

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. 50. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 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.

Where Do We Stand at End of 1945?

Tasmanian Electoral Campaign's Broadcast

On Sunday last the Tasmanian Electoral Campaign concluded its 1945 series of weekly talks by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., broadcast from 7HO, Hobart, with a brief review of the present situation, the recent past and future possibilities. Tasmanians were rightly advised to make every effort to maintain and extend local control of the affairs of their State. (Citizens of other States should, of course, do likewise.) Most of the broadcast is reported hereunder:

This is our last broadcast for this year, and it is appropriate at this time to glance over the year that has passed and try to see, if but dimly, what is ahead of us.

This year, 1945, has brought so many epoch-making events, so great in their significance that the mind reels at a mere guess at their possible repercussions.

Although none of us are very happy about the prospects of peace, we should not allow that to cause us to forget the great debt we owe to the gallant young men who went out in the early days of the war and helped to contain and hold back the National Socialist armies of Germany. Some of these young men have not come back, and we extend to their parents and relatives the sympathy of myself and members of this organisation.

NATIONAL SOCIALISM NOT YET BEATEN ON HOME FRONTS

The young men who have come back, although they have helped to save us from a great tyranny, are the first to realise that great battles have still to be fought before the peoples of the world can obtain freedom with security.

The British people have always fought hard and sacrificed much for political freedom. The German Socialists scrapped political freedom in an attempt to obtain economic security, and they finished up with neither.

All the large organised political forces of the Left and the Right, and the large financial monopolies, make no bones about where they stand: they stand definitely against political freedom. And the influence behind these forces is "German" in origin. The Great German General Staff never goes out of existence. After World War

No. 1 the German Officers' Corps moved into Russia; the financial section moved into America—and there they are still, more powerful than ever.

U.S. LOAN TO BRITAIN AND INTERNATIONAL PLOTS

Today treaties are being made, world organisations are being set up, and the world is being divided between different gangs. No one would be stupid enough to suggest that the peoples of America or Russia or Great Britain are having the slightest say in the conditions that are being imposed upon them by a few men.

Members of the British Parliament have been debating the American Loan to Great Britain. The debate was a matter of legal formality. They know that they are selling their country into bondage, but they will sign on the dotted line, as they had to sign after the First World War.

We can see, therefore, that international conditions—international treaties—imposed by international financial monopolies, can make a farce of any democracy. A small super-gang in New York rules the world today. Many people have laughed at us since we first made that statement in one broadcast eight years ago: but now even the dullest are beginning to see this for themselves.

This centralised control over world affairs should be known and stressed by as many as possible, because it explains many things otherwise inexplicable. It explains, for example, how Prime Ministers and Presidents are unable to take the simplest and most elementary precautions against disaster to their own countries; it explains how money was made available to Germany to re-arm, while England and France were kept

almost unarmed; it explains how Great Britain came out of the war victorious, and is now treated as a beaten people.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT

The British House of Commons is being forced to ratify the Bretton Woods Agreement. Probably few in that House understand that Agreement. It is safe to say that not one in 10,000 of the British people have seen it, know anything about it, or, if they did, would understand it. It is safe to say the same things about the American Parliament and the American people. But when the Bretton Woods Agreement is signed Great Britain will be sold into bondage, the American people will be cursed from one end of the world to the other, and the stage will be set for World War No. III.

It should be fairly obvious by now that each government is being used to impose upon an entire population "the will of a few men, and often as not these men reside outside the country. For a generation a few men in New York have imposed on Great Britain conditions, which the armed forces of Germany were incapable of imposing.

NO REASON FOR APATHY

I can hear you say, "Very well, Mr. Guthrie, what can we do about it?"

Well, we can each do a lot. Before we can attack an enemy we have to find where he is; he has to be exposed. Exposure is the first step.

As the crisis develops—and it is developing now—more and more will see what is happening, and when the next move comes there will be sufficient people

to say, "No you don't! We have seen that trick before."

You can do a lot by watching and protesting against those internationalists who are helping the international gang in New York. There are speakers on the A.B.C. who help them regularly—perhaps in ignorance: men like Professor Julius Stone, Dr. Clunies Ross, Dr. Frank Lewer, etc.

FIGHT AGAINST CENTRALISERS

Meanwhile, we in Tasmania have got to make the best of the institutions we have at our disposal. We have got to make ourselves as independent as possible of the Labour-Union-Cartel gang of Sydney. We have got to see that the Hydro-Electric and the Education Department do NOT come under the control of the paralysing hand of Canberra. The State Parliament has got to compel the Federal Government to relinquish its financial stranglehold—and there are quite a few ways of doing this, none of which the State Government has shown the slightest desire to try.

We are getting very tired of Labor's ideas of social reforms, which are mostly variations of the old political trick of taking a shilling from you and giving you back 9d.

And now we wish to remind listeners that we have maintained these talks for nine years. We do not get paid for this work, but we expect you to help to pay for the cost of broadcasting, and we ask you to send your contribution to the Electoral Campaign Office, 101 Collins-street, Hobart.

Finally, I wish you all a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

NOTES on the NEWS

An amazing situation has developed in England, where black-market food dealers have threatened a Christmas strike, and deputations from workers and housewives are seeking protection for such dealers so that they can continue to get food to the people. The dealers have agreed to resume sales on the understanding that the police do not interfere.

It is said that most of London's food supply depends on black-marketers. This only goes to show that Bureaucracy has once more failed to deliver the goods. If officials stand aside, there is no need for black market. Our Food Board bureaucrats and price controllers are doing their best to create a similar situation here by restricting and even destroying our production. They must be demobilised before a complete breakdown occurs.

STRIKE SUBSIDY: An interesting situation has now developed from the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act, one that may cost taxpayers £1,000,000 a week to subsidise strikes. Workers, other than strikers, who lose their job as a result of strikes will be entitled to receive the dole. If the number of actual strikers can be kept down to a small number, say, in a key industry, the great body of temporarily displaced workers can draw the dole from the taxpayers, and perhaps help to finance the actual strikers. The question now arises: was the Act designed to meet such a situation, or are the super-bureaucratic Planners more stupid than they appeared to be? What do you think?

SHARE STUNTS: Some time ago legislation was passed to prevent company shares being sold except through official share peddlers, much to the delight of the said share sellers. Later on more legislation was passed bringing into being the "Capital Issues Board." This bureaucratic set-up was given control over the type of industries that could be established, much to the delight of the industrial and financial bigwigs. But, despite the centralisers' rat-like cunning, a new stunt has been produced to circumvent them. A company is reported to have raised capital to the extent of £750,000 by issuing certificates instead of shares, and having "Trustees" instead of Directors or Promoters. This move is said to have caused grave concern in stock-broking circles. It would be just too bad if a new undertaking could get under way without the knowledge and consent of the powers-that-be!

BALKAN BLACKOUT: Russia claims 100% state of democracy in Bulgaria. Commenting on this, Arthur Jordan, London "Daily Mail" correspondent, says: "The men we regard as war criminals hold ministerial positions and hundreds more of them are among the Party rank-and-file. The most cynical of all appointments is that of Foreign Minister (Georges Tatarescu), who was a notorious pro-Nazi, and would have been arrested had he entered the British or American Zone. Only ardent Government newspapers get sufficient newsprint; in fact, they get more than they need and sell

the surplus on the black market."

SETTLING SOLDIERS: Lengthy statements from politicians on soldier settlement and welfare schemes continue to flow freely, but when it comes to action, well here it is: Our heroes are mostly unable to obtain houses; if fortunate enough to even get a room, our benevolent Government compels them to pay 25% sales tax on carpets and other floor coverings, and of course they are soaked good and proper by direct taxation. No honest politician can justify imposing these crippling taxes on returned men. Soldiers, and indeed all sections of the community, can be actively interested in the Tax-Limit Campaign if campaigners will bring the letter-forms dealing with this situation under their notice. What about it?

CINEMA CONTROL: The Sydney correspondent of the "Observer," in a recent review of trade prospects and American influence, remarked: "Most cinemas are under American control and very seldom take a British picture." He also pointed out that the fine British picture, "Tunisian Victory," went to Australia, was stored for a year, and then sent back without even one showing to the public. Other writers have stated that the U.S. Government has under various appropriations provided many millions of dollars for publicising American production in all countries, as part of the drive to capture the world's markets. Some day some sane man may see the folly of this export mania, and use the country's resources for (Continued on page 4.)

Significant Political Pointers

Those money reformers who believe that financial power is the only power to worry about, should consider for a few minutes the manner in which the British Government was forced to sign the "American" Loan Agreement on terms dictated by international gangsters.

In spite of widespread opposition to the loan and the deadly conditions attached to it, some British representatives probably felt that they had no option but to agree. The important point to grasp is that military power first had to be invoked in order that conditions could be created making it well nigh impossible for the British to withstand the demands made upon them.

Under war conditions, the vast bureaucratic army also used its power to create a situation helpful to the international gangsters.

The battle for individual freedom and security cannot be won by merely fighting on the monetary-reform front while ignoring what is happening elsewhere. Social creditors must see the battle, and it is a battle, as a whole. As the next Federal Election draws closer, it becomes increasingly obvious that it must be used to smash the power of the centralised bureau-

cracy; which, in spite of talk about reductions in Federal Government departments, is as strongly entrenched as it was a few years ago.

The Melbourne "Herald" of December 15 reports that the Canadian House of Commons has ratified the Bretton Woods Agreement.

The only members of the House of Commons to oppose the ratification were the Social Crediters, who refused to support an agreement designed to break the British Empire. Significantly enough, "Liberals," Socialists and "Conservatives" agreed on the "sell-out." But the action of the Social Crediters will have far-reaching effects when the full implications of the Bretton Woods monetary scheme becomes apparent to the people.

As was predicted by most observers, the headquarters of the United Nations' Organisation will be located in U.S.A.

As some of the most dangerous international crooks in the world have used America as their place of residence for some considerable time, it is only natural that the headquarters of an instrument they expect to use to further their plans should be located to suit their convenience.

Australian delegates voted in favour of America as the country for headquarters of U.N.O.—and so did Russian delegates.

Melbourne's socialist daily, the "Herald," continues its pro-Soviet propaganda.

Mr. J. B. Priestley, English novelist, has just contributed three lengthy feature articles telling "Herald" readers how Socialism in Russia is not as bad as some people would have us believe.

Mr. Priestley upholds the Soviet's policy of ensuring that all neighbouring countries are "friendly"—i.e., willing to submit to domination by Moscow. A little bashing may be required here and there, but apparently the end justifies the means!

(Continued on page 2.)

Social Credit Talks "On the Air"

NEW VICTORIAN BROADCASTS

Mr. Eric Butler will give the first radio talk over 3CS, Colac, at 9.10 this evening, Friday, December 21. All Victorian listeners who can tune in to 3CS are invited to listen and to make the broadcast as widely known as possible.

In future, Social Credit talks will be given from 3CS, Colac, every Friday evening at 9.10.

The weekly talks from 3MA, Mildura, which started two weeks ago, are broadcast at 7.20 every Friday evening.

SPECIAL NOTICE TO NEWSAGENTS & READERS

The "New Times" will NOT be published on December 28 and January 4.

The next issue of the "New Times" will be published on Friday, January 11, 1946.

THE AMERICAN LOAN TO G.T. BRITAIN

Another Major Step In A Long-Term Plot

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

Sir, —Let me break the continuity of my letters relating to the identity of the Promoters of War in order to comment briefly on the "American" loan to "Britain." The acceptance of the scheme by the British House of Commons is a calamity of the first magnitude.

A small body of enlightened men has been trying to arouse the people of the United Kingdom to the danger, which threatened them, and although these men have done wonders in the time and with the resources available to them, the enemy has captured the British Parliament. The way in which that was done may yet, metaphorically, be the rope by which the enemy will be hanged.

Six years ago the world's outstanding realist, in the person of C. H. Douglas, set out the real objectives of the war as follows:—

(i) The establishment of the International Police State on the Russian model, commencing with Great Britain;

(ii) The restoration of the Gold Standard and the Debt system;

(iii) The elimination of Great Britain in the cultural sense, and the substitution of Jewish-American ideals; and

(iv) The establishment of the Zionist State in Palestine as a geographical centre a World Control, with New York as the centre of World Financial Control.

So once again we see events happening just as C. H. Douglas said they would. These events are of Jewish origin.

This infamous loan will do to the people of England what the military might of Germany, Italy and Japan failed to do on the battlefield—namely, convert their beloved homeland into an "American" concentration camp.

We have been told in press reports that the outlook for the people of Great Britain was admitted to be "gloomy," that "America" had "driven a hard bargain," that it was "unpalatable but unavoidable," and so on. But only a few of the Members of the House of Commons had the courage to vote against handing over the innocent populace to a bunch of ruthless non-Christian gangsters. As I see it, the great majority of the Members, including 29 Jews, voted for the surrender to aliens of the sovereignty of the British Parliament and indicated their own allegiance to a foreign power.

None of the press reports has given us the name of the PERSONS who "drove the hard bargain," or at whose direction such a hard bargain WAS driven. And who dictated that the granting of the loan would be absolutely conditional on the British Parliament accepting the Bretton Woods international monetary plan?

Some PERSON or PERSONS did that, and we must do what we can to get their names and to find out their purpose and the source of their authority. Apparently they realised that the only way in which it could be forced on the British people was at the point of the pistol. President Truman was appointed to succeed President Roosevelt at Jewish instigation and President Roosevelt's Brain Trust included Morgenthau, Baruch, Sol. Bloom, Felix Frankfurter, and other "representative Americans." Sol. Bloom was Director of Purchases for the British Purchasing Commission in New York, and key men are suitably installed in all countries to watch that the directions of the Brains Trust are not flouted. For example: Mr. Byrnes, present Secretary of State for U.S.A., is the protégé of Bernard Baruch. The Russian Foreign Minister is of the same fraternity as Mr. Baruch. The British delegation now at Moscow includes Major-General Jacob. All communications between the Continent and the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Forces in Europe were "supervised" by David Sarnoff, the American Jewish financier, and Mr. H. Lehmann is Director-General of U.N.R.R.A. The Admiralty Registry was in charge of Mr. H. D. Samuel, and the names of the highly placed personnel in the Military Intelligence Services is very illuminating. The members of the President's Brain Trust are the lawmakers and dictators of policy. Sol. Bloom has been organising U.S. Senate support for the "loan" for more than 25 years. Social Crediters have been warning the world of what was afoot, and it will be appropriate to recall a

ABOLITION OF MEANS TEST

MR. A. W. Noakes, hon. secretary of the Bardon (Qld.) Progress Association, reports as follows:—

At the last meeting of the Bardon Progress Association, on November 12, the following resolution was carried:

"That letters be sent to our Federal representatives requesting that they take action for the abolition of the Means Test, as applied to all pensions and allowances."

I was directed to point out that everybody is taxed directly and indirectly to provide money for payment of these social services, therefore everybody was justly entitled to receive whatever allowance their age or physical condition would entitle them to receive, without any consideration whatever of their financial position. The application of the Means Test to persons who have contributed to the revenue from which these pensions and allowances are paid is simply a gross injustice and a direct negation of equity.

little of the information thus circulated even after the commencement of the war in 1939. This will show that the war was not won by those who fought in it. It was won by those who arranged it.

In 1940 the press gave big headlines in reporting that the British Cabinet was willing to have a "union" with the United States, and Dr. Tudor Jones, writing in "The Social Creditor" of 28/9/40, had this to say on the subject:—

"Mr. Churchill has been forced to give an undertaking . . . that the House of Commons shall be a partner in his schemes . . . The secret policy, which is being pursued, is to secure the final overthrow of individual initiative by the construction and consolidation of ever vaster and vaster machinery for control . . . Mr. Churchill's policy (an American policy) is to win the war for America and to lose the peace to America. What is America? Until America speaks, it is enough to answer with a shrug."

On 22nd July, 1940, it was reported that "Sir Frederick Phillips, of the British Treasury . . . was able to assure Mr. Morgenthau that the British Government . . . plans to liberate monetary and trade policies as soon as possible after hostilities cease." ("The Social Creditor," 27/7/40.)

In an article entitled "The Real War," published in "The Social Creditor" of 24/8/40, H.R.P. said:—

"To be accurate, the present military conflict is a phase in a war extending over centuries and millennia between the individuals comprising mankind and a very few individuals controlling key institutions." General Smuts, whose grandfather's name was Isaac, broadcasting to Great Britain and America on 21/7/40, declared:

"We aim at a society of nations which will possess a central organisation equipped with the necessary authority and powers to supervise the common concerns of mankind."

Note particularly the words, "the common concerns of mankind."

Of course, he did not explain what he meant by the word "we."

At the outbreak of war in 1914, Mr. Walter Hines Page, then American Ambassador in London, cabled to President Woodrow Wilson: "The British Empire is delivered into our hands." This proved a little

premature, but the plot was even then in process of execution.

President Wilson was almost completely controlled by the German Jews, Schiff and Warburg, partners in the international banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and it was thus into THEIR hands that our Empire was supposed to have been "delivered." William McAdoo, Secretary of the United States Treasury, had previously been a business associate of his father-in-law, Paul Warburg—founder of the Federal Reserve Board!

Mr. Herbert Hoover, ex-President of the United States, said it was essential that Europe should be allowed to exhaust itself, and the strength of the United States be increased by keeping out of the war, so that the voice of the United States would be decisive regarding the Peace terms. ("The Social Creditor," 12/7/41.) For "America's" purposes, the exhaustion of Europe was ESSENTIAL. Well, according to the "Review of World Affairs" of 28/3/45, Europe IS exhausted, as follows:—

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

On 9/8/40 the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" published the following report from Mexico City:

"Leon Trotsky, exiled Russian Communist leader, predicts that the United States will become 'the legitimate inheritor' of Canada, Australia and New Zealand. This would follow the defeat of Britain by Germany," he told newspapermen, today at his fortress-like Mexican villa. "The United States has left the job of smashing England in the hands of Germany," he said. Trotsky predicted that the United States, without entering the war, would emerge as the most imperialistic nation in the history of the world as a result of it."

It was kind of "the United States" to leave the dirty job to Germany, but bad luck for them that the people of England had other ideas!

The London "Daily Telegraph," in its editorial of 22/10/1940, contained the following:—

"Signor Giovanni Ansaldo, writing in the Leghorn newspaper, 'Il Telegrafo,' expresses a serious concern about the future of Great Britain. He makes the assumption—interesting in itself—that the United States will shortly intervene in the war as our ally, and he warns us of the inevitable consequences. Britain will pass completely under the control of the United States; her independence will be gone forever . . ."

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 16th December 1945.

(To be concluded in next issue.)

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1)

The Planners have said that only in war or under the threat of war will the British people submit to large-scale planning—i.e., Socialism.

Germany was the chosen instrument to create the threat of war and eventually actual war. The growing Russo-German coalition is now obviously the chosen instrument to further the general policy. The threat of war has to be maintained in order to plan and bully the individual.

By example, the British peoples can show the way to escape from the increasing menace of centralisation.

It is interesting to learn that Churchill would not accede to "American" demands to open a "Second" Front in 1942.

At that time the Communists and others were screaming that the British were letting the Russians do all the fighting. The more the real facts about the war are made known, the more clearly we see how great was the contribution made by the British people to ultimate military victory.

There appears to be little doubt that another Federal Powers Referendum will be held next year.

Recent High Court decisions have revealed just what a great bulwark against complete serfdom our Commonwealth Constitution is. Dr. Evatt and the forces behind him are apparently engaged in a two-pronged drive against the Constitution. It is no doubt visualised that treaties entered into under the External Powers clause in the Constitution can be used to override the States. However, there are obvious weaknesses in this line of approach, thus making it necessary to continue the direct attack on the Constitution itself.

All blackmailers first start with maximum demands. If these demands succeed, well and good; but, if they don't they can then be modified with hope of success. Evatt and Co. are going to modify their original demands; they are going to be more subtle.

But their "new" demands, if acceded to, will make it easier to proceed towards further demands.

Social creditors should now be looking around the community and ascertaining who, other than themselves, are going to fight the next demands by the centralisers. Encouragement, advice and information should be given to these fighters.

Members of State Parliaments should be contacted and asked, "If social security schemes must be organised, why cannot State Governments do what the Federal Government has done or desires to do?" Answers to this question should prove interesting.

Mr. Mann M.L.A., speaking in the West Australian Parliament on September 5, 1945, said:—

"We ship by far the greater part of our wool oversea. Further, we bring it down from the North to Fremantle, where it is appraised and auctioned and then sent overseas, to England, Japan, China, India, and other parts of the world. This practice is uneconomic. The wool has to be brought down to Fremantle from the Murchison—a very long distance—and when it arrives here it contains at least 40 per cent to 50 per cent of foreign matter."

"There should be more appraisal centres and less centralisation. It was a very hard battle to get an appraisal centre established at Albany. The whole idea seems to be centralisation: everything possible for the metropolitan area! Take the case of Sydney. Sydney has a population of 1,800,000, and it is one of the most congested cities in Australia, if not in the world. Town-planners today definitely state that when a city has a population of more than 250,000, there will be a period of congestion, and that is what will happen in our metropolitan area. For some time we had only one wool appraisal centre, and that was at Fremantle. We are slowly decentralising in that connection. We should have more appraisal centres, as these would enable the appraisers and buyers to go to the areas where the wool is grown and have it shipped at some port more convenient than Fremantle."

—E.D.B.

SOCIAL CREDIT ACTION GROUP

Mr. W. J. Carruthers, Hon. Secretary of the Victorian Social Credit Action Group, reports as follows:—

"Since my last report in these columns, many readers have contacted me in order to assist financially. My group is more than confident that a fighting fund of at least £20 per week can be established in order to continue and increase the state-wide campaign already started by Mr. Eric Butler. Since last reporting, one social creditor has come forward with a regular contribution of 10/- a week. Surely there are hundreds who could easily subscribe a shilling or more regularly. Already two country radio stations are broadcasting weekly Social Credit talks, and in the near future we hope to use three more stations. But all this requires financial support."

"Melbourne actionists who can help to arrange suburban Town Hall meetings are urged to come forward. These meetings will deal specifically with the fight against Uniform Taxation, and State Members will be invited to be present."

"All donations and offers of other assistance should be forwarded to Mr. W. J. Carruthers, 32 Kendall Street Ringwood, Victoria."

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

Background to Present Dollar Diplomacy

(From the "Social Creditor," England, 29/9/45.)

Great Britain spent a greater percentage of her national income to pay for the war than Russia, the United States, or any of the Dominions from 1940 to 1944. The following table shows the percentages for each year:

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Great Britain	15	39	49	53	54	54
Russia	22	27	35	45	48	44
Canada	2	10	19	40	54	52
New Zealand	2	9	23	50	54	49
Australia	2	12	25	43	48	44
United States	2	3	11	35	46	46

These figures are taken from a chart attached to President Truman's 20th Lend-Lease report.

The mistake, which has tainted the foreign policy of this country for a hundred years—we pass over its origin—is the fallacy that the United States of America is an Anglo-Saxon nation fundamentally friendly to the British. Whatever may have originally been the case, it is not true now.

Not only is the United States predominantly foreign; but its population is either hereditarily anti-English, or originally indifferent, and anti-British by education. And it has a press, which is dominated by interests, which are not even European.

During the nineteenth century, it served the purpose of the "City," and notably the Rothschilds, Cassels, and other German Jews, who were aggrandising themselves by lending British credit to build up, with cheap immigrant labour, a successor to the country they were emasculating, to secure the vogue of the "hands across the sea" nonsense—a purpose which was the easier of achievement by the colourable imitation of Americanese spoken in Whitechapel, and the fact that a minority of the inhabitants of the British Isles, and a majority of the inhabitants of Ireland had relatives settled overseas. Outside a minority, the population of the United States suffers from an inferiority complex, the usual penalty of getting rich too quickly; and Anglophobia is a not unnatural consequence.

The dangerous factor in this situation is that we appeal to American common interest for assistance.

Since, on the only two occasions on which, very leisurely, it has been given, that interest has reduced us to a condition of inferiority far greater than was imposed on Germany by the loss of the 1914-18 phase of the War, it ought to begin to dawn on us that the situation envisaged for "Britain" is that of a stormy bastion for a comfortable America. That is neither an attractive nor an inevitable destiny; and

it is to be hoped that Lord Halifax will intimate the fact without undue delicacy.

In the main, the explanations to which United States citizens attribute their special situation in tool-power politics (without usually recognising the nature of that position) are wide of the mark. It was an authentic Yankee, Artemus Ward, a type, which seems to have disappeared with the late-lamented Will Rogers, who remarked, "There's nothing that makes men so ridiculous as knowing so many things that ain't so." Nevertheless, they make no mistake in claiming certain virtues for some of their earlier immigrants (mainly from these islands) in the situation in which they found themselves. They were self-reliant; they did not allow themselves to be hampered by rules; and they were ready to try anything once. What their successors have failed to grasp is that this situation was bound to be transient; it was merely a recapitulation of conditions met more successfully and with less assistance thousands of years before in Europe; and that mere preponderance in gadget production offers no promise of the transfer of those qualities to the far more difficult frontiers which now bar mankind from the promised land.

The world is sick unto death; many of the origins of the possibly fatal disease are compromised in the mysterious word, organisation, whose very etymology ought to make it suspect—the treatment of things as though they were organisms, and the treatment of persons as though they were things. If we are to escape the coming judgment, we have not much time in which to recognise the nature of the standards we are asked to accept in place of those from which grew the derided English conception of life. There is a minority in America, which knows this as well as we do; to that minority, not to the United States, we call.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSN. ATTACKS N.S.W. ELECTRICITY BILL

The Local Government Association of N.S.W., embracing virtually all the municipal and shire councils, considers the N.S.W. Government's Electricity Bill is a step towards dictatorship. An official statement issued by the President of the Association, Councillor Shaw, included the following remarks:—

"A basic feature of the policy of Local Government is decentralisation. That means, the devolution of powers from Central Authority and the creation of greater Local Government. That is not prompted by a desire for the aggrandisement of Local Government, but by a firm conviction that only in that way can democratic principles be effectively implemented. The first step towards Totalitarianism is to strip power from the people; thus, any trend towards centralisation must be fought vigorously.

"The Electricity Bill provides for the creation of a new central authority of seven members, all appointees of the Government, with power to construct power houses and erect transmission lines, and to control the operation of existing Supply Authorities, including Councils, even to the extent of fixing maximum rates for supply.

"The more recent examples of the seemingly inevitable growth of Central Authority at the expense of Local Government is apparent in the development of the Main Roads Department and the State Housing Commission. Today, it is Electricity tomorrow it will be something else. That the sponsors of these proposals are sincere (and may be ambitious) makes them all the more dangerous.

"Local Government has already done a great job in giving electricity to the country. The only restriction on further development is money. Electricity supply can be carried anywhere, if sufficient funds are available. Creating a new Authority will not provide money—but it will increase costs.

"Where is the money to come from? Although provision is made in the Bill for appropriation by Parliament to assist development, there is no statutory obligation on the Crown to provide a penny piece. On the other hand, Supply Authorities, which are to be levied for the purposes of the Bill, have no protection whatsoever. The amount to be payable by them is not stated, nor is the method of calculating the contribution. This will be fixed by regulation, in other words, the Government is asking for a blank cheque. There are grounds, therefore, for the suspicion that Local Government will be called on to contribute far more than the Government is prepared to say. As the levy may be varied with different

Authorities, most of this money will come from the successful undertakings.

"Little, if any, discretionary power, even in the reticulation field, is left to Councils, while heavy penalties on Local Government bodies to ensure compliance with directions are a feature of the Bill.

"Local Government claims that it is a partner of the Trinity of Government. The Government's conception of Local Government is that of a subordinate, without status and without dignity. What a slap in the face for the thousands of men and women voluntarily giving their time and energy in the interests of good government!

"Finally, Local Government says that if a new Authority is necessary to ensure a greater degree of co-ordination, Local Government should have majority control thereon, with representatives nominated by it, not selected by the Minister, because—

"1. Local Government should control its own affairs. It now generates over 70 per cent, and reticulates over 94 per cent, of electricity for public supply. Local Government has pioneered the industry and invested millions of the ratepayers' money therein.

"2. Local Government will thereby have an effective say in the contribution it should be called upon to make for electricity development. If Local Government 'pays the piper,' Local Government should also 'call the tune.'

"3. With strong Local Government representation, there will be inherent in the new Authority a force which will preclude further growth at the expense of Local Government.

"4. It will ensure available funds being expended on rural development on a regional basis instead of on a grandiose scheme, costly, uneconomic and premature.

"5. Because it will preserve power to the people."

"Let there be no misunderstanding. If the Government wants to assist electricity development, it has legislative authority to do so now by subsidising rural extensions through Local Government under Section 493A of the Local Government Act, thereby giving effect to its declared policy of decentralisation, using Local Government, not destroying it."

—"Electrical and Radio World," Brisbane, 20/11/45.

NO VICTORY FOR OUR POLISH ALLIES

In 1939, when Brown Totalitarian Imperialism burst into Poland, the British peoples were committed to war, on that account. But since Red Totalitarian Imperialism flooded into Poland, replaced its counterpart—and settled there—not a finger has been lifted.

Now, at the end of this year of "victory," let us at least have the decency to remember the heroic effort and the recent tragic fate of our faithful first allies—the Poles. A short reminder of that fate is provided by the following extracts from the British "Hansard" report of a House of Commons debate on Poland on August 24 1945.

Sir Ernest Graham-Little (London University): "I have it on good authority that the way in which elections have been conducted in Poland is as follows: There is a great army of Commissars distributed in proportion of one to 18 voters, and the Commissars are very eager and efficient in making the voters vote as they would wish them to do. If a voter does not vote, he is liquidated or otherwise disposed of, and the result of the arrangement is that it is usual to report that the candidates have been elected by 100 per cent. of the votes. "The treatment of the delegation that went to Poland is surely a very salient and incontestable obstacle. It is an instance of a breach of international law and order. When a delegation has received a safe conduct and is imprisoned on arrival in the country, it is something of which to take notice . . .

"Comment has been made on the fact that the defendants, if you can call them such in the trials of Moscow, if you can call them trials, admitted their 'guilt' Hon. Members must remember the series of State trials which took place in Moscow from 1931 to 1936. They all followed a similar pattern.

"They are obviously not trials in the sense in which we have trials, but State functions carefully arranged; and the fact that every accused person admits the crimes of which he is accused, and invents some for himself, surely shows up the travesty of justice which these trials really are.

"With regard to the reality of the opposition to the return to Poland of the Polish communities outside that country, I have details here of a Congress of Polish emigrants. Something like 600,000 members were concerned in the matter in France composed of factory workers and the general middle and working classes. They passed a unanimous resolution that they would have nothing whatever to do with the Lublin Government, that they would never be ruled by the Lublin Government, and expressing their complete loyalty to the Polish Government in London. . . ."

Professor Savory (Queen's University, Belfast): " . . . During the last war I was sent out by His Majesty's Government to become the Secretary to His Majesty's Minister in Stockholm and it was through Stockholm that passed all the negotiations

with regard to the independence of these countries. As the physician who presided at the birth of these three Baltic States I may perhaps be allowed to take an interest in the growth of these children and I have followed them up to manhood. I want to know, are you going to allow those three independent States to be absorbed in Russia?

"Let me remind the House of the history of this question. During the whole of the early months of 1939 the question of these three independent States was being constantly raised in the negotiations between this country and Russia.

"You had given a guarantee to Poland. The Prime Minister came to this House on March 31 and suddenly announced that a guarantee had been granted to Poland.

"No attempt had been made apparently up to that time to find whether that guarantee would also be ratified by Russia. A whole series of contentious negotiations were entered into and it is quite certain historically that we could have had a Russian alliance at any time—if we had been prepared to hand over to Russia those three independent Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. But be it said to the honour of the Government of Mr. Neville Chamberlain that he refused to be a party to such a dishonourable bargain, with the result that Stalin negotiated with Ribbentrop and found Ribbentrop a good deal more complaisant. While conducting negotiations with us, he was also secretly conducting negotiations with Germany, which led to the famous Treaty of Alliance of August 1939 . . .

"It was only in San Francisco that finally M. Molotov confessed to the right hon. Gentleman the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that they had been arrested, in spite of the safe conduct, in spite of the assurance that had been given by the Russian Government to the British Government here and which had been conveyed to the Poles in London.

"I admire the courage of our former Secretary who refused, backed up by Mr. Stettinius, to carry on any further negotiations. Then we had the trial in Moscow and we have been told by hon. Gentlemen opposite that these men confessed. We know how these confessions are brought about; we have not forgotten the trial of the British engineers for sabotage. They

were forced to confess by methods on which I shall not dwell, but, as our White Paper shows, immediately after having made these confessions, when they were released, they went to the British Legation in Moscow and retracted the whole of their statements, which they said had been extorted from them by methods which had worn them out, and which had compelled them to confess . . .

"I challenge the hon. Gentleman to deny the facts which I give him on this question. Can you expect to find confidence in the existing administration? On July 24 Reuter's despatch, published in this country, reported that 300 people were condemned by a special court in Warsaw for 'treason against the Polish nation,' and that 6000 more cases were pending. On August 18 Warsaw radio gave another item which developed this information by saying that—

"'1692 new cases of treason against the Polish nation were opened before a special tribunal in Warsaw last month.'

"If the hon. Gentleman will look up the archives, he will find that there are full copies of these dispatches. The British Government are extremely well informed of these facts, because British prisoners were in Poland—men who had to make forced landings from aeroplanes—and others, who have been repatriated and have come back to this country. Their depositions have been made; what they have witnessed has been recorded.

"At the same time, most stringent orders have been given to these men that they should not say anything about their stay in Poland. It has not been thought desirable that they should reveal facts of which they are cognisant.

"But some of them have a most intimate knowledge of the circumstances in Poland today. Some were sheltered and taken care of by noble and gallant Poles, and from them learned the Polish language. They were thus in a position to talk to the Polish people, and they have related what they have seen of the way the Polish population was treated when the Russian troops arrived. All this was taken down when they arrived in this country. It is all on record, and I hope the War Office will now withdraw the ban and allow these men to give evidence, so that the people of this country can know what is the truth, what are the circumstances at present existing in Poland . . .

SECRET BALLOTS ON STRIKE MOVES

The recent strike of coalminers, etc., in New South Wales has illustrated and emphasised the danger of trade union bosses starting big strikes, which may not be wanted by the majority of unionists concerned. "Mass" meetings attended by a small fraction of the membership at which opponents of the executive are intimidated obviously provide no safeguard.

It is significant that, at a conference with Mr. Chifley during the recent strike, union delegates rejected his proposal to take a secret ballot. Some basic considerations in support of such intervention were set out in the following letter from a prominent Sydney social creditor to his State Member:—

Mr. D. B. Hunter, M.L.A.,
Parliament House, Sydney.

Dear Mr. Hunter,—I believe you will agree that the source of all social power is the individual. All that happens in society arises as the result of the application, or misapplication, of this force.

I believe I am therefore right in feeling a personal responsibility for what is happening in the community today. If I remain inert, I passively sanction all that is done. The only way an individual can discharge responsibility for what is now proceeding is to do what he can to express HIS desires as to the direction in which the social power, which flows from HIM, should be applied.

All our institutions, including Parliament, are simply means, which have been designed for the purpose of applying this social force in an effective and appropriate manner.

It is to discharge this obligation (an obligation which I believe lies upon each individual) that, as a Constituent, I am now addressing myself to you as my Representative. I feel confident that this is the best method by which, as a Constituent, I can strengthen your hand, as my Representative; and that if similar action be taken by sufficient Constituents to support their Representatives, the power generated will be adequate to re-align ourselves speedily in the direction of sanity. I believe you will agree that the first essential is that power, which is exercised should be rightly derived from those in whose name it is exercised; and that power should be closely associated with responsibility.

I am strongly of the opinion that the power exercised by the Miners' Executive, in precipitating upon us all the elements which make for civil disorder, have not been rightly derived.

The method of ascertaining whether this opinion is well founded or not is very simple and obvious. It is that the lawful authority (the State Government) should take immediate steps to hold a secret ballot to ascertain whether the policy now operated in the name of the miners is rightly derived or otherwise.

Until this has been done, all action will lead to further confusion.

As I am confident that this opinion is widely held among your Constituents, I urge you to do all in your power to move the State Government to hold a secret ballot, and that full protection be afforded to all concerned so that there shall be no intimidation.

So far as lies in my power I am urging all

NATIONAL SOCIALISM IN GREAT BRITAIN

The rumours of the death of Hitler and Mussolini must have been very much exaggerated, according to an account in the "Calgary Albertan" on Tuesday, October 9, of what is going on in Great Britain.

If the story given by the "Albertan" is true (and there couldn't be any reason to doubt it, could there?) nobody but a Mussolini or Hitler could have thought up anything as brilliant—or as fantastic—as the proposed procedure in Britain—unless, of course, Professor Laski has had another brainstorm.

It appears from this article that the Socialist Government in London is very seriously alarmed over the shortage of babies in the country, and so they have set up a Royal Commission to study into the causes. This Commission proposes to send out innumerable Paul Prys to go through the country to "question" a million and a half British women as to why they do not have more babies. Could Hitler or Mussolini have beaten this?

This piece of impertinence is, of course, typical of the National Socialism of Germany and the Fascism of Italy that we have been fighting for six years to keep out of the Democracies.

Would you say that this proposal of the first Socialist British Government is a reversion to type?

—N. B. James in "The Canadian Social Creditor,"—October 25, 1945.

WAR CRIMINAL'S BACKGROUND

Rosenberg was in Moscow in 1917, eagerly studying the "Wise Men of Zion" and comparing them with events. Konrad Heiden comments: "It is understandable that the first attempt at a State-directed revolution should have been made here. Through this conspiracy Russia became the spiritual mother country of modern fascism . . . the task was to drive the (German) Government to revolution. But how? This time it looked as though the orders had come directly from the Wise Men of Zion. Two refugees from Russia devised the plan—Alfred Rosenberg and his friend, Max Richter." (K. Heiden, "Der Fuehrer," p. 108.)

all who are not too indolent to concern themselves with their own affairs; all who by their inaction will otherwise align themselves as passive supporters of those forces making for civil disorder; all who desire to see a secret ballot taken—I am urging all such to communicate with their Representatives.

I believe that the great privileges and safeguards of democracy are not to be enjoyed by a people prepared on every occasion to sit back and "Let George do it"; that the benefits of democracy must be paid for in coin more sterling than a willingness simply to mark a ballot paper once in three years; that unless direction on policy re issues as they arise is expressed by a sufficient number of thoughtful and responsible citizens and impressed upon their Representatives—then the direction of policy will tend to gravitate into fewer and fewer hands, until our boasted democracy will degenerate into what cannot be distinguished from dictatorship.

I am saying to my friends: "This is YOUR country. The responsibility for the purposes to which its forces are applied is your responsibility. It is up to the Constituent! GET BUSY!"

—I am, sir, yours faithfully,

JOHN M. MACARA.

69 Lucas Road, Burwood, N.S.W.,
12th December 1945.

TALK BY MR. JAMES GUTHRIE

On Tuesday evening, December 18, a small but attentive group of Melbourne social creditors listened to a very stimulating talk by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., of Hobart.

Mr. Guthrie's major point was that the ideas grouped under the term Social Credit are so precious to civilisation that social creditors must make certain that these ideas are not perverted in any way.

He also said that the state of the world is such that anyone who will not spend more than a mere half-hour a week advancing Social Credit ideas is not a real social creditor.

At the conclusion of his address, Mr. Guthrie answered questions.

Mr. Carruthers, honorary secretary of the Social Credit Action Group, in moving a vote of thanks to Mr. Guthrie, said that those present were very grateful for a brilliant address.

NOTES ON LEARNING HOW TO THINK

By H. T. PARKER

A good deal of what goes by the name of thinking nowadays is secondhand—and, of course, secondhand thinking is not thinking at all. A phrase or a sentence that passes from mouth to mouth may have been a thought in the beginning, but repetition makes it only a catch-cri. Sometimes we call it a slogan—if it becomes fairly worn and well known.

But slogans—catch-cries—are not thoughts. On the contrary, slogans and thinking just won't go together. They are opposites. If you're thinking, there's no room in your mind for slogans. If you're repeating a slogan, there's no room for thinking. Proverbs, wisecracks, maxims are all in the same class.

Now I believe there's a time to think and a time not to think. And the time not to think is when we have to act. Normally and naturally, thinking goes before action. That's how action has to be guided. As we say, we have to make up our minds—decide what we will do before we begin doing it. But if we spend all our time making up our minds, we'll do nothing—get nowhere. And if, in the middle of doing we begin to ponder and hesitate, we'll end up by being confused. Again, we'll get nowhere.

In the middle of action a maxim may help—add force, determination, when to begin to think would upset everything.

READY-MADE OPINIONS

Still, I'm very suspicious of ready-made opinions. Thinking is hard: parroting slogans or quoting proverbs is easy. And they have such a plausible, attractive sound, very often: and they are so simple. They solve, or seem to solve, some of the most troublesome problems. They leave no room for doubt, no uncertainty. Religion, politics, morals—they offer us the final word in each, and no questions asked.

To be a victim of the slogan habit is to be very easy prey for the propagandist. He works with a technique well known to the psychologist—the technique of suggestion. And the whole art of suggestion, if you should want to know, is to take the victim unawares, to slip an idea into his mind by the back door, so to speak, so that he will accept it as his own without being aroused to question it.

Now all this is, up to a point, according to nature. I mean we are all built that way—built to accept and appropriate other people's opinions without question or scrutiny. It's largely a matter of prestige. We would think twice before questioning the statement of a person who was really an authority on the topic he was speaking about. Almost all the knowledge we possess has come to us indirectly—through reading, through the observation and report of those who, as we say, ought to know. And sometimes it's more important that we should scrutinise the credentials of those who claim to speak with authority than try to criticise what they say. The trouble really begins when we misplace our confidence, or when we accept uncritically matters which depend on commonsense, and which we ought to think out for ourselves—when we believe a thing because "it's in the paper," or because Professor Blank or the Honourable John Dash said it.

I think I've said enough to assure you that learning how to think is not the simple straightforward matter it may appear to be. It's not something one can take lessons on or do exercises on, so many minutes a day, to improve one's mental powers. In fact, doing exercises, or studying the rules of thought, has very little to do with it, any more than studying the laws of grammar is part of learning how to talk, or studying, say, physiology a part of learning how to play tennis.

CHILDREN AND PARENTS

Let's go back to the start, to the case of the young child just beginning to imbibe ideas of things. He—yes, imbibes them—drinks them in—opinions and ideas from the people about him. It's the only way he can learn. He's too young to think for himself, and there are some things he must know. They're practical ideas, most of them, and his parents and elders are experienced. They really do know better than he does, so, quite rightly, they have authority and prestige.

By the time he is old enough to begin thinking for himself, and that is not until the period of middle childhood, he has acquired a system of ideas, which he thoroughly believes in. He has not tested them out; he believes them because he was told.

Then he comes to the age of doubt, or questioning.

This is the time when many parents have their feelings hurt. Does the boy doubt his mother's word? Doesn't she know best? Has she ever deceived him? Or been selfish towards him?

But she's wrong; and she oughtn't to feel hurt. Nature is stirring within him, making him want to shoulder some responsibility for himself—responsibility for his own observing and thinking. What if he is wrong, and his parents right? Understanding will come, and judgment, and wisdom, all in good time.

Young people learn how to think, as they learn how to walk, and speak, and use the knife and fork, by trying them out. They may need guidance at times, and occasionally a little help, but in the main their ability must come through their own efforts. At first their speaking and actions are awkward and fumbling; so is their thinking. What would we think of a parent who, every time he saw his child trying to

walk, picked him up and carried him where he wanted to go? Or took the words out of his mouth when he tried to ask for something? Or insisted on feeding him with a spoon when he wanted to feed himself? Actually, some parents try to do these very things, and the result is that they positively prevent their children from growing up.

Precisely the same thing can happen when the child makes his first essay in thinking for himself. His parents or elders rush to his aid and insist on correcting his mistakes—thrust their own beliefs or conclusions on him in the absurd fear that he'll grow up a fool if he's allowed to form wrong opinions. They don't realise that the same impulse that led him to make his childish judgments will, as time ripens and strengthens it, lead him to forsake those judgments for wiser ones. They don't realise that if they insist on his acceptance of their beliefs and opinions, he will in the end give up trying to think for himself, and settle down into fatuous repetition of what other people tell him. He'll join the happy crowd of slogan users.

PUPILS AND TEACHERS

And it's fatally easy for the same thing to happen in school. The results of schooling are commonly thought of as so much information acquired, so much skill gained; thus the processes by which these ends are achieved come to be thought of as secondary in importance. Some people—teachers, too—seem to think that processes are important only because of economy in learning. But that is entirely wrong. If passing an examination and getting a certificate were all of education, there might be something to be said for stressing the importance of factual results. But I think we've almost all come to understand that that's quite a wrong attitude. And the teacher who does a child's thinking for him, just in order that he may pass his exams, is doing him a very grave moral and intellectual wrong.

Well, what can we do about it? How far is it a matter for the school, this teaching a child how to think? After all, thinking is not exclusively a school-time occupation. But the school certainly has a very serious responsibility to do its share in ensuring that every pupil shall learn to be active,

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR EVATT

Dear Dr. Evatt, —Because we want you to receive this letter during your next visit to Australia, we are writing it prior to your arrival next month.

It is indeed pleasing that, in spite of your strenuous world planning activities, you can find a little time to visit Australia and look things over. But no doubt you and your international friends desire a little first-hand information on how the Big Idea is progressing in this country.

Frankly, Doctor, we don't think it is progressing too well. Something will have to be done about this High Court and its insults to your legislation.

You can, of course, have another Referendum. But perhaps you cannot spare the time in Australia for such an event? We would suggest that you hand the matter over to your fellow lawyer, Mr. Menzies. After all, Mr. Menzies is as determined as you are that all social "security" schemes should be controlled by the centralised Canberra bureaucracy.

But we imagine that Mr. Menzies would be as heavy a liability to you as he was to the "No" campaigners during the last Referendum.

ARE WE ON THE ROAD TO SERFDOM?

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

The conflict with which we have to deal is a fundamental one between two irreconcilable types of social organisation, which have often been described as the commercial and the military.

In either both choice and risk rest with the individual or he is relieved of both. In the army, work and worker alike are allotted by authority, and this is the only system in which the individual can be conceded full economic security. This security is, however, inseparable from the restrictions on liberty and the hierarchical order of military life—it is the security of the barracks.

In a society used to freedom it is unlikely that many people would be ready deliberately to purchase security at this price. But the policies, which are followed now, are nevertheless rapidly creating conditions in which the striving for security tends to become stronger than the love of freedom.

If we are not to destroy individual freedom, competition must be left to function unobstructed. Let a uniform minimum be secured to everybody by all means but let us admit at the same time that all claims for a privileged security of particular classes must lapse, that all excuses disappear for allowing particular groups to exclude newcomers from sharing their relative prosperity in order to maintain a special standard of their own.

There can be no question that adequate security against severe privation will have to

courageous and I should say, humble in thinking.

Every true teacher will admit the responsibility. As to the means, there may be differences of opinion. There are, in fact, two conflicting tendencies in school practice that have an important bearing on this matter. Because I'm rather fond of giving names, let me call them the formal and the natural tendency.

MOULDING OR EDUCATING?

The formal tendency is to take the young child while his mind and feelings are still plastic, and mould them into a form that is designed to meet the needs of life, by making him efficient in reaction, informed on circumstances, ready in responses. To do this the child must be put into a suitable attitude of mind. He must be taught how to behave by being drilled in acceptable ways of behaving; how to think by being conducted through the process of thinking; how to appreciate beauty, truth and goodness by having approved forms and models of each brought before him.

The natural tendency rejects all or most of this discipline. It requires the child to be stimulated to express himself in a wide variety of natural ways, and by expressing himself come to know and control himself; to perfect his powers by exercise; to learn how to behave by experiencing the effects of various modes of behaviour, acceptable and otherwise; to learn how to think by exercising thought; to appreciate beauty, truth and goodness by making his evaluations of beautiful and ugly things, of true and false things, of good and bad things.

There's a good deal to be said for both the formal and the natural tendencies, and perhaps it would be unwise to dogmatise about them. It may be that we should combine the best features of both. But when it comes to a matter of teaching how to think, there is a conflict between the tendency to insist on rightness of thought and activity of thinking. Suppose, for example, that a teacher's and a pupil's opinions are at variance. Most likely the teacher will be right and the pupil wrong, but not necessarily so. Should the teacher, who is sure of his ground, try to convert the pupil? Should he insist on the pupil's going over the logical processes that led him—the teacher—to his conclusion, and require that the pupil assent to them? Should he, because of his prestige as a teacher, take the risk of the child's assenting without having thought the matter through? Should he silence the child who is, say, too obstinate or too dull-witted to agree with him? Is it better, in short, that the pupil should be right?—or honest?

I offer you no answer. I leave it to you.

—An A.B.C. Broadcast.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

the benefit of the millions of ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed Americans. That goes for Australia too.

SHINTOISM SECRETS: On the subject of eradicating Shintoism, the Associated Press correspondent in Tokyo remarks: "Shintoism was strengthened rigorously by the militarists in the past 10 years because they recognised in it a ready weapon for glorifying death on the battlefield and for promoting the idea of the Japanese as a super-race. The fanatical beliefs were advanced through State support of shrines, payments of priests and emphasis on compulsory religious instruction to impressionable primary-grade pupils." Briefly, it is just another form of the indoctrination practised by Hitler and others. The super-race theory in its original form comes from the Jews.

POST-WAR PROBLEMS: Some quaint statements were recently uttered by big-shot banker Sir Frederick Tout, e.g.: "While capital, enterprise, organising ability and thrift are denied all but a negligible return, they will seek an outlet elsewhere." But this wise guy omitted to say where these attributes would go. Since there is no spot in the known world where the blight of Socialism is not rooted, these attributes will not be able to find an outlet anywhere. Another recent wisecrack came from Sir Keith Murdoch when lauding his own paper, the Melbourne "Herald." He said: "The world has had a terrible lesson on the power of propaganda, the distortions of the newspapers and of the schools and universities." Well, he should be an expert on such matters!

RUSSIAN "REALISM": Alexander Clifford, London "Daily Mail" correspondent in Berlin, reports "British troops in Germany have become largely anti-Russian." He attributes this to the fact that "many of the Red Army are Asiatics who are traditionally cruel in war and know extraordinarily little about the world" (Melbourne "Herald," December 7). In this connection, Mr. Mark Ethridge, President Truman's special emissary, reporting on Soviet-controlled Bulgaria said: "The bourgeoisie opposed Communism and the Courts had sentenced to death 3000 people and imprisoned 6000 people because of their opposition" ("Herald," December 13). Mr. Ethridge also said he was told that "10,000 people had been massacred without trial, and police practised torture on a large scale." It sounds like a reproduction of the 1917 Russian revolution terrors; but it's "democratic"—according to Communist codes. —O.B.H.

COUNTRY CAMPAIGN

Mr. Eric Butler reports that there are still many Victorian country centres from which he has received no indication of a desire to co-operate in the Statewide country campaign planned for early next year.

In order to make all organisational arrangements, it is essential that those desirous of utilising Mr. Butler's services should write to him, as soon as possible, c/o Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

THIS "TREND" NONSENSE

Commenting on the South Australian Electricity Trust Bill, which provides for the taking over by the South Australian Government of the Adelaide Electricity Supply Company, an editorial in a recent edition of "Radio and Electrical Retailer" points out that opposition to the Bill was due, primarily, to objection to radical extension of Government control, on the grounds that the development of the nation depends largely on the efforts of the individual. But the article goes on to say:

"Whilst as individuals many Australians must agree with this thought, the fact remains that it is in opposition to a general trend—in fact, it appears to be a worldwide trend towards nationalisation of public utilities."

The fact that the feelings of so many Australians are opposed to this "trend" should surely indicate that the matter should be more closely examined, rather than unquestioningly accepted as inevitable. An answer to the simple question, "who benefits?" would reveal that this move towards nationalisation is not at all the blessing that we are asked to believe it to be. Further enquiry would show that this so-called "trend" is a skillfully directed move by a small but powerful and well-organised group of men to centralise power in their own hands.

war and most of the evils from which we suffer.

The guiding principle in any attempt to create a world of free men must be this: A policy of freedom for the individual is the only truly progressive policy.

**THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS**