

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).

THE NEW TIMES

Vol.10. No. 31. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1944

"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., Melbourne.

Those "No Industrial Conscription" Pledges

A Warning to Australian Workers

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

It is all too evident that the leaders of the "Yes" campaign are not feeling too confident. Dr. Evatt, Mr. Currin, Mr. Dedman and other Ministers are loud in their denials of the idea that they favour industrial conscription after the war. These men have had it brought home to them that there is a strong opinion among thinking Australians that a "Yes" vote would mean the continuance of present economic methods after the war.

Thinking Australians have been carefully examining the words AND ACTIONS of the "Yes" advocates, and are not likely to be misled by last-minute promises such as those now being made. I could fill pages by quoting "solemn promises" made to Australian electors by members of ALL parties in the past—promises which were either subsequently forgotten or broken.

So, when Mr. Dedman assures the people that he would walk out of any Government, which supported industrial conscription in peacetime, I look back on Mr. Dedman's past. I recall the man who said he was opposed to military conscription of Australians—and then helped to introduce it when another man who said he would never introduce military conscription (Mr. John Curtin), said it had to be!

It is on record that, on December 4, 1942,

Mr. Dedman addressed the Victorian Labor Party on the necessity of conscription. The following extract from his remarks is illuminating:—

Mr. Dedman: "I know that I now have to eat my words. I was not only against conscription because it was compulsory military conscription, but also because it was against my religious principles. But events have made me change."

Mr. Calwell: "So you are prepared not

only to eat your words, but to eat your religious convictions?"

Mr. Dedman: "That is so."

—(Sydney "Century," July 14.)

And now Mr. Dedman has the hypocrisy to expect us to take seriously his remarks about industrial conscription! Note the plea, "events made me change." That is what they all say. And that is why all the talk about the "powers" sought at the Referendum only being for five years is so dishonest. During those five years "unforeseen circumstances" could occur and we would have the spectacle of the anti-industrial-conscriptionists of today telling us that "the position has changed." Mr. Dedman would no doubt be prepared to throw even his religious principles overboard again!

Dr. Evatt is quoted at length in the Sydney "Truth" of July 16. He categorically denies that the Government will maintain industrial conscription after the war. He says that no one "will be man-powered or industrial-conscriptioned after the war." Yet, apart from certain ominous remarks made by Dr. Evatt in the past and quoted in these columns, and apart from the fact that the big bureaucrats have made it perfectly clear that they are working for industrial conscription after the war, it must be remembered that Dr. Evatt was a party to the Unemployment and Sickness Benefits Act (No. 10, of 1944). That Act (Part 3, Division 1) contains the following provisions, which reveal Dr. Evatt's remarks about being against any form of industrial conscription as even worse hypocrisy than Mr. Dedman's:—

That any worker who is unemployed shall NOT receive benefits unless he—

"(c) satisfies the Director-General that he—

(I) is unemployed and that his unemployment is not due to his being a direct participant in, a strike.

"(II) is capable of undertaking, and is willing to undertake work, which in the

opinion of the Director-General, is suitable to be undertaken by that person."

The implications of the above are obvious. A manpower Director-General will have the power to tell men where they will work and at what job. And even worse, CLAUSE 8 OF THE ABOVE ACT PROVIDES THAT THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL CAN DELEGATE HIS POWERS TO ANY OTHER PERSON. What have these Labor leaders to say about the above? Surely they have reached the very pinnacle of hypocrisy with their latest "pledge."

Personally, I regard this latest move by the Labor leaders as a particularly low political trick. Evatt and Co. no doubt believe that, as they have signed a "pledge" which Mr. Menzies and Co. will not sign, they are thereby going to advance the "Yes" campaign.

It should encourage every intelligent Labor supporter to start immediately working for a "No" vote.

In effect, this is what the Labor leaders are saying to Labor voters:

"THIS ALTERATION OF THE CONSTITUTION WOULD CERTAINLY ALLOW INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION TO BE INTRODUCED, BUT WE HAVE PLEDGED THAT WE SHALL NEVER INTRODUCE IT. MENZIES AND CO. WILL NOT GIVE THAT PLEDGE—WHICH REVEALS THAT THEY WILL INTRODUCE IT WHEN THEY REGAIN A MAJORITY IN PARLIAMENT."

To which the thinking Labor voter must reply:

"What! You ask me to give powers which you openly threaten will be used by other Parties to introduce industrial conscription! You insult my intelligence!"

Labor voters would be well advised to consider the above facts very closely before selling their liberties.

There are also other serious matters, which they might consider before August 19. I recently mentioned in these columns that the official Labor Party paper, "The

(Continued on Page 4)

Guard Australia's Independence!

To the Editor: Sir, —In view of the conclusions reached at the World Monetary Conference the other week by "representatives" of forty-four nations assembled at New Hampshire, U.S.A., it seems to me most urgent that those who realise what it will mean to the world if the International Financiers who have staged the conference succeed in their plans to force the nations back on to the gold standard and so seize control of their currency and credit, should do all that is humanly possible to avert the catastrophe—for Australia at least.

The following correspondence on the subject, with Mr. Makin, M.H.R., Minister for Munitions, may suggest to readers a similar line of action. His reply, particularly the last paragraph, is noteworthy as showing that our M.P.s are not indifferent to their electors' letter.

My suggestion is that as many as can, should write at once to their Federal members as well as to Mr. Chifley, the Federal Treasurer, and so prove my statement that my fears are shared by a very large number of people. Now is the time, I am persuaded, to bring the collective force of our enlightened opinion to bear upon our Parliament, before the subject is brought up in the House, or even, it may be, legislation is smuggled through at a secret session. If we, who appear to be the only section of the Australian public aware of the significance of what is going on, do not take drastic action, then I fear the position is hopeless.

—Yours, etc., MARY H. GRAY, Adelaide.

Here are the letters:

68 Findon-road, Woodville,
Adelaide.

June 19, 1944.

The Hon. Norman Makin, M.H.R.,
Minister for Munitions, Parliament
House, Canberra.

Dear Sir, —The decision of the Australian Federal Government to send certain representatives to the International Monetary Conference in the United States on July 1 is a matter of grave concern to the Australian people—or should be, if they but understood its significance.

It may be, as the Deputy Prime Minister assures us, that Australia will not be committed to any agreement at the meeting without first referring the question for discussion in Parliament. That is as it should be; but keeping in mind that the chosen

delegates represent orthodox finance first and foremost, whatever recommendations they bring back to the Government will for that reason be biased in that direction.

There is a very large and ever-growing body of opinion in Australia—of which, I have no doubt, you are not unaware—who are watching every move of the International Financial Gang to further their selfish ends and fasten their clutches upon the nations of the world in a ruthless attempt to ensure that whichever side wins the war High Finance will come out on top. In other words, the Money Barons—headquarters in Wall Street, New York—have been working day and night in order that before the issue of the war is determined, and while the world is still in the throes of the fierce struggle, their plan for a world hegemony of finance will be firmly established and the nations put in the strait-jacket of their infamous debt system.

I am not talking without knowledge. Almost every day events confirm the evidence that this is the end for which these men—many of whom can be named—are striving; namely, a World Dictatorship of Finance, whether achieved by a World Currency scheme based on the Gold Standard, by Federal Union, or by any other sort of planning that will serve to undermine the independence of nations and peoples and bend them to their will.

It will be a black day for Australia if her Ministers accept the advice of those false prophets, the financial "experts," and permit this country to be drawn into the toils.

You may remember my writing you on this subject over a year ago, when you said, in your courteous reply, that you would bear in mind the contents of my communication.

Now that the danger is imminent, I ask you—not only as my representative in Federal Parliament, but as a responsible Minister of the Government that has power to make or mar our future by its action now—I implore you to resist in Parliament any attempt that may be made to bind Australia to the World Currency scheme or any similar plan to deprive her of autonomy in the vital matter of finance.

In this request I assure you that I speak for a very large number of people—many of them in your own constituency—who also regard the situation as ominous and look to their Member of Parliament to defend the interests of Australians when the delegates return from the Washington Conference.

I am, etc., MARY H. GRAY.

MINISTER FOR MUNITIONS.

July 5, 1944.

Dear Miss Gray, —I wish to acknowledge your recent letter, setting out your com-

NOTES on the NEWS

In September, 1939, Mr. Menzies moved the second reading of the National Security Bill—for the prosecution of the war—and every member of the Labor Party, including 10 Ministers of the present Federal Government, voted against it ("Hansard," page 219, September 8, 1939). Mr. Alex. Wilson, M.H.R., who is now advocating a "Yes" vote, also voted against the Bill. Can such political acrobats be trusted? The answer, on August 19, should be an emphatic "NO."

PRESENT POWERS: There seems to be no doubt that Section 51, Sub-section (VI), of the present Commonwealth Constitution provides adequate power to repatriate and reinstate members of the fighting forces. Politicians who suggest otherwise are, inter alia, seeking an alibi for not having satisfactorily done so because of financial reasons. This applies to all political Parties. Another existing section of the Constitution—namely, 116A—fully covers "religious freedom" as far as the Federal Government is concerned (Dr. Evatt admits that), and Section 5 makes Section 116A "binding on the courts, judges, and peoples of every State and of every part of the Commonwealth, notwithstanding anything in the laws of any State." Section 109 confirms and supplements Section 5 in this regard. From this it will be clear that Dr. Evatt's alleged "guarantee" or "safeguard" is only a worthless sop, designed to fool the people into granting other dangerous powers.

"NO" NOTICES Butchers' shops in Adelaide are reported to have placards with a prominent "NO" displayed in this fashion: "NO" coupons, "NO" meat, "NO" not our fault. At other shops similar placards show "NO" eggs, and so on. The "NO" is also applied to beer and cigarettes in hotels and barbers' shops. Mr. Coles, M.H.R., of the Rationing Commission, who is attending to the interests of his Henty (Victoria) constituents by conducting a "Yes" campaign

ments respecting a decision by the Federal Government to send certain representatives to a Conference of the United Nations at present being held in America to deal with Post-War International Monetary Co-operation.

I understand that numerous proposals will be placed before the Conference, but all agreements must be referred to the Governments concerned before a final decision is reached.

I appreciate your comments on these matters of national interest, and will be pleased to refer them to the Commonwealth Treasurer for his information.

—Yours faithfully, (signed) NORMAN MAKIN, Minister for Munitions.

in Adelaide, is very annoyed because he thinks these "NO" signs are connected with the Referendum. By the way, who said big business and chain stores were opposing the powers plot?

DENTAL DEDUCTIONS: Now that war expenditure is declining, demands for tax reductions are starting to appear. Mostly (Continued on page 2.)

Demand Scrutineers For Referendum!

In our issue of June 30 we "published a letter from Mr. W. F. Andrews, hon. secretary of the Perth Electoral Campaign, in which it was revealed that the Government had no intention of providing scrutineers for the Referendum. Mr. J. T. Lang, M.L.A., has also dealt with the same point in recent public utterances. Considerable public opinion has been aroused where this matter has been publicised.

So strongly have many electors in various parts of Australia felt about this matter, that they have instigated democratic campaigns in their own localities for the purpose of uniting all electors, whether they be "Yes" supporters or "No" supporters, to insist that the Government appoint an adequate number of scrutineers.

ONE INDIVIDUAL in a Sydney suburb recently drew up a petition and went out canvassing for signatures. He obtained over 150 signatures in a matter of a few hours' canvassing. Here is the text of the petition:—

"We, the undersigned, constituents of the Electorate of Cook, demand that you take all effective action to have scrutineers appointed in relation to the Referendum; such scrutineers to be nominated by those advocating the "No" vote, and by those advocating the "Yes" vote, in equal numbers, on a similar basis to that operating in ordinary Federal Elections."

We recommend the above line of action to all democrats who believe that scrutineers should be appointed at the Referendum. Any person using a petition such as the above must himself authorise it, as laid down under the Electoral Act.

Big Public Debate On Referendum

Mr. L. H. Hollins (Independent M.L.A. for Hawthorn in the Victorian Parliament) and the Hon. John Cain (leader of the Labor opposition in the Victorian Parliament and a State representative at the Canberra Convention) will debate the Referendum proposals at the Hawthorn Town Hall (Melbourne), on Friday night, August 11. The Mayor of Hawthorn (Cr. J. Brook Pridmore, J.P.) will officiate as chairman. The debate will take place under the auspices of the Hawthorn Movement (Non-Party). A very large attendance is anticipated. "New Times" readers who are able to attend will presumably take full advantage of question time.

MISLEADING ARTICLE BY PROF. BUTLIN

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

Sir, —Plausible pleading by phoney professors is still the order of the day. Who could forget the scandalous and, to a large extent, untrue "Letters to John Citizen" written in 1931 by Professor Lyndhurst Falkiner Giblin, all designed to persuade the people at large to accept conditions dictated by Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Guggenheim? These two emissaries of the International Financiers were also helped materially by other professors, particularly by Professors Douglas Berry Copland and Richard Charles Mills. All three are still officially employed as Government "advisers."

One would have thought that the facts associated with the "depression," the stupidity of the utterances by accepted "authorities," and the complete exposure of the financial fraud then perpetrated on an unsuspecting community, would have provided a warning for younger men who were to follow them as professional economists, but unfortunately that has not been the case. Not only do we see and hear similar nonsense from the same discredited "authorities," but men acting in their places at the universities are indulging in similar foolishness. Indeed, there is justification for using stronger words with which to describe their conduct. Surely we have the right to expect that men in high places, men who are given access to the radio and to the columns of the press for the expression of their views, shall conduct themselves, and express themselves strictly in harmony with the realities of the situation. **Once again the facts indicate that attempts are being made to persuade the Australian people to accept burdensome conditions dictated by the International Financiers, and once again we find the professional economists prostituting their positions to serve the interests of these aliens. All the professors mentioned are taking a leading part in the Referendum campaign, and are telling the people of the chaos which must result unless they vote "Yes" on 19th August. These self-same men also told us that chaos would result if we did not accept the so-called "Premiers' Plan"! We took their advice—and had a lovely time!**

The same sort of thing is afoot again, but now it is the "Reconstruction Plan" we are told to accept, and Acting-Professor S. T. Butlin, of the Sydney University, has joined in the frightening chorus. He recently wrote an article for "The Australian Journal of Science," under the title, "Paying For The Peace," but without any explanation of what had to be paid or to whom the payment had to be made. The article was quoted in "The P.O.A. Chronicle" for July 1944, and it is from "The Chronicle" that my extracts have been taken.

He says, "... it is clear that shortage of money is not a real limitation on the size of the war effort; a Government can always make the money it needs." That statement is only partly true. Some Governments, to wit, the STATE Governments, CAN NOT make the money they need. They only what they can COLLECT, and have no say whatever in the VOLUME from which collections are to be gathered. To that extent, therefore, the statement is false. But an even more reprehensible aspect is the uttering of the statement that a Government CAN make its own money in the face of the fact that it does not do so, and the additional fact that it does not intend doing so.

Notwithstanding his admission that the Federal Government CAN obtain the money it requires by having it made, he went on to declare that "a large reconstruction programme would require the maintenance of stiff taxation and the raising of large loans." A little further on he said, "but the amount of money which can be extracted from the public in taxes and loans is in itself no more a limitation on post-war plans than it is on war plans."

Is not this a clear contradiction? If a potato-grower could produce plenty of potatoes, why should he steal and borrow potatoes from other people? If a Government can produce its own money, as the Acting-Professor admits, why should it steal from us or borrow from private manufacturers of money? And if taxation and loans are further increased at the expense of the general public, how will we be able to provide an expanding local market for the producers?

This learned Acting-Professor admits that taxes, loans, rationing, quotas, and the like are all "weapons" for getting money out of the hands of the people so that they cannot spend it! The people do not wish to be deprived of their money, but their servants employ certain weapons to "extract" it. Except to the extent "permitted" the people cannot spend it if they do have it, and so it could rest quietly in the account at the bank without even moving or giving the slightest trouble to the keepers of the books. But then, of course, it would be available for the payment of our debts, and to put it to such a use is unthinkable! It must therefore be taken from us and our indebtedness increased!

"Some of these weapons," the Professor said, "are not financial in form, such as rationing, quotas, and the like, but all have one common purpose, which is not to provide the Government with money to spend, but to prevent private individuals from out-bidding the Government."

Shame on you miserable creatures receiving the basic wage or thereabouts for even attempting to do such a wicked thing! Your "Government," whoever he may be, must surely have a greater need for food, clothes, and shelter than you could possibly have. Why should you desire anything at all when there are such needy Governments around? You see a Government, which can obtain whatever money it requires by simply having it MADE and without

any cost to itself could never hope to bid against private individuals who merely produce the wealth of the world—but are not allowed to take a hand in the production of money for themselves!

If it were not such a tragic matter we could afford to laugh. I agree that in wartime the Government should organise all our resources for war purposes. That, however, is not a matter of out-bidding; it is a matter of earmarking supplies. For this purpose the Defence power rightly gives it authority to freeze, confiscate, prohibit, control, man-power, rationalise, and so on. Those "weapons" were not contemplated for use when war is not raging, and the Government has no call for such intrusions upon our normal activities.

"For solving the new puzzle (peace), the same sorts of methods of moving labour and materials are available as in war, including the financial methods," says the learned professor. The fact that this is untrue does not seem to worry him. Of course, the same financial methods are NOT "available." In wartime the Government does not have to submit its programme to the Loan Council. In peacetime it does have to do so.

Space permits only one other reference. Apparently, without intending to do so, the Acting-Professor confirms our claim that the

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

these are for trifling concessions such as deductions for dental expenses; so far no important principles of taxation justice have been expressed. The position today is that crippling taxation is undermining the honesty of the community and is causing them to defend themselves by evasion, which has in turn brought about the Gestapo actions of the taxation department. This dangerous situation is a matter of concern to all sections of the community, and it seems that the time is ripe for a concerted move along the lines of people's association groups getting together and defining prescribed limits beyond which the Government cannot go. In plain words, the people must tell the Government how much taxation they will pay—instead of the Government (servants) dictating to the people.

HUSH HUSH: A new decree in Germany insists that restaurant proprietors must suspend service during national broadcasts and see that the news is not interrupted by conversation. Here we see what happens when people are foolish enough to permit political adventurers to assume control over

WELCOME TO ERIC BUTLER

The date of the welcome home to Mr. Eric Butler, when he comes on leave to Victoria, has been altered to September 4, and will take place at "The Victoria," Little Collins Street, Melbourne (between Swanson and Russell Sts.). This will also serve as a rally and a social gathering, at which friendships can be renewed. Mr. Bruce H. Brown will preside over the proceedings, which will commence at 8 p.m. and will be followed by a supper. All supporters are invited, and the charge will be 3/6 per head. Please advise Miss M. Fahev, c/o of "New Times" Office, as early as possible if you will be there, so that catering arrangements can be attended to. It will also facilitate arrangements if payments accompany acceptances.

their lives. Of course Hitler promised them full employment and a lot of other things similar to those being offered as bait to the electors of Australia at the present time. This development should be a warning to those likely to vote "yes."

CURTIN'S CANT: Mr. Curtin recently shed some, crocodile tears because 8000 Canberra civil servants were disfranchised, but appears to be unconcerned about the fact that 30,000 Australian prisoners of war are also unable to vote. There is no justification for deciding such an important issue as the Referendum while so many soldiers who will be vitally affected by the decision are denied the opportunity of registering their protest at the attempt to destroy the system of democracy for which they are fighting. It will be a very bitter experience for these men to escape from one totalitarian prison to come home to another created in their absence.

BENEFITS BUNGLER: Pointing out that doctors, like other sections of the community, were consulted by the Government merely as a smoke screen and an empty formality, were then ignored, and later were abused when they criticised the legislation, Dr. Roseby, of the B.M.A., speaking on the mis-called Pharmaceutical "Benefits" Act (vide Melbourne "Herald"), said: "By some curious twist of mind the Ministry has decreed that everyone, be he tall or short, thin or fat, sick or very ill, should receive the same formula for the same illness. The addition of even a drop or a grain to the formula invalidates it—and the patient must pay for the whole." And of course the victims of the so-called benefits must pay

objective of all political parties is the same, the seeming difference being in the methods they use. Read this extract with care: —

Mr. Fadden's post-war credit policy . . . was relevant to the circumstances in which it was originally proposed, when the POLITICAL PROBLEM was how to tax small incomes. Since then, under Labour Government, Australia has taxed low incomes more severely than any other of the United Nations except New Zealand, with its more radical Labour Government. Mr. Fadden's scheme then became relevant only to the reconstruction, period . . ."

So you see, one "leader" demanded compulsory loans and the other "leader" demanded heavier taxes on the workers. The important question to be asked is this, "Who created the political problem of taxing small incomes, and WHO imposed it upon the Government?" None of my friends favoured it, and all my audiences deny that they ever asked for it. And d'markrasy is still supposed to be functioning. Now that low incomes have been taxed, by those whose hearts bleed for the hardships of those on low incomes, an excuse must be found for maintaining this inexcusable imposition. That excuse is Post-War Reconstruction and the Rehabilitation of Heroes! To persuade us again, the same plausible but dishonourable tactics are being used as deceived us in 1931. This time, however, there is evidence that the people are a little better informed on the subject and much more suspicious of the men who have been misleading them for years. All these professors are working frantically for a Yes vote, and that in itself is a good reason for voting No.

Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.I.
30th July 1944.

the doctor 10/6 before they get the free (?) dope. Of course it would never do to ensure that they had adequate incomes and let them choose their own doctor and manage their own affairs—that would be democratic!

PLANNING PLUS: The planners thought out a nice plan a little while back for checking disappearing foods. Under this scheme the Director-General of Health (Dr. Cumpston), who apparently was short of a job, invited housewives to weigh stocks of food in the house, or the part likely to be used during the week. Supervisors would then call and show the housewives how to record all food purchased or obtained from the garden or other sources, noting weight and price (of course). The housewives would then learn how to weigh food served at each meal, and record absentees and visitors. What do you think of such stupidity? It seems that some of those lunatics who escaped from custody some time ago have not yet been captured.

WOMAN'S WISDOM: At the South Melbourne Court some time ago a woman was charged with unlawfully altering her identity card. Her defence was that she altered her name on the card to Joan Patricia Baniski, because she wanted to join the Journalists' Association, and thought that with such a foreign name she would have a better chance of admission. The prosecution agreed to withdraw the charge and the P.M. adjourned the case so that the matter could be arranged amicably. Evidently this woman knows something of the methods of controlling our news supply—and the preference for foreigners to this end.

EVATT'S EGO: Arising from the enquiry into the interference with mail sent by Mr. A. J. Hannan, K.C. (opposing the Powers as discussed at the Canberra Convention), and other snooping actions Mr. Playford deplored the statement by Dr. Evatt that "he intended to find out where the money came from, and make the information available to be used politically." Apart from the fact that theoretically at least in a democracy one is entitled to spend one's own money in whatever manner one likes, it is no concern of Evatt's if people choose to use it to prevent dangerous powers being given to men with a mentality such as that indicated in the above statement. Hitler's ego is infantile by comparison with Evatt's.

U.S. UNEMPLOYMENT: Because of reduction of war production, involving several million-war workers in unemployment (unpaid leisure), the War Production Board in U.S.A. is organising an immediate limited return to the manufacture of civilian goods. That should interest our local bureaucrats, who seem determined to prevent the workers in our depressed war industries from returning to their civil occupations. Most of these workers have their pre-war jobs waiting for them, and they will not need any Government interference or directing as to employment. But that's not what the Planners want—it would be just too bad for them if the people solved their own problems.

ALIENS ALARM: On August 10 last year, at St. Luke's Hall, Fitzroy, the Carlton-Fitzroy sub-branch of the R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. convened a protest meeting against aliens carrying on business in the district while Australians were away fighting. As a result, the Australian Council for Civil Liberties published a special booklet (distributed free), well illustrated, and worded to convey the idea that the above meeting was "anti-Jewish" in protesting against aliens filching the livelihood of absent soldiers. The C.F.C.L. and the Communists appear to have a common bond in defending aliens, especially Jews. Perhaps it is a form of appreciation of the action of certain Jews in arranging and financing the Russian revolution (as explained in "Communism Why Not?" the second edition of which is now available). —O.B.H.

Post-War New Order?

Don't make any plans for your future, There are experts to do that for "you: With blue-prints galore And a very large store Of orders and edicts—brand-new.

The Food Control system is lovely, It gets better and better each day, With no help on the farm There's no need for alarm, For the herds are all dwindling away.

They have plans for the growing of mushroom, Where once grew potatoes and rice; And you may go to bed, So the Bed Board have said, When, a form you have forwarded twice.

And when you arise in the morning Don't start off the day in high glee, You must know it is wrong To commence with a song— Regulation two hundred and three.

When you sit down at last to your breakfast After washing—Rule 36B— Don't eat all your egg, To remind you I beg That the shell must be saved up for tea.

You open your daily newspaper, The news won't delay you for long: The pages are blank, Some censorship crank Has decided that reading is wrong.

You bid fond farewells to your dear ones, In the manner prescribed by the code: Namely, "Greetings One B, Para, two seven three," And then you set out on the road.

You are pushing a small filing cabinet, It's on wheels as the Transport Board state; You take out a file That's marked "Transport" and while The Inspector peruses it—wait.

The next train in seventeen minutes Is going the opposite way, But you board it because Your priority was Marked "Down" and not "Up" for today.

You alight at a small wayside station, To drink with a nice friendly man, But an edict just out, Forbids you to "shout," Even though you don't know of the ban.

The stranger is really a snooper, Though he looked so obscure and unknown, But he wields ready power, For within half an hour Into a deep dungeon you're thrown.

You're guilty although they can't prove it, On that point Doc. Evatt is clear, And no hope remains With justice in chains, Though you're tried after only a year.

You'd be free if you swore that your father Had failed to pay taxes last year, In Ireland they're shot, But Curtin says, "Rot! Informers are heroes out here."

You die and tell Peter your story, He despatches you straight down below; You start with surprise, Then you read in his eyes: You deserve it for not voting NO.

—"JUNIUS."
Melbourne, 28/7/44.

"ROMANCE OF BANKING"

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —My attention has been attracted by a news item in the Melbourne "Sun" of 25/7/44, entitled "Romance of Banking."

It is stated that this "romance" is to be discussed in three sessions in the "Australian" Broadcasting Commission's "University of the Air." As would be expected, the persons "selected" to participate in the session are representative of orthodox financial interests, those named being Messrs. Alec. White (Melbourne banker), G. R. Mountain (bank "economist"), and H. Burton (University lecturer). It is stated that the final session, on August 10, will deal with some of the controversial issues of banking practice and policy, which have arisen in recent years. In view of the certainty that this session will be avoided of by the interests mentioned to further deliberately mislead the people per medium of "their" "national" stations, your readers would be well advised to communicate with their representative in the Federal Parliament, (a) protesting strongly against this misuse of a public facility; (b) requesting that the Minister for Information be asked to furnish a report explaining why participation in such sessions is denied to all save the spokesmen of financial orthodoxy; (c) asking that representatives of Social Credit and Electoral Campaign bodies be invited by the Commission to participate in the "University of the Air" session. In the latter connection (c) it might be desirable to specify particular bodies or individuals.

Trusting that this matter will be taken up by your readers with their M.P.'s.

—Yours, etc., J. BRADSHAW.

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 of the "New Times," and legal responsibility for its publication is accepted by H. F. Allsop, McEwan House, Melbourne.

A WARNING TO DOCTORS & PATIENTS

(Continued from last issue.)

Here is a third 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 BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

We have to thank for this mess into which we have been brought those intriguers on the Executive of the B.M.A. who have commingled with Government and P.E.P. and have pressed, at the instigation of P.E.P. and the Fabians and their offshoots and associates, for the creation of a Central Authority. It is quite likely now that some of the more responsible officials, with some feeling for the tradition and liberty of an old and noble profession, were misled, and are now sorry. Such can still retrieve the situation.

They should realise that if a Central Authority comes, the B.M.A. will cease to have any importance.

Its only possible significance is as an Association of free professional men. It is the chief organisation of the Profession. But if the Profession were organised by a Central Authority, the B.M.A. would become redundant. What could it offer new graduates?—The derisive efforts it has made to improve the capitation fee should dispel any unlikely illusions about even its present power to affect the decisions of the bureaucracy; it has never used the sanctions it has now, but which it will certainly lose under a Central authority controlling the whole Profession. It is doubtful if even the B.M.A. would survive; its value to the Profession in a crisis is displayed by its endless publication of correspondence on contraception, while it suppressed numerous letters, of which we have seen copies, dealing with this crisis in the history of medicine—and freedom. Its place will be taken, no doubt, by a Journal issued by the proposed C.H.S.C.

Now that the White Paper has been published, the secrecy, which hitherto has had to surround the discussions of the Representative Committee with the Minister, can be abandoned. We look forward to the publication of the Report of the Representative Committee to its constituent bodies. This report should certainly be available to the forthcoming Divisional and other meetings of the B.M.A. This report will probably reveal that the Committee, while pressing for complete centralisation, hoped that some body, such as the proposed Corporate Body, would capture control of the Profession for its own potential bureaucrats. If this is so, then the division of function between the "Minister," the C.H.S.C. and the C.M.B. may be regarded as a defeat; control of policy, which is the real prize, falls to the "Minister," whose orders the C.M.B. would carry out, while the C.H.S.C. is merely a sop—the "Minister" can pick its brains, but it is devoid of powers. So that the Medical Planners have been outmaneuvered by the more experienced and astute Bureaucratic Planners—the former have been invaluable to the latter by "softening-up" the Profession with their talk of "inevitability" and all the rest.

RESULT OF THE M.P.A. PLEBISCITE

The evidence is overwhelming that the Executive, without democratically ascertaining the real wishes of the Profession, worked to get a Central Authority to control doctors and their practices. As it became more and more clear that this did not represent the true wishes of the majority of the profession, the Medical Policy Association, in response to many requests, conducted a plebiscite of 30,000 doctors in England and Wales. The question was, "Is it your wish that any form of Central Authority should be set up to control doctors and their practices, and to 'organise' the profession?"

The response to this was remarkable, a greater proportion of doctors replying than the proportion of electors who vote in the wartime bye-elections. Moreover, the huge

volume of correspondence that accompanied the returns indicated that there was a very wide-spread appreciation of the position.

The result, certified by R. Dayas Just and Company, Chartered Accountants, is as follows:—

Total replies received 10,015
"No" 7,721 = 77 percent.
"Yes" 1,489 = 15 percent.
Informal, absent,
deceased, etc 805 = 8 per cent.

This result represents the will of the profession to at least as great an extent as present bye-elections represent the "will of the people"; but as the issue was clear-cut, as opposed to blanket mandates asked for from general electors, it is correspondingly more significant. Within the B.M.A., of course, it is far more significant than the indirect voting at the Representative Meetings, on a controlled agenda. The Executive never has had, and certainly has not now, a mandate to press for a Central Authority, under any name, Corporate Body, C.H.S.C., or anything else.

THE PUBLIC.

The realisation that the whole community is threatened with a totalitarian coup d'etat, of which the plan to regiment the medical profession is only a part, though an essential part, of a much wider plan, is becoming more and more widespread. Numerous periodicals, of which "The Tablet" and "Truth" are responsible and representative examples, bear increasingly urgent testimony to the fact, and various organisations and societies warn the public even more urgently. Hence the hurry of the bureaucrats: "Only in war or under the threat of war . . ."

In Bulletin 9 we showed that the public would be regimented under the Beveridge plan, and that a centrally controlled medical profession would be used to impose on patients whatever might be concealed behind the words "positive health" ("It is high time that man made use of biological knowledge to improve the human race. . . . Positive eugenics?"). Patients, equally with doctors, would lose their control over policy, exactly as the soldier loses control. Decentralised control over policy is the essence of democracy. The doctor-patient relationship, of which the essence is privacy and freedom of contract between individuals, must be destroyed if medicine is organised under a Central Authority, just as it does not and can not, exist in the Army. In this connection, it is important to realise that "freedom of choice" is something quite different from the doctor-patient relationship. Freedom of choice is an essential to liberty, but that is a separate matter. This realisation is important, because "The Times" has been tendentiously suggesting in its leading articles on the White Paper that the doctor-patient relationship has been preserved because, for the time being, freedom of choice is to be allowed (that will not be for long, however). The facts are far otherwise: the doctor's contract is with the C.M.B. and/or the Joint Authority; the patient's contract will be with the Ministry of Labour or some other body which will employ him, and which will impose on him the duty to be fit ("The individual should recognise the duty to be well and to co-operate in all steps . . ."—Beveridge Report, para. 426). Medical records will be the property of the "State," and will have to be forwarded to Higher Authority, which will scrutinise them to ensure that both doctor and patient are fulfilling their "obligations." Regulation 33B will be redundant then.

(To be continued.)

"THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION"

By C. H. DOUGLAS. (Continued from July 7 issues.)

In view of the urgency of the situation with which they deal, chapters from Major Douglas's forthcoming book are being printed in abridged form in the "Social Creditor," whose publisher's Australian representative has given us special permission to reprint them in this country. Below is the first part of Chapter 2:

Francis Bacon, Earl of Verulam, may not have been the first man to apprehend our danger. But his emphasis upon the necessity of "restoring or cultivating a just and legitimate familiarity between the mind, and things" strikes a pure note of consciousness, which establishes it as an authentic scripture. Confronted with some of the words around which so much of our modern politics revolve, such as "the State" or "the Nation," he would have instantly demanded to be led to him. A Queen he understood; but to be told that her condition (state, from L. "status") could be, and should be, separated from the person in occupation of it, would have appeared to him to be a gross superstition into which the barons at Runnymede were careful not to fall. To him, and to most of his contemporaries, everyone had a "condition." Their consequence was precisely measured by what they did with it. He understood the Doctrine of the Incarnation.

If Bacon had been told that the country's minerals were "nationalised" and he could have grasped some idea of the

strange new word, he would probably have asked what the Queen could do with them. The statement that they ought to be nationalised he might have ridiculed as "being vertiginous, or in the way of perpetual rotation." But if told that the minerals were to be put at the disposal of a monopoly, he would have understood.

To put into contemporary terms the way his mind would have worked, we might say he would have asked, "Do I get cheaper coal? More coal? Better coal? If I don't is there some new, rapid, effective way by which I make my dissatisfaction felt upon those responsible? No? Then who is benefitting?"

He would have gone to the heart of the problem. He would have grasped at once that here was the Divine Right of Kings in operation, raising up this man, and putting down that. Two things would have concerned him. Where is the King? Is he doing a good job?

To leave the wise and witty Francis at this point to which he has led us, we can see that the transfer of powers and privi-

MR. ERIC BUTLER'S ACTIVITIES

On Wednesday, July 26, Mr. Butler delivered the third of a series of lectures to Sydney electoral campaigners. On Saturday, July 29, he addressed a small house meeting at Beecroft, putting the arguments for a "No" vote at the referendum. On Sunday afternoon, July 30, he addressed a well-attended meeting arranged by the Sydney Social Credit Movement, and emphasised the fact that no real social creditor could do anything but do all in his power to obtain an overwhelming "No" vote. A resolution was carried demanding that the Government appoint scrutineers for the referendum.

"New Times" readers in Dr. Evatt's electorate will be interested to know that Mr. Butler will speak in Cornell's Hall, Hurstville, on Wednesday, August 9.

DON'T MISS THIS?

A quantity of back numbers of the "New Times" is available to our supporters. If you write to us at Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, and simply ask for a parcel of back numbers, we will forward same free of charge. If you are in Melbourne, you may pick up a parcel at our office (5th floor, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins St.).

Many of these copies contain articles on the Federal Powers question, so they are not only helpful for introducing the paper to prospective new readers, but also for spreading the truth about the Referendum proposals, and that is very urgent.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill) made a statement in the House of Commons on May 10 in reply to a question by Colonel Lyons whether, "in view of the information which has been published as to the supplies of material and munitions of war from the U.S.A. to Russia" he would publish detailed particulars of the assistance rendered by Great Britain and the Empire countries.

The following list was circulated in the Official Report ("Hansard"). The figure "probably excludes what was lost" (the Prime Minister); and "owing to the wide variety of their nature, specific reference has not been made to all categories of supplies":—

SUPPLIES TO U.S.S.R. DESPATCHED BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 1941, TO MARCH 31, 1944

1. MILITARY SUPPLIES.

(a) Armaments and Military Stores.
Tanks: Since October 1941, 5031 tanks have been supplied, of which 1223 were Canadian built.

Vehicles (includes lorries and ambulances): 4020.
Machinery Lorries: 216.
Bren Carriers and Starters and Chargers: (including 1348 from Canada).
Motor Cycles: 1706

Weapons:
800 P.I.A.T., with ammunition.
103 Thompson sub-machine guns.
636 2-pdr. anti-tank guns.
96 6-pdr. anti-tank guns.
3200 Boys anti-tank rifles.
2487 Bren guns.
581 7.92 mm. Besa guns.

Ammunition t
85,000 rounds P.I.A.T.
19,346,000 rounds .45-in. machine gun.
2,591,000 rounds, 2-pdr. anti-tank gun.
409,000 rounds 6-pdr. anti-tank gun.
1,761,000 rounds .55-in. Boys anti-tank rifle.
75,134,000 rounds .303-in. rifle.
51,211,000 rounds 7.92 mm. tank gun, Besa.

G.L. Equipment:
(a) Mark II: 302 sets.
(b) Mark III: 15 sets British; 29 sets Canadian.
Cable: 30,227 miles telephone cable.

(b) Naval Supplies:
9 Mine-sweeping trawlers.
3 Motor minesweepers.
103 Asdics.
3006 Mines.
50 Vickers 130 mm. guns.
603 Anti-aircraft machine guns.
40 Submarine Batteries.

(c) Aircraft (Fighters). —Total despatched: 6778 aircraft. (Including 2672 aircraft sent from U.S.A. These were sent on United States Lend/Lease to U.S.S.R., as part of the British commitment, in exchange for a supply of British aircraft to U.S. forces in the European theatre.)

2. RAW MATERIALS, FOODSTUFFS, MACHINERY AND INDUSTRIAL PLANT.

(a) Raw Materials: The greater part of these supplies have been bought from Empire sources. Over the last 2½ years we have sent:

QUEENSLAND NOTES

(From the Electoral Campaign, Room 14, 2nd Floor, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane.)

Readers of the "New Times" will be interested to learn that a very generous, active and sincere supporter of Social Credit, Mr. L. B. S. Reid, late engineer to Murweh Shire Council, Charleville, has retired from that position and has taken up residence in Brisbane. He is now devoting the whole of his time in an honorary capacity to Social Credit activities. To use his own words: "I've given up building bridges and am now building Social Credit." He will be pleased to welcome old friends from Charleville and Warwick Districts at our Headquarters, where he is ably assisting to carry on the good work.

In addition to Mr. Reid, Mr. J. D. Hogan, of Pomona, affectionately known to all Social Crediters in Wide Bay as "Just-Price Jimmy," and Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Madgwick, of Maryborough, are at present residing in Brisbane; all of whom are giving much-needed assistance at Headquarters in the Referendum Campaign.

Mr. J. P. Reynolds, of Avoca, Port Douglas, spent a few weeks recently in Brisbane and was a constant visitor to our office. He is one of our principal supporters in the far North.

Cheery Mrs. Doug. Aiken, of Bundaberg, also dropped in to inspire us to greater effort.

Quite a number of the boys in uniform from southern States call in. It is very gratifying to see so many of them interested in Social Credit and spreading our literature amongst their mates.

Inquirers please call or write for literature; we have all the latest in stock.

—A. W. NOAKES, Hon. Secretary.

30,000 tons of aluminium from Canada (£3,038,000). 2000 tons of aluminium from United Kingdom (£720,000). 27,000 tons of copper from Canada (£1,431,000).

10,000 tons of copper from United Kingdom (£620,000). \$4672,000 worth of Industrial Diamonds, mainly from African production (£1,168,000).

80,921 tons of jute from India (£3,687,000). 80,423 tons of rubber from the Far East and Ceylon (£9,911,000). 8550 tons of sisal from British East Africa (£194,000).

3300 tons of graphite from Ceylon (£160,000). 28,050 tons of tin from Malaya and United Kingdom (£7,774,000). 29,610 tons of wool from Australia and New Zealand (£5,521,000).

Total Value of these and other raw materials: £39,115,000.

(b) Foodstuffs: These include: Tea from Ceylon and India; cocoa beans, palm oil and palm kernels from West Africa; ground-nuts from India; coconut—oil from Ceylon; pepper and spices from India, Ceylon and British West Indies.

Total value of all foodstuffs supplied: £7,223,000.

(c) Machine Tools, Industrial Plant and Machinery! These form the principal direct contribution from United Kingdom production to civil supplies for the U.S.S.R. Since the entry of Russia into the war, the following have been provided: Machine Tools: £8,218,000. Power Plant: £4,250,000. Electrical Equipment: £3,314,000. Miscellaneous Industrial Equipment: £1,980,000.

Various types of Machinery: £3,019,000 (e.g., Telephone equipment, food processing plant, textile machinery, port and salvage equipment).

Total value of (c): £20,781,000. Grand Total of Civil Stores made available to U.S.S.R. by the United Kingdom from all sources: £77,185,000.

3. MEDICAL SUPPLIES AND COMFORTS:

The public has contributed some of the funds for these supplies. Since October 1941, £3,047,725 has been spent through charitable organisations on surgical and medical items and clothing. In addition, His Majesty's Government has made a grant of £2,500,000 for clothing, nearly all of which has been spent.

leges from an individual to an organisation simply means the transfer of those powers and privileges to the persons controlling it. The organisation is an accommodation address. The police always suspect them. To call that organisation the State or the Nation is quite legitimate if you are quite clear that you have put the Divine Right of Kings into commission. If you imagine that there is anywhere in the world either a democracy or any other system, which confers on Mr. John Citizen an effective control or a beneficial share in those powers which he has been persuaded or jockeyed into transferring from a tangible to an intangible executive, then you are labouring under what may quite possibly prove to be a fatal delusion.

At the time of writing these lines (January, 1944), it is already evident that "moneynary reform" is coming out of the wilderness into the most respectable circles. That is good. But the idea that John Citizen must automatically benefit thereby is premature. Various well-meaning if somewhat naive organisations have stated, as though it were both axiomatic and desirable, that only "the State" has the "right" to issue purchasing power. That is the

Divine Right of Kings complex once again. Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of "England," may be heard to murmur, "Nationalisation? We welcome it." A much abler, if less theatrical banker, Sir Edward Holden, Chairman of the London, City & Midland Bank (Midland Bank) during the 1914-1918 war, when told that his policy was leading directly to nationalisation of banking, replied, "Well, I don't care. I should still manage it."

To put the matter quite shortly, transfer of power almost certainly, means transfer of policy. We have seen the transfer of power. What is the policy? Whose is the policy?

The policy is MONOPOLY. We shall see in the course of the following pages that its source can be identified within fairly narrow limits. It is preferable to establish its realistic implications, as well as the devices employed to bring it into actuality before concerning ourselves overmuch with personalities. They can wait.

(To be continued.)

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 third instalment from the above-mentioned book:—

Stockingless Moscow, with its silver fox furs, made a deep impression on me. But I soon discovered that this was only one of many paradoxes. The modern buildings and the broad streets shielded a world of dingy shops, dark, overcrowded flats and empty markets. The queues—waiting for anything from milk to shoes—were even more numerous than they had been in Madrid after a year of siege.

Everywhere you looked you found incongruous contradictions. The Moscow drinking water was chlorinated, and the gas unreliable, yet the streets were dotted with the latest type of snow-sweeper imported from America; the buses broke down, and the street cars stalled, yet three magnificent new bridges spanned the Moscow river; the dwelling-houses were unsanitary and the rooms overcrowded, yet construction had already begun on the "Palace of the Soviets," which officials proclaimed would be "bigger than the Empire State Building" with a statue of Lenin on top "bigger than the Statue of Liberty."

The emphasis on glamorous subway stations, modern cinemas and American jazz in a capital where the postage stamps wouldn't stick, the water-taps broke down, and the door-bells were invariably out of order, caused a French diplomat to shrug his shoulders, and say, despairingly: "Mais, C'est une facade!"

Certainly Soviet life was a strange travesty on Western civilisation. For a nation that sent its disciples abroad to convert the "pluto-democracies" to the leadership of Moscow, it seemed to have little to offer from a practical point of view, other than squalor and poverty. But far more disconcerting than the wretched conditions was the tyranny that gripped "the capital. It was estimated that the purge, which had swept the country during the past two years, had sent over six million people to concentration camps. The G.P.U. were interwoven throughout the life of the nation; you couldn't be in Moscow long without feeling "its influence. Foreigners were avoided like lepers, as many "purge" victims had been accused of connivance with capitalist powers, and Soviet citizens no longer dared run the risk of being seen in "bourgeois" company. I soon relinquished any hope of seeing General Gal; during the month I was in Moscow not a single Russian visitor crossed the threshold of any of the embassies.

The only contact foreigners had with Russian life was through their servants, or with officials who received them at their offices. But limited though one's associations were, dread tales of the secret police were constantly brought to one's attention.

The Russian secretary of Harold Denny, the "New York Times" correspondent, was "taken" in the middle of the night and not heard of again; a Russian chauffeur's fourteen-year-old son was imprisoned in the Lubianka as a protest against one of the dispatches his employer, a journalist, had sent; and at one of the embassies one of the footmen was sent off to Siberia because

he studied French at night, giving one of his colleagues the opportunity of denouncing him as a Trotskyist. Magnify these things a million times and you can get some idea of what Russia was like.

When I think of Moscow now I always think of the stately yellow buildings of the Kremlin in the late afternoon. When it snowed the Oriental cathedral domes gleamed against the darkening winter sky like pearls. One evening I looked out of the window at the silent white scene and saw the sky grow black with carrion crows. They swept over the Kremlin in a mighty wave, then dropped down on the roof ledges, with a quick, falling movement, as though their spirit had suddenly died. To me that dark cloud seemed symbolic of the terrible shadow that hung over Russia.

Certainly the shadow was as strong as a prison bar, for it had shut the frontiers, and now the nation was as insulated, as a hermetically sealed laboratory. Indeed, the state of isolation in which Russia existed seemed scarcely possible in a world so closely knitted together by transport and wireless.

Tourist trade was almost non-existent; ninety per cent of the foreign correspondents had been expelled, and of the hundreds of foreign engineers who had swarmed over the country several years before, only forty or fifty Americans had been allowed to remain.

It was no longer a mystery to me why there were only three people on the train going into Russia; and I understood Fitzroy's surprise at seeing me. The more I thought of it the more surprised I was myself. Why had I been granted a visa? Both Sir Robert Vansittart and Randolph Churchill (who had put in a word for me with Mr. Maisky) were "anti-appeasers"; I could only come to the conclusion that the Russian imagined I had been sent to write in praise of the Soviet Union—in an attempt to counteract a point of view, current in England, favouring the exclusion of Russia from European politics.

Whatever was in their minds, I was received at the Foreign Office by Mr. Schmidt, the Foreign Press Chief with marked cordiality. Four of Mr. Schmidt's predecessors had been liquidated, but his manner gave no indication that he regarded his job as a precarious one. He was an affable, smiling man, who sat in front of a large window, overlooking the grey confines of the Lubianka prison. He rubbed his hands and said: "Well, now, tell me your first impression of Moscow."

The woollen stockings were still uppermost in my mind, but I decided they were better left unmentioned and murmured the dull, non-committal phrase I was to murmur a hundred times before I left: "Oh, very interesting." He asked me what I wanted to do in Moscow, and when I told him I would like to see as much of the everyday life as possible he drew up a long list ranging from factories and collective farms to schools and museums.

(To be continued.)

HITLER'S POLICY IS A JEWISH POLICY

(Continued from last issue.)

The above heading is the title of one of the most interesting and informative wartime 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:

REPLY TO DR. COHEN'S SECOND LETTER

"Birker" 173 Walmley Road, Erdington, Birmingham, December 6, 1940.
The Rev. Dr. A. Cohen:

Dear Sir.—I have to thank you for your letter of the 18th November and enclosed leaflets, which I have read with interest.

Before attempting to explain and answer, if that is possible, the points raised by you, may I be allowed to preface the following with the remark that, as a realist I have little interest in a man's ideas, spiritual or otherwise, except in so far as they inspire his actions.

Hitler has SAID many things against Jewish domination, but I maintain that the sum total of his ACTIONS contradict all he has said. In all probability he is the most potent agent through which the leaders of world Jewry are carrying out their final attempt of world domination. This statement requires some explanation.

(1) HITLER'S ANTI-SEMITISM IS MERELY A BLIND.

You say that, in this connection, I ignore the Nazi ideology of "Blood and Race," of which anti-Semitism is but a part.

Now it should be remembered that Hitler is not the only person who attaches importance to "blood." None have been more interested and laid more stress on the importance of "blood," in its social aspect, than the Jews themselves. Hitler's blood theories have resulted in his Nuremberg laws, which are but the transplantation

on Gentile "soil" of those marital laws to which the orthodox Jew attaches so much importance.

Hitler's Jew laws are, as you know, the only original addition to a programme of aggrandisement and centralisation of power which he has taken over direct from Bismarck and Wilhelm; both these gentlemen were constantly surrounded by Jewish advisors, and all the German Reich-constitutions have been framed by Jews. Mr. Roth, a co-religionist of yours, writes on page 274 of his "Jewish Contribution to Civilisation":—

"Karl Rudolph Friedenthal . . . was one of the founders of the Free Conservative party. He it was whom Bismarck invited in 1870 to formulate the Constitution of the German Empire . . . it was overthrown in favour of the Weimar Constitution, one of the principal architects of which was Hugo Preuss [a Jew]."

At the close of the wars to which this new "Empire" was so addicted, the Jewish banking house of Bleichroeder (1870) and Warburg (1918) negotiated the financial arrangements. The proclamation of the Republic was written by Max Warburg, of Hamburg for Prince Max of Baden. The German inflation of the early 'twenties was planned by the same agencies, and a large part of the enormous loans to Weimar-Germany were provided by the Jewish house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. There can be no doubt, then, of the Jewish contribution to the framing of that Weimer-Germany which ruined the German middle classes and thus provided the background for a man of Hitler's type.

PRE-FABRICATED HOUSES

In the House of Commons, May 10, 1944:

Mr. Hugh Lawson asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works if he "will erect a small number of pre-fabricated steel houses in various parts of the country for immediate occupation so that the opinions of the occupants may be sampled before mass production starts."

Mr. Hicks: "The prototype had to be constructed by hand and it will therefore not be possible to arrange for the erection of a number in various parts of the country for occupation before production starts."

Mr. Hugh Lawson: "Can the Parliamentary Secretary make arrangements for at least one or two more of these houses to be built, so that they may be lived in by ordinary people before the job goes into mass production?"

Mr. Hicks: "The Ministry of Health is now responsible for distributing the tickets-to-view, and this has been designed to ensure that representatives from all areas should have an opportunity of viewing the house. I am afraid that, at the present time, I am unable to entertain the suggestion that more should be built for the purpose of enabling people to live in them before it is decided to go into production."

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

(Report from United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.)

The stark danger to our liberties is bringing more and more supporters into the fight against the Powers Plot, but even at this zero hour many are leaving their share of the fight to "the other fellow." This is undoubtedly a crucial period, when every nerve should be strained by every supporter to make sure of victory—every vote YOU win for "NO" will count. On the credit side, offsetting the sleepers there are inspiring examples of individual action.

One campaigner reports a 90% result in getting shopkeepers to actively distribute "NO" literature. Some traders tell this actionist that such "political" action would ruin their businesses, but he tells them that they won't have any businesses if "YES" wins—and off they go!

Quite good audiences are being obtained at public meetings and debates, but we rely mainly on the printed word being got into the homes, factories and shops, etc.—we cannot risk waiting for people to attend meetings. YOU and every other individual can carry out this form of campaigning. All YOU have to do is to obtain suitable literature for your locality and get on with the job.

The response to our financial appeal for £1 from every supporter has provided a good range of literature, which is available from the above address. Total amount of donations previously acknowledged is £126/19/-, and amounts since received are: N. Clark, 10/-; E. Cawthorn, 10/-; F. Hebbel, £1; A. Moore, £1; T. R. Price, £1; Sgt. Rock, 10/-; L. Strain, £1; M. Starrick, £1; S. Simpson, £1; L. Scheele, £1; P. T. Torney, 10/- (Grand Total: £135/19/-.)

There is an urgent need for more donations to keep the literature pouring out, so if you haven't contributed already, please don't delay any longer—send your contribution now to the above address, and let us know how much literature YOU can handle.

—O. B. HEATLEY, Campaign Director.

DEATH OF SENATOR DARCEY

It is with very great regret that we record the passing of Senator Richard Darcey, of Tasmania, who died at the Martyr Hospital, North Sydney, on Wednesday of last week (July 26), after a short illness, at the age of 74 years. Monetary reformers all over Australia will lament this gap in their ranks, and those who knew him or had even heard and seen him on the public platform will deeply regret the passing of such a potent personality. His courageous and persistent fight against the Money Power was recorded in past issues of this journal, and that record remains as a monument to his labours in a great cause.

CALLING CAULFIELD CAMPAIGNERS!

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—I would like to enquire, through your journal, whether there is anyone in Caulfield district who would contact me at 36 Langdon Rd., (near Town Hall), to assist me in distributing leaflets, etc. (there is plenty of scope), or, not having time or energy, would like to assist by donating a bundle or two of leaflets.

—Yours, etc., "RAYMUR."

Roth once more furnishes interesting information on page 275:—

"Henrich Friedjung [a Jew] was by conviction a passionate Austrian. In 1880, in collaboration with Georg von Schoenerer (later leader of Austrian anti-Semitism) and the Jew Victor Adler (subsequently founder of the Austrian Social Democratic party), he produced the Linz programme as a basis for the future policy of the German Austrians."

"Two years afterwards this programme was adopted by the German Nationalist party with the addition of a single clause: 'No Jew can be a member of the German Nationalist Party.' Thus the programme of the movement which is now menacing the existence of German and Austrian Jewry was in the first instance drawn up by Jews."

Comment is superfluous.

(To be continued.)

"Full Employment"

Shall We Build Modern Equivalents of Pyramids After the War?

"Perhaps even the slaves who toiled and sweated in the construction of the Pyramids derived some satisfaction from their grandeur. The more complex triumphs over the forces of nature which modern engineering developments achieve are much more capable of inspiring a real, if vicarious, sense of achievement and power." —Dr. H. C. Coombs, Director of Post-War Reconstruction.

"Thy pyramids built up with newer might To me are nothing novel, nothing strange; They are but dressings of a former sight." —William Shakespeare.

"The men who, several thousands of years ago, imposed upon their people the task of building pyramids knew well what they wanted. By accomplishing that gigantic monument, they wrote four thousand years of history."

—Adolf Hitler, Leader of the German National Socialist Labour Party.

"To perpetuate their memories, the Pharaohs made the building of mighty Pyramids Public Works Project Number One."

—Wm. C. Hayes, Department of Egyptian Art, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

It is not strange that men whose star is high Should seek like Pharaoh to enshrine their fame

In mighty structures destined for the eye Of future ages. Thus might the name Of Pharaoh, or his later counterparts Outlive the little fame of "lesser" men.

Thus Pharaohs speak though death has stilled their hearts, Even their dear-bought tombs boast for them then.

And yet how strange that fools may still be found Whose wasted lives build Pharaoh's pointed tower—

Whether in stone his vanities resound Or in a planner's pyramid of power.

Well may men fear lest Pharaoh's spirit call To one among them, and enslave them all. —W.P.I.

COMING MEETINGS

A series of "No" campaign meetings, in the Melbourne suburbs of Malvern, Armadale, Tooronga and Caulfield is being arranged by Mr. F. Elliott, of 1 Arthur St., Malvern (phone, U 9679). Lots of assistance will be required. If YOU live in or near those suburbs, and you are prepared to assist, you are urgently invited to communicate direct with Mr. Elliott.

THOSE "NO INDUSTRIAL CONSCRIPTION" PLEDGES

(Continued from page 1.)

Standard," was forced to try and deny that the Government is responsible for the outrageous actions of the bureaucrats. This was an open admission that responsible Government is becoming a thing of the past in this country. German methods are not only being introduced into this country by the bureaucrats; but the very politicians asking for greater powers are publicly defending them!

All democratic Australians were shocked by the revelations of the Censorship Committee, and Mr. Curtin promised to ensure that despicable censorship practices would cease. But Senator Keane, who appears to believe that he is a dictator instead of a paid servant of the people, says that he and his bureaucrats are going on with their anti-British censorship methods. The following is from the Sydney "Daily Mirror" of July 20:—

"Senator Leckie: 'you have no scruples at all. Letters from wives to husbands have been opened and passed from one department to another.'"

"Senator Keane: 'We are going on with it, too.'"

What are we Australians thinking about! This isn't Germany, and Senator Keane should be told so. This man publicly defends what better Australians than he will ever be are dying to defeat. He should be hounded from public life by an aroused public opinion. And so should power-lusting Chifley. He has also joined the ranks of those who appear to be trying to out-Hitler Hitler. In a recent broadcast the Commonwealth Taxation Commissioner urged Australians to become a nation of anonymous "pimps" and informers; he even urged that wives should anonymously give information concerning their husbands' financial position! Mr. Chifley defends the Commissioner! Words are inadequate for me to express the contempt and loathing I have for men like Mr. Chifley—men who are traitors to the cause of decency, Christian charity and the democratic way of life.

These men must be answered, and answered IMMEDIATELY. There must be an increasing storm of protest from liberty-loving Australians, expressed in an overwhelming "No" vote on August 19.

Are YOU doing your utmost in this fight of fights? You still have time to rally increasing public opinion to the "No" cause before August 19. Obtain your supply of leaflets for distribution; write your letters to the local press, and forward that urgently required financial assistance to your Campaign Headquarters.

Printed by M. F. Canavan Cullinton road Hartwell for the New Times Ltd. Melbourne.