

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. 11. No. 15. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 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.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F.
Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

The "Bretton Woods" Plot Exposed Again!

Grave Warning from the London Chamber of Commerce Not Published in Australia

In these columns we have published several exposures of various appalling dangers inherent in the International Monetary Agreement approved by the Bretton Woods Conference and now before Federal Parliament. In a recent remarkable Report, published as a pamphlet for the benefit of the public, the London Chamber of Commerce explains at some length certain dangers not previously dealt with fully in the "New Times."

The Report indicates that the Bretton Woods scheme is designed to ensure that debtor nations, old and new, shall be prevented from ever getting out of debt, and shall even be forced deeper and deeper into debt—whereupon, punitive rates of interest may be imposed! Furthermore, the scheme would assist overseas aliens to buy up the fixed assets of a country like Australia. The scheme would NOT prevent economic aggression against the independence and economic stability of a nation. Such economic defences as were formerly employed against these perils would be swept away. The Report concludes: "It is the gravamen of the Chamber's criticism that the International Monetary Fund does, in fact, seek to deprive the nations of their defences whilst failing to remove the perils which called them into use."

The Chamber's serious warning is of special importance to Australia—it is a matter of vital and urgent concern to every section of the general public in this country—yet, as far as we are aware, not one of Australia's so-called "capitalist" daily papers has seen fit to publish it, although they have devoted an enormous amount of space to trivial matters and pernicious rubbish.

The pamphlet is entitled, "Report of the London Chamber of Commerce on the Final Act of the United Nations' Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, U.S.A." Its contents demand YOUR careful consideration. The full text is as follows:

FOREWORD.

The Council of the London Chamber of Commerce, at its meeting on July 11, 1944 asked its Special Committee on Post-War Reconstruction to consider, and report on, the findings, when available, of the United Nations' Monetary and Financial Conference then being held at Bretton Woods, U.S.A.

The Special Committee submitted the following report on the Final Act of the Conference and, after prior circulation, it was adopted unanimously by the Council at its meeting on December 12, 1944.

—A. de V. Leigh, Secretary.
69 Cannon Street, E.C.4. (City 4444.)

REPORT.

UNITED NATIONS' MONETARY AND FINANCIAL CONFERENCE

1. The London Chamber of Commerce considers that agreement and co-operation

between the nations in matters of trade and finance are essential pillars in the structure of a post-war world, and it consequently regards the collaboration of 11 nations at Bretton Woods as in itself a great achievement.

2. Monetary technique is not an end in itself: it is a means to an end. Whether it is appropriate or inappropriate cannot be considered apart from the objective it is sought to attain. Unless we have first made up our minds as to what sort of economic order we want, it is clearly impossible to decide whether a particular monetary technique is likely to promote or retard its realisation.

3. The growing confusion resulting from a multitude of conflicting ideas, which is so marked a characteristic of our times, is, in the Chamber's submission, largely due to failure to distinguish clearly between means and ends.

Significant Political Pointers

Russophile Senator Grant, speaking in the Senate on February 28, said: "Russia will not engage in war with Japan merely to further the interests of Britain and America; Russia is looking after its own interests. This is a war of power politics, and we must do the best we can in the light of the facts. We do not know the facts sufficiently well to criticise the war policy of the 'Big Three.' I am not here to say what the Government should do . . ."

Those who pay Senator Grant to look after their interests might ask him who does tell the Government what to do, if he and other representatives of the people don't. The above statement is further evidence of the fact that our so-called political representatives are prepared to throw us to the power politic wolves and to "justify" their actions by telling us that we don't know all the facts. Senator Grant is paid to find out the facts and to tell his electors about them.

The socialised railways in Queensland are some of the worst in the world. In spite of the fact that the danger of floods in the north has been discussed for years, it took recent train hold ups as a result of flooding to galvanise the socialist managers into making promises to do something. Apart from the loss of human lives and animals, the railway line to the north is a major military consideration, and it would be revealing to know what upset to military operations has been caused as a result of the line being rendered useless.

What an outcry there would have been if that dreadful monster, Private Enterprise, had been responsible! There is much to

Freedom Defined

"The only freedom that deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in, our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it."

—JOHN STUART MILL.

commend the recent suggestion that the State Governments should seek to sell the railways to private enterprise and use the proceeds to liquidate railway debts, thus making possible the reduction of taxation collected to pay interest bills on these debts.

But it is highly improbable that the banks would support this policy. They prefer their investments to be backed by the State. No matter what some of their propagandists may say, orthodox banking policy makes Socialism inevitable.

Ask your Communist friends the following question: "In view of the fact that British arms made possible the liberation of France, Belgium and Holland, how would you regard demands by the British that they be allowed to establish military bases in these countries in order to safeguard Britain's security?" You will undoubtedly hear a tirade of abuse concerning "British imperialism" in reply. Only the Russians are permitted to safeguard their "security" by grabbing territory off small countries. And another interesting question: "As Germany is allegedly going to be prevented from ever becoming a military power again, who is going to menace Russia?" Perhaps the Swiss! Or the Icelanders!

The correspondent who sent the following to the Sydney "Bulletin" has a keen sense of humour and a clear perception of realities: "A lot of people I meet in queues and during the early morning meat and egg (Continued on page 4)

4. The Chamber has, in previous Reports, expressed the view that international trade should be a bond of union between the nations and not a source from which antagonisms spring, and that until those factors in our international financial system which create that uncertainty have been recognised and eliminated, trade will not flow freely.

5. This, then, being the objective to which the Chamber gives priority, it is necessary to consider the International Monetary Fund from the point of view of whether it would inspire confidence in the conduct of international trade.

6. At the back of all international trading systems is the possibility of default. It has been customary to regard this problem as arising through nations buying more than they could afford and borrowing more than they could repay. It is only in recent years that there has been a growing acceptance of the fact that this is an over simplification of the case—a recognition that the fault may, and frequently does, lie not with buying, but with selling nations; not with debtor but with creditor nations, since the latter may take effective measures to prevent the buyer and the debtor from making payment.

7. It is essential that there should be a clear distinction between the two types of international default;—the default resulting from a nation importing more than that for which it can pay with exports accept-

able to a willing buyer; and the default consequent upon the action of other nations exporting far in excess of their willingness to accept payment in the form of imports from the world at large. The former type of default is by no means the more common nor that which caused the greatest disruption of international trade during the inter-war years.

8. The second was the more prevalent reason for default—sellers and creditors were unwilling to accept payment from the world in the only practicable way—namely, in goods and services. It is clear that if one or more nations consistently use every means to promote their sales abroad, whilst using their best endeavours to prevent an offsetting inflow of goods and services from the rest of the world, some nation or nations, through no fault of their own, are going to find themselves in a deficit position.

The Chamber believes that failure to draw a clear distinction between these two types of default has been a prime cause of preventing international trade from becoming what it ought to be—a bond of union and mutual aid.

9. The fundamental fact of trade is the exchange of one man's or one nation's "surpluses" for those of another man or another nation so that both are better off. The introduction of a money economy was intended to facilitate these exchanges, not

(Continued on page 2.)

NOTES on the NEWS

The U.S. State Department is said to be working frantically to prevent the San Francisco Conference from crashing. The New York "Sun's" correspondent says, "the incredible stupidity of the secret Yalta agreement will spring through Congress new doubts concerning the integrity of the Administration." It is also reported "a wave of disillusionment about Russia is sweeping Washington." Meanwhile Bernard Baruch, confidential Jewish "adviser", described by the Press as the mysterious financier, is visiting Churchill in England, which indicates that something not very palatable is cooking. For the time being the World Plotters have overplayed their hand; but watch the reshuffle.

FARMERS' FINANCES: Official data on recent farmers' debt adjustment shows that 4423 applications had been received from farmers whose debts approximated £20 millions, and assets £16 millions, leaving a deficit of £4 millions. All but 125 of these cases had been finalised; £2,891,000 had been paid to creditors, which leaves £1,119,000 yet to be paid in respect of the 125 outstanding cases. The Debt Adjustment Board had made it possible for farmers to convert mortgages and contracts-of-sale to lower rates of interest usually not exceeding 4%, so it won't be long before these farmers will be broke again. With prices rigged by the marketing Boards on the one hand and vicious direct and indirect taxes imposed by a so-called friendly Government, it is almost impossible for farmers to remain solvent. It's about time farmers realised that things are rigged to keep him on the farm merely as slaves in bondage.

FOOD FAILURE: Forceful and truthful remarks were forthcoming at the recent conference of the Victorian U.C.P. Mr. Dunstan, who was one of the speakers, had this to say: "Aided and abetted by professors, bureaucrats, economists, arm-chair advisers and planners, the Federal Government have reduced the food front to a tragic muddle . . . When the professor-ridden Commonwealth administration came to office wheat silos were full, today the silos are empty and farmers in the drought areas are unable to secure a few bushels of wheat to keep starving stock alive." No wonder the Commos want to get rid of Mr. Dunstan. The President (Mr. Phayer) then dealt with the army of bureaucrats leg-roped to the Department of Commerce, vested with powers as far reaching as any dictator could desire. The battle against the bureaucrats should meet with substantial public support.

ALIEN ALARM: At a conference of Ministers of Education in March, the Western Australian Institute of Inspectors were scheduled to submit the following motion: "That no group of alien settlers in the post-war period be given the right to finance and conduct its own schools." This indicates an awakening to the dangers of alien infiltration in Australia, and it would be interesting to know the fate of this motion. Of course, the motion would be described by the opponents of the White Australia Policy, etc., as "racial discrimination." Again, we are informed that there is a special clause in the World Government Plan clearly aimed at preventing a country from protecting its own nationals against undesirable aliens, and preventing safeguards against incompatibles causing racial problems, as in U.S.A. This is an illustration of the dangers of international agreements

which will prevent us from managing our own affairs. This menace must be resisted.

POTATO PRIZES: While the Potato Board is busy wasting taxpayers' money on costly advertisements to stimulate sales, the Mildura military base hospital is expected to receive a large supply of potatoes as a result of a "potato matinee" run by the local picture-show promoters. All children are asked to take a potato; prizes will be given for the largest and most unusual shaped spud; the first 80 children who arrive with spuds will receive free tickets; and the inmates of the hospital will then get the potatoes. Apparently the Potato Board is debarred from this novelty. Other strange events are happening in those parts: for example, the Red Cliffs war-loan committee reports disappointment at the very poor response to the loan. Maybe the Mildura and Red Cliffs people are busy on that potato quest. Perhaps the Potato Board could apply the potato prize to the loan, and offer a potato for every shilling subscribed.

FASHION FUEHRERS: In Moscow recently, Soviet judges (mostly middle-aged plump men and women) chose the styles to be mass-produced for the Russian masses. The Soviet has de-glamorised the mannequin, so the models were displayed by factory workers distinguished by their undistinguished appearance. The judges accept or reject the models by vote; the clothes chosen and no other will be worn by the Soviet masses for the next year. Presumably the English and French fashions, if any, will not be for the masses residing in the "classless State," and if anyone designs something smart or unusual to suit their individual type for themselves they will have to forget it or wear it in the privacy (Continued on page 3)

Puppet Government

"No amount of propaganda can hide the fact that the Lublin regime in Poland is Communist in character or that it is directed from Moscow. The name Boleslaw Beirut, acting president of the "Provisional Government" at Lublin, is assumed. London Poles say his real name is Krasnodebski. The name, Beirut, was made up of the two first syllables of two other aliases — Bienkowski and Rutkowski — used during previous political activities. Beirut was born in 1891, near Lublin. In 1921 he was accorded Soviet citizenship and admitted to the Comintern. Since then, say the Poles, he has worked in varying capacities, including a tour of duty in the OGPU (Soviet secret police)."

—William Philip Simms, in the New York "World-Telegram."

THE WICKED (A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown.)
Sir, —St. Paul wrote: "In all thy getting get understanding."
What a pity it is that so many of the men who set themselves up as
God's spokesmen do not act on that excellent advice. And what a
pity it is that so many of us overlook the fact that God knows
everything; that He cannot be deceived whatever men may say.

Usually I have dinner at a teahouse in the City, and recently an elderly lady has been seated at the same table. This lady, in the course of conversation, inquired whether I had heard the Rev. J. Arthur Lewis, of the Collins Street Baptist Church. I replied that I had not, and that I had not bothered to go because the published reports of his addresses had not inspired respect or confidence. This surprised the lady, but she thought it would be to my advantage to hear him for myself, and so I promised I would. Sunday, April 8, was my first opportunity, and the subject as published was "The Fight for the Soul of Melbourne."

As readers of this paper will know, I am always on the look-out for evidence that the preacher really understands the CAUSE of the people's suffering and wrongdoing, but am generally disappointed when the most prominent of the clergymen fail to produce any such evidence. Unfortunately in this respect Mr. Lewis is no exception.

Before commenting briefly on his address it may be appropriate to quote the contents of a letter I sent to him on October 20, 1943, as follows:—

"Dear Mr. Lewis, —More than 100 years ago, Balzac said that the final battle for Christianity would be over the money problem, and that until that question is solved, there can be no universal application of Christianity.

"Balzac was right. Even the work of God has to be fitted into the money supply, and those who control the money supply dictate the policy of Governments and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people. They control the distribution of the bounty of God.

"In the light of these FACTS, I was sorry to get the impression from the report in Monday's 'Argus' that you not only personally support the present methods of financing Governmental activities, but actually called upon others, in the name of God, to do the same. The existing system is a system of usury, and in this respect I invite you kindly to read Psalm 15. Jesus knew what He was saying when He declared that we CANNOT serve God AND Mammon."

The letter was not answered. To show that the soul of Melbourne is going from bad to worse, Mr. Lewis called attention to statistics dealing with suicides, divorce, revolutions, and wars during his own lifetime, and altogether painted anything but a lovely picture. Gambling and drinking were also distressing evidence of the loss or deterioration of the soul of Melbourne. The figures quoted were, of course, correct, and it would be reasonable to say that it would be far better for all of us if there were less of these things; but it is equally correct to say that, from the way things are going it is as certain as the sunshine that there will be MORE of them, despite the eloquence of clergymen who tickle the ears of their congregations with smooth-sounding words which contain no enlightenment as to the real CAUSE of the bulk of the undesirable things mentioned.

Except in pathological cases, suicides reflect living conditions, and living conditions are governed by war and finance. Divorce, too, is great influenced by war conditions and finance. Revolutions never occur spontaneously: they are organised; and finance plays the controlling part. As for wars, they are the product of struggles for markets, and markets are places where there are people with money to spend. In most cases men and women indulge in gambling because it affords the POSSIBILITY of collecting some of the stuff they are chronically short of—MONEY. It also provides revenue (MONEY) for Governments! Drinking is a deplorable business when indulged in to excess, but nevertheless it is quite legitimate and mostly taken in harmless moderation. An important consideration, of course, is that it provides dividends for breweries and REVENUE for Governments.

Instead of telling his congregation that FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS are at bottom of our community troubles he filled his allotted time with expressions of the following kind:

"We have been beguiling ourselves with sweet illusions";

"Mankind is sick and is getting sicker, and no one seems to know what to do";

"We need God more desperately today than ever before";

"The natural way of doing things will no longer do. We need the supernatural";

"We have thought a lot about making the world comfortable. We have thought too little about making it Christian";

"I utter an imperious warning against the blasphemous impertinence of thinking we can use God for our own purposes."

All very nice, but what do they mean?

When he says "we" have been beguiling ourselves with sweet illusions, whom does he mean? and what were the illusions? If he refers to certain leading clergymen he may be right, and the illusions with which they have been beguiled may be the supposed wickedness of the human heart, the alleged weakness of human nature, or the so-called inherent selfishness of mankind. Far be it from me to suggest that there is no wickedness, no weakness, and no selfish-

ness. But I do suggest that these are magnified, and that most of them are effects of removable causes, which are carefully excluded from pulpit addresses. Or perhaps he meant the illusion that the two wars and the depression we have suffered during his lifetime were brought about by natural phenomena such as spots on the sun or blizzards. You know, the "economic blizzard"! Or it may be the illusion that slums are a necessary part of society? Or the illusion that the living conditions which are demoralising our families, and which are planned to continue, are just something to be borne with patience in the expectation that there will be pie in the sky when we die?

Mankind, as such, is NOT sick, is NOT getting sicker, and there IS someone who knows what to do. Mankind, being the creation of God, is good, and as has been said before in these columns, there are very few supporters of the criminal element. Almost unanimously the audience at a picture show supports the hero or the heroine, and is naturally disposed to boo the villain. That is typical of mankind, but mankind is being criminally imposed on, and I am sorry to think that all too many leaders of the Churches, albeit unwittingly, have been tools in the hands of the criminals.

For more than 25 years C. H. Douglas has been showing the world what ought to be done, but thanks to the Churches and the controllers of the channels of publicity, the PEOPLE (mankind) has been kept uninformed.

What more could God do than He has done and is doing? He has never failed us on the physical side, and yet His children live in conditions of hardship, squalor, fear, and hopelessness of outlook. God is in no way responsible for that, and He has nothing whatever to do with the book-keeping system, called finance, which controls how much of His bounty may be used and by whom it shall be enjoyed. It would be more reasonable to say that God needs US desperately, and that the Churches should be fully engaged in exposing those responsible for preventing our co-operating with Him. Instead of this,

The "Bretton Woods" Plot Exposed Again

(Continued from page 1)

to after the fundamental fact. The implied contract, therefore, when a nation imports consumers' goods, is that its goods or services will, in due course, be taken in exchange, either directly or through a third party; and the same is true, so far as interest and amortization are concerned, when it imports goods on capital account. Under a barter economy the settlement of what goods a nation should take in payment for its exports was part of the bargain. Under a money economy, however, the buying nation gives the original selling nation a claim to its goods in the form of money, in order that the selling nation may have a wider freedom of choice or may, if it likes, defer its purchase for a reasonable time. It can also exchange its claim on that nation for a claim on another. There is nothing in these proceedings of an aggressive or hostile nature calculated to arouse resentment. On the contrary, they appeal to men everywhere as just in principle, friendly, and helpful. Unfortunately, however, in the course of time means have become confused with ends; and instead of nations recognising that they are trading their goods and services for the goods and services of other nations, and that the acquisition of another nation's money is merely an intermediate step to facilitate their return purchases, they have come to think of the acquisition of foreign money as an end in itself to be used for purposes other than the return purchase of goods and services.

10. The Chamber has approached the study of the Bretton Woods Final Act with the greatest good will and in the belief that some basically sound and practicable scheme, even if marred by technical imperfections, would be better than no scheme at all.

The ultimate test, however, of any new international financial system must be the extent to which it induces nations to observe those fundamental principles of international trade which have already been outlined above. If the nations are unwilling to take goods or services in exchange for their sales of goods and services abroad, any financial system which permits them to profit by this unwillingness and to use the proceeds of their sales to depress the exchange rate and threaten the internal stability of the country to which they have sold, or alternatively, to invest the proceeds in that country, thereby gradually acquiring control of its fixed assets, must, in the long run, lead not to co-operation, but to chaos.

11. This is the test to which the Chamber in its deliberations has submitted the International Monetary Fund. If it is found to fail in this test there can be no doubt that its utility will be but transient. For an International agreement on money is merely a means to an end, and cannot wisely be judged apart from that end.

12. Article 1 (ii) states that one of the purposes of the International Monetary Fund is "to facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade."

however, Church dignitaries, with few exceptions, actively oppose those who seek to expose the agents of Mammon.

The natural way of doing things is the only satisfactory way. Our difficulties are not the result of failure of anything natural, but they have come from the fact that we have been denied the opportunity to do things naturally. If we followed the dictates of nature we would eat and use the things we produce, but our enemies have decreed the destruction of the bounty of the earth while mankind went hungry. Our enemies have decreed that the wealth of the world shall be used for purposes of destruction, whereas the natural thing is to employ it for the health and happiness of the people, "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly."

And what, I wonder, did he really mean when he said: "We have thought too little about making the world Christian."

Is it possible to make the world Christian when world conditions are controlled by men who are NOT Christian? If we have been devoting so much thought with so little success to making the world "comfortable," what would be the prospect of greater success if we merely transferred our thought to another desire and did nothing to take control from the non-Christians? No man can serve God effectively until he faces up to the FACT that under present conditions world POLICY is formulated by men who do not subscribe to the Christian faith.

To acquiesce in the continuance of these conditions and at the same time complain about the world not being Christian is so much humbug.

I agree with the warning against thinking we can use God for our own purposes, if anyone IS so foolish, as to think that way. But who does? All the people I know realise that God sends His bounty for OUR use, and that OUR proper sustenance is the purpose of His wonderfully sustained goodness to us. It is not a question of using God at all. It is a question of misusing His gifts. And this misuse does not spring from Christian men and women. It springs from the designs and activities of non-Christians. Does Mr. Lewis know the identity of these non-Christians and how they function? Apparently he doesn't, and in my view it is high time for him to start finding out. In the meantime, the people of Melbourne can forget what he said about their soul.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2.
15th April 1945.

ZIONISTS' SYMPATHISER

According to "Peterborough" in the London "Daily Telegraph" of January 11, the widow of Major-General Orde Wingate, the Chindit leader, to whose baby son the Emperor Haile Selassie has presented an old Coptic cross and chain surmounted by a crown, "has never, I believe, been to Abyssinia, where her husband worked wonders with the 'Gideon Force.'"

"She saw, however, much of his success in Palestine, in the troubles which lasted from 1936-39. Zionist activities and ideals appealed strongly to Mrs. Wingate, and her name has been inscribed in the Jews' 'Golden Book.'"

"Miss Rachel Wingate, the General's sister, about whose appointment as secretary of the Royal Central Asian Society I wrote not long ago, has now, I hear, left her work as Books Censor at the Ministry of Information. She expects to begin her new duties next Monday." (Our emphasis.)

THOSE MEN AGAIN?

It was stated in the British press of February 17 that Dr. Schacht had gone to Switzerland to arrange terms of peace. The whereabouts of Mr. Montagu Norman were not indicated.

—"The Social Creditor," England, 3/3/45.

15. Although under Article VI. Section 3 members may exercise such controls as are necessary to regulate international capital movements, they must not exercise those controls in a manner, which will restrict payments for current transactions. The Chamber questions whether it is practicable to control the movement of capital if controls in respect of payments and transfers for current international transactions are swept away. Under Article XIV, Section 4, these must be removed within a maximum of five years.

16. The Final Act does not distinguish between beneficial foreign investments in the form of the export of capital equipment calculated to assist in the development of other countries, and the undesirable form of foreign investment, referred to above, which results from refusal of a nation exporting current consumers' goods to accept, directly or indirectly, return imports. It can be neither wise nor prudent for an importing country to incur capital debt to another nation for current consumers' goods although it is recognised that in quite abnormal circumstances, such as war or natural disaster, it may be driven to such a course. Current consumers' goods do not increase the productivity of the country importing them (unless they are part and parcel of a scheme of capital development) and if a country is incapable of paying for them at the time of importation, their acquisition will not make it more capable of doing so. Such a loan is, then, a profligate act on the part of the borrowing nation and a foolish one on the part of the lending; yet under the International Monetary Fund, a nation importing current consumers' goods and potentially capable of exporting its own products in payment for them has no guarantee that the country from which it has bought may not refuse to take imports in payment either directly or indirectly. Should this happen, it will find itself, before long, a debtor nation through no fault of its own.

17. In the past it was within the competence of each nation, faced with a threat to its economy, to impose exchange restrictions. Within five years of acceptance of the Bretton Woods scheme, a nation may be required to establish the free inter-convertibility of its currency, and if it fails to do so will be liable to penal action by all the other nations at the instance of an International Financial Board. The Chamber believes that until the dangers to the independence and economic stability of nations, described in Paragraph 10 above, have been removed, it can only destroy confidence and lead to further chaos to attempt to deprive nations of those mechanisms upon which they have relied for their defence in the past—however undesirable these would be in a smoothly working and co-operative world economy. A nation is to be allowed to alter its exchange rate, but only provided that the proposed change, whether an increase or decrease, does not exceed 10 per cent, of the initial par value—any alteration beyond this limit can only be made with the consent of the Governors of the Fund. In the past, a nation could put on tariffs or quotas to prevent imports entering the country, and although the Final Act does not specifically prohibit this being done in the future, such action might be held to be contrary to the purposes of the Fund. A nation could also prevent the sale of its currency on the Foreign Exchange for what it would fetch, by imposing exchange restrictions. It is the gravamen of the Chamber's criticism that the International Monetary Fund does, in fact, seek to deprive the nations of their defences whilst failing to remove the perils which called them into use.

(The End.)

* * * *

[URGENT: We urge you to post this copy of the "New Times" to your Federal Member at Parliament House, Canberra, and send him a covering letter as well, requesting that he vote against ratification of the International Monetary Agreement. We suggest that you then obtain extra copies of this issue from your newsagent (or failing that, direct from the "New Times," Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne) and pass them on to other electors, with the suggestion that they follow your example in regard to their own Federal Members. — Editor, "New Times."]

THE PROBLEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

A Political Primer for Patients and Doctors

By B.W.M. (Continued from last issue.)

IV. DEMOCRACY FOR DOCTORS

While the patient is interested in results, and not in methods, the doctor is primarily a technician; he is an expert in methods of getting results. This brings out clearly a difference in the two sides of the doctor-patient relationship, which will repay examination as illustrating the distinction between policy on the one hand, and method, or technique, on the other.

The doctor is a technician; he is an expert in ways of doing things in a particular field, that of health. His business is to apply his technical knowledge to produce results required by, or for, the patient. The patient, for example, may have an abdominal pain, and go to the doctor to get it relieved. That is the result required by the patient, and the doctor's part is to apply his technical knowledge of method to relieve the pain. It may require a dose of medicine, an operation, or merely advice, so that the doctor must make a choice of the correct method. His expert-ness is to be judged by his patient's satisfaction with the result.

It can be seen at once that it would be quite improper for the doctor to decide on the result to be obtained or for the patient to decide on the method. Thus, if the patient said that he wanted to be relieved of an abdominal pain, and the doctor said no, he would like to try out a new operation on the nose, quite naturally the patient would exercise his right of free-choice and go elsewhere to get the result he really wanted; and equally, if the patient had a pain in the stomach and said he wanted the doctor to cure it by amputating his toe, the doctor would think him mad. In point of fact, of course, the patient goes to the doctor in the belief that the latter knows the correct thing to do and is competent to do it—a matter which he judges by the satisfaction the doctor has previously given to other patients, or to himself—while the doctor accepts simply the desire of the patient to be made well as the result he is to obtain. He takes orders from the patient as regards policy, and gives orders in regard to method.

This is a special case of the general relation that always holds in a true democracy, between the individual who wants something, and the expert whose business it is to produce the results required in his special field. It would be difficult to over-estimate the importance of a thorough comprehension of this relationship. It is the business of experts to take orders from those requiring results, but it is none of their business to choose the results.

The totalitarian conception, on the other hand, is that experts should decide what everyone should have, either "for the good of the nation" or "in the public interest." The expert plans a happy "society," and the statistician divides the result by forty-four million, and there you are—forty-four million happy individuals! Or, again, Hitler decides that for the good of the Aryan race everyone should have guns instead of butter. In totalitarian medicine, the chief of the health service says what sort of health is good for people, and also why it is good for them: it keeps them "fit for employment."

But in a democracy, it is the fate of the expert to render his services to the order of others. He does not have the fun of telling others what they "ought" to do or be. He is the servant of democracy. In his functional capacity he is absolutely excluded from a voice in policy. But it is also true that the majority of experts are excluded from decisions of policy in the totalitarian organisation, for only the fuhrer-experts have this power.

What, then, is the difference in the position of the expert in the two systems? The difference is decisive, and it has two chief aspects.

First, under democracy, the expert is at the service of, and solely responsible to, the individual who employs him. The doctor is directly responsible to each patient individually. But in the totalitarian system the doctor, or any other expert, is responsible through his immediate superiors to the Central Authority, and the Central Authority assumes all responsibility to the individual patients. If doctor 7439 makes a mistake the Central Authority is blame-worthy. It recompenses the patient (perhaps), and punishes the doctor (for certain), either by sending him to one of the less popular Health Centres, which have to be staffed somehow, or by retarding his promotion.

The second difference concerns the freedom of the doctor. The primary business of the doctor is to render to persons who seek it, advice and services in connection with health. In return for this he receives money, which is a general claim on goods and services provided by other members

DON'T MISS THIS!

YOU may obtain, free of charge, a small parcel of assorted recent back numbers of the "New Times" if you simply write and ask for it. Our postal address is Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. If you live in or near Melbourne, you may prefer to call at our office in McEwan House, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

YOU can spread our ideas and help us to increase our circulation by distributing some of these specimen copies to fellow-citizens. What about it?

of the community; in the absence of any other source of income he is dependent on his ability to exchange his services for money. To maintain himself and those dependent on him, he must devote a proportion of his time to rendering those services, and during that time he is not free.

Therefore, for a given income, his freedom is diminished by any of the following:

(a) Lowering of income per unit of service—e.g., lowering of the capitation fee. In order to maintain his income, he must give up to work time in which previously he could please himself what he did.

(b) Unremunerated services required in addition to purely medical services—e.g., filling in and returning forms, keeping additional records, etc.

(c) Increases in medical work per unit remuneration—e.g., increased medical service per unit capitation fee.

(d) Increased cost of living, including taxation. Since the purchasing power of money is constantly falling, a fixed rate of remuneration per item of service entails a loss of freedom. Panel practitioners must either take more patients, which diminishes their freedom, or suffer a loss of purchasing power, unless the capitation fee rises steadily, which it doesn't. Loss of freedom is thus automatic.

(e) Fines for breaches of Regulations—e.g., "excessive" prescribing.

Panel practitioners are thus controlled by central control of their income, a control that increases automatically because the purchasing power of money falls continuously; and also by the network of Regulations issued by the Central Authority. The two forms of control are clearly inter-related, and, in fact, the former provides a transition to the latter.

It is sometimes thought that if doctors are not controlled by a Central Authority, they are not controlled at all. In fact, however, doctors are most effectively controlled, and with the most marvellous flexibility, directly by their patients.

If a doctor needs a certain minimum income to maintain himself and his dependants, he will require a certain average number of patients to provide that income. This means (so long as he does not possess a monopoly) that his services must satisfy the required number of patients—we saw previously that the criterion of an expert's competence is the satisfaction of the recipient with the result. That is one reason more for the fundamental importance of free choice. Now although the doctor is dependent on, and therefore controlled by, all those patients, he is dominated by none of them. It is a beautiful system, and perhaps the essence of what democracy means to doctors.

Under the totalitarian system the doctor is controlled by the Central Authority. There are two forms of this control. The first form is exemplified by the Panel System, with its capitation fee. Here the doctor is controlled democratically by his patients, in that his fees are dependent on their choice of him. The interest of patients is therefore in the retention of the capitation system as against the salary system. But it also gives the Central Authority an interest in keeping the fee as low as possible, and in bringing as many people as possible within the scope of the system, and thus under its control. This, of course, is exactly what has happened.

The second form is payment by salary. This places all control in the hands of the Central Authority, and it is exercised by the seniority, or rank, system. Each doctor is responsible TO his next senior, and FOR those below him.

It is a vicious system, destroying initiative and personal responsibility, since each man is thinking of what his senior will think of anything he does, and of what effect that will have on his advancement.

Responsibility for patients, however, is borne by the Central Authority. But if the Central Authority is a Minister responsible to Parliament, then Parliament is ultimately responsible to the individual patient. If an injured patient does not agree with the compensation provided for him by regulation, the procedure would be for him to write to his Member, who will ask a question in the House of Commons, and on a really serious question a debate may take place, culminating in rare cases in the transfer of the Minister to another department. In less serious cases, the complaint could be dealt with to the satisfaction of the authorities simply by issuing a fresh batch of Regulations, designed to prohibit practitioners from such medical procedures as might result in the asking of these embarrassing questions.

We see, therefore, that there is a very real difference for the expert in being a servant of democracy as against being a servant, or employee, of a Central Authority, and that this difference is concerned with his personal freedom.

In brief, freedom is time in which one can do what one likes. Time expended in

earning a living is surrender of freedom—for a specific and necessary purpose (and the interest of individuals, whether experts or others, must surely lie in reducing this loss to the decreasing minimum which modern technical resources make possible). Time expended in earning income over and above the cost of living is present freedom exchanged for future freedom; but that is a matter of individual choice. Independence of income confers independence, exactly as dependence of income on a single authority brings subjection to that authority. And income derived from many different sources, direct, gives a flexible independence subject to true democratic control. The interests of patient and doctor are thus once more seen to be complimentary within the framework of the doctor-patient relationship, privacy, and free choice.

(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.]

"THIS KING BUSINESS"

The artificial nature of current political sentiment, to which the "B.B.C. panders as far as it dares, is nowhere more evident than in the accusations levelled at Mr. Churchill that he is supporting monarchist interests in "liberated" countries. That he is not, is not the point, which is, why shouldn't he? Is there a single fact to set against the array of evidence that monarchism of the nineteenth century was immeasurably more attractive to every class than a Europe run by thugs like "Marshal" Tito, et al? We have always repudiated the fake antithesis of "Monarchy or Money Power," much as we agreed with the author of the book of that name, because this country is a monarchy, and is being ruined by money-power plotting. But we are inclined to place the locus of this anti-monarchist sentiment in New York. It may be remembered that the U.S. Ambassador to Germany in 1915, James W. Gerard, wishing to curry favour with President Wilson, gave as the cause of the European War, "This King business." Anything more grotesquely incompetent it would be difficult to find. Kaiser Wilhelm II was an undesirable monarch, and not an attractive individual; but comparison of the Kaiser's War and the Paperhanger's War does not incline us to adulation of the Milkenium of Paperhangers.

As we have said previously, this is a cultural war. Perhaps the best feature of the Kaiser's Germany was that, to quite a considerable extent, it kept "money" where it belonged.

For the greater part of the nineteenth century, the dominant note of American culture was "money" (we do not overlook the considerable, but not dominant exceptions). The money culture resented the credit-power of Courts. Ultimately, this credit-power succumbed largely to money, and lost its attractions. But it was a menace to money, and it had to go. "The King is the fountain of Honour" had to be, and largely has been, replaced by "The cheque book is the sludge-pump of titles."

At bottom, the argument simply boils down to a decision as to whether or not there is anything in hereditary aptitude reinforced by specialised training from birth. If there isn't, then there's nothing in this king business.

—"The Social Creditor," England.

UNDERSTANDING

"There is no need for a new 'body' to be formed, to create yet another 'vested interest' in communal activity, to bang drums and blow trumpets and waste precious time, energies and money in pompous and utterly ineffective conferences and meetings merely to publicise its leaders and to justify its existence and the salaries of its principal beneficiaries."

—"The Jewish Chronicle." (Quoted in "The Social Creditor," England, Feb. 17, '45.)

"FOLLY AND PRESUMPTION"

"The statesman who should attempt to direct private people in what manner they ought to employ their savings would not only load himself with a most unnecessary burden, but assume an authority which could safely be trusted to no Government whatever, and would nowhere be so dangerous as in the hands of a man who had folly and presumption enough to fancy himself fit to exercise it."—Adam Smith.

But, of course, Adam hadn't met Sir William Beveridge.

BIRDS OF A FEATHER

"The Nazis? The trouble with them is that they've never done a stitch of honest work. They don't want to work; they want to rule." (From an article on "German Prisoners" in the "Saturday Evening Post")

For Nazis, read Fabian Society, most Trades Union Officials and the Champions of Labour generally.

—"The Social Creditor," England.

"LIBERATED ITALY"

"Living conditions within liberated Italy have reached the point where they barely touch subsistence level. People are actually starving in some regions. Everywhere they are hungry. Infant mortality is mounting. Tuberculosis is rampant."

—Former U.S. Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles. (Quoted in Sydney "Bulletin," 28/3/45.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

of their rooms. Hope this doesn't start an exodus of feminine readers to the Soviet fashion centre.

YALTA AND YANKS: Senator Bushfield (U.S.), in a strong denunciation of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, on which the Yalta plot is based, was recently reported as describing it as "simply a new League of Nations that two or three great powers will completely dominate by force." He asked, "Would any great power consent to a police force controlling it? We know it would not." The "Chicago Tribune" also attacked the Yalta decision, and accused Mr. Roosevelt of selling out to Stalin. Other U.S. commentators said that Stalin offered something in return, which "the American public will appreciate in due course." Since then Russia has denounced the neutrality pact with Japan, which means that Stalin will also have Allied help in removing the Jap. threat to Russia's back door. In no circumstances would this offset the betrayal of Poland.

POLISH PROBLEM: North American Newspaper Alliance reports strong opposition of Polish troops to the Yalta decision, and points out that "if the London Polish Government is bankrupted, Polish troops will seek to be released from the Allied Forces; the troops say that the Lubin Government bears no real relation to true Polish interests, and that 65% of Polish troops in Italy belong to the annexed portions of Poland." Meanwhile news is awaited of representatives of the London Polish Government, which accepted an invitation and a safe passage to go to Poland to discuss the question. This mission is overdue at Moscow. In this regard the "Age" of April 9 claimed that transport conditions between Poland and Moscow may account for the situation, and that it is too early to attach any sinister implications yet.

HEBREW HOMES: Edward Gelber, Vice-president of the Zionist Organisation in Canada, strikes an unusual propaganda note to further the cause of Jewry in Palestine. According to the Melbourne "Herald" of February 24 he says: "All European Jews should be forcibly deported to Palestine after the war." Presumably Jews are unwilling to live in Palestine, and Britain would be called on to service the plan! Mr. Gelber also says that "anti-Semitism" is so firmly established in Europe that the position of Jews is untenable, and "they will never be able to live there with liberty, confidence and self-respect." Although this person specifies his interest in the Jews, he, like others, incorrectly uses the term "anti-Semitism." The Arabs, for instance, are Semites just as much as the Jews. Therefore, it would be quite in line with Mr. Gelber's use of the term for the Arabs to say that Mr. Gelber and other Zionist Jews are anti-Semitic! When this term is met, it is just as well to ascertain precisely what is meant. —O. B. H.

THE BEST LEGISLATION

"The most valuable additions made to legislation have been enactments destructive of preceding legislation, and the best laws which have been passed have been those by which some former laws were repealed. . . . It is clear that the progress of civilisation cannot be due to those who, on the most important subject, have done so much harm that their successors are considered benefactors simply because they reverse their policy."

—"History of Civilisation in England," by Buckle (Vol. I., p. 200).

PALESTINE POPULATION

"If the White Paper on Palestine remains in force or an alternative settlement is not made, the Jews are fated to remain as a permanent minority; as a dwindling minority, in fact for the Arab birth rate is twice as high as the Jewish, and one of the most striking facts of the many-faceted problem is that Arab immigration into Palestine in the past decade has actually been higher than Jewish immigration."

—Jerusalem correspondent of "New York Times."

THE ONE-PARTY TYRANNY

"Lenin invented . . . the system of totalitarian one-party tyranny, which stamps out all actual freedom completely. Mussolini and Hitler borrowed Lenin's technique . . . Stalin—who despises the masses, and fears freedom—perfected it on the home ground, extinguishing in Russia the last surviving trace of the democratic concept of the Rights of Man. His Great Purge, in which an estimated 300,000 persons were shot or imprisoned, was a purge of all who might conceivably oppose his despotic power."

—Max Eastman: "We Must Face the Facts About Russia."

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Congressional appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority (T.V.A.) to 1943 amounted to more than £163,000,000. (This is the project, which is being quoted as an example.) The greater part of this would normally be recovered in taxation, much of it from individuals who have never been nearer to Tennessee than Professor Laski to productive labour.

—"The Social Creditor," England, 3/3/45.

THE NEO-FEUDALISM IN AUSTRALIA

The Local Phase of the World-wide Plot

By B.W.M. (Concluded from last issue.)

Mr. Curtin, then, has announced the Bureaucracy's intentions, and the main points in his speech [to the Secondary Industries Conference on February 5] display the essential framework for a comprehensive central control of the community—i.e., Totalitarianism.

To begin with, all policy is to be derived from the primary policy of forcing everyone to work—"full employment." Just as the primary policy of making war entails manpower control, organisation of industry, etc., etc., so will a work-policy.

As succinct a statement of the implications of the policy of "full employment" as is to be found anywhere is that of one of its advocates, Professor L. F. Giblin.

Professor Giblin, who was trained at University College, London, and King's College, Cambridge, is chairman of the Commonwealth Financial and Economic Committee, and was a Director of the Commonwealth Bank. In "The Problem of Maintaining Employment," he says:

"What kind of pressure is going to be brought to bear on people to take specific employment? You must try persuasion and inducement first, but at a certain point there must come a time when somebody must decide what is a suitable job for a man, and he must do it. That is going to be politically very difficult. So in the last resort WE shall require the power to divert labour to certain things, with the penalty of being unemployed without receiving unemployment benefit, on refusal."

"We"—the chosen! They are as conscious of their "mission" in this world as Hitler.

Secondly, we are to continue with external exchange control. This implies the continuation of censorship of external mail, to ensure that control regulations are not being evaded. Once the authorities have the legal right to open mail, there is no obvious limit to the extent to which they may make use of the information thus available to them. (It is probably not so widely recognised as is desirable that, far from censors merely deleting certain passages in letters, etc., they also make extracts, which are circulated within the bureaucracy. Neither writer nor recipient is informed, however, unless it is proposed to take action against one or other. But dossiers are constructed which might prove very useful "come the revolution.")

Thirdly, there is to be a system of priorities over materials for the building trade. A vast range of materials enters into the construction of a house!

Next, price-control gives to the bureaucracy a means to interfere in every industry to which it is applied. Although what the Government calls "price-subsidies" are obviously derived from the Social Credit compensated-price technique, and will have to be permanent in some form or other, there is all the difference between an automatic adjustment of prices the relative levels of which are the result of competition between various producers, and, on the other hand, the Government system of basing a subsidy on an investigation of profits. (The Prices Branch is to move into a new "temporary" building in Canberra next August. This is evidence, if any more is needed, that the "plans" announced by Mr. Curtin have been maturing, without publicity, for years.)

Lastly, we may note "a high rate of taxation." We have a complete framework of control, from the issue of money, through the control of the use to which it can be put, to the control of the means of withdrawing it. The objective is to ensure that none of it "sticks" to individuals, so conferring any sort of independence from the central machine.

The amalgamation of money-power and Government is virtually accomplished. Announcements of "intentions" are largely announcements of faits accomplis. For years the money-racket has been doomed, but, well in advance of any publicity, the steps necessary to control the individual through a network of regulations, superseding remote control by financial manipulation, have been taken. During war, that perfect opportunity, the scheme has been finalised; the "announcements" are but the removal of the scaffolding to expose the completed structure. And if we don't like it, it's too late now—or so we are meant to believe.

A plot of such magnitude as the one, which involves us cannot be concealed. But the forces, which could stamp it out, can be, and are being, confused, diverted, and corrupted. What IS concealed, however, is the progress of the plot. That is to say, the implementation of plans is much further advanced than appears to be the case, and the debate and clamour over what is no longer concealed very effectively diverts public attention from what is going on. The public is shutting a succession of stable doors.

While no doubt the plot has not proceeded entirely according to plan—there is certain evidence that the time-table has been dislocated to some degree—it is certain that its crisis may be on us in a matter of very few months, and in any case cannot be long delayed.

It is a situation to be faced with the utmost determination—"They shall not succeed." We believe that Social Credit is "bound back to reality," that it is, in the ultimate sense of the word, a religion. With the strength that comes from a glimpse of reality, we must fight. If there is a revolution, which is obviously contemplated should Fabianism prove insufficient, and possibly in any case, it will be a fight to the death.

There are many names for the fundamental cleavage that runs through the civilised

world, depending on the aspect under consideration. From the religious point of view, it is the war between good and evil. For Christian civilisation, the designation is clear Philosophically; the antithesis is individuality and collectivism. Politically, it is initiative, which can be manifested only in individuals, against centralisation.

The strength of individuality is demonstrated by the strategy "only in war"; and even yet the tyranny is not consolidated. Now, war has been a demonstration, as it was intended to be the mechanism, of the fact that collectivist opposition to collectivism leads to permanent collectivism—i.e., to totalitarianism; and the Party System is only war with different weapons. Two vitally important conclusions follow: That individuality is a tremendously powerful force, and that the strategy of opposition to collectivism must be based on the natural attributes of individuality.

That is to say, if the opposition to collectivism allows itself to be organised by, for example, the "Liberal" Party, then it has lost the battle, for organisation as such is the objective of the totalitarian.

Given a particular philosophy, policy follows, and strategy may be regarded as policy in action. That is to say, strategy to deal with a given situation is relatively fixed. While situations do not remain "as given," certain elements are relatively unchanging, and this in turn determines certain principles of strategy. But to say that the principles are fixed, in this sense, is not to say that they are obvious. They require deep study. The chaos in the world today is the calculated result of the application of strategy derived from collectivist philosophy, worked out by experts, and applied through conscious and unconscious agencies and organisations.

The task before us, though formidable, is possible. Douglas places the greatest weight on integrity (see "The Big Idea"). Given integrity, and as deep an understanding of the situation as possible, the individual who

undertakes the task of restoration must inevitably progress towards his goal.

There are certain facts, which help to delineate strategy. In the first place, recognition of the tremendous forces which the plotters have had to bring to their aid gives us a measure of the forces available in opposition to them—"to every action there is an equal and opposite re-action."

The natural resistance to totalitarianism has sufficed to produce, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon culture, the seeds of a true liberty and a true democracy. The conception of freedom, which, in the first place, could only be an abstract idea, has, in fact, been progressively actualized; and the great steps in that process, such as Magna Charta, have had their dynamic in the re-action of individuals to tyranny.

Now, so long as it remains true that "action and re-action are equal, opposite, and wholly automatic," we need not be worried by the mere magnitude of the sanctions employed by the enemy.

The problem becomes, therefore, that of the effective use of the force at our disposal. This, in turn, is to a large extent a problem of properly equipping that force. That is to say, we have to ensure that when action occurs, it will be the right action; and to accomplish this, we have first to identify those agencies and individuals in whom and through whom that action is going to be manifested. Our second task is to establish our own credit, of which the basis in reality is integrity and understanding, with those individuals and agencies, to the end that we may be in a position to provide that "small impetus from a body of men who know what to do and how to do it."

It is a common impulse, when one sees somebody doing something, to shout out advice on how to do it. The minority, however, lend a hand, when necessary. Competent assistance may evoke a request for advice, later, when the real difficulties arise. In any case, the only important thing is actually to TAKE, not talk about, the correct action.

Broadly speaking, our immediate objective is a modern Rurymede. This time it is the Bureaucracy which has to be put in its place, and its power reduced and forever after that limited, by a Bill of Rights.

A tolerable future depends on our success in that. We must show that we will not tolerate the use of temporary emergency powers to effect permanent changes in peacetime conditions.

Douglas has brought us to the point where a decisive battle is possible; but the decision, now, rests with us. The criminals—i.e., the instigators—can be hunted down later. Let every individual conscious of the immense gravity of these days play his part to the utmost. One good heave, all together!

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

rush at the local shops growl a fair bit about things in general. Then, inevitably, there arises the usual gloom-chaser to remind us of our narrow escape from invasion and a fate 'wuss than death.' Well, when you're standing long hours in queues you get time to think, and it occurs to me that our escape is much greater than we realise, for, Japs or no Japs, we couldn't have lasted much longer. That should be obvious to anybody who reads the books, pamphlets and advertisements and listens to the broadcast statements of the brilliant fellows who are planning our future at Canberra. How on earth did we manage before?"

How can the planners hope to achieve their aims when sturdy common sense, such as the above continues to exist in spite of the general mesmerism?

* * * * *

A correspondent writes to say that surely there are some good points in the Federal Government's banking legislation. He instances the abolition of the Commonwealth Bank Board, the provision to license the trading banks and the proposal to abolish the 25 per cent. gold or sterling backing for the note issue.

The principal weapon of the trickster is to divert your attention until the trickery is completed. The above points have diverted the attention of many sincere monetary reformers from the fundamental question of control and policy. There is every indication that control and policy are going to become even more centralised than they are now. That is part of the Big Idea.

So far from having less banks, as suggested by the socialist money reformers, there is every reason to support the idea that there should be more. Monopoly, whether it be "private," as in the case, of the trading banks, or "State," as suggested by the socialists, is a curse.

It doesn't need great economic study to see that, were all banks permitted to handle the people's credit under a definite and clearly recognised policy, and to charge no more than a stipulated maximum service fee, the banks would then be in the same position as most other businesses: the bank making the most profit would be the bank with the biggest turn-over of business. And to get this business it would require to give the best service and charge the lowest service fees. Bank managers would then need to seek business; they would be keen to support every productive project put forward by individuals desirous of using their social credit.

The major task of a Government should be to ensure that the economic arrangements in a community are such that no individual or group of individuals can be exploited or prevented from doing any particular job. Social creditors must make it perfectly clear that, say, in the case of B.H.P., they are not concerned about B.H.P. as a productive organisation; they are concerned with whether those controlling the B.H.P. can influence Governments to support policies designed to prevent any other group from manufacturing steel in this country. If the Government discovers that there are groups of people in this community who desire to compete with the B.H.P., but cannot do so because of some artificial impediment, deliberately created by the B.H.P., the Government should ensure that that impediment is removed. Under a really free competitive system, the people would automatically only retain those institutions, financial or industrial, giving the best results.

The further entry of the Government into the administration of banking or industry means even less competition than we have now; it means the dull monotonous Slave State; the equality of the cemetery.

—E. D. B.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The next meeting of the S.C.M. of S.A. will be held in the United Democrats' rooms, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, April 26, at 8 p.m. Some important business is to be discussed, so all members are requested to attend.

—J. E. Burgess, Hon. Secretary.

taken an active hand in the game of "rationalising" Canadian industries.

In 1929, the year of the onset of the Economic Blizzard, Melchett told delegates to the Congress of the British Empire Chambers of Commerce:

"The writing is on the wall . . . the great American Economic Unit which exists today will be followed by the European Economic Unit in no too distant time, and the great plea M. Briand launched the other day was the first official step in that direction."

M. Briand was a high-grade Grand Orient Freemason. In 1929, he proposed at Geneva to turn the League of Nations into the government of a United States of Europe; he hoped to realise in a twelvemonth (the "Morning Post": "the idea of creating a United States of Europe in a twelvemonth took away the breath of most delegates") what Continental masons had dreamed about and worked for since the French Revolution. But neither Briand, nor Lord Melchett, who died in 1930, were to see the day when another "seer of visions and dreamer of dreams"—as Ben Tillet, the Socialist, admirably called Mond the Monopolist—was to effect in a twelvemonth the European Economic Unit known as the Hitlerite New Order. (To be continued.)

MASTER-PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

By ERIC D. BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

The story of how Mond set about centralising control of the raw materials, etc., necessary for war, is best outlined by the following extracts from an article in "The Social Creditor," England, of March 18, 1944:

Perhaps we may end the list of "advantages" of the cartel system advanced by Sir Alfred by quoting his dictum on page 227 of "Industry and Politics," a volume containing some of his characteristic speeches: "Amalgamation is the way in which the transfer of labour from the obsolete to the new modern factories can be dealt with," a dictum which receives proper significance when it is recalled that the Ministry of Mr. Ernest Bevin, who has his own way of dealing with this particular problem, a way which is at times more than half-way to Moscow, is at present housed at the London headquarters of Imperial Chemical Industries, to the formation of which we now must devote a few lines.

By the middle of the 'twenties, Mond . . . "perceived that rationalisation was already strengthening the chemical manufacturers in Germany." It was as Government director of the British Dyes Corporation that he in 1926 went to the Continent "to meet the leaders of the German chemical industry," thinking that "it would be an advantage to the British industry to make an agreement with the Germans in regard to dyes, in return for certain rights and knowledge of the process of extracting oil from coal." Having completed his business with the Germans, Sir Alfred sent his son, Henry, to London to contact Lord Ashfield, Chairman of British Dyestuff Corporation, while he himself proceeded to New York to confer "with the Americans" and Sir Harry McGowan, who had also repaired thither. It was during their return to England in the Aquitania that the two future leaders of the I.C.I. "planned the rationalisation of assets which amounted to almost £100,000,000." (Hector Bolitho: "Alfred Mond, First Lord Melchett")

The agreement with Lord Ashfield, of the British Dyes, and Sir Max Muspratt, of the United Alkali Company, was signed on their return. On the Board of Directors they were joined by Rufus Isaacs, first Marquess of Reading ("I want men like Reading, Colwyn, Weir, for my directors," said Mond), Sir Joseph Stamp, and the Hon. Henry Mond. In an article which he contributed to the "Spectator," Mond, now Lord Melchett of Melchett Court, said in November, 1927:

"In order to give effect to the purpose of having a common labour policy throughout all our works and for all our 40,000 workers a Central Labour Department has been established with a member of the Board (Henry Mond) as its chief. Secondly, we have established a complete system of Works Council . . . a Central Works Council in London, over which, as Chairman of the Company, I shall preside."

Lord Melchett organised the Melchett-Turner Conference, which was another attempt at bringing the "Masters" and "Men" together. Of the Masters can be mentioned

Lord Weir, Lord Ashfield, Lord Hirst: "We realise that industrial reconstruction can be undertaken only in conjunction with . . . those entitled and empowered to speak for ORGANISED Labour."

[After the Mond-Turner conferences the headquarters of the Trades Union Congress were moved to offices owned by I.C.I. The Labor "leaders" took the view that, "While rationalisation can never prove an alternative to nationalisation, the movement was prepared to welcome such changes in organisation of industry during the period of private ownership (sic) as would lead to improvement in the efficiency of industry." Isn't it remarkable that we have been hearing surprisingly similar ideas in this country from Communists and others working to organise the "workers" into bigger and bigger units! —E.D.B.]

In 1928, Melchett, who so long had deplored that the unique anthracite mines of South Wales should suffer "because they were scattered among several small owners," effected the Amalgamated Anthracite Collieries, with himself as Chairman.

In this way Melchett (who, during the period was Member for Swansea, and whose son, Henry Mond, during the First World War had served in the regiment commanded by Sir Ivor Phillips, whose A.D.C. was Captain Gwilym Lloyd George, the present Minister of Fuel) achieved the control of 85 per cent. of the Welsh anthracite mines.

The year before, Melchett ("Industry and Politics," p. 199) "had invited two of the leading directors of the Rhenish Westphalian Coal Syndicate to come across and inform me of the coal-selling syndicates in Germany." The Rhenish Westphalian controls more than 70 per cent. of the total coal output in Germany. Since 1919 there has been "statutory requirement" in Germany for coal-producers to form themselves into selling syndicates. Such selling syndicates, Lord Melchett hoped, "would not only control output and stabilise prices but would lead to the amalgamation of mines and groups of mines" (p. 201). But should such amalgamation "prove tardy" it could "be accelerated by the functioning of a Board of Commissioners who had inducements in the way of cheap credit and other facilities."

In the same year of 1928, Mond Nickel Co. was sunk in the merger of International Nickel Company of Canada, a Dominion with which Brunner-Mond had done business for half a century . . .

"It seems that just as Sir Harry McGowan was his natural ally in rationalisation, so his ideas of Empire Economic Unit were made fruitful with a man, like Lord Beaverbrook who made them tangible and powerful through his newspapers." (Hector Bolitho: "Alfred Mond, First Lord Melchett.")

Lord Beaverbrook, like Lord Melchett, had