

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O. Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

VOL. 17, No. 2.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1951.

SIXPENCE WEEKLY

Communist Influence in America

Douglas Reed's Disclosures

Although "capitalist" America is persistently paraded as the great bastion of the anti-Communist nations, the following material from Douglas Reed's latest book, "Somewhere South of Suez," provides frightening evidence of the influence of Communist conspirators in Washington:

In the American Republic the spearhead of this individual effort to expose the undermining of elected government by alien and treasonable infiltration has been a parliamentary committee, The House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities, which for years has dug among the evidence. The hidden strength of Communism throughout the world is shown by the derision, which is poured on this body by newspapers in many countries (including Conservative ones in England), and by the sustained "smearing" of its leaders and members. Its best-known chief, Mr. Martin Dies, was "smeared" into oblivion. When the Democratic Party is in power, as it has been for a generation, save for two years between 1946 and 1948, the majority of the committee appears to be automatically used to frustrate its work. Nevertheless, a minority of its members persists, and in those two years they accumulated material, which a generation ago would have been enough to send any government crashing in ruins.

The Canadian Report.

The committee, between 1946 and 1948, sought to bring about a public investigation comparable with that of the Canadian Report. Just before President Truman's reelection in November 1948, it published a Report (September 27th, 1948). This referred to the Canadian Report, saying the American people were deeply shocked by its disclosures, and also "by the disloyal operations of some of Canada's prominent citizens, who were working in collusion with Soviet agents." Without specifically mentioning Mr. Mackenzie King's intimation that matters were even graver in the American Republic, it said "the American people applaud the vigorous manner in which the persons involved were brought to trial, and, in view of the fact that the major effort of developing the atom bomb was being carried on in the United States, presumed that similar prosecutions would follow there." These never came, and the Committee has been endeavouring to find out why.

President Opposes Inquiry.

The reason was bluntly stated: Presidential opposition. The Report says an American General testified on oath that he was prohibited by "a Presidential directive

of August 5th, 1948, from discussing with you or your committee any information relating to the loyalty or integrity of any government employee or former government employee." He added "as a general opinion" in the matter, that "there was continued and persistent and well-organised espionage against the United States and particularly against the atom bomb project, by a foreign power with which we were not at war, and its misguided and traitorous domestic sympathisers." The General said he had informed President Roosevelt of this in a report which the President read in his presence "just before he left for Yalta," and that the same report was put before Mr. Truman by him immediately the new President took office. The Un-American Committee's report adds that it covers only one small, local field of its investigations, and in this found "three separate acts of treachery by scientists, . . . which required immediate prosecution to the full extent of the law." It mentioned by name several persons of Eastern European birth or secondary origin, and concluded that the full story of the conspiracy could not be told "because the Presidential veto denies Congress access to the evidence in the files of the Executive branch of the Government . . . The iron curtain imposed by Presidential directive must be forthwith lifted." That appeared to raise a clear and major issue between Parliament and President, even more clearly stated in Senator Homer Ferguson's words: "Congress is rapidly being pushed into the intolerable position of having either to legislate through a blind spot or compel the President to answer for his conduct in an impeachment proceeding . . . Congress is charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of our people through legislation. But if, when it tries to do so, the President can deny to Congress the information it needs to legislate intelligently, then the President has gone beyond the prerogative of his office and threatens the very foundations of representative government."

Elections Saved Communists.

The issue between Congress and President was obscured by one of those timely interventions, which are so distinct a feature of this century's deterioration; at moments—when the rot seems about to be stayed,

something happens to ensure continuance. Five weeks after issue of the Committee's Report, Congressional elections restored to the Democrats their majority in the House of Representatives. At once the political writers foretold that the Un-American Activities Committee would be allowed to make much more trouble. Since then its minority members have been consistently balked in their efforts and constantly "smeared." All this, moreover, was in the period when the menace of Communism was supposed to have been recognised and the chief aim of the American Republic's policy was presented as the stopping of its spread.

(Continued on page 5)

OUR POLICY

1. The preservation of Australia's sovereignty as a part of the British Empire, and the exposure of all internal and external groups, which attack that sovereignty.
2. The preservation and extension of genuine local government.
3. The preservation and strengthening of all Constitutional safeguards for the purpose of protecting fundamental individual rights.
4. The encouragement of all activities designed to bring Governments under more effective control by the electors.
5. The preservation and extension of genuine free, competitive enterprise and private ownership, and opposition to all Monopoly, whether it be "private" or State.
6. The support of a financial policy which will (a) permit free enterprise to make available to all individuals an increasing standard of living and greater leisure for cultural pursuits; (b) result in no further increase in the community's indebtedness and the sound business practice of gradually reducing existing debt.
7. Recognising that the basis of any sound economy is agriculture, the encouragement of agricultural policies which will ensure the preservation and building up of soil fertility by organic farming and gardening; and the prevention of soil erosion and the protection of forests and watersheds.

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.

The following extract from an article in "The Nineteenth Century", of June, 1950, by an American writer, Marjorie Bremner, may help to explain why men like Senator McCarthy can be elected to Washington, whereas in British countries genuine patriots find it difficult to make any headway against the Party machines: -

"The separation of the legislature from the executive, the box structure of American party organisation, and the lack of strict party discipline (hence 'free votes'), the paramount importance of local interests, and the wide use of the committee system, all mean that individual Senators and, though to a lesser degree, Representatives are much more important than back-bench British M.Ps. can hope to be...

"The division bell does not, as in Britain, send them automatically into the proper lobby to vote with the party. Strong control by the executive is unknown. Not only does the Executive not control the legislature; not only can the two branches of the Government be controlled by different parties; but legislative leaders themselves are often unable to control the Senators and Representatives from their own party on votes of vital importance. .

"The American Constitution requires that Senators and Representatives be residents of the State from which they are elected, and custom has extended this to mean that Representatives must reside in their own Congressional districts as well. So ... the American Senator or Representative is

more dependent upon his constituents than the British M.P., and, therefore, less dependent on the central high command his party. Should an American legislator have to choose between pleasing the national Democratic or Republican Party organisation or his home people," the odds are he will choose the latter.

"True, sanctions may be taken against a recalcitrant Republican or Democrat in America. These may take the mild form of withholding patronage -- for instance, no Federal grants of money for new post offices in the erring Congressman's district until a reformation is effected. Attempts may be made to 'purge' the guilty man at election time. But even the strong President and party leader, the popular Mr. Roosevelt, failed when, in 1938, he essayed such a 'purge.' The British Labor Party 'purge' of 1950, when the Labor independents were 'sunk without a trace' and replaced by loyal party men, in striking contrast. So in America, much more than in Britain, legislators are individuals, important in their own right, even when newly elected, and, without important positions. They think as individuals, and they vote as such."

Indonesian Aggression

In a letter to the Sydney Bulletin of November 1, a Mr. Wilkes, of N.S.W., makes the following comment upon the aggression being committed against the Ambonese:

"Official Australian comment on the fighting at Ambon is conspicuously absent, but it is to the credit of the Australian Red Cross that that body is actively seeking permission to forward medical supplies to the besieged Ambonese.

"It is incredible that U.N. should ignore the complete blockading, naval bombardment and military oppression of a cultured, freedom-loving people like the Ambonese by a minority section of extremist Javanese whose only claim to fame, or rather infamy, is the fact that their leaders fraternised with the Japanese, massacred Europeans interned by the Japanese, broke an agreement with the Dutch, and latterly have been co-operating with an Indonesian organisation which takes its orders from Moscow.

"U.N.'s apparent complacency cannot be excused by its preoccupation with Korea, nor does the official Australian silence square with our belligerent protests against the Indonesian proposals to include Dutch New Guinea in the Indonesian Republic. D.N.G. would be untenable, in the military sense, against a hostile Power based on Ambon and the Kai Islands. Darwin could also be threatened again.

"Perhaps Mr. Spender doesn't know that a very large proportion of the Javanese people favour agreement with the Dutch. They like the Dutch and acknowledge their past friendship. The militant minority and

the republican army is largely composed of the types who, in ancient times, formed the roving bands of armed bandits who lived on the loot extracted from unwary villagers. Javanese youth has always been attracted to these bands by the glamour and romance of banditry.

"These gangs of bandits were in existence right up to the Japanese occupation. The Dutch maintained special police units to keep them in check.

"During the war the Japanese, by romantic propaganda and special inducements, enlisted and armed these types. On V.P.-day, Soekarno took over the leadership of this ready-made mercenary army, and, with its aid, imposed his will on the people and the Dutch. "Merdeka" (Freedom), the Republican rallying-cry, appealed strongly to these types because it meant freedom from the Dutch police. The Linggadjati Agreement was broken by Soekarno because his bandit leaders would not consent to co-operation with the Dutch -- they wanted 'Merdeka' at once.

"A Dutch psychologist (Prof. Dr. P. M. Van Wulfften Palthe) defines these bandits as 'a group formation of a magical-mystic nature around a leader: a number of persons, resident at a certain district, who periodically go in for rampok. In Western terminology rampok might be described as robbery by a number of persons in combination, committed with violence or under threat of violence. The band is thus local in origin whilst its activities are widespread.'"

It seems that, in Ambon, Soekarno is practising rampok on an international scale. Meanwhile, U.N. is proud of its success in Korea, and Mr. Truman announces that the U.S.A. will oppose aggression wherever it might be. Well, it is at Ambon, now.

A King's Man or a World Stater?

Of course there is a plot. Of course it is a world plot. It is a world plot in the sense that its objectives can be defined, pin-pointed in world affairs, and the tactics of the plotters seen in every walk of life.

It can be defined as a plot to overthrow the sovereignty of the individual nations and combine them into a World State.

Any man, therefore, who for any cause whatsoever, advocates the abrogation of national sovereignty and participation in any form of United Nations alliance, is on the side of the plotters.

Any man who acts against the Constitution of his country, whether in the name socialism, or nationalisation, or national emergency seeking to replace Constitutional Law by Statutory Administration, is on the side of the plotters.

Any man who strives to impose censorship upon the Press, the radio, the stage, on any other means of public expression of opinion is on the side of the plotters.

Who the plotters are, though they are well known both by name and strategy, is immaterial. What is material is that no Christian — and this phrase is advisedly chosen — is on the side of the plotters. So far as Britons are concerned, there is but one counter measure, which we need pursue — again the word pursue was chosen advisedly. It is included in the phrase, which we used in this newsletter last week: "Fear God; honour the King."

At the beginning of this edition we said that three menacing trends are in motion simultaneously; we have contented ourselves with giving just a little evidence of that fact. We shall neglect these trends at our peril. The danger is not from wars, from atom or hydrogen bombs OR from Soviet Russia, or even the dreaded Koreans. It lies closer at home -- here in England in London, everywhere around us. You must make up your own mind. Either you are a King's man or a World Stater. You can't be both.

London Newsletter

DEMOCRACY

Canberra's formula for legislation is to waste the first weeks of a session on show-sparring and then pack all the real business into all-nighters, which shut out effective debate. Menzies is following the Chifley formula.

—Sydney Century, November 24.

The International Jew. . . 2/9

By Eric D. Butler

The most detailed commentary on The Protocols yet written. Packed full of explosive factual material.

The Mysterious Protocols. 2/9

Full text of "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion."

Second Thoughts on Migration

By J. T. Lang

Many people who were wildly enthusiastic about the migration scheme when launched by the Chifley Government are now having second thoughts on the subject. They are the same people who attacked me when I stated the case against unrestricted immigration in the last Parliament. They are now beginning to realise that those warnings were based on sound reasons in the national interest of this country.

The only argument adduced by the sponsors of the indiscriminate admission of displaced persons, of stateless persons, and of the surplus population of any European nation, was that this country needed more population for defence.

It was argued that we must populate or perish. So the answer to the defence problem was to be wholesale admissions. The new population was supposed to fill up the empty spaces. Then this country would no longer be attractive to any Asiatic nation with surplus millions and no means of subsistence. That was the theory.

But in practice how has it worked out? Have those admitted to this country since the war strengthened our armed defences, or have they imposed additional tax upon our resources?

Informed opinion now appears to be veering in the latter direction. The Minister for Migration, who is also Minister for Labor, last week, introduced the National Service Bill into Parliament. That Bill provides for compulsory call-up of youths when they reach the age of 18 for extended military training. They are to be the foundation of the new Australian defence forces, if Parliament passes the necessary legislation.

The Minister was most emphatic that it was to be universal training without any exemptions apart from conscientious grounds and the minor exemption for the coal mining industry. Every Australian youth is to be subject to call-up. The period of obligation is to extend to his 26th year. That is recognised as the best recruiting ages by the armed forces.

But what about the so-called New Australians? Are they to be subject to the provisions of the National Service Act? The Minister was forced to admit that, until such time as they take out nationalisation papers and become Australian citizens, they would not be subject to call-up.

International conventions prevent a nation conscripting the nationals of another country. So the New Australians will not be undergoing any defence training, unless they choose to enter on a voluntary basis. But, as training is to be extended, it is hardly likely that many of them would respond to a voluntary appeal. They could probably earn more money outside the armed forces.

That destroys entirely the idea that this country will be more secure, the more millions that we have. A country's defences can only be assessed in terms of its armed strength, not in terms of non-combatants. The higher the ration of civilians, the more vulnerable a country under normal circumstances.

Next we had the propaganda that the new millions would fill up the empty spaces. Now the same people are complaining that the newcomers are not being assimilated into the Australian community. They are

congregating in national settlements, preserving their original national identities and importing many of their Central European manners and customs. Instead of going into rural occupations, or even factories, we find that, as soon as their indentures are up, they tend to crowd into the cities. Sydney has its Bellevue Hill-Bondi foreign axis, and Melbourne its St. Kilda. Every Australian city is having the same experience.

Now we are told that the migrants threaten to reduce the standard of living for the average Australian citizen. In short, the rate of input is greater than can be absorbed in industry. Instead of improving the over-all housing position, they are making it worse.

Until such time as the Government can guarantee that the number of migrants admitted to this country will make provision for more houses than they require for themselves, they must represent an additional burden. If they get a new home, an Australian family has to go without.

The same applies to the cost of living. If we admit an additional 200,000 migrants in the course of a year, we must feed and clothe them unless they can feed and clothe themselves. It is not only a matter of earning capacity. They will all eat butter, drink milk, eat potatoes, sugar and every other commodity. Unless they immediately increase production of all those commodities by at least as much as they require, then they become an additional burden on production.

That means that the migrants will be taking value out of the Australian £. They will cause increases in prices by increasing demand for available goods. That means that, instead of living standards being improved, they will deteriorate.

We are also told that the sudden upsurge in population is placing a tax on our capital goods. We are unable to replace them quickly enough, especially those from dollar sources. The migrants reduce the average share of such goods. It is the same story all the way down the economic line. Yet the Government is talking glibly about this country reaching the 11 million mark by 1960. What will happen in the event of a world trade recession?

Then there is the added worry as to whether we have been successful in getting the best types. Recent incidents involving some of the newcomers have indicated that European countries are not allowing their best types to be included in migrant quotas. It is only natural that they should keep the cream. Crimes of violence are becoming all too common. Many are exceptionally good types. But the anxiety to build up numbers has no doubt led to inferior types being accepted. In addition, the problem of screening was impossible.

Had a Liberal Government been responsible for such an ill-balanced migration

scheme in the first instance, the Labor Party would have been up in arms long ago. It is ironic now to recall the campaign against the Hughes Government during the first World War, because it was alleged that it had imported a few Maltese. But the Chifley Government committed the Labor Movement, and that is why there are no protests. The second thoughts are coming from workers and the thinking section of the population, who are relying on their own personal observations. They are not happy at the general trend. Migration, instead of being a national asset, can become our greatest national handicap.

—Century, Dec. 1, 1950

How Canberra Spends Our Money

CANBERRA, Friday. —Canberra this week has again witnessed a spectacle, which should not be considered any less discreditable than in recent years because it sustains precedent.

The estimates on which Australia's record £700 million Budget was based were churned through the House of Representatives in less than 14 hours, to enable members to hurry home for Christmas.

The rate of voting the people's money averaged nearly £1 million a minute.

If what some members are euphoniously calling "the estimates debate" means anything, it must surely mean only that in spite of all the pious promises of economy and prudent expenditure made in Opposition and on the election platform, the Menzies Government, basically, is as cynically indifferent to the real control of public expenditure as the Chifley Government proved itself to be.

It is very certain that there will be no real economy in Federal accounts until it is an established practice for Parliament or a Parliamentary Committee, critically to survey in some detail the whole field of each year's public expenditure.

As matters now stand Ministers know that there will be no real scrutiny of what each department proposes to spend, and that it is as easy, or easier, to get away with extravagance as ever it was.

Worse, the Ministers, on the whole, are very much dependent on the senior officials of the public service for the size and shape of the departmental estimates.

Departmental chiefs have learned from pleasant experience that, for all Parliament is likely to know or care, they can write their own chits and serve them on the Treasury with no more danger of being caught out in acts of extravagance or ineptitude than of being struck by lightning.

When the Budget estimates ran around £60 million there was generally a somewhat searching debate of two or three weeks upon how the money was to be spent.

—Extract from "Capital Talk," by E. H. Cox, *The Herald*, Melbourne, December 8 1950.

D.S.C.M. WOMEN'S GROUP

(VIC)

Now Meets on
THE THIRD THURSDAY
of Every Month.
All interested are invited.

"New Times," January 12, 1951 — Page 3

THE NEW TIMES

Established 1935.

Published every Friday by New Times Limited, McEwan House,
343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Postal Address: Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU 2834.

Subscription Rates: 25/- Yearly; 13/- Half Yearly; 7/- Quarter.

VOL. 17.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1951.

No.2.

THE POLICY OF MONOPOLY

Late last year the Commonwealth Bank issued a directive to the trading banks which can only mean an intensification of the policy of monopoly. This totalitarian directive, the details of which have not been made public by Socialist planner, Dr. Coombs, has been issued under the powers conferred upon the Commonwealth Bank by the 1945 Banking Legislation. Apparently with the approval of Treasurer Fadden, Dr. Coombs is continuing the policy of Socialisation denounced so strongly by Mr. Menzies and his associates when they were in the Opposition.

Although the Commonwealth Bank talks about a "more selective credit policy to limit the inflationary effect of expenditure financed from bank advances, on goods generally and on capital goods in particular; the real meaning of its directive is that all small business organisations, who normally work on overdraft, must seek their financial requirements outside the banking system. While it is possible for the more highly centralised economic units, particularly public companies, to survive the Coombs directive, it is almost impossible for smaller units to do this.

The inevitable result can only be more economic centralism leading to more monopoly. As J. T. Lang pertinently states: "It is difficult to see what nationalisation of banking would have achieved that it (the Commonwealth Bank) is not in fact achieving under its present policy, approved by the present Government,"

The present Government is as much under the domination of the Socialist "experts" as was the Chifley Government. It is, however, heartening that a section of the Government parties are becoming increasingly concerned about the direction in which the Government is proceeding. With another Federal Election getting closer, an increased effort to influence rank and file Government members might produce a "show down" on the question of whether the Government is to honour its pre-election anti-Socialist promises.

The Late Mackenzie King

Since the death of the late Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King things have come to light, which may have some importance when historians a generation hence return their final verdict on him. He is shown to have left three-quarters of a million dollars, and to have enjoyed in later years at least the income of a millionaire, what with income from investments, salary and perquisites. This is not to suggest that his estate consisted largely of ill-gotten gains. It is merely to suggest that Mr. King was a much wealthier man than anybody supposed. It is not customary for Canadian Premiers to leave huge estates. The richest of them all was undoubtedly Lord Bennett, but he had the good luck to be bequeathed a match factory. Sir Robert Borden could earn large sums at the bar. But Mr. King was not a renowned barrister, nor the owner of a flourishing industry. He was, until he entered politics, a social worker, an upholder of the rights of labour, an enthusiast who sought to

better the lot of the poor man. The assumption that he was a poor man himself was not unreasonable; it was certainly unjustified. In addition, Mr. King sought to give the impression of straightened means. He apologised for the meagreness of the hospitality of Laurier House on the grounds that he could afford no better. Mr. King, to use an Irish expression, "made a poor mouth." We have been told by a spokesman for Mr. King that he was surprised, even "shocked," when on taking an inventory he discovered what a large estate he had somehow absent-mindedly been able to accumulate. The public was probably shocked, too, without supposing that Mr. King had used his office for private gain. The shock was occasioned merely by the discovery that Mr. King was not quite the sort of man he had been generally supposed to be. -TORONTO GLOBE AND MAIL (Canada), November 10, 1950.

Liberal-Socialism in W.A.

"A Certificate of Title to freehold land does not mean a thing in Western Australia if bureaucracy as represented by the Housing Commission decides otherwise," said Estates Development managing director J. D. K. Roche recently.

It's latest seizure of land along the Waneroo road numbers 33,000 quarter-acre building blocks (with the 7000 already seized). With 5 persons to a house they have enough to duplicate the population of Perth, roughly 200,000.

"What a great way to tie up a city into their hands for another 20 to 30 years!

"No one can even buy a bath now without a permit.

"What of the future when we have *this sovietising of the building industry!*

"What is the Liberal Government doing?

"What is the building industry doing about it?

"Hundreds of home builders who have bought or are buying land in this area and are ready to build, will now have to delay perhaps two years until the State Housing Commission has decided whether these people are to have any particular block or where they *are to be put (like Russia).*

"Some already have their foundations in.

"Let us have a Royal Commission as to whether suburban building developments *are to be sovietised or not*, and whether bureaucrats are to be given greater power.

"The fact is that some members of the Government are too weak to disagree with the bureaucrats in their departments.

"These seizures might even with the seizure of the lovely McLarty lands in Pinjarra for closer settlement.

"Labor if re-elected, will now have something to go on.

"Our company is being forced out of business by having land equal to 9300 quarter-acre lots seized. This land we have owned and developed over the last 20 years.

"The Housing Commission's method of seizure under price control is subject to great criticism.

"Owners of land are entitled not to the control price (based on 1942 values) but to the true value of the land when seized.

"Our company is prepared to lodge £1000 with the State Government to have a Royal Commission to examine whether the seizure of these tens of thousands of building blocks is necessary, and whether private enterprise and development is to be allowed to carry on, or whether sovietisation of *suburban housing is to be carried out* by the Liberal Government.

"What a lead for the Communists!"

—The Sunday Times (Perth), December 3
1950.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The article, which appeared in the issue of January 5th, entitled "The Objectives of Total War" is by C. H. Douglas, and originally appeared in the English journal "Sovereignty" in 1948.

Printed by W. and J. Barr, 105-7 Brunswick Street, Fitzroy, N.6, for New TIMES, Ltd., McEwan House, Melbourne, on whose authority these articles appear.

Communist Influence in America

(Continued from page 1)

Thereon the Committee, suspecting that its further inquiries might be impeded, published the material already accumulated. This seemed, in perusal, even more startling than the Canadian Report, and if its statements were true they appeared to bear out Mr. Mackenzie King's belief that "the situation" in the American Republic was even graver than the Canadian one. The witnesses heard by it included a Mr. Whittaker Chambers, until then a senior editor of the mass-circulation journal *Time*, who, from remorse, confessed to have been earlier a Soviet secret agent and courier. He said he had obtained, and forwarded to Moscow, secret papers of the highest importance to the American and other Allied Governments. He accused a high State Department (Foreign Office) official of Mr. Roosevelt's Administration (who was a member of that President's staff at the fateful Yalta meeting) of making these documents available to him. The official brought a libel action.

Truman Dodged Hiss Case.

At this stage President Truman called the affair "a red herring" and during other, later enquiries and disclosures; frequently and irritably used the same tone. In some instances, as judicial and other investigations were under way, these comments might have been held to amount to contempt of court in any other man. The President several times placed himself in this way between demands for investigation and the matters at issue.

Accused of libel, Mr. Chambers led detectives of a Grand Jury, which seemed to be slowly coming into the affair, and of the Un-American Committee, to his farm in Maryland, and to his pumpkin plot, where he pointed to one, the top of which had been sliced off and put back. Inside were found masses of microfilm photographs of secret documents about ' American and British tanks, aircraft and war vessels, and diplomatic reports covering many parts of the world. This proved that Mr. Chambers, as the investigating Committee of the House of Representatives stated, had, in fact, procured documents of the highest secrecy, from whatever source. As to that, the appeal of the official concerned, from a conviction in the first instance, pends as I write.

"Suicide" of Officials.

Five days later a Mr. Laurence Duggan, also a State Department official during President Roosevelt's time, fell to his death from the sixteenth storey of an office building in New York. The Un-American Committee forthwith released material showing that he had also been accused of complicity in these matters. The acting chairman of the Un-American Committee suspected murder, and so did an eminent colleague of President Roosevelt, Mr. Sumner Welles, who said: "I find it impossible to believe that his death was self-inflicted." I know of no inquiry arising from these suspicions that Mr. Duggan was murdered. The matter seems to have been passed over.

Within a few months a Minister for Defence, barely resigned, and two officials of the American Foreign Service (the second was Press Attaché at Santiago, in Chile, and his death may or may not have been connected with these matters) died through falling from high windows, while three

other high officials or former officials, of various Departments, justly or unjustly accused in this or similar affairs, died suddenly; one was found in the river with his throat cut, and another committed suicide in the Justice Building. During this period many other disclosures or charges were made, relating to espionage in government departments or to conditions in the atomic research plants. If these reached juries, the verdicts were usually of guilty; if congressional committees examined them, they were generally pronounced empty. A broad picture emerged of secret and subversive influences working through the organisations of the American Republic. A persistent effort to conceal this was equally visible.

The various incidents I have enumerated formed a series of disclosures which, at any former time in almost any country, would presumably have led to an irresistible public demand for complete investigation, exposure and the determination of responsibility into which public debate had fallen in the American Republic in the years following the Roosevelt era, it appeared possible, at any rate for a long period, to confuse the issues in the public mind by the intensive "smearing," through the press and radio, of any who pressed for full inquiry and exposure. Nevertheless, there was always someone who would not be deterred, and this led, at the end of 1949, to the most remarkable disclosure of all.

Was Hopkins Russian Agent?

A former American Air Force officer, a Mr. George Racey Jordan, who, during the war, was Lend-Lease Inspector at Great Falls, Montana, whence Lend-Lease aircraft were flown to Moscow, stated publicly in a radio interview that in 1943 and 1944 substantial quantities of atom bomb compounds and uranium were sent to the Soviet Communist Government. He further averred that, becoming suspicious of the large amount of baggage which Soviet officers were carrying in these aeroplanes, he had a search made and discovered a large quantity of highly secret American State Department documents, in carbon copy or photostat facsimile, from each of which the stamp "secret, confidential or restricted" had been cut away. In one suitcase, he alleged, was a letter on White House notepaper with the name of Mr. Harry Hopkins (who lived at the White House) printed on it. This letter, he stated, contained the words, "I had a hell of a time getting these away from Groves." ("These" referred to the secret documents; General Groves, who at that time was in charge of atom bomb research, was the officer who told the Un-American Activities Committee after the war that he was debarred by Presidential veto from testifying before it about espionage.)

Mr. Jordan further stated, in this broadcast statement, that Mr. Harry Hopkins instructed him to expedite certain freight shipments to Soviet Russia, to say nothing about them, even to his superior officer, and to keep no record of them. He said, "Mr. Hopkins was the button the Russians touched every time they needed emergency help." Mr. Jordan's statements did not receive the full and public investigation, which their gravity seemed to demand; they were scouted and he was "smeared." They

lead to two fascinating fields of thought.. .

The first is this: At the time the atom bomb compounds, uranium and information were being sent to Soviet Russia, at Mr. Harry Hopkin's prompting (if Mr. Jordan's statements are correct), the public at large had not even heard of atom bombs. The thing happened in 1943 and 1944, if it happened. The public first learned of the atom bomb when it was dropped in September 1945. The initial research work was done by British scientists and the results of this were transferred to the American Republic by Mr. Winston Churchill under his sovereign empowerment of the war. Presumably he thought that his own country would benefit by the American development of atomic research, and apparently he was wrong, because, in 1949 (when I was in the United States), the British Government requested access to information and experiments and seems to have been denied this; at any rate, those American columnists who had been clamouring for the Soviet Government to be given all atomic information at once joined in the chorus that "the atomic secrets must be nailed down." Presumably, also, Mr. Churchill thought that the further development of those atomic mysteries, which he entrusted to America, would remain secret from the Soviet Government, and, for that matter, from all other countries, for some time after the war's end he declared that exclusive American possession of the atom bomb was the one solid guarantee of continuing peace. He seems again to have been wrong, for the secret originally yielded up by Britain to America, was by then no longer in exclusive American possession.

Uranium Exports to Russia.

That appears to be a fact, irrespective of the accuracy or inaccuracy of Mr. Jordan's statements, for no sooner were they made than the American State Department (apparently prompted by them to these charges) announced that in 1943 (two years before the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima) four export licences were granted for shipping uranium compounds to the Soviet Government. That was in 1943. From the first public appearance of the atom bomb in 1945 until 1949 leading politicians in America and other countries were telling their peoples that peace was only safe while the atom bomb remained a secret in American keeping, and would become insecure when the Soviet, despite this secrecy, of its own ingenuity solved atomic mysteries. Late in 1949 President Truman suddenly announced that the Soviet "has the atom bomb." If readers of *From Smoke to Smother* were puzzled by a somewhat ironical, or even flippant note in my references to contemporary debate about The Absolute Weapon, they may now see the reason. All students of the Roosevelt era shrewdly suspected these things, which are now coming to light piece by piece. Seldom in the course of human events have the realities been so different from the appearances, or the facts of what was going on from the official statements.

Treachery at Yalta.

The second field of reflection now opened to public survey by Mr. Jordan's statements is larger still and even more interesting.

(Continued on page 8)



Malnutrition in the Midst of Plenty

Dr. Ehrenfried Pfeiffer, a Swiss-born agricultural scientist, with wide experience of farming conditions in Europe and the U.S., addressed a large and intensely interested audience at the Caxton Hall, on July 13, at the conclusion of his recent visit to this country. As befitted the title of his address, "Can Farming Save Itself—and the World?" he emphasised that agriculture, as the great creative occupation common to all mankind, had a deep philosophical significance and could, if rightly used, do much to ease international tensions.

But he laid stress on right usage. Among the many striking points he made was the information that the American people, though probably the best-fed nation in the world as regards quantities and variety, were suffering from serious dietary deficiencies, more especially in vitamins and minerals. These deficiencies originated in faulty farming; the International Harvester Company had discovered that American soils were becoming so run-down that, in 20 years, farmers would no longer be able to afford to buy machinery.

As a biologist, said Dr. Pfeiffer, he saw the soil, not from a technical or a business angle, but as the bearer and supporter of life. It was the capital of our life. Yet it was characteristic of human beings that they liked to spend as little as possible on the necessities of life.

The greatest deficiency in modern agriculture was human. The American farm population had shrunk in fifty years from 35 percent to 12 percent of the total population. It was said that increasing mechanisation helped the farmer to be more efficient. But it did not take away burdens—it added to them. Under present economic conditions, a mainly dairy farm of 150 acres in the States had to be run, with the help of mechanisation, by two human beings. That meant a 12-hour day and a 7-day week, which physically precluded any creative thought on the part of the farmer. There existed research stations and advisory agencies to tell the farmer what to think and do; but they could not help that kind of farmer.

Existing fertiliser theory was one-sided; it worked on poor soils, but not on fertile soils rich in life. And it was fertile soils, which we wanted. Shortage of a single element, including the trace elements, could destroy the health of a soil and its crops. Mineral deficiencies were directly associated with biological imbalance. It was no use adding this or that element to the soil; they had to be assimilated. That was the big point, which the N.P.K. (nitrogen-phosphorus-potassium) theory had missed.

The organic movement was trying to correct this mistake, now acknowledged by many scientists, by insisting on the idea of the soil as a living entity.

Deficiencies and Neurosis

Dr. Pfeiffer went on to say that one of the commonest deficiencies was in magnesium; he had seen much evidence of it during his tour of England and Scotland. It led to deficiencies of chlorophyll and protein in plants; in humans the symptoms were fatigue, nervousness and a general inability to cope with the problems of modern life. There was surely some significance in the fact that more beds in American hospitals were occupied by mental cases than by all other diseases put together. At their laboratory at Spring Valley, New York,

—*Rural Economy* (England), they used white mice for testing foods; they were sensitive little animals, who soon showed by their behavior when they were upset. One group fed on wheat and weeds grown on organic manures alone had remained perfectly peaceful throughout the experiment, whereas another group, fed on apparently similar foods grown with artificial fertilisers, had fought to the death. Fighting was always a symptom of a deficiency; he commended the idea to the United Nations.

The outward appearance of foods was often misleading, said Dr. Pfeiffer. One day a scientist friend brought him a carrot and told him to look at it. It seemed a perfectly normal carrot in colour, size and texture. His friend asked him to analyse it. He did so and was astonished to find that it contained no carotene whatever, and therefore no vitamin A. Yet it is precisely for this vitamin that the consumption of carrots is widely recommended by the medical profession and nutritionists. Such revelations helped to explain how it was that 20,000 people in Los Angeles, one of the richest cities in the U.S., were found to be suffering from malnutrition as severe as that in Holland after the German occupation.

Importance of Wholeness

The great German poet, Goethe, said Dr. Pfeiffer, in conclusion, had taught that the whole is more than the sum total of the parts. Wherever we could do an analysis, there had been a synthesis. Why could we not recognise that there is a Creative Mind at work in Nature, and that all we can achieve, even including the atom bomb, is by comparison amateurish in the extreme?

He had himself been a farmer, working with his own hands, and his opinion was that the first step towards rescuing the soil and its food products from their state of deficiencies was to rescue the farmer from a life of drudgery. The farmer had to earn money in order to live and farm.

But farming was much more than a moneymaking proposition; it was a calling of deep responsibility, for on the farmer's ability to work with Nature depended the well being of all other human beings. Yet no college or university had ever taught him agriculture as a philosophy of life; he and countless other farmers had had to learn that the hard way, through their mistakes. Only by developing such a philosophy could they save farming and so save civilisation by showing that human beings need not be degraded to slaves of machinery or merely intelligent animals.

The chair was taken by Mr. Rolf Gardiner, who spoke of the progressive deterioration-taking place throughout the world—not only the visible erosion of soils, but also the consequent debility of human beings, leading to lack of purpose and belief. He quoted Archbishop Temple to the effect that a farmer who looks after his land but forgets to pray, serves God better than one who prays but neglects his land. After Dr. Pfeiffer had spoken, the meeting was also addressed by Lord Portsmouth and Lady Eve Balfour.

September, 1950.
—*Rural Economy* (England)

Farmers Fear Wool Tax May "Spread"

All primary producers might ultimately be brought within the scope of the Wool Sales Deduction Act, a primary producers' leader said today.

This 20 percent "wool grab" established a precedent which might spread and embrace the cattle grower, the vice-president of the Australian Wool and Meat Producers' Federation, Mr. G. E. Humphreys, said.

He said that the legislation, which appeared to be valid, was regarded as most dangerous to all primary producers.

The Federal Treasury would reap £103 million in advance from woolgrowers. This would be expended in meeting the present £730 million budget.

Mr. Humphreys said that, having expended this amount of next year's income, it would be necessary to enlarge the scope of the act and so gain further funds.

The act would defeat the Queensland Government's efforts to encourage new development within the grazing industry, because it would cut off most of the existing surplus finance now used for this purpose.

—Melbourne Herald November 21.

The primary producers' fears are well grounded. Once a policy of totalitarianism is set in motion, it progressively gains momentum, and because more and more destructive of individual rights and liberties. Totalitarianism can best be defeated by ensuring that it never starts. The price of liberty is still eternal vigilance.

Organic Farming Is a Whole

Julian Herbert

Objections to organic farming are often based on disparagement of a single feature, detached from its place in the system as a whole. I have tried, therefore, in the following notes to emphasise the essential unity and purpose of that system in such a way as to be helpful to other members when they encounter such criticism.

The basic principle of organic farming is the natural nourishment of soil, plant and animal, as opposed to the now general practices of feeding the plant direct with artificial fertilisers and the animal with concentrated feeding-stuffs. These methods I will define, for the sake of convenience, as "orthodox farming."

All the practices involved in organic farming are directed towards the one objective I have mentioned. They are chiefly: Sub-soiling, shallow cultivations, composting, the four-year ley with deep-rooting legumes and herbs, and self-sufficiency as regards seeds and feeding-stuffs. These are not individually, or in themselves, necessarily good things; but when combined, they form the essentials for the natural feeding of the soil, plant and animal.

For example, sub-soiling, to be of value, presupposes the subsequent use of deep-rooting plants to bring into circulation the minerals made available by breaking up the sub-soil, after which the need for mechanical sub-soiling diminishes. Shallow cultivation, similarly, presupposes the existence of an ample humus supply, with the accompanying bacteria, earthworms and other denizens of the soil, through whose activities the texture and aeration of the soil is maintained. Composting, again, the four-year ley and mixed grazing are closely inter-related, and are designed to maintain the fertility of the soil by restoring to it, in natural, balanced form, what has come from it.

Finally, self-sufficiency presupposes the production on the farm of organically virile seed and feeding-stuffs.

Now, in orthodox farming, the plant is fed direct with artificials, and livestock largely with concentrates, while specialisation, or even monoculture, is common. The ideas behind these practices are not fundamentally dissimilar from those behind soil-less culture. The soil is regarded merely as the medium for holding the plant in position and retaining the fertilisers applied. As these fertilisers must be in solution if they are to be available to the plant, adequate water at all times becomes essential for it to continue growth.

In such circumstances, where the soil is deficient in humus, bacteria and earthworms, there would be no virtue in shallow cultivations, since there would be no fear of burying the humus or soil organisms, while the artificials will function just as well with the soil upturned. In fact, under such conditions, it is more than probable that deep ploughing would produce better results, since it would provide the aeration of the soil that is not being carried out by natural agents.

The full benefits of composting, the four-year ley and grazing as fertilising agents are not achieved by orthodox farming, since

the manure from livestock fed on concentrates will be deficient in certain essential minerals and if there is only one, or possibly two, types of animal grazed (as often happens on dairy or poultry farms), the varying manurial value of mixed livestock with different digestive processes will be lost. A rotation of grazing is as essential as is a rotation of cropping.

There is likewise no virtue in using one's own seed or feeding-stuffs in orthodox farming because, generally speaking, they will be of no greater virility than any other. Indeed, it is often advisable to obtain new seed from a more invigorating climate.

In orthodox farming, the farmer, having taken over from Nature the responsibility for feeding his crops, must take over also all the other duties normally carried out naturally. He must plough his soil deeply to aerate it and break it down; he must dress his seed to save it from fungoid attack because it lacks natural resistance. Similarly, he must spray and dust his crops, vaccinate and inoculate his cattle; otherwise, should he fail to provide his own man-made substitute for every normal natural process, the crop or livestock will suffer. The individual operations of organic farming—for example, shallow cultivations—are no more adaptable to orthodox farming than would be, say, crop spraying to organic farming, and would produce no more success.

One has first to decide the basic question: "Am I going to feed my soil, plants and animals naturally or artificially?" The answer determines exactly what techniques must be adopted to produce satisfactory results. The two methods cannot be mixed.

Where the factors involved in organic husbandry are fully understood and translated into practice, farming is simplified; for there is eliminated the impossible task of endeavouring to "balance" artificial fertilisers to meet a variety of differing requirements, and the equally difficult task of "balancing" concentrated feeding-stuffs to suit the complicated digestive and productive systems of animals.

Natural feeding, moreover, produces a state of health that removes the need for continually diagnosing the causes of failure, and the continual search for, and use of, artificial antidotes against such failure.

—Mother Earth.

Organic Manure Superior to Chemicals

"In long-continued experiments at Woburn and Rothamstead in England it has been found that stable manure has maintained the fertility of the soil over much longer periods than has the use of chemical fertilisers containing nitrogen, potash, phosphorus, and sulphur."

—*Soils and Men*, U.S. Department of Agriculture Year Book, 1938.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

(Lectures and Studies Section)

ASSOCIATE EXAMINATION

The next examination for the Diploma of Associate will be held in March 1951. Entries for this will close January 31st, 1951.

The books set for special study this year are:—

- Realistic Constitutionalism.
- The Realistic Position of the Church of England.
- States, Real, Actual and Potential.

Students wishing to take the examination can obtain fuller particulars from:—

Miss G. MARSDEN
(Representative in Australia),
6 Harden Road, Artarmon, N.S.W.

COMPOST

For Garden Plot Or Thousand Acre Farm

By F. H. Billington, N.D.A., N.D.D.

Here is the very book for the gardener or farmer who has had no previous introduction to the subject of compost making. It is a most comprehensive survey of the whole subject of organic farming and gardening. Price 7/10, post-free.

-Order from New Times Ltd.
Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

BOOKLETS BY

ROBERT H. WILLIAMS

(Published in U.S.A.)

FEPC AND THE MINORITY MACHINE —The Conquest of American Cities

2A (postage 2d.)

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE and Its Use in the World Communist Offensive

2/6 (postage 2d.)

THE UNTOLD STORY OF STATE MEDICINE

2/- (postage 2d.)

Now available from

NEW TIMES LTD., Box 1226L, G.P.O.,
MELBOURNE.

A Patriot's Policy

Few subjects have aroused, in our circle, such constructive comment as our observations upon the trend towards an international army. Captain Bernard Acworth, D.S.O., R.N., author and war-time naval correspondent, laid down a positive strategy for Great Britain in our office, a policy which he argues is not only strategically sound, but falls within our economic capabilities. Here is a verbatim report of his statement: —

"What to me is the most astonishing feature of the current world revolution (in the prosecution of which British politicians of all parties have been, and still are, as active as those of all other nations, not excluding the U.S.S.R.), is the total absence of any criticism in the House of Commons, in the Press, or on public platforms of our international military strategy. For the third time in this disastrous century, we are turning our backs on our historic maritime defence strategy, as economical as it was almost bloodless, to pursue what Commander Bowles has aptly described as international 'mud and blood' or 'bomb and bombast' policy. This 20th century strategy has brought, not peace, but universal devastation and misery, as well as economic ruin for ourselves.

"Closely associated with this revolutionary and bloody strategy, and the alleged justification for it, is the insane doctrine initiated by Litvinoff and catastrophically championed by such political strategists as Churchill and Shinwell, that war and peace are 'indivisible.' How politicians of all parties have been able to impose so fantastic and revolutionary a doctrine upon our once free land, without a whisper of criticism, or so much as a mention in the recent sham-fight called the General Election, I will not here discuss; all that need be said is that it manifestly has a conspira-

torial basis. What is of immediate importance, if our final ruin by incorporation into a World State is to be avoided, is that our foreign policy and the strategy appropriate thereto shall be freed and reversed without delay, and restored from an International 'mud and blood' basis to an essentially British maritime basis.

"This involves: (a) Repudiation before the world of strategic bombing, whether of atomic or saturation variety, as a means of waging war; (b) an end to British participation in Continental soldiering; (c) the abolition of conscription; (d) the full restoration of British sea power in strength and influence; (e) the establishment of a British air force on an ordinary defensive basis; (f) the maintenance of a small, regular army, equipped appropriately for garrisoning our island, and our overseas naval bases; (g) the cessation of the revolutionary policy of 'manning' the fighting services with women.

"With such a defensive system, we, and the Dominions, would be secure from invasion and as secure as it is possible to be from enemy bombing — and free for a change to mind our own business which, in all conscience, needs minding. Such a policy would cost hundreds, instead of thousands of millions, and greatly ease our dependence on internationally controlled foreign oil. Furthermore, it would spare other nations from repetition of their ghastly experience of 'Liberation by Devastation'—a fear that is over-shadowing their very natural dislike of temporary foreign occupation.

"Sea power, restored and carefully employed, can once again become the greatest human means of saving the freedom of all nations, and not least important, of our own."

—London Newsletter.

THE FARM EXCHANGE

(J. E. Harding & A. E. Webb)

If you should think of coming to Central Queensland to live, we shall be glad to advise upon, and assist you to find, Farming, Grazing, Business or House Property. We are Farm Specialists, both having had extensive practical farm experience. Write to us about your needs. Social Creditors will be very welcome. Central Queensland has much to commend it.

THE FARM EXCHANGE

Real Estate Agents, Auctioneers, Valuers.

DEN HAM ST., ROCKHAMPTON, C.Q.

Phone 3763.

After Hours 3199 and 2161.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN AMERICA

(Continued from page 5)

Mr. Harry Hopkins was President Roosevelt's chief counsellor at the Yalta Conference. The nature of the advice he gave is available for all to read, in his own handwriting or in his own notes. The Yalta conference was the fourth decisive event of this century. The first two were the establishment of the Communist State and the Balfour Declaration; the Reichstag Fire and the Yalta Conference cleared the way for the expansion of the Communist State and the erection of the Zionist State. At Yalta the scenes were set for the third act of the melodrama, for the second half of the century, for the continued pursuit of these two ambitions, in peace and war, to the point where they meet in the servile World State. President Roosevelt was so close to death that he may not have understood all that was done at Yalta; by his own words, he did not understand the Plan for Germany when he initialed it. Thus the personality of his chief adviser there, who was also so near to death, becomes of great interest to the future historian, and if Mr. Jordan's statements should not be publicly disproved, a wide area of surmise is left open.

These were the things, I found in course of study that caused my American friends to fear that, despite its outward power and wealth, the American Republic was in de-

USE ENWITE specialities

TEXIT waterproofing compound.

SOLVIT paint remover. No difficult neutralization.

AQUALAC wood putty. For good class Cabinetwork.

BRYNAC. The enamel for *resisting* water, acids and alkalis.

FERROSOL. Rust killing paint. In all colours.

RUSTEX. For removing rust from motor bodies and metal work.

THERMEX. Silver paint. Can be made red hot without discolouring or coming off.

Manufactured by:

ENWITE PTY. LTD.

84-86 Cromwell Street,
Collingwood, Vic.

PHONE: JA5967

CODNER BROS.

Builders and Joinery Manufacturers

HOMES AND HOME SITES AVAILABLE

Wheatsheaf Rd GLENROY

cline, its energies were being used to further exterior causes, and the patriots were not strong enough to stop this.

The young republic seems to be caught, like other countries, between the pringers of Soviet Communism and Political Zionism, the revolutionary power and the money power, of advisers in high places and infiltrators at lower levels. The method was implicit in Theodor Herzl's words: "When we sink we become a revolutionary proletariat; when we rise there rises also our terrible power of the purse" (a Jewish State). It is dangerous for the American Republic, and dangerous for the world, because in the third act the world will not be able to judge for what real aims the power of the Republic is being used.