

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. II. No. 12. MELBOURNE, THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1945

## "NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1. HALF Rates for Members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.

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

## "Problem of National Industrial Efficiency"

### Institute of "Public Affairs" and the Planners' Plot

By J BRADSHAW A.F.I.A.

Considerable space and prominent headlines have been given by the "Herald" (Melbourne), February 24 and March 3, to a series of articles prepared by the Industrial Committee of "The Institute of Public Affairs," the central theme of which is the "supremely important problem" of "bringing the community's output of goods and services of every kind to the highest level possible in the light of our resources of labour, material, and capital equipment."

The "industrial committee" is said to consist of Messrs. G. H. Grimwade (chairman), F. E. Lampe, C. D. Kemp (economic adviser), G. R. Mountain, and Captain A. C. Leech (secretary). Mr. G. J. Coles, founder of the large chain-store organisation, which bears his name, is chairman of "the Institute." Perhaps it is significant that Israel Moses Sieff, the head of a large chain-store organisation in England, is chairman of P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning). The headline of the first article proclaims, "Production must be planned." It is certainly significant that the "industrial committee" of "the Institute" includes bankers' representatives. Note also, the inevitable "economic adviser."

The subject matter of the articles is precisely what might be expected from such a "brilliant" personnel with such a noble and "intellectual" background.

Immediately I commenced to read the first article I felt sure that here I was in touch with truly "great" minds, that here was a small body of highly trained, efficient, "experts" (including at least one fully certified "economist") who are animated by the single, lofty aim of bringing all their wealth of specialised knowledge and ability to bear on a clear elucidation of post-war economic "problems," to the end that we lesser, less deserving mortals may be fitted in to the scheme of things in such a way as to ensure our "maximum efficiency," so that we may thus attain "maximum productivity," and thereby be enabled to share more generously in the expanded output of "planned production."

As one who has not enjoyed the thrill of moving in the rarefied "intellectual" atmosphere, which is the close preserve of "certified economists" I was awe-struck by the crystal clear, uncontaminated purity of the logic by which all the argument and conclusions are supported.

There was brought back to my mind the memory of that valuable contribution made by Professor Giblin to the "problem" of economic depressions when he suggested they might be caused by "spots on the sun."

Of course, I realised that it could only be by virtue of his moving in that rarefied "intellectual" atmosphere that the Professor was able to get close enough to the sun to observe the spots on it—and I hoped as I read on that the "industrial committee" of "The Institute of Public Affairs" might improve on the Professor's achievement by removing the spots from the sun, thereby ushering in the millennium.

Reference is made to "two post-war aims, which have been given a primary place in economic planning and in the public thought"—viz., "full employment and social security." Whilst we are told that these are both "of high importance," it is stated "both can be satisfactorily achieved only through a rapid expansion of the national income, which, in turn, depends entirely on a more productive organisation of resources—of men, materials, and machines."

A little further on, mention is made of "a nation-wide organisation" founded two years ago by "leading businessmen in the United States" for the purpose of providing

"post-war jobs for millions of returning servicemen and war-workers." This "Committee of Economic Development" is actually said to be basing its "attack" on the problem on what is admitted to be the sound premise that "jobs are a by-product of production and distribution."

However, seeing that the providing of "jobs" is the objective to achieve, which the "Committee of Economic Development" was founded, the faint hope that a body of "certified" economists might be displaying a streak of sanity is quickly dispelled.

The "Committee" has taken as its "Number One Post-War Objective" the attainment of a "record-breaking increase in the gross output of peace-time goods and services over the record-breaking year of 1940." "Jobs," you see, are a "by-product of production and distribution." So far, so good. But, to the end that "many millions of returning servicemen and war-workers" may have "jobs," the "Committee" has adopted the "Number One Post-War Objective" just quoted. The "record-breaking" increase in production which is sought is not desired primarily in order that the returning servicemen and war-workers may obtain access to a larger, more adequate share of the increased production, but so that they may have "jobs." We therefore have the proposition that the proper function of an economic system is the provision of "jobs," although the admission is made that "jobs are a by-product of production and distribution."

As neither the "Committee" of the American body, nor the "industrial committee" of our own (?) "Institute" pay any attention to the all-important question of ensuring an increased flow of purchasing power to accord with the projected "record-breaking increase" in the output of goods and services, it must be assumed that these bodies of "experts" either do not consider such an obvious necessity to merit their attention, or that they have chosen to

ignore it. Nor does the utter incompatibility of the aim of "full employment" with the "more productive organisation of resources" appear to be apparent to them.

To anyone not rendered mentally moribund by economic orthodoxy, however, it must be obvious that to the extent to which success is achieved in the progressively "more productive organisation of resources" resulting in "record-breaking" increases in output, the number of "jobs" for which men and women are required must be a diminishing factor.

Strange to say, the first article emanating from the Industrial Committee of the Institute of Public Affairs commends the viewpoint of the United States Committee of Economic Development which insists that "all policies of governments, business and labour be examined from the point of view not of an economy of scarcity, but of an economy of plenty, and that if changes in policy are needed to contribute to expansion these changes should be made." Yet, the objectives stated as being the aims of both these Committees are objectives, which belong to the economics of scarcity and its concomitant, financial orthodoxy. No one would dispute the statement of the "Industrial Committee," also contained in its first article, that higher standards of living are made possible only by higher standards of production.

But the Committee omitted to mention the fact that, even the "higher standards of production" will not enable the people to enjoy higher standards of living unless their incomes are also higher; unless, too, their incomes are raised partly by a process which does not involve higher costs against industry and hence does not cancel the benefits of the higher income by causing higher prices for the goods and services produced by industry.

After its commendation of the foregoing pronouncement of its American counter-Continued on page 3.)

## Significant Political Pointers

When Dr. Evatt's rather crude attempt to centralise all political and economic control at Canberra met a definite rebuff at the Referendum, it became obvious that the internationalists seeking to destroy Australia's sovereignty would have to embark upon a more subtle strategy in order to achieve their ends. There is no doubt that Dr. Evatt and his backers had their alternative prepared.

No sooner had the electors given their answer than Dr. Evatt said the Federal Government could use International Agreements to overcome local constitutional difficulties. Every Australian should note carefully Dr. Evatt's exact words:

"What I have said to this House is that, should there be an international agreement to which Australia was a party, on subjects such as labour conditions and the like, it might become the duty of the Executive Government to ratify the agreement, and that, in such an event, in my opinion, it would be within the power of this Parliament to carry out the agreement throughout Australia." (Vide Federal "Hansard," November 24, 1944.)

Australia is being committed to a series of international agreements, the full significance of which cannot even be understood by Federal Members, still less by citizens who only receive garbled press reports of abstract statements which can mean anything. Every effort should be made to prevent the Federal Parliament from committing Australians to further Agreements, which, we may find later, can be used to sweep aside the Constitution and attack our individual rights. The issue is: national sovereignty versus international slavery. Contact your Member about the matter immediately.

In appendix "C" of their report on the Bretton Woods Conference, "our" delegates said:

"If international agreements are not to interfere with the sovereignty of nations, no agreements whatever are possible."

In other words, no international agreements are possible unless YOU are prepared to go on being pushed around by the local bureaucrats, who take their orders from the international bureaucrats!

Webster's Dictionary defines sovereignty as "Independence; a State in which independent and supreme authority is vested."

Dr. Evatt is about to meet his backers in America at another of those international conferences at which the independence of nations, particularly small nations, is invariably attacked. But, to make their schemes work, the world planners need a local bureaucracy to implement their plans. Smash the local bureaucracy and make responsible government a reality, and sovereignty may be preserved. Every effort must be made at the next Federal elections to elect a Government pledged to a policy of less and less bureaucrats.

The Oxford Dictionary defines TREASON as a "Violation, by subject, of allegiance to Sovereign." (Sovereignty.)

A R.A.A.F. sergeant in the Pacific, in a spirited reply to Federal Union propaganda in "Wings," the official Air Force magazine, concludes:

"Our kinsmen are dying daily on the battlefields and thousands more of us will die willingly to preserve intact the integrity of our Empire and the Sovereignty of our King. Let us have international co-operation by all means, but there is a big difference between co-operation and surrender. Complete co-operation by unarmed nations through an unarmed League is a worthy ideal, but to establish an armed force in an otherwise unarmed world is to prepare the way for the greatest tyranny of all time."

The editor of "Wings" hastened to deny that his intentions were treasonable! You hit your target, Sgt. Patterson!

Apart from the Catholic press and the Sydney "Bulletin," the principal Australian papers are indulging in an orgy of fantastic lies concerning the Polish issue, the Yalta Agreement and Soviet Russia. The Melbourne "Argus" has even resorted to quot-Continued on page 2.)

## Madness Defended

For some three years it has not been possible for the average Australian to buy a suit made of double weft material. He has had to content himself with single weft shoddy.

During this period, however, a large quantity of double weft cloth, of high quality, has been manufactured and exported to New Zealand and sold as English.

This anomalous situation was ventilated in Parliament at Canberra the other day, and was defended by Mr. Beasley, representing the Minister for Supply.

"The material is sent there to capture the New Zealand trade," Mr. Beasley said. "It is the duty of the Government to find export trade if it is at all possible."

He said it was true the double weft cloth was sold there while it was not available in Australia.

It is pathetic to see Labor Ministers still harbouring the discredited export mania—the madness that starves home consumption and causes world wars. —"New Era."

## NOTES on the NEWS

**WHITE AUSTRALIA:** Once more the forces behind the scenes are at work, endeavouring to whittle down the White Australia Policy, and once more a clergyman, in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Fisher), is the spearhead of the attack. However, this time several opponents of the plot are given space in the daily press, particularly the "Age" of March 20, wherein Mr. H. S. Redding, of the A.N.A., objects to a repetition in Australia of the racial problem that U.S.A. is vainly trying to solve, while Mr. Bains, of the R.S.L., insists that the White Australia Policy must be preserved at all costs. Then comes the professor of anthropology at the Sydney University (Prof. A. P. Elkins), who points out that Australia's stand is not due to prejudice. Persistent attacks on the White Australia Policy will necessitate continued resistance from intelligent Australians.

**BUREAUCRATS' BUILDINGS:** Although thousands of Australian producers' and soldiers' families are homeless, the people's (?) government has begun the erection of another large temporary building to accommodate the non-productive Prices Commission's Canberra bureaucrats. There is also another administrative building under consideration at a cost of more than £1,000,000. This makes it quite clear that the Labor fuhrers are more concerned with housing non-productive Federal officials, than with the plight of the homeless. If the question of accommodation for more bureaucrats or for the workers' and soldiers' families were submitted to the people, it's a safe bet that the bureaucrats would be by-passed. It's significant that no protest comes from union leaders or Communists against this unjustifiable misuse of manpower and materials.

**CRIMEA CRITICISM:** Signs of considerable dissatisfaction with the "Crimea" decisions are beginning to appear in U.S. as Congressmen take a look at them, and influential Senators were reported in the Melbourne "Herald" of March 15 as "insisting that the whole Yalta declaration and other interim arrangements shall be subject to review. Few are prepared to defend the Polish settlement." In connection

## Ten Thousand Evicted Farmers

British farmers who have been evicted under the direction of War Agricultural Committees met in London on December 20 last, according to "The Times," and formed the Dispossessed Farmers' and Supporters' Association. Mr. W. M. Bowran (Rickmansworth) said that 10,000 farmers had been disposed.

with the earlier Dumbarton Oaks conspiracy, an interesting statement appeared in the "Herald" of March 13, wherein it was stated that "the Russians threatened to leave if the proceedings were publicised." It should be remembered that these secret arrangements are to be the basis of the coming San Francisco Conference, so it will be seen that the dice is well, and truly loaded, and that small-fry delegates will only be there to make up the numbers.

**POPULATION PERILS:** Amid the din of population and migration propaganda, the following press report about the town of Quorn is appropriate: The town of 2000 is serviced by one doctor and six nurses, who are facing an epidemic caused by primitive sanitation and lack of water. Ten babies are being accommodated in a ward the size of a bathroom because the hospital is hopelessly overcrowded. There is only one bathroom and lavatory for the hospital's fifteen patients and staff of ten, male and female. This report should be framed and prominently displayed at all overseas immigration centres, so that intending migrants will know what to expect here as we draw nearer to the Socialist Utopia.

**ITALIAN INTRIGUES:** Yet another repetition of Communist treachery and brutality is reported, this time concerning Italy. The Melbourne "Sun" of March 15 states "Communists have assaulted Liberal mayors and driven them from office. They have also broken up Liberal meetings and have burnt the Liberal Party headquarters in Rome; the new government is being harassed by the activities of both Communists and the remnants of Fascism in liberated Italy." So far, there has been no widespread gunning or murder as in Greece, which indicates that the authorities have been wise enough to disarm these killers. Incidentally, coming nearer to home, the (Continued on page 4.)

# THE "LIBERAL" PARTY OF AUSTRALIA

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

**With the commencement of the new Parliamentary session in Canberra we have seen installed the new Liberal Party of Australia. This Party is seeking to collect all those who wish a new start in political life and who are opposed to the bureaucratic Socialism, which is being forced on this country under the cloak of war emergencies.**

There is no doubt the Labor Party is in power today merely because of the sheer incompetence of the old U.A.P. leaders; and as the Labor Party leaders have shown, if possible, a greater incompetence. It looks as if the next Federal Government is likely to be run by the Liberal Party—unless, of course, Mr. Menzies decides that he doesn't want to take office!

**It becomes important, therefore, to understand what this Liberal Party stands for.**

In the political field we are confronted with a variety of names which have different meanings to different people; names such as Conservatism, Liberalism, Socialism, Labour. These names, as often as not, are used as political swearwords to condemn or to dismiss somebody you dislike.

The extreme Leftist groups in politics usually call anybody who disagrees with them "Nazis" or "Fascists"; but few of them realise that the word NAZI is made up of four letters, N.A.Z.I., which stand for National Socialist Party of Germany: that the Nazis are Socialists, and that Germany is the home of Socialism, and that from Germany come most of the ideas and slogans used by Communists and Socialists in this country.

**That is one of the queer things in politics, which the ordinary man doesn't understand, although he often suspects something fishy about the people who wish to imitate the people they profess to hate.**

In many sections of the community there are to be found quite a few persons who would, no doubt, call themselves advanced thinkers; you find them in all parties. These men are genuinely annoyed at the slowness of reforms of all kinds; they want changes and they want them in a hurry, and the price doesn't matter.

These men are useful men in the community; such men become dangerous, however, when they are tainted with the "Puritan" strain—that is, when they consider they have a moral right to use compulsion or brute force to make other people conform to their view. And it should always be remembered that any reformer who attempts to get a law passed in Parliament to force a minority to do what it doesn't want to do is using brute force to compel submission to his ideas.

Many reformers would be horrified if you accused them of this, but if you listen to them or speak to them in private you would find that this statement is true.

**Such are the men who make up the raw material of those parties, which have drenched Europe and Asia in blood.**

**There is no greater killer than the religious maniac who goes political. One can hate vice too much; one can hate vice so much that one has no love left for any man.**

There are those who hate the rich so much that they desire to make all men poor—to level men down, not to raise men up; they want equality—the equality of the gutter. The ideas and slogans used by millions of young men and women have been imposed upon them by such men as these. Such ideas, born in hate, can only destroy—and they have destroyed millions.

To be considered "progressive" these days one has to be considered progressive by the proper people, one has to conform to a rigid pattern. One doesn't need to do anything; one doesn't need to know anything; one only needs to repeat a few mystic phrases. A sure and easy way to get into the inner ranks of the intelligentsia is to laugh at and ridicule anything British; to speak evil of any man working for a profit—but, of course, you mustn't mention the miners!

The ideas of the Leftist group have become well known to us; they are in the process of being debunked. The men of substance in the ranks will re-group and move into the Centre.

**A new danger is the Socialist planners in the groups of the Right, in the new Liberal Party. Such men want things done in a big way; they want big water schemes, big hospitals, centralised milk control, large schools, large combines and large unions—with the hope, perhaps, of having control of such organisations.**

Such men with a desire for power naturally gravitate to positions of power, and, as their ideas suit those in control today, their selection becomes certain. We see certain names placed consistently before the public, names of doctors, engineers, lawyers, etc. These men may be in the Liberal Party, but they would serve equally well in the Labor Party; in fact, that is where they belong.

In the days ahead, many difficult problems will have to be faced. The returned soldiers are not going to settle down easily to civilian life; it is going to be very difficult for many, and very difficult for their friends and relations. Roads have to be repaired, houses built. Whatever Government is in power will have to find large sums of money to repair the damage done by war. How is this money to be found?

Today, people are heavily taxed, and that taxation has held up effort in every part of Australia. In wartime, however, most of the people put up with anything, and the output of munitions from

Australia is not vital to the needs of the Allies. The Australian food production is vital, however, and the present Federal Government is just beginning to find that out.

**If the Liberal Party is to go into power, it had better tell the people where it is going to get the money to rehabilitate the soldiers and ensure houses for the people; if it attempts to maintain the present taxation racket, it will not only commit political suicide, but there will be precious few houses built.**

Heavy taxation is bad enough, but the present method whereby anybody working overtime is not only taxed on his overtime, but is also taxed extra on the rest of his wage—this method must have been designed by somebody who wanted to make sure that no industry in Australia would keep working.

The miner, when he works overtime and earns £1 extra, finds that the Government takes about 10/- of it, and then he finds that the 10/- is only worth 7/- of pre-war money—that is, of the alleged extra £1 he is supposed to earn he only gets 7/-. And what is the result? Miners won't work overtime. They find it more profitable to grow vegetables in the garden or to go fishing or to repair their houses. All this mystery about the miners is just a lot of ballyhoo; and what goes for the mines goes for most industries in Australia.

**The chaos we see today, and that we saw before the war, is not due to lack of planning—it is entirely due to the planning of the Government. The Government may be coerced by some outside influence,**

**but whatever diabolic influence is at work, the Government must accept the blame.**

The young bloods of the Liberal Party would do well to realise that this country does not suffer through lack of planning; we are being swamped with plans. And there is hardly a man of any value in this country who has not had his work held up for years by those same planners.

What we require is not more plans, not more laws, and not more bureaucrats—but some principle by which people who are able and willing to co-operate in the community are permitted to do so. There are too many bottlenecks to human effort, and most of those bottlenecks are held by Government officials.

The supreme job of the Government in this country is to remove bottlenecks and to prevent exploitation by political and financial monopolies. The Government's job is not to run industries, but to see that industries can run on proper lines. If it did this it would do a magnificent job, and it has plenty of power to do it.

**The Government's job is not to educate the people, but to see that money is available so that every family can select the education it desires for its members. The best schools will set the pace for the others.**

**The Government's job is not to provide work for everybody—that can only be done in a Slave State; its job is to see that nobody has to go without the essential needs of a human being.**

At the Referendum the people voted against the ideas of the Socialist groups in this country; it is to be hoped that the Liberal Party doesn't waste our time and patience by serving up a rehash of this discredited scheme.

In wartime, as in peacetime, there are many kinds and conditions of people willing to serve the community, but who are not permitted to do so. The supreme task of the Government is to remove the bottlenecks. The bottlenecks will be found sitting in chairs in Government offices.

## ORIGIN & AIMS OF ZIONIST MOVEMENT

By N.F.W., in the "Social Creditor," England (Continued.)

**It is a strange quality about all Jewish affairs that the Jew is never to do anything for himself. It is always a question of what other nations or individuals might, or should, or MUST, do for him. The attitude is not adult: the race seems never to have grown out of the nursery stage. Essentially Zionism boils down to that. Little Ikey-Mo must have little Mohammed's train, and Britannia must stand by and see that there are no reprisals.**

I am not suggesting by that that the Zionist Movement is a matter we can afford to overlook. On the contrary, when children want things it is usually a very serious affair, for those grown-ups whose need is peace and leisure to "get on with the job."

Considerable sums of British revenue have gone in the administration of Palestine in the last quarter of a century, and not a little administrative energy has been diverted from where it was badly needed. And if the showing has not been conspicuously happy or successful, I think as much of the blame may be attributed to the original falsity of the Jewish claim and our own weakness in yielding to it, under no matter what pressure, as to any administrative ill-will or incompetence. After all, no administration, apparently, in the whole period has come in for so much Zionist criticism as that of Sir Herbert (now Lord) Samuel, one of the chief pillars of Zionism in England.

"Most Zionists," we are told by Mr. Ben Jacob,\* "contend that by taking the standpoint that the development of Palestine was conditioned by the interests of the local population, he [Lord Samuel] was destructive of the just aspirations of the Jewish people."

Somehow I feel that if the Jews had armed themselves and taken Palestine by force from the Arabs, as the Italians did Abyssinia, the situation would have been a more authentic, more tractable affair than this legalistically revised title to supersede a centuries-old Arab occupation. It was the full implication of this claim that Arthur Balfour's conscience would not allow him to endorse in his Declaration. Instead he hedged, he actually quibbled! He definitely left an avenue of escape; and down that avenue, forced by the unhappy events with which the whole Experiment has been associated; the British Administration has steadily retreated throughout the period. The process has been undignified and difficult; equivocal situations have undoubtedly arisen; and Britannia, in the guise of Lord Samuel and the other High Commissioners, has had no thanks—no more than would little Ikey-Mo's mother if she had tried to keep the peace between him and little Mohammed over the wretched train.

The period has been punctuated by disputes and riots of increasing violence—in Jerusalem in 1920; in Jaffa in 1921; those arising from the "Wailing Wall" incident in 1929; and almost continuously from 1936 to 1939, beginning with the Jaffa massacre. This last produced the Passfield Report in May, 1939—Sidney Webb, the hoary Planner, reporting adversely on the Plans of the Arch-Planners—which described conditions as "bad, and the displacement of the Arabs as serious." That same spring, on the strength of this Report, Jewish immigration was reduced to 75,000 covering the next five years, and the disappointment and bitter anger of the Zionist high-ups—the Jewish Kahal, really—were focussed on Neville Chamberlain and his Government. Later the same year, to be precise, on September 1, Germany invaded Poland. Again, on February 28, 1940, owing to more trouble, the British Government was forced to reduce still further the immigration

quota and to draw up a Land Settlement zoning plan, far less advantageous to the Jews than that which had been turned down by the Zionist Congress of 1937. In May 1940, Western Europe was overrun by German arms, and "Chamberlain had to go." In less than a year he was dead.

**Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that not withstanding all this ill success, the urge for the further realisation and extension of the Zionist Experiment will not be even stronger in the coming settlement time than it was at the end of the 1914-18 struggle.**

It must not be overlooked that the inner need for the Palestine Home is not really concerned with the agreement or success, or happiness of the individual Palestinian Jew or Arab, or even with the victims of Hitler's persecutions, in spite of anything the Movement's superficially active members may think. The inner, "racial" need, as I have said, is essentially political. But the Jewish race is without franchise, and in consequence the individual Jew, in respect of his Kahal, or Central Council, is as powerless as is the individual German today where his own General Staff is concerned. That, as we saw, was the danger of all centralised, secret organisations. At the top, power without personal responsibility; and in the ranks personal responsibility without power. The only hope for the members of a Secret Society is that they should become enlightened—in other words that they, and the rest of the world, should come to realise and understand what it is their leaders are about.

(Concluded.)

## CARTELS AND SIR C BAILLIEU

From the London "Daily Express" of November 28, 1944:—

New York, Monday. —An attack on the espousal of cartels by the British delegation to the recent world businessmen's conference was made today by Senator Harley Kilgore, Congress big anti-cartel man.

He said: "Sir Clive Baillieu (vice-president, Federation of British Industries) was chairman of the cartel section at the conference.

"His federation was British signatory to the notorious Dusseldorf agreement negotiated in the final stages of Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler.

"This agreement provided for rapid extension of cartel relations between British and German industry, and, among other things, required joint representation to their respective Governments by British and German cartelists if American firms refused to participate."

It was to the everlasting credit of the British people, said Kilgore, that they repudiated this statement and the whole appeasement programme spearheaded by the Federation of British Industries.

Kilgore alleged that two delegates to the conference, one from the Argentine and the other from Italy had Axis connections, and that even some of the American delegation had good relations at one time in the Axis world.

## WHERE "COMMOS" RULE

Under this heading, "Smith's Weekly," of March 17, published the following:—

A debate at the Communist Kearsley (N.S.W.) Council last week was amusing and confusing, because of its inconsistency. Kearsley is the only Council in Australia with a "Commo" majority.

A miner applied for a bus licence to run to seaside resorts during holidays.

Mr. W. Jenkins, who is employed in a colliery on the Cessnock coalfield, also runs a bus to and from the colliery daily to carry miners to work.

He told Kearsley Council he had three buses running to various collieries in the district, and he himself had a job in a mine.

Cr. Blackwell (Lab.) said the policy of the Miners' Federation was "one man, one job." If there was another man putting in for the job who made his living solely by running buses, he should get the licence.

When asked what amount he was paying his drivers, Mr. Jenkins intimated to Council that they were receiving £2/13/- a fortnight. Payment made was not quite the award wage.

Cr. Blackwell said Jenkins should be made to pay the award wage.

In reply to this, Jenkins pointed out that it would be impossible for him to run his buses and pay award rates on the limited time his drivers were employed.

Cr. Mrs. Simm (Com.) We all believe in the policy "one man, one job," and I agree that Mr. Jenkins should pay the award rates. We also have men in the mines playing in the Musicians' Union.

(Cr. Simm voted for Mr. Jenkins to get the licence.)

Cr. Palmer (Com.): This man admitted he was not paying award rates. There are plenty of men employed in the mines who also have businesses, either run by themselves or their wives. If we are to deal with this matter we are tackling a very big question. I am going to move that the application be granted.

(Cr. Palmer is a mine employee.)

Cr. Blackwell (Lab.): If Jenkins is going to take on bus running he should get out of the pit and allow some of the unemployed to go into the job.

Council unanimously decided to grant the licence to the applicant, despite the fact that five Communist members said they were in favour of "one man, one job," and award rates being paid to all workers.

Every Labour alderman also voted for the licence to be granted.

So what? Evidently Clarrie Fellon, of the A.W.U., has set a bad example. He held eleven jobs a year or two back. Now he has only nine.

## BACK TO FEUDALISM?

As a correspondent to "The Scotsman" points out, the Russian collective farm, communally worked by peasants (who have also 25-acre crofts of "their own"), and administered by State officials, is simply the European Feudal system with all its disadvantages, and none of the advantages of the "barony court" which decentralised the Scottish Feudal Barony. The same correspondent draws attention to the curious contradiction between the much-advertised Russian Collectives and the dividing up, under Russian influence, of the large Polish estates into a mass of peasant proprietorships, thus creating a class of "bound serfs," and asks, with justification, whether in fact the fundamental objective of "agrarian reform" everywhere is not simply to provide offices for hectoring bureaucrats. — "The Social Creditor," January 20.

## Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

ing extensively from the Communist "Daily Worker" in order to try and justify its opinions concerning Poland.

Dr. Evatt, who can always be relied upon to try and prove that black is white, said in answer to a challenge by Mr. Menzies on the Polish issue, that nothing had been done to break the Atlantic Charter, and then went on to say that "the Soviet Government had concluded that the Polish Government in London did not represent the Poles."

How considerate of the Soviet Government! Perhaps they will choose OUR Government for us in future? We certainly couldn't have a much more reactionary crowd of political gunmen at Canberra if they did.

While there has been some tacit admittance that all is not well concerning the Polish settlement, the fate of the Baltic States has been ignored. Two of the States, Latvia and Estonia, have Protestant populations, and it is high time Protestant leaders in this country were asked whether they are going to show some semblance of sympathy with the brutal rape of two small nations by Soviet Russia. Or are they too busy lauding "progressive" Russia and howling about the Jews. Practical Christianity has to do with protecting the rights of the INDIVIDUAL; and yet so-called Christian leaders wonder why Christian ideas are being discarded everywhere while they support, either actively or passively, every anti-Christian policy put forward in the name of "progress," "the common good," or some other abstraction. Judas was possessed of the highest virtues compared with some of our "Christian" leaders. — E. D. B.

# A Political Primer for Patients and Doctors

By B.W.M. |  
I. INTRODUCTION.

There are a number of fundamental conceptions on which British medical practice has been built up, and these are so important that even the veriest amateur among the planners usually feels that he must at least pay lip service to them.

There are so many planners about these days, all using the words standing for these conceptions in their own ways, that probably few people have much idea of what is really meant by them. But the words do stand for something, and for something so important in the British way of life that it is necessary to define these conceptions carefully before proceeding to an examination of the problem of general medical services

**THE DOCTOR-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP.**—This is probably the most important conception of all. It is essentially a relationship between two individuals, and it has complementary aspects. The basis is;—

- The desire of the patient to be relieved of some form of ill-health, or to obtain advice which the medical practitioner by reason of his special training and experience is able to tender; and
- The desire of the doctor to obtain a suitable reward for his services and to exercise his special ability and skill.

There is a natural unfolding and extension of this relationship, on the one side into the family, so that we have the conception of the family doctor; and on the other to include the services of specialists and consultants, and the use of certain technical resources such as laboratory investigations, and hospital accommodation. These extensions are, however, quite limited, and depend on the initiative of the parties to the primary contract.

Many writers on medical problems seem to assume that there is no organisation in the medical profession and medical services. But in fact these services are very highly organised, with the complexity of the living organic structure, the multiplicity of connections, which arise from continuous acts of free choice. There are general practitioners, who enter into the basic doctor-patient link; and a link further on, the consultants, a number of whom are chosen by the general practitioner, each for the particular needs of his individual patients, and to some extent guided by each patient's choice. The consultant in turn is linked with particular hospitals, whose traditions he has absorbed, and whose ways perhaps he has influenced. And thus the complexity grows, made more complex still by further cross-links between various parts of the whole. It is a wonderful organisation, flexible and adaptable to the myriad personal needs and desires of individuals.

**FREE CHOICE OF DOCTOR AND PATIENT.**—This means the right of each patient to choose or reject any doctor, and the right of each doctor to accept or reject any patient. As such, it is part of the conception of liberty, and, like liberty, an important and unobtrusive background of life. The emphasis is on the word "right"; for its existence, as a right does not imply anarchy: it implies respect for, and recognition of, individuality. With that right as a background, the status of both patient and doctor is enhanced by the recognition in each of that right in the other. There is no free choice in the Army, and both doctor and patient are degraded thereby; the system has sacrificed the status of both.

**PRIVATE PRACTICE.**—The essence of private practice is its privacy. It means the right of the patient to a completely confidential relationship with his doctor, secure in the knowledge that a doctor's lips are sealed, that any medical records made are solely for the guidance of the doctor, to be seen by no one else. And it means, too, that the patient brings to the doctor the problems that are in the most intimate sense his own problems, and that he brings them of his own choice and on his own initiative. This initiative again is a manifestation of his essential individuality. The normal, happy, human being quite naturally wishes to be healthy; to him ill health is a nuisance. On his own initiative, therefore, he will seek to be made well when he ails. But the unhappy, under-nourished, ill housed, and over-worked express these disabilities in dis-ease, physical and mental, and every doctor knows that only its grosser forms can be alleviated, and that otherwise the cure of one disorder merely prefaces the onset of another. Misapprehension of that fact is the great fallacy of so-called "positive" health. There is either normal health or lack of it; most ill health is a deficiency disease in the wider sense. And when the crude deficiencies in homes, food, and joy are made good, the doctor becomes a minor part of the pattern, concerned then with those personal problems, which the patient brings on his own initiative.

With these basic conceptions in mind, we may make a general survey of the medical problem, and the proper starting point would seem to be the question, "What do patients want from doctors?"

In a speech, which the late secretary of the British Medical Association delivered in 1943 in a number of centres, he stated that under a "comprehensive" medical service, most of the people who would not wish to take advantage of their benefits under that service would belong to the highest income groups. In other words, those who could afford it would prefer to have what private practice provides today.

It can hardly be supposed that the desire for that particular type of medical at-

tention is confined to those in the highest income groups—indeed, I would say that practically all those who have experienced that private relationship would prefer it. The explanation of Dr. Anderson's statement is simply that people with the money to pay for it in this way express their natural preference, which is probably nearly universal. The tragedy is that more people are unable to do so.

Doctors individually know quite well that their patients prefer private practice; but nobody officially seems to have taken the trouble to find out what the people want. The public does not now demand, and never has demanded, "organisation" of the medical profession, as such. On the other hand, there has no doubt been a widespread feeling that medical attention should be more readily available. Dr. Anderson's statement reveals clearly enough that the lack of availability is simply a lack of money to buy the existing services.

Approached in this way, it can be seen that the true problem of medical services concerns the availability of those services. One solution, but not the only one, is to re-organise medical services. This is the sort of answer that appeals to the Planners. And if there is re-organisation to be done, it is only natural that Government bodies should see themselves carrying out this re-organisation, and that they should visualise the machinery of a State Medical Service conforming to the prototype of any State Service. Medical bodies, on the other hand, see what they call the Corporate System, on the lines of the B.B.C. Amateur Planners, of whom there are many, have various other schemes.

What is important is that basically all these schemes are similar; only the administrative personnel differ. And none of them meet the true wishes of patients and doctors. All of them involve a Central Authority, which controls the purse, and Corporation control of the purse is not fundamentally different from State control.

When a patient spends his money on a doctor, he buys private medical attention.

## MASTER-PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

### "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

With commentary by ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from March 9 issues.)

#### PROTOCOL NO. 4

"Every republic passes through several stages. The first of these is compromised in the early days of mad raging by the blind mob, tossed hither and thither, right and left: the second is demagoguery, from which is born anarchy, and that leads inevitably to despotism—not any longer legal and overt, and therefore responsible despotism, but to unseen and secretly hidden, yet nevertheless sensibly felt despotism in the hands of some secret organisation or other, whose acts are the more unscrupulous inasmuch as it works behind a screen, behind the backs of all sorts of agents, the changing of whom not only does not injuriously affect but actually aids the secret force by saving it, thanks to continual changes, from the necessity of expending its resources on the rewarding of long services."

(Comment:—That is a penetrating commentary on the party-system and on the irresponsible bureaucracy being rapidly extended in every country of the world.)

Protocol No. 4 continues as follows:—

"Who and what is in a position to overthrow an invisible force? And this is precisely what our force is. Gentle masonry blindly serves as a screen for us and our objects, but the plan of action of our force, even its very abiding-place, remains for the whole people an unknown mystery."

"But even freedom might be harmless and have its place in the State economy without injury to the well-being of the peoples if it rested upon the foundation of faith in God, upon the brotherhood of humanity, unconnected with the conception of equality, which is negated by the very laws of creation, for they have established subordination. With such a faith as this a people might be governed by a wardship of parishes, and would walk contentedly and humbly under the guiding hand of its spiritual pastor submitting to the dispositions of God upon earth. This is the reason why it is indispensable for us to undermine all faith, to tear out of the minds of the goyim the very principle of Godhead and the spirit, and to put in its place arithmetical calculations and material needs."

(Comment:—Need we mention here any more than the fact that destruction of Christian ideas has proceeded rapidly since the "Protocols" were written?) Protocol No. 4 continues as follows:—

"In order to give the goyim no time to think and take note, their minds must be diverted towards industry and trade."

(Comment:—This has been successfully accomplished, with the result that industry has become an end in itself, instead of a means to an end—a fuller life with more leisure for the individual.) Protocol No. 4 concludes as follows:—

"Thus, all the nations will be swallowed

What he gets out of it is his own affair, and if he doesn't like it he spends his money elsewhere. But the State or Corporation, when it spends its money, buys organisation. It is not a customer for its own services.

Although perhaps some Government departments and business monopolies lose sight of the fact, the reason for their existence is to provide services to the public. Let us assume that they have the worthy intention of pleasing the greatest number. The more standardised the demand, the easier it is to meet it. The demand for postal facilities is about as standardised a demand as any human demand can be, and the Post Office seems to meet it reasonably well, though there might be improvement.

But medical demands are quite extraordinarily subtle and individual. More than that, they are intensely personal. Going to a doctor is not like posting a letter. One of the effects of turning the medical profession into an "organised" public service under an authority would be very similar to the effect of instituting censorship of mail. Even though we know that the censors are impersonal in their job, the mere knowledge that what we write will be read by alien eyes subtly alters what we say. And since a necessary consequence of organising the profession under a central authority is that the patients pay their "fees" to this authority, which thus becomes responsible for the service rendered by each doctor to each patient, it must be concerned with personal medical records, so that it can judge the service being given. Thus in each case we have an intrusion into a peculiarly unique, private, individual, and personal relationship.

Since it seems indisputable that both doctors and patients would prefer an extension of private practice rather than its diminution, it is time that some exhaustive investigation was made into possible methods of extending this facility as widely as possible. This, of course, does not in the least appeal to the Planner, for it leaves him less to organise, and leaves the head of the organisation less to control. That is why, so long as Collectivism appears to be in the ascendant, the State advocates a complete State Service, and the B.M.A. [in England] a ninety per cent. service—the odd ten per cent. of private practice being left temporarily to save its conscience and to meet the demands of those who are still in a position to buy what they want. Unhappily, the B.M.A., too, has its Planners, who at present hold the reins of its government.

But when a little sanity returns, it will not be found really difficult to extend private practice. When you know what you want to do, it is not so hard to find a method. At present the situation is confused, because what is really a matter of availability is confounded with "organisation."

(To be continued.)

| Editor's Note: The foregoing is reprinted from an outstanding booklet published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., Liverpool, England, and about to be re-published in Australia.]

## DISPOSAL OF WAR STORES

By W.P.

In a letter to the President and Councilors, Sutherland, N.S.W., the Secretary of the Sutherland Voters' Policy Association draws attention to the highhanded action taken by the Commonwealth War Goods Disposal Commission in connection with the disposal of surplus war stores. It is suggested that the export of goods, which might be needed by Australians, to other countries, entails a colossal undertaking, suggestive of omniscience, and that the Commission doesn't care a button for the desires or requirements of our own people.

Moreover, it is pointed out that such stores are the property of the Australian taxpayers, who have paid in "toil, tears, blood and sweat," or are yet to be paid for in taxation; and that no disposal of stores should be made until the needs and desires of Australians have been fulfilled.

The Councilors are reminded that Councils will need tractors and road-making machinery for post-war work, and Councils should therefore sight the goods likely to be disposed of in order that goods required may be chosen and purchased. Credits for purchase could easily be arranged without adding to the indebtedness of Councils. It is suggested that the assessed value of such goods purchased might constitute a collective credit to be distributed to the local population individually on an equitable basis—say, in proportion to each individual's payments of direct taxation during the past five years. The increased purchasing power placed in the hands of individuals would enable ratepayers to pay temporarily increased rates to pay for Council purchases, and would also enable private individuals to purchase surplus goods according to their own desires.

It is not suggested that this is the only equitable method, which could be devised; it is merely indicated that goods of great tangible value might be salvaged from the sabotage of human effort, known as war, without cost to the Council, and with satisfaction to the people.

## "PROBLEM OF NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY"

(Continued from page 1.)

part, "the Industrial Committee" enumerates some of the "great and, for the most part, laudable post-war goals," which are gradually taking shape in government quarters. It then further stresses that "the hopes engendered by these ambitious plans are doomed to disappointment unless our industrial machine is organised to produce at the highest levels of efficiency." But the article then moves from the plane of physical reality to financial symbolism. Under a sub-heading, "Big Costs Before Nation," a glance is taken at some of "the goals" enumerated, and an attempt is made, measuring in terms of money, to estimate "the vast claims which they will make on the total production of the nation." This unrealistic note is heightened by the following statement: "It is true that some of these charges on the national income are in the nature of 'transfer payments'—that is, they involve the transfer of income from one set of individuals in the community to another set, and do not of themselves make a direct levy on the national production." Now, the charges referred to in that quotation are represented as not of themselves making a direct levy on the national production in contrast to others which do make such direct levy. The direct charges on the national production mentioned include the planned housing programme, expansion in health and educational facilities, new hospitals, etc.

After the above-quoted sentence, the article, referring to the various charges on the national production, continues: "On the other hand they must be paid for through taxation and therefore necessarily limit the extent to which taxes can be imposed for other purposes."

That sentence makes it very clear that "the industrial committee" is incapable of envisaging any developmental projects or the provision of any amenities beyond what can be "paid for through taxation"—or, of course, by further pawing of the people to the credit monopoly. The distinction drawn between "some of these charges" which "do not of themselves make a direct levy on the national production" because they are "in the nature of transfer payments," and others which, presumably, do make "a direct levy," is one which has no foundation in fact. All governmental expenditure which is financed by taxation is "in the nature of transfer payments," involving the transfer of income from those who have earned it to the government, and thereby inevitably reducing the purchasing power of the taxpayer, hence reducing their capacity to make effective demands on the "record-breaking" increase in output of goods and services which we are enjoined to strive for. Although such deep stress is laid on the oft-reiterated need to achieve this "record-breaking" increase, it is plainly stated that all this must be accomplished within the framework of the prevailing financial system. By implication at least, it is denied that attainment of the "higher standards of production" urged necessarily involves, if it is to mean correspondingly higher standards of life and living for the people, an increase in the incomes of the people, such increase to be partly distributed otherwise than through industry in the form of wages, salaries, or dividends. The "experts" thus demonstrate that they are ignorant of the realities of the situation, or that they prefer to ignore those realities. (To be concluded.)

## FELIX FRANKFURTER'S GANG

"The little group of Frankfurter protégés who were dictating the country's policy on cotton were seven in number. Four were Harvard graduates. Four were Ph.D.'s. None had any business experience. None had any knowledge of cotton. Five had never been on a cotton farm."

—Senator James O. Eastland, Mississippi. (Quoted in the "Social Creditor," 9/12/44.) Planners are like that, the world over.

## ARE THESE MEN REALLY SERIOUS?

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

Sir, —It is difficult to believe that Mr. Dunstan (Premier of the State of Victoria) and Mr. Menzies (Leader of the Federal Opposition) really understood what they were saying last week in connection with the probability of Depression and the Banking Bills respectively.

On 21st March Mr. Dunstan issued a special "warning" that if spending is continued a depression will be inevitable, and the next day the press contained a report of Mr. Menzies' "attack" in the Federal Parliament on the Government's Banking proposals. If these men are really serious in what they are publicly reported to have said, then, in their present spheres of political influence, they are a very great menace to the future welfare of the people. If they are not serious, then they are irresponsible; and irresponsibility is no qualification for participation in the counsels of the nation.

According to the Melbourne "Argus" of 21/3/45, the Victorian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) made these considered statements: —

1. The carnival of extravagance and Commonwealth expenditure would have to be curbed or Australia would soon be heading downhill for one of the worst depressions she had ever known.

2. People are being fed on "new order" propaganda, which is a snare and a delusion.

3. Unless a halt were called to the vast outpourings from the public fund the people of Australia, sooner or later, would find themselves floundering in a hopeless financial morass.

Strange, is it not, that some men never learn?

If we look at these statements realistically we find that depressions never occur in the midst of heavy spending. They always occur when expenditure has been reduced or stopped. Therefore, if we are NOT to have conditions of depression, then the so-called "carnival of extravagance" must be continued in some form. If Commonwealth expenditure is curbed to any appreciable extent, as Mr. Dunstan clearly desires, and is not replaced by other expenditures, then we WILL have depression. The very thing he professes to be anxious to avoid is the very thing he is seeking to have brought about; and yet, not so long ago, he admitted that if money can be found for war it must be found for peace.

Much of the "new order" propaganda IS a snare and a delusion, as he says, but the natural desire of the ordinary man and woman for higher effective incomes, shorter hours of toil, etc., is NOT a snare and a delusion.

In using Mr. Churchill's warning to the people of Britain that "after the war more mental toil and physical sweat would be needed than ever before" as justification for similar talk to the people of Australia, Mr. Dunstan shows how very superficially he looks at things. Great material destruction has taken place in the United Kingdom and the position of the brave people of that wonderful country will be much more difficult than ours. That should provide us with the opportunity to GIVE them all the succour we can, not SELL it to them. If our money system is put right we can liquidate all Australian costs with Australian money before the goods are despatched, and thus allow them to enter England regardless of any question of "purchase" or any quid pro quo condition. The only thing that will stand in the way of this Christian action will be financial mentality of the Dunstan type.

So far as the future possibilities for the Australian people are concerned there is no physical justification whatever for a gloomy outlook.

Our centres of population have not suffered material destruction, and without the assistance of 1¼ million of our best able-bodied men and women who have been withdrawn from normal production activities to go to Munitions and the Fighting Services, we who remain are not only supporting ourselves, but also the 1¼ million referred to, the American Forces based on Australia, an increasing number of British personnel, and to an appreciable extent the people of Great Britain. After the war we could continue to do that if we wished, and we could do it without any assistance at all from the 800,000 in the armed forces or the 500,000 in munitions activities. But when their assistance does become available it will obviously be possible to reduce hours of labour and still have a greatly increased output of goods. There will be no PHYSICAL difficulty in fulfilling our natural and legitimate desires, and only the mentally undeveloped will ever say again that what is physically possible is not financially possible.

As to the outpourings from "the public fund" (provided they are NOT used as indirect means of regimentation, etc., or to sustain an inflated bureaucracy) the means by which the "fund" is supplied are far more important than the expenditure from it.

If the present means, i.e., taxation and borrowing, are going to be continued, then the future WILL be full of trouble; but if the "public fund" is supplied from the monetisation of the public credit without any burden of interest, then funds will be available for anything that is physically possible and desirable. It seems to me that Mr. Dunstan is already floundering mentally, in a "financial morass," and instead of trying to get out of it he is trying to drag others into it. He has a lot to

say about the "collection" and "disbursement" of the stuff called funds, but never says a word about the PRODUCTION of it. He must know that the primary producer produces FOOD and the like, and that unless he can then COLLECT sufficient of the stuff called money, WHICH HE DOES NOT PRODUCE, he goes broke. It is therefore as plain as the noses on our faces that the product of the money-producers is the stuff all of us are compelled to fight for, and that all other producers are subservient to these lords of creation. Mr. Dunstan SPEAKS for the farmer, but FIGHTS for the money manufacturers.

Will someone therefore kindly explain to him that depressions DO NOT come from spending, but from the following deliberate actions on the part of those who control monetary policy: —

1. A rise in interest rates;
2. The unloading of Government securities on the general public;
3. A tightening of the "money market" to curtail loans and overdrafts;
4. Calling in of overdrafts.

If these things are NOT done, there will be no depression of the kind we have previously experienced.

In the case of Mr. Menzies, we are told that he "was greeted by packed galleries in which there was not even standing room," and that he "held attention throughout a fighting speech of two and three-quarter hours." According to the "Argus" report of this "fighting speech," he merely devoted his time to an exhibition of a collection of red herrings, and apparently used them to deceive even his brilliant self.

One of the statements he made should be specially noted and brought forward on every occasion on which he speaks in public as a champion of Democracy. In this statement he publicly confesses that he no longer stands for the sovereignty of the national Parliament or of the will of the people. His exact words, taken from the "Argus," are as follows: —

"If those who sit with me are returned to office in the future they will take prompt steps to restore board control of the bank, with political independence in its central bank functions."

It is on public record that on one special occasion the clever Mr. Menzies sought to convince the Privy Council that the words

"absolutely free" did not mean absolutely free. But the meaning of the words was confirmed and Mr. Menzies's juggling with terms proved another slip. He may try a similar thing again to hoodwink the people, and those who understand the situation should be on the alert to prevent his doing so.

The significant words in this "assurance" are these: "will take prompt steps to restore board control of the bank, with political independence in its central bank functions."

That means he will so arrange matters that if Wall Street Financiers decree depression then we shall have depression regardless of our productive ability or the physical needs of our people.

It also means that the Bank Board would be greater than the Government or Parliament, for with complete "political independence in its central-bank functions" it could ignore the Government, the Parliament, and the Australian People. Notwithstanding this, he has the hardihood to stand up in public and tell us that our sons are dying for the PRESERVATION OF DEMOCRACY! Perhaps he doesn't really understand the meaning of the words.

Let me repeat that, whichever way we look at the words, they mean the same thing, i.e., the Bank Board would continue to be in the position to impose, as it did in 1929-1930, whatever financial POLICY may be determined OUTSIDE Australia. Parliament would be subservient to the Bank Board, as it was in 1931, and in that situation would not be in the position to give effect to the will of the people.

Democracy simply could not exist in such circumstances, and not even Bob's alleged cleverness could alter the fact.

Apparently he did not know that the "Central" banking system was planned only a few years ago by the German-American Jew, PAUL WARBURG, and that its declared purpose is to give world-wide financial hegemony to Wall Street. Poor Bob has had the mistaken idea that Central Banks were established only to "serve the people"! He forgot to inquire "which people?" The reason why the depression was WORLDWIDE was that the "central" banks had made it so.

Another thing he said was that "the most vital element in banking structure is the depositor."

Before there can be a depositor there must be something to deposit. The most vital element in banking is thus to be found in the answers to these simple questions: What IS this something? Who PRODUCES it? How is it manufactured? And who controls the quantity? Will someone kindly tell him too?

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,  
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.  
25th March 1945.

## NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

Sydney police are reported to have seized secreted arms, including two machine guns. This secret arming is attributed to the underworld, and no political significance is attached to it. Just the same, the experience with overseas Communist revolutionaries should not be forgotten.

**FUEL FINDINGS:** The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, after examining all Australian shale oil and coal resources, strongly recommends the recovery of liquid fuel from this source as a means of making Australia less dependent on foreign sources. The estimated cost of hydrogenation plant for this purpose would be about the cost of 12 days' war (£12 millions), to produce about 45 million gallons of petrol annually and certain by-products. It has been found that from Melbourne and Altona Bay to Bacchus Marsh, over an area about 40 miles long by five to ten miles wide, there is a seam of brown coal from 50 to 100 feet thick, containing about 20,000 million tons. In addition, there is an estimated quantity of 1000 million tons at Yallourn, and many other millions of tons in neighbouring districts. There are also other deposits in Tasmania and Queensland, which were not regarded so favourably.

**CAUCUS CONCERN:** The housing shortage has become such a menace from the election viewpoint that even Labor Members are starting to protest; several Members are now pointing out that the Department of War Organisation of Industry had refused many applications for permits to build homes, even when materials were available. However, these Members have given a cute turn to the protests by blaming what they term "high-handed methods adopted by bureaucratic public departments." This is an attempt to shift the blame from Labor Ministers. However, there's no escaping the fact that the Labor Government must be held responsible for its own Departments; therefore, if there is any sincerity in the Caucus clamour, the correct thing to do is to sack the bureaucrats, and remove the restrictions preventing people from building homes. Unless that is done Labor must be prepared to face the possibility of political extinction as the consequence; and it must be done before the election.

**DEMOCRATIC DUKE:** The Duke of Windsor, who, it will be remembered, was deposed from the throne without reference to the people of Britain, is now reported to have resigned from the position of Governor of the Bahamas. Conflicting reports have appeared as to the reason for this; for example, the Melbourne "Age" of March 3, said, "the Duke is resigning because of ill-health," while the "Argus" of

the same date said that "the Duke has been anxious to bring into force certain reforms which he considered overdue, but he was in conflict with his advisers over this." It will also be remembered that the Duke demanded improved conditions for the distressed people of South Wales just prior to being deposed. These reports show both daily papers "cook" the news, and also that the world is governed by persons quite other than most citizens imagine. Incidentally, the Duke of Windsor may return to reside in London later on; this may be interesting, because at present there is no male heir to the throne.

**ARCHBISHOP'S ADVICE:** In the Melbourne "Sun" of March 19, Archbishop Mannix is reported thus: "I do not think that England, Ireland, Scotland and the Dominions should exchange democracy for any other form of Government." Continuing, he said: "We do not want to reproduce here or anywhere within the Commonwealth of British Nations anything of the system that has brought disaster upon Italy and Germany, and I believe will even bring greater disaster upon Russia in the future." This pronouncement is welcome, because the menace of Communism is in need of every possible resistance. It is an appalling thought that there are still in our community some people who lightly regard this threat to our well-being, despite the overwhelming evidence of the evils of this alien philosophy.

**PILLAGE PROFITS:** Pillaged goods estimated at about £500,000 per annum, when sold on the black market, are stated to provide a rake-off of £2 millions for the pillagers. Formerly only a few men working together operated this stunt, but now the racket has been taken over by clever organisers, who plan and bribe and execute the job on a lavish scale. Since rationing makes the market for these gangsters, it is not unreasonable to assume that part of the rake-off will be used to influence the retention of rationing. Yet, how easy to take the profit-motive away and collapse the black market—simply by progressively abandoning rationing, the need for continuing most of it having either disappeared, if it ever existed, or being removable. Theoretically, rationing, when really necessary, is humane and equitable, but it does not always work out that way in practice—and after all it's the results that matter, not theory. Black market can only operate if the people patronise it; no moralising can alter that fact. There is no unavoidable need for rationing of so many everyday commodities in Australia; only the bureaucrats with jobs at stake assert otherwise. Let's be sane in the campaign to eradicate black market—by rationing the rationers.

—O. B. H.

## HOUSING BOSSES' ROUGH DEAL FOR OWNERS

The following report, under the above heading, appeared in Melbourne "Truth" of March 10: —

Classic and almost unbelievable example of how individual rights are being steadily whittled away as we approach the "new order," was given to "Truth" this week by the owner of three blocks of land in Coburg acquired by the Victorian Housing Commission. Purchased 17 years ago to provide a home for each of his three sons, now serving in the A.I.F. and Navy, they cost £297, but with interest, rates, etc, represent a total outlay to date of £670.

In June last year he received a formal printed notice of the commission's intention to acquire the blocks, and asking that he return on the enclosed form the price required.

The owner did not wish to sell, as he desired the land to be used for building homes for his boys. He therefore put down the full price of £670, which, through a personal interview with his wife a month later, the commission declared was excessive.

It was prepared to pay £55 a block, with an adjustment for existing fencing. The wife was advised that if this were unacceptable, the owner could apply for arbitration.

This was the last the owner heard of the matter. No cheque was forwarded and no further intimation of any sort was received.

Imagine his surprise, therefore, when he went to look over the blocks last Sunday to find a house practically finished on one block, another half-completed, on the second, and foundations laid on the third.

Inquiries by "Truth" confirmed the owner's statement in every detail, commission officials pointing out that the original notice stated the intention to acquire the land, and that if the owner were not satisfied with the price, the next move was up to him to apply for arbitration.

Apparently, however, the commission itself recognises that this was pretty brusque treatment, as a circular letter is now sent with the Notice To Treat, which makes the position clear. It also advises that, subject to eligibility under the Act, and other things being equal, the landowner will be granted preference in the allocation of a house.

However, there are still plenty of snags for the block owner, as revealed at a meeting of the North Ward (Preston) Progress Association, when it was pointed out that the prospective purchaser had no say whatever in the design and details of the homes being constructed.

Considerable criticism of the "barracks-like" appearance of commission homes was expressed.

It was argued that, even at best, the man who had been debarred by war conditions from building his home on the block of his own choice, either had to accept a home out of harmony with his own ideas or be forced to sell at a loss to give somebody else the privilege of living on it.

## CANADIAN "COMIC CUTS"

From the "Social Creditor," England, on December 9, 1944: —

Our beloved "Punch" being a little subdued nowadays (and who shall wonder?) the receipt from a Canadian friend of a short book entitled "What About the Jews?" which is packed with good, clean fun, is particularly welcome. Starting off with the sure-fire winner that the Jewish Problem is really a Gentile Problem—that all the regiment is out of step except Ikey—it demonstrates that the world must be altered to suit him. In case this fails to register, the author, who is a Doctor of Pedagogy, inform us that sooner or later the Jew stand "triumphantly" at the graveside of his persecutors.

We needn't spend too much time over the plagiarism of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" from "a French lawyer, Maurice Joly, who had a grievance against Napoleon III"; but "Mr. Neville Laski's public warning that a tremendous wave of anti-Semitism is to be expected in England when the present war is over" is new to us, as is the remark of "an Anglican bishop" that "in Australia, anti-Semitism seems to have come in like a tidal wave."

But, of course, you would like to know what to do. Well, it's just too simple. You have a Communist Revolution, just like Russia, run by Jews, and, presto! You've eliminated anti-Semitism. Or if you haven't you can soon eliminate the anti-Semite; in Russia, we are informed, anti-Semitism is "a dead issue."

This little gem is published by "The Canadian Association for Adult Education, 198 College-street Toronto, and is positively given away.

## PROF. LASKI ON DEMOCRACY

"Mr. Harold Laski, left-wing British economist and source of much of the New Deal's pattern of thought . . . 'It was possible,' he said, 'to believe in the permanence of the democratic ideal in the brief hour of its triumph in 1918. Since then, events have proved that it was unsuited to the conditions of our age.'"

—"Saturday Evening Post," September 30, 1944.

We seem to remember Hitler and Mussolini saying that, too!

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