

THE
WORLD-GOVERNMENT
PLOT
EXPOSED!

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
AND
THE SECOND WORLD WAR

BY
ERIC D. BUTLER

*

"By all these means we shall so wear down the Goyim (the Gentiles) that they will be compelled to offer us international power of a nature that by its position will enable us without any violence gradually to absorb all the State Forces of the world to form a Super-Government. Its hands will reach out in all directions like nippers, and its organisation will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world"

- From *'The Protocols of The Learned Elders of Zion'*,
claimed to be International Jewry's plan for complete
world domination.

THE WORLD-GOVERNMENT PLOT EXPOSED

*

International Finance and the
Second World War

*

INTRODUCTION

The plan for world domination proceeds. No longer are we in doubt concerning the objectives of the Second World War. Since I first wrote about this matter in '*The Real Objectives of the Second World War*', the inspired propaganda for a World Government has been alarmingly intensified. Centralisation is being rapidly advanced in every country of the world as an essential prelude, while various groups and associations have been brought into being for the express purpose of fostering the idea.

The question of real political democracy - i.e., decentralised and direct control over our representatives and institutions - is the fundamental problem confronting this and every other country today. One of Britain's greatest thinkers has recently written: "That no major reform can be carried out in the face of centralisation, which is exactly why the centralisers are now so busy."

THE WORLD-GOVERNMENT PLOT EXPOSED

The first move to centralise political control in Australia - as was predicted some time ago - is the intensive campaign to abolish State Parliaments. This move is one of the most insidious and dangerous moves ever directed against Australian democracy.

The financial control is to be also more directly maintained by International Finance, centred in New York; with the result that Mr. R. G. Casey, who belongs to the banking world, has been appointed as Australian 'representative' in the U.S.A.. As has already been intimated by the finance-controlled daily press, one of Mr. Casey's principal tasks is to tell the financial oligarchy in Wall Street what a wonderful field for investment exists in Australia.

The time has arrived when Australians who still have sufficient initiative to do a little thinking for themselves, and who realise the supreme menace of International Finance to civilisation, will have to face the issue with courage and determination. To thoroughly understand what is happening it is essential that we make ourselves thoroughly conversant with certain events during and since the last war; that we understand the nature of the moves and objectives of certain groups during that period; and, more importantly, that we make publicly known the names of the individuals responsible for these moves, together with all their friends and associates.

By keeping the fierce spotlight of thorough investigation on these individuals we will help to remove the cover of anonymity which has cloaked their activities for far too long. It is a very significant feature of every attack on individual liberty and local or national sovereignty, that its origin has always been as anonymous as possible. It is present in very misleading phrases and 'idealistic' jargon, and is 'fathered by an institution which cannot be made responsible for it'.

If any kind of society is to function satisfactorily for the benefit of the individual members of that society, it is essential that certain individuals must not have power without responsibility. The dangers of such a position are obvious; anonymity of these individuals only increases the dangers, while making reform practically impossible.

In my first booklet I have, more or less, covered the general question of International Finance and its fight for world domination. At the request of many people, and feeling that it is vitally essential, I am, therefore, elaborating on certain aspects of the subject and presenting other new material.

A great many diligent students of the forces behind the last war now agree that the *real* objectives were the Russian Revolution, the formation of the League of Nations, and the financial subjugation of Great Britain. I will deal with the attainment, or partial attainment, of these objectives as I proceed.

The main objective of the present conflict appears to be a super-centralised World Government, controlled by International Finance in New York. The smashing up of British democratic institutions is essential to the successful carrying through of this plan.

WHO'S BEHIND IT?

The question now arises: Who are the individuals and groups responsible for this policy? The answer to that question opens up one of the most vexed problems of the day. It can be called 'The Jewish Problem'; and let me take this opportunity of stating that those who say there is no such problem, or who refuse to face it, are, in my opinion, somewhat out of touch with modern realistic thought. Furthermore, silence can no longer be maintained in face of the overwhelming facts - in fact, silence is only aggravating an issue which, unless faced in the correct manner, will come to a head in a wave of crude anti-Semitism, which will solve nothing, and leave the powerful and influential group of International Jewry with their control of credit policy

still firmly entrenched. For example, tens of thousands of Jews suffered in Germany after Hitler came to power. But this does not alter the fact that International Jewry is using Germany in the present conflict. For example, apart from other instances I have previously brought forward, it was interesting to read in a recent issue of the Melbourne *'Argus'* that American copper was being shipped to Germany, via Russia. Copper is a Jewish controlled monopoly. So is Nickel.

The student of history knows that a 'Jewish Problem' has existed for centuries. Thinkers like Voltaire and Benjamin Franklin clearly recognised it. Why has it existed? Mainly because of results produced by a policy which is the expression of a philosophy. That policy is to obtain world domination, and I intend to quote various statements which have been made throughout history by prominent Jews, promising Jewry as a whole that they will inherit the earth.

It is also a fact that Jews, with few exceptions, have carried out a policy of discrimination against non-Jews. It is this unfortunate fact which has rendered them parasitic to the nation on which they descend. It is this feature which has caused them to be hated and persecuted when their control reaches a certain point. This particular philosophy and the policy arising from it is being insidiously fostered by International Jewry today. I believe that that policy will mean the death of civilisation if persisted with. Therefore, the individuals and groups responsible must be exposed.

The rank and file of Jews would be playing their part in the present struggle if they helped with the exposure, instead of starting the cry of 'anti-Semitism'. As I have mentioned, merely putting our heads in the sand is not going to help. Already in Britain is it assuming tremendous proportions. Even a Fleet Street journalist has written a book on the question. H. G. Wells, in his book *'Homo Sapiens'*, faces the question. Here in Australia, with the influx of 'refugees', the first danger signs are appearing.

I believe that the problem can only be solved by opposing and exposing the Jewish policy and philosophy, and replacing it with a philosophy and policy which will break the monopoly of credit which is in the hands of Jewish International Finance. I sincerely hope, therefore, that in facing this question I will not be classed as a Nazi (quite a ridiculous suggestion, only made by unthinking people), or as one in favour of anti-Semitism. It is because I fear anti-Semitism that I have endeavoured to clearly state the problem as above. Any group or race which pursues an anti-social policy must be exposed and opposed - whether they be Nazis, Communists, Jews or 'Puritans'.

THE PROTOCOLS

I do not think that the general subject of international politics can be satisfactorily discussed without making some reference to those amazing documents, '*The Protocols of The Learned Elders of Zion*'. It can be said with certainty that those protocols were written prior to 1905, and they are claimed to be a complete plan for the enslavement of the world by Jewish International Finance. Whether authentic or not is hardly the point. The fact remains that what has taken place since that time has been a deadly replica of the moves announced in these protocols.

Unfortunately, these documents have been associated with crude anti-Semitism, and have not gained the earnest attention they deserve. While recognising the Jewish problem, I am more opposed to anti-Semitism than ever before, after reading these protocols. But there is such a thing as a *Judaic policy* which even Hitler and other so-called anti-Semites strongly pursue. That is what I am opposed to. The individuals responsible for that policy, which is now wrecking civilisation, must be made to accept responsibility for their policy. That International Jewry even welcomes anti-Semitism is indicated by the following extracts from the protocols: "But it has paid us, though we have

sacrificed many of our people. (Protocol No. 2). Also, "Nowadays, if any States raise a protest against us it is only *pro forma* at our discretion and by our direction, for their anti-Semitism is indispensable to us for the management of our lesser brethren."

The following, from Henry Ford's '*Dearborn Independent*' of May 14, 1921, is very interesting in connection with the above.

"It is amazing to discover the number of indications that the attempts to suppress '*The Dearborn Independent*' have been principally to prevent the Jews reading it. The leaders do not care how many non-Jews read these articles; but they do not desire their own people to read them. The Jewish leaders do not desire their people's eyes to be opened."

All this seems to indicate that, as far as Germany experienced anti-Semitism, the 'Higher Command' was not concerned with the loss of a few 'troops'; ultimate victory is the aim. Incidentally, Max Warburg and other influential Jews are still in Germany.

I will give several interesting extracts from the protocols later. In view of the present inspired propaganda for an International Government, the following extract from Protocol No. 9 is particularly significant: "By these acts all States are in torture; they exhort to tranquillity, are ready to sacrifice everything for peace; but we will not give them peace until they openly acknowledge our international Super-Government, and with submissiveness."

Protocol No. 3 leaves no doubt that International Communism is part of the Jewish plan. To quote: "We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces - Socialists, Anarchists, Communists - to whom we give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly role. ..." The Jewish influence in the Communist parties and other similar movements is very notable. Those who refuse to face this aspect of the struggle now raging throughout the world are, it

seems to me, divorced from the underlying realities of the situation.

WHAT HENRY FORD SAID

Those who think that the suggestion that International Jewry fomented and won the last war is groundless would be well advised to carefully consider the following remarks of Mr. Henry Ford, published in the *'Jewish World'* of January 5, 1922:

"It was the Jews themselves who convinced me of the direct relations between the International Jew and the war; in fact, they went out of their way to convince me.

"You remember the effort we made to attract the attention of the world to the purpose of ending the war through the medium of the So-called Peace Ship in 1915. On that ship were two very prominent Jews. We had not been to sea 200 miles before these Jews began telling me about the power of the Jewish race, how they controlled the world through their control of gold, and that the Jew, and no one but the Jew, could stop the war.

"I was reluctant to believe this and said so. So they went into details to tell me the means by which the Jews controlled the war - how they had the money, how they had cornered all the basic materials needed to fight the war, and all that, and they talked so long and so well that they convinced me. They said, and they believed, that the Jews had started the war, that they would continue it so long as they wished, and that until the Jews stopped the war it would not be stopped."

A detailed study of all the events of that terrible struggle emphasises the correctness of the above claims. Mr. Ford set out to expose these international groups, but after having tremendous pressure brought to bear on him has been very quiet ever since.

Another statement made in connection with the last war may also prove enlightening. It was made by Count Albert Mensdorff, who, for the ten years preceding the Great War, was

Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in London. In his book '*After the War*', Lieut-Colonel Repington records a conversation with this Ambassador in Austria in 1921. He says, "M. Mensdorff thought that Israel had won the war. They had made it, thrived on it and profited by it. It was their supreme revenge on Christianity. But, terrible as the last war was, it was but an incident 'in an onward march towards horizons sombre and forbidding'."

The part played by Jewish International Finance in the establishment of the present Slave State in Russia has been dealt with time and time again. I will deal with further evidence of this later. This menace of collectivism, or bolshevisation, which now threatens the entire civilised world, is essentially Jewish. Engels, the Jew millionaire, amassed his huge fortune by the terrible exploitation of child labour in the Manchester district in England. With this fortune he helped finance Karl Marx (Mordecai), the Jewish prophet of collectivism. Russia today is run mainly by Jews, and the unrelenting policy of the controlling group is world revolution and bolshevism.

RUSSIA'S PART IN THE PRESENT CONFLICT

Since publishing my first booklet, in which I dealt with this matter, I have received the following report of a speech made by Stalin at 10.00 p.m. on August 29, 1930. It was published in the French paper '*La Croix*', and, after some delay, was released by Reuter's for the English press. Among other things Stalin said:

"Peace or war? We are absolutely convinced that if we conclude a treaty with France and Great Britain, Germany will be obliged to give way to Poland and to seek a *modus vivendi* with the Western Power; war will be avoided, and the further developments of this state of affairs will become dangerous for ourselves.

"If we accept the German proposal and make a non-aggression pact with them, Germany will certainly attack Poland, and the intervention of England and France in the war will be certain.

"We shall have plenty of opportunity to remain outside this conflict, and we shall be able to wait for a turn to our advantage. Our choice is clear. We must accept the German proposals and send the Anglo-French missions back to their countries with courteous refusals.

"It is evident that Poland will be annihilated before England and France can come to her aid. In that case, Germany cedes us part of Poland as far as Warsaw and also Galicia.

"Germany will allow us complete liberty of action in the Baltic. Let us examine the case of a German defeat. England and France will be strong enough to occupy Berlin and to destroy Germany, and we are not in a position to render them effective aid.

"Our aim, then, must be that Germany shall carry on the war as long as possible, so that England and France may be exhausted, and so exhausted that they will not be in a state to beat Germany.

"From thence our position: all the while remaining neutral, we help Germany economically, supplying raw materials and foodstuffs; but it goes without saying that our help must not go beyond a certain point, lest it compromise our own economic situation and weaken the power of our own army. At the same time, we must, in general, conduct an active Communist propaganda, particularly in the Anglo-French bloc, and especially in France."

Since the war began, the group behind the scenes have pushed on with their insidious plans, and, as mentioned, Australians must realise that they are also being rapidly encompassed in the toils of collectivism, bolshevisation and centralisation. In the meantime, Jewish 'refugees' continue to arrive in this country, buy property and increase their hold. At the same time, a stream of Australian youth is leaving to be

smashed to bloody pulp in the second war to 'save democracy', which, like the first war, was fomented by Jewish International Finance, will be financed and controlled by the same group, and will mean their undisputed world domination, unless action based on an accurate knowledge of the facts is taken immediately. These facts are well worth thinking about.

THE FINANCIAL SUBJUGATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

It has been said that a study of history is the best cure for pessimism concerning the progress of man. This might be so if history dealt with the underlying factors of great social movements instead of being a constant repetition of dogma, dates and worn-out shibboleths. No real history can be written or taught today which does not recognise that Money has been a major factor in the affairs of nations from the time of the Roman Empire. H. G. Wells, in his *'Outline of History'*, clearly shows that the Roman Empire collapsed from the same social disorder which now threatens the present civilisation - the manipulation of money in the hands of private financiers.

Behind a curtain of deception on the world stage upon which the human drama has been played over the past two thousand years has flitted the shadowy but menacing figure of Finance. Rarely seeking the footlights, Finance directs the entire play from behind the scene. If this human drama, which is simply the fears, hopes and ambitions of the hundreds of millions of individual human beings expressed in everyday life, is to be saved from the tragedy which now threatens it, this curtain of deception must be ruthlessly torn aside.

Nothing less than a clear understanding on the part played by Finance in reducing the entire world to chaos can possibly save us. That understanding is the key to the past and the hope for the future. The history of Britain over the past two hundred years can be written around the history of the private banking system and its terrible effects upon the British people.

Australia, since its very foundation, has been governed by the same system.

I have already indicated that one of the *real* objectives of the last war was the financial subjugation of Britain. Unless the present financial system is radically altered before very long, not only will Britain's war effort be hampered - as during the last war - but those who survive the conflict will find themselves completely enslaved under the world-wide system of Bolshevism, which appears to be the main object of the present conflict.

Many people throughout the British Empire are asking how we can keep on mounting up debt and taxation as we are rapidly doing. They realise that we are still paying the interest bill on the debt incurred during the last conflict, without reducing the debt itself by one penny. This may appear a little ridiculous, but, if we take our studies back still further, we will discover that the same position exists in connection with the Napoleonic Wars!

In fact, the history of Britain, since 1655, when International Finance moved in, has been one of merciless exploitation. As colonisation took place, which, on the whole, was the part played by real British effort in making habitable the many scattered corners of the globe, Finance exploited these accomplishments. The result has been that a great confusion has been deliberately created in many people's minds concerning what we might term British Imperialism.

AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION

Finance has used the traditions of the British people for its own insidious ends. I might be allowed to elaborate on this point a little, as I consider it fundamentally important at the present critical juncture. We will take the example of Palestine, where the efforts of British troops against the Arabs have caused a revulsion of feeling amongst all those people who are familiar with the facts.

Other countries, particularly Germany, have laid the blame at Britain's door. The truth of the matter is, that the British people and British politicians are completely ignorant of the manner in which they have been used to further the objectives of International Finance. I intend to expand upon the situation in Palestine and the Middle East later. Let us be perfectly clear in our minds about the complete opposites of Finance and British Democracy.

A confusion on this issue is conducive to defeat. Representative Democracy is a product of the Anglo-Saxon race; it has not failed, and is our greatest potential contribution to the world, if we will only understand it, and attempt to make it function. It is certainly nothing to be ashamed of, and is not related to the idea of 'British' Imperialism, an idea fostered by Disraeli, who has been described by one writer as 'Disraeli the Destroyer'. I agree.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF BRITAIN'S DEBT

Prior to 1694 there was no such thing as a National Debt. The control of the nation's money supply was the prerogative of the Crown. However, with the arrival of the financiers in 1655, and the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694, the British people were started on the long trail of debt, taxation and subjection which has progressively increased and threatens the entire nation.

This banking swindle has been rightfully termed the greatest confidence trick of all time. It allows private individuals to create money for the mere cost of the pen, ink and paper used, lend it to the Government as a debt, and charge interest for the 'use' of it. In times of war this money - literally created out of nothing - has to be expanded to meet the needs of the nation.

Now, while the people have been mesmerised enough to believe that this money has a gold backing, it is essential that the

bankers endeavour to have the debt paid in gold when the war finishes. This, of course, meant that the people had to be sacrificed in order to force the nation back on the gold standard. This strategy was used after the Napoleonic Wars of 1793 to the Battle of Waterloo in 1815, with the result that there was chaos. Years of misery and distress followed, with the result that in 1839 one person in every seven in Britain was a pauper 'on the rates'. The National Debt then stood at £816 millions.

The same criminal activities took place during the last war, with the subsequent attempt to force the nation back on to the gold standard after the conflict was finished. The terrible result of that policy will bear elaboration later. The financial subjugation of Britain has been graphically described in the following brief terms by A. N. Field in '*All These Things*'.

"Thirty-three years after Cromwell had let the Jews into Britain a Dutch Prince arrived from Amsterdam, surrounded by a whole swarm of Jews from that Jewish financial centre. A very natural result, following on this event, was the inauguration of the National Debt by the establishment, six years later, of the Bank of England for the purpose of lending money to the Crown. Britain had paid her way as she went until the Jews arrived. The pawnshop was then opened, and the resulting situation in which the nation finds itself today could not be better described than in the words put by Shakespeare, with prophetic vision, in the mouth of the dying John of Gaunt:

"This blessed spot, this earth, this England, ...

This land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leas'd out (I die pronouncing it),
Like to a tenement, or pelting farm,
England, bound in with the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of wat'ry Neptune, is now bound in with shame,
With inky blots, and rotten parchment bonds:
That England, that was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.'

"The history of the second Jewish settlement in Britain is one long trail of parchment bonds shackling the nation in debt. Every step in the ascent of the Jew in the nation's affairs has been marked by the increase and multiplication of debt. The culmination was reached when, under the Asquith and Lloyd George War Ministries, surrounded by the Marconi Scandal Jews, the European War was financed by the fictitious lending of £6,000,000,000 of completely non-existent money. The barefaced fraud of these proceedings was capped after the war by an audacious contraction of the means of payment, and the consequent wholesale wrecking of British industries and reduction of millions of the people to destitution."

Destitution is hardly the term for it. After the last war had finished, International Finance carried out a policy which was a deliberate attack upon British people and British institutions. Personally, I am exasperated at the manner in which the financially-controlled press of this and other British countries has dramatised the refugee problem in Central Europe, while millions of British people have been facing hell for the last twenty odd years. But *they* are forgotten.

When International Finance decided that the British people had to be subjected to a murderous policy, it was deliberate. The mentality of the men responsible for this policy can best be judged by the statement attributed to Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, by John Gunther in his book '*Inside Europe*'.

Mr. Norman was listening to a banking friend who said that the policy being pursued (just after the last war) would impoverish Britain in the long run. Norman replied that he was not sure that countries which were too rich didn't go to pieces.

So, in order to save Britain from going to 'pieces', Mr. Norman and his friends put two Million British workmen on the dole, where they and their dependents have lived in earthly hell for years.

THE CREDIT SWINDLE OF THE LAST WAR

If it did nothing else, the last war partially revealed to many people the swindle being foisted upon the nation by the private trading banks. Unfortunately, it was not recognised at the time - otherwise the post-war history of Britain would have been much different, and we would not be engaged in war again. When war started, the vaunted custodians of the people's money, publicly bankrupt, were unable to pay out to their depositors in legal tender as much even as one-fifth of the amounts standing to those depositors. Bank doors were closed, and the Government stepped in to save a public disclosure of the whole banking swindle.

The obligation to pay gold was suspended, and currency notes were issued to the banks, with which they were able to meet their depositors' demands. Yes, it was as simple as that. This new currency had been issued by the State, and was backed by the State. The people accepted it, and there was no talk of 'inflation'. This money was also free of interest. Here was a unique opportunity for the Government to take over the sole prerogative of managing the nation's money supply, which could be created as the nation needed it, without debt or taxation.

But the shrewdness of the Financiers was only surpassed by their blatancy. No sooner had the Government saved the bankers from ruin by their action than they demanded that the Government must not issue any more money on an interest-free basis. The war must be run with borrowed money, which they would create by mere book entries - credit - using the currency supplied by the Government as a basis. The Government yielded and the huge swindle went on. While British boys were dying in France, the bankers were busy writing up the ever-mounting debt in their ledgers.

The National Debt of Britain rose, between August, 1914 and December, 1919 from about £660 millions to about £7,700 millions. Needless to say the interest bill was staggering.

Practically the same thing went on in Australia, although a considerable amount of money was issued by the Commonwealth Bank at an infinitesimal rate of interest. Between 1914 and 1919 the Australian nation debt rose from £339 millions to £704 millions.

This is the same policy which we are being asked to endure again. This treacherous policy of the financiers must be altered immediately if we hope to win through to ultimate peace, liberty and security.

AN AMAZING DISCLOSURE

The most amazing aspect of the financing of Britain during the last war was the fact that the Government must have realised, as already pointed out, that the entire country was a victim of a gigantic criminal swindle.

For example, there is no disputing the evidence that it was known before war broke out that the Bank of England and other banks could not meet the possible demands of their depositors. The currency which the Government had printed, in order to save the banks, was printed at least **A WEEK BEFORE WAR WAS DECLARED**. We have that on the authority of Lady Waterlow, whose husband's firm, Waterlow & Sons, did part of the printing. She herself told the story in the columns of a Sunday newspaper of November 10, 1929:

"I remember that in 1914 - incredible as it may seem in 1929 - there were no one-pound Treasury notes. My husband's firm was ordered to rush through the first issue of one-pound notes on the Tuesday before war was declared. At eleven o'clock at night I went down to the works to be at my husband's side when the first notes were passed by the Government officials. It was a solemn moment, for it presaged war, and changes that would lead we knew not where.

"My husband told me that the men would have to work night and day for three weeks at full pressure to get the important Government order through. He dreaded it for the

men, for he knew the strain that it meant."

Although the press reports reaching the public at that time declared that the decision to print the notes was not made until the Cabinet met after war had been declared, the above statement from Lady Waterlow's *'Memoirs'* exposes this deliberate lie.

Lady Waterlow's version of what took place was also confirmed by Lady Atterbury on August 27, 1933, when she wrote in an English newspaper: "Sir John Bradbury and a colleague came to my house at Hampstead Heath and asked my husband, Sir Frederick Atterbury, K.C.B., in the Chancellor's name, to get the paper money made. My husband was at that time Controller of H.M. Stationery Office. It was a matter of extreme urgency, and the first note was designed in my drawing-room in a few minutes by my husband. ... As it was not possible to obtain his Majesty's signature in the extreme haste required by Mr. Lloyd George, Sir John Bradbury signed the note, on behalf of the Treasury.

The work was strenuous to get the required amount of notes issued in so short a time. The firms who printed the notes - Messrs. Waterlow and Harrison - kept their men working day and night. ... To the best of my belief, notes to the amount of five millions were printed under my husband's direction, by the Wednesday." This was a week before war broke out. Having saved the banks by such an issue of interest-free, paper money, backed by the State, it is hard to understand why Mr. Lloyd George's Government did not take over the sole prerogative of issuing money.

At times during the war he displayed a contempt for orthodox procedure in matters of finance, and was warned on one occasion by the *'Financial Times'* that if he did not stop interfering with credit policy his finance would be stopped. Apparently, the banks were more concerned with maintaining their system than the possible defeat of the British forces on the battlefield. However, on this occasion Lloyd George promptly told the Bank of England that if the money he wanted was not

available in three hours there would be a new Bank Board the following day. Unfortunately, it was issued as a debt for the mere cost of pen and ink to the banks, who were using the currency which the Government had so kindly supplied them with when war broke out as a basis for their pen-and-ink money.

AUSTRALIAN INCIDENT

In passing, it may be of interest to recall a somewhat similar incident in Australian history which clearly indicated the financial swindle to which the people are subjected. I refer to the time when J. T. Lang gave the bankers of this country the greatest shock they have ever experienced. They immediately started a 'run' on the Savings Bank in New South Wales, which, like every other bank, was unable to meet the total demands of its depositors in legal tender. Lang, of course, was blamed. The bankers did not foresee the possible result of their action as people all over Australia started to draw their money from the banks in cash, and, if this procedure had been adopted by the people as a whole, every bank in Australia would have had to shut its doors. The mask would have been removed.

The situation was so serious that it necessitated the late Sir Robert Gibson, former Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board, making a dramatic national broadcast on May 31, 1931, in which he told the people that everything was all right, as "the Commonwealth Bank had control over the note issue, and can command resources, in the form of currency, to any extent, which, in the opinion of the Bank Board, is deemed necessary".

In other words, if the people did demand their money the printing machines would be put in motion. That admission is historic, and should be remembered by every Australian who is concerned with the fate of civilisation on this continent. It reveals a position such as that exposed by the events in connection with the banks in England at the outbreak of the last war. Ironically enough, when the swindle looks like being exposed, the people who are being swindled, through the

Government, acquiesce in saving the banks. The banks then carry on as before.

DICTATORSHIP THROUGH DEBT

The operations of the financiers during the past clearly indicate that they are in no way concerned with the repayment of their fictitious debt; in fact, they are opposed to the repayment. They desire to keep the nations as deeply enslaved as possible, in order that the tremendous power of taxation can be maintained. Taxation is mainly levied for the purpose of meeting interest charges on the debts. The weapon of taxation allows the financiers to use Governments for the purpose of dictating to the individual. It is significant that every political party, whatever the label, is in favour of taxation. It is almost a mania with the Socialists and the Communists. This is, no doubt, the reason why such movements are not regarded with any apprehension by High Finance.

One of the most amazing statements on record in connection with taxation was made by no less a person than Sir Josiah Stamp, of banking fame, when addressing the British Association in 1936. He said: "We have seen in a few years that the human or social temperament has a much wider range of tolerance than we had supposed. ... Direct taxation 30 years ago ... seemed to reach a breaking point, and was regarded as psychologically unbearable at levels which today are merely amusing. ... There can be little doubt that, with the right application of experimental psychology and adjusted education, the mind of man would be still more adaptable." So we are to be conditioned to accept more financial dictatorship! The present war is being admirably used for that purpose.

This diabolic policy has been rigidly adhered to ever since Britain fell to the financial invasion of the Jews in 1655. At the time of the Napoleonic wars the attempt to force Britain back on to the gold standard, after a huge fictitious debt had been incurred, was the result of the Bullion Committee of 1810.

"A leader in the fight for a return to the gold standard was David Ricardo, who was chiefly responsible for formulating the Bullion Report," says Professor Irving Fisher, in '*Stabilised Money*'. Ricardo was a Jewish financier, and played a leading part in encompassing Britain in the toils of debt.

In 1786 William Pitt set up a sinking fund to extinguish the National Debt. This fund had wiped out over £238 millions of debt by 1813, and it was estimated that it would have wiped out the entire debt by 1845. However, this scheme to save Britain was smashed by a gentleman, with the fine, British-sounding name of Nicholas Vansittart, who was Chancellor the Exchequer. Read the following statement which he made on March 3, 1813: "The great danger of the sinking fund is that it will liquidate the debt too rapidly. ... All our financiers, accordingly, have concurred in the necessity of limiting, in some way or other, this powerful agent of liquidation." No wonder that Britain sank deeper and deeper into the mire of debt and resulting taxation.

The power of taxation to keep the nation enslaved may be appreciated if I mention that Britain has already paid, *in interest*, five times the total debt incurred during the Napoleonic wars; while the effects of the last war were ably summed up by the late Arthur Kitson in the '*Builders' Merchants' Journal*' in 1934. Kitson said: "Our national debt on March 31, 1919, was £7,434,949,429. From 1920 to 1933, inclusive, there has been paid in interest charges on the debt £4,288,925,186. In spite of this, our national debt on December 31, 1933 (including our debt to the U.S.A.), was £7,947,000,000, being £512,000,000 *more* than the original debt of March 31, 1919."

After a survey of this history, can we be otherwise than apprehensive that the maintenance of the same financial policy during the present conflict will leave the entire British Commonwealth of Nations in hopeless financial subjugation? Australia is ruthlessly tied to the juggernaut of International Finance. We must immediately break with a financial system which has been responsible for the events already outlined.

AFTER THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

In *'The Real Objectives of the Second World War'* I have dealt with the main evidence relating to the financing of the Russian Revolution by the Jewish International Banking Houses in New York. Two of the senior partners in the main banking house concerned with the financing of Lenin and Trotsky (Kuhn, Loeb & Co.) were the Warburg brothers. During the last war, Max Warburg was financial adviser to the German Government, while his brother Paul Warburg, was financial adviser to the American Government. No wonder that Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, the British Ambassador to America at that time, said that in dealing with these financiers it was just like negotiating with the enemy.

Having achieved the object of conquering Russia through the Revolution, and at the same time prolonging the war, the international financiers decided that they would throw in their lot with Britain if certain promises could be guaranteed in connection with the Zionist Movement. No doubt, the aim to bring Britain under the dominance of Wall Street also actuated this group in its decision.

After the Revolution, Jacob Schiff, the head of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., wrote as follows to his son Mortimer: "You might cable Cassel (Jewish financier, who was one of the principal men in the formation of Vickers, with which the Jewish Armament King, Sir Basil Zaharoff, was actively connected throughout the war), because of recent action in Germany and developments in Russia we shall no longer abstain from Allied Government financing."

Schiff also wrote to Boris Kamenka, president of the Banque de Commerce de L'Azoff-Don: "Nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to be of advantage to new Russia in all and any opportunities that may present themselves.

And to Zangwill, on April 5, 1917: "The Romanoff Dynasty has been ended overnight by a bloodless revolution, which, by a stroke of the pen, has also brought forth the

emancipation of Russian Jewry." On the following day, America entered the war.

THE BETRAYAL IN PALESTINE

The manner in which International Finance, with its world-wide ramifications, used the British people in connection with the betrayal of a promise made to the Arabs during the last war makes disgraceful reading. It further portrays the manner in which the destinies of the British Commonwealth of Nations are no longer even in the hands of Britishers. They are the pawns in the hands of alien international groups. Those who talk of their great patriotism would do well to look to it. Most of this patriotism takes the form of blindly worshipping a set of ideals which are certainly not British in any sense of the term.

In 1915 the British Government, under the McMahon Agreement, promised the Arabs complete independence if they would desert from the Turkish armies and enter the war on the side of the Allies. The Arabs accepted this promise, only to find themselves completely betrayed by the now-famous Balfour Agreement in 1917. Lord Bertie tells how the main man to approach the British Government in connection with the Zionist movement in Palestine was Baron Edmond de Rothschild.

In 1917 there is no disputing the fact that because of the murderous tactics used by International Finance to prolong the war and weaken Britain's war effort, Britain was in a desperate position. The oil situation was almost hopeless, and those who are so keen on patriotism to Britain might ask themselves who were the men responsible for having the British Navy transferred from coal-burning to oil-burning with the result that the fate of the Navy was in the hands of those international groups controlling oil. At one stage during the last war reliable authority has it that the British Navy was completely without oil for ten days.

No wonder the British Government set aside the former promise to the Arabs in Palestine. However, once the Balfour

Agreement was signed, credit was made available to Britain, and America entered the war.

Since the war, the position in Palestine has been one of perpetual turmoil. The Middle East is, in the present war, the most explosive part of the whole war-zone, because of the importance of oil. Those who are talking about Jewish atrocities in Central Europe would be well advised to read some authentic history concerning the treatment of the Arabs since the last war. It is shocking. However, when we later go into some detail as to who owns and control the powerful international newsagencies throughout the world, we can then make certain significant observations.

SOME INSIDE HISTORY

Until the present time the public has heard very little, except one side of this history. I, therefore, quote in detail from a pamphlet intended only for Jewish Zionists, written by Mr. Samuel Landman, who, during the war, was solicitor and secretary to the Zionist Organisation. This pamphlet was issued in March, 1936. This is what Mr. Landman wrote:

"During the critical days of 1916 and of the impending defection of Russia, Jewry, as a whole, was against the Czarist régime, and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would, in certain circumstances give them Palestine. Several attempts to bring America into the war on the side of the Allies by influencing influential Jewish opinion were made and had failed. Mr. James A. Malcolm, who was already aware of German pre-war efforts to secure a foothold in Palestine through the Zionist Jews and of the abortive Anglo-French démarches at Washington and New York, and knew that Mr. Woodrow Wilson, for good and sufficient reasons, always attached the greatest possible importance to advice of a very prominent Zionist (Mr. Justice Brandeis of the U.S. Supreme Court), and was in close touch with Mr. Greenberg, editor of the '*Jewish Chronicle*' (London) and knew that several important Zionist Jewish Leaders had

already gravitated to London from the Continent on the *qui vive* awaiting events, and appreciated and realised the depth and strength of Jewish national aspirations; spontaneously took the initiative to convince, first of all, Sir Mark Sykes, Under-Secretary of the War Cabinet, and afterwards Monsieur Georges Picot, of the French Embassy in London, and Monsieur Gout, of the Quai d'Orsay (Eastern Section), that the best, and perhaps the only, way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the war was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilise the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a *quid pro quo* contract basis.

Thus, as will be seen, the Zionists, having carried out their part, and greatly helped to bring America in, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret 'gentleman's' agreement of 1916, made with the previous knowledge, acquiescence, and/or approval of the Arabs and of the British, American, French and other Allied Governments, and not merely a voluntary, altruistic and romantic gesture on the part of Great Britain, as certain people, either through pardonable ignorance assume, or unpardonable ill-will would represent or rather misrepresent."

Mr. Landman continues, that, after the Declaration was agreed to "the change in official and public opinion, as reflected in the American press, in favour of joining the Allies in the war, was as gratifying as it was surprisingly rapid."

AFTER THE WAR

After the war finished, Britain was forced to pay the terrible price of the betrayals which the Government and those who controlled the Government had been responsible for. One of those men who played a dominant part in the debt negotiations with America after the war was Lord Reading (Rufus Isaacs), the man whose influence on British affairs

throughout the war was not very savoury. This man had close contact with the International Financiers in New York and was, consciously or unconsciously, connected with every move throughout those terrible war years which pawned Britain further and further into the hands of the financiers.

In *'The Real Objective of the Second World War'* I have dealt in detail with the manner in which Britain, after the war, was financially strangled by Wall Street. The following two quotations from very conservative sources may prove very interesting. They were in connection with the depression launched by Wall Street in 1929. The first was made in the House of Commons by Mr. W. Graham, who explained how the British Government was forced to reduce the dole rates at the instigation of Wall Street.

He said, on September 10, 1931: "... it was specifically put to us (the late Ministers) that unless one item in particular - a 10% cut in unemployment benefit to yield £12,150,000 - was included in the programme, it would not restore confidence, and we were told that no other item could be put in substitution. ... Let the House be under no misapprehension. It was because of an outside insistence upon that specific point that the late Government broke."

Also read the following, from the *'Daily Express'*, September 27, 1929:

"To propitiate Wall Street, British industry is to be taxed another 1%. From the list of directors of the Bank of England we publish today (under the heading of 'Our Masters: Who's Who at the Bank: Who Are the Financial Dictators of Great Britain?'), it will be seen how few of them are engaged in the daily uphill task of making goods and finding markets. Their eyes and minds are more on the ends of the earth than on the troubles and needs of their immediate fellow citizens.

"The voice of Wall Street is heard and obeyed in their councils. ... The Governor of the Bank has followed his customary line by leaving industry to shift for itself, while he moves his pieces on the board as though credit, and all that

depends on it, were merely pawns in a game of international chess."

HITLER BROUGHT TO POWER

One of the most significant statements on record concerning the Hitler régime in Germany was made by Dr. Schacht, the American-trained banker. When Hitler came to power he said: "For three months we shall do what Hitler tells us. After that he will have to do what we tell him." Things did not quite go that way.

From all the evidence available, there seems not the slightest doubt that Hitler was helped to power by the Wall Street group. The French magazine '*Cyrano*', has dealt with the memoirs of Sidney Warburg, connected with the Jewish Banking House of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., who was responsible for the negotiations which led up to making finance available to the Nazi Party. As far as can be gathered, Hitler was put in touch with Thyssen and other powerful industrialists and financed by or through them.

Apart from this, there can be no disputing the evidence that International Finance has played a major part in building up Germany to her present strength. Good care was taken, of course, to see that, although she obtained raw materials, she was unable to obtain sufficient raw materials for consumable purposes.

Hitler was a product of the conditions created by International Finance after the last war. The process leading up to the present conflict seems to have been as follows: Create the conditions which will produce a Hitler. Help him to power. Then have a war to crush Hitlerism; and, in the process, build a system of 'World-Hitlerism'; which is exactly where we are all heading at the moment.

The one thing of advantage obtained by the German people from the wreckage of the last war was a democratic constitution. But this did not alleviate their economic

conditions, which became progressively worse. No wonder that Hitler and all he stood for seemed like a possible solution to the German people. They surrendered their freedom for the possibility of better material conditions. The other democratic countries are rapidly following the same path to tyranny.

THE BANK OF ENGLAND AND GERMANY

Mr. Montague Norman, Governor of the Bank of England and Wall Street's bailiff in Britain, has been openly in favour of building up Germany since 1931, when British bankers borrowed money in America at low rates of interest and lent it to Germany at 7% and 8% interest. By 1935 the City of London (the Bank of England) was openly pro-Nazi, and was actively engaged in re-arming Germany, as revealed even in the *'Financial News'* of May 15 of that year.

In 1937 the *'Banker'* said that "we regret to have to admit that from a small but influential circle in the City of London there flows a constant stream of propaganda in favour of credits for Germany."

Mr. Paul Einzig, one of the best-informed writers on finance today, says, in *'World Finance, 1918-36'*, that "there can be no doubt that practically the whole of the free exchange available to Germany for the purchase of raw materials was supplied, directly or indirectly, by Great Britain. War material, which will eventually be used against this country, could never have been produced but for the generosity with which Great Britain is giving her enemy free exchange for the purpose of raw materials. If the day of reckoning ever comes, the liberal attitude of the British Government in this matter may well be responsible for the lives of British soldiers and civilians."

Unfortunately, there has been no Government in Britain willing or able to challenge the financiers, who carry on arming and financing where they see fit. This was particularly noticeable when, after the Czechoslovakian crisis, the British

Government was forced to admit that it had no power to restrain the Bank of England from allowing millions of pounds worth of gold to be sent from Czechoslovakia to Germany.

Apart from direct credits, the supplying of Germany with raw materials for war has depended upon International Finance, which controls directly or indirectly, the main mineral supplies of the world. The following figures may prove an eye-opener to those parents who have sons going overseas to fight Hitlerism, and who never even concerned themselves in years gone by with the financial swindle that paved the way for the present conflict.

During 1938 Britain and France supplied Germany with 94% of nickel requirements, 26% of iron ore, 33% of lead, 62% of copper, 61% of manganese, 60% of zinc and 52% of rubber.

The German Trade Returns show that following figures for imports of pig-iron into Germany from Britain and France during the twelve months ending February, 1939:

BEFORE MUNICH

Six Months

Mar. to Aug. 1938

From

France.....23,757 tons

Great Britain 2,332 tons

AFTER MUNICH

Sept., 1938 to Feb. 1939

From

France.....204,506 tons

Great Britain..... 39,203 tons

Right up to the very eve of war, the papers were admitting that Britain was seriously depleting her own rubber and copper stocks in order to supply German orders. Well, of course, it would be a terrible thing if the war started without both sides being well armed! But it is not a very nice thought to think of British young men being shot with munitions supplied by so-called British interests.

SINCE THE START OF THE WAR

As soon as the war started, International Finance brought pressure to bear, through its tools in the American Government, to have the arms embargo removed in order that munitions could be supplied to the Allies. The war, if it goes on long enough, will mean that all Britain's assets will have to be pawned to the American financiers, in order to carry on the war. Apart from this factor, even the daily press has indicated that America is also supplying Germany with materials.

In the Melbourne *'Sun'* of February, 10, the following report appears: "The German Liner, Koenigsberg, sailed from Belem (Brazil) yesterday with 2000 tons of copper and an unusually heavy supply of fuel oil. The Soviet steamer, Mayakovsky, loaded 200 tons of molybdenite at San Pedro, consigned to Leningrad, but believed to be destined for Germany."

Taken in conjunction with this report, the following report, which appeared in the stop press of the Melbourne *'Sun'* on Friday, December 1, 1939, makes very interesting reading. (Significantly enough, this report did not appear, as far as I know, in any other paper in Australia.) It read: "Nazi Plan to Raise Loan in United States. London - A Berlin report states that Dr. Schacht, Hitler's financial adviser, is planning to raise a loan in the United States from bankers of German descent. He expects to obtain enough foreign currency to pay for imported war materials."

Also note the following report which appeared in the Australian Press on April 9: "The Department of Commerce reveals that United States exports for the war rose by 33% totalling \$1,949,000,000 compared with \$1,460,000,000 for September to February, 1938-39. Britain and France took 24% of the total." No doubt a great amount of the rest of the increase found its way to Germany through the neutral countries, as indicated even in the following report in the Melbourne *'Herald'*, April 4:

"Significant figures have been revealed in the New York '*World Telegraph*', which show that while the decrease of direct exports from the United States to Germany over a recent period of five months, amounted to £12,600,000, the United States exports over the same period to Belgium, Holland, and Hungary, Roumania, Italy, Jugoslavia, Switzerland and Denmark, had increased from £53,900,000 to £76,560,000. On the reasonable assumption that most at least of that increase was destined for Germany, Germany had actually greatly increased its imports from America despite the Allied blockade."

Most of the Wall Street groups are, or have been, controlled by German Jews, such as the Warburgs, Schiff, Brietung and Kuhn.

Unless Britain can throw off the *enemy within* before very long, I am afraid that I, for one, must confess that her position looks little short of hopeless. When the war starts in earnest it will mean that Britain, France and Germany will be exhausted in a devastating struggle, leaving Russia and America completely controlling, in one way or another, what is left.

The more I study the question the more I am convinced that the main object of this war is to smash the British Commonwealth of Nations and bring the whole world under a system of domination and regimentation such as that operating in Russia. If Britain is going to win this war, in the military sense, something drastic will need to be done internally. The *home* front is the most important, and already Britain is suffering major losses on that front. It recalls to mind that famous statement made by Abraham Lincoln, when he said: "I have two great enemies: the Southern Army in front of me and the financial institution in the rear. Of the two, the one in my rear is the greater foe."

Since the outbreak of war, individual enterprise has been progressively smashed in Britain, cherished liberties are being lost, while 'sovietisation' is proceeding rapidly. Mr. Sieff and his planners have been having a great time, and the following statement, made in the '*PEP. Journal*' of October 4, 1938, now

takes on a terrible significance: "We have started from the position that only in war, or under the threat of war, will a British Government embark on large-scale planning."

In the *'Daily Telegraph'* of December 5, 1939, the following appeared: "Industrial power will win the war. Overwhelming output of armaments would shorten it, with its incalculable loss of life and misery." And yet at that time there were at least 172,000 more unemployed in Britain than when the war began. This was in spite of the fact that there were 1,250,000 men under arms and 1,700,000 public or private A.R.P. officials, apart from the vast army of bureaucrats.

This is a result of planning and debt-finance. No wonder that the following, appearing in a syndicated article recently published in Britain, seems to sum up the tragic policy now being followed: "Behind it all is a suspicion in some people's minds that the Treasury, working in concert with a few big interests, is bent on trustification of industry, such as Sidney Webb and Philip Snowden foretold would prelude Socialism, and that the profits, or most of them, will go into the national coffers as a form of indirect taxation."

Thus International Finance, through the Bank of England, is attacking Britain on the home front. The debt structure continues to mount higher and higher, with taxation pressing heavier and heavier. Here in Australia, as we will see later, we are also fighting a desperate battle on the home front.

THIS WORLD-GOVERNMENT

As I have pointed out previously, since the present conflict broke out we have been subjected to a flood of ideas concerning an International Government. The manner in which this propaganda is being broadcast, with the aid of both the press and radio, is little short of astounding, and clearly indicates that it is being pushed by powerful groups. We will see later that this idea is an American and Russian idea. The League of Nations was a similar attempt by International Finance at the

conclusion of the last war. That attempt failed. However, we will find it of interest to make ourselves familiar with that attempt, because it, like the second attempt, was espoused by American leaders, under the domination of the International Financiers in Wall Street.

Before going on to deal with this, I quote the following extract from a broadcast, early this year, by Clifford M. Utley, Director of Chicago Council of Foreign Relations: "Some may think it ridiculously early to talk about the next peace; or you may think it none of our affair. We shall have a great influence on the next peace, if the Allies win. If the war goes on for long we shall have all the money in the world.

Post-war Europe will be bankrupt, and will look to us for financial aid to start things going again; and, much as we condemn the reckless loans that we made to Europe after 1920, we shall probably make some new loans. ... *We will be in a position to demand a price. That price may be the handing over to the United States of new-world possessions of European nations, if we decide we want such possessions.*"

THE REAL FORCES BEHIND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Much has been written by so-called authorities concerning the first attempt to establish some form of international government - the League of Nations. Who were the principal individuals responsible for this idea? Although popular history constantly mentions the name of President Wilson, it would be more appropriate to ask who were the individuals behind Wilson. Once again investigation clearly reveals the subtle work of our Wall Street friends - the Warburgs, Schiff, Brietung, Kuhn, etc.. The Zionist leader, Mr. Nahum Sokolov, said of the origin of the idea, in his book '*The World Crisis: The Aftermath*', page 147, that it was 'a Jewish idea'. No less a person than Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador in America during the last war, left no doubt about

the real powers behind Wilson, and he wrote in one of his letters (published in 1929), that German-Jewish bankers were getting hold of the Principal New York papers, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and 'Schiff, the arch-Jew ...' having acquired the '*New York Times*'.

The Secretary of the Treasury at that time, Mr. McAdoo, apart from being the President's son-in-law, was a former partner of Warburg. Then there was the famous Colonel House - a Jew, whose real name was Mandel Apfelhaus - who was also connected with the Wall Street groups. When Wilson finally discovered the manner in which he had been used by House he showed him the door. Wilson died a victim of deception.

It will not be out of place here to mention another man who played a dominant part in American affairs during the last war, and who is one of the most powerful men behind Roosevelt today. That man is Bernard M. Baruch, who, at an investigation after the last war, said that he had more power than any other man in America. He controlled practically every industry.

Apart from being surrounded by these financial vultures, Wilson also had his famous Fourteen Points drafted by the Jewish journalist, Walter Lippman. As if this influence were not sufficient, the Chicago '*Daily Tribune*' of July 22, 1922, said: "A Jew, Justice Lubits Brandeis, ruled the White House by secret telephone."

I think that the reader will agree that, in view of the above, Wilson was little more than a mouthpiece for those behind the scenes. When the peace talks took place Max Warburg represented Germany, while his brother, Paul Warburg, represented America. Mr. Lloyd George has said quite clearly that the statesmen, diplomats and journalists were swept aside by the international financiers.

Those who have studied the factors behind the formation of the League of Nations know that the big objective was to form a Bank of International Settlements, with Central Banks throughout the world. Thus International Finance hoped to obtain world domination. Things went very well for some time,

although the scheme fell short of its objective a few years ago. It certainly did not function as desired.

This Bank of International Settlements, with headquarters in Basle, showed its teeth when it used the League of Nations to cripple Austria just after the war. Austria at that time was carrying out an unorthodox experiment in monetary policy, and, according to all the reliable evidence available, was then easily the most prosperous country in Europe. Pressure was brought to bear, and the chains of debt and taxation were firmly clamped upon the Austrian people, producing subsequent events which destroyed what has been termed the 'flower of European culture'.

As was to be expected the League of Nations had the support of all the 'Left-wing' elements. The same elements now support the same idea which seems to be the main objective of the second World War. It is now called Federal Union. The author of the idea is an American Jew named Streit. The financial proposals in this scheme would mean more complete world-domination by International Finance. We will see that Federal Union has the backing of the same interests as were responsible for the Russian Revolution and the building of Russia's tremendous armed forces. This was only to be expected.

SIMILAR TO THE RUSSIAN IDEA

In view of the close relationship between the Russian experiment and the Internationalists, perhaps it is not so surprising that similar proposals are put forward in connection with the idea of a world-government.

Back in 1905, Trotsky was talking about a 'United States of Europe'. The organisers of the famous Communist Manifesto, issued in 1848, had similar views. Both Marx and Engels thought that this classless society would be achieved by a series of revolutions, starting first in Germany, although Marx is supposed to have said that 'a European revolution without England would be a tempest in a teacup'.

However, it remained for Lenin and Trotsky, aided with liberal funds from New York, to make the prophecy come true in Russia, at least. However, Russia was only a part of the world, and Engels and Marx had said that anything short of world-revolution was no good. From 1918 to 1921 there was the pathetic spectacle of Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and other members of the Third International keeping up the hopes of the revolutionaries by saying that the world-revolution was only a matter of weeks, or, at the most, months ahead. Lenin soon put forward the idea that there was one stage which Marx had overlooked: Imperialism. Imperialism must end in world-war, which would pave the way for the revolution.

However, this did not appear likely for some time, so they were forced by 1921 to stop talking about the revolution just around the corner. In 1924 Lenin died, and Stalin began to become the dominant figure in Russian affairs. While Stalin was all for building up Russia internally, as an immediate objective, with world-revolution in the future, Trotsky opposed this. The clash continued until 1929, when Trotsky was exiled. The two Five-Year Plans were put into operation, and Russia professed peace with the world while building up her huge industrial machine and her armies. However, it must not be forgotten that Stalin is a Marxian, and world-revolution is a vital part of the Marxian creed.

War broke out on September 3, 1939. 'Imperialism' has resulted in war and the long-awaited opportunities for world-revolution have arrived. The power-drunk Hitler, egged on by Stalin, takes the fatal step, and the war for world-revolution began. Stalin takes the biggest part of Poland, virtually controls the upper Baltic, smashes Finland and then turns his attention south. Stalin was right; Trotsky was wrong. World-revolution in 1924 was 'an outside chance'. On present indications it is 'even money'.

One of the most important things advocated by the interests desiring Federal Union is an overwhelming air force to back up the will of this central European Government. On

present indications, unless the leaders in Europe start to realise the real objectives behind this war, who but Russia will be left with an overwhelming fighting force? Perhaps the origin of this Federal Union idea now becomes apparent. Russia has used the past twenty years to great advantage and presently I hope to strip the mask from what I consider the greatest lie ever foisted upon a long-suffering and deluded humanity.

However, let us not despair. As one writer has said: "Hitler can be beaten; Russian Communism, with its soulless materialism and ant-heap idealism, can be beaten; American financial domination can be beaten; but they can be beaten only by the preservation of our national British culture and by the expression of those ideas of independence which are peculiarly ours."

THE DISEASE OF BOLSHEVISM

It is a remarkable thing how the idealism of many people can be successfully exploited by movements, which, on the whole, depend upon the successful labelling of a particular abstraction. Although there are many labels and much disagreement between such movements the fundamental aim is identical. For the sake of a better term, we can define this common aim as 'bolshevism', which is being brought about in every country of the world by various tactics. Revolution was used in Russia, Planning is being used in Britain and is now being introduced into this country. New Dealism is the technique in America.

Discussing this question with some people, I have found that they advance the argument that there does not appear to be any logical co-operation between these various movements. I don't think that Finance is much concerned with any surface understanding. A policy of confusion and chaos appears to be more satisfactory. Any movement which furthers this policy is, therefore, advantageous to the common aim. We might briefly examine one example.

There are many people belonging to such movements as the Political and Economic Planning Movement in Britain, and similar movements elsewhere, who would be particularly indignant if they were called Communists, and yet their fundamental aim is the same: the regimenting of the individual under the monopoly-State. Let us take another example: Many conservative people are waxing enthusiastic about the prospect of destroying national sovereignties and the formation of a World Government. Strangely enough, this has been the dream of Communists for years.

Now, a little independent and clear thinking on this important matter indicates the menace of being carried away by labels. Because they were successfully labelled, Communism and Nazism were for years supposed by many to be completely opposite - although recent events have somewhat shattered this illusion. I might be allowed to make one further point: No one would seriously suggest that Mr. Menzies and his Government espouse Communism, but I would be very pleased if someone could indicate to me the practical difference between their stated aims and the aims of the Communists.

Since war broke out we have seen legislation introduced which openly sets out to give the Government complete control of industry. Monopolies will be thus encouraged. Primary producers are also to come under the control of the State, as witnessed by the various bureaucratic Boards being set up. Individual liberty must progressively decrease unless an alteration is made. As far as I understand the Communists, this is exactly what they are also aiming at.

If Finance can achieve its ends with the control of finance from above it will do so. Failing this, a revolution from beneath will achieve the same end, only with a little more ruthlessness. While on this point, I might quote a former French Ambassador, who reports in his book '*Geneva Versus Peace*', a conversation he had with a former Jewish revolutionary from Hungary. This revolutionary had become a director of a big Wall Street Bank, and said: "... Bolshevism finds favour in our

eyes; it is an admirable salting tub in which to corrode and not to preserve. ..."

Apart from the common objective of certain movements, there is another significant feature which cannot be ignored. I refer to the power wielded either directly or indirectly by International Jewry in most of these movements. International Jewry has openly said that it aims at world-domination. It proudly boasted that the conquest of Russia through the Revolution was the first big step.

Since that time a policy of insidious propaganda has flooded the entire world. The present war is the last act in this struggle; and no one but a fool would attempt to deny that the possibility of complete world domination by Jews International Finance is now more than a mere possibility. It recalls to mind a quotation from *'The Hidden Hand of Judah'* by O. B. Good, M.A. who writes: "And the Jew, Rathenau, a former Minister for Foreign Affairs in Germany, said before his death: 'The year 1941 will bring to the Jews their final goal of world-domination'."

There is not the slightest doubt that Russia is the working model for the 'New World Order'. Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, the influential Chairman of the Planning Movement in Britain, has said in one of his documents on planning that: "The only rival world political and economic system which puts forward a comparable claim is that of the Union of Soviet Republics."

Mr. Sieff is a director of one of the big chain-store monopolies in Britain, trading as 'Marks and Spencer'. This monopoly was able to declare a 40% dividend during 1933, mainly by virtue of the fact that it handled almost exclusively all imports from Soviet Russia, and was thus able to under-sell British competitors. Now that Britain is engaged in war, Mr. Sieff and his friends are actively engaged in furthering their ideas of reducing Britain to one big State monopoly, such as exists in Russia.

In view of the fact that most of these ideas concerning Planning, World-Governments, etc., have obtained their

inspiration from groups responsible for the building up of the present régime in Russia, the following report by Mr. Oudendyke, the Dutch Minister representing British interests in Russia during the war is truly prophetic. This report was dated September 17, 1918. He said: "I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is now the most important task in the world, even more important than the war which is still raging. Unless, as I have already said, Bolshevism is strangled at birth, it will spread in some form or another all over Europe and throughout the entire world, for it is inspired and organised by Jews, who have no nationality, and whose sole aim is to destroy, in their own interests, the existing order of things. The only way to remove the danger would be by collective action on the part of the powers."

Significantly enough, this report, which was published in the British Blue Book, and was being distributed amongst politicians, was suddenly withdrawn from circulation. "Under the pretext of corrections, copies were reclaimed from those who had already received them, and a new, abridged edition was substituted for the first one. All the part played by the Jews, such as the above, had been suppressed."

THE TACTICS OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM

There are some people who are apparently not every concerned with the aims and methods of our local Communists. I also held that view some years ago; I have learnt quite a lot since. Because of their subtle white-anting tactics the Communists wield a far bigger influence than many people think possible.

In the first place, they are international and more concerned with Russia than Australia. They take their orders from Moscow. They have also very cleverly created or used various organisations with high-sounding names for the purpose of introducing their ideas. Such movements as 'The League for

Peace and Democracy', 'The League of Nations Union', etc., are facades behind which the great religion of collectivism is propagated. There is one thing which they do not propagate: How to smash the power of Finance, both national and international.

Now some people will say that these are rather definite statements. Can they be substantiated? Yes; I have taken some considerable trouble to peruse various authoritative Communist publications for the sake of showing the folly of supporting or condoning in any way any movement which menaces the British Parliamentary system of democracy.

Some reader will no doubt remark that the Government has now taken rather strong action against the Communists. Yes, but this is only aggravating the problem. Communism is an *effect* and not a *cause*. The only way to beat it is to bring it out into the open and expose it. Try do drive it underground and you are only paving the way for violence and bloodshed. In fact, the Communists have suggested on more than one occasion that they are not much concerned whether they are declared illegal or not.

Revolution does not depend upon constitutional action; exactly the reverse. And a revolutionary situation can be used by Finance to completely destroy the work of those who are seeking a democratic and constitutional reform of the financial system. High Finance and Revolution are two opposites, but they work for the same end. Australia is facing a very critical period.

I have said that the Communists are more concerned with Russia than Australia. Let there be no delusion on this point. The following statement by J. B. Miles, Secretary of the Australian Communist Party, reported in '*Smith's Weekly*', October 1, 1939, is interesting. Mr. Miles said: "Should England become involved in a war against Russia, the Australian Communists will side with Russia, and do everything to guarantee her victory." Any person making this statement in connection with Germany would be interned immediately.

Apparently Russia is different. In spite of Russia's brutal rape of Finland, there still exists a great sympathy for Russia in some Labour quarters. Sir Walter Citrine, the well-known British politician, said early this year, after visiting Finland, that the British Government would be very unpopular with Labour supporters if it declared war on Russia. He went on to say: "There are many thousands of people in Britain who felt that, despite all the happenings of recent weeks, there was still something in the Russian Revolution which was worth preserving."

Mr. Attlee, the Labour leader, went so far as to say at the same time that Russian Communism was superior to Nazism because it was inspired with a noble ideal. This only indicates the tremendous influence of the insidious poison of internationalism which has been poured into the British people since the Russian Revolution and all that it stands for was launched by International Finance over twenty years ago.

One of the main points in the Communist's programme is the fact that the workers of the world must be mobilised to help Russia. To quote: "The masses must realise that their devotion to the Soviet Union has to be shown by striking revolutionary faith - not tomorrow but today." - *'The Communist International'*, No. 6, 1932.

"The Thirteenth Plenary Assembly of the Committee of the Communist International appeals to all nations of the Communist International, to the workers of the whole world, to arise in a spirit of utter self-sacrifice and defend the U.S.S.R. against the imperialist coalition." - *'Pravda'*, January 4, 1934. Also: "The masses outside Russia must be mobilised to defend the U.S.S.R.."

I have clearly indicated in *'The Real Objectives of the Second World War'* that Russia intends to use the present war to foment revolution in every part of the world. Let me quote from the 'Programme of the Communist International', 1936 edition: "The Communist International is the only international movement whose aim is the dictatorship of the proletariat and

Communism, and which openly acts as the organising force for the world-wide proletarian revolution."

Also, note the following: "The conquest of power by the proletariat is not a peaceful conquest of the ready-made machine of the bourgeois State by a parliamentary majority. ... The conquest of power by the proletariat means the forcible abolition of the power of the capitalist machinery of government (the bourgeois army, the police, the civil service, the law court, Parliaments, etc.), its place being taken by the new organs of proletarian power, which are essentially repressive instruments for breaking the resistance of the exploiting class."

At the beginning of *'The Statutes of the Communist International'* the aims of the Communist Parties of the world are clearly defined. "The Communist International, an international association of workers, is the organisation of the various national Communist parties into a single world-wide Communist Party. The Communist International guides and organises the world-wide revolutionary movement of the proletariat ... for the institution of the world-wide dictatorship of the proletariat, for the creation of a World Federation of Soviet Socialist Republics. ..." This last is exactly what International Finance, centred in New York, is also preaching. It is the most hellish idea ever conceived by the mind of man, and must be fought if our present civilisation is to survive.

HAVE THE COMMUNIST CHANGED THEIR TACTICS?

"We are sometimes accused of departing from our Communist principles. What stupidity, what blindness. We should not be Marxists or Leninist revolutionaries, nor disciples of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, if we were not capable of completely altering our tactics and our mode of action as circumstances may dictate. But all the deviations and all the ins and outs of our tactics are directed to a single end - the world

revolution." - Demitrov, General Secretary of the Communist International. (Verbatim Report No. 39, p. 1846)

The above explains the manner in which the Communists have used other fronts to cloak their activities at times. Some of them claim to desire peace and pacifism. Numerous quotations could be given, all indicating that Russia supports international war, which will be used to foment civil war in every country. Here is one: "Communists will endeavour to draw the opponents of war, organised to serve the cause of peace, into the struggle to transform imperialist war, against the bourgeois, and for the overthrow of capitalism." - Resolution on the report of Comrade Ercoli, adopted August 20, 1935, at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, Moscow. (Correspondence Internationale, p. 1279)

The following quotation will indicate that the Communists are no pacifists: "It is our duty to pillory all those writers who describe the threat of a new war as a dream and lull the workers to sleep with pacifist lies." - (Stalin, Remarks on Subjects of Current Interest; quoted by L'Espoir Francois. No. 189, September 17, 1937.)

Also: "We coldly and calmly look forward to the outbreak of war." - (Report by the Communist, Thorez, to the Filleuranne Congress, January, 1936)

Another organisation, which, although claiming to be against war, has been used by the Communists, is the 'Movement Against War and Fascism'. When the British Women's Organising Committee Against War and Fascism had its first conference, Mrs. Despard set the tone of the meeting by declaring: "Will it be seditious to say that we are all for revolution? (Applause) I am a revolutionary. (Applause) No revolution will be carried through without the women. We should like to see the unemployed equipped for war, and then - I had better not say what then." (Prolonged applause)

The Communists also hide behind the democratic front. But this is another lie to cloak their attacks upon the parliamentary system of democracy. When I debated Dr. O'Day

early this year, he left no doubt on that point. He spoke a lot about the dictatorship of the proletariat. Just what does this mean? Stalin in '*Leninism*', page 41, says: "The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be complete democracy, democracy for all." Also: "Scientifically speaking, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a power which is restricted by no laws, hampered by no rules, and based directly on violence. Dictatorship means unlimited power based on force and not on law." - (Stalin, '*Questions of Leninism*', p. 23)

The French Communist paper, '*L'Humanite*' of January, 9, 1936: "The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot function within the parliamentary system." Here we have another point of agreement between Finance and the Communists. They are both working to destroy the parliamentary system through which the people can alone govern themselves.

As for opposition political parties, Stalin left no doubt on that point when, on November 26, 1936, he said: "As for the freedom of political parties other than the Communist party, there can be no question of that. We Bolsheviks regard this as a good feature in the Constitution." (i.e. the New Soviet Constitution)

The Communists have also had quite a lot to say about the freedom of the press. Let us see what their great god, Stalin, has to say in connection with this matter: "In our country there is no freedom of the press for the bourgeois. There is no freedom of the press for the Mensheviks and revolutionary socialists, who represent in our country the interests of the defeated and dispossessed bourgeois. But what is surprising in that? We never undertook to allow freedom of the press to all classes, or to make all classes happy. ... That being so, how can the dictatorship of the proletariat be expected to secure freedom of the press to the bourgeois?" - ('*Problems of Leninism*' p. 298)

WHAT OF AUSTRALIA?

I have, I hope, left no doubt that our local Communists are merely stooges for the World Revolutionary machine, which hopes to utilise the second world war for the establishment of the World Federation. In this country, as elsewhere, they have always been to the fore in any attack upon those who are trying to break the stranglehold of Finance. They were mainly responsible, with the assistance of the Bank of New South Wales, for the removal of Lang from leadership of the New South Wales Labor Party.

They, no doubt, remember how Dr. Lloyd Ross, who is a member of the Political Bureau of the Australian Communist Party, was to be invited to a dinner arranged by no less a person than Sir Alfred Davidson, the General Manager of the Bank of New South Wales, when the British Labor politician, Mr. Bevin, was out here in 1938. Sir Alfred told Mr. Bevin that he was keen on getting rid of Lang and having a 'properly led opposition'. These sensational facts were made public in the Federal Parliament in November, 1938, by Mr. J. Beasley. The Bank of New South Wales supplied to the 'Heffron Group' the finance required to get control of the '*Daily News*'.

Whether they know it or not, the Communists are a valuable instrument to Finance. Finance can create the ideal breeding ground for Communism, which can then be left to tear down the existing order of things.

A brief survey of Communist history indicates that Moscow is particularly well informed on affairs in this country. Recently, Mr. Nicholas Dozenberg, alias George Morris, alias Earl Browder, has been sentenced by a New York court to four years' hard labour with a heavy fine for criminal activities. I was very interested to read this, as Comrade Browder was a member of the U.S.A. Central Committee of the Communist Party which fed the Australian Communist Party with literature from 1921 onwards. In 1927 Moscow formed the Pan-Pacific Union, an organisation which, among other things, opposed the

White Australia policy and worked for the Communist control of China. Browder was also in this Union.

In 1927 we had a gentleman by the name of Rubinov out here to put the local Reds on the right lines. Browder had meanwhile been appointed head of the Pan-Pacific Union in China, and in 1929 called a conference at Vladivostok. A committee was formed to draft a plan for Australian Unionists. Mr. Lozovsky, now one of the leading lights in Russia, and leading advocate of revolution through war, said that in Moscow there were 'no illusions about the revolution in Australia'. Not even the Sydney Labor Council 'could be considered constantly revolutionary', though it was 'most progressive'. 'Australians should never negotiate with the bosses. ... Arbitration and industrial peace must be continually condemned'. Class war was to be carried on in this country as in other British countries.

It was after this conference that the Sydney Labor Council started to mend its ways. It sent 'fraternal greetings' to Comrade Lozovsky, and 'placed on record its acknowledgment of the serious mistake made regarding the industrial peace conference'. It pledged itself to 'carry out the instruction of the Red International as a loyal affiliated body', and accepted an invitation to be present at the next Moscow congress.

In 1930 Comrade Sharkey, of the Australian Communist Party, attended the Moscow conference with Browder. Sharkey wrote from Moscow: "I got a very good hearing, as our recent struggles ... have been closely followed over here."

Since then Mr. Sharkey has become chairman of the Australian Communist Party, and is a member of World Executive of the Communist International, which tells the local Communists what to do.

If Australians like this sort of thing they will remain apathetic to the attacks being launched against the parliamentary system in this country. If they are concerned they will make it a point to oppose any suggestion of the destruction of national sovereignty, the tearing down of our institutions, which is part of International Finance's plan to rigidly control the entire world.

If the war goes on, the Communists will endeavour to foment civil strife as indicated. If we break the control exercised by Finance, we will remove the things which breed revolution: poverty, insecurity and class bitterness.

THE MENACE OF CENTRALISATION

Immediately after the second World War began, a flood of literature appeared in connection with a proposed World Union, as set out in C. K. Streit's book, 'Union Now'. All that the internationalists have done is to change the name of the League of Nations to Union Now. The ultimate aim is identical: to smash national sovereignties and centralise all control in the hands of an international government, backed by international finance. A little investigation clearly shows that the same groups and interests responsible for the League of Nations, and the Bank of International Settlements, have been responsible for this further sinister move in their quest for complete world domination.

At the same time, under cover of war, which the same interests have been primarily responsible for, centralisation is being insidiously fostered in every country of the world - particularly British countries. The fight against centralisation is the main task confronting those who realise that the fate of civilisation now hangs in the balance.

In fact, so important is this question of centralisation that I think it most appropriate to quote a particularly significant extract from the 'Protocols of Zion'. I quote from Protocol No. 5 (Marsden translation):

"We shall create an intensified centralisation of Government in order to grip on our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw, one by one, all the indulgences and liberties which have been allowed the goyim, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportion as

to be at any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any goyim who opposes us by deed or word.

"There is nothing more dangerous than personal initiative. If it has genius behind it, such initiative can do more than can be done by millions of people among whom we can sow discord. We must so direct the education of the goyim communities that whenever they come upon a matter requiring initiative, they may drop their hands in despairing impotence."

The above is well worth careful study. If we do so, and then look around at the tide of events which threatens this and every other country, we are in no doubt about the urgency of exposing those people responsible for the present chaos.

MOVE TO DESTROY NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

The following extract from an address by Professor Arnold Toynbee to the Fourth Annual Conference of the Institute for the Scientific Study of International Relations in 1931 is a sample of the poisonous activities which have been pursued by internationalists since the last war: "I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national States of the world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national States of the world is still a heresy for which a publicist or a statesman can be - perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracised and discredited. ... The fifty or sixty local States of the world will no doubt serve as administrative conveniences. But sooner or later sovereignty will depart from them. Sovereignty will cease, in fact if not in name, to be a local affair."

Now it might be appropriate if we conduct a little investigation into the early history of this Royal Institute of International Affairs. The organisation was born at the

Versailles Peace Conference in 1919, where International Jews and their friends dominated the proceedings and paved the way for the second world war. The first task of the International Institute was to write a history of the Peace Conference. There was a shortage of funds until Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, of Wall Street - who is a keen advocate of a Federated Union in Europe - subscribed £2,000. Such has been the power of powerful groups behind the scenes that this Institute has grown to the extent that it has an income of over £35,000 a year, and is even now granted treasury funds to the extent of £35,000 by the British Government.

In 1926 the late Sir Otto Beit gave the Institute a sum of £1,000. The Bank of England then became a regular subscriber, while J. D. Rockefeller and P. A. Molteno also gave liberally. Since then the following have helped considerably: Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., Prudential Assurance Company, Reuters Ltd., N. M. Rothschild and Sons, and J. H. Schroeder and Company. This explains why this Institute was brought into being. It is further evidence of the activities of International Finance, in reducing the whole world to a regimented slave State.

"UNION NOW"

It is very significant that Lord Lothian has been the British Ambassador to America since war broke out. Why? Because Lord Lothian is another internationalist, and is keenly in favour of Federal Union. He has written a pamphlet on the matter called '*The Ending of Armageddon*', which Federal Union is distributing from 44 Gordon Square, New York. It is claimed that 44 Gordon Square belongs to the Schiffs, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.. It was formerly occupied by the head of Thomas Bolton & Co., who married one of the Behrens. Which is all very interesting.

One or two observations in connection with the proposals for Federal Union may also prove interesting. The first thing

which the supporters of this move advocate is an international government. Our own Justice Evatt has commented on the proposal by saying that the further you get away from the source of power, the people, the greater the danger to democracy. In effect, advocates of Federal Union say: "We have not yet been able to make democracy function on a small scale, so let's try on a big scale." Such reasoning is the product of immature minds nurtured on abstractions.

It would naturally appeal to the Socialists, and the following statement, made by Mr. Attlee, leader of the British Labor Party, at a private Conference of Socialist M.P.'s at Caxton Hall during the second week in November, 1939, is well worth putting on public record. He said: "... Fifthly, there must be acceptance of the principle that international anarchy is incompatible with peace, and that in the common interest there must be recognition of an international authority superior to the individual States, and endowed not only with rights over them, but with power to make them effective, operating not only in the political but in the economic sphere. Europe must federate or perish. ..."

"There must be an international force, possessed of such overwhelming strength that no would-be aggressor would dare to challenge it. For many reasons an international air force is the most appropriate instrument, while, in addition, the abolition of national air forces will remove the apprehension of aerial attack. ..."

In other words, we are to have an international government backed by international finance controlling the only fighting unit in the world. We can well imagine this international air force being used to bomb into submission any nation which dared to challenge the financiers in any way whatever. And, as I have mentioned before, if this struggle goes on, who will have such an air force? Only Russia and America, the two greatest strongholds of the internationalists.

Mr. Attlee, and other Socialists with such half-baked ideas, may not agree with this, but it is no longer a possible

theory. It is a real possibility unless this world-wide campaign towards centralisation is exposed and opposed.

One other interesting feature of Federal Union is worth mentioning. Mr. Streit advocates a return to the gold standard. Now we begin to realise what it is all about. The peoples of the world must be forced back to the worship of gold; they must not be allowed to become free to obtain access to the goods of the world under a decent financial system, based on goods and services instead of a practically useless yellow metal.

Make no mistake about it. This idea of Federal Union is making progress. The press and the radio are pushing it. Many sincere people feel that it is the only way out of war. That is what the Internationalists want us to believe. It has the wholehearted support of all the 'Left-Wing' groups while even the *Right* Book Club has published Streit's book. Of course, no one seriously thinks that there is very much difference between the 'Left' and the 'Right' these days. Stalin and Hitler removed that delusion.

Those who believe that the individual is more important than the State will fight it with all their strength. There is no more important issue before the people today. The entire structure of civilisation is being deliberately undermined. Behind all these moves will be found the Schiffs, the Warburgs, Brietung, Kuhn, Loeb and all their kith and kin. They are a deadly tribe.

CENTRALISATION MENACES AUSTRALIA

Bearing in mind the history of the move for a Central World Government and the individuals responsible for the furthering of this idea, we obtain some conception of the menace to political democracy in Australia if the State Parliaments are abolished, leaving only a centralised Federal Government in control. It can be taken as axiomatic that, fundamentally, the people as a whole are not opposed to the number of

representatives in the Government of the country. A little discussion on this point always elicits the information that the real objection is one of 'cost'. If the electors can be clearly shown, as I have no doubt they can, that, compared with the millions of pounds paid in interest every year on fictitious debts to the private trading banks, the cost of State Parliaments is infinitesimal, they would, perhaps, realise that their discontent would find a better outlet in bringing pressure to bear upon their State Members of Parliament, to have the financial swindle ended immediately.

As it appears that the electors may be stampeded into agitating for the abolition of State Parliaments on the grounds of cost, it would be very pertinent to ask if such a move would reduce the total cost of government to the Australian people. It is very doubtful. The work now done by the State Parliaments would be transferred to a centrally controlled army of bureaucrats - as if we are not already sufficiently overburdened with the menace of bureaucracy. The electors might also bear in mind that State Members are responsible to the electors for their actions. Bureaucrats are not.

It is quite apparent, as previously indicated, that this increasing drive towards bureaucracy is a deliberate attempt to under mine democratic government in every country of the world where a semblance of it still exists. This menace has been clearly seen by no less a person than Lord Hewart in his great work, '*The New Despotism*'. Dealing with similar moves in Britain, Lord Hewart points out: "... with the technical ability arising from lifelong experience, that the modern Civil Service is characterised by an administrative lawlessness which is something quite new in British experience.

More and more the business of the country is being controlled by some irresponsible *Fonctionnaires* sheltering behind some Enabling Act. Each interference increases the mass of 'forms', and invites still greater armies of Office Staff. The sheer inability both of individuals and businesses to make any headway against this situation is adduced as justifying still

further interference. There is no check upon it whatsoever; no one in Government Service is responsible for anything." The menace is already rapidly increasing in Australia. The abolition of State Parliaments would be a national catastrophe.

THE ABSTRACT MIND

The mania for Universal Federation and Centralisation appears to me to be, in the main, a product of the type of mind nurtured on such abstractions as those fostered by the majority of the Left-Wing groups. Gigantic schemes for building up a 'powerful State', in which the individual exists merely for the purpose of benefiting the 'State' are fostered by people with a desire to do things in a 'really big way', no matter how many *individuals* suffer in the process. In this respect the Communists, near-Communists, and the Bankers display a remarkable similarity of outlook.

Mr. Montague Norman restricts the claims to life - credit - in order to keep the private banking system 'sound'. Millions suffer in the process. Stalin 'liquidated' millions of Kulaks in Russia in order that 'State Socialism' could be built. In both cases the system is more important than the individual - a philosophy which threatens the basis of our present civilisation.

Now it is a fact, well known to those who have taken the trouble to study this aspect of the subject, that, in the main, those responsible for this philosophy have had very little experience with practical scientific accomplishments. They desire to do things in 'a really big way', no matter how many individuals suffer in the process. On the other hand, engineers and scientists always make a number of small scale experiments before finally deciding on any big project. Success always comes through small experiments.

Now exactly the same argument applies to the science of government, of which Major C. H. Douglas, noted British sociologist and engineer, has said: "The general principles which govern association for the common good are as capable

of exact statement as the principles of bridge building and departure from them is just as disastrous."

A survey of history clearly indicates that political democracy functions best in small political units, where the representative of the electors is in personal and direct contact with those he is representing. Initiative for desired results must always come from the individual electors. Now strangely enough, these realities concerning representative government were appreciated as far back as the thirteenth century. A study of Scotland's history from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century is most enlightening. However, with the growth of the banking swindle in Britain, government became more and more centralised, while individual initiative and liberty in self-government became progressively less.

Dealing with contemporary history, it is a well-recognised fact that the smaller States, such as Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Switzerland have very little discontent with their political systems, which are similar to our own. Most of the discontent which does exist is due to the debt system. The love of liberty in these countries is outstanding, as witnessed by the terrific struggle waged by the Finns in their hopeless struggle against the might of the Red Army.

On the other hand, the larger countries, which have been subjected to Federation or centralisation, such as the United States, Russia and Germany, have been the scenes of increasing political discontent. The same thing is now occurring in Britain as a result of Centralisation. The two big countries in which Federation has taken place - Russia and America - have rapidly drifted towards a centralisation of power and a decline of individual liberty.

History supports the idea that smaller political and economic units have much to commend them, except to the World Planners, with their desire to destroy National Sovereignties and to remove Government still further from the people by running things in 'a really big way'.

This is exactly what will happen in Australia if we allow our State Parliaments to be removed. Most people realise that, taking all factors into consideration, they get more real representation from their State Members than their Federal Members. The State Member represents a smaller political unit, and is therefore more easily contacted by his electors. This is particularly so in country electorates, where practically every elector knows the representative personally.

Viewing the question of State Parliaments in the light of the foregoing facts, it is urgently necessary that every citizen knowing the real facts behind the proposed move for centralisation should help to further immediate action to not only oppose the abolition of State Parliaments, but to also bring them under the control of the electors, in order that they will provide a closer and more decentralised medium through which the electors can get what they want.

CIVILISATION'S LAST STAND

It is no mere coincidence that the control of the main news agencies of the world is centralised under the domination of Finance. Those who merely think that the steady trend towards world domination by Finance has been a haphazard growth are out of touch with real history. I have taken some trouble to study the early history of the growth of Finance, and I believe that the chaos we see today was foreseen by real thinkers when the modern system of banking began to take shape. But the warnings which these men brought forward were either suppressed or ridiculed. Others, like Abraham Lincoln, paid with their lives.

Now, if a plan for world domination was to be carried through, it was essential that the organs of publicity should be controlled. Once again I might direct the reader's attention to two quotations from those remarkable documents, *'The Protocols of The Learned Elders of Zion'*. The following appears in Protocol No. 2:

"Through the press we have gained the power to influence while remaining ourselves in the shade; thanks to the press we have got the gold in our hands, notwithstanding that we have had to gather it out of streams of blood."

Also note the following from Protocol No. 12: "Not a single announcement will reach the public without our control. Even now this is already being attained by us, inasmuch as all news items are received by a few agencies, in whose offices they are focussed from all parts of the world. These agencies will then be already entirely ours, and will give publicity only to what we dictate to them."

Let us take one of the big newsagency monopolies today, such as Reuter's. In 1935, one of the chief officials of this agency, Mr. C. Fleetwood-May, lectured to the Post Office Telephone and Telegraph Society at the Institute of Electrical Engineers, London. In the course of his remarks he said: "The fact of being the world's news-centre means a great deal. London could hardly have become the financial hub of the world if it was not also the news-centre. News collected on an internationally-organised scale was originally nothing to do with newspapers, *but started as an essential part of international Finance.*" This was when the Rothschilds utilised the first news of the battle of Waterloo to distribute false reports and make a huge fortune in a few hours on the London Stock Exchange.

Since then the power of the various news monopolies of the world has assumed tremendous proportions; which explains why the idea of a Federated Europe as a prelude to an International Government receives so much publicity.

If the people can only be kept mesmerised by the press about the financial system, the financiers have nothing to fear. The following quotation from a letter written from London by the Rothschild brothers to their New York agents when introducing their system into America is some indication of the contemptuous manner with which they regard the people's welfare: "The few who can understand the system will either be so interested in its profits, or so dependent on its favours, that

there will be no opposition from that class, while, on the other hand, that great body of people, mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantage that Capital derives from the system, will bear its burden without complaint, and, perhaps, without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests." This sort of thing will continued while the people depend upon their daily papers for real information concerning the financial structure, and its world-wide ramifications.

SINCE THE OUTBREAK OF WAR

"The money power preys upon the nation in times of peace and conspires against it in times of adversity." Thus spoke William Jennings Bryan, famous American lawyer and statesman of last century. That is what we are seeing today. It is no accident that the British people are being 'bolshevised'. They have led the fight against financial dictatorship throughout the world. They stand between the power-drugged financiers and their dream of world domination. Is it any wonder that, since war broke out, Britain has been systematically attacked from within?

The British home is being broken up, private enterprise is going to the wall and the debt to the financiers is being piled higher and higher. Britain is being beaten on the home front, and today faces the greatest crisis in her history. Is she to lose those cherished institutions and liberties which are a part of the traditions of the British people? Is her national sovereignty to be destroyed; are her people - those who survive the conflict - to be regimented by an international government backed by international finance and 'overwhelming force'? How ironic seem the words of one of England's greatest sons:

"This England never did, nor never shall,
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,
Unless it first did help to wound itself
But now her princes are come home again

Come the three corners of the world in arms,
And we shall shock them; naught shall make us rue
If England to itself do rest but true."

England has not been true to herself. The conquerors arrived with the banking swindle, and have been systematically engaged in conquering the nation ever since. Wherever the British people colonised, the financiers moved also.

WHAT OF AUSTRALIA?

Exactly the same thing is taking place in this country. It was only to be expected. It is taking place in every British country. In Canada, where the election of the Albertan Government for another term of office was a crushing answer to the money power, a powerful move is being made to abolish the provincial Governments, the same as the move in this country is to abolish the State Parliaments. Since war broke out in this country we have seen insidious moves being fostered. First we had the National Security Act brought down, an Act which will be used when the forces behind the Government feel that time is opportune. Then the 'spontaneous' campaign for the abolition of State Parliaments. Mr. Casey was sent to Wall Street. Our masters are to be well informed on affairs in this country. Now we have a suggestion that the Constitution be altered in order that the Government can retain its dictatorial powers over the entire nation when the war is over.

I don't know what the average person feels about these insidious moves. They terrify me. At the same time the debt structure is mounting higher and higher. Taxation must become heavier and heavier. The immediate task which requires every ounce of our energy is the breaking of the financiers' grip in this country, at least. This means the restoration to the people of the control of money. The issue has probably never been better summed up than in the following words of Lincoln: "The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the

Government and the buying power of the consumers. The people can and will be furnished with a currency as safe as their own Government. Money will cease to be master, and will become the servant of humanity. Democracy will rise superior to the money power."

The control of money, or credit, is the issue which will decide the fate of this civilisation. One of the originators of the scheme to enslave the world, Meyer Rothschild, put the matter in a nutshell when he said: "Permit me to issue the credit of a nation and I care not who makes its laws." If Australians are to play their part in the struggle to overcome the Money Power, they must quickly obtain control of their members of Parliament, and force them to tackle this issue while we still have time.

THE LAST STAND

I have endeavoured to point out in this story of the move for a centralised world government, the tactics which have been used by international finance. Slowly, but surely, the people of this and every other British country have been beaten back. Liberties have been taken bureaucracy is introduced and centralisation is insidiously fostered. How much longer will the British people stand it? So far International Finance has been very successful. Is our fate sealed? I for one do not believe it. The British people are hard to stir, but their inherent characteristic of love of freedom will, in my opinion, be the deciding factor. They will stand so much but no more. As the situation gets worse, they will be more or less forced into the last ditch. They will then be forced to make a determined stand. Australians must vigorously oppose bureaucracy, the abolition of the State Parliaments and the pawning of the nation's assets to the private banking system. We, as a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations, must play our part in the struggle to preserve what civilisation we still possess.

Before concluding, let me quote one of the Empire's greatest men of today, Professor Soddy, who, in '*Poverty Old and New*', wrote:

"Has not Britain, which has led the world to freedom before, a message today for the rest of the nations where freedom is already in the shadow, the penumbra of eclipse? Is it not possible, rather than handing over the world to a League of International Financiers operating through the League of Nations, and who are responsible for the very evils they are relied upon to lure, for Britain to put its own house in order and learn to govern itself? That, today, is tantamount to governing our money system. If we were to break this new tyranny of money pretenders, we should establish once more the Pax Britannica throughout the nations, and lead the way to their living in harmony and co-operation rather than in the fratricidal competition and economic rivalry that inevitably leads to war. The small nations are looking to us, and the powerful would welcome the lead.

Some of us have made contributions to the understanding of these problems, which, however they may have scaped the blessings of those at home, have been welcomed and received in a spirit of fairmindedness all over the world wherever the British tongue is understood. We can claim in this, at least intellectually, to have helped to blaze the trail. Can we not put our conclusions into effective action for the benefit of the world? Or has the spirit of Democracy become too feeble to wish even to survive?"

As the lights of liberty flicker in the darkening gloom, let us draw a new breath of hope and inspiration, and carry on the race against time. International Finance *can* be beaten. Australia can blaze the trail. Freedom will live again.

Heritage Book Service
P.O. Box 6086
Lake Munmorah
N.S.W. 2259

