

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.

New, 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. 46. MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1945

## "NEW TIMES" SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home or elsewhere every week are as follow:  
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.

## Federal Powers Fight Enters New Phase!

### The Post Election Situation in Victoria

Although unable to win a majority of seats at the Victorian election, the Labor Party has been able to form a Government, which should be able to hold office for some time.

The main issue emerging from the election is whether Labor can obtain sufficient parliamentary support to give the Federal Government the increased powers, which it and the bureaucrats continue to demand.

It is almost certain that the first major demand by the Federal Government is now being carefully prepared. If the Federal Government can have the Uniform Taxation Plan maintained permanently, the imposition of National Socialism will have been taken one step further.

The "capitalist" press is, as usual, helping the plot against democracy. In last Monday's Melbourne "Age" a special correspondent at Canberra is quoted as follows:

"There seems no doubt whatever that uniform income taxation has come to stay. The exigencies of the war situation in 1942 enabled it to be introduced almost overnight. The Commonwealth and most of the States are of the opinion that it has far more virtues than defects, but there must be substantial modification if Victoria is not to receive harsh and unfair treatment."

This type of statement has been made, not only by Victorian Labor Members, but also by some Liberals. It is no doubt hoped that a suitable "reformation" of the Uniform Taxation Plan may appease Victorian electors. This is the greatest danger confronting Victorian electors at present. Social crediters should be encouraging Victorian electors to associate for the purpose of instructing State Members that Uniform Taxation must not be continued permanently in any shape or form, without a Referendum on the issue. Unless electors insist on this democratic procedure, it is more than likely that Labor will get sufficient support from an Independent and/or one of the Liberals for a continuance of Uniform Taxation without the electors being consulted.

As was mentioned in the "New Times" last week, Mr. Menzies is seeking a "properly constituted" Convention to discuss possible changes in the Commonwealth Constitution.

The decision of the High Court last Monday that the Victorian Government, if it so desires, may proceed with its action

against the Commonwealth to test the validity of the "Free Medicine" Act, is taken by Canberra as a clear indication that, with the exception of old-age and invalid pensions, all the Federal Government's "social service" schemes are in danger of being declared unconstitutional. Even if the Victorian Labor Government does not carry on with the case already started against the Commonwealth, there is no doubt that the Federal Government will seek to persuade the State Governments to grant the required powers or have another Referendum.

Social crediters should do all in their power to ensure that, if the Federal Government persists with its demands, a Referendum shall be held. The danger of the State Governments giving way to the Canberra power-lusters has been increased by the advent of Labour Government in Victoria and the precarious position of the Playford Government in South Australia.

That great Socialist daily, the Melbourne "Herald," is not only campaigning for the continuance of a "suitably reformed" Uniform Taxation Plan, but is also backing Mr. Menzies in his demand for an all-party Constitution Convention. In its editorial of November 20, the "Herald" says: "The power of the National Government to provide social services should be beyond question."

Social crediters believe that people should have economic democracy and thus provide their own "social services," and they challenge the "Herald's" totalitarian proposition. Why cannot the various States, if they are not completely hamstrung by Uniform Taxation and other centrally controlled financial policies, provide social services just as well as the Federal Government? Why should the people of any one State, who may, for example, desire to reduce their taxation, and, by modifying financial policy, still obtain adequate social services, be compelled to do what the Federal Government desires?

The more government is centralised, the

more difficult it is for the local people to obtain results which they desire. Every Victorian elector may desire taxation to be immediately reduced by, say, 50 per cent, but, while Uniform Taxation in any shape or form continues, Victorians would not have sufficient representatives at Canberra to have the slightest effect.

Worthwhile reforms of any description are extremely difficult to obtain from any central Government. Local Government

must not only be preserved, it must be extended. Social Crediters can make this issue clear if they will only realise that the Battle for the Peace is now on in earnest. Victorian social crediters, who did excellent though unspectacular work during the recent State elections, can now do even better work in the critical months ahead. Demand from all State Members: No surrender to the Canberra power-lusters on any point!  
—E.D.B.

### Open Letter to Mr. Gray, M.L.A.

Dear Mr. Gray, —Labor Party politicians never tire of saying that their opponents always attempt to use subterfuge in order to trick the people. Yet it seems, Sir that you yourself are not above neglecting the truth when it suits your own political purposes.

You will no doubt recall that, during the Referendum last year, you worked for destruction of the sovereignty of our Victorian Government. The majority of the electors of Victoria refused to agree to the betrayal which you and other anti-local-government advocates proposed. We suggest that you should have resigned from an institution which you worked to destroy.

Just prior to the recent Victorian elections you were asked by at least two of your electors whether, if elected, you would abide by the decision of the majority of the Victorian electors as expressed at the Referendum: that no increased powers be granted to the Federal Government. In one of your replies you had the effrontery to say that you were prepared to abide by the will of the majority of the Victorian electors as expressed at the Referendum, but that the majority of Victorian electors had expressed themselves in favour of giving increased powers to the Federal Government! Let us quote your exact words:

"My recollection of the position in so far as the recent Referendum is concerned is that Victoria indicated its willingness by vote for the transference of powers; therefore, I do not feel obliged to oppose such transference."

Your "recollection of the position" in-

dicates very definitely that you are not fit to be a Member of the Victorian Parliament. Do you ask us to believe that a Member of the Victorian Parliament does not know that a majority of Victorian electors did NOT vote in favour of a transference of powers at the Referendum? Not only did a majority of Victorian electors vote AGAINST greater powers for Canberra, but a majority of your own electors voted likewise.

If you did not deliberately distort the truth in the matter mentioned above, then we can only say that you are so ill-informed on recent and vital political events that you should have no place in a democratic Parliamentary institution.

We do not intend to forget this matter. In the course of time the representatives of the electors must again face an election. Our advice to all democrats in your electorate of Box Hill, and there are many, is to do all in their power to have you removed from Victorian politics at the next election.

You could, of course, decide that perhaps it would be more advisable for you to recognise that you could have a longer and far more comfortable political life, by upholding the sovereignty of the Parliament of which you are a Member.

—Yours faithfully, "THE NEW TIMES."

### Woman M.P. on Local Government

In the following letter to the "Newtown Daily" (N.S.W.), published on November 8, Mrs. Lilian Fowler, a Lang Labor member of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly and a member of the Newtown Council, makes some important and refreshing observations on the subject of Local Government:

Dear Sir, —I am glad that the Premier of New South Wales said that "Municipal Councils may play an important part in public administration," as reported in your paper last week. The emphasis is on the word "may," and the trend as fostered by the Government leaves no doubt that he should have said, "will not."

There is no doubt that in a democracy it is desirable that as much as possible of Governmental functions should be administered by Municipal and Shire Councils. But the present Government, although it continually asserts the precept of extended Local Government, is, in effect, decreasing its powers and responsibilities. As an example, the followers of the Government in the Newtown Council have indicated that they are in accord with the Government's policy of centralisation, and, in this respect, Aldermen Bodkin, Greenup, and Wright appeared before the Royal Commission on Local Government Boundaries and expressed the view that Newtown should become part of the City Council. How can they reconcile this centralising move with their ideas of decentralisation, is one that is hard to explain. Newtown people will appreciate this fact when they have to take their troubles in to Sydney for attention.

On the other hand, Mr. McKell claims that great things are being done for Local Government by the recent amendment to the Act and by the Town and Country Planning Act; but if it had not been for the active opposition offered in Parliament to the structure of these Acts, which secured vital democratic amendments, the whole of the power would have been concentrated in the hands of the Minister. Surely this is only decentralisation in thought, because it retains the power at the centre.

The suggested idea of the Decentralisation Committee that Local Government should have more place in a decentralised State is a happy thought if brought to fruition, but the other recommendation of the Decentralisation Committee that—"The ultimate establishment of regional administrative councils in place of the existing regional advisory councils and the gradual

delegation to them of such authority and powers as would give to such councils (regional government appointees) a full measure of responsibility and ample scope for initiative in the development of their regions"—does not augur well for the future of Local Government, and they are, in effect, centralising decentralisation.

Mr. McKell was right in the concluding paragraph of his statement when he said that we had much to learn in this country about the art of Local Government, and I am afraid that until such times as he and his colleagues really learn the true meaning of Local Government as applied in this country, then Local Government will gradually be deprived of its powers and duties and ultimately finish in one centralised department having its headquarters in Macquarie Street. —Yours truly,

ALD. LILIAN FOWLER, M.L.A.

### Indonesian "Nationalists" and Their Friends

The Moscow papers are now giving more space to the struggle in Indonesia than they gave to the entire Pacific War.

But for Australians there are a number of questions still to be answered satisfactorily regarding the Indonesians.

(1) Is it a fact that Australians in Java, including survivors from the Perth, were handed over to the Japanese by the Indonesians?

(2) Is it a fact that the present Indonesian Nationalist Government consists of politicians who collaborated with the Japanese on the understanding that they would be able to take their part in the Nipponese Greater East Asia, as an independent republic?

(3) Are the local Communists supporting the Indonesians who murdered British officers and Indian Gurkhas in the recent struggle?

—Sydney "Century," Nov. 9.

**When the Department of Information was created by the Menzies Government early in World War II, Mr. A. Calwell, M.H.R., was one of those who suggested that the Department would be used as a propaganda instrument to bemuse the Australian people. Mr. Calwell spoke truer than he knew!**

In the course of time he became the Federal Minister in charge of the Department of Information. Like Topsy, it has continued to grow and grow, and Australian taxpayers are called upon to pay hundreds of thousands of pounds annually to maintain it. Some of the material issued

### Facts About Palestine

In the British House of Commons on August 22, Captain Marples asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies "what is the latest available estimate of the total population of Palestine, other than Transjordan; how many of this number are Jews and Arabs, respectively; what, in square miles, is the estimated cultivable area of the country; and how many square miles, believed to be cultivable, are estimated to be still uncultivated?"

Mr. George Hall: "The estimated population of Palestine at December 31, 1944, was:  
Moslems ..... 1,061,277  
Jews ..... 528,702  
Christians ..... 135,547  
Others ..... 14,096

Total ..... 1,739,624\*

\*So in the Official Report—Editor.]  
"Of the Moslems, Christians, and 'others' it is estimated that 1,180,000 are Arabs.

"The estimated area of Palestine regarded as 'cultivable' for fiscal purposes is 3410 square miles; but I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to Chapter IX of the Report of the Royal Commission on Palestine (Cmd. 5479) for an explanation of the difficulty of estimating how much land is in fact capable of cultivation."

by the Department has been nothing but blatant Socialist propaganda. The real menace of this typical National Socialist instrument was revealed last week when the Department took it upon itself to abuse Great Britain and the Dutch, in regard to the Indonesian issue. The statement by Mr. Chifley, that the material issued by the Department does not reflect official Government opinion, is not enough. No Federal Government should tolerate the continuance of an instrument, which can be used for dangerous propaganda purposes. The Department of Information was a wartime Department. It should now be abolished.

After some delay, the Fourth "Victory" Loan was over-subscribed. It is very obvious that members of the general public didn't do the over-subscribing.

Strange though it may appear to Mr. Chifley, who berated the people for not subscribing more freely when they had so much "surplus" purchasing power, most people at present are more concerned about spending any money they have saved, on things they have been denied during the war years. Even companies are mostly thinking more in terms of funds for reconstruction rather than investing in loans. Many companies are even trying to sell their holdings in Government bonds in order to have immediate purchasing power. According to the Melbourne "Age" of November 15, there has been "increased pressure to sell Government securities in recent months." And who is buying these securities? Some people who thought that the Labor Government was going to prevent the banks from (Continued on page 3.)

A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown. (Continued from last issue.)  
Sir, —In "The London Spectator" of October 16, 1920, in the course of a review of the book entitled "The Cause of World Unrest," it was pointed out that it was an undoubted fact that most of the revolutions in Continental Europe in the nineteenth century had been led by Jews.

Two years later Mr. Hilaire Belloc's book, "The Jews," was published, wherein he declared, "the South African War was openly and undeniably provoked and promoted by Jewish interests in South Africa."

General Smuts was connected with that, and to those who have made a study of the matter there is nothing surprising in the fact that he is still connected with the execution of "plans" drawn up by or at the direction of the same "interests."

Speaking of the Panama Scandal in France at the end of the nineteenth century, and of the Marconi Scandal in Great Britain in the early part of the 20th century, Mr. Belloc said this: —

"They might have passed as isolated things a generation before. They were now connected, often unjustly, with an uneasy sense of a general financial conspiracy. They were at any rate connected with an atmosphere distinctly Jewish."

More will be said of the Marconi scandal later.

C. H. Douglas has warned the world that the great menace of the day is MONOPOLY, and in this regard the words of Mr. Belloc, published 23 years ago, are very much to the point, as follows: —

"I do not think that the Jews have a sufficient appreciation of the risks they are running by its development. There is already something like a Jewish monopoly in high finance. There is a growing tendency to Jewish monopoly over the stage, the fruit trade in London, and, to a great extent, the tobacco trade. There is the same element of Jewish monopoly in the silver trade, and in the control of various other metals, notably lead, nickel, and quicksilver. What is most disquieting of all, this tendency to monopoly is spreading like a disease. One province after another falls under it and it acts as a most powerful irritant. It will perhaps prove the immediate cause of that explosion against the Jews which we all dread, and which the best of us, I hope, are trying to avert."

Mr. Belloc was not then aware of the Jewish monopoly that was to develop in the radio, cinema, and news-distributing fields—the three most potent propaganda agencies for the mass conditioning of the minds of the people. However, he went on to say: —

"It applies, of course, to a tiny fraction of the Jewish race as a whole. One could put the Jews who control lead, nickel, mercury, and the rest into one small room; nor would that room contain very pleasant specimens of their race. You could get the great Jewish bankers who control international finance round one large dinner table, and I know dinner tables which have seen nearly all of them at one time or another."

That public statement by Mr. Belloc, backed up as it is by plenty of evidence, is either true or it isn't true. If it is true

**In the Debate on Procedure in the British House of Commons on August 24, some Members showed an appreciation of the dangers of mass-production of laws and government-by-regulation through anonymous bureaucrats. Here are some interesting and informative extracts from the speeches of three Members: —**

**Mr. Hopkin Morris (Carmarthen):** . . . If one examines, for instance, the volume of legislation and change in the nature of legislation in recent years, particularly due to the last two wars, it will be found that there has been a great increase. The right hon. Gentleman the Lord President of the Council quoted Gladstone and 1886, when Statutory Rules and Regulations had not begun to be published. In 1889 they had begun to be published, and it is interesting to compare their volume. From 1901 to 1914 the annual output of Statutory Rules was something in the neighbourhood of 1000. In 1920-21 the number had more than doubled annually. It is argued that this is rather a convenience and that detailed matters of administration should be left to the experts; and that the House, in some mysterious way, is not competent to deal with them. I should like to challenge that view.

**Squadron Leader Dormer (Basingstoke):** . . . We all know that the Civil Service is conscientious and hard working, but it cannot get the same daily contact with the people of this country which hon. members of this House have got, and it cannot, therefore, be aware what the people of this country will willingly accept and what they will bitterly resent.

We had an example of that in the last Parliament over the Requisitioned Land and War Works Bill. It was plain that that Bill as drafted contained many things abhorrent to large numbers of people. Representations were made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Amendments were moved on the Floor of the House, and, on the whole, many satisfactory compromises were reached. I hope, therefore, that this House will never deprive itself of the opportunity of adequate discussion of legislation on the Committee stage of any Bill or leave our people at the mercy of the machinations of anonymous permanent officials, who, though they do their very best to frame and administer the law, must nevertheless abide by the regulations and rules which are laid down and cannot make allowances for those individual

then the people of the community should be joining together to do something about it. If it isn't true, then someone should be able effectively to refute it.

The fact that responsible men are beginning to take an interest in this all-important matter, and are finding facts which shock their sensibilities, is, I suggest, the main reason for the campaign against so-called "Anti-Semitism," the immediate aim being to so condition the mind of the Australian people that they will unthinkingly accept legislation which would make it a criminal offence to criticise Jewry or the conduct of certain Jews.

Mr. Belloc appeared to realise this, too, for he went on to say: —

"The Great War brought thousands upon thousands of educated men (who took up public duties as temporary officials) up against the staggering secret they had never suspected—the complete control exercised over things absolutely necessary to the nation's survival by half a dozen Jews who were completely indifferent as to whether we or the enemy should emerge alive from the struggle."

That's worth thinking over, and it will be shown that the same state of affairs still obtains. At this very moment, tremendous financial pressure is being brought to bear against the British Empire by a few men who are "completely indifferent whether we or the enemy should emerge alive from the struggle." The "enemy" in the sense used by Mr. Belloc is the military enemy, but the greater enemy is, of course, the group of men seeking to put us into financial servitude from which we could never emerge.

Mr. H. Wickham Steed, former editor of the London "Times" and for many years its correspondent in various foreign capitals, would not be regarded as an irresponsible commentator, and even in these days he is featured as an outstanding broadcaster for the B.B.C. In 1924 was published "Through Thirty Years," and in the concluding chapter he ranked International Jewry as the most potent force in the world at the time. He also remarked that he had been puzzled why it was that the Jews who were worse treated in Germany than in Austria, France, and Britain should have become more and more pan-German. There was a reason for it, and I think Mr. Eric Butler has indicated it clearly in his contributions to the "New Times" under the title "Master Plan Behind Hitler's Plan."

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham Street, East Melbourne, C.2. 18th November 1945.

(To be continued.)

cases of hardship with which we are all so familiar. That is why apparent discourtesy and lack of consideration are an inherent part of any system of bureaucratic control, and that is why today I am asking that the legislation of this Government shall be fully debated on the Floor of this House. If it were otherwise, the hardship and injustices may prove to be innumerable, and those injustices will bring bitterness and discontent.

The first paragraph of the Motion, which we are now discussing says:

"That a Select Committee be appointed . . . to report what alterations, if any, are desirable for the more efficient despatch of such business."

The word "efficient" seems to me to require some elucidation. Some people think that "efficient" means producing the maximum production of something. We should do more harm than good if we were to approach procedural reform with any kind of assumption, conscious or unconscious, that whatever tends towards greater efficiency in that sense is a constitutional improvement . . .

I submit this fact, which it may well be in the interest of His Majesty's Government to consider, that innumerable authorities on statecraft and political philosophers of many nationalities have long reached the conclusion that the fewer laws a Government passes the better is that Government. That view was shared by Plato and by many eminent humanists, such as Saint Thomas More, one of the greatest of Englishmen; Erasmus, Vives, that great Lord Chancellor, Francis Bacon; that great Dutch thinker, Hugo Grotius; Thomas Hobbes, Winstanley, James Harrington, and that American idealist, Belamy, and many more. Now we are assured by the Lord President of the Council in his speech this morning that so great is the bulk of Government Business, that we must speed up the passage of legislation in this House . . .

**Sir William Darling (Edinburgh, South):** . . . Mr. Gladstone has been quoted. There have been other Prime Ministers whose sayings and achievements linger in the memories of some of us. One of the great Prime Ministers of this country was Lord Mel-

bourne. He was Queen Victoria's Prime Minister, and he was a successful Prime Minister. There was a great deal of peace and happiness, pleasure and human enjoyment in the days of Queen Victoria—[An Hon. Member: "And starvation wages."] I look back with a certain nostalgia to the days of the starvation wages, compared with the proposals of the present Minister of Food. Lord Melbourne was a practical politician. It is reported that he met his Cabinet four times a year. On one occasion he met them at a quarter to twelve o'clock and said that he was to have a glass of sherry at twelve and consequently would not retain them very long with the agenda. He said on another occasion: "Must we really do anything?" While I do not agree with such an extreme policy of inaction I shall not be surprised if we are converted to a policy of inaction before this Parliament comes to an end. Why this passion to do things? [An Hon. Member: "We are sent here to do things."] The great world moves on irrespective of the gyrations and eloquence of people in this House . . .

I will conclude that if this Committee has as its object—as doubtless it will have its instructions—the curtailment of the rights of Members of this House, the consequence will be plain. A year or so from now these benches will be empty. The public will cease to have an interest in this Chamber and hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite will have served their purpose because a stage will have been achieved—not a stage created and designed as the creature of the imagination of reactionary Tories—but of

## QUEENSLAND NOTES

The Hon. Secretary of the Queensland Electoral Campaign, Mr. A. W. Noakes, reports that, since his last report in these columns, a further £6 has been donated to the Organisers Fund. Those Queensland social creditors who have not yet sent a donation to this fund are urged by Mr. Noakes to do so without delay.

The sixpenny booklet, "Democracy Flouted," containing the banned Army Education Broadcast, is being approved everywhere as one of the most effective booklets for introducing people to social credit ideas. Copies of "Democracy Flouted," and "Sack the Bureaucrats," by Eric D. Butler, are obtainable from The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide St., Brisbane, Queensland.

## 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-street, Adelaide, on Thursday, November 29, at 8 p.m. Following general business, a talk entitled "Present-Day Finance as Seen from a Social Creditor's Point of View," will be given by Mr. J. Guerin. Social Crediters in Adelaide and interested friends are asked to attend to hear this interesting address.

the totalitarian State, to which Socialism as well as National Socialism has inevitably moved.

## ARE WE ON THE ROAD TO SERFDOM?

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

**Collectivism means the end of truth. To make a totalitarian system function efficiently, it is not enough that everybody should be forced to work for the ends selected by those in control; it is essential that the people should come to regard these ends as their own. This is brought about by propaganda and by complete control of all sources of information.**

The most effective way of making people accept the validity of the values they are to serve is to persuade them that they are really the same as those they have always held, but which were not properly understood or recognised before. And the most efficient technique to this end is to use the old words but change their meaning. Few traits of totalitarian regimes are at the same time so confusing to the superficial observer and yet so characteristic of the whole intellectual climate as this complete perversion of language.

The worst sufferer in this respect is the word "liberty." It is a word used as freely in totalitarian States as elsewhere. Indeed, it could almost be said that wherever liberty as we know it has been destroyed, this has been done in the name of some new "freedom" promised to the people.

**Even among us we have planners who promise us a "collective freedom," which is as misleading as anything said by totalitarian politicians.**

"Collective freedom" is not the freedom of the members of society, but the unlimited freedom of the planner to do with society that which he pleases. This is the confusion of freedom with power, carried to the extreme.

It is not difficult to deprive the great majority of independent thought. But the minority who will retain an inclination to criticism must also be silenced. Public criticism or even expressions of doubt must be suppressed because they tend to weaken support of the regime. As Sidney and Beatrice Webb report of the position in every Russian enterprise: "Whilst the work is in progress, any public expression of doubt that the plan will be successful is an act of disloyalty and even of treachery because of its possible effect on the will and efforts of the rest of the staff."

Control extends even to subjects, which seem to have no political significance. The theory of relativity, for instance, has been opposed as a "Semitic attack on the foundation of Christian and Nordic physics" and because it is "in conflict with dialectical materialism and Marxist dogma." "Every activity must derive its justification from conscious social purpose. There must be no spontaneous, unguided activity, because it might produce results which cannot be foreseen and for which the plan does not provide."

**Perhaps the most alarming fact is that contempt for intellectual liberty is not a thing which arises only when the totalitarian system is established, but can be found everywhere among those who have embraced a collectivist faith.**

The worst oppression is condoned if it is committed in the name of Socialism. Intolerance of opposing ideas is openly extolled. The tragedy of collectivist thought is that, while it starts out to make reason supreme, it ends by destroying reason.

There is one aspect of the change in moral values brought about by the advance of collectivism, which provides special food for thought. It is that the virtues which are held less and less in esteem in Britain and America are precisely those on which Anglo-Saxons justly prided themselves and in which they were generally recognised to excel.

**These virtues were independence and self-reliance, individual initiative and local responsibility, the successful reliance on voluntary activity, non-interference with one's neighbour and tolerance of the different, and a healthy suspicion of power and authority.**

Almost all the traditions and institutions which

have moulded the national character and the whole moral climate of England and America are those which the progress of collectivism and its centralistic tendencies are progressively destroying.

## PLANNING v. THE RULE OF LAW.

Nothing distinguishes more clearly a free country from a country under arbitrary government than the observance in the former of the great principles known as the Rule of Law. Stripped of technicalities, this means that government in all its actions is bound by rules fixed and announced beforehand—rules that make it possible to foresee with fair certainty how the authority will use its coercive powers in given circumstances and to plan ones individual affairs on the basis of this knowledge. Thus, within the known rules of the game, the individual is free to pursue his personal ends, certain that the powers of government will not be used deliberately to frustrate his efforts.

**Socialist economic planning necessarily involves the very opposite of this. The planning authority cannot tie itself down in advance to general rules, which prevent arbitrariness.**

When the government has to decide how many pigs are to be raised or how many buses are to run, which coal mines are to operate, or at what prices shoes are to be sold, these decisions cannot be settled for long periods in advance. They depend inevitably on the circumstances of the moment, and in making such decisions it will always be necessary to balance, one against the other, the interests of various persons and groups.

In the end, somebody's views will have to decide whose interests are more important, and these views must become part of the law of the land. Hence the familiar fact that the more The State "plans," the more difficult planning becomes for the individual.

**The difference between the two kinds of rules is important. It is the same as that between providing signposts and commanding people which road to take.**

Moreover, under central planning the government cannot be impartial. The State ceases to be a piece of utilitarian machinery intended to help individuals in the fullest development of their individual personality and becomes an institution which deliberately discriminates between particular needs of different people, and allows one man to do what another must be prevented from doing. It must lay down by a legal rule how well off particular people shall be and what they are to be allowed to have.

The Rule of Law, the absence of legal privileges of particular people designated by authority, is what safeguards that equality before the law, which is the opposite of arbitrary government.

**It is significant that Socialists (and Nazis) have always protested against "merely" formal justice, that they have objected to law which had no views on how well off particular people ought to be, that they have demanded a "socialisation of the law and attacked the independence of judges.**

In a planned society the law must legalise what to all intents and purposes remains arbitrary action. If the law says that a board or authority may do what it pleases, anything that board or authority does is legal—but its actions are certainly not subject to the Rule of Law.

By giving the government unlimited powers, the most arbitrary rule can be made legal: and in this way a democracy may set up the most complete despotism imaginable.

(To be continued.)

## SPEECH BY LEADING SOCIAL CREDIT MEMBER OF CANADIAN COMMONS

The Hon. Solon E. Low, national leader of the Social Credit Association of Canada, and former Treasurer of Alberta, who is the new Member for Peace River in the Canadian House of Commons, made what he termed his "first real address" in that Parliament on September 10, during the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Most of the introductory part of his speech appears hereunder:—

Mr. Speaker, allow me first to offer you my sincere congratulations upon your election to the highest office it is within the competence of this House to bestow upon one of its members. Let me assure you, sir, of my earnest desire to make the onerous duties that go with your high office as much lighter as careful observance of the rules of order and considerate, forthright conduct will make them. I do hope that when you have served your term, as Speaker of the House of Commons you will have accumulated a rich aggregate of pleasant memories and personal friendships. The start you have made assures me that you will serve with impartiality and distinction.

I wish also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the resolution now before us upon what I consider to be two able addresses. I listened with real interest to what they had to say, moved at times by the lofty sentiments they expressed and fully appreciating the smooth, easy and clear delivery of their messages. Almost they persuaded me to be a Liberal! Both hon. members demonstrated ably that the young men of this day are well prepared to make a valuable contribution to the enrichment of our national life. Of course one would not expect these young men to parade before the House the weaknesses of the Government they were elected to support. That if expected from those on this side of the House, and doubtless hon. members here will take full advantage of their opportunities.

However, I should like to make it clear, in this my first real address in Parliament, that in anything I shall say now or in the future by way of criticism I shall try to be eminently fair. I do not indulge in carping criticism, nor do I hurl poisoned personal harpoons. But that does not mean to say that I shall not be outspoken when I see in the Government's actions, trends that in my humble judgment may militate against the welfare of the Canadian people. I do not believe in crying "peace" where there is no peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to come into the House of Commons representing the people of the constituency of Peace River, which is at once one of the largest ridings in Canada and the last great frontier in the Dominion. The immense possibilities of that great inland empire are just beginning to dawn upon the Canadian people. The richness of its fertile farm lands is unsurpassed in all America, a fact attested by the records of crop yields and superior quality grains that have captured scores of top honours at the leading shows and exhibitions of the world.

Nature endowed the Peace River country not only with unsurpassed soil, sunshine and rainfall resources, but also abundant timber, fur-bearing animals, and, doubtless, minerals of many varieties. But her greatest pride is her people. True pioneers with a vision of empire in their souls settled the country, as a result of the policy of the Federal Government in the days when Ottawa alone controlled the natural resources of the Prairie Provinces. They carved out homes and farms, towns and villages, through application of sheer determination and stubborn courage. And in spite of their hardships, their isolation, and the fact that their country and their pressing needs have been consistently ignored by the Federal Government, which alone must bear the responsibility for their settlement in the north country, the people of Peace River have maintained the true spirit and hospitality and friendliness of the pioneers; their cabin doors are never locked.

I said their country and its development have been consistently ignored down the years by Ottawa. The present Liberal Government has since 1935 done nothing to remove the heavy transportation handicaps they have suffered since the first settlement in that section.

Their most urgent need now is a rail outlet to the west, perhaps through Pine Pass, to link up with Prince George, British Columbia. Such a rail link would obviate the necessity of the long back-haul of three hundred miles to Edmonton.

Almost as urgent is a new and equitable schedule of freight rates; for, in common with other parts of Alberta, the Peace River has been placed at the very peak of a most unfair and discriminating freight rate structure that throttles its development. Added to the natural disadvantage of its geographical position, a series of discriminating practices have grown up in the Canadian railway system which have the effect of favouring both central Canada and the coast Province of British Columbia at the expense of the Peace River and Alberta generally. To these two grave problems, the sympathetic support of the Government can bring satisfactory solution.

### JEWISH "COLLABORATOR"

For "ruthless collaboration" with the Germans, Helga Zweig, a twenty-year-old German Jewess, says the London "Evening News," has been sentenced to death by a Brussels military court. She is said to have even denounced her parents to the Gestapo to obtain their personal effects.

—The Social Creditor, 22/9/45.

The Peace River cannot fulfill her destiny as a producer of an abundance of much-needed foodstuffs for the early alleviation of short world supply unless these needs, among others, are met. For the proper development of this last great frontier, where perhaps fifty thousand more people could settle in comfort and security, the rail outlet to the western seaboard and the revised freight structure are absolutely essential. Time will not permit me to enlarge on these matters now, but I have pledged myself to work unceasingly for them, and I am prepared to raise my voice on every possible occasion and to haunt the offices of those who have it in their power to do something about them, until the needs of my people are satisfied.

I wish here to thank the Government for finally undertaking, jointly with the Province of Alberta, to build the Grimshaw-Notikewin-Hay River Road. This will play a big part in the development of the north as well as in making available to the rest of Canada the vast mineral wealth of the northern territories.

But the Government need not have waited until they were facing an election to an-

noun their participation in the project. Their sincerity would have been infinitely more impressive had they consented to join with Alberta on any one of the many occasions during the past eight years when that Province attempted to interest Ottawa in undertaking to build the road.

I wish to identify myself with the expression of thanksgiving in the throne speech that tragic war has ceased and that final victory has come to the united nations. Surely it must be evident from the many miraculous events of the past six years that Almighty God has sustained our efforts, and that without His divine intervention civilisation might have completely destroyed itself. It is no mere scientific accident, in my opinion, that the secret of the atomic bomb was discovered first by the Anglo-American people.

Mr. Speaker, my thanks go out also to the people of Canada, whose magnificent war effort has aroused the admiration of the world. To the fighting men in all branches of the service, we owe a debt, which I sincerely trust we shall acknowledge, and pay, by adequate provision for their future happiness and security, no matter what that might cost us. My sincere sympathies go out to all those bereaved families whose sons, husbands, brothers or fathers will not return. So not to break faith with them who gave their lives that we might be free to choose our way of living, let us pledge ourselves not only to do our utmost to prevent a recurrence of tragic war, but also, what is more important and pressing, to get at and root out of our national life those things which are the real causes of war.

(To be continued.)

## CALLING SOCIAL CREDIT ACTIONISTS!

Keep This Date Free: Thursday, November 29, at 8 p.m. sharp.

At Scot's Church Hall, Russell Street, Melbourne, C.I.

"CAN WE WIN THE PEACE?"

A Challenging Address by MR. ERIC D BUTLER.

Chairman: Mr. Bruce H. Brown.

—Authorised by W. J. Carruthers, Hon. Secretary, Social Credit Action Group.

## SIGNIFICANT POLITICAL POINTERS

(Continued from page 1.)

taking over Government securities will no doubt be interested to know that "temporary permission" has been given to the trading banks to make purchases of Government securities direct on the open market. This "temporary permission" "coincided" with the Fourth "Victory" Loan! Will some money-reform apologist for the Labor Government explain this arrangement, for our benefit?

\* \* \*

No sooner had the military war finished than our American "Allies" told Australian officials that they wanted a detailed inventory of the residue of Lease-Lend materials held in Australia.

Australian officials claim that if the Australian pound were valued on a realistic basis, American Lease-Lend and Australian reciprocal aid would approximately balance out. The balance might even favour Australia! But the Americans will have none of this, and it is reported that we may be called upon to pay something over 100,000,000 dollars. Australia cannot pay this unless she can export goods to America. As America does not want our goods, and has indicated her intention of attempting to capture the entire export markets of the world, the possibility arises that Australia may be forced to part with ownership of some of her fixed assets in order to liquidate the Lease-Lend debt.

While there is little doubt that the majority of American people are, at the best, apathetic spectators of the attempt to dismember the British Empire, to suit the Wall Street financial gangsters, it should be made perfectly clear to them that many of the financial difficulties of the British peoples were created during those dark days when thousands of Empire troops were dying to stem the Nazi tide which threatened the entire world, including America.

Social creditors said at the start of the war that the most dangerous threat to the British Empire was the group of international crooks in New York. Perhaps Mr. Menzies, who says that he stands for the preservation of the British Empire, will cease his hypocrisy and have a few words to say about these crooks. Perhaps!

\* \* \*

Sir Ben Smith, British Food Minister, was reported last week as saying that certain of Britain's food reserves were taken by the War Office for Germany and Austria.

A further report stated that in Washington recently it was agreed that the British people's food rations be cut drastically, in order to send more food to Europe.

The list of those facing treason trials in Great Britain should be greatly increased.

\* \* \*

It would appear that the International Financial crooks and the Communists are going to do a little business together in Hungary. The following report appeared in the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" of October 23:

"Reuter's diplomatic correspondent says the pact gives Russia a half interest in practically the whole of Hungary's economy. It envisages the establishment of a Number of Big Combines, the Control of which will be shared equally, he says. The combines will undertake the development of all key Hungarian industries, commerce

and natural resources. Provision is also made for the establishment of a Soviet-Hungarian Bank to finance operations."

An excellent point was raised in a speech by Mr. McDonald, M.L.A., in the West Australian Parliament on August 30:

"The first thing I wish to refer to is the changing factors in our Constitution, which I think are of vital importance to the legislative situation in the various States. In 1927, as a result of the Financial Agreement, which was incorporated in the Australian Constitution, the Loan Council was set up consisting of Premiers or Treasurers for the purpose of reaching agreement on the allocation of Loan moneys. Since that time, as happens in every country—whether its Constitution is written, as in Australia, or unwritten, as in England—there has developed a Constitutional convention, in our case what we now know as the Premiers' Conferences. This appears to me to be a natural development of our Federal system and a convenient one, and I think its importance will grow rather than diminish in the future. But the result is that decisions are arrived at and policies are determined more and more at these conferences without prior reference to the Legislatures of the States, and that is to my mind one of the weaknesses of the new convention or usage which has arisen and is being more widely employed."

Hon. J. C. Willcock: "Very often the decisions of such conferences have to be ratified by Parliament."

Mr. McDonald: "Frequently they have to be ratified by Parliament, but I venture to suggest that the wisdom of the Premiers'

## WHO FOUGHT THE WAR?

We won't waste time over the question of who won the war, because we knew before it started, but some details of who fought it, from an Editorial in the New York "World-Telegram," may be of passing interest:—

Britain-baiters like to harp on such refrains as "Britain lets her colonies fight her wars," and "England will fight to the last Canadian."

British Empire casualty totals just made public show up this sort of propaganda. Here they are:—

	Killed	Missing	Wounded	Prisoners of War	Total
United Kingdom	233,042	57,472	275,975	183,849	750,338
Canada	36018	2,866	53,073	9051	101008
Australia	21,415	6,519	37,477	26,800	92,211
New Zealand	9,844	2,201	19,253	8,485	39,783
S. Africa	6,417	1,980	13,773	14,595	36,756
India	23,295	12,264	62,064	79,692	177,315
Colonies	6,741	14,811	6,773	8,051	36,376

Totals... 336,772 98,113 468,388 330,523 1,233,796

The population of the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales and North Ireland) is about 47,000,000. Populations of the other countries are, roughly: Canada, 11,500,000; Australia, 7,250,000; New Zealand, 1,600,000; South Africa, 11,000,000; India, 389,000,000.

A little figuring shows, in ratio to population, the following percentages of lives sacrificed during "World War II:—

United Kingdom .005 N. Zealand . .005  
Canada.....003 S. Africa . .0005  
Australia . .003 India.....00006

To the United Kingdom life-loss must be added 1200 Home Guards, 60,000 civilians killed in air raids and V-1 and V-2 attacks, and most of the 30,000 merchant navy dead.

With these added the United Kingdom total of killed is 324,000, and the percentage of population is almost .007.

So the British of the home islands have not only sacrificed more lives in total than all the rest of the Empire combined—they have sacrificed a greater number in proportion to population than any other part of the Empire.

The United States' life sacrifice has been .0018 of our population—nearly 250,000 of our 135,000,000.

Conferences would be enlarged if there were references—where such references are possible—to the Legislatures of the States before the conference discussed the matters, which were to come before it.

"I suggest also that, except in matters of urgency, it should be a principle that no decisions made by the Premiers' Conferences should be binding on States—I say except in matters of extreme urgency—unless they are discussed and ratified by the Legislatures of the various States.

"I have observed that in Great Britain, when a Minister returns from an international conference, he makes a statement to the House of Commons on what has taken place—not a perfunctory statement, but a detailed statement often occupying some hours. I have also observed that the Prime Minister of Great Britain has frequently—perhaps almost always—considered it to be his duty to make his statement first to the Legislature rather than to the press; and when that statement is made it is not merely for the information of the people's representatives but it is for the purpose of giving those representatives the opportunity to voice their opinions, either affirming or criticising the action taken or proposed to be taken at the conference which the head of the State has attended or is to attend.

"As we have a Premier who is now entering on office, I suggest to him that he would gain prestige by recognising the increasing trend towards Premiers' Conferences and the initiating of legislative machinery which is going to keep the democratic side of our institutions to the fore, not only to preserve the proper authority of State Parliaments, but also to secure from those State Parliaments assistance in the transaction he may have to undertake before the Premiers' Conference." —E. D. B.

## CENTRALISING ELECTRICITY IN N.S.W.

The following letter on this subject, which appeared in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of November 5, provides yet another indication that the advocates of centralised planning are encountering increased opposition:

Sir, —After local government has pioneered and developed electricity supply in this State at an estimated capital investment of £40 million, the armchair adventurers of Bridge and Macquarie Streets have decided that electricity control must be co-ordinated.

If the country people had waited for these centralised coordinators to bring electricity to them originally, many a country town now using electricity would still use candles and kerosene lamps. It is the real spirit of local government, the feeling of a local need and the realisation of that need by local people that has given us such electrical development as we now have.

The ideal of bringing electricity to as many farms as possible will have the support of the whole community. The Bill before Parliament does not make it clear how such extensions are to be financed. It is said that a levy will be placed on all stations generating above a given figure, such expense being passed on to the consumer. If this is so, Sydney-Newcastle-Wollongong people will probably bear the cost. This is wrong in principle; it is sectional taxation. Since 1935, an Electricity Advisory Committee

with no bureaucratic ideas, has assisted the Government in coordinating and advising on the development of electricity. Apparently it is now necessary to create a "Commission."

It is rather humorous to note that Mr. Cochran, chairman of the State Electricity Commission, Queensland, in his report to the New South Wales Government on electricity organisation, advised that, to avoid confusion, the body here should not be called the State Electricity Commission or Central Electricity Board. But there is no confusion in the minds of the Local Government Association, the representatives of the people who developed electricity in this State. They realise the danger, whatever name is used to camouflage it. They say: "Let there be no mistake. If electricity passes to centralised control, it will ring the death knell of a greater local government, and eliminate any hope of a real and living democracy in New South Wales."

R. P. KITCHEN, Town Clerk, Newtown.

**The course of events abroad and the global fish fry in San Francisco bring us closer day by day to a decision far more difficult and terrible than the one that took us into this war.**

**As it subsides, we are coming to the time when we will have to decide whether we are willing and able to fight for liberation from unlimited government at home, or want to make unconditional surrender to the system of ideas about the State which we presumably set out to destroy in Europe and Asia in this war, and which have invaded and conquered us here while we were doing it abroad.**

To make any sort of armistice with unlimited government will not save us from the choice, for we cannot merely drop anchor in the swift stream of Statism on which we are riding, and we shall finally have to get ashore to the firm ground of freedom or go over the falls of dictatorship and serfdom.

This is a decision which is perhaps of less concern to business management than to labour and the rest of the American community, because for more than a decade now, business has been occupied territory, operated largely with captive labour and management hostages; but everybody in this country who still wants any sort of freedom for its own sake has a stake in that decision. Today the question of liberty in America is no longer merely an economic issue, a matter of the market place. It goes far beyond and much deeper than the problems of business or labour organisation. It reaches into every part of the life of the individual and touches everything that makes it worth anything to himself or anyone else.

**Nor is it merely a domestic decision, a matter of individual liberty and independence we are talking about, for it will determine where we stand in the One World of totalitarian States in which this war will end, and may finally decide our independence and freedom as a nation, and perhaps whether or not or how soon we must be prepared to fight again for it.**

In that sense, there is no doubt that the fundamental issues of domestic and foreign policy are inseparable, or indeed identical. They come down to the decision whether or not this country is to remain within the international system of compulsory collectivism, and be kept permanently in the iron circle of Socialist States, which this war has created throughout the world. Every event in the field of foreign affairs from Hot Springs and Bretton Woods to Yalta and San Francisco makes it evident that this is the underlying aim of all international policy towards the United States, until lately, under the exigencies of war, our Government has shown little sign of successful resistance to it, or indeed, of any disposition to oppose it. Instead, we have been trying to buy international peace, by bargaining away our birthright of freedom bit by bit here at home.

**I think it is one of the greatest paradoxes of history that having beaten Germany we have adopted, or are about to adopt, all her basic economic and political ideas—Bismarck's social security plan, Hitler's full employment plan, and Schacht's scheme for controlling foreign trade, which is "Bretton Woods."**

We must realise by now that whatever the military or diplomatic outcome of the war in the West, the essential economic and political ideas of National Socialism have conquered Europe even more completely than the Nazi armies did. It is not merely that the Soviet legions have overrun the Balkans and the Baltic countries, and already turned out the lights of an entire continent from Kiel to Korea, but that in most of the rest of Europe, in Italy, France, and England, no Red armies were needed to destroy economic freedom and civil liberty. It had been done long before by the politicians, businessmen and labour unions of these countries. Our armies abroad have been fighting for ideas—for a philosophy of life and a conception of government—which, in fact, were dead nearly everywhere in the Old World long before the war began.

What is more important is that all of the ideas for the post-war world which are accepted today in Europe, especially in England and Russia, assume it is an imperative condition for their success that this country be brought within the same system permanently after the war, and every device for shaping American thought and feeling to this end is being used today, as they have been during the past decade.

**The European and Asiatic statesmen who are planning and building their post-war world on the foundation ideas of National Socialism with a facade of new names, having destroyed the Nazi military power with our aid, know better or sooner than the Nazis did that the world cannot live for long half under Socialist serfdom and half under economic freedom.**

This recognition is no less urgent in the long run for Uncle Joe's totalitarian autarchy than it is for a nation under parliamentary government like England, who must live by trade or starve, and who knows that her post-war planned economy, however complete, cannot compete in any free markets of the world with the productive power of a free America.

So I say to you that the character of American political institutions and her economic system after this war have become as much a crucial concern of the rest of the world as those of Germany were at its beginning, or as those of Russia were after the last war, but this time in reverse fashion, because in a post-war world of

Socialist States the idea of economic freedom will remain a subversive revolutionary force internationally as well as internally, just as Bolshevism was after the last war.

**I think that this fact will furnish the key to most of the post-war problems of international relations as well as those of domestic policy for another decade or two.**

Whether America can be kept within this global structure of National Socialism which has been erected around her political institutions and economic organisation during this decade, or whether she is to resume life within the traditional framework of economic freedom and competitive effort where she left off—this is the central issue for the post-war world. It underlies not only the larger problems of international reconstruction, but also the practical domestic problems of reconversion for us.

I know that few of us in America are yet aware of these things, and hardly anybody has been quite willing to believe that the question would come to that, partly because we are used to thinking that freedom is free, and can't imagine having to

buy and pay for it again, but mostly because in the current debates about it, the real issue is disguised in very shifty economic terms like "full employment," "social security," "expanding economy," "compensatory fiscal policies," and "international planning," until hardly anyone knows what anybody is talking about in these matters any more.

**You know as well as I do that in this country we have been living for a decade or more in a new Tower of Babel deliberately designed for us by our bureaucracies, under a carefully planned confusion of tongues, in which the meaning of all words and ideas is made relative to the political purposes of the moment, and the end of every sentence cancels out the beginning, until even the most absolute tyranny may commit murder and pillage, condone or encourage slave labour, and maintain concentration camps, in the name of freedom democracy, free enterprise, or international peace.**

There is no chance that we in America may make any wise or courageous or honest decisions upon the fundamental issue that faces us in our domestic situation or our foreign relations—if we want to—unless somebody begins soon to nail down in candid and definite terms some of the ideas and words we are dealing with in discussion of these matters today, and tells us plainly where they lead. There are many of them, and their meaning shifts from day to day amid the semantic shadow dances of the official word-changers, so all I shall try to do here is to spell out the plain implications of one of these ideas—that of unlimited government guarantee of income or purchasing power, which has been successively marketed under the changing labels of national planning, the planned economy, social security, full employment, guaranteed annual wages and international stabilisation, and has finally become the keystone of the international structure of compulsory collectivism, embodied simultaneously in the Full Employment Bill in America and the Beveridge Plan for Britain.

(To be continued.)

## MASTER PLAN BEHIND HITLER'S PLAN The Power of the International Financiers

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

**Early in World War 2 it was reported that Kuhn, Loeb and Co. further increased their power by taking over the House of Morgan. During World War 1, Bernard Baruch, Kuhn, Loeb and Co.'s "stooge," was the most powerful man in America, a dictator with immense powers. We have this on his own admission when interrogated by Congress after World War 1. He said that he had more power than any other man in America. During World War 2 he was just as powerful as ever.**

Shortly before his death, President Roosevelt "sent" Baruch to Britain and Europe ostensibly to make an economic survey for possible "American" financial "assistance." His old friend, Isador Lubin, went to Moscow at the end of the European part of World War II on the Reparations Commission in order to "consider the extent of the methods of exacting compensation" from Germany. In an interview given to Mr. A. Victor Lasky, a staff-writer on the American forces' journal, "Stars and Stripes," Mr. Baruch indicated that he was once again going to be a powerful figure in the "reconstruction" of Europe:

**"What happens after . . . five or seven years depends on the peace the big boys are preparing for us now. And one reason I am over here is to hold the big stick over the big boys to make damn sure they're not going to foul the peace."**

So Mr. Baruch holds a "big stick" still! Very interesting!

Dealing with his views on how Germany should be dealt with, Mr. Baruch said: "This settlement of the German question could be used as a basis for a comprehensive agreement with Russia, because it would solve the Russian question of security against Germany." Needless to say, Mr. Baruch did not mention anything about security for Western Europe against Soviet domination.

Europe and parts of Asia being suitably smashed up, "reconstruction" on the lines indicated in the "Protocols" proceeded almost simultaneously with the advent of Allied victories. Leading bankers were the first into Italy after the Eighth Army, and within a few days they had the taxation system working! It is interesting to recall that Fascist Italy, the second major European State to adopt Socialism, was financed by the two Jews, Counts Volpi and Pirelli. Strangely enough, these two gentlemen have not been mentioned in the list of war criminals. In the "New York Times" of October 30, 1929, Signor Natti, former Italian Premier, declared that Fascism kept going with loans from Wall Street, secured on Italian industries. While the "American" press was condemning Italy's attacks on Abyssinia, American exports of war materials to Italy increased by up to 40 per cent. During the early part of World War II great quantities of war materials were shipped from America to Italy.

Mr. William C. Bullitt, American Ambassador to Moscow from 1933 to 1936, and who was in Italy and other parts of Europe during World War II, has stated that he had first-hand evidence of the large sums of money available to the Communists in some European banks. Mr. Bullitt asked:

**"Will the results of this war be the subjugation of Europe by Moscow instead of Berlin?"**

A very pertinent question!  
In considering what reparations Germany should pay, it would be interesting to know whether von Strauss, head of the German-

Jewish Deutsche Bank prior to Hitler and, strangely enough, one of the first members of Hitler's Reichstag in 1933, has been consulted by Lubin and others. There is also Kurt von Schroeder, from Cologne, who is related to the Schroeders in Britain. Kurt von Schroeder played a big part in financing Hitler and obtaining overseas assistance. He was a Director of the Bank of International Settlements, and the chairman of that institution, Mr. McKittrick, the American, was his friend. There is also Georg von Schnitzler, representative of the big chemical combine, I. G. Farben, who worked the "refugee" disguise in 1943 and arrived in Spain, where it is alleged, he renewed friendships on both sides of the Atlantic.

The following interesting item appeared in the "Sydney Morning Herald" not long after the end of the European part of World War II:

**"Marshal Zhukov may have been surprised to see that the great administrative building of I. G. Farben, which covers acres of ground, and which stands very close to the ruins of one of Germany's major cities, was hit by only one small bomb, and remains to-day in practically unscathed condition."**

The correspondent who sent the above, Colin Bingham, commented that the strange position of the I. G. Farben works supported the proposition that "Farben's international ramifications had providential results for Farben's administrative building, and the records contained therein."

Perhaps the Jew, Mond, of I.C.I. could shed some light on this matter. Don't forget his close connections with the German chemical combines.

It is also interesting to recall here the statement made by the U.S. Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, when addressing a Senate sub-committee on cartels, in 1944:

"Mr. Biddle said that the period between wars was only an armistice in which German firms conducted war against the United States with cartel contracts covering such strategic items as beryllium, magnesium, synthetic rubber, optical instruments, synthetic nitrogen, Pharmaceuticals, and electrical and radio equipment.

"Mr. Biddle said that the Krupp firm when ordered to destroy their machinery after the war, transferred their patents, licenses, and secret processes to the Swedish manufacturer, Bofors, and continued to manufacture heavy artillery, tanks, anti-aircraft guns, and other armament. Krupp entered into a cartel arrangement with the General Electric Company to restrict U.S. production of tungsten carbide.

"Another cartel, the I. G. Farbenindustrie, representing the chemical, oil, metallurgical, and pharmaceutical companies, held a conference with American industrialists in 1929, including representatives of the Dupont Co., aluminium companies, and the Standard Oil Cartel. Arrangements were made under which important firms were kept from the Latin American market.

## ABOLITION OF MEANS TEST

As a result of a meeting held in Science House, Sydney, on 6th instant, there has been formed "The Citizens' League for the Abolition of the Means Test."

Demand Forms have now been prepared by the League, and are available at the rate of 2/6 per 100 from the Hon. Secretary, Mr. Hugh McSweeney, 37 Henry St., Waverley, N.S.W.

Under the above heading, the wording of the demand forms is as follows:—

To Mr. . . . . . M.H.R.,

Parliament House, Canberra

Dear Sir,

As a Constituent in the Electorate of . . . . . I desire that the Means Test be abolished.

With all our young men returning and helping in production; with all our munition-workers, and our vast factories directed to the production of goods for our civil needs, there must result a glut of goods, and consequent stagnation and depression, unless special avenues are opened to move such production into the hands of consumers.

The Abolition of the Means Test will provide some avenues of distribution, and will, therefore, benefit production, and all taking part therein. Production will thus be stimulated, and moreover, aged citizens, who have given a lifetime service in industry, will be benefited.

None will be injured.

This question must be solved in the realm of production and consumption, and not in the realm of taxation and finance.

I, therefore, trust you will do your utmost to have the Means Test abolished immediately.

Signature . . . . .

Address . . . . .

## ELECTRIC SUPPLY ENGINEERS FIGHT CENTRALISERS

Growing opposition to the planners' move to centralise control of electricity is reported in New South Wales, where the Electricity Supply Engineers are organising a campaign to oppose the N.S.W. Government's plan to impose a centrally controlled electricity distribution scheme similar to the British Grid System.

As part of their vigorous campaign to arouse the public on this vital question, Aldermen and councillors throughout the State have been circularised by letter, urging them to protest to their Members of Parliament against this move, "emphasising that electricity supply be left as a function of Local Government organisation."

This is a step in the right direction. We would suggest, however, that the word "DEMANDING" be used instead of "emphasising," and that the local Members of Parliament be reminded that as the servants of the electors it is their duty to represent these demands in the House.

The Secretary of the Local Government Association and the Shires' Association summed up the position most precisely, when in an article on this question he stated: "Admittedly there is room for further development, but the problem is one of finance . . . . The people do not want another Commission consisting of appointees remote and uncontrolled."

The people are beginning to wake up to the real meaning behind this more-power-for-the-planners' racket. By making our local government organisations work, we are not only making it more difficult for the planners to succeed, but we are removing power from remote Boards and Commissions and putting it in the hands of local authorities, where it can be more easily controlled by the people.

Others were forbidden to manufacture strategic products, including synthetic rubber, the plastics industry and the development of the magnesium industry were retarded, an American company was prevented from selling Britain a certain type of munitions, and the Germans were enabled to obtain information through inspection of American plants."

In view of the above and the fact of big loans to Germany by the big international banks, perhaps the following item from the English returned soldiers' journal, "Reveille," of March 26, 1945, is not so surprising:

**"One of the major scandals of the war has been revealed in a 'News Chronicle' report from Stanley Baron. Writing of the Cologne bombing, Baron said it was 'miraculously accurate.' He drove for four and a half miles into the city centre without seeing a roof on a building. Few houses had one wall intact. Allied pattern bombing had flattened the homes of the working people. But, said Baron, two omissions from the devastation stood out—the enormous Ford and Courtauld plants. Baron did his best to point his hint. He explained how easily these targets, standing in an open space in a bend of the river, could have been identified . . . The factories had not even been camouflaged, and they were considered so immune that workers lived in them during the raids."**

These factories, although working for Hitler, had been made available as a result of a policy followed by International Finance—a Jewish policy. Yet, some people still scoff at the idea of an international power behind the scenes! (To be concluded.)