

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. 17. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MAY 4, 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.

## Burning Question of "Soldier Preference"

### A Union Paper Sees the Way Out

A rare and remarkable ray of light has penetrated into one of the trade union circles. It should help to dispel the dark clouds of mental confusion, which arise from the work-complex and prevent a realistic approach to the problem of giving a fair deal to ex-members of the Services without victimising those who have been retained on the home front.

The "ray of light" to which we refer is an article entitled "What of Soldier Preference?" appearing in the April issue of "Aircraft News," which is issued by the Inter-Union Area Committee and Aircraft Youth Association at the Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation, Melbourne. The article reads as follows: —

The question of soldier preference is at present claiming a great deal of public attention in view of the Federal Government's proposed legislation to give effect to this principle for a period of seven years after the war.

The Government's intention is opposed by a section of the Labour Party and Trade Union Movement on the grounds that soldier preference is unfair to those persons engaged in industry who have been prevented from enlisting because of their work, and that, alternatively, the Government's policy of full employment should be adhered to.

Because of the vital importance of the issue involved, an examination of some relevant facts relating to same might prove of some benefit.

What does soldier preference or full employment signify? The former gives returned soldiers preference over civilians in employment; the latter provides employment for everybody desirous of working, which suggests in effect that obtaining employment is a paramount necessity, and the person unsuccessful in this respect is indeed unfortunate. Experience has proved that to be so, and we as a people have been so busy pursuing or preparing for our vocations in life and struggling to keep in employment that we haven't paused to reflect upon some undeniable facts. In the first place, why do we work? Speaking from a racial viewpoint, there can be only one answer to that question—to provide ourselves with the essentials of life—food, clothing, and shelter. To these essentials can be added such things as provision of services, comforts, amenities, or anything else, which modern science and development has to offer; the sum total of which can be designated "standard of living."

A nation's standard of living should be gauged by the total national production of the things mentioned above. Who will say that Australia has not come up to scratch

where the production of the things that matter is concerned? Rather have we seen it rise to such proportion that disposal of it becomes an official "problem," and criminal methods of restriction have been enforced. A notable example of Australia's productive capacity has been witnessed during the war, when perhaps 50 per cent, (as a possible estimate) of our total population is engaged in fighting the enemy or in war work, which is unproductive from the point of view of consumer goods and services. The other 50 per cent have to maintain the production of those things, which keep body and soul together, and which represent our standard of living, not only for themselves but for the entire population at home and abroad. Who can deny that they have succeeded to a remarkable extent? Not only in nearly six years of war have we not known a day's hunger, but we have contributed to the task of supplying Britain with badly needed food-stuffs, as well as feed many thousand Americans.

Will anyone say that, if the war were to go on indefinitely, we would have to surrender because we cannot maintain our supplies of life's essentials? Surely not? And yet after the war, when our troops return, we are suddenly faced with a "problem." A problem to find or create work! Our fighting men suddenly become our opponents—our rivals in the war of job finding. For what purpose? To restrict the production which has kept them in the field?

Would it not be more sensible to invite them to join in production in a voluntary capacity, and so by their added assistance help to raise the standard of living for all concerned? Surely such an objective would be worthy of our combined effort?

But man has devised a system, which decrees that the object of a person working is not so much to aid production as to qualify for a share of existing production,

which might already be adequate. In other words, we are forced to find work in order to earn money, because without money we can have no share in the nation's production. Therefore, instead of trying to find work for everybody—a very difficult task when modern production methods and machinery can turn out goods far in excess of our local requirements—would it not be a logical solution, if we have excess manpower, to ensure that everyone has as the first essential a weekly allowance of money sufficient to provide them with the bare necessities of life, and let work commence at that point?

Let it be understood that when everybody, without exception, has a regular weekly income, they will spend it buying the things they need, thus requiring more to be made, and so creating a vast market with consequent widespread prosperity.

The suggestion that people be given money for which they don't work meets

with much opposition from the person it will most benefit—the working man. He contends that it will encourage laziness, and that no one will want to work. But what type of person will be satisfied to live on the "free money," which need only be £2 or £3 a week? (A suggested figure with which to start and to be increased when accustomed to and desired by the people.) Although providing bare necessities this amount will not satisfy the ambitious person, and it is certain that a family could not be raised on it or a man save enough to get married on or buy a home. To supplement this "national bonus" a man would need to work just as he does at present, but with one difference. Would it not be perfectly logical, with manpower in excess of requirements, to reduce the working week from 44 hours to 30 hours without loss of pay, so that decent citizens could enjoy a little well-earned leisure? Remember that production is all that mat-

(Continued on page 2)

We have it dinned in our ears that the present excessive taxation is for war purposes, and yet Mr. Curtin now tells us that, although war expenditure has declined, taxation will not be reduced. He was replying to a suggestion from Mr. E. S. Spooner to the Sydney Retail Traders' Club, that a substantial reduction in taxation rates should be made. Mr. Spooner contended that excessive taxation is a substantial factor in causing black markets. There is a strong feeling in the community on this question, and the irresponsible attitude of Curtin and Co. indicates that in addition to a demand for a substantial reduction of direct and indirect taxation, constitutional provision should be sought for a referendum on future proposals for tax increases. In a democracy the people should determine how much taxation they shall pay—it is not for the political servants to compel payments from their employers. Usually employees are dismissed when they help themselves to their employers' money.

**COMMUNIST CONTESTS:** The State Secretary of the Queensland Communist Party is considering putting up candidates against all members of the Labor Party regarded as "Rightist" at the next State Election. These would include the Minister for Labor (Mr. Gair) and the Transport Minister (Mr. Walsh). From this it may be inferred that those M.P.'s not to be opposed are "Leftists," and are sympathetic to the Communist's objective of obtaining power by all and any means including force! So long as the Communists make that point clear, all will be well and their votes as before will be few; moreover, this method of dividing Laborites into "Left" and "Right" divisions will disclose disguised Communists. It is more likely, however, that Communist candidates will as usual pretend to be the workers' friends and even the inventors of democracy!

**WORKERS' WOES:** At the all-Australian Trade Union Convention workers are to be asked by their alleged political servants to increase their working hours per week. Federal Labor Members are said to realise that the effect of high taxation will make their proposal difficult to put over; but apparently they have no intention of removing the obstacle—that would be too sensible and desirable! This will be an occasion when both Labor-stalwart Curtin and anti-Labor Menzies can stand shoulder to shoulder, along with the Communists, in a gallant attempt to restore the ten-hour working day on behalf of Mr. Chifley and the tax-gatherers. If any returned soldier unionists happen to be present, after risking their lives and now finding themselves working for the Treasury, there may be some interesting repercussions.

**SOVIET SLAUGHTER:** Maurice Hindus, New York "Herald-Tribune" correspondent, who has returned after 18 months in Moscow, gives some idea of terrific loss of life in Russia. He estimates the slaughter at 15,000,000, including civilians—1,500,000 died from famine in Leningrad alone during 1942. He describes the terrible conditions thus: "The rooms were not heated, there was no water, no light and no food. 1,000,000 in White Russia and 2,000,000 from other parts are still missing; many were deported to Germany, but others just vanished. In the Ukraine it is estimated that 4 to 8 millions perished, while mass deportations and executions were the order of the day." It is indeed a terrible story, and similar to the fate that befell the Russians during the massacres that occurred when the Communists seized power—the only difference being that in that instance Germany was not the aggressor.

**UGLY UNIONISM:** The Victorian-Tasmanian branch of the Shop Assistants' and Warehouse Employees' Union has forwarded a circular to the Geelong Trades Hall Council asking members to see they are served by Union shop workers. Here is yet another form of terrorism in the making. Commenting on this, Mr. T. K. Maltby, M.L.A., said: "Such a plan would be a dangerous attack upon the British principle of freedom of the individual, and comes

strangely as a threat from a workers' organisation." It certainly is an alien idea, which does not originate from rank-and-file British-Australian workers, who would not approve such tyranny. The time is overdue for decent Unionists to take a hand and depose the small clique of Hitlerites who have seized executive control, and are responsible for these terrorist tactics.

**BALTIC BATTLE:** The Lithuanian-American Council has issued a statement saying that "Russia has imposed a totalitarian Communist system in the Baltic" (Melbourne "Herald," 19/2/45), and continues, "we appeal to the United States to help Lithuania to achieve a free independent country in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, which was re-affirmed at Yalta." The Council claims to represent 1,000,000 persons of Lithuanian descent. It is odd to note the statement that "the Atlantic Charter was reaffirmed at Yalta," because in reality the Atlantic Charter is in the discard, and the Yalta sell-out, if it becomes effective, will be the foulest blow ever struck against British ideals. Fortunately signs are appearing to indicate that this is recognised as unwarranted appeasement of Stalin, which has gone too far.

**RUBBER RIDDLE:** Because of the shortage of "carbon black" Australia has reduced its production of rubber tyres. Some idea of the terrific intelligence (?) of our socialistic economists may be obtained when it is recalled "ten years ago the production of carbon-black was stopped because it was uneconomic; now, production is to be resumed in Tasmania." We have the same certified economists with us today, which explains the continued blunders and sabotage occurring daily, and they are now telling us that car, plane and petrol production and many other vital war and peace time needs are uneconomic. The same fellows are telling us how important it is that we permit them to retain the controls through which they push us around now. Our very existence in the future may depend on us beating them to the punch, and giving the K.O. We must not pull our punches in this fight.

—O. B. H.

## Significant Political Pointers

The Electricity Bills recently passed by the Queensland Parliament, and commented on previously in these notes, have been rejected by at least one group of Queensland electors. At the recent council meeting of the Queensland South-West Local Authorities' Development Association, the following resolution was passed: "This meeting believes in greater powers for local government, and is opposed to the creation of more boards not accountable to the people." After some discussion, a telegram was sent to the Acting Premier, Mr. Hanlon, stating that the meeting was opposed to the control of electric supply being exercised by centralised organisation.

The above action is commended to all Queensland social crediters. The Electricity Bills are a portion of the Big Idea, and will be used to foist another army of bureaucrats on the electors. Queensland social crediters should be doing something about the matter.

There is every reason to believe that as a result of the growing disgust with the present Government, the "Liberal" Party is gaining considerable electoral support.

The tragedy is, of course, that all the essential practices of socialism, irrespective of the labels used, will continue, irrespective of a change of Government.

The appointment of Miss Nerida Cohen, a barrister, to the New South Wales executive of the "Liberal" Party should ensure that there is no departure from the major policy of government by Law. There is nothing like a Cohen in a "key" position — just to keep an eye on things, you know.

Mr. Arthur Bryant, the English writer, outlines a most important idea in the following words:

"To our freedom-loving English minds, it

### A Socialist Viewpoint

"We were the first to assert that the more complicated the forms of civilisation, the more restricted the freedom of the individual must become."

—B. MUSSOLINI.

seems that the proper judge of how a man should shape his life, his work, and his pleasures is not the State—but a man himself. We do not want to be ruled from the cradle to the grave by bureaucrats or gauleiters. We want, under God and the Law, to rule ourselves. Our fathers were not mistaken when they declared that property was an essential attribute of a free people . . . Because the great conception of property has been used as a means of accumulated power against the just rights of other men and the well-being of the community, too many idealists have attributed to it all the evils of our time."

William L. White's "Report on the Russians," written after that writer's visit to Russia with Mr. Eric Johnston's party last year, has caused a storm in America.

It is reported that every big newspaper in U.S.A., except "Time" and the "New Yorker," has denounced the book as a "dangerous slander against our Russian ally."

Now isn't it strange how all the "capitalist" newspapers should be so unanimous that Mr. White is really wrong in his firsthand impressions of Soviet Russia!

No doubt Mr. White's allegation that the Russians started to denounce the Jews when it appeared that Germany would capture Moscow, hit a very tender spot. Apparently the Russians have no love for some of the Jewish bureaucrats.

It is now obvious to even the meanest (Continued on page 3)

## COLLECTIVE FARMING FAILS IN U.S.A.

It is reported that Joe Stalin has recognised that collective farming does not give the best results. Even so, the Comrade is really a bit behind the times, because Julius Caesar discovered that fact when he observed the results of collective agriculture in Germany about two thousand years ago.

But it is not only in backward countries like Soviet Russia and ancient Germany that collective farming has proved so unsatisfactory. Collective farming experiments in U.S.A. in recent years confirm the verdict, according to an article in the "Reader's Digest" written by Congressman Harold D. Cooley, Representative for North Carolina.

Mr. Cooley was born and bred in rural North Carolina. Since election to Congress in 1934 he has been recognised in the House as an authority on agriculture. As Chairman of a Special Investigating Committee he has spent nearly a year studying the Farm Security Administration—hence his article, in which he describes two methods (apart from higher returns for primary producers) that have been used in attempts to rehabilitate depression-stricken farmers.

In themselves, both these methods involved no radical departure from orthodox financial principles. And neither method would have had a chance but for the fact that a huge flow of newly-created "credit"-money, apart from employers' overdrafts, was going into "circulation": some of it reaching farmers indirectly through higher prices and directly through subsidies. But given that same favourable opportunity, the individual method succeeded while the collective method failed dismally. Mr. Cooley describes the experiments in his article (to which we have added sub-headings) in the following words:—

### TWO EXPERIMENTS

In North Carolina, as in every State in the Union, a depression-ridden farmer was found by a federal bureau. Perhaps the man needed a mule, some tools, seed, feed, fertiliser, and a little cash. It all came to about \$350. The bureau loaned him the money. In a couple of years he was on his feet, a self-supporting, independent, American farmer.

This story is important, because the Farm Security Administration did that job for nearly a million farmers. But it is also important because that same bureau had some other ideas about the farmer. It thought it could create a new kind of farm life in America, on the collectivist model, where farmers worked on Government-owned or Government-managed farms. It tried out this theory in 197 projects.

And while it was making brilliant success of rehabilitating farmers on the American plan, FSA was making a grotesque fizzle of the job on the collectivist plan. Let us examine the two experiments.

### HELPING THE FARMER

The first was simplicity itself. An FSA agent discussed the farmer's problem with him and ascertained his needs. Then the Government made him a loan and gave him expert advice about the best crops and markets.

By June 1943, the FSA had assisted 950,000 farmers in this way and loaned them \$778,522,000. Of this amount \$404,327,000 had fallen due; and \$377,133,000—93 percent—had been repaid.

Nearly 400,000 families thus aided have paid their debts in full, an almost incredible showing for persons once broke and discouraged. Further, the farmers have trebled their production of food for home use; the average family has increased its home consumption of milk from 99 to 465 gallons per year. The outlook now is that the Government will recover at least 85 cents out of every dollar loaned.

The cost of carrying on this great work in human salvage has been approximately \$75 a year for each family.

### RESULTS OF COLLECTIVISM

But now behold the other experiment. Consider, for example the following project, one of those 197 efforts to introduce American farmers to life on the collectivist model.

In 1933 the Government purchased a tract of land in Pender County, North Carolina. The land was subdivided into 105 farm units, with homes and outhouses, and named Penderlea. There was a brick school and a "teacherage" (teacher's home), an auditorium, community house, training shop, and other buildings. A corporation was organised; it established a store, a filling station, and food and livestock processing plants. The total investment in the project was \$2,277,000.

At Penderlea everything was managed with a capital "M" by Government agents. There were farm management and home management. And to manage this small community of 105 farmers required the following personnel: community manager, at \$4400 a year; farm specialist, \$2900; clerk, \$2000; home supervisor, \$1920; stenographer, \$1380; two typists, \$1380 each; janitor, \$960. Total \$16,320. The annual cost of managing 105 poor families was approximately \$155 each.

Of course, the farmers could not pay it. They couldn't even get along. The FSA had to lend them individually \$309,519, and make outright grants of \$30,426 more. The Government supplied these funds, and had to borrow the money. A Congressional committee estimated that a fair interest charge for all money invested and loaned was \$409,874. Put all of these amounts

### WANTED TO BUY

"THE NEW AND THE OLD ECONOMICS," by Major Douglas. Also, "CANADA'S BANKERS AND CANADA'S CREDIT" (Major Douglas's evidence before the Canadian Banking Commission).

—"X.Y.Z.," c/o "New Times," Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

together and you have an outlay of nearly \$30,000 for each of the families that occupied the units.

### ANOTHER FIASCO

By 1938, after five years, Penderlea was obviously a complete failure. But the story did not end there: the next idea was to join factory and farm, to help the settlers to independence by making them wage-earners as well as farmers. Accordingly the farmers were organised into another corporation. It was called the Penderlea Industrial Corporation. One share of \$1 stock was issued to each "client." This corporation, with slightly more than \$100 capital stock, owned by slightly more than 100 insolvent farmers borrowed \$800,000 from the FSA. It built a fully equipped, air-conditioned hosiery mill, with lovely lawns and landscaping.

The clients or settlers were to work in the mill for wages and as stockholders were to share in the profits. This enterprise was a pathetic failure. Up to December 1942, operating expenses amounted to \$154,891, while income was \$140,035. Loss: \$14,856.

Five of these 197 managed-economy experiments went in for hosiery mills. Skyline, in Alabama, seems to have earned the prize for losses. Its operating expenses were \$139,344, not counting interest, rent, or what was sunk in the buildings. Its income was \$26,816.

There were other experiments in wedding factory to farm—Arthurdale, in West Virginia, for instance. This project was the brain child of Dr. Rexford "Guy" Tugwell, once Farm Security Administrator, and now Governor of Puerto Rico. Dr. Tugwell apparently had the idea that it's a bad thing for farmers to own their own land and work for themselves. At any rate, Arthurdale was the first beautiful experiment in the planned life. Each of the pioneers was to get a nice, new pre-fabricated home, with from two to four acres of land. The community plan called for a school, with six buildings, a gymnasium a library, a weaving shop, a building for metal work, called "The Forge," three brick and steel factory buildings, a co-operative store, a shirt factory, furniture factory, tractor assembly business, electric vacuum factory, an administration building, and a beautiful community building.

### FRUITS OF "BEE HIVE" PLANNING

All this swiftly passed from a glamorous announcement to death. A large poultry,

## FIRST-HAND REPORT ON THE SOVIET

(Continued from last issue.)

**When Eric Johnston, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, was invited to visit Russia last year, his party included William L. White, one of the war's most realistic and entertaining reporters. Mr. White here recounts his observations of the way of life of the Soviet people and their masters:—**

### OUR FIRST GLIMPSE OF SOVIET ARISTOCRACY

Tonight our Russian hosts with Kirilov in charge take us to a concert at Tschai-kowsky Hall. There is an excellent violinist, followed by a mezzo-soprano. In between I look at the audience, and notice its shabby clothes. Each performance on the stage is introduced by an attractive brunette in a simply cut dress of gleaming white satin. By contrast with that shabby audience, she is a dream princess. The male performers are in evening dress; the women's clothes are well cut and of good materials, clean and pressed. This drab Socialist audience stares as though at some unattainable fairyland of which they get just an hour's glimpse.

A pianist has just taken his bows and retired to the wings, and his grand piano is being removed for the next act. How? Well, the slender brunette in the white satin dress is pushing it—a feat made possible because it is on casters. I find myself unconsciously leaning forward in my seat and pushing on the rail of our box to help her. I notice Joyce and Eric are doing the same.

But this, it seems, is a purely Anglo-Saxon reaction, for the audience does not even rustle. Later, after watching many slender women heave pianos, trunks and crates around, we become almost as calloused

farm in a three-story building with glass windows and modern conveniences, failed. A co-op, dairy was started and abandoned. A radio manufacturing plant was launched, but did not succeed. The planners were not so good at business.

This expensive plaything cost an enormous amount of money. No one was really rehabilitated, and no farmer was started on the road to home-ownership. Much has been printed about it, so that many people have supposed it to be an isolated blunder of well-meaning souls. But remember, there were 197 such experiments, of differing varieties.

Mr. Wendell Willkie describes in "One World," a Russian farm that he visited. He saw a tract of 8000 acres with 55 families. The farm belonged to the Government. Each family had a cow and there was a common pasture. But the farm was worked as a single mechanised farm. The manager was czar. Machinery belonged to the Government. The Government took a share of the harvest as rent, and distributed the remainder among the farmers. Every man and each working member of his family was checked in and out of every field and job, and a record was kept of every hour and minute that each worker laboured.

Compare that with Scuppernong Homesteads, in North Carolina. It contains 11 309 acres. The United States Government owns it. There are 71 farmhouses. The farmers are tenants. The Government is the landlord. About 40 of the units are worked as one big mechanised farm. All the produce goes into one big pool. The Government takes a share of the harvest for rent. The remainder is distributed among the tenants. Farm, community and home managers are hired by the Government to run the show. Each farmer can keep a cow and have a small garden. He works where he is told to work under constant scrutiny. He is checked into the corn field and out of it, into the cow barn and out of that into the hog pen, and a careful record is kept of where, when and how long he works.

### A COSTLY LESSON

The Government's investment at Scuppernong Homesteads was \$79,000, or \$11,000 a family. The cost of operation to June 1942 was \$97,000. Income was \$23,000. Loss: \$74,000, or \$1000 a family, on operation alone. To this must be added \$104,805 in loans to the clients. Also add \$317,000 interest on the capital investment. The whole thing looks like a burden of \$18,000 a family. Most pathetic of all, the families themselves were worse off financially at the end than before they were "reclaimed" and "redeemed." There were 11 projects like this Scuppernong Homesteads, some of them even more costly.

The Government could have given each of these families simple title to the same, and a gift of \$1000 in cash, and still have spent less than half the cost per individual of Scuppernong and similar projects.

FSA officials, unable to defend the flat failure of the 197 communal experiments, say, in effect: "After all, these projects made up only about one per cent, of the agency's entire operations." But that one per cent, representing the collectivist idea as to how to "save" 15,500 farmers, cost almost a third as much as the FSA's sensible rehabilitation loan programme for 950,000 farmers.

FSA clients, working under the communal plan, are not being rehabilitated, are not paying back their loans, are hopelessly involved in debt. But those other FSA clients who have been aided by the American plan are steadily paying back their loans, are improving their standard of living, are buying their own farms, and achieving real independence.

—"Reader's Digest," May 1944.

## THE BURNING QUESTION OF "SOLDIER PREFERENCE"

(Continued from page 1)

ters, and if a man can keep his vegetable garden in order by working all Saturday afternoon, he is hardly likely to dig it up again on Sunday just for the sake of something to do.

At present we see the spectacle of a country rich in all kinds of production producing surpluses which must be disposed of on overseas markets (so we are told), while the great majority of her people are limited in their share of this great wealth to the extent of the basic wage—about £5 per week. The basic wage has increased by dribs and drabs over the years, and has taken the cost of living with it. Surely it is time the Australian people saw the need for a new mechanism whereby the goods in their abundance can be got to them without them having to be cooped up in an office or factory all day every day. Surely we are not going to let our soldiers down on their return by virtually forcing them to carry the weight of our production, which is what soldier preference means. Why not let them volunteer to work? They have been good enough to volunteer to fight, and in many cases sacrifice their health.

Let us hand them and every adult man and woman in Australia the means to live, irrespective of whether they can "qualify" by getting a job, and the war will be well won and the peace assured.

To many enquirers who will say that the idea sounds all right, but where is the money coming from, I would point out that money hasn't prevented us from engaging in wasteful war and therefore why should it be allowed to stand in the way of real peace. Money is only a mechanism and I would advise anyone who doesn't completely understand this to give the matter earnest thought and study. We owe it to ourselves, the men who have fought for us, and the nation of which we are so proud.

this point—the officer sparkles a quarter of a mile away. In the Western countries heroes modestly keep their medals in their top bureau drawers, and the award is represented by a coloured ribbon sewed on his tunic. The more robust Russians do not understand such false modesty, and Soviet officers' chests jingle with bronze and gold medals. [Remember Goering? —Ed.] Here military men salute each other constantly and from all distances. There is more saluting in this Socialist army than in any other in the world, and most of the other old Czarist military caste lines between officers and men have been vigorously revived.

On trains officers travel in "soft" compartments, enlisted men in "hard" ones. No Soviet officer may carry a conspicuous package on the streets. Although Red Army officers still must spend some time in the ranks, very recently military schools have been established which give promising youngsters training toward commissions.

These officers in the foyer of the Concert Hall are, except for the fact that they are undersized, fine-looking men. They are usually blue-eyed blondes, and their unsmiling faces and cropped bullet-heads constantly remind one of old-time Prussian officers.

### HORS D'OEUVRES AND CHAMPAGNE

Our hosts tear us away from the crowd to a room near our box, where a little between-the-acts supper is being served in our honour by the director of the theatre. A table for about 15 is set with immaculate linen. Before each napkin is the tall white-wine glass, the shorter-stemmed red-wine glass, the tubular champagne glass and the squat vodka glass. In the centre is a dazzling array of Russian hors d'oeuvres on about 20 platters: smoked salmon, delicious Volga sturgeon, spiced ham, cold roast chicken, salami and countless kinds of sliced sausages.

Gnarled old waiters in baggy dress suits pass around bowls of cold caviar resting in cracked ice. I take what would be several dollars' worth in America. With it are served little pastries and a great slab of unsalted butter.

This initial course of caviar, sweet butter and pastries precedes the smoked sturgeon and sausages, and with it goes white wine. We were to find out that the same course also preceded every meal—including breakfast—which our hosts served us during our stay in the Soviet Union.

When we had returned to our box, Kirilov nodded toward the stage. The house lights went down and the footlights came up. Only then was it casually explained that they had kept this underfed audience of about 5000 waiting for ten minutes while I dallied with my second piece of chocolate-layer pastry and that last sip of champagne.

But no Russian thought it unusual. Weren't we honoured guests of the Soviet Union? These people inherit an even stronger tradition from the Mongolian Emperor, Genghis Khan, than they have derived from Karl Marx.

Looking around the hall, I wonder where they keep the old people. All these faces are young; so were those on the streets this afternoon. What became of Russians who should now be 50 or older? Did they sicken and die during the terrible famines of the Revolution? Were they liquidated in later purges? Or have they only been so diluted by the terrific Russian birth rate that they only seem to be few? Now back in America, I still wonder.

—"Reader's Digest," January. (Condensed from the book, "Report on the Russians.")

(To be continued.)

# PROBLEM OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

## A POLITICAL PRIMER FOR PATIENTS AND DOCTORS

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

### VI. MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

When a group of people are not organised under a Central Authority, but have particular interests in common, they often form an association to further those interests. Among doctors there are a number of associations of this sort, most of them devoted to technical interests in particular. The British Medical Association, however, covers the interests of all doctors, and is largely concerned with those general relations of the profession with the community, which we have been considering.

The primary reason why individuals associate together is that they can obtain thereby what is called "the increment of association." Ten men pulling on a rope, for example, can achieve a result that ten men acting separately are unable to achieve; ten men lifting together can lift a weight that none could lift alone. These are examples of transient associations formed to meet the needs of the moment, as when a number of motorists held up on an obstructed road co-operate to shift the obstruction, and then go their own ways. But when, as with professional men, the same general collection of individuals have successive, continuing, or recurrent objectives requiring co-operation, it is convenient for them to form a permanent association. The principle, however, remains the same, and the individual joins the association because he believes that his personal ends are more likely to be attained through association with others. Approached in this way, it is evident that the political association we have examined under the name of democracy is derived in the first place from the belief of individuals in the value of association as a means of attaining their own personal ends.

When an association becomes large, it is impracticable for all its members to take part in the running of its affairs, and hence its business comes to be done by a small number on behalf of the rest, and some form of Executive is empowered to act for all.

As we have seen, this Executive must carry out the orders of the general members in respect of policy if the association is to remain democratic; otherwise the fundamental basis on which the individual associated is destroyed, for the association ceases to serve the personal aims of the individual. He did not give power to the Executive in order to have it used against him.

In general, the larger the association, the greater the power it possesses; and it falls to the Executive to make use of this power in the interest of the members. But as Lord Acton pointed out, "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Consequently, we find, all too frequently, that the Executive begins to entertain totalitarian ideas, and aims to secure for itself more and more the control of policy. It begins to say what members "ought" to do, what is "good" for them, and so on. Inevitably these idealistic, and often rationalised, notions, begin to conflict with the motives that induced individuals to associate in the first place; and when such conflicts occur, the Executive begins to look round for sanctions to be used to compel the individual to conform to its desires.

In the larger community, the State controls the Armed Forces, including the police, in addition to more subtle sanctions. In the smaller association, however, only the more subtle sanctions are available. If the principle underlying the use of sanctions is grasped, there should be no difficulty in appreciating the fact that centralised control of money, of propaganda, and of the agendas of meetings are sanctions of this description.

This brief outline of fundamental relationships may serve as a frame of reference in considering the British Medical Association as an organisation existing to further the desires of its members. It is so large an association as to make an Executive imperative; the question we have to consider, therefore, is the degree to which the Executive comes under the control of members as regards policy. In the democratic association the first duty of the Executive is to ascertain the wishes of its members, and the second to devise means of implementing these wishes. And it must always bear in mind that it is individual wishes, which are important; a society where everyone is satisfied is the ideal. Under the first heading may be included the duty of stating political alternatives clearly—clarifying policy—and under the second, providing a suitable mechanism for allowing expression of opinion on policy.

Now, for many years the vital issue before the medical profession has been whether or not it should be organised under a Central Authority.

That is the bedrock question. All other considerations and questions are derived from this one, and the future of the profession will be radically different, as the earlier chapters have shown, according to the decision carried out.

Yet this question has never been put to the profession by the Executive [in Great Britain], except ambiguously, in a form analogous to the question, "Have you left off beating your wife yet—yes or no?" As an actual example of the way things are done we may take the following Recommendation addressed by the Council of the B.M.A. [in Great Britain] to the Divisions:

"That the State, while assuming responsibility for the organisation and provision of medical services, should not assume control of doctors rendering individual or personal health service . . ."

Granted the responsibility of the State for organisation and provision of medical services, we may be certain that the negative recommendation would be overridden as a practical necessity. The effect of the whole recommendation is to encourage the State to set up an organising authority. The Council was, at that time, aware of the Government's views on the matter, as a result of their discussions with the Ministry.

It is evident that for many years the Executive [in Great Britain] has been infiltrated by officials who wanted (no doubt quite sincerely believing it to be "in the public interest") the profession organised under a Central Authority. In this way they have been at one with the Ministry of Health, with whom, however, they have differed over questions of method. Now in a democracy it is improper to submit to members' questions of method, as we have seen. On the other hand, such a technique is the chief technique of pseudo-democracy.

Where the officials of a democracy become idealists and believe that they know better than the people concerned what is good for them, and what therefore should be imposed on them, pseudo-democracy begins the transition to totalitarianism.

Pseudo-democracy is the imposition of the will of the Executive on the members in regard to policy, under a facade of democracy. It operates by controlling the agenda in such a way as to secure a vote on alternative methods of implementing the Executive's policy, and is supported by Executive control of communications, propaganda, and financial resources. There is no free press in the B.M.A.; its "Journal" is issued by the Executive, which controls its policy; and this control operates to select correspondence for publication which either supports its policy, or offers no effective challenge to it; and to put forward tendentious leading articles.

It would take more space than we can afford to analyse in detail the technique of pseudo-democracy; perhaps the best approach is for the individual doctor to ask himself how he can control the policy of the Executive, which will lead him direct to the difficulties of the method of elections; of the indirect voting through the Representative Meetings by which his opinions are to be conveyed to the Council; of the confusion of issues; the sanction of "the will of the people"; his lack of time; his political immaturity in dealing with professionals; and very much more, that leads to that apathy which is often complained of, but is less apathy than feeling of helplessness.

Against the sanctions wielded by the Executive the individual may well appear powerless; but in fact he is not. His problem, which is the problem of the Member of Parliament with Cabinet, and of elector with Parliament, is to control the Executive in his own interest, not to be controlled by it in the name of "the people." A Society of a million happy individuals is a happy Society; a Society of a million individuals sacrificed to "the people" is not. "The people" is an abstraction, a hypothetical majority used to coerce successive minorities into yielding their powers of self-determination to an Executive, an Authority, which wishes to determine them. They are to surrender their power in order to have it used against them. Yet, if democracy, true democracy, is to come into being, this problem must be solved. It is a question of

what sanctions the individual possesses. He has two supreme sanctions, if he has the will to use them.

The first is understanding. The individual must realise the distinction between policy and method, and insist that his is the right to control policy, and equally that he must not be forced to decide on methods, which are the province of the expert receiving orders on policy.

He must learn to place the responsibility for obtaining required results squarely on the expert, and judge the latter by his success in achieving those results, exactly as a doctor is judged by his patients; he should dismiss the expert who fails.

The second sanction is the right to contract-out. If an association ceases to serve the purposes of the individual member, it fails in its only justification to that member; he does not join it for sacrifice, but because he believes it will serve his ends. This is a most powerful sanction, for it provides the clearest indication to the Executive that it must change its ways; if it does not change, and individuals exercise their right to contract-out, the association will cease to exist when there are no individuals left whose purposes are served; and that is as it should be. Contracting-out is first exemplary, and then destructive. That is why the individual should guard carefully his right to contract-out: it is one of the fundamental guarantees of liberty. And that is why, too, the totalitarians will, if they can, destroy that right. That is why all liberty is lost under a Central Authority controlling all income, because then contracting-out means starvation.

Of course, one cannot, as the world is, contract-out of the State. But democracy begins still where it had its foundation—in small affairs. Should doctors control their own Executive, the effect would be exemplary, and would revitalise democracy in the larger field. If they fail, and thus fall prey to a Central Authority, they will have allowed the larger democracy to come nearer still to its death. No part of the community is to be left free in the totalitarian State, and it is towards this that we travel with a fearful momentum.

In September, 1943, the Medical Policy Association (London) sent out to 30,000 doctors a question, "Is it your wish that any form of Central Authority should be set up to control doctors and their practices, and to 'organise' the profession?" Ten thousand replied—a remarkably good return in war-time conditions—and of these, 77 per cent, did not want a Central Authority, 15 per cent, did, and 8 per cent, were absent, deceased, or replied informally.

There never was much doubt that doctors wished to retain their freedom to serve their patients directly, and to be responsible to and taking their orders from their patients direct. The result of the plebiscite confirmed that policy, despite the years of advocacy of totalitarian change by the Executive and the Socialists, the constant iteration of "inevitability," "will of the people," "there must be some Central Authority with powers of direction," etc., etc.

Yet in America the doctors' Executive has taken quite the opposite line. In America the doctors are warned of the threat to all doctors contained in such proposals to socialise medicine as the current Wagner Bill. It is not inevitable that the British Medical Association Executive should endeavour to paralyse resistance, and press on the profession a Central Authority under the magic name of Corporate Body. And just as in New Zealand and Australia a well-led profession resisted the attempt to totalitarianise it, so it could, and should, here. The B.M.A. can be used as well to defend liberty as to surrender it. Why, then, is it acting as the agent of the centralisers?

(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.)

# Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1.)

intelligence that the campaign to "boost" the Soviet system of Government has the active support of some of the richest and most powerful men in the world.

It is on record that the late Mr. Morgan, prominent American financier, stated at a banquet to celebrate the formation of his shipping trust that "we are the advanced socialists; we have discovered that combination, not competition, means success in the trade . . ." The Trade Union Bosses have exactly the same idea.

The Canberra bureaucrats continue to itch for more power. They believe they could make a much better job of governing than our State Governments. They have had the whole of the Northern Territory to govern. But the results are rather curious: 87% of the people in the Northern Territory recently said that they were dissatisfied with the present administration and desired an elected Legislative Council. Strange how Anglo-Saxons still hanker after local self-government instead of submitting passively to centralised bureaucracy.

Unless Australian electors unite to oust the bureaucrats at the next elections, they will find themselves as completely disfranchised, in effect, as the people of the Northern Territory are now.

Behind the scenes in Germany important moves are undoubtedly being made by people whose names do not make the headlines. American Congressmen were recently staggered to learn that American investments before the war were greater in Germany than in any other European country—1,290,000,000 dollars. Some of the "American" investors are going to ensure that the American Government looks after their interests and supports their policies. The fact that "American" investments in Japan total 90,000,000 dollars is also worth thinking about.

One of the greatest menaces to democratic government in this country is the over-centralisation of the population; approximately 50 per cent, of the population living in Melbourne and Sydney.

People in the mass have always been easier for the Planners to deal with, and it is not without significance that in Australia, as in Canada, social credit ideas receive the best support in rural areas and the smaller cities.

This question of over-centralisation in Australia has been the cause of agitation in Victorian politics for some time. Both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, which derive most of their support from Melbourne electorates, have been determined for some time to reduce the number of representatives elected by rural electorates. While it may be conceded that Victorian country electors elect a disproportionate number of representatives compared with city electors, it is essential that they do so under present circumstances, otherwise a majority consisting of city electors, without any knowledge of or sympathy for rural interests, could be used, as they have been used, to force unwanted policies on country electors.

The crazy one-port policy in Victoria is a result of this utilisation of a majority to defeat a minority. It is generally recognised that either Portland or some other local coastal centre is the natural seaboard for the entire Western District of Victoria. But Western District electorates can never hope to get appropriate action in the State House.

While the present political circumstances continue, it is just as well that the Dunstan Government has resisted attempts to decrease country representation in the State House. But the real solution must be faced sooner or later: there must be a further decentralisation of Government in order that majorities cannot be used to thwart the legitimate policies of minorities. And real democracy means that minorities should not be dictated to by majorities—that is, assuming that the policy of the minority does not interfere with the majority.

—E. D. B.

# TWIN ENEMIES OF THE BRITISH WAY

(From the "Social Creditor," England, 27/1/45)

At the C.C.F. (Socialist) Conference in Montreal on December 1, 1944, an effort was made to include in the programme of the party "the complete and final severance of Canada from Great Britain." Mr. Coldwell, the Leader of the Party, was born in England, and is in close touch with the London School of Economics. We are not responsible for him but we apologise.

The downfall of the British Empire has been the steady objective of international intrigue, of which Socialism is one limb, and High Finance another, during at least one hundred years. It has been said of Great Britain that she acquired an Empire in a fit of absence of mind, and many people, and more especially American and German Jews, translate "absence of mind" by "paucity of intellect."

But, in fact, it is not difficult to prove that whatever its genesis, the genius of Great Britain, which to some extent has extended to the countries linked by the Crown, is insistence on the importance of quality as compared with quantity. Parenthetically, we have no doubt whatever that a return to that principle is the only hope of survival of British culture.

Socialism is an assertion of the importance of quantity and the irrelevance of quality.

Since International Finance is determined to be the only fount of honour as well as the Permit Office for bed, board and clothes, British culture is incompatible with its aims, and it has, in fact, already been driven underground. The effective policy of Great Britain at the moment is that of the big cosmopolitan industrialists, the

banks and the trades unions, all of whom hate the traditional independence of thought, which distinguished the natives of these islands, much more than they hate Germany. That is why Mr. Montagu Norman has retired with a peerage after collaborating with Dr. Schacht to build up "Hitler."

"Nationalisation (Socialism)? we welcome it."

Even in production and manufacturing, Socialists and Financiers dislike a policy of quality first.

One of our ineffable Socialist Ministers, Dr. Hugh Dalton, hardly attained office before sponsoring "utility" clothing of the slop-shop standard, which no rank-and-file Socialist will wear, and "utility" furniture, which has sent up the price of other kinds to black market levels.

Anyone who wishes to obtain a "pre-view" of the kind of civilisation to which these gentlemen wish to reduce us with the help of the Russian myth, as propagated by the "B."B.C. and the Communist propaganda in the factories, should read "Report on Russians" by the American journalist, William L. White, which is appearing in abbreviated form in "The Reader's Digest." But, of course, Russia is scheduled for the greatest internal explo-

## THE TASK BEFORE US

"Every prohibition of individual initiative is a victory for the enemy to exactly the extent that it is effective. Not only does it, in itself, represent one more step towards the Slave World, but, except under certain conditions, it sets up a habit of apathetic acquiescence which is exactly what is desired. One of the Planners 'hoped to keep the war going' for exactly this purpose; those conditions, however, are not unduly difficult to create.

"The first strategy has many times been emphasised — it is to insist that members of Parliament are representatives, not delegates. I am still of the opinion that so long as Parliamentary institutions subsist, which may not be much longer, this line of action is vital."

— C. H. DOUGLAS, in "The Big Idea."

sion in all history, although perhaps not just yet. Two hundred millions of people will not tolerate a penitentiary such as the Soviet regime when they have seen anything else. The emergence of the ordinary Russian into a Europe, which still contains the remains of civilisation, is probably the most important event of our times. But at the moment she is framing up for war with America.



## YET ANOTHER DISAPPOINTING LEADER

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

Sir, —Anzac Day brought mixed feelings to tens of thousands of Australian men and women. For some it was a day of pride; for others, a day of great sadness; but for all a day of misgiving about the future.

With my daughter I stood for 1½ hours watching the gallant fellows march past, and then we were admitted to the enclosure for the "bereaved" at the Shrine for the special Anzac Service. That service was a great disappointment, particularly in the part played by the "leader" of it.

The Order of Service was as follows: Hymn—"Lead, Kindly Light." The Lord's Prayer. Hymn—"Abide with Me." Mr. G. W. Holland, C.B.E., M.M., President, Victorian Branch Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia, Anzac Day Commemoration Hymn, Silent Tribute. "Last Post." "Reveille." National Anthem.

Two things disappointed me—firstly, the somewhat mechanical use of the Lord's Prayer without regard to the significance of the words it contained, and secondly, the platitudinous nature of the uninspiring address given by Mr. G. W. Holland, C.B.E., M.M.

It is little wonder that our returned heroes have been so poorly treated when their chief spokesman so obviously lacks understanding of the nature of the only obstacle that stands in the way of the fulfilment of the soldiers' desires.

All I wish to say about the Lord's Prayer on this occasion is that it is quite unfair for men and women to say to God, "Thy kingdom come" or "Thy will be done on earth" while they go on accepting, even without protest, conditions which make it quite impossible for His Kingdom to Come or His Will to be Done.

His Will is Concord, and only the mentally afflicted would expect concord in babel. His Kingdom is Perfection, and only a lunatic would look for Perfection in chaos. Consequently, for those who are not insane to be appealing for Perfection and Concord at the very time when they are parties to conditions which inevitably produce the opposite results is, to say the least, unreasonable.

When the prayer was repeated at the Shrine on 25th April I felt that it was done parrot-fashion, and that in the particular respect I have mentioned it was a case of the blind leading the blind. Seeing that we and our forebears have been repeating this prayer for close on two thousand years, there must surely be some explanation of the fact that we continue to get the things we have not prayed for.

The explanation is not to be found in the much-maligned human heart or human nature, either; it is to be found in the POLICY imposed upon humanity by the small minority of persons who have so far succeeded in concealing their identity from the people in general. These persons are not Christians, but they use Christians to secure the implementation of their plans.

As to Mr. G. W. Holland, C.B.E., M.M., I was hopeful that he would avail himself of the wonderful opportunity to tell the great gathering of Australian people why it is that year after year the requests of the League on behalf of returned heroes meet with so little success. Or why it is that service personnel in distress can get relief only if a long-suffering public contribute to a special "fund." Or why it is necessary that a returned hero who borrows £800 to purchase a home should be required to pay back £1500. Nothing is too good for these fellows—and so we give them less than nothing! He did not touch on these important questions, but merely recapitulated the deeds of the fallen, referred to the heritage they bequeathed us, and enjoined us never to forget. That has been said over and over again during the period of 30 years since the landing on Gallipoli, but those who survived, to say nothing of their dependants, still suffer from the effects of their gallantry. They were thrown to the economic scrap heap in the period of the depression, and now have only the prospect of intensified competition for "markets," general regimentation under the "full employment" idea, a heavier burden of national debt, and taxation at an all-time high-level record. Notwithstanding this, Mr. Holland told the multitude that we must learn the lessons of the past and prove worthy of the unselfish sacrifices made by those who fell. "We will remember them. Lest we forget."

Platitudinous language with an emotional objective will no longer do. Something having a closer relationship to reality is required. He did not indicate the nature of the lessons we must learn or where the learning should begin.

Neither did he attempt to explain the grounds upon which he based the inference that the mothers and fathers of those who fell were less unselfish than their brave sons.

How easy it is to say that what "we" need is to see manifest more of that spirit of sacrifice that we see amongst the members of the fighting forces, as though the members of the fighting forces are a race

### ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

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

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

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

So it is that already there is open talk of preparations for the Third World War, as though it is something unavoidable.

So far as I have been able to find out there has been no formal protest or any other official action on the part of the Victorian branch of the R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. against this trend of events pointing to the loss of the Peace in connection with the present war.

As things are going our sons WILL have died in vain, and this despite Mr. Holland and his "lessons of the past," to say nothing of the sacrifices of the men and women who were the fathers and mothers of those who fell. My two sons (one killed on active service) have reflected the unselfishness of their mother, and that I believe is typical of practically all other Australian families, after due allowance is made for the economic conditions in which they have had to struggle for existence.

The people of Australia do not ask these fellows who are described as "leaders" for the sort of stuff they are in the habit of uttering. We do NOT want a lesson in unselfishness, and should not take it from those not qualified to give it. What we do really need is information that will give us clear understanding of the CAUSE of war and the identity of the persons responsible for it. When the people get THAT information THEY will give the lessons.

Apparently Mr. Holland cannot meet their needs in this regard and must therefore be looked upon as yet another disappointing "leader."

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 29th April 1945.

## BRETTON WOODS PLOT

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —The "New Times" is to be congratulated on its timely publication (April 20) of the analysis of the implications of Bretton Woods issued by the London Chamber of Commerce. I and others have tried in these columns, to stress the point that when a nation is in "default," i.e., cannot pay for her imports, the fault may lie with the creditor and not with the debtor. The use of money has obscured the fact that international trade is, or should be, in effect, merely the barter of surpluses; and barter implies that when you offer something to a customer you are willing to accept goods and services in return.

The disruption of international trade was caused by a gang in London and New York deliberately forcing countries into default by refusing to accept payment in the only payment the country could make: goods and services. The debtor nation, caught in a trap, was forced to pay her debts by selling parts of her own body, i.e., the fixed assets of her country, to foreigners.

The Bretton Woods Scheme ensures that no nation shall ever get out of debt to the International Exchange Fund. This is achieved by the simple process of preventing any country excluding goods of a "one way traffic" nation. And the "nation" which exports and refuses to import will have the privilege of lending its surpluses to its victim! And only when the creditor nation refuses to continue to lend its surpluses is the victim nation permitted to protect itself at all!

In 1928-29 Australian exports were £21 per head, with which she had to pay for imports of £23 per head, plus £5 per head for interest on her debts. It was this position, which ushered in the depression, brought Otto Niemeyer to this country, and left us with a permanent army of occupation, headed by Professor Copland and other geny of the London School of Economics.

The Foreign Exchange Houses, by withholding credits and switching their funds, could, almost at will, force countries to part with their fixed assets. In wartime this sordid business is accelerated by the fear motive, and large parts of the assets of the British Empire have passed into the hands of foreigners. The Bretton Woods proposals remove all existing rights any country may have had to protect its own fixed assets.

Questions asked in Parliament have so far failed to elicit any answer about the continuous transfer of fixed assets, and Mr. Curtin himself has admitted that his Banking Bill is necessary in order to carry out international obligations. Now that we know what these international obligations are, we must do everything in our power to see that the London Chamber of Commerce Report on Bretton Woods is placed in the hands of every person who can use it —Yours, etc., JAS. GUTHRIE, B.Sc., 101 Collins St., Hobart.

### MEAT-RATIONING OPPONENT'S FINE REMITTED

Regular readers of this paper will recall that Mr. W. H. Hand, of Sydney, successfully appealed against a conviction imposed under "national security" regulations because he used democratic "pressure politics" against the original imposition of meat rationing. (The important judgment upholding his appeal — in which the Judge pointed out that Mr. Hand had merely exercised a democratic right, which all electors have in this country — was published in these columns.)

Here is a sequel to that: A bulletin issued by the Sutherland (N.S.W.) Voters' Policy Association, under date of 3/4/45, informs us that — "A letter has been received, intimating that His Royal Highness the Governor-General has been pleased to remit a fine imposed upon Mr. W. H. Prescott for a breach of National Security Regulations in connection with Meat Rationing."

Mr. Prescott's alleged breach of regulations was of the same kind as Mr. Hand's.

### AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT

(MELBOURNE BRANCH.)

A series of Public Meetings will be held in the AUSTRALIAN CHURCH HALL, 19 Russell Street, Melbourne. The dates, speakers and subjects will be as follows: —

MAY 7: MR. B. H. BROWN on "The Key to Social Organisation."

MAY 28: MR. J. MALAN on "Exports, Health and Wealth."

JUNE 4: MR. J. BRADSHAW on "People, Politicians, Parliaments."

JUNE 18: MR. P. IRELAND on "The Control of Human Beings."

JULY 2: Mr. J. T. SMITH on "Financial Returns or Fertile Fields?"

JULY 23: MR. JOHN DALE on "Hospitals Are Not Health."

JULY 30: MR. W. BROWNING on "Your Hopes and Aspirations, and the Australian People's Movement."

(All meetings 8 p.m. Admission Free.)

apart from their parents and their brothers and sisters. Such statements are gratuitous and slanderous, and yet they are repeated in divers places by men otherwise regarded as intelligent. Who looks for such sacrifices, anyway? And why? Are men born to slaughter and to be slaughtered?

And when we think that ninety parents in every hundred experience a never-ending struggle to give their youngsters a fair go and make ends meet, it becomes even more obvious that to put the troubles of today on to the "selfishness of mankind" is just too absurd. That some of our people line up in tobacco queues, or accept butter coupons from others (as I heard a speaker recently say), is not evidence of selfishness or of criminality. It is an effect of subnormal conditions brought about by the exigencies of war. If enough of these selfsame people understood the actual cause of war it would not be long before such uncivilised and ungodly occurrences would be finished forever. But the people are kept uninformed on this question, and

## MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

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

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

The oil industry of the world has also been successfully monopolised, and we can do no better than examine the admission of a Jewish apologist concerning the chief men controlling the biggest oil monopoly:

"Jews are largely concerned with the second great international combine, the oil combine, which, in its ramifications, affects politics . . . Shell-Mex is an important member of the oil combine, and Shell-Mex was founded by Lord Bearsted (a Jew), and its control remains in the hands of the Samuel family." (Sydney Dark, in "The Jew Today.")

Sir Henri Deterding, one of those mentioned with the financing of Hitler's rise to power, was declared to be "of Jewish descent" in the "News of the World," 5th February, 1939.

"It was Deterding who induced the House of Rothschild to give Royal Dutch its backing . . ." ("The Oil War," by A. Mohr, 1926.)

The ramifications of the Dutch-Shell interests are world wide, and may eventually destroy the "Gentile" Standard Oil group.

It is interesting to note that one of the principals in the Dutch-Shell group, Lord Samuel, in an appeal for the Jewish National Fund just after the outbreak of war in 1939, stated:

"The principle of the land for the people, owned by the people, is the bed-rock foundation on which our movement rests."

Thus another prominent Jew identified himself with the Communist idea of collectivism, which the "Protocols" advocate.

Concerning the "rationalising" of Britain's electricity supplies under the infamous "grid" system, C. H. Douglas has written: —

"The Grid Electricity Scheme, the child of the brain of Samuel Insull, the London-born Chicago Jew, who was pursued around Europe by a United States warrant on a charge of fraud, probably represents the sabotage of fifty million sterling value in serviceable plant alone, . . . and immensely greater military vulnerability." ("Whose Service Is Perfect Freedom.") Notice how the "Grid" idea is being "boosted" in Australia now!

Back in 1928 a member of the British House of Commons, Mr. Walter Baker, exposed an attempt to bring about a fusion of all cable and wireless properties. Melchett, Lazard Bros., and other Jews were the chief centralisers mentioned.

A similar move was made in U.S.A. under the aegis of the Jew, Lothnes Behn. No doubt the ultimate aim was to place control of all cable and wireless communications in the world in the hands of Jewry.

Whenever big industrial monopolies are mentioned, the name of du Pont in America comes to mind. The "Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge" says:

"The du Ponts, who are leading factors in the economics and manufactures of Delaware, are of Jewish descent."

Fortunately for civilisation there is growing opposition to monopoly in industry in all countries; although, ironically enough, Jewish-inspired socialist movements are making use of this opposition to further the advocacy of the worst monopoly of all — Government monopoly!

Let us now return to the text of the "Protocols": —

PROTOCOL NO. 5. (Continued.)

"Nowadays it is more important to disarm the peoples than to lead them into war: more important to use for our advantage the passions which have burst into flames than to quench their fire: more important to catch

up and interpret the ideas of others to suit ourselves than to eradicate them. The principal object of our directorate consists in this: to debilitate the public mind by criticism; to lead it away from serious reflections calculated to arouse resistance; to distract the forces of the mind towards a sham fight of empty eloquence.

"In all ages the peoples of the world, equally with individuals, have accepted words for deeds, for they are content with a show and rarely pause to note, in the public arena whether promises are followed by performance. Therefore we shall establish show institutions, which will give eloquent proof of their benefit to progress.

"We shall assume to ourselves the liberal physiognomy of all parties, of all directions, and we shall give that physiognomy a voice in orators who will speak so much that they will exhaust the patience of their hearers and produce an abhorrence of oratory.

"In order to put public opinion into our hands we must bring it into a state of bewilderment by giving expression from all sides to so many contradictory opinions and for such length of time as will suffice to make the GOYIM lose their heads in the labyrinth and come to see that the best thing is to have no opinion of any kind in matters political, which it is not given to the public to understand, because they are understood only by him who guides the public. This is the first secret.

"The second secret requisite for the success of our government is comprised in the following. To multiply to such an extent national failings, habits, passions, conditions of civil life, that it will be impossible for anyone to know where he is in the resulting chaos, so that the people in consequence will fail to understand one another. This measure will also serve us in another way, namely, to sow discord in all parties, to dislocate all collective forces which are still unwilling to submit to us, and to discourage any kind of PERSONAL INITIATIVE which might in any degree hinder our affair.

"There is nothing more dangerous than personal initiative if it has genius behind it, such initiative can do more than can be done by millions of people among whom we have sown discord. We must so direct the education of the goyim communities that whenever they come upon a matter requiring initiative they may drop their hands in despairing impotence."

COMMENT: —

The foregoing extract should be read and re-read. It is a fact that more and more people have, particularly since the First World War, felt that there is nothing they can do to protect their own welfare. How often have we heard the apathetic statement: "But what can I do about it?"

It is surely obvious that only INDIVIDUALS can do anything to obtain control of their own affairs. Individuals using their initiative have been responsible for every great step forward by the human race. All those peoples who have succumbed to open dictatorships have done so because their initiative had been destroyed. People can only develop their initiative by doing things for themselves, by taking action as a result of an urge from within, and not by being the passive tools of planners, who seek to mould individuals as they think fit. Personality is a precious thing, and can only blossom to the full in a people who are confident in their ability to control their own affairs.

(To be continued.)