

The "New Times" is a really independent, non-party, non-class, non-sectarian weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and opposing totalitarianism in all its forms.

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)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE** PRICE—FOURPENCE  
**NEW TIMES**

Vol. 10 No. 30. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 28 1944 Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

**"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES**

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

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., Melbourne.

# Power-Lusters Want Centralised Control

## New Despotism Behind Referendum

By ERIC D. BUTLER

Commenting on the New Despotism which the war has greatly strengthened in Australia, Professor F. Bland, Professor of Public Administration at Sydney University, recently stated in Sydney:

"Having escaped the despotism of arbitrary monarchs, democracy has surrendered its liberty to a despotism of its own creation. . . . It is axiomatic that you cannot exist for years on totalitarian lines without being infected with the virus of the system."

Professor Bland has made some very refreshing remarks of late concerning the menace of centralised bureaucracy and its methods in this country, and I hope that his views are being carefully noted by thinking Australians.

### WE FACE A TERRIBLE DANGER.

Professor Bland also said that we are being conditioned to accept what is happening as natural. It is unfortunately true that many people prefer to let power-lusters plan their lives rather than act for themselves. This, I believe, is the most terrifying problem facing us to-day; one which should be spunging each and every one of us to do more and more to save ourselves from stark tyranny while there is yet time.

Never before in this country has there been so much mass mesmerism, so much cynicism and so much lack of the mental vitality to face up to realities and appreciate what is happening. Large numbers of people are shouting about "liberty" while actively helping to bring about more regimentation of themselves and others.

The campaign to stampede Australians into surrendering their liberties to a central bureaucracy that the Federal Government obviously cannot even remotely control is one of the greatest examples of subtle, lying and vicious propaganda yet seen in this country. We are experiencing, so far on a smaller scale, political tactics similar to those the Germans experienced.

### EVATT'S ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY

While I have no doubt that he is only a tool for bigger forces behind him, I believe that Dr. Evatt in particular is one of the greatest menaces to Australian democracy. It may be that he doesn't know what he is doing; perhaps his legal training and the

influence of his Jewish friends in America have blacked out his perception of reality. This, however, does not absolve him from responsibility, particularly when, as I have shown over and over again in these columns, he has been a party to political trickery of a most objectionable type. His frantic fear-propaganda has almost bordered on hysteria, and reveals all too clearly what we are up against.

Any man in Dr. Evatt's position, who says that the last depression in Australia was the result of the Federal Government having insufficient legal power, is either a hopeless ignoramus or a political rogue.

In either case, he should be removed from such a position of public trust at the first opportunity.

I sincerely hope that all "Yes" advocates are asked how they can give a guarantee that there would be no depression if the Referendum were carried.

This question has already been put to some "Yes" advocates, but, needless to say, they can give no guarantee whatever. One glib Trades Hall man in Sydney replied that he had received an assurance from a Government spokesman, and that was good enough for him! People who talk like that sometimes make me despair. They are "Yes"-men in every sense of the word. They talk about "fighting" for the workers—while they themselves are little better than a docile flock of sheep.

### THE MIS-USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS.

One of the most outrageous aspects of the campaign for greater powers for Canberra has been the mis-use of public funds. It is not only the use of public funds for propaganda purposes NOW to which honest people object, but they also object to the fact that various Government Departments

have, for some time past, been issuing booklets by the thousand, most of them printed on good paper, subtly conveying the impression that the Federal Governments housing and other plans cannot be carried out unless the Federal Government has "adequate powers." And planners like Dr. Lloyd Ross and Dr. Coombs (both paid by the public) have been working solidly for greater powers for Canberra for months past.

While on this question of the mis-use of public funds, I hope that loyal Australians notice and make widely known the fact that there are three Communists on the "Yes" Referendum Committee. Dr. Evatt will need all his smart-Alec lawyer-politician's tricks if he attempts to explain how Communists have obtained the right to participate in spending tax-payers' money.

He might also explain whether Mr. W. Taylor, member of the Commonwealth Bank Board, and also a member of the "Yes" Referendum Committee, is advocating the policy of the Commonwealth Bank Board on the Referendum issue.

### MONOPOLISTS AND COMMUNISTS

We are told that "Big Business" is opposing a "Yes" vote—but, among others, chain-store monopolist A. W. Coles is supporting it! And, seeing that there are three Communists helping to direct the "Yes" campaign, how can Dr. Evatt reconcile that fact with his assurances concerning the future of private enterprise? It is of course, perfectly obvious that the little genuine private enterprise and ownership (not monopoly) still left in this country will soon be crushed out unless a halt to present policies and proposals is called immediately. Monopoly will reign supreme if Dr. Evatt and his friends have their way.

The tragedy is that most people still engaged in genuine private enterprise are hopelessly on the defensive in their fight to survive. Readers of this journal should do all in their power to show such people the real nature of their problems and how to fight constructively.

### THAT "PRIVATE ENTERPRISE" BOGEY.

In "our" socialist "A.B.C. Weekly" of July 1 Dr. Coombs states that "private enterprise means the right of the individual to produce, buy, and sell, without direction or restraint. . . ."

That statement appears to be a deliberate distortion, calculated to mislead the unthinking.

Private enterprise is NOT free of restraint or direction. In addition to competition and governmental interference is the fact that it relies upon "finding a market" for its goods—and "markets" are people WITH MONEY. (If the "market" lacks buying-power, less workers are needed. The trading banks regulate the total supply of money and they grant or refuse overdrafts—thus controlling so-called "free" private enterprise.)

That is an elementary fact of economics which, unfortunately, is obviously beyond the grasp of a product of the London School of Economics.

Even under a sane system, private enterprise would never be free to do exactly as it liked. Profiteering would be prevented by a well-known financial method (without giving Canberra more "powers") and production policy would be controlled by the people having sufficient "money-votes" to indicate what they wanted. Private enterprise would then devise the best ways and means of producing the results desired. The people know what they want and they don't need a Government Department to tell them.

### ARE YOU FOR LIBERTY?

Those who feel that they cannot run their own affairs will vote for the policies of Dr. Coombs on August 19. Similar people supported Hitler in Germany. Those who still have a feeling that liberty—real liberty, the liberty to accept or reject one thing at a time—is a thing to be encouraged and strengthened, will take the offensive and rally every possible elector to the cause of liberty and independence before August 19.

Have you sent that letter to the local paper yet? Have you sent for those few hundred "No" Campaign leaflets you know you should distribute in your neighbourhood? And what about slipping a few in your letters to your friends and relatives in the Forces? Have you organised a local group to work for a "No" vote?

Liberty is not an abstract thing to think and write and talk about; it is a reality for which you must fight—before it is too late. You have very little time left.

## Federal Labor's Reasons Why You Should Vote "No"

"WHITTLING AWAY DEMOCRACY: Once again democracy is attacked. There is never a bold, frontal attack. That would alarm us and we should unhesitatingly resist. But little by little control over the things that matter is stolen from the people. By delegating to unrepresentative, irresponsible authorities the reality of power, our 'elected persons' evade responsibility.

"Here, under the cloak of technical and ambiguous language, upon the pretext of an emergency, is another attempt to whittle away our self-government. Those who believe that responsibility should accompany power will vote 'No.' Protect the freedom which the Constitution guarantees: Defend the 'Seamless Garment' of Australian unity: Resist every attack upon Democracy. VOTE NO!"

—From Official Statement C.45, "The Case For and Against," published by the Chief Electoral Officer, Canberra, 30th December, 1936, prior to the Referendum on "Aviation and Marketing," 6th March, 1937.

This emphatic denunciation of the proposed transfer of TWO MINOR POWERS formed the concluding

## BELIEVE IT OR NOT!

Under the heading, "Noble BRITISH Sentiment" (our emphasis), the following news-item, "by cable from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency" appeared on the front page of the "Australian Jewish Herald" (Melbourne) of July 14, 1944:—

London, Wednesday—"Not the flying bombs, but the tragedy of Hungarian Jewry was main pre-occupation of the Government during the last fortnight," said Mr. Brendan Bracken, Minister for Information . . . speaking at a meeting held here in connection with the Kisch memorial.

paragraphs in the "Argument against the Proposed Laws" advanced by Federal Labor (1937 Referendum).

Nine of the present Federal Labor Ministers were amongst those who authorised the above, viz.:—

Rt. Hon. John Curtin, M.H.R.

Prime Minister.

Hon. F. J. Forde, M.H.R., Deputy

Prime Minister.

Hon. N. J. O. Makin, M.H.R.

Hon. E. J. Holloway, M.H.R.

Hon. A. S. Drakeford, M.H.R.

Hon. J. S. Collings, Senator.

Hon. E. J. Ward, M.H.R.

Hon. C. W. Frost, M.H.R.

Hon. H. P. Lazzarini, M.H.R.

"All Power Corrupts, and Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely." — Lord Acton.

"RESIST THIS ATTACK UPON DEMOCRACY"  
VOTE "NO."

## NOTES on the NEWS

The daily press of July 21 informed us that dictator Hitler was nearly "bumped off." On the same day the same papers reported Mr. Eden as telling the House of Commons, in regard to Allied terms to Germany, that "the British Parliament will NOT be consulted. What's the difference between a dictator and a dictator?"

**SEALED SOVIET:** According to the daily press, Mr. Ian Milner recently eulogised the Soviet system to the Constitutional Club, and made a special plea that "we should be given a chance to learn more about Soviet life and conditions." Judging from a statement by W. H. Chamberlin (Moscow correspondent of the "Christian Science Monitor" for many years), a counter-plea could be made on behalf of the Russians. This on-the-spot observer has written: "The Soviet Union is far more thoroughly and hermetically sealed against the infiltration of political and economic ideas from outside than any other large country in the world." This quotation (and many others on Russia) appears in the new edition of "Communism Why Not?" now available at 2/7½d. posted. Perhaps Mr. Milner has not read it.

**SALES-TAX SCANDAL:** The "Age" of July 10 reports Mr. Curtin (the champion of the people's rights) as refusing several requests for the removal of the burden of sales-tax on materials used in home-building. Now here is a case where the Government has the power to help the people—but deliberately refuses to do so. To make matters worse, these self-styled protectors of the workers pretend sympathy with the homeless whilst they rob them of, on an average, about £80 on each house. There is no excuse for this robbery. Moreover, it is profiteering of the worst kind—and yet, you know, those responsible for this are those who get all hot and bothered about the profit motive! No honest politician can justify the sales-tax racket.

**WOOLLY WADHAM:** Another theoretical babbler (namely, Professor Wadham) has been advancing the Communist fallacy that the small farmer is inefficient. Happily, the Ultimo Wheat and Wool Growers' Association took him to task by adopting the following resolution (as per the "Age" of July 10), viz.: "that such opinions are those of a theorist, and are not founded on facts

nor borne out by practical experience." The resolution further declared that "farmers were prepared to co-operate among themselves, but were not prepared to accept any form of collective farming against their better judgment and experience. The farmers had never let Australia down, and never would, but if they forsook practical experience for theory they would let themselves and Australia down." If these truths about useless economists and professors continue to be made public, we'll soon happily see the end of these humbugs.

**CHIFLEY'S COMMANDMENT:** Following complaints in the Federal House against broadcast appeals by Mr. Jackson, of the Taxation Department, encouraging people to "pimp" on their neighbours, Mr. Chifley said he would make no apology for the methods used by the Taxation Department. And so, as the "Age" of July 19 puts it we have a brand-new officially recognised eleventh commandment: "Thou shalt spy on thy neighbour." Such despicable action, and approval of it, illustrates the type of mentality of those seeking more power. It is indeed difficult to understand how such specimens of the human race came to occupy positions of trust.

**POWER PERIL:** Mr. Hannan, K.C., is reported in the "Adelaide Advertiser" as commenting on interference with his mail from Canberra during the Convention on the Powers Bill. He said that in his correspondence he pointed out that "subdivision C

(Continued on page 2.)

### YIELDING "YES MEN"

A New York report says that "there is no Fascist movement in Australia, but there is something WORSE—a tendency to go along with the Government WHATEVER it may do."

That must apply to those who are working for a "Yes" vote at the Referendum.

# REASONS WHY WE SHOULD VOTE "NO"

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

**Sir, - Each day sees an increase in the flood of propaganda, all of it purporting to clarify the issue, but most of it being irrelevant and confusing. The same applies to the radio "discussions," in which men erroneously described as "leaders" or "authorities" merely indulge in phrases which have little relation to reality, if you notice carefully, you will observe that all of them dodge the question of control of FINANCIAL POLICY, which is the crux of the matter.**

Last week brief reference was made to each of the first seven of the "powers," and we continue with item (viii.):

"The control of overseas exchange and overseas investment; and the regulation of the raising of money in accordance with such plans as are approved by a majority of members, of the Australian Loan Council."

I have not been able to find any power which enables State Parliaments to control overseas exchange and overseas investments, and it seems hardly possible to transfer a power which does not exist. However that may be, it is clear that it is the Loan Council which is to decide what may be done, NOT PARLIAMENT, and so financial dictatorship is to continue. It will be the will of the Bank Board that will prevail, not the will of the PEOPLE! As to the "raising of money," it would seem that the machinery to be employed for this purpose should be determined by the weight of the money and the height to which it has to be raised! A powerful crane might help! It is not the "raising" of money that we need to be concerned about. The vital aspect is the PRODUCTION of it; but discussion of that is invariably sidetracked and our politicians never mention it. We are all struggling for money, and it stands to reason that whoever controls the production of the stuff we fight for controls the nature and intensity of the fight. Anyhow, Section 105 A of the Constitution Act, incorporating the provisions of the Financial Agreement, already determines what may be done by the Loan Council, and these Powers proposals will make no difference whatever. At best, the Loan Council is merely a mouthpiece for the Bank Board.

Item (ix.)—"Air Transport":

Developments in aviation have not been retarded in Australia under the existing powers, and it will be found that no difficulties arise in securing effective co-operation with the States when their "revenues" are safeguarded and financial obligations are not imposed upon them.

Item (x.)—"Uniformity, of Railway Gauges":

Back in 1934 we were promised that if we voted for Mr. Lyons and his Government one of the first jobs the Government would put in hand would be the unifying of the railway gauges. Everything actually required for the job was plentiful—steel for rails, ballast, wood for sleepers, manpower—and the people by voting for that Government indicated that they wanted the work done as promised. A few weeks after the election, however, Mr. R. G. Casey, then Assistant Treasurer, announced that the Government had been obliged to abandon the idea because it could not obtain the necessary funds! The position is precisely the same to-day. It is a question of FUNDS, and there will be no difficulty whatever in getting on with the work just as soon as the Commonwealth provides the finance, regardless of the result of the Referendum.

Item (xi.)—"National works, but so that, before any such work is undertaken in a State, the consent of the Governor in Council of that State shall be obtained, and so that any such work so undertaken shall be carried out in co-operation with the State."

If these words mean anything at all they mean that the position after the Referendum will be the same as now, whether the people vote Yes or No. Such works can be undertaken now with the consent of the Governor in Council, and no State has failed to co-operate in national works of a beneficial character when the funds have been available. All State Premiers have admitted that given satisfactory financial conditions there are no obstacles to complete and happy co-operation. Sir Bertram Stevens openly admitted this in 1932 when, as Premier of New South Wales, he said:—

"We are prepared, as courageously as our bankers will allow, to get out into the field of development to assist in arresting the drift from the country to the city."

Here was the clearest admission that Governments do what bankers permit them to do, not what the PEOPLE desire them to do.

Item, (xii.)—"National health in co-operation with the States or any of them":

The remarks just made regarding national works apply absolutely to national health, and we should be grateful to the Henry George League for publishing the following extract from "Hansard":

Dr. Ewart: "No additional powers are required to make grants to the States for Housing purposes. . . . Under Section 96 of the Constitution, the Commonwealth can of course make grants to the States for carrying out National Works on conditions laid down by this Parliament."

Finance is the great obstacle to national health, and that remains untouched by any of the fourteen "powers."

Item (xiii.)—"Family allowances":

Family allowances are a matter of money not a matter of State power. If the Commonwealth makes financial provision there will be no obstacle whatever on the part of the States to the payment of family al-

lowances. The States, as already shown, have no power to produce money—they may only join in the scramble to "collect" it. The production of money is a Federal prerogative which will not be affected by the result of the Referendum.

Item (xiv.)—"The people of the aboriginal race":

Like all the other items, treatment by the States of the aborigines has been conditioned by the finance available. All Australians are agreed that the treatment has been unsatisfactory, and in some respects discreditable, and although this has come within the province of the States the responsibility really belongs to the Federal Parliament, because it has failed to assert its sovereignty over finance, and has allowed the whole community to be exploited by international financiers, the majority of whom are neither British nor Christian.

Now if the foregoing is reasonable comment, and if it is based on facts, as I claim, the question to be asked is: "Why is the Commonwealth Government going to such pains to persuade us to reduce the powers of the State Parliaments and increase the powers of the Federal Parliament? Is there more behind it than appears on the surface? It is my belief that there is, and here again FACTS are more important than OPINIONS.

Efforts to secure greater concentration of power are proceeding simultaneously in several countries. These efforts are part of a co-ordinated plan, and have been going on for years, with special intensification since the beginning of the war. Such efforts are behind the propaganda for Federal Union and a "world organisation" of the nature recently favoured by the Empire Prime Ministers, who met in London, the purpose of which is to secure world domination for the International Financiers, with the rest of us filling the role of slave taxpayers providing interest payments for these creators and controllers of irredeemable debts.

That our troubles arise from the money system is now beyond dispute, and that the proposed "transfer of powers" has nothing whatever to do with the correction of that system or the proper management of it is also beyond dispute. Obviously, therefore, the real purpose behind the Referendum proposals is different from that which is put forward by their sponsors. What is that purpose?

In a memorandum issued by P.E.P., the following appears:

"Time and again, in the absence of decisive leadership, the bad old habits of sovereignty have triumphed in the face of the most urgent crises. Failing Great Power leadership those habits will continue to triumph."

The same memorandum, after commenting that all problems of politics are, at bottom, problems of power, goes on to say: "Power now rests on the ability to command the continued and active allegiance of the increasingly individualistic and politically-conscious masses. These qualifications only, a bare handful of the greatest powers can command. It follows that the world is moving irrevocably towards a new international power system. . . ."

So we see that the abolition of sovereignty, with its bad old habits, and the commanding of the allegiance of the masses, is the great objective. We naturally ask who are those who seek to deprive us of our sovereignty and to get the politically-conscious masses under control? This leads us by investigation to the men who dictate financial policy.

In a letter written by James Buell, official representative of the International Association (as published by the Monetary Education Bureau, Washington, in 1919) the following appears:—

"We are careful to conceal the ugly fact that by our iniquitous monetary system we have nationalised a system of oppression more refined but none the less cruel than the old system of chattel slavery. . . ."

That is a correct description of the monetary system as we have it, and it is the intention not only that that system of oppression shall be maintained, but that our own political servants shall be used to trick us into expressing approval of it.

An equally glaring thing was said by Professor Arnold Toynbee, of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, as follows:—

"We are at present working discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local National State of the World, and all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands."

You know the idea—The Spider was charming to the Fly!

As far back as 1926 the late Lord Stamp warned us against the Wall Street financiers. He said this:

"Never in the history of the world has so much power been vested in a small body of men as in the Federal Reserve Board. These men have the WELFARE OF THE WORLD in their hands, and they can up-set the rest of us either deliberately or by some unconscious action. . . . It is precarious to have such concentrated power vested in such a body."

Neither in Australia nor in any of the other countries (U.K., Canada, India U.S.A., etc.), does the centralising campaign even touch the controllers of finance.

Professor Cassel, of Sweden, who is described by the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" as one of the world's foremost authorities on foreign exchanges, declared that the world price level is controlled by the policy of the Reserve Banks in expanding or contracting credit. He also wrote:

"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. . . ."

Who are the men behind this international financial business? The following names carry an eloquence of their own: Rothschild, Sassoon, Kuhn, Loeb, Schiff, Warburg, Montefiore, Niemeyer, Guggenheim, Strakosch, Baruch, Schuster, Cohen, Sieff, Goschen, Lehmann, Morgenthau, and so on. Will a "Yes" vote curtail the power of these men, and if so, how? If it will not, and Australia continues to submit to a financial policy dictated from outside Australia, how will "the worker" ever become other than a debt-enslaved toiler, and how will the returned heroes ever become other than members of a multitude struggling for "employment" or trying to eke out an existence on the equivalent of a dole? Even those in employment are marked down for further exploitation. Read what Acting Professor S. J. Butlin, of the Sydney University, wrote recently in "The Australian Journal of Science," viz.:—

"A large reconstruction programme would require the maintenance of stiff taxation. . . . Under a Labor Government, Australia has taxed low incomes more severely than any other of the United Nations except New Zealand, with its more radical Labor Government."

And so, if we vote Yes we approve of the continuance of stiff taxation, and also of workers on low incomes having their incomes further lowered by heavier taxes. What a great prospect for the worker, and greater prospect for the money-lender!

Even now, a conference instigated by these very men, with Henry Morgenthau as chairman, is taking place in the United States to arrange a world currency plan under which the Parliaments of every country will surrender control of monetary policy and place their peoples under the direction of absentee aliens. That this is the intention is clear from the report in the Melbourne "Herald" of 6/7/44 as follows:

"The International Stabilisation Fund is now being debated behind closed doors. The real issue is not the design of the Stabilisation Plan, but whether the Conference shall undertake to exercise discipline over the INTERNAL affairs of member Governments."

Any doubts regarding this intention were removed by a later report in the same paper (15/7/44) quoting the President of the Cleveland Trust Company as follows:

"Encourage all countries to balance their budgets, end deficit financing, and halt wasteful expenditures. . . ."

As budgets are merely instruments for controlling Parliaments, this means that after the war Governments may spend only what the bankers permit, and that it is intended to impose a policy of deflation. The Referendum will make no difference to this.

Two of the men "selected" to represent Australia at the present World Monetary Conference are men who helped to put the swindling depression over us. They were "yes-men" for the financiers, and consequently are neither qualified nor worthy to represent Australian families. Men of similar type and conduct are also still being retained as official Government "advisers," and this can only mean that the Government does not contemplate any departure from the prevailing financial methods.

If the Government continues to accept the "advice" of Professors Giblin, Copland and Mills there certainly will be hardship and great difficulty after the war, but if the Commonwealth Bank Board is properly instructed by Parliament, and the Bank properly managed by competent and trustworthy Australians, there need be no hardship for anyone. The Report of the Monetary and Banking Commission clearly states that the Commonwealth Bank possesses the power to create whatever money is necessary for the fulfilment of any obligation imposed upon it, and that it can make money available to the Government free of any charge. In addition to this the late Sir Denison Miller (formerly Governor of the Commonwealth Bank) said that HE could provide all the finance required by the Commonwealth Government and that the Commonwealth Bank was as strong as the Australian people made it, i.e., it could arrange for anything to be done that the Australian people were prepared to do.

So it comes to this: If we are content to have our affairs controlled by aliens and believe that that would be good for us, then we should vote YES; but if we are capable of controlling our own affair and wish to see Australia managed for the benefit of the Australians as Australian would wish it to be managed then we should vote NO.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN  
189 Hotham St., East Melbourne 23rd July 1944

All matter in this issue dealing with the forthcoming Referendum, and not bearing the name and address of the writer, is written to express the editorial view the "New Times," and legal responsibility for its publication is accepted by H. F. Allsop, McEwan House, Melbourne.

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

is indeed very similar to article 48 of the German constitution, which enabled Hitler to establish the Nazi Party in power and thus paved the way to the world war." No wonder his mail was held up!

**IMMIGRATION INTRIGUE:** A press report says that "speculation whether Australia intends to revise its White Australia policy is revived by a recent announcement that Canada and China plan reciprocal immigration with suitable types of migrants." Why this should cause speculation or why Canadians would want to migrate to China is not stated. And so we see this question being pushed forward on the slightest pretext from unseen quarters. The report also states that "an inter-departmental committee is examining all aspects of this matter." Isn't that nice of them; it eliminates the need for the people to meddle in their own affairs!

**DEBT DILEMMA:** Latest Treasury returns show that the national debt is expected to reach £3,000,000,000 after the next two budgets. The interest payment on this is expected to reach £100,000,000 per year. This interest burden—which must be borne by the community in general and the workers in particular having their money claims to the goods they produce taken from them in taxation—is causing grave concern to the money-riggers, who fear that the racket will become too visible. One way to veil this situation is thought to be to increase production so that the amount taken by taxation will not appear so great; and here we have a reason for the loud screams for employment to further delude the workers. And the workers' mis-leaders have fallen for it.

**POWERS PROPAGANDA:** A pernicious form of propaganda is being put over by Labor "yes" advocates—to the effect that the Labor Party should be trusted with more power in order to give effect to their financial policy. This is doubtless intended to undermine the activity of monetary reformers in opposing the centralisation plot. In this connection it should be remembered that Labor has no financial reform ideas other than nationalising banks; which in itself does not alter policy—as evidenced by N.Z. Labor's performance. It is to be hoped that no monetary reformers will be fooled by this delusive bait.

**MONEY MAGIC:** Another function of the proposed World Bank is seen in the appointment of a special committee of the World Monetary Conference "to devise means whereby the World Bank could bring economic sanctions on neutral countries harbouring war criminals." This is at least an admission of the power wielded by the international bankers, who already have too much power to bludgeon countries into accepting their policy. Incidentally, the bankers want restoration of the gold standard, not merely the World Bank. However, the master-crooks may prefer Government sponsorship so long as policy is not interfered with. Ownership is one thing, but control of policy is a very different matter.

**CRIME CENSUS:** Children's Court figures for 1943 show that (in Melbourne) Camberwell heads the list with 163, then comes Malvern with 141, North Melbourne with 81, and Port Melbourne with a modest 55. Commenting on this, the town clerk of Port Melbourne said that "although the boys club had been suspended, kindergartens and mothers' clubs had helped quite a lot." Then the town clerk of Camberwell was in a spot to explain the position, because Camberwell was very well served with playing space, infant-welfare centres, kindergartens and community centres. Here's a problem for top-notch planners—not kindergarten planners. A Malvern resident explained the position by saying that "all the Malvern women welfare-workers were away looking after the children at Port Melbourne." This chap has something coming to him!

**TRIAL TACTICS:** A Washington report of what is described as the "Sedition Trial," published in the Melbourne "Herald" of May 25, quotes one of the defendants (Lawrence) as saying that "his defence would be worthless unless he was permitted to show that the Government was in a world conspiracy with the Communists," and that "this trial is rather a hammy imitation of the Moscow purge trial; the defendants in the Reichstag fire trial got a fairer hearing than we are getting." This trial may, bring some sensations of peculiar interest to world Jewry later on; for the moment the curtain has been drawn.

## REFERENDUM DEBATE

A particularly interesting public debate on the Referendum proposals will take place next Monday night (July 31) at the Ringwood Town Hall. Mr. R. J. Gray M.L.A., will put the case for a "Yes" vote and Mr. L. H. Hollins, M.L.A., will explain why electors should vote "No." Readers are urged to attend and have their questions ready.

## REFERENDUM: YES OR NO.

This question will be discussed by Mr. C. A. A. Ellis, of the Re-Education Movement, in the Assembly Hall (main hall) Collins Street, Melbourne, on Thursday August 3 at 8 p.m. Chairman A. Griffiths. Questions and discussion.

Come and hear a scientific exposition of the issues involved. Australia stands at the crossroads: now is the time to play your part! (This meeting marks the opening of a third series of weekly lectures on political science at the same address on Thursday. -Authorised by C.A.A. Ellis 97 Sackville Street, Kew.)

## OPEN LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP MANNIX

To the Most Reverend Dr. D. Mannix: Your Grace.—In view of what you have referred to in your public statement relative to the Referendum as "a widespread effort especially in certain political sectarian circles, to propagate the idea that the bishops of Australia have secretly, if not openly, asked, or perhaps ordered, Catholics to vote "No" having left you "no option" but to break your "self-imposed silence", it seems to me urgently necessary to once more focus public attention on the unrealistic mental attitude toward the issue which is so prevalent, and which is being stimulated by Governmental and official pronouncements.

Needless to say you are perfectly entitled to that same freedom of opinion on the subject which you concede to every voter. But, your Grace, of what value to the individual is his or her right to an opinion in a particular subject if power over his or her own person and property (if any) has been surrendered? It has more than once been stressed in these columns that the "Four Freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter are available to the inmates of gaols and mental institutions, and that these freedoms are insignificant and meaningless unless there be added thereto "freedom to ACT, to CHOOSE, or to REFUSE."

Moreover, even though YOU do not wish to deprive any person of his or her right to hold a particular opinion, the head of the present Commonwealth Government (Mr. Curtin) evidently does. At Perth, in May 1943, Mr. Curtin made the following utterance:—

"If in the years to come, the authority of the Government for the ORDERING OF THE PEOPLE'S MINDS was not acknowledged it would be easy for democracy to end in turmoil and disorder."

Such a declaration coming from the head of the Government which is asking that it be given supreme power over the life and activities of the individual, appears to conflict sharply with the decision to add to the Referendum proposals clauses purporting to guarantee freedom of speech and freedom of belief. Freedom of speech and of belief presuppose the existence of freedom of thought.

But how can there be freedom of thought if the Government is to have authority to "order" the minds of the people?

Article 125 of the Constitution of Russia "guarantees" "freedom of speech." There is a wealth of evidence, however, indicating that death or Siberia, or both, are the portion of any who dare to express "freedom of speech" in opposition to the ruling CLASS. I quote Walter Duranty, who lived for 20 years in Russia, and who wrote in "The Kremlin and the People:—Freedom of speech, as we know it, is not one of Russia's freedoms." I trust that the Communists whom you are glad to see supporting the Government, will be happy if it obtains, in Dr. Evatt's own words, "power to do the same things in peace as in war." That includes power to imprison persons without trial, or even without laying a charge. Such a power, I submit, is absolute, and cannot safely be put in the hands of any person or Government. Dr. Evatt, however, on February 11th, 1944, after admitting that "many powers could be abused," added these words:—

"I want the House to consider these powers IRRESPECTIVE of the possible abuses of them and of the political policy that may be carried out by any particular Parliament that happens to be constituted over a period of years."

In common with you, I deprecate any intrusion of sectarian issues into public discussions on the Referendum; and, I hope that, in deciding whether they shall vote "Yes" or "No," Australians will be influenced by no considerations other than the merit or otherwise of the proposals and the extent to which their acceptance would be conducive or otherwise to the ensuring of a fuller and freer life for every man, woman, and child.

If our people are guided by that principle, I have no doubt but that they will vote an emphatic "No." You say you have too lively a recollection of what happened after the last war to cast a "No" vote on this occasion. You quite rightly denounce the conditions of impoverishment, humiliation, and degradation to which hundreds of thousands of Australians were condemned; and, if you believe that an affirmative vote is necessary to the prevention of a recurrence of those inexcusable conditions, you are surely justified in voting "Yes." But, is a "Yes" vote necessary to prevent a recurrence of such conditions? As a later point in your statement you say that "if Britain and the other Dominions can be trusted with the powers now sought by our Federal Government, surely Australians can trust their own Parliament with these same powers."

Now, if Britain and the other Dominions already possess the powers now sought by our Federal Government, powers which your Grace believes will prevent a recurrence of conditions of impoverishment, humiliation, and degradation, it follows, if our view be correct, that the Governments of Britain and the other Dominions, armed with those powers, must have been able to prevent the existence of conditions of impoverishment, humiliation, and degradation in their countries.

But DID those Governments prevent such conditions? THEY DID NOT. In fact, the people of Britain especially, suffered more acutely than did the people of Australia. The facts, therefore, do not sustain a belief that a "Yes" vote can prevent recurrences of the conditions referred to.

In referring to the alleged failure of the States and of private enterprise to deal with our problems after the last war, you declare that this time you prefer to give a chance to those who, if they get power, promise to use it.

But, of what value are the promises of members of either the present or any other Government?

People who have faith in the present Government may believe as they choose regarding its intention to honour promises made. But, your Grace, viewing the question in a genuinely realistic manner devoid of all wishful thinking, is there ANY valid, logical reason whatsoever for believing that a Government which will not use powers it ALREADY POSSESSES to prevent the repetition of errors committed and evils suffered during and after the last war, is likely to use added powers to promote the happiness and well-being of the people? I think not. Is there not sound reason for being more than suspicious regarding the motives of men, who, while adding to the Referendum subjects clauses purporting to guarantee "freedom of speech" and "freedom of belief," subscribe to the principle enunciated by Mr. Curtin and quoted herein as to the "authority of the Government for the ordering of the people's minds!" Do you think there is any difference in principle between the declaration of Dr. Evatt that the individual must abandon the right to choose his own vocation in the interests of "the State," and the Hitler regime in Germany, which is founded on the doctrine of the Supreme State? Have not Christian leaders of all denominations repeatedly declared that that doctrine on which the Hitler regime is founded violates the cardinal principles of Christianity?

Even if the present Government CAN be trusted not to abuse the additional powers, we have absolutely NO guarantee against their despotic use by some FUTURE Government. To say that the people will still be able to displace one Government and elect another Government bearing a different party label is equivalent to saying they are free to jump from the frying pan into the fire.

Bitter experience has proved that though the party in opposition exploits for its own advantage the people's dissatisfaction with undesired legislation, it takes no action to repeal such legislation when elevated from opposition to Government. Members of the present Government, as Opposition members, denounced the financial policy of non-Labor Governments, and Mr. Curtin, in one impassioned utterance, said, "We will finance the war without paying tribute to the money lords and the masters of the temple of Mammon." But Mr. Curtin's Government, like all its predecessors, is obtaining funds for the prosecution of the war and for other purposes by further

pawning the people of Australia to the private credit manufacturing monopoly. And, your Grace, it is in the subject of finance that the crux of the matter lies. This subject is NEVER mentioned either by Government spokesmen, or by the groups led by Mr. Menzies and Mr. Fadden, who are making a display of opposition to the Referendum proposals. It is a matter of FACT as distinguished from a mere opinion, that irrespective of any other "powers" "transferred" to it, neither the present nor any future Government will be able to do anything for the people more than is permitted by finance. And, if control of financial policy is exercised by some "power" outside of and above Parliament, then the people stand to gain nothing and to risk the establishment of permanent industrial bondage and political subservience by voting "Yes." It is also a FACT that the Referendum proposals, provide for the CONTINUATION of prevailing financial arrangements.

The State Government authorities did NOT fail us after the last war. In so far as they failed to carry out all that should have been done, the failure was due to nothing other than LACK OF FUNDS. Private enterprise, too, succeeded as never before in producing an adequate volume and variety of goods and services. But the people lacked purchasing power.

No alteration of the Constitution was necessary to enable the late Sir Denison Miller to ward off a depression in 1920—and no alteration of the Constitution was required in 1931 to permit our Federal Government of that time to impose on the people a financial depression bringing in its train conditions of impoverishment, humiliation, and degradation. Those dreadful conditions were caused by the policy dictated by the German banker Niemeyer, and Professor Guggenheim (Gregory). As I have already shown, possession by the Governments of Britain and other Dominions of the powers sought by our Government HAS NOT prevented the bankers from imposing THEIR policy on those Governments. There is no reason for believing that our Government will be any different in its supine surrender to the financial dictators.

In conclusion, I would quote the following profound words of the late Pope Pius XI:—

"It is an injustice, a grave evil, and a disturbance of right order, for a larger and higher organisation to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed by smaller and lower bodies. That is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains its full truth to-day. Of its very nature, the true aim of all social activity should be to help individual members of the social body, but never to destroy or absorb them."

I earnestly hope, your Grace, that you will give mature thought to the foregoing, and that you may be persuaded to reconsider your attitude regarding this most vital issue.

Very truly yours, J. BRADSHAW.

## A WARNING TO DOCTORS & PATIENTS

(Continued from last issue.)

Here is a second instalment from the tenth bulletin issued by the Medical Policy Association (London), which embodies an analysis of the White Paper published by authority of the British Minister of Health on February 17. We offer no comment upon the document beyond saying that, in our opinion, the picture presented of far-reaching, interlocked, cunning controls designed, and destined if the measures of totalitarian planning contemplated become law, to uproot and to destroy what we know as the English way of life is not exaggerated in a single particular. We give the text of the bulletin in full, because of the urgency of this matter, to secure the maximum of publicity and effective resistance to similar plots in this country:—

### THE CONTROL OF CONSULTANTS

The chief points in the plan are: (1) Consultants are to be employed by the hospitals, instead of by the C.M.B. This will ensure much greater rigidity in the caste-system, whose development has been encouraged in every way possible for some years. The controlling authority for consultants will be the Joint Authority for the district administering the orders formulated by the "Minister." This division of the profession into two parts under separate administrative authorities is a subtle move—an application of the "divide and rule" principle.

(2) Consultants are to be more evenly distributed, and more are to be selected. Doubtless one of the criteria of "rightness of type" will be willingness to be "posted." The "Minister" also proposes to provide (i.e., control) facilities for the training of the new selectees. (Fuller details of the method of selecting and training "right" types as a special caste may be found in Hitler's "Mein Kampf.")

(3) Consultants are to be remunerated by the central funds, through the hospitals, but subject to "some central regulation of scales." Central control of remuneration, plus "more regular attendances and duties," will lead in time to the desired regimentation of consultants. It is essential for this purpose that the central authority should have the power to make Regulations against which consultants may offend, thus laying themselves open to disciplinary procedure. That this is not merely guesswork may be confirmed by examination of the set-up in the forces. And certain consultants, although they give their valuable services freely to the Forces, have refused even high ranks within the Forces, because they prefer to retain their freedom of action and honorary status.

It should be noted that for some time past certain officials have been going around the country to discuss with various bodies, who should keep the Register of Consultants—not what the Register should be for, or whether there should be one at all. (There are other signs of quiet activity behind the scenes possibly in preparation for a coup d'etat; for example, it has been intimated to various doctors that their

"status" in the new service will depend on their behaviour while it is being prepared (i.e., intimidation); and certain organisations are quietly buying up and storing great quantities of medical instruments, under the supervision of employees of the manufacturing firms).

### CONTROL OF VOLUNTARY HOSPITALS

The technique for acquiring control over these ancient and honourable institutions again is simple; lip service is paid to the idea of voluntary hospitals, but the shape of things to come is conveyed in a warning: "If once the situation were to arise in which the whole cost of the voluntary hospitals' part in the public services . . . was repaid from the public money, or indeed in which it was recognised that public funds were to be used to guarantee these hospitals' financial security, the end of the voluntary movement would be near at hand." (No word here of the quality of service rendered.) Since they are to render the whole of their part in the public service for less than its cost, they are put at an immediate relative disadvantage. Can such phrasing be anything other than calculated?

To make sure that the end will not be long in coming, the voluntary hospitals are invited to "contract" to give services, for which they will receive a "specified sum in return," and these payments are to be "settled centrally" on principles of uniformity. As a result of accepting these grants, the hospital must submit to visiting and inspection, and observe conditions to secure "reasonable uniformity in accounts and audit." There are a number of other conditions which interfere with the autonomy of the management in such a way that the costs of the hospital can be increased to a point where it will become virtually dependent on the public funds for its "financial security." Then the end will have come. It is the old, old scheme of inducing a person to live beyond his resources on borrowed money, thus mortgaging his independence, and, when the crash comes, foreclosing. Many valuable businesses have been acquired by that technique.

The bureaucrats, by their financial trap and their creation of a special Ogpu-Ges-

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

"FREEDOM PROM WANT" CAMPAIGN: We recently published in these notes the news that it was unanimously decided at the annual conference of the United Old Age and Invalid Pensioners' Association, New South Wales, to make a determined drive to have the pension rate raised to £3 per week without reference to the Means test. We have now received a copy of the minutes of this conference. The following appears under the heading, "General Secretary's Report":—

"The General Secretary then gave her annual report, in which she stated Grand Council had conducted an investigation into the present cost of living, with the result that it was found that an old age or invalid pensioner could not possibly live on less than £3 per week, taking into account the present high cost of living. We say the time has come when the old age or invalid pensioner can no longer make any pretence of the pension covering his or her needs; it just means slow starvation. Doctors have admitted that many old age and invalid pensioners are dying of malnutrition and starvation. To get the support of as many old age and invalid pensioners' organisations as possible we have written to every State in Australia, also Tasmania and New Zealand. Their views upon the matter have been placed before you to-day; some pamphlets upon the matter have been printed and circulated. Grand Council have asked Federal Members of Parliament to support an increase in the pension to £3 per week. Some have agreed, some have not. Since our last conference we have had many deputations to Ministers on behalf of our old and infirm members."

Under the heading of correspondence from M.H.R.'s various promises by Members are set out. The most satisfactory of these promises is that made by Mr. T. Williams, Member for Robertson. He stated in his letter:

"I have always thought the amount of pension provided was extremely inadequate to meet the needs of these people. You may (Continued on page 4)

tapo of inspectors, are leaving nothing to chance. The details of their scheme may be found on pages 22-24 of the White Paper.

### SUMMARY—POLICY AND METHOD

There are many issues raised by the White Paper which we do not propose to discuss here. They are secondary to the main purpose of the plan, and we are concerned with the policy underlying the plan, to which the methods of implementing that policy are subordinate (see Bulletin 6 for a full discussion of this).

The policy underlying the plan is to set up an authoritarian organisation of the profession, dominated by bureaucrats, and governed by regulations formulated by the "Minister" and having all the force of law. It is vital that the Profession should understand exactly what is the central issue, keep this clearly in mind, and avoid being side-tracked by fruitless discussions of side-issues, most of which will be "terms of servitude." The "Minister" can afford to make any concessions in these, because once the Central Authority is set up, it can vary these terms by Regulation under the overruling sanction of "the public interest."

(1) THE POLICY of the White Paper is to centralise the Profession and rule it by Regulation.

(2) THE METHOD is to "divide and rule"—separate authorities under the "Minister" for (a) General practitioners, (b) Consultants, (c) Hospitals:

(a) General practitioners: These are the weakest; they are therefore to be given no power, and are to be "highly centralised" under the control of the C.M.B.

(b) Consultants: These are to be given caste status, and are to be employed by the hospitals.

(c) Hospitals are given power to employ consultants, but are themselves under the control of Local Authorities.

(3) The plan is long-sighted—provision is made to eliminate private practice and voluntary hospitals, gradually, but definitely.

(a) General practice: All new graduates automatically come under the authority of the C.M.B. This authority would be gradually extended by Regulation. The C.M.B. also is to assume control over movement of doctors from one place to another, whether or not those doctors are under contract to the Board (p. 51, (i)).

(b) Voluntary hospitals are to be strangled by central financial control, and finished off by the Ogpu-Gestapo system of inspection.

(4) Side issues, which are likely to be promoted as Red Herrings, but which the Profession should avoid while they concentrate on the real issue, are:

(a) The minor distribution of delegated powers between the various subsidiary authorities.

(b) The distribution of function between the C.M.B. and the C.H.S.C. (see next section).

(c) Questions as to who is to make the "positive plans" for various areas.

(d) Remuneration, compensation, superannuation (which will be subject to Regulations).

(To be continued.)

# HITLER'S POLICY IS A JEWISH POLICY

The above heading is the title of one of the most interesting and informative war-time publications dealing with the Jewish Question, consisting principally of letters to a well-known Jewish publicist.

In reprinting the contents of this booklet we tender our acknowledgments to its original publishers, K.R.P. Publications Limited, of Liverpool, England, and to the Democratic Federation of Youth, 296 Pitt-street, Sydney, publishers of the Australian edition from which we quote:

## PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

The term "anti-Semitic" is so loosely used by many people that K.R.P. Publications Limited consider it advisable to inform readers that, while those of their publications which refer to Jews are uncompromising in their attitude to facts which expose the designs and activities of powerful Jews and also certain characteristics and activities general to Jews, the PURPOSE of these publications is to show how the individual, including the individual Jew, can be released from the tyranny of centralised control. The ACTION recommended in these publications is not anti-Semitic; it is entirely the reverse. It marks the way to freedom, from all forms of persecution for Jew and Gentile alike. If the FACTS made known in these publications are "anti-Semitic," then the Jews themselves must accept responsibility for this.

—John Mitchell, Manager, K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

## FOREWORD

A few words are necessary to explain the omission of the letters of the Rev. Dr. Abraham Cohen, the well-known Jewish publicist, from this correspondence, which was called forth by his letter to the "Birmingham Post" of November 11, 1940.

At a moment when the discussion was well under way, Dr. Cohen made the continuation of it dependent upon my providing the name of a Professor of Economics or History willing to endorse my historical views, as well as my procuring and studying a work on Anti-Semitism by a Swedish lecturer, Mr. Hugo Valentin. Such a proposal being wholly unacceptable to me, I chose to terminate the correspondence.

When, later, Dr. Cohen was asked for a direct answer as to whether he would agree to publication or not, he stated that he must have a written assurance, from those who were to publish my pamphlet, to the effect that their publications were not of an anti-Semitic nature. The evidence with which I provided Dr. Cohen did not satisfy him, and he decided to withhold his consent. [See publisher's note above.]

Dr. Cohen's reason for not allowing his part of the debate to appear before the public seems a curious one, since, if his arguments had been sufficiently convincing they would have neutralised any tendency to "Anti-Semitism" contained in our letters.

On being presented with a last proposal that the letters be published privately and unconnected with any publisher whatever, Dr. Cohen was equally emphatic in his refusal.

Although legally entitled to give the gist of Dr. Cohen's letters, I prefer to leave undisturbed the void created by his decision.

—Borge Jensen, Birmingham; February, 1941.

## DR. COHEN'S FIRST LETTER

### "A SYMPTOM OF HITLERISM."

To the Editor of the "Birmingham Post":  
Sir,—The remark addressed yesterday by Mr. Justice Tucker to the woman whom he sentenced to ten years' penal servitude for an act of treachery against the State deserves wide publicity and close attention. He said:

**"You have undoubtedly been led to do this by your anti-Jewish obsession, which the Solicitor-General rightly described as a virus which had got into your system and had destroyed your mental and moral fibre."**

It is more than a coincidence that the men and women who were active in fomenting anti-Semitism in this country have all been interned under the Defence Regulations because their liberty was thought to be a menace to Britain in this time of crisis.

Anti-Semitism is a conspicuous symptom of Hitlerism. Note should therefore be taken of the question asked yesterday in the House of Commons about hotels which refuse to "cater for members of the Semitic race." The Home Secretary, in his reply, said that a person who is the victim of such discrimination can take legal action. I suggest that even more effective would be the boycott of these hotels by Christians who value the ideals for which the British Empire entered the present struggle.

—A Cohen, 2 Highfield-road, Edgbaston; November 8.

## THE REPLY TO DR. COHEN'S FIRST LETTER.

"Birker," 173 Walmley-road, Erdington, Birmingham, 24. November 13, 1940.  
To the Editor of the "Birmingham Post", New-street, Birmingham, 2

[This letter was NOT published by the "Birmingham Post."]

Sir,—Dr. Cohen, writing in your correspondence columns on November 11, at-

tempts to dispose of the anti-Semitic question too easily. No doubt any racial hatred can be carried too far and become an "obsession" and a "virus" leading to the deterioration of "mental and moral fibre," but, however far it is carried, it cannot be identified with "treachery to the State," which is a different thing.

Most Englishmen have a reasonable sense of fair play, and that includes a repugnance to cruelty of an unreasonable nature; but many of us believe that Hitler's anti-Semitism is merely a blind to cover the fact that he has received powerful support from highly-placed financial interests.

There are one or two aspects of this question which should not be overlooked. In the first place, Jews are not the only sufferers to-day, in fact, they are not likely to be the chief sufferers. Secondly, it is perfectly reasonable that any country should take precautions to see that key positions affecting the lives and happiness of individuals should be filled by nationals only. The most important of those key positions to-day, and possibly in all times, is the power inherent in the control of the money system.

It seems likely that the Jewish "question" arises from the activities of a handful of Jews. I have been told that the "decent Jew" knows of and deplores the activities of "less than 10% of Jews." At bottom it is a question of checking the anti-social behaviour of evil-disposed persons regardless of race, although race can be some indication of pre-disposition to

# INSIDE SOVIET RUSSIA IN PEACE-TIME

(Continued from last issue.)

**"To anyone who wishes to obtain an unbiased and objective view of Soviet Russia, I can recommend the Russian Section of "Looking For Trouble," by the American journalist, Virginia Cowles, who took considerable risks to get away from the spoon-feeding which is the usual treatment of investigators,"—C. H. Douglas, in the "Big Idea."**

Here is a second instalment from the above-mentioned book:—

The next morning I was up early, eager not to miss any of the Russian landscape. It was bleak and dreary; miles of snow-bound plains, dark clumps of trees, and every now and then a cluster of small wooden houses. Occasionally you saw people trudging along the roads; they looked so infinitesimal against the great sweep of snow that I could already feel the morbid despair reflected in so many Russian stories.

About noon the train drew in at the Alexandrovsky station in Moscow. Although Fitzroy Maclean had come to meet me, he looked, astonished when I stepped off the train.

"What a surprise!" he exclaimed. "I got your wire, but I didn't actually think you'd turn up. People have a way of saying they're coming to Moscow, but they don't always make it."

Fitzroy was a strange sight bundled up in a huge coat with a wild-looking fur hat pulled down over his ears. He was the sort of man you could never mistake for anything but an Englishman—and an English diplomat at that. Tall and thin, he had a lackadaisical appearance that belied the fact he had "bummed his way" from Moscow to China and India, across the dangerous tribal lands of Central Asia; had been captured by bandits en route, escaped, and finally reached Delhi two months later—one of the few foreigners to succeed in making the trip. Fitzroy spoke Russian fluently, and was considered not only one of the most enterprising, but one of the ablest young men in the diplomatic service.

As we drove through the streets, I craned my neck to get a glimpse of the city. I was surprised by the tall, modern buildings and the broad thoroughfares; but I was even more surprised when we reached the Embassy, a large stone residence on the Sofiskaya Naberezhnaya, and Fitzroy glanced through the back window and said, casually: "We haven't lost the rest of the party. We're all safely home again."

A green car with two men in the front seat had pulled up a few yards behind us—the G.P.U. (the secret police) car.

Fitzroy explained it usually followed the Ambassador, but as he was away on leave, the honour fell to the lesser members of the staff. I was astonished. My conception of "secret police" was of a mysterious force that flourished in the shadows. "But what's the point of following people about openly?" I protested.

"Oh, I don't know. But it's a great convenience to have them tagging on behind," said Fitzroy. "You grow dependent on them. When your car gets stuck in a snow drift, or you run out of matches, you just whistle, and they give you a hand!"

Everyone who goes to Russia has a very definite first impression. Mine was a feminine one. At lunch I met a French journalist (I can't remember his name), who offered to take me sight-seeing; I asked him to drive me to the shopping centre because I wanted to buy some woollen stockings. His jaw dropped.

"You don't mean you've come to Russia without any woollen stockings?"

"Why not? I thought I'd buy them here."

certain habits; if we had to leave young children alone with a strange dog, most of us would choose a poodle rather than a greyhound, but we would probably reverse the choice for catching rabbits.

The following names should be scrutinised: Rothschild, Mayer, Baruch, Schuster, Warburg, Kahn, Guggenheim, Neimeyer, Schiff, Steff. They are the names of men or families who move about in the shadows behind Governments and wield enormous influence almost unknown to the general public.

A Jew once assured me that they are cleverer than we are; and it is possible this is correct, but many of us cannot rid ourselves of the suspicion that the Jew is fundamentally incapable of understanding the conception of all men being "free and equal in respect of their rights," to quote from the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. America has embodied the same fundamental idea in the Declaration of Independence. It is the central idea in Christianity. The "Rule of the Road" on land and on sea embodies the idea in a practical form. The "queue" is an almost instinctive acknowledgment of this equality. Our Laws—at least in theory—work from that conception. It is the only possible conception on which to build a social organisation that will "work"—i.e., produce stable conditions likely to give man the conditions he desires.

An implication of this conception—of the natural equality of men in respect of their rights—is that "cleverness" above the average confers nothing on the fortunate individual beyond a greater opportunity to serve his fellows.

Anti-Semitism would disappear or take on a correct perspective if the "decent Jews," of whom I am sure Dr. Cohen is one, came out into the open and joined with the "decent non-Jew" in exposing and curbing those "evil things" which Mr. Neville Chamberlain may have had in mind when he used that expression.

—Yours faithfully, P. R. Masson.  
[To be continued.]

## FREE-FOR-ALL PLAN

From the "Social Creditor" (England) May 13-

It is evident that we are coming closer to the crucial matters involved in the planners' scheme to impose a totalitarian State in this country (and, of course, everywhere else.)

Following the "Government's" proposal for "free" regimentation of doctors and patients, the "indicator" has been hoisted that at all events the Royal College of Physicians of London (the hoariest of the strongholds of professional privilege in medical matters) will not stand in the way of "free" regimentation of future candidates for training.

Universal serfdom is to be reached by way of a universal free-for-all: a world oligarchy through the doorway of egalitarianism.

In keeping with the general deterioration of public discussion under the prevailing conditions of censorship-by-all-the-means there-are, the report of the Royal College's Planning Committee is undistinguished. Lord Moran signs it. Possibly the Prime Minister's physician did not write it. Its extravagant appreciation of at least one Oxford School which is a byword even at Cambridge, suggests that it cannot have been put together at Oxford, unless in the "Latin" quarter.

The report recommends that "the field from which medical students are to be selected should be widened by making all university education free, and by the provision of maintenance grants to those university students in need." Since the Beveridge Plan, in conjunction with the plans foreshadowed by the volte-face of Sir John Anderson's budget, is designed to secure the universality of need, "free" maintenance will be "free-for-all" too. It will have to be. The Royal College has had time to look about it during these hectic planning years, and "it understands that the needs of other branches of university education are similar, and it does not wish that medicine should be made a special case." Big of it, isn't it?

How can the issue be made clear? The Chancellor of the Exchequer has been trying to make it clear to the taxpayer (and how many he is now!) that having money to spend unnecessarily is a valid excuse for pinching it. The argument is familiar but unpopular. When papa has no longer to find even a third of the cost of Tommy's instruction in whatever it is that "medicine" is to consist of, though the chief item will be the rules for controlling the issue of certificates to employed persons, the Chancellor will find a willing ear for the contention that "inflation" (good only for the State Post-Office) can be averted only by taking away that which is no longer wanted. And the "profit motive" to which Tommy, fortified by Marxian precepts as he is, might increasingly succumb under the impact of conditions fit for Russians to live in, will be officially fortified by the reminder that since neither he nor papa has ventured anything; it is unreasonable to expect to win anything.

It is no longer impossible to reveal the motive behind planning. —T.J.

## ERIC BUTLER TO ADDRESS BIG "NO" MEETING IN SYDNEY

All Sydney readers of "The New Times" will be interested to know that Mr. Eric D. Butler will address a big "No" meeting in the Manchester Unity Hall, 10 Enmore Road, Newtown (near Newton Bridge), on Wednesday, August 2, at 8 p.m. Hear the Answer to Dr. Evatt!

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(Continued from page 3.)

be assured that I shall do everything in my power to secure action on the part of the Government to remedy this position.

As far as we can ascertain Mr. Williams is the only M.P. who has definitely consented to push for the full claims of the pensioners, and it is therefore obvious that more pressure must be brought to bear upon these Members who have, not committed themselves to a specific sum.

We congratulate those pensioners' organisations who have had their own request letter forms printed and circulated, and also those who have arranged deputations to wait on their M.P.'s. We feel confident that by a judicious blending of these two democratic forms of approach to their Parliamentary representatives pensioners will have their just claims met.

BOOKS TO READ: "The Money Power versus Democracy," by Eric Butler, price 9d. "Social Credit the Only New Order," by Wm. Stones; price 6d. "The Tragedy of Human Effort," by C. H. Douglas (An outline of the principles of association, which, according to Douglas, are as capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building); price 6d. (All plus 1½d postage.) F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

## NO CONSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

Temperance Hall, Russell Street, Melbourne  
SUNDAY, JULY 30, At 7.45 p.m.  
Senator Cameron, Minister for Aircraft Production, will give his views on THE REFERENDUM PROPOSALS  
Come along and question the Minister.

The No Conscription Campaign is holding a Vote "No" Rally at the Yarra Bank every Sunday.

—Authorised by K. J. Kenaffick, Hon. Sec.

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road, Hartwell for the New Times, McEwan House, Melbourne.