

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. 39. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, SEPT. 29, 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.

"No" Advocate Takes Up Curtin's Challenge Alternative To Federal Powers

It will be remembered that Mr. Curtin, commenting on the defeat of the Government's proposals at the recent referendum, challenged advocates of a "No" vote to come forward with alternative "plans." Of course, it is not the function of citizens to provide technical "blueprints"; but, not wishing to allow Mr. Curtin the alibi that the referendum result tied the Government's hands in regard to post-war prosperity, Mr. F. C. Paice, who conducted an independent "No" campaign in Victoria, has forwarded proposals which lay down certain principles and outline their application:—

28 Belgrave Street,
East Coburg, N.13,
September 18th, 1944.

Rt. Hon. John Curtin, M.H.R., Prime
Minister, Parliament House, Canberra,
A.C.T.

Dear Sir,—As an elector who voted and worked for a "No" vote and in response to your invitation to such persons to put forward their proposals, I humbly but most earnestly submit the enclosed, trusting that you and your colleagues will give them your serious attention.

I would indeed be grateful to you for an expression of opinion.

—Yours sincerely, P. C. PAICE.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION.

The results of the Referendum show that the majority of the Australian people do not approve of the Government's Post-War Reconstruction plans and proposals. This does not mean that the people want more depressions, more tax or inflation. The average Australian desires individual freedom up to the point where such impinges upon the freedom of his fellows. He desires reasonable security, with opportunities to choose his vocation. He desires shorter hours of labour without reduction in income. He desires that his income shall not be unduly reduced by taxation and rising prices. He desires also, that when he and his fellows have, with the aid of machinery and the application of science to industry produced an abundance of goods and services, that he shall not be pushed aside, without the means to purchase that which he has produced, while the goods and services are allowed to rot or are destroyed.

It is reported that, as a result of sustained pressure, the Labor Caucus is to consider the reconstruction of the Commonwealth Bank Board. But it should be noted that there is no suggestion of any fundamental change of financial POLICY, which is far more important than the SET-UP of the Board. Unless pressure is maintained, the Labor Party will merely make some alteration of personnel or administrative set-up—which would be meaningless by itself. What is required is that the financial needs of the people shall be met, in accordance with physical realities, and that these needs shall be determined by known and recognisable factors, NOT by the arbitrary notions of the Treasurer or Party of the day. The policy must also include provision of some unconditional income for all the people as individuals, in addition to that which comes through industry.

REFUGEE REACTIONS: Westbrook Peglet, of the New York "World," has this to say about certain immigrants: "There is much biographical data to prove that many who came to America shortly before the first world war, for asylum from European tyranny, did not join the American youths in destroying those tyrants, but joined alien groups and movements and tried to destroy the American system instead." It was to prevent such a situation that our "White Australia" policy was designed, and we should keep a weather eye on all who endeavour to undermine it; also on those advocates of mass migration of incompatible European refugees, particularly when the

The Sinister Aspect

... But the most sinister aspect of the situation is what is being plotted behind closed doors—to establish an international authority possessing control of finance, of international trade, of aerial transport, and the armed forces.

"If such an absolute power is ever centralised in an international authority, it will be a worse tyranny than the world has ever experienced in the course of its history—the end of human liberty, the end of the limited democracy we have, the end of everything dear to us.

"Yet this monstrous thing is taking shape from month to month as we draw near to the victorious end of the war."

—Hon. Solon E. Low, national leader of the Social Credit Association of Canada. (Translated from "Vers Demain" by Marie L. Bernadou.)

The following proposals would make possible the attainment of these desires, as they provide for:

- (1.) Shorter hours of labour without reduction of income.
- (2.) Freedom to choose his own vocation.
- (3.) Prevention of depressions.
- (4.) Progressive reduction of taxation.
- (5.) Prevention of inflationary rise in prices.
- (6.) A rising standard of living, limited only by the people's ability to produce and consume.

THE PROPOSALS.

Shorter Hours: Hours of labour should be reduced to thirty per week immediately after the war ends. Whilst this will not, of itself, provide opportunities of employment to all returning service men and munition workers, it would be a first step in that direction. As shortening the hours of labour will increase the labour costs of production, and as shorter hours on lower wages will reduce the standard of living, any resultant increase in this cost would be made up by subsidy from the Federal Government, paid either to the employer or direct to the employee, and would not be included in prices as a cost in production.

Note: The principle of subsidising producers is well established in most countries, including Australia.

Freedom to Choose Own Vocation: The stimulus given to industry by more people possessing the means to buy, by the foregoing proposal, would increase the demand for goods and services, opening up many and varied opportunities of employment from which to choose, for some years to come.

latter are obsessed with a "herrenvolk" or "chosen race" theory, which in itself prevents harmonious relationships and their assimilation.

ALDERMAN'S ACTIVITIES: Mr. H. G. Alderman, the Adelaide K.C. whose conduct at the recent Inquiry into the "Dean Case" caused considerable criticism, has also been under fire in connection with the alleged political bribery and corruption surrounding the sale of radio stations 5KA (Adelaide) and 2HD (Newcastle). According to the "Age" of September 21, Mr. R. G. Menzies demanded a Royal Commission, because "the transaction undermines honest administration in this country." It also transpires that Mr. Alderman has been acting for the Government at Victoria Barracks in regard to the settlement of difficulties over Service Hirings. Much more may be heard about this person who is apparently so highly esteemed and frequently employed by the powers-that-be.

WOOL WORRIES: American reports on wool reserves say that the U.S. have a reserve of 1,300,000,000 lbs., and the British Government also has a reserve of 600,000,000 lbs in America. According to the reports, such reserves constitute a "threat to the post-war wool market." Australian wool stored in U.S. is apparently being sold to U.S. mills, causing "concern" among sheep men. Under a sane financial system, sane people would regard this surplus as a blessing, not as a threat.

U.N.R.R.A.: Although there was no official confirmation that a branch office of U.N.R.R.A. would be established here, a (Continued on page 2.)

Reduction of Taxation: The Commonwealth Government could, by making full use of its financial powers under Section 51 of the present Constitution, instruct the Commonwealth Bank Board to draw up a National Balance Sheet, and, from the Credit Account, provide it with debt-free credit (based upon the country's ability to produce) with which to meet the costs of national works and social services. As the need for national borrowing thus progressively disappeared, so could taxation be reduced. Taxation does not pay for social services, for national works or for war; it mainly pays the interest charges on borrowed money.

Prevention of Depressions: As industry cannot pay out in wages, salaries and dividends, sufficient money to buy the whole of its production, with the application of science and power to production (so that one man with a machine does the work of many), it is not long before an abundance of goods is produced for which there is no market (people with money to buy). The producer naturally cannot keep on producing things he cannot sell, and he is forced to lay men off, still further reducing his market. As he cannot sell, he cannot meet his costs, such as bank overdrafts, etc., and even if the banks were willing to advance further money on loan, he naturally declines to borrow further until he sees prospects of selling his goods. Thus this thing snowballs until the abundance is destroyed, rotted or in some way disap-

pears, and then the slow climb out of the depression begins. Modern depressions are caused by financial poverty, not physical poverty. As machines displace people from industry, money must be given to the people to enable the product of the machine to be bought, in order to avoid depressions. The difference between total incomes and total prices must be distributed in equal parts to every man, woman and child, as a subsidised income without becoming a cost in production, or partly as such and partly as a subsidy in return for reduced prices of goods for sale.

Prevention of Rise in Prices (Inflation): Whilst the foregoing proposals would not justify increasing prices, yet experience shows that prices would be increased unless something is done to prevent it. There would be no compulsion, but traders, producers and retailers would be invited to enter into an agreement to work on an agreed percentage of profit on turnover, and to sell at (say) 25% below cost; this 25% to be reimbursed by the Government. Thus more purchasing power is made available: prices are reduced. Note: The principle of subsidising to keep prices down has been established in Great Britain during the war. The only difference between such subsidies and the proposed ones being that in Great Britain they are paid from borrowed moneys, whereas these would be paid from debt-free credit.

Radio Monopoly Broken in Canada

Social Credit M.P. Inaugurates "Community" Broadcasts

The following was broadcast by Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., from the House of Commons, Ottawa, on May 22:—

This broadcast is sponsored by the Community Radio Stations of Canada. It marks the birth of a new idea—the idea that members of Parliament should be given some free time on the radio in order to discuss, public affairs. I believe this idea to be of fundamental importance because, if democratic government is to continue, close personal contact must be maintained between the people and their Parliament.

In the past the public depended almost entirely on their members for political information. But these days, with a radio in every home, people listen to commentators who do not represent the listeners, and who are in no way responsible to them. In other words, the paid salesmen and agents of unknown interests enter every home, while responsible Members of Parliament remain outside the door.

The fact is, radio has revolutionised the means of propaganda—and is being exploited to the full by commentators who broadcast for unknown, but organised minorities.

And, until now, members of Parliament—the responsible agents of the unorganised majority of people—have been barred from the air, if only for reasons of expense. So that, if you want to hear your member give an account of his actions in Parliament, you must attend a public meeting at some hall, perhaps miles away. I am not saying we can do away with public meetings, but I do suggest that an annual local meeting is not enough these days—too much is happening in the world. And, naturally, you prefer to stay at home, to turn on the radio, and listen in comfort, rather than travel to a meeting in order to hear an account of public business. That, of course, is your privilege, but you can be sure of this, if you do not look after your business, other people will take advantage of your lack of interest. It's all very well to talk about the duties of members of Parliament and to criticise their shortcomings, but did you ever put yourself in their places? Did you ever ask yourself how long you would continue to worry yourself about public business if the public showed little interest, either in you or in your handling of their affairs? Well, before you criticise Parliament and its members, let me ask—do you not owe a duty to yourself as a free citizen?

Surely, you should at least let your members know what you think, and what you want. You owe that much to yourself, as well as to your member, who has a right to be heard—if he is to be of real service to you.

I therefore welcome, and want to thank the sponsors for this opportunity of speaking to the people whom I represent. This broadcast is merely the first of a series in which every Member of Parliament will be given an opportunity to speak to his constituents at least once a month. It is hoped that it will be possible to build up a radio audience big enough to justify the extension of the plan to weekly broadcasts. But that depends on you as well as on me. If you are interested—and I hope you will be—tell your friends, write to this station,

and don't forget to let me have your opinions and suggestions.

As I have said, this broadcast has nothing to do with the C.B.C.—it is sponsored by private concerns in the public interest. And this is a good time to tell you something about Radio Broadcasting, which is being discussed in a committee of Parliament.

As you know, radio in Canada is controlled by a public utility—the C.B.C. This control is supposed to be impartial in the interests of truth, free speech, and the free exchange of ideas. But, there are increasing complaints that the services of the C.B.C. are being more and more used for "leftist," that is, for Socialist and Communist, propaganda.

It is charged that the chief adviser to the C.B.C. on "Talks," and the like, is a Communist. It is stated that the C.B.C. is honeycombed by "Communism." That the chief adviser on talks is the new chairman of the Writers', Broadcasters' and Artists' War Council. That five of the seven branches of that Council were personally organised by a member of Tim Buck's national executive.

If this be true, and it has yet to be proved untrue, it is a most serious, even (Continued on page 2.)

Two Labour Budgets

The outstanding figure in the Budget of New Zealand, submitted to Parliament during the first week of August, is the increase in interest on the Public Debt of that Dominion from £12,362,529 to £17,552,149, a jump of nearly 50 p.c., amounting to 1/6 per head per week for every man, woman and child in Maoriland.

The outstanding figures in the Budget Speech by Mr. Chifley, Federal Treasurer of Australia, delivered in the second week of August, were set out by him as follows: "The aggregate public debt of the Commonwealth and the States at 30th June, 1944 amounted to £2,366,858,000, of which £1,476,038,000 is Commonwealth and £890,760,000 State debt. The increase of £369,200,000 in Commonwealth debt for the year is due to the war."

—Hobart "Voice," Sept 16

GERMAN-JEWISH IDEAS THREATEN US

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

(Continued from issue of September 8.)

Australian soldiers played a vital and distinguished part in the defeat of the German armed forces during the 1914-18 war. But the German-Jewish fifth column of that war was thoroughly entrenching itself in British countries under war conditions. This was accomplished principally by the banking system organised on an international scale.

The German-Jewish bankers struck a deadly blow at Britain almost immediately the Germans had been beaten, and many soldiers who fought the Germans on the field of battle have placed it on record that they endured worse conditions during the worst depression years than they did during the war. Here in Australia, only twelve years after we had played a big part in defeating the Germans, two German financiers, Niemeyer and Guggenheimer, arrived and told Australians that they had to accept a coolie standard of living because, they said, our financial position was "unsound."

Those two Germans, as a result of financial dictatorship, (did as much damage in Australia as a German panzer division.

These two foreigners were more than a match for the Federal Government and the whole of the Australian people. They were responsible for appalling misery and suffering, which drove many thousands to take their own lives in despair. And this great tragedy was forced on us at a time when we were producing, or willing to produce, an abundance of everything for every man, woman and child in Australia. But this did not matter to Niemeyer and Guggenheimer, who said that the money system was much more important than human beings and real wealth.

Do Australians want to see the German-Jewish financial dictatorship continue? It certainly will unless we fight hard, not only on the military front, but also on the home front. It was on the home front that the last peace was lost. There is no excuse for a repetition of this defeat again.

But sinister things are happening. Already we read alarming news about proposals for an international bank being established and a return to the gold standard. It is also being suggested that the entire world must be planned by one central authority, and that peace can only be maintained by an international armed force. That is exactly what the German planners did in Germany: one strong central Government, with all the armed force, planning the whole of Germany. Now it is proposed that this German idea be extended on a world scale.

I have no doubt that the proposed international Government could maintain world peace—the same type of "peace" as the Germans experienced under Hitler!

The big German-Jewish financiers in America and elsewhere are bent on bringing to fruition a dream they have had for a long time. They saw their ideas perfected in the German laboratory; now they see them being taken to all parts of the world.

I have already mentioned the London School of Economics. Guggenheimer has been a prominent professor at this school, the nursery of German ideas in the British Empire.

It will be recalled that Guggenheimer's orders to Australians back in 1930 had the full support of Sir Keith Murdoch and his newspapers. Sir Keith is also a product of the London School of Economics, so it was not surprising that during the recent Referendum campaign he advocated that Australians should vote for adopting the German idea of centralised government in Australia.

Dr. Evatt is, of course, a friend of the German-Jewish bankers and planners in America; he even used words by Bernard Baruch (the Jew who leads the "unofficial super-Cabinet" and has placed it on record that he was the virtual dictator of America during the last war) to support his referendum arguments. Dr. Evatt is also a friend of the Jew, Professor Harold Laski, a prominent teacher at the London School of Economics. Laski says that socialism can never be introduced in Britain until the Monarchy is removed!

Two other well-known planners in Australia who are keen to see Australians give up some of their liberties in exchange for "security," just as the Germans did, are Dr. Coombs, Director-General of Post-War Reconstruction, and his associate, Dr. Lloyd Ross.

This clever little trick of trying to get people to give up their liberties in exchange for "security" is not only being tried in Australia. The London School of Economics pumps its German-Jewish ideas out all over the English-speaking world.

In Britain, Sir William Beveridge drew up a "security" plan, but the people were not told about certain clauses in the Beveridge Plan, clauses which are undoubtedly designed to place the individual citizen at the complete mercy of a soulless State bureaucracy.

The well-known English publicist, Mr. Douglas Reed, has pointed out that the Beveridge Plan shows remarkable similarity to the Prussian "security" plan of Bismarck's time.

Sir William Beveridge has been a "big shot" of the London School of Economics for many years.

Canada's main planner, Dr. Marsh, is a product of the London School of Economics. The head of the Canadian Federal Government's Consulting Committee of Post-War

Reconstruction, Dr. Cyril James, also wears the "old school tie." The Governor of the Bank of Canada, Graham Towers, has as his right hand man, Louis Raminsky, grandson of a Jewish refugee, another product of the German nursery, the London School of Economics.

The American Plan of "Social Security" for National Recovery has been drawn up by a Dr. Burns, a product of the London School of Economics.

A perusal of the above facts should convince thoughtful citizens that ideas being introduced by products of the London School of Economics need careful examination.

Speaking in the British House of Commons on June 7 of this year, Mr. Austin Hopkinson, made the following pertinent observation:

"Every day we get a little closer to the position existing in Germany, the position existing in Italy, and the position existing in Russia, and adopt one after another the principles of the totalitarian States. I think historians will say, if we go on as we are going with our present policy, that the enemy, even if he is defeated in the field, will have won the war because he will have forced us to adopt all those principles of

Radio Monopoly Broken in Canada

(Continued from page 1.)

alarming, state of affairs. For this is exactly the way that democracy has been undermined, and destroyed in other countries—by its enemies obtaining hidden control of propaganda. Now, of course I believe in free speech, and I would defend the Communist rights to their freedom of speech, but these C.B.C. Communist talks are not advertised, or sponsored, as such. This propaganda is disguised as education for democracy in the New Order, or the "Shape of Things to Come" and the like.

The same is true of the motion pictures. No doubt many of you saw a film called "Mission to Moscow," which was advertised as the truth. About a year ago two prominent Americans wrote a letter about this picture to the "New York Times." E. J. Dewey, and Suzanne LaFollette had been in Russia as chairman and secretary of the international mission of inquiry into the Moscow trials. Let me quote from their letter:—

"The film, 'Mission to Moscow,' is the first instance in our country of totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption—a propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission or pure invention of facts, and whose effect can only be to confuse the public in its thoughts and loyalties. The film is anti-British, anti-Congress, anti-democratic and anti-truth. It deepens that crisis in morals which is the fundamental issue in the modern world. 'Mission to Moscow' is a major defeat for the democratic cause. It assails the very foundations of freedom. For truth and freedom are indivisible, as Hitler knew when he expounded his method of confusing public opinion through propaganda. The picture, 'Mission to Moscow,' makes skilful use of the Hitler technique. This kind of 'truth' is on the march, and God help us if nothing can stop it."

I did not see the film. But let me ask you this: How is it proposed to build the four freedoms on a foundation of falsehoods, when truth and freedom are indivisible? Is it not written: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." I would advise you to examine all propaganda, all proposals for a new order—for a new world—from the point of view that truth and freedom are indivisible.

Ask yourself two questions. Is it the truth? If not, then it will destroy liberty. Does it propose to bring about a better world for curtailing liberty? If so, it is not the truth. But instead of the truth we have "Propaganda to confuse the public in its thoughts and loyalties. Totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption. This kind of truth is on the march and God help us if nothing can stop it."

In a letter to the chairman of the radio Committee of Parliament, a loyal Canadian citizen states:—

"In the name of the vast multitude of Canadians who are alarmed at the present abuses of the radio system for which they pay, I wish to protest. This system, in the guise of education, is being used to destroy our hopes of freedom. In particular I wish to protest against such programmes as 'Of Things to Come.' Certain commentators always colour their remarks to re-lect the glory of Stalin and slyly to belittle British institutions. They appear to be concerned mainly with the future security of Stalin and the spread of world Communism."

Now, please understand, I do not quote this against Russians. What they do in Russia is not the concern of Canadians, but of the Russian people. You do not need me to remind you of Russia's epic struggle

his against which we are supposed to be fighting."

In case some people should be a little doubtful about the danger of our succumbing to German ideas (whether they be introduced by the "Right" or the "Left," whether they be applied by the German-Jewish international financial system or by the German-Jewish socialist planning) would do well to read carefully the following statement made by the representative of the German-Jewish bankers in Germany, Dr. Schacht:—

"Germany is going to win in the end. Bit by bit, the so-called democracies will be forced into adopting the totalitarian system, which exists in Germany—the State control of every activity of human life. War conditions will push them deeper and deeper into the mire, and at the end of the war they will not be able to get out again, just as Germany cannot. But mark this distinction between Germany and the democracies: Germany will have had the advantage of having practised that system for years and of having gained that experience which the democracies lack. Therefore, the democracies, when they become totalitarian States, will be at a great disadvantage and will go under."

Surely the British people are not going to prove Dr. Schacht's contentions correct. Let us immediately start to expose those groups, institutions and individuals who preach German-Jewish ideas in our midst. Let us draw encouragement from our British tradition of self-government; let us develop the idea that we can solve all our problems without aping the nation we are defeating militarily; let us assert confidently that we believe in the sanctity of the individual and the idea that he should be supreme above all institutions, political or financial.

against Germany, but is that any reason why we should be asked to believe that Russia is more efficient and more democratic than we are when, in point of fact, Russia is a totalitarian dictatorship—whatever it may become in the future. That is the TRUTH, and it is time people realised that subversive elements in Canada, and elsewhere, are using the Russian army as a means of propaganda to undermine confidence in Canadian ideals and institutions. And such is the gall of these subversive elements; they label anyone who opposes this Communist propaganda as a Fascist, anti-Semite, or some such name. Last year, in the House of Commons, while criticising proposals for such an international bank and a world currency based on gold, I named some of the chief international financiers and quoted from a certain book containing these very same proposals, which undoubtedly would destroy the sovereign freedoms of the Canadian people.

At once I was denounced as an anti-Semite by the Vancouver Labour Council in a statement carried by the Canadian Press. This "Labour" Council demanded that my speech be stricken from "Hansard" and that I be forbidden ever to repeat it. And who control this Vancouver Council. Well, I have the written authority of the Minister of Justice to say:—

"These persons mentioned are, according to information I have, and believe to be reliable, prominent Communists."

So, here is a Communist organisation, under the guise of a Labour Council libelling, trying to intimidate a member of Parliament and demanding that he be silenced in the House of Commons itself. And for what reason? Because in criticising a scheme of international control by the gold standard, I named the chief international financiers as follows:—the Rothschilds, Sassoons, Kuhns, Loeb, Montefiores, Warburgs, Sieffs, Niemeyers, Sieppmans, Fruhlings, Cassells, Strakosches, Schroeders, Baruchs, Schusters, Cohens, Bleichroders, Kleinhorts, Kahns, etc.

Well, there they are, or at least some of them, all well-known names, and I put it to you—Are you willing to place the control of the world, including Canada, in the hands of these financiers, not one of whom is a Canadian? And now, perhaps, you will understand why the Socialists introduced Bill 37, whose purpose is:—

"to prevent public utterances, or dissemination of material calculated, or likely to cause discrimination or disharmony on account of race or religion. The intention of the Bill is to make such action unlawful in the interests of unity and harmony."

If it becomes law Communists and other subversive elements could hide behind the Bill, defy opposition, and prosecute any critic for causing disharmony on account of race or religion.

The introduction of this Socialist Bill has stirred up general opposition, and members of Parliament have received hundreds of petitions protesting the Bill, and denouncing it as a threat to our freedom of speech.

Now, why should Communism resent criticism of international financiers and their gold standard? Is there a bond between international finance and international Communism? You think that is absurd? Well, don't forget what Bismarck said to Karl Marx—"We march separately, but we conquer together."

But that is a story for another day. The Bank Act is now before the committee of Banking and Commerce and, as one of its members, I shall deal with Finance, the gold standard and international dictatorship in my next broadcast.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

Deputy Director of that body (United Nations' Belief and Rehabilitation Administration), along with a Mr. Rolf Nugent, recently arrived here in this connection—so, apparently they just blew in, so to speak, off their own bat. They opened up their propaganda with the usual visitors' blather to the effect that "Australia was regarded as the world's greatest democracy, which had proved so successful at solving her own political and economic problems that she can also solve other nation's problems." And, of course, they introduced the blessed "sacrifice" which we would be happy to bear! These fellows will need some watching. Incidentally, concurrent with their arrival a Bill to commit Australia to the World Food Bank idea has been announced. These fellows certainly blew in at the right time!

PRICES PLAN: The Melbourne "Herald" of August 23 tells us "it is practically certain that another attempt will be made to obtain a Federal power to control prices, and certain other economic powers to meet post-war problems." In the same issue of the "Herald" we find this: "Ministers admit that most of the other Commonwealth postwar plans can be carried out by collaboration with the States." This was strenuously denied before the Referendum. As for price control, there's no sensible reason why this (if necessary) cannot also be taken care of by agreement between States; but the term "prices control" is much too vague—besides, judging from results to date, this control is unlikely to be acceptable to the community. Consumers are mainly interested in values, and price is only one factor.

TRAIN TROUBLE: Scores of members of the R.A.A.F., soldiers and naval men were recently fined for travelling on "our" trains without tickets—most of them were fined 20/- with 4/- costs. One soldier gave the excuse that he only had 1/6 to last him to payday, and so he decided to risk riding without a ticket. Well, if the "publicly-owned" railways are part of the system, which these members of the services are fighting for, they probably won't mind paying twice. It is when we try to use "our" railways without a ticket that we find out who really does not own the railways. Obviously it would be stupid to pay for rides on conveyances, which we owned. It just goes to show what a myth this "common ownership" really is.

HEROES' HOMES: While the Professors are making more Plans, "the wife of a returned soldier has been living with her three sons in a room in a relative's house, and she is waiting to go into hospital again." (Melb. "Herald," August 7). Thousands of people are in similar circumstances. Yet the planners are still determined to prevent anyone from obtaining enough building materials and permits to get on with building houses, while the planners prattle about plans. What is required is the removal of the restrictions, which are preventing houses from being built. Meanwhile, Cr. Crespin is featured in the same issue of the "Herald" as advocating the erection of two magnificent monuments to remind future citizens (if any) of great men such as Churchill and Roosevelt. Presumably space will be let in the monuments to the homeless heroes.

SUNSHINE SKILL: A wonderful array of works of art—all leisure-time creations by workers from the Sunshine Harvester Works—was recently displayed to the Melbourne public. They consisted of oils, water-colours, pen and pencil drawings, photographic studies and extensive exhibits of crafts and hobbies such as model aircraft, shopping "jeeps," etc. The talent was indeed outstanding, and illustrated in a striking manner just what latent cultural attributes could be developed—if greater leisure-time was available. But the Planners are obsessed so much with the work mania that, if they have their way, these cultural possibilities will not be realised. These warped minds regard work as more important than life and living.

U.S. UNCERTAINTY: According to the American "Institute of Public Opinion," there is considerable questioning in U.S. on the post-war intentions of the Soviet Socialists. The latest "Gallup Poll" taken on this question shows that 39% are prepared to trust them, while 37% say "No," and 24% reserve judgment. It is also stated that this doubt as to the Soviet ruling-class's intentions is one main reason why U.S. opinion is sharply divided on the idea of a permanent military alliance with Moscow, similar to that proposed between Britain and U.S. for after the war. The latter was favoured by 61% and that with China by 58%.

PACIFIC PLANS: A Washington report says: "The probability that the United States will insist on exercising complete military authority in New Guinea and New Caledonia as well as in other French and British territories in the Pacific has been deduced by leading diplomatic correspondents from President Roosevelt's speech yesterday" (Melb. "Herald," Aug. 8). No indication is given as to whether or not Britains or Australia's or France's views on this matter have been deduced. However, we are led to believe that Japan will be rendered impotent as a future enemy, so WHERE'S the pretext for grabbing these islands for which Australian soldiers were the first to take up the fight, and many of whose graves there can be identified by thousands of white crosses?

—O.B.H.

WICKEDNESS OF THE HUMAN HEART?

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

Sir, —Apparently my letter last week touched a tender spot, for on Saturday morning I received a letter of criticism. The handwriting suggests that my critic is a lady of middle age. At the beginning of her communication she says, "Your intentions may be the best, but you are certainly a long way from being a competent man on the Theological field." I am glad to observe from this that I am not regarded as a Theological expert, as at no time have I professed to be such. But I do put forward the claim that it is not necessary to be an expert before we can recognise demonstrable facts. To those who criticised Jesus, He was not a competent man on the Theological field either.

Now as I have obviously touched upon a sensitive point with this particular lady, and she has been interested enough to take the trouble to write to me as soon as she had read my contribution, it may be that there are others whose reaction has been similar, and for that reason I am quoting what has been written to me and offering some brief comment of my own.

Extract: "Although I agree that there ought to be a big alteration in the financial mechanism of the nations of the world, there is no doubt that a change of heart is necessary—I do not mean the physical, but the moral and spiritual outlook of the people."

Comment: It is one thing to say that a change of heart is necessary before the people of the world can have peace and contentment, but it is an entirely different thing to establish it. This lady has not even a doubt on the point, but has given nothing concrete in support of her assertion. Instead, she says she doesn't really mean a change of heart, but only a change in the "moral and spiritual outlook of the people." It seems to me that the "outlook" of the individual is influenced greatly by environment and physical conditions, and that both of these are influenced greatly by economic conditions. Jesus did not believe in preaching to hungry people. He was too realistic for that.

Extract: "In fact, the word sinner does not seem to have any meaning to you except to define it as a usurer, and even Sunday-school children know that the heart as mentioned in Scriptures is nearly always, and almost without exception, alluding to the moral and spiritual. See James 3-14 and scores of other passages."

Comment: I must confess that I am not very worried about the word "sinner," as I prefer to remember what Jesus said to the scribes and Pharisees when they brought a sinful woman to Him in the Temple, urging that she should be stoned. He said: "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her." When they had all slunk away, as was to be expected from a bunch of hypocrites, Jesus said to the woman, "Where are thine accusers? Doth no man condemn thee? Neither do I condemn thee." Jesus also said, "I judge no man," and in the matter of sin that is an example all of us would do well to copy. I am not unacquainted with Sunday-school children and what is taught them, and I have referred to James 3-14 as requested. This verse reads as follows:

"But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth."

I respectfully commend the terms of that verse to the further careful study of my critic. This is no denunciation of the heart. It is a plea for truth. May I also ask her to refer to James 2, verses 15 and 16, which read as follows:

"If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them: Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?"

Long before a child has the capacity to think or to understand, the needs of the body must have careful attention. Conscientiousness of sin does not affect this fact.

Extract: "Even God admits that He pours the rain on the just and the unjust, and although I cannot explain why the innocent have to suffer with the guilty either through wars, earthquakes, or political misadministration, I think you will agree with me that the Rule is that a nation, speaking collectively, gets the Government it deserves."

Comment: This is the clearest confirmation that God does not discriminate against us because of our hearts or our outlook, and we are warned in the Scriptures that if we have respect to persons we commit sin. This applies irrespective of hearts, morals, or outlook? The innocent have to suffer in wars and political misadministration because of their lack of understanding, not because of their hearts or outlook. Their natural desire and general outlook is for peace—but WAR is IMPOSED on them. My belief is that the people deserve a much better Government than they get, and I think I gave proof of this last week.

Extract: "Even your own articles to the 'New Times' have admitted the apathy of the people towards anything constructive. The people still seem to prefer circuses to wholemeal bread, even during the depression."

Comment: I do not recall having expressed myself in the terms stated, as I do not make it a practice to condemn the fruit of a tree. If the fruit is bad it is the tree that should have attention. It is true that knowledge regarding the true cause of our community difficulties does not spread as quickly as knowledge of less important things, but that surely is not surprising when regard is had to the way in which the channels of enlightenment are intentionally misused by those who control them. For many years we ourselves were similarly uninformed, even though we thought that conditions ought to be better. But without an understanding of the nature of the problem we were like a boat without a rudder. Our hearts were right and our desires were right, but we simply did not understand.

Extract: "If the people had a change of heart in the true sense, the present financial system would not last five minutes. The politicians and financiers are only a reflection of the people and their apathy."

Comment: I tried to point out last week that less than 1% of the people have any say at all in the determination of financial policy, and without an appreciation of the fact that they are being swindled by it, the 99% of the people would simply continue to accept the system, just as the uncivilised continue to accept the witch doctors and medicine men. Neither the politicians nor the financiers can truthfully be said to reflect the people. The fact is that the people reflect the actions of the politicians and the financiers. Most people profess to be Christians, but the great bulk of them do not as yet even suspect the financial system.

Extract: "You mentioned in this week's 'New Times' the Adelaide bushfires. It is rather amusing to find that certain people have got to be on the verge of being burned alive before less than one per cent. will volunteer to assist them, and I have no doubt that those same unfortunate people, with teeming thousands of others, were below subsistence level in Adelaide for a period of years, but I did not hear of any rush to their assistance by the people of Adelaide who had enough and to spare."

Comment: The lady has allowed her mind to wander and her imagination to run riot when reading my letter. I do not see any occasion for amusement in people being threatened by devastating bushfires. The "less than one per cent." are those who control financial policy, and these were no-

where near the fires! It was the 99 per cent. who were represented by the volunteers. The people did rush to the assistance of the threatened homes, and the fire fighters included men "who had enough." Very few of us had "to spare" in those days, and the people of Adelaide were not responsible for that condition any more than the people of Melbourne were responsible for it.

Extract: "Please do not think that I am advocating Doles or Charity, but to suggest that the people are morally and spiritually sound is not correct."

Comment: Here again a statement is made without any support whatever. The question of the moral or spiritual soundness of the people is not the question under discussion, but it is not unreasonable to suggest that there is far more reason to denounce the satanic conditions under which the people are forced to struggle to live than the moral and spiritual lapses which appear to upset my correspondent, lapses which in the main are the product of those satanic conditions.

Extract: "In fact, the whole of your article in 'New Times' of September 22nd indicates that the human heart is very wicked indeed, and when the Financial system has changed you will find the Melbourne Police Force almost as big as ever, or, to use the text from the Apostle Paul, 'It is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.'"

Comment: This part of the letter seems to be rather muddled. I have re-read my contribution of 22nd September, and cannot find any indication of what the lady says is there. I had not thought of the size of the Police Force, but if the hours of policemen are reduced, as they would be under a proper financial system, then it would not be surprising to see the number of policemen increased. And as for the connection between this and the text quoted, I just don't see it. Had there been no sinners there would have been no Christianity, and this suggests that perhaps we should give thanks for the sinners!

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 24/9/44.

ARGENTINE PEOPLE BETWEEN TWO FIRES

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —The reference of O.B.H., in the September 15 issue of "The New Times," to "Argentine Affairs," prompts me to submit the following, which appeared in the Melbourne "Sun News-Pictorial" of 28/8/44:

Army to "Force Will" on Argentines: New York, Sunday, A.A.P.—President Farrell, addressing 5000 non-commissioned officers at a luncheon, said the Argentine army intended to force its will on the country "for the benefit of the people," the Associated Press correspondent in Buenos Aires reports.

Farrell added: "Let them call us tyrants and partisans! We will continue our conduct. Our tyranny is precisely for the creation of liberty for all, and if we must be tyrants to make the people freer, we will be!"

* * * *

It would appear from O.B.H.'s quotations that the Argentine Government resents the domineering attitude of the U.S. Government. This resentment is quite justifiable, but on the other hand the above quotation from the "Sun" indicates that the Argentine Government subscribes to the peculiar notion that a self-confessed tyranny can "impose" freedom on a people, or would it be that this is only a "blind" such as Hitler used to deceive the Germans while he made his position as a dictator unassailable?

The whole affair becomes a fight between U.S. and Argentine power groups for the power to exploit the Argentine people and the natural resources of that country for the benefit of a group, foreign or domestic, as opposed to the people of Argentina.

—Yours, etc., C. H. CHRISTOPHER, Yallourn.

ENDS AND MEANS

"The end cannot justify the means, for the simple and obvious reason that the means employed determine the nature of the ends produced."

—Aldous Huxley, in "Ends and Means." That seems to dispose of the World State in the minimum number of words.

"B."B.C. "NEWS" BULLETINS

"We should estimate the 'weighting' of the News Bulletin of the 'B.'B.C. on the Forces and Eastern Programme, which is received in India, to be 75-25 in favour of the American Army, as compared with the British Army. We gather that the R.A.F. occasionally flies, but only on the easy bits. Tune in at 5 pm. and listen for yourself."

—"The Social Creditor" (England), July 22.

WHY ANCIENT ROME FELL

"Rome succeeded with its legions in organising a universal government and preventing serious wars for over a century throughout the Mediterranean Basin and Western Europe, but it became both tyrannical and corrupt at the centre; it proved unable to adapt itself to changing conditions, and the Eternal Empire passed away, the victim of over-centralisation."

No, Clarence, that is not a quotation from a Social Credit publication. It is an extract from a Report of the Carnegie Commission, an organisation whose objects appear to run parallel to, and to supplement, the activities of the International Money Trust and World Cartel.

—"The Social Creditor," July 22.

spread through the village. All along the lane neighbours were hanging over their fences discussing the event.

Our Polish chauffeur told us the police cars had just arrived, and the drivers were reporting us to the farm director.

He advised us to pay our respects immediately.

The director's headquarters were in a large cottage, a few yards back from the lane, known as an "agitation point." We walked in to find him in conversation with a uniformed militiaman.

Both of them gave us hostile looks and demanded our papers. But Frank's diplomatic passport evidently made an impression, for, after questioning us for ten or fifteen minutes, they finally let us go.

On the way home we looked back and saw the police cars following us; this time they each contained three G.P.U. men. Where they all came from still remains a Soviet mystery.

* * * *

Before we left Kiev we said good-bye to Mr. Matusinski, the Polish Consul, who had been so kind to us. Six months later, when the Russians marched into Poland, he was called out of his bed at midnight, and taken to police headquarters for questioning.

What sort of a third degree he was put through no one knows, for he was never seen again.

When the Soviet authorities were questioned about this brutal act, they disclaimed any knowledge of his whereabouts, and suggested that perhaps he had met with an "accident." They offered, ironically, to make a search for the body.

(To be continued.)

INSIDE SOVIET RUSSIA IN PEACE-TIME

(Continued from last issue.)

"To anyone who wishes to obtain an unbiassed 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 eleventh instalment from the above-mentioned book:

As we drove along, the countryside became more and more deserted, but we jounced through snow and mud, across incredible roads; over one particularly nasty bit we looked back to see both our police cars stuck in a snowdrift. We whooped with delight at this piece of luck, and a mile or so farther on reached our collective farm—unescorted.

A more desolate sight would be hard to imagine. It was a small village of perhaps two dozen cottages on either side of a narrow lane; and the lane was a sea of mud. The fences in front of the cottages were sagging, the walls dilapidated, and the roofs in a bad state of repair.

There was not a soul to be seen.

"Now that we're here, what do we do?" asked Frank.

"We're going in to talk to the people. And you must do the interpreting!"

"But we can't just burst into people's houses!"

"Why not?" We'll never be lucky enough to escape the G.P.U. again."

"Good Lord!" said Frank. "Before we're through with this trip, I'll be the journalist and you'll be the military attaché."

We walked through mud that oozed up over our boots, pushed our way through a rickety gate and walked round to the back of the cottage.

We banged on the door and a few minutes later a frightened-looking woman opened it. She might have been any age. She had wispy, blondish-grey hair that hung in strands about her face, red hands and a dirty smock. She stared at us in bewilderment.

Frank explained we were Americans who were making a trip through Russia, but the words seemed to make no impression, for she just stood there gazing at us dumbly. We asked her if we could come in and she moved aside and opened the door.

The cottage consisted of two rooms: the floors and walls were bare and the only furniture was three stools, a cupboard and a table.

In the one corner of the room was a large porcelain stove; two babies, bundled up in cloth, were sleeping on top of it.

Conversation was difficult as the woman didn't talk, but just kept staring at us. We asked her what conditions were like and if she had plenty of food.

Her face brightened at this. "Oh, yes," she replied. "We have bread."

She hurried over to the table, lifted a cloth, and showed us a plate of black bread. As far as we could see there was no other food in the house.

We left, with her still staring after us, and walked down the road to another cottage.

This was a more lively affair, for inside we found a family of eleven people, ranging from grandmother to a child of four.

The grandmother was a very old woman. She had a yellow, withered face, but a pair of incredibly bright eyes; it soon became apparent that she was still very much the matriarch of the household. She was tremendously excited at our arrival, dragged two stools from the corner, and, chucking and bowing, told us to sit down.

"What have you got in your hat?" she said, pointing at me.

Frank said it was a veil.

"But what's it for?"

The difficulty of an explanation was avoided, for her attention suddenly shifted to my silk stockings. She knelt down and felt them. "Aren't you cold?"

We asked her about conditions in the village and she nodded her head in satisfaction, and gave us the same answer we had heard in the first cottage: there was bread.

Then she chuckled, and added, there was vodka as well.

The cottage was as bare of furniture as the first one. When we asked where everybody slept she pushed open the back door and pointed to a loft filled with hay.

Near the door there were two icons hanging on the wall. Frank commented on them.

"I didn't think you kept those any more."

The old woman laughed. "The younger people don't have them, but I like them."

They're so bright."

In the meanwhile, the rest of the family clustered round, the children staring at us with their fingers in their mouths.

One of the boys suddenly darted into the next room and came back with a battered accordion. He squatted on the floor and began to play, while two of the girls clasped hands and did a little dance. The grandmother said something; one of them broke off, ran over to the cupboard and pulled out a dress. It was made of homespun cloth, painstakingly embroidered with flowers. She slipped into it; her sister did the buttons up, and then resumed the dance.

When we were ready to leave, the grandmother called our attention to a small faded snapshot tacked on the wall. She said it was a picture of herself taken many years ago, then pointed to Frank's camera and remarked how wonderful it would be to have a new one.

We suggested a family group, and at this the cottage went into an uproar. The boys knelt down to clean their shoes, the girls began to smooth their hair, and the mother wiped her children's faces. Finally, they lined up outside the cottage, their expressions tense and nervous. When the camera clicked a sigh of relief swept through the group. They surged forward while we wrote down their address, then one by one shook hands and said good-bye.

When we reached the car again we discovered that news of our arrival had

THE By C. H. Douglas. (Continued from last 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.

It is necessary, in order to understand the working of super-national politics, to realise that control of a few chemical products means control of war. For instance, it was recently stated by Mr. R. E. McConnell, a mining expert and a war-tune Assistant to the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, that control of two materials only, oil and nitrogen, would give power to defeat any country, however large, which could not obtain them. Coal and oil are nearly interchangeable: nitrogen is "fixed" from the air by power from coal.

While, to the onlooker unfamiliar with international intrigue, a chemical combine such as Imperial Chemical Industries might appear to be a source of strength, the entire situation is altered when it is realised that it is certainly possible, and highly probably that certain controls are both extra-territorial, and extra-national.

And when, as in the case of Alfred Moritz Mond, the channel of communication had high political aspirations both personal and racial, which did not necessarily correspond with the interests of his more or less temporary hosts, the danger is one, which no country should tolerate.

Mond was primarily a Zionist Jew. His immediate colleagues were Herbert Samuel, Rufus Isaacs, Godfrey Isaacs; Mr. David Lloyd George was solicitor to the Zionist Committee, but the whole of the powerful international group of Jews controlling a large part of world finance—Schiffs, Schusters, Rothschilds, Bleichroeders, Warburgs, and others, have to be taken into consideration. To the uninterested, Zionism is a slightly romantic semi-religious cult of much the same character as the Crusades, which, equally misunderstood, are regarded as a symptom of the rudimentary intelligence of our forefathers. The real force behind the Crusades was probably very different to that we are asked to accept in standard history; and Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for "Israel."

The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists:

The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means required to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly; and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry. In the past the control of money, gold, and credit, has been the primary weapon of the Zionist.

But the money myth has been exploded; and legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue. Genuine and unfettered private property of any description whatever, is absolutely fatal to it; and the liberal financing of any movement, "Commonwealth," "Liberal," "Socialist, Henry Georgite "Single Tax" or Communist, which attacks the idea of private ownership in anything whatever, can be traced without difficulty, if not to Zionism, to Zionist bankers.

This is the answer to the fact, which seems to puzzle so many people; that the richest body of individuals in the world should subsidise attacks on wealth. Not a single one of the movements mentioned has ever attacked the Money Power or the Jews.

Since it was impossible, after the publicity given to the subject by the election of the Social Credit Government of Alberta, to ignore the subject of Finance altogether, practically all the Left Wing parties now include the "nationalisation"—i.e. central control of banking in their programmes. The objective is precisely similar to that involved in the "nationalisation" of coal.

During the early years of the 1914-18 phase of the war, the British Empire was heavily handicapped by the chemical situation, particularly in regard to high explosives. The Government Explosive Factories were under the control of Sir Frederick Nathan, Messrs. Brunner, Mond did what they could to help: they constructed a large factory at Silvertown with Government money, but unfortunately it blew up, killing forty people and destroying 800 houses. Much misfortune seemed to attend the attempts to produce aniline dyes, although they were discovered by an Englishman Perkins.

But fortunately, after the collapse of Imperial Russia and the visit of Rufus Isaacs to Washington, followed by the Balfour Declaration on Palestine, things soon righted themselves.

As Sir Alfred Mond remarked in a speech to the New York Zionists, reported in the "Jewish Chronicle" of November 8, 1928: "Has it ever occurred to you how remarkable it is that out of the welter of world blood there has arisen this opportunity? Do you really believe that it is an accident? Do you really in your hearts believe we have been led back to Israel by a fluke?" After the cessation of military hostilities in 1918 the explosives and allied industries were concentrated into the control of Nobel Industries Ltd., with Sir Harry, now Lord McGowan as Chairman. British Dyes Ltd. with Mr. Herbert Levinstein as managing

director, and Brunner, Mond, with its affiliate United Alkali, merged with these to form, in 1926, Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. (I.C.I.). Directly and indirectly, Imperial Chemical Industries thus became probably the most important industrial group in Great Britain. Having centralised the capital side, and assembled the factors leading to the centralised control, via "nationalisation," of raw material, obviously the next step was to centralise Labour control.

At this point, perhaps it may be desirable to touch upon the most formidable difficulty, which has to be overcome in mobilising public opinion on major politics.

Even well-informed people, when their attention is drawn to the dangers which threaten civilisation, are apt to say that we are merely witnessing the results of the "Capitalist" or "Profits" system. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As Mr. Austin Hopkinson, Member of Parliament for the Mossley Division of Lancashire (Independent) in a recent speech in the House of Commons said:

"Big Business has nothing to do with legitimate commerce and industry; nothing whatever; it is a purely parasitic growth, living upon the lifeblood of industry and of the workers. It is obvious that Big Business, in collusion with the Labour Boss of the syndicalist type, is preparing a brave new world for these young men (the fighting forces) when they come home. Many hon. Members will have seen a manifesto by Big Business recently. What did it mean? It meant that great monopolistic bodies will be set up in each industry, vested with statutory powers whereby they may crush every form of independent enterprise by making one great monopoly. By collusion with the labour boss, they would always have a majority on the council for each industry, and by their statutory powers they could always enforce their will on everybody else. If I may quote a familiar Latin saying, 'Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant,' which means that these people would make a monopoly, and call it 'peace.' This is not the first time we have had to fight against this sort of thing. Many hon. Members will remember the 'peace in industry' stunt of the late Lord Melchett (Sir Alfred Mond) some years ago, which was exactly the same thing as is being prepared in this country today. The idea was to set up large councils for industry

on which the big monopolistic firms would have a majority, and if they could work with the labour boss, as they intended to do, they would be able to crush out any chance for any of those young men who are fighting for us abroad . . ."

The proposals to which Mr. Hopkinson refers were the subject of the Mond-Turner Conferences, and a "Joint Interim Report" of them may be found on pp. 219-230, Trades Union Congress Record, 1926.

No very detailed statement in regard to their outcome was issued. But it is perhaps not without bearing on the question that the headquarters of the Trades Union Congress were moved to convenient offices owned by Imperial Chemical Industries, and the relations between the officials of both enterprises have been continuously amicable. The general public is, of course not represented.

There is no fundamental, and not much detailed difference between the Mond-Turner proposals and the Fascism, which this war purports to eliminate. It will not be difficult to show that it is a coherent part of a much wider strategy, adopted by Germany at the time of Frederick the "Great." But each step of this strategy requires assistance from Powers controlling finance and industry. That is to say, political power has to make terms with economic power. The objective of World Domination is quite certainly sponsored by Germany, and in particular, the German Great General Staff. But behind them, we can perceive the movement of forces whose controllers have very different ideas as to the ultimate Sovereignty.

The main proposals of the Mond-Turner Conference was that industrial affairs should be taken out of the hands of Parliament, and dealt with in a kind of Third Chamber, consisting only of members of the Trades Union Congress, and the Employers. The resemblance to the Italian Fascist Corporation is striking.

Associated with Mond, on the Employers side, were Sir Hugo Hirst (Hirsch), Lord Ashfield, Lord Weir, Lord Bamby, and Mr. Lennox Lee. How far his associates understood the implications of the policy, it is, of course, impossible to say.

The Trades Union representatives were Mr. (afterwards Sir) Ben Turner, Mr. Ernest Bevin, now Minister of Labour, Mr. (now Sir) Walter Citrine, Mr. A. J. Cook (Communist), Mr. Ben Tillet and Mr. Gosling. Of those who survive, it is interesting to note that they have been selected for steady promotion.

"On the subject of rationalisation" (i.e., squeezing out small firms) "the Conference decided that this tendency should be encouraged" (Lord Melchett) with certain pious reservations.

(All rights reserved.)

HITLER'S POLICY IS A JEWISH POLICY

(Continued from September 15, 1944.)

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. (Concluded)

You will recall Disraeli's description of the Jews as a splendidly organised race. The expression is extremely apt. While other races have simply grown, the Jewish race has been "organised"; they are, as the moderns would say, the result of a very long process of conditioning. In one sense we are, of course, all the result of conditioning, but we should distinguish between more or less natural, and more or less artificial conditioning.

The Jews have, perhaps, been the victims of more artificial conditioning than any other race we know. In this process of conditioning, the "Law" has been the chief instrument

From Millman to the most modern historian it is obvious that the daily life of the Jew of the Diaspora was hemmed in by a complex of laws, most of which were completely arbitrary, and it appears clearly that everywhere, from the Judarios of Spain to the Ghettoes of Russo-Poland, the pattern of law was fundamentally the same. You state that Abrahams is of the opinion (and Abrahams is an authority!) that the organisation of Jewry in the Ghetto of the Middle Ages was a "thoroughly democratic one; the only aristocracy being one of merit and learning."

It is characteristic of that traditional or collective attitude that I mentioned, that not one of the Jewish scholars of these matters have been struck by the fact that all the Jewish communities were ruled by a very few families whose chief members occupied most singular double positions as the chief Rabbi, Banker-Legislator of their own communities (over which they, in many cases, had full and ABSOLUTE authority) and at the same time as chief financial advisor, tax-collector or body-physician of the local Popes, Emperors and Kings.

This is curious, as this fact would seem to furnish the key to the Jewish (or anti-Semitic) problem.

Mediaeval Jew-baiting can be traced more especially to the Code of Justinian, the implementation of which resulted in the complete segregation of the European Jewries. If you will refer to Justinian in the Jewish Encyclopedia you will find that the Emperor and Empress had highly influential JEWISH friends and advisors, Theodosius was one of them.

If you turn to Italy you will see that there was hardly a mediaeval Pope without

remain in authority through ties of relationship and common interest. At times the administrative authority was retained in the hands of a few powerful families."

It was from this Russo-Polish "Pale" that batches of Ghetto-Jews, at propitious moments, were fetched over to the Western World by the Jewish leaders such as Schiff, and the centre of gravity of Jewish life began to shift from Poland and Russia to the U.S.A. Everywhere they participated as agitators, socialists and leaders of "movements" in establishing, on a world-wide scale, the same kind of law-hampered socialistic (or if you prefer, "democratic") society from which they had come.

It is of course, only too obvious that not one in a thousand knows what he is doing. But the results of their actions are there for all to see.

New York, Chicago, Birmingham, Liverpool, are monuments to the "efficiency" of Jewish administration. In the final bringing about of complete socialism, i.e., complete subjugation of the individual to an authority called "The State," which is now taking place in the U.S.A. under the name of "New Deal" (Baruch, Frankfurter, Sol Blum), and here under the auspices of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, of Political and Economic Planning (in conjunction with Churchill and his socialist friends, Greenwood, etc.), the Jewish hand is only too visible. Everything has to be done communally, including eating, and Lord Woolton hopes that it will all be continued after the war. In the Ghetto the Jews had to take their turn over "communal pots and pans." So you see, we are almost home again. Almost . . .

In conclusion, a word on the question of intermarriage:

There does not seem to be any doubt that the Jewish marital laws aimed at preserving a central core of ethnically distinct individuals as that, in fact, is what they have resulted in. But I am perfectly well aware that a certain margin of Jews has always been allowed to stray outside the Judaic fold.

We know, for instance (Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge), that merchants of the first guild and Jewish prostitutes were allowed outside the Pale of Settlement in Russo-Poland. We know also that a surprisingly large percentage of Rothschild daughters married into the local aristocracies of Austria, France and England, in which countries the families soon acquired large landed estates. And then, of course, there are all those "converted" intellectuals and politicians who remained "converted."

You object to Mr. Masson using the term of banker in connection with Mr. Baruch, of New York, whom you describe as an industrialist. In the States, however, he is better known as "the Eagle of Wall Street" or even as the "unofficial president of the U.S.A." He was already before the [first] world war connected in business with Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn Loeb and Co., and was, during the war, appointed by Schiff (via Mr. Wilson) to supervise all Allied purchases, in which position he "had more power than any other man" as he himself has stated. He "has been identified with the New York Stock Exchange" is the comment of the Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge. He has been known to suggest appointees to directorships of the Federal Reserve Board, most powerful central bank in the world, and his suggestions have been known to have carried weight. Perhaps the term "financier" would be more suitable.

Finally, I would refer you for proof of the inconsistencies between the various parts of Judaic law to that collection of extracts from the Talmud commonly known as the Shulcran Aruch, which was compiled by your co-religionist Rabbi Joseph Caro. Law No. 55 states: "It is always a meritorious deed to get hold of a Gentile's possessions."

It is of this legal work that the Jewish intellectual leader Ginsberg in his reply to Rabbi Lolli, said in 1897: "With all its uncouth sections it was the book that best suited the spirit of our people."

—Yours truly, BORGE JENSEN.

P.S.—I rather envy you the possession of the stately volumes of the Jewish Encyclopedia, particularly as they appear to have been withdrawn from circulation.

(To be continued)

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

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

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE," A short history of the Bank of England. Price 9d. Postage 1d (6/- per dozen, post free.)

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

**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.

* In the Jewish Encyclopedia.