

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. 18. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 10, 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.

Party Bosses and the Tyranny of Taxation

Different Jockeys, Same Horse

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

Sir,—Last week my subject was "Stooges," and you will recall that reference was made to Mr. Chifley and his statement that taxation rates would never be reduced to the pre-war level. It was shown that a man with an outlook like that is a menace to the men and women of Australia, particularly when such a man is accepted as a Labor "leader."

On the 1st and 2nd of May we were treated to the views of two other "leaders" on the subject of taxation. Mr. Cain, the Labor Premier of Victoria, was the first, and the Melbourne "Argus" of 1/5/46, under the title, "Premier's Gloomy Prediction," contained the following:

"There will be only slight income tax reductions in the future, and I doubt if taxation rates will ever again assume the levels that existed prior to the war," said Mr. Cain, Premier, in an address to the Royal Victorian Institute of Architects. If the people wanted better living conditions, he went on, they could not expect big tax reductions. It was desirable that payment of taxes be made proportionately by all classes. No matter what Government was in power, Australia would never again enjoy low taxation."

The very next day, Mr. Menzies, leader of the "Liberal" party, was reported in the same paper as follows:—

"There is ample room for a substantial reduction of taxation," Mr. R. G. Menzies, Federal Opposition leader, said, commenting yesterday on the statement by Mr. Cain Premier, that the days of light taxation would never come again. Nobody imagined that for many years to come the rates of tax could come down to those existing before the war, Mr. Menzies said, but there was a big difference between the tax burden before the war and the present burden, which was in total about twenty times as much. It was to a real reduction of the tax burden, with all the consequential benefits to the community, that the Liberal party was addressing itself."

These statements from political opponents seem to me to be eloquent confirmation of the claim that behind all Parties is the same basic financial policy—i.e., conduct of Government affairs on the basis of taxation and loans—the only difference being one of detail.

Two of the statements made by Mr. Cain are of great importance, viz., (1) "If the people wanted better living conditions they could not expect big tax reductions"; (2) "No matter what Government was in power, Australia would never again enjoy low taxation."

These statements show that no matter how nice he may be as an individual man, he is a political menace to all who are finding the struggle to live so tough.

What sound grounds are there for the belief that better living conditions depend upon heavy taxation? Living conditions are determined by food, clothes, shelter, and general amenities. All of these are material matters depending upon natural resources, etc. High taxation is one of the surest ways of retarding the utilisation and development of natural resources, and the simple truth is that the material needs for better living conditions cannot be obtained we do have big tax reductions. Better living conditions and present rates of taxation cannot co-exist, and it is undeniable that

high taxation worsens the living conditions.

His second statement is an open admission that under present conditions all Australian Governments are subservient to the dictators of financial policy, and when he speaks of a Government being in "power" he really means a Government in "office."

Will someone please tell Mr. Cain that in the Province of Alberta the Government is reducing the debt, reducing the taxes, and at the same time increasing the people's purchasing power. In that Province the people are getting better living conditions AND tax reductions, showing that a really independent Government has no need whatever to impose taxation tyranny at the behest of alien policy-makers.

Mr. Menzies' statement, though not so dogmatic, means precisely the same as Mr. Cain's. He says there is ample room for a substantial reduction, but that nobody imagines that the rates could come down to those existing before the war. Clearly, therefore, he, too, favours high taxation, but says he wants it not QUITE so high. He, too, regards heavy taxation as inevitable, and has his mind closed to the advancement of any facts, which would establish the erroneous nature of that belief.

What does he mean by a "substantial" reduction—one-twentieth, one-half, or what? He would not reduce the annual interest charge on the national debt, which even prior to the war absorbed more than the whole of the revenue from Income Tax,

Land Tax, Unemployment Tax, Sales Tax, Estate Duties, Entertainments Tax, and Motor Taxation.

Nor under the present system, which he publicly supports, would he avoid further borrowing. (Since the beginning of the war the debt has already been trebled.)

Mr. Menzies could bring about a "substantial" reduction in taxes by substantial "economising" in governmental expenditure. If he sacked a lot of Government employees, curtailed public works, and cancelled the so-called "social security benefits" of the present Government he could effect a substantial reduction in expenditure. It is most unlikely, however, that he would do anything of the kind, and so we might expect the same result from him as we are getting from Mr. Chifley and Mr. Cain, all being committed to precisely the same method of financing Government requirements. And if Mr. Menzies is really able to reduce taxes now, why was Mr. Bruce unable to reduce them between 1921 and 1929?

It is thus as clear as the sunshine that if we change from Mr. Chifley to Mr. Menzies, in the hope of securing big tax reductions, we will, in effect, merely put a different jockey on the same horse, which always runs for the benefit of the book-maker.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne,
C.2.5th May 1946.

NOTES on the NEWS

Following the public outcry against continuing bread zoning the bread bureaucrats tactfully pretended to abandon zoning; but as soon as the pressure abated said that "a new plan of zoning is being put into operation," and, according to bread manufacturers, these new monopoly arrangements will be backed by State legislation.

A few more bakers are to be permitted to enter the zones, but customers will still be prevented from choosing their own bakers, and returned servicemen will still be prevented from serving the public under this modified form of Hitlerism. There must be no compromise with this zoning evil; customers and tradesmen must be absolutely free to exercise their choice.

COUNCIL CONSPIRATORS: There is a strong move afoot to cajole or trick suburban Councils into merging with the Melbourne City Council. This centralising move needs nipping in the bud—now. It is disguised as the "greater Melbourne scheme"—which, of course, really means a "weaker Suburban scheme." Although it is strongly approved by certain leading Laborites (and non-Laborites), West Richmond branch of the Labor Party is resisting this plot and insisting that the proposal be placed before the ratepayers in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act. It would be a wise move for local Electoral Campaigners to get busy about their Councillors and advise them on the scheme to rob them of the control of local affairs, and to load the suburbs with the debt burdens of the City Council. They should be told that higher rates must inevitably follow this move. The time to act is NOW.

MALONEY'S MESSAGE: Ex-Minister to Moscow, Mr. Maloney, continues to explode the myth of Soviet Russia as a Utopia, thus: "There has always been a scarcity of food and clothing . . . and the common people receive very little of either commodity . . . One has to be really high up in the Soviet set-up to enjoy more than one room for himself and family . . . Women receive equal pay for equal work, but as practically all work is on piece rates, this social equality depends entirely upon women's physical ability to perform the same work . . . Women cut coal in the mines, fell trees, swing 8 to 12 lb. hammers and operate all kinds of heavy machinery." ("Age," 28/4/46.) Won't our female Communists be eager to enjoy these Utopian conditions?

PETROL PRICES: In support of its contention that petrol prices should be lowered still further here, the R.A.C.V. says "petrol is cheaper in France, which has been in Germany's grip for five years. The retail price of petrol in Australia, 2/6½d a gallon, including 1½d tax, is the highest in the Empire. In England, the retail price is 2/4, including 10d tax. In South Africa, 2/3, including 8d tax. New Zealand motorists pay 2/7½d, including 1/2 tax, but 6d of this is allocated for roads, compared with less than 3d in Australia." Good luck to the R.A.C.V. in its fight against petrol taxes; but someone should suggest the Electoral Campaign to help their

cause along.

TOURIST TRADE: The Lord Mayor of Melbourne (Cr. Connelly) has strongly criticised the second-class service offered in this country to visitors, and suggested that it would cause the loss of a "valuable" tourist trade. He remarked that "Australia put a 'two bob a meal' limit on themselves and expected wealthy tourists to accept the same standard," and that unless "Australia is prepared to give a 'pound a meal service' we may have to wait 100 years for another opportunity to attract tourists." Apart from shortages caused by bureaucratic controls, it is true that Australians suffer an unnecessarily low living standard, but Cr. Connelly should remember that this is not of their own choosing; although the means to a fuller life are available, the money incomes are not available to obtain it, and it is odd that the Lord Mayor should show such concern for foreign tourists, and little or none for Australians.

VICTORY VISIONS: Strong criticisms have been voiced in the House of Commons regarding the victory celebrations to be held on June 8. It is reported that many Members feel that "it is unsuitable to hold a pompous military ceremonial at a time when the world is fighting against starvation." Sir John Mellor commented that he had "made the widest enquiry and found a widespread lack of interest"; Mr. R. J. Paget tellingly asked, "Is this the time to celebrate victory which, in the largest sense, is not yet won?" Here is another illustration of a handful of higher-ups imposing their idea of unwanted pomp and ceremony on a war-worn people still suffering the totalitarian way of life. It is idle to boast of victory while Fascist controls still operate. This also has a special application for Australia.

BUREAUCRATIC BURDENS: Some idea of the determination of vested Labor interests to maintain and increase the taxpayers' burdens is seen in the following from "Hansard" for April 4, p. 953: "In the first year of the war, 1939-40, expenditure by the Department of Information totalled £22,000. In 1945 the figure had risen to £141,000, while the estimated expenditure for 1946 is £166,000." Here's one Department nobody would miss. Last year the Department of Post-war Reconstruction expended £316,000, and the estimate for this year is £400,000; here is useless Department number two. Similar burdens are being

(Continued on case 2.)

Significant Political Pointers

A report from U.S.A. states that a big proportion of the shops are displaying in their windows price cards showing a three-part price: the unloaded price of the article displayed, the amount of taxes added to the price, and the total which the purchaser has to pay.

If this were done in Australian shops, most Australians would be staggered by the indirect taxes they are paying on a large number of commodities. Further, they would realise that it is not profiteering by the terrible capitalists that is causing prices to be so high, but the policies of the controllers of the Taxation Monopoly. It would be an excellent idea if purchasers of commodities always asked the retailers how much of the price of the commodity bought is made up by taxation.

At the annual conference of the Victorian Country Party, held early last month, it was stated by many delegates that the Country Party should become as rigidly organised as the Labor Party. Mr. Dunstan, ex-Premier, pointed out that the Labor Party presented a united front in Parliament and never divided on anything. "I happen to know that while Labor often has a devil of a row and a general dust-up in the Party room, the members walk into the Assembly like a regiment of soldiers." In other words, Mr. Dunstan believes that dictatorship can only be defeated by further dictatorship. It cannot. It can only be defeated by the practising of democracy. Individual Members of Parliament must not be bound by majority decisions made behind closed doors in Party rooms; they must be bound by the instructions of their electors. The sooner electors unite to give instructions the sooner the Party tyranny will be destroyed.

Following Federal Government's assumption of control of the administration of social benefits and the setting-up of a Commonwealth scale of benefits, Queensland Government's obligation to meet claims for unemployment relief will cease on June 30. Should the Federal Government receive a 'Yes' vote at the forthcoming Referendum for a continuance of its powers to control Social Service benefits throughout Australia, it will mean that Queenslanders will have lost all claim to the millions they have paid in to the Queensland Government in compulsory contributions to the Unemployment Insurance Scheme.... Definite it is that executive departmental officers employed by the Queensland Government view the continuance of the Commonwealth scheme as not being in the best interests of Queenslanders. These men, seized with a comprehensive knowledge of the requirements of Queensland as against

the closely settled States of Victoria and N.S.W., are totally opposed to the complete handing over of powers for administration of hospitalisation, employment, and Social Service Benefits, to the Commonwealth Government. Foregoing facts indicate a 'No' vote in Queensland.

—"Smith's Weekly," April 27.

Apart from the destruction of incentive to produce, thus creating shortages, the present taxation policy is also preventing many commodities already produced from reaching consumers at more than a slow trickle. Many wholesalers, and retailers, who have desired goods, are deliberately curtailing sales in order to limit incomes. If the commodities are all sold now, most of the increased profits will be eaten up by heavy taxation. Many businessmen openly admit that rather than do this, they are deliberately restricting their business to a certain level, hoping that taxation may ease in the future and still leave them with some goods for sale.

Nothing less than a united and determined demand by the electors that they want the bureaucratic army dictating taxation policy demobilised will be of any use. Electors will have the opportunity of using their votes intelligently at the Federal Elections.

It is sometimes stated by Labor apologists that the Labor Party was unable to introduce its financial measures, such as they were, during the Great Depression because of a hostile Senate. Without waiting for an answer to the question of why the Federal Labor Government are introducing serfdom at a time when there IS a Labor Senate, we can profitably pass to a consideration of whether there is any truth in this statement. If the Labor Party had been determined, which they were not, they could have had a double dissolution of Parliament and a direct appeal to the electors. Section 57 of the Federal Constitution makes very definite provisions for disagreements between the House of Representatives and the Senate. Enlightened electors should be acquainted with these provisions:

"If the House of Representatives passes any proposed law, and the Senate rejects or (Continued on page 4)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BY-ELECTION IN TASMANIA

(A Broadcast by JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc., from 7HO, on May 5.)

Next Tuesday a by-election is to be held for the Tasmanian Legislative Council to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Mr. Eady. There are four candidates for the seat, one Liberal, one Labour and two independents. The people of Hobart have to try to make up their minds who they are to vote for, and this is not an easy task at any time.

From bitter experience we have found that the Australian people have almost completely failed to control the central Parliament at Canberra. It becomes important, therefore, that Tasmanians should acquire some control over their local State Parliament, and try to isolate this State from some of its childish reliance on the whims of Sydney politicians and mainland interests.

Tasmania will have to build up a solid group of men who will look after Tasmanian interests. We do not want a repetition of the tragic performance of men like Mr. Cosgrove and Senator McKenna, who, pretending to represent Tasmania, go over to the mainland and hand this island on a platter to the Canberra bureaucracy to do just what they like with it.

In a properly organised society no public man would have the power to reverse the laws of this land by a trick. Today, Tasmanians have practically no protection against the actions of the worst political elements on the mainland. The Australian Constitution, which was once our chief protection, and practically our only protection, has been shot to pieces by cunning lawyers, who are continuously engaged in finding ways of destroying the Constitution.

In the past, the Legislative Council of Tasmania has not only protected Tasmania against ill-considered legislation, but it has protected the whole of Australia on one important occasion. The chief purpose of the Upper House is to hold up legislation until such times as the people have had time to consider it.

This delay is of vital importance, as it prevents a flood of ill-digested legislation reaching the statute book. If laws are important, then it is important that the people should have had time to consider them. But it is almost impossible to get a copy of some of the most important Bills even a day before they are passed. I know, because I have tried.

This sleight of hand has got to be stopped, and the Legislative Council has played a very great part in protecting Tasmania from trick law making.

Last Wednesday a broadcast debate was to have been held in Hobart; it was one of that series which goes under the name of the "Forum of the Air." The subject was to be, "Is the Upper House Necessary in State Governments?" The Labour spokesmen were to argue that it wasn't necessary, and the Liberal spokesmen that it was necessary.

However, the debate was suddenly postponed, because it would be very awkward for the Labour candidate who was standing for the Legislative Council a week after his Party had proved their desire to do away with it. And whatever Labour candidates may say to the contrary, the evidence that the Labour Party is determined to do away with the Legislative Council is beyond dispute.

Some of the strongest opponents of the so-called Labour Party are one-time followers of the Labour Party; that is why Labour wants the voting age reduced to 18, so that it can rope in the young and inexperienced voters.

The Labour Party is such a public menace that it would have no chance of being in power at all except for the sheer incompetence of the old U.A.P. or Nationalist Party, now called the Liberal Party, and which, for convenience, I shall call the Conservative Party.

We know where we stand with the Labour Party; it intends to do away with the

Legislative Council; and as far as taxation and the army of bureaucrats are concerned the sky is the limit. It has practically wiped out the State Parliament, and if it gets its way the State Government will be entirely wiped out and everything will be run from Canberra.

We know where we stand with the Labour Party; but we do not know where we stand with the Conservative Party, which has played a most peculiar game; and just as the so-called capitalist press—especially the big city dailies—has paved the way for Socialist victories both in Australia and England, so the Conservative Parties, by their amazing antics, have forced the people to vote for a Party which they would not otherwise tolerate.

At the same time, they have made the Labour Party much more destructive than it need be. The Party system is tragic enough in all conscience, but when the Opposition takes on the duties of an official opposition and then refuses to do the job, the country is left with very little protection; the country is handed over to a Party dictatorship.

The rank and file and the leaders of the Conservative Parties, here, and elsewhere, don't seem to have any clear beliefs about anything; if they have, we don't hear of them, or see any of them in practice. When the people in England voted against the Conservative Government, they voted against the socialistic restrictions of that Government. The voters didn't know they had again put into power the very men responsible for those restrictions. They are beginning to find it out now. But what a tragic price they are paying for their ignorance and their dishonest news service. Without a healthy Opposition political democracy ceases to function, and the sell-out and collapse of the Conservative Party is something that wants a great deal of investigation. What the people have failed to see is that there has been a working agreement between the two extremes of Right and Left. In England this is called the Mond-Turner agreement.

Sir Alfred Mond represented the big monopolies; Ben Turner represented the Trade Union Bosses. They helped each other to squeeze out competitors, and, in particular, to wipe out small businesses and the independent trade unions. Similar agreements are working in Australia, and the two main parties are therefore forced to use in practice much the same policies.

It is for this reason that the so-called Conservative Parties are no longer true to label. What the rank and file of the Conservatives have refused to see is that the wealthy men and the directors of big combines are not interested in private enterprise; a director of the Bank of "England," when he was told the bank was going to be nationalised, said it didn't matter: "I shall still run it." A director of Coles Chain Stores is now a Government servant and director of national airways, and, of course, helped to put Labor in office.

We in Tasmania ought to feel thankful that we have had a Legislative Council to protect us against the incompetence and collapse of the U.A.P. Party Opposition; and now our job is to get rid of both Parties, and to build up a strong group of independent and energetic men who will fight for Tasmanian interests. If independent men are supported more will come forward. I therefore recommend that you give your vote to Mr. George Gray, the Independent candidate.

DOES S.O.S. MEAN "SAVE OUR SOIL"?

(Continued from April 26 issue.)

An affirmative answer to the above question is given by Major George Bruce in an article appearing in the "Kew Advertiser" (Melbourne) of April 18, 1946, and reprinted hereunder:

In my last article I pointed out how our towns are swallowing up the life of our Australian soil, returning nothing to the land to maintain its fertility. Let us see what other towns are doing in other countries.

In England several wise and far-seeing municipalities have for many years practised composting their town waste and sewage; making these unpleasant things into clean, sweet-smelling humus, eagerly bought up as a first-rate manure by intensive farmers and market gardeners. Since Sir Albert Howard published his famous "Agricultural Testament," the practice is extending to many other towns. One hop garden in Kent, owned by the great Dublin brewers, Guinness and Sons, buys every year 10,000 tons of London town wastes, and composts it on the garden with animal refuse. Not an ounce of chemical fertiliser is used on this garden: the compost is a complete manure.

India, where the supply of manure for the land has always been a problem, is doing the same, as are also many towns in the United States. The New Zealand Humic Compost Society is strongly urging the matter on New Zealand towns, and before long it will be a regular practice there. The

most notable example is South Africa, both from the way in which the idea was started, and from the fact that, in contrast to all other countries of the Empire, the Government is helping and encouraging the work.

In 1939 Mr. van Vuren, a junior officer of the Department of Agriculture, was posted to Ficksburg, a small town on the Basutoland border. He had studied the work of Howard, Wad, Jackson, and others, and now he had a chance to put his ideas into practice. With the support of the Health Officer, he began to experiment in composting town waste and sewage by Howard's method. He made some mistakes at first, but the Town Council backed him up, and before long Ficksburg was turning out every month 70 tons of high-class manure for the land.

Other towns heard of this, and from every side enquiries began to pour in. Just three years after he came to Ficksburg, the Department of Agriculture appointed Mr. van Vuren Coordinating Officer for the Union of South Africa, and put under him six regional officers to travel all over the Union explaining the methods in every urban centre and spreading the idea. Within another three years more than one hundred towns had taken it up, and many more have since come in. In this matter South Africa is well in the lead of the whole Empire.

Just think of that, you towns of Victoria!

One youngish man with brains, pluck and the spirit of the pioneers, confident that if he blazed the trail others would follow; one small town in the back-blocks, smaller by far than Wangaratta, Sale or Echuca, but with a town council which had intelligence and vision; and between them they started a movement which in six years swept a country larger than Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania added together, and has put their Dominion ahead of all Empire countries in this most vital work.

Brains, pluck, pioneer spirit, intelligence, and vision. Those are qualities, which we in Australia believe that we have. If we have, now is the time to show them. Can we find an Australian van Vuren? Will his town council stand behind him as Ficksburg stood behind its leader? If not, can we honestly claim to possess the qualities, which those men in South Africa have shown so outstandingly?

HOUSING COMMISSION'S TOTALITARIAN LAND-GRAB

The case of Mrs. O. D. Lawrence (as reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of May 1), who has had her block of land—in which she had sunk practically all her savings—compulsorily "acquired" by the Housing Commission, which began erecting a house on it apparently without her knowledge, is a glaring example of the totalitarian nature of the legislation which gives arbitrary and coercive powers to governmental bodies. This matter is obviously of supreme importance, because it cuts directly across the rights of the individual gained through a thousand years. Neither Mrs. Lawrence nor any other individual has any direct sanctions for dealing with such tyranny instituted under the guise of the "common good."

For a clear understanding of this matter, it is necessary to grasp the essential difference between what is known as the Rule-of-Law principle, which (much like a sports club) lays down the rules, as few and as simple as possible, by which the game may be fairly played and applying impartially to all individuals; and, on the other hand, authoritarian (totalitarian) law, which gives arbitrary and coercive powers to specified individuals or groups to control the policy of others.

For example, the Rules of the Road are of the former kind. They allow the individual—any individual—the maximum use of the roads. They neither control where the individual is to go nor what he is to go for.

But the Transport Regulations Board is quite literally totalitarian in action. A person who purchases and registers a commercial vehicle, and consequently undertakes the responsibility involved, has to operate according to the arbitrary orders of the Board's officer, which may, for example, limit him to one road in the State. If as a result he incurs financial loss (as a not inconsiderable number have), he has no comeback—only heavy responsibilities (duties), without any power (rights). And the Board operates on exactly the reverse principle: Power without responsibility. The individual is subservient.

This, of course, constitutes a complete inversion of democratic principle. "Demon est Deus inversus." The condition is tragically widespread, and is permeating every aspect of human endeavour. It may be observed that every safeguard the individual has had against tyranny has been marked out for systematic attack from subversive quarters.

For those who do not wish to suffer the fate of which Mrs. Lawrence and many others have already had a taste, the only effective action is to reduce the powers of arbitrary government—which, from a practical viewpoint, means to demand an immediate reduction in the number of bureaucrats (say, to the 1938 level for a start), and the restoration of responsible government decentralised to allow of genuine and positive electoral control.

—JOHN WELLER.

POLITICAL MURDERS IN POLAND

In the British House of Commons on January 23, 1946, Professor Savory asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs "whether he is aware that Bolislaw Sciobiorek, President of the Committee of the Wici, Polish Peasants' Organisation, was murdered on November 2, 1945; that Jan Rytlewski, a prominent member of the Polish Christian Labour Party, was murdered at Juchda, on November 2, 1945; that Jozef Wrona, Peasant leader, was murdered at Zolkiewka on December 8, 1945; and whether, in view of these repeated murders of political opponents which follow on several others, he has drawn the attention of the Polish Provisional Government to the continued violation of the terms under which it has been recognised."

Mr. S. Silverman: "On a point of Order. In view of the fact that Poland is a State which we, in fact, recognise, and with which we exchange diplomatic representatives, is it in order to describe it on the Order Paper as the 'Polish Provisional Government?'"

Mr. Speaker: "Yes, I believe it is quite in order and the correct description."

Mr. Bevin: "I am seriously concerned at the number of political murders that have been committed in various parts of Poland in recent weeks, in circumstances that in many cases appear to point to the complicity of the Polish Security Police. I regard it as imperative that the Polish Provisional Government should put an immediate stop to these crimes in order that free and unfettered elections may be held as soon as possible in accordance with the Crimea decisions."

Professor Savory: "Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is by no means a complete list, that all these victims are members of the Opposition parties and partisans of Monsieur Mikolajczyk, and will he urge that the General Election takes place before all potential leaders of the Opposition have been murdered?"

Mr. Bevin: "I do not desire to add to what I have already said. The task of recreating Europe and getting tranquility is a very difficult one; we have to exercise patience. At the same time, I am looking forward to the end of these police States."

Notes on the News

(Continued from page 1)

imposed by the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Supply and Shipping, and many other bureaucratic setups. It is imperative to call a halt to this form of Hitlerism. The 1938 level is a reasonable reduction aim.

MANGLED MACHINERY: Despite the fact that Melbourne engineers had an urgent use for lathes from munition factories, the Government had them smashed to pieces, because—according to Mr. Makin—"they were too old for economic salvage." The firms, which desired to buy them, reminded him that they were the best judges of this matter and of their value; they also indicated by inference that those who advised the destruction of the machines had a personal interest in this sabotage. It is just another story of what can only be described as corruption in high places (Canberra). Fancy giving such a bunch more power! This episode should swell the "No" vote at the Referendum very considerably.

SLAVE STATE: Now that Hitler's despotism is overthrown, here is a recent report of what Jugoslavia is suffering under Red totalitarian rule: "One of the ugliest features is the preparation of a secret report on every citizen by the Council of the Commune in which he lives. If it is unfavourable he has very little or no hope of obtaining a job, because the State now controls 90% of all jobs. The victim of this iniquitous system does not know who is reporting him, and he has no chance of self-defence." (Melb. "Herald," March 21.) Leaving aside fair words, this pattern of Communism indicates the results, and that is what matters. This pattern is the same wherever Communists seize power, and it is easily recognised as the "Protocol" pattern. Incidentally, Communists always seize power; they never obtain it by constitutional methods.

—O.B.H.

"THE PUBLIC MEMORY"

"Modern education, press, and propaganda have almost eradicated memory. If the public memory could last ten years, few Ministers would hold office twice. If the public memory could last ten weeks, how many newspapers would be read for the accuracy of their news, or the consistency of their opinions?" —The Earl of Portsmouth.

BIG N.Z. POWER SCHEME

"New Zealand engineers will begin work soon to complete the largest hydro-electric project in the Southern Hemisphere—10 great dams and generating stations on the Waikato River, in the North Island.

"They will harness more than 1,000,000 horse power and generate 900,000 kilowatts, trebling the generating capacity of all the North Island plants.

"The Minister for Works (Mr. Semple) said plans were based on the Tennessee Valley project in the U.S.

"The largest generator, at Maraetai, will use about 250,000 horsepower, with an output of 180,000 kilowatts.

"It is estimated that the electricity generated annually will represent an output of more than 4,000,000 tons of coal.

"The coal output of the entire Dominion in 1945 was slightly less than 3,000,000 tons.

"The first station in the chain will probably be operating in the middle of 1949."

—"Radio & Electrical Retailer," Sydney, April 1946.

"THERE WAS A CAMPAIGN"

"... Mr. Churchill is not the man to embarrass his hosts. We now know, too, that for a week or more before he spoke at Fulton many influential American newspapers created the right atmosphere for him to say precisely what he did say. In other words, there was a campaign, and Mr. Churchill's speech formed a part of it."

—"Truth" (London), quoted in the "Social Creditor," 23/3/46.

"THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIAL CREDIT"

By ERIC D BUTLER

Price 1/1d posted.

Supplies of this new booklet are now available.

Here is a booklet which clarifies Social Credit and exposes the attempt to foster the idea that the Federal Labor Government's 1945 Banking Legislation is similar to Social Credit.

No social creditor can afford to be without this booklet. Order now from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"ATOMIC BOMB HYSTERIA" DEBUNKED BY U.S. AVIATION EXPERT

The world has been deluged with scare propaganda about the potency of the "atomic" bombs dropped on the Japanese cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This propaganda has been blatantly used in an attempt to hustle the nations into abandoning Self Government and submitting to World Government.

The flimsy basis of such propaganda is revealed in the following article, condensed from the "Reader's Digest" for March, 1946, in which it appeared under the heading, "Atomic Bomb Hysteria." The writer is the famous American aviation expert, Major Alexander P. de Seversky, author of "Victory Through Air Power," etc.:—

As Special Consultant to the U.S. Secretary of War, I spent nearly eight months studying war destruction in Europe and Asia. I became thoroughly familiar with every variety of damage—from high explosives, incendiaries, artillery shells, dynamite, and combinations of these. In this study, I inspected Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the targets of the atom bomb, examining the ruins, interrogating eyewitnesses and taking hundreds of pictures.

It is my considered opinion that the effects of the atom bombs—not of future bombs, but of these two—have been wildly exaggerated.

I began my study of Japan by flying over Yokohama, Nagoya, Osaka, Kobe, and dozens of other places. Later I visited all of them on foot.

All presented the same pattern. The burned areas looked pinkish—an effect produced by the piles of ashes and rubble mixed with rusted metal. Modern buildings and factories still stood. That many of the buildings were gutted by fire was not apparent from the air. The centre of Yokohama, for instance seemed almost intact when viewed from an aeroplane. The long industrial belt stretching from Osaka to Kobe had been laid waste by fire, but the factories and other concrete structures were still standing. On the whole it was a picture quite different from what I had seen in German cities subjected to demolition bombardment. The difference lay in the fact that Japanese destruction was overwhelmingly incendiary, with comparatively little structural damage to non-inflammable targets.

In Hiroshima I was prepared for radically different sights. But, to my surprise, Hiroshima looked exactly like all the other burned-out cities in Japan.

There was a familiar pink blot, about two miles in diameter. It was dotted with charred trees and telephone poles. Only one of the city's 20 bridges was down. Hiroshima's clusters of modern buildings in the downtown section stood upright.

It was obvious that the blast could not have been so powerful as we had been led to believe. It was extensive blast rather than intensive.

I had heard about buildings instantly consumed by unprecedented heat. Yet here I saw the buildings structurally intact, and what is more, topped by undamaged flag poles, lightning rods, painted railings, air raid precaution sirens and other comparatively fragile objects.

At the T-bridge, the aiming point for the atomic bomb, I looked for the "bald spot" where everything presumably had been vaporized in the twinkling of an eye. It wasn't there or anywhere else. I could find no traces of unusual phenomena.

What I did see was in substance a replica of Yokohama or Osaka, or the Tokyo suburbs—the familiar residue of an area of wood and brick houses razed by uncontrolled fire. Everywhere I saw the trunks of charred and leafless trees, burned and unburned chunks of wood. The fire had been intense enough to bend and twist steel girders and to melt glass until it ran like lava—just as in other Japanese cities.

The concrete buildings nearest to the centre of explosion, some only a few blocks from the heart of the atom blast, showed no structural damage. Even cornices, canopies and delicate exterior decorations were intact. Window glass was shattered, of course, but single panel frames held firm; only window frames of two or more panels were bent and buckled. The blast impact, therefore, could not have been unusual.

Then I questioned a great many people who were inside such buildings when the bomb exploded. Their descriptions matched the scores of accounts I had heard from

BOOKLETS FOR SALE

The United Electors of Australia, 343 Lit. Collins Street, Melbourne, advise that they have a wide range of booklets for sale, and submit the following portion of their list—

Programme for the Third World War. By C. H. Douglas. A survey of existing factors, which must lead to another war if they are not remedied. Price 2/7d posted.

Reconstruction on Christian Principles. An open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Read this and see that you local clergyman receives a copy. Price 7d posted.

Federal Union Exposed. An exposure of the dangers of U.N.O. World Government. Price, 1/1d, posted.

Communism, Why Not? An illuminating story of local and international Communist treachery. Price 2/7d posted.

The Answer to Tax Slavery. A comprehensive analysis of the present-day taxation tyranny—and a way out. Price 1/1d posted.

The Problem of the Medical Profession. Features the evils inherent in socialised medical schemes. Price 1/1d posted.

Unique Alberta. A very useful leaflet suitable for general distribution. Price 6d per dozen, posted.

people caught in concrete buildings in areas hit by block-busters.

Hiroshima's ten-storey press building, about three blocks from the centre of the explosion, was badly gutted by the fire following the explosion, but otherwise unharmed. The people caught in the building did not suffer any unusual effects.

The total death, destruction and horror in Hiroshima were as great as reported. But the character of the damage was in no sense unique; neither the blast nor the heat was so tremendous as generally assumed.

In Nagasaki, concrete buildings were gutted by fire but were still standing upright. All of downtown Nagasaki, though chiefly wooden in construction, survived practically undamaged. It was explained that apparently it had been shielded from the explosion by intervening hills. But another part of Nagasaki, in a straight, unimpeded line from the explosion centre and not protected by the hills, also escaped serious damage. The Nagasaki blast had virtually dissipated itself by the time it reached this area. Few houses collapsed and none caught fire.

All destruction in Nagasaki has been popularly credited to the atom bomb. Actually, the city had been heavily bombed six days before. The famous Mitsubishi plant was badly punished by eight high-explosive direct hits.

What actually happened in Hiroshima and Nagasaki? There is little evidence of primary fire; that is to say, fire kindled by the heat of the explosive itself. If the temperature within the exploding area of an atom bomb is super high, then the heat must have been dissipated in space. What struck Hiroshima was the blast.

It was like a great fly swatter two miles broad, slapped down on a city of flimsy, half-rotted wooden houses and rickety brick buildings. It flattened them out in one blow, burying perhaps 200,000 people in the debris. Its effectiveness was increased by the incredible flimsiness of most Japanese structures, built of two-by-fours, termite-eaten and dry-rotted, and top-heavy with thick tile roofs.

The wooden slats of the collapsed houses were piled like so much kindling wood in your fireplace. Fires flared simultaneously, in thousands of places, from short circuits, overturned stoves, kerosene lamps and broken gas mains.

The whole area burst into one fantastic bonfire.

In incendiary attacks, people have a chance to escape. They run from their houses into the streets, to open places, to the rivers. In Hiroshima the majority had no such chance. Thousands of them must have been killed outright by falling walls and roofs; the rest were pinned down in a burning hell. Some 60,000, it is estimated, were burned to death.

On a vast and horrifying scale it was fire, just fire that took such high toll of life and property in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The victims did not die instantaneously in a sort of atomic dissolution. They died as people die in any fire.

Perhaps there were some deaths from radioactivity. I met people who had heard of casualties from radio burns and radio poisoning. But I could not obtain direct confirmation. The doctors and nurses at the hospitals I visited had no such cases under their care, though some of them had heard of cases. I also interrogated fire fighters and Red Cross workers who had rushed to the scene in the first few minutes. **They all denied personal knowledge of any lingering radioactivity.**

Such are the facts as I found them—they seem to me tragic enough without pseudo-scientific trimmings. I am not alone in my opinions. Scientific observers on the spot to whom I talked, in general shared my point of view. Nothing official came from the War Department to justify the wild opinion. It simply is not true that matter was vaporized in the intense heat—if steel had evaporated certainly wood would have done the same, and undamaged wood abounds everywhere in the rubble. In neither of the bombed cities was there a bald spot, and both atom-bombed areas have tree trunks and walls with growing vines to disprove the claims of super heat.

The more painstakingly I analyse my observations, indeed, the more convinced I am that the same bombs dropped on Pittsburgh or Detroit would have exacted no more toll in life than one big blockbuster, and the property damage might have been limited to broken window glass over a wide area.

Three scientists at the University of Chicago have taken me severely to task for saying 200 B-29's with incendiaries could have done as much damage at Hiroshima as the atom bomb did. They have pointed out "that if 200 Superforts with ordinary bombs could wipe out Hiroshima, the same number of planes could wipe out 200 cities with atomic bombs."

These experts merely forgot to mention one detail—that the 200 cities should be as flimsy as Hiroshima. On a steel-and-concrete city high explosives would have to be added to do the job. One atomic bomb hurled at Hiroshima was equal to 200 Superforts; but in New York or Chicago, a different

kind of atomic bomb, exploding in a different fashion, would be needed before it could equal one Superfort loaded with high explosives.

It seems to me completely misleading to say that the atomic bomb used on Japan was "20,000 times more powerful" than a TNT blockbuster. From the view of total energy generated, this may be correct. But we are not concerned with the energy released into space. What concerns us is the portion, which achieves effective demolition. From that point of view, the 20,000 figure is reduced immediately to 200 for a target like Hiroshima. For a target like New York, the figure of 20,000 drops to one or less.

All we can say with certainty is that the atomic bomb proved supremely effective in destroying a highly flimsy and inflammable city.

Eventually, of course, the problem of obtaining maximum results from atom missiles will be solved. Methods will surely be found for dissipating less of the released energy in space and directing more of it to destruction.

The Chicago scientists reminded me in their statement "the bombs dropped on Japan were the first atomic bombs ever made. They are firecrackers compared with what will be developed in 10 or 20 years." That is exactly the point I am trying to make: that they are as yet in the primitive stage. Humankind has stamped into a state of near hysteria at the first exhibits of atomic destruction. Fantasy is running wild. There are those who talk of a dozen suicides who will put on false whiskers, take compact atomic bombs in suitcases, and blow some country to bits. This is nonsense.

On the size of the bombs, incidentally, there has been much uninformed rhetoric. How do so many people know that the atomic bombs weighed only "a few ounces" or "a few pounds"? After all, the biggest U.S. bomber, not a pursuit plane, was chosen to carry it.

I am the last one to deny that atomic energy injects a vital and perhaps revolutionary new factor into military science and world relations. But I do not believe that the revolution has already taken place and that we should surrender all our normal faculties to a kind of atomic frenzy. Whatever we decide to do, let us do it calmly, logically and, above all, without doing violence to ascertainable facts.

ERIC BUTLER TOURS EYRE'S PENINSULA

Accompanied by Mr. H. Harvey, member of the executive of the United Democrats, Adelaide, Mr. Butler addressed six meetings on Eyre's Peninsula, starting at Port Lincoln on Friday, April 26. Other meetings were at Cummins', Tumbly Bay, Kimba, Buckleboo and Cowell.

Outstanding results were obtained. A total of approximately 150 people attended the six meetings—which, in view of the small centres, was excellent. Fifty new direct subscribers for the "New Times" were obtained—that is, one in every three of those attending the meetings were signed up. Over 100 pieces of literature, mostly booklets on Alberta, were sold for the week.

These results only further demonstrate Mr. Butler's contention that never was there a greater opportunity for advancing Social Credit.

Mr. Butler arrived back in Adelaide on Saturday, May 4, and addressed a special rally of social crediters at the United Democrats' headquarters that evening. Those present were enthused by Mr. Butler's address, and agreed that Mr. Butler had clearly indicated what social crediters can and must do.

STAMP SAVERS WANTED

The United Electors of Australia report as follows:

"We wish to advise Mr. J. D. McLennan that his promised box of stamps has not yet arrived; also to thank Mr. L. V. Turner for his collection, which, with others, has been sent to England. Here is an easy job, which every reader can undertake and thus help to augment our funds. Will YOU get busy saving those used postage stamps and send them to the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, and will you get your friends on the job with you? Thank you."

GARFIELD DISTRICT MEETING

To "New Times" readers in and near the Gippsland (Vic.) centres of Tyngon, Garfield, Bunyip, Iona and Vervale:

Your help is required for a bumper meeting in the Garfield Hall on Tuesday, May 28, to hear Mr. Eric Butler. Tell your friends!

—Convenor: Mr. Jim Stewart, Vervale Post Office. (Phone: Iona 241.)

LECTURES ON ALBERTA

The lantern lectures on Alberta, in the Temperance Hall, Canberra Building, Edward Street, Brisbane, will commence on May 29, at 8 pm, — not on May 16, as previously reported.

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."

Current Commentary

Comment on "Liberal" Party centralisation: "It is not consoling to find that Liberal parties in England, as well as in Australia, are tending towards an adoption of the caucus system. It is on this question that Liberalism should be prepared to fight once again for freedom and liberty, and it is wrong that those ideals of political and social philosophy should be sacrificed on the altar of utility and party discipline. Meanwhile we must express the hope that the vital principle of representative government will not be sacrificed."

The quote is from "Liberalism in Australia," written some years ago. And the author? Dr. Evatt!

Now it is extremely doubtful whether any man has done more to undermine representative government in Australia than Dr. Evatt, who stepped off the High Court Bench to enter "Labour" caucus politics. Almost immediately, advised by W. S. Robinson with well-known Baillieu-B.H.P. affiliations, he became Minister for External Affairs and Attorney General, which positions gave him A DIRECT AND POWERFUL INFLUENCE ON THE WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT POLICY, BOTH EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL.

An individual with such power and yet less representative of genuine Labour interests can hardly be imagined; but then the essential similarity between "Labour"-Socialism and "Liberal"-Socialism is becoming increasingly more obvious. The basic policy being pursued by Mr. Menzies, who has said that he is a "practical socialist" and also has Baillieu-B.H.P. affiliations, is identical.

What is urgently required is an effective sanction, which will enable the electors to ensure genuine representation of their policy, without regard to Party interests. Dr. Evatt will not help us.

* * * *

Definition of Fascism: "Open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary section of the big capitalists. Two main features are: (1) At home, brutal suppression of democratic rights of masses and the enslavement of all toilers; (2) abroad, wars of spoliation and conquest of other nations, prepared for and carried through by "totalitarian" organisation of nation, by "bestial chauvinism," abandonment of every moral principle, extinction of other States, wholesale massacres and enslavement of entire nations." —Communist "Glossary of Marxist Terms."

The difference between that and Communism escapes us. This technique of "terrorist dictatorship" is precisely that of the Communist Party, and has been applied partly or wholly in every revolutionary campaign. The theory is clearly set forth in "Problems of Leninism," by Joseph Stalin.

But perhaps the reference was to "Red Fascism"?

* * * *

"The highway of all history to tyranny and dictatorship is extreme centralisation of government."—D. H. Drummond in "Australia's Changing Constitution."

* * * *

Running counter to the highly propagandised centralisation of government idea is the fact that in at least six parts of this continent there are moves to form new States—the Kimberley region of W.A.; North and West Queensland; North, South-West and Southern N.S.W. Government from Sydney and Brisbane and Perth has proved wholly unsatisfactory.

For example, in North Queensland: "The people of the Gulf and north of Townsville intend to bring about the establishment of a new State north of latitude 19. Encouraged by the Brisbane Government's reiteration of its 'decentralisation policy,' they decided to urge construction of meat works about 30 miles from Georgetown. With aerial transport it would be possible to deliver fresh meat at any of the northern coastal towns in about two hours, and with it fruit and vegetables. When the Royal Commission on Abattoirs visited Georgetown the residents staged an exhibition of produce; but the Commission reported that the Gulf was breeding country only, and that reconditioning of the only railway serving the district would be unwarranted. Instead of the Almaden-Forsyth railway being reconditioned for heavy stock trains, it was merely reconditioned to carry a rail-motor. It was pointed out that the rail-motor will haul only two trucks, and the only livestock allowed is an occasional truckload of bulls, even that being refused until pastoralists pointed out that they were being urged to improve their herds.

"The State recently announced its road construction policy for the far North; but no big works were contemplated north of the railway from Townsville to Cloncurry. The Gulf country is thus denied road and rail communication. The Abattoirs Commission estimated that the Gulf country proper depastured 750,000 head of cattle. A 10 p.c. annual turn-off would give 75,000 head. Fat cattle lose 100 lb. per head when they have to be transported by road and rail from the Daintree River to Cairns."

—Condensed from a letter by PC in the Sydney "Bulletin," 10/4/46.

* * * *

"The Soviet G.I.'s were shocked to find that the workers in capitalist Europe had bathrooms. They thought a bath was a present you received with the Order of Lenin." —N.Y. "Journal-American" correspondent. — JOHN WELLER.

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:

14. Is there any doubt that the Government of the Soviet Union is a dictatorship?

There is not the slightest doubt in the mind of any properly instructed person.

Dr. Sherwood Eddy, who has visited the country on a dozen occasions and lived in it for lengthy periods, and whose books are exceptionally fair in their criticism of Soviet life, says: "The Government does not pretend or profess to provide for this bourgeois prejudice of liberty or formal democracy. It is a frank dictatorship. . . . It denies at one sweep freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of association. One and only one political party is allowed. That dominates the Government, which in turn absolutely controls the press, the radio, and all means of communication. There is a universal censorship of all publicity, and all news, and the complete suppression of any organised opposition to the dictatorship and its programme." (Sherwood Eddy: "The Challenge of Russia.")

"People can see," says Boris Silver, a Left-Wing Socialist, who lived in Russia as a worker under both Tsar and Soviet, "if they will take the trouble to look—that is, if they really want to look for actualities and are not to be put off with camouflage—that here is a mighty nation of one hundred and eighty million inhabitants who are strictly rationed, are perpetually dragooned, have their letters censored, are prohibited from reading any but officially selected books, are watched in every detail of their private lives, are forbidden to express their thoughts, and are terrified even to think too much.

"They are, in fact, all inmates of a great prison. They have to work hard without knowing when, if ever, the term of imprisonment will come to an end. Liberty is dead, morally, politically, economically." (Boris Silver: "The Russian Worker's Own Story.")

By a decree published in January 1931, ten years was decreed in the Penal Code for lack of discipline amongst the transport workers, with death in special cases. By a decree published in February of the same year, work certificates on the military model were introduced, showing workers' records with penalties suffered, if any. By a decree published in June of that year factory chiefs are given full authority to transfer workers from place to place without regard to humanitarian considerations. Dismissed or defaulting workers were deprived of both food tickets and lodgings.

Boris Souverine (formerly leader of the Communist Party of France) speaks of "This monstrous system of oppression . . . utterly unparalleled in any capitalist legislation." (Boris Souverine: "Stalin.")

In December 1932, the Government required the entire urban population to possess internal passports. "Nobody," says Souverine, "could move or stay twenty-four hours away from home without the visa of the G.P.U." (Boris Souverine: "Stalin.") This law exceeded anything known under Tsardom.

By a decree of August 7th, 1932, city workers became liable to the death penalty for stealing goods in transit, and peasants to the death penalty for theft in the fields.

KOMMISSAR RACKET

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

"Now that our local kommissars can board the American built trans-Atlantic plane and spend a comfortable weekend conferring with their superior officers in Washington, it is pleasant, as we contemplate the two square inches of indurated cocoa-nut matting which our butcher playfully calls the meat ration, to compose the kind of lunch available in Washington's many excellent restaurants, as well as in its palatial hotels. Of course, if you want an elaborate lunch, you can have it, but we might begin with a Manhattan cocktail, for which whisky supplies are plentiful. Fricasee oysters a la Creole, followed by canvas-back duck, with cranberry sauce and brown sweet potatoes, or, if preferred, a grilled steak of Virginia peach-fed ham, and a good Roquefort cheese, all washed down with a sound, imported burgundy (If it is felt that it will not jar with the Manhattan), would induce that mellow feeling which will enable us, after a suitable interval, to negotiate the diversion of food cargoes consigned to 'Britain' to the underfed Indonesians of Balikpapan, who will reciprocate with raw rubber for the new Russian armoured-car tyres. We can understand that Sir Ben Smith feels that International Socialism, with its headquarters accessible for the weekend, and a really adequate cuisine for the Politbureau and its friends, is a good deal better than driving a taxi-cab.

"How long it will take the general public to grasp the fact that Socialism is little more than a clever scheme to maintain selected Socialists and their Masters in luxury at disproportionate expense, we do not know. But there is no lack of evidence."

The trade unions have no power of independent action, and opposition to the Government is treason.

The American journalist, H. R. Knickerbocker, who knows the Soviet Union well, says that the Terror was "the chief weapon in the struggle to establish Socialism. . . . The Terror destroyed democracy. Without political democracy, the vaunted 'economic democracy' of the Soviet Union became a farce." (H. B. Knickerbocker: "Is Tomorrow Hitler's?")

15. If it is true that the Russian people live in the conditions stated, how does it happen that they have fought with such heroism against the Germans?

This is one of the most frequently asked questions of today, and there is no doubt that many ill-informed persons have been convinced by it that all is well in Russia. But the question actually presents no difficulties.

First of all, however, let us reduce the argument of the Communists to absurdity by making them follow their own logic to conclusions they will not accept.

Briefly stated, the Communist argument is this: "The Russians have fought bravely; people who fight bravely must have something worth fighting for; the Communist system must therefore be a good one."

Now no one will deny that the Russians have fought bravely, but does this really prove that they have a good system of Government? Very well! But does anyone deny that the Germans and the Japanese have fought bravely, too? Obviously not! That being so are we not entitled to say that they also have a good system of Government? And if not (accepting the Communist logic), why not?

Either the Communist must accept this conclusion or he must acknowledge that a bad cause can have brave defenders—that patriotism will continue to exist however bad the political system.

Having dealt with this, let us now consult the facts of history. The supposition that the Russians have never fought bravely until the Communists came to rule them is one of the most amusing beliefs existing at the present time. The Russians are a fighting race; they have fought heroically under even the most cruel of the Tsars. They pursued a "scorched earth" policy against Napoleon and razed the "holy" city of Moscow to the ground in order to defeat the French. Here is how a French writer, Capefigue, has described the courage with which they defended their country under the Tsars:

"With the Austrians and the Prussians one might, by means of strategy, make whole masses prisoners; one might finish a campaign by a few decisive marches which threw into the arms of the Emperor Napoleon the half of any army as captives; but with the Russians there was nothing but to kill and be killed, to break their ranks and smash the last man with cannon-ball, and that, too, without any considerable result." (Capefigue: "Europe Under the Consulate and the Empire," quoted in MacFarlane's "Life of Napoleon Bonaparte.")

On their retreat into the interior of Russia in 1812 the Russians destroyed everything that could be of the least assistance to the French. So astonished was Napoleon that he exclaimed: "This exceeds all imagination. This is a war of extermination. Such terrible tactics have no precedent in the history of civilisation. To burn one's own cities! A demon inspires these people. What savage determination! What a people!" ("Napoleon's Invasion of Russia": "Contemporary Review," February 1943.)

In an article published in June, 1942, Professor Hearnshaw, the distinguished British historian, chronicled their deeds of valour throughout the ages and showed how false is the assumption that only Communism could have inspired them with the courage to resist the might of Germany.

"Their heroic achievements in the present war," said Professor Hearnshaw, "are due, not to any devotion to the discredited and obsolescent cause of Communism, but to the old spirit of patriotism and independence which was displayed in 1380, 1760 and 1812, as conspicuously as it is today." (Professor Hearnshaw: "National Review," June, 1942.)

Moreover, as H. R. Knickerbocker points out, on invading Russia, Hitler for the first time "tackled a country with lives to waste and miles to waste. . . . They could lose as many men as the entire German army and still have left an army as big as the former French Army. In fighting against the Germans they could afford to lose two to one and still have superiority in numbers. . . . The same advantage in size held with respect to terrain. They could afford to retreat over distances equivalent to the width of many European countries and still have room to live in, just as the Chinese did." In addition to this, for nearly a quarter of a century the Red Army "has received a larger share of the national income in peace time than any other defence force of any nation has ever enjoyed including Germany." (H. R. Knickerbocker "Is Tomorrow Hitler's?")

These facts do not detract from the heroism of the Russian people, fighting

bravely against a barbarous enemy, but they cannot be ignored, nor can the immense assistance gladly given by Britain and America in the common cause be quite forgotten. America alone had given 5200 tanks, 8800 planes, and 250,000 military vehicles by April 1944, together with vast quantities of munitions, boots, food and locomotives. Britain, by March 1944, had given 5031 tanks and 6778 fighter aircraft.

(To be continued.)

THE "USURY" QUESTION

From "The Social Creditor," 12/1/46:—

We make no apology for recurring to the dangerous disservice to genuine reform, which is offered by many "monetary reformers" who mix up certain ill-understood "moral principles" with attempts at practical design. Amongst the objects of their attack, an easy first is "usury," which they would define, if they troubled to define it, as the taking or giving of interest upon a money loan.

It should be understood without much difficulty that, in a predominantly gold coinage system, if Moses Finkelstein lends one hundred gold sovereigns to John Brown and demands back one hundred and twenty-five at the end of a year, and continues that process, it is only a question of time before Moses owns all the gold. But if John Brown makes a deposit in his bank, and the bank allows him three per cent. interest, there is no available evidence to show that John Brown will come into possession of the bank. What has happened is that John has shared, to a minute extent, in the profits of the bank, in return for providing a smoke-screen for the legend that banks only re-lend money deposited with them. Now that this legend is exploded, John has been informed that he is no longer wanted, and his share ceases. In fact, he is charged for keeping his account. That is what the usury hunters have achieved.

But, you may say, the banks "have no right" to create money to bribe John with a decimal fraction of it. The only part of this sentence, which makes sense, is the latter. John and others like him ought to have a larger "interest" on their deposit (really, a dividend on the money created). The greatest nonsense, of much, which has been written about the banking system, is that which attacks their dividends and interest paid on deposits. These items are the only fresh money, corresponding to the normally increased real wealth, which comes into the hands of John Citizen. The rest disappears into invisible reserves, such as those colossal figures, which Mr. Dalton [Chancellor of the Exchequer] will not disclose, which, by the acquisition of the Bank "of England," have now been made a free gift to Mr. Barney Baruch, et al.

"STAR CHAMBER" LAWS

From the "Sydney Morning Herald" 29/4/46:—

Lawmaking by Governor-General in Council, instead of by Parliament, was called "Star Chamber legislation" by Mr. David Maughan, K.C., on Saturday.

It should not take place in a democratic community, he said.

As retiring president, Mr. Maughan was addressing members of the Law Council of Australia at their annual meeting.

"In practice, the Governor-General in Council, under all war-time Governments, has passed laws upon every subject under the sun, whether the matter was one of urgency or not, whether Parliament was sitting or not, and even if the law interfered in a radical way with ordinary common law rights of the citizen," he said.

"It is my submission, as the present head of the profession in Australia, that such laws should prima facie only be made by Parliament, where there is opportunity for criticism by the public, press, and members of all parties."

"FREEDOM" IN "BRITAIN"

"For hag-ridden Britons—after all these months of total peace—living comes down to 8000 'thou shalt nots'. . . . Under penalty of a £5000 fine, Britons shall not export a fret saw or a pudding-basin. Neither must they refuse to go down a coalmine or up a chimney, if in the sole opinion of the Ministry of Labor, they are capable of performing these actions. As ordinary Britons in their own country they cannot freely: Set up as a cobbler or a plumber; go for a short row anywhere off the coast; buy an alarm clock; manufacture a new line of goods; kill and sell a pig; go to a theatre on Sunday; send a packet of stamps to a schoolboy in France; eat a fillet of plaice and a lamb chop in the same meal; buy a tailor-made suit with a velvet collar; avoid going through at least five authorities if they want to undertake any building for their business; buy a new typewriter or break up their old one; set up any sort of a retail shop, from a haberdasher's to a grocer's; buy a loaf of "white" bread; go to visit Malta, Kenya or Ceylon without a special permit; take more than a single trunk (i.e., 100 lbs. of heavy luggage) when they travel by railway; sell a skipping rope more than 9ft. long or a powder-puff with a piece of material more than 3ins. square; send a present valued over £5 to anyone in Canada; buy vegetables from the man who owns the next allotment."

—London "Daily Mail," quoted in Sydney "Bulletin," 27/3/46.

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

fails to pass it, or passes it with amendments to which the House of Representatives will not agree, and after an interval of three months the House of Representatives, in the same or the next session, again passes the proposed law with or without any amendments which have been made, suggested, or agreed to by the Senate, and the Senate rejects or fails to pass it, or passes it with amendments to which the House of Representatives will not agree, the Governor-General may dissolve the Senate and the House of Representatives simultaneously. But such dissolution shall not take place within six months before the date of expiry of the House of Representatives by effluxion of time.

"If after such dissolution the House of Representatives again passes the proposed law, with or without any amendments which have been made, suggested, or agreed to by the Senate, and the Senate rejects or fails to pass it, or passes it with amendments to which the House of Representatives will not agree, the Governor-General may convene a joint sitting of the members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

"The members present at the joint sitting may deliberate and shall vote upon the proposed law as last proposed by the House of Representatives, and upon amendments, if any, which have been made therein and by one House and not agreed to by the other, and any such amendments which are affirmed by an absolute majority of the total number of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be taken to have been carried, and if the proposed law, with the amendments, if any, so carried is affirmed by an absolute majority of the total number of the members of the Senate and House of Representatives, it shall be taken to have been duly passed by both Houses of Parliament, and shall be presented to the Governor-General for the King's assent."

* * * *

Karl Marx, the German-Jewish revolutionary (who was financed by Engels, who made an immense fortune out of exploiting Lancashire child labour), never once attacked the financial monopoly.

"There is not a word about the dominant position and responsibility of finance to be found in Marx, and Socialism has attacked every form of property, and at the moment is attacking every form of property except that which is the monopoly of the international financier, and has steadfastly refused to have anything to do with financial reform."

—C. H. Douglas in "The Big Idea," "Australian" Communists support the alien Bretton Woods Monetary Scheme.

—EDB.

PALESTINE PROBLEM

The following extracts are from the British "Hansard" report of the House of Commons debate of 21/2/46, on Palestine—

Mr. Thomas Reid (Swindon): . . . To conclude, I ask, is the British taxpayer going to keep on paying money to keep this policy going? Since 1920, the British taxpayer has provided over £13,000,000 to keep Palestine out of bankruptcy. He has contributed tens of millions also on military expenditure owing to this unfortunate policy. The policy of establishing a Jewish State can only be maintained by force. Are the American or the British Government to send their boys to fight in Palestine to establish a Jewish State by force? The thing is untenable and impossible. I ask that this question should not be decided on grounds of expediency, but on grounds of decency. The following words, those of Burke, which I quoted in Palestine in 1938, are applicable:

"It is with the greatest difficulty that I am able to separate policy from justice. Justice is itself the great standing policy of civil society; and any eminent departure from it, under any circumstances, lies under the suspicion of being no policy at all."

Mr. Olivier Stanley (Bristol, West): . . . I am not denying for a moment the great material advantages which Jewry in the last 20 years has brought to Palestine, and to the Arabs, too. But not all peoples in the world—and certainly not the Arabs, I think—measure everything by material standards. You may be offered considerably increased prosperity by Western standards, but it may be at the cost of something that you value very much more. Your own mode of life, we may think, is lazy, inefficient and backward, but it may be the mode of life that you like, believe in and want to continue. In the Arab race there is undoubtedly a fear of domination by a race, which is alien in character, in religion and in economic concept. . . .

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS

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