

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. 27, Nos. 4 & 5

10th March, 1961

EDITORIAL

DARKEST AFRICA AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION

The decision of the U.N. Security Council to use force if necessary in the Congo to prevent civil war is one which could have far-reaching consequences. In theory the Congo is a sovereign, independent state and a member of UNO. In fact, of course, there is no such thing as a Congolese nation. However, if UNO can take action in the internal affairs of one of its so-called members, a dangerous precedent could be established and used to justify intervention in the internal affairs of genuine nations like South Africa. And ultimately in the internal affairs of all nations.

While there is still a great deal of confusion concerning the situation in the Congo, it is clear that UNO is being used to further a revolutionary programme. It is important to recall that UNO was invited into the Congo by the late Mr. Lumumba, now being built up into a black martyr by the Communists and their dupes in all parts of the world, and that in spite of the verbal attacks upon UNO by the Communists, the Secretary-General and his staff has consistently pursued a policy which seeks to drive all Belgians from the Congo and to establish a central government which would dominate the Katanga and other provinces which have in fact declared themselves independent states.

COMMUNIST DIALECTICS

The Communists' use of dialectics suggests that it is highly probable that the violence of the Communist attacks upon UNO is designed to mask the fact that the Communists are pleased with general developments. Just as they never used their veto powers to prevent the UNO decision to intervene in Korea, so the Communists significantly refrained from using the veto to prevent the U.N. Security Council from deciding to use force in the Congo. If UNO can be used to destroy Mr. Tshombe and to force the Belgians out of Katanga, the Communists will be delighted. It would almost appear that the early policy of UNO in doing nothing in the Congo, while raping, looting and tribal warfare broke out, was deliberately designed to produce a situation where the current policy could be successfully implemented.

Whatever the real truth, it is certain that the use of force in the Congo will shortly be used as an example for urging similar action in the Rhodesias and other parts of Africa as the natives are increasingly whipped into an anti-European passion. President Kennedy's representative in Africa, "Soapy" Williams, has already made it clear that Kennedy and his masters are going to continue furthering the revolution in Africa by their support of black demagogues preaching "Africa for the Africans". Ultimately the Europeans in South Africa will be forced to resist strongly against so-called black nationalism. "World opinion" is being carefully prepared to accept the necessity of UNO intervention—although the excuse will be offered that such intervention is in the best interest of the Europeans themselves.

A SIGNIFICANT STATEMENT

The growing revolution in Africa could well be the second-last phase of the world revolution. In the statement issued by the 81 Communist Parties which met in Moscow in the latter part of last year, it was claimed that the European Powers' retreat from their colonies was the most important world development since the revolution in Russia in 1917. The last phase of the revolution could come with the final isolation of the European communities everywhere and their acceptance of the "inevitability" of the situation.

The *primary and immediate* issue confronting the non-Communist world today, particularly the European nations, is not one of the complete re-organisation of the social, political, and economic structure, *but of survival*. Some modifications of economic and financial policies such as we have put forward from time to time, would undoubtedly be of great value in the struggle to survive. But unless the will to survive is maintained, social theories become dangerous diversions from the principal task of the moment. C. H. Douglas warned that it was dangerously foolish to talk about reforming the financial and economic system until the *Money Power* was defeated. The present plight of the world is the direct and indirect result of the policies of the International Money Power. These policies must be defeated if there is to be a future.

A NECESSARY ACTION

One of the first moves the European Powers should make is to withdraw from UNO before it is too late. And as far as Australia is concerned, the criminal folly of breaking down the present immigration policy should be strongly resisted. Already there have been moves to bring in UNO officials to investigate the question of the aborigines. The creation of race problems in Australia would lead quickly to an exploitation of these problems as an excuse for international intervention. If European migrants are genuinely required, we suggest that the Australian Government offer to accept all Europeans in Africa who desire to leave before they suffer the same fate as the Belgians. Some financial assistance towards bringing

(Continued on page 4)

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING COMMISSION FAVOURS ECONOMIC LUNACY

By G. K. TAVENDER

The producer of raw materials for food and clothing, more generally called the farmer, takes pride in delivering top quality. He also aims for maximum quantity in relation to available means. His successful continuance is determined mainly by incentive, i.e. financial return in excess of "costs". In other words he is as efficient as environment permits, and, without any spurring from bureaucrats on his back, aims naturally at still greater efficiency.

Any benefit from exchange of knowledge through A.B.C. radio talks by practical farmers is discounted by the futility of other talks by conditioned purveyors of the London School of Economics' ideology.

Here it is well to recall what Prof. J. H. Morgan, K.C., wrote in the *Quarterly Review* of January, 1929 (p.p. 187-8), "When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums on . . . the London School of Economics, he replied, 'Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State'." Be it noted the pre-eminent example of the Slave State in the world today is not true communism but State Socialism. And this is the perverted ideal towards which policy makers in Australia and all other so-called Christian countries are pushing us, with the co-operation of the "capitalist" press, radio, and, with few exceptions, pulpit.

A.B.C. "Countryman's Session" talks by economic "experts" deals with effects, which they attribute to anything except the right cause. Means are confused with ends. Loss by export is regarded as gain, and receipt of payment (imports) as loss.

One "expert" dismissed the possibility of an increase in price for agricultural products, but "felt" that low incomes could be off-set by reduced costs, improved efficiency, and greater output. Which means that farmers will be better off if they increase their unsaleable surpluses!

The big idea is to blame the over efficient producers for the ineptitude, or treachery, of the policy makers — passing the buck.

Fed up with such humbug I requested the A.B.C. to counter it with Social Credit speakers and so put into effect its alleged policy of presenting balanced viewpoints.

This correspondence ensued:—

Reply to my request for Social Credit talks.

9th January, 1961

Mr. G. K. Tavender,

SEVENHILL.

Dear Mr. Tavender,

We must apologise for being so long in acknowledging your letter of 30th October. Your suggestion for a talk on Social Credit was referred to our Head Office, and it is possible that you may already have received an answer direct from Sydney. If not; our understanding of the

matter is that it is felt that Professor Campbell, who is Professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Sydney, presented in the opinion of the editors of "The Countryman's Session" a balanced viewpoint which did not represent any one controversial school of thought, and for that reason it is not considered that a further viewpoint is called for.

With thanks for your interest,

Yours faithfully,

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING COMMISSION,
J. S. Miller, Manager for South Australia.

Copy of my reply:

Sevenhill, S.A.

13/1/61

Dear Mr. Miller,

Thank you for passing on to Head Office my request that A.B.C. present Social Credit talks on the present economic and political crises, in fulfilment of its alleged policy of presenting differing views in a balanced way.

The refusal by Head Office is most unfortunate for the people of Australia. The following is written in full cognizance of your disassociation with the decision. A copy will be sent to H.O.

Firstly, Professors of Economics at Universities are either direct, or, next-in-line, products of the London School of Economics, an institution for training bureaucrats for the Slave State — not, as one would have supposed, to remove unnecessary obstacles to the efficient functioning of individual initiative in industry and distribution of production.

The talk by Professor Campbell mentioned by me was not the only one that failed to come to grips with economic reality. Every one since has been equally at fault. For instance, one interviewee deplored falling wool prices, which is partly due to inadequate demand. He concluded with the "thought" that we could counter the effect of low price by increased production! Even conventional economists should know that, all other factors being unchanged, increased production would cause price to fall still lower.

Apparently, whoever is responsible for the talks believes that feelings and opinions, rather than reasoning from correct premises and relevant facts, is the proper basis of policy.

The London School of Economics viewpoint as presented by the A.B.C. is much in the newspaper headlines with regard to the current export hysteria.

On January 6th, for example, we were informed of Australia's receipt of £M143.4 worth of goods in part payment for our exports. But so called orthodoxy sees this gain as a loss! Could there be a more controversial or unbalanced view?

With the copy of this letter is enclosed an article by Dr. Monahan on the chance that someone at A.B.C. Head Office is capable of understanding its simple truth. With best personal regards, I am,

Yours faithfully,

G. K. TAVENDER.

THE NEW TIMES

HOW PEARL HARBOUR WAS PLANNED IN WASHINGTON

The present plight of the world is the result of conscious policies persistently pursued over many years. Like the first two great disasters of this century, the First World War and the Great Depression, the Second World War was deliberately promoted in order to further the programme of destroying traditional civilisation. But the Second World War could easily have finished much differently if President Roosevelt and those supporting him had not been able to bring a reluctant America into the war in December, 1941.

In the following chapter of a new book now in process of being published, Mr. Eric Butler shows how "world opinion" can be deliberately misled and how Pearl Harbour was promoted and brought to fruition by Roosevelt and his advisers:

THE TRUTH ABOUT PEARL HARBOUR

The Japanese attack upon the American Pacific fleet in Pearl Harbour, Hawaii, on December 7, 1941, was presented to the American people by Roosevelt and his associates as an unprovoked, surprise blow delivered by a treacherous enemy who had been pretending that he was seeking peace. The Roosevelt version is still accepted by many people who are not aware that Pearl Harbour was in fact no real surprise to Roosevelt because the American President's policy was to force Japan to attack America in order that the reluctant American people could be brought into the war.

In the chapter, "The Russian Problem and the Pacific" of his book, *The Decisive Battles of the Western World* (Vol. III) Major-General Fuller outlines the major developments which led to Pearl Harbour. As Fuller points out, the notorious Atlantic Declaration, or Charter, was probably "the biggest hoax in history." The issue of this Declaration, which was never a formal state paper, "but nothing more than a publicity hand out," masked the fact that the real question discussed at the Conference in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, between August 8 and 13, 1941, was how Roosevelt was to get the Americans into the war. Although Roosevelt had openly declared economic war upon Germany, Hitler refused to oblige Roosevelt with a suitable excuse for an open declaration of war. Shortly before the Atlantic Conference Roosevelt told his son Elliott that Churchill "knows that without America, England can't stay in the war." Some sort of negotiated European peace would have been imperative, a prospect which the Communists must have found alarming.

Roosevelt promised Churchill at the Atlantic Conference that the United States, "even if herself not attacked, would come into the war in the Far East." He also promised that upon his return to Washington he would send a provocative note to Admiral Nomura, the Japanese Ambassador to the U.S.A. This was done on August 17.

Secretary of War Stimson summed up at the attitude of Roosevelt and those associated with him, in the following record in his diary of November 25: "The question was how we should manoeuvre them (the Japanese) into firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves."

DIVISIONS IN JAPAN.

In order to understand how Pearl Harbour was brought about, it is essential to stress the fact that Japanese leaders were far from united on the question of foreign policy.

There was the extremist group, comprised of those mili-

tary and civilian leaders who wanted to exploit the war in Europe to build a great Asiatic Empire under Japanese domination. But there were also influential leaders, with close associations with the Emperor, who were moderate in their outlook, desired to avert war and a break with the West, and who believed that Japan could support its growing population through industrial and commercial expansion. This policy required, of course, that Japan be permitted by the Western Powers to obtain access to essential raw materials.

Admiral Nomura, the Japanese Ambassador to the U.S.A. in 1941, was a member of the moderate Japanese group and desperately worked for peace between the U.S.A. and Japan. Leader of the Japanese moderates in Japan was Prince Konoye, who was able to maintain his position as Prime Minister until American policy made his resignation inevitable.

The major issue of disagreement between Japan and Washington was Japan's control of Manchuria and the war with China. But the moderate Japanese leaders made it clear that they were prepared to try to settle the China question if supported by Washington. Proposals were put forward as the basis for negotiation which would have given the Chinese far more than they could reasonably expect to obtain by their own efforts. But Roosevelt and his advisers flatly refused to meet the Japanese moderates in any way. If the Japanese moderates were to have any chance of restraining those wanting war, it was essential that they persuade the Roosevelt Administration that it must ease the severe economic blockade imposed in July of 1941.

ECONOMIC WARFARE

The first major step leading towards Pearl Harbour was taken by President Roosevelt on July 25, 1941, when he froze all Japanese assets in the United States. This was a policy of severe economic blockade and tantamount to a declaration of war. Roosevelt himself had admitted in a statement made just prior to the imposition of economic sanctions that any attempt to cut off Japan's oil supplies would have led to an attack on the Netherlands East Indies "and we would have had war".¹

Although the real significance of Roosevelt's economic blockade was not understood by many in the U.S.A., including those campaigning to keep America out of the war, American naval leaders certainly knew what the blockade meant. In a report drafted on July 19, the Navy's War Plans Division had expressed opposition to the policy of economic blockade, pointing out that Japan already had

sufficient oil for eighteen months of war, and that the economic attack could only have the effect of precipitating war. But the precipitation of war was exactly what Roosevelt and his advisers sought.

As already mentioned, there was a cleavage between Japan's leaders in the critical period prior to Pearl Harbour. If Roosevelt had genuinely desired peace in the Pacific, his diplomacy would have been directed towards supporting the pro-Western moderate elements in Japan and thus helping to sever Japan's loose ties with Germany and Italy. But Roosevelt's policy persistently refused to give any encouragement whatever to the Japanese moderates led by Prince Konoye.

PRINCE KONOYE'S FINAL EFFORT

In spite of the refusal of Roosevelt to meet the offers of the Japanese moderate, Prince Konoye and his colleagues still worked desperately to avert war. Prince Konoye next offered to take a tremendous political and personal risk by travelling to meet Roosevelt on American soil.

The experienced American Ambassador in Japan, Joseph C. Grew strongly recommended the proposed meeting to the Roosevelt administration. He made the following warning if the Konoye offer was rejected:

"The logical outcome of this will be the downfall of the Konoye Cabinet and the formation of a military dictatorship which will lack either the disposition or the temperament to avoid colliding head-on with the United States."²

Grew reported on October 1 that Konoye's proposals had general political and military support, and observed that

"For a Prime Minister of Japan thus to shatter all precedent and tradition in this land of subservience to precedent and tradition, to wish to come hat in hand, so to speak, to meet the President of the United States on American soil, is a gauge of the determination of the Government to undo the vast harm already accomplished . . ."

Prince Konoye's offer placed Roosevelt in a difficult position, but, although it was never definitely rejected, it was skilfully sidestepped and left to die. Roosevelt was determined on war. When Konoye's last effort for peace failed, he resigned on October 16 and General Tojo took his place. The pace of events then quickened and war became progressively more certain as the American policy makers rigidly refused to accept any Japanese proposals to ease the situation.

THE ROLE OF THE SECRET COMMUNISTS

It is important to note that Owen Lattimore, at that time an American adviser to Chinese leader, Chiang Kai-shek, strongly urged that America refuse to have anything to do with Japan's proposals for a compromise

My Ten Years in Japan, by Joseph Grew (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1942) pp, 456-62

peace in Asia in exchange for an easing of the American economic blockade of Japan. It was not known at this time that Lattimore was a pro-Communist, if not a top Communist secret agent. Later Lattimore came out openly against Chiang Kai-shek and supported the Chinese Communists.

Lattimore worked in collaboration with Mr. Lauchlin Currie, the President's assistant on Far Eastern Affairs. In his book, *The Twenty-year Revolution from Roosevelt to Eisenhower* (1954), Chesley Manly, the well-known American journalist, deals extensively with the large number of influential Communist agents in the Roosevelt Administration, and quotes the following evidence before the American Senate sub-committee on August 14, 1951:

"I would say that our best ones (Communist agents) were Henry Dexter White and Lauchlan Currie . . ."

When Mr. Cordell Hull, American Secretary of State, worked out between November 22 and 25 a proposal for a suggested 90-day truce between Japan and the U.S.A., during which time America would resume economic relations if Japan undertook to make no further territorial conquests, this move was blocked by the action of Lattimore and Currie. The proposal was therefore never even presented to Admiral Nomura.

The next move was the substitution of a ten-point proposal which, as revealed by William L. Langer and S. Everett Gleason in their quasi-official history, *The Undeclared War*, was the work of the Communist agent, Harry Dexter White. It was presented through Henry Morgenthau, and was an ultimatum to the Japanese which could only mean war. The Japanese militarists immediately intensified their long-prepared plans for an attack upon the U.S.A.

In an address to the American Chamber of Commerce in London on June 20, 1944, a British Cabinet Minister, Oliver Lyttleton, summarised the question of how the Pacific War started as follows: "America provoked Japan to such an extent that the Japanese were forced to attack Pearl Harbour. It is a travesty of history to say that America was forced into war."

Our story would be incomplete without a reference to the fact that the Communist conspiracy reached into the Japanese Government as well as the American.

The case of the German Soviet agent, Richard Sorge, who lived in Japan before and during the war, is one of the most amazing stories of Communist espionage activities. Sorge held a semi-official position with the German Embassy and was very friendly with the German Ambassador, Eugeb Ott. He was also closely associated with the top secret Japanese Communist, Hozumi Osaki, who was a key member of Prince Konoye's brain trust and thus in a position to vitally influence Japanese policy. Osaki also had two friends who were secretaries to the Japanese Cabinet.

As told in his own story³ Sorge and his highly placed colleagues worked to prevent any possible Japanese attack upon Russia and to turn any expansionary movement southwards. Stalin co-operated with his non-aggression pact with the Japanese.

Looking at events retrospectively, Prince Konoye came to doubt seriously "whether the whole series of events from the Manchurian incident (1931) to the present war have not been what they (the Communists) have purposefully planned". Konoye referred to the "disguised activities of the Communists behind both the military and bureaucrats" in Japan. He said that some of the younger army officers had been flirting with Communism and that in his opinion these men brought about the Manchurian War to further Communist objectives."⁴

ROOSEVELT'S COLD-BLOODED PLAN

As a prelude to a brief examination of the Pearl Harbour disaster itself, it is necessary to point out that by a stroke of miraculous good fortune, American intelligence had, months before the Japanese attack, cracked the Japanese code concerning ship movements and the code used to advise Japanese diplomats throughout the world. This placed Roosevelt and his associates in the position where they knew exactly what the Japanese were saying and planning amongst themselves. As Sanborn writes in his book, *Design for War* (p.277):

"If, therefore, American statesmen truly wanted peace, theirs was not a difficult task, particularly so because they were at all times fully acquainted with Japanese hopes and plans through the breaking of the Japanese code. On the other hand, if American statesmen either wanted war or at least welcomed it as a backdoor means of entry into the European war, their task was equally easy. Perhaps for the only known occasion in diplomatic history the Americans had everything at their finger-tips. It was a complete set up for them. And it eventuated in war."

But Roosevelt not only wanted war; he wanted it to come in such a way that America would be united immediately to fight. One of the most authoritative books on the Pearl Harbour disaster is *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbour* (Devin-Adair, 1954), by Rear Admiral Robert A. Theobald, one of the commanders of the American Fleet in Pearl Harbour at the time of the Japanese attack.

³Hearing before the Committee on Un-American Activities on American Aspects of the Richard Sorge Case. (Government Printer, 1951).

⁴*Japan's Struggle to End the War, U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey* (Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1946), p. 22.

Rear Admiral Theobald shows conclusively that Roosevelt had not only persistently strived to force the Japanese to attack, but that he wanted to make certain that the attack would be of such a nature that he would have no difficulty in obtaining an immediate declaration of war from Congress. He was afraid that even an attack on the Philippines would not bring America into the war. Against naval advice he therefore held the American Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbour as a deliberate target for the Japanese to attack. Further, when the last Japanese messages to arrive in the U.S.A. on December 6 left little doubt about the time and place of the coming Japanese attack, this information was kept from the American Naval and Military Commanders at Pearl Harbour, with the result that they had no warning about the attack or any opportunity to prepare for counter-action. And so Roosevelt risked a major American naval disaster in order to achieve his objective. General Marshall certainly knew of Roosevelt's cold-blooded tactics and helped further them by not making certain that the military and naval commanders at Pearl Harbour possessed the vital information obtained through the deciphered Japanese code messages.

In order to divert attention away from Roosevelt's role in the Pearl Harbour disaster for the American Navy, the local Commanders were made the scapegoats. In his foreword to *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbour*, Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey bluntly states: "I have always considered Admiral Kimmel and General Short to be splendid officers who were thrown to the wolves as scapegoats for something over which they had no control . . . they are our outstanding military martyrs."

It has, of course, been argued that, although there can today be no disputing the fact that Roosevelt and his adviser's deliberately planned Pearl Harbour, this action was justified because it brought a united America into the war and led to the military defeat of the Axis Powers. But this is merely one more example of the age-old claim that sometimes the end justifies the means. *But the end is always determined by the means used.* And so it proved in this case, because although Roosevelt made Manchuria and the China question the fundamental reason for forcing Japan to war with America, *he then proceeded to allow the Communists to fake that for which it was claimed it was necessary to fight Japan.* At the Yalta Conference early in 1945, Roosevelt betrayed Chiang Kai-shek when he entered into a secret agreement to hand Manchuria over to the Communists.

And so, just as the war in Europe, ostensibly started over the Polish issue, finished with the Communist expansion into Eastern Europe, the war in the Pacific allegedly started because of Japan's control of Manchuria and penetration of China, finished with Communist expansion into the Far East. The Communists therefore won the war in the Pacific as they won it in Europe.

Darkest Africa and The World Revolution

(Continued from Page 1)

these people to Australia would be a sound investment in the struggle to survive. Tens of thousands of settler types from Africa, including French settlers who desire to escape from Algeria, would bring not only some genuine pioneering types to this country, but also people who would help dispel a lot of the current flabby sentimentalism concerning Australia's immigration policy. There was never a greater need for stern realism concerning the exploitation of race friction in the interests of world revolution. It may be too late now to halt the tide of revolution in Africa, but Australians and other European nations still have time to prepare to save themselves—if they possess both the will and the faith.

THE CORE OF THE PROBLEM

Out of the current welter of comment on the Government's restrictive financial policies has emerged the fact that at least most of the commentators know that increased credit expansion is necessary if growing economic problems are to be alleviated. But the call for increased credit expansion is also a call for more inflation under present financial rules. We have stressed this fact on numerous occasions and we note that Mr. John Eddy, the Melbourne *Herald's* financial writer, in an article on February 25, endorses our view when he writes that a revision of the "credit squeeze" means inflation. He writes:

"I admit that the alternative to a recession is continued creeping inflation. This, I think, is the lesser of two evils and could be partly met by compensating cases of hardship."

Inflation is not a genuine alternative to deflation, but a variant of the same destructive, policy of centralised credit control. The core of the credit problem is how to expand financial credit without inflation. The solution is basically simple: the application of a portion of the new credits to financing the *reduction* of prices by scientific subsidies paid only at the retail counter upon genuine consumer demand. Credit expansion via subsidisation would be a genuine increase in purchasing power for all. There would be no resultant cases of hardships.

As we have often said in the past, we are prepared to discuss this question with anyone who wants to try to do something effective about it. Once again we suggest that leaders of the wool industry should give further consideration to the subsidisation principle as a major solution for their problems. At least they no longer have to deal with the silly question, "Where is the money to come from?"

"THE SECRET LIFE OF ERIC BUTLER"

The Story of Twenty Years of Character Assassination

This exposure of the persistent campaign to destroy Mr. Eric Butler reveals for the first time how the author was nearly interned as a result of Communist influence during the early war years. The truth about Dr. Evatt's Inquiry, and what Mr. Justice Dean said about Mr. Butler's work are outlined.

Of considerable historical interest is the revelation of how Dr. Evatt first tried to woo Social Crediters in an attempt to defeat opposition to his campaign to destroy the Federal Constitution, and when this failed then played a prominent role in the campaign to smear Social Crediters.

In this book Mr. Butler answers in detail every charge and smear levelled against him in the widely distributed article, "The Secret Life of Eric Butler," and makes clear his views on a number of important issues, including the "Jewish Problem."

Order from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 5/4, post free.

INFLATION AND THE MORAL LAW

The Rev. Norman Hill's address on inflation at the 1960 Melbourne Anglican Synod has now been published in brochure form. It is important that this brochure be given the widest possible publicity, particularly in Church circles. Order from *New Times Ltd.*, Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 5/-, post free.

USE ENWITE SPECIALITIES

TEXTIT waterproofing compound. SOLVIT paint remover. AQUAC wood putty. BRYNAC enamel for resisting water, acids and alkalis. FERROSOL, the rust killing paint. RUSTEX for removing rust from motor bodies and metal work. THERMEX, the silver paint.

ENWITE PTY. LTD.

84-86 Cromwell Street, Collingwood, Vic.
Phone: JA 5967.

CODNER BROS.

Builders and Joinery Manufacturers
Homes and Home Sites Available

WHEATSHEAF ROAD, GLENROY