

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. 12, No. 17. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 3, 1946

"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.

Chifley • Blarmey Duel Provokes a Question

Is Chifley Himself A Stooge?

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

Sir, —Can you tell me what is meant by the word "stooge"? I cannot find it in my Oxford dictionary or in Webster's, but it has been in frequent use in certain quarters for some considerable time. During the past week it has been bandied around in the press, and has been deemed of sufficient national importance to be specially telegraphed from London. This was because it was used by the Australian Prime Minister as a term of opprobrium against General Sir Thomas Blamey.

Sir Thomas Blamey can speak for himself [he did!] and doesn't need assistance from me or from anyone else; but when he is called a "stooge" by the Prime Minister, who, theoretically at any rate, speaks for all of us, then it is desirable for us to know what a stooge is.

From what has been published, it may be assumed that General Blamey is regarded by Mr. Chifley as having merely been the display window of some military clique, the opponents of U.S. "imperialism," the arms manufacturers or some other unspecified group with dirty work to be done. Anything, apparently, except as a responsible individual expressing his own thoughtful convictions. That, I should think, is about the meaning of the word as used by the Prime Minister.

PARLIAMENTARY STOOGES

If I am right in this, then it is obvious that there are stooges and stooges. All Members of Parliament, for example, have stood up in public and declared that

they were striving only for those things which would bring contentment and happiness to the people in general and, in the case of "Labor" Members, to the "workers" in particular.

Notwithstanding this, the people in general continue to get the conditions they do NOT want; and the sad fact is that no matter how many wars we win or how often we change the "government," the struggle to live never gets any easier for the "workers."

Clearly, therefore, someone has us by the throat and won't let go.

HIDDEN CONTROLLERS

The people have not asked for the conditions they are getting; they have desired to be freed from them; and as such release is physically and easily possible, it would not be unfair, on the basis of Mr. Chifley's published remark, to suggest that Members of Parliament, under present conditions, are only stooges serving the interests and

doing the dirty work of a group whose identity is carefully concealed.

Regular readers of this paper are aware of the identity of this carefully concealed group and of the way in which its members work, and know that if the supposedly sovereign Parliaments permit them to continue in that way, then Members of Parliament must continue to be stooges, whether they are conscious of it or not.

MR. CHIFLEY AND TAXES

Examples of what I mean could be given by the book full, but one of the latest was the statement from Mr. Chifley himself that taxation will never be returned to pre-war levels.

That statement alone suggests either that our present Prime Minister is not aware of the nature of the flaw in the financial system or that he is a stooge of a kind that is harmful to the public.

If he were aware of the nature of the flaw in the financial system he would also be aware that by removing it we would be able not only to reduce taxation progressively to the pre-war level, but eventually to abolish it altogether.

If he is not aware of the nature of the flaw in the financial system and, as a Labor "leader", continues to act upon the advice of those who desire no change in the method of producing and distributing money,

then he will continue to be a stooge for the controllers of that system.

ANTI-PEOPLE POLICIES

Unless I misjudge his public actions, he is advocating all the things that suit these secret controllers of financial policy, and none of the things that suit the real everyday interests of the populace.

He is pressing for centralisation of power, for continuance of controls, for the maintenance of heavy taxation, and for the ratification of alien-inspired "agreements" which would override our Constitution and deprive the Australian people of sovereignty over their own affairs.

All these things are very detrimental to the general welfare of the people, but very helpful to the small international group seeking to impose their policy in all countries.

ELECTORS MUST ACT

To prevent this world dictatorship the people must strongly resist the things I have enumerated, and reject as mere stooges all members of Parliament and all candidates for Parliament whose actions or words make them the equivalent of local agents for alien managers.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
28th April 1946.

NOTES on the NEWS

A press report informs us that during an address to the Australian Natives' Association, Sir Isaac Isaacs presumed to tell Australians that they "are DUTY-BOUND to say 'Yes' at the forthcoming Referendum." If this report is correct, his statement can only be described as insolent presumption.

Continuing, he said: "The Government needs extra powers to carry out the provisions of the San Francisco Charter." In view of the fact that the San Francisco Charter has already been, ratified, he thus indicates that the Government ratified it without having the necessary powers!

LEGAL LAWLESSNESS: Judge Foster's report on the waterside problem and his recommendations, like some of his earlier statements, have a strong Soviet-Socialist flavour. Among other things, he urges that the suggested Commission "have power to impose limited fines for certain breaches of awards and orders." Here we find a judge advocating usurpation of the functions of our judicial system; it is a most dangerous Communist concept. The Taxation Department, the Prices Branch, Food Boards, and other Departments have the power to impose fines and other penalties, and, needless to say, abuse them to some order; if this practice is extended, it is clear that our judicial system will completely break down. In the circumstances, it seems that Judge Foster has contracted an alien ailment.

PRICES PLUNDER: John K. Heughan, Melbourne "Herald" special correspondent, points out in a recent article how Price Fixing is sabotaging our production. For example: "Price fixing has compelled many manufacturers to discontinue production of pre-war lines and forced them to develop 'new' products, in most cases not equal to their pre-war products, in order to obtain price relief." It is good that other writers are now repeating what has been reiterated in these columns. Price fixing does not reduce prices, but it does reduce quantity and quality. It is a racket sponsored by the workers' so-called leaders.

PLANNERS' PICNIC: The first meeting of the Victorian Central Planning Authority was held recently in Melbourne, and, ironically enough, was eulogised by Mr. Stoneham, Minister for Decentralisation. What a joke! One would have expected centralisers and decentralisers to be firm opponents. Anyway, the central body is to determine the objective (policy), although the municipal Councils, as purely local bodies, should determine policy and seek external co-operation (not dictation) only on matters, which they could not handle themselves. Apparently local Councils are merely to obey the central body, and load the ratepayers with the bill. It is to be hoped that ratepayers will resist this form of totalitarianism.

FOOLISH FALLACY: The fallacy of the Socialist contention that redistribution of big incomes would solve the problem of poverty, is seen in the following data: If all income above £400 a year was confiscated and redistributed among those receiving less, the net gain to the individual would be about 11/- a week. If all income above £1000 was divided among those receiving £200 and less, the individual would gain an extra 6/- per week. If all income above £1000 was distributed among those receiving £400 a year and less, the individual gain would be about 3/- per week.

These figures are based on 1941-42 statistics. Most Socialist and Communist slogans, like "Soak the Rich," upon analysis, are shown to be simply vapoury visions.

AIRLINES ANALYSIS: A recent Gallup Poll discloses that 51% oppose Government competition, while 33% approve, the remaining 16% having no opinion. This question was one of the few put by the Gallup Poll, which was understood and capable of being answered on a "Yes-No" basis. Another interesting feature was that 39% of those who usually vote Labour opposed Government interference in this field; so it will be observed that Labour in this issue only "represents" a little over half of their own alleged supporters. Most workers will find air travel beyond their purse, so Government airliners won't benefit them.

BRIDGES' BOMB: U.S. Senator Bridges, on behalf of seven Senators, has raised a hornet's nest by asking for "complete data on all past unpaid public and private loans to foreign nations, and an estimate as to how these loans would be repaid, and also the tax burdens involved." The Treasury will be working overtime to dodge that bomb! However, Senator Bridges will be prepared for the evasion, because he also said: "Congress receives the least possible information, and that as confusing as human ingenuity could contrive." How appropriately that describes the situation here and in other countries! This situation supports the statement that Parliaments do not really govern; they simply sanction legislation at the instigation of the real unseen Planners.

STAKHANOVIK SCHEMES: The Jugoslav Government is now introducing the Russian "Stakhanovist" (piece-work) system by giving special rewards (profit) to workers whose production exceeds a stipulated output. Under this capitalistic system Russian and Jugoslav "shock workers" will receive special food-ration cards, extra clothing and fuel, and special privileges on trams, railways and buses. In capitalist countries, however, workers on piecework who exceed normal output, simply get extra money, which is, of course, a number of "votes" for ANY things the individual workers may fancy; so there is freedom of choice.

DOLLAR DIPLOMACY: Some innocent people were impressed by the press headline: "Unexpected Support in U.S. for British Loan." Senator Vandenberg (U.S.) disclosed in part the real reason for this: "If the loan were denied Britain the whole structure of the international financial agreement would inevitably crumble." He might have added that Britain would thus avoid the deadly clutches of the financial ghouls. O.B.H.

Significant Political Pointers

Speaking on the Constitution Alteration (Social Services) Bill, Labor Member Chambers said: "This is the National Parliament and it should have the right to dictate a uniform set of industrial conditions for the nation." (Vide Federal "Hansard," April 3.)

Mr. Chambers and his friends should be told very bluntly that there has been far too much dictation by the Federal Government already and that it is about time the people did a little dictating.

The Federal Government is completely out of touch with the varying conditions in different parts of Australia. The electors are not interested in a "uniform set of industrial conditions"; they desire to govern their own affairs, industrial and otherwise, in accordance with local conditions. If, for example, the people of Victoria desire to have different industrial conditions from those in other States, they should use their local State Parliament to get those conditions.

All genuine progress comes from small political units. The less the Federal Government and those controlling the Federal Government have to do with dictating industrial conditions, the more chance there will be of getting some real peace in industry in this country.

Even Canadian Labor leaders speak very highly of the industrial conditions in Alberta under the provincial Social Credit Government. The people of Alberta didn't need to have any dictation by the Federal Government at Ottawa.

"I submit that this Bill (to make Uniform Taxation permanent) is the biggest step towards putting Commonwealth and State financial relations on a proper scientific basis that has been taken in the history of federation. It is interesting to note that Canada proposes to do exactly what this Bill sets out to do."

—Senator McKenna at Canberra on April 3.

It is indeed most interesting to note that a Federal "Liberal" Government in Canada is being used to destroy effective local government in Canada in exactly the same manner that a Federal "Labor" Government is being used to destroy effective local government in Australia.

Could the use of the same anti-democratic tactics in both countries be explained by the fact that the Federal Governments in both countries have as their "key" economic advisers economists trained at the London School of Economics?

It is not often that one agrees with Mr. Holt, M.H.R., but he must be given full marks for the following statement at Canberra on March 28:

"The smaller organisations have not, in the war years, been able to build up reserves to the same degree as their larger competitors. They are mainly family concerns. The individuals engaged in those businesses have to carry the highest rates of tax, and can put very little away in reserves for expansion. But the large under-

takings, with their capital position established over a long period, and concerned with the payment of moderate incomes from time to time, can set aside large reserves for expansion purposes. During the war, we have witnessed the steady concentration of business in the hands of large organisations in Australia at the expense of the smaller ones. It has always amazed me that a government, which claims to represent especially the smaller man has consistently pursued a policy which has built up the larger businesses at the expense of the smaller ones. Just how important small industries were in the Australian scheme of things immediately prior to the war is indicated by statistics contained in the Commonwealth Year Book, which show that at least 50 per cent, of industrial employment was given by organisations with fewer than 100 employees. . . . Last year fewer than 40 per cent of the employees were engaged in organisations with fewer than 100 employees, whilst about 60 per cent were employed in the bigger businesses. I believe that that trend is continuing, and will be accentuated in the post-war period."

It certainly will if the financial policy which Mr. Holt has never criticised is not drastically modified.

It is generally recognised that one of the major factors in the success of the British fighter aircraft, which just managed to turn the tide in the Battle for Britain, was the use of the Rolls-Royce Merlin engine. The successful development of this all-British engine was the result of genuine private enterprise.

Rolls-Royce engines were used by both Sir Henry Seagrave and Sir Malcolm Campbell in their cars for breaking the world land speed record; also in the motor boats and aeroplanes used to establish water and air records. Many of the funds for these ventures were liberally supplied by Lady Houston, who was determined that her fortune should be used to help British enterprise.

No Government Department or Socialist enterprise had anything to do with the development of the engine, which played such a big part in winning the war.

Private enterprise also gave Great Britain an early start in the development of jet-propelled planes. But, when Socialist lawyer Sir Stafford Cripps took over Power Jets Ltd. as a Government Department, decay set in.

Following the lead of Commander Frank Whittle, inventor of the jet engine, 16 experts have resigned rather than work for the Government. The senior project engineer said that things began to change as soon as Cripps took over: "Our function (Continued on page 2.)

CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH "MEANS TEST"

The Citizens' League For Abolition Of The Means Test reports that thousands of copies of its demand-form already have been signed by electors and forwarded to Members of Federal Parliament. This pressure has been followed up by a letter sent direct to each M.H.R. and each Senator. The League is also seeking new members (subscription 2/-) in every part of Australia. The demand-form and the letter are reproduced hereunder: —

ABOLITION OF MEANS TEST

To Mr. M.H.R.,
Parliament House, Canberra.

Dear Sir, —As a Constituent in the Electorate of I desire that the Means Test be abolished.

With all our young men returning and helping in production; with all our munition-workers, and our vast factories directed to the production of goods for our civil needs, there must result a glut of goods, and consequent stagnation and depression, unless special avenues are opened to move such production into the hands of consumers.

The Abolition of the Means Test will provide some avenues of distribution, and will, therefore, benefit production, and all taking part therein. Production will thus be stimulated, and moreover, aged citizens, who have given a lifetime service in industry, will be benefited.

None will be injured. The Means Test imposes a penalty on the thrifty, and so discourages thrift.

This question must be solved in the realm of production and consumption, and not in the realm of taxation and finance.

I, therefore, trust you will do your utmost to have the Means Test abolished immediately.

Signature
Address.....

CITIZENS' LEAGUE FOR ABOLITION OF MEANS TEST.

(Non-Party Political.)

Mr.

Parliamentary Representative, Canberra

Dear Sir, —I have been directed by my Executive to communicate with you in relation to the subject matter.

The Citizens' League for the abolition of the Means Test was formed as the result of a Public Meeting held at Science House on 6th November 1945.

As a result of the activities of our members and our supporters, there has been an articulation of public opinion supporting the proposal for the Abolition of the Means Test, and many letters have been addressed by Constituents to their Representatives.

We are confident that such an articulation of the opinion of your Constituents, is very helpful to you, and that it is appreciated by you.

We feel that by this means you have become adequately informed of the policy of your Constituents on this matter, and that, as a Representative, you will discharge your function, and RE-PRESENT this policy and urge its adoption.

We are very mindful of the fact that during the War, with 800,000 of our most active young men in the field, with large numbers of men and women withdrawn from ordinary production, and engaged wholly in producing goods which we gave gratis to the enemy (i.e., munitions), the remaining population was able to supply us with goods in such quantities that our standard of living was only slightly reduced, notwithstanding the fact that we

passed over enormous quantities of food, etc., to maintain our allies.

Therefore, we insist that this matter can never be realistically considered, must less finalised, in the realm of finance and taxation. Productive capacity, not finance, is the determining factor.

We are therefore confident that the capacity of Australia, if reasonably stimulated, is quite capable of furnishing her aged citizens with ample supplies, without inflicting deprivation on other sections of the community, and without subjecting them to the scrutiny of the Means Test. We feel sure that you cannot do other than concur. Therefore, all that obstructs access of aged citizens to reasonable supplies without the Means Test, must be overcome.

We will not be satisfied with the reply that there are difficulties.

Representatives must insist that if the present advisers and experts, employed by the Government, cannot overcome the difficulties, they must be dismissed, and new ones appointed. But in any case, we insist that our policy be carried out.

We quite realise that one placed, as Mr. Chifley, in a position of high authority, is subject to tremendous pressure. The basis for this supposition is to be found in the writings of such men as W. E. Gladstone and Benjamin Disraeli, Prime Ministers of Great Britain (also Ramsay MacDonald); President Wilson, of U.S.A.; Lord Hewart, Chief Justice of Great Britain; Lord Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer; T. Johnston, Lord Privy Seal (both of Ramsay MacDonald's Labour Government); Sir Josiah Stamp, Sir Reginald McKenna, etc., etc., etc.

Space permits only one quotation from the above authorities, i.e., from the late President Wilson, of U.S.A., in his book, "This New Freedom": —

"Some of the biggest men in U.S.A. know there is a power so organised, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breaths, when they speak in condemnation of it."

Therefore, if our policy, the Abolition of the Means Test, is to be implemented, we quite understand that we must exert counterbalancing pressure, to support Mr. Chifley, otherwise he will be unable to resist the pressure from hidden sources, and he will not be able to implement our policy. Our supporting pressure upon Mr. Chifley must be exercised by and through our Representatives, and we want to know if you are prepared to exercise such pressure on our behalf.

This League would therefore appreciate a statement from you, setting out clearly what steps you have taken, and what steps you are prepared to take, to impress this policy upon the Prime Minister, and to support him when he moves in that direction.

We are giving wide circulation to this letter, and we will endeavour to give the utmost publicity to your reply (or to your non-reply), so that Constituents will be disposed to cast their votes for a Representative who will truly RE-PRESENT their policy.

Yours faithfully, JOHN M. MACARA,
Hon. Secretary, 69 Lucas Road, Burwood, N.S.W. 16/4/46.

NATIONAL INSURANCE v. THE RIGHT TO CONTRACT OUT

In Great Britain the following Petition has been drafted and is being circulated over signatures of which the first is that of Dr. C. G. Dobbs, 21 Hampstead Hill Gardens, N.W.3, London:

PETITION

We, the undersigned, humbly petition our Sovereign Lord the King, whose loyal subjects we are; appeal to the House of Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, whose duty it is to be the Guardians of the wholesome traditions of this Realm; and require, as our just right, our representatives in the House of Commons, whose duty it is to serve as faithfully in such a matter; to protect all those personal liberties which we have inherited as subjects of the British Crown, and which the recent most grievous War against the King's enemies was fought to preserve.

We ask for ourselves, and for all others, rich and poor, freedom to choose, without pressure or coercion, financial, legal or in other forms, whether or not we shall participate in any National Insurance Scheme (including Health Insurance Scheme) which may be set up; that is to say, FREEDOM TO CONTRACT OUT COMPLETELY, whether by exemption from all relevant taxation, as well as contribution, or by refund of the total amounts paid.

We would point out that if financial participation is ENFORCED upon objectors, only those who can afford to refuse the benefits will escape subjection to the numerous conditions, penalties and interferences which are attached to the return to members of the community of their own money at time of special need, and which may be altered unilaterally by regulations from time to time.

We base our objection to compulsion in this matter, also upon the following considerations (among others).

1. Insurance is a contract between two parties; but a contract which the weaker party (the individual) is not free to refuse, and in which he is compelled to accept whatever conditions may be made at any time by the stronger party (the State), is a tyrannous and immoral proceeding, and a travesty of civil justice.

2. Insurance is a contract willingly entered upon by free people only in proportion to their fear or expectation of financial loss, leading to penury through sickness, accident, unemployment, old age, etc. It follows that the imposition of compulsory insurance upon all can only be justified if the Government expects so to conduct the affairs of the Nation that the fear of such penury will be, and will remain, great and universal.

3. We note that in the National Insurance Bill (Clause 5) exemption is to be allowed to those whose income is not over £75 a year. This means that the extremely poor, who cannot possibly pay the contributions, will be excluded from the benefits; which disposes of the contention that all alike must be made to contribute in order to provide freedom from want for all.

4. The idea of compulsion applied to State Insurance is completely alien to the British tradition of freedom and responsibility. It came, as did other forms of totalitarian thought from Marxism to Nazism, from our recent Enemies, and was increasingly applied in the German State from Bismarck (1883) to Hitler. In this country it has been persistently propagated by certain agencies, which have also been permeating the Government and the Civil Service, and have been working to undermine the Sovereignty of the Nation as well as of the individual. The best known of

these agencies are the Fabian Society, the London School of Economics, and P.E.P.

5. At a most critical phase of the War, the Beveridge Report, a document having obvious connections with the above agencies, was produced at the taxpayer's expense, and a favourable view of its main proposal, compulsory State Insurance for all, was imposed upon the public mind by overwhelming propaganda, including compulsory lectures for the Services, at a time when effective opposition was impossible. It is admitted that the Government pressed this propaganda upon the public as a War measure intended to stimulate morale.

5. At the General Election, 1945, by agreement between the Party Leaders who had previously been colleagues in the Coalition Government, no opportunity was given to the electors of returning a Government not committed to compulsory State Insurance. It follows therefore that no mandate has been, or could have been, given in favour of it.

7. Even had such a majority mandate been given, at a time when public opinion had not been biased by one-sided propaganda, it would confer no right upon a Parliament to infringe the personal liberty of any minority. In the case of military service, when the State is in danger, exemption is allowed in all cases of genuine objection, based upon moral convictions, although the arguments in favour of compulsion are much more powerful than they can possibly be in the case of National Insurance, which is not a matter of desperate emergency.

We declare, therefore, that, bearing in mind the nature and origins of National Insurance, and the way in which it has been, and is to be, imposed upon this people without freedom of choice, we regard it as an immoral and unjust piece of legislation, liable to bring the Law into contempt, and repulsive alike to the British tradition and to the Christian Faith. Accordingly we desire to have no part in it whatever, and we call upon all loyal subjects of the King to join us in exposing the facts of the case, to exert themselves to obtain freedom for all to contract out of National Insurance (including Health Insurance), and to press for the Repeal at the earliest possible moment of any legislation which may infringe freedom.

"THE SKY'S THE LIMIT"

From "The Social Creditor," 16/3/46: —

It is not without significance that Mr. Churchill, in his speech at Fulton, Missouri, made after a conference with Mr. Bernard Baruch, should have emphasised "free, unfettered elections and a secret ballot." The whole speech reeks of Jewish Freemasonry—the insistence on "the sky's the limit" in legislation; the World Police, like the World Bank, above all law; and the use of "Russia," exactly as "Germany" was used, so that "in war, or under threat of war" the Big Idea may be advanced one step further.

If anyone is still innocent enough to suppose that the speech was made without an understanding that our State Socialist Government is wholeheartedly in accordance with Mr. Churchill's thesis, then they are no doubt saved some unpleasant anticipation. But most of the readers of this review left the political kindergarten some time ago, and they will readily apprehend that Mr. Churchill is gambling on futures, as he always has done, and for this reason is not much interested in the immediate reaction to his speech. It is quite possible that Mr. Randolph Churchill may cash in on the "futures."

One lesson stands out from the speech crystal clear for anyone to see. It is little less than insanity to waste time in trying to substitute a "Conservative" for a "Labour" Government. For ten years a so-called Conservative majority was in power at Westminster. It passed more P.E.P.-Socialist legislation than has the present Administration, and it served no interest but internationalism and Cartels. Anyone who is foolish enough to suppose that it would do any better under, say, Mr. Harold Macmillan, deserves what he would undoubtedly get. The present dog will do just as well as its blood brother—if it is given a thorough good hiding for bad habits.

BRISBANE LECTURES ON ALBERTA

Mr. A. W. Noakes, honorary secretary of The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane, reports as follows:

We have received the pictorial brochure, "Your Opportunity in Alberta," from which we have obtained thirty lanternslides. We expect to start exhibiting these slides and delivering lectures from our booklet, "Progress in Alberta," on Thursday, May 16, at 8 p.m., in the Temperance Hall, Edward Street, Brisbane.

We believe that the truth about Alberta should be kept before the people all the time. There we have something definite and concrete in support of Social Credit, which cannot be refuted.

We also intend to place before the people at the same time the necessity for protecting our Australian Constitution from being emasculated through the coming Referendum for greater Federal powers.

Everyone in Brisbane who is interested should get in touch with us and arrange for a lantern lecture in their locality. We are prepared to visit any place within the Greater Brisbane area any Thursday night. Leaflets for advertising such a meeting will be sent on application.

COLAC PUBLIC MEETING
DR. JOHN DALE
(Melbourne City Health Officer)
will speak in Colac on
Friday, May 17, at 8 p.m.
Subject: "Health and Liberty."

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

changed from producing something which would work and demonstrating that the engines we were making would go, until we were not allowed to think out new applications of jet propulsion. . . . It was obviously the Ministry's policy that we were no longer allowed to act as engineering designers in the realistic sense. . . . From being a team of enthusiastic pioneers, we were gradually turned into civil servants, and all the adventure went out of the job." And thus we have yet another terrifying example of Socialism in practice.

It has been disclosed in the British House of Commons that British military aid to Russia totalled £308 million. In addition there were raw materials, food, machinery, and medical supplies worth £128 million. Included in the military supplies were 5218 tanks and 7411 aircraft.

There is no confirmation of the rumour that Soviet newspapers have devoted big headlines to this news.

Mr. H. H. Lehmann, former head of U.N.R.R.A., and closely related to one of the big Wall Street Jewish banking groups, has recently criticised the American Government on its attitude towards the "world food crisis." Mr. Lehmann, praised Australia and Canada for retaining war-time controls.

It is so nice to know that we are doing the right thing in this country.

Commenting on Lord Vansittart's realistic suggestion that German centralisation be broken down in order to prevent the danger of "national Communism," Lord Jowitt said in the House of Lords that, while agreeing with Lord Vansittart, "Britain recognised the advantage to be gained in certain fields by a central administration, particularly in finance and economics. . . ." Now, isn't that interesting? Who could this "Britain" be who wants centralisation in finance and economics? And what a "coincidence" that the Communists are so enthusiastic about this centralisation!

The Soviet leaders helped Germany to win the peace after 1919. Are the British peoples to be swindled in the same manner a second time?

Melbourne's Lord Mayor, Cr. Connelly, has recently helped the "municipal reform" campaign along. This "reform" is designed to centralise control of Victoria's 140 municipalities under 12 or 14 regional councils. All under the guise of decentralisation, too!

If the ratepayers cannot effectively control the existing councils, what nonsense to suggest that there will be any greater control, leading to more effective decentralisation, if there are fewer councils!

Ratepayers should be taking far more interest in their councils and ensuring that they represent the policies of the ratepayers.

"S.A. Liberal Premier Goes Socialist." — "Smiths' Weekly," April 27.

During the recent debate on the Electricity Trust Bill in the South Australian Legislative Assembly, a jubilant member of the Labor Opposition referred to Mr. Playford's Liberal Government as "the best Labor Government the State's ever had."

Mr. Menzies once proclaimed himself as a "practical Socialist."

It is about time the practical anti-Socialists woke up. —E. D. B.

A DANGEROUS CARTEL

From "The Social Creditor," 16/2/46: — The world's potentially most dangerous cartel is not I. G. Farben, but Schmelz Oilman's (Sidney Hillman) World Federation of Trades Unions. There is no argument which can be brought against monopoly of material which is not twice as valid in reference to monopoly control of labour, and Alfred Mond, to whom monopoly was a much more potent God than monotheism, made no mistake when he endeavoured (was it only an endeavour? —ask Mr. Bevin) to combine a labour monopoly with that of essential raw materials. It is little short of miraculous that the true nature of Trades Unions has been successfully presented as beneficial, and, if there were no other indication to the contrary, the insistence of Big Business on Collective bargaining ought to have aroused suspicion. The obvious fact is, of course, that, under a cartel-monopoly combined with our insane financial system, wage increases mean little or nothing to the Managerial Kahal. They have no intention of paying dividends to the public in the future; and labour charges (wages) are merely costs to be passed on to the silly consumer in prices. Monopoly is all they care about; with monopoly, the world is theirs—they think.

THE NATURE OF SOCIALISM

It is so apparent that Socialism and restriction are inseparable, that it is little short of amazing that so few people seem to realise clearly that continued prison rations are of the very essence of the plot. What essentially is Socialism but "controls"? And how do you impose controls except by saying that there isn't enough to go round and that the Hottentots are starving and so you must be rationed by father, who knows the Hottentots personally, and who knows best? That gives time to organise a secret police-force which will see that by the time you find out that everyone is being treated better than the p— b— (native) English, it doesn't matter: they've got you where they want you.

—"The Social Creditor."

MAJOR DOUGLAS ON THE POLITICAL PROBLEM

It is a curious commentary on our carefully directed educational system that what is perhaps the most quoted phrase of that useful tool of international finance, Abraham Lincoln—"Government of the people, for the people, by the people"—is an exposure and condemnation of Lincoln himself. What is a people?

The United States in 1861 consisted broadly of two Anglo Saxon settlements, the "Yankees" or New Englanders, in the North, the descendants of the bitter Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Settlement, and the Southern landowners, very much of the George Washington type, the Lees, Randolphs, the cadets of many Scottish Lowland families. Hereditarily, these were a "people" in any usual sense of the word. The rest of the population was an undigested mass of Dutch, "German and Mid-European elements, the disappearing "Red Indians," and the Negro slaves.

It is only necessary to contemplate these unquestionable facts to be convinced that Lincoln's words are "a tale told by an idiot, all noise and fury, signifying nothing." Two parts of the only recognisable whole led the two sides of the American Civil War: Lincoln's actual policy (i.e., the policy of which he was the visible executive), contradicted almost every one of his spoken statements—as for instance, his declaration that any country had a right to secede if it had the power—and a cold analysis of his most publicised apothegms indicates that they can bear any meaning which it may appear desirable to read into them.

If the orbit of the ideas for which Lincoln's verbiage was supposed to be the expression were bounded by the North American Continent, they might be left to work out their true meaning, as they are doing today, on the graveyard of the noble redskin. But, of course, they did not originate in America, and they are not confined to it. Lincoln's travesty of "Democracy" is the sheet anchor of the Supreme State; "vox populi, vox Dei" is the travesty and blasphemy of the Immanence of Good; and Tool Power Politics is the Incarnation as manifested in the Coming of the Prince of This World, the False Messiah.

Nothing is more remarkable in matters of politics than the sheer inability of even thoroughly honest and well-intentioned people to realise the consequences of their opinions.

There are as many definitions of "democracy" as there are men; yet, in fact, as has been admirably expressed in an Australian broadcast, the key to democracy is to reduce a problem to the limits of interest and understanding of those concerned. That is to say, democracy is not so much a question of the mechanism of voting (although that is not of negligible importance); but rather a rigorous exclusion of matters for which the franchise is too wide; and at present the number of persons who think they understand everyone's business, but cannot manage their own, would suggest very simple electoral issues.

It is not too much to say, I think, that anyone who cannot grasp this simple idea, or, having understood it, will not admit its validity, is unworthy of a vote and is a public danger if in possession of it. In the light, which it throws upon the limitations of democratic theory, it is perfectly understandable that the condition of the world in general and Great Britain in particular has deteriorated in proportion to the extension of the ballot-box plot. No one would give a child of six a ten-pound note, turn him loose with a box of matches in a fireworks shop, and tell him to set off the pretty rockets. But that is exactly what has been done by giving the initiative to an uneducated—worse, a misinstructed—electorate, and allowing it to provide something claimed to be a mandate to interfere in the business of everyone having "a vested interest."

There are many matters, which require attention; but interference with them will only deliver us from bad to worse until we can admit that power without understanding is the tool of the Devil. There is only one worse thing than the fool in politics, and that is the technical expert who knows everything about his business except its legitimate object. We have often miraculously survived the former; but the latter shows signs of writing our epitaph.

—C. H. DOUGLAS, in "The Social Creditor," England, 16/2/46.

"TWENTY QUESTIONS ABOUT RUSSIA"

(Continued from last issue.)

The above heading is the title of a valuable little booklet written and published by H. W. Henderson in Great Britain during the latter part of the recent war, and obtainable from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7 Victoria Street, Liverpool 2, England, at 4d (sterling) per copy, plus postage. The following is taken from the booklet:

12. What is the position of religion in the Soviet Union today?

No one acquainted with their works can be ignorant of the fact that from Marx and Engels onwards practically all the leading Communists have been professing atheists.

Lenin (himself an atheist) put the matter thus: "As Marx and Engels frequently declared, the philosophic basis of Marxism is dialectical materialism—a materialism which is absolutely atheistic and strongly hostile to religion. . . . Religion is the opium of the people, said Marx, and this thought is the corner-stone of the whole Marxian philosophy in the question of religion." ("Selections from Lenin," in Sherwood Eddy's "The Challenge of Russia.")

Stalin himself is equally clear: "The Party cannot be neutral in regard to religion. Communists who hinder the broadcast development of anti-religious propaganda have no place in the ranks of the Party." (Interview with American Labour Delegation, Sept. 15, 1927; in Eddy's "The Challenge of Russia.")

Said Madame Lenin: "It is necessary to inject a materialistic spirit into education to energetically work with organisations of children, to develop in them the spirit of comradeship, to extricate more deeply the very roots of religion." (Mme. Lenin: "The Way to the New School"; in Eddy's "The Challenge of Russia.")

In view of these statements (and dozens of similar ones are available) it is not surprising that the Soviet regime was hostile to the church from the first.

Nevertheless, the Constitution at one time granted freedom to religious bodies, stating, "Freedom for religious and anti-religious propaganda is recognised for all citizens." (Article 5, Constitution of R.S.F.S.R.)

But so great was the progress made by various religious bodies that the Soviet leaders became alarmed and this clause was afterwards altered to read: "Freedom for religious confession and anti-religious propaganda is recognised for all citizens." ("Izvestia," 22/5/29.)

This meant that citizens were allowed to worship in their churches, but not to carry on any other activities or to propagandise for new members, while the whole propaganda apparatus of the Government (newspapers, wireless, and schools) was directed against them.

"Religious bodies," says Dr. Sherwood Eddy, who has spent many years in the country, "are forbidden all educational, philanthropic, social or practical activities. They are not allowed to form co-operatives, agricultural or industrial associations. They are forbidden special meetings for children, youths, and women for prayer purposes. . . . literary, needlework. . . . excursions and children's gatherings, to found libraries and reading rooms, to organise sanatoria and medical assistance. Their church property is nationalised. The teaching of religion in

any public or private educational institution is forbidden, but theological courses may be organised by special permission for those over eighteen years." (Decree of All-Russian Central Executive Committee, "Izvestia," 26/4/29; in Eddy's "Challenge of Russia.")

These conditions still exist. See a letter contributed to the London "Times" of September 30, 1941, by Dr. Rushbrooke, President of the Baptist World Alliance, and the report of an address given to the Protestant Youth Conference in Woostan, Ohio, by Dr. Lewis, General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, published in the "Scottish Catholic Times," of March 23, 1944.

At the Ohio Conference, Mr. Paul Anderson, of the International Committee of the Y.M.C.A., emphasised that the recent elevation of the Orthodox Patriarch Sergius did not mean that the Soviet had thereby recognised religion.

Foolish apologists for Communism often assert that the hostility of the Bolsheviks to religion was a result of the "corruptions" of the Russian Church. Herein they display a complete ignorance of Communist teaching. Marx taught that religion—all religion—was opium or dope. Lenin endorsed this view and taught that the good priest, because of his influence with the people, was more dangerous than the bad. When the Soviet forces invaded the Baltic States one was predominantly Roman Catholic, another predominantly Protestant, and the third predominantly Greek Orthodox. All were treated in the customary Communist fashion, irrespective of whether their religion was "good" or "bad."

13. But if this is the position in Soviet Russia, how is it that British newspapers report large attendances at Moscow Cathedral and elsewhere during Christmas, and how is it that Russian religious dignitaries have been reported as denying persecution?

The answer to these two questions is in reality very simple.

With regard to the first—the attendance of large numbers of people at the churches on special religious occasions—note that the law does not forbid religious worship; it only forbids religious propaganda. This, of course, as a notable authority on Russia has pointed out, is designed to cut religion off at its roots, since the children are being steadily won over to materialism in the schools. But it is natural that on occasions such as Christmas the older people should turn out in large numbers even under the contemptuous noses of the Communists. This, however, cannot hide the fact of persecution, which is abundantly evident in the disabilities placed upon religious bodies, which are being slowly strangled.

Secondly, with regard to the pro-Bolshevik bishops—for that is a fitting description of them—it must not be forgotten that

there are quislings in religious as well as secular life, and that it is possible to quote Italian bishops in defence of Mussolini and German bishops in defence of Hitler. And in addition to the open traitors there are others who, although in full possession of the facts, believe in the power of soft words to turn away the wrath of their persecutors.

We have seen petitions from Jewish bodies resident in Germany protesting against the charge that they were persecuted under Hitler.

Fear is another motive, which obviously enters into these matters. But the fact of persecution is plain and no Christian is eligible for membership of the Communist Party.

It is interesting to note the view of so firm a friend of Russia as Maurice Hindus, whose recent work, "Mother Russia," was reviewed in the "Scotsman" of September 22, 1943. "Mr. Hindus," says the "Scotsman," "does not believe that there is a revival of religion in Russia. He contends that the basic antagonism of the Soviet to religion remains. 'The ruling party of Russia,' he writes, 'will not admit a believing man or woman to membership.' " "At present," he adds, "the Orthodox Church is no longer a danger to the Soviet regime. It has no property. It commands no power. It is not a member of any foreign body. In its economic teachings it has become Bolshevised."

In other words, it is a mere tool in the hands of the Government.

The good-will visit of Dr. Garbett (Archbishop of York) to Russia in October, 1943, when he gained fleeting glimpses of the religious position, did nothing to disprove facts known to every properly instructed person. The "Daily Express" reported that being asked, "Is it possible under present conditions to proselytise (make converts to) the faith?" the Archbishop was unable to give an affirmative answer. Asked: "Is there any equivalent of a chaplain with Red Army units?" the Archbishop replied: "There is not. Nor is there any religious teaching in schools. Monasteries are all closed, and the training of new priests is the great problem facing the Church." (12th October 1943.) Said the "British Weekly" (deeply sympathetic to Russia): "The Archbishop's mission had been one from the Anglican Church to the heads of the Russian Orthodox Church and had nothing to say to the other religious bodies. Asked about the position of the Baptists, one of the largest and most lively religious movements in Russia, his reply had no substance. The privileges sought by and granted to the Orthodox Church did not apparently apply to Baptists, and Dr. Garbett made it clear that while religious ritual might be performed, the preaching of the Gospel would still be banned." (October 14, 1943.) This was the visit, which was supposed to show that the religious position was satisfactory in Russia! It would be difficult to imagine more damaging admissions.

To be continued.)

Current Commentary

As a result of the Atom Spy Trials in Canada, "the heat was turned on famous McGill University, described as a 'Red hot-bed.' Why, demanded probers, were so many of the suspects either faculty members or graduates of McGill?"—"The Australasian Post," 11/4/46.

It is significant that McGill's young principal, Cyril James, is from Professor Laski's London School of Economics.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the housing shortage is an entirely phoney situation. Symptoms of the policy of deliberate sabotage include:

(1) The iniquitous fixing of land valuations at the 1942 level.

(2) Price-fixing anomalies on raw materials.

(3) A go-slow policy among the building trades.

(4) Insufficient financial inducement to produce.

Compared, say, with the problems of war production, the housing shortage, considered as a production problem, is insignificant.

You have observed that Cabinet Ministers have acquired the use of £1800 fluid-fly-wheel Chryslers (or even a luxury plane) at our expense; have no petrol and tyre difficulties; pay no registration or toll fees; have No. 1 priority in all first-class travel; apparently suffer no food shortages; raise their own rate of pay and get "expense" allowances considerably in excess of what is spent.

Now this is what is called the Common Good, and so that you may work for it unflinchingly you are exhorted to austerity while the general standard of living is steadily lowered. The technique consists mainly in (1) inflating prices, thus driving down the incomes of the small business and professional men, while keeping the real wage of the worker at subsistence level by raising it nominally, thus giving an appearance of progress; (2) sabotaging capital assets by means of controls and high taxation, reducing every individual business to an unsound economic proposition; and (3) transferring as much of the population as possible to direct dependence on the Government via social security and housing schemes, etc.

And thus the "Managerial State" will be ushered in. Unless the electors demand to regain control of their own affairs. Step No. 1: Vote "No" at the forthcoming Referendum.

—John Weller.

A KEY WOMAN

The effectual head of the most powerful, and now camouflaged, Commission for Military Supplies (U.S.A.), is Anna Rosenberg. She was appointed by direction of Bernard Baruch.

—"The Social Creditor" (Eng.), 23/2/46.

WHO IS CORRUPTING THE JUDGES?

By J. T. LANG. (Condensed from "Century," 19/4/46.)

Another Judge has been appointed to the High Court. According to the newspapers, the Federal Parliament was treated to a very excellent debate on the principles underlying appointments to the Bench and the conduct of the Judges on the Bench.

We are told that the contribution of Mr. Menzies and Dr. Evatt to that debate was brilliant. They both understand and were devoted to the highest principles of appointing and maintaining an impartial judiciary.

It reminds me of a criticism of America's great democratic President, Jefferson. It was said of him that nobody so often or so lovingly spoke of the principles of the American Constitution, and yet no President so often or so vigorously assaulted those principles.

The fundamental principle of the relationship between the Government and the Judiciary is that a Judge, once appointed, has nothing to fear and nothing to hope for from the Government.

This doesn't mean a lawyer's politics are not considered before appointments.

What it means is that a Judge once appointed cannot be sacked or disrated simply because his decisions, honestly arrived at, displease the Government.

It means that no judge can hope for, or be given promotion or favours if he pleases the Government.

No Ministers have ignored these principles more than Menzies and Evatt.

Despite their brilliant speeches, they are the only Ministers who have rewarded judges with perks and favours.

It was Menzies who took Chief Justice Latham, not unwillingly, away from his work as Chief Justice of the High Court and made him Ambassador to Japan.

While still holding the office of Chief Justice, Latham was taken off the Bench and thrown into the hurly-burly of politics.

Not to be outdone, Evatt had barely got into the Attorney General's chair before he took Owen Dixon away from the Bench, again not unwillingly, and made him Ambassador at Washington.

After a year or two in the hurly-burly of politics he, too, returned to the Bench.

Even so, he continued to hold administrative jobs for some time after he returned from America.

The behaviour of Menzies and Evatt in both these cases showed that Judges of the High Court had very much to gain in the way of favours, promotions and preferment if they stood well with the Government.

Now it has been announced that the Chief Justice of Queensland, Sir William Webb, has been appointed to the newly created vacancy on the High Court Bench.

Although Chief Justice of Queensland, Sir William has for some time been engaged on important policy work for Attorney-General Evatt.

He was inquiring into Japanese atrocities and subsequently he was sent to England by the Commonwealth Government on some mission connected with that work.

Later on, Sir William was appointed to the Court at Japan to try war criminals, and is still engaged on that work.

This unusual behaviour apparently caused some criticism in Queensland, because Mr. Justice Brennan, of the Queensland Supreme Court was moved to publicly reprove his brother Judge and Chief Justice.

It was closely following Brennan's attack that the Bill was rushed through Parliament creating another vacancy on the High Court Bench and Webb was appointed to the vacancy.

The independent judiciary, with all its imperfections, is a worthwhile guarantee of personal liberty that is denied to citizens of the totalitarian State.

Neither Dr. Evatt nor Mr. Menzies render any service with their fine speeches if by their actions they are responsible for undermining the principles on which that independence is built.

The employment of Judges on political work, whether it is Royal Commissions or foreign ambassadorships, strikes at the very roots of the purity of the courts.

"ENEMIES OF THE PEACE"

Hear—

MR. E. J. GROGAN

Thursday, May 9, at 8 p.m.

at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of

Victoria, "The Block," Melbourne.

(Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)

M.P. ON THE ARAB-ZIONIST QUESTION

(Concluded from last issue.)

In the Canadian House of Commons recently a notable speech was made by Mr. Norman Jaques, Social Credit Member for Wetaskiwin. The occasion was the Debate on External Affairs, on December 17, 1945. According to the "Hansard" report, Mr. Jaques said:

The story of Palestine is one of broken promises and secret agreements by the great powers—of power politics. The late Colonel T. E. Lawrence—Lawrence of Arabia—whose actions and writings prove him to have been a very great and brilliant Englishman, and an honourable man, led the Arab revolt against the Turks in the first great war. When he heard of the broken pledges to the Arabs he refused all the honours offered by his country, enlisted in the ranks and finally committed suicide.

I submit that the "Pax Britannica" was maintained by faith in British pledges and that Palestine is a graveyard of that peace. Certainly those who are working hardest for Britain's downfall are to be found among the Zionists, their agents and Communist cousins.

MR. WARREN: I submit that on other occasions it has been ruled that Members are not permitted to read speeches.

MR. JAQUES: I stated at the beginning that I was dealing with a thorny subject. If my speech does not please the hon. Member, may I suggest that he just go to the other side of the curtains?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of whether or not the speech pleases another hon. Member; the only question is whether or not the hon. Member is in order.

MR. JAQUES: I will recall my remark and regret that I made it. In regard to the objection that has just been raised, I may say that I have been here for ten years, and I do not think any one has ever accused me before of reading a speech. I do not think there are many hon. Members who can say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not rule that the hon. Member was reading his speech.

MR. JAQUES: Thank you very much.

Principles have been sacrificed for expediency, for which we have broken faith with our friends and faithful allies, such as the Poles, the Yugoslavs and the Arabs in Europe, Asia and Africa.

Quite recently it was reported that the national leader of the C.C.F. [Socialist Party] at a public meeting in Washington, "urged the immediate opening of Palestine for Jewish immigration to the fullest possible extent so as to provide a refuge from the terror of their persecutors." In the light of the present critical conditions in Palestine, I would ask the leader of the C.C.F.: Can he assure us in making those demands that he is promoting the interests of world peace? Does he realise that such demands are calculated to embarrass Great Britain and if insisted on may lead to a clash of interests between the British empire, the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.? In the event of war in Palestine and the Near East, is he prepared to commit Canadians to active service in such a war? If not, whom would he expect to fight? The Nazis having been destroyed, from what persecutors and terrors does he seek refuge?

About a year ago the C.C.F. leaders were denouncing Great Britain's efforts to protect Greek civilians from Communist terrorists, and now they are hindering her efforts to protect Palestinian civilians from Zionist extremists. To show the extent of the propaganda that is being used, may I quote from a pamphlet, which was recently sent to me by a business friend in Toronto who told me that he found it pinned to an invoice, which he received from another busi-

nessman. I shall not read the whole thing, but I should like to make one or two quotations. It is headed, "Pretend You're a Jew" and reads:

"Offhand would you say Jews are entitled to a break now? You say without reservation that these three million surviving European Jews deserve to be left alive.

"But (and here's where your non-Jewish neighbours are amazed to hear about it), England doesn't think so. England thinks they ought to die as fast as possible. And England is seeing to it that they may really die as fast as possible."

And further down:

"England's new Labour Government is still barring Palestine to the Jews. And the Jews are desperate. The European Jews are desperate to get in. The Palestine Jews are desperate to get them in.

"So there's friction. Friction between Palestine's Jews and the English authorities. Only the English Colonial Office, being good publicity men, are careful to tell the world that the trouble is between the Jews and the Arabs and that the English are just the poor referee.

"And England keeps sending troops into Palestine, and it's not for the troops' health either. She even goes so far as to transport one hundred thousand anti-Russian and anti-Jewish Poles to Palestine. These Poles are afraid to go back to Poland, and England sends them to Palestine instead of to Canada or Australia or New Zealand. England is fixing to have plenty of manpower to quell any revolt of the Jews.

"But whether you're interested in more of the story or not, just bear it all in mind when you see those little stickers that the undersigned has been putting on his business correspondence."

And the sticker reads:

"As proud and self-respecting Canadians we will buy no goods made in England as long as England bars the Jews from Palestine."

That statement is signed and the name and address of the writer is given. I do not know that I should advertise the author but, if the Committee wishes, I will give his name and address.

MR. PROBE: Certainly; give them the works.

MR. JAQUES: It is signed by I. M. Gringorten, the address is 272 Van Home Street, Toronto, and it is dated October 1 1945. You may say that that is an irresponsible individual, but here is a statement that was recently made by Doctor Stephen Wise, president of the World Jewish Congress in a national radio address in the United States. He charged:

"The anti-Jewish riots in Tripoli were instigated by the Arab League under the leadership of reprehensible underlings of the British Colonial Office."

That statement was made by the president of the World Jewish Congress, and these statements are being made to inflame the feelings of millions of people in America and elsewhere, who thus are being taught to become anti-British. There can be no doubt that this biased and misleading propaganda by well-known public men is sowing the seeds of racial, national and reli-

gious hatred among people everywhere. Let me quote a statement that was printed in the "Statesman" of Calcutta on April 13, 1944:

"The shocking twaddle spoken and written by United States publicists and the press about Palestine contains more than one danger . . .

"The more the strongest and more democratic existing nation undertakes permanent responsibilities on peace-loving men's behalf outside the American continent the better we shall be pleased. But if that happens there is already danger that it will have initially to contend with widespread Muslim suspicion.

"Owing to American propaganda about the Palestine problems, which is presumed to reflect American general opinion, many Muslims now suppose the U.S.A. to be anti-Islamic. For that reason comments such as have recently come from the U.S.A. on the very delicate and complex problem of Palestine which excites Muslim interest everywhere appear to us to be deplorable."

That statement is from the Calcutta "Statesman." There is another curious side of this question, which is presented by Dr. Charles Watson, of the American University of Cairo. He wrote in April 1944:

"The reason given for the disturbances at this time is that as soon as Europe is open to a return of now exiled Jews, there will be a mass exodus of Jews from Palestine back to their homes in Europe, which will weaken seriously the Zionist cause and support. The time to strike is therefore now."

In the "Reader's Digest" of May, 1944, Frederick C. Painton stated:

"The Jewish Agency people fear that the skilled refugees who make many of these products (exhibited in Tel Aviv) will return to their native lands when the war is over. The Czech Jews were being absorbed in their nation until the war—they knew no persecution. They look upon themselves as Czechs, not Jews, and want to go home. The Dutch diamond-cutter intends to go home to Holland. Strangely enough, scores of the German Jews want to go back to Germany. This failure to sink roots deeply applies to American Jews; of 5500 such in Palestine less than 100 have given up their American passports. The other Jews in Palestine know this and fear it, and it is one reason why the extremists are making the trouble now. Many leading Jews told me they feared they would lose their main argument at war's end by having more emigrants than immigrants."

According to these Zionists, the non-Jewish inhabitants have not been injured; they have been benefited. But it is curious that the lucky Arabs should be so blind to their own welfare that they resist the gifts and benefits which the Zionists and their agents of this Palestine Committee are so anxious to bestow, even by force, if necessary. How would we Canadians appreciate a few million aliens being forced upon us who thereupon proceeded to buy up our land, with the proviso that no Canadian ever again could own the land or even work on it. Would we be primitive and guilty of blackmail if we resisted such an invasion?

THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that his time has expired.

MR. JAQUES: I have just three lines more, Mr. Chairman. Had we known that the United Nations would force us to accept such terms, would we have ratified the United Nations' Charter? Let me repeat, my whole object is to establish the truth and so to promote world peace based on international good faith in international promises.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

Mr. Eric Butler addressed two Adelaide suburban meetings last week, prior to leaving by boat for Port Lincoln, on the west coast, on Thursday, April 25. At Henley Beach, on Tuesday, April 23, and Westbourne Park, on Wednesday, April 24, small but attentive audiences heard Mr. Butler analyse in detail the menace of centralised control of monetary policies, industrial policies and political policies.

Mr. Butler is finding no effective opposition to the proposition that only in local, State Government can the Australian people provide themselves with an increasing standard of living without surrendering their liberties. He is urging all electors to defeat the Canberra bureaucratic tyranny by only supporting at the Federal elections candidates pledged to reduce the bureaucracy to the 1938 level, and by working for a "No" vote at the Referendum.

New readers of the "New Times" continue to be obtained at all meetings, while information on Alberta is in demand.

Mr. Butler's itinerary for the next two weeks is as follows:—
Riverton: Monday, 6th May, 8 p.m., Town Hall Supper Room.

Tanunda: Tuesday, 7th May, 8 p.m., Lodge Hall.

Adelaide: Wednesday, 8th May, 8 p.m., Stow Hall, Flinders St. Subject: "Why Can't Ex-servicemen Get a Fair Deal?"

Prospect: Friday, 10th May, 8 p.m., Town Hall Supper Room.

Forest Range: Sunday, 12th May, 3 p.m.
Barmera: Monday, 13th May, 8 p.m., Church of England Hall.

Berri: Tuesday, 14th May, 8 p.m., Institute.
Renmark: Wednesday, 15th May, 8 p.m., R.A.O.B. Hall.

Seacliff: Thursday, 16th May, 8 p.m.
Glenelg: Friday, 17th May, 8 p.m., Rechabite Hall, Gordon St.

A TEST CASE IN QUEBEC

A Petition for Annulment, together with the requisite bond for 1050 dollars, has been filed in connection with the election of G. Octave Poulin in the Quebec Provincial by-election for Beauce constituency. Practically every elector in the constituency was supposed to be a Social Creditor; the circulation of "Vers Demain" is much greater than that of any other political paper; and it was well recognised that the candidature of Professor Gregoire for L'Union Creditiste des Electeurs was a test case. Its importance is indicated by the fact that "Time," the New York news-magazine, sent a special reporter, whose description of the proceedings was frank in the extreme. It is estimated that at least 350,000 dollars was spent in defeating Professor Gregoire. Streets were specially paved for blocks of electors; best Scotch whisky by the bottle was distributed to any voter for the asking; and a really good time was had by all. Monsieur Poulin, the Government candidate, was elected by a plurality of more than 5000 votes. Amongst the long list of allegations against him is that "out of a total of 115 ballot boxes, 114 were not in the condition required by law . . . in 27 ballot boxes there were more votes than there are electors." Waal, waal, waal.

—"The Social Creditor" (Eng.), 23/2/46.

THE CASE OF A JEWISH "REFUGEE"

In the British House of Commons on February 21, 1946, Mr. S. Silverman asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, "why Siegfried Gembicki, a Jewish refugee from Germany who escaped from a German concentration camp, where all his relatives were murdered, was interned in this country for over six years, and then sent back to Germany against his will and by force, without means, friends, or home; and what crimes this man had committed to deserve this penalty?"

Mr. Ede: "There is no evidence that this man, was a refugee from Nazi oppression, but he has nine convictions in Germany and France (from which country he was twice expelled) for fraud, embezzlement and similar offences. He entered this country by impersonating a Danish subject. He was convicted here of making false statements to a registration officer and other offences under the Aliens Order, and was recommended by the Court for deportation. This could not be done before the war, and, in view of his former service in the German Air Force and of his criminal record, he was interned during the war as an alien of enemy nationality. When circumstances permitted, he was repatriated as an undesirable alien."

A DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION

"A democratic constitution, not supported by democratic institutions in detail, but confined to the central government, not only is not political freedom, but often creates a spirit precisely the reverse."

—John Stuart Mill, "Political Economy."

THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE AT ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS

FEDERAL ELECTION ISSUE

The Canberra bureaucracy is sabotaging production. Government by bureaucracy is destroying local self-government.

The big Government Departments are taking over every form of economic activity:

The bureaucracy is using the financial and taxation system to introduce a dictatorship.

No worthwhile reforms can be introduced in the face of a highly centralised bureaucracy.

The next Federal Elections must be used to ensure that all candidates, irrespective of label, who will not pledge themselves to reduce the number of bureaucrats at least to the 1938 level, receive a stream of last preference votes.

Use these booklets in the anti-bureaucracy fight: "Sack the Bureaucrats," by Eric D. Butler, 6d. "Democracy Flouted," 6d. (Both plus lid. if posted.) Both booklets obtainable from all Social Credit Movements.

THIS "PLANNING" IS NOT INEVITABLE

No idea is being more sedulously cultivated in Australia today than the "axiom" that planning is inevitable. Professor Hayek, in "The Road to Serfdom," has written:—

"It is a revealing fact that few planners are content to say that central planning is desirable. Most of them affirm that we can no longer choose but are compelled by circumstances beyond our control to substitute planning for competition. The argument is rarely developed at any length—it is one of the assertions taken over by one writer from another, until, by mere iteration, it has come to be accepted as an established fact." (My emphasis.)

To make this matter clear it may be permitted to observe two fallacies (there are others), which are constantly persisted in, and are even accepted by many, strangely enough, as axiomatic:

(1) "A large organisation, centrally controlled, is necessarily more efficient."

It is NOT, and the supposition is contrary to all human experience. Every particle of available evidence goes to show that after the optimum size has been reached there operates, at a geometric rate, a law of diminishing return.

(2) "Central planning and control is rendered inevitable by technological progress and the complexity of modern civilisation."

Modern civilisation is inconceivably complex—and that is just the reason why it cannot be centrally "planned," because no central impersonal authority can possibly obtain or comprehend the necessary data, which is yet available in all its infinite detail to decentralised personal groups. The advance of science, particularly the improvement of communication and liaison facilities, makes decentralised organisation easier and even more efficient. The success of an organisation depends in the final analysis on the character of the individuals composing it. Personal responsibility and authority is the only sound basis of organisation. The psychologist, teacher, staff

or works manager can each produce evidence from his special field to support this contention.

Now, what are these "circumstances" which it is claimed are "beyond our control"? It would be idle to assume that this patent fallacy of "inevitability" has propagated itself. The jargon of planning can be traced back at least as far as 1931, when P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) was set up.

At first under the chairmanship of Sir Basil Blackett, a director of the Bank of England, it was shortly afterwards taken over by Israel Moses Sieff, big business head of Marks & Spencer, chain stores. It is now under the chairmanship of L. K. Elmhirst, who has connections with Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

Its now well-known document, "Freedom and Planning," laid down the principles for "planning" Britain, but it was apparently considered unnecessary to make an adequate analysis of prevailing conditions. While it was admitted that production was not the problem—"applied science puts at men's disposal foodstuffs, raw materials, services of all kinds, in ever growing abundance"—the only diagnosis offered was that there was "world-wide loss of control of the machinery of civilisation."

On no sounder basis than this is the whole spurious edifice of planning built, and it is tacitly accepted that we are "compelled by circumstances beyond our control" to concede the centralised control of the Planned (or Totalitarian) State.

Unless we are to be completely enslaved effective action must be taken without delay. The first step is to prevent the central Government acquiring further powers, and to reduce the bureaucracy to at least the 1938 level. There is nothing inevitable about planning. Local and responsible government can and must be restored.

—John Weller.