

PLANNING THE MEDICAL PROFESSION. (Page 2.)

FARMING IN NORTHERN IRELAND. (Page 3.)

THE JEWISH PROBLEM IN GREAT BRITAIN. (Page 3.)

SOIL, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD VALUES. (Page 4.)

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 10. No.5. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1944

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).

Organisation—Our Master or Our Servant?

Australians Must Choose Quickly

By ERIC D. BUTLER

"Association is at once the direct cause of our progress and of our threatened destruction."—C. H. Douglas: "The Tragedy of Human Effort."

Social crediters have constantly, and rightly, stressed the importance of people knowing certain fundamental facts about human association. They have attempted to show how organisation in every sphere of human activity has made possible a fuller life, in terms of satisfaction, for every individual. In association men have achieved some remarkable results—results that they could never have achieved as separate individuals.

But, contradictory as it may appear, the very thing, which could have made life a much fuller experience for the individual—and has done so to a limited extent—has also threatened him with regimented living death in an "Ant-State." Today the world is being led into the worst slavery possible, a slavery which does not depend upon the lash or the bludgeon; a slavery which the slaves will not easily recognise as such.

The instigators of the New Slavery strive, by means of the press, the radio, the "talkies" and other centralised mediums of "enlightenment," to condition the minds of the people to such a degree that they will actually put their chests out and claim how "free and progressive" they are. (There is obviously little use talking about freedom, real freedom, to slaves who actually believe they are already free.)

One of the main hallucinations being sedulously fostered at present, is the belief that organisation, the bigger the better, is an end in itself. This crazy and pernicious idea must be attacked as vigorously as possible.

ORGANISATION IS ONLY A MEANS TO AN END. If any organisation is not achieving the desired end of those comprising the association, it should either be modified until it does, or be scrapped completely. Organisation must be a servant. Unfortunately, time and time again throughout history it has, in the hands of

tyrants, become master. Man's history can be written around his struggle to master his organisations.

Most historians are agreed that approximately six thousand years ago, in the Nile Valley, the first great experiment in human association took place. It was perceived by probably one or two individuals that the growth of certain cereals as a result of the regular flooding of the Nile could be utilised for a settled community life. The former nomadic hunter now had more time to develop himself.

But, slowly but surely, he obviously lost one of his greatest assets: the clear appreciation of cause and effect. Prior to his entering into the first big-scale human association, man tinkered away with his rough tools, rejecting all ideas, which he could clearly see were failures, and retaining those, which worked. He experimented with roots and berries, constantly rejecting those he found

unpalatable. He was free to accept or reject as he thought fit.

But, when he entered into associations of which he had no practical experience, he lost his understanding of cause and effect; and, where those in control of the association were producing results of which he disapproved, he appeared powerless to do anything about it. The association, which could have brought him greater freedom, was perverted, and the Egyptian priests ruled a great slave community worshipping the god Osiris, upon whom they believed they depended.

The Egyptian civilisation perished because man failed to learn to control the vast organisation, which sucked away all initiative. Time and time again throughout history man has attempted to master organisation. Sometimes he has partially succeeded—as in the early Greek democracies—but only to fall back and start painfully all over again.

Social crediters know that there is no hope of our civilisation being saved from an even worse fate than that which destroyed all early civilisations, unless people actually work to develop their understanding and control of all organisations. The task is undoubtedly hard, but very far from impossible. The first job is to show the people how all associations should only exist to serve them. Then the people must be shown how to actively set about

controlling their associations, political or economic, and they must be urged, encouraged and helped, in every possible way, to do this.

Now there is one thing we learn from a study of history: The bigger and more centralised the association, the less control the individual had over it and the results from it. And, much more important, all big organisations have been used by power-lusters for their own ends.

It is essential that all forms of monopoly be broken down into groups which the people can control; groups sufficiently small to allow the individual to see the direct link between cause and effect. But this is exactly what the international power-lusters of today are opposing with every weapon they possess. Note this extract from a book by one of the "planners" preparing our people for the acceptance of the very thing that we took up arms in 1939 to prevent:—

"It must be admitted in all frankness that such slogans as, for instance, the re-establishing of the independence of Denmark, or even Holland or Norway, cannot move or inspire our imagination . . . In spite of all horrors, Hitler is preparing the ground for a better, wiser, and more united Europe." (From "After Hitler's World," by Axel Heyst.) Heyst and his type are those who advocate imprisonment—(Continued on page 4.)

NOTES on the NEWS

A recent Sydney report states that "butchers in nearly every suburb, at the end of the first week of coupon rationing, sold surplus meat without coupons because, if kept, it would have gone bad." This common-sense action aroused the ire of bureaucrat Hudson (deputy director of rationing) who commented thus: "I say definitely that butchers should have allowed the meat to go bad rather than sell it in this way." There was a time when anyone advocating such sabotage would have been immediately suspended—from the nearest tree.

FIRE FINANCE: The paltry sum allocated by the Federal Government to bush fire victims illustrates very clearly that the prewar money mesmerism still exists. Millions and millions of money are being provided for planes and incendiary bombs for our gallant airmen to start fires in enemy countries. Yet, when bush fires destroy the homes of some of our airmen (and others), and in some cases cause the death of their parents, sisters or brothers, the best a "grateful" Government will do is to provide little more than enough to bury them. It is truly an appalling situation.

COLOUR CONUNDRUMS: Speaking at the A.N.A. Australia Day luncheon, Mr. Justice Brennan said "Mr. Curtin should make a definite stand in favour of the White Australia policy when he visits London." He also asked, "why are so many of our public men so timid about expressing in plain language what practically everyone in Australia favours?" He also hoped that "lease-lend obligations to U.S. would not involve Australia in a free influx of immigrants irrespective of race." Having regard to America's appalling experience with mixed breeds, surely U.S. would not be a party to creating the same problem for Australia. Secondly, surely it is unlikely that U.S. would have the presumption to meddle in the slightest degree with our natural and intelligent desire to manage our own racial strains.

TYRE TROUBLES: An example of laying the blame at the wrong door is seen in the proposal of the Victorian Wheatgrowers' Association, suggesting that tyres be stripped from city motorcars and given to primary producers. Doubtless farmers have a real grievance in the matter of insufficient tyres, but the suggestion, even if practicable, would only solve their problem for a very short time. We are told that processes for producing synthetic rubber are available in England and America, which means that they could also be available here, if powerful rubber and other interests were pushed aside. If the farmers directed their criticism to their Federal political representatives, asking them what had been done in this connection, they would be on the right track.

MATERIAL MISTAKES: Reports from city tailors say that Federal Cabinet production executives (impractical theorists) refused to permit practical men to produce good quality double welt cloth for local civilian use; however, they have agreed to allow mills under licence to produce double welt worsteds for civilians in New Zealand. Good quality British worsteds are now reaching N.Z., even though the British people who produce them are compelled to wear inferior cloth. Meanwhile only our best worsteds go to N.Z.—presumably to compete with Britain. Of course, it is of no consequence to bureaucratic planners that Australians have to waste their money,

coupons and manpower on low-grade materials. How much longer will the people tolerate these crazy production planners?

BLACK BARTER: At Manchester assizes, according to the press of December 10, seven men and three women were fined sums involving four figures, and given terms of imprisonment ranging from six months to five years, for alleged black marketing. It appears that the victims diverted cloth released for export to the home front. Although the home front is severely rationed, apparently the powers-that-be are prepared to supply foreign markets—whereas common sense dictates that the British people who produced the cloth should have first choice. In effect, the Government's action causes the so-called black market. (Continued on page 2.)

Australian Gestapo

Professor F. A. Bland, Professor of Local Government Administration at the University of Sydney, contributes the following letter to the "Sydney Morning Herald":

There was a time when projected laws were subjected to three tests: The object sought, whether that object would be achieved, and the actual and potential cost.

Measured by these tests, many of the bureaucratically made laws that are being churned out under the National Security Act would find scant support. Has anyone calculated what they are costing in manpower, material resources, and morale?

Let us grant, as axiomatic in any society, that laws must be obeyed. "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone."

In a democratic society it is an essential presumption that laws shall have a popular foundation, shall not offend the canons of equity and common sense, and are not over costly to enforce.

Has it entered into the consciousness of those who today are plastering our markets, shops, and business houses with edicts, prohibitions, commands, and restrictions that they are not only disregarding the canons, but are poisoning our society?

Are they aware that by appeals to informers, spies, eavesdroppers, and snoopers, and by the employment of an army of special agents and even ardent agents-provocateur they are effectively introducing the Gestapo and O.G.P.U. to Australia? Every man's hand is being turned against his brother; every appeal to sentiment, every solicitation to good nature and friendship must be suspected as a trap and ruthlessly rejected.

All that is worst in human nature is being brought out; all that is best is being distorted. Whatever the official justification there can be little doubt that conditions are being developed that will be fatal to the emergence of a desired New Order. Is it all worth it?

A Letter from an Actionist

The following letter, received by the Campaign Director of the United Electors of Australia, is published as an indication of real individual initiative that might well be widely imitated, and we hope that some of our supporters in the districts mentioned will get in touch with the writer direct, as they are not all known to us and/or the U.E.A.:—

Dear Mr. Heatley, — In view of the fact that a referendum is to be held some time this year for the purpose of altering the Australian Constitution, it is necessary for us to go right into action immediately in order to counter this insidious move. The only way that it can be defeated is to build up a powerful wall of public opinion against which the enemy's storms of propaganda can lash, but unavailingly. I am therefore anxious to cover all the Wimmera and other country papers with letters, or a series of letters, on the subject, warning the people against Evatt's dangerous proposals.

As many of the Wimmera papers are not now available for public inspection at the local library, I am unable to state whether some of my letters have been published in the past. And, as the Constitution issue will become our main fight before long, I want to be in the position to say that my letters have been definitely published by all papers, i.e., all papers to whom letters are forwarded. There is only one way to overcome the difficulty, and that is for a regular reader of the "New Times" and staunch supporter of our movement in each of the required centres to keep me informed as to whether my letters are published or not, by forwarding a copy of their local paper, if possible.

If no inconvenience, would you kindly forward me the name and address of a reader of the "N.T." in each of the following centres or surrounding districts: Nhill,

Kaniva, Rainbow, Minyip, Rupanyup, Donald and Birchip?

With a view to opening up discussions on various aspects of our work, seeking the services of another person (or persons), who will take up the fight against the Enemy Within through the country press, etc., I would welcome the name and address of a reader of the "N.T." in the following centres or surrounding districts: Horsham, Dimboola, Jeparit, Hopetoun, Murtoa, St. Arnaud and Stawell.

Many other country papers could be contacted, but I will content myself with dealing with the above-mentioned groups, and, if time permits, will endeavour to go further afield. The wider the area covered with the facts on the Constitution issue the better for all concerned, and we must leave no stone unturned to ensure that our work permeates all sections of the community. Public meetings on the Federal Powers should help to a considerable degree, while weekly radio sessions should also be put to the best possible use. When the fight begins in earnest we can expect to meet strong opposition from the big finance-controlled daily press and radio. We must also help those who are prepared to fight and pay for our advice. It is no use trying to get people to help us to fight. No one helps me to fight the enemy. I am acting and fighting all the time as an individual should do, and that is what more campaigners must be made to realise; they must accept more personal responsibility and act on their own initiative. No campaigner should be afraid to use the country press, distribute literature (free) or sell it, or pass information along to his fellow countrymen. We have got the facts and provided one sticks to the facts, no harm can be done. The enemy's agents may try to prove the facts wrong in some instances by resorting to the use of abuse and lies; but we can only do our best to expose the lies. Nothing hurts the enemy more than the truth, and a complete exposure of their tactics, etc.

Well, Mr. Heatley, I could write more, but the foregoing will suffice for the present. Trusting you will be able to accede to my request, when convenient. With best wishes to yourself and all at headquarters for another successful year.

—Very sincerely yours, L. H. STRAIN, Bangerang North, via Warracknabeal, Vic. 24th January, 1944.

Nationalised Coalmines

On the grounds that it was not in the public interest, Major Lloyd George, the British Minister of Fuel and Power, replying to a question in Parliament, did not give the output figures per month for the Clifton and Point of Ayr Collieries prior to and since the Government's taking them over, but admitted that while in one case there had been an improvement, in the other "owing to the condition in which the colliery was a tremendous amount of development work had to be done."

Some curiosity was expressed as to what was the public interest, which prevented the giving of the exact information asked for.

PLANNING THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

The following passages on the proposals of the British Medical Association, and those expected from the British Ministry of Health, for the reorganisation of the medical profession, are taken from Bulletin No. 6 of the Medical Policy Association (London): —

The Method of the Ministry: — . . . the [Ministry of Health] White Paper is likely to contain some variant of the plan whereby doctors are to be controlled by organisations with which the Ministry is already closely connected. For example, hospitals might be advocated as the centres of organisation, in place of "Health Centres." Same intention, different method. The plan will be one or another type of State Medical Service. It will make provision for the close control of certification. There will be some form of "central authority" and/or local authorities, who will be responsible, as the phrase goes, "through the Minister to Parliament"—just as any such authority is. If you want redress, you try to get your Member to get enough support to bring pressure to bear on the Ministry to bring pressure to bear on the Authority to bring pressure to bear on the Official to alleviate your distress, always providing it does not conflict with Policy. It's as easy as that. Remember the capitation fee?

The general function of the Authority will be to "administer" the service. It will do this by issuing regulations ("government by regulation") covering matters such as certification, what work general practitioners may, and may not, do conditions of "promotion," conditions of appointment, composition and functions of Medical Boards together with rules covering their procedure, standardisation of forms, collection of statistics, remuneration of Medical Officers, etc., etc. To say nothing of Disciplinary Machinery and Investigation of Complaints (to be submitted on form XY/B.43(a).l.). A good general idea of what it will deal with (by degrees, but quite inevitably) can be got by reading the appropriate Paras. of "King's Regulations and Air Council Instructions for the Royal Air Force," which may be purchased from H.M. Stationery Office. (The R.A.F. Medical Service is a form of State Medical Service, and it is worth noting that its administrative personnel are practically all doctors, so that it is a State Medical Service "run by doctors.")

The Method of the British Medical Association: —We know, from Bulletin 5 and from things which Dr. Hill, who seems to be the official spokesman for the Executive, has said, that the Executive, like the Ministry, stands for central control of the profession; but it goes further—it wants bigger and better control—one really big powerful "machine" (to use Dr. Anderson's word), capable of exercising authority over about 60,000 doctors. That would give you about one chance in sixty thousand of controlling the "authority," if it was an elected authority and did not surrender its power to its permanent officials, its private bureaucrats. No elected authority can carry on without non-elected permanent officials. In the "British Medical Journal" for July 17 [1943], Dr. Hill is reported to have said, "the profession believed that at the centre, whether in the form of a department or a corporate body, there should be an organisation concerned solely with health and administration of all the health functions of a central government" (our emphasis). This Dr. Hill regards as "fundamental." We agree with him that it is fundamental, and are duly grateful to him for the added warning he has given us of Executive intentions. Obviously the Minister could hardly quarrel with that statement. It only remains for them to settle between themselves, taking the profession into their confidence in due course, the details of "machinery," and the question of the personnel who are thus to be elevated into the coveted positions of dictators over the medical profession.

But on what authority does Dr. Hill state "the profession believed"? In an earlier statement ("British Medical Journal," May 22, p. 62) he was telling us "We must steel ourselves for changes which we may not like." Is it Dr. Hill's business to tell us to "steel" ourselves for what we don't want, or is it first to ascertain, and then to advocate, those things, which

A SUGGESTION

(To the Editor.)

Sir.—In last week's "New Times" you published an excellent letter on meat rationing by Mr. L. S. Bull, to the Prime Minister. I intend to send my copy of "New Times" to the Prime Minister, place an arrow pointing to the article, with the words, "I agree"; also, at top of paper write: "With compliments from—name, address."

This action lets him see that we have read and digested the article. There is also a fine article in the Williamstown "Chronicle" on meat rationing, I intend to carry out the same procedure and send it to Senator Keane.

The week before last you published a fine broadcast by Mr. Guthrie; he was dealing with Mr. Chifley, Federal Treasurer. I posted that copy on to the Treasurer in the same manner as stated above. I put this suggestion in for other readers. This is pressure politics—remember the National Insurance campaign, which was a success because numbers took action.

—Yours, etc. DAVID McINNES, 24 Campbell St., Moreland, Vic.

of all is a clear realisation of the intention—the policy—of the "planners." When the profession's basic policy as stated will be the time to formulate a method to implement it.

* * * * *

. . . To summarise the results, which could be expected from the Ministry's and the B.M.A. Executive's "plans": —

1. Doctors would be brought under a central authority (Board, Department, Corporate Body, Local Authority), which would be concerned (not all at once, but eventually) to introduce as much uniformity into the methods and results of medical practice as possible. That is because it is easier to "administer" a service, which is standardised in all its parts. Standardisation of motorcar parts made mass-production possible. Statistics, and therefore diagnosis in accordance with official classifications, and a diagnosis for every patient, duly recorded and passed on; invalidity according to schedules; medical classification to suit different grades of work—all these things would be of primary importance and would be the subject of one regulation after another.

2. Control of policy would be centralised. The authority would be administrative chiefly, and either itself advisory (Ministry method), or (B.M.A. method) advisory in conjunction with an "elected"

we do want? It is pure nonsense to say that the profession "believes"—unless, of course, Dr. Hill thinks that we have been hypnotised into that belief; there has been enough propaganda to justify him. The fact is that the profession has never had an opportunity to vote on the straight question of Control; that question has never been put to it except hidden in schemes like the Grey Book. We are simply told, in the hope that we will believe it, that a Central Authority is "inevitable"—like Hitler's victories. It's the same technique.

So the result at which the Executive is aiming is a Central Authority. The method is a "corporate body" or a "department." The effect would be—issue of regulations, control of certification, control of appointments and promotions, forms and more forms, discipline—for the rest, see under Ministry above.

Both the Ministry and the B.M.A. Executive want the same thing—an "organised" medical profession run by a

SPOTLIGHT ON BISHOP OF BRADFORD

Whether by reason of the fact that the diocese of the Bishop of Bradford, Dr. Blunt, is the centre of a large Jewish population, and the antecedent circumstance that Dr. Blunt wrote a series of books lauding the Jews, or simply by personal ineptitude, he appears to be ambitious of a high place amongst contemporary ecclesiastics of the Anglican Church who demonstrate their dislike of Christianity, and their affinity with Anacharsis Clootz, the Freemason, who called himself "the personal enemy of Christ."

Dr. Blunt's antics at the time of the Constitutional [abdication] crisis will be remembered; and he has written a Foreword to a production entitled "Christians in the Class Struggle," published by the "Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership." This contains the following sentence:

"Is it not obvious that if we are to have Socialism—real and permanent Socialism—all the fundamental opposition must be liquidated (i.e., rendered politically inactive) by disfranchisement, and, if necessary, by imprisonment."

If that is Christianity, we are Mohammedans.

* * * * *

The primary postulate, that there is a class struggle, is so basically wicked that we find it difficult to understand how men pretending to a liberal education can tolerate its use in connection with any religious tenet. So far as our memory serves us, there is not a single basic reform for the benefit of the under-privileged in this country, from Magna Charta onwards, which has not originated in individuals privileged by experience and opportunity above the average.

And there is hardly a political or economic injustice existing at this present time which cannot be traced to the influence of those people who, for the past hundred years at least, have moulded the policy of the so-called Labour and Socialist Party—those people with whom Dr. Blunt is evidently so popular. If we are to accept the reality of the class struggle, then the deadliest enemies of the community as a whole, not excepting themselves, are those classes in whom a minority of Anglican prelates appears to discern a monopoly of all the virtues, in the face of all evidence and common sense. That is so thoroughly, even if subconsciously recognised, that even the latest booby-trap, the Commonwealth Party, has to obtain the services of a baronet of fifteen generations, doubtless possessed of the instincts, if not the intelligence, of a genuine will to serve. It is true that, in order to guard against belated development, Sir Richard Acland has only been "elected" leader for one year. But that does not invalidate the demonstration.

* * * * *

It is a matter of history that the incursions of ecclesiastics into concrete policy

central authority. One result, two methods. The profession will be asked to choose the method by which it will become subject to a central authority. Each method, of course, will have its selling points—pensions, holidays with pay, "free choice," no surgeries to keep up, maintaining privacy, doctor-patient relationship, etc. But both will have forms, and statistics, and standardised certification, the ownership of medical records by "the State," control of income, a hierarchy of authority, seniority.

* * * * *

. . . There is no doubt that a contributory scheme that would "spread" medical expenses, and thus remove the basic cause of all this trouble, could be evolved for those who need or want it, and such a scheme need not involve any form of central control over doctors. And nothing would annoy the "planners" more. At this stage it is entirely premature to put forward any concrete method by which such a scheme could be implemented, but it should be realised that such schemes are in operation in various places, and at least one suitable one has been formulated which would meet the conditions of this country. Until the policy of the profession as a whole, for freedom or control, has been unequivocally stated, consideration of specific plans is futile. What is required first

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

POWERS PLOT: The "Australian Institute of Political Science Summer School" is also being used as a pretext by the daily press to fill its pages with the usual dose from Evatt & Co. for the purpose of mesmerising the people on the powers referendum. Evatt was the star-turn magsman telling the world that only chaos and disruption would ensue if electors refuse to recognise Evatt, Curtin and Co. as our God-sent saviours. The press are right behind this plot to rob the people of their freedom, but maybe John Citizen recognises the dangerous link-up between the "capitalist" press and the so-called champions of the workers—it should not be difficult for Labor followers to "smell a rat" this time. The united press agitation in favour of transferring power should convince them that there's a very big nigger in the woodpile.

WESLEY WILES: According to the Melbourne "Sun" of January 31, Dr. A. R. Haywood, A.N.A. chief, supported the plot to centralise power at Canberra from the Wesley Pulpit; obviously he was putting over pro-referendum propaganda when he said "it would be better for State Premiers to take orders from Canberra." Dr. Haywood is a disciple of the political Labor machine, and unsuccessfully contested "Henty" Federal electorate some time ago. It was a clever trick merely to put him up as the A.N.A. chief, so that his political bias would be obscured. Here we see the Wesley Pulpit being used to further the powers plot. Wesley supporters would be well advised to throw the searchlight beam on Benson.

BEER BREWING: A resident of Coburg (Vic.) was recently fined, along with other amounts, £25 for having been "in possession of beer on which Government dues had not been paid." The magistrate, presumably out of sympathy for the beer monopoly, ordered imprisonment until the fines were paid, but suspended the order for four weeks. This illustrates how the political Parties load the price of beer, grant monopolies to certain chosen firms—and then use our police and courts to protect the vested interest. Like other productions, beer need only conform to certain pure foods standards—there's no need for excise rackets, which, in the last analysis, are only obstacles to good homemade beer.

CANADIAN CAPERS: Refusing electors the opportunity to pass judgment on their political servants through the ballot box, Mr. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister of Canada, is reported as telling the Canadian House of Commons that the Government "does not intend to be interrupted by a general election in war-time." He "desired to stay in his post until the war was won." No doubt he wants to stay at his post, but the important point is, do the people of Canada want him to stay at his post? Only an election could settle that all-important point, and, apparently, Mr. Mackenzie King is not prepared to risk it.

HOME-FRONT HITLERS: Mr. Donald Nelson, U.S. war-production chief, is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of January 19 as uttering the following timely warning: "Although the Allies were well on the way to defeating Fascism, we must remember that the Hitler Psychology is not confined to foreign nations." This warning has a special application to our local departmental bureaucrats strutting around as national security officers or national service snoopers. Even some of our politicians, judging from their insults to the public, aided and abetted by the daily press, are imbued with the Hitler mentality.

CRITICAL CHURCHMAN: The Moderator of the Church of Scotland (Professor John Baillie) is reported as saying: "The threatened coarsening of the fibre of the nation's girlhood through being thrown into the women's services was aggravating the youth problem." (Melb. "Sun," 19/1/43.) It is (Continued at foot of next column page 3)

authority for what happens to patients. It is therefore his duty to call for and forward reports on juniors, when a complaint comes in; and he, in turn, may be "directed" to discipline the junior concerned.

5. Initiative would be killed, because any new idea would have to be referred to the central authority for its approval and permission; in those august regions the idea would be considered "in the light of the Minister's policy." ("I am directed to inform you that your application to . . . has been rejected since it is not the Minister's (or perhaps Government's) policy . . .")

It is vital to understand what is likely to be the end result of the policies now to be put forward, and to decide whether that is the result desired. It is essential to look beyond methods to the fundamental policy, and to leave side issues—pensions, holidays, health-centres—out of account until you have decided what major results you want. Democracy is the choice, not only of results, but of the order in which they are obtained. Pensions and holidays are "terms of service"—or perhaps they are better described as "terms of servitude."

Remember what Lord Acton said: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Before you surrender the power to make your own decisions, and give a central authority power to make decisions binding on you make sure that that is what you intend as the result of your vote.

"THE PRICE OF FREEDOM IS ETERNAL VIGILANCE."

body, on matters of policy to the Minister (Minister of Health or Minister of Social Security). We have referred to the well-known phrase "responsible on matters of policy through the Minister to Parliament," which means that the Authority and the Minister whack up policy between them. Control of policy is great fun—it is telling people what they have to do.

3. Subject to direction on matters of major policy, the central authority would have the power to make and enforce regulations (see Lord Hewart—"The New Despotism").

4. The seniority principle would be introduced—i.e., each doctor would be responsible to the next senior, but would be responsible for those junior to him. This is the most effective method known for destroying personal responsibility. It is sometimes known as the Fuehrer-prinzip. The system would come in, probably, fairly gradually, and the authorities would concentrate to begin with, on applying it to the intake of junior doctors. Present elder practitioners could expect to have a certain amount of responsibility delegated to them, especially if they were Army trained. In this way responsibility to higher authority would be substituted for responsibility to patients. The theory is that the highest authority in a given area (or region) is responsible to the central

THE FARMER IN NORTHERN IRELAND

An account of an address by J. O. GIBSON, given at an Area Meeting of Social Crediters, in Belfast, on November 6, 1943:—

After the experience of the last World War, it is a gratuitous insult to hand the farmer any more bouquets. But there can be no doubt that next to the men actually in the firing line, the farmer, in the present crisis, performs the most real and vital, and the hardest job, and, in a climate like that of Northern Ireland, probably the dirtiest and most uncomfortable of all.

No two things could be less "mixable" than heroics and agriculture. To the farmers of Northern Ireland, beyond the conventional "strategic" interest in it, and in the defeat of the Germans, the war means primarily the fact that he is making some profit again, instead of just keeping body and soul together at the cost of capital depletion and mortgages. He is paying off indebtedness, and in many cases actually has cash to his credit, as the recent Treasury forays under the Wings for Victory banner prove.

Two factors stand out predominant in his mind. First, that the "money" to be made, due to the war situation, is largely being realised at the expense of the capital fertility of the land, and that if there is not a return to some system, profitable to the land as well as to him, of self-supporting (in the natural sense) mixed farming, the land, which constitutes his capital (and the fundamental capital of the entire community), will be rapidly drained away.

The second factor is his entire lack of any belief in the Government's good faith; in the possibility of any reliable or continuous policy on the part of the Ministry of Agriculture where the land is concerned. Circumstances, particularly the deadly experience of the slump after the last war, when every conceivable promise made to the farmers at the crisis of the U-boat menace was broken, and every hope frustrated by "events," have left him quite cynical. The farmer is naturally elemental—slow, but sure. The old wisecracks that still hold true hold true especially in his case—such sayings, for instance, as "Once bitten, twice shy." And the post-war deflation of the

last "peace" made a deep impression that has left him very shy indeed.

There is "war" on again, and some money to be made, and he is prepared to take what he can get, and stifle his "better" feelings where the fertility of the land is concerned. To his way of thinking—and though undoubtedly it is a very slow way, it is quite rational and sound fundamentally—it seems "mad" that a commodity like potatoes, for instance, for which only a few years ago he could not get two pounds a ton, though they cost him about three to produce, and was fined if he grew too many, now bears a subsidy to him of ten pounds for every acre he will put in. If that is the way society is "governed," it's a mad way, and not "natural" as he understands nature. But he wasn't in a position "to quarrel" with the offer of two pounds, and he's not going to quarrel with the present state of affairs. Nevertheless, it leaves him totally without confidence in the future, and in the worst possible sense cynical.

He has no more understanding than the "next man" of the present operations of the "compensated price," but his common sense tells him that a subsidy to the producer is a cock-eyed and wasteful and unnatural way, of doing something that on the face of it appears to be necessary. His instinct tells him that the method, as applied predominantly and in this form to Agricultural prices, tends to give the general public the idea that Agriculture is the favoured and pampered pet of the powers-that-be, a distinction he repudiates. He sees far enough to recognise that the beneficiaries are consumers in general in the retail prices they pay, and that his better profits are no different from those of the industrialist, and arise "mysteriously" out of the state of war. The worst feature of his cynicism is that it is fundamentally a political cynicism. It is not the understanding cynicism that induces tolerance for human frailty. The farmer tends to be, not even indignant at the lack of policy in government, but disgusted, and therefore indifferent. Like the great majority of individuals in an "artificially" frustrated democracy, he has not yet grasped the fact that political apathy and biological suicide are synonymous. He is by nature an individualist, with all the individualist's antipathy to cold-blooded co-

operation; though in the case of his neighbour in a crisis he can be first-rate. He does not understand combined action in its positive sense, and his instinct in a crisis of a more general kind is to break up and go off on his own—a follower of what is known by the ugly misnomer of "guerilla-tactics."

This aspect shows the agriculturist as not politically minded, in the party-politics sense. But if we deplore his positive non-cooperation and see in it the reason for his inability to put his own case clearly and make necessary demands with "one voice," it must nevertheless be recognised that from the opposite, negative angle, he understands perfectly the democratic art of what Douglas calls "contracting out"—the prime offence—from the point of view of the centralisers and planners; the "sin" for which four million Russian agriculturists lost their lives not ten years ago.

The farmer of Northern Ireland is cynically prepared to let the Ministry do what it likes provided it still brings cash into his hand, and he gets at least a twelve months' guarantee of price. And he keeps himself free from petty interference by the simple means of putting 50 per cent. of his Government forms "in the back of the fire" instead of filling them in and, within the war-time framework, by going his own way exactly as he always has done. His real (scientific) experience and his natural phlegm combined can put up a barrage through which the young house-trained Ministry inspector is quite unable to penetrate. And he will continue on those "negative" lines unless and until Bren-guns are brought out against him. Instinctively he realises that the Government is playing with him the same game that he himself is being forced to play with the land, which might be described as fast-and-loose, and the above constitutes his reply—not, perhaps, a very intelligent one, in the circumstances that is not to be expected—but a very realistic and concrete one, as the young Government inspectors must be discovering.

Regarded literally, it will be recognised that the picture is a fairly dark one—not to say sinister, as cynical apathy always tends to be. And its future developments might be more so. Let us imagine the war over, and a number, if not all, of the subsidies withdrawn under the pressing "financial necessity" for exports, i.e., imports to pay interest on external loans. What then? Granted the small farmer has achieved in the war boom a degree of solvency and has not involved himself deeply in machines subject to quick depreciation (a decent horse must have quite five times the "life" of a Fordson, and a plough more like fifty), his impulse

will be just to "quit work" that contains none of this "iniquitous" element of profit against which the Archbishop of Canterbury has come out to do battle. He can grow enough feeding stuffs for his stock. Barring wheat flour, control of which is becoming almost concentric with the Cinema Circuit industry, he can be nearly self-supporting, with a diet, in Northern Irish country districts based on milk, butter, potatoes and bread.

Doubtless, if the farmer could be induced to formulate his instinctive outlook, the above would approximate to it—the outlook of the absolute individualist, pure and simple—too pure, and too simple, of course, as are all "absolute" outlooks. Because, in the first place it is over-realistic. As an attitude, it postulates nothing but self; just as Socialism postulates nothing but the State. Whereas, the reality of the situation is neither the individual versus the State nor the State versus the individual, but the individual and the State.

It is when two absolutes can only see one another in opposition that Bren-guns come into the picture, and either civil or military defence units are turned into a Gestapo. So that an individualistic "realism" that overlooks the above is in fact failing in realism. And isn't it just that failure that Anglo-Saxon culture has succeeded in avoiding so far?

Granted, however, that the worst came to the worst, and the citizen (the member of the State) was threatened with starvation by a sit-down strike of the real agricultural experts, it can be seen how useful a weapon the Nationalisation of the Land would be in instituting a land serfdom such as Russia had, and still has—serfs being those who work by compulsion instead of impulsion—and the farmer might wake up, too late, to realise the mistake of his political apathy when the going was comparatively good. That is, more or less, the black side of the picture—the obverse, the "wrong" side. To it belongs by right the threatening, the obvious, the looming the predominating. On the other side (it is always the same) are a handful of "small mercies," and the Art of Living and of good judgment consists in learning their red worth, and the practical unreality of all the "show" on the other side. Douglas has said, in "The Policy of a Philosophy," that "Good will always be vanquished by evil, so long as evil understands its tools better than good; but if good can only be taught to use its tools correctly, the good will vanquish evil." What are the counterbalancing mercies?

(Continued on page 4.)

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS' headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.) 'Freedom From Want' Campaign: We are pleased to announce that the S.A. Division of the Pensioners' League have now decided to actively push this campaign, which was started by the Prospect Branch of Old Age and Invalid Pensioners' Association.

The following letter has been sent to most of the Federal Representatives for S.A. Divisions:—

3 Elizabeth Street, Prospect., South Australia, 21st January, 1944.

Dear Mr. - . During the coming weeks you will probably be receiving numbers of the attached request letters ("Freedom From Want" letter). We want you to consider these in the spirit in which they are signed, one of co-operation and helpful instruction. The primary fact to bear in mind is that you were elected to represent the wishes of your constituents in Parliament and obtain for them, as far as possible, the things they want. These things are not con-nected to the items on your "Party" platform. The needs of your constituents transcend in importance "Party" limitations, as the present request demonstrates. It is with a keen desire to help you to truly represent the people of your electorate that this letter is sent.

The request of £3 a week is a reasonable one and readily agreed to by at least 80% of the people. A percentage refuse to sign because of the last sentence, and we think it is perhaps quite unwarranted in your case, as you will no doubt be eager to actively support this request.

Your reply will be communicated to your electors.

— Yours for true democracy, J. T. FITZGERALD, President, Prospect Branch of Old Age and Invalid Pensioners' Association.

NOTES ON THE NEWS (Continued).

gratifying indeed to note that attention is being drawn to such aspects of contemporary life. The fact that women are capable of being stampeded into abandoning their natural horror of the destruction of life, and into actually taking part in it, is a development that would have been thought impossible only a few short years ago. As a result of women's fight for "equality," they may in the next war be permitted complete equality — to compete with men for battle honours. We may even see whole family units in the fray!

PACIFIC PACT: The Melbourne "Herald" of January 21 informed us that after Nash, Eyatt, Curtin and, Co. had finalised the Pacific agreement all that remained to be done was to merely formally present it to Cabinet (not to Parliament) for ratification. So, you see that neither the electors nor their representatives are to be consulted in this matter; and, of course, as you know, no instruction or mandate was given by the people in this respect. The following morning the Melbourne "Sun" announced "a solemn assurance from Mr. Nash (N.Z.) that neither the holding of the conference nor the agreement was a departure from the principle of the British Commonwealth of Nations." Despite this assurance, no definite declaration of adherence is contained in the agreement; to the contrary, its inspiration is stated in the agreement to be the "Moscow declaration of October, 1943." If the agreement is not more reliable than Mr. Nash's assurance, it will indeed be just another scrap of paper.

—O.B.H.

THE JEWISH PROBLEM IN G.T. BRITAIN

(An extract from DOUGLAS REED'S latest book, "Lest We Regret.")

I have no hostility to the Jews, nor have I found any in the British people. As we go down Civvy Street, in search of the future which was denied us after the last war, we shall encounter forces which strive for power, or territorial conquest, in our world: great nations like Germany and Japan, financial interests like banks, oil undertakings, armaments trusts, and religious organisations like Jewry. All pursue aims which reach across frontiers, and thus may conflict with our paramount need, the safety of this island.

This is no matter of prejudice; we have the right to discuss whether they will profit or injure us. Our interests and those of organised, international Jewry are not identical, and if I, gentle reader, am much alone in saying this today, that is because our politicians and newspapers have come to a dangerous state of infatuation or bondage. The files of British Parliamentary debates and newspapers show that objective debate was formerly common. About 1926, G. K. Chesterton remarked that, by some hidden means, this open argument was being stealthily curtailed. People, he said, were still allowed to express general impressions about their country, until they came to the case of the Jews; but there the tendency was to stop, and anybody who said anything whatever about Jews as Jews "was supposed to wish to burn them at the stake."

"Anon" [the "hidden hand."—Ed.] has proved most powerful in this matter. Today, the most substantial arguments are dismissed by the asinine braying of "Yah! Anti-Semolina!" (or whatever the lunatic saying is) and our entire, once public-spirited Press yields to this servile stupidity. That is not good enough. This repression of free speech in ONE question alone will have to stop.

A large number of Jews has been brought to this country by two Tory Prime Ministers, two Tory Home Secretaries, a Socialist Home Secretary and a Socialist Labour Minister. They were exempted from military service, but allowed to take any kind of employment. They were even given preference in employment, because our own men and women were sent to the Services and factories, or imprisoned if they objected, and employers engaged these newcomers, believing they would not be so taken. We have as much right to discuss this, as our relations with Russia, housing, or the Beveridge Report. This concerns us.

These Jews should have been received only on condition that they took no employment vacated by a British subject (indeed, the Government gave this promise, but broke it) save under the legal obligation to surrender it to a returning British subject out of work (which legal safeguard the Government refuses) and that they should share the burden of military service (which the Government also declines to impose on them, pleading that they are technically "enemy aliens," though they are numerous employed in the Ministries and the B.B.C., where they have access to vital military information!).

A very serious statement was published in a London periodical, "The Economist," in 1939. (It caused Sir Abe Bailey, a warm supporter of the Jews, to utter an emphatic warning.) It was, that "the average refugee is more helpful to the

community than the average Englishman, whether the standard is monetary, capital, industrial skill or intellectual attainments."

Hitler never said anything more hostile. This statement gained importance when Mr. Brendan Bracken, who was Managing Director of "The Economist," became Minister for Information. No Member ever asked whether he shared the view expressed in his periodical. But the Ministry of Information, and the B.B.C., have been foremost among public employers in recruiting Central European Jews. I know, from many sources, the bitterness this causes, among qualified British subjects.

A pledge was given in Parliament that aliens would not be employed, in such Departments, in preference to qualified British subjects. I was in a position to know that the statement was incorrect. A question was put, and the pledge was then reduced. British subjects would be given preference "provided they were suitable in other respects." A pledge thus qualified means nothing. This is the beginning of the thing which always starts, when the

"PROPOSED REFERENDUM ON THE POWERS BILL"

A Public Address by:

MR. F. C. PAICE,

on Wednesday, February 9, 8 p.m.,

AT CHRIST CHURCH HALL,
PUNT ROAD, SOUTH YARRA.

A Most Important Subject.

Questions Invited.

—New World Movt., S. Yarra Branch.

Jews arrive; exclusion, as practised by Doktor Farisy and his colleagues in Prague.

"The boys' did not or could not settle down; their jobs had been filled long ago by the people at home." This was written, by a Jewish author, about the Hungarian soldiers who returned to Hungary after the last war. He is now in this country, and has been enabled by our Government to take any job he wishes. "The Jew must be better in every respect than the Gentile if he wants to attain the same result, and win the same recognition." These are also his words. The claim is not true. I have nowhere found the Jews cleverer than the Gentiles, or more stupid. They attain immoderate power though the strength of their cohesion, the cement of which is an age-old anti-Gentile teaching. The weakness of the Gentiles, few of whom know the Mosaic Laws (of which Hitler's racial laws are the copy in brown) is that they do not realise this.

But if that is the source of Jewish strength, its main instrument is the infatuated Gentile, who is more Jewish than the Jews. From these, we suffer sorely. They are the stupid Gentiles of Jewish anecdote. Infatuation for a half-comprehended cause may drive a man to rabid bigotry.

In this country, examples of such infatuation fill the newspapers. Some are truly grotesque. Here are two:—

In the Commons, on August 6, 1942, Professor Hill "asked the Minister of Labour whether he is aware that a number of foreign refugee dentists are at present unemployed; and whether, in view of the shortage of manpower, he will cease to reserve further dental students from military service until these refugee dentists are absorbed." (Our own lads, that is, should be removed to make room for aliens! When the Minister, in reply, cautiously spoke of the "need to maintain the future supply of British dentists," Miss Eleanor Rathbone said the "excuses" which were given were "really untenable."

In the "News-Chronicle," on January 12, 1943, Mr. A. J. Cummings, quoting Mr. Vernon Bartlett and the "Observer," asked why our Government permitted the removal of 5000 Italians from Abyssinia to Italy "without insisting on the release of Jews in at least equal numbers from Axis countries." (According to the War Minister, on September 8, 1942, Italy then held 15,500 British prisoner-of-war. Should the doctrine then obtain, even in respect of our captives that "the average refugee is in every way more helpful to the community than the average Englishman"?)

(To be continued.)

SOIL, AGRICULTURE & FOOD VALUES

Hereunder we publish the third instalment, under the above heading, of a series of extracts from four extremely important and interesting speeches made in the House of Lords during the debate on October 26, 1943, as reported in the British "Hansard":—

Lord Geddes: . . . Dr. Enid Charles has published the results of her examination into the demographic statistics and position of Prince Edward Island. It is relatively a small community, one of the provinces of Canada, peopled almost entirely by descendants of Western European stocks; the Scots form 44 per cent, the English about 21 per cent, and the Irish and French make up the rest. There we have a very high standard of health, an extraordinarily vigorous, active population, and, quite remarkably, after fifty years of close examination, no fall whatever in the birth rate. It is the only social organisation composed of Western Europeans, which has not shown in the last fifty years a really sharp fall in the birth rate.

. . . Prince Edward Island is surrounded by the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The population is engaged in fishing farming and the rural trades and crafts. There are no great cities. The farming there is mixed, not like the farming in the prairie provinces of Canada. It is mixed farming, and it has always been carried out in the traditional manner, not using large quantities of artificial fertilisers, but using muck and the products of the sea. There we have this Scotto-Anglo-Erse-French population maintaining a standard of health, a standard of well being, and a standard of reproduction, which is unique among Western Europeans at the present time. That is not a chance impression . . . it is the result of one of the most beautiful pieces of demographic research that can be found anywhere . . . We have got, therefore, in Prince Edward Island, a population living very much as the noble Lord, Lord Teviot, has suggested we all should live, drawing their food fresh from the sea and from the field in the traditional manner, living upon simple foodstuffs, the products of their own farms and fishing, and maintaining an extraordinarily good state of health and birth-rate.

Another paper by Dr. Enid Charles, who is now in the employ of the Canadian Government, . . . on the differential birth rate in Canada, . . . shows something which I think, is of extraordinary interest. The French people in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec have a very high birth rate. They live in a traditional way in all those provinces. If, however, the French Canadians move to the wheat farms of the Prairie Provinces, their health declines and their birth rate falls in some cases below the level of British stocks . . .

What has happened? Those people have moved away from their traditional life and their traditional type of agriculture, and from their traditional association with the sea to a continental climate and to wheat farms where a large part of their food is similar, being imported, to the food in the towns and cities, and therefore their birth-rate falls abruptly and their health declines abruptly. . . . It is a most extraordinary thing that as soon as you get to a people of different stock origin, the Central Europeans, that is to say, the Eastern Germans, the Czechs, the Poles and the Rumanians—as soon as you get to the stock of Canada derived from those countries you find that the birth-rate rises as they go West; it is low in the East and high in the centre; and their health goes up, too, as far as I can make out the figures. And what clearly suggests itself to my mind as the line along which one has to look for an explanation would be that they are racially adapted to a continental climate, where the Western European is racially adapted to a maritime climate, and that we have thus got another factor coming into health.

. . . If you . . . work out the correlation of health and reproduction, which Dr. Charles does, you will find that only something between one-third and two-fifths of the variations in this manifestation of positive health can be accounted for by the environmental conditions, and that the rest, the two-thirds or three-fifths that is left, are not explained unless they have an association with the nutritional type with which the individual is by descent associated, and with the climate type with which again he is by descent associated. So that we have got a highly complex picture before us, and we find in it one of

The Former in Northern Ireland

(Continued from page 3.)

Small enough. There may be more, but two that come to mind are, first, the growing tendency in the farmer, as in every one else, to approach his M.P. about it. This is testified to. And the second, in regard to post-war agricultural policy, the fact that Britain has been more or less drained of her overseas credits, and may therefore be forced to "economise" on imports, i.e., cheap food. Little enough, surely! But both tangible and positive. We may look for "good" to get the upper hand of "evil" in proportion as the farmer, and individuals generally, grow to understand better their democratic "tools," that is, their representative in Parliament, and their power through him.

—N.F.W.

AUSTRALIA'S GREAT POST-WAR PERIL

(A letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN. Continued from last issue.)

Sir,—As a result of the legislation introduced by Mr. Churchill in 1925, England went back to the gold standard and took Australia with her. According to Mr. J. M. Keynes, (now Lord Keynes) this little episode put a thousand million pounds into the pockets of the rentier class, and added 750 million pounds to the dead weight of the British National Debt. It also precipitated the coal strike, the most disastrous strike in England's history, and accelerated the spread of ruin and poverty in all directions.

While that was going on, Mr. Montagu Norman, who in 1920 had been appointed from an American banking house as Governor of the Bank of "England," was spending a great deal of his time in New York consulting the Federal Reserve Board, of which, you will remember, Paul Warburg, a German-Jew and the originator of the "central" banking system, was the dominating force. Mr. Norman had himself been described as "Wall Street's deflation agent to bring 'Britain into line,'" and how well he has done so is shown by the trend of events since his appointment. He keeps his name out of the press as much as possible, rarely appears in public, goes to extraordinary lengths to hide his movements (often travelled under the name of Professor Skinner), and never explains anything.

In addition to the personal visits at the Federal Reserve Bank by the Governor of the Bank of "England," continuous liaison was maintained through a Professor Sprague, of Harvard University. This Dr. Sprague was another connecting link between the Federal Reserve Board and the U.S. Treasury on one side and the Bank of "England" and the British Treasury on the other side. He was also a member of President Roosevelt's New Deal Brain Trust. This may explain why it was that our very own Professor Copland was careful to visit Harvard, and why certain other prominent Australians who faithfully served the financiers from platform and pulpit were "awarded" honorary degrees from the same institution.

Conditions in America were, of course, following a similar course to those in England. So much so that in November, 1923, Mr. William Jennings Bryan, one of America's most ardent fighters for monetary reform, wrote in "Hearst's International Magazine" as follows:—

"The Federal Reserve Bank, that should have been the farmers' greatest protection, has become his greatest foe. The deflation of the farmer was a crime deliberately committed, not out of enmity to the farmer, but out of indifference to him. Inflation of prices had encouraged him to buy, and then deflation delivered him into the hands of the moneylender. The Federal Reserve Bank can be a blessing or a curse, according to its management. If the Wall Street speculators are in control of it they can drain the agricultural districts and keep up a fictitious prosperity among, the plunder-bund."

Mr. Bryan had believed that the Federal Reserve System would be beneficial to his countrymen, and therefore supported it. Before he died, however, he said that that was the one action in his political career that he regretted.

In 1926 Sir Josiah Stamp, a Director of the Bank of England, told us that "never in the history of the world had so much power been vested in a small body of men as in the Federal Reserve Board. These men had the welfare of the world in their hands, and they could upset the rest of

us either deliberately or by some unconscious action. . . . It is precarious," he said, "to have such concentrated power vested in such a body."

In the same year the leader of the United States Farmer Labour Party, giving evidence before a Congressional Committee, declared that unless a certain group of men had their power curbed, the world would be plunged into another war, compared with which the last war would be like a picnic. "A certain group of men"! Apparently Ramsay MacDonald was thinking of the same group in 1931 when he said: "A few financiers . . . pursuing their own ends and looking after their own fortunes, are able to destroy the fruits of good harvests and the productive accomplishments of human energy."

A prominent American author, Mr. Ludwell Denny, in his book entitled "America Conquers Britain" (published in 1930), wrote thus:—

"Many nations may laugh at our State Department, but all must tremble before our Federal Reserve Board. High money rates in the United States in 1929 forced an increase in the official discount rates almost at once in England, in ten European countries, in two Latin-American countries, and two in the Far East, and in almost every, case that action, restricted business and brought suffering to millions of foreign workers . . . That blow hit Britain hardest of all and checked her trade revival. As a result the British Board of Trade index soon showed a decline in commodity prices which the British correctly attributed to the rise in European rates owing to the necessity which devolves upon Central Banks to withstand the pull of high call money rates in America."

At the annual meeting of shareholders of the Midland Bank, London, in 1928, the Chairman declared that "the American price level is not affected by gold movements, but is controlled by the policy of the Reserve Banks in expanding or contracting credit." The important question is, "Who determines this policy?"

The accuracy of this declaration by the chairman of the Midland Bank was confirmed by Professor Cassel, of Sweden, who is described in the "Encyclopedia Britannica" as one of the world's foremost authorities on foreign exchanges. He said: "The Federal Reserve authorities controlled not only the general level of prices in the United States, but also the price level of all other gold standard countries in the world . . . Consequently, the world price level is actually regulated by the leaders of the United States Bank policy." Again, we should ask, "Who are the leaders of this policy." In 1931 Professor Cassel also wrote in the "Financial Times" as follows:—

"Practically absolute power over the welfare of the world has been placed in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, and one is appalled to see the apparently haphazard manner in which the Board uses this power, how ignorant it is of the aim which ought to dictate America's monetary policy."

Is the position today any different? It is not. Will the position after the war be any different? It will not unless we DO something NOW to "curb the power of these men." Which men? Listen to Mr. Norman Jaques speaking in the Canadian House of Commons on March 24, 1943:

"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, Warburgs, Montefiores, Sieffs, Niemeyers, Sierpmanns, Fruhlings, Cassells, Strakosches, Schroeders, Baruchs, Schusters, Cohens, Bleichroders, Kleinworths, Kahns, Goschens. How many French names are in that list? How many British? How many Christians?" (Quoted from "The Social Creditor" of 26/6/43.)

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham St., East Melbourne, C.2.
30th January 1944.

(To be continued.)

GET THE FACTS!

What is Democracy? What is Totalitarianism? What is Communism? What is Socialism? What is National Socialism? What is Fascism? What is the choice before us?

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE 'ISMS,'" which is available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1d.).

**THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS**

ORGANISATION—MASTER OR SERVANT?

(Continued from page 1.)

ment without trial for people whom they call "pro-fascist"!

In October of last year Professor Woodruff told a large audience in the Caulfield (Melbourne) Town Hall "reconstruction at home—whether Britain or Australia—is impossible without WORLD reconstruction." This kind of talk, coming from an allegedly educated man, is an appalling indication of the type of mesmerism with which we have to contend.

Professor Woodruff may believe that, if all the other countries sank beneath the sea, Australians couldn't feed, clothe, and house themselves! But I doubt whether the majority of Australians are so mesmerised that they believe such utter nonsense. However, they must realise that Professor Woodruff & Co. believe almost religiously in large-scale organisation for the mere sake of large-scale organisation.

After experiencing the results of centralised "planning" from Canberra, Australian primary producers and other realists are not likely to give more power to Canberra—still less to some international authority on the other side of the world. But the men controlling political and economic organisation in this country have no intention of allowing the general public to understand what is being planned.

"Planning" and "Organisation" have become gods to be worshipped blindly, as the Egyptians worshipped Osiris. There is only one way to overcome this mesmerism: Practical demonstrations, of people controlling their organisations, along the lines constantly indicated in this journal. Every

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere 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.

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

victory, even if only over trade-union bosses, shows others what can be done. And it increases the knowledge and faith of those who already maintain rank-and-file control of any association.

We Australians can either learn to control our associations and organisations (political or economic, national or local, governmental or otherwise) and use them for OUR conscious ends, or allow them to be used to drive us down the scale of existence. We must have the freedom-of-action to keep aloof or withdraw, individually, without penalty, from ANY enterprise whose results and/or conditions are not those WE desire. Unless we have that freedom, most of us are going to find ourselves in much the same position as hordes of ancient Egyptians: having a meagre "cart-horse security" while being used to construct the modern equivalent of the Pyramids (planners' grandiose wild-cat schemes, perhaps a thousand miles from our homes, called "public works") or, equally servile and futile, being "directed" to labour in mass-production factories making gadgets for export to the Hottentots. ("Suitable penalties" to be inflicted on "cart-horses" who "jib.")

Nothing is more certain than the fact that nothing less than a widespread understanding and application of the principles governing association can save us. We who understand those principles have a sacred trust, a trust that should inspire us to even greater effort when we sometimes think that the road to success is too hard and long.

BOOKLETS BY C H DOUGLAS

Now on sale: "Programme for the Third World War." Price: 2/-, plus 1d postage.

Also available: "The Land for the (Chosen) People Racket." Price: 2/-, plus 1d. postage.

And: "The Big Idea" (Second Edition). Price: 2/6, plus 1d postage.

Obtainable from: The Democratic Federation of Youth, 3rd Floor, 296a Pitt Street, Sydney.