dealing with war criminals. Strangely enough, he indicted none of Hitler's international financial backers! Can it be possible that he hadn't read about the manner in which Wall Street financed Hitler and Mussolini? Europe is being "reconstructed" by losing its sovereignties to the debt-merchants. Well, we were forewarned. In an article by Ludwig von Mises, in "The Voice of Austria" (published in New York) for August 1941, the following statement appeared:

"... If there is any hope at all that foreign capital can be procured for the post-war reconstruction of Europe, then a new legal system for the safeguarding of these investments and loans is essential. No country, which stubbornly wishes to maintain its full sovereignty in this field, can expect to attract foreign capital."

"The new covenant of the League of Nations will therefore have to include a rigid limitation on the sovereign rights of every nation, which intends to borrow abroad or to obtain foreign investments."

An American report in the Melbourne "Herald" of June 3, 1942, said that the end of the war would see the formation of an international organisation for financing the "reconstruction" of Europe. It concluded with the following significant statement:

"No nation can expect its economy to be underwritten or to dispose of its surplus goods or secure means for development unless it accepts certain standards of behaviour."

This is the policy of debt finance as outlined in Protocol 20, further extracts from which we can now proceed to examine:

"Today we shall touch upon the financial programme, which I put off to the end of my report as being the most difficult, the crowning and the decisive point of our plans. Before entering upon it I will remind you that I have already spoken before by way of a hint when I said that the sum total of our actions is settled by the question of figures..."

"Our rule, in which the king will enjoy the legal fiction that everything in his State belongs to him (which may easily be translated into fact) will be enabled to resort to the lawful confiscation of all sums of every kind for the regulation of their circulation in the State. From this follows that taxation will best be covered by a progressive tax on property." (Comment: No doubt it is mere "coincidence" that this has been happening.)

"Economic crises have been produced by us for the goyim by no other means than the withdrawal of money from circulation. Huge capitals have stagnated, withdrawing money from States, which were constantly obliged to apply to those same stagnant capitals for loans. These loans burdened the finances of the State with the payment of interest and made them the bond slave; of these capitals... The concentration of industry in the hands of capitalists out of the hands of small masters has drained away all the juices of the peoples and with them also of the States..."

The present issue of money in general does not correspond with the requirements per head, and cannot therefore satisfy all the needs of the workers. The issue of money ought to correspond with the growth of population and thereby children also

TAX-LIMIT CAMPAIGN

The time is opportune for more intensified action to further this campaign. This can only be achieved by supporters obtaining supplies of letterforms and circulating them for signatures. Yallourn and Geelong supporters are to be congratulated for their activity in this matter. If their example is followed by others, Members will be bombarded with demands for substantial tax reductions. This is a job that YOU can do in your own town, suburb or street. Will YOU play your part in this activity? You don't need a leader or a committee, you only need yourself. Write NOW for "am munition" at 1/6 per 100 posted from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Don't delay, write NOW.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

must absolutely be reckoned as consumers of currency from the day of their birth. The revision of issue is a material question for the whole world.

"You are aware that the gold standard has been the ruin of the States which adopted it, for it has not been able to satisfy the demands for money, the more so that we have removed gold from circulation as far as possible..."

"... Every kind of loan proves infirmity in the State and a want of understanding of the rights of the State. Loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers, who, instead of taking from their subjects by a temporary tax, come begging with outstretched palm of our bankers. Foreign loans are leeches, which there is no possibility of removing from the body of the State until they fall off of themselves or the State flings them off; they go on in persisting in putting more on to them selves so that they must inevitably perish, drained by voluntary blood-letting..."

"What also indeed is, in substance, a loan, especially a foreign loan? A loan is —an issue of government bills of exchange containing a percentage obligation commensurate to the sum of the loan capital. If the loan bears a charge of 5 per cent, then in twenty years the State vainly pays away in interest a sum equal to the loan borrowed, in forty years it is paying a double sum, in sixty—treble, and all the while the debt remains an unpaid debt."

Comment: The perfect comment on the

ARE WE ON THE ROAD TO SERFDOM?

(Extracts from "The Road to Serfdom" by Prof. Hayek.)

It is revealing that few planners today are content to say that central planning is desirable. Most of them affirm that we now are compelled to it by circumstances beyond our control.

One argument frequently heard is that the complexity of modern civilisation creates new problems with which we cannot hope to deal effectively except by central planning. This argument is based upon a complete misapprehension of the working of competition. The very complexity of modern conditions makes competition the only method by which a co-ordination of affairs can be adequately achieved.

There would be no difficulty about efficient control or planning were conditions so simple that a single person or board could effectively survey all the facts. But as the factors which have to be taken into account become numerous and complex, no one centre can keep track of them. The constantly changing conditions of demand and supply of different commodities can never be fully known, or quickly enough disseminate by any one centre.

Under competition—and under no other economic order—the price system automatically records all the relevant data. Entrepreneurs, by watching the movement of a few prices, as an engineer watches a few dials, can adjust their activities to those of their fellows.

Compared with this method of solving the economic problem—by decentralisation plus automatic co-ordination through the price system—the method of central direction is incredibly clumsy, primitive, and limited in scope.

It is no exaggeration to say that if we had had to rely on central planning for the growth of our industrial system, it would never have reached the degree of differentiation and flexibility it has attained. Modern civilisation has been possible precisely because it did not have to be consciously created. The division of labour has gone far beyond what could have been planned. Any further growth in economic complexity, far from making central direction more necessary, makes it more important than ever that we should use the technique of competition and not depend on conscious control.

It is also argued that technological changes have made competition impossible in a constantly increasing number of fields and that our only choice is between control of production by private monopolies and direction by the government.

The growth of monopoly, however, seems not so much a necessary consequence of the advance of technology as the result of the policies pursued in most countries.

The most comprehensive study of this situation is that by the Temporary National Economic Committee, which certainly cannot be accused of an unduly liberal bias. The committee concludes: "The superior efficiency of large establishments has not been demonstrated; the advantages that are supposed to destroy competition have failed to manifest themselves in many fields... The conclusion that the advantage of large-scale production must lead inevitably to the abolition of competition cannot be accepted... It should be noted, moreover, that monopoly is frequently attained through collusive agreement and promoted by public policies. When these agreements are invalidated and these policies reversed, competitive conditions can be restored."

Anyone who has observed how aspiring monopolists regularly seek the assistance of

above is an extract from the "Jewish Encyclopedia".

"It is, however, mainly in the direction of foreign loans that there has been any definite predominance of Jewish financiers, this being due, as before stated, to the international relations of the larger Jewish firms."

Protocol 20 continues: "But it is a proof of the genius of our chosen mind that we have contrived to present the matter of loans to them in such a light that they have even seen in them advantages to themselves."

Comment: In a letter by a Rothschild, dated June 25, 1863, the following appeared: "The few who can understand the system will either be so interested in its profits, or so dependent on its favours, that there will be no opposition from that class, while, on the other hand, that great body of the people, mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantages to be derived from the system, will bear the burden without complaint, and perhaps without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests."

There is also the advice of the Chief Rabbi, Maimonides, on the question of usury: "God has ordered the practice of usury towards the Goy [non-Jew] and the lending to him of money only in case of his agreeing to pay interest."

* * *

[Editor's Note: No further instalments of Mr. Butler's material on the "Protocols" will appear in the "New Times." As previously stated, his articles are to be published in book form. The title of the book will be, "Hitler's Policy Was a Jewish Policy." The book will contain not only the material published in the "New Times," but comment on all "Protocols" not dealt with in these columns. In view of the demand, not only in Australia, but also in New Zealand and Canada, that Mr. Butler's work on the "Protocols" be published in book form as soon as possible, it was decided to curtail the material appearing in the "New Times" and make immediate arrangements for book publication. It is expected that the book will be available for sale some time early next year. Further details will be published later.]

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1)

introduce the "first past the post" method.

The New Zealand Labor leaders are apparently worried about their prospects at the next elections. The huge majority gained at the 1935 elections, mainly on a money-reform policy, has been progressively reduced at subsequent elections, and there appears to be little doubt that, without an alteration in the electoral boundaries, Labor was doomed to defeat at the next election, now getting close. But rather than face defeat, the Labor leaders have very shrewdly seized on the fact that there are certain alleged anomalies in the New Zealand electoral boundaries, and decided that a Bill for "electoral reform" should be introduced.

This "reform" reduces the number of country electorates and has bitterly incensed the New Zealand farmers, who have been very critical of the New Zealand Labor Government for some time.

If electors in all electorates simply united to ask for those RESULTS they desired in common, it would not be of great importance whether there were a few thousand more electors in one electorate than in another. (It will never be possible to have an exact number of electors in every electorate.)

At present there is more than a suspicion that the "one vote one value" argument is cleverly employed to use the more highly centralised city vote against the comparatively decentralised rural vote. This rural vote includes, of course, the country towns.

It is not without significance that Social Credit has made the greatest progress among predominantly rural populations. Not only is this true in Alberta and the rural areas of Quebec; it is also true in Australia.

The only way to allow such political minorities to pursue the different public policies they desire is to decentralise government much further and give greater powers to local government bodies.

* * *

It is surprising how many people fall into the collectivist trap as a result of ignorance of financial policy. Speaking on the necessity of fodder conversation, Mr. Hilton, M.L.A., said in the Queensland State Parliament on August 14:

"... From my observations not many primary producers will undertake fodder conservation in a big way. In fact, many of them are not financially capable of doing it. I think this is something that has to be handled collectively. If that is so, the only way to do it is to create trusts and give them statutory authority."

Some of Mr. Hilton's electors should ask him why he does not advocate a financial policy that will allow primary producers to become "financially capable" in order that they can look after their own affairs without the introduction of socialistic planning. If money can be found to create trusts, then it is obvious that there is no reason why this money should not be made available direct to primary producers. But this is not part of the Big Idea, which is to discredit private enterprise by denying it access to adequate finance while allowing socialist planners to spend freely on their schemes.

In view of the present state of Europe, particularly that portion under Russian hegemony, it is interesting to recall some of the statements of William Bullitt, former American Ambassador to Russia and France and a former friend of President Roosevelt, made just over twelve months ago.

Writing from Rome, where he was a Major in the French Army, he wrote that half of Europe was being "communised" with Soviet money obtained from America. He attacked Roosevelt's failure to attach conditions to financial credits granted to Russia. He said that Stalin was indirectly using American resources to consolidate his position in Europe.

It will be interesting to see whether the present industrial trouble in U.S.A. will be used to "communise" that country. There is little doubt that this is part of The Plan. Wars, revolutions and industrial strife are all necessary preliminaries to the creation of the "New Order."

* * *

Some very revealing facts have been brought out in the Nuremberg trials.

Although the Communists and fellow travellers have never tired of abusing the late Neville Chamberlain because of his alleged pro-Nazi sympathies, apparently Hitler did not take this view. He threatened that if Chamberlain "or some other dirty swine" came to dissuade him from invading Poland, he "would kick him in the belly in front of the photographers." Hitler apparently revealed the attitude of one gangster to another when he expressed his admiration of Stalin as a statesman.

It will be interesting to discover whether the declaration that the Allied Tribunal will not tolerate the summoning of "unnecessary witnesses from Britain, Russia and other countries," is designed to prevent the possible summoning of Dr. Schacht's financial friends in London or New York.

If the counsels for the Nazi leaders so desire, they could reveal facts, which would seriously implicate not only international financiers, but also many prominent Russian leaders. But it is safe to say that the trials will not be allowed to reveal too much.

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