

# 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. 25, No. 22

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

13th November 1959

## EDITORIAL

### PREPARATIONS FOR DOLLAR CREDITS FOR KHRUSHCHEV

In a recent address given in Krasnoyarsk, Central Siberia, the Communist leader Khrushchev clearly revealed that one of the major purposes of his visit to the U.S.A. was to attempt to prepare the way for the obtaining of large dollar credits. Khrushchev is reported as having said: "The imperialists fear that the liquidation of the cold war, the elimination of international tension, may affect their profits . . . We have been telling them and still tell them: 'reshape your economy in a way to serve peaceful purposes. We shall help you in that. We shall place our orders with you'."

Khrushchev went on to say that dollar credits were necessary to buy American production. As the well-informed American journal, *The Tablet*, has observed, there is no doubt that there are influential groups in the U.S.A. prepared to "do a deal" with the Communists on the question of dollar credits. They are the same groups who provided dollar credits following the Roosevelt Administration's recognition of Soviet Russia. And the same arguments of the thirties are being used today to try and influence American businessmen to accept the policy: Increased Communist buying will help them financially. This is the same argument being used to soften resistance to trade with Communist China.

As the ultimate objective of the Marxist-Leninists is to control the world, not blow it to pieces with nuclear bombs, Khrushchev and his supporters have nothing to lose but much to gain by their current campaign for a general disarmament programme. The campaign has enormous propaganda from the Communist viewpoint, even if the non-Communist nations accept the proposal to make a start towards disarmament by stopping any further nuclear tests. If the Communists can persuade the Western politicians that they will ease international tensions in exchange for dollar credits and an acceptance of the present Communist control of Eastern European nations, they will have made their biggest advance since the notorious Yalta and Potsdam Agreements, which paved the way for Communist domination of both Eastern Europe and of China.

Although Khrushchev's main bargaining weapon for achieving his immediate objectives is the proposal to ease both international tensions and the burden of armaments, there is still widespread

disbelief in the non-Communist countries concerning the Communists' sincerity. And there would be bitter opposition in America to a policy of providing the Soviet with dollar credits. This raises the question of the role of Communist China in the international situation, the obvious exaggeration of the immediate menace of Communist China as a major industrial and military power, and the fostering of the idea that the Chinese Communist leaders are "Stalinists" who are not very enthusiastic about Khrushchev's current activities.

Apart from the fact that the Chinese Communist leaders are just as dedicated to the furtherance of Marxism-Leninism as are the Russian Communist leaders, those most competent to express an opinion have stressed the fact that the Chinese Communists are almost completely dependent upon Soviet Russia for whatever industrial development there is. Already several American journals have exposed the failure of the much-publicised production of steel in backyards. But the most comprehensive report we have yet seen on the real industrial position in China comes from the reputable *U.S. News & World Report*, which in its issue of June 15 of this year carried an article entitled "I Saw Red China From The Inside". Mr. Louis Wiznitzer provided his picture of "a depressing, over-rated country" in answer to a series of questions.

Mr. Wiznitzer's conclusion is that "China Without Russia is no adversary . . . China is no world power, except for limited wars—wars like Korea, where China can send in a few million men and sacrifice a few million men easily".

There is little doubt that fear of Communist

(Continued on page 4)

# MEDICAL POLITICS AND THE PLIGHT OF THE WORLD

We are indebted to "The Social Crediter" of October 31 for the following extracts from a Canberra Post-Graduate Course Oration given by Dr. Bryan W. Monahan in April 1958:

.... When I was in England during the war, I became associated with a small number of doctors there who were very alarmed at the prospect of being socialised. We formed a small association called the Medical Policy Association, and under its auspices I was asked to speak to a number of meetings of doctors in various places. Now one of the first things I noticed at these meetings was a widespread dislike of the idea of associating medicine with "politics", by which was meant, of course, party politics.

Party politics are in my opinion, one of the most fiendish swindles ever perpetrated on mankind, and I think a little consideration of why this is so will lead us to a correct conception of what politics, including medical politics, are.

Why do groups of people form associations of various kinds? There is I think, only one answer to that: it is because they believe that some particular purpose common to all those associating will be better served by working together than by working as individuals. It is, in fact, possible to achieve things by working in association that could not be achieved by separate individual efforts. There is a result over and above the sum of the individual efforts of those working in association, and this result we call "the unearned increment of association".

Sometimes there is a limited and finite purpose calling for associated effort—for example, the co-operation between surgeon, assistant, anaesthetist and theatre-staff in the performance of a surgical operation, or between the passengers in a number of cars in shifting a tree that has fallen across a road. In cases of this kind, there is an association, although it is neither formal nor named, and there is an objective, which is usually self-evident, and a benefit to the participants, which is the unearned increment.

In other cases, associations may have continuing and varying purposes. Our own British Medical Association is an example of the type. And here we come to the heart of politics. The choice made of purposes, or objectives, defines the policy of the association, and the choosing is politics. So medical politics consist in the choosing of an objective in relation to a given set of circumstances affecting members of the medical profession.

Here we come up against a problem which is really the root problem of politics in general, and that is that the greater the number of individuals involved, the more difficult it becomes to define a policy acceptable to all, because the desires of individuals are not uniform and standardised. What we rather vaguely understand as democracy is an attempt at a solution of this difficulty. I think that the only conception of democracy, which makes sense, is that it is the choice of objectives which meet the desires of as large a majority of the members of an association as possible, without penalising minorities. If we

accept this as a definition, we can see that it has nothing to do with the methods by which choices are made. Different methods are appropriate to various objectives, and to try to make one method cover all contingencies will defeat any true democracy. The essential notion to grasp is the relationship of democracy to policy.

Party politics capitalise disagreements about objectives, and enable interested outsiders to despoil both sides. The present fantastic rates of taxation are sanctioned by the envy of the less well off. The B.M.A. would not last two years if its affairs were conducted on party-political lines. And I doubt if free society will last another two years if the same methods are continued.

The problem of politics is easier to solve when we realise that there are only two major policies in the world, the policy of freedom of the individual, and the policy of subordination of the individual to the group—the policy of servitude. Particular problems resolve themselves into special cases of those opposed policies, usually in the sense that the premises of a particular problem are, either openly, or more often implicitly, drawn from the objective of freedom or of servitude.

By "freedom" I mean the ability of the individual to choose or reject one thing at a time. In the light of this definition it is clear that in the purely biological sphere, for example, the individual is far from free. We must breathe; we must eat; we must sleep. Nevertheless, it is also clear that man, as compared with the animal and vegetable species generally, has emancipated himself to a higher degree than any other species from the domination of his activities by such fundamental necessities. From our present point of view, the important activity is feeding - -or, to put it in a more general and useful form for our purpose, getting a living.

Now the major activity of the greater part of the animal and vegetable world consists in obtaining and consuming food. From one point of view, progress in the evolutionary sense means cutting down the amount of time and effort spent in this activity. I do not want to enlarge on the biological aspects of this matter. What is important is that it shows the direction of evolution, which is towards freedom.

On the biological level, man shares with many species of animals—notably the carnivores—the ability to satisfy his nutritional requirements in a fraction of his available time. But in the case of man, organisation of effort through association has reduced this fraction still further. This fact is disguised because his aesthetic requirements have been more complicated; but this, in principle, is a matter of choice. If we would be satisfied with a simple life, the business of getting a living could be satisfied with a very small part of our available time; and in the case of highly industrialised communities, with a very insignificant part.

On the other hand, it is the personal experience of all of us that getting a living is very nearly a full-time occupation. Is this entirely because of the complexity of our requirements? I shall give a categorical answer to that question: it is, "No".

I said, or implied, earlier, that the policy of freedom was opposed by the policy of servitude, or compulsion. This is not merely an abstract consideration: it is the crux of politics. Put in concrete terms, the position is this; we in Australia could enjoy the standard of living we do in fact enjoy, working say not more than a quarter of the time we do at present work, and very probably less than that. But we are compelled to spend our potentially free time working. This affects us as doctors just as much as it affects labourers, and everyone else, and so is a problem of medical politics.

Where there is an over-riding compulsion of this sort we are in the presence of a system of government, and if we do not want to acquiesce in the compulsion, our task is to identify that government. What is it that compels us to spend what should be our free time working? The answer to this becomes obvious when we realise that we work for a living, and that in a community such as ours, the access to living is through money. Put succinctly, the conditions under which we can obtain money, which is virtually our only access to the necessities of life, are a system of government.

We cannot here go into the economics of this situation, important though they are. But to an audience of this kind, I think the truth and importance of a few broad observations should be apparent. The first is this: the value of useful effort is highly diluted by useless effort. By useless I mean that it does not enlarge the cake, which has to be shared by the whole community. I think you would all agree, for example, that the greater part of the "work" done by the bureaucracy, so far from enlarging the cake, acts as a deterrent to the efforts of those who are making the cake. Similarly, virtually nothing but the rigid requirements of bookkeeping for financial purposes employs enormous numbers of "workers" who produce nothing but marks on pieces of paper.

We had better assume, I think, that doctors play some essential part in making the cake; but as we all know, an increasing part of our work consists in treating conditions, mostly mental, but physical as well, which arise from the stresses associated with getting a living. In relation to things as they could and ought to be, this represents wasteful effort, and is a source of stress for doctors.

Another diluent of useful effort is the over-production of capital equipment, and the production of goods for export in excess of imports. I shall not go into the former, which involves some rather technical arguments, but I assure you as one who has gone closely into the matter that there is much over-production; in the terms we have been using, we are making too many basins, beaters and ovens for the size of the cake we are making. As regards exports—we export a large slice of the cake in order to get money, not in order to enlarge the cake.

I hope what I have said gives you a broad picture of the nature of our economic activity, and if it does, you will see that it is, from our point of view, a largely senseless activity. But from the point of view of anyone who wishes to compel the individual into subordination to group activity, it is ideal.

By way of a return to medical politics, let us look at the mechanism of compulsion from another angle. There can be no doubt that under modern conditions, the activities of all but a chosen few are dominated by the necessity of obtaining money, and this is true of a higher proportion of the population than it was 150 years ago. Do not be confused by the fact, if it is a fact, that the standard of living of the majority is higher than it was then. It is my carefully considered opinion that the degree of independence is much less than it was 150, and even twenty years ago. The essential point to bear in mind is that whatever the standard of living, the degree of subordination of the individual to the system by which he obtains that living is increasing. And the mechanism of that subordination is very simple.

Despite the ever-increasing network of Government regulations, anyone who can obtain an independent income—that is, an income he does not have to earn—is comparatively, and to a large degree (providing he does not offend against regulations and laws) absolutely free. He can spend his time as he chooses. But the man who is dependent for his income on work is not free. In almost every case, his particular "standard of living" appears necessary to him, and he will be found to spend eight hours a day, or more, earning the money to obtain it. And that this is a state of affairs deliberately conceived and brought about is proved, I believe, by the absolutely confiscatory nature of taxation under a Government of any Party, and by persistence in monetary inflation. The objective of this is to deprive everyone of "savings" of an amount sufficient to produce independence.

Whenever I go into a business centre, it always gives me the impression of a system designed to deprive everyone of their money as fast as they earn it. When I say "designed", I do not mean consciously designed; the design has grown from the purpose. But of the purpose there is no doubt. Shops exist from their own point of view to get money out of the public; the fact that they supply individual needs and wants merely enables them to get this money; and every effort is made artificially to stimulate wants and needs. The huge, wasteful apparatus of advertising has no other purpose; and itself has to be paid for, again without enlarging the cake.

One final aspect of the policy of compulsion. Governments are agents of this policy, not, I think, by first intention, but because they accept and are dependent on the postulates of the financial system. Governments have to obtain money, and therefore they obey the rules governing access to money.

The conclusion, then, is that the real government of the world is in the hands of the controllers of the monetary system; that the policy of these controllers is to retain and

make impregnable their government; and that the method is by keeping everyone in "full employment", and deprived of economic independence.

This is the background of medical politics. In common with everyone else, doctors face the problems of freedom or compulsion, and the particular problems of medical politics are nearly all special cases of that general problem . . . . Medical politics, in my opinion, transcend in importance the mere interests of the profession. This, unfortunately, is less true now than it was in the immediate post-war period. I believe that a centrally controlled medical profession is an essential element of the so-called Welfare State, just as I believe that the Welfare State is the transitional stage to the Slave State. Had the profession in Britain successfully resisted central control and—very important—proclaimed its reasons for resistance, the Welfare State might not have materialised. There are other ways of providing Social Services than those in force in the Welfare State, and if the attempt to impose a plan on Society had failed, those other methods would have been applied sooner or later.

When I speak of a Slave State, I do not want to convey the picture of a gang of sweating natives controlled by a boss with the lash. Methods of control have been mechanised and automated since those days. A slave is someone with no control over his own destiny. What has changed in modern times is not the status of the slave, but the methods of control. The insertion of the wage system between what a man does to get his living, and what his living consists of, makes it possible to bamboozle him by all sorts of abstract considerations, which are the current abracadabra of so-called economics. A man's well being is supposed to be measured not by the number of blades of corn he can raise in his own garden, but by the performance of the latest fancy bomber his country can produce.

Every single modern bomber costs hundreds of thousands of pounds. The aggregate expenditure on bombers and other means of 'defence' is astronomical. Now suppose that that amount of money were distributed amongst the members of the community, and that bombers, etc., were built on a subscription basis. It seems to me a self-evident truth that the armaments industry would perish almost instantaneously if it were supported on such a voluntary basis. The fact is that not one-tenth of one per cent of the world's population wants war, particularly atomic war. But that a considerable proportion of the industrialised world's population is engaged in making the means of war is surely a proof that the individuals involved do not control their own destiny. That is the modern form of slavery.

Australia is small fry. I regret to say that I foresee the success of the attempt to bring about a world Police State, in which case, of course, the medical profession in Australia will do as it is told. But if this attempt is to be defeated, it will be defeated by the demonstration that security is possible with freedom, instead of, as in the Welfare State, at the cost of freedom. So that I think the medical profession, not only on the grounds of self-interest,

should take a conscious and determined stand on the policy of freedom for doctors as individuals. The deadliest thing a free Society is up against is the continuous, insidious, subtle propaganda—brain-washing—to the effect that loss of freedom is inevitable because of the increasing complexity of modern living. It is a calculated lie. That propaganda seemingly makes it impossible for more and more people to grasp that the natural and proper result of labour-saving machinery is labour saved, and that labour saved should mean leisure and freedom.

About fifty years ago the world faced the imminent prospect of an absolutely unheard Age of Leisure, prosperity, and individual freedom. Now, it stands on the brink of a new, and quite probably permanent, Dark Age—the Age foreseen by George Orwell in his despairing book, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. If this is to be averted it will be by the determined exercise of such liberty as remains.

## PREPARATIONS FOR DOLLAR CREDITS FOR KHRUSHCHEV

(Continued from page 1)

China as an immediate danger is being fostered with a view to creating a picture of Khrushchev and his associates as potential allies against the Chinese "Stalinists". The real objective of all this is to make it easier for Mr. Bernard Baruch and fellow financiers to pour dollar credits into Soviet Russia.

Big Finance and Communism are merely different aspects of the same philosophy, and between them will plunge the whole world into a new Dark Age unless they are defeated.

### **CODNER BROS.**

Builders and Joinery  
Manufacturers Homes and  
Home Sites Available

**WHEATSHEAF ROAD, GLENROY**

### **USE ENWITE SPECIALITIES**

TEXTIT waterproofing compound. SOLVIT paint remover. AQUAC wood putty. BRYNAC enamel for resisting water, acids and alkalis. FERROSOL, the rust killing paint. RUSTEX for removing rust from motor bodies and metal work. THERMEX, the silver paint.

**ENWITE PTY. LTD.**

**84-86 Cromwell Street, Collingwood,  
Vic. Phone: JA 5967.**