

THE NEW TIMES

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

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

VOL. 24, No. 8

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

MAY 9, 1958

EDITORIAL

MR. MENZIES AND THE MENACE OF CONCENTRATED POWER

Recent revelations concerning the continued growth of the Federal bureaucracy have caused the Prime Minister to make warnings about the threat of concentrating power at Canberra. As it is difficult to believe that Mr. Menzies is so ignorant of realities that he does not realize that the very financial and economic policies being imposed by his Government make the progressive centralization of power inevitable, the only conclusion to be reached is that Mr. Menzies is attempting to shift the blame from the Government to the people. This is not the first time Mr. Menzies has attempted this. In spite of his specific promise at the 1949 Federal Elections that he would take steps to "put the shillings back in the pound," he subsequently tried to suggest that it was "lack of restraint" by the electors that was responsible for inflation continuing.

If Mr. Menzies really is worried about the destruction of the Federal system, he can take steps to remove his worries. Or are the economic planners, the generals of the bureaucratic army, so powerful that Mr. Menzies is not prepared to try and move against them? Whatever the truth of the matter, Mr. Menzies insults the intelligence of electors when he tells them that they are causing power to be centralised by their demands on the Federal Government. He tells electors that they should do more to help themselves. Electors would be willing to help themselves if they had control of their own financial credit. But Mr. Menzies and his Government have such a monopoly of finance in Australia that State Governments, Local Governments and the people are progressively dominated by Canberra.

The first major blow at the Federal system in Australia was struck when the Financial Agreement prior to the Great Depression placed the States at the mercy of the Local Council. Mr. Menzies will no doubt recall that he was a member of the Victorian Government at that time and made some very strong comments upon the manner in which the States had been deprived of a major part of their financial sovereignty. The same Mr. Menzies made similar strong remarks when the Labor Government continued Uniform Taxation after the war. He made numerous statements pointing out that a Federal Taxation monopoly was another major blow at the Federal system. But the same Mr. Menzies has used every possible excuse to avoid handing the States back their taxing powers. He has provided one more example of the truth of the great Lord Acton's

warning that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. The major instrument of centralised control in Australia is the banking system. When the Labor Government introduced its 1945 banking legislation in order to centralise still further the centralised control of credit in Australia, once again Mr. Menzies waxed warm on the menace of centralised power. Here was a further step towards the creation of the Socialist State. But when Mr. Menzies came to office he did nothing whatever to undo what the Labor Government had done. A few administrative changes have been made while leaving Dr. Coombs, the Socialist planner, in control of credit policy. Mr. Menzies has proved the truth of his famous pronouncement early in the war years, that he was a "practical Socialist", that the electors would accept from him what they would not accept from the Labor Party. He also said that the extreme policy of today became the commonplace of tomorrow.

The Federal system in Australia will be restored and strengthened only when there is a real decentralisation of power back to State Governments, Local Governments and the people. There is no difficulty in putting forward specific proposals to achieve this objective. But nothing will be done until sufficient responsible members of the community make it clear to Mr. Menzies and all Federal politicians that they are tired of verbal gymnastics which are designed to try and persuade the electors that they are responsible for the growth of the Monopoly State. They are responsible in one sense only: that they listen apathetically to the promises of Federal politicians instead of realizing that they

(Continued on page 4)

ERIC BUTLER IN SOUTH AND WEST AUSTRALIA

Mr. Eric Butler returns to Melbourne today after a most successful visit to South Australia and West Australia. A full report of this tour will appear in the next Action Group Bulletin issued with the next issue of *The New Times*. Mr. Butler leaves for Sydney and Brisbane next month.

NEWS SECTION

Eisenhower Advised By Baruch: Following Mr. Bernard Baruch's recent testimony before the American Senate Finance Committee, when this influential Zionist advocated higher taxation, President Eisenhower commented that he had read a great deal of Baruch's testimony about the American recession, that he has long respected Baruch's opinions, and that he takes his advice seriously. President Eisenhower knows, of course, that he would not be the American President today if it were not for the support given by Baruch and his colleagues.

Although it is probably true that President Eisenhower is an ignoramus concerning economic and financial matters, he must be aware that the growing American recession can only be halted by an expansion of individual purchasing power. He is "reluctantly" signing Bills from Congress, which are designed to deal with the recession by mammoth public works such as new highways.

Now the policy of expanding the volume of new credits through public works and any other form of capital development must, under present financial rules, intensify the development of inflation. Mr. Bernard Baruch in his advice made the significant point that "Inflation is the most important economic fact of our time." Is the stage being prepared in the U.S.A. for a rapid intensification of inflation as a preliminary to accepting Mr. Baruch's "advice" concerning further centralised controls?

"The International Jew": Between the years 1920 and 1922, Mr. Henry Ford, Sr., caused to be published in the *Dearborn Independent* (official organ of the Ford Motor Co.) a series of articles under the heading "The International Jew." Later this series was bound together into a single volume. Organized Jewry carried on a terrific campaign of pressure against Mr. Ford and the Ford Motor Co. The campaign resulted in physical threats, boycotts, campaigns of character assassination, etc. Under pressure from partners and relatives, the book was

withdrawn from circulation and a so-called apology by Mr. Ford was published. Some years later, Mr. Ford told Gerald L. K. Smith personally that he had never signed the apology, but that it was signed by an employee named Harry Bennett. After Mr. Ford's death, Mr. Bennett wrote a book entitled *We Called Him Henry* in which he corroborated Mr. Ford's statement to Mr. Smith. He admitted that being an artist he had learned how to capture Mr. Ford's signature perfectly, and for the sake of the family and the business he had signed Mr. Ford's name to the apology.

—*The New Letter* (Washington).

Colombo Plan Criticised: Further evidence confirming the repeated criticism levelled against the Colombo Plan by those with first hand knowledge, has been provided by Australian sheep man R. E. G. Cunningham who spent four years in Pakistan for the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization. In reply to the usual nonsense in which Mr. R. G. Casey specializes, Mr. Cunningham states:

"To date, not one Pakistani has got one more spoonful of food in his mouth or one more garment on his back as a result of agricultural aid under the Colombo Plan," said Cunningham.

"This, despite the fact that Australia has poured £8,000,000 into Pakistan over the past eight years."

He said that 215 tractors worth about £3,000 each, and huge ploughs and combines sent from Australia would never be used on Pakistani farms.

"The Pakistani farmer ploughs with two bullocks yoked to a wooden plough the same as he did 1,000 years ago.

"Each farm consists of only a few acres and the farming land is all divided into small plots surrounded by low earth banks to hold the rainwater.

"If we gave the farmer a steel tip for his wooden plough we would be doing more good than sending him expensive tractors that are now rusting white elephants."

Mr. Cunningham's facts will, of course, be ignored by those power groups using Australians to help impose mass industrialization upon the Asians and thus help prepare them for Communism. One of the most tragic aspects of this matter is the way in which the Christian Churches have uncritically accepted the propaganda about the Colombo Plan.

(Continued on page 3)

WORK IS A MEANS, NOT AN END

It is idle to quote the dictum: "If a man will not work neither shall he eat." Such a dictum can only, in reason, be made to apply in the case of a community which depends on the labours of its members to produce a sufficiency for all: in such a case it is only fair that the member who will not work should be the one to go short. Unfortunately, however, the word 'work' has been given a moral connotation wholly inapplicable. For work is a means, not an end in itself; and while, in cases, moral judgment may be passed on the end for which one works, to apply such a judgment to work itself is to confuse the means with the end, and to make a virtue of a necessity. But the result of such a judgment has been to give the 'worker'—as understood and determined by the Labour and all Leftist parties—an undeserved prestige to which, nevertheless, it should be noted, no privilege is attached or allowed; for should he be displaced by some mechanistic device he becomes dependent on the state. Indeed he is at all times dependent, either on a job if he can find one, or on the state if he cannot, and it denotes a certain measure of realism on the part of the 'worker' that he refers to his work as a 'job,' since he knows quite well that the end of the work for him is and must be the pay packet. He is in fact and perforce a mercenary. It may be retorted here that the businessman, the industrialist, the 'wicked profiteer,' who employs the 'worker,' is also a mercenary. And in the sense that, and in those cases in which, with all the cards stacked against him, his living depends upon his making a profit, this is of course true.

By contrast the privilege that pertains to the privileged class, referred to by the 'worker' as 'the idle rich' lies in the fact that its members are free to choose the end and nature of the work they do, and to seek and find satisfaction therein. Their security and freedom are based upon the surety and security of a free income, whether acquired from their own past endeavours and savings, or from that of their forebears, based in short, on an inheritance. But the common, the national inheritance and its beneficial results of freedom and leisure, due to man's many inventions and discoveries, is denied to man. It has been filched from him, not for the sake of its material and cultural benefits which could be made accessible to all; but for the sake of that power with the intention to destroy man body and soul, and at the last to gain complete dominion over him, and which perforce must forever be the sworn enemy of man's freedom and leisure. The plan to establish a World Government should make this clear

THE NEW TIMES

and nothing could serve this plan better than to attribute the destruction of man's soul to mechanisation, for it helps to preserve the anonymity of the real perpetrators. Further, the policy of Full Employment is perfect for their purpose. Although such a policy must clash with the increasing and continuing rate of mechanisation and must, inevitably, be the cause of tension and conflict, no one questions it. Those who are free from the tyranny of such a policy, either from a jealous dislike of seeing their privilege extended to all, or through sheer stupidity, fail to see the inroads made upon their own freedom, by means of the many devious methods of taxation and inflation, with the intent to reduce them also, in the end, to the level of paid 'workers,' or state dependants. Even the scientists who pride themselves on their fidelity to facts and reality make no protest. So there is no need for brainwashing and propaganda to induce people to accept such a policy, it works, as it were automatically. Also, ironically enough, mechanisation can be drawn in to serve its purpose by putting it to the use of grandiose schemes and projects, not in the interests of man's well-being, but to foster man's pride, and create the need for a multiplicity of agents and employees to further them, and thus maintain the fiction of the need for Full Employment.

—B. C. Best in *The Social Creditor*

NEWS SECTION

(Continued from page 2)

The Jews in Russia: The Communist *Guardian*, Melbourne, in its issue of March 20, features an article on the prominence of Jewish scientists in Soviet Russia. Figures given from the journal, *Problems of Philosophy*, published by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, reveal that there are two million Jews in Russia, or one percent of the total population. However, 10.8 percent of the total number of scientists are Jews. *Problems of Philosophy* states: "These new figures show how spurious are the recent 'reports' about discrimination against Jews in Soviet Universities. The only 'discrimination', if it can be called that, seems to be in favour of Jews".

All the available evidence indicates that Jewish influence in Soviet Russia is as strong as ever.

Bertrand Russell: Knave Or Fool? Those who control the world's news agencies never cease to ensure that the views of Bertrand Russell are given the widest possible publicity. Anyone who doubts

(Continued on page 4.)

NEWS SECTION

(Continued from page 3)

that Russell is one of the "greatest living philosophers" is, of course, an "illiterate" and "reactionary." At the risk of having these and similar swear words hurled at us, we draw attention to the fact that this great "intellectual" now believes that it is preferable for the West to submit to conquest by the Communist Powers rather than risk destruction by nuclear weapons. We understand that Bertrand Russell is now nearing the end of his life, so presumably is not distressed by the thought of Western Christendom under Communist control.

When the "genius" of Bertrand Russell is extolled, it might be recalled that only a short time ago he was calling for the atom bombing of Russia to force the Communists into World Government. Only twelve months ago he was supporting nuclear weapons as "a real deterrent." But now he is not concerned about deterring the Communists. Perhaps this is understandable when he makes the claim that Lenin was the greatest man of his own times. Can Science Save Us? "With the new demand, based on a concern for political survival, for engineering and scientific studies, the Liberal will receive, it seems clear, even less and less attention. May it be once for all interred? We want science to save us, is the cry; we must have more and better scientists than the Communists in Russia have—that, or we perish. Perhaps this presents the simple practical situation. But as Josef Pieper says in his remarkable little book *Leisure*, it is a question of what, with the liberal diminished or even deleted, we the survivors would be and of what our surviving civilisation would be."

—*Modern Age*, U.S.A.

Dangers Of Race Mixing: Biologically, human beings are animals. Yet it is generally recognised that one does not breed extreme variants of a common species to advantage, such as a cross between an Aberdeen Angus bull and a cow from a Bantu kraal. Surely it is the same with men.

The unassailable proof of this argument lies in the vast differences between North America and South and Central America. The colonisation of both continents by Europeans began at the same time; both contain vast mineral wealth; both contain areas of extreme climate. Yet North America has left South and Central America (with the exception of European-dominated Argentina and Chile) far behind in almost all forms of progress, whether it be industrial development, standard of life or, to a less extent, literature, music and the arts. The only

major reason that *can* explain this great difference is that whereas the European settlers in North America, up until recent times, have mostly only married amongst themselves, the Spaniards and Portuguese in South and Central America mated indiscriminately with both native Indians and later the Negro slaves, with very few exceptions. A further lesson to be drawn from this analogy of North and South America is that, far from achieving the millennium of lasting peace that is prophesied by advocates of "One World, One Race," racial intermixture, from the examples of the Central and South American republics, produces perpetual riots, revolutions and civil wars.

—John Bean in *Candour*.

Plan To "Retire" American Farmers: Embarrassing food "surpluses" in the U.S.A. have forced the American Government to consider experimenting with a plan to pay farmers to take their soil out of production for periods of up to ten years in exchange for an annual "rental" of so much per acre. A survey in four States indicates that one out of every ten farmers is interested in the proposal. Farmers have been told that the maximum annual "rental" per farm would be 10,000 dollars. However, despite the interest, it is doubtful whether the scheme will be started for some time because farmers required a higher "rental" than that being asked.

Under a realistic financial policy food production would be governed automatically by consumer demand, which would be fairly constant. There would be no question of production for the sake of production and the obtaining of a monetary income. At least the American proposal indicates a willingness to agree to the principle that a farmer is entitled to a reasonable income even if his production is not required. But then the same principle should apply to the wage earner in the industrial system. If the production system, now largely semi-automatic, can supply sufficient required goods without the wage-earner's services, is he not, also entitled to at least an income which will enable him to acquire the basic requirements of life? Financing such a scheme is no more difficult than financing the "export" drive into outer space!

Mr. Menzies and the Menace of Concentrated Power

(Continued from page 1)

must insist that Canberra starts to disgorge its powers. If Mr. Menzies replies that he does not know where and how to start disgorging power, we will gladly give him some suggestions.

THE NEW TIMES

ARTICLE SECTION

COMMUNISM in ISRAEL

by Dr. Fayez A. Sayegh

*Counsellor of the Arab States Delegation to the
United Nations*

In the following pages, we shall establish—exclusively on the basis of official Israeli publications, and the writings of Zionist and pro Israel authors—the following facts: 1. The only country in the Middle East in which the Communist Party is recognized by law, and operates openly and freely, is Israel; 2. In addition to the Communist Party, there are two leftwing Marxist parties in Israel; 3. These three parties jointly occupy 25 seats in the Israeli Parliament; 4. The two Israeli left-wing Marxist parties participate in the five-party ruling *coalition*. They have four ministers in the 16-man Cabinet; 5. Over 88 percent of the rural settlements in Israel are organized on a communal, collectivist basis and *governed by Marxist principles*. Israel is the only country in the entire Middle East in which Communism operates freely, with the sanction of the law. There Communist organizations are permitted to engage openly in the full range of the state's political life. An illustration of the casual reference made to Israel's monopoly of legal Communism in the Middle East, may be found in a recent book, by Harry B. Ellis, of *The Christian Science Monitor, Israel & The Middle East*. The Israeli Ambassador to the United States hailed this book, when it appeared in 1957, as a "painstaking and honest attempt to examine a very complex problem." While noting that "every Arab government has outlawed the Communist Party within its own country" (page 239) and that Israel Communist Party "is the only legal Communist Party in the Middle East" (page 154), the author, as usual, writes as though Communism prevailed in Arab society!

The political strength of Communism in Israel is not confined to the orthodox Communist Party. There are two other leftist, fellow travelling parties, known as the *Mapam* and the *Ahdut Haavoda—Poalei Zion*. Let us analyze the objective and principles of these three groups.

This is the orthodox Communist grouping which follows the usual lines, mouths the usual catchwords, which have become universally familiar through the operations of Communist Parties in various countries. In an official publication of the Israeli

Government (*Facts & Figures, 1955*, published by the Israel Office of Information, New York) the program of the Israel Communist Party is authoritatively summed up (in page 19):

Its aim—Socialism. Basing itself on the Marxist theory of class struggle and guided by the theory of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, the party fights for peace, the real independence of Israel, genuine democracy, civil and national equality of rights, and for the interests of the toiling masses.

The relationship of these two parties to Communist doctrine and practice is more subtle than that of the Israel Communist Party. From an ideological standpoint, the *Mapam* and the *Ahdut* are offshoots of one and the same movement. They have at times merged into one party for actions and votes. At other times they have parted company as a result of differences over practical or procedural issues.

Before the establishment of Israel, three independent groups, known as *Ahdut Haavoda*, *Poalei Zion*, and *Hashomer Hatzair*, merged and formed a single party, to which the name, *Mapam*, was given. After the establishment of the Zionist state, this new political compound became the second strongest party in Israel. It was described at that time by Dr. Joseph Dunner, an American Zionist, in his book, *The Republic of Israel*, (pages 129-130):

The distinguishing feature of *Mapam* since the merger has been its strong pro-Soviet orientation. It holds that . . . Israel . . . *must* rely on the Soviet Union and the "people's democracies" of Eastern Europe for support. *Mapam* takes credit for the flow of arms and ammunition to Israel from Czechoslovakia.

After its success in the parliamentary elections of 1949 and 1951, when it gained 19 and 15 seats respectively, the *Mapam* Party underwent successive splintering. First, a faction seceded in January 1954, and organized itself as the Left Socialist Party. It merged in October of the same year with the Israel Communist Party. Second, the *Ahdut Haavoda* abandoned the merged party in August 1954, and reverted to its original name, while the *Hashomer Hatzair* retained the name *Mapam*.

The character of these parties may be gauged from their own definition of their objectives, *supplied by the parties themselves*, to the Israel Office of Information in New York. In 1957 this material was published in *Facts About Israel*. According to this official publication (page 62) *Mapam* defines itself as "a left-wing Zionist Socialist Party" and proclaims that "its programme postulates . . . a line of neutrality on the part of Israel" and the "abolition of all military pacts and alliances." The *Ahdut Haavoda*, on the other hand, announces (page 62) that it stands for "a neutralist foreign policy; opposition to foreign military aid and foreign bases;" and "friendship with all peace-loving peoples." The party omits from the definition of its program supplied in an English translation for publication in the United States, some elements which appeared in *Facts & Figures, 1955*, published by the Government Press Office in Israel, such as the fact that its program calls for *support of the "world peace policy of the USSR"* and of "Popular China" (page. 18). *Today, the Communist and Leftist Parties jointly occupy more than one-fifth of the total number of seats in Israel's Parliament.*

To assess accurately the strength of these Communist and Leftist forces in the political life of Israel, one must remember that the Israeli system of parliamentary elections is based on the principle of "proportionate representation." This means that the people vote for *parties*, and not for individuals. Each party is assigned a number of seats proportionate to the votes it received. In turn, it names the individuals who occupy those seats. That the Communist and Leftist parties have won 25 seats out of 120 means more than 20 percent of the Israeli electorate have voted for the Communist and Leftist programs, and supported the Marxist-Socialist ideology. Since the beginning of its political history, Israel has had coalition governments. At no time has there been in the Israeli Parliament a party sufficiently strong to form a cabinet without the support of other parties. The present cabinet represents the five-party coalition, which has been in power since the elections of 1955.

While the Communist Party is not a participant in the coalition in power now, among the five ruling parties the two Leftist parties—*Mapam* and *Ahdut*—are represented by two ministers each in the 16-minister cabinet. Under the present setup, *Mapam* has the portfolios of Development and Health, while the *Ahdut* has the portfolios of the Interior and Communications.

Thus, we see that a quarter of the ministers composing the present ruling regime in Israel, and

participating in its coalition cabinet, are representatives of the avowedly Leftist and pro-Soviet parties. Communism is now strongly entrenched not only in the political life and institutions of Israel, but also in the structure of Israeli society. The political strength of Communism as an ideology and a way of life to Israeli masses. It shows the strong influence of Marxist-Socialist teachings upon Israel's socio-economic organization.

The political fortunes of Israeli Communist and Leftist Parties must be viewed not as incidental or passing phenomena in Israel's political life, but as direct manifestations of the deeper and more lasting influence Communism exercises over the minds, hearts and aspirations of large groups of the Israeli people. This aspect of Communist strength in Israel is primarily in the rural settlements, through which the Zionist experiment in Palestine was initially conducted. They are today main pillars of Israeli society. The majority of these are organized on a *communal, collectivist* basis, and governed by Marxist principles.

The most extreme and widespread type of communal, collectivist settlement is the *Kibbutz* or the *Kvutza*—but it is not the only variety. Other types include the *Moshav Shitufim* and the *Mos-hav Ovdim*. Officially, the Israeli Government in *Facts About Israel* describes and defines the *Kibbutz*:

Kibbutz or *Kvutza* (plural: *kibbutzim* or *kvutzot*): Communal collective settlement; all property is collectively owned and work is organized on a collective basis; the members give their labour and are supplied in return with housing, food, clothing, education, culture and social services; there is a central dining room and kitchen, communal kindergartens and children's quarters, communal social and cultural centres and central stores.

This description of the pattern of socio-economic organization, which governs the *Kibbutz*, may be supplemented by the reports of interest and sympathetic observers. Collective ownership is fundamental. As Dr. Dunner observes in his book. *The Republic of Israel*, (page 142):

Not only the means of production are owned in common, but *all the personal things of life are also possessed by the group* as a whole. Everyone draws his clothing from the common stock. His wants are satisfied in accordance with his needs. Everyone gets his tobacco or cigarettes from the common supply. He who requires more, gets more. Those who need less do not envy the others . . . He who joins a *Kvutzah* gives up his money, his private home, furniture, books, clothing, all his earthly possessions. No individual accounts are kept.

Collective ownership leads to other related features of communal organization. The author continues (pages 142-143):

No money whatsoever is used in the internal relations of the settlement. . . . Only the external financial relations of the settlement are governed by customary capitalistic standards. The *Kvutzah* sells its surplus production for money He who leaves the settlement for a vacation, a necessary journey, or some specialized education is given his expenses from the common treasury.

In his book, *The New State of Israel*, Colonel Gerald de Gaury reports (page 206) that all products of the *Kibbutz* are marketed and sold by the community, either directly or through co-operative marketing organizations, and that "pay for work of a member outside the *Kibbutz* goes direct to the secretary of the community for the community."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, reporting on her visit to a *Kibbutz* (in *India and the Awakening East*) observes with evident enthusiasm that "no one receives any money for his work; indeed he has no need of money, for the community supplies him with everything from pins and toothpaste to clothes, food and medical care." (page 43).

In this setting, work is not conducted on a free and selective basis, but is *assigned* to each member by the community, and carried out within the framework of a general plan devised by all the members in a sort of town-hall meeting.

A different system is described by some observers. Colonel de Gaury says, "rosters for duties are posted by the secretary, and it is a law of the *Kibbutzim* that the duty must be undertaken before any complaint is made." Mr. Ellis explains that the assignment of work for members of the *Kibbutz* is undertaken by committees acting on behalf of the whole community: "The *chaver's* [i.e., comrade's] responsibility is to accept the job assigned to him by the *Kibbutz* as a whole, through committees elected for that purpose. Committee memberships are rotated throughout the *Kibbutz* as are work assignments generally, though certain jobs tend to be performed by those with applicable skills" (page 168). He adds that the list of assigned jobs is displayed on the bulletin board outside the communal dining hall, and "each evening the *chaverim* read . . . their work assignments for the next day" (page 185).

There is little privacy in the *Kibbutz*, According to Ellis (page 168):

Privacy is avoided by the *Kibbutz*, and to eat alone is considered anti-social. Thus meals are taken in common by members in a large dining hall.

The Zionist couple's room or quarters, however, do not house the children. "Children live apart from their parents in their own separate quarters, where

they eat, sleep, and have classes," writes Ellis;

" . . . At four o'clock each afternoon the children go to the room of their parents for a two-hour period. This is the children's hour When supper time arrives, the children go back to their own quarters, where they eat and then go to bed" (page 169). He adds: "For one and one-half months after giving birth to a baby, a mother is exempted from work. Then gradually she works back into the organization, until, when her baby is six months old, the mother assumes her full workload. From that point on, except in cases of special need, she sees her child only during the children's hour" (page 186).

While its system is the most extreme embodiment of communal organization in Israel, the *Kibbutz* is not the only type of settlement organized on a communal and collective basis. Other types include the *Moshav Shitufi* and the *Moshav Ovdim*. The former resembles the *Kibbutz* in that it is based on "collective economy and ownership;" but it departs from the *Kibbutz* in that each family has its own house and is "responsible for its own domestic services." (*Facts About Israel*, page 80). In the *Moshav Ovdim*:

Each individual farm is worked by the member and his family, but the produce is sold through a central co-operative, and purchases are undertaken co-operatively. Certain types of agricultural equipment are owned by the settlement as a whole No transfer of a farm or acceptance of a new member is possible without the approval of the village council (page 79).

Having described the patterns of socio-economic organization, which prevail in Israeli communal and collective settlements, we should observe that these patterns are not incidental by-products of a process of haphazard growth. They are, in the words of the Israeli Government, reflections of "various social philosophies" (*Facts & Figures*, page 51). It is significant that, having asserted, "ancient Jewish civilization was rooted in the land" and that "it was natural and inevitable . . . that the return to the land should have constituted the soul of modern Zionism," the Israeli Government describes the prevailing methods of rural settlement as "the unique pattern of group settlement characteristic of Israel farming." (*Facts About Israel*, pages 78-79.)

Mrs. Roosevelt, commenting on the *Kibbutz*, writes: "It is clear that agricultural communities such as this one are not merely economic projects to these people, but an entire way of life, of living and working together. They apparently take great hold of the young people who are captured by the communal idea" (page 45). Evidently, this Zionist appeal is catching—affecting Mrs. Roosevelt

herself—for she subsequently speaks glowingly of the "crusading zeal and imagination" she professes to have found on the Zionist farms; and, singling out the *Kibbutz*, she confesses that she found it "particularly" interesting, and writes about the "heroic part" it played not only in peace but also in war (pages 43-46).

The enthusiasm of the Israeli, and the excitement of Zionists and quasi-Zionists, over the predominating types of rural settlement do not conceal nor alter the fact that they are organized on communal and collective bases *and governed by Marxist principles*. Many students of socio-economic systems have compared these Israeli communal settlements with the *Kolkhozes* of the Soviet Union—only to find that the Israeli type exceeds the Soviet type in the degree to which it realizes the communal principle.

Zionist Dr. Dunner proclaims, "*the Kolkhozes never applied communistic principles in the relations of their members to the extent of Israel's Kvutzot and Kibbutzim*" (page 144); while Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, asserting that the *Kibbutz* "*is probably more strictly socialistic than the collective farms in Russia,*" explains:

In Russia, while all farmers are on collective farms most of them have a small plot of land. There they may grow what they like and sell it on the market. They also have separate homes and kitchens. In a *Kibbutz*, however, everything is communal. (*Strange Lands and Friendly People*, page 274).

Perhaps, then, the special Study Mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives was actually understating the case when it described the *Kibbutz* as "*a form of elementary communism*" and judged that it "cannot be classified among democratic institutions." (House Report No. 2147, pages 30 and 32.)

The relevance of these findings to our examination of the strength of Communism in Israeli society today is reinforced by the fact that the *overwhelming majority* of rural settlements in Israel are communal and collective. According to official Israeli statistics, the total number of Israeli communal and collective settlements of the three types is 507. There are only 69 permanent settlements of more

conventional types. More than 88 percent of the permanent rural settlements in Israel are communal and collective in organization.

Nor is the impact of communal settlements upon Israeli life fully told by statistics alone. The *Kibbutz* enjoys a special role in the shaping of Israeli society. It was originally conceived as "an outpost of Zionist settlement in Palestine" and designed "to set the pattern for the future Jewish community of Israel" (Murray Weingarten, *Life in a Kibbutz*, pages 7-8). The *Kibbutz* soon became "the *instrument* of Zionist settlement in Palestine" (Ellis, page 58) and remained, throughout the Mandate, "the basic form" of such settlement (page 98). Later, it played "an indispensable role in the early days of statehood" (page 172). Even today, it remains the symbol of Zionist "pioneering"—so much so that, when Premier Ben Gurion decided to retire in 1953, it was to a *Kibbutz* that he went; and, upon his return to public life, he continued to seek rest and inspiration in a *Kibbutz*. We have surveyed the most important manifestations of Communist strength in the domestic life of Israel—political, social and economic. The other side of the coin—Israel's relations with the Soviet Bloc—merits separate examination.

In this examination we shall establish—relying exclusively on official utterances of the Israeli and the American Governments, on Zionist and pro-Israeli publications, and on news reports published by the *New York Times*, which cannot be charged with anti-Israel bias - - the following facts: 1. The Soviet Union's support of the establishment of Israel in 1947 was crucial; it tipped the balance at the UN in favor of the partition resolution; 2. The first Israeli diplomatic envoy was appointed *to* Prague; the second, to *Moscow*; 3. The first country in the Middle East to purchase arms from the Soviet Bloc was Israel; 4. The first country in the Middle East to proclaim a "neutralist" foreign policy, and to adhere to it consistently and without deviation since its inception, was Israel; 5. Israel pledged in July 1953, never to join any anti-Soviet alliance or pact; 6. Israel's trade with the Soviet Bloc continues to be vital for Israel's economy and, relatively, in excess of Arab-Soviet trade.

Printed by W. & J. Barr, 105-7 Brunswick Street, Fitzroy, N.6, for New Times Limited, McEwan House, Melbourne, on whose authority these articles **appear**.