

Socialist and

In Co-operation with The



Comment Review

Socialist Party of New Zealand.

From Nazism to Stalinism

FUSION AND CONFUSION IN GERMANY

At the beginning of February, 1946, elections for the Federation of Free German T.U.'s of Great Berlin took place. The results were obviously faked—apparently those who doctored the figures have yet to learn from their Russian advisers. The Berlin "Tagespiegel" which is published in the American Zone and thus enjoys more freedom than the other papers, stated that the subsequent conference of T.U.'s was run in a spirit of "regimentation." (Gleichschaltung.) As for the T.U. elections—districts which traditionally were Social Democrat "strongholds" only "Communist," while Berlin's C.P. stronghold, Wedding, delegated only Social Democrats!

Now the Russian authorities hope to force a fusion of the S.D.P. (Social Democrats) and the K.P.D. ("Communists").

Let us have a look at the "leaders" of the German "Communists." First, there is the President, W. Pieck. He is the same gentleman who, when he was safely in Moscow during the war, stated that they ought to adopt the flag of the old German Empire: Black, White and Red. "In these colours we Communists tender our homage to the Reich which was founded beneath them." New Leader, London, 24/2/45.

The Russians are trying to make a national hero out of Pieck. On his 70th birthday he was presented with a whole trainful of coal, while Berlin workers were freezing.

The Berlin "Deutsche Volkszeitung" (official organ of K.P.D.) declared: "These who were fortunate enough to participate in the great demonstration realise that this manifestation was the expression of the will and aspiration of the German people's unity." (N.Y. "Call," 4/3/46.)

The program of the German Stalinists is the usual hotch-potch of reformism, with special provision for "freedom for private enterprise." (Sozialistische Tribune, Mexico, 15/7/45.)

But Pieck is a "revolutionary Marxist" compared with the Vice-President of the German Stalinists, Walter Ulbricht. HE has served as an agent for Stalin's N.K.V.D. (better known by its former name—O.G.P.U.) since 1932, was sent to Spain in 1936 to organise a German division of the N.K.V.D. and to spy on the German and Austrian workers fighting there.

He is the famous author of the Ulbricht Letter—the instruction given to the German Stalinists working under

ground to denounce all social democrats and independent socialists who were opposed to the war, to the Nazis. Of course, THAT was during the period of the Russo-German pact. (The letter, in full, can be found in "The Betrayal of the Left"—Collance.)

On October 12th, 1945, Ulbricht told a cheering German Stalinist mass meeting in Berlin that "all anti-Soviet lie propaganda must come to an end." (The Network, N.Y., October, 1945.)

It is with such people that the German Social Democrats are asked to unite.

The Stalinists are in an excellent position. Through the Russian authorities in Berlin, they are able to provide paper, transport, and "numerous concessions" to those S.D.P. leaders who are in favour of fusion. (Age, 3/4/1946.)

As for Democracy—well, listen to what Franz Dahlem, C.P., Central Committee, had to say: "We Communists do not regard the numerical proportions of the S.P.D. and K.P.D. as a yardstick for the allocation of posts." (Digest for Germany and Austria, British Foreign Office Publication, November 31st, 1945, page 4.)

But the German Social Democrats aren't a whit better. Their executive, as a matter of fact, were the first to propose "Unity" in June, 1945. But at that time Ulbricht and Co. turned them down. Now the S.D.P. has become afraid that it will be swallowed up. As Franz Dahlem mentioned above stated: "The Party (K.P.D.) is now the only one in the whole Reich which possesses ideological and organisational discipline!" (Digest for G. and A., November 8th, 1945.)

The Social Democrats, on the other hand, are split. Those outside the Berlin Zone seem definitely to be opposed to fusion; they passed a resolution at Hesse that the decisions of the Berlin E.C. were not binding for the Western Area. (9/1/46.)

Their "leaders," however, are no more Socialists than the Commos. For example, Paul Schumacher, one of them, declared in a speech at Kiel: "The idea of our class is the idea of the nation. . . We want to prove by deeds what we owe to our country. . . We are the representatives of the German people and nation. Shades of Marx and Luxemburg! Digest, November 2nd, 1945, page 2.)

The anti-fusionists have had great difficulties in making their point of view known. "Their arguments have not

been presented in the columns of "Das Volk," the Berlin S.D.P. paper, which was not even permitted to print a speech on the subject by the party's chairman." (London "Tribune," 4/1/46, page 5.)

"Berlin newspapers complain that they have been reporting the facts behind the K.P.D.-S.P.D. fusion talks." (Reuter, 15/1/46.)

In spite of this, the German Social Democrats must have remembered some other "United Fronts," they recalled the United Front of the Stalinists and the Nazis in the Berlin Transport Strike in 1932! Perhaps they have not forgotten that the K.P.D. and the Nazis voted together against the Social Democrats in a plebiscite?

At any rate, in spite of the "Fusion by May 1st" slogan, the K.P.D., in spite of their favourable position as being the only party endorsed by an occupying power, they have, at the time of writing, not yet succeeded in their plans for the totalitarian control of the German "Labor" Movement. In a 23,500 poll, 65 per cent of Social Democrats in Berlin have voted against fusion with the Communist Party. . . The Russians stopped voting in their sector at the last minute and the Social Democrats' Central Committee, which is in the Russian sector, sought an embargo on the plebiscite." (A.A.P., Melbourne "Sun," 2/4/46.)

Since then Social Democratic delegates have repudiated the Central and District Committees and expelled a number of "leaders." (A.A.P., Melbourne "Sun," 9/4/46.)

However, whatever the voting in Berlin, the Russian Zone will come out in favour of fusion. And no wonder. "It is no secret that Russia is active—in support of a fusion—even to the extent of 'removing' Social Democrats who are most vigorous in opposition." (Age, 15/4/46.)

As we mentioned, no plebiscite was permitted on the issue in Berlin's Russian Zone. It was done by the Soviet authorities some 30 minutes before it was due to begin. "In one district of Berlin Zionskirch Platz, where the news of the ban came slightly later, there were found in the ballot box 53 votes against and 9 for the fusion." (Ladur Call, 10/4/46.)

What is the British Government? As was to be expected, they have started to back the anti-fusionists. Not because the British Labor Party has any interest in the issue as such, but rather because they hope to use them as pawns in the game of post-war politics, just as the Russians are using the pro-fusionists.

At the Social Democratic Congress, a message of 27 M.P.'s supporting the fusion was read. Signatories were the usual fellow-travellers of the Stalinists.

(Continued on page 4 col. 1.)

"Work to Win Security"

UNCTUOUS LABOR ECONOMICS

In the Sydney Sun (7/5/46) appeared a leading article dealing with the statements of Mr. Cosgrove, Labor Premier of Tasmania and Mr. P. Walsh, Senior Economic Advisor to the New Zealand Government. We deal with the matter, not because anything said was new, but because of the publicity which is being given to it. Nearly every newspaper heralded the statements as being the very thing that had been waiting for from someone inside the Official Labor Organisation, Mr. Cosgrove was reported to have said:

"The whole outlook of Labor must be changed. . . The world needs production to save it from disaster. Labor standards of living in Australia cannot now be saved by mere adjustments of wages. . . The aim of ALL WORKERS IS MORE GOODS PRODUCED AT A LOWER PRICE. . . I appeal to all workers to continue the sacrifice."

A LIFELIFT FOR CAPITALISM

Is it any wonder that the proprietors of the kept press snatched at this lifelift for Capitalism? When Labor representatives of the calibre of Mr. Cosgrove and Mr. Walsh lay their hands on the economic levers in such a manner the ruling class know at once that they have them "in the bag." As Karl Marx said:

"There is never a ruling class able to assimilate the most prominent men of a ruled class, the more solid and dangerous is its rule." (Capital, p. 706, Vol. 3.)

According to Mr. Cosgrove, the cause of all our troubles is the inability of capitalism to produce sufficient and to produce cheap enough goods. Therefore the (workers) must produce more and cheaper goods. This suggestion, made at a period when the productive capacity of mankind was never greater, not only smacks of sophistry, but it indicates an inability of some people to face the logic of their own propositions.

What would be the position if workers acted and acted on the advice of the Cosgroves and the Walshes? If all the workers of all the world increase production at lower costs, what would be the effects?

OVERPRODUCTION
The immediate result would be a huge increase in production. This means greater surpluses for the capitalists of the world to get rid of. Hence we get increased competition, glutting of world markets, inability to dispose of all surpluses; overproduction creeping on until, finally, production must stop. Then follows the inevitable crises with their corollary, unemployment, increased suffering for the working class. And, as the warehouses begin to bulge with the surplus commodities, the economists of the Cosgrove-Walsh tradition reaches the masters' crisis call to the workers to "make more sacrifices." We've heard it all so often before.

WORK HARDER — FOR LESS

Another point these Labor economists ignore, with regard to their cry for cheaper production and low prices, is that as soon as prices fell, that merchants in the office of capitalist administration, the Arbitration Court, faced with lower index figures, will reduce the basic wage and pay envelopes shrink accordingly. The "Sun" leader writer knows this as well as anybody but exploits the statement of Labor's economic advisors to add weight to his own illogical advice to workers. "You must work harder." His twaddle about workers giving "ungraded efforts" to increase production in present circumstances is like asking a donkey to pull a bigger load and at the same time taking the wheels off the cart.

We expect such economic trash from the avowed handmaid of capitalism and regard it as natural coming from them. But when it is backed by the most prominent men of the ruled class, we sense the slimy hand of the political scoundrel. Karl Marx would smell these fellows a hundred years ago. It's up to you, Fellow Workers, to set rid of them. SOCIALIST knowledge is the best exterminator we know of. What about giving it a trial?

The Rat Catcher.

May Day

Prior to the May Day celebrations, the N.S.W. Labor Council issued a leaflet in which we were told:

"The object of the Labor Movement is the emancipation of the Working Class."

From this we are to infer that the object of the Labor Party is the abolition of Capitalism for when the Labor Council speaks of the Labor Movement it has in mind the Labor Party. This distorting of political facts is designed to perpetuate the illusion that fools so many workers. In continuing their support of the anti-working class policy of the A.L.P.

To spread further confusion, the leaflet contains:

"FIGHT WAR-MONGERS AND DISRUPTERS"

Never was a more misleading statement served up to working men and women, let us analyse it. Who are the "War Mongers"? And how similar is the slogan to that which was popularised prior to all the recent wars, that we, the three main powers left to-day, continue capitalism's unending conflict which invariably leads to wars. They are Russia, the United States and Britain. These imperialist powers are making fresh announcements in preparation for the future. Each is frantically searching for newer and better weapons. Each vying with the other in the atomic bomb race; each is marshalling its military might establishing spheres of influence, setting up jumping off bases

for the future Pearl Harbours or similar "get in first" tactics.

But those who hatter on ignorance and after six years of urging us, Fellow Workers, to kill, maim and mutilate one another, they now call on you to "maintain fraternal relations with the workers" of all lands irrespective of nationality, color or creed.

"SOCIALISM OUR AIM"

We draw special attention to the last part in the leaflet which reads:

"On the 1st of May, 1946 May Day celebrations, the N.S.W. Labor Council sends greetings to the people of Socialist Russia to the workers of all countries. We, pledge ourselves to strive unflinchingly against the enemies of Labor to assist the coloured people of the Pacific in their fight for national liberation improve the bonds of internal solidarity and to do everything possible to achieve the ideals of the Labor Movement-Socialism in our time."

The first sentence — to Socialist Russia — is a concession to ignorance and a puerile pander to the Communist Party. How can R. King, Labor M.L.C. (who signs the leaflet) reconcile this ridiculous statement with those of his colleague, Karl M. King, who recently returned Minister to Soviet Russia, who presented facts and figures to show that Russia was as Totalitarian as ever was Nazi Germany. King either knows no better, or he is hoodwinking the workers who marched behind him in the May Day procession. Whether a fool or a tool of the Communist Party he is tracking for us, for the A.L.P., from those unions dominated by Communist officials.

Another concession to the Communist Party is that bit about "the coloured peoples of the Pacific and the fight for national liberation." A covert attack on his erstwhile Dutch associates, as the recent blood bath is a cover for his and his friends' suspicious silence on British Imperialism in India, the West Indies, Africa and elsewhere, and Yankee Imperialism in the Pacific and South America, and Russian Imperialism in Europe and Asia. Communist support of French Imperialism in Indo-China and elsewhere is conveniently forgotten.

The leaflet ends with "Socialism in our time." So there you have it. The people, who, from snug and cosy sinecures, sent millions to their doom, now prate about "fighting war-mongers" and eliminating war from human society. The supporters of a party that has jailed men and women for taking a day off from nagging too loudly pose as the inspirers of the 40-hour week movement. Self-seekers who have played every obstacle in the path of Socialism now prate about "consummating social changes" and instituting "Socialism in our time."

And so we saw thousands of men and women, proudly marching, heads held high, shackled to the myths of opportunism, providing the means for emancipating their betrayers and their victims, perpetuating their own slavery. (Continued on page 3, col. 3.)

Banned Books, Free Press and a Lot of Hoey

During recent weeks several books have been banned either by the Courts or the book-sellers, and in some cases the publishers themselves have withdrawn the books from circulation. The reasons in most cases are given that the books are "so unpalatable" for public mental consumption.

Acts of censorship are exercised from time to time and the circumstances vary. However, the chief reasons for banning books have invariably been based on either moral or political grounds.

THE MORAL ASPECT

As more publicity seems to be given to the moral side of the censorship question, let us first examine this aspect of the thing. In some cases, we are told that a publication deserves to be banned because it is bad for public morals. Immediately we are treated to a flood of abstract articles dealing with some nebulous abstraction called "morality." The pro-banners protest against what they term "the undermining of our morals," and repeat the worn dogmas concerning the conservation of the Higher Things, M.L.C. King, would describe any pornographic and irreligious they see in every reference to sex some devilish desire on the part of the author to seduce society. Everything they believe in is elevated to a Godhead and that to which they are opposed is labelled libidinous and licentiousness; hence, they cry, in a screech which betrays their own weakness, "BAN IT! BAN IT!"

On the other hand, we have the anti-banners who would publish anything and who are, in many cases, driven into the position of supporting the outpouring of any level of obscenity because they are against the censorship and opposed to banning of any description." These people charge the pro-banners with wanting to push us back to the dark ages and stifling our intellectual life.

THE BASIS OF MORALS

The point both of these moralising schools of thought (that is, if such mental manifestations can be rightfully designated thought) seems to miss it, that morals are not a thing divorced from the realities of life. They fail to see that their so-called morality is just an abstraction from the ideologies of an ever-changing social order. It is an outlook dependent upon the interests of the ruling class of every particular epoch. They do not perceive that as societies change so also do the intellectual, and so-called spiritual, reflections change correspondingly. The ruling class encourages this change as much as sniffs their requirements and discards as much of the old ideology as is repugnant to their requirements. Without an understanding of the material forces underlying social and intellectual development it is utterly impossible to explain the ideological and spiritual changes which give rise to the moralising sentiments of the prescribers pro-banners and their anti-banner opponents.

THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE QUESTION

Why is it that there is but a relatively feeble outcry against the banning of books on political grounds? The answer to this can be sought in the fact that the class nature of the political question is much more apparent than that of the moral. It is the ruling class that regard the moral and religious yawningness as they do political deviations. One may speculate on the religious beliefs; it is possible even to doubt the existence of the gods, Demies or poke mullock at the priests and parsons. When their interests demand it, the ruling class are not averse to interpreting their propaganda sheets with a few "hooleys," innumerable "bells," and even some of the holy fellows have justified an occasional use of the term "Yellow Bastard."

Let anyone dealing with religious matters from a political point of view and as soon as the powers that be rake up enough courage or manifest sufficient stupidity on goes the ban. We don't forget the "Socialist Religion"; "The Ragged 'n' Trousered Philanthropists"; "Christianity and Communism" (based upon "Socialism and Religion"); and "Where Socialist periodicals and pamphlets.

WHERE DO THEY STAND?

The inconsistency of most of the anti-banners is most glaring when we deal with the political aspect of the censorship.

Members of the Labor Party "protest" but put in power and keep in power the very governments which are responsible for the banning against which they "protest."

Member of the Australian Journalists' Association condemn the banning of Australian writings, yet demand an embargo on the importation of overseas writings. In this they are supported by the Writers' and Authors' Fellowship whose members also support the censorship governments.

Adversity (or stupidity) makes strange bed-fellows. The proprietors of the "Sydney Morning Herald" was wrath against "censorship"; at the same time they censor and refuse the advertisement of the Socialist Party of Australia and ignore letters requesting reasons for their "liberal" attitude.

The Labor Party, through the late Senator Kaine (Minister for Customs) has the unique distinction of being the first Australian governing party to deny newsprint to the Socialist Party for the publishing of a Socialist paper.

The "Sydney Morning Herald," which antedate organ of frozen democracy, belittles loudly against censors, yet apart from lying attacks on the Socialist Party of Australia, it refused to publish our reply to the accusations.

Well might we ask: "Where do they stand?"

BOOKS AND BOOTS. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

Man cannot live on "Forever Amber." Neither can he keep the wolf from the door with half-hour snatches of "Love

Me Sailor." The boss places embargoes on books for the same reason that he puts tariffs on boots. It's a question of profits. Imports of foreign commodities like the home manufacturer, hence the embargoes which manifest themselves mostly when the Labor Party (the manufacturers' party) is in power.

In the same way, a priest ridden cabinet cannot afford literature which might weaken the "morals" of its sheep-like followers. Both Labor and Liberal Governments, which boast about their British traditions, ban some of the best in British literature. Members of the Labor Party, the Country Party, the Liberal Party, and the Communist Party, all of which have regimented us for all these years, conscripted us into a militarily, regulated and rationed war, forced us and fooled those who were weak enough to be fooled, now wail about the banning of a few sexy novels which at best are not a patch on Balzac, the Bible or a Midsummer Night's Dream." Cut out the kidstake gentlemen! It's not a sex question. It's a social problem. If freedom of the working class is concerned the only solution is Socialism.

MAY DAY

(Continued from page 2)

Behind the mask of May Day was the hideous face of political confusion. The whole thing was a travesty on work-meaning effort; a merry masquerade for the Marionettes of Moloch. But the wirepullers were not happy; the fight for jobs is on and the elections are in the offing. Labor and Communist speakers threw sly digs at each other from the official dais. They weren't sure how the confusion is going to work out.

Mass political confusion can only be dispelled by spreading Socialist knowledge, but the apologists for Capitalism abhor Socialism. Such knowledge cannot come from the palatial political policy of the A.L.P. as a matter can be helped by the bloody hands of totalitarianism.

Socialist organisation alone will dispel the illusions and eliminate the enemies of the working class who prostitute the principles of Socialism. Our May Day message is still the same:

"WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE. YOU'VE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR CHAINS. YOU HAVE A WORLD TO GAIN."

J.I.C.

AUSTRALIAN BRANCHES

SYDNEY—P.O. Box 2291, G.P.O.
SYDNEY BRANCH—Meets 1st and 3rd Tuesday, 8 p.m.
St. Helens, Rawson Place, Tuesdays, 8 p.m.

See "Sydney Morning Herald," Meetings and Lectures Column for announcements.

MELBOURNE—P.O. Box 1440, Elizabeth Street, 1st and 3rd Tuesday, each month, at Room 12, Temperance Hall.

For other activities, see "Age" Meetings and Lectures Column every Saturday.

FROM NAZISM TO STALINISM

(Continued from page 1)

After the message was read, a senior officer of the British Military Government "issued an inspired statement denying that the Labor Party supported the fusion." He pointed out that the 27 M.P.'s represent 7 per cent of the total of Labor members. Herald, 22nd and 23rd April, 1946.)

The farce ends, for the time being, with the formal fusion of the S.P.D. and K.P.D. into a "Socialist Unity Party" on April 22nd. The Executive is recruited on a 50-50 basis. This party only exists in the Russian Zone. (Age, 24/4/46.) Its programme is no different from any other reformist hodge-podge including "State or Municipal ownership of public utilities," "equal rights for all citizens," and, best of all, "Freedom of spoken and written opinion and of religion." (Labor News (Ironworkers), March, 1946, page 8.) We wonder whether the last points will also be supplied in Russia?

We hold no brief for the Social Democrats. We have constantly pointed out that they are a non-socialist, reformist organization. But our readers should be informed of the trickery that is being used by German Stalinist and self-appointed Social Democratic "leaders" to flout the wishes of the rank and file.

The situation is indeed gloomy. Workers have become pawns in the hands of their "liberators." Naturally, neither the British capitalist class nor the Russian bureaucracy wished to see an independent Socialist movement in Germany. Thus, for the moment, there seems little hope that those German workers who have learnt their lesson, will be able to start a party on the lines of the S.P.C.B. and Companion Parties. Opposition against the policy of one power seems to lead inevitably into the camp of another.

But the work of Marx, Engels and Luxemburg cannot have been in vain. In the British and American Zones, at least a chance for independent political action exists. The moment will come when a real Socialist Party of Germany will be created—a party based neither on the myth of Russian "Socialism," nor on Reformism, but on principles and understanding.

Then, and then only will the German workers have something to unite for—Socialism.

Henry Holmes.

COMPANION PARTIES

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA—P.O. Box 1751, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN—Rugby Chambers, Rugby Street, London, W.C.1.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND—P.O. Box 62, Petone, New Zealand.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND—P.O. Box 1929, Auckland.

PETONE—P.O. Box 62, Petone; Discussion Group, Room 12, 37 Courtney Place, Wellington. On Sundays (except the first Sunday in each month).

AUCKLAND—P.O. Box 1929. Economic and Discussion Class. Every Monday, 7.30 p.m., Carpenters' Union Rooms, Union Bank of Australia Buildings, East Street, and Karangahape Road.

WORKERS' SOCIALIST PARTY OF U.S.—12 Mayward Place, Boston, 11, Mass.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

The Socialist Parties of Australia and New Zealand hold:

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess, but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

7. That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTIES OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND therefore enter the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and call upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under their banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment, apply to nearest address.

THE GOLDEN RULE

WAY OUT WAS IN

Henry Addison (71), grey and crippled, told an Essex court: "At my age I am left with three choices—stealing, the workhouse or suicide. I shan't go into the workhouse and I don't want to die."

Instead he went to gaol for nine months.

Sydney Sun, 9/5/46.

Spurred by the pinch of poverty, He gazes in the shops; The emptiness of hunger grips his guts And in his pockets, nought but knotted hands.

Bereft of all and in that hopeless state That leaves to him no choice but one of three—

To steal—the workhouse—or to die, And driven thus, to hunger and despair,

Crippled and grey—a menace to his kind, Obnoxious to the import of his act

And knowing not the wherefore or the why; One thing is clear—he does not want to DIE.

And so he STEALS—a crime within the Law

Maintained by Minions of a Master Class Who hail him to a Court whose very Soul

Is fashioned out of Yellow Glittering GOLD.

Stamped with the Hall Mark of a hellish greed;

Emblazoned with the creed "Dieu et Mon Droit";

Translated into law "Thou shalt not steal."

The Lion and the Unicorn look down Upon a Bench where Justice wears a frown;

And so arraigned, this outcast, gaunt and pale

Is sentenced to a full nine months' in gaol.

It calls to mind a case of similar kind In which a man who stole a loaf of bread.

When hailed before the Minion of the Law Pleading, with solemn mien, "A man must live,"

"Tut, tut," the Bench replied, in accent merrily,

"Tut, tut, my man, tut, tut, not necessarily."

—W.J.C.

Published by W. J. Clarke, Box 2291, G.P.O., Sydney, and printed by Premier Printers, 65 Arthur Street, North Sydney.