

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. 36. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 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.

The "Dean Case" Inquiry Held in Melbourne

The Impressions of a Witness

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

Sir,—On Friday, August 25, 1944, a Summons dated August 22 was delivered to me reading as follows:

"In pursuance of the powers conferred on me in that behalf by Regulation 8 (1) of the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations, I hereby summon you to attend before the above-mentioned Board of inquiry appointed under the said Regulations at No. 1 Court, High Court Building, 451 Law Court Place, Melbourne, in the State of Victoria on the 29th day of August, 1944, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the forenoon and so on from day to day as may be required of you, and then and there to give evidence concerning the matters under enquiry.

The summons was signed by G. S. Reed, who, I understand, is a judge of the Supreme Court of South Australia, and purported to have been issued under the National Security Act, the National Security (General) Regulations, and the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations in connection with "the matter of an Inquiry by the Board of Inquiry into matters relating to certain legal proceedings by Angus Dean in the High Court of Australia.

Upon receipt of the summons, which had been handed to me at my place of employment, I sent a letter to the Chairman of the Board asking for the following information:

(i) In what way does the inquiry in this case become a matter affecting the "public safety and defence of the Commonwealth?"

(ii) At whose instigation had I been summoned to attend the inquiry?

(iii) For what purpose was my attendance deemed necessary?

(iv) What is the nature of the "evidence" I was expected to give?

This letter was duly delivered to the Chairman, but he has not furnished a reply.

When I noticed the almost fearsome list of National Security Authorities under which the proceedings were being conducted I wondered whether something of a world-shaking character was at stake, and

so felt it advisable to consult the authorities referred to. The National Security Act bears the title "An Act to make provision for the safety and defence of the Commonwealth and its Territories during any war in which His Majesty is or may be engaged," and Section 5 of the Act stipulates that regulations may be made "for securing the public safety and defence of the Commonwealth." It will thus be seen that any matter not constituting a threat to public safety or adversely affecting the Defence of the Commonwealth is quite outside the scope of the Act or the Regulations made thereunder, and consequently it may be deemed desirable at a later date to challenge the validity as well as the propriety of what has taken place apparently at the direction of the present Attorney-General Dr Evatt.

That any matter referred to a Board of Inquiry must relate directly to questions of the defence of the Commonwealth is further emphasised in the Regulation under which Boards may be appointed. Regulation 3 of the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations provides that a Minister may appoint a Board of Inquiry to inquire into any matter in relation to the public safety and defence of the Commonwealth which is specified in the instrument of appointment. The "instrument of appointment" means the

Soldier's Letter to Mr. Calwell

The following letter, dated August 27, has been sent by Sgt. Eric D. Butler to Mr. A. A. Calwell, M.H.R., and Minister for Information. It speaks for itself:

Dear Mr. Calwell,—As a sergeant in the A.I.F., I was particularly interested in your following remarks at Canberra on July 20:

"The money expended on the 'No' campaign has been subscribed by those who, if they were in France, would certainly be supporting the Vichy administration. If they were in Norway they would be quislings, and if they were in any other part of German-occupied Europe, they would be supporting and arch-collaborationists

More "Extermination"

The "Liverpool Evening Express" (England) of June 29, 1944, reported:

"Thirty-two members of wealthy business families in Hungary, mainly Jewish industrialists, have arrived in Lisbon this week, travelling in German civil aircraft, and hope to go to America. A huge financial and material deal with German interests made it possible for them to leave Hungary.

"Among those who have arrived are Choren and Weiss, reputed to be the richest men in Hungary, who have a virtual monopoly of the country's heavy steel and munitions industries. They were arrested on March 19 and taken to Vienna, but after intercession by the Hungarian Government they were released and returned to Budapest. There, without the knowledge of the Hungarian Government, they made an important deal with a German financial group, and were consequently permitted to leave Hungary with their families—but each family has had to leave a hostage behind to guarantee their discretion abroad.

"A special train took them from Hungary to Stuttgart, where three special aeroplanes awaited them. They were allowed to bring out cash, jewels and gold, which have been deposited with the Portuguese Customs authorities. The first group arrived here on Sunday and the last group yesterday."

(Our emphasis.)

with, the Axis Powers. The Australian quislings and reactionaries who are behind the 'No' campaign to prevent the National Parliament from doing justice to the fighting forces, are the very people who, if the Japanese had come to Australia, would have been the first to make a deal with them." ("Hansard," No. 15, p. 350.)

Now that the people of this country, along with the men in the Forces, have informed you and other paid servants of the people that they have grave doubts about the German idea of centralised government being of benefit in a British country, perhaps you would care to withdraw the above insulting remarks?

I am one of those who honestly object to more powers for Canberra; not only did I write a considerable number of articles opposing the granting of the powers sought—articles which I am pleased to say were distributed in tens of thousands throughout Australia—I also contributed financial assistance to "No" campaigners from my Army pay.

Forget the idea that the Referendum was defeated because of the "vested interests," Mr. Calwell. It was defeated because an increasing number of people are beginning to think that there are too many people in this country trying to emulate Adolf Hitler.

You may think that you can say and do as you like because of a little "brief authority." You may think that you can utter such sweeping insults as the above while hiding behind Parliamentary privilege. I volunteered in the A.I.F. to fight the Japanese, and, if you think that I am one of those who would "make a deal" with the Japanese, I would ask you to put your signature to such a statement.

It is my intention to give this letter the widest possible circulation throughout Australia, and I sincerely hope that tens of thousands of other loyal people, just as loyal as you will ever be, Mr. Calwell, will let you know that there is no place for arrogant Federal Ministers in our national Parliament.

Yours faithfully, ERIC D. BUTLER.

Terms of Reference, and the Terms of Reference in this case are as follows:—

1. The circumstances of and connected with certain legal proceedings recently instituted in the High Court by Angus Dean of Hobart in the State of Tasmania including the allegations in connection therewith made in circulars recently distributed to Parliament.

2. The object of those responsible for the publication of such circulars and whether such object was a bona fide desire to protect the interests of justice or the furtherance of some other purpose.

Item 1 is of course unexceptionable, but Item 2 has been used for the purpose of interrogating citizens who had nothing whatever to do with the publication of the circulars and who had no knowledge of the persons responsible for it. The nature of the questions put to witnesses by the "King's Counsel assisting the Board" indicated clearly that the proceedings were concerned much more with "monetary reformers, than with the propriety or otherwise of what Angus Dean has done.

Fortunately, before going to the Court I took the trouble to read the whole of the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations, and found that under Regulation 11 a witness could refuse to answer questions put to him by any person other than a member of the Board. For the benefit of your

readers I quote Regulation 11 in full, thus:

"A person appearing as a witness before a Board or Commissioner shall not refuse to make an affirmation or to answer any questions relevant to the inquiry put to him by a member of the Board or by the Commissioner."

The set-up of the Inquiry was as follows. The Bench was occupied by Mr. Justice Reed, with the Honourable J. Allan Guy, M.H.R. for Wilmot (Tasmania), seated at his left. At the official table in front of the Court were Mr. Alderman, K.C., a Lieutenant in the A.W.A.S. with great quantities of materials from the Security Service, a civilian official of undisclosed status, and an Army Lieutenant.

At the other side of the table, and for varying periods, sat a gentleman in civilian clothes, for the most part wearing a smirky grin and presenting an appearance, which suggested that his ancestry might not have been Australia. He appeared to take no part at all in the proceedings except every now and then to look in a knowing way at the mighty King's Counsel. There is no doubt, however, that he had some status in the case, because he was privileged to enter and retire through the official quarters.

As soon as the Chairman had become seated, Mr. Alderman announced that it (Continued on page 4.)

The matter of ratifying or rejecting the World Bank and Gold Standard scheme will have to be faced up to by Parliament. It is more than probable that three or four members of the Cabinet are opposed to this bankers' gold plot, which would remove control of monetary policy from our Parliament to "Wall St." These men will need strong support to defeat Curtin, Chifley, Evatt and Co. The best way to meet the situation is to keep up the pressure on every Member of Federal Parliament, and in particular on those in the Cabinet. Go to it!

TAX TIP: The Melbourne "Herald's" tax expert, in his column, "Tax Points Explained," on August 9, in reply to one of the tax-gatherer's victims, gave the following sound advice: "This anomaly should be brought to the notice of your Federal Member." It is pleasantly surprising to note how this simple and effective idea is permeating the community. M.P.'s must also be agreeably surprised at the growing realisation among their constituents as to their usefulness. It will be a happy day for Australia when the politicians receive so many complaints or directions that they will consider it wise to consult their electors (employers) before introducing new measures. Such action will, of course, also influence Members (employees) to quickly rescind unwanted Acts.

POWERS PROBLEM: An interesting situation now exists as a result of the Referendum in N.S.W. and Queensland. The Parliaments in those States surrendered the powers without amendment, and it appears that notwithstanding the decision of the electors in those States, the Federal Government may exercise the whole of the 14 powers. The question is: "Would the power-maniacs dare to flout the people's decision in this manner?" The "Surrender Bill" contains a provision that the transfer of powers may not be repealed by a State Parliament without a referendum in the State concerned; so electors in N.S.W. and Queensland should write to their respective State parliamentary representatives, demanding a State referendum on the repeal of the local Powers Bill.

PAUPER PREMIERS: Press reports recently informed us "the Loan Council will discuss a limited States' loan programme." It was a sorry day when the Premiers foolishly allowed themselves to be tricked into the Financial Agreement Act, etc.—thus surrendering their local control over finance, such as it was. Since then, they have gone every year or so on a paupers' pilgrimage to Canberra. Incidentally, the Financial Agreement comes up for reconsideration soon, which will provide an opportunity to scrap this iniquitous measure. This is an issue you could take up with your State Member, with a view to having the Act repealed.

BUDGET BRAWLS: There have been preliminary skirmishes for tax reductions in the Budget, and we have seen the amazing spectacle of the Labor Government (with a majority in both Houses) insisting on strict limitations on reductions, especially on low incomes (workers wages). There have been times in history when the people politely and firmly decided just how much taxation they would allow their political servants, but now the servants simply take what they want without asking. The encroachment has reached the stage when the servants can completely dispossess the people through taxation.

When this position is put to the man in the street he is amazed and objects strongly, and he is willing to agree that the time has come when definite limits of taxation should be imposed on political servants by the people. This idea is worth pushing around.

SPINNING STORY: An advertisement by the W.O.I., appealing for women to spin Australian wool and cotton into yarn says: "We've got the wool, we've got the cotton—the rest is up to you." Many will remember what is often referred to as the "depression," when the bankers stopped the money supply and thereby stopped the works. Well, it was equally true then to say to the financial experts, in respect of every desired undertaking: "We've got the manpower, we've got the materials, we've got the machines, we've got the skill—the rest is up to you." Unfortunately, few citizens were well informed and intelligent (Continued on page 2.)

Another Bank Bill In Alberta

Another Provincial Bank Bill has been carried through the Alberta Legislature. It is designed to eliminate the stated objections of the Dominion Government to the last application for a provincial bank charter, made by the Province in 1940.

It provides for members of the Executive Council to become shareholders in the Alberta Provincial Bank, to the extent of 500,000 dollars, and to act as directors of the Bank, exercising all powers and functions of directors, as required by the Bank Act.

The Act also provides that the Provincial Treasurer may pay costs and expenses of incorporating the Provincial Bank out of the Province's general revenue fund, and that the sum of 500,000 dollars which will enable members of the Executive Council to become shareholders in the Bank to that amount, may be paid out of the general revenue fund.

If a Minister ceases to hold that office, the Act provides that he shall cease to be a shareholder or director of the bank.

The Act also repeals the present Banking Powers Act, which was the basis of the Province's first application for a bank charter.

If and when a Provincial Bank is established, Treasury Branches would come under the provisions of the Provincial bank Act, instead of being administered under the provincial Treasury Department as at present.

Mr. Maynard said that under the new Bank Act, no extra privileges will be asked Ottawa, nor will anything be asked that is not granted to any other bank.

—The "Social Creditor," June 17.

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

By C. H. DOUGLAS. (Continued from August 11 issue.)

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.

CHAPTER VIII.*

On November 11, 1918, at eleven o'clock—the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month—an Armistice in the World War came into force between Germany and the Allies, France and Great Britain, with the Associated Nation, the U.S.A., concurring. The slightly mystical character of the date and hour is not without interest.

Germany was beaten. The military history of 1918 is curiously unconvincing, but certain facts stand out. Powerful forces were at work behind the German Front to halt the war before the American casualties became serious. And the German Staff was determined that the destruction wrought in France and Belgium should not be repaid in kind on German soil.

Palestine had been conquered by General Allenby's Forces, and Russia had been reduced to chaos, through the agency of a sealed train of expert revolutionaries, headed by Lenin (Oulianoff) and Trotsky (Bronstein), almost all of whom came from New York.

London abandoned itself to an orgy of relief and rejoicing. Mr. Lloyd George stamped the country into a General Election with the main items in his programme announced as "Hang the Kaiser" and "Make the Germans pay." The Kaiser died a peaceful, natural death in the Castle of Doorn, Holland, twenty-two years later; Herr Hitler, the National Socialist, having given orders to the German troops invading Holland that they were not to approach the Castle nearer than one mile, so as not to disturb him. It is instructive to consider the success of the second item:

It should be remembered, however, that hardly had the guns ceased fire, than numbers of distinguished and well-patronised economists the world over announced that it was impossible to make Germany pay. The basis of this statement was not that Germany could not pay. It was that the Allies could not afford to be paid! A conspicuous exception to this attitude was the United States, the Associated Nation, which not only insisted on being paid "out of pocket expenses" by Germany, but the much more considerable debts incurred by the Allies, and underwritten by Great Britain. It must be remembered also that Great Britain entered the war a large creditor of America; parted with gold and securities to an amount almost equal to the debt; and received in return war material, much of it so inferior as to be almost useless, and all of it at tremendously inflated prices.

The freedom previously enjoyed by Great Britain in regard to foreign policy disappeared with the entry of the U.S.A. into the war. And President Wilson was influenced preponderantly by German Jews such as Jacob Schiff, with their own policies to further. What did the economists mean? There is little doubt of what they meant. It was not that Germany could not pay, and not even that Germany could not be made to pay. It was that all the politicians were in the hands of the financiers, and had been made to understand quite clearly that the interests of finance were paramount. This involved certain clear issues:

The first of these was that every effort must be made to re-establish gold as the basis of payment. (Rufus Isaacs, Lord Reading, had agreed in Washington that British debts to U.S.A. should all be paid in gold.)

The second was that everyone should be poorer—or think themselves poorer—so that "employment" for wages might be re-established everywhere as quickly as possible. Whoever was to be paid, it must be on no account be the ordinary individual.

The third was that debts to bankers must be given priority over debts to Governments.

And the fourth was that the American-speaking German-Jewish bankers, such as the Warburgs and Schiffs, who were paramount at the peace conferences, were determined that Germany should be in a position to renew the struggle at the earliest possible moment. Apart from other reasons, they had done too well not to wish for a repetition.

The first payment ordered by the Reparations Commission was in kind. The German Government was ordered to deliver 2,234,000 tons of coal per month. After numerous protests at non-delivery by the French Government, the Reparations Commission informed the Allied Governments on June 30, 1920, that Germany had voluntarily defaulted on coal deliveries. She could deliver, but she would not.

At Boulogne in May and June 1920, the Reparations Money Indemnity was fixed at

*The extracts now being published in "The Social Creditor," of which the present is the fifth, are published with a view to the existing situation, and not in the sequence or detail in which they will later

BRUCE BROWN AT HAMPTON

Mr. Bruce H. Brown will conduct the service at the Hampton Methodist Church (Melbourne) on Sunday next, September 10, at 7 p.m.

269 milliards of gold marks, spread out over 42 years. The Germans did not pay. The paper mark began to fall in exchange value, which would normally indicate that she was importing more than she exported. Enormous quantities of paper marks were sold to speculators in foreign countries for gold currencies. When these became valueless the Germans had received a considerable war indemnity and wiped out their own National Debt.

Germany had agreed to supply large quantities of timber. On December 26, 1922, the Reparations Commission declared Germany in voluntary default in the delivery of timber.

On January 26, 1923, the Reparations Commission declared Germany to be in general default both in respect of deliveries in kind, and in monetary payments.

By this time, France and Belgium were ranged in solid opposition to Great Britain and the forces working through the British Government were assisting Germany in every way to defy France. On August 11, 1923, the mark collapsed completely, and became worthless. As a consequence German properties were bought up for trivial sums in dollars by Jews with foreign balances.

We now enter the almost incredible period of the Dawes and Young Plans, by which Allied and American bankers, under an American Chairman, supervised the building up of German credit, and provided the funds for the modernisation of German industry. With Mr. Montagu Norman as Governor, and a nominee of the Federal Reserve Board, Dr. Sprague, to advise him, the Bank "of England" co-operated with New York banks in assisting Dr. Schacht, described by Lord Vansittart as "the most oleaginous rascal I have ever met," to obtain large sums of money from both countries, small fractions of which were returned as "reparations." This fantastic situation finally came to an end with the failure in May, 1931, of the Credit Anstalt, a large Austrian bank which had been supported by the Bank "of England," which coolly transferred a loss of £40,000,000 from its own accounts (the Bank "of England" being a privately owned bank) to the debit of the Exchange Equalisation Account, which is national property. Germany declared a moratorium, which finally terminated all reparations payments. At the same time President Hoover declared a moratorium, which temporarily suspended Allied payments to America.

Turning to the military aspects of this period, Article 160 of the Treaty of Versailles read, "The Greater German General Staff and all similar organisations shall be dissolved, and may not be reconstituted in any form." The G.D.G.S. merely went into plain clothes. The Treaty limited the German Army to 100,000 men. General von Seeckt trained them all as officers, which most of them had been before. Von Seeckt made a secret arrangement (and this is significant) whereby army units were trained in the Soviet Union, and an aviation school was established near Moscow. The "Black Reichswehr" was set up to thwart, the Allied Control Commission, and to spend secret funds where they would further the main object: to weaken the military power and national morale of Great Britain and France, and to build up that of the Reich.

This steady pursuit of a fixed and unalterable objective was completely independent of the various forms of Government, which succeeded each other in Germany in the fifteen years between the Armistice and the accession to power of Adolf Hitler, the ex-corporal who had been a paid spy for the Army. To suppose that he came to power without the consent of the G.D.G.S. is simply to misapprehend the possibilities of political Germany.

It may be convenient at this juncture to emphasise an aspect of the matter, which has an importance, if possible, greater at the present time than during the period of German re-armament. Both Britain and France had staffs of men in Germany on the Reparations Commission, and in other capacities, who knew what was going on, and reported their findings. British businessmen visiting Germany reported the drilling of thousands of armed men in every district of Germany. Mr. Douglas Reed, for some years a foreign correspondent for "The Times," has stated that his warning dispatches were suppressed.

Almost up to the outbreak of war in 1939, the British public was abysmally ignorant of the situation, so that Mr. Stanley Baldwin, with that engaging honesty which must ensure him a place in history, remarked in 1936, "Supposing I had gone, to the country and had said 'Germany is re-arming; we must re-arm.' Does anyone think this pacific democracy of ours would have rallied to that call?"

The British Press, with a few honourable exceptions, played down the dangers, which lay clearly ahead, and were supported by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation, the latter under the obvious control of the Bank "of England." Broadly speaking, the British Press is controlled by international Big Business and Finance. The Labour-Socialist Party did everything possible to hamper re-armament, and actually stopped the completion of the Singapore Base (not on technical grounds, which appear to have existed but for pacifist reasons).

At the present time, we are being presented with the same description of dis-

torted information on the social conditions of the totalitarian States, and notably of Russia, whose military prowess is systematically confused with social well-being.

It is impossible to dispute the evidence which is available that there is a tacit conspiracy between the international financier with his controlled press, and the international socialist, to stampede the general public through the agency of continuous misinformation, just as the same forces prevented the British Government from utilising the unemployment period of 1928-1933 to anticipate and suppress the German re-armament which proceeded throughout with unabated vigour. Does Lord Baldwin or anyone else suppose that the unemployed in the Distressed Areas would have refused to make guns in 1930?

It must be obvious to anyone who will give the matter serious consideration that the interests which control British publicity consciously worked to emasculate British military power and to build up that of Germany, and that they were assisted, whether consciously or not, by certain carefully selected Trades Union leaders, who moulded the policy of the Labour Party in accordance with the parallel policies of the German-speaking Jew-inspired Fabian Society (later, P.E.P.), and the Zionists.

In the Report of the (U.S.A.) Custodian of Alien Property, published in 1919, after explaining the care with which German control had been concealed, it is remarked: "In many of the large German-owned companies taken over by the alien property custodian after investigation it was found that espionage was one of their chief functions. Every scrap of information of commercial or military value to Germany was carefully gathered by the representatives of these concerns in this country, and quickly forwarded to the home office in Germany. . . . Especially the American chemical industry was a natural centre for German espionage."

J. Carlton Ward, President of the Fairchild Engine and Aeroplane Corporation, speaking at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in New York on January 20, 1943, said:—

"Britain began to re-arm very slowly in 1935. That so-called slow phase of re-arming extended through 1937. The British political situation at that time has had a fairly close parallel in the United States. The Government was not free to spend the monies required for armament."

The control of the money policy of Great Britain is predominantly in the care of the Bank "of England." The control of the monetary situation in the United States is predominantly in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board.

Since it is probable that the Jewish question will be one, if not the major, preoccupation of the twentieth century, the obvious contradictions of German policy in this regard demand attention. In the world's press at this time (1944) "Nazi," a Jewish word meaning "Prince" "as well as National Socialist, is made to appear synonymous with the persecution of the Jews. How much persecution there really has been will not be known until a much later date. That there has been some is quite logical and understandable. The inflation racket inflicted untold hardships on the general body of the German people. German-speaking Jews were conspicuous exceptions. They appeared to be possessed of large quantities of American currency or credit, and used it to buy out every German business, and even personal property, from a population which saw its means of contact with food and lodging disappear overnight. A raging thirst for revenge was undoubtedly wide spread, and in the lawlessness of the times some of it found satisfaction. But that the genuine higher policy of Germany is anti-Jew is patently absurd. There is abundant evidence that Hitler received exactly the same kind of support from powerful Jews, as did the Kaiser.

On the authority of the pre-Ausschluss Vienna police. Hitler himself is an illegitimate descendant of a Viennese Baron Rothschild. Martha von Haushofer, the wife of the leading German exponent of geopolitics, who is said to exercise almost the major influence on Hitler, is a Jewess. Many important German-speaking Jews are just as powerful in Germany so far as can be gathered from relevant evidence, as they were in the reign of the Kaiser, and after. They are in accord with the G.D.G.S. or they would not be there.

In comparison with the atrocities perpetrated in Russia on Russians at the behest of German and Russian-speaking Jews, both in numbers and nature, it appears certain that the "atrocities" stories are exaggerated out of all proportion. But they have an obvious use. They form an excuse for forcing the barriers of immigration laws. And the objective is exactly that of parachute troops—to get behind the enemy's lines. The effect on internal politics of the "refugees" in every country ought to be sufficient indication as to the identity of the enemy.

The indisputable fact is that there is a coherent Jewish policy everywhere. At the present time it can be seen in full operation in practically every country in the world, and on both sides of the fighting-line. It is the conditions which are inseparable from total war which alone make possible the erection of the bureaucratic state alike envisaged by the Jews and the Great German General Staff as the instrument of World Dominion. Hence, so long as this influence is allowed to operate, we can expect one war after another until someone has enslaved the planet.

The Rooseveltian "New Deal" was an attempt at a more or less bloodless revolution, which would centralise power in the U.S.A. It failed to achieve sufficient success to be stable. The war was the next step. "War is the pursuit of policy by other means."—(Clausewitz.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

enough to know it. However, a great many have since learnt about the bankers' racket and their dastardly depression.

SOAPBOX SCIENCE: "The nation's soap-box orators held a conference at Chicago today (to elect the king of the soapbox). The honour went to Charlie Weindorf, from Union Square, New York, who made an impassioned appeal for a two-day, eight-hour working week. He said, 'the curse of this world is too much work, I favour starting at noon and quitting at five!' (Melbourne "Argus," July 12.) Thus it would seem that the soapbox orators have really appreciated the leisure age made possible by the accumulated knowledge of past ages and the development of machinery. Will economists and work-mad workers' mis-leaders please take note?"

FUEL FIENDS: The Sydney "Bulletin" for August 23 records the following example of regulation mania: "A milk-truck driver gave a lift to a farmer's wife from Tooradin to Melbourne. He was making the trip in pursuit of his calling, and didn't have to jettison any milk cans to make room. He was fined under Fuel Control Board regulations for giving a lift when there were trams or 'buses' in the district." What a fiendish regulation! And what price the fiendish minds that devised it?

SECURITY SCHEME: Under the specious plea of "World Security," the big-finance-gangsters are proceeding to finalise the plot of world control at Dumbarton Oaks. However, it seems that certain people in U.S. and elsewhere are very dubious about the scheme; a certain group in the U.S. Senate oppose it on the grounds that, "the League would inevitably support the peace treaty concluded with the Axis, therefore it would be unwise to create the League until it is known what kind of peace it intends to support" (enforce?). Since it was the international bankers who finalised the last peace treaty, and since they still control affairs, obviously they will frame the peace proposals, which the proposed League would have to enforce. Let us do our utmost to see that Australia is not tricked into this dastardly trap.

ERRING ECONOMISTS: Tasmanian dairymen are so incensed at unjust price fixing that they have threatened to strike, as a last resort, to obtain a fair price (vide Melbourne "Herald," 8/7/44). In addition, they are so fed up with being bossed around by theoretical bureaucratic economists, that at one meeting they passed the following resolution: "In the opinion of this meeting, while the Government keeps Professor Copland as Prices Commissioner, it need not look for any support from the milk producers in Tasmania; and we ask all producing organisations to endorse this." Public agitation against these impractical economists will surely ensure their removal so that producers and others can get on with the war effort.

SUNDAY SANCTIONS: The "Advent Radio Church's" bulletin for August 6 objects to the Victorian Council of Churches seeking State sanctions to enforce Sunday observance. The article quotes many authorities of all denominations as agreeing that no command exists in the Bible as to the sanctification of Sunday. The writer also says that the Sunday edict was made by Emperor Constantine (321) because other attractions were more popular than church services, and so the aid of the State was invoked by the churches. The article also says, "even in those days there were ecclesiastics working hard for an amalgamation of Church and State." (Socialised Christianity!) —O. B. H.

LETTER TO MR. MUTTON, M.L.A.

On Monday last Mr. F. C. Paice sent the following letter to Mr. C. Mutton, M.L.A.:

Dear Mr. Mutton, —In the Victorian "Herald," No. 6, page 576, you are reported as saying: "Much has been said about the Referendum, and I marvel how members on the Government side of the House can discuss the things they are debating today when the opportunity to do something worthwhile presented itself last Saturday. Only two sections of the people voted 'No'—the capitalists and the hoodlums."

These are very sweeping words, but perhaps some allowance should be made for your anger and disappointment when you realised that over 2,000,000 electors (obviously the majority of them were workers) disagreed with your views and refused to transfer more powers from the State Parliaments to Canberra.

Having frequently heard you proclaim your belief in Democracy, it seems that you must have been speaking on these occasions with your tongue in your cheek, for you now declare that the vast majority of the people of Australia are "capitalists or hoodlums," including nearly half the men in the fighting forces who are offering their lives for people like you and me.

Are you quite sure that these "capitalists and hoodlums" are worthy of your continued representation? In view of the fact that you are a Member of a State Parliament which you frequently and openly state you want abolished (contrary to the expressed will of the people), I feel sure you will not long delay your decision to refuse any longer to "represent" "capitalists and hoodlums" in an institution which you have done your best to deprive of all legislative powers. Or will you?

—Yours faithfully, F. C. PAICE, 28 Belgrave St., E. Coburg.

"Few discoveries are more irritating than those which expose the pedigree of ideas."—Lord Acton.

It comes as a shock to many people when someone points out that there is considerable evidence that, after engaging in two long and devastating wars to defeat the Germans militarily, the British peoples themselves are partially succumbing to the very ideas, which destroyed the individual in Germany. If we are going to win this war for the British way of life, then some very serious thought must be devoted to the activities of certain people and institutions in our midst.

While all thinking people have agreed for some time past that there are certain reforms necessary in our community, it is a pathetic fact that many of those shouting about "New Orders" are merely aping what power-lusters have been advocating under different names for centuries past. Many of the so-called progressives in our midst are in reality the most dangerous reactionaries.

In that very thought-provoking book, "The Road to Serfdom," by Professor Hayek, the following statement appears:

"If we are to build a better world we must have the courage to make a new start. . . . It is not those who believe in inevitable tendencies who show this courage, not those who preach a 'New Order,' which is no more than a projection of the tendencies of the last forty years, and who can think of nothing better than to imitate Hitler. It is indeed those who cry loudest for the New Order who are most completely under the sway of the ideas which have created this war and most of the evils from which we suffer."

As a man who lived in close contact with the Germans for many years before leaving his native Austria, Professor Hayek tells us some very sobering facts. He says:

"In the dozen years in which this country [England] has now become his [the author's] home, he has become increasingly convinced that at least some of the forces which have destroyed freedom in Germany are also at work here, and that the character and the source of this danger are, if possible, even less understood than they were in Germany. The supreme tragedy is still not seen that in Germany it was largely people of good will, men who were admired and held up as models in this country, who prepared the way, if they did not actually create, the forces which now stand for everything they detest. . . . Few are ready to recognise that the rise of Fascism and Nazism was not a reaction against the socialist trends of the preceding period, but a necessary outcome of those tendencies. This is a truth which most people are unwilling to see even when the similarities of many of the repellent features of the internal regimes in Communist Russia and National-Socialist Germany were widely recognised. As a result, many who think themselves infinitely superior to the aberrations of Nazism and sincerely hate all its manifestations, work at the same time for ideals whose realisation would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny."

One of the most ironic aspects of the present world turmoil is the determined effort by socialists everywhere to convince people that Russia's internal system must be fundamentally different from that of Germany's because Russians are fighting Germans. THAT KARL MARX WAS A GERMAN-JEW, THAT SOCIALISM WAS PIONEERED IN GERMANY AND WAS EXPORTED INTO RUSSIA DURING THE LAST WAR BY THE GERMAN HIGH COMMAND, ARE FACTS CONVENIENTLY OVERLOOKED. The early German socialists worked in close collaboration with Bismarck and other Prussian leaders, the men who worshipped the big State and preached the doctrine of efficiency for the mere sake

of efficiency. It was the work of the German-Jews in association with both Socialism and Prussianism, which turned Germany into the highly centralised military State that it is today. These German-Jews, particularly the big financiers such as the Warburgs, built up their associations throughout the world. During the last war they worked for the destruction of the British Empire. They represented both sides at the Peace Conference, and made certain that Germany won the peace. When Hitler is removed in Germany it will be found that these men and their institutions are still there.

And, as Professor Hayek points out, most of the refugees from Germany have brought German ideas with them. Lord Vansittart, former permanent head of the British Foreign Office, and one of the greatest living authorities on the Germans, has recently warned us about these refugees.

"The Germans had a better chance of fooling the Allies this time, for they had organised infiltration on a scale never before attempted. There are large numbers of German refugees in Britain and the Empire and still more in U.S.A. who, in democratic disguise, were in agreement with Hitler's external policy of expansion. . . . The worst offenders are in U.S.A., where the Germans are making some headway toward losing the peace for us."—(Sydney "Daily Mirror," July 19.)

The extent to which the great majority of Jews and Germans have allowed themselves to be moulded and used by the powerful financial and other groups, mainly Jews or German-Jews, is their own business. But we must ensure that they are not used to mind ours.

We have recently been hearing about inquiries in U.S.A. concerning international cartels. The idea of these cartels originated in Germany, and German-Jews have been closely connected with them all over the world. From Germany also came the first talk about "planning"—planning every human activity until the individual is merely a passive tool in the hands of the planners, who are loud in their statements that their planning is all "for the common good." Hayek writes:

"In the advance towards a completely planned society the Germans, and all the people who are imitating their example, are merely following the course which nineteenth-century thinkers, particularly Germans, have mapped out for them."

Australians, who are concerned with the saving of this country from the "planning" of the men who are merely aping the Germans, should make it their duty to find out who the "planners" are and what they really want to do in this country.

One of the most dangerous institutions in the British Empire is undoubtedly the London School of Economics. This institution was founded by the Fabian Socialists, the German-Jew financier, Ernest Cassel, providing considerable financial assistance in order to "raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State." This London School of Economics has been staffed largely by individuals of foreign extraction, a considerable number being Germans or German-Jews.

(To be concluded.)

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 an eighth instalment from the above-mentioned book:—

One afternoon I drove back from the American "dacha" with the wife of an official in the German Embassy. She told me she believed a European war inevitable, owing to the fact that the German economic system was designed for one thing and one thing alone: expansion.

"Of course, if we could get an agreement with Russia, perhaps it would serve as an outlet for us. Many people in the German Foreign Office favour it, but Hitler is so anti-Bolshevik, he won't give his consent."

"But what about the Soviets?" I said, in surprise. "Surely they wouldn't consider it?"

"Oh yes. The Russians are willing. They are afraid of coming up against Germany." That was February 1939 six months before Russia signed her non-aggression pact with Germany. At the time I didn't take the rumour seriously; too much bitterness seemed to block the way. But observers were already noting significant changes in Russia's policy. It was swinging, pendulum-like, from an aggressive policy of world revolution to a negative policy of self-defence.

That February, the Red Army discarded its path to the world proletariat, and for the first time, bound its allegiance solely to the Soviet Fatherland.

It was also noted that when Hitler attacked Czechoslovakia in his pre-Munich Nuremberg speech the Soviet press dismissed the occasion with only four lines!

What was happening? Was Russia forsaking Communism and going Fascist herself?

The answer to Russia's policy, both internal and external, both then and now, lay in one thing: those empty shops, those queues and those dark, overcrowded dwelling houses.

The struggle in which the Soviet Union was involved that winter, on the eve of its swing-over to Germany, was the same struggle upon which the country embarked in 1928 when it announced its five-year plan; namely, the struggle to industrialise a vast backward agricultural country with a mixture of dozens of nationalities and a largely primitive people.

But in 1939, the problem had become more acute than ever. Heavy industry was showing little increase, a fact which foreign engineers attributed to the workers' inability to handle highly complicated machinery; to wastage, bureaucracy, and a general lack of coordination—difficulties which were a result of an attempt to superimpose twentieth century industrialisation from above rather than let it develop gradually from below.

The Soviet Union was, discovering gradually and painfully that Marxism was not a philosophy designed for an agricultural country; it was a philosophy of distribution rather than of production. The expert engineer was proving far more important to Soviet industrialisation than the zealous party

man; and for this reason the power of the Communist Party was steadily declining. Although Communism was still the official philosophy of the nation, in 1939 the party resembled nothing so much as a vast publicity organisation to sell the Stalin regime to the worker.

These salesmen were invaluable in bolstering up the sagging morale of the people; impressing on them the iniquities of the Capitalist system and assuring them they were better off than the workers of other countries. But the Communist theory "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" had been discarded for the workable, but un-Communist, slogan "from each according to his ability, to each according to his worth."

This meant that the majority of Soviet workers and peasants were paid, not regular salaries, but by piecework and labour days.

The average worker's wage was estimated at 240 roubles A MONTH, but the minimum wage was sometimes as low as 130 roubles. The purchasing power of the rouble was roughly estimated at THREE-PENCE. (The official exchange was 25 roubles to the pound.)

Food prices were so out of proportion that if meat had been available every day (which it was not) it would have cost the average working man a quarter of his weekly salary.

The majority of workers and peasants lived on bread, which was kept at a low fixed price, on cabbage, soup and porridge. Although rents were cheap, in Moscow it was impossible for a worker to rent more than a few feet of floor-space. Sometimes three or four families shared the same room. When a Russian girl (who worked at one of the embassies), known to be unhappily married, was asked why she didn't divorce her husband, she replied that since the law forbade her to turn him out of their living quarters she was afraid he might get married again and add an extra person to an already crowded room! The important Soviet police official or bureaucrat had none of these inconveniences.

He was rewarded not only by a far larger salary than an ordinary worker, but in his ability to get a room or a flat to himself; to get vegetables and meat without standing in a queue; to have a car and chauffeur at his disposal rather than waiting endlessly for overcrowded buses. When manufactured goods appeared on the market, he had the first and usually the last choice.

Since positions of power in the Soviet Union carried with them privileges that in other countries would be considered everyday necessities of life, the struggle that went on for bureaucratic jobs was fierce and ruthless.

Although the Communist party performed an indispensable job as Stalin's "super-salesmen" they had little power in running the country. Stalin ruled and he ruled by means of the secret police. G.P.U. agents were interwoven in the fabric of every dwelling house, of every factory and village. Any rebellion or dissatisfaction with the regime was conveniently bracketed as "anti-Communist." Although the Constitution of the Soviet Government proclaimed freedom of speech, a volume issued that winter, entitled "A History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," carefully explained that disagreement equalled diversion; that diversion equalled dissension; and that dissension equalled sabotage. Thus, when it was considered advantageous to liquidate a rival it could always be done on an orthodox basis.

In view of the difficult conditions, and the fact that the Soviet Union was abandoning many Socialist principles in practice, there is little doubt that some of the old Bolsheviks came into disagreement with Stalin on methods of procedure. There even may have been plans to take the control of the government in their own hands. Since it would have been impossible for Stalin to eliminate Lenin's "old guard" on grounds of disagreement, it became necessary to fabricate stories of treason and connivance with foreign powers. It is interesting to notice that Mr. Ivanov, one of the defendants in a trial in 1938, was accused of "wrecking" by means of putting ground glass and nails in the butter. This evidence was received with immense satisfaction, as it seemed to explain the great scarcity of butter throughout the country!

The purge not only swept through Soviet political and army life, but continued like a mighty avalanche through the industrial life into the most humble home. The Russian imagination had been fired; and with ambition and envy playing a prominent part in the "denouncing" of rivals, the purge continued until it grew out of all proportion. In the winter of 1939, Yezhoff replaced Beriya as the head of the G.P.U., and there was an effort to bring it to a halt. But it was too late.

(To be continued.)

SAVING PRUSSIA

Retribution would fall, not upon the 'tribe of Isaacs' thus established in English government, but upon the unfortunate Jewish people as a whole, from the German nation that Isaacs had gone to Paris (Peace Conference) to protect. For there was no doubt in Chesterton's mind that it was his (Isaacs's) work at the Peace Conference to strive for the survival of Prussia, no matter how Europe and the rest of the Germans suffered."

—Gilbert Keith Chesterton," by Maisie Ward, p. 362.

(The Isaacs referred to is Rufus Isaacs, Lord Reading.)

NATIONAL DIVIDENDS

"Why do not the Planners plan to tame Money and domesticate it, instead of planning to worry Men?" This question, and the matter following, appears for new subscribers on a special page in "Vers Demain," the Quebec social credit paper, kindly translated for the "New Times" by Miss Marie L. Bernadou.

"We never had a shortage of production before turning to munitions and the destruction of production. But money to buy production—there was none when production was abundant. Money increased when destruction began. Money to buy comes more freely when there is less to sell. It is a criminal game. Why are all political parties satisfied with the present money system? Are they bound by the money power? Or is it easier to lead men by the nose when their pockets are empty? The Social Creditors' Electors' Union has had enough of political parties, new and old. They want free men.

"Social Credit is reasonable in saying: 'The goods are there. The need of the goods also. Money alone is short. Well, it is money that must be created. Then, so that the increased money may buy the goods that were wasting, this money must be put in the homes.'

"Hence, Social Credit proposes its dividend for everyone.

"The National Dividend—a supplementary sum of money, outside money earned in wages, distributed to every man, woman and child of the country, without any enquiry or any conditions.

"A dividend for everyone because there are goods for everyone, waiting for money in everyone's pocket. A dividend to all unconditionally. It does not mean everyone on the same level of means. Those who earn more, continue to have more.

"The latest baby in the poorest home of Quebec is co-proprietor of the Crown forests, waterfalls, social organisation, scientific and cultural inheritance, as much as the Prime Minister, or the biggest business man of the province, and has a right as much as they to a dividend on this common capital; when this common capital is productive.

"The P.M. will have 10,200 dollars, but the new-born child in the settler's hut will have a right to his 200 dollars. That is what is inspiring a whole army of men with feeling for others, resolved to drive out barbarians from Canada and place Canadian production at the disposal of Canadian families, even if the masters of Finance and their servants of the Political Parties shriek their protests."

COBURG CAMPAIGNERS GIVE A LEAD

During the Referendum campaign, Government propaganda stated that a vote for "NO" was a vote for depression, dole and chaos. "YES" advocates argued that the extra powers were needed by the Government in order to rehabilitate members of the fighting services, to avoid depression, etc. Readers of this paper who worked for a "NO" vote informed the electors, per medium of leaflets, advertisements, speeches, etc., that the statements of "YES" advocates were not true. A group of actionists in Coburg (Vic.) believe that, in view of the defeat of the Referendum proposals, many electors who voted "YES" (and some who voted "NO") are anticipating the promised (Government) depression with apprehension. We know that a depression can be avoided and that there is an alternative to the defeated proposals for Post-War Reconstruction. Such an alternative will give Security with Freedom if implemented. In an endeavour to make known to the electors the cause of depression and to place before them the alternative, a public meeting will be held at the Coburg Town Hall (Concert Hall) on Monday, September 11, at 8 p.m. Mr. Bruce H. Brown will deal with the cause of depression and Mr. F. C. Paice will place before the audience proposals for Post-War Reconstruction. What about actionists in other electorates following this example? —E. J. G.

POLICY GROUP'S EXAMPLE

Approximately 40 people were present at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Johnstone, Surrey Hills, Melbourne, on Wednesday evening, August 23, to hear Mr. Eric Butler discuss the referendum results and future activities.

Those present agreed that more attention must be paid to State members of Parliament in future. The first immediate action by the Surrey Hills Policy Group has been taken. The local State member, whose electors mostly voted "No" on August 19, is being taken to task and asked to explain why he voted for the transfer of powers by the State Government without consulting his masters. In view of the decisions by his electors, he is also being asked whether he will now reverse his attitude to the transfer of powers to the Federal Government. Should he still be in favour of the transfer, the Policy Group intends to make the matter an issue in the electorate.

We strongly recommend action along the same lines to all those democrats throughout Australia who live in State electorates, which showed a "No" majority at the referendum, if their State members supported the transfer of powers. Never has there been a more opportune time for action to establish closer contact and a correct relationship between State members and electors.

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 THIRD LETTER

Tyn Twil, Bonwm Corwen,
North Wales,
December 16, 1940.

The Rev. Dr. A. Cohen, 2
Highfield Road, Egbaston,
Birmingham.

Dear Sir, —My friend, Mr. P. R. Masson, has asked me to reply to your letter of December 9, as he himself cannot, at the moment, find the time to write the kind of reply he feels your letter deserves. He has shown me the letters exchanged between you, and has paid me the compliment of consulting me over his last letter to you.

I gather that it is your opinion (Deuteronomy vii. 4) that it is the question of religion (i.e., the adherence to Judaism) which has been uppermost in the minds of the Jewish law-givers when they framed the marital laws, and, as far as I can gather from the official Jewish works on anti-Semitism and kindred subjects, adherence or non-adherence to Judaism, orthodox or reformed, is still, in the eyes of official Jewry, what makes a man a Jew or a non-Jew. Your subsequent statement that there has been throughout history an admixture of blood with the original Jewish stock, I shall deal with later.

As I share Mr. Masson's view that we should judge a man by what he DOES, and not by the principles he PROFESSES I must admit that I cannot take seriously the view that an open profession of Judaism should be taken as the hall-mark of the genuine Jew. The history of the Dispersion shows too many wholesale "conversions" at opportune moments, as well as equally wholesale backsliding at favourable times, for such a view to be tenable.

The clearest example of what one might call the "policy of conversion" is that of the Marranos of Spain, who first gave up Judaism, then as "Catholics," or even "Protestants," entered the various countries of the old and new world, becoming leaders of the local Jewish communities as well as chief traders, bankers, diplomats, etc., of "what the Jews call the "general" communities, after which they in most cases reverted to Judaism. In some cases they stayed "converts" for generations, or even centuries, as in Portugal, where five thousand families who had been "Catholics" since the fifteenth century returned to the Judaic fold not so very long ago.

What matters is, of course, that the vast majority of the members of the Jewish race, or, if you prefer, the Jewish people, can be seen from their own histories to have carried out, in the case of the majority quite unconsciously, what one might describe as the Policy of the Jewish race.

The aim has everywhere been the same: the creation of vast, highly centralised, totalitarian Empires, or Federations, directed

by a small, mostly anonymous group, invariably members of the Jewish race. Whether they appeared before the world as bankers, merchants, owners of department stores, or industrialists, is a matter of no importance so far as the carrying out of the central POLICY is concerned.

If you will consult the Jewish Encyclopedia under such titles as "Alexander the Great," "Napoleon the Great," "Bismarck," "Bleichroeder," "Cromwell," "Manesseh ben Israel," "Disraeli," "Rothschild," "Sassoon," "Schiff," as well as "England," "Italy," "Germany," "France," "Russia," "Poland" and "Spain," to say nothing of such individual works as "Jacob Henry Schiff, Life and Letters" by Cyrus Adler, Lucien Wolf's "Essays in Jewish History" and Roth's "Jewish Contribution to Civilisation," you will find some startling evidence in support of the theory that all the "Great" military despots from that of Alexander to that of Wilhelm of Germany, as well as all the modern financial despots generally known as the "Democracies," have been sponsored by members of your people.

RUSSIA AND THE U.S.A.

In the creation of all modern Federations, especially those of Australia, South Africa, Germany of 1870, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., Jews have been pre-eminently active. In all known cases of Federation there has been a perceptible decrease of INDIVIDUAL freedom as well as a distinct increase of the power of the central government. The most extreme cases of Federation are the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., the two countries that are now, as you know, the chief depositories of Jewry. The U.S.A., like Soviet Russia, was born through a revolution. The Revolutionary War in America was "brought on" by the efforts of Benjamin Cohen, Jewish councillor and Attorney-General of Philadelphia, and a continuation of the war was made possible by subsidies from European Jews, mostly of Amsterdam, and negotiated by the New York Jew, Haym Solomon. The Anglo-American war of 1812 was financed by the same agencies, the richest man in New York being the Jew, Hendricks. The Civil War, which once and for all disposed of the right of the individual States to secede from the Union, was financed by Messrs. Seligmann of New York, who "obtained all the American and European finance available for the Civil War." Then begins the epoch of Jacob Schiff of Frankfurt. His firm, Kuhn, Loeb and Co. (like the Warburgs, etc., in Germany), obtained control of many of the railways and pursued with great energy the work of making the whole economic life of the Union dependent upon the central money trust. In this work he was ably assisted by the "Gentile" banking house of Morgan, and to what extent he succeeded was seen in the findings of the Pujio Commission appointed by the U.S. Government to look into the activities

*Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge.

"DEAN CASE INQUIRY" IN MELBOURNE

(Continued from page 1.)

was he who had selected the persons to be called, and I subsequently learned that he had made his choice from a list supplied by the Security Service. This suggests that all those who can be roped in under the general term of "monetary reformer" had better watch out. We were not the only ones on the "list." We were "selected" from it! You may recall that towards the end of 1942 this same "Security" Service sought to have the New World Reconstruction Movement purged of its association with the bad men of "The New Times" and the United Electors of Australia. My letter to the Attorney-General on that particular effort has already been published, and those who were present in the Court were quickly made aware that "The New Times" and the U.E.A. were to receive far more attention from the "K.C. assisting the Board" than Angus Dean or the merits of his case before the High Court.

Notwithstanding my previous experience with what is called the "Security Service," I was amazed as I saw and heard the plan of the "King's Counsel assisting the Board" unfold.

To me it was a deliberate attempt to spread the idea that monetary reformers were acting subversively or allowing themselves to be used by subversive persons;

ERIC BUTLER TO SPEAK AT TEMPERANCE HALL

(Russell Street, Melbourne),
Sunday, September 10, 7.45 p.m.

Subject: "Can Australia Win the Peace?"

The Referendum has been defeated; what now? Hear the Answer on Sunday Night.

—Authorised by the No Conscriptio Campaign.

Page 4 — "New Times," September 8, 1944

that they were connected with men of pro-Japanese and Pacifist sympathies, and that they were actively playing "the Nazi game."

In the cast of the first three witnesses, Mr. Alderman tried to get them to admit that they were sympathetic to Japan and against the war; that they were believers in "monetary reform"; and that they were directly connected with the "New Times," which he described as a monetary reform newspaper working against the Jews.

The last two witnesses were brought specially from camps of internment. Both were Germans and both were interested in "monetary reform." One said he understood Social Credit and believed in it, but the other was a believer in the ideas propounded by Silvio Gesell. Believe it or not the ill-informed and intimidatory King's Counsel "assisting the Board" did not know that there was any difference between the two! When asked to give the names of the "monetary reformers" in South Australia with whom he had associated before the war, one of these witnesses protested that an internee should not be asked to do that, as all the persons concerned were men of the highest character, loyal Australians, and very pro-British.

The evidence of these two internees provided an anti-climax to what appeared to those in Court to be a most reprehensible plan designed to connect loyal Australians of irreproachable character with activities of interned enemy aliens. The infamous idea was to sandwich the "evidence" of men connected with the "New Times" between that of the witnesses referred to, so that the background and the foreground would both be of the right type to create the impression desired.

Next week, Mr. Editor, I hope to mention the part I was called upon to play in the "inquiry" as one of the witnesses.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2,
3rd September 1944.

of the money-ring, before which Mr. Schiff, with Messrs. Morgan, had to appeal. (1913.)

The Russo-Japanese war was almost exclusively financed through the efforts of Mr. Schiff (vide "Life and Letters"), and the Russian Revolution of 1905 was equally made possible through "Western" finance (vide Francois Coty: "Financiers who sport with the World"). The two Russian revolutions of 1917, which brought an end to the Russian Empire and native Russian culture and resulted in the emancipation of the vast Russian Jewries, were directly financed by Messrs. Schiff and Warburg in collaboration.

For the part played by Jewish leaders in the bringing about of the chief results of the last war—namely, the League of Nations, the financial subjugation of Great Britain, and the Russian Revolution, I can refer you to the "Letters" of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice (British Ambassador to Washington during the last war), the work "Geneva versus Peace" by the Comte de St. Aulaire (French Ambassador to the Court of St. James), and to "One Hundred Red Days," by Edgar Sisson, President Wilson's representative in Russia during 1917.

With regard to the actual FINANCING of the Russian Revolution I would refer you to American State Papers Document Catalogue Volume 14, P.2050, and as regards the participation of individual Jews in the actual uprising see British White Paper "Russia I, 1919," containing a warning against Bolshevism to the powers of the world, by His Excellency M. Oudendyke, the Netherlands Ambassador to St. Petersburg.

So much for the creation of the two largest Federations of the world, the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

I think it is a complete mistake to imagine that there is any essential difference in the economic systems of the two countries, just because one is CALLED "Capitalist" and the other "Communist." If we examine the facts we shall find that from the very inception of the Soviet State there has been intimate BUSINESS connection between the two Unions, although diplomatic relations, diplomatically enough, were not resumed until many years later. If you will turn to the Encyclopedia Britannica under "Russia, New Financial Policies," you will find:—

"The State Bank was established in 1921 and given authority to issue bank notes as well as to serve as a credit institution . . . THE ROUBLE WAS THUS GIVEN ITS PRE-WAR GOLD EQUIVALENT."

In other words, the Jewish system of finance—i.e., the issue of credit based on gold, was adopted by the "new" and "proletarian" country as obediently as by all the other "Capitalist" countries. The link between the two largest Federations in the world is, fittingly enough, the ruling Jewish financial house of the world, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and when members of the families of Warburg, Kahn, etc., visit the Soviet capital they are received with royal pomp, the Soviet troops (whose caps are adorned with the five-pointed Star of David) presenting arms as they pass.

(To be continued.)

¶Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge.

GERMAN REPARATIONS

Major C. H. Douglas recently sent the following letter to Mr. David Kirkwood, a Member of the British House of Commons:

Dear Sir, —I have read your request to the Prime Minister that no reparations or indemnities either in kind or money should be extracted from the Germans "which would be injurious to trade or employment" as after the last war.

The implication of your question is perhaps the most mischievous suggestion, which it would be possible to make at this juncture. The idea that the population of this country should be made to do work which has been caused by German enemy action, instead of making Germans do it, can only be described as the delirium of Socialist politics, and as a demonstration of the complete misconception of your duties as an M.P., which do not include the care of German interests.

If you had taken the trouble to look at the figures, you would have been able to convince yourself that it was not Germany, but Great Britain and France upon whom the payments for reparations fell most heavily, and that the depression which succeeded the armistice was the direct result of the policy of deflation announced by the Government in May, 1920, and regarded by our only Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer, Viscount Snowden, together with all orthodox financial policy, as being inspired by principles for which he had the highest admiration, but no understanding of their meaning.

If you have any comment to make which would modify your question as reported, I shall be happy to consider it, as I propose to ensure that your opinion is not allowed to pass unnoticed.

—Yours faithfully, C. H. DOUGLAS.
June 9, 1944.

SMUTS, JEWS AND GERMANS

"Weizmann [Zionist leader] went to Smuts, the Christian, who welcomed him with enthusiasm. 'One of the great objects for which we fight this war,' said Smuts, 'is to provide a national home for the Jewish people.' . . . Smuts, German in his outlook, said, 'I look upon the Germans as the most cultured race in the world.'"

—"Grey Steel; F. C. Smuts, a Study in Arrogance," by Captain H. C. Armstrong, pp. 301-316.

DEATH OF MR. G. E. TRENOWETH

It is with the deepest regret that we record the death, which occurred last week, of Mr. G. E. Trenoweth, of Swan Hill, and formerly of Melbourne.

Mr. Trenoweth helped to found the "New Times," and was a director of New Times Limited for about two years after the paper commenced publication. In those days he also did a great amount of very valuable work as organising secretary of the Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria. An earlier activity was the founding of the Goodwill Group, an important "discussion group" consisting of somewhat divergent elements kept in harmonious association and even useful co-operation by his unostentatious diplomacy and organising genius. In previous years he had been very active in the Labor Party—in fact, his interest in social problems began at a very early age. This was no merely academic interest, no mere hobby of the parlour reformer; but a deep human sympathy with the under-dog, unrelenting hostility to tyranny and injustice, and, above all, an untiring determination to DO something intelligent and effective, however unspectacular, toward combating the evils he saw around him. It was an interest that endured to the end; as witness an unfinished letter to Dr. John Dale, of Melbourne, written a day before his death and forwarded by his daughter. Like many another, he did not live to see all his most cherished reforms in operation; but he achieved much that has already born fruit and much that will do so ere long. That is an invisible monument that few men have earned, and it is something that calls for the deep gratitude of those who now carry the torch onward over less stony ground. His relatives and close friends are not alone in mourning the passing of one whose fine and endearing personal qualities were no less great than the quality of his citizen ship. —H. F. A.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' headquarters, 17 Weymouth Street, Adelaide.)

Subscriptions: Many past members have not yet renewed their membership fee for this year. To these people we would like to point out that the membership fee is one guinea, which became payable on the 1st July. We shall be glad if those who intend to renew will do so as soon as possible in order to save the time of executive officers. We should also like to point out that we are always open to receive donations. Anyone who feels that we are doing a good job, but does not wish to become actively associated with us, could materially assist us by making a donation to our funds.

General Meeting on September 13: -We wish to remind members that a General Meeting has been called for this date, to be held in our rooms commencing at 8 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to map out a plan of campaign for forming Voters' Policy Associations. We urge you to make a special effort to be present at this meeting, as your Secretariat consider now is the time, when politics are generally in a state of flux and citizens are looking for a way out, to put our ideas before them.

Books to Read: We have available and can recommend the following:—"The Answer to Socialism," by C. Barclay-Smith.

Price 2/6. "The Story of the Common wealth Bank," by D. J. Amos. Price 1/3. "Social Credit the Only New Order," by Wm. Stones. Price 6d. (All plus 1d post age.) —F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

ERIC BUTLER AT COLAC

Colac supporters are to be congratulated on the meeting they organised for Mr. Eric Butler to address on Friday, August 25. There was a much larger attendance than at any pre-referendum meeting. Mr. Butler was given an enthusiastic hearing and his outline of how local policy groups should be formed and efforts made to give State members more support in their fight against the demands of the Federal Government, was well received. Mr. Butler reports having had a long and interesting discussion with the local State member, who believes that the State Governments now "have the ball at their feet" if the electors will support them.

SOCIAL CREDIT TALKS

Mr. P. M. Ireland has resumed his talks on Social Credit, and will be speaking on Wednesday night, September 13, at the headquarters of the Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, Room 8, 1st Floor, "The Block," Elizabeth St., Melbourne. "New Times" readers are invited to attend and bring their friends.

THE "NEW TIMES" IS OBTAINABLE AT ALL AUTHORISED NEWSAGENTS

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