

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. 41. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19, 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.

Modern Machinery versus Full Employment

Work-Complex Aids Wage-Slavery

By JAMES GUTHRIE, B.Sc.

Now that the strike on the wharves in Hobart is over we might be able to remove some of the heat from the discussion, and let in a little more light.

The strike was alleged to be caused by the introduction of fork trucks on to the wharves, with consequent reduction of men needed to load and unload ships. The use of the fork trucks made the work of the wharfies much easier, but some of the men were worried about losing their jobs, and they referred back to the unemployment in the depression times.

Now, to me, it seems essential, if we are going to escape all the old troubles of the past, that we get rid of the large amount of clap-trap that masquerades as political thought—especially among those people who call themselves progressive.

If it is true, and I think it is true, that machinery does away with the need for labour, or what is called "full employment," then, of course, one can understand the feeling of resentment towards the introduction of machinery, especially by men who want full employment. And this fear of machinery goes back for many years.

One is reminded of that oft-repeated story of two unemployed labourers watching a steam shovel at work. Says one labourer to the other: "There would be 50 of us working here with pick and shovel, if it weren't for that mechanical shovel." And his mate replies: "Yes, Bill, and if it weren't for picks and shovels there would be a thousand of us working here with teaspoons."

Now, it is quite obvious today that whether it be on the wharves or in the coal mines, the wharves or the coal mines are not looked upon as places where ships are loaded and unloaded, or when coal is supplied to the people, but as places where men in certain unions are given the privilege of punching a clock and drawing a pay envelope.

(The unions themselves are no longer trade unions, but political organisations used by a minority of men to disrupt society. That the majority of trade unionists bitterly resent the disruptive and dishonest tac-

tics of the Communist leaders is becoming increasingly evident, and a show-down is long overdue.)

As long as the avowed object of the Socialist, the Communist and the Labor Party is to prevent any person from receiving an income, or we may call it a right to live, unless he or she gets permission to punch a clock, then, since all new machinery must reduce the number of clock-punchers, it naturally follows that the proper way to provide clocks for everybody to punch is to shovel earth with teaspoons and to do away with all machinery. That WOULD give full employment.

The destruction of ships and wharves and houses by bombs has supplied England and Europe with full employment for quite a long time; that was the Big Idea behind the war. America has not had her factories and cities destroyed by bombs, nor have her industries been dislocated as have those of England; she is ready for peace production; she is ready to pour out goods from her mass production factories on a large scale—motor cars, radio sets, refrigerators, electric washing machines, etc., etc. And accordingly, the American Government is horrified because, American industry being so mechanised, America can produce very much more than the American people can buy. Machines will have to stop, and much clock punching will have to stop, and millions of unemployed are expected in America.

There are several very important questions to be asked here: First, if machines can do the work more easily than men, why

should men want to do the work? Also, if with the aid of machines we can produce a surplus of goods, why should those who are not permitted to punch a clock have no claim to these goods?

On the wharves, in the coalmines and in Government offices a vast amount of useless labour is involved; men are busily creating useless work for men. And the Government planners are busy, not with building houses, but with vast new schemes for spending the taxpayers' money.

It appears that the people who run this world have a very definite policy, and that policy is as follows: Everybody is to be made to work whether the work is required or not. Work is to be provided for everybody, on condition that as little as possible of the production goes into the homes of the people.

War, of course, is the easiest way of doing this. Most of the factories' produce is shells and guns, etc., etc., which are given to the enemy—free, gratis and for nothing. After the war is over it is found that the enemy cannot possibly "pay" for these shells and guns. But in peacetime there are no enemies to GIVE surpluses away to, and as we never have sufficient money to buy the huge production of the factories, the factories have to slow down. The Australian surplus production can be given to the enemy for nothing, but it cannot be given to the Australians for nothing!

In peacetime a price must be attached to everything, and if that price is not paid the production has to be destroyed. In other words, the whole of our civilisation depends on figures in books, and the whole of Europe can be stirred into unrest and revolt and war by a few key men who wangle the figures in the national books. The names of these men are well known, but, of course, none of them figure as war criminals.

It is quite obvious that as the use of machinery makes production easier the distributing of that production grows more difficult, as the purchasing power of the people simply cannot cope with the prices. In wartime, owing to the lack of consumer goods for sale, the Government used every possible device to remove money

from the people to prevent over-bidding for goods—it follows, therefore, in peacetime, when there are more goods than money, the process will have to be reversed and money pumped into circulation.

After the last depression banks created extra money, or credit, and lent it to Governments for public works, and this money, when it came into circulation, was used to buy consumer goods, such as food and clothes. The objection to this process was that although it was created out of nothing, the money came to us, as a debt. That debt can be seen today in the debt on our houses, in the municipal debt, the State debt and the Federal debt.

When a man is in debt he must limit his consumption; he cannot pay for the goods he so easily produces. The hire-purchase system is an attempt to sell this year's production for next year's pay—but it cannot do the job. If the people collectively go further into debt each year, it can only mean one thing: that the prices of the goods and services produced are greater than the money issued to the people in wages and salaries and dividends, to buy those goods.

And as the dividends paid in Australia only amount to £30 million a year, and wages and salaries amount to about £600 million, it is obvious that the Socialist and Communist claim that dividends upset prices is, like the rest of their stupid jargon, without any basis in fact.

The difference between the money the people have in their pockets and the potential production of this country is so enormous that £30 million paid in dividends, or what is left of £30 million after taxes have been taken from it, is so small that it hardly enters into the picture. Or, to put it another way, £30 million a year distributed to the people of Australia would not liquidate our national debt in 100 years. Something different to what the Socialist has to give is required. The answer to social debt is social credit; the people as individuals will have to be credited with a sum of money each year sufficient for them to buy the surplus produced by the machines. This is merely a book entry, but a very vital one.

Significant Political Pointers

During the recent Budget "Debate" at Canberra, Labor Member Barnard said: "... the fact remains that we are looking for a new world order now that the war is over. Such an order cannot be achieved unless there is fairly high taxation." To which an "Opposition" Member, Mr. Ryan, said, "That is what I was asking for." (Vide Federal "Hansard," September 19.)

It would be an excellent idea if Federal Members ceased maintaining the pretence that there is some vital difference in their financial policies and ascertained what their employers are asking for. There is no evidence to suggest that the majority of electors are asking for "fairly high taxation," although, unless shown how to frame their own policies, there is every possibility that they will vote for heavy taxation at the next elections.

* * * * *

"The Constitution, as originally framed, contemplated that the Federal authority should be the spender of only a limited amount of money. If any member would like to acquaint himself with the position as designed by the framers of the Constitution, let him read Section 87. He will find that originally the Commonwealth was entitled to use for its own purposes only one quarter of the revenue collected for Excise and Customs. The other three-quarters had to be divided among the States. In respect of the quarter that was allowed for all Commonwealth expenditure, if there were any surplus—if the expenditure did not use up the whole of the revenue—the surplus had to go back to the States. . . . "The last evasion (by the Commonwealth)

was one of the greatest importance, especially to our State. That was the entry by the Commonwealth into the field of direct taxation, thus cutting from under the feet of the States their principal large source of revenue. It is true that when, during World War No. 1, the Commonwealth Parliament for the first time imposed taxation on income, it was alleged that it was merely a war measure, and that when the war had finished there would be no more attempt on the part of the Commonwealth to enter that field. . . . But the statement that it would be abandoned was falsified by the conduct of the Commonwealth. . . . But despite all this creeping usurpation, what has placed the States and the Parliaments of the States in their present humiliating position is their consent to allow their Parliaments to be degraded. . . ."

—Hon. N. Keenan, in West Australian Parliament, August 4.
Victorian electors should elect at the coming State election a Parliament comprised of Members who will ensure that their State Parliament is not further degraded.

* * * * *

There is little doubt that the "Jewish Question" is becoming one of increasing importance in international politics. The demand of the Zionists that an increased number of Jews be allowed into Palestine, if acceded to by the British Government, will certainly provoke serious trouble with the Arabs and the entire Moslem world. President Truman's impudent suggestion to the British Government that the demands of the Zionists should be met, is indicative of the tremendous pressure being exerted by the Jews. It was most significant to note that the British counter to Truman's proposal, that America accept joint responsibility with Britain for the Palestine mandate, was hastily rejected in America. It is obvious that the main strategy is to force Britain to accept all responsibility, British troops, no doubt, being used to help the Jews against the Arabs should hostili-

(Continued on page 3)

NOTES on the NEWS

The recent conference of the Federated (blessed word?) Association of Australian Housewives is reported to have seriously considered "COMPILING every girl between 15 and 16 to attend a home management class." It seems as if they have fallen for Hitler's ideas in a big way.

It is really extraordinary the number of people who seem to have forgotten that the democratic way of life involves inducement—not compulsion. Maybe it's the war period that has so warped the mind and clouded the vision. Let us hope that this dangerous mental disease is quickly exterminated before it destroys the very basis of a free society.

RUSSIAN RUSES: Although the Kremlin announced some time ago that there would be complete freedom for the press to report events in Soviet-dominated parts of Europe, so far there has been a signal failure to carry out this undertaking. So much for mere words. For the most part reporters have to become what is called string-men, obtaining their news from local newspapers or organisations in the form of handouts from the official agency. It is plain that in these circumstances such "news" would be "properly" coloured. In this connection, the "Age" of October 2 says: "The experience of some of these string-men has not been happy. Cases are known in Bulgaria where first-rate correspondents sending objective reports of events in that troubled land have suddenly disappeared. One day they leave home, and their family never see them again."

SYNOD SCENES: Archbishop Booth left no doubt about his sympathy for the totalitarian way of life, when, at the October Anglican Diocesan Synod, he pleaded for a continuance of wartime controls. He also uttered familiar Communist platitudes about common ownership and other socialistic abstractions. One bright spot in this conference came from Bishop Cranwick, of Tasmania, who notified Synod that, because of the housing shortage, he is making arrangements to share his "Bishopscourt" with a young married couple that he would make the necessary alterations at his own expense, and he would not charge rent. It is worth noting that no other clergymen offered to follow this practical Christian example. Here is an illustration of the difference between words and actions.

POLICE PRESSURE: A timely warning is sounded by Lord Cooper, President of the Edinburgh High Court, on the practice of the police producing "voluntary statements." He refused to accept one such statement submitted by the

police and said: "I view with growing uneasiness the frequency with which alleged voluntary statements are said to have been made by persons charged with grave crimes." A very vital principle is involved in this. The same practice is followed here—frequently accompanied by allegations of duress, and often physical violence, inflicted by the police. It is nearly always a feature of Fascist Russia's court procedure. Lord Cooper has performed a great service in drawing attention to this aspect of "justice," and it is to be hoped that our judges will in (Continued on page 2.)

Broadcast Banned in New Zealand

On September 24 the following Notice of Question was given in the N.Z. House of Representatives by Mr. R. M. Algie (Remuera):—

Has the attention of the Minister of Broadcasting been directed to a statement which appeared in "Democracy" on the 19th of September 1945, and which makes the following allegation:

"Mr. John Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., of Melbourne, who has broadcast over independent stations in Australia on behalf of the Australian People's Movement, was invited by the Crusade for Social Justice to give their usual Sunday talk on August 8th, while he was visiting this country. He submitted the following script (published in "Democracy," 19/9/45) to the authorities. It was returned as totally unacceptable."

Is that statement substantially correct? If so, then upon what principle are the people denied the opportunity of hearing over the air expressions of opinion that can be safely uttered through the newspapers or from the public platforms of the Dominion?

Industrial Conscription in Great Britain

In the British House of Commons on May 2, 1945, Sir L. Boyce asked the Minister of Labour, "How many persons have been convicted for absenteeism under the Essential Work Order, and how many have been sent to prison under that Order?"

Mr. Bevin: "Up to March 31, 1945, 18,436 persons were convicted in England and Wales for absents themselves from work or for being persistently late in presenting themselves for work without reasonable excuse, and of these 1323 were sentenced to imprisonment."

IDENTIFYING THE PROMOTERS OF WAR

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

Sir, —Although M. Francois Coty quoted Walter Rathenau as saying that the world is governed by less than 400 men, everyone of whom knows all the others, I prefer to consider the question on the slightly broader basis suggested by C. H. Douglas. In "Programme for the Third World War" he puts it this way: —

"I suggest that about two thousand millions of individuals are affected by the present war. I should place the number of individuals who would be quite unable to say with approximate accuracy what it is about at, roughly, nineteen hundred and ninety-nine millions, so that we are left with this simple alternative. Either the total population of the world likes war without knowing what it is about . . . or, on the other hand, we can find the causes of war if we examine the actions of a minority hidden among less than a million individuals. . . . It wouldn't really matter much what this minority did or thought if they were not in control of mechanisms which enabled them to force the other nineteen hundred and ninety-nine millions to take part in a war they didn't understand and didn't want. If I am not wrong in this . . . you can prevent war amongst the nineteen hundred and ninety-nine millions if you destroy the power of the small minority over them."

That statement of the position seems to me to be right, and it helps me to understand why repeated attempts were made during the war to prevent me from publicly criticising the financial system (the "mechanism") or referring to the leaders of World Jewry (the "minority")?

Evidence now being accumulated points increasingly to these as the two main switches, and in the past it has proved dangerous to touch them. To the honest student there is no longer any doubt that the financial system is the mechanism by which the many millions of war-hating citizens are put into a condition of conflict by the minority hidden amongst less than a million individuals."

There is not the same extent of agreement as to the identity of the hidden minority, but the need for establishing that identity has never been greater in the whole period of the history of man. To me it seems a fair proposition to say that if we can identify the controllers of the financial system in the international sphere we can identify the promoters of war.

A statement is not necessarily a fact, but it should be comparatively easy to check the accuracy of any statement put forward as a fact. "I believe that I am stating an ascertained and incontestable fact," says C. H. Douglas, "when I say that Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, beyond any other great powers, have been at all significant times dictated to in matters of policy by Jews, and predominantly by German Jews We know beyond peradventure that during the period in which it was most obvious, the period of Bismarck and Wilhelm II, it was moulded and organised by such men as Rathenau, Ballin, Bleichroeder, and others, all Jews. It should be observed that there was during this period a facade of violent anti-Judaism in Germany of about the same effective value as that professed by the National Socialist Administration. Practically covering the whole of this period, the German-Jew Sir Ernest Cassel, was probably the most powerful single individual in Great Britain, and his opposite number and correspondent, Jacob Schiff, the patron of Presidents in America."

Sir Ernest Cassel financed the establishment of the London School of Economics, and Jacob Schiff financed wars and revolutions. Readers of this paper are already aware that Jacob Schiff has been succeeded in influence by his brother Jew, Bernard Baruch.

At this point it should also be recalled that the chief financial advisers at the Peace Conference in 1919, representing both victors and vanquished, were all cousins, all Jews, and all connected with one German-

Jewish bank in New York, of which Jacob Schiff was the head! These are facts or they are not facts, and they will not be altered by opinions about them.

Writing early in 1943, Major Douglas said that if the Germans were to be credited with elementary intelligence they must see that nothing could ensure the safety of the Jews so effectively in a European War as a ferocious display of anti-Semitism. It immediately establishes the "persecuted" as non-combatants; it provides a mass of "refugees," many of whom are perfect spies and propagandists; and it puts them in the well-known position of backing every horse in the race. . . . "I am convinced," he said, "that the Jewish High Command desires the ultimate victory of Germany, and will fight tooth-and-nail, not to end the war, but to see that Germany is not defeated in the Peace. That alone is a sufficient reason for the complete defeat of Germany."

In the light of these prophetic words, may I invite particular attention to the significance of the following extract from a report in the Melbourne "Argus" of 13/10/45, viz:—

"Evidence is accumulating that while America continues to talk a 'hard peace' to Germany, officers entrusted with the duty of carrying out General Eisenhower's directives are actually following a 'soft peace' policy . . . It is now suggested that General Patten was merely following the implied policy of a group of Wall Street men who are playing a big part in the occupation of Germany. They are taking orders from General Eisenhower but interpreting them to suit themselves."

That brings to mind the declaration of Professor Arnold Toynbee, Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs that "we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands!"

Now consider the words of Lord Vansittart, who was Chief Diplomatic Adviser to the British Foreign Office, as published in "The Sunday Dispatch" of 1/8/43:

"This has always been a phoney war, and we may get a phoney peace unless at long last these people are put and kept in their place."

Unfortunately he did not clearly indicate the identity of "these people," and so someone else must try to do so.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 14th October 1945.

(To be continued.)

P.S.—After writing the above, I went to the Camberwell Presbyterian Church in the evening to see and to hear a Mr. Burgoyne Chapman preach. I went because one of my nieces heard him the previous Sunday at the Box Hill Presbyterian Church and felt incensed at some of the things he had said. He was introduced to the Camberwell congregation (church 25% full) by Dr. Wilson Macaulay, who described him as "a Master of Arts and a great scholar." His sermon was devoted entirely to a denunciation of all and sundry who offer criticism of Jewry. Some of the statements he made were untrue and most of them misleading, and never in my previous experience had I known a Christian pulpit to be used for such anti-Christian purposes. All being well I shall make some further reference to this next week. In the meantime I would recommend that readers of this paper who can spare the time find out where Mr. Burgoyne Chapman will be "preaching" and go to hear for themselves. He leaves before the service concludes, so there will be no opportunity to challenge him face to face. —B.H.B.

ON THE FULFILMENT OF "PROPHECY"

(From "The Social Creditor," 18/8/45.)

"I have a great mind to make a prophecy, and THEY SAY (our emphasis) "prophecies work out their own fulfilment."

—John Keats: "Letters."

We return to this subject for the reason given by the great poet, who like all great poets, was gifted with intuition. It is quite likely, moreover, that he moved in circles much affected by the Illuminati of the French Revolution.

Now, it is on record before 1933 in a form, which is quite beyond question that September 1936 ("the Entrance to the Hall of the Grand Orient" of the Pyramidologists), August 20, 1938, March 3-4, 1945, and February 18, 1946, are predicted by the "prophets" as key dates in history. We do not recall at the moment anything critical, which occurred in September 1936, although it would be easy to say that it was a fateful time. But the other dates deserve attention. August 1938 was evidently intended to be the date of the outbreak of war. It has been stated, and never contradicted, that only the personal action of Mr. Chamberlain in arresting the issue of a certain document from a Government Department deferred the war for a year.

The "American" Press and Jews everywhere, foamed with fury at "Munich." Senator Pittman, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Government, kindly informed once-great-Britain

that it was better to die than to be disgraced. He was subsequently the bitterest opponent to any participation of the United States in the war, and the early stages of hostilities, a year later, were characterised by the systematic stripping of Great Britain of her overseas securities by the cash-and-carry policy. The prophecy miscarried by a year, but it was evidently an unpleasant surprise to numbers of people that it did.

Now, it would be impossible to contest the significance of the early days of March 1945. In the first place they were marked by the death of Roosevelt. It was at this time that the defeat of Germany was announced and practically every competent military commentator expressed the opinion that political rather than military considerations alone justified this view.

As these words are written, an announcement has just been broadcast from Washington by President Truman that the first atomic bomb has been dropped on Japan (August 6). This date, August 6, was given by an American officer speaking at Clifton College, as the date on which the Germans would have dropped a similar bomb

(see "T.S.C.," July 14). February 18, 1946, is still in the future—but not much.

There are three explanations of this phenomenon. The first is that the future exists now, can by certain people be seen now, and cannot be avoided by anyone. We refrain from elaborating this theory because clearly it undercuts all human endeavour.

The second is that as, at any given instant of time, an infinity of events is taking place, any given prediction can be verified by attaching it to something contained in infinity. At first sight, this seems plausible, but it becomes less plausible as the area of the event becomes larger. It is always possible to prophesy that an unnamed Englishman will die on a given date. But a prophecy that all Englishmen will die on a given date is another matter.

And the third explanation is that there are individuals concerned to procure the fulfilment of "prophecy" for their own ends. And those people will naturally publicise the "prophecy" and finance its fulfilment, while remaining in the background. The most expensive advertisement of the Pyramid "Prophecy" is alleged to have been paid for by B'nai B'rith, the Jewish Secret Society, in New York. And all the significant dates point to war and catastrophe as being the Divine Will.

Instead of the revolting "War Trials" of ninety-year-old Petain (not Gamelin, you notice) and similar puppets, why not do a little enquiring as to who paid for prophecies which involved disaster for Europe, but not for New York?

STALIN FOLLOWED MUSSOLINI'S EXAMPLE

From the "Social Creditor" (Eng.), 18/8/45:—

If any remnant remained of the idea that Socialism possesses any moral standards whatever, the entry of Russia into the war against Japan ought to (but in the mind of some of its dupes, probably will not) dispose of it forever. For the moment, we are not thinking of the results of this unprovoked aggression, not to Japan, but to the rest of the world, although those results are bound to be grave, and, as now is usual, gravest to the people of these islands.

What is starkly clear is that mob force has been enthroned as the only law.

We have always seen that war is nothing but "the pursuit of policy by other means" and that in itself war is policy, whether it is pursued by atomic bombs or Trades Union card votes. It is the imposition of decisions by blind force. If a man builds a house, he obtains a house by following consciously certain natural laws, which we call "Theory of Structure." But if an army takes a town and dispossesses the individuals who obtained their houses by the arts of peace, or a Trades Union, such as the Miners' Federation blackmails the community into handing over the coal and the collieries by threats, either political or economic, an entirely new set of laws separating the action from the actor, is in operation—a set of laws which as all history teaches, is purely destructive and contains nothing, of the creative energy which built the houses or developed the collieries. There is a great deal of stored energy—momentum—in all social systems, and they run on it (just as Russia has run on energy derived from an earlier system) for a long time. But they run down.

Whatever the outcome, there is no difference whatever between Russia's attack on Japan at this stage, and Italy's attack on England and France in 1940. Both are equally despicable and immoral.

"Satan is unchained," it is far from being merely a question of "Christianity." There is not a great religion in the world, with the exception of that travesty of religion, Judaism, which does not recognise, in some form or another, the Golden Rule.

The story of Jael and Sisera as an example to be admired fortunately stands high as an example of treachery lauded as a virtue.

Mr. Mackenzie King [Liberal, Prime Minister, who lost his seat at the general election] is, however, considered essential to the success of the Big Idea in Canada, and has been restored via a safe seat. Latest developments have been reported to us by a London correspondent, who forwards the following information, not to our knowledge featured in the Australian press, perhaps because of the remarkable parallel to our own State Premiers' Conference: —

"The 'Daily Telegraph' of August 7 reports: 'From Our Correspondent, Ottawa, Monday: The Dominion Government under Mr. Mackenzie King today outlined its peace-time programme for achieving full employment, a high national income, and social security. The chief points in the programme, which developed almost into an ultimatum, were readiness of the Provinces to turn over voluntarily to the Federal Government for a minimum of three years their rights to collect personal taxation. . . . in return for increased subsidies, and willingness for the Provinces to agree to a single constitutional amendment permitting them to delegate any of their powers to the Federal authority. This will be so that the Dominion may exercise any increase of jurisdiction over labour, wages and marketing which its economic policies may need. . . . If the Provinces do not like any feature they are able to withdraw after a minimum of three years. The whole tenor of the document was that unanimous provincial approval would be required to implement it, but if a minority refused to concur in giving up their tax rights the Federal Government would nevertheless go ahead. As a result the citizens of such a Province would have to submit to double taxation without sharing any benefits.'

"The 'Times' of August 7 has three-quarters of a column, 'Economic Plan for Can-

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1)

future refuse to accept such statements. If this were done citizens would be more secure, and police reputations would be thus enhanced.

MONEY MIRAGE: The practice of cluttering up inter-State passenger planes with bureaucrats and departmental officials was recently criticised in the daily press; it was pointed out that this practice delayed business executives from getting the wheels of industry going. However, the following illogical argument was used to support the criticism: "Trade must be increased to provide the money which goes into the pay envelope." This is certainly incorrect, because the banking system provides the money while industry provides the goods. It is hazy thinking to suggest that industry provides money. If industry were permitted to provide or manufacture money there might not be the chronic money shortage peculiar to peacetime.

HEBREW HAVEN: Judging by the flood of press propaganda for the dispossession of the Arabs to establish the Jewish Haven, it would seem that Jews do not lack influence or friends in the newspaper world; in fact, it strongly supports the claim that the press of the world is controlled by the "chosen" few. Mr. Dewey, who opposed President Roosevelt at the last Presidential Election, is reported to have addressed 20,000 people at Madison Square Garden (U.S.), at a meeting sponsored by the Zionist Emergency Council. At the same time the Melbourne "Age" gave publicity to the opinions of Mr. Burgoyne Chapman, "author and scholar," expressed at a luncheon at the Hotel Australia, sponsored by the local Jewish Council. His subject was anti-Semitism, and he was especially concerned at the anti-alien attitude of returned soldiers, who believe that they have a priority over aliens.

PRICE-PEGGERS' PREDICAMENT: The N.S.W. Deputy Prices Commissioner (Mr. Herlihy) is reported as lamenting the inability of successfully fixing used-car prices. Of course, he blames willing buyers and black marketeers. However, he does illustrate some of the devious methods used to defeat price peggers. The methods used show clearly the impossibility of satisfactorily fixing prices. But all this theoretical bureaucrat can suggest is "heavier fines." This, of course, would not stop lower grade crooks, who would not pay any fine because gaol has no terrors for them. Sensible men would never attempt price fixing on such a variable commodity as used cars, or houses, boots, millinery, etc., where the quality and the quantity can be so varied.

—O.B.H.

"B."B.C. VERSUS KING LEOPOLD

From the "Social Creditor" (Eng.), 18/8/45:

The letter of Lord Keyes to "The Times" of July 30, taken in conjunction with the eagerness of the "B."B.C. to assist the repudiation of King Leopold by M. Spaak and his Socialists, is a further instance of the indifference of Beelzebub's Brethren to the honour of this country. Lord Keyes, who was gratuitously attacked by M. Spaak, makes it clear that the action of the King in refusing to run away with M. Spaak and his valiant Ministers gave the British Army those two indispensable days, which alone made the retreat to Dunkirk, and the miraculous escape of the shattered British Army, possible. Does the "B."B.C. care? Not at all. What is the country's debt of honour in comparison with Professor Laski's glorious revolution?

We refer to this matter because it clarifies the main issue before the world. Is there a standard of conduct, or is everything simply a question of the aggregation of power by artificial and misinformed majorities? There isn't much time to make up our mind on this question.

ada': The Premiers of nine Provinces were assembled round a table on the floor of the House of Commons and the benches were occupied by Federal and Provincial Cabinet Ministers and their advisers. The national character of the meeting was emphasised by the presence of political leaders not affiliated with the Government, including Mr. Bracken, Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Low, leader of the Social Credit Party in Federal Parliament . . ."

Now we'd like the Australian Liberals to tell us the difference between Labour and Liberal.

—B.W.M., in "The Information Sheet," Sydney, September 1945.

A PLANTATION ECONOMY

"There is very little in the higher culture of the last half century that is morally superior to that which it mocks at and seeks to displace. . . . The most important thing in social legislation is not to relieve this or that group. It is to preserve for each boy and girl growing up the sense of growing up in a free world, where their civil obligations are few and clear, and not into a plantation economy where they will be set their life-long tasks, and well looked after in return."

—The "Tablet," London.

MEN BEHIND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The following is the full text of a broadcast talk by Mr. James Guthrie, B.Sc., delivered on behalf of the Electoral Campaign of Tasmania, over 7HO, Hobart, on Sunday, September 30, 1945:—

The strange and sudden termination of American Lease-lend to Great Britain, followed by the inability of the British delegates at Washington to reach a satisfactory agreement, together with the stormy meeting this week between the various foreign ministers in London, all cause apprehension at the outbreak of peace, and also at the possibility of much international rivalry.

The settling of problems between various nations has never been an easy matter, but a mass of evidence has been collected to prove beyond all manner of doubt that there are certain very powerful and very wealthy gentry who have had a finger in nearly every disturbance of the last half-century. And since these disturbances have cost the loss of millions of lives and also come near to wiping out the British people, I think that it would be profitable to know something more about these very wealthy and very powerful men.

These people, as you would imagine, do not advertise themselves, and, having control of the more important newspapers and international news service, they are able to supply us with an enormous amount of information all very useful for leading us up one blind alley after another.

The most powerful and the wealthiest organisation in the world today is undoubtedly Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of New York. As far back as 1912 the popular clamour against this organisation was so great that a public inquiry was commissioned, and it was discovered that Kuhn, Loeb & Co. controlled in banks alone a capital investment of over 4000 million pounds—all under the control of one man, Jacob Schiff.

It was also discovered that their agent, Bernard Baruch, was the chief adviser of the American Presidents, and at the enquiry Baruch said: "I suppose I was the most powerful man in the United States during the 1914-18 world war."

If power brings responsibility, then these powerful men have a tremendous lot to answer for. This powerful international gang originated in Germany, and now have their headquarters in New York. That part of the firm, which operated from Germany were very anti-British—and so is the New York part of the firm. In fact, a great deal of trouble is continuously being stirred up, and the anti-British propaganda in Ireland, India and Palestine is kept going by American money and is being ably supported by American films.

The powerful Banking Interests, which rule the American Government, are also the power, which governs Russia. The evidence in support of the fact that the Russian Revolution and the subsequent Governments of Russia were financed and controlled by the Banking Interests, which govern America, is monumental.

It is only necessary here to refer to the chief document treating of the financing of the Russian Revolution. This is the one drawn up by the American Secret Service and transmitted by the French High Commissioner to his Government. It was published by the Documentation Catholique of Paris on March 6, 1920:

Section I states that "it was found out that the following persons, as well as the banking house mentioned, were engaged in this work of destruction: Jacob Schiff, Guggenheim, Max Breitung; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Felix Warburg, Otto Kahn, Mortimer Schiff, and S. H. Hanauer." Kuhn, Loeb & Co. had a complete monopoly of the contracts for financing the industrialisation of Russia.

The Banking Interests, which govern America and Russia, have the most powerful international connections. How "unexpected" as well as extensive is indicated by the fact that during the 1914-18 war, whilst Max Warburg was the trusted financial adviser of the German Emperor, Max Warburg's brother, Paul Warburg, Director of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and founder of the Federal Reserve Bank, was, as "Grand Treasurer of the United States of America," playing a similar role at the side of President Wilson.

The artful conspiracies and paralysing hindrances with which the Allies found their path beset, may be imagined; whilst it should be borne in mind that those engaged in the terrible struggle never had the least suspicion.

It is interesting to record that Max Warburg's partner, Dr. Carl Melchior, was one of the leading representatives sent by Germany to the Versailles Peace Conference, whilst his brother, Paul Warburg, of the same financial house, was one of America's chief representatives.

The interests of this group of bankers who control America and Russia are international, and their aim is the disruption of Europe with a view to their complete domination of it.

The disruption in Europe is so terribly obvious that it is almost too painful to think about. What must it be to live in? Yet the fact remains there is no other civilisation yet capable of taking the place of European civilisation. France, which has given so much to the world, lies broken in spirit and body; Austria, one of the leaders in European culture, was destroyed

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

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

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

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

and truncated after the last war to make an American colony under the name of Czecho-slovakia.

The American people are quite unready to accept the responsibilities that their great wealth has thrust upon them. And, just as the British stood alone after France fell, and, by their fearlessness and amazing resourcefulness, put courage into the rest of the world and formed the nucleus round which the nations rallied, so again must the British people form the rallying point for reconstruction for peace.

It is perfectly obvious this war did not go according to schedule. It was expected that England and Europe would be ruined and overrun, but it was not expected that England would smash the German air force, nor that America would be brought into the war. Nor was it expected that England would produce more high-class scientific and engineering inventions than the whole of Germany, America and Russia put together. All sorts of funny things have happened—and all sorts of funny things are going to happen.

CENTRALISING ELECTRICITY IN N.S.W.

... The McKell Government is about to meddle with electricity management on a statewide basis. Works Minister Cahill has an Electricity Supply Plan ... The Government's aim is to bring all electricity undertakings under the one control.

"It will then appoint its own General manager, and establish a costly Department to run a State Electricity undertaking, spending £8,000,000 on power schemes, from Broken Hill to the Coast and from Albury to the Queensland border.

... The Sydney County Council is a very poor advertisement for centralised control.

... If the Government Centralised Control Plan had been in operation during the past month, the whole of the State would have been in darkness ...

—Sydney "Century," October 5, 1945.

The following letter was published in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of October 1, 1945, under the heading, "No Commission—Lower Costs":—

Sir,—Mr. E. W. Chambers, a visitor from Melbourne, comments on the Government's proposal to create an electricity authority in New South Wales, saying that he is amazed a body like the State Electricity Commission of Victoria has not been set up before this.

In New South Wales, local government councils have of their own volition taken up and developed electricity supply in their own shires and municipalities. Their genesis goes back long before the Victorian Commission was set up, and their accomplishments do not lag one whit behind

FROM "NO SHELTER FOR MORRISON"

To show the quality and tendency of the work, we quote the following from a political satire by Caius Marcius Coriolanus in the form of an account of a trial before the "Commissioners of Political Lunacy" of the Member of Parliament for Atleigh-under-Cloud, despite the emergence of that gentleman and his apparent entry into the Seventh Heaven since the book was written. It is published by Dorothy Crisp and Co. Ltd., priced 4/6 in England:

MR. LIMEHOUSE: "We enjoyed office, but never power."

CHAIRMAN: "I see! A few votes and you would have been galvanised into action! A few more seats and a team of lame cart-horses would have been transformed into cavalry chargers!"

L.: "I resent being called a lame cart-horse. Our whole thought was for the common people of Britain, and if we could not ..."

C.: "With your permission we will investigate that statement. Have the common people of Britain any affinity with such a thing as the chemical monopoly?"

L.: "Certainly not! The idea is preposterous."

C.: "I find that in 1905 Mr. Ramsay MacDonald sent a wire to his followers in Cardiff saying, 'If I were a Socialist in Cardiff I would vote for Mond.' How do you account for that?"

L.: "1905 was a long time ago. I suppose the old boy thought a Liberal was preferable to a Tory. There has always been an affinity between Labour and Liberalism."

C.: "Although the Liberal Party is the party of the international banking interests?"

L.: "Not more so than the Conservative Party."

C.: "Come, come! Would you say that the free movement of goods and capital across national frontiers was a classic Tory doctrine?"

L.: "No. Perhaps I must grant you that point."

C.: "So that when you say that there is an affinity between Labour and Liberalism what you mean is that there is an affinity between the Labour Party and the great banking interests."

L.: "That is complete nonsense."

C.: "We shall see. You remember the Cunliffe Committee, Mr. Limehouse?"

L.: "I do. It was a committee of bankers whose recommendations guided the monetary policy of this country for over a decade after the 1914 war."

C.: "With disastrous effects?"

L.: "As you say, with disastrous effects. But I would remind you that it was Mr. Churchill and not we who re-introduced the Gold Standard."

The Schiffs the Warburgs, and the Baruchs have had a wonderful time, but quite a lot of information has been gathered about them. The limelight is going to be focussed on them, and they and their friends are going to be the world's main issue in the coming years.

There is no doubt that we are up against organised evil forces on a colossal scale; the world is definitely being run by gangsters—but they are gangsters who have access to information denied to the rest of the world and who are directed by men who have been carefully tutored in the exploitation of every human weakness. As John Buchan said: "The European tradition has been confronted with an Asiatic revolt, with its historic accompaniment of assassins. There is in it all, too, an ugly pathological savour, as if a mature society were being assailed by diseased and vicious children."

It seems to me the British people are taking quite unnecessary risks when they permit their children to be educated by the scum of Hollywood, and allow their news-channels to be handled by men who are violently anti-British. If the British people are crippled, then there will remain no barrier against a complete world dictatorship—against which there can be no effective resistance.

the efforts of that body. In New South Wales the number of farming customers of electricity service is approaching 8,000. The Victorian Commission claims 5,600

Compared with the £25,000,000 investment of the S.E.C., Victoria, New South Wales local government bodies have invested nearly £40,000,000 in electricity schemes, and 95 per cent. of the supply is in their hands. The greater part of this has been done without any subsidy or assistance from the Government.

Under the decentralised and essentially democratic local government system, overhead costs have been kept to a minimum. Consequently, the New South Wales people are supplied with cheaper electricity than under the Victorian Commission. Figures show that Sydney enjoys the lowest charges of any of the capital cities of the Commonwealth, and the majority of tariffs in New South Wales country towns are lower than in Victorian towns; they do not have to pay for the top-heavy overhead costs of the organisation which your correspondent says, "is probably the largest in the southern hemisphere."

We have had enough of commissions and bureaucracies in New South Wales, and must resist any move to set up another such authority in the electricity supply industry.

GEO. W. STEWART, Secretary, Association for Electrical Development, Sydney.

Political Pointers

(Continued from page 1)

ties occur. A war against the Moslem world would have disastrous effects on Britain's standing in India. The British "Daily Mail," in a recent article pertinently asks, "What are British troops doing in the Netherlands East Indies and French Indo-China? ... If these are United Nations' affairs, why are we not getting more help from the Americans, whose manpower reserves are so much greater than ours? The British seem inevitably to be involved whether the shooting is in Greece, Syria, Palestine, Annam or Java. They get nothing for their trouble except execrations from everyone else."

The Big Idea is, of course, to discredit the British everywhere as a prelude to the internationalists taking over the British Empire. There are certain people in America just itching for an excuse to meddle in India.

The international planners continue plotting to control the world's food supply more rigidly than ever. It is reported that a conference began a few days ago in Quebec, which is "to attempt to organise the food and agricultural resources of the world." Australian delegates are in attendance.

The Melbourne "Herald" of October 2 reports: "Powdered milk and tinned meat are in short supply in every country, and allocations for international markets are made by the combined Allied Food Committee at Washington."

The statement by Dr. Evatt that we might have to forego some of our control over domestic agricultural policy becomes more significant every day.

Not only food, but also "education" is to be controlled internationally. The Melbourne "Argus" of October 5 reports: "Dr. Evatt, Minister for External Affairs, will lead the Australian delegation at the United Nations' conference in London on November 1 to establish a world-wide educational and cultural organisation." It is hoped that Australians are starting to realise that they are being rushed at a dizzy rate right into the world slave State. But one feels that Evatt and his masters may yet over-reach themselves.

Comment on the increasing centralisation of the generation and distribution of electricity in Australia has been made in these notes from time to time. Both Queensland and New South Wales State Governments introduced legislation a few months ago for Government control of all electricity. The South Australian Government has now introduced similar legislation. Surely the continuity of policy is obvious. When the States have centralised all electricity, the Federal Government will then be able to take over from the States and have one central control. Thus all electricity consumers will be at the mercy of the Central Government. Of course we will be told the fairy story about the wonderful "common ownership." But perhaps some bright person will mention the "commonly-owned" post office and how the Government promised that the increase in the price of postage stamps would only be a war measure.

Which brings to mind Mr. Lazzarini's statement during the Banking Bill debates at Canberra, that the people had only one source from which to buy postage stamps, which, in Mr. Lazzarini's opinion, was a good thing.

It is interesting to recall that one of the major reasons advanced to persuade the electors of the States to support Federation, was the argument that the expense of maintaining the Commonwealth would be so small that it was estimated that it would not exceed the amount then collected in Australia for the dog tax.

Far too many people uncritically accept the idea that the State Governments should periodically approach the Federal Government and seek the finance on which to run their States. It would be a far better idea if the States had exclusive control of finance and periodically allocated the Federal Government what they thought the Federal Government should have for its legitimate needs. It becomes clearer every day that the States must wrest control of financial policy away from the central Government. —E.D.B.

THE BUREAUCRATIC MENACE

Speaking on the Requisitioned Land and War Works Bill, in the British House of Commons, on April 18, 1945, Mr. W. F. Brown (Rugby), said:—

"... I have had during this war enough dealings with government Departments to make me very nearly an anti-Socialist. [Interruption.] I said 'very nearly.' I was restrained from saying 'completely' because I know the passion for liberty, which animates hon. Members on these benches. I submit we ought not to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer the vast powers contained in this Clause, until we know how he will use them. I have seen, during this war, powers used and abused by a Government on a scale, which I, as an old civil servant, thought I should never live to see. I have seen the Government repudiate moral obligations, which were as stark and sharply outlined as they possibly could be. From now on, this Committee would be well advised never to give powers to a Government merely on the supposition that they will be used reasonably. We had better be quite sure that they cannot be unreasonably used ..."

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

The Power of International Finance

By ERIC D BUTLER (Continued from last issue.)

Before quoting from Protocol 20 it is essential that we examine in some detail the history and ramifications of International Finance. Anyone with even a most elementary knowledge of the financial system must be impressed by the knowledge of financial policy displayed by the writer of the "Protocols."

Considering when the "Protocols" must have been written, it is obvious that the writer had access to material written by men with a great inside knowledge of the banking system and its value as a weapon for controlling people everywhere. Protocol 20 demonstrates all too clearly that there has been a conscious plot against civilisation for centuries.

Werner Sombart, the famous German historian and admirer of the Jews, went to some trouble to prove that the present banking system, or, rather, the exploitation of that system was a Jewish idea. The following from "The American Hebrew" of September 20, 1920, puts the matter beyond argument:

"Out of the economic chaos, the discontent—and it was a legitimate discontent, be it noted—of the Jew evolved organised capital with its working instrumentality, the banking system. That was a great achievement, almost as great as the evolution of organised government . . . Gradually, in every country in the world the Government and the Jewish banker effected an alliance that constituted up to the outbreak of the Great War—and apparently still constitutes—the dual force that controls the destinies of nations and of individuals everywhere."

In his revealing book, "The Unseen Empire," Dr. David Jordan, former President of Stanford University, U.S.A., writes:—

"The European peoples are no longer under the Governments of their respective nations. They have passed under another sceptre. They have become the subjects of another Power—a Power unseen but felt in palace as in cottage, in Russia as in Spain, by every parent and every child, by every potentate and every labourer. No nation on the European continent has any longer an independence that is more than nominal. The political autonomy of every one of them has been surrendered to the will of a despotism before which every kingdom and empire and republic fawns in the most abject subservience . . . the occult Powers of MONEY who rule and reign."

When Jewish Finance is mentioned, the name of Rothschild immediately comes to mind. The following are only a few of the salient points concerning the immense power and worldwide connections of this Jewish family:

The founder of the Rothschild financial power, Mayer Amschel Rothschild, was born in Germany in the Frankfurt ghetto in 1743. It is of interest to note here that the house in which he lived was later owned by the forebears of Jacob Schiff, whose activities we have already studied in some detail. Jacob Schiff's father was broker to the Rothschilds.

During the Napoleonic Wars the sons of old man Rothschild were sent to the various capitals of Europe.

Both Napoleon and his enemies were financed by the Rothschild group.

When in 1814, it was thought that Napoleon had been finally dealt with, the big conference of European countries in Vienna was dominated by Prince von Metternich. Metternich was advised by Solomon Rothschild, while Herr von Gentz, the Prince's private secretary, was a Rothschild agent. Metternich advocated full rights for the German-Jews.

A generation later Bismarck often dined with the Federal Treasurer, Herr von Rothschild. Bismarck, whom Hitler worshipped, had the Rothschilds appointed court bankers to Prussia. Bismarck, of course, was working away vigorously to centralise all the German States under one control. At the same time, the Minister for Finance in Sardinia, Cavour, was working for the centralisation of all Italy under one control. Count Corti writes in his classic work on the Rothschilds:

"The Sardinian statesman realised that the dearest wish of himself and his people could only be achieved by war."

Just like today! Don't forget the Zionist Sieff and his statement, "only in war or under the threat of war . . ." Once you get the small States centralised into "nations" as the result of wars, then you can centralise the nations into a World Organisation by some more war!

Cavour received adequate finance for his "War of Federation" from James Rothschild of Paris. Having been supplied with the financial sinews of war, Cavour and Bismarck then declared war on their neighbours. In 1870 the individual German and Italian States were compelled to give up their sovereign rights by circumstances brought about by war—truly a forerunner of the modern tactics used to force nations to give up sovereign rights.

One Rothschild connection with the first League of Nations is interesting:

The late Mr. Lionel de Rothschild was chairman of the Austrian Credit Anstalt Committee (League of Nations) when strong action was taken to bring Austria back to the principles of orthodox finance after World War 1. One of the defeated countries, Austria embarked upon a sane financial policy and was soon one of the most prosperous countries in Europe. But the League of Nations stopped all that (that's what these world organisations are for!) and soon Austria was in chaos in preparation for being taken over by Hitler. Since then, of course, Austria has been "liberated" by the Russians, who believe in centralised control from Moscow instead of from Berlin. The Rothschild Paris Branch supplied Mussolini with 750 million francs towards the conquest of Ethiopia.

(To be continued.)

UNDEMOCRATIC EFFORT TO SUPPRESS "REPORT ON THE RUSSIANS"

By J. Donald Adams. (Condensed from "New York Times" Book Review.)

No book of the current year has stirred up such violent controversy as W. L. White's "Report on the Russians." No publishing house in recent history has been subjected to such insistent and heated pressure to remove a book from its list.

This department is not concerned here with the merits or demerits of Mr. White's portrait of the Soviet Union today; suffice it to remark that the estimates of its value by informed observers of the Russian scene, past and present, range all the way from the severest condemnation to the highest praise. This department is, however, very much concerned over the kind of attack to which Mr. White and his publishers—Harcourt, Brace & Co.—have been exposed.

The publishers have had to defend themselves against an intensive barrage. There is nothing wrong with that, of course; what matters is that some of these letters demand that the book be withdrawn, or failing that, request the discontinuance of advertising or other promotion.

In some instances the demands are accompanied by the writer's admission that he has not himself read the book.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT MOVEMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The next meeting of the S.C.M. of S.A. will be held in the United Democrats' rooms, 17 Waymouth St., Adelaide, on Thursday, October 25, at 8 p.m. Following the usual business, a general discussion on Post-War Reconstruction by all Municipalities and District Councils, will be the item for the evening. All members are requested to take part. At the annual meeting all retiring officers were re-elected, including Mr. T. P. Hoppood as president. Members are reminded that annual subscriptions are now due, and early payment will save postage.—J. E. Burgess, Hon. Secretary.

heart of one of the most important of the freedoms we are fighting for."

There are those who protest that, at a time when Soviet-American relations leave something to be desired, it is unwise to give circulation to statements, which call attention to the faults or lacks of our allies. It seems to this writer that there is no better time for the frank exchange of honest criticism, and that there can be no hope of building permanently better relations unless there is such an exchange. What other way is there for two individuals, or two nations, who find themselves at odds over important issues, to arrive at a sure understanding?

Do the zealots who bombard the offices of Mr. White's publishers, with demands that his book be suppressed, write similar letters when the Soviet press speaks its mind freely about ourselves? I doubt it very much.

The liberty they prize is the liberty to express their own findings and opinions, never those of another who fails to agree with them. Theirs is an attitude of mind against which, if this war is not to have been fought in vain, we must keep an unceasing vigilance.

That attitude pulls like a powerful undertow throughout our world today. It is in this country a minority attitude, but we have had ample proof in our history of what minority attitudes, if held with sufficient vigour and determination, can accomplish. There is but one way to meet them, and that is with an even greater vigour and a greater determination.

—"Reader's Digest," August 1945.

POST-WAR GREAT BRITAIN

The pattern of the Great Plot is now becoming clear for all to see. This country is as tight a totalitarian dictatorship as ever Germany or Italy was, and is progressing fast towards the Russian model. For the moment there is a perfunctory display of the velvet glove; but the iron hand is nonetheless effective. The reservation of all first-class sleeping accommodation for the bureaucracy; the announcement, with barely concealed insolence by the "B."B.C. that "there is good news for motorists," the basic petrol ration will be continued; the information that every country is to be well-fed before Great Britain; Mr. Churchill's suave agreement with a "King's" Speech which heralds revolution, accompanied by an expression of delight that "America" is on top of the world, including ourselves, all make it unmistakably clear that we lost the war the day we entered it. All we have done has gone according to plan, and Bretton Woods will hardly be necessary to impose on us that modest hush which is becoming to those who know their place—in the discard.

(In the circumstances, it is perhaps not to be wondered at that Mr. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister who regarded election as a formality, which should not interfere with dictatorship, displayed the Red Ensign on Parliament Building in Ottawa, as an ostentatious repudiation of the Union Jack. While no doubt the colour was irresistible to him, we doubt whether the Merchant Navy, whose flag it is, will be amused.)

—The "Social Creditor," 25/8/45.

MORE LIGHT ON "CZECHOSLOVAKIA"

The Editor, "The Social Creditor": Sir, —Some months ago you were good enough to publish an article in which I attempted to describe the part played by Jews and Masons in the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. In the interval I have received from the editor of the "Czech Press Service" (16 Thurlow Street, London, S.W.7) some informative and, in parts, very illuminative Bulletins dealing mostly with the Sovietisation of the Czech and Slovak peoples. Bulletin No. 12 contains the following passage entitled "How the Czechoslovaks settled in Great Britain," written by Dr. Karel Locher, a passage which underlines the point I attempted to make in "Birth of a Republic":—

"In 1938, very shortly after the Munich Agreement, there appeared in Great Britain considerable numbers of refugees who styled themselves—Czechoslovaks. It was a new nationality, which had never before existed in the history of mankind. For thousands of years there have been Czechs in Europe, inhabitants of the old kingdom of Bohemia. There have been Slovaks also, one of the nations living formerly inside Hungary. But there was never any such thing as a Czechoslovak Nation, just as there is no such thing as an Anglodutch or Anglomaltese Nation. Czechoslovakia was the name of a State where Czechs and Slovaks lived. It was possible to be a citizen of Czechoslovakia without being either a Czech or a Slovak, just as there are British citizens of even Chinese origin. Czechoslovak does not mean a nationality, but a citizenship.

"Who, then, are the Czechoslovaks in Great Britain? And how did they settle here? When Hitler came to power in Germany, Czechoslovakia became an asylum for Jews from that country and from many other countries in Central Europe. The Czechs never entertained any anti-Semitism, nor was there at that time any Jewish problem in the country. The Czechs, having themselves been deprived of political independence for 300 years, were genuinely sympathetic towards every kind of political refugee, and did not hesitate to offer them shelter. Thus in Czechoslovakia, there was asylum for Russians who escaped from the Bolsheviks, Hungarians who escaped from Horthy, Poles expelled by Pilsudski, and eventually, Jews from Germany, Austria, Hungary, Roumania and other countries. The country was a refuge for anti-Bolshevik Russians and for pro-Bolshevik Serbs.

"After the Munich Agreement, the Jews who had found shelter in Czechoslovakia began to move on. The majority of them obtained Czechoslovak passports. With them went a large number of Jews who had been settled in the country for a long time. This was only natural because by then Jews were the most threatened people in Europe. Every Czech tried to help them to get away safely. They went via Poland, where they were looked after and administered by the Polish Union of Jewish Socialists.

"The activities of this body, however, were not referred to as a relief of Jewish refugees, but as relief for Czechoslovak refugees. The Polish Union of Jewish Socialists received funds for their work from England; organisation and policy they retained in their own hands. They were the ones who decided who was a political refugee and who was not, and they made all decisions about where individuals would be sent. The Communists and Socialist Jews were despatched by them to Great Britain, where they appeared as Czechoslovaks.

"When the whole of Czech territory was occupied by Hitler, many genuine Czechs and patriots were forced to escape. When they got to Poland they could not make themselves understood by the Czechoslovak relief committee, because the official language there was German. The aversion of the Czechs to the "Czechoslovaks" dates from that time. Things grew worse when, after the collapse of France, a few Czechs succeeded in reaching England, where, to their great surprise, they discovered that the Czechoslovaks who had turned up in England eighteen months earlier, were now posing as representatives of the Czech Nation. They were acting the role of being martyrs for democracy. Even, worse, the bewildered Czechs found out quickly enough that Mr. Benes and his associates, who had been expelled by the Czech Nation after

Munich, were hand in glove with the Czechoslovaks. Benes claimed to be the representative of the Czechoslovaks, and the Czechoslovaks of various nationalities who had been sent to this country by the Polish Union of Socialist Jews soon proved to him that his claim was quite well founded. Anyone who dared to say that Czechs should be represented by Czechs and Slovaks by Slovaks was shouted down as a pro-Nazi Jew-hater and sent to gaol.

"Mr. Benes and his associates have left Great Britain, but the bulk of the Czechoslovaks have remained behind. They are radical Socialists or Communists, but they do not fancy living under a Communist Government in the Czech Lands or in Slovakia. That is their business, and we do not want to interfere in the affairs of any foreign nation. What we reject most emphatically, however, is their completely unfounded pretence of being the representatives of Czechs and Slovaks.

"Mr. Erdely who, under the name of Snittler, was Press Attaché in Vienna of the Hungarian Communist Government of Bela Kun, is a Hungarian Jewish Communist, or Socialist—or perhaps he has changed his mind and is now a Hungarian Jewish People's Democrat. What he never will be or can be is either a Czech or a Slovak. If the Polish Union of Jewish Socialists is not ashamed of its name, why are these others ashamed and why do they hide here under the name of Czechoslovaks?"

Elsewhere in the same Bulletin the editor, M. Vladimir Lezak-Borin, who reveals a shrewd sense of observation of men and things, describes the first acts of M. Benes's "Moscow-directed Government that the British taxpayers have sustained during their long exile in London. (We may note in passing the remark of the "Jewish Chronicle" of June 15 that "the [Benes] Government itself is very friendly to the Jews, and fully recognises the zealous service rendered by many during the period of exile.")

Citing private channels of information, the writer says all the inhabitants of the former Sudeten German districts are being expelled from their homes and from the country in which their ancestors have lived for 700 years by the Benes Government. This follows the usual Communist technique of uprooting rural populations, and the traditions they uphold. We are further informed that all the former political leaders of the genuine Czech nation, who during the German occupation were the prisoners of the Gestapo, are now imprisoned by the Benes-Communist Government, much as their Polish colleagues have been turned from German into Russian concentration camps, and in another connection M. Borin points out that of all the Nations whose countries are occupied by the Russians, the Germans are receiving the best treatment (cf. the passage of a recent leader in "The Social Creditor" to the effect that "the heart of the conspiracy is now in Russia and there will be no peace before this heart is cut out").

—I am, etc., BORGE JENSEN.

—(From "The Social Creditor," 18/8/45.)

REDUNDANT NOW?

The "B."B.C. broadcast, with the King's Call to Thanksgiving, those of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Chief Rabbi. Why drag in the Archbishop of Canterbury? —The "Social Creditor."