

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. 34. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 31, 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

Westralian Premier Wants More Sacrifices!

What Does He Really Mean?

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

Sir, —There has been another Premiers' Conference at Canberra and the usual avalanche of words. Nothing new took place, and there is no promise of any benefit at all to the general population. Indeed, if one may judge from the published remarks of the Premier of Western Australia, we may look forward only to conditions of "sacrifice."

It is high time we challenged these sacrifice-mongers and called upon them to indicate what they mean and whom they serve. We know from scriptural records that a certain man of old was quite ready to slay his own son as a "sacrifice," regardless of what the son might think of the idea, and we also know that there are some still about who are full of the idea of sacrificing, provided that they themselves are not offered up as the sacrifice. An important question to be asked is whether we really want the perpetuation of this Jewish idea, and, if so, for whose benefit?

My reason for saying this is the all too obvious emergence again of the sort of mentality that lost us the last peace, and to call attention to two extracts from a report in the Melbourne "Argus" of 21/8/45, under the heading, "PREMIERS TO CO-OPERATE FOR PEACE." The first extract is as follows:

"Premiers and Commonwealth Ministers yesterday pledged themselves to a policy of restoring Australia to a peacetime economy. Resources will be marshalled to maintain a steadily increasing population in comfort and security."

So they pledged themselves to a policy. Who determined the policy? This policy is to restore Australia in a peacetime economy. To restore a thing is to put it back as it was. Who wants a peacetime economy of the kind we had before — i.e., as ordained by Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Guggenheim Gregory acting as messengers for the Bank of England? What is meant by the word "steadily"? The pace of a snail is steady! And what is meant by the words "comfort" and "security"? A horse in a stable is comfortable and secure! A gaol is a secure place for its inmates, and I am told there is comfort even there. The comfort we want is, of course, a far different sort of comfort. We want the comfort of mental

security, and we can get that only by having access to the things we and our families need, and which can now be produced in great abundance and with ease. Access to these things is obtained through MONEY.

The second extract is the more important for the purpose of this letter. It is as follows:

"Mr. Wise, West Australian Premier, said if they could organise for peace as they had organised for war, they had things entirely in their own hands. There was no doubt as to the development of Australia along the right lines if they could imbue the people with the same spirit of sacrifice as existed during the war."

Please read that again. If THEY could organise . . . they had things entirely in their own hands. Who are "they"? There was no doubt as to the development of Australia ALONG THE RIGHT LINES if . . . If "they" could imbue "the people" with the same spirit of sacrifice as existed during the war. This makes it clear that "they" are a different group from "the people," for THEY are to imbue THE PEOPLE! And what is meant by the words "along the right lines"? Who has fixed this? What ARE the right lines? According to the Premier of Western Australia, the right lines are the lines of sacrifice.

What I should like to know is exactly what Mr. Wise means by the words, "the same spirit of sacrifice as existed during the war"?

We sacrificed our sons during the war because we were told that an armed alien force was endeavouring to enter our land and crush us—i.e., to imbue us with the spirit of sacrifice and plenty of it. That enemy has been defeated, and we are no longer so threatened. This being so, whence does Mr. Wise get the idea that we should be willing to continue sacrificing our sons in peacetime? Who wants them to be

sacrificed, anyhow, and why? Perhaps he does not mean the sacrifice of life.

During the war our wives sacrificed themselves in many ways. Besides losing their sons, they accepted the role of a beast of burden. They had to struggle home laden with domestic necessities. That was to help in preventing an alien armed force from entering our land to imbue us with the spirit of sacrifice. With the assistance of their gallant sons our wives have accomplished this.

Is there now any real need for their continuing to act as beasts of burden? If so for whose benefit?

If not, precisely what does the Premier of Western Australia mean by his talk of "the same spirit of sacrifice"? Perhaps he does not mean the sacrifice of our wives.

During the war our workers also sacrificed themselves in many ways. They gave up their leisure to work longer hours. They submitted to an increase of 25 per cent, in the cost of living, which meant a decrease of 25 per cent, in their standard of living. They accepted, almost without demur, outrageous increases in taxation, which further reduced their standard of living. They were subjected to a system of rationing and regimentation, which still further reduced their standard of living and restricted their civilian liberties. All that was done to assist in preventing an alien armed force from entering our land to imbue us with the spirit of sacrifice.

That task has been accomplished, and there is therefore, no longer any necessity for workers to give up their leisure, to be mercilessly taxed, or to submit to regimen-

tation. Does Mr. Wise think that the Australian workers should be called upon to continue to make sacrifices of this kind? And, if so, in whose interests?

Perhaps he does not mean the sacrifice of our workers.

The only real problem that confronted the Premiers' Conference (apart from Federal power-lust) was the problem of MONEY, and it was only a real problem to them because they were mesmerised on the subject and still accept the advice of incompetent advisers. There is nothing the people could not do for themselves on the basis of physical reality provided the MONEY is made available, and when the money is made available in the correct way there will be no need whatever for the spirit of sacrifice in the sense referred to in the "Argus" report. What, precisely, does Mr. Wise want the Australian people to sacrifice and to whom will that sacrifice be offered?

Will someone in Western Australia please bring this letter to the notice of the Premier and respectfully suggest to him that there has already been too much loose talk of the alleged need for sacrifice, and that what we are looking for is a better sense of reality and better RESULTS from our legislators' activities. Any "leader" who calls upon the people for sacrifice in an era of rapidly increasing scientific production is no leader in the correct sense of the term. He is a misleader.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2, August 26, 1945.

An indication of some of the effects of "Australia's" hasty acceptance of obligations to U.N.R.R.A. is seen in a statement by a Commonwealth authority, reported in the "Sunday Telegraph" of August 5. He declared that these obligations may entail stricter food rationing and diversion of man-power to industries producing U.N.R.R.A.'s main needs. Thus a new excuse for maintaining rationing and manpower regimentation will be available. It is also stated that these demands may retard our post-war reconstruction. It's about time the responsible persons who committed us to these international agreements were put under lock and key.

ANTI-RED ACTIVITIES: Sydney trades unionists are making a drive to depose Communists from official positions in their unions. Factories and workshops are being flooded with anti-Communist stickers. Union officials say that waterfront Communists lost considerable ground over the Balmain dispute. Three members of Ryde branch of the official A.L.P. have been expelled for alleged association with the Communist Party. Similar action is afoot in Queensland. From this it seems that many unionists are alert to the treachery of the Communists. Nevertheless, much more than deposing Communist officials is needed. It will be necessary for unionists to decentralise policy control, so cunningly centralised by the Communists. In each union (not an amalgamation) the local rank-and-file should exercise complete and continuous control of that union's policy; the executive should merely administer the rank-and-file's policy. The rank-and-file should be on guard against the executive using the union as a political weapon.

DRUGS DUMPED: Those responsible for the heavy press boost accorded to sulphamylidide and penicillin drugs must have been very interested to learn that "after three years' study of its use in combat areas, U.S. hospitals and authorities have abandoned the use of sulphamylidide for soldiers." (Melbourne "Herald," July 9.) The authorities considered, inter alia, that "no known drug can sterilise an infected war wound." The report pointed out that the adverse conclusions also included penicillin. Moral—beware of press boosts.

UNDERHAND UNIONISM: In N.S.W. the Department of Education is being used to compel teachers to allot part of their meagre pay to union funds, thus furthering the fascist scheme of compulsory unionism. The "Gazette" of September 1, 1944, p. 246, proclaimed compulsory unionism in State Government departments and in corporate bodies. ("Smith's Weekly," August 18.) Employee organisations are being requested by the Education Department to pimp on those who have not joined up. The victim then receives a polite ultimatum reminding him of the law. Naturally, the profit motive impels union officials to spy out any individual who has not contributed to their upkeep.

MIXED MARRIAGES: About 50,000 British brides who married U.S. soldiers have had their allowances stopped. They have since been receiving from U.S. Red Cross workers frank talks on the American

way of life, to break down the glamorous illusions created by some U.S. soldiers. The "bride problem" has now spread to Germany, where British soldiers may soon be allowed to marry German girls. Another problem said to be confronting the authorities is the nationality of children born to British fathers and German mothers.

POLES' PLIGHT: In a bitter address to his troops in Italy, the commander of the Polish Army, General Anders, expressed his determination to return to Poland "only with arms in our hands" (Melbourne "Herald," July 14). General Anders appealed to his troops to join him in the struggle and said: "I am going with you to meet our fate. Don't think that arrest and terror await only those who are supposedly Fascist . . . let no one be deceived; he goes back not to Poland, but to Russia; not to freedom, but to captivity." Can this be the liberation that the Poles were promised?

DOSSIER DESIGN: Form S.U.3 (claim for sickness benefit) contains 29 questions, which must be answered before the sufferer's claims will be considered. It is a perfect secret-service dossier, which would tax the strength of a hale and healthy person. The questions leave almost nothing of the applicant's private or business affairs unrevealed. As a press article puts it, "this dossier is more appropriate to the Gestapo files of a totalitarian State than to a democratic social service department." Some of the questions are especially rele-

(Continued on page 2)

Significant Political Pointers

It appears to be a deliberate strategy of the policy makers of the Canberra Government—i.e., the economists and their bureaucratic staffs—to utilize the immediate post-war period to create "chaos" for the purpose of making another attempt to obtain the powers the electors have denied them.

Already thousands of munition workers have been dismissed from work no longer necessary, and there is no doubt that a rapid rise in unemployment figures will take place over the next few months. The power-lusters are getting their propaganda under way to exploit the situation. In effect, they are saying: "We cannot provide work for the unemployed. You electors wouldn't take our advice at the Referendum and now look at the mess you are in. If only we could get sufficient power there would be no need for these unemployed munition workers and others to worry."

At the same time every possible obstacle is being used to hamper private enterprise from supplying consumers' requirements. To take one example: It is true that Mr. Chifley has stated that homes up to the price of £1200 can now be built without permits, but Mr. Chifley neglected to point out that the bureaucracy has created a shortage in building materials and is determined that permits for that material

shall continue to be controlled and issued as it thinks fit.

Every effort is being made to ensure that private enterprise has even less chance of demonstrating its virtues in the post-war period than it had in the pre-war period.

The position is very serious, but even a few letters from electors to their State Members would help to stiffen their resistance to the predatory demands from Canberra. A few thousand letters would work miracles.

* * * * *
Mr. Dunstan's attack on Unified Taxation was unanswerable. Mr. Chifley and his advisers didn't attempt to answer it. It was pointed out in these columns over two years ago, that anyone who believed that Unified Taxation was designed merely as a war measure was indeed very simple. Significantly enough, while the Melbourne "Herald" publicises the anomalies of Unified Taxation as applied to Victoria, it says that these anomalies should be merely removed in order to obtain "financial unity." The centralised control of financial policy is fundamental to the plotters who control the Canberra Government, and, let there be no mistake about it, this policy is going to be vigorously pursued irrespective of what Party the electors send to Canberra. Electors in all States should be contacting their State Members and asking them for an assurance that they will give no support to the continuance of Unified Taxation as a permanent financial measure.

Social creditors advocate a steady reduction of all taxation, but while taxation continues it is absolutely essential that it be controlled locally.

* * * * *
Mr. J. D. Corbett, who writes the weekly "Canberra Commentary" for the "capital- (Continued on page 4.)

Mr. Bevin on Bretton Woods

Speaking on the Finance Bill (No. 2), in the British House of Commons on June 4, 1945, Mr. Ernest Bevin said:—

" . . . I will join with anyone in finding a rational basis for an international price level, properly organised, provided it does not reflect itself in depressing the standard of life on the home market. As yet, neither the Chancellor nor Lord Keynes has ever been able to persuade me that there are sufficient safeguards in the Bretton Woods proposals to achieve that object."

Another New State Wanted

PERTH. — The report that another Kimberley conference will be held at Marble Bar next month, and that a "new State" move for the Kimberlys is under way, suggests the possibility of another secession problem for Western Australia.

While the recent Whim Creek conference decided that the north should remain attached to the south of Western Australia, some people feel that a new State, or incorporation with the Northern Territory, would be in the best interests of the Kimberleys.

Problems there are entirely different from those in the south, and the State Government will be fully occupied with development of the southwest, it is felt.

Melbourne "Herald," August 27.

THE END OF THE WAR—WHAT NEXT?

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

The British peoples have celebrated the end of six years of war, and the relief to many has been great. But the British peoples have yet to win the peace—the kind of peace THEY want.

Some of the young men who went away at the age of twenty-one will now be 27 years old; they will be changed; they will be more matured. But their experiences will have been obtained in a world totally different to that to which they must now come back. To get these young men to settle back into civilian life is not going to be easy; they will require all the help we can give them.

In the dark days of the war, when the issue was in the balance, young men from Australia fought alongside other young men from the Dominions; they fought in the R.A.F., and they helped to win the first great victory of this war.

These young men represent some of the cream of the British race. Some of them will not come back. Those who do come back will not be the same young men who went away; they have gone through terrific experiences.

There are others, too, who have patrolled the seven seas in command of ships. They left here raw and inexperienced; they will come back with that assurance which the acceptance of such responsibility gives.

What are we going to do with these young men? Are we going to ask them to start from where they left off six years ago? Are we going to push them back into oblivion—shove them on to an office stool and say to them: "The war is over now; we have no more need of courage and daring, nor of anyone who is prepared to take a risk?" Is this what we are going to say to them?

I think that the artificial problems of peacetime are going to require just as much courage and grit as did the problems of war. In many ways the "problems of peace" are much more difficult.

In wartime the essential process of killing takes little notice of human tragedies; in peacetime our chief occupation must be to eliminate human tragedies—as far as that lies in our power.

In Europe today the main preoccupation is how to get the basic essentials of an animal existence—food and shelter. There is a risk, and a very grave risk, that the peoples of Europe may sell their souls and sell the future of civilisation, for the right to be permitted to live merely as animals. It is probable, therefore, that any settlement made in Europe just now, if made under these conditions, will be the cause of future wars; a real settlement, therefore, will have to wait until more normal times. Our own men returning from the war will probably accept jobs quite unsuited to them, and this we shall have to bear in mind.

We shall have to think over these things, and gradually we shall have to break away from the idea that a man has to punch a clock in an office or factory in order to be permitted to live.

There are great numbers of men who refuse to accept responsibility, and who wish to have simple routine work; but all men are not like that. It takes all kinds to make a world, and the minority have to be catered for as well as the majority, because the freedom and welfare of the majority depends on the minority who are prepared to take risks and to accept responsibility.

Some of that minority will find a niche for themselves whatever happens, and these don't concern us at present. But we have to remember that many who can make

great contributions to society are not very good at looking after their own welfare.

Grave injustices were done to such men after the last war, and we shall have to try to prevent them happening again after this war.

The harvest of bitterness and unrest, which is being garnered in Europe, is partly due to the failure of society to offer scope for its talented young men and women.

It should be remembered, too, that the restless and venturesome spirits among our fathers found scope for their energies by building a new home in Australia or America, and the sons of these pioneers are still with us. But the world has become "smaller" since then, become more rigid, more controlled, and more hostile to those who would break from the rigid creeds of Authority.

Our politicians, our bureaucrats and our trade union bosses represent the town-dweller; they represent clock-punchers, and they have all the limitations of several generations of clock-punchers. And they are about the last people on this earth capable of planning a country fit for heroes. In any case, it is very probable that most of their planning will be out of date before the ink is dry on the plans.

The vast superiority of the inventive genius of the British people in this war was due to the fact that their plans and designs could be changed and changed and changed again. The extreme rigidity of the German mass-production system made them quite incapable of keeping pace with British inventions and with British methods of production.

And the tragedy of all large, centralised organisations is the tremendous work involved in altering them in any vital way. The over-riding emergency of war may allow military commanders to cut through red tape, but in peacetime that excuse does not exist. Waiting outside the office of some bureaucrat to get permission to do anything is not likely to produce the atmosphere where returned men will feel that they have won anything vital in winning this war.

Mistakes will be made, but it is much less dangerous and much more profitable to progress if these mistakes are made locally rather than nationally.

After all, one of the chief prerogatives of a free and independent people is to be allowed to make their own mistakes rather than to have them made for them by some stranger living sometimes hundreds of miles away.

One of our most pressing tasks today is to get houses built for the people, and for the soldiers returning from the war. In this housing shortage we are going to face many a human tragedy in the shape of a broken up home; and when we consider that the returning servicemen are going to find it awkward enough fitting into civilian routine; to add to this the lack of a home for himself and his wife is going to aggravate every social problem.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF "JOHANNESBURG" TO WORLD-"PEACE"

By B.J., in the "Social Creditor," England, June 2,

"The Freedom previously enjoyed by Great Britain in regard to Foreign Policy disappeared with the entry of the U.S.A. into the war. And President Wilson was influenced preponderantly by German Jews such as Jacob Schiff."

—C. H. DOUGLAS, "The Brief for the Prosecution."

The three hundred men "all of whom know one another, who choose their successors from their entourage" and who are alleged to control Europe and the world, are faced with the difficulty of presenting a disillusioned and sceptical world with an Eternal Peace for the second time within the life-span of the same generation. Their difficulties are not rendered less by the fact that the number of reliable "world"—politicians is strictly limited, so that some of the performers of the Paris drama of 1919 have to play the same parts over again, and the parts of dead brother-politicians as well.

If there is one thing more than another, which distinguishes the Old Faithfuls, it is an ardent admiration for the politico-military events of 1870-71.

This admiration embraces both the efforts of Bismarck and William Hohenzollern acting for the Rothschild-Bleichroeders as well as the good work done in Italy by Cavour on behalf of the same "Frankfort"-directed interests. The centralised Great-Germany of 1870, the first step towards that United States of Europe for which European Masonry has worked openly since 1919, must be kept United whatever else has to be "dismembered"!

The leading Whig-historian of England, Mr. Trevelyan, wrote an article, "If We Want to Keep the Peace Won," in "McClure's Magazine" in December, 1914 (sig-

nificant date), reprinted in New York on March 18, 1944. He said:—

"Germany also was united on a national basis, but there the healing process stopped . . . the war of 1870, though it did well in uniting Germany, did ill in putting a stop to any further liberationist movements on the national principle."

Mr. Trevelyan here expresses the same point of view as that of Jacob Schiff, of Frankfort-New-York, who had been asked to comment on the Third German Peace Note of 1918, and did so to the effect that if only the crust of autocracy was removed and "the German people would have the courage to establish a Republican form of Government" all would be well. This was, moreover, the official "line" at the Conference, and it was obediently toed by all the prominent political Masons assembled at Paris in 1919. The Socialists and Zionists, the shock-troops of world-Masonry, were among the staunchest upholders of the Unity of the New German Republic, whose Constitution was drafted by the Jewish lawyer, Hugo Preuss, and at the head of which had been placed a Socialist saddler by the name of Ebert. It is significant that the strongest opposition to General Foch's demand for the creation of an independent Rhineland Republic comprising the Rhemish-West-Phalican territory, the original home of the Vehm Secret Tribunals as well as of that Jew-backed German Heavy Industry which financed Hitler, should have come from the local "Labour" movement.

It is equally significant that British "Labour" having learnt nothing and, apparently,

forgotten everything, even today, as a quarter of a century ago, maintains an official policy of hands-off the Bismarckian Reich.

Thus prominent Anglo-Jewish Leftists like Mr. Gollancz (vide "Shall Our Children Live Or Die?"), Mr. Laski (cf. his declaration at Labour Party Conferences which he dominates), Mr. I. M. Sieff (vide "Planning" No. 182: "Hitler has succeeded in creating the basis of European Unity, etc."), and their Gentile collaborationists, such as Mr. H. N. Brailsford (vide his correspondence to "The Times"), the crypto-Socialist Lord Hinchingsbrooke (vide his speeches at "United States of Europe" meetings, London, 1944, where Mr. Massigli, the present French Ambassador, also spoke), and others are united in deploring the methods by which the Extended German Unity was brought about.

But they are equally united in applauding the RESULT, a result which it is hoped that "the Americans," assisted by ex-underground Jewish burgomasters and prison-superintendents, as in Cologne, will do their best to consolidate.

During the last phase of the world war there has appeared (contemporaneously with "American"-produced films extolling the Soviet Paradise and the "Idealism" of President Wilson) a spate of books dealing with the lessons to be learnt from the Second Versailles. The majority of Leftist writers are quick to acknowledge the debt of gratitude they think our generation ought to feel for General Smuts, who with Botha, another ex-Boer leader, appeared at Paris as Plenipotentiary of that South African Union of which he is generally considered the Grand Architect. Most of these works help to reinforce the impression conveyed by the head lines of the world press, from which the name of Smuts appears so often, that "Smuts is the wisest man in the world."

And many readers will have noticed that it has been etiquette during the second phase of the world war to have most Great Coming Events foreshadowed through the mouth of the Veteran War Hero of the Veld.

Thus Mr. Harold Nicolson, M.P., B.B.C., etc., whose "Peace-Making, 1919," was first published in 1933, and republished in 1943, found the General Smuts of 1919 "armed, gentle, and aware of present and future horizons beyond my ken." Another journalist-politician, Mr. A. Howden Smith, quotes in his arrogantly Pan-American book, "Mr. House of Texas," first published in 1943, Colonel House's remark that Smuts "was one of the few men in the Government who did not seem tired," and Mr. Smith himself is of the opinion that Smuts "had the best mind of the Britishers." There must be some reason for this widely diffused appreciation of our enigmatic Dutch-African statesman: Jan Christian Smuts is the son of Jacobus Abraham Smuts, a Calvinist Boer of the Veld. Mr. H. C. Armstrong writes in "Grey Steel: J. C. Smuts, A Study in Arrogance" (London, 1937), that:

Smuts "had a personal liking for the Jews; he liked them around him. They had the same background as his own people: the Dutch of the Veld and the Jews of the Desert. They had the same characteristics. Both were sour, bitter people . . . with their lives based on religion learned from the same book—the Old Testament."

Like Abraham Lincoln, and a host of other "saviours" and "founders" of centralised Federations, the architect of the Union of South Africa began his career as a lawyer. He was a student of law at Cape Town, and Cambridge, England, but unpopular, particularly in Cambridge, with his fellows, and as a practising lawyer he achieved little success.

Rhodes was, according to Mr. Armstrong, the object of Smuts' youthful hero-worship, and Rhodes we know was the "shop window" or "Gentile front" of Alfred Beit, the Berlin-born Jew through whom the London Rothschilds effected the amalgamation, first of the Kimberley diamond mines, and a decade or so later, of the gold mines of the Johannesburg sector.

Other members of the Rhodes-Beit group were Lionel Phillips, of London, Barney Barnato (alias Henry Isaacs of the East End of London), Sigmund Neumann (later known as Newman). "It is not too much to say," writes Mr. Paul H. Emden in "Jews of Britain" (London, 1944), "that Jews were responsible for the Johannesburg we know today." The Johannesburg "we know today" can boast a record number of gold-mining companies, Masonic lodges and Jewish synagogues.

There followed, in the middle of the nineties, the curious incident known as the Jameson Raid, the repercussions of which were to prove far-reaching: "There is not the least doubt that this rash affair at the turn of the year 1895 to 1896, however clumsy, was the first step towards the Union of South Africa" ("Jews of Britain," p. 425).

(To be continued.)

"CHALLENGE OF THE PEACE"

Hear—

MR. BRUCE H. BROWN

On

Thursday, September 6, 8 p.m.,

at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, "The Block," Melbourne

(Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1.)

vant to the taxation snoopers, rather than to the welfare of the sick person. The questionnaire certainly reflects the "police" mentality and the unhealthy cultural background of certain Labor fuhrers. A doctor's certificate of ill health is all that would be necessary for workers to get back some of what is taken from them through taxation.

TAXATION TRENDS: Pre-war Federal taxation (fair average) was £75,000,000. Post-war taxation is expected to be £300,000,000 or more. Interest payments to service debt will be over £85,000,000 per annum. It is a curious, yet undeniable fact that Governments of all Party hues must continue to be unpopular while they continue the debt and tax system. More borrowings mean more taxation, and this means more hostility. The only way to remove this hostility is to abandon the system. Now that the military conflict has ended, the time is ripe for an anti-tax campaign, especially as an election is not far away. Labor electorates react well to such a campaign.

ARBITRATION ANTICS: Federal Liberal Leader (Mr. T. M. Ritchie) recently criticised the Arbitration Court on the grounds that it disregarded the incidence of taxation, and basic wage earners, assessed on costs of living, received less than a living wage. He urged an alteration in the method of computing the basic wage. This chappie should be old enough to know that the mere method of computing the basic wage will not alter the workers' plight, since all wages, high or low, are reflected in prices. If wages are increased they will be offset by increased prices, and the real position will be "as you were." The Arbitration Court is powerless to correct this cycle. Mr. Ritchie should be able to understand that workers can only obtain a real benefit if and when the financial system provides each individual with a supplementary income, without it going through industry as a cost. Unless so-called Liberal Leaders and others realise this fact, their political future is not very bright. —O.B.H.

A NEW ZEALAND NOTE

From the "Social Creditor":

The Economic Reform Club (London), which we take to be a Freemasonic mechanism for obstructing Social Credit, has opened a branch in New Zealand, with Mr. John Hogan as secretary.

It may be a coincidence that an advertisement of this organisation appears opposite a notice and advertisement of that very curious concern, calling itself "The Rosicrucian Order" of San Jose, California, in Mr. Hogan's paper. If there is any body which avoids advertisement, it is the genuine Rosy Cross.

In the issue to which we refer, there is also a three-quarter-column advertisement of Selznick-International Pictures. Our understanding is that this concern is controlled by Warner Bros. The Communist "Daily Worker" (U.S.A.) boasted that Warner Bros. spent more money on advertising, "Mission to Moscow" than had previously been spent on publicity for any one film. It was stigmatised by the "New York Times" as "anti-British, anti-Congress, anti-democratic, and anti-truth."

A film entitled "Objective, Burma," for which apparently Messrs. Warner take responsibility was described by an American officer, Lieut. -Col. Taylor, in a letter to "Seac," the Service paper, as "a travesty of the truth." It suggested that the Americans freed Burma.

We are not concerned with Mr. Hogan's paper beyond repudiation of its implied claims to represent Social Credit views or policy.

THE DELIBERATE POLICY OF SCARCITY AND INFLATION

From the "Social Creditor":

It is quite obvious that the policy of this country in regard to the release of consumers' goods to the "victorious British" is being dictated by what for brevity may be called the Chatham House gang, without the smallest concern for the comfort and convenience of the natives beyond the point which will keep them reasonably fit to work and fight. The Scottish trawl fishermen have entered a vigorous protest against the gift to the Italians of motor trawlers, which are urgently needed in Scotland. What are we getting in return? It is absolute nonsense to say that Italy has nothing to export. She has an immense surplus of excellent wine, for one thing, and if put on the consumers' market at a price not more than double cost (instead of fifty times cost) it would bring down prices of wholesome drinks.

Our greatest economic risk to the individual at the present time is debasement of the currency. Every politician mouths the word "inflation," which is debasement of the currency for the benefit of the debasers, yet every Government department devotes such energies as it has to preventing at least the fall, and raising, if possible, of prices, by keeping goods off the market, so that its international friends may cash in on the inflation. The policy was all ready for use on the first day of the war and was initiated by a 60 per cent. rise in postal charges and an approximately equal rise in railway rates.

It, of course, represents a capital levy of the meanest and most fraudulent kind, without legislation, and everyone suffers except the money-forgers.

The following article, written by Major C. H. Douglas for the newspaper, "Social Credit," in 1935, and recently republished in the "Social Creditor" (May 19, 1945), is of special interest in view of the recent elections in Great Britain. Furthermore, the basic analysis and conclusions also apply to this country:—

During the past few years it has been suggested from various sources that the Social Credit Movement in general, and myself in particular, have not shown fanatical admiration for the Labour Party. It has been deduced from this, quite erroneously that the Social Credit Movement has not sufficient sympathy for those who are the more obvious sufferers under the present economic, financial, and social systems.

This confusion, which is quite understandable, arises from the assumption that the Labour Party is representative of its constituents, an assumption which I should myself deny, and which an increasing number of its constituents would also deny.

At a time when there is impending a General Election, which is bound to have tremendous consequences, an understanding of it as a political manoeuvre, so far as it can be imparted in the time available, is of paramount importance.

The coming Election is between something, which is called a National Government, and the titular Labour Party, since by common consent no other Party is likely to figure largely in the returns. I hope to show that there is no important difference between the true policy of the Labour Party and that of the National Government, and that they are both, in fact, correctly described as being Whig policies, which are primarily dictated by the Bank of England, the "City" and International Finance.

To place beyond doubt what may at first sight appear to be an unjustifiable statement, I have tabulated, quite broadly, the policy of both parties in regard to the main divisions of politics: Foreign Policy, Industrial Policy, Financial Policy, and Real Property Policy.

BANK OF ENGLAND:

Adviser: Mr. Montagu Norman (Old Etonian), Foreign Policy: Internationalist.

Bank of International Settlements, Basle. Industrial Policy:

"Rationalisation," i.e., vertical trusts, "Favourable Balance of Trade," i.e., more exports—capture foreign markets. Wage system (no work, no pay).

Financial Policy: International Financial Monopoly, i.e., "Orthodox."

Real Property Policy: Punitive taxation, leading to acquisition by banks and insurance companies, (Liberal Wing: "The Land for the People," i.e., bought on mortgage from financial institutions).

Over-riding Policy: The weakening of the individual, and the centralisation of power.

LABOUR PARTY:

Adviser: Dr. Hugh Dalton (Old Etonian), Foreign Policy:

Internationalist, League of Nations, Geneva.

Industrial Policy: "Nationalisation," i.e., vertical trusts, (Mr. Montagu Norman: "Nationalisation? We welcome it!")

Employment for all, i.e., more exports—capture foreign markets. "No dividends to parasitic classes," i.e., wage system (no work, no pay).

Financial Policy: Orthodox, i.e., International Financial Monopoly.

Real Property Policy: Confiscation in favour of a "nation" controlled by the Bank of International Settlements, via the League of Nations.

Over-riding Policy: Collectivism, subordination of the individual to the group.

* * * * *

There are, of course, minor variations in this very broad programme, and the vocabulary in which it is customarily described is, in many cases, so different that only a somewhat specialised knowledge of the subject will enable it to be seen that it is nothing but the vocabulary which varies and not the policy.

If, however, I am correct in my main contention that, as at present carried out, an Election will only be an Election of personnel and not an Election, which will decide policy, how does this state of affairs come about?

ABE LINCOLN FOUGHT FOR CENTRALISATION OF POWER

Said Civil War Was Not For Ending Slavery

The extract hereunder is from "And Yet I Like America," recently published by Gollancz, London. (A condensation of the book is featured in "World Digest," June, 1945.) The author, J. L. Hodson, wrote the book after travelling widely in the United States during the winter and spring of 1943-44. The extract is as follows:—

The Civil War is still a real topic. When Southerners come North, I'm assured that within an hour it's not uncommon for the Civil War to be discussed, and with some feeling.

By the way, Lincoln, who ended slavery [?], did not fight the Civil War with that as a chief purpose. He wrote in 1862:—

"My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save, or to destroy, slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

There is really very little doubt about it. Party, politics provides a career and a livelihood, and there is no career, and certainly no livelihood in politics outside Parties, at any rate at the present time. It is the business of Finance in particular, and "Big Business" in general to facilitate the advancement in a political career of those who can be relied upon to take advice in regard to policy. Or, to put the matter in the plainest possible way, Finance has its nominees in the key positions of every Party almost equally.

So far as the Labour Party is concerned, this is even easier than it is with the so-called Conservative or Liberal Parties, since the bribes which can be offered, not by any means necessarily or wholly of a monetary nature, form a greater contrast to what would otherwise be the normal life of the recipient.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, I do not think that it is primarily in the ranks of Labour Members, or their titular Leaders, that this influence is so effectively exerted. Permanent Party officials, "packed" Committees, and those who appoint them, "Research" Committees and other agencies which present the Labour M.P. or Cabinet Minister with the material on which he is practically bound to act, are much more effective channels of influence.

I do not wish to draw invidious distinctions between the denizens of the political underworld, and I have no doubt that, to the extent that it is necessary, exactly the same thing will be found in the same places in the Liberal and Conservative Parties.

But the hardly-concealed smirk of the Conservative press, both in this country and in Canada at the Canadian Federal Election results ought to be sufficient evidence that an overwhelming Liberal victory causes them no anxiety whatever.

The Labour Electorate, however, is potentially much more dangerous than the Whig Electorate, and it is therefore in the headquarters of the Labour Party that we

"MEDICAL POLITICS IN AUSTRALIA"

(Concluded from last issue)

This is the title of Memorandum No. 1 issued by the Medical Policy Association (N.S.W.) P.O., Box 7, Epping, N.S.W. The matter contained in this Memorandum is of sufficient importance and urgency to warrant reprinting in full:—

4. THE CHOICE OF A POLICY.

An adequate appreciation of the situation, which confronts doctors, should make it clear that to have any chance of success against the might of totalitarianism, their policy must be based on the fundamental realities. The only safe course is to specify directly the result required. This is FREEDOM FOR DOCTORS AS INDIVIDUALS.

It has already been stated that policy is concerned with results, not with methods. A statement of policy is a statement as to the results desired. In the light of the previous analysis, the policy of freedom for doctors as individuals can be stated in the form of certain objectives towards which concrete action may be taken, and such a statement, besides this positive aspect, forms a convenient framework against which to examine proposals put forward for modifications in the general organisation of the profession. **General Objective:** Freedom for Doctors as Individuals:

(a) To ensure receipt of income from different sources: to prevent control of income passing to any single authority.

(b) To confine a doctor's sphere to the direct doctor-patient relationship: to prevent the substitution of third-party (bureaucratic) authority for this relationship.

(c) To preserve personal responsibility of doctor to patient: to prevent the substitution of responsibility to officials and "higher authorities" for responsibility to patients.

5. CONCLUSION.

It is often said that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance and this means just what Colonel Spalding said: "Nothing is guaranteed except to an enlightened people, who are informed and who understand the significance of what is happening about them."

Why is this so? Freedom is not a birth-right of man. Freedom began as an abstract idea, and became real only as the result of constant struggle. Even yet, real freedom has been the privilege of only the few, and even such freedom as has been gained has time and time again been lost to tyrants struggling for power over the multitudes. Moreover, freedom is a Western concept; the idea is foreign to the East. Magna Charta and Habeas Corpus, whose suspension "for the duration" has placed us at the mercy of the bureaucrat, were fought for, and could disappear tomorrow more easily than one is inclined to suppose.

Now, whether one thinks that opposition to freedom is a blind force, or a conscious force, it is the evidence of our eyes that freedom is ever threatened. At the very least we must recognise that actions in the last resort are the actions of individuals. "Power corrupts," said the wise Lord Acton, "and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

It simply is not safe to put great power in the hands of individuals. Now, this is exactly what centralising policies do.

should logically expect to find the most astute and unscrupulous nominee of Finance, just as I feel sure that, if there were a Social Credit Party in this country, long before it became a formidable menace, its organisation would contain in most of its key-positions a set of rogues who would make the best exhibits of Smith Square, Abingdon Street, and Palace Chambers, look like respectable citizens. There is plenty of promising material about at the present time.

I believe, then, that the British people, in particular, without delay, must assert their sovereignty, and, to put the matter in its most concrete form, I think that they have AT ALL COSTS TO BREAK THE IDEA AND THE FACT THAT THEY ARE ASKING TO BE RULED FOR FIVE YEARS IN THE WAY THAT THEY HAVE BEEN RULED IN THE PAST, AND ON THE CONTRARY, TO ASSERT THEIR DETERMINATION TO RULE THOSE INFLUENCES WHICH HAVE, IN THE PAST, RULED THEM.

THIS MEANS THAT THEIR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT MUST BE ELECTED ON THE CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WILL DISREGARD THE PARTY WHIPS AT ANY TIME OR ALL THE TIME IN FAVOUR OF THE INSTRUCTIONS OF THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

I feel sure that it will be suggested that this point of view is the product of a diseased imagination, and that what is required is a little sweetness and light. "Honi soit qui mal y pense."

Everyone is entitled to his own opinion. My own, put forward with, I trust, becoming and customary diffidence, is that the world in general, and the Anglo-Saxon Race in particular, is faced with a fight to a finish against something which may be symbolically described as the "Devil Incarnate, The Father of Lies."

However you please to describe it, I believe that this Force is implacably hostile to the best interests of the human race, and that there is no crooked and slimy trick too despicable, no crime too black for it to commit, to further its ends. I think that it has made an exhaustive study of human frailty and perverted ambition, and makes every possible use of them. To me it seems about as reasonable to expect a six-foot cobra to nurse the baby and wait at table, as to suppose that this Agency will listen to anything but the irresistible logic of force.

INTEREST-FREE ENTERPRISE CAUSES CONCERN!

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—A writer, calling himself "Meteor," in the English "Electrical Times" of June 7, 1945, has some interesting things to say about the financing of the great Shipshaw hydro-electric power development on the Laguenay River, Quebec Province, Canada, a war-emergency enterprise, with an ultimate development of 1,200,060 horse power, for the production of the vast quantities of aluminium needed for the manufacture of military aircraft.

Amongst other things, this is what "Meteor" says:

"... The United States, through subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, advanced about 68 million dollars, interest-free, taking repayment in aluminium... What will be the future, in particular the peacetime, role of Shipshaw is an interesting speculation. This great plant, built with interest-free capital, is in a position to continue production of aluminium at a price with which other aluminium producers, financed by normal methods, will presumably find it hard to compete. The repercussions will extend not only north and south of latitude 49 north, but throughout the world. An international agreement to secure stability in the aluminium production industry seems indicated."

What is the implication of "Meteor's" last sentence? Does it suggest that this great plant, unencumbered by interest payments, is to be artificially shackled in some way, by international agreement, so as to prevent competition with the debt-ridden remainder of the industry, and thus prevent the benefits being passed on to the consumer?

—Yours, etc., C. H. CHRISTOPHER, Yallourn.

NEW APPOINTMENT IN ALBERTA

That Mr. L. D. Byrne has been appointed Deputy Minister of Economic Development in the Alberta Government will interest our readers the world over but to those who know the inner story of Social Credit, Mr. Byrne's eminence already stands so firmly that no title, or the absence of it, will affect their appreciation of him as an historic character. But his new appointment, while probably not greatly affecting his essential activities, puts him in a position to deal more directly with the stream of attack directed against him by the Socialists and others.

—"The Social Creditor," 23/6/45.

As our regular readers are aware, Mr. L. D. Byrne was previously Technical Adviser to the Government of Alberta.

A VERY REMARKABLE AND SIGNIFICANT FACT

One of the many curious features of these very curious times is the emergence, just before the outbreak of hostilities, of a gaggle of lavishly illustrated periodicals, all vulgar in tone, all crypto-Communist, and all apparently regardless of either monetary or newsprint restrictions. In several cases they appeared to be well supplied with inside information, always presented with a "we are the champions of the mob" outlook.

If it be recalled that practically every reputable publication purporting to cater to British culture, whether in journalistic or book form, has been curtailed in size, and obstructed in its circulation, and that very large sums are required to produce a picture magazine, the matter seems to demand investigation.

Mr. Beverley Baxter, writing in a Canadian magazine of wide circulation comments on the steady stream of subversive books proceeding from one Jewish publisher alone, and considers that they have inflicted serious damage on right-wing prospects.

—"The Social Creditor" (Eng.), 16/6/45.

WAR-BEREAVED MOTHER'S PLEA

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—May I suggest that Mr. Bruce Brown's "Suggestion to Servicemen" [last week's issue] is not sufficiently comprehensive? As a war-bereaved mother I find it hard to understand why pensions to widows are taken as an accepted fact, whilst parents are denied all compensation until they reach the stage of penury, no matter what the deceased son has been contributing to the home. We are being taxed to subsidise others against loss and to provide endowment payments, which were not available to us whilst we were educating our children in Depression times, yet our need of compensation is overlooked. Unlike many war widows, parents are no longer young, their stamina is further undermined by shock and strain, and the association and assistance which were voluntarily forthcoming whilst their children were alive is now summarily cut off and all appeals to our Government meet with stony refusals. That this is not the will of those who have benefited from our sacrifice I am certain, and, therefore, ask that this be made plain in any leaflet you may issue. In such case, I will undertake to distribute one thousand, and will pay £1 toward the cost.

—Yours, etc., VIOLET HANCOCKS, Kew.

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: —

PARTY POWER AND PRIVILEGE.

And now, while we are on the plane, headed south out of Siberia and down into the country of the Tartars and the Mongols, whose nomadic emperors Tamerlane and Genghis Khan once ruled nearly all Asia and threatened Europe, let us consider this Communist Party whose rule here is no less absolute.

In 1917 when it seized power from the collapsing Romanoff dynasty, the Bolshevik Party was a handful of Marxist theoreticians. Russians only fleetingly enjoyed freedom and the Party then assumed the autocracy handed down from Genghis Khan. The heritage of this party is in almost equal parts of Marx and of Genghis Khan.

The small hereditary ruling class from whom the Bolsheviks seized power had done little to justify their privileges. At the time of the Revolution, Russia was not ready for liberal democracy.

The greatest indictment, which can be brought against Stalin, is that, because of his iron rule which suppresses freedom of opinion, Russia is still less ready today, in spite of his paper constitutions.

In America, anyone can be a Republican. But becoming a member of the Communist Party is extremely difficult. The aspirant is watched carefully for a year. Everything about him is investigated—from his work habits and political opinions to his sex life. Once the coveted membership is gained, the man is less closely watched, but any slackening in zeal, any deviation from the Party's political line, or any signs of "personal ambition" are punished with expulsion. These admissions and expulsions are controlled by the Party's secretary, and in the early days this was put in the charge of a comparatively obscure Bolshevik, Joseph Stalin. Only after Lenin's death did the more prominent Communists like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin and Trotsky come to realise that the man who controls the Party's membership controls not only the Party, but all Russia.

The High Party members, who now wield the power of the Romanoffs, have moved into both the palaces and the privileges of the old aristocracy, and are drinking quite as much champagne.

The Communist Party had about five million members until Stalin's purges beginning in 1936 reduced it by about half. After the war began the base was broadened and membership raised to some four and a half million.

One of the Party's functions is to provide the Kremlin with accurate reports on the state of Russian Public opinion. In the field of foreign affairs, the people have no facts other than those provided by the government-controlled press, which is, of course, only what their government wants them to know. Lacking any independent basis for judgment, they must accept allies and peace treaties as these are handed out from the Kremlin. But in domestic matters the people have definite ideas as to what they like and do not like. The Party is sometimes unable to check a trend in public opinion. If it is a real ground swell they do not fight it, but divert it into "proper" channels.

They remember 1917, when they themselves rode into power on the crest of a tidal wave of unrest, which the old autocracy failed to recognise in time, and was too stupid to handle. They expect similar unrest after this war, and are sure they will be quick enough to canalise it before it gets out of hand.

On one side of the picture this is a slave Empire. On the other side it is a vigorous, dynamic empire—moving on.

COMMUNIST "SOCIAL ENGINEERING."

We fly south across the huge arid Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan. Below are bleak co-operative farms, to which were sent, in 1939 and 1940, hundreds of thousands of middle-class families from the Baltic States and Poland's eastern provinces at about the time Russia annexed their homelands. In order to understand why these regions voted by majorities as high as nine to one for union with the Soviet Government after they were occupied by the Red Army, it is necessary to understand the meaning of the term "social engineering," as first coined and later practised by the Communist Party.

A FOOD-FRONT MYSTERY

From the English "Social Crediter" of June 16, 1945:

This food business gets curiously and curiously. Canada alone is supplying us with 87½ lbs. of meat per family this year; we have huge contracts with the Argentine; the Danes (vide "The Times," May 19), are ready and partly able to feed Europe; with the possible exception of Holland, the general testimony is that there was little shortage except in the British home until we "liberated" the Continent. Norway had little or no war. Yet we are apparently pouring thousands of tons of food into Norway weekly. Can it be that someone wants this country to complete its ruin, as in 1919?

in it. He does not need to be told that, if he does step behind the screen, this fact will be remembered. Few changes are made!

The assembly made up of delegates so elected meets a few days later. In occupied Poland such assemblies passed standardised resolutions taking over the authority of the old government, requesting admission to the Soviet Union, confiscating large estates, and praising "our great leader, Stalin."

In addition to the 180,000 Polish war prisoners, an estimated million and a half civilians were removed from Poland in the early part of 1940, as a part of the "social engineering" programme. These people were moved in "transports." A Soviet transport is an ordinary boxcar, with two small, high, barred windows, a stove, and a hole chopped in the floor for a toilet. Between thirty and forty deportees are locked in each car.

Most deportation round-ups were conducted by the N.K.V.D. late at night, when the population is most docile. It is also an axiom of "social engineering" to separate families, not as an act of needless cruelty (!) but because men are suited for stronger, more rugged work than are their wives and daughters.

It was the practice to send men to lumber and mining camps in northern Siberia, women and children to brickyards and co-operative farms in southern Kazakhstan.

There was much unavoidable (!) confusion. Although the cars were supposed to be opened daily, sometimes, through neglect, they stood for days on sidings, and when they finally opened it was nearly always necessary to remove a number of bodies of those who had died from general weakness induced by thirst or cold. But none of this was deliberate (!) and in such large mass population movements, oversights are inevitable.

It should be said in defence of the Soviet Government that under similar circumstances it has treated its own people exactly as it did the Poles (!)

(To be concluded.)

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

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

One of the principal brains behind the Nazi Luftwaffe was the Jew, von Milch. Professor Haushofer, the German geopolitician who had such a tremendous influence on Hitler's policies, had a Jewish wife. She was a close friend of Hitler.

Then there was Admiral Canaris (real name, Moses Meyerbeer), said to have been one of the most influential men during the Hitler regime. "The Times" (London), in an article published on June 4, 1942, stated that Heydrich the Jew-baiter worked in close connection with Canaris.

In the "Christian Free Press," February 1940, the following appeared:

"'News Review' (1/2/40) gives details of some of Hitler's organisers who keep modestly in the background, yet 'serve their masters more efficiently than most of his loud-mouthed paladins.' One of them Helmut Wohltat, chief of the Economic High Command, 'has many Jewish friends' and 'some Nazis wonder how he stays put.' Several others are described. The official we would like to know something about, however, is one Herr Meissner, who keeps very much in the background."

The following month the "Christian Free Press" printed the following:

"Referring to our request last month for information about Dr. Meissner, we notice that the 'Sunday Times' reported him as being present at Summer Welles' interview with Hitler. He was described as Secretary of State. Holding a position like that, it is strange that more is not heard of him."

Yes, and it is strange that more has not been heard of what Summer Welles discussed with Adolf Hitler when he visited him on that occasion early in World War II. That was during the period when, as Dr. Dalton admitted in the British House of Commons, considerable exports from U.S.A. were going to Germany via Soviet Russia. Of course, the Soviet was helping Hitler directly, too, and the oil she was supplying was handled by two Russian Jews!

Anyone who doubts whether the "anti-Semitism" of Hitler and Co. was sponsored by Jewish international finance need only examine a copy of "World Service," the propaganda bulletin issued by Colonel Fleischauer. Most of the material used in it merely fostered an unreasoning hatred of the Jews in general, while supplying further material for those who seek to ridicule the suggestion that there is a "Jewish Problem." On copies of "World Service" will be found marginal notes concerning the banks through which payment for this journal had to be made. All these banks were directly or indirectly controlled by German-Jews! Some of the Jewish apologists should try to explain this remarkable fact.

They might also endeavour to explain why Hitler, the "anti-Semite," had so little trouble in obtaining all the raw material needed for his war machine—materials such as nickel, which is controlled by international Jews.

The fact is, of course, as Thyssen says in his book, that powerful international Jewish firms helped Hitler. Hitler himself said (vide "Hitler Speaks") that the Jews helped him.

In his book, "Lessons of My Life," Lord Vansittart, head of the British Foreign Office for many years, wrote rather bitterly:

"We and several other countries were in it too [financing Germany]; but the United States were by far the major sinners, and alone provided over 50 per cent of the loans...Some of the first were made to

to the big German armament firms. . . . Wall Street and the City kept fattening her for the slaughter of others."

Here again, the friends of the Wall Street Jews might try to explain this, and why these German-American Jews are not being tried for mass murder along with other war criminals.

Certain aspects of the German "persecutions" would also be hard to explain away. Let us, to take one example, look briefly at the "extermination" of the Hungarian Jews.

Nearly all the world's newspapers conveniently forgot to tell us that Imredy had been driven from the Prime Ministership of Hungary in 1938 because of a strong Jewish strain in his ancestry. And yet, Hitler made Imredy a Governor when he took over that country!

The German High Command and the Gestapo apparently made a very careful selection of the Jews to be exterminated—as witness the following news item, published in June 1944:

"Thirty-two members of wealthy business families in Hungary, mainly Jewish industrialists, have arrived in Lisbon this week, travelling in German civil aircraft, and hope to go to America. A huge financial and material deal with German interests made it possible for them to leave Hungary."

"Among those who have arrived are Choren and Weiss, reputed to be the richest men in Hungary, who have a virtual monopoly of the country's heavy steel and munitions industries. They were arrested on March 19 and taken to Vienna, but after intercession by the Hungarian Government they were released and returned to Budapest. There, without the knowledge of the Hungarian Government, they made an important deal with a German financial group, and were consequently permitted to leave Hungary with their families—but each family has had to leave a hostage behind to guarantee their discretion abroad."

"A special train took them from Hungary to Stuttgart, where three special aeroplanes awaited them. They were allowed to bring out cash, jewels and gold, which have been deposited with the Portuguese Customs authorities. The first group arrived here on Sunday and the last group yesterday."

—"Liverpool Evening Standard" (England), June 29, 1944.

Examples such as the above could be multiplied indefinitely.

The fact must be faced that Hitler brought about one of the biggest dispersions yet seen in Jewish history. His conditioned "refugees" are with us, and we must examine their actions. The argument that because they were "refugees from Hitler" they are automatically democrats, understanding and upholding our British way of life, is utter nonsense. Even a leading Jewish apologist (Dark) has said:

"The mentality and the average culture of these German immigrants will be vastly

POLITICAL POINTERS

(Continued from page 1)

ist" Melbourne "Argus," gives the impression of being a typical "progressive thinker". He usually manages to work in a very clever undercurrent of collectivist propaganda in his notes. A typical example appears in his material of August 25, when, after commenting on the issues discussed at the recent Premiers' Conference, he said: "Ah, well! This sort of thing is inevitable when you try to adapt a horse-and-buggy constitution to an aeroplane age." The inference is obvious.

It would be an excellent idea if some of the Liberal Party supporters started to make inquiries regarding these "capitalist" papers, which allegedly support their "anti-socialist" policy. But perhaps the Liberals are not as "anti-socialist" as they thought they were! Their recent electoral defeats appear to have inspired the idea that, if they don't go half way to Moscow, the "opposition" will go the whole way.

Although no Jews were elected as Conservatives or Liberals at the recent British elections, their success under the Labor Party banner was striking. Twenty-six were elected, of which five are Ministers. One of the newly elected Jews is Chairman of the British Zionist Movement, and will no doubt be attempting to have the Labor Party bring about unrestricted Jewish immigration to Palestine. His twenty-five Jewish colleagues will lend a hand.

It was suggested in these notes last week, that it would be excellent strategy for one of the State Governments to challenge Canberra on financial policy and to proclaim bluntly that it intended to assume authority for the issue of financial credit for the purpose of permitting its citizens to utilise their own resources. The writer suggests that it is far from clear that such a policy could be proclaimed unconstitutional. It has been assumed that the powers allocated to the Federal Government, regarding money, preclude the State Governments from issuing financial credit; but the Constitution also states that State Governments have full power over "State Banking." A recent editorial in the Sydney "Times" argued that the Constitution permitted the States to issue financial credit through the State Banks.

The onus should be placed on the Federal Government to prove that State Governments cannot issue financial credit. The results would be interesting.

—E. D. B.

THESE VESTED INTERESTS!

With the enthusiasm of Fido barking for a biscuit, Mr. Herbert Morrison celebrated his return to Opposition [before the British election] by accusing the Government of "pandering to vested interests." Not, of course, to the £60,000,000 Labour Cartel which is the basis of Mr. Morrison's not inconsiderable emoluments.

—The "Social Crediter."

ROSENBERG

Alfred Rosenberg, "high priest of Nazism," is said to have been arrested at Flensburg. Benjamin Rosenberg, a Berlin-born Polish subject, escaped from a military escort at Fleetwood last week. It is understood that he was not on his way to an investiture at Buckingham Palace, but to internment in the Isle of Man (for the present). —"The Social Crediter," 26/5/45.

different from that of immigrants from eastern Europe. I have noted that the German Jews are far more German than Polish Jews are Polish. They are the heirs of German culture, in the creation of which they played a great part, and however bitter they may be against the present [Nazi] German Government, and however properly resentful of the treatment to which they have been subjected, they will carry out all the definite and distinctive qualities of German Judaism. . . .

—"The Jew Today."

No doubt the German-Jewish refugee, who, at Canberra early in 1944, publicly deplored the White Australia policy, was giving us a taste of the "distinctive qualities of German Judaism."

The use of Hitler to disperse the agents of German-Jewish kultur all over the world, where, under cover of war, they achieved positions (particularly in British countries) from which they can now work for their leaders' objectives, is exactly the sort of thing the "Protocols" advocate. The "Jewish leader" who told the writer, Sisley Huddleston, "When Hitler comes to power I hope he will persecute the Jews — we thrive on persecution," knew all about the "Protocol" policy. (See "In My Time," by Sisley Huddleston.)

(To be continued.)

[Editor's Note: The foregoing concludes the commentary on the eleventh of the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion." In view of changed circumstances brought about by the sudden end of military hostilities, only those portions of Mr. Butler's material on the "Protocols" which are thought to be particularly relevant to the current situation will be published in these columns from now on. As soon as this material is completed in the "New Times," the entire work will be published in book form.]