

WHY DO WE HAVE A  
PARLIAMENT? (Page 2)

URGENT JOB FOR SOCIAL  
CREDITERS. (Page 3)

WORKER'S LETTER TO  
LABOR M.P. (Page 3)

CANADIAN M.P. ON RE-  
CONSTRUCTION. (Page 4)

# THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9. No. 36. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, SEPT. 10, 1943.

Now, when our land  
to ruin's brink is  
verging.

In God's name, let  
us speak while  
there is time!

Now, when the  
padlocks for our  
lips are forging,  
Silence is crime.  
Whittier (1807-1892).

## How the Beveridge Pup Was Sold in Britain

### Criticism in the Commons

In the course of a speech in the British House of Commons, on April 8, the Member for Cambridge University, Mr. Pickthorn, described the propaganda methods by which the Beveridge Plan was "put over" in Great Britain. The following verbatim extracts from his speech are illuminating:—

... What has tended to happen is that the more machinery for discussion has been elaborated and modernised the more has the temptation been upon Governmental persons to see that a question does not emerge above the surface so far as to be open to discussion until things are already so arranged that only one answer to the question is possible. That is the modern temptation. It is the modern temptation of all countries under all sorts of democracies; whether you have the plebiscitary gangster kind of "democracy," the sort of "democracy" of Hitlerism, or any other, there is a temptation to try to do the thing that way.

I beg hon. Members to believe that if I am now going to talk about the Beveridge Report it is not with any wish to criticise the Beveridge Report. . . . My argument has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the Report. There is, perhaps, another preliminary remark, which I ought to make, and that is that the Minister of Information must, I think, to some extent, take responsibility for knowing the newspapers. The B.B.C. and the Ministry of Information are really indistinguishable. If anybody challenges that view I shall have to waste the time of the House by reading a long chain of quotations from Ministers. Everything that comes to us over the ether comes upon the responsibility of my right hon. Friend the Minister who ought to be on the front bench. The B.B.C. and the Ministry of Information are responsible not only for what is emitted by this machinery but equally, though it may not be quite so obvious, for what is not emitted by it, and though they are not responsible for editing newspapers they are responsible for knowing what the newspapers do. I do not say they are responsible for trying to print everything the newspapers do not print and for not printing anything that the newspapers do print, but they are respon-

sible for trying to see that what goes out on the air shall enable the man who reads one or two newspapers, in conjunction with what he has heard on the air, to be able to make up a fair picture for himself. . . .

There was not a great deal of preliminary boosting of the Beveridge Report on the wireless, although there was some—which included a statement by Sir William Beveridge on November 21, that if all ex-Service men and workers knew that the Government had good plans for maintaining employment after the war, that would be a major contribution to victory. That was not the line taken by the Minister yesterday in answer to a question by the hon. Member for Barnstaple (Sir R. Acland). The Minister did not think it was flattering to our Forces to suggest that they would fight better because of political promises about the post-war future. I am bound to say that I do not. I think that if that were necessary, it would take us even longer to win this war than it is going to take, and we should be quite certain to lose the next one. . . .

There was a certain amount of preliminary stuff on the wireless, and a great deal on the day on which the Report was printed. There were Questions answered in this House about how it was being published. I ventured to ask the Leader of the House whether we could have an assurance that this Report would not be expounded on the air by those who had the advantage of reading it before the rest of us had had a chance of reading it, and the Leader of the House said that that would be considered. I do not know how much consideration there was, but it did not have much effect. In fact, that evening there was a long summary of the thing, telling us all about it and, I think, there was an interview with Sir William

Beveridge. The next evening there was a long talk by Sir William Beveridge, and a few days later there was a conversation between Sir William Beveridge and the Editor of the "Daily Herald." There was nothing of a critical nature at all.

Certainly my impression is—I send for the scripts pretty often, and I have read almost all of them—that there was practically not at all, all the way through, on the Home Service or the Foreign Services, anything in the way of criticism. There was one conversation in which an American journalist called Ed. Morrow took part—there were half a dozen of them altogether, but I happen to remember his name—with a couple of people who said something of a mildly critical kind. On the whole, this thing was put across in such a way that practically everyone was bound to take it. It was like the exercise of skill when the conjurer offers you a card. I do not know how it is done, but with a really good conjurer you always take the card he is trying to offer you. Anyone listening to these broadcasts was bound to get the impression that this was the card they were to take and that the thing was to be swallowed whole, and not to be looked at or criticised. . . .

I have envelopes full of these broadcasts, and I obviously cannot read them all to the House. Perhaps it is hardly fair to expect the House to take my word for it, but I assure hon. Members, that for the first six weeks or more, so far as I can say, there was no attempt at anything in the nature of criticism or question in what was addressed to overseas audiences. It is true that there was put into broadcasts now and then phrases like, "Of course this is only a proposal," but it was done in a rather perfunctory way. My

right hon. Friend is too good a propagandist—it is his business to be—not to know very well the importance of the mood in which you say things, whether you say them in plain indicative mood—"this is," or "this will be"—or whether you state them in a more conditional way. We started off on December 1, when the nine main proposals were explained to the world, although nothing was said about the rate of contribution. On the same day, Mr. Gordon Walker told Europe that want could be abolished. . . .

When the Report was issued it was clear that the phrase was to be the slogan or the "leitmotiv" of the whole thing; it was to be tied up with the Atlantic Charter and with the Prime Minister's lifelong devotion to social reform: these things were obviously the "mot d'ordre," the word imposed. Those phrases were repeated in broadcast after broadcast day after day in every sort of language. On December 1, Mr. Gordon Walker said that the scheme had the support in Britain of the vast mass of our people who were fighting and working. I do not know whether Mr. Walker had then read the Report, and how he found out that the vast mass of our soldiers approved of it I cannot guess. On the next day, Sir William Beveridge spoke. I will only quote from one paragraph of the speech and will leave out all the words except those, which illustrate the indicative nature of the language. The quotations are:

"The main feature is . . . the scheme applies . . . it does not apply . . . everyone will be insured . . . the benefit will be the same . . . it will last . . . the one exception is . . . the scheme provides . . ."—and so on. You see what I mean. I

(Continued on page 4.)

An indication of returning sanity is seen in the report from Sydney of impending "large-scale release of manpower from the Army for the purpose of increasing food production." If all the futile Boards' and Food Committees' manpower is also released and directed to the practical tasks of production our food muddles will soon be corrected. Of course, it will also be necessary to free the practical producers from Government interference, and to give them the necessary inducement. It will be a happy day when Government bureaucrats are pushed aside. Then, and only then, will our sabotaged food-productivity be restored.

**COMPULSION CONTESTS:** The U.S. Gallup Poll, anticipating one of the problems confronting Congress, put this question: "Are you in favour of drafting (conscripting) single women into auxiliaries of the armed services." The answer was 45 percent Yes, 48 per cent No, 7 per cent. Undecided; men opposed the proposal by a majority of 4 per cent. Isn't it strange how the compulsion-mania peculiar to the totalitarian minds is sweeping like a plague through the world? Surely the acceptability or otherwise of such proposals can be determined by permitting each individual concerned the right to choose or to refuse.

**MEAT MYSTERY:** The Minister for Commerce, Mr. Scully, is reported in the "Age" of September 1, as saying that "talk of rationing meat" (already rationed without coupons) "is premature and unwarranted." Continuing his explanation of how rationed meat was not rationed, he said: "Australia had more beef, mutton and lamb than ever before, and the curtailment of civilian supplies was caused by manpower and transport problems." Overlooking the contradictory statements, surely the supply of a basic food such as meat should have first priority for manpower and transport. Won't the small butcher being butchered, and the harassed housewives, be pleased to learn that it's all a mistake on the master-planner's part?

**MASTER MINDS:** After much effort with pencil and paper, resulting in alluring theoretical "production targets," the recently appointed food planners now say that "without substantial and permanent release of manpower from the Army, munitions, or some other source, production targets already set could not be attained." Just fancy that now! Just like setting out on a car journey without petrol. If the manpower muddlers had not caused the production lag there would have been no food-planners. But what's wrong with the planners ploughing and tilling the land? School children could arrange the other details—in their spare time.

**COMMUNIST CAPERS:** A correspondent in the "Age" of September 2 throws more light on the Communist plot

to merge the points out that, despite strong opposition from members, and the decision of the Arbitration Court (to which was submitted signed objections from 1000 members) the dictator executives are continuing to implement the plot. They have called a special meeting, excluding their opponents by the underhand methods of suspending them or refusing them O.K. cards (despite the fact that they were financial) then attempting to alter the rules requiring a ballot by the rank and file. Fortunately, some wide-awake democratic Unionists are determined to prevent these totalitarian ideas being imposed.

**PACIFIC PROBLEM:** David Lawrence, "Washington Star" correspondent, deploring the slow progress of the Pacific war, says: "The percentage of the U.S. war effort is so small that if the American public knew the actual amount, it would ask how long Washington and London will take to realise the character of the enemy in the Pacific. The Japanese know the figures, and are slowly building up communications and bases, thus making it steadily more difficult to capture them." Meanwhile, presumably, U.S.A. has an army of "national security" officers, similar to ours, snooping around issuing dire threats against civilians for allegedly passing on inside information (which they haven't got) to the enemy, who, according to the commentator, already possess it.

**DAYLIGHT DELUSIONS:** Once more the daily press bangs the drum for another season of "daylight saving" (which boils down to imposing an idea on the people, whether they like it or not). The idea is that by altering the clock hands you alter the course of the sun; but, in reality, all that happens is that the people adjust themselves to the clock hands. Quite a lot of people consider this a good idea. However, that doesn't alter the fact that the "planners" are imposing another stunt, which is far from a good idea to a large section of the community. There is no law to prevent those who require more daylight from rising as early as they desire in the morning. Surely this is a matter for individual choice.

**POWER PERIL:** The Federal Union idea is given another boost (free) in the (Continued on page 2)

## Regimented Farming Denounced

"The Countryman" of August 20 reported an interesting and informative pre-election statement by Lt.-Col. Geo. Bowden, M.C., a practical farmer and Chief President of the U.C.P., who contested the Gippsland seat. Inter alia, he said:—

"Although we all look forward in the post-war years to the extensive development of very valuable raw resources, such as bauxite, oil and coal, in Gippsland, and to the establishment of secondary industries in country centres, I think the majority of electors will admit that the primary industries, and dairying in particular, are the solid foundations on which its prosperity rests," declared Lt.-Col. Bowden. "For that reason I make no apology for referring to the 'new order' in agriculture or 'production by regulation,' which has been introduced by the Labor Government under statutory rule 165, because it threatens to revolutionise the agricultural industries, and must have serious reactions on the livelihood of the men and women on the land. These regulations were not considered by Parliament. They were issued after Parliament had risen, and without consultation with the State Ministers for Agriculture or members of the Agricultural Council.

"Here in a nutshell are a few of Labor's far-reaching and drastic proposals, operating through the War Agricultural Committees. Regional committees have already been formed. In each instance the chairman is a civil servant:—

"Farmers are to be placed in groups of 8 to 12 farmers.

"Each group elects a leader, who has to compile facts and figures relating to labour, machinery, and production, together with material and other necessary assistance required by the group members.

"The group leader has to be compensated with labour from the group for time lost in administering the affairs of the group.

"Statistics and information cards are required from the farmers to cover operations of several previous years.

"No farming machinery may be withheld from a neighbour who wishes to hire it.

"Every group leader's advice or instruc-

tions from State Executive must be accepted by the farmers.

"Full particulars of next year's production has to be furnished on March 31 each year to the group leader.

"The group leader is asked to observe secrecy in connection with members' private affairs, but why, I ask you, should any farmer be placed in a position that he has to rely on a neighbour's discretion?"

"If the producers had fallen down on their job," Col. Bowden continued, "there might have been some semblance of an excuse for such arbitrary action. But, despite depleted manpower and difficulties and disabilities arising out of abnormal conditions, the target or quota set by the Agricultural Council has been exceeded in every instance but one. Moreover, this praiseworthy effort was achieved without coercion or regimentation, simply because the producers realised the urgent necessity of maintaining production in the interests of the nation and our Allies.

"Farmers, however, are only human, and they are individualists, or they would not be farmers! Therefore there is no doubt that they will bitterly resent being dictated to by a civil servant as to how and when they shall use their land. Such mischievous interference must have an extremely adverse effect on production, and will eventually defeat the object of the objectionable regulations.

"Primary producers and all whose welfare is linked with their stability would do well to ponder over Labor's experiment in Russian collectivism, which can only be carried out at the expense of Australian agriculture and the nation's food supply," said Col. Bowden.

"No country in the world has a higher standard of production than Australia, and that standard has been attained by encouraging individual initiative and enterprise."

## THE PROBLEM OF THE MILK SUPPLY

Last week, under this heading, we published an interesting talk, broadcast from 7HO on June 13, by Mrs. Barbara Guthrie. A further talk on the same subject, delivered a week later, is quoted hereunder:

During this past fortnight, a Committee has been sitting to enquire into the milk supply of Hobart. I have been attending this enquiry regularly, and have listened to the evidence given.

In my broadcast of last week, I complained about the published statements issued in the Press concerning the evidence given; I am glad to see that this week there has been some improvement in the manner in which the evidence has been published.

In an enquiry of this nature, the answers given by witnesses depend largely on the questions asked. For example, if Mr. Guthrie were on the Committee of Enquiry the questions he would ask would be quite different from the questions asked, and, naturally, the answers would be different—quite different. That is why Mr. Guthrie is not asked to sit on any Committee of Enquiry.

The supply to Hobart of clean fresh milk of good quality is a very important thing; it is a vital factor in the health of the community. And it is up to all of us to see that the job is done thoroughly.

The City Council has been trying to get an improvement in the milk supply for several years now, and they have been meeting with some success; the conditions of production have improved. But much remains to be done.

Much of the good result, however, is being upset by the Government's zoning system, as people are forced to take milk from vendors whether they like it or not—there is no redress. People cannot penalise bad producers or vendors by going to good ones; they have to take what they get—or go without. Surely housewives could have a second choice.

Dr. Gaha and others have been running a campaign for years to obtain pasteurisation of milk and a central depot, and many ignorant people have some mystical belief that pasteurised milk is good milk, or 'fresh milk or disease-proof milk. It is none of these things. Pasteurisation prevents milk from going sour; it therefore enables stale milk to be sold which otherwise could not be sold.

Some doctors say that pasteurisation will prevent bone tuberculosis in children; others strongly disagree. There is no expert opinion available that can prove that pasteurisation can do anything except prevent stale milk turning sour. Pasteurised milk doesn't turn sour; it slowly putrefies.

The great danger in pasteurised milk is that if dairy farmers know the milk is to be pasteurised they won't bother to send milk quickly to town; stale milk will be good enough. And all the attempts that have been made to get cleaner, fresher milk will be nullified.

According to "Armchair Science," London, April, 1938, quoted in the "New Times," Melbourne, June 4, 1943, "Probably pasteurisation's worst offence is that it makes insoluble the major part of the

calcium contained in raw milk. This frequently leads to rickets, bad teeth, and nervous troubles; for sufficient calcium content is vital to children, and with the loss of phosphorus, also associated with calcium, bone and brain formation suffer serious set-backs. Pasteurisation also destroys 20 per cent, of the iodine present in raw milk, causes constipation, and, generally, takes from the milk its most vital qualities."

This statement, if true, is very important, and should be investigated, because it means that if men like Dr. Gaha get their way, Dr. Gaha will have to start building much larger hospitals, and more spectacular hospitals. It means that the finest food there is for little children, and the only food babies have, is going to be destroyed.

Mr. Maclean, the Hydro-Electric Commissioner, gave evidence on Tuesday about pasteurisation in Toronto, Canada. There, he said, most of the milk was pasteurised, except for a small quantity of pure raw

milk from a tested herd, which was supplied to those suffering from various kinds of disease. This milk, of course, cost more to produce. He also said that special supplies of milk were supplied daily for babies, especially babies being weaned.

Now, none of the Committee members asked if this special supply for babies was pasteurised or fresh milk. I and another lady were interested; we left the Committee room to get the answer to this vital question; and the answer we received from Mr. Maclean was this: that it was this pure, fresh milk from the tested herds, milk that was not pasteurised, that was supplied to babies.

If you take the trouble to look up the evidence published in last Wednesday's "Mercury" you will find no reference to the way in which this pure raw milk was used—only that pure raw milk was expensive.

And this brings us to the crux of the whole question. Good, clean fresh milk of high quality is more expensive to produce and distribute—therefore the children of Hobart have got to have cheaper milk; low quality milk from mass-producing cows; stale milk; pasteurised milk from one central depot.

Well, we don't intend to put up with this priceless racket. (To be concluded.)

## WHY DO WE HAVE A PARLIAMENT?

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

Some people will probably look aghast at the above question. But I am serious. Does any honest person really think that all the fundamental policies pursued in this that debates at Canberra influence Members to read carefully all past debates in Parliament—and note which way Members voted?

With very rare exceptions, they all voted as their Party ordered. And they will continue to vote as the Party orders—unless, of course, electors decide to forget all their foolish fights among themselves and give orders to the representatives. Now and then, of course, some private Member will dare to speak critically of an issue, but the real test comes when the vote is taken. And still Members have the effrontery to talk about what they will do! Labor Members, on the average, are even more hypocritical than their U.A.P. and U.C.P. opponents. For example, we don't hear any promises from the U.A.P. and U.C.P. about monetary reform. We know where we stand with these groups. But Labor Party Members have gained hundreds of thousands of votes from people we have educated on the banking swindle, people who have been tricked into believing that mere TALK necessarily means ACTION. Well, we are all going to learn—particularly those optimists who have told me that the Labor Party was only waiting for a real majority before it tackled the banks. Perhaps these people can tell me why the Labor Government is about to stage another loan.

Labor Members, relying, as all political tricksters do, on the short memories of the people, told us before the recent elections how much they are concerned about the future of returned soldiers after this war. Perhaps those gentlemen can explain how, then, with the exception of Mr. Blackburn, not one of them voted for an increase of at least 33 1-3 per cent, in servicemen's pensions when that issue was debated at Canberra last March. Some Labor

Members undoubtedly desired to vote for the increase, but they had to vote as the Party Caucus ordered. Other issues could be mentioned, but it shouldn't be necessary.

Under the present tyranny of Party Government, the position is this: The Opposition may as well stop away from Parliament, because all their talk never affects the voting on major issues. The Government Party's private Members may as well stay away also; they vote as they are told by the Caucus. So we find a dictatorship of a few men. And these men are all amenable to highly organised pressure from powerful anti-social groups.

Is there any solution to this undemocratic state of affairs? There is. Social Crediters have placed it before the electors—day in, day out—for the past few years. The solution is simply this: Electors must unite to demand the RESULTS that they desire, one issue at a time, and bring their Parliamentary Representatives under control, thus defeating centralised Party dictatorship. This procedure has already been adopted successfully on many issues. That is why Social Crediters are hated by all the various exponents of centralised dictatorships. We have easily enough Social Crediters in the Australian community to show electors how to control every Member of Parliament long before the next elections. But ACTION is wanted, not mere speculation and talk.

Unless the people can control Parliament, and control it every day, why continue with the farce any longer? Why not let a few men in the Labor Caucus govern us—and cut out all the hypocritical talk about Democracy?

## ELECTORS MUST BESTIR THEMSELVES

The following leaflet has been circulated in South Australia:

It has been said that world affairs are in the sorry mess in which we find them because of the colossal impudence or stupidity of elected persons, not excepting some of those most highly exalted in office.

Whether such a view is partially true or not need not be discussed, because the real blame for social disease or disaster rests ultimately upon the citizens of the community.

In other words, the affairs of the district, or State, or nation, will be managed to bring results, which please all the people concerned if citizens stir themselves into action in a commonsense way. Whereas, if citizens sit back and fail to act, then affairs will remain in the present unsatisfactory condition, with the real management in the hands of a few people, who satisfy their lust for power over their fellows.

This leaflet is issued in the hope that interested electors may respond and show their desire to form a local Citizens' Policy Association.

The avowed purpose of such a group would be to develop and maintain a healthy relationship between as many as possible of the electors in the nearby district and their elected representative in Parliament, whoever he may be.

What a citizen does on polling day is of little importance compared with what he or she does to give clear-cut directions to the "sitting" Member (or, may be, "sleeping" Member). For instance, the Sales Tax could be abolished, and would be abolished, if enough electors demanded relief of this kind. And this is only one of many issues on which Parliament could be made to bow to the sovereign

will of the people whom they are supposed to serve.

An entirely new vigour will be found to develop in Australian political life as soon as it is recognised that the JOB OF THE REPRESENTATIVE IS TO FIND OUT WHAT RESULTS ARE DESIRED BY THOSE ELECTORS, and then to hold expert technicians (especially those in financial matters) to a rigid responsibility till the wanted RESULTS are accomplished or delivered.

So soon as enough determined electors express their demands and insist that it is the function of the Representative to pass on these demands—so soon will the frustration and chaos due to "party" politics (including any National or Coalition Government) begin to give way to satisfactory health and progress in community affairs—a health and progress founded in personal freedom and personal economic security.

The Representative will cease to be a theorist, will cease to be bound by "party" considerations, will cease to be an irresponsible "Independent," will cease to fear the pressure now exerted by hidden manipulators, will cease to consider himself a leader; but he will speak with the undoubted authority of those who are his constituents, and join in demanding the RESULTS they desire.

A room has been reserved at ..... on ..... at 8 p.m.

Any interested person is asked to attend or else communicate with ..... of ..... (Phone .....) offering to co-operate.

When this leaflet has been noted, please pass it along to Numbers ..... in the street.

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

London "Daily Mail" by a New York correspondent who hints at "the possibility of a common British Empire-American policy." He also says "Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt are moving very cautiously in this direction." In this connection the following from one of the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" (No. 5), appears significant: "We shall create an intensified centralisation of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community." Odd is it not—or is it?

**HOMELESS HEROES:** Commenting on the appalling shortage of housing, Mr. Oswald Barnett, of the Victorian Housing Commission, is reported as saying: "It is psychologically wrong to stop house building altogether, as its effect will be to bank up so much bitterness that it may cause an explosion. Discharged soldiers unable to get a home are asking with a great deal of bitterness, 'What did I fight for?'" It is gratifying to learn that Mr. Barnett is taking up the cause of the underdog soldier against the sadists who are obstructing really urgent home building; in an attempt to build up a Socialist "work-for-all" plan after the war. Mr. Barnett is certainly up against concrete mentalities.

**BURMA BOOM:** The Press of August 28 points out "the promised offensive against Japan encouraged bidding for Burma oil and Far-Eastern bank shares." Needless to say, the bidding was not done by those actually carrying out the offensive; but, indirectly, of course, the real actionists may be doing the bidding of the bidders.

**ASININE ARCHITECT:** The chief architect of the Public Works Department is reported (free) in the daily press of August 8 as objecting to single-storey houses on the score of "wasting land." He must think there's a shortage of land in Australia. He attempted to soften this argument, by advancing other more humane reasons, namely, that "Single-storey semi-detached houses made it difficult to provide sufficient sunlight for the living rooms." This is also an attempt to justify the two-storey hovels built by the Government. But what's wrong with completely detached single-storey houses for all? That would permit the entry of plenty of sunlight—and only a Public Works architect would believe that there is a shortage of land.

**POLICING PRICES:** The Acting Deputy Prices Commissioner, Mr. Duffy, is reported (free) in the Melbourne "Herald" of August 14 as appealing to the public to help his department to police the price-fixing regulations. This propaganda recalls Protocol 17 of the Elders of Zion: "In our programme, one-third of our subjects will keep the rest under observation. . . . It will then be no disgrace to be a spy and informer." The Mosaic pattern of the world-to-be is surely taking shape.

**WINTER WOES:** Widely publicised appeals by financial circles, imploring the Government to forcibly take more money from John Citizen, to prevent him from spending it on goods that are not in existence, is in direct contrast to this form of "annual appeal": "The Victorian Association of Benevolent Societies is appealing for funds (money) to buy blankets for needy people." Presumably there are some available blankets, but no money. Imagine the reactions of the aforementioned "needy people" to the bankers' proposal to take their "surplus" money from them!

—O. B. H.

## ELUSIVE CREDIT

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—The finance laddie of the "Bulletin" (Sydney, 18/8/1943), uses a lot of ink to record his verdict on the use of bank credit. In the matter of credit for post-war reconstruction—case of Sir Claude Reading v. John Curtin—he finds for the plaintiff on the grounds that the use of credit in peacetime must be "at the expense of the personal living standards of the people . . . even though (it) may result in the development of national assets, instead of the almost sheer waste that results from wartime spending." Neither he nor Sir Claude gives a reason why assets make people poorer. Possibly they don't know, or, more likely, won't tell.

In another part of his judgment the "Bulletin" writer rules, that "credit in its legitimate sense means nothing more than 'time to pay'," but fails to explain what is to be paid for, or by whom, or to whom. However, from the context it is clear that the payment is for the national assets, and is to be paid by the people to the banks.

And so it appears that "credit" is just a fancy name for usury—the exchange of time for money; the lender supplies the time, which God provides free, and the borrower finds the money, which he must either earn or steal!

From which I gather that the "Bulletin" scribe is really not concerned with bank-credit or any other kind of credit in its true sense—but what a tangled web he weaves!

—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, 69 Strathalbyn-street, East Kew, E.5. 30/8/1943.

## ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE." A short history of the Bank of England. Price, 6d Postage 1d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d Postage 1d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

## "MISSION TO MOSCOW"

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—Readers will recall that, in the "New Times" of April 22, I commented on Davies' book, "Mission to Moscow," and expressed the opinion that the film being made of the book would leave out much of importance. Those who have seen the film version of the book agree that it is a deliberate distortion. For example, filmgoers were not given the opportunity of seeing the German and Russian Ambassadors shaking hands after the Russo-German pact of 1939. The following extract from the Sydney "Bulletin" of August 11 is pertinent comment:—

"Though the film 'Desert Victory' arrived in Australia long before 'Mission to Moscow,' the latter is to be shown first. Glorifying a foreign regime as it does, with cunning falsification of history and misrepresentation of British policy—on these points Americans as far removed as Professor Denvey and Dorothy Thompson are agreed—it is naturally preferred to a factual account, with actual battle scenes, of a superb British imperial achievement in which our own soldiers, airmen and seamen won deathless glory. It is to be shown in Britain, also, by favour of Churchill, but when the dotting Joe Davies had it unwound before Stalin at a private screening, Uncle Joe gruffly vetoed its exhibition in Russia."

—Yours etc., ERIC D. BUTLER.

Responsibility for all unsigned election comment in these columns is accepted by H. F. Ailsop, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne.

## WHAT IS THE NEXT URGENT MOVE?

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. Continued from last issue.)

Sir,—Up to now we have seen that Australia is controlled by three bank-owning monopolies, and that each of these monopolies is represented on the Board of the Commonwealth Bank. The Sugar, Gas, and Tobacco Monopoly, embracing the Bank of New South Wales, the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney, and the Queensland National Bank, is represented by the chairman of the Board, Sir Claude Reading. The Metal Monopoly, embracing the Commercial Bank of Australia, the National Bank of Australasia, and the Bank of Adelaide, is represented by Sir Clive McPherson. The Overseas Group, embracing the three English banks (Bank of Australasia, Union Bank, and E.S. & A. Bank) is represented by Mr. J. H. Ashton. The three English Banks, with Headquarters in London, are represented on the Bank of England.

The Bank of England "communicates" directly with the Commonwealth Bank by cable and in the form of a "fortnightly" letter. During the "trough" of the Depression, the late Sir Robert Gibson, who was then chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board, explained this relationship to the Commonwealth Parliament as follows:

"The Commonwealth Bank, AS A CENTRAL BANK, has the great honour of being looked upon by the Bank of England as an institution of good standing. The Governor of the Bank of England has been good enough to extend to the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank a fortnightly letter in which are reviewed all questions with respect to WORLD monetary conditions, trade prices, and so forth. It is confidential as between banks, because it is the kind of information which it is necessary for CENTRAL BANKS OF THE WORLD to possess."

Note the words I have emphasised, and think of them in the light of the declaration of Paul Warburg, of the Federal Reserve System, New York, that his plan of having Central Banks in every country was designed to secure "banking hegemony of the world." So you see that in addition to the actual control from London of three of the "Austrian" trading banks, there is also direct and very close "co-operation" between the publicly owned (but privately controlled) Commonwealth Bank and the PRIVATELY-OWNED Bank of England. And to make the "cooperation" complete, the Bank of England is directly connected with the Federal Reserve Bank, New York, on the one hand, and with the Bank of International Settlements at Basle on the other hand.

Power is exercised through control of banks, insurances, and trustee companies. This control gives power over the creation and cancellation of money, and commands millions of pounds of capital, and almost illimitable financial resources. Finance controls all other things, including the export and import business. The men who form the directorates of these interlocking organisations do not spend their time controlling the savings and insurances of the people from feelings of benevolence, but because it gives them control of other people's money which they can hold from, or divert into, any channel they wish. They can finance themselves into any enterprise in which they are interested, and can withhold finance from any enterprise that threatens their established activities. They can extend this treatment even to "SOVEREIGN" GOVERNMENTS!

They sit on directorates of the most diverse industries—such as beer, banking, sugar, gas, tobacco, wool, mining, smelting—and industries which they do not control personally are nevertheless subject to their will, for they control the financial institutions on which every industrial organisation and every trader in the Commonwealth necessarily depend. The three monopolies have always been well represented in every State Parliament, and the following men, well-known in Federal politics, are, or have been, connected with them: Sir Walter Massy-Greene, Sir Frederick Stewart, S. M. Bruce, R. G. Casey, W. A. Watt, Sir John Latham, Sir Harry Lawson, A. J. McLachlan, R. G. Menzies and J. V. Fairbairn. Sir Earl Page also has never done anything contrary to the interests of the secret dictators, and actually was the instrument used in 1924 to intro-

## URGENT JOB FOR SOCIAL CREDITERS

By ERIC D BUTLER

This is an urgent appeal to every Social Creditor in Australia. After his return from America last year, Dr. Evatt (close friend of Professor Harold Laski, the man who has written that the British Monarchy is the main hindrance to the establishment of Socialism in the British Empire) desperately tried to deprive the State Governments of their few remaining rights by methods, which I can only term deliberate trickery. We were able to defeat that trickery—but only for the time being. Another attempt is about to be made.

Dr. Evatt has been abroad and associating with powerful international financiers and international socialists since his defeat by the State Governments.

The Labor Party was returned at the recent elections because of a combination of circumstances. A close study of the total first preference votes for Labor candidates does not reveal any great swing in favour of Labor—not as great as we have been led to believe. However, that is by the way. Mr. Curtin has lost no time in telling us that the elections were a vote in favour of his policy. Nothing could be further from the truth. Right throughout his campaign Mr. Curtin assured electors that he was not seeking a mandate to impose socialism. But every endorsed Labor candidate had to sign a pledge stating that he would uphold the Labor Party's fundamental policy of "socialisation of land, the means of production, and distribution." I'll guarantee that thousands who voted for Labor didn't know such a pledge existed. Complete socialisation can never be introduced into Australia until the Constitution is altered.

I was not surprised, therefore, to read

duce the amendment of the Commonwealth Bank Act by which control of the bank was transferred from the Governor to a specially-selected "board" representing the three monopolies. Right through his parliamentary career he has professed to be working for the primary producers, when all the while he has been serving the purpose of the primary producers' enemies.

More recently we have heard a lot in parliamentary circles of names such as Spooner, Spender, McCall, Harrison and Sir Charles Marr, who have always been on the side of the bankers against the PEOPLE. Some of these men have now been dismissed from the Parliament, and it is very necessary that men of similar type and outlook be dismissed also from the Commonwealth Bank Board. Each of us as individual electors should communicate with our representatives in the Federal Parliament and tell them we want this done. —Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, 5th September 1943.

## DAYLIGHT SAVING

Victoria's views on daylight saving have been sent by the Premier to the Prime Minister. The Dunstan Government is strongly opposed to the reintroduction of the scheme. It contends that no practical benefits can be shown, but considerable dislocation and hardship is caused in the country, particularly with farming communities. To date the Commonwealth has not informed the State whether it intends to reintroduce daylight-saving regulations for the coming summer.

—"Age," 27/8/43.

Victorian electors' letters on this issue should now be addressed to Federal Members of Parliament.

## POST-WAR DEPRESSION?

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—Recent statements in the daily press indicate that the bankers intend to enforce" a policy to suit their convenience at the conclusion of the war. Expressing his "strictly personal views," Sir Claude Reading suggested that bank credit could only be used to a very limited extent. The Melbourne "Herald's" special representative (Wed., Sept. 1), states that "there will be a period of general poverty" in the post-war period. Surely these people do not imply that another man-made depression is to be imposed on the people. A new Government, which will probably be still in office at the conclusion of hostilities, has just been returned for the ostensible purpose of attending to the desires of the majority of the people, and it remains to be seen whether this body of men is big enough to counter these totally unnecessary forecasts, which may become obvious facts. —Yours, etc., J. C. NIELSEN, 1 Alfred Cres., N. Fitzroy.

[If the electors adopt a Micawber-like post-election attitude, and fail to assert themselves along "Electoral Campaign" lines, any Government is most unlikely to be "big enough" in the matter of "attending to the desires of the majority of the people"—but it would be quite "big enough" to regiment the people. —Editor.]

that early legislation is to be introduced for a referendum to enable the Federal Government to obtain the powers sought by Evatt.

This issue is the most vital question before the Australian people. We can expect a barrage of high-pressure propaganda in an attempt to trick the electors. We must start to fight now. There are enough anti-socialists in Australia to successfully oppose Evatt's scheme, which, of course, will be enthusiastically endorsed by the Communists.

The anti-socialist groups want direction. We gave them successful direction during the first clash with Evatt's socialist plot. But we must do even more now. Letters of protest should start to flow to Canberra immediately. State Members should be contacted and given concrete backing. Letters should be written to all newspapers, country and suburban. Everyone can do something.

This is a major issue. If Evatt and the forces behind Evatt obtain the powers they are seeking, then God help Australia!

What about it, social crediters?

## THE PLAN FOR WORLD CONTROL

(A Radio Talk by the late Mr. William Aberhart, Premier of Alberta, Canada, broadcast on May 3. Concluded from last week's issue.)

Listen carefully, Ladies and Gentlemen! For the past three years—in fact, ever since the outbreak of war—there has been a steady stream of propaganda, carefully organised and well financed, to win support for setting up a World Federation of Nations under an International authority, to which all Nations would surrender control of finance, international trade, their armed forces and their citizenship rights. How long is it going to take for the people to realise what is going on and what it will mean to them?

In the first place, it would mean that the people of Canada would no longer be sovereign. They would no longer be the constitutionally supreme authority in their own country. By giving over control of finance to some alien dominated international dictatorship, they would be giving that authority complete control over every aspect of their national life. You see, control of finance would mean control of the money system—and that in turn controls every phase of production and distribution. Stripped of all its camouflage, the final result will be a slave State, worse than anything as yet proposed by the bombastic dictators. Is that what our brave soldiers are fighting and dying for? Do you, as a true Canadian, desire such conditions? Then I ask, what are you doing about it?

Now is the time to act. If we wait until the bonds are welded and this dreadful totalitarian order is set up, the people of Canada will then be helpless to do anything about it if they do not like the harsh conditions that are imposed upon them. Remember that in addition to control over finance, the international authority would also have control over the Armed Forces

ism; anyone should even suggest that we do away with all that our brave lads are fighting to defend.

It is most important that we realise that the proposals for inveigling us into an international dictatorship are not put forward in an obvious, above-board manner. No, indeed! They are carefully wrapped up in an attractive and subtle propaganda form. You are told that international control of money is a means for ensuring orderly world trade. You are not told that immediately you hand over constitutional control of finance to an international authority, it will be impossible for the people of Canada ever to change their unsatisfactory monetary system. That fact is kept hidden,

Again, you are told that international control of the Armed Forces is necessary to maintain world peace. The plausible term used to describe it is an "international police force." It sounds more innocent. You are not told that such a force would place the people of all nations completely at the mercy of the international

## WORKER'S LETTER TO LABOR M.P.

Some workers are not mesmerised by the word "Labor." One such, in a letter written before the recent Federal Elections, addressed the following remarks to his Federal representative, Hon. E. J. Holloway, M.H.R., Minister for Social Services, etc.:—

Dear Sir,—Unless you can advance sound reasons why I should do otherwise, it is my intention to work and vote against your return to the next Federal Parliament. I am conscientiously compelled to take this action for various sound reasons, some of which are stated hereunder:—

(1) Because the present Labor Government has just carried on from the point where the previous reactionary Government left off; enacting the same class of legislation with very slight variations. All legislation against the people, none for the people. The setting up of a never-ending number of boards, commissions and controls, which are distasteful to the people, and are the means by which we are being headed straight for the servile State, which is the direct opposite to Democracy.

(2) Because the present Government is carrying on the same old policy of piling up unpayable debt, but at a faster rate than any previous Government, and leaving a burden of perpetual interest to be shouldered by generations yet unborn.

(3) Because the members of the present Government and their followers, after being anti-conscriptors for decades past, have now turned to conscription instead of making the pay of the members of the services and their dependants as attractive as that of any other occupation.

(4) Because the social security legislation, of which you are the sponsor, has no basic difference to that which was brought forward by a U.A.P. Government some few years ago, and which you were compelled —by force of numbers of your electors—to fight against both in Parliament

and on the public platform. Your social security scheme is on a par with the Beveridge plan—both plans are bankers' plans to impose on the people the lowest possible standard of living, instead of aiming at the highest possible standard, the limit being the ability of the people to produce goods and services.

(5) Because it seems to be the policy of the present Government to introduce Socialism, which is only another name for Communism, Fascism or Nazism. No need for Hitler, Mussolini or Stalin to interfere in this country; their methods are being put over by our own Governments.

(6) The compulsory unionism tendency of the Government is abhorrent to me, and I regard this as the last straw in strangling individual freedom.

(7) Last year I had to pay £2/11/- in come tax, this year, £17/10/-. God help us next year!

(8) Although I am entitled to 10/- a week child endowment, it is now four months since I received a payment. I understand this department is under your charge. There seems to be no hope of breaking through the red tape.

(9) Penny postage was introduced about a hundred years ago; today it is two pence halfpenny, and our Postmaster-General boasts of a five million pounds profit. I regard this as exploitation of the crudest kind; it is robbery of the unfortunate people by an unsympathetic Government Department.

—Yours Respectfully, M. F. KEOGH, 78 Smith St., South Melbourne.

and the citizenship rights. If any individual dared to challenge the authority of the international over-lords would have control they had deprived him of his citizenship rights. And if the people as a whole started to kick over the traces—well, they would be un-armed and helpless while the international over-lords would have control of all the Armed Forces and the World Police Force. So it would be just too bad for the people.

Do you consider it fantastic to imagine that anything like that could happen? How can you when the very idea I have outlined has been put forward seriously as the basis of our Post-War Order?

In the first instance, two books on the subject were published. One of these was written by a man connected with a newspaper, which, on the evidence of a British Ambassador to the United States, was controlled by the banking institution that is the Headquarters of International Finance. The other book was by the son of one of the founders of the Money Power on this continent. There is absolutely no question about it that this plot, this evil conspiracy—to set up an international totalitarian dictatorship with control over every aspect of our lives and armed with overwhelming forces to impose their will upon us—can be traced to that small group of men which comprises International Finance.

If ever that scheme should be put over, it would mean the end of democracy, the end of the British Empire, the end of freedom. On the other hand, it would be the establishment of a World Slave State more ruthless and vile than anything, which the evil genius of the Nazis has as yet conceived. Yet poisonous propaganda in favour of this diabolical idea is being openly scattered far and wide in Canada—and that in wartime also. I assert that it is treachery of the worst kind that, even while all the suffering and sacrifices of this present war are going on to overthrow totalitarian-

authority which controlled that force.

And, remember, where you have a concentration of power in a few hands, all too frequently men with the mentality of gangsters get control. History has proven that. As the British peer, Lord Acton, put it so aptly: "All power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

I warn you, Ladies and Gentlemen, with every ounce of sincerity and vehemence I possess; for your own sake, for the sake of the brave lads who are fighting so heroically to overthrow tyranny, for the sake of your children, for the sake of the future of our country—yes—for the sake of everything you hold dear, oppose, expose and resist by every means in your power this audacious and evil conspiracy by the Money Power to set up a World Slave State.

And now, before I close, may I once again thank all of you who have written to me, and who have contributed to these broadcasts during the past week. You will be glad to hear that our radio fund is building up nicely, but we have not yet reached the point to undertake the more ambitious programme to which I referred last week.

I hope that, if these broadcasts are giving people the satisfaction, which the increasing number of letters indicates, the time is not far distant when all who listen to them will be sharing in their cost.

I feel with all the fibre of my being that this question of Post-War Reconstruction is so urgent and the situation which is developing is so critical that it will require a supreme effort by us all, working together, to meet the problems we face.

I will be on the air again one week from tonight, over the same Station at the same time. Until then, I bid you good-night, Ladies and Gentlemen.

## CANADIAN M.P. ON RECONSTRUCTION

A speech by Mr. Norman Jaques in the Debate on the Budget in the Canadian House of Commons on March 24, 1943: —

I wish to make a few remarks on reconstruction. We are told that such discussion is premature. But it is quite evident that those who make such a statement are busy planning the future according to their own ideas. For instance, I have here a dispatch from London. It says:

"Important financial discussions have been in progress here for weeks . . . Three main issues are under discussion: 1. An international bank. 2. An international currency unit based on gold, and known as Bancor. 3. An international exchange-clearing house."

We do not hear anything about that in Parliament. I suppose it is not part of Parliament's duty to discuss such issues.

Then I find a great deal of confusion as to the proposals that are made and that have received such wide propaganda. For instance, the allied nations are always referred to as the United Nations. We are fighting to preserve our democracy, but we are to have a new order. We are to preserve the old and create a new order. We are to restore sovereignty to the conquered nations, while we are to surrender our own sovereignty to international control. Trade restrictions are to be removed, but the gold standard is to be restored, and that is the greatest of all trade restrictions. Then we are to have work for everyone, even if the work has to be created for that purpose. We are to have so many freedoms, but everything is to be planned and everybody is to be controlled; that is, everything but finance. Why? I think it is plain enough. Because the financiers are doing the planning and they intend to do the controlling. There is not a new order, but an old racket, and the purpose of this so-called new order is to make impossible any effective reform of this old racket. Let me read a few words that were written something over one hundred years ago, touching upon this very subject:

"Legalised by Act of Parliament, passed in 1694, in words every man should bear in mind, words fatal to the peace and happiness of England, words which were the precursor of a scourge greater than ever before afflicted any part of God's creation. Thus arose loans, funds and national debts, things that England had never heard or dreamed of, things without which she had a long and glorious career of many centuries, and had been the greatest and happiest country in the world. Seeing that to lend money at interest, that is to say, for gain, that is to say to receive money for the use of money, seeing that this is contrary to the principles of the Christian church . . . The scheme, the crafty, the cunning, the deep scheme has from its ominous birth been breeding swarms of usurers of every description, feeding and fattening on the vitals of the country till at last it has produced what the world never saw before—starvation in the midst of plenty."

Those are the words of a very great Englishman, William Cobbett. We do not hear much of him; that is our loss, but he fought this thing all his life, because he saw it at first hand and hated the results it brought to England and the English people. Starvation in the midst of plenty! That was Shylock's new order, and, of course, there had to be some new rules for a new order. Accordingly Ricardo invented or discovered a new set of rules for the use of his uncle Shylock. He invented the iron law of wages, and the whole economy or economics of scarcity. Presently uncle and nephew were joined by another nephew, Karl Marx, who proposed revolution as the remedy for starvation in the midst of plenty. And so the world progressed towards wars, fire and the sword, the breaking of laws and revolution, all of which this century has seen.

Let me now read a few words by another great Briton, not an Englishman this time, but a man still living, who more than anyone else inspired the allied victory in the last war:

"At Versailles, the financiers resumed command and issued their orders like emperors who would brook no interference with their imperious demands . . . Their unfortunate financial policies dominated our trade and restricted production for the whole period between the wars. An effort was made to induce the Government to employ the credit of the country to supply the crying needs of the people, but Mammon was on his throne and ruled all these schemes out. Today we are suffering from the consequences of these policies."

Those are the words of David Lloyd George, in "Britain's New Order," published in 1941. What were the conditions between the two wars? We are familiar with them in this country: the bankruptcy of business and farmers, the destruction of a great deal of private enterprise, millions of unemployed, and so on. We had international finance controlling trade, industry and distribution. We had financial crises and depressions, and nothing could be done because we had no money. When these conditions inevitably brought about war we were told that war results from national sovereignty and private enterprise; and we spend as much money on destruction in a day as could be found in a

month for construction. At the same time every method of propaganda has been used to advocate that the whole world should be turned over to the financiers who had created these conditions leading to war, so as to make effective resistance impossible. Who were these international financiers? I have not a complete list, but I have a number of names here which I believe will be familiar: the Rothschilds, Sassoons, Kuhns, Loeb's, Warburgs, Montefiores, Sieffs, Niemeyers, Sreppmanns, Fruhlings, Cassells, Strakosches, Schroeders, Baruchs, Schusters, Cohens, Bleichroeders, Kleinworths, Kahns, Goschens. How many French names are in that list? How many British? How many Christians?

Mr. Martin: Let us have no Jew-baiting. Mr. Blackmore: Then do not do it. You are mentioning it; the hon. member is just giving the names.

Mr. Martin: The implication is quite clear.

Mr. Jaques: If the cap fits I cannot help it. One of those international financiers financed the London School of Economics which was founded by Socialists for the purpose of training the bureaucrats for the future World Socialist State; and that same London School of Economics is playing a very big part in the shaping of things to come. One of its distinguished graduates is the chairman of our own committee on post-war reconstruction. Another is Sir William Beveridge, the author of "social security." Still a third is Professor Laski, the internationally known Communist. (To be continued.)

### Soviet Minister's Rolls

From the Sydney "Century," September 3: —

The Commo hoi polloi were staggered when the Soviet Minister came to Sydney in the latest model super Rolls Royce, flying the hammer and sickle insignia. The Rolls has always been regarded as the hallmark of Capitalist plutocracy. While the British High Commissioner gets around in the proletarian Morris, the representative of M. Stalin is swanking it with the Rolls.

The experts in Marxian dialectics are at a loss to explain the phenomenon. If Communism means Rolls-Royces for the proletariat, what does capitalism mean? If a diplomat ranks a Rolls, what does a Party member deserve? After all, diplomats are low in the social hierarchy in Moscow.

Comrade Miles has been able to adopt the Stalin pose by smoking a Stalin pipe in the past. Now it looks as if the faithful will have to provide him with a Rolls. If Miles gets one, then the ironworkers will have to cough up one for "Call 'Em Up" Ernie. There are social headaches ahead for the Commo elite. If one Party executive gets a Packard instead of a Rolls, there will be a first-class faction fight.

Certainly the Minister is going to be the innocent cause of much strife and internal jealousy. Meanwhile, Syd Snow and the boys at the Union Club will be thinking there's something to this Communist State after all. The Rolls Royce is an invidious means of upsetting all social values.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES (From THE UNITED DEMOCRAT, of 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

Control Your Member: There are only two main forms of Government—Dictatorship and Democracy. Dictatorship may take one of a number of forms—e.g., Nazism, Communism, Fascism, and the like. Democracy may be defined as "Government in accordance with the will of the people." Therefore, if dictatorship is abhorrent to you, keep in constant touch with your Member and see that he carries out your wishes. If you do not care to write as an individual, get your friends and neighbours to sign the letter as well, and thus give it added weight. Remember, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. We are here to give you free advice if you need it.

Quarterly Rally: The next rally will be on Saturday, September 25, at 8 p.m. Keep this date free.

Cultural Evenings: Don't forget to attend the first of these on Wednesday, September 15, at 8 p.m. Everyone welcome.

Fighting Forces Protection League: Supplies are on hand of a demand letter to abolish taxation on goods sold from canteens in operational areas. Call and get a supply of these and help in the campaign.

Books: We have stocks of the following books on hand:—"The Story of the Commonwealth Bank," by D. J. Amos. Price 1/3. "The Enemy Within the Empire," by Eric D. Butler. Price 6d. "Problem or Swindle," by K. Tavender. Price 9d. (All plus 1d. postage.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

### "New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home every week are as follows:

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. (HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.)

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

### How the Beveridge Pup Was Sold to Britain

(Continued from page 1.)

might slip into that sort of language by mere inadvertence, but not the Minister, and not anybody acting under his aegis or guidance, and not anyone whose script had been vetted by the B.B.C. Those are the nuances, the fine shades, by which the thing is done, by which the pup is sold. Either the Minister and his advisers know nothing about propaganda or they know all about this technique . . .

Sir William Beveridge is a unique creature. He was Chairman of a Committee, but he was Chairman without a Committee. He was suspended, like Mahomet, Has there been any previous case where the Chairman of a Committee has given views to the Press beforehand of the sort, which were broadcast on November 19? Has there ever been any previous case of a B.B.C. broadcast of the views of a Chairman as to the good work his Committee were going to do? Has there been any previous case in which the B.B.C. allowed, or invited on their own, a Chairman to explain his own stuff on the day before his Report came out, or on the day after? Is that the ordinary practice of the B.B.C.? If it is not the ordinary practice, did they venture upon this startling innovation—I am sorry that there is only one Governor of the B.B.C. left in the House—entirely by the initiative of the Governors, whose pent-up energy had for years wanted to do something and at last broke all bounds? Or how did it happen?

We are all very apt to assume that all Continentals always like us best when we are standing on our left foot. It is not true . . . and in war-time particularly it is a mistaken view to suppose that everybody on the Continent likes us better when we say we are more interested, or even as much interested, in social questions as in national, strategic and frontier questions; because it is national, strategic and frontier questions that interest you when you are defeated, occupied; make no mistake about that. . . .

Was the Foreign Secretary really consulted? Was he clear before the ether was mainly used, as it was for weeks, for persuading the world of our interest in social reform? Our wireless boasted something to this effect, "Today even Tunisia

### BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from The United Electors of Australia, Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.)

"The Big Idea." By C. H. Douglas. A masterly survey of the underlying factors at work in the modern world. Your education is incomplete unless you have read, read, and thoroughly digested this book. Every social creditor should have a copy for frequent perusal, and other copies for "widening the circle." Price, 2/7d. posted.

"The Tragedy of Human Effort." By C. H. Douglas. Indicates how to make democracy work. Specially recommended for distribution at the present time. Price, 7d. posted.

"Federal Union Exposed." Exposes the international bankers' plot to dominate the world through World Government. A complete analysis—and a most important reference book. Price, 1/1d. posted.

"Alberta's Road to Freedom" is the answer to false statements about Alberta's attempt to overthrow the bankers' tyranny. Describes the Treasury Branches scheme. Price, 9d. posted.

"Red Glows The Dawn." A well-documented record of the disruptive anti-British activities of Communists in Australia. Price, 7d. posted.

"Banks and Facts." A remarkable presentation of the banking swindle. The banker states his own case—and is answered paragraph by paragraph. Price 7d. posted.

"Frustration of Production of Motor Fuel in Australia." A compelling array of facts, showing that motor fuel resources are abundant in Australia—certain interests preventing the development of same. Price 7d. posted.

"The Story of the Commonwealth Bank." By D. J. Amos, F.A.I.S. Price, 1/4d. posted.

and Stalingrad have been knocked off the headlines by Beveridge." That was what Europe was told . . .

I should not have said that the ether was monopolised. There were also more or less anodyne talks—there was news, but I will undertake to say this: that the main argumentative message to foreigners for weeks after December 1 was Beveridge . . .

## PROGRAMME FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Creditor," England. (Continued from last issue.)

Although British professional, trained, diplomats, like British Generals, are all incompetent, ill-informed, and old-school-tie failures, immeasurably inferior both in intelligence and judgment to the staffs of the "Daily Worker" and its three penny edition, nevertheless, in their unanimity on the German mentality they are supported by so many foreigners that we must reluctantly accept their view. Germans from the time of Frederick the "Great," whether under Monarchies, Republics, or National Socialism, have, as a people, part of them actively, and the rest of them passively, accepted war as the primary national industry-

Now, so-called democracy is definitely pacifist and strongly pro-German, while Socialism both in Russia and Germany is strongly militarist. The pseudo-democracy of Great Britain or the United States views war with weary distaste, and is not easily persuaded to retain sufficient armed strength to enable his diplomats to make their voices heard.

I believe that I am stating an ascertained and incontestable fact when I say that Germany, Great Britain and the United States, beyond any other great powers, have been at all significant times dictated to, in matters of policy, by Jews, and predominantly by German Jews. Although, for instance, Lord Vansittart is most careful not to attribute German policy to Jewish control, the point that he makes, which is that there is no change in German policy during the past century; that it has been, and is consistent, amounts to saying that it has always been Jewish, because we know, beyond peradventure, that during the period in which it was most obvious, the period of Bismarck and Wilhelm II it was moulded and organised by such men as Rathenau, Ballin, Bleichroeder and others, all Jews. It should be observed that there was during this period a facade of violent anti-Judaism in Germany of about the same effective value as that professed by the National Socialist Administration. Practically covering the whole of this period, the German-Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, was probably the most powerful single individual in Great Britain, and his opposite number and correspondent, Jacob Schiff, the patron of Presidents in America.

If anyone is naive enough to suppose that these people knew nothing of the underlying policy of each other, then I would ask him to consider the fact that the chief financial advisers at the Peace Conference in 1919, representing both the "victors" and the defeated, were all cousins, all Jews, and all connected with one German-Jew bank in New York.

As Premier Stalin said (and we had better take notice), "Hitlers come and Hitlers go, but the German people and the German State remain." He made it clear that he intended them to remain, more or less as they are.

It must surely be obvious that if you have a single effective control over three ostensibly independent nations, and in one of them you exalt militarism to the status of a religion, and in the other two you finance pacifism, together with adulation of the militarist nation (it sounds impossible, but it has been, and is being, done) you cannot

conceivably have any primary policy but one. You desire war. Since war in itself is, to put it conservatively, disagreeable, you obviously do not intend to take part in it, but to use it to further conditions satisfactory to you.

If the Germans are to be credited with elementary intelligence, they must see that nothing could ensure the safety of the Jews so effectively in a European War as a ferocious display of anti-Semitism (I use this misused word advisedly in this instance). It immediately establishes the "persecuted" as non-combatants; it provides a mass of "refugees," many of whom are perfect spies and propagandists, and it puts them in the well-known position of backing every horse in the race. I am completely agnostic as to the extent of genuine barbarity by Germans to Jews. Some of the atrocity stories, such as the use of Jewish babies as footballs, are merely idiotic. But even if I were convinced that it is considerable in extent, my comment would be that it is not a tithe of the suffering endured by the fighting troops, and is an example of using an army, not without loss, but with a minimum of loss, and the minimum of risk of final defeat. I am convinced that the Jewish High Command desires the ultimate victory of Germany, and will fight tooth-and-nail, not to end the war, but to see that Germany is not defeated in the peace.

That, alone, is a sufficient reason for the complete defeat of Germany.

Since Great Britain is, and always has been, the great obstacle to the Big Idea, it is obvious that however much of the fighting is done by her, and however much (and the more the better) her loss and damage, she is to return, like the butler in Barrie's play, "The Admirable Crichton," to that self-effacing hush which is supposed to be becoming to the good. (Anyways, General Eisenheuer won the North African campaign, didn't he!) The Armistice period is incomprehensible other than as a well-arranged plan to emasculate and demoralise this country and its people.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I don't believe that in the consummation of the Great Plan, the Germans would fare very much better than anyone else. But it appears evident that the Germans are the ideal people to do the dirty work antecedent to the coming of the New Jerusalem, and are already "air conditioned" to hand over the reins of power at a suitable moment. (All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)