

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. 13. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 6, 1945

"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.L.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.

What's Behind Federal Banking Legislation?

Regimentation by International Agreement

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

Sir, —A few months ago, when the local financiers launched their campaign against the Government's Banking proposals, we asked what all the fuss was about, seeing that there was little probability of anything happening that would alter the fundamental basis of the present system which keeps the poor, poor in the midst of actual and potential abundance.

We ventured the opinion that there would be no alteration in the arrangement under which money comes into existence only as an interest-bearing debt, and that debt and taxation would continue to scourge us as they have been doing for years, only more so. At the same time, however, we pointed out the very great and very real danger of changes being made, which would have the effect of increasing our subservience to the international financiers whose headquarters are in New York. That idea was ridiculed in certain quarters.

Well, what about it now?

The Banking Bills are before the Commonwealth Parliament and have already been "debated" at some length; Mr. Curtin has intimated that he will not accept any amendments.

I have carefully read the Bills, as well as the special statements dealing with them circulated by the Treasurer to the bankers, and can find nothing at all in any of them that is consciously calculated to effectively improve the living conditions of the great mass of the people.

On the contrary, the Treasurer has officially stated that taxation will continue at the present high levels, and that all the so-called "social benefits" will be financed from taxation collections. This means that the poor will continue to be poor even though the rich, other than the money controllers, may be reduced to the poverty level.

Mr. Crayton Burns, the Canberra Correspondent of the Melbourne "Argus," recently told us that there was no occasion for any of us to be apprehensive about the banking legislation because all those who had been chosen by the Government to give effect to the legislation are men of "orthodox" views who had proved their reliability, and that no important change in policy is likely while they are in charge. He gave us their names and showed how all of them had been faithful to the policy which had been IMPOSED from abroad in 1929 et seq.

He also made a special appeal for Professor Melville, who for several years has been economic adviser to the Commonwealth Bank and apparently is really, a good sort of fellow. Unfortunately, so it would appear, he has been suspect in certain quarters merely because he happens to be one of the "professors." Of course, it would be too silly to say that the RESULTS of his advice provide all the grounds for his condemnation. During his association with the Bank, there has been no let up in the struggle to live, no let up in the burden of debt, and no let up in the process of strangulation by taxation. Truly, he is a good "adviser" for those who benefit from his advice, but he is a very poor adviser from the point of view of 90 families in every 100. He is the sort of fellow whose advice we can well do without.

Records indicate that the man who has been nominated for the office of Deputy Governor of the Commonwealth Bank has had direct contact with the Federal Reserve Board in New York.

Strange that that important detail was not mentioned by Mr. Burns! Perhaps he did not know. Strange also that when I asked my representative in the Federal Parliament for definite information on the point I was informed that it could not be given.

The important aspect of the banking legislation has only now been openly

revealed; first by Mr. Forde in a public statement upon his arrival in the United States, and then by the Prime Minister a few days ago in the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Forde declared that Australia would join with those who wished to impose a WORLD PLAN for what is called "collective security." Dr. Evatt had previously said a similar thing, and in the course of his movements around the world at our expense he has made it his business to meet the "right people," such as Bernard Baruch, Felix Frankfurter, and Harold Laski, to discuss WORLD PLANNING. It will be remembered that "Barney" Baruch had a large say in our losing the last "peace," and that he has been quoted with approval by Dr. Evatt.

Now this WORLD PLANNING policy has been in action very strongly since 1931, and the chairman of the group in England is ISRAEL MOSES SIEFF, who has spent appropriate periods in the United States consulting Baruch, Frankfurter, and other important brethren. LASKI is president of the Labor Party in the United Kingdom, and in some strange way the sayings of EMANUEL SHINWELL, M.P., are given world-wide press publicity whilst the far more important utterances of far more important men are never mentioned. This planning, under the inspiration of leading members of world Jewry, has not been going on for nothing, and unless the common people take a hand we will quickly reach the time when it will be IMPOSED upon us in such a way that it will be almost impossible ever to escape from it.

According to Mr. Crayton Burns, "Camber's Pattern for Peace is Planned Economy Within and Collective Security Without." In the "Argus" of 26/3/45, he reported as follows:—

"Two relatively short statements by Mr. Curtin summed up the outlook very neatly. He intervened in the banking debate late on Thursday night just when the word had passed around that Mr. Ward, Transport

Minister, had the call and the galleries were filling to see the fun. But there wasn't any.

"Mr. Curtin surprised most listeners by pointing out that there was an international aspect to this banking legislation which made it necessary for the Government of the day to control the national credit and monetary policy.

"Australia had no choice but to take part in international agreements not only of a military character, but agreements about trade, economic planning, and monetary arrangements. Such international agreements could be entered into and carried on only between Governments.

"To participate in such arrangements Australian Governments of the future would need to prove to other powers that they had control of the internal economy and monetary policy."

Note especially the references to "international agreements" governing military, trade, economics, and money; and when noting this bear in mind that these agreements may be entered into regardless of the provisions of our Constitution. At least Dr. Evatt said they could, which means that our Constitution could be subverted to alien interests. And if Mr. Curtin's words mean anything, just that is what is afoot.

Could anything more completely confirm the truth of what we have been ridiculed and condemned for saying? In the clearest possible language we are now told that the banking legislation is for international purposes, and apparently NOT for the emancipation of the Australian worker at all. We are also told "Australia has no choice." If that is true, then who does have the say?

In no case has any of these international agreements come into being as the result of the expression of the will of the PEOPLE of any country, and so far as I have been able to find out, in no case has any such agreement been originated by an

(Continued on page 4.)

Australians may rest assured that their futures will be well organised by the World Planners at San Francisco. Mr. W. S. Robinson is one of the "unofficial" members of the Australian delegation! Now, isn't that encouraging! Mr. Robinson is, of course, a very retiring gentleman, and desires no public praise for his worldwide activities on our behalf.

When Mr. Curtin called at 10 Downing Street London, Mr. Robinson was jogging his elbow. He also kept a friendly eye on Dr. Evatt during that gentleman's first two visits to America.

A recent cartoon in "Smith's" is easily the most pertinent comment on the San Francisco Conference to appear in the Australian press. Mr. W. S. Robinson is depicted entering the San Francisco Conference with Mr. Forde in his right-hand hip pocket and Dr. Evatt in his left-hand hip pocket. Mr. Forde is saying how he is leading the delegation, to which Dr. Evatt replies, "Sez you!" Dr. Evatt knows who is master!

The discussions between Dr. Evatt, international socialist, Mr. Robinson, international financier, and Mrs. Jessie Street, one of our local Communists, should be most interesting. What a pity Eddie Thornton cannot be present, too!

Mr. Curtin's speech on the Labor Government's Banking Bills was magnificent—on behalf of the power-lusters who obviously "briefed" him for a delicate piece of work! The point about the danger of inflation was a real winner. And how strange that Mr. Fadden's amendment would not exclude from the Bills the points upon which Mr. Menzies based most of his criticism!

But Mr. Curtin's "key" statement was to the effect that future world agreements would have to be carried out by a Central Bank.

It has been pointed out time and time again in these columns that the Australian banking system was to be suitably "reformed" on behalf of the internationalists. The tragedy is that some sincere people still think that any alteration to the ADMINISTRATION of the financial system, particularly if Menzies and Co. can be used to create a smokescreen of opposition, is going to benefit them personally.

Socialist Dedman's speech during the sham Banking Bills fight revealed more evidence of the fact that the banking legislation is designed to implement the slave State.

Mr. Dedman, who is Post-War Reconstruction Minister—God help us all!—stated that the Government proposed to draw up specific investment programmes covering both private and public spending.

A good thing, too! Why should Bill Jones be allowed to use his own share of social credit for building himself a decent home, when members of Mr. Dedman's Department want to spend it on "national culture" or on big public works? Didn't Mr. Dedman point out in his speech on the Banking Bills how we "squandered" money here in Australia prior to 1929. If there is to be any squandering in future, Mr. Dedman's bureaucrats will do it. After all, nearly six years of war should have given them considerable practice!

In commenting on a report on Canada, issued by the Royal Bank of Canada, the Sydney "Bulletin," of February 28, says:

"And all this, you may think, has been achieved by Aberhart and succeeding Douglas-credit Governments in Alberta, and by nationalisation of banking."

It is the duty of all social crediters to (Continued on page 3.)

NOTES on the NEWS

Following the easing of wage pegging, Mr. Curtin announces that any permitted wage increase will NOT reflect itself in increased PRICES. In some cases (at the discretion of some bureaucrat) some employers will be compelled to pay the increased wages, but will not be permitted to recover the extra costs through prices. In other cases the employer will be eligible to seek a Treasury subsidy to meet the extra costs. Here we see an illustration of ARBITRARY or variable law which delights the bureaucrat who becomes the judge and jury; it is NOT a law that ALL must obey. If, for example, you were a loyal Labor or U.A.P. (Liberal) supporter and your Party nominee was in office you might be privileged to recover your costs. If not—that would be just too bad. Of course, you COULD "back both horses" by supporting BOTH Parties in order to play safe. There are other angles to this, but that's the danger of arbitrary laws.

POLICE POSER: Some idea of legal word play and conflicting attitudes towards the police appeared in the Melbourne daily press of March 20. In one case counsel for the accused said, "I feel that the police are no more to be believed in this case than my client . . . As in my own profession, there are some who go astray." In another case the magistrate complimented the constable appearing in the case by saying, "his handling of the case is characteristic of the conspicuous fairness which we have

come to expect of him." Bypassing the first illustration, and without detracting from the praise given to the constable, is not fairness the very least we should expect from our police? And is it to be assumed that fairness from the police, being "conspicuous" in the case mentioned, is the exception rather than the rule?

MUNITIONS MUDDLE: According to a statement made in the Federal House, the Munitions Department spent £7,500,000 on developing an Australian tank. In this connection, "Smith's Weekly" claims to have proved, on authoritative evidence, that this venture has cost taxpayers £37,000,000, and that not one tank was completed. Senator Cameron admitted that none were produced. Another venture consisted of producing 90 pistols, at an average cost of £2900 per pistol. There are many other examples such as these to prove that the bureaucrats have made a marvellous war effort.

SOVIET SOCIALISM: An interesting comparison of living standards, provided by a correspondent in the "Age" of March 26, dispels the theory that Communism produces satisfactory results. The units of comparison are, one kilogram of butter, sugar, meat and flour. The hours of work required to produce these goods in different countries before the war were as follows: U.S., 2 hours and 45 minutes; Britain, 5 hours and 9 minutes; France, 6 hours and 18 minutes; Poland, 9 hours and 9 minutes; Latvia, 9 hours and 49 minutes; U.S.S.R., 19 hours and 49 minutes. (This analysis (Continued on page 2.)

For the Bosses of the Masses

"The latest thing on wheels is a \$20,000 eight-cylinder luxury limousine, designed especially in England for a high Soviet official. Equipped with silver fittings and a heating and air-conditioning system that maintains the air at a constant temperature even in sub-zero weather, the car also has electrically heated windshield wipers to prevent ice from forming, and thermostatic control to keep radiator water from freezing."

—"Forbes" Magazine." (Quoted in "Canadian Social Creditor," February 1, 1945.)

That reminds us of the luxury Chrysler limousines that were specially imported recently for our own "Labor" Cabinet Ministers.

POPUP (Condensed from "Ends and Means," by Aldous Huxley)

In his recent book, "Which Way to Peace?" Bertrand Russell has written a significant paragraph on this subject, "Schools," he says, "have very greatly improved during the present century, at any rate in the countries which have remained democratic. In the countries, which have military dictatorships, including Russia, there has been a great retrogression during the last ten years, involving a revival of strict discipline, implicit obedience, a ridiculously subservient behaviour towards teachers, and passive rather than active methods of acquiring knowledge."

"All this is rightly held by the governments concerned to be a method of producing a militaristic mentality, at once obedient and domineering, cowardly and brutal. . . . From the practice of the despots, we can see that they agree with the advocates of 'modern' education as regards the connection between discipline in schools and the love of war in later life."

Dr. Maria Montessori has developed the same theme in a recent pamphlet:—

"The child who has never learned to act alone, to direct his own actions, to govern his own will, grows into an adult who is easily led and must always lean upon others. The school child, being continually discouraged and scolded, ends by acquiring that mixture of distrust of his own powers, and of fear, which is called shyness and which later, in the grown man, takes the form of discouragement and submissiveness, of incapacity to put up the slightest moral resistance. The obedience which is expected of a child both in the home and in the school—an obedience admitting neither of reason nor of justice—prepares the man to be docile to blind forces. The punishment, so common in schools, which consists in subjecting the culprit to public reprimand and is almost tantamount to the torture of the pillory, fills the soul with a crazy, unreasoning fear of public opinion, even an opinion manifestly unjust and false. In the midst of these adaptations and many others which set up a permanent inferiority complex, is born the spirit of devotion—not to say of idolatry—to the 'condotteri,' the leaders."

(Dr. Montessori might have added that the inferiority complex often finds expression in compensatory brutality and cruelty. The traditional education is training for life in a hierarchical militaristic society, in which people are abjectly obedient to their superiors and inhuman to their inferiors. Each slave "takes it out of" the slave below.)

In the light of these two citations, we are able to understand more clearly why history should have taken the course it actually has taken in recent years. The intensifications of militarism, the rise of dictatorships, the spread of authoritarian rule at the expense of democratic government—these are phenomena which, like all other events in human history, have a variety of interacting causes. Most conspicuous among these, of course, are the economic and political causes. But these do not stand alone. There are also educational and psychological causes.

Among these must be reckoned the fact that, for the last sixty years, all children have been subjected to the strict, authoritarian discipline of State schools. In recent European history, such a thing has never happened before.

At certain periods, it is true, and in certain classes of society, the discipline imposed within the family was exceedingly strict. For example, the seventeenth-century Puritan family was governed almost as arbitrarily and as harshly as the family of the Roman farmer or the Japanese Samurai. Samurai and Roman had the same end in view—to train up children in the military virtues, so that they should become good soldiers. The Puritan had a religious end in view; he was imitating Jehovah; he was breaking his children's will because St. Augustine and Calvin had taught him that that will was essentially evil. And yet, though the ends were different, the results of the Puritan's educational system were the same as those attained by the essentially similar system devised by the Roman and the Samurai for quite another end. His children became first-rate soldiers; and when they were not called upon to go to war they exhibited their militaristic qualities in the field of

THE BRITISH LION'S SHARE

President Roosevelt's Admissions

More than 95 per cent, of essential civilian supplies landed in France in the first 90 days after D-Day came from British stocks. President Roosevelt revealed in a recent lend-lease report to Congress.

The President said: "Supplies provided by Britain for the United States Armies have made a life-and-death difference in the fighting this year."

"Great Britain's part in this has been made possible through the miracles of production and steadfastness her people have achieved in five successive years that were lived literally on the front lines."

President Roosevelt also revealed:—

The entire output of Britain's sheet-steel industry for three months was used to equip United States invasion vehicles.

Bailey bridges, built by Britain, enabled critical supplies to reach the front line when, thousands of bridges were destroyed in France.

A new type of aeroplane sparking plug developed in Britain, has been used since 1943, in virtually every Flying Fortress based in Britain.

Detachable auxiliary petrol tanks made in Britain from old newspapers and waste paper, made possible United States raids deep into the heart of Germany.

commerce and industry, becoming (as Tawney and Weber have shown) the first and almost the most ruthless of the capitalists. The Puritans, I repeat, were strict disciplinarians within the family. But not all the population was composed of Puritans.

When most children were brought up within the family, a great many experienced only kindness and consideration. In other cases spasmodic brutality alternated with spasmodic affection. In yet others, no doubt, parents would have liked to impose a strict Roman or Hebrew discipline, but were too lazy to do so systematically, so that the child came through almost unscathed.

It is a highly significant fact that the members of the upper classes, who, as children, had been under tutors or sent to school, were always the actively militaristic element in mediaeval and early modern society. The common people were seldom spontaneously bellicose. War and imperialistic brigandage were the preoccupation of their masters—who had enjoyed the privilege, during boyhood, of being

bullied by some sharp-tongued hard-hitting pedagogue.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, secondary education for the middle classes was enormously extended; in the second half, primary education was made universally compulsory.

For the first time, ALL children were subjected to strict, systematic, unremitting discipline—the kind of discipline that "produces a militaristic mentality, at once obedient and domineering."

The members of the middle and upper classes still undergo, in most countries, a longer period of education than do the poor. This is why the members of the middle and upper classes are still, on the whole, more bellicose than the members of the working class. (Such organisations as the Peace Pledge Union have more adherents among the poor than among the rich.) Even the poor, however, are now given several years of authoritarian discipline.

The decline of democracy has coincided exactly with the rise to manhood and political power of the second generation of the compulsorily "educated" proletariat. This is no fortuitous coincidence.

By 1920 all the Europeans who had escaped compulsory primary education were either dead or impotently old. The masses had gone through, first, six or seven years of drilling in school, then, in most countries, anything from one to three years of conscription, and finally the four years of war. Enough military discipline to make them "at once obedient and domineering." The most actively domineering ones climbed to the top, the rest obeyed and were given, as a reward, the privilege of bullying those beneath them in the new political hierarchies.

(To be concluded.)

BETTER DOCTORING FOR THE PEOPLE

By DR. JOHN DALE, President of the B.M.A. (Vic. Branch)

(Condensed from the Melbourne "Age," March 24.)

The recent articles by Sir Hugh Devine and Senator J. M. Fraser (Federal Minister for Health) on good and better medical services are of great interest in view of the present intentions of the Federal Government, as expressed in recent legislation and in various statements, to mould the medical services in closer accord with its general policy.

It might be expected that the British Medical Association would have something to say and, as current president of the Victorian branch, I feel that I should offer some comments.

A considered statement representing the views of the majority of the profession will later, I hope, appear, but the fact of the matter is that so many of the doctors are on service and the rest are at present so over-worked that it is exceedingly difficult to prepare such a statement.

This brings me to a first and main objection on the part of the profession to what it regards as the precipitate and ill-considered actions now being undertaken and threatened. The medical services of the community, however static and imperfect they appear to be, are in fact a vast and delicately adjusted mechanism, constantly evolving and being modified in response to the advances of science in numerous fields, and to the social, economic and domestic changes which take place in society.

The profession itself has developed on a basis of freedom and independence. Largely responsible for the education of its own members and for its research activities, it is proud of its ancient tradition of service to all members of the community, according to their need and irrespective of their circumstances. It seeks continuously to improve both the quality and the availability of its services and has always been ready and anxious to advise and co-operate with governmental and other bodies in respect of those improvements. Judged by results, it has not done a bad job.

Such was the situation. Came the war and the profession was prepared to play its part to the utmost. Nearly one-third of its members, including a majority of the younger and more fit members, were called to serve with the forces. This has imposed a very great strain upon the older and less fit who are doing their best to serve the civil population and it is an unfortunate fact that many of them are literally "fagged out."

NATIONALISATION

It is in these circumstances that the profession has to face what is, without beating about the bush, the threat of nationalisation, the loss of its ancient freedom and independence, and the prospect of regimentation into a civil service. As soon as the present intentions of the Federal Government became apparent, the profession, through its Federal council, approached the Ministry and urged that no major alterations of medical services should be decided upon until one year after hostilities ceased; until, in fact, the serving members, whose interests would be so largely involved, had returned to civil life, and the profession collectively would have time and opportunity to deliberate and advise.

An assurance was received that no drastic alteration would be made during wartime, but following upon Cabinet changes, the Government, well equipped with planners, saw fit to act otherwise. The doctors, situated as they are, feel they are being caught unfairly.

The intention of the Government appears to be to provide all medical services "free" in the sense that no individual himself

would be required to pay for any services rendered. That the services will have to be paid for collectively is obvious and the adjective "collectively" suggests, I think, the nature of the Government's intention. The medical services are to be socialised as part of a larger plan.

REGIMENTATION

In Senator Fraser's article the medical services of the armed forces are praised as being free to all and of the highest quality. We are indeed glad that our colleagues are doing such a fine job, and are proud of it. But are these the kind of services, which the doctors themselves would like to give, and the people themselves would like to receive in peacetime? I say most emphatically, No! An army is necessarily the very pattern of totalitarianism. And yet that is the kind of service and the kind of life to which the enforcement of socialism would inevitably lead. The doctors, at any rate, do not want to be regimented. They desire to retain their personal freedom and independence. They want to be able, as far as possible, to choose for themselves the nature and conditions of their work, subject to the law, and to their duty and responsibility as members of a learned profession.

And does the patient want the kind of service that he gets in the army, and does his wife? The outstanding feature of private medical practice is its complete privacy. Records are made and kept, but they are strictly private. Intervention of a third party would change entirely the character of medical practice. The doctor would not be responsible to the patient, but to his employer—the State. It has been suggested that State medicine would be like veterinary work.

The introduction of a State medical service is being urged mainly on the grounds that many cannot afford to pay for the full benefits of modern medicine. That is obviously true, and the doctors, at any rate, have always been and are ready to do their best to ensure that no one goes without the best medical attention, because he is poor. And it is, on the whole, grossly untrue to suggest that at present the rich can afford to be cured and that the poor may die because they cannot afford treatment. Everyone knows that even under existing conditions when a life is threatened the most expensive serums and drugs, and the highest skill of the profession are made available, quite irrespective of the means of the patient. Take, as one of countless examples, some extremely difficult or delicate operation, perhaps for a tumor on the brain, an operation in which only a very few of our most skilled surgeons have specialised. Any person in any part of the State can and does get the most skilled service—under present conditions.

STANDARDISATION

We certainly challenge the assumption that there are three parties essential to any contract, namely, the Government, the doctor, and the patient. Government intervention is likely to lead to standardisation of methods and the loss of initiative and personal responsibility on the part of the doctors and so hinder rather than help the growth and application of medical skill. Medical needs vary with every individual

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

was provided by the International Labor Office in 1939). It is the result that should interest the workers, not the idle chatter of Communist propagandists, and on this basis, analysis places U.S. Capitalism an easy winner, with the Soviet Socialism a bad last. It's rather a handy piece of information to have around.

CURTIN'S CONTROLS: Despite the overwhelming Referendum verdict against the principle of Federal control, Herr Curtin made it clear at the February conference of Australian manufacturers that further attempts will be made to obtain the powers. What a man! What a democrat! The reported method of gaining the powers is that of endeavouring to cajole, bluff or trick State Premiers into, surrendering the powers when, as stated, "controversies of the Referendum campaign have been forgotten." It will be a curious situation if the people ever forget the misrepresentation of the "Yes" advocates. They will have observed that all the lies as to the dire catastrophe and chaos that would follow a "No" vote were but the vapourings of fanatical minds. Just the same, freedom-loving electors will have to maintain pressure on their State Members to prevent any treacherous surrender of power to the Federal Bureaucracy.

HEBREW HOSTILITY: A recent Washington report in the Melbourne "Herald" stated: "Open defiance of British policy limiting immigration of Jews to Palestine has been expressed by the spokesman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation." This hostile Hebrew is reported as saying: "We intend to run the blockade immediately after the war, and we will do it before then if we can obtain the ships." This spokesman also admitted that, "from 1937 to 1940, 40,000 Jews went to Palestine despite British opposition." From this it seems clear that this body is determined to embroil Britain in further turmoil in keeping the peace between Jews and Arabs who are determined not to be dispossessed by the Jews. It is to be hoped that intelligent rank-and-file Jews will really try to stop this provocative action, and that they will do their utmost to discipline this body of agitators, who, by their actions, will assuredly precipitate more hostility towards innocent Jews.

HUNGRY HEROES: Hungry Australian naval ratings in the islands have had to beg and scrounge food from Americans, because their own rations were so poor and inadequate. That's not enemy propaganda, either, unless the Melbourne "Herald" of February 12 can be so described. When this complaint was referred to the Navy Department in Melbourne, no comment was forthcoming. Further to this, quite recently a consignment of maggot-infested hams had been accepted for despatch to our soldiers, when a box was accidentally dropped and broken, and the position disclosed. Wharf labourers who witnessed the incident said it was not the first time affected foodstuffs were shipped ("Smith's Weekly," March 17). How do these facts square with the bureaucrats' excuse for the food shortage here? Their alibi that "the missing food goes to the troops" is obviously inadequate.

FEDERATION FEELER: As a means of preventing a third world war, Lord Huntingdon advocated in the House of Lords that there should be a Federation of all European "democracies." He contended that the scheme would solve the problem of what to do with Germany, because all her war potentialities would become the property of the European Federal Government, of which Britain could also be a member. Lord Cranbourne objected that the scheme was too far removed from reality; he said there was need for closer international co-operation but preferred the Dumbarton Oaks plan of force! The principle of voluntary co-operation which binds the British Empire is the only form of international association under which the members have not warred between themselves; it is significant, therefore, that this idea is resisted by all "global" minds.

—O. B. H.

and in different circumstances, and treatment cannot be standardised.

There are, of course, fields in which Government or community arrangements are useful and necessary, such as those of public health, child-welfare services, and many others wherein the profession co-operates wholeheartedly.

But the majority of doctors do not wish to be socialised or conscripted, and neither, we believe, do the majority of our fellow citizens. Many of us regard the proposals to provide free medicines and to subsidise hospital beds, provided that treatment in them is free, as measures designed to enmesh the doctors and the public in the net of regimentation. The Pharmaceutical Benefits Act may look innocent on the surface, and we fully agree that the expense of drugs, and particularly some of the newer drugs and serums, does in many cases fall hardly upon many patients, and that arrangements should be made whereby the cost of these could be shared. This, however, can certainly be arranged without at the same time laying hands upon the personal freedom of the doctors.

BOOKS TO READ

(Obtainable from The United Electors of Australia, Room 9, Floor 5, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.)

"Federal Union Exposed." Exposes the international bankers' plot to dominate the world through World Government. A complete analysis—and a most important reference book. Price, 1/1 posted.

WHITE AUSTRALIA POLICY IN DANGER
The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, is the latest to join in the propaganda drive to destroy the White Australia Policy. He has said that we must widen our immigration policy to admit Asiatics. His argument is that Britain is committed to such a policy under the Atlantic Charter. What is important to Australia is whether or not the Archbishop is acting as an unofficial mouthpiece of British policy. In that event Australia will find itself on the defensive during the peace settlement negotiations.

For 5½ years Australia has been making heavy sacrifices to defend its own Australian way of life. The cornerstone of the edifice is the White Australia policy. The White Australia Policy saved Australia in 1941. We were fortunate, indeed, that we had no Japanese "fifth column" inside this country.

Idealists like the Archbishop of Canterbury would long ago have lowered the barriers to permit the free entry of Japanese.

His predecessor in his high office was amongst those who protested, prior to the outbreak of war, against the exclusion of the Japanese from Australia.

Yet the United States of America found itself in jeopardy of losing the war in the Pacific in 1941 as the result of its failure to put its quota system into operation earlier.

Pearl Harbour was the handiwork of Japanese pilots who had lived in Honolulu.

The Japanese on that island far outnumbered the Americans. Fortunately, the Japanese High Command made a bad blunder when it failed to realise how devastating had been its blow at Pearl Harbour. Otherwise, the United States might have lost its most vital base.

Even on the American mainland, there was a real fear that the Japanese population of California, with the Japanese half-castes, or the Nisei, might constitute a dangerous fifth column. The result was the biggest mass migration in the American history, when the Japanese population was moved inland.

If a nation of 130,000,000 people, such as the United States, could be rendered vulnerable, because some years previously it had admitted Asiatic immigrants, then what would be the position of Australia with 8,000,000 inhabitants?

We have already had the experience of colonies of foreigners in this country. The sugar fields of Queensland have had their Italian settlements. There have been German settlements in South Australia.

Now, apparently, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his fellow-idealists, would like to see Australia dotted with colonies of Asiatic settlers!

Australia has never sought to dictate to British politicians or clerics regarding the

social, economic, or political policy that should be adopted by Great Britain.

In 1941, Australia found that when Britain was engaged in the European war, it could not afford to provide the means of defence for this country. The British Fleet was needed in the North Sea. It could not then be spared for the Pacific. In those critical days, the population of this country learned that for the future, we would have to fend for ourselves.

We could never again run the risk of help arriving too late.

That is why the White Australia Policy must remain the crucial plank of our future defence policy.

We could never hope to defend this country if we had to fight, simultaneously, a foe within and a foe without.

The Communist Party subscribes to the same tenets as the Archbishop of Canterbury. It believes in a white, brown, yellow, or brindle population for this country because it has no interest in the defence of Australia.

Instead of interfering with the domestic policy of Australia, the Archbishop of Canterbury would be better advised to turn his attention to the problem of raising the world living standards.

In the past, there have been those who would reduce Australia to the coolie standard of living. They wanted Australians to get down to the rice-bowl standard.

If there is to be future peace in the Pacific, then the first step must be to raise the standard of living of all peoples bordering the Pacific. The era of foreign exploitation of coolies is now over. Those who are concerning themselves about the Atlantic Charter should first turn their attention to the promises that living standards would be raised. If that promise is fulfilled, there will be no reason for mass migration or need for territorial expansion.

At the same time, Australia must tackle its own problems first.

Through the White, Australia Policy, it could protect its own living standards, and provide for its own safety.

There is a clear obligation for the Curtin Government to stand up and tell the world at large that under no circumstances are we prepared to surrender our national safety.

Only a cowardly Government will remain silent.

Jaffe, Deutch, Mendelsohn, Bartholdi and Dr. Melchoir.

The American delegation included Baruch, Liffman, Morgenthau and Paul Warburg. The official interpreter at the conferences was also a Jew, Mantoux.

What a "coincidence" that the Warburg brothers, both members of the powerful Jewish banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., headquarters at Wall Street, New York, represented both Germany and America! About the time of Versailles, Max Warburg received the following from Paul's senior partner, Schiff, of whom we will learn more later.

"Paul is now with you, who, with his clear intelligence and the vast experience he has acquired from his membership on the Federal Reserve Board, and otherwise, can no doubt be of much aid to you in formulating plans for the future."

And what plans they were! Every so-called "agreement" since the 1914-18 war, including the "agreement" that the Second World War was necessary to establish a new League of Nations, can be shown to be the result of planning by powerful Jews.

Jewish spokesmen have placed it on record that Jews hold key positions everywhere. In the "Jewish Standard" (England) of May 17, 1940, the following remarkable statement appeared:

"... it must be admitted, bitter though it is to tell the truth at a moment like this—that the democracies did not appreciate in time the tremendous contributions which Jews could have made, even early in the struggle, towards victory. In a war of this kind and of the present dimensions, it is a people like ours that could have played the decisive role, OUR INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIONS, SYMPATHIES IN KEY POSITIONS... we could have given to the Allies prizes and services they could not otherwise obtain... This is the truth which must now be hammered into the minds of the statesmen of the embattled democracies." (My emphasis.)

It is essential that the significance of the above be "hammered" into the minds of the British peoples everywhere.

(To be continued.)

OBITUARY NOTICE

The Hon. Secretary of the Westralian Electoral Campaign reports as follows:

With very great regret we announce the death of Captain T. James, of 5 Sandgate Street, South Perth, W.A. Capt. James passed away on the afternoon of March 24, the remains being interred in the Methodist portion of Karracatta Cemetery.

During the early period of activities of the movement, Capt. James took a very active and prominent part. Subsequently, ill health made it impossible to lead an active life.

A few months ago, Capt. James started to take a treatment from England, and was getting very good results (the best results for years) when he had the misfortune to contract enteritis. Although he presumably recovered from that, his power of resistance was not great enough.

We would like to thank all those who made donations towards the treatment that Capt. James was able to take before he contracted enteritis. It at least gave him hope, even if too late.

—Wm. F. Andrews.

The "Never Again" Association, of Bromley, Kent, England, is issuing a series of booklets containing articles on topical and very important subjects by well-known people. Douglas Reed, author of "Lest We Regret," "All Our Tomorrows," etc., contributes a strong article entitled "Sovereignty." It contains absolutely unanswerable arguments against "Federal Union." Reed sees the very grave danger to Britain and the Empire in the Federal Union idea. He says:—

"In everyday life, men are only deprived of control over their affairs when they have been certified insane, or bankrupt; this proposal means that we should be treated, and even ASK to be treated as insolvents, or idiots, at the moment of victory.

"When we have sacrificed enough life, liberty and treasure to gain victory in the fighting, are we to request that, as the first fruits of our victory, others shall take our last liberty from us: the liberty to fight, if need be? Shall we, by this means, when our men have defeated the enemy, achieve what Hitler could have achieved in 1940 if he had known a way to drain the Channel dry, or to destroy our air force: our own defenselessness? Shall we, by this means (when our sailors, soldiers and airmen have won the war) inflict on ourselves that which has been known as the supreme penalty of defeat since the world began: the surrender of our arms and our citadel, the acceptance of tutelage and slavery.

"Shall we, indeed (by handing over our National Sovereignty to some anonymous tribunal when our fighting men have overcome the foe) put ourselves further back than we were in 1939, when this war overtly began, and make quite certain that such of our island freedom and our imperial unity as remains to us from this war will be destroyed in another that will very soon be begun against us?"

"If there are any who try to see what actually goes on 'under cover of war,' they should reflect that this war was not made in Germany alone. It was made also by the two greatest political parties in this country, the one of which supported the 'reconstruction' loans for Germany (these

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

make it clear that Social Credit has no connection with the nationalisation of banking, and that social crediters, while repudiating most of the bank-inspired propaganda appearing in this country, are opposed to the Government's Banking Bills, which are designed to transform a racket into a bigger and more centralised racket. This issue must be made clear to the public.

A full-page advertisement in the Sydney "Bulletin," of March 14, gives the following advice to the public:

"Tell your Federal Member: 'Hands Off the Commonwealth Bank!'"

And those responsible for this advice? Our old friends, the Sane Democracy League! Times have changed since the days when social crediters used the above watchword in their fight against Mr. R. G. Casey's Bank Amendment Act. The Sane Democracy people were in favour of hands ON the Commonwealth Bank then!

Those concerned with making the drastic reduction of the local bureaucracy one of the major issues at the next Federal Election, will find the following statements by a Polish Patriot helpful:

"Small nations can make a real contribution to the task of regeneration of Europe—after all, small countries like Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, have proved excellent laboratories of democracy, while the great expanses do not always favour the development of free and responsible citizens. The Great Powers seem often to be breeding places of the doctrine of State-worship and subjection of the individual."

"And so when today some people in this country try to teach the countries of Europe that State intervention must increase, that planning is inevitable, and so on, and so forth—we reply that we know that song by heart, that we have had bitter experiences with State control and with the rule of bureaucracy, which is the scourge of the twentieth century; that we know that the planning schemes started in Nazi Germany, and so we view such things with considerable suspicion... These are not the kind of lessons we want to accept from this country. We are rather of the opinion that the State—called once by Nietzsche the most cold-blooded of beasts—should relax its control, and that modern man cannot be subjected to its omnipotence."

Start today in the march back along the road to freedom. Help and encourage the anti-bureaucracy campaign.

—E.D.B.

A PUBLIC DEBATE

On Sunday, April 8, 1945, at the Savoy Theatre, Russell Street, Melbourne, at 7.45 p.m., a debate will take place between Mr. J. A. Dawson and Mr. J. Bradshaw. The debate is the result of a challenge recently issued by Mr. Dawson to Mr. Bradshaw, the subject being: "That the Social Credit Proposals are not in line with the realities of the situation." Mr. Bradshaw will, of course, negative this proposition. Supporters are urged to try to attend this debate, which is being held under the auspices of the No Conscriptio Campaign.

MASTER-PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

With commentary by ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

PROTOCOL NO. 5.

"What form of administrative rule can be given to communities in which corruption has penetrated everywhere, communities where riches are attained only by the clever surprise tactics of semi-swindling tricks; where looseness reigns; where morality is maintained by penal measures and harsh laws but not by voluntarily accepted principles; where the feeling toward faith and country are obliterated by cosmopolitan convictions?"

"What form of rule is to be given to these communities if not that despotism which I shall describe to you later? We shall create an intensified centralisation of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences and liberties, which have been permitted by the goyim, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportions as to be at any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any goyim who oppose by deed or word.

"We shall be told that such a despotism as I speak of is not consistent with the progress of these days, but I will prove to you that it is.

"In the times when the peoples looked upon kings on their thrones as on a pure manifestation of the will of God, they submitted without a murmur to the despotic power of kings: but from the day when we insinuated into their minds the conception of their own rights they began to regard the occupants of thrones as mere ordinary mortals. The holy unction of the Lord's Anointed has fallen from the heads of kings in the eye of the people, and when we also robbed them of their faith in God the might of power was flung upon the streets into the place of public proprietorship and was seized by us.

"Moreover, the art of directing masses and individuals by means of cleverly manipulated theory and verbiage, by regulations of life-in-common and all sorts of other quirks, in all which the goyim understand nothing, belongs likewise to the specialists of our administrative brain.

"Reared on analysis, observation, on delicacies of fine calculation, in this species of skill we have no rivals, any more than we have either in the drawing up of plans of political actions and solidarity. In this respect the Jesuits alone might have compared with us, but we have contrived to discredit them in the eyes of the unthinking mob as an overt organisation while we ourselves all the while have kept our secret organisation in the shade. However, it is probably all the same to the world who is its sovereign lord, whether the head of Catholicism or our despot of the blood

of Zion! But to us, the Chosen People, it is very far from being a matter of indifference.

"For a time perhaps we might be successfully dealt with by a coalition of the GOYIM of all the world; but from this danger we are secured by the discord existing among them whose roots are so deeply seated that they can never now be plucked up. We have set one against another the personal and national reckonings of the goyim, religious and race hatreds, which we have fostered into a huge growth in the course of the past twenty centuries. This is the reason why there is not one State which would anywhere receive support if it were to raise its arm, for every one of them must bear in mind that any agreement against us would be unprofitable to itself. We are too strong—there is no evading our power.

"The nations cannot come to even an inconsiderable private agreement without our secretly having a hand in it."

COMMENT:—

The Jew, Disraeli, made it very clear that the Jews were the chief negotiators for all European Governments. Let us briefly examine a little evidence.

Back in last century Bleichroder in Berlin and Alphonse Rothschild in Paris were the secret distributors of news to Bismarck and Napoleon III. Constant communication was maintained. When Bismarck was besieging Paris during the Franco-Prussian war, he made his headquarters at Rothschild's castle at Ferrieres. Bleichroder for Prussia and Alphonse Rothschild for France made the arrangements for the indemnity of the vanquished.

At the Peace Conference after the 1914-18 war, the following were present:—
 Lloyd George, one time solicitor to the Zionist Movement.

Sir Phillip Sassoon, his secretary. A Rothschild on his mother's side.

Sir Maurice Hankey, claimed as a Jew by the "Jewish Guardian," June 1922, was British secretary.

Secretary to Clemenceau was Mandel, well-known Jew.

One of Italy's main representatives was Baron Tonnis, a half Jew.

The German Delegation was comprised of the following Jews: M. Warburg, Von Stress,

"INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS" AND THE PLANNERS' PLOT

By J BRADSHAW, A.F.I.A.

Hereunder we continue the article commenced in our last issue by Mr. Bradshaw, in which he comments on a series of articles emanating from the "Institute of Public Affairs" and published recently in the Melbourne "Herald":

Although, in one section of the concluding article, we are told that "the State must give every encouragement to private enterprise," it does not appear to dawn on these superficially-minded, pestiferous planners that their mental attitude (to the subject on which they are represented as being so well-informed) as disclosed by their articles is incompatible alike with the existence of genuine private enterprise and with the maintenance of any other than a totalitarian regime.

The following quotation from the third article appeared in bold type:

"The common interest plainly demands that the efficiency of private industry should be a main item on the agenda of the State's post-war policy. On the grounds of public welfare, there is the strongest of prima facie cases against any controls which obstruct and hamper the productivity and efficiency of private enterprise."

Now, if those responsible for the articles under criticism can be presumed to have used words with some degree of regard to their meaning, we can justly conclude that "the productivity and efficiency of private enterprise" must mean the achievement of a maximum volume of production with the minimum expenditure of effort and energy consonant with maintenance of the highest quality of products and services. These pseudo-intellectual planners, however, are either unaware or deliberately regardless of the obvious truth that "the productivity and efficiency of private enterprise" which, we are told, "should be a main item on the agenda of the State's post-war policy," is totally incompatible with the declared post-war policy of all the States—viz., "full employment"—a policy which is endorsed both by the "Industrial Committee of the Institute of Public Affairs" and by its American counterpart.

A section of the final article headed "Tax Changes Necessary," declares that, "up to the present stage of economic development, the State's use of the taxation WEAPON has been for the most part crude and uninspired."

Note the admission that taxation IS A WEAPON, and all that is implied therein. "Taxation has been regarded chiefly as a means of raising revenue and of re-distributing the total national income more equitably between the poor and the rich, but seldom, if ever, as a constructive instrument of economic progress." That sentence, also, has far-reaching implications. Firstly, it may be observed that as taxation can, and, according to the "industrial committee" should, be regarded as more than a means of raising revenue and of re-distribution of the total national income, then, conversely, it may not be at all necessary for governments to impose taxation, and that there may be some other means of raising revenue which would be a more "constructive instrument of economic progress." The Committee, of course, does not suggest that taxation should be abolished. (Would any body on which bankers were represented do so?) It merely complains, "The State's use of the taxation weapon has been crude and uninspired."

Most people who are being crushed by the present atrocious rates of taxation will readily agree that they represent a "crude" use of the tax "weapon," but how can it be reasonably claimed that they represent an "uninspired" use of the "weapon"?

They certainly are inspired by someone—mainly, it appears, by the bankers' stooges who are "advisers" to the present "Labor" Government, as they were also to the preceding "anti-Labor" Governments. But cheer up, you hard-pressed, harassed taxpayers! The "industrial" (bankers?) committee is trying hard to remedy this "crude" use of the taxation "weapon." It aims to have this "weapon" used in a refined manner. No doubt it is aware that Hitler and Himmler have devised improvements in the "crude" use of the torture "weapon." To speak of taxation, as "a constructive instrument of economic progress" is a contradiction in terms—except to minds with distorted ideas of "progress."

The appropriation by taxation of a steadily increasing proportion of the incomes of individuals must inevitably diminish the independence and economic security of individuals.

Then there is the effect of the enormous burden of indirect taxation to be taken into account. As, doubtless, even the "industrial committee" would admit, indirect taxation is passed on to the individual consumer in the form of prices, as also are employers' contributions to "free" "social security" schemes. This results in higher prices with a correspondingly lower purchasing power of individual incomes. Furthermore, as members of the "industrial committee" are probably aware, though equally probably they would deny it, it is utterly impossible for governments to finance either war or projected post-war expenditure solely by taxation. This is due to the fact, of which their bankers' stooge "advisers" are well aware, that industry cannot distribute as incomes in the form of wages, salaries, and dividends out of which taxation can be paid, an amount equal to the selling price of its products. If that statement is incorrect as orthodox economists would

contend, why cannot the war, for example, be financially "paid for" exclusively by taxation? The truth of the statement is proven by the fact that all governments at all times have recourse to borrowing from the banking system in order to finance various projects.

If the banking system refuses to manufacture and "lend" to any government, either directly or through other financial houses or industrial organisations, then industry and the entire economic system is stricken as though with a blight.

A government thus refused financial accommodation cannot adjust the position by making good the amount refused it with heavier taxes, for the very good reason already stated that industry cannot distribute in the form of wages, salaries, and profits, out of which taxation can be paid, an amount equal to the total prices of the

products of industry: it is obvious, of course, that there is no source other than the products of industry from which a government can draw the real, tangible resources, as distinguished from the financial symbols, with which to carry out its projects.

We, therefore, are faced with the inescapable conclusion that the use by governments of taxation as "a constructive instrument of economic progress" can only accentuate its effects to which attention has been drawn: no reshuffling of its incidence, however "constructive," can make possible the implementation of the post-war projects and schemes detailed in the articles prepared by the "industrial committee" of the "Institute of Public Affairs" without continuous and large-scale financing of such projects by the banking system through the manufacture of new money.

In other words, it is impossible for the people to "pay" fully either for the war or post-war projects out of their incomes and/or savings, because such incomes and savings are insufficient to "pay" therefor.

Needless to say, the "Institute of Public Affairs" would be horrified at the mere suggestion that the Commonwealth Bank, or the banking system as a whole, should be required to manufacture and issue the necessary financial credit at a rate not exceeding the cost of the bookkeeping and administrative costs involved. (To be concluded.)

THE PROBLEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

A Political Primer for Patients and Doctors

By B.W.M. II.

"ORGANISATION"

It was pointed out in the Introduction that the medical services are exceedingly delicately organised, with the complexity of organic growth from their early beginnings. Yet we are constantly hearing that medical services must be "organised." What this really means is that certain people want to start from scratch and re-organise those services according to a Plan.

There are many Plans. But if we examine them, we find that their invariable characteristic is CENTRALISATION OF AUTHORITY. Ultimate authority and responsibility is vested in one person or in a very small number of persons at the top, and the chain of authority extends down, according to various patterns varying with the administrative affiliations of the planner, through levels of decreasing authority and responsibility. The prototype is the Army, and the principle is totalitarian.

But there is more to the totalitarian principle than this, and a full understanding of the principle is essential to an examination of the problem of the medical profession. "The Times," in an editorial article on health services, once stated that the problem is "the reconciliation of administrative self-government with central planning and direction of policy."

POLICY is the choice of objectives, or results. It is the decision as to what end result you want, irrespective of the method by which that result is obtained. Now "central direction of policy" means that a central authority makes the decisions as to what results are to be obtained by the organisation which the authority controls. When that organisation is a complete Society, such as the German nation, and the authority is one man, such as Hitler, the Society is known as totalitarian, and the authority as a dictator. But obviously the same principle holds with lesser organisations. Totalitarian Germany really consists of a number of parts each organised on the totalitarian principle under a lesser authority, or "gauleiter." The essential feature is that the decisions on policy, the choice of results, is made by the central authority; and the principle remains the same whether the central authority is one man or a small number. This is not just theory. It is a short paraphrase of what Hitler has stated at length in "Mein Kampf," and everyone is agreed that Germany organised according to Hitler's theory is totalitarian.

Policy must be distinguished from ADMINISTRATION. Administration is the carrying out of policy, the attainment of the chosen results. It is the method of doing things. Centralisation of administration is usually the most efficient way of doing things. When it is a question of getting a certain result, it is usually best to have someone to give the orders; but of itself it has nothing to do with choosing the results. If, however, a centralised administration makes decisions of policy, it is automatically totalitarian.

So it is evident that "The Times" was advocating the totalitarian type of organisation when it referred to central control of policy. It is hard to say what "administrative self-government" means, if it means anything. It may mean some degree of "free-for-all" in administrative procedure, which would be highly inefficient and unreliable.

SANCTIONS. —Both in theory and, as we can see for ourselves in the case of Germany, in practice, central control of policy requires some form of power. Control of income is one form of power—economic power. Thus, if a Central Authority controls the income of doctors, it exercises control over them to the extent that they have no other source of income. Legal power, such as the power to make Regulations having the force of Law, is another form of power. A third is control over some kind of armed or organised force,

such as the police or secret police, or the Army. A more subtle form of sanction is the manipulative use through centralised propaganda facilities of the alleged "will of the people"—the use of a hypothetical majority to intimidate and coerce a minority.

Everybody who uses the word "Democracy" seems to have a different meaning for it. If, however, we proceed from the idea that it is the opposite to totalitarianism, which is generally agreed, it is obvious that it must be decentralisation of policy. That is to say, democracy is the system where the choice of results to be obtained is made by the individual concerned. An analogy may make the matter clear. If a hundred individuals go to a central railway station, each one can go to any place he chooses to which trains run (provided he has the money). Each individual controls his own policy. Now in going to the place of his choice by train, he makes use of a centralised administration, for railways are run by centralised administration. But if somebody said those hundred passengers must all go to Brighton that would be totalitarianism. If the General Manager of the Railway Company said they were all to go to Brighton that would be government by bureaucracy. And if he said they were all to go to Brighton, but that they could run the train themselves, it would be "central direction of policy with administrative self-government!"

There is another way of doing things, which may be called pseudo-democracy, and this is really confusion between policy and method. Pseudo-democracy is individual choice between two or more methods of getting one result. To return to our analogy, somebody says to the hundred travellers, "You must all go to Brighton, but you can go by any route you choose." If he was very pseudo-democratic in his outlook, he might even let them go by motor coach. That is called "making concessions"—but the important thing to notice is that the policy is not affected—only method.

Closely allied to pseudo-democracy is the technique of controlling the agenda. Pseudo-democracy is concealed totalitarianism, and the technique of controlling the agenda leads people to think that pseudo-democracy is true democracy. The technique is that the central authority decides on the policy to be followed by the organisation, arranges an agenda giving two or more methods of carrying out that policy, and then allows the members of the organisation to vote on those methods. The essential part of the technique is to keep the members confused as to the distinction between policy and method.

With these conceptions to help us, we may return to the consideration of the medical problem.

(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.]

WHAT'S BEHIND FEDERAL BANKING LEGISLATION?

(Continued from page 1.)

ected representative of the PEOPLE. How, then, does it come about that Australia has no choice, particularly in view of the fact that every Allied "leader" has declared over and over again that the war is being fought to ensure that the people of every country shall have the absolute right to choose the sort of Government they will have and the domestic arrangements which should apply within their own borders.

And who has been vested with such overriding powers that Australia, as a supposedly sovereign nation, is obliged to submit to "economic planning" dictated by aliens and largely prepared by them or their agents? That this is no idle comment or query may be gathered from ordinary observation of what is taking place throughout the world. For example, Senator James O. Eastland, of Mississippi, recently declared as follows:—

"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 knowledge of cotton. Five had never been on a cotton farm."

Is not that typical? Why, do you think, Professor Copland recently went to the United States, and why, do you think, he has shown attachment to Harvard? He holds a degree from that institution! And why have honorary degrees been bestowed by Harvard on certain built-up Australians? Accidental, what! Although this great professor has been described by a Tasmanian M.L.C. (Hon. J. Darling), as "the curse of the primary producers of Australia," he is still employed by the Federal Government to order the producers about.

As we have said before, Frankfurter is a personal friend of Dr. Evatt, and Frankfurter is a leading planner, Harold Laski, another personal friend of Dr. Evatt, and also a world planner, is on public record as having said, "It was possible 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," 30/9/44). And so, instead of Democracy we are to have international regimentation, and when we point out that this is precisely what the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" intend us to have, and that certain Jews are taking a leading part in having it imposed upon us, we are described as anti-Semitic Fascists! If this international planning is not Fascism then what IS Fascism?

The influence of the leaders of world Jewry has in the past been out of all proportion to the number represented, and the condition of the world is terrible testimony to the evil nature of that influence. It is high time a halt was called. As late as 17/11/44 Mr. Churchill, in the course of a warning to the Jews about the assassination of Lord Moyne, admitted in the House of Commons that he had been "a consistent friend of the Jews and a constant architect of their future." On the same occasion he admitted that Dr. Weizmann, President of the World Zionist organisation, "is a very old friend of mine." Investigation by any truth-seeking person will confirm that the more important "representatives" of the various countries are surrounded by or have contact with members of World Jewry. What other race has "millions of eyes throughout the world to keep watch"? This, of course may mean nothing, but what is actually happening suggests otherwise.

If Australia will have to "prove to other powers" that certain controls are being effected here, then Australia in future will be subject to government from abroad, as the "other powers" referred to will give the orders and the Australian Government will be obliged to carry them out. The question to be asked is which powers and what orders? It is another case of "denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands," (Professor Arnold Toynbee), as our "leaders" talk loudly of democracy and freedom while they actually work with aliens to strengthen the chains of economic and financial servitude. And to think that responsible Ministers have repeatedly assured us that Australia had not been committed to anything!

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. April 1, 1945.

Editor's Note: Further to Mr. Brown's observations regarding the activities of certain Jews, we quote the following remarkable item from the Melbourne "Herald" of April 2:—

"FINANCIER IN CREDIT TALKS."
"The 'Herald' Special Service, 'LONDON, Sunday. —The mystery man of Wall Street, Bernard Baruch, is spending the weekend in the country with the Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill), says the 'Sunday Dispatch.'"

"Barney" Baruch, an almost legendary figure known to financiers on both sides of the Atlantic, has just arrived in London, and it is a fairly open secret that this man, who was confidential adviser to Woodrow Wilson in the last war, and who now holds the same position with Roosevelt, is here for discussions on post-war credits from America for European countries.

"Baruch was largely responsible for the financial clauses of the Versailles Treaty."

Several Cabinet Ministers are also spending the weekend with Mr. Churchill, and will discuss economic and financial plans which the Allies will initiate as soon as possible after European hostilities cease.

"Baruch will also confer with the accredited economic representatives of liberated countries in London."

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