

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. 44. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1945

"NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Our charges for supplying and pasting 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.

British M.P. Condemns Bretton Woods Plan

Speech in the House of Commons

As a further indication that the dangers of the Bretton Woods scheme are appreciated in some diverse quarters in Great Britain, we publish hereunder extensive extracts from a recent speech in the House of Commons by Mr. Norman Smith, Member for Nottingham South. He was speaking during the Debate on the Address, on August 20, 1945. According to the Official Report ("Hansard"), he said: —

... Under Bretton Woods, His Majesty's Government would find themselves compelled to abdicate all financial control in favour of an alien authority not resident in this country, and not answerable to anybody at all. Talk about Fascism! Once bound by the fetters of Bretton Woods we shall be unable to strike them off because Article XI of the Bretton Woods Final Act empowers this international authority not only to declare economic war against us, but even, as part of its belligerent operations, to instruct our own Dominions to boycott and blockade us.

On the whole question of deflation, I think it is axiomatic that under modern conditions the gold standard must necessarily stereotype depression. Whereas the world's supply of gold cannot be expanded rapidly in the nature of things, unless by a fortuitous development like that of Klondyke, the world's supply of goods can be expanded very rapidly. Indeed, already

in 1944 the output of British industry was up by 40 per cent, over that of pre-war, and the output of America was up by nearly 100 per cent, notwithstanding the fact that in both countries there were millions of men in the Services who were unemployed in the economic sense of the word. It is a very sobering reflection that the America of 1944, with 11,000,000 of her best citizens unemployed in the economic sense, should have been able almost to double her industrial output. The rest of the world is very much concerned with the use, which America will make in the next few years of her immense productivity. I would remind the party opposite that the productive capacity of our own country has been very substantially increased during the war, with the result that we have it in our power very greatly to improve our standard of living.

The Washington correspondent of "The Times" said recently that America had it in her power to double her standard of living,

Reference was recently made in these notes to Professor Einstein's advocacy of Socialism. Since the advent of the atomic bomb, this prominent Jew has been using his standing as a scientist to help along the World Government Plot.

What an asset the atomic bomb has been to the inter-national planners! A worldwide campaign of fear has been encouraged in order to try and coerce the people of every country to submit meekly to having their lives planned by men over whom they will have not the slightest control.

Professor Einstein is reported in the Melbourne "Argus" of October 30 as follows:

"Everything, especially knowledge about destructive weapons, should be used to bring about a centralised organisation for security."

National armaments must be made "superfluous," says Einstein.

A nation without armaments in a world of gangsters is simply asking to have its sovereignty destroyed. While there are gangsters in the world who have under their control highly centralised Governments, the race towards world slavery or world suicide must continue. The British Empire must preserve its sovereignty, and, by example, show the way to peace, real peace, not the type of "peace" which Russia is imposing on Eastern Europe.

The continual inspired propaganda in favour of kindergartens is something which thinking people should examine carefully. If people had economic security, they could easily make arrangements for the education of their children as they think fit. But the type of kindergarten envisaged by the planners is one in which children of tender years will be conditioned as in Soviet Russia.

Major Douglas outlined his views on education in "Programme For the Third World War." Social Crediters should consider carefully the following statement:

"The inculcation of social or industrial theories at an early age should be discouraged by every means available."

Speaking in the Federal Parliament on October 2, Sir Earle Page said:

"If our tax laws could be so simplified as to be readily understandable, the people would be more inclined to accept the many burdens imposed on them."

If the tax laws were simplified to the extent that all taxation was one direct tax, even the bemused taxpayers would be so convinced that they were in the grip of modern highwaymen that they would demand relief.

There is much truth in the old adage, that one can judge a man by his friends and admirers.

"Senator Keane: Today's issue of the Sydney Morning Herald pays a high tribute to the Commonwealth Prices Commissioner, Professor Copland, who, unfortunately, will be leaving the Government Service at the end of this month, for the magnificent work done by his department in stabilising the cost of living and staving off what looked like a dangerous threat of currency inflation.

"Senator Allan MacDonald: The critics have got rid of him at last.

"Senator Keane: They often criticised him, but it is good to see him praised by a leading non-Labour journal."

—Federal "Hansard," October 2.

"Let us examine the incidence of indirect taxation during this financial year. The estimates of receipts from items, which the Treasurer is pleased to call 'indirect taxation' and which embrace customs, excise, sales tax, and flour tax amount to £101,900,000, or more than £3,000,000 more than these items yielded in the last financial year. The estimated receipts from sales tax for 1945-46 show what a small reduction the Treasurer proposes to grant. Receipts last year totalled £29,671,802; the estimated return this year is £28,000,000. But when we take into account all forms of indirect taxation, the estimated yield this year is 3 per cent, in excess of last year's figures. Therefore, these concessions do not mean a reduction of taxation on the whole. The yield from this indirect taxation will be greater than it was last year.

"The proper thing to do, particularly now that the war has ended, is to see that no greater amount shall be collected this year from sales tax than the return in the last year of the war. That is only logical. When hostilities abruptly ceased, the Treasurer revised his budget and reduced the estimated expenditure by £100,000,000. Surely, then, the amount collected from sales tax this year should not exceed the receipts last year. But are these all the indirect taxes that affect the ordinary citizen? The payroll tax is described as a 'direct' tax. It may be, but I prefer to think of it as a tax, which has been passed on to the people in the prices of consumer goods or services. The entertainments tax, too, is described as a direct tax. In my opinion, entertainments tax is no more a direct tax than is excise. It is interesting to note that it costs a man 12s to take his wife and two children to a motion picture theatre on a Saturday evening. He may be aware that the admission charges are 9s, and entertainments tax 3s, but he knows that he has to pay 12s. When those two items are added to the 'indirect' tax acknowledged by the Treasurer, the total 'indirect' taxes which the people of Australia will pay this year will be £117,900,000, or more than one-third of the total receipts from taxation, direct and indirect."

—Mr. Harrison, M.H.R., in Federal Parliament on September 28.

The following extract from a speech by Mr. Hill, M.L.A., in the West Australian Parliament on August 22, is one of those real "gems" which only men hopelessly mesmerised by finance can give us: —

"I believe that at the close of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, the Prussians decided to make France pay for the cost of the war, (Continued on page 4.)

but there can be no great increase in the standard of living if in the future trade and industry are to be hampered by the gold standard. If a relatively fixed amount of money has to distribute an increased quantity of goods—the money being controlled by the gold standard and the quantity of goods by technology—there is a condition of things necessitating a falling price level. When our industry is governed by the gold standard and the falling price level, not only does our tremendous National Debt become very much more burdensome, but also do we have to reckon with permanent deflation and chronic depression, with which we were all too familiar between the wars — depression for which the Leader of the Opposition accepted full responsibility on behalf of the Conservative Party, when in 1932 he confessed in this House his own mistake of 1925, precisely this mistake of putting us back on the gold standard, which he did, as he confessed at the time, on the advice of outsiders—not, indeed, on the advice of Professor Laski, but on the advice of the financial experts of whom I am perfectly certain history will record that their advice was inevitably and invariably wrong. I would submit that the British Government's decisions on commercial policy really ought to precede decisions on financial policy. Bretton Woods would begin by telling us engaged in British industry and agriculture, and all the people engaged in the politics, industry and agriculture, of every country of the world: "Here is a rigid, cast-iron financial system over which neither you nor your legislature has any control whatever. You have to make all your activities conform with the requirements of that system." Whatever else that might be, I submit it is not democracy. I devoutly hope I have not come to this House to play a game of political football, in which the referee is somewhere across the ocean. I think it would be more suitable for the nations severally to assess their potential prospective export surpluses and import requirements, and get together—through the Council of Foreign Ministers or in some other way—to devise the exchange of goods for goods either through bilateral or regional clearing arrangements. Bretton Woods begins at the wrong end altogether.

I can account for Bretton Woods only on the sinister supposition that the financial controllers are desirous of using the instrument of finance in such a way that Labour Governments here or elsewhere shall not pursue an expansionist industrial policy.

Another possible explanation of Bretton Woods is the explanation that the people concerned are desirous of perpetuating a system of competitive overseas investment by private individuals, which we on these Benches regard as being, to say the least, a cause of disharmony in the world. The economic convenience of Bretton Woods is only too clear from the point of view of a creditor nation that might wish to export its own unemployment problem by selling its goods to other countries and refusing to buy their goods in exchange. Such a creditor country, acting in accordance with the orthodox doctrine of the favourable balance of trade—the amazing and astounding doctrine that one has a favourable balance if one parts with more than one gets—will proceed to sell its goods, say, in Great Britain and take payment from them by using the resulting sterling to buy shares in valuable British companies, a predatory proceeding which Article 6 of the Bretton Woods Final Act would encourage, but which would certainly undermine international good-will. We were never such a creditor country. When we were investing freely abroad, at least we opened our ports to enable our debtors to pay us in goods.

We are now a debtor country. If we ratify Bretton Woods our external war debt of about £3,500,000,000 will no longer exist in blocked sterling, to be repaid in goods as and when that can be done; it will exist in the form of dollars or gold, which we shall never be able to get hold of except we pay the price of reducing catastrophically the standard of life of our own people. An international financial set-up like that of Bretton Woods is bad if it can exist only at the cost of rendering inevitable default on international indebtedness. The House will remember the unfortunate controversy about the American debt of the last war. Great Britain never did default on the American debt of the last war. What we borrowed from the Americans was neither gold nor dollars; it was goods. If we had (Continued on page 2)

NOTES on the NEWS

The Melbourne "Sun," of October 31, reported a strong attack on America's demand for the abolition or reduction of British Empire preference. This particular attack came from Mr. Quintin Hogg, British M.P., who asked: "When will President Truman explain to the American people that the average European would object to being owned by Wall Street rather than being ruled from Washington, and has a feeling that the Dollar Imperialism of Big Business is more dangerous than the other types of imperialism?" He also asked: "When will President Truman admit that American economic policy between wars caused the slump of 1929?" He also referred to "America's inability to control the wider oscillations of their economic pendulum."

It's good to know that there is a growing opposition to this unwarranted attack on British preferences to Britishers. The Sterling Bloc is a most powerful safeguard, which the British should retain at almost any cost.

INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS: General MacArthur is reported to have ordered Zaibatsu, one of Japan's great industrial combines, to disclose its financial records for the period between 1935 and 1944. He has ordered that the names of all foreigners owning shares shall be included in the records. Such disclosures (if published) might have greater repercussions than an atomic bomb; therefore, it would not be surprising if MacArthur was recalled, or told to confine his attentions to military and less important matters. Readers will also remember that strong opposition was always met when attempts were made to ascertain the names of foreign shareholders in the Bank of England; it will be interesting to see if this information will be disclosed and publicised now that the Bank is nationalised.

HOUSING HORRORS: Describing the Victorian Housing Commission's houses as the slums of the future, a correspondent in a Melbourne daily paper objects to "pairs" because every sound, even the switching on of an electric light, penetrates the dividing wall. Dealing with the lack of privacy, the writer draws attention to the full view of the backs of eight houses built in a semi-circle, and a front porch directly gaping into the back porches of other houses. Then there's the 11ft. 9in. bedroom, which has to accommodate two children, and no bedroom for the third, who has to sleep in the living room. Doubtless, homeless people will appreciate almost any kind of shelter, but that is no reason why the Commission should exploit the situation by building such unsatisfactory permanent houses. There's no shortage of land in Australia; and good, roomy, detached houses cost

very little more than these nasty Commission constructions.

RUSSIAN REACTIONS: The contact of Russian soldiers with westerners has, to some extent, made them realise the backwardness of Soviet conditions. This is causing Soviet higher-ups grave concern, because of the complaints of shortages of civilian goods, and demands for improved conditions. The Melbourne "Sun" of October 27 reports President Kalinin as saying that "the leaders should expose the petty, superficial, bourgeois German culture, which had apparently impressed some soldiers returning from Germany." Apparently the Soviet soldiers had observed evidence of what appeared to them an amazingly high standard of living, recently enjoyed by workers in the despised "capitalist" regions. The war may do some long-range good for the enslaved Russians, in so far as it may have shown them that a cruel hoax has been played on them for more than a quarter of a century.

COMMUNIST CUTTHROATS: The Melbourne "Sun" of October 20, reported "Communists in Athens killed the printer of an anti-Communist newspaper, and then organised a demonstration against the Right Wing at his funeral." The same issue of the "Sun" also reported that local Communists were soon to announce their State Election policy. One wonders whether their speakers have told election audiences of the above-mentioned murder as an illustration of what Communism really means. On the other hand, they may have threatened the "Sun" editor with a similar fate for publishing the report. The latter course would be strictly in line with Communist precedents of the milder sort.

(Continued on page 2.)

IDENTIFYING THE PROMOTERS OF

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

Sir, —After noting carefully what has been said of the French Revolution, viz., that "thanks to their racial qualities, Jews were the strategists and directors of the movement, from which they almost alone derive advantage," and also that the Soviet Union regards anything anti-Jewish as "counter revolutionary," let us consider some of the things that have happened SINCE the French Revolution.

One of those things of which we often hear, but about which very little is actually known by the general populace, is the "bursting of the land boom" in 1893. Of course, nothing happened to the land at all, and it was as good then as it had been before. What did happen was that the land "values" were changed in terms of money as the direct and inevitable result of financial manipulation. That manipulation was done by the INTERNATIONAL FINANCIERS, and it was never intended that we, the ordinary people, should ever get to know about it.

A similar thing happened to us in 1930 and 1931. Production was better than it had ever been before, but we had a "depression." Another of the "booms" was burst.

For those who wish to look into the facts of the 1893 "bursting of the boom" in greater detail I recommend careful reading of "The Truth About the Slump," by A. N. Field. It is from that book I have obtained most of the material used in this week's letter. After reading the book, no intelligent person could be left in doubt as to the origin of the pressure exercised during the war to prevent open discussion of INTERNATIONAL FINANCE AND WORLD JEWRY, the latter being the POLICY makers and the former the mechanism for giving effect to the policy. The terms are almost synonymous.

Documentary evidence obtainable from Congressional records shows conclusively that the FINANCIAL crisis of 1893 was made to the order of the American Banking Association. It was preceded by attempts on the part of Bankers to have silver excluded as legal tender and have gold established as the only standard. A great battle had raged around the silver question in different countries, and as two metals are more difficult to control than one, silver had become objectionable to the international money interest.

On 17/6/1867 delegates from twenty countries met in Paris as an International Monetary Conference and voted in favour of an exclusive gold standard. In commenting on this, Mr. George H. Shibley, Director of the American Bureau of Political Research, told a Congressional Committee in 1913 that "Thus was accomplished the first step in one of the most horrible conspiracies against mankind the world has ever witnessed."

As the result of this Conference, movements were initiated all over the world, "even in countries as remote as Japan" with the object of making gold the only monetary standard, and Mr. Field tells us that in Great Britain and the United States this objective was achieved by subterfuge.

In Great Britain, which had long been "on gold," there was power under the law to resume the issue of silver as full legal tender by Royal proclamation, subject to the concurrence of the Privy Council. In 1870, a Bill to consolidate the Mint Laws was introduced into Parliament with that provision omitted. When the Bill was up for passage through Parliament no mention of this great change was made. The House of Commons was assured that the object was simply to perfect the mint law, and the same false statement was made in the House of Lords.

In the United States the same thing was done. A Bill was introduced into Congress to revise the mint law, and the silver dollar was dropped from the list of coins that might be minted. The first appearance of this Bill was 24 days after the British mint law revision had been passed by Parliament. However, the Bill did not get through until 1873, and eight months afterwards even the President was not aware that silver money had been abolished except for small change for amounts not exceeding five dollars. Leading members of Congress were also not aware of what they had done.

On the discovery of this trick, a tremendous agitation followed, and as the re-

ANTI-BUREAUCRACY CAMPAIGN MUST CONTINUE

The major issue confronting Australian electors in the Federal sphere is to take steps to ensure that the next Federal Elections are used to remove from office all present Federal Members who are not in favour of an immediate reduction of the number of bureaucrats to at least the pre-war level. If Australian electors cannot reduce the power of the Central Government by reducing the power of the Central Bureaucracy, they have little chance of obtaining any worthwhile reforms. There is no doubt that the anti-bureaucracy demand can be made a successful issue at the next Federal Elections if social crediters will only do sufficient "spade-work" before the elections take place.

Those seized with the importance of the anti-bureaucracy issue would be well advised to obtain supplies of the booklet, "Sack The Bureaucrats And Win The Peace," specially written as a handbook by Mr. Eric Butler. Supplies of this booklet can be obtained direct from The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide Street, Brisbane, at 4/- per dozen, post-free.

suit of this, standard silver dollars were again made full legal tender. This was in 1878. A monetary stringency was imposed by the financiers in 1890, and this was followed by the passage through Congress of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act, providing that, in order to prevent contraction of the currency, the Government should buy a stipulated quantity of silver each month. This action on the part of Congress was viewed unfavourably by the financiers, and they immediately started an agitation against it.

The Hon. Chas. A. Lindbergh, Congressional Member from Minnesota, told the House of Representatives that he had seen a circular sent out by the American Banking Association to the influential national banks of the United States. This circular was dated 11th March, 1893, and read as follows:—

"The interest of national banks requires immediate financial legislation by Congress. Silver, silver certificates, and treasury notes must be retired, and national bank notes upon a gold basis made the only money. This will require the authorisation of five hundred millions to one thousand millions of new bonds as the basis of circulation. YOU WILL AT ONCE RETIRE ONE-THIRD OF YOUR CIRCULATION AND CALL IN ONE-HALF OF YOUR LOANS. BE CAREFUL TO MAKE A MONEY STRINGENCY AMONG YOUR PATRONS, ESPECIALLY AMONG INFLUENTIAL BUSINESS MEN Advocate an extra session of Congress to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and (or its unconditional repeal per accompanying form. Use personal influence

NOTES ON THE VICTORIAN ELECTION

The Prime Minister, Mr. Chifley, entered the Victorian political arena last week. His reported statements concerning the former Premier of Victoria, Mr. Dunstan, were an insult to Victorian electors.

Mr. Chifley doesn't want to see Mr. Dunstan again at Canberra conferences. But Mr. Chifley must know that Mr. Dunstan's so-called obstructive tactics against the Federal Government were in complete harmony with the expressed will of the overwhelming majority of the Victorian electors, as demonstrated at the 1944 Referendum.

Victorians can govern themselves without any "assistance" from Mr. Chifley or any other Federal politician from another State.

The internal dissensions in the Liberal Party are bringing to public notice some interesting facts about Party politics. Party politics are, of course, machine politics. There appears to be little doubt that the Labor Party machine is far more rigidly organised than the Liberal Party machine. The most hopeful aspect of the Liberal Party's dissensions is the fact that there are Liberals who are determined to challenge the Party machine. It has indeed been a pleasure to see the rank-and-file in various electorates disregarding the veto of the Central Executive.

No doubt, Mr. Menzies finds this democratic trend very disturbing.

It seems that the rank-and-file of the Liberals, however, are beginning to realise that they have little hope of winning a Federal election while rigidly adhering to Mr. Menzies' policy, and that of those who back Mr. Menzies.

It is heartening to record that many Victorian social crediters have done some excellent work during the few weeks before the election. Candidates have been approached in some electorates, letters have been written to local papers, and vital questions have been asked at election meetings. But much more could have been done.

If the endorsed Liberal candidate for Hawthorn, Mr. F. L. Edmunds, is a representative of Conservatism, then the Socialists and Communists must be highly pleased with the progress of Red-anting in Conservative quarters.

In the course of his policy speech in the Hawthorn Town Hall last week, Mr. Edmunds spoke of investigating the Soviet educational system. Halfway to Moscow, and all that!

A group of critical questioners at Mr. Edmunds' meeting brought out some interesting points. Mr. Edmunds and his two supporting speakers, Senator Leckie and Mr. Menzies, made the point that Labor Government in Victoria would hand over to the Federal Government the powers refused at the Referendum. Mr. Edmunds inferred that the Independent candidate, Mr. L. Hollins, M.L.A., did everything Labor desired.

At question time Mr. Edmunds was asked whether, in view of what he and supporting speakers had said about the importance of denying the Federal Government increased powers, it should not be publicly admitted that Mr. Hollins had, in fact, strongly opposed the transfer of powers to Canberra, both in the Victorian Parliament and also during the Referendum campaign.

Mr. Edmunds, in spite of protests to the contrary, insisted that Mr. Hollins had adopted a "Yes-No" attitude to the Referendum!

The sooner all-parliamentary candidates

with your Congressman and particularly let your wishes be known to your Senators. The future life of national banks as fixed and safe investments depends upon immediate action, as there is an increasing sentiment in favour of Government legal tender notes and silver coinage."

Note particularly the part I have written in capital letters. We had been led to believe that a monetary stringency was something imposed by God through natural processes as a punishment for "living beyond our means," or as an indication that we needed a change of heart. In 1930 and 1931 it was referred to as an "economic blizzard."

The special session of Congress desired by the bankers was duly called by President Cleveland, but the Bill for the repeal of the Sherman law did not pass. So the financiers immediately got busy, and on 25th June 1893, it was announced that India had stopped the free coinage of silver, with the result that silver went to the lowest price ever recorded. Silver mines in the United States stopped work, banks began to fail in the South and West, factories closed down, and men of unquestioned credit could not get cash for their cheques. Bankruptcies skyrocketed and three of the greatest railways systems went into the hands of receivers.

Please remember this, for later on it will give us further confirmation of the identity of those who brought the disaster about. It can be said at this stage that the Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. figured prominently in it.

By this action the financiers won, and at another special session of Congress later in the same year, the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman law was repealed.

In the meantime, the "crisis" was extended as far afield as Australia and New Zealand, causing the suspension of many of the banks here and the ruination of thousands of innocent people.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C2. 4th November 1945.

(To be continued.)

BRITISH M.P. CONDEMNS BRETTON WOODS PLAN

(Continued from page 1.)

had an intelligent international financial set-up, and had been permitted to repay in kind, that debt would have been on the way to liquidation long ago.

I am glad that the interests of this country at this very difficult epoch, when international relations are so tangled and complicated, are in the very capable hands of my right hon. Friend who, in his ample person, manages to combine not only statesmanlike qualities—I am not sure what they are—but also downright horse sense, which he has learned in the rough and tumble of industrial life. He may have to deal with some persons who may not always see the British point of view. There are persons responsible for the financial policy of great nations who take the extraordinary line that a certain country should export a torrent of goods and import only a trickle, making good the deficiency by a continuous and cumulative process of overseas investment; there is no other way of making good the deficiency....

I would like to say this in conclusion. I hope that British international policy will be to buy from those who will buy from us; and I hope that His Majesty's Government, which is committed in its policies to bulk purchase and import boards—which Bretton Woods would forbid—and which is committed in the Gracious Speech to the maintenance of a high level of home agricultural output—which Bretton Woods would render impossible—will reject all specious pleas for compulsory multilateral international trade under monetary sanctions, pleas which can mean only that private enterprise shall buy what it likes and sell where it can, having no regard to the international trade balance, and leaving any disequilibria to be corrected by the creation of international indebtedness on commercial account, a process which would bring quick retribution at the hands of the monetary Fund proposed by Bretton Woods.

Let us face up to the implications of the fact that Free Trade has gone, never to return. Let His Majesty's Government preserve the right to recourse to what are often condemned in financial quarters as discriminatory practices. Let His Majesty's Government reserve the right to enter into bilateral trade arrangements with our Dominions and with Soviet Russia. Let His Majesty's Government revive and extend the sterling area. Those are practical alternatives to the appalling international thralldom which is Bretton Woods, a thralldom that would poison world harmony and would have the effect of frustrating the declared intentions of the British electorate, intentions so admirably interpreted in the Gracious Speech. I commend those alternatives to my right hon. Friend above the gangway.

THE REAL WAR CRIMINALS

On no previous occasion have the people generally been so interested in the question of war criminals. It is urgently desirable that readers of this journal take action to inform their fellow citizens of the master war criminals, the financiers who so treacherously betrayed the interests of the British Empire while helping the Axis Powers.

An excellent exposure of such financiers is Mr. Eric Butler's "Enemy Within the Empire." Here is an eye-opening booklet for social crediters to hand to those who want to learn about the real war criminals. There are still a few thousand unsold copies of this "best-seller." Obtain a supply immediately and help to prevent another world war. Quantities of half a dozen copies or more are now available at 3/- per half-dozen, post free. Order NOW.

Notes On The News

(Continued from page 1)

TRADES-HALL TROUBLES: Many "shop committees" have caused Trades Hall executives an oversize in headaches, because these committees have taken over control of strike policy. The Bunnerong strike is a case in point. It is, of course, plain to see that the Communists have control of many "shop committees," thus short-circuiting the Trades Hall bosses. If the rank-and-file workers oust the Communists from the "shop committees" and then control their own affairs, it will be all to the good. On the other hand, if the Trades Hall executives want to regain the workers' trust, which they have abused, they will have to displace the Communists, get closer to the workers, and become their obedient servants—not their masters, as in the past.

SUBSIDISED SOCIALISM: Socialistic Russia is getting new railway equipment from capitalistic Britain and America. Doubtless, as in other instances, the Russians will be led to believe that the equipment is the product of Soviet super-planners! In the early development of Soviet Russia practically all her hydro-electric schemes and other large engineering undertakings were designed and constructed by capitalistic experts with the aid of socialised labour. When attacked in 1941, Russia was nearly overwhelmed, and lost to Germany a considerable proportion of her territory and her population in a few months. Then a flood of modern tanks, planes, guns and other war equipment came to Russia from the despised capitalist countries and saved the Soviet regime from annihilation. Capitalism again kept Socialism alive! No doubt some of these facts may have dawned on the Russian people, despite the rigid censorship imposed by the Stalin regime.

—O. B. HEATLEY.

343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I.

Arthur Koestler, himself a Leftist, who has suffered grievously for holding views contrary to those professed by the ruling clique, has emerged a disillusioned man.

In his book, "The Yogi and the Commissar," he reaches this interesting conclusion:

"If I have to choose between living under a Political Commissar or a Blimp, I unhesitatingly choose Blimp. He will treat me as an annoying kind of oddity and push me about from sheer lack of imagination, [but] his muddled decency and clinging to traditional values will be a great asset."

Here is a selection from his observations:

No foreign newspapers are allowed. "Each town in the Union, Moscow included, has two morning papers, a governmental organ and a party organ. All governmental papers throughout the country appear every morning with one uniform leader—the leader of the Moscow 'Izvestia.'" Similarly, the leader of "Pravda" is published in all party newspapers. "Local news consists of official leaflets."

"Under my hotel room window in Kharkov, funeral processions marched past all day." There was neither electricity nor light, no fuel or petrol, and temperatures (winter 1932-33) 30 degrees below zero.

"Life seemed to have come to a standstill, the whole machinery was on the verge of collapse."

Yet, "each morning when I read the 'Kharkov Kommunist' I learned about plan figures reached and over-reached, new giant combines in the Urals, and so on; the photographs were either of young people—always laughing—or of some picturesque elder of Uzbekistan, always smiling and always learning the alphabet." "Not one word about local famine—the dying-out of whole villages . . ." "The enormous land was covered by a blanket of silence." . . . the foreigner's ignorance was unbounded. . . . His contacts were restricted to Soviet officials."

Stalinist propaganda has so twisted the truth that "the masses were made to believe that the mere building of factories was identical with Socialism." The Dnieper Dam, the Turk-Sib Railway, the White Sea Canal and the Moscow Underground, etc., were represented "as something unique the world has never seen . . ." The majority of the Russian masses actually believe that Moscow is the only town in the world to have an underground railway."

Even in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy people could travel freely once their passport visas were obtained; but not in Russia. "The secret which the Soviet Union guarded was not of a military nature; it was the average living conditions of her citizens."

The Forced Labour Camps on the White Sea, "the exiled and deported millions in Siberia and Central Asia" are "as remote from the Western observer as the dark side of the moon from the star-gazer's telescope."

The Russians believe that though their life might be a purgatory, those who were abroad lived in hell.

"In 1933 in Moscow I saw a film in which a German scientist was flogged in the vaults of a Catholic Monastery by monks in black cowls, reinforced by Nazi storm-troopers. The film was prefaced by Lunatcharsky, former People's Commissar for Education."

A popular Ukrainian writer was convinced that in capitalist London, policemen walk about on Sunday mornings pushing proletarians off the pavement.

"The new Constitution of 1936 re-established inequality from birth. Inheritance was made legal again."

Thus, at the "death of the outstanding aircraft designer, Comrade N. M. Polikarpov, hero of Socialist Labour, Deputy of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., following serious illness, the Soviet Government has decided to assign a grant of 100,000 roubles to Polikarpov's wife and daughter, and pensions of 1000 roubles a month to his wife for life, 500 roubles a month to his daughter until she completes her education, and 400 roubles a month to his sister for life."

In contrast to this a labourer will receive an old age pension of 30 roubles per month if there is one non-earning member of the family, 40 roubles if there are two or more.

In the first case an average of say 1000 roubles per head, allowing for interest on the 100,000 roubles, in the second 13 or less per head!

Higher education is now a privilege of parents who could afford it—i.e., those of the bureaucracy, technocracy and the new intelligentsia. This has meant a decline in the percentage of children of manual workers in the Universities and Secondary Schools as under:

	1933	1935	1938
	%	%	%
Universities	50	45	34
Secondary Schools . . .	42	32	27
	92	77	61

The introduction of school fees in 1940 made the class distinction even more marked and only the exception can overcome it.

There are also great differences in wages and the introduction of Stakhanovism in 1933, following the exploit of Alexei Stakhanov who cut 102 tons of coal in a six hours shift instead of the usual seven tons, a few days later increasing it to 175 tons and then 227 tons. This, of course, was accomplished by division of labour. The outcome is that Stakhanovites are privileged and have separate dining-room in factories and are paid up to twenty times the average of 125 roubles per month—a much

greater difference than in Western Countries.

The salaries of directors, chief engineers and administrators are up to a hundred times higher than the average wage.

"The apologist may argue that, regrettably unequal as Soviet incomes may be, they still represent salaries and not profits as in capitalist countries." But Comrade Berdyevkov, the Director of a State Farm in Kasakstan, the first official Soviet Millionaire, has the advantage of administering the undertaking and enjoys all the benefit of ownership without the financial risk. As a contrast to the Proletarian millionaire Koestler calls attention to the condition of the Proletarian Paupers. Prices since 1913 have risen fifteen to twenty times, and the index of real wages based on two estimates which he gives show:

	1913	1928/29	1937/40
Index of Real Wages 100	139	65	

Colin Clark (critique of Russian statistics), he says, estimates that the food consumption per head has fallen 30 per cent. This figure is estimated to be 30 per cent, below the 10 per cent, worst fed of the British population.

The labour conditions are worse than those in Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy. "Foremen and factory managers were invested with the power to discharge without notice workers for being more than twenty minutes late for work, for leaving work before time, for idling, unsatisfactory output, etc.† Dismissal for idleness en-

tailed loss of ration card and of the right to dwelling space"

Insurance benefits depended on the length of time in one job. Only after ten years at one place could full insurance benefits be enjoyed. If you changed your job you would have to start at the bottom again!

In regard to the treatment of criminals, children of twelve are treated as adults.

The dependents of a man who escapes military service by deserting abroad are subject to deportation for five years to the remote regions of Siberia if they did not know about his crime if they did know, then five to ten years with confiscation of property. (Para 3 of the decree of June 8, 1934, published in "Izvestia," June 9, 1934.)

The home passport system (decree, December 27, 1932) made it necessary to get special permission to enter all the bigger industrial towns and the surrounding area varying in radius from twenty to a hundred kilometres. Even absence from home for more than twenty-four hours had to be reported to the police.

He reports vile cruelties equal to those inflicted by the Nazis on their victims; for instance, "standing for forty-eight hours against a wall in the big cellar clothed only in a shirt, in more serious cases standing, for forty-eight hours in cold water up to the belt. The latter punishment frequently ended in paralysis, insanity or death." Prisoners, may be kept in a cell 48 square yards area for 236 days without leaving it.

Koestler also mentions the millions, estimator at 15,000,000 to 18,000,000, "lost souls" in slave camps with appalling death rates. He sums up by saying:—

"The Russian revolution has failed in its aim to create a new type of human society or a new moral climate. The ultimate reason for its failure was the arid nineteenth century materialism of its doctrine. It had to fall back on the old opiates because it did not recognise man's need for spiritual nourishment."

Many other matters besides conditions in Russia are discussed in this book.

—R. G. in the "Social Crediter," 1/9/45.
* "Soviet War News," August 2, 1942.
† Decree of December 29, 1939.

ARE WE ON THE ROAD TO SERFDOM?

(From "The Road to Serfdom," by Prof. Hayek.)

There can be no doubt that most of those in the democracies who demand a central direction of all economic activity still believe that Socialism and individual freedom can be combined. Yet Socialism was early recognised by many thinkers as the greatest threat to freedom.

It is rarely remembered now that Socialism in its beginnings was frankly authoritarian. It began quite openly as a reaction against the "liberalism" of the French Revolution. The French writers who laid its foundation had no doubt that their ideas could be put into practice only by a strong dictatorial government. The first of modern planners, St. Simon, predicted that those who did not obey his proposed Planning Boards would be "treated as cattle."

Nobody saw more clearly than the great political thinker, de Tocqueville that Democracy stands in an irreconcilable conflict with Socialism: "Democracy extends the sphere of individual freedom," he said. "Democracy attaches all possible value to each man," he said in 1848, "while Socialism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number. Democracy and Socialism have nothing in common but one word: equality. But notice the difference: while Democracy seeks equality in liberty, Socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude."

To allay these suspicions and to harness to its cart the strongest of all political motives—the craving for freedom—Socialists began increasingly to make use of the promise of a "new freedom."

Socialism was to bring "economic freedom," without which political freedom was "not worth having."

To make this argument sound plausible, the word "freedom" was subjected to a subtle change in meaning. The word had formerly meant freedom from coercion, from the arbitrary power of other men. Now it was made to mean freedom from necessity . . . The demand for the "new freedom" was thus only another name for the old demand for a redistribution of wealth.

The claim that a planned economy would produce a substantially larger output than the competitive system is being progressively abandoned by most students of the problem. Yet it is this false hope as much as anything which drives us along the road to Planning.

In recent years observer after observer has been impressed by the unforeseen consequences of Socialism, the extraordinary similarity in many respects of the conditions under "Communism" and "Fascism." As the writer Peter Drucker expressed it in 1939, "the complete collapse of the belief in the attainability of freedom and equality through Marxism, has forced Russia to travel the same road toward a totalitarian society of unfreedom and inequality which Germany has been following."

No less significant is the intellectual outlook of the rank-and-file in the Communist and "Fascist" movements in Germany before 1933. The relative ease with which a young Communist could be converted into a Nazi or vice versa was well known, best of all to the propagandists of the two Parties.

The Communists and Nazis clashed more frequently with each other than with other Parties simply because they competed for the same type of mind and reserved for each other the hatred of the heretic.

Their practice showed how closely they are related. To both, the real enemy, the

man with whom they had nothing in common, was the liberal of the old type. While to the Nazi the Communist and to the Communist the Nazi, and to both the Socialist, are potential recruits made of the right timber, they both know that there can be no compromise between them and those who really believe in individual freedom.

What is promised to us as the Road to Freedom is in fact the Highroad to Servitude. For it is not difficult to see what must be the consequences when democracy embarks upon a course of planning. The goal of the planning will be described by some such vague term as "the general welfare." There will be no real agreement as to the ends to be attained, and the effect of the people's agreeing that there must be central planning, without agreeing on the ends, will be rather as if a group of people were to commit themselves to take a journey together without agreeing where they want to go: with the result that they may all have to make a journey which most of them do not want at all.

Democratic assemblies cannot function as planning agencies.

They cannot produce agreement on everything—the whole direction of the resources of the nation—for the number of possible courses of action will be legion. Even if a congress could, by proceeding step by step and compromising at each point, agree on some scheme, it would certainly in the end satisfy nobody.

To draw up an economic plan in this fashion is even less possible than, for instance, successfully to plan a military campaign by democratic procedure. As in strategy it would become inevitable to delegate the task to experts. And even if, by this expedient, a democracy should succeed in planning every sector of economic activity, it would still have to face the problem of integrating these separate plans into a unitary whole. There will be a stronger and stronger demand that some Board or some single individual should be given powers to act on their own responsibility.

The cry for an economic dictator is a characteristic stage in the movement towards planning.

Thus the legislative body will be reduced to choosing the persons who are to have practically absolute power. The whole system will tend toward that kind of dictatorship in which the head of the government is from time to time confirmed in his position by popular vote, but where he has all the powers at his command to make certain that the vote will go in the direction he desires.

Planning leads to dictatorship because dictatorship is the most effective instrument of coercion and, as such, essential if central planning on a large scale is to be possible. There is no justification for the widespread belief that, so long as power is conferred by democratic procedure, it cannot be arbitrary; it is not the source of power, which prevents it from being arbitrary; to be free from dictatorial qualities, the power must also be limited. A true dictatorship of the proletariat," even if democratic in form, if it undertook centrally to direct the economic system, would prob-

GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S.A.

(From the "Social Crediter.")

While exercising that restraint so continuously enjoined upon the British, and so joyously repudiated elsewhere, we still think that a cursory recapitulation of the relation of this country to the United States of America is advisable.

In 1938 a flood of abuse was directed against Mr. Chamberlain for attempting to avoid war. When, in 1939, we did declare war on Germany, we were promptly informed that all supplies were strictly business, and we stripped ourselves of £2,000,000,000 of overseas investments to buy inferior material, including practically useless aeroplanes. We then handed over our best designs, built at our own expense factories in the United States which could quite well have been built elsewhere, handed over our manufacturing processes and carried on a single-handed war with Germany, the contribution of France being a liability rather than an asset. The magnificent, if short-lived, contribution of Poland is another matter. For some not very obvious reason, we diverted the channels of our food supplies to U.S.A., and we took delivery of nearly inedible "lunch hams," spam, and other goods at ruinously inflated prices, of a quality which would never have been accepted in America. For three years, the military, as distinct from the manufacturing, contribution of the United States was negligible. Not a bomb fell on her shores, and until the final years of the war, not an American aeroplane raided Germany. Nevertheless, with the wholehearted co-operation of the "B.B.C.," the impression has been successfully disseminated that the Empire which declared war at the frenzied appeals to "Stop Hitler," and carried it on single handed for over a year at a time when the German Reich, with its command of Europe, was a far greater power than the United States, has really only played a minor part in the defeat of "Nazi-ism" (never, if possible, called Socialism), and is committed to a minor role in the settlement.

It is quite time that block figures of millions of pounds and billions of dollars were excluded from this discussion. Anyone not bemused by them can see that we are immensely poorer, and the United States is immensely richer from this war. The contribution of the British Empire must obviously have been, as it has been, immensely the greater, and it is quite time a realistic balance sheet was presented.

If the best contribution we can make to the discussion is to talk about increased exports without considering what the unit purchase price of those exports will be in competition with an American production capacity which we have done our best to build up, then it will not be long before the atomic bomb will dispose of all our problems.

BRITISH ELECTION INQUEST

From a letter to "The Scotsman": (2). A million American soldiers in the country for three years, each believing Britain governed by marquesses in monocles, and spreading Left, propaganda in highway and byway, pub and club—a million unpaid propagandists. (3). Military prestige of Russia thought to reflect credit on her social system; German Army, that Russia needed two allies to overcome, not thought to reflect credit on German system—example of popular logic. (4). Temporary glorification of the common man, just because he is common.

PROPOSED BROADCASTS IN WESTERN VICTORIA

As mentioned in these columns last week, social creditors of Colac (Vic.) are proposing to sponsor a series of Social Credit talks over the Colac radio station. £25 is required to pay for a series of 13 weekly ten-minute talks. Approximately £15 has now been subscribed by Colac and District social creditors. All social creditors throughout the Victorian Western District who desire to help launch this important venture, are urged to send a donation to Mr. Spencer, Garage Proprietor, Murray Street, Colac, Victoria.

ably destroy personal freedom as completely as any autocracy has ever done.

Individual freedom cannot be reconciled with the supremacy of one single purpose to which the whole of society is permanently subordinated.

To a limited extent we ourselves experience this fact in wartime, when subordination of almost everything to the immediate and pressing need is the price at which we preserve our freedom in the long run. The fashionable phrases about doing for the purposes of peace what we have learned to do for the purposes of war are completely misleading, for it is sensible temporarily to sacrifice freedom in order to make it more secure in the future, but it is quite a different thing to sacrifice liberty permanently in the interests of a planned economy.

To those who have watched the transition from Socialism to "Fascism" at close quarters, the connection between the two systems is obvious. The realisation of the Socialist programme means the destruction of freedom. Democratic Socialism, the great Utopia of the last few generations, is simply not achievable.

(To be continued.)

ARMY EDUCATION BANS SOLDIERS' A.B.C. BROADCAST

Hereunder is the introduction to a very interesting and significant sixpenny booklet bearing the above title, recently published by the Electoral Campaign of Queensland, 142 Adelaide St., Brisbane. The booklet also contains the full text of the broadcast mentioned below:

During this war there has been a lot of talk about democracy. Soldiers have been told on countless occasions that they have been fighting to save democracy. Soldiers themselves believe that they have. It has also become evident that many of them know just what real democracy means. Some of the discussions taking place in Army Education discussion groups bear this out. But it appears that there are people in our midst, in fact, people in charge of Army Education, who do not want the public to know what soldiers are thinking and saying.

This booklet is the result of one of the most outrageous attacks upon soldiers' democratic rights yet seen in Australia. The publishers found it hard to believe that the story related in this booklet could be true, but upon thorough investigation were forced to the conclusion that the facts as related are accurate in every detail.

Ironically enough, this attack upon soldiers' democratic rights was made by the Director of Army Education, who even overrode the Australian Broadcasting Commission by saying that the Australian public could not hear a proposed Broadcast. In case the Director of Army Education is not aware of the fact, his Army Education service has a series of booklets dealing with the meaning of democracy. It would be an excellent idea if he studied these booklets, particularly the one dealing with freedom of discussion. He apparently approves of the idea that democracy means freedom of discussion—but only such discussion as he thinks fit! The following facts tell the story of a banned A.B.C. broadcast.

In June 1945, a representative of the A.B.C., a returned soldier, approached Army Education at one of the biggest training camps in Australia. He wanted to know if the camp's A.E.S. discussion group would like to have one of its discussions broadcast over the national stations. The group said that they did not think that the discussion group would be very interested, as they were sure that they would have to deal with some "wishy-washy" material and would not be allowed to say what they thought. But the assurance was given that such would not be the case that provided normal censorship requirements were met it was desirable that the public know just what the soldiers in the group thought. The subject was then chosen: "Does Totalitarianism Threaten Us on the Home Front?" In view of subsequent developments, a most appropriate title.

Members of the group then went to work and finally produced a script embodying the main views of those in the group. This

script was typed and many copies distributed in order to discover what soldiers generally thought of the material. Most of them approved of it. The publishers consider it one of the most stimulating talks they have yet read, and one, which the general public should read. The publishers were delighted to think that such material was to be broadcast over the national stations, but, when they heard that it had been banned, they felt that they should perform a public service by publishing the script, a copy of which they possessed.

When the script was completed, a copy was sent to the A.B.C. and the local A.E.S. Headquarters. The material was passed by the Army Censor at Victoria Barracks, Melbourne, by the Public Relations Censor, and by the A.B.C. Many favourable comments upon the material were made, particularly by the A.B.C. In view of the fact that the A.B.C. could only give 181 minutes to the broadcast, the original script had to be condensed slightly. The parts in the brackets were deleted by the discussion group. Everything was now set for the material to be recorded. The members of the group worked hard rehearsing their parts for the recording, which was to take place early in July. It was to be broadcast early in August. But then came the bombshell. After all final arrangements for the recording had been made, a message came through from the Director of Army Education, who in spite of the material having been passed by all the Censors above, stated that he could not give permission for the broadcast to proceed. Here was that great thing, Democracy in action! Soldiers in the discussion group were disillusioned, disappointed and disgusted, particularly when they heard that the only apparent excuse for the high-handed banning of the broadcast was the too-frequent use of the word bureaucrat!

In spite of this ban on the talk, the A.B.C. were so keen on it that they desired to go ahead and put it over the National Stations as an exclusive A.B.C. feature without doing it through the Army Education. However, the soldiers dropped the matter when they no longer had official Army sanction—although the only section of the Army opposed to the talk was the Director of Army Education. Or was he acting under pressure from some undisclosed source? No doubt most Australians hold very definite views concerning Government by regulations drafted by bureaucrats. Was it thought that a nation-wide broadcast of the following talk would strike a too-responsive note in the thoughts of those who heard it? Let the reader study and judge for himself.

In trades-union circles, as in several other spheres, the power-lusting centralisers are not getting it all their own way in this country. Among examples of unionists' resistance previously reported in these columns, that of Balmain ironworkers was prominent. A recent leaflet issued in that quarter reads as follows:—

FEDERATED IRONWORKERS' ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA. BALMAIN BRANCH.

Temperance Hall,
Montague St., Balmain.
1st October 1945.

Phone: WB 2662.
Fellow Workers,

Two immediate questions confronting us are the decisions of the National Council to merge the two Sydney Branches and the Balmain Branch, and to increase the contributions.

The Balmain Branch is definitely against both these decisions.

In regard to merging the three Branches, a meeting of eight officials was held on 30th July, at which Leehy, Brislan, and McKeon were alleged to be representing the Balmain Branch.

These three were suspended from office on 22nd May last and could not represent the Branch. In the Arbitration Court judgment on the 29th of August we find the following:

"The resolutions for suspension were carried at the ordinary monthly meeting, which was held on 22nd May, 1945, and in my opinion Leehy's conduct was such as to justify the meeting in electing a chairman and subsequently carrying on its business in the absence of Leehy. I hold that the decisions of this meeting suspending the officers and members of the Committee and appointing others to carry on the business of the Branch until the suspensions were dealt with were legal and effective."

We claim that the decision to do away with the Balmain Branch cannot be justi-

BUSINESS PREMISES WANTED

"New Times" reader urgently requires business premises in City or Eastern Suburbs of Melbourne. (A garage or large shed in good condition, with minimum measurements of 30 feet by 10 feet, would do.) Requires same for clean work without machinery. Willing to donate £5 to any Social Credit activity designated by person giving information leading to procurement of suitable premises.

Replies to "N.B.," c/o "New Times" Office.

quarters in conjunction with the Shipwrights' Union.

It is still possible for any Branch, operating under rank and file control, to pay its way on the present contributions.

FELLOW IRONWORKERS,

The Balmain Branch has had no say in the merger decision, or the increase in dues. The National Council is defying the judgment, and our members will not have a vote on the issue.

We claim that even if the ballot was valid, each Branch should have the right to accept or reject the merger.

At the end of the year, we will conduct our ballot for Annual elections of Branch officers.

Fellow ironworkers of Sydney No. 1 and No. 2 Branches! Exercise your vote to throw out both the merger and the increase! By doing so you will be helping Balmain fight for democratic control, without which the Unions are worthless.

By doing so you will be helping yourselves!

VOTE NO.

Yours fraternally,

B. THORNTON, President.

N. ORIGLASS, Assistant-Secretary.

F. R. McGRATH, Secretary.

RING WB 2662 FOR LEAFLETS.

POLITICAL POINTERS

(Continued from page 1.)

and to this end imposed a very heavy indemnity. The result was that the people of France worked hard and paid the indemnity, thus creating prosperity in France and depression in Germany. I believe the position was so bad that Bismarck is reported to have said that if there were another war with France, and if Germany won, one of the conditions of peace would be that Germany would pay an indemnity to France. After the war of 1918, the Allied Nations thought they would make Germany pay. They could not collect enough cash from Germany, so they collected coal, and ships built in German yards. The result was that Great Britain obtained ships and coal from Germany instead of coal from Wales and ships from the British shipbuilding yards. As one English writer explained, it was not the German people that paid the indemnity, but the coalminers in Wales and the men of Britain."

Judging from Mr. Hill's comments, the only way for us to create prosperity in Australia is to pay our defeated enemy, Japan, the largest possible indemnity!

—ED.B.

MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN

The Power of the International Financiers

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

While the Rothschilds were busy controlling European affairs last century, their fellow German-Jews, Schiff, the Warburgs, Kuhn, etc., left Germany and went to America, where they established the most powerful banking group in the world, Kuhn, Loeb and Co. We have already dealt with many of the astounding activities of this group, but there is much more we can add.

Early this century there was a tremendous agitation in America against the concentration of economic power by a few men using the banking system as their principal instrument of control. The public outcry was so great that President Wilson was obliged to establish a Commission of Inquiry. The findings of the Commission as presented to Congress showed that a "Banking Trust" did exist. It included five principal banks, as well as numerous financial and industrial groups throughout America and other parts of the world. In adding together the capital sums represented by the banks, which formed part of the "Trust," the Commission arrived at the staggering figure of £4449 millions. One man, Jacob Schiff, was virtual controller of this tremendous economic power! The Report finished in the following terms:

"The powerful grip of these men is placed upon the lever which controls all credit, and its wheels turn or stop at their signal."

As a result of this Report, the Federal Reserve Board was created; but so far from weakening the power of the German-Jews, it actually strengthened their control. The Board was finally established in 1913, just in time for the start of World War I, during which it was dominated by Paul Warburg. While Paul Warburg was advising the American Government; his brother, Max, was advising the German Government!

Even a British banker, the late Sir Josiah Stamp, was moved to place the following on record:

"Never in the history of the world has so much power been vested in a small body of men as in the Federal Reserve Board. These men have the welfare of the world in their hands." (Vide "National Bank Monthly," February, 1926.)

The German-Jews of Wall Street emerged from World War I with enormously increased power; the British Empire under their financial domination (vide the present writer's "Enemy Within the Empire"), Europe weak and exhausted, ready for suitable "reconstruction," and Germany preserved intact for future military operations; the League of Nations and the Bank of International Settlements formed; and a foothold gained in Palestine for the Jews. (As mentioned previously, people know that the Bank of International Settlements, with representatives from all enemy countries, including Japan, carried on right throughout World War II. More will yet be heard about this institution's wartime activities.)

There is indisputable evidence that the international banking groups in America maintained liaison with their connections in Germany right throughout World War II.

It will be recalled that Mr. Sumner Welles made a visit to Germany and Italy early in World War 2. It can be taken as almost certain that Mr. Welles, although allegedly representing President Roosevelt, was in reality representing the Wall Street banking groups. It must not be forgotten that these groups had tremendous investments in Germany.

Mr. Welles had previously worked for the Wall Street groups in Honduras and the Dominican Republic. When Ambassador to Cuba in 1933 he ousted President Mahado, ruled as an unofficial dictator for a few months and saved two billion dollars in investments belonging to Wall Street and Guggenheimer sugar interests. It is also interesting to remember that the wealthy oil broker, Mr. W. R. Davies, was also in Germany about the same time as Mr. Welles. Oil companies seem to be always well informed concerning possible revolutions and wars. In 1929 the Standard Oil Company made contact with I.G. Farben, A.G. of Germany providing for merger of interests in development of hydrogenation of coal. The new company formed was the Standard I.G. Company. The majority of

the stock of the Company was held by Standard Oil. The exclusive rights for licensing the process of hydrogenation were assigned by Standard Oil to another company. The same rights were given to a company incorporated in Holland in June 1938. This company, in turn, took over the organisation of another company registered in Liechtenstein, which was looking after the interests of Royal Dutch Shell and Imperial Chemical Industries in the matter of hydrogenation of coal.

The main results, which followed the visits of Mr. Welles and Mr. Davies to Germany, were increased American exports of war materials and oil to Germany. The Melbourne "Age" of August 24, 1940, reported "Izvestia," the official organ of the central executive of the Russian Communist Party, as saying:

"Russia is helping Germany to beat the British blockade by supplying raw materials. . . Commerce between the two countries is now at the greatest point since the last war."

The Russians were merely "stooges" for the international financiers, who had no fears that their investments in Europe, particularly in Germany, would be affected by a long war. On December 1, 1939, the following appeared in the Australian press:

"A Berlin report states that Dr. Schacht, Hitler's financial adviser, is planning to raise a loan in the United States from bankers of German descent. He expects thus to obtain enough foreign currency to pay for imported war materials."

The American Jew, Morgenthau, stated frankly enough what was happening: "Any amount of money can be sent to Germany. It is silly, but we are at peace with Germany, and cannot do anything about its funds." (Vide Melbourne "Herald," August 9, 1940.) In other words, the German-Jewish banking groups in America were taking no action to hamper the Germans buying in America.

The Melbourne "Age" of September 26, 1940, published the following report: "The New York Daily News" states that 10,000,000 dollars worth of war materials are going to Germany and Italy from the U.S. every month via Spain, Portugal, Cuba, Russia and Mexico. Department of Commerce figures show, for example, compared with the first seven months of last year, shipments across the Pacific to Russia, and thence to Germany, were leaping up."

The Melbourne "Argus" of March 7, 1941, contained the following:

"Germany's funds in the United States now total 300,000,000 dollars, according to official data on international finance made available today. These funds are said to be increasing faster than they can be spent. . . . Reliable sources affirm that Germany's financial position is so favourable that some dollar assets for which Germany finds no use are being transferred to . . . the Japanese."

(To be continued.)

"MONEY REFORM OR SOCIAL CREDIT?"

Hear—

Mr. W. R. BROWNLEY

One of Australia's earliest Social

Credit writers and lecturers

Thursday, November 15, or 8 p.m.

at the

Douglas Social Credit Movement of Victoria, "The Block," Melbourne. (Entrance through grille in Elizabeth Street.)