

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

*"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"*

Vol. 24, No. 22

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

NOVEMBER 21st, 1958

## EDITORIAL

### INTERNATIONALISTS' VICTORY IN AMERICA

**The recent American election results provide further evidence of our persistent warning that so long as present economic and financial policies are accepted as something akin to natural law, there is no hope whatever of averting disastrous political policies. While it is true, as we have often pointed out, that both political parties in America have been used by the "inner steering group" mentioned by Senator Jenner, the patriotic Republican Senator who stood firmly with the late Joseph McCarthy, it is the Democratic Party that has been most blatant in its support of internationalism.**

Some months ago we warned in an editorial on the significance of the American recession, that it would, amongst other results, increase the Democrats' control of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and ultimately lead to another Democrat being elected to the White House. The recent overwhelming vote against the Republicans was not, as so many commentators have claimed, the result of dissatisfaction with what *appeared* to be an anti-Communist policy. It was primarily a vote against the results of economic and financial policies. It is true, of course, that opposition to trade with Communist countries, particularly Red China, is weakening amongst sections of the American business community. But this weakening is also the result of internal economic and financial policies, which make it appear "inevitable" to the business community that exports to Communist countries, must be accepted irrespective of the ultimate consequences.

Here in Australia exactly the same development has been taking place. As far as we can ascertain, Dr. Evatt's open advocacy of increased Australian exports to Communist China has not harmed his electoral prospects in any way. In fact, he has strong support amongst leading primary producers and manufacturers. If it were not for the split in the Labor Movement, there is little doubt that Dr. Evatt would be sweeping towards victory on a domestic financial policy, which is very similar to that put forward by the Democrats at the American elections. In fact, Dr. Evatt has been making this very point.

Needless to say, the Communists have welcomed the American election results. No doubt their minds go back to how President Roosevelt

came to office in similar circumstances in the Great Depression. They look forward to being able to operate their conspiracy more openly in America than they have been able to do for some years. Who knows but perhaps even Alger Hiss may be restored to favour! Those who have supported Hiss and other traitors will breathe more easily now that outstanding patriots like Jenner and Malone are no longer in the Senate. Although Senator Jenner had resigned and did not contest the elections, he would have almost certainly been overwhelmed by the electoral avalanche against the Republicans. If he had been alive, even Senator McCarthy would probably have been defeated in Wisconsin. At the height of Senator McCarthy's influence, we went on record warning that false economic and financial policies could be a greater threat to him than his political opponents.

While we have always insisted that the peoples of the British Empire must have a definite understanding with the American people in these critical times, we have also warned that the defeatist and cowardly attitude of following passively every policy direction from America must ultimately lead to disaster. The American election results should be a signal for the peoples of the British countries to cease following Washington and Wall Street, and to restore their position in the world in order that they act as independent and sovereign nations. We have not the slightest doubt that the victory of the Democrats in the U.S.A. will result in an intensification of the internationalist policies leading to the creation of the World State. The challenge can and will be met by those who not only understand the realities of the situation, but who will not flinch from the battles which must be fought before victory is achieved.

## NEWS SECTION

**Communists Helping Dr. Evatt:** Mr. L. Sharkey, national leader of the Communist Party, is reported in the Communist *Tribune* of November 5, as follows:

"We want the victory of the labor movement over Menzies. We recognise that Dr. Evatt, as Labor leader, has to play a nationwide role in this campaign against Menzies. We did not want to hamper him in this by standing a candidate against him."

**Even The Aged Must Have "Full Employment!":**

A recent address by Dr. J. H. Lindwell, chairman of the Victorian Hospitals and Charities Commission, is another distressing example of an influential, and no doubt, well-meaning man, advocating a policy which is leading straight to George Orwell's 1984. Dr. Lindwell claims that new jobs must be found for ageing people. He suggests the setting up of committees comprising employers, employees and doctors "to review the person's capabilities with the aim of finding him a new job." Provided they had economic independence, the majority of elderly people would have no trouble whatever of finding ways and means of employing their time and talents without the direction of committees. There is, of course, a modicum of truth in the view that some elderly people feel lost when forced to leave their employment at 60 or 65 years of age. The present modern economic system has a soul-destroying effect upon many who are compelled to submit to serving the system for the best part of their lives.

The realistic answer to this problem is start progressively to reduce the retiring age, and to ensure that those retiring have an independent income. But Dr. Lindwell apparently is unaware that economically the requirements of the whole community could easily be produced if every individual was required to work present hours in industry until the age of 40. He suggests "the finding of new activities for ageing people would ease the growing problem of providing for them, which came principally on the earning section of the community."

There is no real "growing problem" of providing economic independence for those retiring from the production system. The real problem is how to show people like Dr. Lindwell that an economic system serving the genuine requirements of consumers can provide sufficient for all with progressively less man hours worked, and that the leisure state, with increasing self-employment in vocation is preferable to the work state and "full employment."

**Bureaucracy Unlimited:** The Federal Bureaucracy continues to expand and the aspiring politicians no longer even pay lip service to a policy of curbing the expansion. Before the 1949 Federal Elections, Mr. Menzies promised that he was going to "reduce the burden of government." But when the bureaucratic expansion continued as before, he made one pathetic and futile attempt to curb it and then turned his back on the problem. And so as the end of the year approaches, the Commonwealth Public Service inspectors begin their annual recruiting drive. It is anticipated that this drive will lift the Commonwealth Public Service to a record exceeding 162,000 when the financial year ends on June 30 of next year.

The Federal Bureaucracy expanded by 1102 in 1955 and totalled 153,000 at the end of June 1956. There was an increase of 4553 by the end of June 1957 and a further expansion of 2570 to the end of this year. There is no hope whatever of halting this bureaucratic revolution, irrespective of which Government is elected to Canberra, so long as the present policies of "Full Employment" and centralism are pursued. If the purpose of the Government is to "make work." then every improvement in efficiency in the private sector of the economy must result in greater Governmental activities to maintain the "Full Employment" objective, and this means progressive bureaucratic expansion.

---

## Special Election Campaign on Red Trade

A number of supporters of this journal have taken independent action to conduct a special election campaign on the subject of exporting to Communist countries. Night after night a team of campaigners have been covering a large number of election meetings, distributing leaflets to all those attending, and asking questions on Red Trade and associated subjects. This campaign has created considerable interest in Melbourne. It is proposed to continue the campaign after the elections. Government Members opposed to exporting to Communist countries have been heartened by the campaign, and stress the fact that only public opinion will prevent the next Government from fostering increased trade with Red China.

We are informed that the reaction of Mr. R. G. Casey, Minister for External Affairs, to the election campaign indicates that he cannot be relied upon to make a fight for principles within the Cabinet. This will not surprise regular readers of this journal.

## SPECIAL AMERICAN LAW TO FURTHER ZIONISM

From time to time we are taxed with not providing sufficient specific evidence to support our comments on the worldwide influence of Political Zionism. Most of the documented evidence supporting our comment is to be found in the numerous books and booklets we handle. It is impossible to quote from these sources every time we make a comment on current affairs. However, the following article by the famous American writer, Miss Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in "The Minneapolis Daily Star" of August 21, 1958, is a sample of Zionist influence in the American Government:

I have in the past spoken of special interests, which have shaped American policy. Here is an example bearing on Zionist influence on congress and the White House.

*The Jerusalem Post* (Israel) on May 29 carried an article by Moshe Levin interviewing Abraham Tulin, an American citizen who is to quote Levin) a brilliant attorney and "a veteran Zionist." After interviewing Tulin Levin wrote: "The story is too fresh to be told in its entirety. Many highly placed persons in the United States who were involved are still active in public life, but the drama behind the 8 million dollar Gerard Swope bequest to the Technion can now be revealed." (The Technion is a technological institute in Haifa, Israel.)

Tulin was the leader in organizing the American Technion society, whose chief business was to raise funds for the institute in Israel. He succeeded in interesting the late Gerard Swope, president of General Electric and a multi-millionaire.

"Mr. Swope was a Jew although few people realized it." He was enormously influential. "He was called on by several presidents to head commissions and stood for years as chairman of many boards of directors."

Swope was over 80 when Tulin met him in 1953. He had shown no interest in Zionism. Tulin approached him through his interest in technology, and between 1953 and 1955 Swope contributed 350,000 dollars to Israel's Technion.

But Tulin thought Swope's fortune ought to go to Technion: "In 1955, Swope's wife died. He had turned over most of his fortune to her, thinking she would outlive him . . . and she willed him about eight million dollars in trust, the income to go to him for life and the principal to go upon his death to such persons or organizations as he should direct in his will."

Tulin subsequently "made out his (Swope's) will," which made Technion the sole beneficiary of this trust.

But since Swope had inherited this fortune from his wife there would be a federal tax of 4,500,000 dollars on it. Levin continues to quote Tulin:

" 'There was nothing in the internal revenue code that could help us . . . Then a thought struck me. Why couldn't we amend the code? It would mean putting a bill through congress, but it was the only way.'

He needed Swope's permission. "He was shocked in the beginning." But Tulin convinced him and betook himself to Washington.

" There I put in the hardest four months of my life . . . I worked in complete silence. Publicity would have spoiled everything . . . I did not talk to a single Jewish member of congress. They would favour it anyway.'

The bill, introduced into the house by Representatives Reed (Republican) and Keogh (Democrat) of New York was an amendment to section 2055 of the internal revenue code of 1945. But, "Congress was about to adjourn, and there was a log jam of 500 bills that had priority."

" 'At this point I received incredible help. People have told me that nothing like it ever happened before in congress.' The bill was jumped over other legislation and passed both houses unanimously.

There was still another obstacle. The Secretary of the Treasury, who had opposed the bill throughout, announced that he would advise the President to veto it. The veto could not be overridden because congress was in recess. "Tulin resorted to friends . . . (who) went to the White House. The amendment was signed and became law. Aug. 6, 1956."

This bill is unique. It provides that "where a trust is established by the will of a testator for the life of a beneficiary who is 80 years old . . . at the time of the testator's death, and who is given the power to appoint recipients of the principal . . . upon his own death and by his own will, and such beneficiary files an affidavit with the internal revenue bureau within one year of the death of the testator naming the educational institutions which he intends to appoint as recipients . . . then the federal inheritance tax on the original amount is waived."

(Continued on page 4)

This bill plainly was tailored to one case. It applies, by inference of the Jerusalem Post article, only to bequests to educational institutions, omitting charities. It makes no provision that such institutions be American.

Swope's will, probated in January 1958, gave this whole American-made-trust to a foreign institution.

Who were the "highly placed persons in the United States," whose names are not revealed? Who were those who gave "incredible help"? Who were the "friends" visiting the White House who overrode the treasury's recommendations? What Americans ever heard of this bill while it was before congress?

This is what I mean by the influence of external interests.

---

### PRE-CHRISTMAS HOUSE PARTY

Mr. & Mrs. Eric Butler wish to inform readers that their annual pre-Christmas House Party will be held at their home, Alma Road, Panton Hill, on Saturday evening, December 6. All supporters and their friends are cordially invited.

---

### D.L.P. Candidate Advocates National Dividend

The Melbourne Age of November 13 published the following report:

Increasing technical advances and automation would enable the Government to pay every citizen a "national dividend," the Democratic Labor party candidate for Melbourne Ports, Mr. J. E. S. Fitzgerald, said at Williamstown last night.

This national dividend, he said, would consist of family endowments, pensions and price subsidies.

At the same time, it should be possible to abolish increased taxation and to lower income tax, as a result of increased production.

**Automation would not cause unemployment, but it would make increasingly shorter hours possible.**

Mr. Fitzgerald said a new economic system was needed - - one that was neither totalitarian, socialism nor private monopoly capitalism.

He described international finance as the real power behind the spread of Communism.

"The money power of New York is a threat to the British Empire and to Christian civilisation," he added.

## League of Rights Questions Candidates on Principles

The submission of the following questions to all Victorian candidates at the Federal Elections is a continuation of "The-Draw-The-Line-Campaign," launched by the League of Rights last year:

1. Are people born into this world with a *right* to develop and live their lives free from all *man-made* restraints except those that are necessary to protect other people's freedom?
2. Should Governmental policies conform to the same Moral Law concerning right and wrong which individuals are expected to obey?
3. If the power of Government is increased, does this not mean that the power of the individual over his own affairs is decreased?
4. Presuming you agree with the view contained in Question 3; have you any suggestions for reducing the power of Government?
5. Do you regard taxation as a means of obtaining finance for legitimate Government activities, a means of economic control, or a combination of both?
6. Can you indicate the absolute maximum of total taxation, both direct and indirect, measured as a percentage of the national income, you would support in peacetime?
7. Are you prepared to give a *personal* guarantee that you would never support the imposition of a higher percentage of total taxation than the one you consider should be the maximum?
8. Do you support the widely held view amongst economists that "controlled inflation" is inevitable?
9. Is it right that people who have lawfully acquired property, either by their own efforts or the efforts of their forefathers, should have it confiscated by Government, by taxation or other means?
10. Do you think there are any moral factors involved in recognition of, and trading with Communist-dominated countries?

An analysis of the answers received as we go to press reveals that the overwhelming majority of candidates of all parties are not prepared to draw a line concerning maximum taxation and to give a personal assurance on the issue. A detailed analysis of candidates' replies will be given after the elections and used as the basis of an extension of "The-Draw-The-Line Campaign."

Authorised by Eric D. Butler, Panton Hill.