

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.

Haw, 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. 24. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 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.

## Declare War on the Federal Bureaucrats!

### Action by Democrats is Needed

(To the Editor.)

Sir, —In recent issues you have stressed the menace of the bureaucrat and the urgent necessity of removing him. Allow me to congratulate you on your timely advice.

We must now ACT—quickly and correctly. Unless we can resist and eventually destroy the local bureaucracy, then we cannot resist the international bureaucracy now coming into being.

Some people have expressed alarm at the manner in which the international planners have apparently carried all before them.

But, never forget, no matter how many charters are signed and international agreements entered into by our "representatives," the internationalists must still implement their policies in this country. And to implement these policies they require a local bureaucracy.

Destroy the local bureaucracy, make responsible Government a reality, and the internationalists are going to find it very, very difficult to make their will prevail.

There is considerable evidence to support the contention that World War 2 has been merely a means to an end: the destruction of national sovereignties and the ultimate imposition of a World Slave State.

The Great Depression was part of the Big Idea, but the British peoples did not plunge into chaos requiring "reconstruction" as applied in Germany, Russia and other countries.

Instead, under the guidance and leadership of Social Crediters, they began to attack the tools of the international financiers.

The "break through" in Alberta, and the rapid increase of interest in monetary reform in all parts of the British Empire, called for a new method of attack against the British peoples.

Israel Moses Sieff's "key" statement in 1938, that "only in war, or under the threat of war, would British Governments embark on large-scale planning"—a la Russia, as Mr. Sieff pointed out—was an admission of

defeat as well as an indication of the new strategy.

While there may be a lot of stupidity in high places, the individuals who financed Germany, while undermining the British Empire, in order that they and their associates could supplement or replace their control through money by bureaucratic control of manpower, raw materials, food-stuffs, etc., are by no means stupid; they are diabolically clever.

In these columns you have exposed example after example of the totalitarian acts of the local bureaucrats. Surely the position is clear: the controllers of the financial system are building a barricade of bureaucracy, which must be destroyed before we can move on and introduce economic democracy.

Irrespective of what different people advocate in the way of economic reform, it must be brought home to them that, unless we all unite against the growing obstacle in our path, no advance is possible. If "social crediters" persist in emphasising monetary reform to the exclusion of all else, then they are committing suicide. That master of strategy, C. H. Douglas, has given us clear direction on this issue, and I want to appeal as strongly as possible to all Social Crediters throughout Australia to get under way a nation-wide anti-bureaucrat campaign.

There is a great deal of AGREEMENT on this issue; it is one on which the people can be united.

A suggestion for ACTION is as follows: First, Social Crediters in all electorates to write to their Federal Members, putting the following direct question:

"Are you in favour of, and will you work and vote for an immediate reduction in the number of public servants—particularly

those who were given positions under war-time conditions—and, after the cessation of military hostilities with Japan, a reduction to the number we had in 1938?"

(I might say that I consider the number of public servants, particularly those employed by Federal Departments in 1938, as far too many for the good of democratic Government. But we must have some basis on which to work, and I don't think there can be any objection to a reduction of public servants to the pre-war level. That will do for a start.)

As soon as Federal Members have classified themselves—anti-bureaucrat or pro-bureaucrat—every effort should be made to let electors know results.

A list of all "pros" should be compiled, showing the majority by which each won his seat. Particular attention can then be paid to "pros" holding seats by the smallest majorities.

From then on until the Federal election every effort should be made to ensure that at the election every "pro" receives a stream of last preferences. If enough "pro" members are defeated, then no Government can be formed to support the bureaucrats.

Political democracy must precede economic democracy. If we cannot make responsible Government a reality, how can we introduce economic democracy?

Here is an issue on which we can (a) effectively smash the plan of the international financiers and their associates; (b) unite the people against party divisions and teach them how to control their political representatives; and (c) raise immeasurably in the eyes of the public the work and objectives of Social Crediters.

What about it, Social Crediters?

—ERIC D BUTLER.

## Significant Political Pointers

We cannot confirm the rumour that Comrade Ernie Thornton, who recently returned to Australia from England in a Liberator, has been addressing meetings and demanding the immediate opening by the Russians of a Second Front in Manchuria against the Japs.

Poor Ernie is probably more concerned about the determined moves by some rank-and-file unionists to free themselves from Communist domination.

No Socialist can complain that Doctor Evatt has not had sufficient "boosting" in the international "Capitalist" press.

But it will take more than this to raise the learned Doctor's standing in the eyes of the Australian electors. Having done his work, the Doctor will no doubt be brushed aside or given another task. Perhaps he may be suitably rewarded with the Governor-Generalship, as suggested in an American paper?

However, don't think that, if Mr. Menzies takes over where the Doctor leaves off, we can expect any automatic change in basic policy. For example, if the "Liberals" continue to make big public works a part of their policy, they will find Dr. Evatt's work on the question of "employment and unemployment" very useful.

After the discovery that Hitler didn't exterminate the European Jews after all, some explanation had to be offered.

We are told that the Jews would have been all exterminated if the war had gone on for another twelve months. This brilliant "explanation" comes from U.N.R.R.A. officials, who also say that the Germans used the Jews in aeroplane factories and elsewhere before killing them.

Some people must think that we are all morons in this country, with no critical faculties whatever.

The alleged partial victory by Dr. Evatt on the veto issue at San Francisco indicates just how the international planners understand the art of blackmail.

They first of all demand the maximum. If they can get away with this so much the better. But, if they have to concede a little point, this can then be claimed as a "victory" for the "opposition," which is then satisfied. And the planners are still left with enough power to accomplish their aims. They have graciously consented to allow the small nations to have their complaints heard by the Central Council. Well, what then? What sanction is Australia to have concerning her sovereignty? None whatever. A world dictatorship is being created.

One correspondent at the San Francisco Conference summed up the general attitude of the internationalists:—

## Lost in Red-Tape

"The Ministry of Food has prosecuted a man under four Orders which were already a month out of date. The explanation offered was that it was difficult to keep track of all Orders!"

—"The Social Creditor" (Eng.), 28/4/45.

"The drawn-out United Nations' conference at San Francisco shows that a League of Nations on the Geneva pattern, with every little nation having a say, cannot get far in this streamlined modern world. 'Power politics' is an ugly phrase, but 'Five Power Politics' might yet become the solution of the world's trouble."

Australians will be asked to applaud this type of argument when Dr. Evatt returns from America.

One of the most disturbing features of our modern society, particularly here in Australia, is the growing tendency for many people to pass their opinions on various things in an arrogant and dogmatic manner. The less they know about a thing, the more dogmatic they become. Christian virtues, such as a little humility in our approach to Life and its problems, are derided as "unscientific." Tremendous emphasis is placed on the physical, while spiritual values are ignored.

Unless a balance can be restored and the truth of the statement that "man does not live by bread alone" be fully appreciated, we are doomed to enter a streamlined barbarism where "science" will have us bred and treated like animals. Consider Germany, where "science" became the be all and end-all of life.

European culture was the result of the fusion of ideas from early Greece with the teachings of Christ. The greatness of the early Greeks, whom I suppose the most self-opinioned of our bright young things from the Universities will admit were not altogether dullards, was their humility in their search for Truth. And if we can only forget our "progressiveness" for a few moments and consider the injunction of Christ that we must become as little children, we may grasp the fact that there is wisdom, in this advice.

Note the simple straightforward approach to any question by any child under, say, ten years of age. The child approaches things directly and without guile. He is content to ask questions about things he does not understand. But when he becomes "educated," just note the difference! Hans Anderson probably had this in mind when he wrote his delightful fairy tale, "The Emperor's New Clothes," in which a young child sees through a fog of mass mesmerism afflicting the adults.

No man is going to develop completely unless it is appreciated that he not only has material needs; he also has spiritual needs. While a back-to-church movement may be unlikely and unnecessary, it appears that the Australian community would be considerably invigorated by an acceptance of the fact that Christ's teachings are not merely platitudes which may be all right for our children but not for adults; that they touch Reality, and, if fully accepted and acted upon, would ensure a much saner approach to the task of saving our civilisation. E.D.B.

## NOTES on the NEWS

An example of using pro-fabricated situations to further the policy of centralisation is seen in the proposal to use the housing demand as an excuse to create a Federal Housing Dictator. Of course, the humanitarian appeal of homeless people is being exploited, and the States will be termed "obstructionists" if they oppose this plot. Now, the fact is that bureaucratic Dictators do NOT build houses. If the material, manpower and money are available, and the restrictions imposed by the Federal Government are removed, individual builders in each State will quickly build the houses. All that is required is removal of the stupid Federal regulations preventing houses being built. It is a dastardly plot on the part of the Federal bureaucrats to interpret the demand for HOUSES as a demand for CENTRALISATION. This should be made clear by all groups agitating for more houses.

TRADE-UNION TYRANNY: An indication of Hitlerite tactics is given in the statement of Judge O'Mara, recorded in "Hansard," May 29, p. 2169, viz.: "There is uncontradicted evidence that G. Anderson, of the Electrical Trades Union, and President of the New South Wales Trades and Labor Council, said, 'We do not recognise the law—we can take no notice of the Court—we can control the Government and wreck it,' and that E. Bulmer, of the Building Workers' Industrial Union, said, 'Without regard to what the law says or what Judge Kelly says, or what Mr. Curtin or Dr. Evatt says, we are determined to crush the Ship Joiners, and it shall be done.' Nice words from alleged democrats! It is also worth noting that Mr. Beasley said he found it difficult to understand Judge O'Mara's findings and comments. Well, that's one way to appease the Communists!"

COUNCIL CAPERS: The Melbourne City Council, after borrowing money to lend it again in war loans, is now to launch another loan of £280,000 at £3/7/6 per cent, to pay off other loan liabilities incurred in 1933 and 1940. The latter loans were, of course, raised to liquidate still earlier ones—and so on, backwards. It's certainly a crazy business which ratepayers who have to foot the bill should put a stop to. This practice of borrowing money to pay debts, then borrowing again and again as the loans fall due, is sheer idiocy under the guise of "sound finance," and the persons responsible should be indicted for involving unsuspecting ratepayers in such doubtful practices. City Councillors should be asked to state where they stand in this matter.

IMPORT IDEAS: In reply to a parliamentary question relative to abandoning control of imports, Mr. Beasley said: "My own experience in this matter has particular reference to textiles. When I was in the United States I found that many of our difficulties arose from the fact that we were working on a government-to-government basis, while other countries, such as Canada, were working through ordinary private trading channels, and were able to do better business than we were able to do. I considered that the time had arrived for us to return to the system under which Australian merchants were permitted to

order their own goods from manufacturers in the United States of America." ("Hansard," April 24, p. 1023.) That at least is an honest admission of the failure of Socialism in this connection. Senator Keane is also reported in "Hansard" as now expressing similar views!

MALNUTRITION: A recent Washington report informed us that our mighty ally, U.S., is suffering serious and widespread malnutrition among school children. Surgeon-General Thomas Parran made this clear in his testimony to the Home Committee, which is considering a Bill to establish a Federal school-luncheon programme. This condition was a permanent feature of U.S. life, as it was here, and it is a terrible indictment for a nation capable of such a mighty war effort, and one that proposes to send millions of tons of food to enemy aliens. No wonder the "Feed America First" organisation is receiving so much support!

HOMELY HISTORY: Dame Mary Gilmore, Australian poetess, strikes an interesting note: "Every school in the Commonwealth (Continued on page 2.)"

## Alberta M.P. Hits Out

In the course of a fighting speech in which he attacked the C.C.F. (Socialist) Party as being the most vicious political machine in Canada, the Hon Solon Low, in the Alberta Legislature, gave his own opinion on some of the Socialist proposals, remarking that—

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging production. 2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. 3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men. 4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. 5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage-payer. 6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. 7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred. 8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. 9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. 10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

## CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM LOVERS

(By BEATRICE C. BEST, in the "Social Crediter.")

**There is a question—and it is surely the supreme acid-test question of the day—that one feels constrained to ask all those who are sincere defenders of our liberties and champions of our individual freedom. (It is necessary to stress the word "sincere" by reason of the lip service paid to freedom by those who use the word to camouflage their very different and contrary purposes.)**

The test question is: "DO YOU BELIEVE IN FULL EMPLOYMENT?" Although it is a question of crucial importance, it is one that is begged from the outset in all discussions, political or otherwise, into which it in any way enters, and it should therefore be subjected to careful scrutiny.

It is necessary, first, to agree about the meaning attached to the term "full employment," for it can be used in a purely academic sense to mean the employment of all the labour necessary to develop "to the full" the resources of the nation. Thus, if one man pulling a few levers, and pressing a few buttons, could produce all the community wanted, that would mean full employment. However, that is not the general meaning attached to the term; and a man whose living depended upon his getting a job would not be interested in it.

To avoid misunderstanding then, one might recast the question as follows: "Do you believe that industry should provide everyone with a paid job or enable everyone to procure a paid job?"—Industry, of course, being taken to include the various services as well as the production of goods. It is necessary to be exact; because the question is not intended to mean, "Do you think people should work?" it means, "Do you believe economic compulsion should be applied to make people work?"\*

So far as can be judged from the writings and public utterances of those non-Social-Crediters who would defend our freedom, one feels entitled to assume that their answer to this question would be "yes," less from anything they say, however, than from the fact that they never raise this important question. So one can only suppose that in this, if in nothing else, they join forces with all those who put "full employment" in the forefront of their political aims.

If one is correct in this surmise one is entitled to ask further, "Why, then, do you oppose, and inveigh against, government planning and controls? Is it not evident that private enterprise in a power-production age cannot work economically, efficiently, and profitably, and at the same time provide full employment? Unless, that is, you are prepared to assess the efficiency of industry by the amount of time spent, and labour employed. But a government concerned primarily with full employment can disregard questions of efficiency, and, by means of planning, and the necessary controls due to planning, can multiply jobs in any amount of wasteful ways not open to private enterprise, and to favour at the same time a policy of full employment is a case of trying to have it both ways."

However, the answer to this question of full employment might be in the negative. It might be acknowledged that the advent of the "power age" made full employment and efficiency impossible partners in industry. In that case it would be necessary to ask, "What, if you are prepared to sacrifice full employment to efficiency, are you going to do about the unemployed? You object to the increasing extension of the Social Services, and the high taxation extorted by the State for such a purpose. What do YOU propose? Support provided by public and private charities, accompanied by a moral 'means test,' i.e., charitable support given to the 'deserving' poor?—Or what?"

Well, it must be left to such lovers of freedom, and such champions of private enterprise and individual responsibility, to extricate themselves from this impasse, since they have ignored, rejected, or damned with faint praise the one man who has revealed the one and only way out of it.

A review by Mr. George Orwell of "The Unquiet Grave: A Word Cycle" by "Palinurus," which appeared in "The Observer" on January 14, throws, perhaps, some light on the curious phenomenon presented by the refusal of some champions of freedom to face the issues involved in this fundamental question of full employment, and come down to "brass tacks." It may explain this refusal, or the lack of appreciation that the question IS fundamental, and the failure to acknowledge that, until it is faced, all talk of freedom and independence, all opposition to State control and high taxation, must appear as "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

When examined, the object of this review appears to have been less one of literary criticism than an exposition of Mr. Orwell's views on the subject of an unearned income. A few examples may serve to illustrate Mr. Orwell's bias. He says, for instance, "On almost every page this book exhibits that queer product of capitalist democracy, an inferiority complex resulting from a private income." Again, "It is a cry of despair from the rentier, who feels that he has no right to exist . . ."† And he speaks of one . . . carrying the burden of an unearned income."

Now whether Mr. Orwell is right in supposing that "Palinurus" suffers from an "inferiority complex," or a feeling of "Despair" due to the fact that he is "carrying the burden of an unearned income," or

\*The first question relates to a matter of opinion or belief alone; but the second relates to, and implies, a desire to impose, or enforce, action in accordance with a belief on others; i.e., to dictate.

†Mr. Orwell would, it seems, see eye to eye with Lord Keynes, who is out for the euthanasia of the rentier.

ing either to taxation or controls. But integrity and single-mindedness give strength to any cause, whether good or bad, in which they are enlisted.

Therefore this attitude is extremely useful and important to those who also pursue a policy of full employment, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the necessity it creates for increasing State control, and ultimately for the power to order men's lives that such control delivers into their hands.

This integrity and single-mindedness are lacking in those non-Social-Crediters who have no bias against an unearned income. Far from regarding it as a "burden," they recognise the value in both the freedom and independence it bestows on its possessor. The weakness of their position lies in the fact that, though their belief in freedom supposedly rests on Christian principles, their belief in the validity of inheritance rests on no such absolute foundation. It is subject to conditions. For they would limit it—and therefore, and in consequence, the freedom it gives—to those who by good luck or good management have been able to save and invest—and thus may be said to inherit from their own past endeavour—or to the rights of family inheritance or generically to transfer of ownership. Their belief in freedom is therefore reserved, and they are guilty of a divided loyalty, and subject to the weakness inherent in such a division. For they stand, as it were, with one foot in the Old dispensation which decreed that man must earn his living by the sweat of his brow, and the other in the New, which enjoined us to regard the "Lilies of the Field." But the Christian has no warrant for this reservation, for if he believes, in fact, that we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, then this inheritance, and the freedom it gives, must be open to all.

(To be concluded.)

## MORE BUYING-POWER FOR WORKERS?

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

**Sir,—At the A.C.T.U. congress in Sydney last week a lot was said about the basic wage and the urgent need for increasing it. Unfortunately, press reports indicate that the men who attended the congress and spoke to the subject were poorly informed as to the actual nature of the problem and totally blind to the effect of the proposals they supported. The poor old workers will continue to get nowhere that way.**

Let me say at once that I am wholly in favour of a substantial increase in the purchasing power of the rank-and-file of the people, and that this increase could be granted at once without dislocating industry or adding to industrial costs. People who do not understand the methods by which money is PRODUCED and the volume of it is CONTROLLED are satisfied to wave their hand and say "rubbish," but this cavalier attitude has no effect on the FACT that all efforts along present lines continue to leave the worker in the position in which his actual buying power gets less and less. That being so, it is time the individual worker required his union representative to deal with the matter on the basis of reality or make way for better men.

According to the Melbourne "Argus" of 14/6/45, the Congress decided to "press the Federal Government for an immediate increase in the basic wage by regulation, and amendment of economic organisation regulations to permit industrial workers to seek an increase in wage rates."

Three prominent union "leaders" took part in the discussion, viz., A. E. Monk, A.C.T.U. Secretary; Mr. Clarey, A.C.T.U. President; and Mr. E. Thornton, Ironworkers' "representative." I quite realise that the press report gives only a portion of their remarks, but it is all that is available at the moment and apparently is a fair indication of the actual approach to the subject.

Mr. A. E. Monk, who submitted the motion, said it was a waste of time for unions to approach the Arbitration Court in the hope of gaining an increased basic wage, and that the A.C.T.U. had not yet succeeded in inducing the Government to increase the basic wage by regulation.

In regard to the former statement, it has been the unfortunate experience in the past that it HAS been a waste of time to approach the Arbitration Court, but it would be fair to explain to the workers that that was because the Arbitration Act itself requires the Judges, in coming to their decisions, to have regard to the economic effects of such decisions.

This means that the hands of the Judges are tied by the Act under which they function, and that in giving their awards they must be guided by the FINANCIAL EFFECTS under the prevailing monetary system, not by the physical realities.

Why is Mr. Monk silent on that important aspect?

On the second statement, I wish to suggest that the Government has good reason for hesitating to impose a wage increase by regulation.

Suppose Mr. Monk himself were an employer and had a hundred men to pay. If the Government arbitrarily directed him to pay every man another ten shillings per week his expenses would immediately rise by £50. Wages are an important item of costs, and costs can only be recovered through prices. Mr. Monk would, therefore, be forced to increase his prices in order to recover the £50, and so the workers in general would have to pay £50 more for their goods, and really be no better off.

But if the Government informed Mr. Monk that the money with which to pay the

additional wages could be obtained from a source such as the Commonwealth Bank, without any charge, then, AND THEN ONLY, would it be possible to increase wages without increasing costs, and for the workers to be better off as a result of wage increases.

Why is Mr. Monk silent on that important aspect?

Mr. Clarey said that unless Congress could show the Government that the new proposals could be effectively adopted without breaking down economic control it would be beating the air. Congress accepted this view, and the proposals put forward by Mr. J. McPhillips, of the Ironworkers' Union were referred to a committee.

What is meant by the words "economic control," and how does this come to be more important than fair dealing for the workers? Children are not born to be fitted into a "control" system. The control system, whatever form it may take, must be modified from time to time to fully meet the physical requirements of the children. The same applies to men and women. If the present system of economic control stands in the way of the granting of the legitimate requests of the workers, then it is the control system that must be altered, not the workers' requests. How strange it is that Mr. Clarey, who has been accepted as a "leader," is leading those who mistakenly trust him UNDER the system instead of OVER it.

The present "control" methods have produced regimentation, the very thing the worker DOESN'T WANT, and yet Mr. Clarey continues to work against the true interests of those he is supposed to be fighting for.

Mr. E. Thornton, "who sponsored the provision for the increase of wages, said wage values had dropped since February, 1942, when the wage-pegging regulations were introduced. The regulation had caused untold trouble in industry, and the trade union movement had 'come to the end of its tether' in submitting to regulation control."

When WE said that that was just what WOULD happen, the great "leaders" said "rubbish!"

While all money continues to come into existence only as an interest-bearing debt, wage values MUST drop, and all the talk in the world won't alter it. Why, I wonder, was Mr. Thornton silent about the professors who "advised" the Government to do it? The RESULTS of their advice provide all the evidence necessary to demonstrate their incompetence; but how many labour leaders, other than Mr. J. T. Lang, have ever attempted to call attention to the fact? The wage slaves will always be wage slaves unless they can get better and more realistic spokesmen to express their requirements, and follow it up with direct pressure on their parliamentary representatives. The Member of Parliament is the responsible man, as no Prime Minister or Treasurer could remain in office without the support of the ordinary member. It is what is done in Parliament that is important, not what is said by Mr. Chifley.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2, July 17, 1945.

## Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

wealth should spend at least one day a year collecting bits of history of the district in which the school is situated." This can be described as decentralised history, which obviously would be an excellent method of making history more interesting for children; moreover, it would be real history. Other writers approve the idea and point out that, Australia being a young country, we would easily capture many historical facts that otherwise would be lost. In addition to this every parish could have a local scribe to keep the "Annals of the Parish." This idea would not appeal to global-minded historians, but it is an idea that deserves encouragement.

**CHURCH CANDOUR:** The following matters occupied the attention of the Presbyterian Church Board of Finance in its recent report (vide Melbourne "Herald," May 5). The difficulty of maintaining the work of the Church if nothing but 3¼% war bonds can be bought (how the Nazarene would have regarded "war bonds" was not mentioned). It was pointed out that the Church had already invested £263,000 in war loans, and that 6% could be obtained on an outlay of £45,000 if the Assembly approved the purchase of a Swanston-street property. Another proposed investment is a quarter of an acre at Abbotsford for the erection of a factory at an outlay of £8000 for a return of 5% net. Later, the report dealt with some religious matters, including, "encouraging friendly relationship towards Jews." And so the work of redemption goes on—with the moneychangers back in the temple again! —OBH.

## EXTRA 23 DOLLARS A MONTH FOR EACH CANADIAN?

"During the year 1943, Canada supplied for the war up to the value of 3,279,000,000 dollars in war munitions; simply war products, without counting, therefore, the production of food, clothing and other articles, made use of by the inhabitants of Canada.

"In twelve months, war products amounting to 3,279,000,000 dollars! All this never enters Canadian homes. It goes to the armies. The armies distribute it gratis on to the enemies' heads, as well as they can. Hence, Canada's gift to the mighty world butchery in one single year is 3,279,000,000 dollars.

"Once the war is over, the machines and men, employed in making these war products, will certainly be able to manufacture an equivalent amount of peace-time goods, and all the more easily with the 700,000 stalwart young men now at war, but then at the disposal of productive undertakings.

"If at present 3,279,000,000 dollars' worth of goods can be given, as a free gift, to destroy life, it can surely be given as a free gift to preserve life. If it is no crime to serve bombs on the Germans gratis, why should it be a crime to give a bag of flour gratis to a Canadian family?"

—"Vers Demain," Quebec, 15/1/45. (Translated by M. L. Bernadou.)

## NINE VOLUMES OF BONDAGE

Nine volumes of National Security Regulations and Orders reveal the amazing extent to which Australians have been regimented during the war. A tenth volume is about to be issued.

About 200 sets of regulations, covering industry, private life and recreation, are in existence, an official estimated recently.

Individual regulations total thousands. On August 1, National Security legislation non-existent prior to the war covered more than 1240 pages.

## HOW TAXATION HAS SOARED

Taxation collected by Commonwealth and State Governments during 1943-44 was just on £325 million—almost three times the amount collected in the year immediately preceding the outbreak of war.

An analysis by the Taxpayers' Association shows that between 1938-39 and 1943-44, the per capita burden rose from £17/19/6 to £44/9/7.

Interim figures released by the Commonwealth Treasury indicate that collections for the current financial year will greatly exceed those for last financial year.

## GET THESE BOOKLETS!

New readers in particular are recommended to read the following booklets if they desire to fully grasp and more clearly follow the articles appearing in the "New Times."

"COMMUNISM, WHY NOT?" Gives the low-down on Communism. Price: 2/7d, posted.

"THE ANSWER TO SOCIALISM." An excellent realistic analysis of Socialism. Price: 2/7d, posted.

"RED GLOWS THE DAWN." Inside information about the white-anting tactics of local Communists. Price: 7d, posted.

"THE BIG IDEA." A comprehensive survey of the plot to enslave the people. Price: 2/7d, posted.

"FEDERAL UNION EXPOSED." Revelations of the plot to impose the World Police State. Price: 1/1d, posted.

"THE ANSWER TO TAX SLAVERY." A clear exposition of the cause of excessive taxation, and the way out. Price: 1/1d, posted.

"MONEY." A simple and complete analysis of the money swindle. Price: 1/1d, posted.

The above booklets are obtainable from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

## CENTRALISING OF ELECTRIC SUPPLY

We have referred several times in these columns to the dangerous moves—past, present and projected—towards the centralisation of the generation and distribution of electric power in this and other countries, under the control of fewer and fewer "public authorities." In this connection, the following article on the "Grid" system in England, published in the "Social Crediter" of April 14, is interesting and informative:—

"The creation of the electric grid sanctioned by the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1926, was one of those rare acts of economic statesmanship which, like the repeal of the Corn Laws, cut clean through the tangle of tradition and established practice."

Thus an article in "The Economist" of February 17 on the "Electricity Grid."

It is unfortunate that "The Economist" should have chosen the Corn Laws as an illustration, because the repeal of these Laws was in the interests of High Finance. Other countries could not pay their debts if tariff barriers prevented their goods coming into the country. Therefore the financiers could not make further loans nor collect their old loans unless the barriers were shifted. "Sir Robert Peel repealed the Corn Laws, which four years before he had assisted to impose. He became a convert to free trade." Then, the Whigs were the handmaidens of High Finance; now, when the Whigs as such have lost hope of power, their position has been taken by the Socialists.

The key word behind the idea of the electricity grid is "control." The citizens who still retained a certain degree of control over their own electricity supplies through their local councils lose it under the grid system. Witness the recent cutting off of supplies over large areas during the winter spell of severe weather.

We can expect a paper of "The Economist's" inspiration, which is purely financial, to bring forth as a primary statement the aim of the grid system:—"The purpose of interlinking the public generating stations was twofold. First, it held out promises of financial economy through a reduction in the proportion of reserve capacity, secondly, it was held to guarantee continuity of supply in war in case of breakdown of individual generating stations."

It is just as well to remind them that the first-named objective was achieved at the expense of the public. Approximately 400 generating stations were scrapped, and the Electricity Commissioners, armed with monopoly powers as regards financial sanctions, refused permission to many undertakings to extend the plant capacity and forced them to take their supplies from the Grid.

Over 300 undertakings were known to be able to generate electricity much cheaper than the C.E.B. Nevertheless, they were forced on to the grid, and the local people lost any hope of control over their own generating stations.

Control, which is the main objective, is centralised in London under the C.E.B. and the Electricity Commissioners.

Such phrases as "financial economy," "increased efficiency," etc., are meaningless terms when judged from the public point of view. As this aspect of the matter has already been dealt with on several occasions, there is no need to repeat arguments here. That many undertakings were already interlinked for mutual benefit in pre-grid days did not save them.

The second part of the statement is not true because the effect of the Grid system

was to concentrate generation of supply in a few super stations assisted by a few much smaller "selected" stations.

This was a sinister policy in view of the war. The increased vulnerability due to this concentration was a serious weakness, and the fact that the Germans did not take advantage of it is one of the great mysteries of the war. That they were aware of it is proved by their own policy of scrapping their own intended electricity grid in the 1930's and reverting to the self-contained system. The whole position is on a par with the Briey Basin ramp of the last war.

It would be idle for the Electricity Commissioners to deny the increased vulnerability, as they have as much as admitted it in their action of duplicating the main distributing centres all over the country since the war started. In this case, it is most noticeable that the much-vaunted "financial economy" is at a discount.

At the present time, when we are repeatedly warned that we are now a poor country, that we have spent all our capital in waging war, that we shall have to tighten our belts, etc. (just as at the end of the last war), there is another aspect of the matter, which should receive a little more publicity.

Apart from the enormous destruction of war there is also what might be termed the enrichment of war. This is revealed in crystal clearness by the wartime expansion of the electricity supply industry:

In the year 1937 just over 20,000 million units were generated yet in 1943 the output had risen to 37,000 million units.

Over and above this the C.E.B. has announced its plans for post-war expansion, namely, the installation of a further plant for the production of 3,000,000 kilowatts. But the end is not yet; there are also the Scottish Hydro-Electric scheme and the Severn Barrage scheme (on which a committee is now sitting). It would be difficult to conceive a more curious policy, especially when we consider the pre-war figures for consumption:—

Domestic uses, 4290 million units; Shops, Offices, and Commerce, 2698 million units; Farms, 50 million units; Factories, 9598 million units.

If the figure for domestic uses is just over doubled it will make 10,000 million units available in the post-war world. Which will leave 27,000 million units mainly for factory use (not reckoning the Scottish Hydro-Electric and the Severn Barrage schemes).

Which means that we shall have an industrial system functioning to full wartime capacity. In order to get rid of all this production, a forced export trade is again to be tried, an export trade more than treble that of pre-war days! And it was shown that the pre-war fight for markets was one of the main causes of the war!

We look in vain for any appreciation of these facts in "The Economist." Which countries will be willing to assimilate our enormous potential post-war output of goods?

—W. A. BARRATT.

## CANADIAN M.P. ON PEACE PROBLEMS

Mr. Norman Jaques, the Social Credit member for Wetaskiwin in the Canadian House of Commons, made a notable speech in the House recently when the then impending San Francisco Conference was debated. The first part of his speech, as recorded in the Official Report ("Hansard") for March 27, reads as follows:—

Mr. Norman Jacques (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have carefully listened to or read the remarks of previous speakers in this debate. All hon. members, of course, desire peace, but it is evident that we are not agreed as to the best way to obtain it. Previous speakers have made their earnest appeals, and I can only hope that they will credit me with like sincerity. It seems to me that this is not a party question, or even a question of right and left. It is a question of right or wrong. Freedom and justice are the only bases of peace. Peace may be imposed by force, but it cannot be maintained by force.

About a year ago it was my privilege to occupy a seat in the gallery reserved for members of Dominion Parliaments in the House of Commons at Westminster. In these days that gallery is occupied by members of the armed forces of the Allied countries. I have heard some remarks as to what the members of the armed forces are thinking in connection with these matters. On this occasion I was sitting in this gallery in the middle of a group of men in uniform, while in the House of Commons the post-war treatment of Poland and other liberated countries was being discussed.

I noticed that the man sitting next to me was a flight lieutenant in the Royal Australian Air Force, and when he turned to me I saw that he was a padre. He did not know me from Adam, of course, but he turned and said, "Is there no one in this House with the courage to get up and tell the truth!"

That remark made a very great impression upon me. I may be asked, what is the truth? To me the truth is a matter between a man and his conscience. Since I have to live with my conscience my greatest desire is to remain at peace with it.

The British Empire has come in for some discussion during this debate. Since in my opinion it is the only effective league of nations, I cannot see the point of at-

sovereign Dominions of the British Empire. I came back from England fully convinced that Canada is the most fortunate country in the world today, not only because of its natural resources, but in terms of justice and liberty, both of which have been gained while it has been a member of the British Empire.

If Germany is disarmed, where will be the threat to world peace? Last fall I made this statement:

"The defeat of German arms is certain, but the plots of International Finance and Communism, their plans for world control by the surrender of national sovereignty to world government and police force, have become a greater threat to our liberties as Christians and democrats than the disaster at Dunkirk."

That statement has met with a great deal of criticism, but I can only say that nothing has happened since to cause me to change my mind. Let me quote from Page 7 of "The Road to Serfdom," by Professor Hayek, in regard to Germany:

"Mere hatred of everything German instead of the particular ideas which now dominate the Germans is, moreover, very dangerous, because it blinds those who indulge in it against a very real threat. It is to be feared that this attitude is frequently merely a kind of escapism caused by an unwillingness to recognise tendencies which are not confined to Germany, and by a reluctance to re-examine and if necessary to discard beliefs which we have taken over from the Germans and by which we are still as much deluded as the Germans were. It is doubly dangerous because the contention that only the peculiar wickedness of the Germans has produced the Nazi system is likely to become the excuse for forcing on us the very institutions which have produced that wickedness." Again at page 194 he says: "Apart from the intellectual influences which we have illustrated by two instances,

totalitarianism comes mainly from the two great vested interests: organised capital and organised labour. Probably the greatest menace of all is the fact that the policies of these two most powerful groups point in the same direction."

Many people seem to think that they could become more ethical by delegating their vices to larger groups!

Then, again, how will we determine who is the aggressor nation? Would that not depend upon who controlled the means of propaganda? Let me refer to the recent troubles in Greece, and quote some opinions in the matter. I hold in my hand a magazine supposed to stand for Christian democracy, and it has this to say on the Greek policy:

"The Greek warfare stands out as part of a connected policy to maintain reaction and monarchy and the 'right kind' of fascism everywhere in Europe. It becomes luminously clear now that the guns are actually turned against the heroic Greeks who for years have resisted single-handed the weight of the German war machine. No blow aimed by our enemies can match the damage inflicted by this present policy of Mr. Churchill."

Then, a press release given by the C.C.F. in an Ottawa paper, and headed "C.C.F. Asks Shift in British Policy," goes on to say:

"The situation in Greece and Italy shows a lack of support for the democratic people's movements and a readiness to impose, even by force, unpopular or discredited elements for reasons of power politics. Our masses are not working and dying to restore discredited monarchs to their thrones, and reactionary rulers to their pre-war power."

On December 10, I wrote a letter published in the Ottawa "Citizen" in protest of the criticism of British policy in Greece.

## VICTORY DAY "UNITY"

According to the London "Sunday Dispatch," the Vicar of Hampstead Garden Suburb has taken legal advice concerning alleged misrepresentation of a disagreement with a local rabbi, Dr. I. Weinstock. The vicar, the Rev. Maxwell Rennie, objected to the terms asked by the rabbi as a condition for the holding of an open-air united Victory-Day service, which, it is stated, were "that the name of Jesus Christ should be omitted from the prayers, and that the hymns chosen would not contain a definite Christian content." The rabbi "thought it was an occasion when all might give and take."

A few days later Mr. Low, national leader of the Social Credit Party, issued a statement to the press in which he described as utterly false and mischievous the propaganda directed against Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the British Government with respect to the Greek situation. He pointed out that it indicated powerful world forces mobilised on the side of Communism.

There you have divided opinion. So far as I know the people of Canada have never been told the truth as to what did happen in Greece. I have procured copies of the debates in the British House of Commons and have made copies of speeches by the Prime Minister and other Members of that House. I have sent those speeches to various newspapers in Canada, but without success. Not a paper to which I sent the speech of the Prime Minister of Great Britain on the subject of Greece would publish that speech. Why?

(To be continued.)

## 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:—

### THE CHURCH NOW TOLERATED

We are driving to our hotel when Eric says, "Kirilov, stop the car; I'd like to go in this church and look around. We've never seen one, you know."

We went in, and presently an old man appeared and began switching on dim little chandeliers. Kirilov said the man was the warden, who would show us around. At one side of the main altar, the choir, a dozen women in early middle age, was sitting around on folding chairs. They went on with their practice, paying no particular attention to us.

I had expected to find the church deserted, except for a few ragged, superstitious old women. But these people were not old and were decently dressed; clearly, they or their husbands held positions of some consequence—engineers, professional men or minor administrators—yet they had no fear of jeopardising their husbands' position by attending church. Kirilov and the other Russians with us represented a party and a Government, which have bitterly opposed the Church. But the women stood in no fear, nor did they make an obsequious fuss over him.

Skilled observers told me that Communist Party members continue their private contempt for religion and all its works. They regard such doctrines as the forgiveness of sin and the immortality of the soul as childish superstitions on a level with palmistry. It is highly improbable that anyone holding to any of these beliefs would be regarded as fit for membership in the Party, which in Russia is the only road to power.

After the 1917 Revolution, most of the Orthodox Church leaders emigrated to the Balkans, and Hitler, as part of his invasion plans for the Soviet Union, seized on this historical background. He established 19 Orthodox Churches in Berlin, including a Cathedral, and earmarked millions of Reich marks for their support. After he invaded France, he commandeered silk to make religious vestments. When he entered Russia, he proclaimed himself the Protector of the Russian Church; every German army quartermaster was equipped with a supply of these vestments, as well as sacred church vessels, and churches everywhere reopened in the Ukraine.

When the Communists dropped their propaganda against religion and suspended the official publication for the Society of the Godless because of a "paper shortage," their critics in the outside world insisted that these moves were made only to impress foreigners.

These critics were wrong; the Party had sounder domestic reasons for changing their policy. For the Germans were making headway in the Ukraine with their religious propaganda, and whispers were going all over Russia. Not only was it popular with the older people, but many of the young were joining the Germans.

As a further answer to this German propaganda in the Ukraine, three dignitaries of the Russian Orthodox Church were invited to see Stalin, and on September 4, 1943, a formal reconciliation was effected and the Church got its place on the council of people's Commissars.

The Bolshevik Party now feels strong enough to tolerate, even to recognise, the Church. The patriarchs have loyally supported the war. The principal reason for the Party's original opposition lay in the fact that the Church had in previous generations preached unquestioning obedience to the Czars. The Party has not

overlooked the fact that a patriotic, nationalistic Church can be as useful to their regime as it was to the Romanoff dynasty.

Although the Church is now recognised and tolerated, it is not officially encouraged. The Party realises that the new policy is popular abroad, and strengthens in America and England their own position and that of their friends in those countries. Consequently, they encourage all news stories and picture layouts coming out of Russia portraying the new state of affairs.

The Party was delighted when the metropolitan Benjamin told a Canadian audience that the separation of Church and State in Russia was not more severe than in all other truly democratic countries. Of course, such statements never appear in the Russian press. Marx called religion "The Opium of the People." The private attitude of the Party would be, "If the people still want opium, why not give them a little? We are strong now, and today the Church is patriotic."

Something of the basic attitude toward the Church, however, may be seen in such a thing as electric light rates. A State-owned store pays only 1.16 kopecks per kilowatt for its current; a home user is charged 5.5, while a church must pay 41.

### THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND FREEDOM.

This evening a big dinner is given in Eric's honour by Popkov, of Leningrad, who is an important figure in the organisation of the Communist Party in that region.

Popkov said the principal thing he didn't understand about our country was this: We were fighting a war together; yet we let a fascist press exist in America; it was clearly fascist because it frequently criticised Russia! Why would we let Russia and her leader be criticised in America?

I said that perhaps I could clear this up because I was not a businessman but that I ran a newspaper, and so could speak for them. America was a free country, and therefore had a free press. And while most of us supported both our President and Russia, all of us would fight anybody who tried to stop criticism of them. Because a country where criticism is dead is not free.

Then a curious thing happened. Some of Popkov's henchmen at the table were old-timers—men in their 50's and 60's. They were smiling and nodding approval. One man, who might have been an architect, even had his hands poised to clap, but then he looked at Popkov and he didn't clap.

At this point Joyce said that in a free country we always criticised our friends. We had been supporting and criticising the British ever since this war began in 1939, and we saw no reason why we shouldn't do the same with Russia.

Then Eric got up and smoothly settled everything—freedom of the press, Russia, England and even Popkov, who had been a little bit taken aback by it all, and who now said that this freedom to criticise was a most interesting thing, and he hoped we didn't mind that he himself had used some of this American freedom to criticise America.

I told him that we didn't mind at all that we had plenty of this freedom in America, and if one day he came to visit us he would find he was free to criticise our leader, our Government, or anything else he cared to.

(To be continued.)



# WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA?

(Continued from last issue.)

**Beverly Nichols' new book, "Verdict on India," is the result of a recently completed tour by one of England's most provocative journalists. It presents conclusions in striking contrast to some current views on the fateful problem of Indian independence. The following extracts are interesting: —**

It seems true that Gandhi's practical influence is sharply on the wane, and is not likely to re-assert itself. Gandhi is now 75 and he has stepped out of gaol to find a very different world from the world he left behind. Britain is no longer struggling with her back to the wall; the Japanese are no longer advancing upon India.

Most important of all, the tremendous gap between his mystic Mumbo Jumbo and the hard but exciting realities of the modern world is more than ever apparent. Every day that Gandhi has been in gaol has seen a rapid increase in the number of young Indians who are being brought into the orbit of the war effort, which means into the orbit of the 20th century.

**From thousands of villages young men are flocking to the army centres where, for the first time in their lives, they are taught the rudiments of hygiene and discipline, and are given their first sight of the magic of modern machinery.**

One of the most brilliant pieces of organisation, which Britain has achieved during the present war, is the War Exhibition, which has been moved from centre to centre in an effort to teach India the issues of the war and the manner in which it is being waged. The Exhibition is not merely a collection of tanks and propaganda posters; it is a complete and self-sufficient picture, on an enormous scale, of modern engineering, aviation, transport, agriculture, radio, cookery, social service, botany, and medicine.

In spite of the frenzied efforts of Congress to boycott it, the Exhibition has been an unqualified success, particularly with the younger men. It has marked a turning point in their lives. They have come from sleepy villages, which, if Gandhi had his way, would go on sleeping, and suddenly the whole wonder-box of modern science is thrown open before them. They stare in amazement and growing delight and soon they are walking in a new world from which even Gandhi's hypnotic voice can never recall them. For into this new world he does not fit.

## PAKISTAN.

The most important Muslim in India is 68, tall, thin, and elegant, with a monocle on a grey silk cord, and a stiff white collar, which he wears in the hottest weather. He suggests a gentleman of Spain, a diplomat of the old school, such as one used to see sitting in the window of the St. James's Club.

Mr. Jinnah is a man to watch because he is in a position of unique strategic importance. Not only is he president of the Muslim League, a compact and fighting organisation, which commands the allegiance of at least 85 per cent. of India's Muslims, but he is potentially the ruler of a vast new empire, Pakistan.

**True, at the moment, Pakistan is only an empire of dreams, but in the minds of the Muslims it is nonetheless real for all that.**

Literally it means Land of the Pure. In geographical terms it means a great block of land in the North-west of India, consisting of Baluchistan, Sind, the Punjab and the North-west Frontier, together with a block

in the east, consisting of the greater part of Bengal.

It is proposed that these areas, which are predominantly Muslim, should be separated once and for all from the rest of India, which is predominantly Hindu, and should proclaim themselves an independent State. I am one of those who believe not only that this will happen but that it MUST happen.

If it does, an entirely new situation will have arisen in Asia, which will shatter the existing balances of power, and drastically modify the policies of every country in the world.

It is often asserted that Pakistan is a mushroom growth, that hitherto Muslims and Hindus have managed to live together, however uneasily, and that therefore this summary divorce is too drastic a measure. This argument ignores the fact that Britain has up till now been responsible for law and order.

But with the approach of national independence, communalism has flared up in a spectacular manner.

When by the act of 1935 representative self-government was established in 11 provinces, Congress found itself in a large majority in seven out of the 11 provinces in the first election. Instead of inviting the Muslims to share the fruits of office, instead of attempting any form of coalition, it rigidly excluded them from all responsibility.

**In schools, Muslim children were compelled to stand up and salute Gandhi's picture. The Congress flag was treated as the flag of the whole nation; and in business matters the discrimination against Muslims, from the great landowners and merchants to the humblest tillers of the soil, was persistent.**

The best proof of these allegations is the fact that, when war broke out and the Congress ministries resigned, the Muslim League called for a Day of National Thanksgiving to mark the end of the tyranny.

What is strange, in the whole Pakistan controversy, is the opposition, which it still evokes from sincere well wishers of India. This is due to the strength of Congress propaganda. The Hindus, by persistent suggestion, have managed to persuade the world that they are "India," and that any attempt to divide "India" is a wicked "plot on the part of the British," acting on the well-established principle of "divide and rule."

**Most liberals of the West have fallen for this propaganda, hook, line and sinker.**

Consequently we have the extraordinary spectacle of British politicians pleading in the House of Commons the cause of Indian "unity" in the joint cause of Indian independence—sublimely ignorant of the fact that their insistence on this so-called "unity" is the one and only thing that keeps the British in the saddle!

Jinnah's own testimony on this point is explicit. "The one thing which keeps the British in India is the false idea of a United India, as preached by Gandhi," Jinnah told me. "A United India, I repeat, is a British creation—a myth, and a very dangerous myth, which will cause endless strife. As long as that strife exists, the British have an excuse for remaining."

(To be continued.)

# MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

## "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"

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

**President Roosevelt's principal advisers were men such as Frankfurter and Baruch, both connected with socialistic planning and having friends such as our own Dr. Evatt in different countries.**

We have already noted the influence of Baruch during the First World War. In the "Empire News," September 24, 1939, the following appeared:

**"This millionaire financier (Baruch) wields enormous power behind the scenes. He is Roosevelt's most intimate adviser. Again and again he has suggested key men for the American Government. Roosevelt always wise-cracks when you mention Baruch's influence at White House: 'I do not mind if folk think that Barney writes all my speeches,' he once remarked, 'but I do object to their thinking he writes only my best ones!'"**

In his very revealing book, "What Manner of Man?" the American writer, Mr. Noel F. Busch, writes of Frankfurter as follows:

"Next to Hopkins, the most influential adviser of the President has probably been Felix Frankfurter, an Austrian emigrant of Jewish parentage. . . . Frankfurter's personal intimacy with Roosevelt appears to have begun to cool about the time the former, on reaching the Supreme Court, attained prestige which had previously been denied him. This fact has not prevented the little judge from exerting a perceptible torque on the affairs of the nation. His views, or more properly his wishes, still permeate the capital as a whole, and the President's clique in particular. Thus, even when he thinks he is seeing someone else, the President is, in fact, often seeing Frank-

furter, as it were, in disguise." (My emphasis.)

Busch also mentions such influential Jews as Judge Rosenman, Isador Lubin and Benjamin Cohen. Rosenman has been Roosevelt's legal adviser, among other things.

There are dozens of other Jews, men such as Berle, Morgenthau, etc., and all directly and indirectly connected with Kuhn, Loeb and Company. The descendants of the late Paul Warburg are still "in business," although the Jewish "B'nai B'rith Messenger" of November 5, 1937, kindly told us that, "Herbert H. Lehman has the prestige to fill Warburg's shoes." Mr. Lehman, head of U.N.R.R.A., is one of the leading figures in the new world-organisations now attempting to plan the lives of the peoples of the earth just as the "Protocols" say they should be planned. Isn't that strange?

And let there be no mistake that the B'nai B'rith is one of the key Jewish world groups. It used its powerful ramifications to attack the late Neville Chamberlain over Jewish emigration into Palestine. It wanted war in 1938, before Britain was ready. It is a tremendous influence behind the American Government.

B'nai B'rith means literally (in Hebrew) "Sons of the Covenant," the Covenant being that of circumcision.

It is a branch of Freemasonry reserved exclusively for Jews. It was founded in

1843 in New York. It was not established in Great Britain until 1910, but has since then succeeded in gaining a controlling influence over all Jewish organisations in Great Britain.

Among leading "British" members today are: Dr. Chaim Weizmann (Zionist Leader), Dr. J. H. Hertz (Chief Rabbi), Neville Laski (President of Jewish Board of Deputies), Israel Moses Sieff (of P.E.P., etc.), and Claude G. Montefiore, of banking fame, and past-president of the Anglo-Jewish Association. The latter is also a leading protagonist of "liberal Judaism," which contends that Jews are a religious community and not a separate "nation." (See also reference in quotation below, wherein this gentleman is seen to have been a member of the Berlin branch of this International Jewish Secret Society in 1910.)

The following is quoted by the Christian "Free Press" from a short history of the B'nai B'rith in England, which was published by the London Lodge of the Order and written by Paul Goodman, a past president of the Society, for private circulation among members: —

"In the year 1843 the Sons of the Covenant formed themselves into a body for the furtherance of the highest interests of Judaism. . . . This effort to unite Jews on the broadest principles of humanity with the specific objects of advancing their intellectual and moral interests, and to protect their civil and political rights wherever threatened, has succeeded in creating an organisation of about 600 constituent units spread over the whole of U.S.A. and in 28 other countries: the more recent being those in Rio de Janeiro and Mexico City (1934), and Khartoum, Sudan (1935).

**"This vast network of Jewish endeavour in the Old and the New World, closely linked together in one united body, moved by a common ideal, represents the greatest organised force of modern times for the advancement of Jewish interests in the Diaspora. . . ."**

"In its effects, perhaps even more valuable has been the political influence which, on the grounds of humanity and justice, the B'nai B'rith has been able to exercise through the diplomatic channels of the U.S. Government in favour of persecuted Jews in Russia, Rumania, Germany and elsewhere. In political alliance with the 'Alliance Israelite Universelle' (an international Jewish society founded in 1860 by Adolph Cremieux) and other national and international Jewish bodies, the B'nai B'rith has for many decades been recognised as representative of American Jewry, and as specially enjoying the confidence and support of the American Government in the protection of Jewish interests abroad. . . . B'nai B'rith was instrumental in ultimately securing the abrogation by the U.S. of the commercial treaty with Russia owing to that country's refusal to vize the passports of American Jews visiting that country." (Shades of Jacob Schiff!)

In describing the foundation of the first London Lodge in 1910, Goodman states that "the fact that the inaugural meeting of likely members took place at the house of Mr. Claude G. Montefiore, the then president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, was due to his membership of the Montefiore Lodge in Berlin."

All of which should make American citizens think seriously before being used in any schemes to "police" the world for "freedom." If they cannot, as yet, effectively impose their own policies on their Washington Government, in opposition to the policies of Baruch, Warburg, Brietung, etc., then how can they effectively oppose the policies of the secret group these powerful Jews represent if there is a centralised world government to contend with? The future of democratic Government everywhere depends on a realistic approach to that question.

(To be continued.)

## REACTIONARY SOCIALISTS

From the English "Social Crediter": —

Perhaps the most significant fact in contemporary politics is that the most implacable opposition in every British Dominion, and in Great Britain itself, to the body of ideas known as Social Credit, comes from Socialists. In New Zealand, Mr. Walter Nash and Mr. J. A. Lee; in Australia, Dr. Evatt; in Canada, M. J. Coldwell and his cohorts; in Great Britain, Professor Laski, Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell and Dr. Hugh Dalton, et al, have no difficulty with the Big Monopolists—they only want to make them bigger. If the world is to be saved at all, it is going to be saved, as ever before, by duality, not by quantity or by politicians of the One Big Union idea.

Together with the big manufacturer who, in the old sense, is not a "capitalist" at all, the Socialist is the most reactionary and atavistic animal on two legs, which the world contains. And his wild enthusiasm for centralised (i.e., nationalised) banking, more than doubles the threat to society, which, with his cartel partner, he offers. There is not an idea amongst the group, which would not have been, and mostly was, adopted by Bismarck.

## RECORD RED-TAPE

All-time high red tape came in a report of the visit of Belgian Supply Mission to America: "Difficulties met with in Washington were considerable. In some cases 265 copies of documents setting forth grounds on which Belgian requirements were based had to be presented."

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From the UNITED DEMOCRATS' Headquarters, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.)

"ALBERTA—NOW!" Thanks to the fact that we have been subsidised by a generous donor, we are pleased to be able to announce that we are able to apply the compensated price to "Alberta—Now!" In future the price will be 6d per copy, plus postage, and 4/- per dozen, post free. We shall therefore be glad if any person or organisation who has had supplies from us will claim an allowance when re-ordering.

ANNUAL CONVENTION: We wish to announce that our Annual Convention will be held on Saturday, July 28. Business will commence at 3 p.m. Items on the agenda are: —1. President's Report. 2. Financial Statement. 3. Election of Officers. 4. Policy for the Ensuing Year. 5. General Business.

At the conclusion of business, tea will be served by the ladies, and the evening will be spent in lighter vein. We appeal to our members and friends to keep this afternoon and evening free, to come along and help to make this, the most important meeting of the year, a success.

BOOKS TO READ: We have available and can recommend the following: — "Victory Without Debt," by C. Barclay-Smith, Price, 1/-; "Why Big Finance Backs Socialism," by Jas. Guthrie, B.Sc. Price, 6d. "The Enemy Within the Empire" (A Short History of the Bank of England), by Eric D. Butler. Price 9d. (All plus 1d post age.)

—F. BAWDEN, Hon. Secretary.

## "THOU PROVIDEST ENOUGH"

The following prayer, removed from the Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI on its revision, is quoted by "The Canadian Social Crediter": —

"They that are ensnared in the extreme penury of things needful for the body, cannot set their mind upon Thee, O Lord, as they ought to do; but when they be disappointed of the things they so mightily desire, their hearts are cast down and quail from excess of grief. Have pity therefore upon them O merciful Father, and relieve their misery from Thine incredible riches, that by Thy removing of their urgent necessity, they may rise up to Thee in mind. Thou, O Lord, providest enough for all men with Thy most liberal and bountiful hand; but whereas Thy gifts are in respect of Thy goodness and free favour, made free unto all men, we (through our haughtiness and niggardship and distrust) do make them private and peculiar. Correct Thou the Things, which our iniquity hath put out of order; let Thy goodness supply that which our niggardliness hath plucked away. Give Thou meat to the hungry and drink to the thirsty; comfort Thou the sorrowful; cheer Thou the dismayed; strengthen Thou the weak; deliver Thou them that are prisoners and give hope and courage to them that are out of heart."

## CONDONED "LIQUIDATIONS"

"The lead in this matter was taken, however, by intellectuals who stood free of the confusion caused by adherence to a gospel. . . . To me, those wholesale murders, and the abject confession of the show victims, brutal and shameful as they were, presented a less dread menace to the march of civilisation than the abdication of moral intelligence by those in other countries who were perfectly free, and whose natural duty it was to judge and condemn them. Romain Holland, Henrie Barbusse, George Bernard Shaw, Max Lerner, Freda Kirchwey, Henry Morse Lovett, Robert S. Lynd, Heywood Brown, Lillian Wald, Harold Laski, Dorothy Parker, George Soule, Upton Sinclair, H. G. Wells, Vida Scudder, Alice Stone Blackwell, John Kingsbury, Vincent Sheean, Waldo Frank, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, Rev. Hewlett Johnson (Dean of Canterbury), the Rev. Harry F. Ward, Franz Boas, Stephen S. Wise, Albert Einstein. The list is too long to recite, but I want to make it plain that I am talking about real people."

—"Morals and Politics" by Max Eastman.

## "FINAL STEP IN MONOPOLY"

"Referring to the anti-trust legislation they are introducing into Congress, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, and Representative Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, said in a joint statement: 'Now that the country must begin to prepare for the post-war world, it must decide whether to maintain a free economy by maintaining a competitive system, or, by permitting the trend toward monopoly to continue, invite the final step in monopoly: namely, the complete absorption of business in government. It will be our intention to ask for early consideration of this legislation, in the belief that it constitutes a first step in the rehabilitation of a free competitive economy in which little businesses can hope to survive.'"

—"Paint, Oil and Chemical Review," March 8.

**THE "NEW TIMES"  
IS OBTAINABLE  
AT  
ALL AUTHORISED  
NEWSAGENTS**

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