

# COMMUNISM

# UNMASKED

JEAN PATRICE, S. T. M. B. A.



NEW TIMES LTD.

# COMMUNISM UNMASKED

By  
JEAN PATRICE, S.T.M. B.A.

PUBLISHED BY  
NEW TIMES LTD.

DEDICATED  
TO A FAMILY  
TO WHOM I AM PERSONALLY  
GREATLY INDEBTED,  
J. AND M. AND J.,  
AN IDEAL FAMILY,  
AND  
TRULY SYMPATHETIC WITH THE MASSES,  
REGARDLESS OF CREED  
OR  
LAND OF BIRTH.

PUBLISHED BY  
NEW TIMES LTD.  
273 LITTLE COLLINS STREET,  
MELBOURNE, 3000  
VICTORIA AUSTRALIA.

FIFTH EDITION, 1970

PRINTED BY  
KENKYUSHA PRINTING CO., LTD.  
TOKYO JAPAN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface to Fifth Edition. . . . .	1
Preface to Fourth Edition. . . . .	18
Preface to Second Edition. . . . .	21
Preface to First Edition. . . . .	22
What's Wrong Today? . . . . .	41
Communism a High Finance Anti-British Plot . . . . .	49
Hypocrisy of Communism. . . . .	52
Lest we Are Misunderstood. . . . .	55
World Full of Wealth. . . . .	59
Money Is an Order on Goods. . . . .	60
Banks Manufacture Money. . . . .	61
Fearful Power of the Bankers. . . . .	65
Depression Caused by Bankers. . . . .	71
Russia Smashed Up By International Finance . . . . .	85
Revolution in Russia . . . . .	92
Jews in Other Revolutions. . . . .	99
Communitic Officials in Russia. . . . .	104
Jews Still Dominate Russia . . . . .	111
Communism in Russia a Huge Failure. . . . .	114
Communism Outside of Russia . . . . .	124
U.N.O. Is a Communitic Organization . . . . .	126
Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.) is Communitic. . . . .	134
Federal Union is Communitic. . . . .	142
International Currency Plan is Communitic . . . . .	147
Communitic Professors of Economics. . . . .	152
Hitler and the Jews. . . . .	160
Six Million Jews Gassed.—What a Joke!. . . . .	174
Fascism is to be Condemned. . . . .	181
Persecution of Religion in Russia . . . . .	187
These Schools for Communism. . . . .	195

	<i>Page</i>
The So-Called New Morality. . . . .	211
This Idea of Work at Any Cost . . . . .	219
The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion . . .	226
The Folly of Dialogue with Communists . . . .	236
Appendix I Stalin the Terrible. . . . .	239
Appendix II Jews and Vatican II. . . . .	257
Appendix III Communism and Strikes . . . . .	269

## **Preface to the Fifth Edition**

With the exception of some chapters, viz., the Jewishness of U.N.O., the alleged slaughter of 6,000,000 Jews, the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, the betrayal at Pearl Harbour, lists of other Jewish-inspired Revolutions, and lists of unsuspected but still Communistic movements in our midst, and a few events of obviously quite recent happening—with these exceptions, this book first appeared in 1943 under a different title and different anonymous authorship.

The work went into many editions, each of thousands of copies, an incontestable proof of its intrinsic worth. It is now being republished after a lapse of some years. We have been strongly advised to keep the different original Prefaces. Some parts of the book could be out of date, but they could serve to show trends. Hence they are not omitted. If, for a moment, the grandiose Red plan is scoffed at as being fantastic, consider that one-fourth of the land surface of the world and one-third of the peoples of the earth are now controlled by the world-wide Communistic bloc.

The book is now being brought out again with the firm conviction of its paramount necessity. In his delightful little book—"Know Your Enemy"—Robert H. Williams goes behind the scenes and exposes some of the Jewish mischiefmakers of the present era.

In our book we are endeavouring to unmask Communism and point out who are the sinister forces working in the dark and leading the unsuspecting masses up the garden path. For the same diabolical forces are at work today as at the time of the original writing of this book.

Lord Acton, speaking of the French Revolution, said: "The appalling thing in it is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke, we perceive evidence of calculating organization. The managers remain studiously concealed, but there is no doubt about their presence from the first."

So then, no one can justly say that this edition of our book is out of date.

The book contains lists of names. These lists prove beyond doubt that Communism is a Jewish movement. The lists should further help readers to see the falsity of Jewish assertions that the Jews are an innocent but much persecuted race and that it is high time that Christians stopped maligning them. It would be much nearer the mark of sincerity if Jewish leaders stopped persecuting the Christians.

Though Communism is controlled by Jews, it must not be thought that every Jew is a Communist. It is quite possible that many Jews do not really know who are running the movement and what are its ultimate aims. What is more remarkable still, high up Communistic Jewry would not hesitate to get slaughtered in pogroms or in wars their lesser Jewish brethren if they considered it a help to the gaining of Jewish world control after these latter have done their dirty work. How many people realize that when Hitler turned on the Jews and scattered them, he was only walking into a Jewish trap by which he helped the Jews to gain positions left vacant by our own soldiers who went to the front?

Enthusiastic anti-communists must not fall into the fatal blunder of physically persecuting the Jews. The Communistic Jews would make capital out of it. What is more, it is an old dodge for the Jews to paint swastikas overnight around the suburbs and then, next day, to call the attention of all and sundry to

"Nazi Persecution". And what is almost unbelievable, Jews have been known to let in pigs by night into their synagogues with the sole purpose of creating sympathy, and then the propaganda machine tells the whole world of the happening.

Some readers may greet this book with cries of "Anti-Semitism". Now, the word "Semite" is too wide and too loose. The Arabs are Semites, and the Jews are persecuting them. So then, these persecuting Jews are Anti-Semitic.

In his wonderful book—"Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement"—Father E. Cahill, S.J., referring to the Catholic Church's condemnation of "The Friends of Israel" says (page 76): "The Church desires sincerely the conversion of the Jews to the true faith. But she cannot compromise with them any more than she can with the Modernist or even with the so-called "Anglo-Catholics". Hence, in the present decree, the Holy See takes prudent measures against the Jewish infiltrations into the Church which were being attempted through the medium of the condemned association and pamphlet. On the other hand, she also reprobates anti-Germanism or any other similar anti-ism that would imply 'racial or national hatred'. But to follow the direction of Leo XIII and 'tear away the mask from Freemasonry and let it be seen as it really is', is not anti-Semitism even where the Freemasons in question are Jews."

Here is something further: If a German or a Japanese or a Frenchman or an Italian or Englishman or Irishman—if anyone of these does anything evil, the masses do not hesitate to condemn them, and no fair-minded person will find fault with such condemnation. But when Jewish criminals are shown up in their true colour, at once the Jewish hands are held up in horror with accusations of "anti-Semitism"!



Of course, it is all Jewish bluff, and the Jewish malefactors secretly laugh at the gullibility or, better still, the cowardice of the Christians who take any notice of them.

Are we Christians expected to remain silent and allow the Jews to ride rough-shod over us in our legitimate rights and to continue triumphantly on their road to ultimate world-control?

And here is something worthy of further consideration. Israel is the national home of Jews. Jews living away from Israel claim their local domicile as their national home. So it would seem that a Jew is attached to more than one national home. That should not surprise us because Jews will readily sing—"Britannia Rules the Waves" . . . "The Star-Spangled Banner" . . . "The Marseillaise" . . . just as it suits them. They back every horse in the race.

Seeing that the world's press is controlled by Jews, what hope has the average citizen of getting any idea of what is going on behind the Communistic scenes? Some years ago I read an eight page brochure entitled—"Jewish Press Control". It dealt exclusively with the London papers. It gave you publication after publication which were all controlled by Jews. Most world news filters through the two great European news agencies—the French Agence Havas and Reuter's Agency in Britain. The Havas Agency was started by Charles Havas, a Portuguese Jew. Beer, another Jew, changed his name to Reuter and built up the vast British Empire Service. Hence, newspaper readers look at the world very largely through Jewish spectacles.

People in general do not realise that the efforts of American soldiers in Vietnam are being curtailed by orders of the Communistic enemy in the high places of the U.S.A. government.

In his recent book—"The Death of a Nation" the renowned writer, John Stormer, asks (on page 56) the pertinent question: "Why do American leaders fight Communism with one hand while aiding it with the other?"

And on page 4 of the cover, Stormer asks some more questions which are food for thought. He asks:

"Why are tax dollars used to pay the agitators and extremists who start city riots?"

"Why does the White House increase American trade with the Soviet Union while Soviet MIG's and missiles kill American boys in Vietnam?"

"Why were communist pirates allowed to seize an American ship and crew with no retaliation?"

"Why did the Supreme Court open America's public schools to Communist teachers while banning prayer and Bible reading?"

I stoutly maintain that the average man calling himself a Communist is no more a Communist than I am. He is only in search of a fair share of the good things of this life to which he is justly entitled. Many a Communist thinks that the triumph of Communism would bring an interminable period of plenty, peace and prosperity and a universal comradeship. They genuinely believe that all racial and class differences would disappear and mankind would be led to a Utopia.

The Jew, Benjamin Disraeli, in his famous book, "Coningsby", makes one of its characters say: "So you see, dear Coningsby, the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."

In her book: "The Surrender of an Empire", Mrs. Nesta Webster, speaking of Communistic activities in Egypt, says (page 343):

"When at the trial of the Communists in 1926, it

became evident that they were principally members of the Chosen Race, that is to say, of the race habitually chosen by the Bolsheviks for the Propagation of their doctrines abroad, Moscow decided to change the nationality of its emissaries, and in 1927 Italians and Greeks were sent to replace the deported Hebrews."

**Winston Churchill wrote in "Great Contemporaries" in 1937:**

"Communism is not only a creed, it is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions, he is the pledged adept of a well thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions.

"No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of goodwill, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of Governments or Statesmen is to be utilised for their ruin. Then, when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence, from revolt to private assassination, must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of Liberty and Democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the Brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinion, must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken."

When the billiard ball stopped rolling, it looked round! In the light of warnings from Winston Churchill and Mrs. Nesta Webster it would be well for world citizens to look round and see the danger of Communistic propaganda.

People do not want wars. They want peace. Yet, those who, left alone would be the best of friends in ordinary civic life, are given different uniforms and are handed a gun and then sent out to shoot one another. A fights B for the benefit of C, and C is the big financier.

Poland was betrayed to the Soviet (1939-1945). The whole of Eastern Europe and North Korea and Manchuria were betrayed to the Soviet (1945). Our wartime ally, Chiang-Kai-Shek, was betrayed to the Chinese Communists. Mysterious orders were given which caused millions and millions of dollars worth of arms and ammunition to be dumped into the Indian Ocean when they should have gone to Chiang-Kai-shek. We hear of the bungling of foreign affairs, but things do not just happen that way. They are arranged.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters were betrayed by their being denied prompt all-important recognition of the new Hungarian Government. Franco had offered to send arms provided that Adenauer would allow Franco's planes to land on West German soil for refuelling. Adenauer agreed. With unwonted haste the Communist-controlled American State Government prevented this arrangement from being carried out.

The Jewish powers helped Castro to oust anti-Communist Batista in Cuba, and this under the pretext that Castro was a democrat and Batista a dictator. Later on, the Jewish-controlled U.S.A. Government promised air cover for the anti-Castro Cubans in their intended landing on Cuba in the Bay of Pigs. But all unknown to the anti-Castro Cubans it was withheld with the result that the patriots ran into a deadly trap with Castro's Army awaiting them.

In our book we make reference to the most astound-

ing documents ever published—"The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion". Although we make reference to them, we do not use them as a definite proof of anything. They were certainly in existence over 60 years ago.

Their origin is seemingly unknown, but they outline a plan for world control by money manipulation, by the corruption of governments, by the control of the press, the undermining of religion and the corruption of morals, the sowing of discord between nations, classes and individuals. By this means the manipulators try to paralyze any plan that might stand in the way of their fulfilment.

The entire plan is so colossal that at first the mind refuses to credit it. Nevertheless, the plan is being fulfilled.

The Jews have put forward various theories as to the origin of the Protocols. At the same time the statement made in Henry Ford's paper, the "Dearborn Independent" of July 10th, 1920, still holds good. "The Jewish defenders leave the text of the Protocols alone while they lay heavy emphasis on the fact of anonymity."

We hear a lot about the Berne trial. As a result of the rapidly growing fame of the Protocols, numerous attempts were made to discredit them as a forgery. But it was not until 1933 that the Jews resorted to legal action. On June 26th, 1933, the Federation of Jewish Communities of Switzerland and the Berne Jewish Community brought an action against five members of the Swiss National Front. The procedure of the Court was astounding. Sixteen witnesses called by the plaintiffs were heard but only one of the 40 witnesses called by the defendants was allowed a hearing. In view of these and similar irregularities, it was not surprising that the Court pronounced the Protocols to be a for-

gery and demoralising literature. But on the 1st November, 1937, the Swiss Court of Criminal Appeal quashed this judgement in its entirety. Yet in spite of this, the Jewish propagandists still declare that the Protocols have been "proved" to be a forgery.

Later on, I give a special chapter on the United Nations Organization (U.N.O.). In the meantime let me quote from Protocol 6: Here is what it says: "In every possible way we must develop the significance of our super-government by representing it as the protector and Benefactor of all those who voluntarily submit to us."

That is exactly the way in which the United Nations Organization is represented to those who voluntarily submit to it. It is exactly the way in which the various United Nations special agencies are represented. It is obvious to every one that the nations of the East are being herded into subjection under the dominance of the Soviet Union. But what of the nations of the West? Are they really the "Free Nations" which they are popularly supposed to be? Far from it! They are being herded into the same sort of pen as other nations of the East under Communism, and often on the pretext that this is the only way in which they can save themselves from Communism. What diabolical trickery!

Under Communism National Parliaments must give way to such bodies as the Council of Europe or the Atlantic Council. National forces must be so submerged that no nation has control over its own means of defence. National economies must be so submerged that no one nation has control over its own economic destiny.

The "Revue des Etudes Juives", financed by James de Rothschild, published in 1880 two documents, which showed how true the Protocols are in saying that

the Learned Elders of Zion have been carrying on their plans for centuries. On January 13th, 1489, Chemor, Jewish Rabbi of Arles in Provence (France), wrote to the Grand Sanhedrin, which had its seat at Constantinople, for advice, as the people of Arles were threatening the synagogues. What should the Jews do? This was the reply—

Dear beloved brethren in Moses, we have received your letter in which you tell us of the anxieties and misfortunes which you are enduring. We are pierced by as great pain to hear it as yourselves.

The advice of the Grand Satraps and Rabbis is the following:—

1. As for what you say that the King of France obliges you to become Christians: do it, since you cannot do otherwise, but let the law of Moses be kept in your hearts.
2. As for what you say about the command to despoil you of your goods: (the law was that on becoming converted Jews gave up their possessions) make your sons merchants that little by little they may despoil the Christians of theirs.
3. As for what you say about their making attempts on their lives: make your sons apothecaries that they may take away Christians' lives.
4. As for what you say of their destroying your synagogues: make your sons canons and clerics in order that they may destroy their churches.
5. As for the many other vexations you complain of: arrange that your sons be advocates and lawyers, and see that they always mix themselves up with the affairs of State, in order that, by putting Christians under your yoke, you may DOMINATE THE WORLD and be avenged on them.

6. Do not swerve from this order that we give you, because you will find by experience that, humiliated as you are, you will reach the actuality of power.

People hear of the London School of Economics. It is a Communistic set-up financed by the Jew, Sir Ernest Cassell (grandfather of Lady Mountbatten, the influential wife of Louis Mountbatten). It was founded specially to train the rulers of the future Socialist States. In plain English, it was to be a breeding ground for Communism. Public Health officers eliminate breeding grounds for physical disease, but what of the breeding ground for this much more dangerous malady, Communism?

How many realize that U.N.N.R.A. was a Jewish organization? The head was the Jew, Leymann, who was followed by another Jew, La Guardia. The "French" representative in U.N.N.R.A. was the Jew, Alphand. A Jew, A.J. Rosenman, was the deputy chief of the Balkan U.N.N.R.A. mission in 1945. The Chinese section of U.N.N.R.A. was also under a Jew. The Jew, Morris Hillquit (real name Misca Hilkowicz) pointed out in his book, "Socialism Summed Up" (1913) that by high taxes, shorter hours, a shorter week and freedom to strike, owners of businesses could be reduced to the point of being glad to have them taken over by the State.

And then there is the EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET. Let me just briefly touch upon it. It is a threat to the British heritage. The insidious thing about the Treaty of Rome is that on the surface it appears fairly harmless, but if the British Government joins the Common Market, it will be the first step towards the destruction of the British Sovereignty and the break-up of the British Commonwealth. The Treaty of Rome



ultimately proposes a highly political and economic structure run by bureaucrats with the loss of genuine sovereignty of the member nations. Any nation coming in to the Common Market is accepting a far-reaching political commitment. The sovereign Parliament of Britain would no longer be sovereign. The High Court of Parliament would cease to be the highest tribunal in the land for governing the British people.

To oppose the Communists is to run the risk of a smear campaign or torture or death.

Let me just touch upon the smear campaign against that American Patriot, Joseph McCarthy. His opposition to Communism resulted in a fearful example of character assassination. The term "McCarthyism" was coined by the Communists and has been used as a powerful political smear word. Even many sincere anti-communists were led to look upon McCarthy as an extremist, a witch hunter, a destroyer of the character of innocent people.

And then there is the case of Whittaker Chambers who exposed the infamous Communist, Alger Hiss. The Communists have presented him to the public as being mentally deranged.

Student uprisings all over the world and in every country are coordinated by international intrigue. Demonstrations on University Campuses are not spontaneous. They fulfil a uniform pattern whether the community involved is New York or Paris or Tokyo or the Argentine, and critics of free love are ridiculed as belonging to the past.

Karl Marx is credited with having said that a revolution in England would come only from foreigners. So then, only the wilfully blind will fail to see a long range plot in this Black influx into England.

Here is an item which may be news to some readers:

We hear of the "British" doing this or the "French" doing that or of the "Germans" or "Americans" doing something else, whereas in most cases the nations are simply carrying out the instructions of the powerful Jews in their respective countries. England wants to interview France, and she does it through a Jew. United States want to discuss some business of importance with Germany, and it is done through a Jew. And when we hear that, e.g., "Poland", has voted for a certain measure, do not forget that the vote comes from the Communistic Jew who is controlling Poland.

If today Russia is such a wonderful country, why are tourists so carefully watched and what are the Russians hiding from them? Successful businessmen make a display of the fruits of their genius.

The American Pacific Fleet was designedly exposed like a barrellful of sitting ducks. Before the Pearl Harbour tragedy with its loss of 18 ships including 4 great American warships and over 4,000 American lives, the anti-war sentiment was prominent in the United States. In plain English, the American people did not want war; above all, war with the Japanese. So the Communist controlled Roosevelt hit upon a Machiavellian plan, namely, Japan was provoked into attacking Pearl Harbour.

It was well known in official circles that the Japanese fleet was well on the way. The American Secret Service officials had tapped the Japanese code. Roosevelt expected the attack. Roosevelt wanted it. Roosevelt precipitated it. But the secret information was designedly withheld from the American High Command at Pearl Harbour, namely, Admiral Kimmel and General Short.

The "attack" brought U.S.A. into a war that they did not want. It produced that hysteria necessary for war. The guiltless Kimmel and Short were made pub-

lic scapegoats. The investigation was a fake. The entire report given to the American people concerning Pearl Harbour was a piece of falsehood and fakery that staggers the imagination. Kimmel and Short "took the knock".

In his foreword to "The Final Secret of Pearl Harbour", Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey states: "I have always considered Admiral Kimmel and General Short to be splendid officers who were thrown to the wolves as scapegoats for something over which they had no control. They are our outstanding military martyrs".

Lest anyone would say that we are very biased in our condemnation of Jewish malefactors let me here give some quotations from Jews themselves.

"The American Hebrew" leading Jewish newspaper in U.S.A. wrote, September 10th, 1920: "The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was the work of Jewish brains, of Jewish satisfaction, of Jewish planning, whose goal is to create a new order in the world. What was performed in so excellent a way in Russia, thanks to Jewish brains, and because of Jewish dissatisfaction and by Jewish planning, shall also, through the same Jewish mental and physical forces become a reality all over the world."

Let me now quote from the "New York Journal American" February 3rd, 1949, page 16.

"Today it is estimated by Jacob's (Jacob H. Schiff, the long-time head of the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Company) grandson, John Schiff, a prominent member of New York Society, that the old man sank about \$20,000,000 for the final triumph of Bolshevism in Russia. Other New York banking houses also contributed."

Let me give an extract from a letter by the well-known Jewish author, Dr. Oscar Levy (Royal Societies

Club, St. James' Street, London, S.W.1) sent to Captain George Pitt-Rivers of Worcester College, Oxford, which letter was published in full in the preface to the latter's book: "The World Significance of the Russian Revolution". (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1920).

". . . I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, . . . who have posed as the saviours of the world, we who have even boasted of having given it the saviour, we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its executioners . . . We who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven, WE HAVE FINALLY SUCCEEDED IN LANDING YOU INTO A NEW HELL . . ."

Let me quote the prominent Jewish author, Marcus Eli Ravage, in an article, "A Real Case against the Jews", in the "Century Magazine" of New York, Jan. 1928.

". . . You have not begun to appreciate the real depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We are subverters. We have taken your natural world, your ideals, your destiny, and played havoc with them. WE HAVE BEEN AT THE BOTTOM NOT MERELY OF THE LATEST GREAT WAR BUT OF NEARLY ALL YOUR WARS NOT ONLY OF THE RUSSIAN BUT OF EVERY OTHER MAJOR REVOLUTION IN YOUR HISTORY. We have brought discord and confusion and frustration into your personal and public life. We are still doing it . . ."

How many stop to reflect that the trouble in U.S.A. between the white and the coloured races is a Jewish Communistic plan, neither for the good of the white man nor the coloured man. Under pretence of helping the negroes in U.S.A. to achieve "liberty, equality and fraternity", the Communists have been carrying

out a vicious programme leading to riot, bitterness and disruption of all normal life. They have induced amongst the negroes a persecution complex, a warped belief that the white man's government is responsible for everything.

That educated, courageous, cultured negro, Manning Johnson, tells the full story in his book entitled—"Colour, Communism and Common Sense". He had felt himself frustrated by his race and colour and he fell under the spell of Communistic propaganda.

For 10 years Manning Johnson had laboured in the cause of Communism; he was a "dedicated comrade". He zealously used all his talents to bring about the triumph of Communism in America and throughout the world: for he felt that the triumph of Communism would bring about a never-ending period of peace, prosperity and universal brotherhood. But after 10 years he woke up to this massive, cruel deception. He saw Communism in all its naked cruelty and ruthlessness; in the low value it placed upon life; in its total disrespect for the dignity of man. He saw sex and perversion used as a means for political blackmail. He saw that the Reds had never contributed anything tangible to the progress of the negroes but that they had collected millions of dollars as a result of race incitement.

Manning Johnson was prepared to spend the rest of his life waking up his fellow Americans to the truth. Unfortunately before his plans got really well on the way, he met with a fatal accident.

With regard to the versatility of financiers, it were well to note: During World War No. 1, Max Warburg was financial adviser to Germany, whilst his brother Paul was financial adviser to U.S.A., and they held these positions at the Peace Conference.

Take Otto H. Kahn of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. He was

born at Mannheim in Germany in 1867. He became a naturalised American Citizen, and, later on, a naturalised British subject. He gave his London residence, "St. Dunstan's Lodge", as a hospital for British soldiers who were blinded during World War 1, that is, for soldiers blinded fighting against the land of his birth.

At the present time in the Press and elsewhere we see a lot of talk about conscience and its use. Briefly, conscience is a courier bringing a message from God, the King of kings, to each individual telling him what he should do and what he must not do. Obviously, it is necessary to see if the messenger is reliable. No wise person would accept at once a message without seeing the credentials of the messenger. So then to say that conscience is always a safe guide is not accurate. Now, here is something of considerable interest to those clergymen who are labouring, I would say foolishly, with Jewish Rabbis to bring about some kind of religious union.

In Protocol 17 we find these words: "We have taken good care long ago to discredit the Gentile clergy and thereby to destroy their mission which at present might hamper us considerably. Their influence over the people diminishes daily. Freedom of conscience has been proclaimed everywhere. Consequently it is only a question of time when the complete crash of the Christian religion will occur."

I am now placing this new edition of my book on the market. I have merely touched upon the fringe of a vast subject, but I feel that my efforts will not be wasted, if readers see the Jewish plan running through world affairs; if readers wake up to it that those controlling the affairs of the world and those at the root of Communism are all the same crowd; in other words, that Communism is a Jewish movement inspired by

Satan and hence diabolically clever; in a word that Communism is the synagogue of Satan. And remember, also, this control is exercised by a mere handful of the population holding strategic positions.

Readers must use their discretion and remember that this book came out in 1943. So then, the references to Hitler and Stalin as being in power were meant for the year 1943. Obviously they are not meant for the present time.

(Jan.-1970)

## **Preface to Fourth Edition**

Since the Third Edition of this book was printed, the Allies have won the War. Hence, a few paragraphs in our work may now seem out of date. However, we have been strongly advised to leave the original book intact.

I am convinced that the average so-called Communist does not know the meaning of the word Communism. Most so-called Communists are decent fellows who have been led astray by Communistic propaganda paid for by High Finance; and note: Communism and Socialism have the same final aim.

Hitler, it would seem, has shuffled off this mortal coil. The trial of some war criminals has begun. No mention, however, has been made of the greatest war criminals of all—the International Financial scoundrels who were ultimately responsible for the world-wide slaughter. As you know, it is always a shrewd move to direct attention from your guilty self to the less guilty or even the innocent.

Britain has won the War, but she has still to win the

Peace. Communists are first class, acrobats. If they think it suitable, they will introduce the sectarian issue. Communism is a movement on the part of Jewish High Finance. Now, could you possibly imagine Jewish High Finance trying to uplift the masses? At once it can be seen that Communism is a movement full of empty promises, a trap set by Jewish High Finance for the unsuspecting working man.

In business the same crowd may trade under different names. These apparently different firms may seem to be rivals and may even go so far as to condemn one another. But all this is calculated to mislead the public. Now International Communistic Finance has different ways of achieving its end. It is at the root of movements which seem to be different and which may even appear to be hostile to one another. And note: If you have in different parts of the world movements which are identical although the characteristics of the people concerned vary, you may rest assured that the same party is at the root of all these movements.

Each movement plays its part, at times perhaps unconsciously. Only a few High Financiers hold the cards, though a great many may believe that they hold them.

We are all aware of the following state of affairs: B, working in a certain line, produces more goods but owing to taxation, he practically receives less money. Naturally, he adopts the "Go Slow Policy." Obviously, those at the root of such taxation do not want production of that particular commodity in question. In other words you have here a refined type of sabotage.

Another Depression, though possible, may not be likely because people are now awake to the artificial shortage of money. But there are other means of bringing about the slave mind—so necessary for the imposing of a Totalitarian State. After all, Bureaucratic



Government means irresponsible government, a government that owes no responsibility to the people or to the Parliament of the day.

The public have heard of the San "Fiasco" Conference, but they have not been led behind the scenes. It is only a culmination of the two infamous agreements of Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks. Mr. H. V. White, the Jewish Director of Monetary Research in the United States Treasury, is primarily responsible for the Bretton Woods monetary scheme to put the world still further into financial chains. The Russian-born Jew, Leo Pasvolksy, was the architect of the Dumbarton Oaks scheme. Molotov is not a Jew. He was a prominent Revolutionary. He married a Jewess.

With regard to the recent elections in England, it is well to note: People voted against Churchill on account of certain regulations imposed by his government. These measures originated from the Communistically-minded Secret Powers. Yet the public actually voted against Churchill and put in the very people who were responsible for those repressive regulations.

Those who were thrilled over the recent Socialist victory in the British Elections ought to know how well "Israel" has been represented in the Government, which is supposed to be for the uplifting of the masses. Not only that, but Harold Laski, the anti-God Jew from Manchester, is chairman of the Labour Party in England, and this Jew went so far as to state that Socialism would never succeed in England so long as their Majesties, the King and Queen, were reigning. And when you see our daily paper in one section condemning Communism and elsewhere featuring this self-same Laski, you begin to ask yourself: "Are those papers ignorant, or dishonest, or both?"

Socialism is not control or ownership by the masses.

It means control in the hands of a few High Financiers behind the Government. So, then, the Nationalisation of the Bank of England simply comes to this: The people of England owe so much money to the Bank of England, and the Government will now act as bailiffs and collect on the part of the Bank of England. So, in reality, the Bank of England has gained in strength. It would be the same as if a policeman were told by the Government to help a highwayman to rob you. The Bank of England has gained power over other banks, also,—(see "Daily Mail" Nov. 6th, 1945).  
(1946)

## **Preface to Second Edition**

The eagerness with which the First Edition of this book was bought up by the public, surpassed the wildest dreams of our imagination.

The words of appreciation spoken were fervent and many. On all sides we heard expressions such as the following: "Brilliant!" . . . "Marvellous!" . . . "A Masterpiece!" . . . "Magnificent!" . . . "I wonder what answer the Communists can possibly make to it?" The book is being acclaimed as the best thing ever written in defence of the Empire. It is being spoken of as "Australia's First Line of Defence." Surely, nothing could be more pleasing to an Australian author.

Since the appearance of the first edition, Mussolini has fallen from his high estate with about the same speed and the same goodwill that accompanied Satan upon his enforced retirement from Heaven. Still, we thought it fitting to keep intact the original references to "Sawdust Caesar."

And now for a word of gratitude: We cannot adequately thank those Communists who tried to stop the sale of the book. Their opposition has been an invaluable though free, advertisement, because it has stimulated the curiosity of undoubtedly thousands who, perhaps, otherwise would never have heard of the publication.

## **Preface to First Edition**

We are blessed in having in our midst an Institution for the Insane; an Institution for Incurables; an Institution for the Deaf and Dumb. But, unfortunately, we have also Communism, which is an Institution for the Blind.

There is no need to give a lengthy account of the Communistic movement. The tactics of Communism all over the world are the same—namely, to get control of the Government of some powerful nation, and then to use the people as revolutionary ammunition against the other nations. If Marx had succeeded in France through his agents in the Paris Commune in 1871, France would have been where we find Russia today.

Communists never tire of stressing the merits of Karl Marx, the Jew. Yet Marx was financed by another Jew, Engels, who made his fortune from the sweating of English children in Manchester.

In the name of progress, all ideas of religion, all respect for the family and for the personality of the child—all this is to be swept away by Communism. The Russian revolutionary, Bakunin, knew Marx well, and he complained in his day of the contempt of Marx and Engels for the poor. Marx referred to the poor and destitute workers as the "Ragged Proletariat" (Lumpenproletariat).

In his "Survey of Socialism" (Macmillan, 1929), Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw, speaking of Marx, says: "First and foremost he was a Jew by race, the descendant of a long line of rabbis, whose proper name was not Marx but Mordechai. In 1824, when he was six years of age, his father, for political reasons, abandoned Judaism for a nominal Christianity."

As a young man, Marx was a member of the Jewish Union for Civilisation and Science, a society which held that the Jewish nation was destined to conquer the world.

Mazzini, the Italian revolutionary, who was long acquainted with Marx, said of him: "Hatred outweighed love in his heart." Schurz, in his "Reminiscences," said of Marx: "I have never seen a man whose bearing was so provoking and intolerable . . . He had a most obnoxious faculty for seeing the worst in all persons whom he met, and all with whom he quarrelled were denounced in language of unmitigated virulence as traitors and fools." In his life of Marx, Spargo gives us details of 14 prolonged and embittered brawls that Marx had with his fellow-revolutionaries. Mrs. Webster, in one of her many writings, says that an old Socialist well acquainted with the family told her that no more miserable women could be imagined than the daughters of Marx, two of whom ended up by committing suicide.

Marx wrote a book called "Das Kapital," for which he got unmerited fame. This ponderous pot-pourri of science and economics and philosophy has been called "the Bible of the Working Classes." But, in point of fact, "Das Kapital" cannot be understood by the working man, and cannot be explained by the philosopher.

The real "Bible of the Working Classes" is the Com-

munist Manifesto. It is a compilation of charges against the middle class and the capitalist. This Communist Manifesto has been borrowed and stolen and plagiarised from other revolutionists.

The charges against the bourgeoisie and the capitalist were taken from the works of the Socialists, Hebert, Marat and Babeuf.

The aims and purposes of Communism were plagiarised from the doctrine of Illuminism, the work of Adam Weishaupt.

Marx's theory of "wage slavery" was current during the first French Revolution. "His" Communism was the Socialism of Babeuf, Blanc, Cabet, and Marat. "His" ideal of internationalism was first propounded by Weishaupt and Cloutz. "His" hatred of religion and love of irreligion were taken from the same celebrities. "His" economic doctrine, that "labour was the source of all wealth," was first propounded by the English Philosophical Economists and Sociologists—Locke, Petty, Adam Smith and Owen. "His" theory of surplus values was first enunciated by Owen and developed by the Chartists.

It must not be thought that I am opposed to each and every Jew. There are wicked, dishonest Christians as bad as the most corrupt Jews, and there are Jews who are the soul of honour. Jews have as much right to live as we all have.

Let me illustrate what I have just said: John Brown is walking along the street and is assailed by someone. A nearby policeman comes to his aid and arrests the culprit. But next day this same John Brown is walking along the street and he attacks somebody. The same policeman now arrests John Brown. Now, let me apply that to the Jews: No one has a right to interfere with their liberties, but when Jews interfere with the liberties of others, it is time to step in.

We shall make reference to that amazing document known as "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion." It is claimed in some quarters to be a Jewish plan to enslave the world and destroy Christianity. Its authenticity has been the subject of heated controversy. But forgery or not, it is remarkable how every prophecy laid down in that document is slowly but perilously coming true. Although I make reference to the Protocols, I do not use them as proof of any statement. As we have said, their origin is a mystery. Although the "Dialogue Aux Enfers Entre Machiavel et Montesquieu," by Maurice Joly, published in 1864, contained many passages of the Protocols, it does not follow that the Protocols are not of Jewish origin. Maurice Joly could have had access to them because he was connected with revolutionary secret societies, especially through his friend, the revolutionary Jew, Adolphe Isaac Cremieux.

It is said that a ship's captain is known by the company he keeps! Let us see what types we are asked to join in the Communistic movement. No reference to Lenin's present address, as it is "unknown"!

Who is Lenin? He was the leader of that famous and bloody revolution in 1917, in which the Government of Kerensky was overthrown, and the Bolsheviks gained control of Russia.

He died of syphilis in 1924, and lies in Red Square, Moscow. His remains were scientifically preserved in a huge mausoleum. Communists made pilgrimages to his tomb with a fervour akin to fanaticism. . .

As regards the death of Lenin let me quote from that well known book by Mrs. Nesta Webster—"Secret Societies and Subversive Movements". On page 386, 5th edition, we find the following paragraph, . . . "The Jewish World," for January 31st, 1924, shows the grief of the Jews on the occasion of Lenin's death.

It says, "Among those who prominently showed their profound grief at the death of Lenin were Jews, and not merely Jews by origin, but conforming Jews. Children from Jewish schools, we learn, joined in the procession, while the Hebrew Art Theatre (Habima) sent a banner with the inscription in Hebrew: 'You freed the nations. You will be remembered for ever.' In addition, Rabbi Jacob Mase of Moscow, the Jewish Relief Committee of that City, and other Jewish bodies sent telegrams of condolence; while the Association of Jewish Authors issued a special memorial magazine in Yiddish dedicated to the memory of Lenin."

Josef Stalin, the present dictator in Russia, is a Georgian by birth and a member of a half-civilised tribe in the Caucasus. For a short period he was a student in a seminary of the Russian State Church, but he was expelled. Subsequently, he joined a group of anarchistic revolutionaries, and in company with Max Litvinoff, planned and carried out the famous Tiflis Bank robbery, in which 50 people were killed and wounded. Upon Lenin's death, Stalin took complete control of Soviet Russia, and he wields a power more absolute than that of a Czar. Marx has gone to his eternal reward, and Lenin has followed suit. So, then, Stalin is free to interpret their teachings just as he wills.

Litvinoff, of whom we have just spoken, is the Foreign Secretary of the U.S.S.R., and is Ambassador-at-large. His real name is Meyer Moisevitch Walloch. In official circles of European police departments, he is known as alias Harrison, alias Finklestein, alias Buchman.

It must not be said that a Jew, on becoming a revolutionary, ceases to be a Jew. Let me quote from "L'Antisemitisme," page 345, by Lazare. He says: "It will be objected that, when he becomes a revolutionary, the Jew almost invariably becomes an atheist,

and thus ceases to be a Jew . . . In general, the Jews, even the revolutionaries, have kept the Jewish spirit, and if they have given up religion and faith, they have, nevertheless, been formed, thanks to their ancestry and

by the influence of Jewish nationalism. This is true in a very special fashion of the Jewish revolutionaries who lived in the first half of this century. Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx are two typical examples. Heine is held to be a German in France. In Germany, he is accused of being French. He was above all a Jew . . . the same holds true for Marx."—(Bernard Lazare, Jew).

Revolution is only another way by which International Jewry crushes people. You see, a lift can crush people by descending. It can also crush a person by coming up from below. Now, International Jewry can crush people by weighing them down with the burden of debts, or it can crush them by causing a revolution from below.

We are going to show that the Communists are only a party in Russia—5,000,000 out of about 170,000,000—and we hope to point out that the Russian people have been trapped. How foolish, then, of anyone to condemn all the Russians for what has been done by only a section—namely, those who have been misled by or who are willing tools of International Finance!

Pope Pius XI., speaking of the Russians in the Encyclical, "Divini Redemptoris," says: "For them (the peoples of the Soviet Union) we cherish the warmest paternal affection. We are well aware that not a few of them groan beneath the yoke imposed on them by men who, in a very large part, are strangers to the real interest of the country. We recognise that many others were deceived by fallacious hopes. We blame only the system with its authors and abettors, who thought Russia the best field for experimenting



with a plan elaborated years ago, and who from there continue to spread it from one end of the earth to the other."

It has been said that after the last war the German aristocracy lost their titles "V on" by "V on." The same can be said of our liberties because they, too, are going one by one.

We see Australia slowly, but surely, becoming the victim of bureaucratic rule. No one can expect civic life to run smoothly in time of war, but excessive bureaucratic interference is totally unnecessary. I wonder: How much of this interference is being dictated from Wall Street, U.S.A.?

Australians are certainly doing more than their share in trying to gain victory. We extend a hearty welcome to the American troops in our midst, but U.S.A. is also fighting for its very existence.

Has Wall Street given us help at a price—namely, the handing over of our liberties, one by one, to be controlled by International Finance?

We have in our midst societies formed for the benefit of Russia. We can well understand Frenchmen in Australia forming a French Society, and Maltese forming a Maltese Society, and those of Scotch descent forming a Caledonian Society, and those of Irish descent forming an Hibernian Society. But to have Australians forming a Russian Society—well, it does not make good sense. Yet, you have Communistic gatherings singing, not "God Save the King," but singing with all their lung power the "Red Flag."

People speak of Capitalism. Yet, the word "Capitalism" is often used by different persons to express very different things, or at least, different aspects of the same thing.

A persistent commercial traveller, who has received as his order the order to go out and to stay out, will

come back again in a different approach. Now, where Communistic aims have been detected and have failed, Communism tries to gain entry by offering the hand of friendship, and tries to form Popular Fronts. Fancy an assassin offering his blood-stained hand in friendship to honest John Citizen, and asking him to join with him in the establishment of social well-being!

It would be interesting to get a full account of the help given by Britain and U.S.A. to Russia. Take notice of this item, appearing in the Melbourne "Herald," February 22nd, 1943. It says: "Half a million pairs of boots had been shipped to Russia from Britain within a week of the German invasion. Shipments to Russia of boots alone occupied more than 40,000 tons of shipping space."

Australian Communists who have been putting out their chests over the recent Russian victories, remind me forcefully of the fly on the chariot wheel. Briefly, the story is: It was a broiling hot day, and a chariot, careering along a dusty road at 20 m.p.h., was raising clouds of blinding dust. A fly, seated on the chariot wheel, kept flapping its wings, and, in a vein of what the unkind will call ultra self-admiration, kept exclaiming: "I am doing all this. I am raising all this dust."

The Communists aim at the amalgamation of the different Unions in our midst. Now, let us see the catastrophic consequence of the amalgamation of all Unions: Suppose you have a bakers' union, an orchardists' union, an egg-raisers' union, a motor-builders' union, etc. Now, it is obvious that any of these unions might have a grievance which totally concerns itself and has no reference whatsoever to any other union. For instance, a bakers' grievance about the hours for baking could have nothing to do with, for instance,

the price of eggs, that might be a grievance for the egg-raisers.

But suppose that all these unions combined. See the result: If the bakers, through a just grievance, went on strike, then the egg-raisers would also have to go out. Not only that, but every other union would have to go out on strike. It would be just as senseless as kicking Smith's dog because President Roosevelt supported the New Deal. The situation is not only ludicrous but it is also positively dangerous. Why do I make this statement? Because a general strike could easily be the forerunner of a bloody revolution, and a bloody revolution is the very thing at which Communism is aiming.

We intend to show in our book that bankers are only bookkeepers who, with a certain amount of legal tender for safety sake, control the affairs of the world by writing or refusing to write names and figures in a book.

Money is not a commodity as wheat or wool or iron, etc., are commodities, but money is simply an order on goods. The Government could be its own bank and create, that is, manufacture money according to its needs. But the Government would have us believe that money is a commodity, and instead of creating its own money for its many needs, the Government of the present time is taxing left, right and centre. Hence, we must not be surprised on finding someone complaining bitterly in the following strain in answer to an appeal for hospital funds. Here is the complaint:

"The Government has governed my business till I don't know who owns it. I am inspected, suspected, examined and re-examined, informed, required, and commanded, so that I don't know who I am; or where I am, or why I am here at all. All that I know is that I am supposed to be an inexhaustible supply of money

for every need, desire or hope of the human race, and because I will not go out and beg, borrow or steal money, I am cussed, discussed, boycotted, talked to, talked about, held up, hung up, rung up, lied to, lied about, robbed and dashed near ruined. The only reason why I am sticking to life at all is to see what the hades is going to happen next."

Let me here remark: Ownership is one thing, use, another. Thus, I own a car. I must pay for its upkeep, the licence, etc., etc., because I am the owner. But when I come to use it, I am at once entangled with the Government's red tape that controls my use of the car, although they have no responsibility for its upkeep. There are so many restrictions, "Cannots" and "May nots," that ownership practically reduces itself to responsibility without any corresponding advantages. When the small boy with the obvious signs of a cold in the head was asked by the anxious old lady if he had a pocket handkerchief, he replied like a shot out of a gun; "Yes, but Mother said I wasn't to lend it to anybody." Ownership without control!

Even if a person has a decent salary, he can still be a slave, owing to this system of boards, coupons, etc., etc.

Were a telephone connected from here to Mars and the Martians (if there are any) were told that they were speaking to a place where people who were owners had little or no control of their goods, they would think that they were talking to a Lunatic Asylum or that we were trying to "pull their legs" (that is, if they have any).

Let me add: Former owners of slaves had some anxiety in looking after the health of these victims because physical wellbeing was needed for the obtaining of good results. Today, the big Communistic Bankers get the same results by the lending of money, but they

are freed from all anxiety about the physical fitness of those in their financial clutches. And these banking victims slave from daylight to dark and hand over their profits to the banker, all of which goes to prove that excessive, intense employment does not necessarily mean anything because the profits may go in taxes or in the paying of interest on borrowed money.

Communism is more than a mere "bread and butter movement". When a certain prisoner was charged with the stealing of a coat and vest, the presiding judge said he would free the prisoner so as to give him an opportunity of stealing the trousers, otherwise there would be no suit! Yes, a man's suit consists of coat plus vest and trousers. Now, Communism embraces three spheres—(a) Economics (bread, butter, clothing, shelter), (b) Philosophy (rights of the individual and his obligations, rights of the State, etc.), (c) Religion (God and things pertaining to God).

Communism is full of contradictions. Here are some of them. I give more later on.

Communism says that the only things that count in this life are material goods. Yet, those at the root of Communism (namely, the big International Jewish Financiers) cause the poverty in the midst of plenty. These Communistic Financiers do not want Financial Reform. If there is danger that any nation will wake up to the financial racket, the big financiers have plenty of red herrings, even in a fish shortage. Their tactics are: Start a war and drag in that particular country. If there is any dangerous political opponent, the remedy is simple; blackmail him, or "bump him off". On the other hand, true Christianity says that the material things of this life are not everything; that they will not last; that they are "shoddy". It points also to Solomon who did not deny himself any pleasure and who eventually exclaimed from the depths

of a heart full of disappointment: "Vanity of vanities! And all is vanity!" And yet, true Christianity denounces the oppressors of the poor and it points out that sufficiency of goods is a positive help to virtue.

Communism advocates a Classless Society (all are to be on the same level). It also advocates the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (the people are to do the dictating). Yet, if all are on the same level, who is to do the dictating, and to whom? Who is going to be dictated to (unless people become shorthand-writers)!

Australian Communists are ready to praise anything not British. They try to hold up our British Generals to scorn and ridicule, referring to them as "Brass Hats", "Old School-tie" failures, although these same British generals fought for years without equipment. As regards this sympathy for the Indians which is being spread in our midst, it is so much Communistic deceit from those who, by artificial famine and slaughter, brought about the death of millions in Russia. The object of this anti-British agitation and pro-Indian sympathy is to cause dissension within the British Empire. It was Communistic propaganda from Wall Street, U.S.A., during the last war that smashed up Russia and deprived the Allies of a Second Front. Under pressure from the same Communistic "Banksters" the Anglo-Japanese Treaty was abrogated in 1922 with the deplorable result too well-known to us Australians. And now Wall Street sends us help against these same Japanese, but, what is the price?

Communism is full of deceit. It preaches that "the poor are poor because the rich are rich". The implication is that all the rich people have stolen their wealth from the poor. It is a subtle type of propaganda because the uneducated masses are not likely to see through the fallacy of the statement. The statement presupposes

that there is a limited amount of wealth upon earth, whereas, the wealth of the earth is unlimited; and we show later that the Communistic Bankers have it in their power to stop the production of wealth.

The International Communistic Gangsters who cause wars would have us believe that wars between nations are just private quarrels on a large scale, and that wars are something that must happen. Now a private quarrel (e.g. when two boys fight) arises from something personal, whereas wars are arranged between people who have no personal grievance. They are arranged, too, by the big Communistic Financier. He is the "Promoter" and sole gainer. He sits at the ringside and applauds. And the more readily is a war arranged if a war means that ordinary John Citizen will now have access to, at least, a modest income which is denied him in times of peace. (Notice how England had, first, a Depression, and then rearmament). Ordinary John Citizen may be given the alternative, viz., to fight (and/or make munitions) or starve. Not only do the nations involved pay in blood and anguish of heart, but they pay in money under the form of taxes. So, what it comes to is this: John Citizen is paid to make things for the war, but, later on, the cost of all these things is charged up to him. This means the heavy burden of taxes which have to be carried even by his as yet unborn relatives.

Some pages back we made reference to the "Last War". It might have been more accurate to say "the First Round of the World War", because, after all, the present war is only a continuation of the last war after a "breather" for twenty years. In all arranged prize fights there is a "breather" after each round. Moreover, if a promoter is depending upon any two fighters to come up again later on, it would not be good business for the promoter if one of these

fighters was damaged beyond all repairs. So, neither would it suit the High Communistic Financier, if Germany were damaged beyond repair. A softened peace would give Germany a chance of appearing again in the International Fighting Ring. After all, a certain section in Germany have ever been invaluable for the starting of wars, and no one knows this better than International Jewish Financiers.

Another point—If you want to prevent a prize fight, there is little use in trying to stop this or that citizen from putting on the gloves. Even want of money might drive anyone into the ring. So, if you want to prevent prize fights, the most effective line of action is to get at the promoter. Now, we are fighting, not only for victory, but also for a lasting peace, but a lasting peace can never be gained unless we restrict the powers of the Promoter of Wars. He is ever ready to set things going when he considers that the time is ripe and when he has picked out a conceited dupe who is prepared to start the fighting.

When I speak of "peace", I mean more than the absence of war. Because it would seem that the International Financiers will give the world the choice between devastating war after devastating war and the voluntary acceptance of a state of slavery which will be but a taste of eternal punishment.

If trouble is started and some people gain by it, it should not be difficult to find who is at the bottom of the mischief. All you need to do is to see who benefits by it. As regards this agitation "for public ownership", it is all "blah". Who are to be the "public"? A handful of International Financiers. The jockey who backed his horse into a butcher's shop divided the "steaks", but the International Communistic Financiers will not divide any stakes. Anyone expecting a share of things from the Big Banker will be as



optimistic as a blind piper playing outside a house to let.

We hear a lot about the unequal distribution of wealth. Now, the photographer who was drying his plates in the sun said that he was airing his views! Let me briefly air my views on this vexed question of property rights.

I buy a ticket for a railway journey. I enter an empty carriage. I place my luggage alongside of me. Disregarding the "two foot rule", I put my feet on the seat. So far all is well, because I am not occupying space needed by another. However, my train soon arrives at a crowded station. Passengers enter my compartment. They are each entitled to sitting space because each has a ticket. Without their appealing to my understanding, I remove my feet. I also remove my luggage. Had I refused to make room the Railways Authorities would have been called in. It is the duty of the Railway authorities to see that passengers get fair treatment.

Now, we are all travellers in the train of life that makes its way to the dark tunnel of death. We all have by right a "ticket" which entitles us all to fair accommodation, i.e. to a fair share of the good things of this life. There is no need for me to explain the origin of this right. I may lawfully own more than I actually need, provided I have got it honestly. So, then, unequal distribution of goods is not necessarily wrong. But, the real difficulty arises when I hold on to something which actually I do not need but which is truly needed by another. It is then the duty of the State to step in, if necessary, and to see that the needy are provided for.

Readers will see at once the injustice of monopolies, combines, trusts that corner the goods needed by the masses and then sell them at an exorbitant price.

Money is not wealth. It is a means of picking up wealth. Although the wealth of the world is unlimited, usually the supply of money is far short of requirements. This shortage is caused by the big bankers. But the poor are deluded by the big bankers into demanding heavy taxation on the property of the well-to-do.

Now, when such heavy taxes are levied, what usually happens? The proprietor borrows money from the bank. He gives his property as security. The bank thus has a mortgage on his property. The bank can easily precipitate a crisis and seize his property (such things have happened again and again). Obviously, the bank has gained by the whole affair, and at once we suspect that the bankers are at the back of this demand for heavy taxation on property. The rich have become poorer by the taxation, but only the very innocent will believe that the poor have become richer. If the Government were really in need of money at any time, it could be its own bank and thus would prevent the big bankers from seizing property by mortgage.

Another item: If I write out an order authorizing you to pick up a suit, I do not thereby increase the amount of cloth in the country. Now, when the banks create money (which is an order on goods) they do not increase the amount of wealth in the country.

And note also: When people are paid so much interest on their war bonds, what it comes to is this: They are taxed to pay themselves the interest, but the interest is only part of the taxation. So, then, the banks do not give something for nothing, Horatio!

Another point with regard to the banker's control of the issue of money: Suppose I control the supply of leather and rubber for the making of footballs. Although there may be many firms with large supplies of footballs, yet I am the dangerous man because I am

the one who can cause a shortage of footballs. Now, although there may be more non-banker millionaires in the world than banker millionaires, the banker is still the menace because he controls the supply of money.

We are going to speak of the different movements in various parts of the world, viz., Communism, Fascism, Nazism, The New Deal, P.E.P., and Federal Union. We shall point out that they are movements all emanating from the very same source. It seems that High Finance aims at having at least one of these movements successful. This their attitude reminds me of the famous Theriac Jug in the history of medicine. The Theriac Jug was known as the gunshot remedy, because it was sure to hit something. They say that the Theriac Jug originated in this wise: If a label came off a bottle, the contents were tipped into the Theriac Jug. If bottles had anything left in them, these remains were tossed into the Theriac Jug. So you can see that the Theriac Jug was sure to hit something.

Communists are most illogical in their line of argument. They will argue as follows—"Communism is fighting Nazism. Nazism is bad, therefore Communism is good." But that is illogical. Why? Because if one gaolbird fights another, one does not then automatically become virtuous, or, if I fight a pickpocket, I am not necessarily good, because we might both be quarrelling over the same stolen purse.

In point of fact, Communism is not fighting Nazism. As we shall point out later, Communism and Nazism have the same outlook on life. So then, what it comes to is this: The Germans, some of whom are Nazis, are fighting the Russians, some of whom are Communists. Perhaps the following illustration will help: The Germans, some of whom are Catholics, are fighting the British, some of whom are Catholics, but

Catholicism in Germany is not fighting Catholicism in Britain.

The man who had been blown to pieces in the explosion calmly collected his thoughts! Would it not be well for us Australians calmly to collect our thoughts with regard to the menace of Communism?

In our book we hope to get to the root of world chaos. A doctor will always try to get to the root of the trouble. He must not make a false diagnosis, for a false diagnosis would mean the application of a false remedy with, perhaps, fatal results. Wealth does not bring with it freedom from all manner of earthly ills. Neither is every ill in life due to the shortage of money. Still, workers must realise the true cause of this world chaos; they must not be gulled into fighting one another. They should realise to what the world chaos is due because "something is rotten in the State of Denmark."

—(Melbourne, May, 1943).

## **What's Wrong To-day?**

Anyone looking out on the world in modern times must realise only too well that it is an age of depression, bankruptcy, budget deficits, with consequent political and social upheaval. The amount of suffering gallantly and, for the most part, silently borne by the people throughout the world surpasses computation. Government after Government has been broken. Depression has proved to be a gripping, paralysing fact, pulling men down to despair and ultimate suicide. Money markets have crashed, and with the crash has come the fall of stock shares, in which men had sunk their fortune. Widows and orphans have been robbed. Soldiers who returned from the last war were thrown on the scrap heap. Farmers, after years of slavery, have gone bankrupt and lost their farms. People have been prevented from getting the benefits of science and mechanics.

We have seen people patronising the pawn shop, and the pawn-broker became the keeper of the watch on the sea of adversity! People were so hard-up that they were forced to sleep on tick! Coffee planters were so badly treated that they did not have a "bean." Fathers were anxious to get their daughters off their hands, but were not anxious to keep their sons-in-law on their feet! Crowds, like Noah, belonged to the floating population!

In trying to get rid of their goods, shopkeepers had recourse to the most fantastic advertisements. The young pork butcher advertised that he killed pigs like his father. The other butcher said he was a butcher after people's own heart. The furrier advertised that

ladies' own skins were made up. Directors of Companies went to Board Meetings wearing crash helmets. Is it any wonder, then, that in times like the ones of which we are speaking, the crowned heads of Europe trembled in their shoes?

In the midst of world-wide poverty and insecurity we have seen nothing but conflict: Workers fighting one another for jobs; producers fighting one another for markets; retailers fighting one another for business; nations struggling to get rid of their goods, but other nations struggling to keep out these goods and thus protect the home markets. We have seen economic wars, fought with economic weapons—price wars, export subsidies, tariffs and embargoes.

Worst of all, we have seen the struggle, nationally and internationally, grow more bitter, and in due time economic weapons have given way to machine guns, howitzers, poison gas and aerial bombing.

The people of these nations have not all gone mad. In reality, they do not want to destroy one another. On the contrary, they have desired peace with a greater passion and intensity than they have ever desired it.

Let me here quote the illustrious Daniel Mannix, D.D., Archbishop of Melbourne. His Grace in his usual inimitable way says: "If we are to be worthy of the peace and security at which we aim we must all pray without ceasing to the Prince of Peace, that the days of the world's chastisement may be shortened, lest Christian civilization be wiped out in destruction and blood and slaughter. All about us, too many cry out for more ruthlessness, reprisals, vengeance and hate. Almost alone amongst the rulers of the nations, the voice of the Vicar of Christ insistently reminds us that we are Christians . . . Only a few years ago some of our present allies were ranged against us in

deadly combat, and the enemies of today were, at one time, our chosen friends. There should be room for all peoples—and let us pray that there will be—in the new and chastened world that God may have in store for us. Even amid the clash of war, we should try to think of the Fatherhood of God and the fellowship of man in Christ Jesus, Our Lord and our elder brother." (Melbourne Tribune, September 24, 1942).

The trouble cannot be due to real want of food, because the granaries of the world have been bursting with wheat. There has never been so much wealth in the world, yet at times never so much dire poverty. We have seen gorgeous shops, and yet so few buyers. We have seen clothing material in abundance, and yet deplorable want of proper clothing.

We have seen jobless thousands lift their hands and curse the machines that displaced them. But depressions are not due to machinery. No, a thousand times no!

So, then, instead of being a healthy, contented citizen, many a man has been half-clad, half-starved, and poorly sheltered, and with a just grievance, because he feels that everybody's hand is against him. Society says to him—"WORK OR STARVE, but there is no work for you. So you must starve."\*

World troubles have really nothing to do with unemployment. Yet, many a public speaker has stressed the necessity of employment. Poverty in the midst of plenty arises from faulty distribution of goods which are in abundance. This is the age of the machine which produces goods far beyond our needs. Notice how goods in plenty are being produced at the present time, although literally hundreds of thousands of able-

---

\* When St. Paul (II. Thess, iii., 10) said, "If any man will not work, neither let him eat," he was referring to those who were living on ill-gotten goods.

bodied people have been taken away from the scene of production to the army. Machinery dispenses with work. The maker of washing machines advertised; "Don't kill your wife. Let our machines do the dirty work."

Goods are produced to be bought and consumed. Money is normally got by employment. So, where there is no employment, there is for many no money with which to buy goods. But money should be obtained, if necessary, by means other than work. If I am going to Sydney, I can reach there by train, or, air or by boat. So also money can be gained by work or by government pension or grant. Hence, when the goods are there, it is the duty of the State to see that money is so distributed that the goods can be bought.

Where international trade is concerned, a country should have enough money distributed to buy its own goods, and, then, export its surplus for goods needed from other countries, all of which is just a simple case of barter, or, as we commonly say, "swapping." There should be enough money to buy these foreign goods.

We see the masses of the world at the present time being used as a club. Let me explain: I use a club. I swing it this way and that. I strike this or that person with it. I do not consult the club in any way. It has no freedom in its movements. It does not know why I move it or why I strike another with it. If it is knocked about in my use of it, the club is damaged but I am not damaged.

Now, the masses of the world are as a club in the hands of the big financier. They may be swung this way or that, but they are not consulted. They are used to slaughter one another, though there is no personal quarrel. On the contrary, in ordinary civic life, these who are now slaughtering one another



could be the best of friends. Yet, to change the metaphor, to international finance the masses are just "cannon fodder."

Instead of solving world problems, High Finance does to death ten million men and then it arms the defeated side so as to start another war. So-called world problems would soon disappear if the International Financial Magnates were put into the firing line and given a taste of the hellish conditions of modern warfare.

We must not say that such a state of affairs must happen, and that it is all due to corrupt human nature. Our adopting that attitude suits the big financier because he wants us to think that way and leave politics to him. Yet politics is the science of right government.

However, these things do not just happen. They are all planned. I can get possession of a man's home in two ways: If I am an armed, all-powerful bandit I can put him out at the point of the bayonet. If I am a respectable (?) money-lender, I can finance him, get a mortgage on the place, and then bring about a financial crash and take possession of his home.

Now, that is how international finance works. It can get control by the lending of money and by then precipitating a crisis. Some politicians and officials can be heavily bribed to carry out the programme, and these politicians and officials will say, or at least think, that they should not care for posterity, because, after all, what did posterity ever do for them? So, then, at one time we are being kept down by finance alone and, to break the monotony, at another time we are kept down by finance plus war.

The real rulers of a country, these unseen assassins, are never elected. When you have a new Government Party in office, well, you have changed the horse, but you have not changed the jockey, who is the interna-

tional financier. And we all know what a jockey can do in a race, except, perhaps, when his memory is so bad that he forgets in the middle of a race which horse he has backed!

Now, in this welter of world upheaval we see Communism coming along, pretending to be friendly with the masses, offering a bunch of flowers—with a concealed dagger in their midst. Communism, I say has come along, and it has infiltrated into Trade Unions, Newspaper Offices, the radio, and, most deplorable of all, into some religious bodies. Why do I say "deplorable"? Because Ministers of religion are expected to preach God, whereas Communism maintains that there is no God. Imagine the public owner of a brewery publicly joining a temperance crusade and publicly advising temperance!

Communism points to Russia as "a workers' paradise," and offers us freedom from all the ills that flesh is heir to if we will only adopt the methods of Russia.

A workers' paradise! And Russians boast of the fact that women are working in their mines. We, Austrians, look upon such action as degrading to women. And we are told that everybody in Russia is employed. Granted, but the slaves who built the Egyptian pyramids were also employed.

But, then, Russia is highly industrialised! Yes, but not for the benefit of the Russians. It is for the benefit of the big financiers and their hordes of Jewish and Gentile hangers-on. Communism denounces the system by which wages are paid to the working man, and paid by the so-called capitalist boss. But the masses in Russia are working for the Big Boss, Joe Stalin, and those whose tool Joe Stalin happens to be. And, of course, the workers are supposed to be happy under this state of affairs.

Although a country progresses materially, its people

can at the same time come more and more under the yoke of the banker.

Communists promise us a worker's paradise, with the people owning everything! What bright prospects for John Smith as, flying along to work second class every day at 40 m.p.h., he addresses the train with an air of satisfaction and says: "You belong to M E. "

Now let me deal with Russia before she became our Ally. Let me briefly explain:

Swamps breed mosquitoes. Clean up the swamps and you have no mosquitoes. Now, poverty breeds discontent, and when people are discontented they are ready to listen to Communism which promises a paradise on earth. Hence, it is clear that those who want Communism to spread in any particular country will want the people of that particular country to be poor and discontented. But, nothing brings discontent to a country so much as the military defeat of that country.

Now, Communism has its headquarters in Russia, and ardent admirers of Communism argued this: "If Communism is to be imposed by Russia on other countries, two things must happen: First, Russia must be powerful and remain powerful; and, second, the other countries which are to be infected with Communism from Russia must be upset and weakened, and their people must be made discontented. But if Russia herself is in any way weakened, she will not be able to force her Communism on others."

The British Empire is the chief place abroad where Russian Communism is anxious to get a grip. Hence, you must expect that Communism would welcome a British military defeat, as such a military defeat would bring among the British people the discontent and turmoil so necessary for Communism, if Communism is to get a grip there. And, note, a defeat of the British

would be helped on if Britons refused to pull their full weight against Hitler.

We all know what happened at the beginning of the war. Russia grabbed half of Poland, and then gave active assistance to Germany for 18 months. Large quantities of material came from U.S.A. and reached Germany via Russia. In the meantime England was fighting a lone hand against Germany. All the while, Communism was hoping that England would be smashed. Why? Because a smashed and discontented England would be the very place for the acceptance of Communism.

Whilst England had her back to the wall, fighting her lone hand against Germany, Communists in our midst (I will not say how many Communists were guilty) were condemning the war and England's part in it. Actually, they did not want England to win, and they threw cold water on the efforts of those who wanted a British victory. They even started strikes to stop war production. It was not that the Communists really wanted peace, because their gospel is one of slaughter and bloodshed, which, they say, is necessary for the establishment of the workers' paradise. And who was England's military leader at the beginning of the war? It was the English Jew, Hore-Belisha. No advance without security!

World chaos arises from the tyranny of the money-lords, who have plunged the world into this upheaval. This panic, this collapse of business, this loss of fortune, this dismissal of men and women who depend upon work for their bread—all this is caused, not by machinery, not by so-called over-production which, in reality, is under-consumption, but it is brought about by the lack of money in the hands of the purchasers, by an artificial shortage of a piece of paper with writing on. In a word, the international chaos is due to

the big bankers' control of the supply of money, a control proceeding from their hardness of heart and longing for power.

And can we hope ever to right worldly affairs so long as the international financier controls the issue and recall of money? With intense conviction we say: You may as well try to build a fence around a winter supply of summer weather; or skim the clouds from the sky with a teaspoon; or catch a peal of thunder in a football bladder; or lasso a tornado or harness an avalanche; or pin a handkerchief over the crater of an active volcano: you may as well try to do anything, no matter how ridiculous or impossible, as endeavour to fix up the state of the world whilst the Communistic International Jewish financier controls its money supply.

## **Communism a High Finance anti-British plot**

A story is told about an ardent prohibitionist who received word from the local station master that his box of "books" had arrived and was leaking! Obviously, the label on the box was not in keeping with the contents.

It has often occurred to me that that little story is an excellent illustration of that movement in our midst called Communism.

The word Communism is misleading. Properly speaking, it means holding things in common, but Communism in our midst is something far different, and it is of this Communism that I am writing.

Communism pretends to be friendly with the masses, but, in reality, Communism in our midst is an anti-

British plot hatched by the International High Financier, Wall Street, U.S.A., for the smashing up of the British Empire.

INTERNATIONAL HIGH FINANCE AND THOSE AT THE ROOT OF COMMUNISM ARE ALL THE SAME CROWD. Football fans have noticed that on practice days their own particular team wears guernseys of different colours. Though they are wearing different guernseys at practice, still the players are all members of the same team. Now, the International High financier and those at the root of Communism are all the same crowd wearing different Guernseys. Like Judy O'Grady and the Colonel's lady, they are sisters under the skin.

Or we may give another illustration: It is well known in business circles that the same firm may trade under different names. Now, International High Finance and those at the root of Communism are all the same firm trading under a different name.

Why is it that in Communistic literature you never see a word against the big banker or against the International High Financier? Why? Because the High Financier and the controllers of big banking and those at the root of Communism are all the same crowd.

Whence comes all the money that boosts the benefits of Communism? It does not come from the poor working man, because after all no one can give what he does not possess. Later on, we are going to show that money from the New York High Financiers was poured out like water for the staging of the Russian Revolution.

Communistic literature denounces the private ownership of big business, and advocates Government control. But who are to be the Government? Not the people! No, a thousand times no! The Government are to be the International High Financiers.

Communism denounces the well-to-do non-banker

in our midst and tries to stir up the working man against him, but it does not denounce the banking fraternity. Why? Because it is the big banker who is at the root of this poverty in the midst of plenty.

We hear of robberies being committed under the very noses of detectives. Yet, how many citizens are awake to what is taking place in our midst? All this regimentation, all this planning, all this formation of Boards, all this filling in of forms stating the number and variety of vegetables you are growing, the number and breed of the hens in the chicken runs, etc., etc.—all this taking away of liberty from the rank and file is nothing more nor less than pure, unadulterated Communism. And we have this sorry spectacle: Whilst we are fighting Germany and Japan for our liberty, well-intentioned but misguided Australian citizens are crushing one another in the interests of Communism, in the interests of the High Financier, who is working like a mole in the dark.

Suppose that I make some poisonous jam and put it into six different pots with different labels. Each pot is the same poisonous jam. Now, how many stop to reflect that Communism in Russia, Nazism in Germany, Fascism in Italy, New Deal in the U.S.A., P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) in England, and Zoning and Boards in Australia—all have the same aim. They are all the same poisonous jam in different pots with different labels. They aim at producing the Totalitarian State, in which the individual will be reduced to the condition of a cog in a machine. These movements or philosophies (call them what you will) are the product of the High Financier. These movements aim at the ultimate introduction of a World State, the rulers of which are to be a handful of cruel International Financiers, helped on by a fleet of bombers.

The International Financier has the same love for Russian people as he has for the Germans or the Italians or the British or the citizens of U.S.A. It is that love which a lion has for its prey. So long as the International Jew can get the nations of the world at one another's throats he is perfectly happy, because the greater and longer and more bitter the strife, the better are his chances of obtaining his goal. By having the civil populations of the world bombed, he hopes that all will appeal to him to arrange peace at any cost. But the ultimate peace to be given by the International Jew will be a despotism worse than that of any Czar.

Is it not well known that, after a Revolution in any country, the Jew in that particular country gains more power? Witness what took place in England after the Revolution of 1688; what happened in France after the French Revolution, and what took place in U.S.A. after the internal strife.

## **Hypocrisy of Communism**

International Financiers were at the bottom of the last Depression, and they can at will cause another Depression. They start wars; they stage revolutions; they overthrow dynasties, and, what is unthinkable, they do not owe allegiance to any Government. They are a Government above a Government.

By their control of finance, International Jewry holds the world in the palm of its hand. They bring about poverty in the midst of plenty, and are thus really responsible for the ensuing discontent among the masses.

But see the brazen-faced hypocrisy of the Inter-



national Jewish Financier! Suppose I secretly punch you and then come along and express sympathy with you. That is bad enough. But suppose I tell you that citizen B was the culprit, and I urge you on to strike citizen B. In that case I am a deep-dyed villain. But suppose I go even further: Whilst you and B are fighting, I rob your homes. Now, those are the tactics of International Jewry. They cause the poverty, but under the label of Communism they pretend to be sympathetic with the victims. They promise the masses better living conditions, a fair share of the good things of this life, etc., etc. They point to others as the cause of the poverty, and urge the masses to attack these who, in reality, are innocent of the appalling state of world affairs. The sympathy of the high-up Communist is not really genuine, because his sole motive is to cause strife, international wars, strikes, civil war. When once the country is at civil war, then, International Jewry hopes to come along and take control, as it actually did in Russia.

And so we find Communism in our midst. It is a trap set for the working man. If there were no poverty, there would be no Communism. If you clean up a swamp, you have no malaria. If you have no poverty, you will have no discontent, and consequently you will have no field in which Communistic ideas can be sown. Honest, trusting people are being gulled into joining any movement which promises security, and so, then, they join Communism. Yet, the aim of those behind the Communistic scenes is to hand over Australia to the control of International Jewry whose headquarters are Wall Street, U.S.A.

I said that Communists get the wrong ones blamed for the poverty in the midst of plenty. They blame the well-to-do, non-banking citizen. They blame God, although, as we all know, God has given us a wonder-

ful world, and no one need be unhappy. Communists will even deny God's existence, a pathetic attitude, for if my suit could not make itself, how could the world make itself? They blame religion as the cause of the poverty, and will go so far as to say that religion is all nonsense. Yet, tell children not to believe or obey their Communistic parents. Do this and see the indignation of those parents in question. Those in Russia who disobey Stalin or question his teachings are summarily dealt with. Yet, religion means believing and obeying God, the Creator of the world, and Lord and Master of all.

For unadulterated effrontery it would be difficult to surpass the following incident. It would be ludicrous were it not so blasphemous. We quote from the "Secret Powers Behind Revolution", page 154:

"In 1923 Trotsky and Lunatcharsky presided over a meeting in Moscow organised by the Propaganda Section of the Communist Party to judge God. Five thousand men of the Red Army were present. The accused was found guilty of various ignominious acts, and having had the audacity to fail to appear, He was condemned in default."

If International Jewry really wants to help mankind, why doesn't it stop the war at once, without further slaughter of lives and the destruction of homes? Yet, instead of doing that, it keeps on the slaughter and destruction of property, while holding out to mankind the promise of a "New Order." Why was not Hitler bombed when it was well known that he was in a railway coach at Compiegne arranging to occupy the English ports? But it would not suit High Finance for Hitler to die so soon. You see, the longer the war, the greater the discontent of the people, and the greater their discontent, the better the chance for civil war. Not only that, but the greater the material des-

truction, the more money would be borrowed for reconstruction. That means a visit to the bank, with the bank's consequent stranglehold on the country.

You recall the campaign against the Kaiser during the last war. The "Kaiser's" army slaughtered the innocent. . . . The "Kaiser" bombed London. . . . "The Kaiser" sank a hospital ship. You see, it was all the doing of the "Kaiser." And when Germany was defeated it was the Kaiser who was blamed and sent into exile. But the international financial scoundrels who had financed Germany and had started the war, well, these remained on.

And now we have Hitler. We see "Hitler's" army slaughtering the innocent; "Hitler's" Air Force bombing London, etc., etc. And the same international financiers are behind Hitler and urging him on. If Hitler loses, then he will be blamed by the German people, and got rid of. If, God forbid, he wins, well—International Finance will know what to do with him, for there are more tricks in High Finance than we dream of in our philosophy.

## **Lest We Are Misunderstood**

I am fully convinced that the average Australian, who calls himself a Communist is, in truth, no more a Communist than I am. And what I say can be applied to most people the world over. After all, we are all entitled to a fair share of the things of this world. The average man is content to go his way unmolested. The average man hates bloodshed and violence, and when men join an organisation professing to help mankind to stamp out bloodshed, they show a truly humane spirit.

As I have already stated, God has given us a wonderful world. He has done His part. He never meant it to be owned by a few.

There is no reason why we should not all be happy. Who has not experienced the delight, the ecstasy of a spring morning in the country at the dawn of day? Just listen to the full chorus of nature's birds singing in one grand symphony. There is music in the skies above and the earth below. Look at the delicate tints of the blossom, the pale gold of the primrose, the silver of the daisy, the crimson of the rose, the milk-white of the lily, the purple of the pansy. Look at the grand, glorious trees in full leaf. What wonderful examples of the handiwork of the Great Architect! They charm the eye with the most pleasing diversities of form, oval, oblong, pointed, serrated, heart-shaped, tongue-shaped—

"I think that I shall never see  
A poem lovely as a tree.

Poems are made by fools like me,  
But only God can make a tree."

Now, if you send me a present of a new coat and it is stolen on the way, I must not blame you if I am cold, because after all you have done your part, but another has interfered. Now, God has done His part, but it is the International Financier who stops us, and has stopped us, from getting possession of the good things that God has sent us in this life.

The average man knows that there is something wrong, but he does not know the source of the trouble. And what does he do? People who are sick and in desperation will try one remedy after another. With regard to a new alleged remedy, they will exclaim:

"At least, it can do me no harm. It cannot be any more useless than the other remedy or remedies. So I will give it a trial."

Now, that is what is happening with many people who compose the masses. It is happening also with some outside the masses. They see that the present system has failed, and in their desperation they are ready to give Communism a trial.

Seeing that so many honest, well-meaning people have been fooled by Communistic propaganda and Communistic promises, it is well nigh impossible to write a book of the present type without offending many who merit anything but wounded feelings.

Let me illustrate: Brown calls himself a Communist, but in reality he is anything but a hundred per cent. Communist because he believes in God. When he reads that Communism denies the existence of God, he exclaims at once: "All nonsense! I am a Communist, and I admit the existence of God."

Then there is Smith, who also calls himself a Communist, whereas he, too, has been led astray by Communistic literature. But he does not believe in a classless society. So, then, when he reads in a book like ours that Communism advocates a classless society, he, too, like Brown, will wax warm with indignation.

Though ordinary John Citizen may be excused for being led astray by Communistic Propaganda, we find it hard to condone Communistic Ministers of Religion, because such people are expected to be men of solid education. But, when Clergymen rush into print and broadcast their Communistic ideas, the situation has become appalling.

When using the word "Jew", some people are particularly slovenly. For instance, when speaking of money lenders or pawnbrokers, they at once call them "Jews". This is as nonsensical as calling every

Catholic an Irishman. And those Christians who would blame Jews for all the evils that befall mankind, ought to remember that in the days of ancient Rome Christians were looked upon with the same suspicion.

It should be fitting to make another remark: As Communism is anti-God, then those Jews who believe in God are no more true Communists than a circle is a square.

It must not be said of me that I am attacking only Communism. I am opposed with equal strength to Nazism and Fascism, because Fascism, Nazism and Communism are all pernicious. You remember my saying that Communism, Nazism and Fascism are all like the same poisoned jam put into three separate tins, with different labels.

Later on, I am going to speak against Nazism and Fascism. I will also show that Federal Union, P.E.P., and New Deal (in U.S.A.) are also wrong, because they, too, are the same poisonous "jam," served up in three other tins. So, then, Nazism, Communism, Fascism, Federal Union, P.E.P., and New Deal are all so many tins of the same poisonous "jam" bearing different labels.

P.E.P. is particularly dangerous. It has always happened, and will continue to happen, that good men have been manoeuvred into wrong camps. Now, Government officials do not realise that all this planning and zoning and filling in of forms, etc., etc.—all this is the plan of Communism. And since these Government officials are doing it unconsciously, they are in reality more dangerous than the Communist who openly waves the red flag and sings the "International." These officials are developing the slave mind in the masses.

But for the present let me confine my remarks to Communism, Fascism and Nazism.

Why do I write chiefly against Communism? Suppose that I have three pots of poisonous jam for sale. Suppose that the public knew that two of the pots are poisonous, but think that the other one is all right. Suppose you know that the third pot is also dangerous. No one can blame you for passing on this information to the people. You will make little or no reference to the other two pots because, really, there is no need.

Now, the people in general know that Nazism and Fascism are poisonous, but they do not wake up to it that Communism is also poisonous.

Communists speak of anti-Fascist Popular Parties. It is all merely a blind, intended to mislead people because a COMMUNIST IS A FASCIST WEARING A RED GUERNSEY. So you see that Communistic propaganda is misleading. And I believe that the disturbances some years ago in Germany between the Nazi party and the Communist party were only brought about by International Finance to create the impression that the two movements were totally different.

So it is amusing to find Communists calling anti-Communists pro-Fascists. It is as nonsensical as calling an anti-New Zealander a pro-Maorilander.

## **World Full of Wealth**

Let me briefly consider the wealth of Australia. What I say of the wealth of Australia can be said of the wealth of most other countries if they were properly developed. After considering the wealth of Australia I shall show how the big financiers can stop us from getting possession of the goods of any country. Our readers will thus see who is the real culprit in the

causing of the world-wide poverty. They will see that the arch-fiend is the International High Financier. When our readers wake up to the fact that the leading Communists are really the International Financiers under another label, then we trust that these readers will protect themselves from Communism as they would guard themselves from the fangs of a deadly serpent or from the germs of a foul and loathsome disease.

Australia is a glorious country, full of wealth to overflowing. We look around and see magnificent dwellings adorning the face of our lovely morning land. Yet to put up those glorious buildings of stone or brick or wood, the surface of the earth has scarcely been touched. Every Australian family could live in a palace because the raw material is there, just waiting to be picked up; and, what is more, Australia could find homes for more than 100,000,000 people. In Australia no one need be badly clad or hungry, because Australia is full to abundance of the materials for clothing. Australia is so rich in foodstuffs that from time to time food has been allowed to go to waste, and in some cases it has been destroyed.

## **Money Is An Order On Goods**

How are the goods of any country brought to our possession? They reach us normally through the channel of money. As things are managed to-day, the big bankers can stop us from getting those goods, and they stop us by refusing to create money; that is, by refusing to issue pieces of paper with writing on.

Readers have all heard of an order for goods. The possession of this order gives the right to pick up the



goods. If citizen A has not this order, then he cannot pick up the goods. Now, money is simply an order on goods.

Let me illustrate all this by an example of a spade. I have a spade at home. I do not need it. I want you to pick it up. I write out a note authorising you to pick it up. The note is not the spade, but it gets its value because the spade can be picked up with it. In other words, the note gets its backing from the spade.

You go along and pick up the spade, and the note comes back to me. I destroy it, because it has done its job.

If there were no spade waiting to be picked up, I could not, with sense, write out the note.

I said that I did not need the spade. So, if I do not write out the note, you have to do without the spade, and it is lying on my hands.

Suppose that there were somebody who, without authority, could physically prevent me from writing out that note. "Intolerable!" you would exclaim.

Now, notes, that is, £1 notes, £5 notes, etc., and cheques are just pieces of paper with writing on, authorising people to pick up goods to the value of £1 or £5, as the case may be.

Coins are pieces of metal that have purchasing value because they are stamped in a certain way. When melted down, they have only metal value. Thus, a shilling melted down would be worth very little.

## **Banks Manufacture Money**

I shall point out by quotations that the banks manufacture (create) money. So then, banks are money fac-

tories. I am going to show that they do not lend deposits. Since banks are money factories, then the Mint is not the only place where money is manufactured.

After all, as we have just pointed out, money is only an order on goods, and goods are the real wealth of a country—

"Money's neither here nor there,  
Goods should be your only care.  
Of these there's plenty and to spare.  
So what's the need to pinch and pare?"

But it is the Bankers who can stop goods from reaching the people, and they do it when they create a shortage of money. Ninety-nine per cent of business is done by cheque.—

"Because by cheque most trade is wrought,  
The banks make money out of nought,  
And cancel when they didn't ought;  
That's why the goods cannot be bought;  
This monopoly must then be fought."

Let me point out at once that cheques are as much money as notes (£1 notes, etc.), silver or copper. Suppose I go to the bank with a £1 cheque, £1 in silver, and £1 in coppers. The bank tots up the whole lot and I have £3 in the bank. Some people speak of the bank as creating credit. To my mind, it would be simpler and clearer, though still accurate, to say that banks manufacture money.

If I go to the bank and borrow £1000, the bank puts my name in a book and places the figures £1000 after it. I can now tell people that I have a loan of £1000 from the bank. Hence, it is clear that when a bank lends a man money, it creates a loan to him for that amount.

Banks run a risk in creating cheque money. For every £1 they have in cash (that is, notes, silver), they create £10 in cheques and lend it. Suppose that all the money lent by a certain bank at a certain time amounted to £10,000,000. There would be in the bank only £1,000,000 in notes, etc. Suppose that all the people holding the £10,000,000 in cheques came along together and wanted notes for the cheques. There would be "a run on the bank," and the bank would be unable to pay cash.

But what about deposits? I can hear some readers exclaiming: "Banks do lend deposits. After all, they give  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. for money on fixed deposits, and lend it out at 5 per cent."

It is true that banks give, for instance,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on fixed deposits, but it is not true to say that they lend out that same money again.

Why, then, do the banks pay interest on fixed deposits? I can give two reasons: If people put their money into the bank on fixed deposits, they will not be looking for cash for that cheque money. So then, bankers will be saved the anxiety of any run on the bank.

Again, this giving of interest by the banks has another beneficial result for the bankers: Suppose I want the loan of £1000. You have it, and I go to you and pay interest for the loan. You see, then, I have not gone to the bank for the loan of that amount. But if the bank can coax you to put your £1000 in the bank, then I must go to them for the loan of £1000 at, e.g., 5%.

I have made no mention of the interest paid to the bank. If they lend me, e.g., £10,000 at 5 per cent. interest, then I have to pay £500 per year as interest. But see what it cost the bank to create that: It cost them the time needed to write in the entry, plus the price of the paper on which it was written. So then,

money is "cheap" in one way, yet "dear" in another.

And now for a few quotations from recognised authorities showing that the banks are only money factories:—

Mr. Colin Clark, financial adviser to the Labour Government of Queensland, said, in the Melbourne "Age," September 21, 1937: "In banking circles, there are still to be found a number of bankers who try to deny that banks can create (or withdraw) credit, though I doubt whether they could find any living economist to support their views. I believe that reasons for the prevalence of this opinion among bankers are largely psychological in origin; a genuine fear of the enormous social and political responsibilities which a banker has to shoulder once it is admitted that banks possess the power of creating or destroying the community's supply of money."

The Right Hon. R. T. Reginald McKenna, Midland Bank Ltd., said: "I am afraid the ordinary citizen would not like to be told that the banks can create or destroy money. . . . We do not like to hear that some private institution can create it at leisure." (January, 1925).

He also said, in "Post-War Banking Policy," page 76: "The amount of money in existence varies with the action of the banks in increasing or diminishing deposits. We know how this is effected. Every bank loan creates a deposit, and every repayment of a bank loan destroys one."

Mr. J. M. Keynes said: "There can be no doubt that all deposits are created by the banks."

H.D. McLeod, in his text book "The Theory and Practice of Banking," says: "The essential and distinctive feature of a bank and a banker is to create and issue credit payable on demand, and this credit is intended to be put into circulation and serve all the

purposes of money. A bank, therefore, is not an office for the borrowing and lending of money; but it is a manufactory of credit. In the language of banking, a deposit and an issue are the same thing."

R. G. Hawtrey, Assistant Secretary to the British Treasury, said: "When a bank lends, it creates money out of nothing." ("Trade Depression and a Way Out").

Davenport's "Economics of Enterprise" says: "Banks do not lend their deposits, but by expansion of credit create deposits."

"Encyclopaedia Britannica," under the heading of "Banking and Credit," 14th edition, states: "Banks create credit. It is a mistake to suppose that bank credit is created to any important extent by the payment of money into the banks. A loan made by a bank is a clear addition to the amount of money in the community."

## **Fearful Power of the Bankers**

The bankers are the ones who have the power to create cheque money. Remember that 99 per cent. of business is done with cheque. If enough money is created (that is, enough notes printed and/or cheques issued) then, the goods are picked up. If the money is not created, then the goods are left idle and allowed to go to waste: in other words, you have poverty in the midst of plenty.

Let me apply all this to the building of a house worth £1000. Let A be the owner of all the material necessary for the building of the house, and let the material be valued at £500. Let B represent the workmen whose wages for building the house will be £500.

A and B agree to put up the house between them. They need it. A gives the material, and the workmen do their part. And lo! a house worth £1000 has been put up. A and B own it between them, and all are satisfied. The whole transaction has been done without going to the bank, that is, without the intervention of money.

But take another case. C and D want to build a house worth £1000. They need it, and they are going to build it through the medium of money. Here again C has all the material necessary, worth £500. D are the workmen who will put up the house for £500.

A builder, John Smith, comes on the scene and borrows money from the bank for the putting up of that house. I am not taking interest into consideration, nor shall I speak of profits. My one object is to show the fearful power exercised by the banker.

So Smith goes to the bank and says that he wants to borrow £1000 to put up a house worth £1000. The bank lends him £1000, and they lend it by putting his name in the book with the figures £1000 after it. Where does the money for that £1000 loan come from? Not from deposits, because banks do not lend deposits, although many people foolishly think that they do. Where, then, does the money come from? You remember the origin of that note which I gave for the picking up of the spade. I wrote it out; that is, I created it. Now, the bank acts in the same way with John Smith. It creates the £1000. My note was created to pick up the spade. That is, the spade gave the note the backing. Now, the £1000 was created to pick up the house worth £1000, that is, £500 worth of raw material, plus the £500 worth of labour. That house, worth £1000, gave the backing to the money created by the bank, for, after all, that £1000 was only a note to pick up a house worth £1000.

Had there been no spade, I could not have written out that note, and if there had been no £500 worth of raw material and the workmen's labour worth £500, then the bank could not have created that £1,000. So then, the bank really depended upon C and D. So C and D were the benefactors of the bank, and not vice versa. A certain John Brown said he kept a pub, and he was asked which side of the counter he worked on. The public, in truth, "keep banks." That is, they keep them going. Yet the banking fraternity would ask us to believe that they are the greatest benefactors of mankind. It is a wonder that they do not get spinal trouble from patting themselves on the back! And, what about those sycophants who publicly praise the generosity of the banks?

Let me now come back to Smith and his £1000 from the bank. He makes out a cheque for £500 and gives it to C for the raw material. He writes out another cheque for £500 and gives it to D, that is, the workmen. Up goes the house. Smith owns it, but he does not want it. He sells it to C and D. Back comes the money, the £1000 from C and D. Smith brings back the £1000 to the bank. The bank strikes out his name as debtor, and the £1000 (paper with writing on) is destroyed.

You see, the money is only another way by which the house has been erected. A and B had straight out barter. C and D transacted the business through money.

Now, in the case of C and D, if the banker had said to Smith: "We cannot give you the money. We cannot find the money. People are living above their means"—had the bankers so acted, then C would have had £500 worth of building material lying idle, and the workmen would have been idle, their labour wasted, and both lots would have been deprived of a new

house. Let us further show what a fearful tyranny is exercised by the banks. I shall first take a very simple case. Let us consider the case of a farming district. Men take up a piece of virgin country and divide it into farms. By dint of hard work, the land is cleared and the stumps are grubbed out, and with the help of the plough the place is cultivated. Homes and barns and cowsheds are erected. Edible grass is sown. In a word, the farmer has produced a national asset, namely a farm, commonly referred to as "the backbone of the country".

In the meantime, a small township grows up, and not before long a trading bank sets up its sign.

It often happens that a farmer is in need of money to carry on his business or to bring the property to greater production or to get over a drougthy season. So then, he goes cap in hand to the local banker to get money. By the stroke of the pen, the banker lends the farmer money. In return, the farm is mortgaged to the bank. That bank is now the virtual owner of the farm.

And, note: The banker has contributed nothing, ABSOLUTELY NOTHING, to the development of that farm. Yet, the deeds of a property are lodged in the bank's safe, and they will remain there until the debt plus interest is repaid. And what has happened to that one particular farmer can happen to every farmer in the district. In a word, the banker has become a financial cuckoo in the farmer's nest. The banks have tremendous power without any responsibility except that of book-keeping. I make no mention of the high blood pressure and coronary occlusions of the farmers in question.

So far, I have spoken of one section for borrowing, namely, the farmer. But all around we find people and business in debt to bankers for pen-and-ink-created money; the victims are individuals, businessmen,



industries, municipal councils and even Governments themselves. They are all in debt bondage to the banks. How does that all come about? The banks are normally the only source of money. In plain English, they are normally the only ones who can lend money, and, further still, the money to pay the interest on the bank-created money must also come from the banks. So it all goes snowballing along.

Each country can tell its own story of National Debt, that has mounted to colossal staggering figures; the paralyzing interest; when Australians are told the Railways do not pay they are not told the reason why, namely, the crippling interest to be paid on bank-created money. And whilst people sleep or rather toss and turn in bed, the debt is mounting every second.

So then, we are not exaggerating when we say that the banks are a government above a government; they are elected by no one; they are not responsible to outside authority; they can set at naught the plans of elected governments; and, though producing nothing, are able not only to control all production but they actually acquire an enormous portion of the wealth of the Nation.

Let me now briefly touch upon the Government's catspaw, the TAXATION DEPARTMENT. Remember, money is not a commodity as, for instance, wheat is a commodity. If there is a genuine shortage of wheat in a country, you cannot create it where money and its shortage are concerned, things are different. Money is not a commodity. It is an order on goods. If the goods are there waiting to be picked up, we should create money accordingly.

Money is created by entering names and figures in a book. Well, if the Government were really short of it, it could become its own bank and create money by

entering names and figures in a book. By so doing the Government could pick up the goods and services needed. But things are not done that way. We have tax gatherers. Readers can see that the Government tax gatherers are legalised highway robbers acting under the protection of the Police.

Taxation reduces the living standard of every man, woman and child; it is an attack upon their personal freedom. By taking away money from e.g., the payroll of wage-earners it means then that these people have partly worked for nothing.

How many stop to reflect on the taxation that has gone into the production of even a loaf of bread! It has been estimated that there are 50 different taxes on a loaf of bread, and about the same number of taxes is loaded into the price of every single article that we humans need.

Anyone who thinks that we are exaggerating in making that statement about the 50 items, can work it out for himself. The farmer pays Federal and State and Municipal taxes (I am speaking here of Australia) as well as Customs and Excise duties, Sales Tax etc. on farm machinery, petrol and fertilizer. The fertilizer firm pays much the same set of taxes and so does the road haulier and the bag merchant and the flour miller and the baker and the retailer.

All these taxes are loaded into the price of every article that we buy, and thus the tax gatherers confiscate a big portion of the average family income. So then, the Taxation Department is a sleeping partner, a cancerous growth battenning on the energy, skill and genius of industry.

## Depression Caused by Bankers

What we have just said with regard to the picking up of C's raw material and the labour of D can be applied all round, whether it is a matter of food or clothing, or anything else.

During the last Depression there were goods in plenty, so much so that they were destroyed.

"Burning heaps and heaps of stuff,  
When we have not got enough;  
Don't you think it rather rough?  
Poverty's a tragic bluff."

And what was the cause of the non-sale of our goods?

During the last Depression people were called upon to swallow without the quiver of an eyelid such drivel as the following: That the banks had struggled unselfishly against adverse conditions, and that they were naturally worthy of the affection, esteem and gratitude of the community: That what was wanted was sound finance: That there was need to restore confidence: That people's difficulties would soon disappear if they were only guided by the spirit of self-sacrifice and the spirit of sound finance: That the Depression arose because the working classes got more than they deserved, or because they had more than was good for them: That wars were needed to gain new markets or to gain new lands for surplus populations.

Others, who knew as much about Christianity as a West Indian Negro does about skating on ice, told us that the Depression was due to the failure of Christianity; whereas Christianity was opposed tooth and nail

to every measure that had brought about the Depression.

Professor Twist, frightened of losing his professorial position at the University if he told the truth, endeavoured to soothe the people's feelings by praising them for their lion-heartedness during the upheaval.

Professor Snob, paid by the money lords to defend their heartless action, said that the trouble was due to one of those inexplicable trade cycles.

Professor Blanket maintained that we were sadly in need of a radical change in constructive society and popular intelligence. He even preached change of heart to people who had not even a change of clothing.

Professor Anti-Concept blamed over-population for the trouble, and recommended the surplus population to take a single trip to the moon!

But what was the plain unvarnished truth? GOODS COULD NOT BE SOLD BECAUSE GOODS COULD NOT BE BOUGHT. AND GOODS COULD NOT BE BOUGHT BECAUSE OF THE SHORTAGE OF MONEY; THAT IS, PIECES OF PAPER WITH WRITING ON, AND THE BANKERS CAUSED THIS SHORTAGE. SO THEN THE BANKS CAUSED THE DEPRESSION.

"Why is plenty treated so,  
And never sold at prices low?  
Because we have not got the dough  
To buy the goods. So now you know."

The bankers deliberately refused to create the money because they wanted to throw the masses of mankind into disorder. So High Finance is low.

Yet, to-day, when it is a case of making munitions and weapons of war for the destruction of mankind, the money is being created by the million pounds.

Only the very innocent will believe that the public loans are only from the people. Try to get a full list of the subscribers, and you will be told that it would not be for the best interests of the community to disclose the list.

"Poor Mother Hubbard went to the cupboard  
To get her poor son some bread;  
But there was so much,  
That the bank said, 'Don't touch,'  
And so her poor son was not fed."

"Poor Mother Hubbard went to the cupboard  
To get munitions instead.  
And wasn't it funny?  
There was plenty of money  
To blow the whole lot of them dead."

We would lay stress on this important point: The arch-enemy of mankind is the big banker, viz., the one who has the power to issue or recall money at will. The enemy is not the non-banking millionaire man of business. It is the banker who can stage revolutions, power over each and every Government, no matter its political colour.

Now, although in our midst we have many wealthy companies, they are not such a danger to the community as the bankers are, because wealthy companies as such cannot cause a shortage of money in the community.

We have stressed that point because it is the aim of International Financiers to stir up strife among the classes. However, there is no word of attacking the real culprit, namely, the International Banker.

Let me give a few more points showing how the artificial money shortage hits the middle and lower classes:—

Take the Apple and Pear scandal of recent years: There were apples and pears in abundance. Millions of cases were allowed to go to waste whilst poor people (adults and children) in our poor slum district would have welcomed the fruit with unbounded jubilation. But the growers could not sell that fruit because people could not buy it. And when any fruit was actually sold, the margin between the price given to the hard-working grower and the price to the public was colossal; the huge profits going to pay for the upkeep of a horde of salary hunters who were battenning on the results of the hard labour of the orchardist.

Now, take a specific case: Orchardist R.R. has a fruit crop. The crop is worth £500, and if he gets the £500 he will be well repaid. £250 is due for expenses, which leaves him £250 for his year's income. Suppose he cannot sell that crop. Then he loses, first, £250 which is due to somebody else, and that somebody else cannot pay his own debts, and so on and forth. Moreover, R.R. loses his £250, his year's income. Added to this, the fruit worth £500 is allowed to rot, and people who otherwise would be enjoying this fruit have to go without it.

But suppose that the Government creates £500 and buys that fruit and gives it to the poor; or suppose that it gave £500 to the poor for the purchase of that fruit. See then what happens: The fruit is bought. The grower gets £500. He pays his £250 expenses and he keeps £250 as the year's income. And all are happy. And all have become happy because the Government became its own bank and created and gave out £500.

The Government created that money by the stroke of the pen. It simply gave an order for £500 worth of goods.

In passing, let me remark that the Government did not exactly make the money out of nothing. The money

had to have a backing, and the backing was not gold, nor bank deposits, but the backing was the £500 worth of fruit. (You remember, the spade gave the backing to the note that I wrote out). You see at once the folly of saying that money must have a backing of gold.

But the powers behind the scenes do not want things to go so easily, and you have, then, Board after Board being formed—so much jobbery. There is an Egg Board, claiming that every egg laid by a hen becomes the property of the Board (truly, a wooden Board). Now, by what right does the Board claim control over these eggs? What have they done in any way towards the production of these eggs? The only thing gallinaeous they have done is to treat the public to an overdose of nauseating cackling about their own merits.

These Boards are interfering left, right and centre. Later on I am giving a special chapter to these gentlemen. In the meantime, I hope to be pardoned for anticipating somewhat. Board members are a pack of interfering muddlers. They would be well advised to ponder on the words of "The Plumber":

"I'm the plumber,  
A handy man in winter and in summer.  
I can wipe a joint with ease,  
But as for touching children's knees—  
Well, I'm the plumber."

Board members who, perhaps, think that potatoes grow on the stalks of a plant, will come along and, with that brazen effrontery due to ignorance, will give agricultural advice to men who are real experts on the job. And what I say of market gardening, can be applied to dairy-farming, egg-raising, fruit-growing, etc.

Our very existence is being threatened by Japan, and a major war effort is needed. But a major war effort

does not mean that we are to have a horde of bureaucrats running around sitting on committees, and interfering and wasting time and paper in the filling in of countless forms. The bricklayer, called upon to make a speech, said he felt more at home upon the scaffold! Our bureaucrats would confer a benefit upon humanity if they sat back in an easy electric chair. This interference is actually hindering our war effort. If the various industries raising things of value for the winning of the war have enough money lent for production, then Australians will produce goods to the maximum capacity. But this interference and artificial shortage of money are actually a menace to Australia, and are playing right into the hands of the enemy.

The Government could be its own bank, and issue all necessary money without interest. Yet it cries out for money as a stranded traveller in the Sahara would cry out for water. The Government appeals to the public for money for the building of ships, etc. Now, suppose that 100 men are assembled for the building of a ship, and I come along with a cheque for £5,000,000, or with notes (£10 notes, etc.) to the value of £5,000,000. I say Here is a cheque (or notes) for £5,000,000 Please begin at once." They will say: "Where are the materials?" Even if you had all the materials but no workmen, you could not get a start. Workmen are wealth, potential, if not actual. So, then, you see, that to build a ship, you need men and materials. You build ships, not with money (pieces of paper) but with materials plus labour. The same applies to guns and munitions, and if we have the materials and the labour, then there is no need for a shortage of ships or guns, as the case may be.

For what, then, is the money given if you do not build ships with it? When you pay the workmen so much money, you are giving them something with



which to purchase goods for themselves (food, clothing, etc.). When you pay so much for the materials, you are giving the owner, or owners, something with which they, too, can buy goods for themselves (food, clothing, etc.).

Yet the Government will call upon the people to save. There is sense in asking people not to use up goods which are scarce in the country, above all, if they are necessary for the war effort. During the last drought in Australia, to save water, the farmers drank their whisky neat! But as regards this saving of money: If people save from buying goods, see what happens: Goods are left on the hands of the shopkeepers, and there is no further call for the production of such goods. So, then, producers of such goods have to close down and are thrown out of work, and thus have no money with which to buy other goods. (I am not speaking of the stopping of non-essential production in war time). But things grow worse if money saved is used for the production of fresh goods, for then you would have two lots of goods for sale with only one lot of money to purchase them.

Is it any wonder, then, that people who understand that money is not a commodity (as wheat, iron, etc.), but is only an order for goods; that the real wealth of a country are the materials plus the labour; that gold is only a metal, as, e.g., tin is a metal; that the Government could be its own bank and create all its own money; that best results for a successful war are got, not by interfering, but by helping with liberal loans for production—is it any wonder, then, that those with this true grasp of the situation should cry out with burning indignation: "THE WHOLE THING IS A RACKET."

My criticism of the Government's failure to use its own bank must not brand me as disloyal or as being

ready to hinder a full war effort. On the contrary, my criticism shows my anxiety for the best war results. Let me illustrate: You and Brown are shareholders in a Company. The Directors are not making the best use of the opportunities they have for getting excellent results. Brown is indifferent as to their efforts. You, on the other hand, see their lost opportunities for gaining good results. So you criticise them severely and point out the faulty management. Your attitude shows that you are heart and soul in the welfare of the Company.

Now, we Australians are all shareholders in the "Company of Australia." Our very existence is being threatened by Japan. We want more and more production of war materials. The Government's financial policy is hindering us in our munitions output. Any criticism of their faulty monetary policy shows in the critic a sound Australian heart. It shows he wants results. Members of Parliament are in the position of Directors of a Company and should pick out experts to get results.

Let me now give you some quotations with regard to the power of the money-lords:—

"Economic Nationalism," page 186, quotes President Woodrow Wilson as saying: "Some of the biggest men in the United States in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know there is a power so organised, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak in condemnation of it."

The same author, on page 188, quotes Mr. Lloyd George as saying: "They (International Bankers) swept statesmen, politicians, jurists and journalists all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no

appeal from their ruthless decree. This settlement (the Dawes Reparation Act) is the joint ukase of King Dollar and King Sterling."

The late Arthur Kitson, noted British inventor and engineer, who fought the money power for nearly fifty years, said: "The world's troubles are due to the immense power wielded by the International Bankers, who, to suit their own ends, can sway peoples and individuals as they will. The money question is the greatest moral and social question which mankind has ever had to consider. It concerns the lives, fortunes, and happiness of every human being in society and of generations yet unborn. All other questions sink into insignificance compared with this one."

Abraham Lincoln said to Congress: "I have two great enemies: the Southern Army in front of me and the Financial Institution in the rear. Of the two the one in my rear is my greatest foe." Abraham fell foul of the big bankers. The story is told by one reliable authority as follows: During the Civil War Lincoln and his Secretary of the Treasury applied to the bankers for loans for the Government to carry on the war. The bankers are reported to have replied something like this: "Well, war is a hazardous business, but we can let you have it at from 24 per cent. to 36 per cent."

The President and his Secretary heatedly refused, stating that the terms were outrageously unpatriotic. The money lenders are said to have replied: "If the Government does not want the money at that figure, why, we will loan it to the Southern Confederacy." Which they did. This was the real reason why Lincoln issued the green backs which became the nation's currency, entirely free from the incidence of debt, interest or taxation. With the green backs he was able to pay the soldiers and finance the war unto victory for the Union. He thereby incurred the enmity of the Inter-

national bankers, who immediately plotted his assassination.

Hilaire Belloc, in "The Jews," says: "The Great War brought thousands upon thousands of educated men (who took up duties as temporary officials) against the staggering secret they never had suspected . . . the complete control exercised over things absolutely necessary to the nation's survival by half a dozen Jews."

Elsewhere Hilaire Belloc says, in the same work: "You could get the great Jewish Bankers who control international finance around one large dinner table, and I know dinner tables which have seen nearly all them at one time or another."

In his book, "America Conquers Britain," Mr. Ludwell Denny says: "High money rates in the United States, early in 1929, for instance, forced an increase in the official discount rates almost at once in England, in European countries, in two Latin American countries, in two in the Far East, and in almost every case restricted business and brought suffering to millions of foreign workers."

Winston Churchill in "Great Contemporaries," 1938, says: "The life and well-being of every country are influenced by the economic and financial policy of the United States. From the cotton spinners of Lancashire to the robots of India; from the peasantry of China to the pawnbrokers of Amsterdam; from the millionaire-financier watching the tape machine to the sturdy blacksmith swinging his hammer in the forge; from the monetary philosopher or student to the hard-boiled business man or sentimental social reformer—all are consciously or unconsciously affected."

Professor Lester T. Ward, in his book, "Pure Sociology," has quoted the words pronounced by the journalist, John Swinton, during a banquet of the Press

in New York: "An independent Press does not exist in America, except perhaps in small country towns; journalists know it and I know it; not one of them dares to express a sincere opinion; if they do so, they know beforehand that it will never be printed. I am paid 150 dollars, in order that I should not put my ideas in the newspaper for which I write, and that I should keep them to myself. Others are paid similar salaries for a similar service. If I succeeded in having my opinions published in a single issue of my newspaper, I should lose my post in twenty-four hours. The man who would be insane enough to give frank expression to his thoughts would soon find himself in the streets on the look-out for another occupation. It is the duty of New York journalists to lie, to threaten, to bow down to the feet of Mammon, and to sell their country and their race for their salary—that is to say, for their daily bread.

"We are the tools and the vassals of the rich who keep in the background; we are puppets; they pull the strings and we dance. Our time, our talent, our life, our abilities, all are the property of these men."

Mr. Henry Ford published in the "Jewish World," of January 5, 1922, the following:—

"It was the Jews themselves who convinced me of the direct relations between the International Jew and the war. In fact, they went out of their way to convince me. You remember the effort we made to attract the attention of the world to the purpose of ending the war through the medium of the so-called 'Peace Ship' in 1915. On that ship were two very prominent Jews. We had not been to sea 200 miles before these Jews began telling me about the power of the Jewish race, how they controlled the world through the control of gold, and that the Jew, and no one but the Jew, could stop the war.

"I was reluctant to believe this, and said so. So they went into details to tell me the means by which Jews controlled the war, how they made the money, how they had cornered all the basic materials needed to fight the war, and all that, and they talked so long and so well that they convinced me. They said, and they believed, that the Jews had started the war, that they would continue it so long as they wished, and that until the Jews stopped the war it would not be stopped."

Rothschild's power is revealed in the late Lord Haldane's autobiography ("Richard Burdon Haldane: An Autobiography:" Hodder & Stoughton, 1929). During the war Lord Haldane, as Lord Chancellor in 1915, was in temporary charge of the Foreign Office whilst Sir Edward Grey was on a holiday. He relates that it was desired to stop a ship from South America, believed to be carrying supplies for Germany, adding: "There was not material to act on, and the only way was to use private influence. I motored to Lord Rothschild's house in Piccadilly, and found him lying down, obviously very ill. But he stretched out his hand before I could speak and said, 'Haldane, I do not know what you have come for, except to see me, but I have said to myself that if Haldane asks me to write a cheque for £25,000 and ask no questions, I will do it on the spot.' I told him it was not for a cheque, but only to get a ship stopped that I was come. He sent a message to stop the ship at once." What the King's Minister could not do, Rothschild could do out of hand.

His late Holiness, Pope Pius X L , says in His Encyclical "Quadragesimo Anno": "It is obvious in our days that wealth and immense power have become concentrated in the hands of a few men," and he further states that this "Power becomes particularly

irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life blood of the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands, the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will."

Doctor Mannix, with his uncanny perception of world problems, said at Newcastle Town Hall, New South Wales (January 16th, 1938): "It is the big financial experts of the world who control the money. These are the people to whom the Pope has addressed his most caustic remarks, and these are the people who will have to release their grip of the world."

Would that more Churchmen had the courage to speak out in such fearless language!

In passing, let us note an interesting episode. It shows the elasticity of the word "Communism" and its frequent misapplication. Here is the item: It refers to Dr. Mannix's speech a few days before in Newcastle:

"If Archbishop Mannix had written to this paper over a *nom de plume* and had made the statements he made on Wednesday night, one or two of our correspondents who are so completely obsessed by the challenge of communism would have called him a "Red" who was subtly undermining faith in the present system. We refer particularly to the following words: "I am old enough to remember when Pope Leo XIII was regarded by many people as a Socialist or Communist of the time because he told us that human labour was not merely a commodity to be bargained for, but that human dignity had to be considered, and that a man was entitled to a living wage for himself and his family."

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice was British Ambassador to the U.S.A. during the last war till February, 1918. Sir

Cecil, speaking of Schiff, of Wall Street, called him "The arch-Jew" and pointed out that he and Warburg were working to get control of Britain.

Mr. Montagu Norman, puppet Governor of the Bank of England (?), arranged the debt settlement between England and the United States after the last war. When Mr. Montagu Norman returned to England with the debt settlement, Mr. Bonar Law, who was then Prime Minister of England, is reported as saying: "If I signed this I would be cursed for generations." Yet it was signed, with woeful results.

It would take volumes to show the countless ramifications of the Wall Street Bankers and the Bank of England. In 1931 the Wall Street group demanded and obtained the reduction in the British Unemployment Dole. The same U.S.A. group, through their control of the Bank of England (?), were instrumental in having Otto Niemeyer and Guggenheim Gregory sent to Australia, with the consequent disastrous result of the Depression.

Mr. W. Graham, speaking of the way in which the British Government was forced to reduce the dole rates at the instigation of Wall Street, said in the House of Commons, on September 10, 1931: ". . . It was specifically put to us (the late Ministers) that, unless one item in particular—a 10 per cent. cut in the unemployment benefits to yield £12,250,000—was included in the programme it would not restore confidence: and we were told that no other item could be put in substitution. . . . Let the House be under no misapprehension. It was because of an outside insistence upon the specific point that the late Government broke."

Read also the following from the "Daily Express," September 27, 1929: "To propitiate Wall Street, British industry is to be taxed another 1 per cent. . . .



The voice of Wall Street is heard and obeyed in their councils (that is, the councils of the Bank of England)."

O.B. Good, M.A., writes in his book "The Hidden Hand of Juda"—The Jew, Rathenau, a former Minister for Foreign Affairs in Germany, said before his death: "The year 1941 will bring to the Jews their final goal of world domination."

In his book, "After the War," Lieutenant-Colonel Repington tells us of a conversation he had with Count Albert Mensdorff in Austria in 1921. Count Mensdorff for the ten years preceding the Great War had been Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in London. Repington says: "M. Mensdorff thought that Israel had won the War. They made it, thrived on it, and profited by it. It was their supreme revenge on Christianity. But, terrible as the last war was, it was but an incident 'in an onward march towards horizons stronger and forbidding'."

"To change or not to change, that is the question,  
Whether 'tis better in the end to suffer  
The debts and failures of our 'sound finance,'  
Or to try 'free money' for our troubles,  
And by this plan to end them. To change, to  
wonder,  
To think: And by such change to say we end  
The Depression and many other evils  
Besetting Mankind, 'tis a consummation  
Devoutly to be wished."

## **Russia Smashed Up By International Finance**

I shall now treat of Communism in Russia. Let me

recall at once that Karl Marx (Mordechai), the Jewish Prophet of Communism, was financed by Engels, the millionaire Jew who had made his money from the terrible exploitation of child labour in Manchester, England.

Let me first speak briefly of certain rights which every one has, and let me point out the limitations of State interference in these rights of the individual. I shall use a simple example of a football team, though not absolutely parallel.

Twenty men form a football team. Another 20 do the same, and another and another, until they have 10 teams. The teams join together and form a Football Association. They elect certain men who are to compose a Board of Control. If there were no Board of Control, there would be chaos on the football field.

Notice the order of events: You first have the individual members, then the club, and then comes the Football Association, with the Board of Control.

The Board of Control is elected to be a help to the players, to regulate their conduct towards one another on the field, to see that the players get a fair deal from one another. Without the Board of Control there would be chaos on the football field. The Board is the servant of the players, doing for the players what the players cannot do for themselves.

The Board thus has limited powers. The players have the power to change their Board of Control. They have the power to criticise the Board of Control.

Player Brown jostles Player Smith on the football field, and the Board reprimands Brown, and rightly so. But one day a member of the Board reprimanded Brown for not keeping his garden in order. Brown was indignant, and exclaimed: "Mind your own business. You are trespassing into my private affairs. You have control over me only in the football circle."

Now, we are all players in the game of life. The State is the Board of Control, seeing that we play fairly, seeing that we get from one another a fair deal, seeing that we get those things which are our due. If there were no State supervision, life would be chaos.

Notice:—We had first the individual player, then came the club, and then came the Association with the Board of Control. And in life we have first the individual, then the family, and then the formation of the State. So then the State came last into being.

As we saw, the Board of Control was really the servant of the footballers. It existed for the benefit of the players. Now, the rulers of a country are really the servants of the people and they exist for the benefit of the individuals who form the State.

Shareholders in a Company want results. They do not know normally how to decide ways and means. They elect Directors whose business it is to pick out experts who know how to get good results. Now, the people in a country want results. Normally, they are not in a position to say how those results can be obtained. They elect Members of Parliament and tell them what they want done. Even the Members of Parliament may not know how things ought to be done. It is the business of the Members of Parliament to pick out experts who are expected to know how the results are to be obtained.

The football Board of Control could be changed by the votes of the players, and those controlling the State can be changed by the individual people composing it.

The Football Board of Control can interfere with the players only in certain spheres of action. You remember my remark about Brown's garden. Now, the State can interfere with individuals, but only in certain spheres.

There are certain rights which are due to each and every one of us, just because we are human beings. We say that these rights are inherent in our very nature. They are given to us by God. The State has no authority to interfere with these rights. For instance, every individual has the right to life (except when, e.g., through murder, he forfeits the right), a right to be reared and educated, a right to liberty, a right to rest and recreation, a right to practise his religion. The State has no authority to interfere in these matters, and if it gives an order contrary to these rights, then people need not take any notice of that order.

Yet, according to Communism, all our basic rights—personal rights, such as life and liberty; political rights, such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of opposition to any party holding office; economic rights such as the right to have private property; family rights and religious rights—all these rights, according to Communism, come from the State, and can be taken away at the will of the State.

According to Communistic philosophy the individual exists for the benefit of the State. On the same line of reasoning, the individual footballers would exist for the benefit of the Board of Control.

If Communistic philosophy is right, that is, if all our rights come from the State, see the logical result: The State can then do no wrong; whatever the State does is the right thing. The State can kill anyone or everyone, and yet it would not be guilty of murder. It can take away the property of anyone and everyone, and yet not be guilty of confiscation. It can indulge in lying propaganda, and still retain a good conscience. It wants arms from abroad, so it can starve the people and send away the grain in exchange for those arms. The State might have political rivals; so then the State

is perfectly justified in assassinating them.

At football matches excited spectators, who think that the referee is not fair, will shout out: "Give them a go, umpire." The spectators are particularly hostile if a small man is knocked about by a big burly player.

Now, Communism does not give the individual a fair go. All this despotism which I said could happen in a Communistic State has gone on in Russia in recent years. Yet, Communism boasts of its democracy. Its hypocritical, lying propaganda would have us believe that in Russia you have Government by the people.

Let me now touch briefly upon the slaughter carried out by Communism in Russia. According to the London "Times," of September 1, 1922, Bolshevik official figures gave 1,766,118 persons as the total executed by the Cheka up to February of that year. This was only a part of the slaughter. The late Lord Sydenham, in the House of Lords in 1923, put the sum total, including those dying of starvation and disease, at about 30,000,000 up to that early date. He says: "This is the most horrible crime in all history."

Many more years of terror and murder have gone on since. As regards the loss of life during the famine in the Ukraine, in 1932 and 1933, estimates vary from 3,000,000 to 7,000,000 people. The foodstuffs needed by people for the winter were taken away by the Soviet officials. Mr. W. H. Chamberlain, "Christian Science Monitor" correspondent in Russia, called it "Organised Famine" in his book, "Russia's Iron Age" (1935). Mr. Eugene Lyons, American United Press correspondent, in his book entitled "Assignment in Utopia" (1938), describes the famine as easily preventable. He, together with Mr. Chamberlain, tells us that its existence was concealed from the outside world by the most rigorous censorship.

Bolshevik methods in Russia are described by

Steinberg, a former Soviet Commissar for Justice.

Writing in the "New York Times," of February 23, 1930, he says: "All the psychological elements of a regime of force and inequality manifest themselves in the atmosphere engendered by terror. On the one side we have intoxication with power and a realisation that anything done by him who wields power will go unpunished, and on the other, fear, depression, silent hatred, and sycophancy; the rise of two classes, masters and slaves. In turn, relations among the suspects themselves become perverted. In the struggle to win the favour of the authorities, treachery assumes appalling dimensions. All become slaves with regard to the Government, wolves with respect to one another."

In his book, "Assignment in Utopia," Eugene Lyons gives his impressions of Soviet Russia after ten years' residence as an American Press correspondent. He says: "Above all, I had the sense of leaving behind me a nation trapped." Yes, that in truth, is what happened. A nation of something more than 160,000,000 had been trapped by foreigners. They were trapped by being promised something far different from the reality.

M. Oudendyk, Netherlands Minister at Petrograd, in a dispatch on September 6, 1918, warned the British Government, for whom he was acting, that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement. He says: "The danger is now so great that I feel it my duty to call the attention of the British and all Governments to the fact that if an end is not put to Bolshevism in Russia at once, the civilisation of the whole world will be threatened. . . . I consider the immediate suppression of Bolshevism the greatest issue before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over the whole world, as it is organised and worked by

Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."

M. Theodor Butenko, who fled from Bucharest to Italy, said in the "Giornale d'Italia," of February 17, 1938, that "In place of the former capitalist a new bourgeoisie had been formed, composed of one hundred per cent. Jews." He said that these Jews controlled all the big industries, railways, and trading, while the Russian people themselves existed "in the most appalling servitude which human history has ever seen and registered."

When, of late, members of the families of Warburg and Kahn visited the Soviet capital, they were received with great pomp. The Soviet troops, wearing the five-pointed star of David, presented arms as they passed. Referring to the visit of Mrs. Otto Kahn, in June, 1931, the "Figaro" says: "The ceremonial displayed exceeded in pomp and solemnity the journey of Amanullah, when king of Afghanistan. The Red Army lined the roads at the present arms . . . it was the least that the heads of the Proletarian Dictatorship could do to honour the wife of one of their sovereigns."

THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE ARE, BY NATURE, A SPIRITUALLY MINDED RACE. MARXISM IS SOMETHING TOTALLY ALIEN TO THE RUSSIAN CHARACTER. Its materialistic philosophy weighs very heavily on people whose outlook on life is mystical. In common parlance, the Russian people are not built that way. And it has often been a cause for wonder why they should be anxious to practise poverty and squalor so as to send money abroad for the propagation of anti-God doctrine. BUT HATRED OF CHRISTIANITY DOES NOT REALLY COME FROM THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE THEMSELVES. It comes from the Jews. It is really

the Jews who are spreading Communistic ideas throughout the world. Now, suppose this happens: If a man starts a street brawl he is arrested as a disturber of the peace. Yet, International Jewry, with its Communistic propaganda, is decidedly a disturber of world peace. The Russians were fooled and tricked into rising against their own nationals, and the Jews stepped in and took control. In the fable the spider invited the fly to walk into his parlour, and the parlour was described as one of beauty. To-day, the lying International Jewish spider has trapped the Russian people, and is trying to get the Australian "fly" to walk into his Communistic web also.

## **Revolution in Russia**

In her "The Surrender of An Empire" (page 66), Mrs. Nesta Webster, treating of "The Rise of Bolshevism," says; "The fact is that propaganda had been carried on so long and systematically against 'Tsarist Russia'—by the Jews before the war, and by the Germans whilst it was in progress—that a totally false conception of conditions in Russia had been created."

I now give you some information on the Russian Revolution. If we consult approved authors, we find that all European revolutions since the English one of 1688 (financed by the Belmonte family in Amsterdam) down to the present time, have been made possible by Jewish finance. If you consult such works as "Secret Powers Behind Revolution," by Vicomte de Poncins; "Le Peril Judeo-Maçonnique," by Jouin; "Waters Flowing Eastwards," by Mrs. L. Fry; and books by Mrs. Nesta Webster—if you consult such works as these, you will find that Jewish finance prepared the



way for revolution by secret societies and other underhand methods. And then, after the revolution was over, they gained for themselves more and more liberty together with key positions in the ruling of the Government. Jewish finance has planned, and started, and paid for, and gained by, the wars throughout the same period.

The Russian Revolutions have been no exception. Jacob Schiff, partner and brother-in-law of Paul Warburg, financed Japan in her war against Russia in 1904-1905. Schiff was described by a prominent American Jew as the "Beloved Leader of the Jews." The same financial interests financed the Russian Revolution in 1905. Schiff had heavily financed revolutionary propaganda among the Russian prisoners of war in Japan, and he perverted them into becoming ardent revolutionaries.

Let me relate one incident after the Russo-Japanese war. Jewish Nihilists, financed by Schiff, were carrying on a reign of terror in Russia. Many of these Russian Jews adopted the following strategy: They went to U.S.A., became U.S.A. citizens, and armed with U.S.A. passports they entered Russia. The Russian authorities woke up to the danger, and refused entrance to these Jews. As a reprisal, Schiff brought pressure to bear on President Taft to break off trade relations with Russia.

In 1917 there occurred the infamous Russian Revolution, in which the Government of the pro-Ally Kerensky was overthrown and Bolshevism gained control. The leader of this revolt was a man who called himself Nikolas Lenin. On April 9 of that year Lenin and 29 other Russian revolutionaries were put on a sealed train in Switzerland and taken through Germany to Stockholm, and then to Russia. At about the same date, Trotsky, with two or three hundred

other revolutionaries, sailed from New York to Russia. Trotsky was arrested at Halifax by the British naval authorities, but he was released under circumstances which have never been fully explained. He was then allowed to proceed to Russia.

In his book "Through Thirty Years" (1924), Mr. Wickham Steed described Jacob Schiff and Warburg as "akin to, if not identical with, the men who sent Trotsky and some scores of associated desperadoes" to Russia.

There is ample evidence that Jewish money was poured out like water in the starting of the Russian Revolution. Mrs. Williams, in her book, "From Liberty to Brest-Litovsk," says, on page 291: "One is forced to draw the conclusion that the hundreds of thousands, or rather millions, spent by Lenin and his followers were furnished to them from some exchequer which had millions at its disposal. Only banks and State exchequers have the possibility of subsidising propaganda on such a scale."

The French High Commissioner in the United States, early in 1919, made a report from material supplied by the U.S. Secret Service, and in it he stated that Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and other Jewish bankers, had started and financed the Russian Revolution, and that "the Bolshevik movement is in a certain measure the expression of a general Jewish movement."

According to Sir George Buchanan, British Ambassador to Russia in 1918, the charlatan monk, Rasputin, was largely financed by certain Jewish bankers.

The "War Memoirs" of Mr. Lloyd George contained a significant fact about the letting down of the Russian soldiers during the last war. It was obviously a Jewish trick to cause discontent amongst the troops.

Vickers, a firm founded by and financed by the Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, had totally failed to carry out its contract to supply the Russian troops with munitions. The soldiers were thus sent into battle badly equipped, and this failure of ammunition is regarded as mainly responsible for the 3,800,000 casualties out of the 7,000,000 men put into the line. All this was obviously intended to cause a discontented revolutionary spirit amongst the Russian troops.

Kitchener set out for Russia on the "Hampshire" to investigate this munitions mystery, but his ship sank under very suspicious circumstances.

And note: The want of munitions recently in Singapore and Malaya makes us wonder if the same diabolical influences are at work trying to sabotage the Empire.

The Imperial Russian General Headquarters received from its agents in New York a secret report dealing with the plotting of the Russian Revolution by the Jews. This report, dated February 15, 1916 was published by the Russian writer, Boris Brasol, in his book, "The World at the Cross Roads." The report, in part, is as follows: "The Russian Revolutionary Party of America has evidently resumed its activities. As a consequence of it, momentous developments are expected to follow. The first confidential meeting, which marked the beginning of a new era of violence, took place on Monday evening, February 14, 1916, in the East side of New York City. It was attended by 62 delegates, 50 of whom were 'veterans' of the Revolution of 1905—the rest being newly admitted members. Among the delegates were a large percentage of Jews, most of them belonging to the intellectual class, as doctors, publicists, etc., but also some professional revolutionaries. . . . The proceedings of this first meeting were almost entirely

devoted to the discussion of finding ways and means to start a great revolution in Russia as 'the most favourable moment for it is close at hand.' It was revealed that secret reports had just reached the party from Russia, describing the situation as very favourable, when all arrangements for the immediate outbreak were completed. The only serious problem was the financial question, but whenever this was raised, the assembly was immediately assured by some of the members that this question did not need to cause any embarrassment, as ample funds, if necessary, would be furnished by persons in sympathy with the movement of liberating the people of Russia. In this connection the name of Jacob Schiff was immediately mentioned."

On pages 70 and 71 of the same work, Mr. Boris Brasol says: "The full history of the interlocking participation of the Imperial German Government and international finance and the destruction of the Russian Empire is not yet written. . . . It is not a mere coincidence that at the notorious meeting, held at Stockholm in 1916 between the former Russian Minister of the Interior, Protopopoff, and the German agents, the German Foreign office was represented by Mr. Warburg, whose two brothers were members of the International banking firm, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of which the late Mr. Jacob Schiff was a senior member."

"What's Wrong With Russia?" (published by "The Australian Catholic Truth Society," November, 1937), says, page 13: "The Communist movement was German-Jewish in origin."

Let me now quote from "Le Peril Judeo-Maçonnique" by Mgr. Jouin, part 3, pages 249 to 251. Jews had placed obstacles in the ways of its publication so that the majority of people do not know of its existence.

The document is divided into eight sections. Let me quote some of the sections:—

"Section 1.—In February, 1916, it was first discovered that a revolution was being fomented in Russia. It was found out that the following persons, as well as the banking house mentioned, were engaged in this work of destruction:—

"Jacob Schiff (Jew); Guggenheim (Jew); Max Breitung (Jew); Kuhn, Loeb & Co. (Jewish banking house) of which the following are the directors: Jacob Schiff, Felix Warburg, Otto Kahn, Mortimer Schiff, S. H. Hanauer (all Jews).

"There can be no doubt that the Russian Revolution, which broke out a year after the information given above had been received, was launched and fomented by distinctively Jewish influences.

"As a matter of fact, in April, 1927, Jacob Schiff made a public declaration that it was thanks to his financial help that the Russian Revolution had succeeded.

"Section 2.—In the spring of 1917, Jacob Schiff began to supply funds to Trotsky (Jew), to bring about the social revolution in Russia. The New York daily, 'Forward,' which is a Judaeo-Bolshevik organ, gave a subscription for the same purpose.

"Through Stockholm, the Jew, Max Warburg, was likewise furnishing funds to Trotsky & Co. They were also in receipt of funds from the Westphalian-Rhine-land Syndicate, which is an important Jewish enterprise, as well as from another Jew, Olaf Aschberg, of the 'Nyah Banken' of Stockholm, and from Givotsky, a Jew, whose daughter is married to Trotsky. Thus the communications were set up between the Jewish multi-millionaires and the Jewish proletarians.

"Section 3.—In October, 1917, the social revolution took place in Russia, thanks to which certain Soviet

organisations took over the direction of the Russian people.

"Section 4.—At the same time the Jew, Paul Warburg, who had been in relation with the Federal Reserve Board, was remarked to be in active contact with certain Bolshevik notabilities in the United States. This circumstance, together with other points about which information had been obtained, was the cause of his not being re-elected to the above-mentioned committee.

"Section 7.—Scarcely had the social revolution broken out in Germany, when the Jewess, Rosa Luxemburg, automatically assumed the direction of it. One of the chief leaders of the International Bolshevik movement was a Jew, Haase. At that time the social revolution in Germany developed along the same lines as the social revolution in Russia.

"Section 8.—If we bear in mind the fact that the Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. is in touch with the Westphalian-Rhineland Syndicate, German-Jewish house, and with the Brothers Lazare, Jewish house in Paris, and also the Jewish house of Gunzbourg of Petrograd, Tokio, and Paris; if, in addition, we remark that all the above-mentioned Jewish houses are in close correspondence with the Jewish house of Speyer & Co., of London, New York, and Frankfort-on-the-Main, as well as with the 'Nya Banken, 'Judaeo-Bolshevist establishment in Stockholm, it will be manifest that the Bolshevik movement is in a certain measure the expression of a general Jewish movement, and that certain Jewish banking houses are interested in the organisation of this movement."

According to the erudite Russian writer, Petrovski, in "La Russie sous les Juifs" (Russia Under The Jews), p. 79: "Nicholas II., the Imperial Family, and the faithful members of his suite, were shot by the Jew,

Yourowsky, assisted by the Jews, Golostchokine and Voikoff, in obedience to the order sent from Moscow by the Jew, Sverdloff, and with the approval of the Council of the People's Commissars."

This council was composed of 20 members; one was a Georgian, one an Armenian, three were Russians, the rest were Jews, including a Jewess.

When we recall that the supplying of funds meant nothing more than the giving of a piece of paper with writing on, an order to pick up goods, which goods were made by others, and when we consider that this process of issuing a piece of paper with writing on is, after all, not very costly or lengthy—when we consider all this, we may then grasp the fearful power of those controlling the issue of money; we can perhaps understand the full meaning of the words of Meyer Amschel Rothschild, when he said: "Permit me to issue and control a nation's money, and I care not who makes its laws."

## **Jews in Other Revolutions**

Jewish organisations can be distinctly recognised in the SPANISH Civil War. When the fight broke out, the leaders, Zemorra, Azara, Rosenberg and the notorious La Passionaria, whose real name was Dolores Ibauri, were all Jews too. And those who flooded into Spain from all sides to render more unbearable the bloody plight of the Spanish people, were all emissaries of the same racial nationalism already victorious over Russia. Ilja Ehrenburg, Bela Kun, Gero Erno, Zalka Mate, the leaders and members of the notorious Rakosi-Roth brigade, all belonged, almost without exception, to the emissaries of this deranged racial "nazism".

When the hour struck, the mask fell! Christian churches and centuries-old art treasures went up in flames, drunken terrorists shoot at Christ's cross and the same "experts" again expertly crucify priests as they had done in Russia before. They scuttled prison-ships with anti-revolutionaries locked up in the hold, they shot tens of thousands of captured Christians in the bull-fight arena. The dead bodies of one and a half million victims and martyrs cover the battlefields of a stricken Spain. Behind all the mass misery and behind the miners of Asturias looms the same mystic power that induced the Russian sailors to revolt at Kronstadt.

We must never forget that Jews aim at corrupting the youth of a country so that, when the time comes for a revolution, these young people are devoid of all conscience. And note further; the Jews have their communistic cells among the prison authorities. When zero hour strikes, the jail-birds well armed are freed upon the public, a hell itself is let loose upon the masses. And when these jail-birds have done the dirty work of their hidden Jewish masters, these latter do not hesitate to liquidate them without further ado.

Lord Acton, speaking of the French Revolution, said: "The appalling thing in it is not the tumult, but the design. Through all the fire and smoke we perceive the evidence of calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed, but there is no doubt about their presence from the first". So then, we must not say that in world affairs things just happen. All this International upheaval has been studiously designed.

Let me in this Chapter just touch upon the part played by Jews in some other revolutions.

Let me first of all speak of Jews in the Hungarian Revolution.



On March 22, 1918, the Hungarian Soviet Republic was established.

The Government of the Soviet was composed of Jews. Let us give here the names of the best known: The blood-thirsty Tibor Szamuely, the Prime Minister of the Government; Alexander Bar-bai Joseph Pogany for the Army; Ronai (Rosenstengel) for justice; Vargo (Weichzelbaum) as governor of the capital; Moritz Erdelyi (Eisenstein) Desso Biro (Bienenstock No. 2) for the police; all Jews.

The Jew, Szamuely, travelled about Hungary in his special train. An eye witness gives the following description (C. De Tormay: *Le Livre proscrit*, p. 204, Paris, 1919):—

"This train of death rumbled through the Hungarian night, and where it stopped, men hung from trees, and blood flowed in the streets. Along the railway line one often found naked and mutilated corpses. Szamuely passed sentence of death in the train; those forced to enter it never related what they had seen. Szamuely lived in it constantly; thirty Chinese terrorists watched over his safety; special executioners accompanied him. The train was composed of two saloon cars, two first-class cars reserved for the terrorists and two third-class cars reserved for the victims. In the latter the executions took place. The floors were stained with blood. The corpses were thrown from the windows while Szamuely sat at his dainty little writing table, in the saloon car upholstered in pink silk and ornamented with mirrors. A single gesture of his hand dealt out life or death".

BUT NOT A WORD ABOUT THIS IN THE JEW-CONTROLLED PRESS. IF A HANDFUL OF JEWS WERE TO BE TREATED TO A DOSE OF MUSCULAR CHRISTIANITY THE "DAILIES" IN SCREAMING HEADLINES WOULD

TELL US OF "THE SLAUGHTER OF SIX MILLION JEWS".

*JEWS IN GERMAN REVOLUTION:*

When trouble came to Germany after World War No. 1, this is what took place:

On the fall of the Imperial Government the Jews at a single stroke and "en masse" seized the control of the country.

The new German Government was dominated by the Jews Haase (Foreign Affairs) and Ladeberg. The former had as assistants the Jews, Kautski, Alzech, who in 1918 was not even a German citizen, and the Jews Kohn and Kertzfeld. The Jew Schiffer was Minister of Finance assisted by Bernstein. The Jew Preuss, assisted by the Jew, Dr. Freund, occupied the Secretariat of the Interior.

It was the same in the Kingdom of Prussia. The Jew Rosenfeld was at the head of the Ministry of Justice which was entirely staffed by Jews and directed by them. Hirsch had the Ministry of Interior, and Simm was in charge of Finance.

The Jews, LISPINSKY and Schwartz, were the soul of the Government of Saxony: the Jews Talheimer and Heimann governed in Wurtemberg; Fulda in Hesse.

It is superfluous to recall the part played by the President of the Bavarian Soviet Republic, the Jew Kurt Eisner, chief of the Bolshevik Revolution in Munich.

It was the same in nearly all the branches of the German administration. Thus the chiefs of Police of Berlin, Frankfort, Munich, Essen, were respectively the Jews Ernst, Sinzheimer, Steiner, Levy. The various branches of the Soldiers and Workmen's Committees were directed by the Jews Cohen, Stern, Lowenberg, Frankel Israelovitch, Laubenheim, Seligsohn, Katz-

stein, Laufenberg, Heimann, Schlesinger, Merz, Weil.

### *JEWS IN OTHER REVOLUTIONS:*

In ARGENTINA, as early as 1918, Solomon Haselman and his wife Julia Fitz began to organise Communism. The Argentine revolution broke out in January 1919, and its victims in Buenos Aires, alone included 800 dead and 4,000 injured. The leader of the revolt was Pedro Wald, alias Naleskovskij, and its Minister of War was Macaro Ziazin, both Eastern Jews. After the suppression of the revolt, other movements were organised by Jews.

\*            \*            \*

The CHILEAN BOLSHEVIK uprising of 1931 and the URUGUAYAN Bolshevik rebellion of 1932 were engineered and led by the descendants of the seed of Abraham almost exclusively by Jews.

When the short-lived BRAZILIAN revolution was suppressed in 1935, it came to light that the actual leaders were all Jews with the exception of a nominal leader called Louis Carlow Perestes.

\*            \*            \*

Of the SOUTH AMERICAN revolutions, the Mexican one is particularly interesting for here again a Jewish millionaire leads the Bolsheviks. The Dictator of the Mexican Bolshevik revolution, Plutarco Elias Calles, is the son of a Syrian Jew and an Indian woman.

In DENMARK, Jewish students as well as the Jewish professors Georg Brandes and Davidsohn of the

University of Copenhagen, directed Communist activities.

\* \* \*

In RUMANIA, Anna Pauker-Rabinovich and other Jews were the champions of Bolshevism. It was they who forced the workers into a bloody railway strike.

\* \* \*

And if one looks at the FAR EAST, it is clear that here, too, the same hands are setting ablaze the fires of Bolshevism. The leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, Bordin and Crusenbergl were also of the seed of Abraham.

\* \* \*

## **Communist Officials in Russia**

In giving evidence before a committee of the United States Senate on February 12, 1919, the Rev. George A. Simons, superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Petrograd from 1907 to October 6, 1918, stated, with regard to the Bolshevik Government in Petrograd: "In December, 1918 . . . under the presidency of a man known as Apfelbaum (Zinovieff) . . . out of 388 members, only 16 happened to be real Russians, and all the rest Jews, with the exception of one man, who is a negro from America . . . and 265 of this northern commune Government, that is sitting in Old Smolny Institute, came from the Lower East Side of New York—265 of them" This evidence appears in Volume 3 of United States Senate Document No. 62, 66th Congress, 1st Session.

Mrs. Ariadna Williams, widow of the late Dr. Harold Williams, for long "Manchester Guardian" correspondent in Russia, in her book, "From Liberty to Brest-Litovsk" (Macmillan, 1919), said: "The predominant class which very rapidly crystallised around the Bolsheviks was mainly composed of individuals alien to the Russian people." She added: "They especially numbered a great many Jews. They spoke Russian badly. The nation over which they had seized power was a stranger to them, and, besides, they behaved as invaders in a conquered country."

The late Victor E. Marsden, London "Morning Post" correspondent in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, compiled a list of 545 early Bolshevik officials. Of these 454 were Jews, and only 23 genuine Russians, the remainder comprising Letts, Armenians, Germans, Finns, Poles, 1 Georgian, 1 Karaim, 1 Immeretian, 1 Hungarian and 1 Czech. The full list of names was published in the "Revealer" (Wichita Kansas), of August 15, 1934.

In the London "Morning Post" book, "The Cause of World Unrest" (Grant Richards, 1920), being a reprint of articles from that journal, with a foreword by its editor, Mr. H. A. Gwynne, was this list giving their real names and the assumed names adopted by them to conceal their racial origin as far as possible:—

#### BOLSHEVIK LEADERS IN 1919

Assumed Name	Real Name	Race
Lenin. . . . .	Oulianov. . . . .	Russian
Trotsky. . . . .	Bronstein. . . . .	Jew
Steklov. . . . .	Nachamkess . . .	Jew
Martov. . . . .	Tsederbaum . . .	Jew

Assumed Name	Real Name	Race
Zinoviev . . . . .	Apfelbaum ...	.. Jew
Goussiev . . . . .	Draphkin ...	.. Jew
Kamenev . . . . .	Rosenfeld ...	.. Jew
Bogdanov . . . . .	Silberstein ...	.. Jew
Gorev . . . . .	Goldman	.. Jew
Ouritzky . . . . .	Radomilsky	.. Jew
Volodarsky . . . . .	Cohen . . . . .	.. Jew
Sverdlov . . . . .	Sverdlov	.. Jew(?)
Kambov . . . . .	Katz . . . . .	.. Jew
Ganetzky . . . . .	Furstenberg	.. Jew
Dann . . . . .	Gourevitch ...	.. Jew
Meshkovksy	Goldberg ...	.. Jew
Parvus . . . . .	Helphandt ...	.. Jew
Riazanov . . . . .	Goldenbach	.. Jew
Tchernomorsky ..	Tchermordik	.. Jew
Martinov . . . . .	Zimbar	.. Jew
Piatnitzky . . . . .	Levin . . . . .	.. Jew
Abramovitch	Rein . . . . .	.. Jew
Solntzev . . . . .	Bleichman ...	.. Jew
Zervditch . . . . .	Fonstein	.. Jew
Radek . . . . .	Sobelson	.. Jew
Litvinov . . . . .	Wallach, etc	.. Jew
Lounatcharsky ..	Lunatcharsky	.. Russian
Kolontai . . . . .	Kolontai	.. Russian
Peters . . . . .	Peters . . . . .	.. Lett
Maklakovsky	Rosenbloom	.. Jew
Lapinsky . . . . .	Levenson	.. Jew
Vobrov . . . . .	Natansson ...	.. Jew
Ortodoks . . . . .	Akselrode ...	.. Jew
Grain . . . . .	Gerfeldt ...	.. Jew
Glazouonov	Schulze	.. Jew
Lebedieva . . . . .	Simson . . . . .	.. Jewess
Joffe . . . . .	Joffe . . . . .	.. Jew
Kamensky . . . . .	Hoffman	.. Jew
Naout . . . . .	Ginzburg ...	.. Jew

Assumed Name	Real Name	Race
Zagorsky . . . . .	Krachmalink	Jew
Igoev . . . . .	Goldman . . . . .	Jew
Vladimirov . . . . .	Feldman . . . . .	Jew
Bounskov . . . . .	Foundamentzky..	Jew
Manouilsky . . . . .	Manouilsky . . . . .	Jew
Larin . . . . .	Lourie . . . . .	Jew
Krassin . . . . .	Krassin . . . . .	Russian
Chicherin . . . . .	Chicherin . . . . .	Russian
Goukovsky . . . . .	Goukovsky . . . . .	Russian

In the above list a query appears against the race of Sverdlov. Mr. Lockhart says he is Jewish. Lenin was married to a Jewess, spoke Yiddish in his family circle, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Jewish Zionist leader, was quoted in the London "Jewish Chronicle" of December, 1932, as saying that Lenin had taken part in Jewish student meetings in Switzerland thirty-five years before. He is generally regarded as a Russian, but there is doubt.

Stalin, present ruler of Russia, is not a Jew, but took as his second wife the twenty-one-year-old sister of the Jew, L. M. Kagonowitz, his right-hand man, who has been spoken of as his probable or possible successor. Stalin's every movement is made under Jewish eyes. Moreover, the "Jewish World," 25th June, 1931, said: "The real author of the Five-years Plan, Kaganowitz, is a Jew, and what is more, a great favourite of Stalin."

#### CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, 1935

According to the "Defender" (Wichita, Kansas) for February, 1936, the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow, centre of international

Communism, consisted of 59 members, of whom 56 were Jews, and the other three were married to Jewesses. These figures are given in other journals also. The list is as follows:—

Non-Jews, married to Jewesses (3): L. V. Stalin, S. S. Lobow, V. V. Ossinsky.

Jews (56): V. A. Balitzky, K. J. Bauman, I. M. Vareikis, J. B. Gamarnik, I. I. Ejoff, I. A. Zelensky, I. D. Kabakoff, L. M. Kaganowitz, M. M. Kaganowitz, V. G. Knorin, M. M. Litvinoff, I. E. Liobimow, M. O. Aazoumow, M. L. Ruchimovitch, K. V. Rindin, M. M. Houtaevitch, M. S. Tchoudow, A. M. Schvernik, R. I. Eiche, G. G. Iagoda, I. E. Iakir, I. A. Iakovlew, F. P. Griadinsky, G. N. Kamin-sky, I. S. Unschlicht, A. S. Boulin, M. I. Kalmanowitz, D. S. Beika, Zifrinovitch, Trachter, Bitner, B. Kaner, Leo Krichman, A. K. Lepa, S. A. Lozovsky, B. P. Pozern, T. D. Deribass, K. K. Streievsky, N. N. Popow, S. Schwarth, E. I. Veger, L. Z. Mechlis, A. I. Ougarow, G. I. Blangonravow, A. P. Rosengolz, A. J. Serebrovsky, A. M. Steingart, I. P. Pavlounovsky, G. I. Sokolnikow, G. I. Broido, V. I. Polonsky, G. D. Veinberg.

In a "World Service" bulletin for November 15, 1935, a list was printed of the Provincial Secretaries (or Governors) of the Soviet Union, each of whom is a dictator, and the personal representative of Stalin. The list contained 49 names and comprised 41 Jews, four Russians, two Armenians, one Georgian, and one Buriat. It was stated to have been reprinted from the Russian newspaper "Nowoie Slovo" (The New World), published in Berlin on October 27, 1935.

The Bolshevik Commissar for Foreign Affairs is the Jew, Litvinoff, of the many aliases, former passer of stolen bank-notes, and lately President of the Council of the League of Nations. A detailed list of the staff



under him, as printed in "Das Berner Fehltrteil," by Stephen Dasz, doctor of law, Budapest (U. Bodung Verlag, Erfurt, 1935) shows it as almost entirely Jewish, both in respect of the principal and minor offices. The same applies to the Bolshevik diplomatic corps abroad. The following list of Bolshevik Ambassadors and Ministers Plenipotentiary in different countries compiled from various publications issued in 1935 and 1936. It may not be quite up to date, but it is nearly so:—

### **Bolshevik ambassadors, 1935-36.**

Country	Ambassador or Minister	Race
Great Britain	Maisky (alias Steinman)	Jew
Germany ...	Suritz . . . . .	Jew
Great Britain	Maisky (alias Steinman)	Jew
Germany ...	Surtitz . . . . .	Jew
France . . . . .	Potemkine (Staff Jewish). . . . .	Russian
Italy . . . . .	Stein . . . . .	Jew
United States	Troyanski (married to Jewess). . . . .	Russian
Japan . . . . .	Yureneff (alias Goffman). . . . .	Jew
Turkey . . . . .	Karakhain . . . . .	Jew
Belgium	Roubinine . . . . .	Jew
Norway	Yakoubowitz . . . . .	Jew
Sweden	Madame Kallontai	Jew
Roumania ...	Ostrovski . . . . .	Jewess
Greece . . . . .	Kobetzki (Staff Jewish)	Jew
Latvia . . . . .	Brodevski . . . . .	Russian
Lithuania ...	Karski (alias Berkmann)	Jew
Finland	Asmous . . . . .	Jew

Country	Ambassador or Minister	Race
Switzerland unofficial)	Dr. Bagozki . . . . .	Jew
Uruguay (ex- pelled) ...	Minkine. . . . .	Jew

League of Nations Delegation: Litvinoff (Jew), Rosenberg (Jew), Stein (Jew), Markus (Jew), Brenners (Jew), Hirschfeld (Jew), Halphand (Jew), Swanidze (Georgian).

The reader may wonder why the newspapers never mention that Bolshevism is simply a Jewish conquest of Russia. The explanation is that the international news agencies, on which the papers rely for foreign news, are also controlled by Jews.

The "Russian" representatives at the Embassy in London in 1935 comprised, in addition to the Ambassador, Mr. Maisky, alias Steinman (Jew), the following: Messrs. Kagean (Jew), Voltchkoff, alias Bekmann (Jew), and Oserski, alias Fridmann (Jew).

All news sent out from Russia was censored under direction of the Jew, Karl Radek, alias Sobelssohn, since imprisoned.

The Jew, Jagoda, was head of the G.P.U. (the former Cheka), now called "The People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs." The life, death or imprisonment of Russian citizens was in the hands of this Jew, and his spies were everywhere. According to an Anti-Comintern bulletin (15/4/35), Jagoda's organisations between 1929 and 1934 drove between five and six million Russian peasants from their homes.

The Government of France had as Prime Minister the Jewish Socialist, Leon Blum. According to the French journal "Candide" (vide "World service," 1/4/36), M. Blum had substantial interests in Weiler's Jupiter aero-engine works in France, and his son,

Robert Blum, was manager of a branch Weiler works in Russia making Jupiter aero-engines for the Russian Government.

The official head of the Anti-God Association of the U.S.S.R. was the Jew, Yaraslawsky, whose real name was Goublemann.

## **Jews Still Dominate Russia**

People are waking up to the Jewishness of Communism and to the Jewish control of Russia. So then, true to form, the Jews with the control of the world press are spreading the lie that the Jews are downtrodden in Russia.

Well, then, read this list of names. It is not the full list of Jewish control. The year in question is 1951:

M. Z. Saburov, president of the State Planning office and Planning Committee, is a JEW.

A. I. Lavrentiev (real name Lippmann), deputy foreign minister, former ambassador to Czechoslovakia, bosom friend of Alger Hiss, director of Soviet diplomatic espionage all over the world and head of the network of foreign espionage which organised the Persian disturbances, is a JEW.

Eugene Varga-Weiszfeld, head of the World Economic and Political Institute of the Soviet Union, one of the most important leading officials of the Soviet's economic life, is a JEW too.

ILIA Ehrenburg, propaganda chief, writer of Pravda leading articles, leading publicist of Soviet ideology, and the director of the Kominform "Peace Movement", is a JEW.

Leonid Menikov, Soviet ambassador to Roumania, is a JEW.

I. Nosenko, minister of heavy industry and transport, is a JEW.

Anatole Yakovlev, Soviet ambassador to the U.S. during the hearings of the Rosenberg treason case, and now one of the heads of Soviet espionage, is a JEW.

M. N. Svernik, former President of the Soviet Union, and now leader of the Russian trade unions, is a JEW.

A. F. Gorkin, Secretary-General of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet, is a JEW.

David Zaslavsky, editor of Pravda, is a JEW.

S. A. Losowsky, former head of the Soviet Foreign Office, and now director of the Soviet Information and News Service in the Soviet Union, is a JEW.

General K. Gorshenin, Minister of Justice, is a JEW.

Jacob Malik, previously chief Soviet delegate to U.N.O., and at present Soviet ambassador in London, is a JEW.

Major-General Boris Rasin, military attache in Great Britain, is a JEW.

Solomon Abrahamovich Reback, deputy-director of the Soviet Atomic Energy Committee, and also security chief of the special department of M.V.D. which controls the atom scientists, is a JEW.

Colonel I. Vigdor, counter-espionage officer commissioned to the security service of Soviet Atomic Research, is a JEW.

Major Kahan, secret police official, detailed to the Atomic Energy Committee, is a JEW.

A. Mikoyan, member of the Politbureau and Minister of Commerce, is an Armenian JEW.

M. M. Brodin, Press chief, is a JEW.

Peter Levitsky, vice-president of the Council of the Soviet States, is a JEW.

D. Manuilsky, dictator of the Ukraine, is a JEW.

A. Kornejchuk author and nominal President of the Ukrainian Republik, is a JEW.

A. N. Jacobson, dictator of Estonia and delegate representing Estonia, is a JEW.

N. Jakovliev, head of Soviet public education is a JEW.

Yu Masenko, special expert on Indian affairs and director of the Communist movement in India, is a JEW.

G. I. Levinson, expert of the Oriental Section of the Soviet Science Academy on Chinese affairs, and one of the Chinese Communist leaders, is a JEW.

A. D. Danyalov, member of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet, is a JEW.

F. T. Gusey, Deputy Foreign Minister, is a JEW.

S. Y. Romin, Minister of Building and Road Construction, is a JEW.

D. I. Fumin, Minister of Food and Raw Materials, is a JEW.

Jacob Suritz, Soviet ambassador to Brazil, is a JEW.

Colonel Rudenko, chief public prosecutor delegated by the Soviet to the Nuremberg trials, is probably a JEW.

Isaac Zaltman, director of tractor production, is a JEW.

I. G. Bosakov, director of the cinema industry, and possessing ministerial rank, is a JEW.

Prof. Pontecorvo, director of Soviet hydrogen bomb production, is a JEW.

S. Z. Ginsburg, president of the State Bank, is a JEW.

K. R. Herzberg, chairman of the Torg Bank, is a JEW.

A. G. Samuelenko, chairman of the Vnieshtorg Bank, is a JEW.

X. Yacob Simenov, chairman of the Prombank, is  
a JEW.

## **Communism in Russia a Huge Failure**

If I were to tell you that I knew of a football team run on the following lines—a team in which the players had no voice in the selection of their captain or the Board of Control; a team in which the players were not allowed to criticise their captain or their Board of Control; a team in which the players were not allowed to make suggestions, but could be penalised or dismissed without any hearing; a team that had to allow the Board of Control to interfere in their domestic affairs, telling the players what they were to eat, the quality of clothing their wives and children were to wear; a team in which the Board of Control told the players where they must send their children to school—were I to speak to you of such a team, and were I to say that they were a happy team, you would smile, and say to me: "Have you any more funny stories?"

Now, we are asked to believe that to-day Communism has brought happiness to Russia, and we are asked to take the word of tourists who return from Russia with glowing accounts of Soviet rule. But ordinary tourists see just so much as Soviet officials allow them to see. And these tourists will speak to us about the employment of the country, but employment does not necessarily mean happiness.

Bring two tourists from Europe to Melbourne. Land one at Victoria Docks and bring him through the slums of Fitzroy and Collingwood. Land the other

at St. Kilda and drive him through Toorak and Malvern. Get each to write a book and compare.

Now, in Russia, the following is a very brief outline of the status of individuals: Individual men and women are looked upon as of no importance. It is the State that is everything, and anybody of no use to the State is of no value. So, then, your aged father and mother, your crippled brother or sister—these are simply in the way. Neither are people allowed to criticise the Government.

Individuals in Russia have no rights whatsoever; they are just cogs in a machine, with the same rights as a cog to be set going, or to be stopped, or to be scrapped, as you would act with a cog of a machine.

In Russia, no individual can say that his marriage is "until death do us part," because the State in Russia can dissolve his marriage at any moment.

In Russia, parents cannot call their children their own, because the children are the property of the State, and the State can claim their total upbringing.

In Russia, people may not criticise their rulers. If they do, the penalty is "liquidation," that is, a trip to that country from whose bourne no traveller returns.

In Russia, all material goods are produced for and owned by the State, to be distributed by individuals according to people's needs. There is no necessity for me to dwell upon the many insurmountable difficulties arising from such a plan.

So, then, when anyone asks us to believe that, with such appalling conditions prevailing, the Russian people are contented and happy, we are justified in smiling and asking that person if he has any more funny stories.

A man may be poor materially and yet free in spirit. And he may be well off materially but a slave in spirit. Let me illustrate: A boss will give a good job to X,

an Australian, if X crawls to him. Embellishing his remarks with coloured adjectives, the Australian says: "Keep your job. If I were a crawler I would cease to be a man." Or he might become Shakespearian and say: "I had rather be a dog and bay the moon."

Australians boast of their spirit of independence. Independence would almost seem to be a national characteristic. So, then, knowing what the Communists want, I find it hard to see how any Australians worthy of the name would lick the boots of the Communistic tyrants and their emissaries.

Even if people in Russia were well-fed and well-housed, that would not be enough. Man is not a mere animal. He is something more. Still, even from a purely material angle, things in Russia are not what we are led to believe. It is not the earthly Paradise where workers are ever smiling and children are always laughing.

I shall now quote authorities who are in a position to speak. Let me state the credentials of each:—

William Henry Chamberlain lived in Moscow from 1922-1934 as representative of the "Monitor" of Boston. He can lay claim to being one of the best known of international news correspondents. All our quotations from his reliable work, "Russia's Iron Age," are from the edition of 1935.

Sir Walter Citrine is the General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain and President of the International Federation of Trade Unions. He is a Socialist. He paid a visit to Russia in 1925, and again in September and October of 1935, as the guest of the Soviet Trade Unions. His book, quoted below, "I Search for Truth in Russia," is the diary of his second visit (ed. Aug., 1936).

Andrew Smith, author of "I Was a Soviet Worker" (ed. 1936), was one of the leading Communists of the



U.S.A., who sold all that he had and gave the proceeds to the Communist Party and worked in a Soviet factory for three years.

Andre Gide ("the leading writer of France," as Jean Devanny, an Australian Communistic authoress hailed him) was himself a Communist; wrote stirring eulogies of the Soviet; visited Russia; was feted by the Communists as one of their greatest intellectuals; delivered the funeral discourse for Maxim Gorki, in June, 1936; was sadly disillusioned by the Communist dictatorship; returned and bewailed the degradation of the Soviet man, the failure of the Communist regime, the tyranny of the Stalin administration, and the total suppression of thought and everything else in the Soviet.

These writers, being sympathetically disposed towards Communism, were given facilities for observation which were denied the ordinary observer travelling through Russia on the Intourist system.

What is their verdict? They draw a picture of grinding slavery, poverty, oppression, and consequent misery.

## **Housing**

"Many things have changed greatly and fundamentally since I arrived in Russia in 1922. But two points on which there has been little, if any, improvement are housing facilities and the sanitary habits of the people." (Chamberlain, p. 117).

"As for the standard of living of the people, it seems to me definitely below most western countries. . . . Housing in Russia, as far as I have seen, is terribly congested. It seems to be the rule, rather than the exception, for workers to have ONLY ONE ROOM PER FAMILY. The houses we have seen represent the

latest Soviet ideas. What are they? They are large tenements badly built, sometimes five storeys high, mostly without any lifts. They have no baths as a general rule, and usually only cold water. The nearest public bath may be a considerable distance away. . . . Compare this with Great Britain. I know how badly we need more houses and cheaper accommodation for our crowded people. But it is unchallengeable that the modern house accommodation in England provides at least separate bedrooms and separate bathrooms." (Citrine, p. 118-120.).

Andrew Smith, while working in the Electrozavod factory, received an invitation from a fellow-worker to visit him and his wife in his "home" at the Cherkisovo Barracks. "This worker," writes Smith, "lived with about 550 others, men and women, in a wooden structure about 800 feet long and 15 feet wide. The room contained approximately 500 narrow beds, covered with mattresses filled with straw or dried leaves. There were no pillows or blankets. Coats and other garments were being utilised for covering. Some of the residents had no beds, and slept on the floor or in wooden boxes. . . . There were no screens or walls to give any privacy to the occupants of the barracks. There were no cupboards or wardrobes, because each one owned only the clothing on his back. I could not stay in the barracks very long. I could not stand the stench of kerosene and unwashed bodies. The only washing facility was a pump outside. . . . The atmosphere was one of sadness and misery unbroken. No laughter or song could be heard. I left as quickly as I could. I was told that 11,000 Electrozavod workers lived in such barracks."

It is different with the upper classes, the G.P.U. officials, the new bourgeoisie, as Andrew Smith's book narrates.

"I visited several of those prosperous Kolkhose dwellings, and I would like to express the bizarre and depressing feeling they give one—a feeling of complete depersonalisation. . . . Every dwelling is inter-changeable. Their rooms are only sleeping dens, and their interest in life centres in the club, in the culture park, in the meeting hall." (Andre Gide, "Back From the U.S.S.R.," May, 1937, Ed.).

Citrine describes a visit to Dnieproges. This is known as "the Socialist City," and is one of the "show places" of the U.S.S.R. It is here the famous Dnieper Dam was constructed, about 200 miles from where the Dnieper River enters the Black Sea. Housing conditions there bring this comment from Citrine:—

"There was a row of about six shacks built together under one roof. . . . We looked inside. A wretched, miserable hovel. Five people were living in one room in two beds, covered with rags for blankets. I wouldn't condemn my worst enemy to such a place. There was no water, of course, in this horrible apartment, and I don't know how they cooked, or how they lived in winter. I couldn't ask. I was too indignant to think that they were being let to live like that. Poor guide! I told him that I really didn't believe that any British sanitary authority would permit the existence of such a rabbit hutch. We had slums in England, which made me blush with shame when I thought of them but I had never seen anything comparable with this." (Citrine, p. 213.).

## **Working conditions and wages**

"The workers are simply cogs in the Soviet machinery." (Citrine, p. 307).

"In Western democratic countries, independent trade unions protect the everyday interests of the

workers. The Soviet trade Unions are thinly disguised organs of State, dominated by appointees of the ruling Communist Party, who are more interested in forcing up production than in voicing demands for the best possible real wages and working conditions. . . . Nothing in all Soviet statistical practice is more mendacious than the recording of paper rouble wage increases without reference to the all-important fact that many articles, which could easily be bought at moderate prices without restriction as to quantity in 1926 and 1927, are now unobtainable, or can only be had in minute rationed quantities in cooperative shops, while PRICES ON THE FREE MARKET AND IN COMMERCIAL STORES HAVE RISEN FIVE, TEN, AND IN SOME CASES, EVEN TWENTY FOLD OR MORE." (Chamberlin, pp. 278-9). It is also to be noted that the penalty for cessation of labour—i.e., striking—under the Russian Criminal Code, is ten years' hard labour.

As for the boasted absence of unemployment, Chamberlin says: "Indeed, 'the abolition of unemployment' might just as plausibly be called 'mass conscription of labour.'" An unemployed Russian MUST accept work that is offered him by the State, even if it is in some far-away place." (Chamberlin, Ch. 5).

## **Liberty**

"That Soviet repression is more severe than that of the Tsars is scarcely open to denial. . . . Far more people in Russia were executed or were banished to hard labour without public trial and for political offences during the period 1928-1933 than during the last five years of Tsarism, 1909-1914." (Chamberlin, p. 265).

"Russia has suppressed all political opposition. Liberty of speech, freedom of the press, and public meeting are denied to all but the Communist Party." (Citrine, p. 286).

"The experience of Russia's Iron Age would certainly indicate that the State, as well as the private employer, can be an exploiter."

"What repelled me in particular was the complete subordination of the individual to the theories of the State." (Citrine, p. 153).

"The workers are simply cogs in the Soviet machinery. . . . The worker is nominally the master. In practice he does exactly what he is told to do. Right from his infancy his thinking is controlled. Propaganda is everywhere, and there is no escape from it and no challenge to it. There is never any source from which the worker can learn the other side. He hears only one side. That is the dreadful thing about it. The capitalist tries to govern the worker through the press and elsewhere. But there is a check upon him. There is the platform, the opposition, the Trade Unions and the Labour Press. He cannot misrepresent facts in the gross way the Soviet can and does. . . . There was a time when I was absolutely confident that the dictatorship was only temporary. I have seen no real signs of relaxation. The decision to institute ballot voting in elections leaves me quite unconvinced. It is a step in the right direction, but when the voter can vote for the candidates of one party only, what real choice has he?" (Citrine, p. 307).

"The Soviet Union . . . has enjoyed the unenviable distinction of having a far larger proportion of its intellectuals in prison or in exile than any other country in the world." (Chamberlin, p. 308).

"It is only very infrequently that an official statement indirectly casts some light on the scope of the

Soviet terror. In August, 1933, it was announced in the Soviet press that over 12,000 prisoners employed in the construction of the canal which links the Baltic Sea with the White Sea, had received a complete amnesty, and that over 59,000 more had received deductions of sentence in celebration of the speedy completion of the canal. . . . It would seem that the number of prisoners on this single enterprise would easily exceed the total number of political prisoners in all the countries of Europe, and this at a time when many countries are under dictatorships which employ ruthless methods with political opponents." (Chamberlin, p. 156).

"The Soviet Union is far more thoroughly and hermetically sealed against the infiltration of questionable political, economic and philosophical ideas from outside than any other large country in the world." (Chamberlin, p. 132).

## **Women and work**

"The women were doing arduous and severe tasks, which in a Socialist State were quite unjustifiable. They were performing physically hard work, such as digging drains in the streets, ordinary navvy's work, pulling down houses, and, in short, the very kind of work which, in Great Britain, we tried to protect them from. . . . I said we trade unionists in England were old fashioned. We did not believe that women should be engaged on dangerous or unhealthy work. The Russians just shrugged their shoulders, as much as to say that, as women were paid the same wages as men, they must endure the same risk . . . protection of women is an absurd trade union notion, completely out of date, according to them." (Citrine, pp. 130 and 195).

## Child welfare

"We travelled to the Moscow-Volga Canal with a G.P.U. man. He told me he was in charge of the homeless children, as well as the labour on the canal. He strongly denied that there were any more than 10,000 such children in the whole of the Soviet Russia. I told him that I had read a recent official speech in which it was stated that there were 400,000 of them, who were deserted by parents, and for whom the State had only been able to make scant provision." (Citrine, p. 77).

As we might expect, the ruling class in Russia are not a happy family amongst themselves. Tomskey, trade union leader, and then head of the State Publishing Trust; Gamarnik, called the Inspector General of the Red Army and Assistant Commissar for War; Alexander Cherviokov, President of the Soviet Republic of White Russia—within recent years all went to their eternal reward, having committed suicide while awaiting their trials for treason.

Eight Generals, including Marshal Tukhashevsky, formerly regarded as the brains of the Red Army, were all charged with attempting to destroy the Soviet State, and were shot on June 13, 1937.

On August 24, 1936, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and others, were shot on a charge of supporting the exiled Trotsky in the policy of terrorism.

On January 30, 1937, Piatakov (formerly Vice-Commissar for Heavy Industry), Serebryakov, and eleven others, were sentenced to death by shooting.

Sokolnikov (formerly Soviet Ambassador in London), and Radek (in recent years the leader writer for the Soviet paper "Izvestia") were both sentenced to ten years' imprisonment.

So then, His Holiness, Pope Pius XI., in his Encyclical, "Divini Redemptoris," remarked, with truth,

that "Communism has not been able and will not be able to achieve its objectives, even in the economic sphere."

## **Communism Outside of Russia**

### **Rhodesia**

The Communist thrust into Africa is frightening. In the North there is the Russian dominating influence, and on the east seaboard, we have the Chinese. The Rhodesian Government under the leadership of Mr. Ian Smith, are making a definite stand against Communism and are holding the front line on the Zambesi River against Communist infiltration down the African Continent. In spite of this fact, many gullible people think that Rhodesia is a "police state", threat to world peace, a state where a minority of "white supremacists" are brutally oppressing the African majority. And to add to the myth, these Communist-trained terrorists against whom Rhodesia is fighting are held up as "freedom fighters."

### **China and Moscow**

The "split" between Moscow and Peking has been hailed by some anti-Communists as a weakening of the Communistic empire, but it is all on the surface, a trick to misguide the unwary. The real controversy between Moscow and Peking is primarily a debate concerning the funeral arrangements of the "Capitalists."



## **Cuba**

And then there is the alleged victory of President Kennedy over Communism in Cuba. In point of fact, it was a huge Communistic victory. The story is too long to be told in this book. Briefly, the Russians had deliberately built missile-launching platforms in the open so that they could be easily photographed by American reconnaissance planes. The demand came from Kennedy to remove them. The request was granted by Krushchev on the condition that Cuba was not to be invaded. The promise was granted, but most of the missile installations are underground, and have remained there ever since.

Not only would there be no American invasion of Cuba but America would not permit any invasion from any other western nation. In a word, the Communists extracted a promise from the President of the United States that Cuba, the major Communist base for revolution and subversion in the western hemisphere, would be completely secure.

After obtaining this far-reaching agreement from President Kennedy, Communists then went on to turn Cuba into one of their main centres for the training of revolutionaries from all over the world.

## **Japan**

The war in Europe was started ostensibly over the Polish issue, but it ended by handing over Eastern Europe to the Communists. The war in the Pacific was started allegedly over Japanese control of Manchuria and her penetration of China, but it ended in Russian Communistic expansion in the Far East.

The war against Japan was already won before Rus-

sia came on the scene in the East. Influential groups in Japan were pressing for a cessation of hostilities in the East, for they recognised that they were defeated. The bulk of the fleet was at the bottom of the sea. The Japanese forces, through the strategy of General Macarthur, were helpless. Japanese forces on the Asian mainland were defeated. But Roosevelt and his Communistic advisers put off negotiations till Russia came on the scene, and Russia, almost without firing a shot, collected the great strategic prizes, prizes which, it had originally been claimed, should go to China. Japan was already defeated when the atomic bombs were dropped.

## **U. N. O. Is a Communistic Organization**

U.N.O. is a Communist Jew controlled set-up. So then, obviously it is folly for the anti-Communists to expect a fair deal from U.N.O. And what fiendish glee on the part of the Jews when they see the readers of the daily paper waxing eloquent over the good work of the U.N.O. army in Communistic-infested areas!

In truth, the military forces sent out by U.N.O. into disturbed areas have seen to it and will continue to see to it that Communism will win. On this point, readers should consult—"Who Killed the Congo??" by Philippa Schuyler.

Listen also to Gerald L. K. Smith. Writing in "The Cross and the Flag" St. Louis, U.S.A., August 1949 he said: "In my opinion the real purposes of U.N.O. were as follows:

1. "To make Franklin D. Roosevelt President of the World which was frustrated by his death.

2. "To open the doors of all nations for the spread of Communism.
3. "To liquidate the British Empire and set up a Jew State in Palestine from which eventually the world was to be ruled."

And here let me add: The League of Nations was a Jewish notion. And also let me note: World War No. 1 opened with the Masonically-inspired murder of the heir to the throne of Austria.

"It has been estimated that one tiny group, constituting less than one per cent. of the world's population, hold no less than sixty per cent. of the permanent posts in the U.N. organization. As of last year (1951) this tiny but powerful group of Zionist nationalists held the following key posts:"

#### SECRETARIAT:

Dr. H.S. Bloc	...	Chief of Armaments and Enforcement Section.
Antoine Goldet	...	Principal Director, Dept. of Economic Affairs.
Ansgar Rosenborg	...	Special Adviser, Dept. of Economic Affairs.
David Weintraub	...	Director, Division of Economic Stability and Development.
Karl Lachman	...	Chief Fiscal Division.
Henri Langier	...	Asst. General Secretary in charge, Dept. of Social Affairs.
Dr. Leon Steinig	...	Director of Narcotics division.
Dr. E. Schwelb	...	Assistant Director, Human Rights Division.
H. A. Wieschoff	...	Chief, Analysis and Research Section, Dept. of Trusteeship of Non-self governing Territories.

Benjamin Cohen ...	Asst. General Secretary in charge of Department of Public Information.
J. Benoit-Levy	Director, Film and visual Information Division.
Dr. Ivan Kerno	Asst. Secretary General in charge of Legal Department.
Abraham H. Felle	General Counsel and Principal Director, Legal Department.
Marc Schreiber	Legal Counsellor.
G. Sandberg . . . . .	Legal Counsellor, Division for Development and Codification of International Law.
David Zablodowsky	Director, Printing Division.
George Rabinovitch	Director, Interpreters Division.
Max Abramovitz ...	Deputy Director of Planning Office.
P. C. J. Kien. . . . .	Chief, General Accounts Section.
Mercedes Bergmann	Executive Officer, Bureau of Personnel.
Paul Radzianko	Secretary of Appeals Board.
Dr. A. Singer. . . . .	Medical Officer in charge of Health Clinic.

### **Information centres:**

Jerzy Shapiro. . . . .	Director U. N. Information Centre, Geneva.
B. Leitgeber. . . . .	Director U. N. Information Centre, New Delhi, India.
Henri Fast. . . . .	Director U. N. Information Centre, Shanghai, China.

### **International labour office:**

Dr. Julius Stawinski	Director U. N. Information Centre, Warsaw.
David A. Morse ... (Moscovitch)	Director General ILO (Geneva).
V. Gabriel-Garces...	Correspondent for Ecuador attached to ILO office.
Jan Rosner . . . . .	Correspondent for Poland attached to ILO office.

### **Food and agricultural organization:**

Andrew Mayer ...	First Vice-Chairman.
A. P. Jacobsen ...	Representative for Denmark to F.A.O.
E. De Vries. . . . .	Representative for Netherlands.
M. M. Libman ...	Economist, Fertilizer Section.
Gerda Kardos ...	Chief, Fibres Section.
B. Kardos. . . . .	Economist, Miscellaneous Commodities Section.
M. Ezekiel. . . . .	Chief, Economic Analysis Branch.
M. A. Hubermann...	Technical Officer, Law, Policy and Organization Section of Forestry and Forest Products Division.
J. P. Kagan. . . . .	Technical Officer, Logging and Equipment Section.
J. Mayer. . . . .	Nutrition Officer, Nutrition Division.
F. Weisel. . . . .	Director, Administrative Division.

### **United nations educational, scientific and cultural organization (unesco):**

- Alf. Sommerfelt ... Chairman, Committee for External Relations.
- J. Eisenhardt . . . . Director, Division of Temporary Intl. Council for Education Reconstruction.
- Miss Luffman. . . . Head of Division of Education for International Understanding.
- Dr. O. Klineberg ... Head of Division of Tensions.
- H. Kaplan . . . . Head of Bureau of Public Information UNESCO.
- C. H. Weitz . . . . Head of Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget.
- S. Samuel Selksy Head of the Bureau of Personnel.
- B. Abramski . . . . Head of the Division of Housing and Travel.
- B. Wermiel . . . . Head of the Division of Recruitment and Placement.
- Dr. A. Welsky. . . . Director, South Asia, Field Science Co-operation Offices.

### **International bank for reconstruction and development:**

- M. M. Mendels ... Secretary.
- Leonard B. Rist ... Economic Director.
- Leopold Chmela ... Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of Czechoslovakia.

E. Polak . . . . .	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of Czechoslovakia.
P. Mendes-France ...	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of France.
A. M. De Jong ...	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of Netherlands.
C. M. Bernaldes ...	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of Peru.
D. Abramovic ...	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of Yugoslavia.

### **International monetary fund:**

Josef Goldmann ...	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of Czechoslovakia.
P. Mendes-France ...	Member, Board of Governors, Rep. of France.
Camile Gutt . . . . .	Chairman of the Executive Directors and Managing Director of International Monetary Fund.
Louis Rasminsky ...	Executive Director for Canada.
W. Kaster. . . . .	Alternate, Director for Nether- lands.
Louis Altman. . . . .	Assistant to Managing Direc- tor.
E. M. Bernstein ...	Director of Research.
Joseph Gold ...	Senior Counsellor.
Leo Levanthal ...	Senior Counsellor.

### **International refugee organization:**

Mayer Cohen. . . . .	Director General, Department of Health, Care and Main- tenance.
----------------------	---

- Pierre Jacobsen ... Director, Dept. of Repatriation and Resettlement.
- R. J. Youdin. . . . . Director, Repatriation Division.

### **World health organization:**

- Z. Deutschmann ... Chief, Technological Section.
- G. Mayer. . . . . Chief, Translation Section.
- Dr. N. Goodman ... Director General. Department of Operations.
- M. Siegel. . . . . Director, Administration and Finance.
- A. Zarb. . . . . Director, Legal Section.

### **International trade organization:**

- Max Suetens. . . . . Chairman, Interim Commission of ITO.

### **International telecommunications union:**

- F. C. De Wolfe ... USA member on Administrative Council.
- Gerry C. Gross ... Assistant Secretary General, Secretariat of ITU.
- H. B. Rantzen ... Director, Telecommunications Services for UNO.

### **International civil aviation organization:**

- A. G. Berg. . . . . Chief, Airworthiness Section.
- Col. A. G. Katzin ... UNO Representative in Korea.
- George Movshon ... UNO Information Officer in Korea.
- Ernest A. Gross ... US Deputy Representative.



- Isador Lubin . . . . Economic and Employment  
Commission.
- Julius Katz-Sochy ... Permanent Delegate from  
Poland.
- Dr. Alex Bebler ... Permanent Delegate from  
Yugoslavia.

It is obvious that not only Israel, but all other countries, are represented by the Jews at the U.N. The same group supplies the representatives for both the Communist and Western Nations. Under this set-up Communism has expanded on all fronts without effective opposition from the U.N., and the Middle East U.N. policy has cost the West the friendship of the Moslem world and the oil of Iran.

Students of international affairs have long warned, and events now confirm, that the real purpose of the U.N. is to pave the way for a 'World Government' to which all nations (but one?) surrender their sovereignty and independence.

One of the most dangerous features about the United Nations is briefly this: After the European retreat from Colonialism, premature independence is being given to people not yet fit for peaceful self-government. This means that every new "nation" brings a fresh vote to the Communistic set up of the United Nations and note: it is a matter of history that the first Premier of the new "nation" of Gabon, formerly a French colony, is one Leon M'ba who served four years in prison for eating his mother-in-law.

United Nations is going to be stacked with all types, and the Western European nations will be acting upon decisions made by some individuals from areas where people are eating one another.

The United Nations failed to insist that the Israelis honour the United Nations agreement they signed with

the Arabs in Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1949. Under this agreement, Jerusalem was to become an international city. Arab territory taken by the Israelis during the 1948, 1949 fighting was to be restored to the Arabs and the one million Arab refugees were either to be allowed to go back to their homeland or to be adequately compensated.

## **Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.) is Communistic**

The diabolical schemes of International Finance are many and varied, but each scheme has the same end, namely, the destruction of small business, the reduction of the masses to the status of wage earners who will be forced to go cap in hand to the big Boss for employment. And never forget that High Finance simply loathes anyone with an independent outlook on life, and in their judgement such a one must be ruthlessly crushed.

Interference is the order of the day. Men who have neither worked upon a farm nor have any intention of working on a farm and have not even a nodding acquaintance with agricultural science, have the presumption to give advice to those who are experts at the game. Truly, "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." But these bunglers and meddlers are highly paid Government officials, and every man has his price, provided it is made large enough.

I have spoken of some of the schemes of the Communistic World Planners. Let me mention some more of their tricks.

At the outset, let us bear in mind that an idea is not necessarily good just because it happens to be new.

Neither does mass production give us a better article. More often than not, we are handed veritable rubbish, whilst small business is noted for the production of a superior type of goods.

"The powers that be" will unnecessarily cut down food supplies, but, as a palliative, they will offer allegedly free medicine. I say "allegedly free," because careful analysis will reveal that there is not such a bargain after all.

Let me deal with the sanity (or, better, insanity) of such proposals. Suppose it is very wet underfoot. I send you out with a broken pair of boots but am ready to supply you with a bottle of cough mixture. However, if I am able to do so, I would be acting more humanely if I gave you a strong pair of boots without reference to any cough mixture.

Now, our Communistic Planners would show more of the milk of human kindness, not to speak of common sense, if they took care that people got good food and in abundance. You cannot beat nature's ways, and good health and good food go hand in hand. Good health cannot be poured into a medicine bottle to be transferred later on to a sickly human frame. But happiness among the masses would not suit Communism, because the germs of Communism flourish in the swamp of discontent.

There is another point in connection with Communistic Planners in their quest for world control, and that has reference to the different parties in Government.

We pointed out in the beginning of our book that each Political Party can be compared to a racehorse, but the International Financier is the jockey. No matter how fanciful or attractive might be the name of the racehorse, the jockey in the saddle is the one who has control.

Now, the names of Government Parties in reality mean very little, but these names can be used by High Finance into tricking the masses so that the masses will give up their liberties one by one.

Let me clarify all this: Smith has a grown up family of 7 sons. I want those 7 sons to come under my control. If I approach them directly, or indirectly through someone whom they view with suspicion, my plans will fail. But suppose that I get their father to approach them. In that case they will yield to their father because they will argue in this way: "Our dad is asking us to hand over our rights and privileges to him. It is hardly likely that he will lead us astray."

That little story should help us to be on our guard against the tricks of High Finance around election time. High Finance will want people to give up their rights and privileges one by one. If they are approached by a Government party which on the face of things, at least in name, is not friendly with them, they will refuse to swallow the bait. But if there is put into power a Government which they regard as friendly towards them, then, without suspecting the trick, they will yield their privileges one by one to this allegedly friendly Government. So long as High Finance gains its object, it does not worry about the Government Party that is in power.

And in the realm of taxation, owners of landed property of respectable dimensions have ever been a thorn in the side of the barons of finance, but these owners must be brought into submission. They must be heavily taxed. In their endeavour to raise this money for taxation, in all probability these owners will be forced to borrow and give a part of their land as security. A financial crisis can then be engineered and the mortgaged property can easily pass on to a new owner, whom there is no need to specify.

People do not require board meetings to run their domestic affairs. Usually, if any article of household use is needed, the deficiency can be repaired by the simple device of getting it without further delay. Yet, if things are to be run according to the new plan of red tape so much so that people will grow entangled in it, then we can expect something like the following:

Mr. and Mrs. Brown want to run a little home as the advocates of the New World Order would like them to do it. So they adopt the following plan: A spacious homestead next door is purchased, and its many rooms are used as offices by committees and sub-committees all of whom are necessary for the better running of the Brown household.

Mr. Brown holds a meeting, himself alone being present, and proposes and seconds and carries unanimously that he will be the Director-General of Domestic Affairs in Household Brown. Then after consulting himself he appoints his wife as Deputy-Director of Domestic Affairs.

Then Brown selects a Manager for the many important officials all necessary for the solving of household problems. This Manager then appoints committees and sub-committees of whom more anon. Naturally there is a cook, the lady Minister for the Interior. She, of course, will have advisers for this Department for Internal Affairs. Of course, there is the General Secretary to take down the reports of the proceedings. Incidentally, he will take down, if possible, everybody else! He will have his assistant secretaries. There is, as you might expect, an adviser on the quality of the paper to be used and an adviser to him as to the place best suited for the buying of paper.

When all committees and sub-committees have been established, the zero hour has arrived, and advisers

and sub-advisers of committees and sub-committees, are all ready to tackle the serious problems of household management for the aforementioned Browns. To be Shakespearian, we "See them stand like greyhounds in the slips, straining upon the start."

The first item to be considered is the shortage of eggs, because the Brown family are partial to eggs, so much so that of late they have been cackling. The cook is in a state of feverish excitement to get something straight away, because her motto is: One boil in the pot is worth two on the neck.

A meeting of the Advisory Committee is called at once. There is a veritable avalanche of business questions to be asked and answered straightaway. First, what quality of eggs are to be bought? Are they for electioneering purposes or household use? By secret ballot on specially prepared paper it is decided unanimously that the eggs are needed for household purposes. That would be obvious to anyone accustomed to doing things in the out-of-date common-sense way, but under the planned economy system, no—a thousand times no!

Having settled that the eggs are to be used for household purposes, the Committee next discusses the age and quality of the eggs. Are they to be eggs of the old brigade, "Lays of Ancient Rome," or are they to be particularly fresh, so fresh that they will be laid on the toast?

The discussion takes a full hour, and after sundry amendments it is decided that two dozen new-laid eggs would answer the needs of the Brown family for two weeks.

But there were other points that had to be cleared up: What was to be the weight and size of the eggs, the breed of the poultry that claimed them for offspring?

Another item: Where are the eggs to be bought? For this there has been established a buying committee with various subcommittees. So this board was called together. Some suggested that it would be advisable to ring up different shops for quotes. Others thought it would be in keeping with shrewd business to make a personal call. After much discussion with pros and cons, it was decided to despatch a buyer by car. So a car is procured, and in spite of the shortage of petrol, the Buyer spends half the day going from one shop to another. He brings back a detailed report of his findings. Incidentally, the lynx-eyed buyer has discovered that one firm had been charging one half-penny per dozen over the Board rate. He suggested that legal proceedings be taken against the offender, whilst, incidentally, nothing was being done against big business that had been robbing the Government and the public to the tune of millions of pounds.

So, eventually, it was decided to order two dozen eggs from I. Layem, of Enfield. But that was not all. A special meeting was held to know exactly how the eggs were to be used; how many for breakfast, how many for puddings, and how many for cakes? Brown was expected to fill in a form and sign it that the eggs in question would be used for these specified purposes and no others. It must not be forgotten that a full account of all those meetings was duly taken down in shorthand and, later on, typed. Each executioner, I mean, member of the Executive, was given a typed copy of the proceedings. One copy was put aside and forwarded to the State Controller for Food Supplies, who, on its receipt, duly put it—IN THE WASTE PAPER BASKET.

It will have been noticed that the aforementioned committees and sub-committees were busy doing nothing. They were sabotaging time and material.

There was much ado about nothing. They did absolutely nothing, either directly or indirectly, to help the war effort and to produce real wealth. To put it simply: They went in a circle, but on their journey around the circular track they caused no end of inconvenience and annoyance.

Mr. and Mrs. Brown, by following the simple, old-time methods, could have got better results and more expeditiously, but under the New Order red tape is everything and results count for nothing.

This little parable of the Brown family may seem ludicrous, but it is not one iota more absurd than the modern way of doing the most commonplace things.

There is in our midst a callous movement to tyrannise over man's activities. It is that organisation known as Political and Economic Planning. Its first chairman was Sir Basil Blackett, a Director of the Bank of England. The present chairman is Mr. Israel Moses Sieff. It is a scheme to centralise power, to divide people into two classes—the Planners and the Planned. The Planners are supposed to have all the brains (save the mark!) and all the directive ability. The Planned, namely, the bulk of mankind, are reputedly so lacking in these qualities that control of their affairs must be taken from them. Clearly, it is a scheme to Bolshevise the British Empire under the pretext of national emergency.

Peace does not supply the conditions necessary for the carrying out of the plan. This was brought out in the P.E.P.'s Journal, October 4, 1938, when it said: "We have started upon the position that only in war, or under the threat of war, will a British Government embark upon large scale planning."

To bring in planning effectively, the scheme is simple: The international finance gangsters start a war. They pick out a man whom they know they can



dupe, some power maniac who will do their bidding—for instance, a Hitler or a Mussolini. Consciously or unconsciously, these dictators are furthering the end of the money powers, although these dictators would have been happier had they remained as paper-hangers or peasants or blacksmiths.

Once a war is started, the Government is tricked into passing, or is forced to pass, emergency acts. Power is centralised, and privileges hard earned after centuries of struggle, are taken away overnight.

Now, that is what has actually come to pass in England, and has come to pass in Australia. Of course, we are expected to believe that all this is necessary for the successful issue of the war. But will these privileges be given back after the war? "That is the question." However, it is true that in war time there will be need to relinquish some privileges, but only for the duration of the war.

People do not fight better if their freedom is taken away. There is an old expression that every man should keep to his trade. Yet under P.E.P. control the farmers and manufacturers will have a corporal standing over them, giving them orders. The farmer will not be allowed to use his own judgment as to what his land can produce or what is needed for current demands. A manufacturer will be powerless to produce what he thinks is in demand by the public. He will be handed a list of the things which are to be produced, and the corporal over him will see that the list is conformed to.

Yet, producers do not need to have ignorant bureaucrats running around telling them what to do. If producers are provided with the necessary finance, they can deliver the goods. Before this modern craze of interference, the Australian producers were able to "deliver the goods." The flow of goods from producer

to consumer is blocked, not by the retail house, but by the shortage of money.

So, then, P.E.P. and Communism have the same objective, namely, world control in the hands of a few. And note, if P.E.P. is to function according to plan, a network of spying will be spread over the masses. Of course, people will be free to buy, but buy just what the Planners produce and at the Planners' price.

Planning is really needed by the masses, but it is not the planning of the type advocated by Israel Moses Sieff. The plan needed is one of united action on the part of the masses. Goods are unsaleable, not because of the system of having small shops, or small centres of production, but goods are unsaleable because the barons of finance control the money necessary to bring goods from producer to consumer. We have an enemy without, but the big Banker is the enemy within.

## **Federal Union is Communistic**

The greenhorn, translating the opening lines of Caesar's "De Bello Gallico," said: "All Gaul is quartered into three halves." The International High Financiers do not want to quarter the world into any halves. They aim at uniting the whole world under one super-government. This, their proposal, gives food for thought, although it will not give food for digestion. This movement has at its command the use of the radio and the use of the press. It is a movement to bring in what is known as the Federation of the States of the World.

The vast majority of people fail to realise that "Federal Union" is but another name for world dictator-

ship, a huge police State, with one central authority set up either in Europe or in U.S.A. With the whole world under its domination, these rulers will have power without responsibility. The Wall Street Financiers (not the American people) are to be these rulers. They are the group who financed the Russian Revolution. They seem to take for granted that the rest of the world is incapable of knowing what is good for them; that they are nothing better than "cannon fodder," and do not count in the scheme of things.

Under this scheme of Federation of States the British Nation will have neither army nor navy. The world's dictatorship will be armed with a fleet of bombers, and any objecting nation will be bombed promptly into subjection. So, then, there will be no nations, no wars, no opposition, no freedom, but total servitude. For the rulers there will be a paradise (of a sort); there will be a veritable hell for everybody else. People will live in fear of the execution squad and the concentration camp. Criticism will be stifled by fear of the secret police. And note, too, people will be subject to absentee management, which means that they are to be governed by rulers who have no idea of, nor care for, their needs.

So what it all comes to is this: Mankind is going to be cured of all its ills if they give up their liberty and all those hard-earned privileges for which they and their fore-fathers have fought, and if they allow themselves to be ruled by a vague, impersonal authority, who look upon them as mere cattle. You may as well promise to cure a man of toothache by offering to chop off his head.

Although Federal Union is one of the most poisonous ideas ever presented to a long-suffering and deluded humanity, it appeals to many sincere but immature minds, who have innocently been ma-

noeuvred on to the wrong side. One has only to read that book, "Union Now," by the Jew, Clarence Kirshman Streit, and the arguments in favour of Federal Union will be seen.

To trick people into accepting Federal Union, the Jew, Sir Victor Sassoon, appeals to fear. Read his article which appeared in the Sydney "Sun" on 19th June, 1941:—

Los Angeles, Wednesday.—A world federation of Democracies, with Britain, Australia and Canada becoming part of the United States, was essential, declared Sir Victor Sassoon, multi millionaire industrialist and financier in the Far East, in an interview, as he was leaving Los Angeles to-day for Shanghai.

"There is no other way to stop Hitler," he said. "It is now so obvious to business men of the world that a Federal Alliance is necessary that it hardly bears discussion.

"England must come into a democracy of the United States, with the full right of Statehood.

"It is also obvious that England must give up her traditions and institutions of government."

The membership of Federal Union is to be as follows:—

						Deputies	Senators
Australia	...	...	...	...	...	7	2
Belgium	...	...	...	...	...	8	2
Canada	...	...	...	...	...	11	2
Denmark	...	...	...	...	...	4	2
Finland	...	...	...	...	...	4	2
France	...	...	...	...	...	42	4
Ireland	...	...	...	...	...	3	2
Netherlands	...	...	...	...	...	8	2
New Zealand	...	...	...	...	...	2	2
Norway	...	...	...	...	...	3	3

	Deputies	Senators
Sweden. . . . .	6	2
Switzerland. . . . .	4	2
Union of South Africa . . . . .	2	2
United Kingdom . . . . .	47	4
United States. . . . .	<u>126</u>	<u>10</u>
	277	42

Hence, it can be seen that the British Commonwealth of self determining nations will have 69 deputies whilst U.S.A. will have 126.

Advocates of Federal Union argue something in this wise: War occurs between States. So, then, abolish States and there will be no war. But the abolition of the State is not the logical answer.

Let me put it this way: The Browns and the Smiths are neighbours in a certain street. I cause strife between them, and they fight one another. What is more, I am always causing friction between them. What should be done? Would you put both families into one big house? Oh, no! I am the one who should be removed, because I am the mischief maker. Even if they quarrelled without my provocation, you would not put them into one house, because, if they could not agree when separated, things would be much worse if they were put to live under the same roof.

Now, let me apply that to the different warring small countries. These States war with one another, not because they are separate countries, but because the barons of finance urge one on against the other. The only way to stop the trouble is to control these mischief-makers. Even if two nations hate one another without being urged on by brutal mischief-makers, you will not bring peace and harmony by trying to unite them as one big nation.

In spite of what is sometimes said, people in general

do not want to fight, but the exploiters of other people like to see them slaughtering one another.

Advocates of Federal Union will say that trouble also arises between nations owing to trade difficulties, and they will give this solution: Unite the nations and the trade difficulties will disappear. Here again they are wrong, and, I believe, consciously wrong.

Suppose there are ten towns, each with its own shop. Each shop is well stocked, but in every town there is a shortage of money. Obviously each shop is hit. Now, suppose that somebody says: "Get all your stocks and put them into one big shop, and get all the people to come along and buy in that one big shop." You can see at once that there will still be the same total money shortage.

Now, there are usually plenty of goods in every country, but in each country there is shortage of money for purchasing the goods. If, then, the countries become one big country with all those goods, all the available money for buying that huge stock will fall short of the amount required.

The craze for centralisation is nothing less than a menace to our freedom. The more you increase the size of an organisation, the more you reduce the power of the individual. In all known works of Federation, its introduction has brought in centralisation of power, but less liberty for the individual. So it must not be a cause for wonder when we say that it is a well-known fact that the smaller the State, the greater is the chance of anything approaching democratic government; whereas, the larger the State, the fewer are the chances of democracy.

The scholarly Catholic Coadjutor Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. J. D. Simonds, showed more than ordinary insight and courage in issuing a timely warning against the trend of Government's filching of

the people's liberties under the pretext of war emergency. His Grace said recently: "We must be very much on our guard these days to see that fundamental liberties we possess are not endangered." His Grace further declared that "The Constitution is the greatest safeguard against infringement of individual liberty."

When we look at the achievements of science, we find that inventions are not the result of organisations. They are the fruits of a few individuals working without red tape or interference. See the other achievements of history—the noble buildings that have been erected; the clearing of a country and the making of it fertile, etc., etc. All these things were done without Government interference. Those in charge were not afflicted by that obstructive, restricting disease known as "red tape." The necessary money was given out for these works of construction, and the people went ahead and did the rest themselves.

Turn to the so-called leaders who have gained complete control over large masses of people. What is their record? They have proved to be an unmitigated curse, leaving behind them a trail of bungling, misery and death.

There will be no solution to world problems unless we deal drastically with those individuals, no matter their race or country, who are trying to reduce the rest of the world to the condition of slaves to be kept in subjection by the world police force.

## **International Currency Plan is Communistic**

We shall deal briefly with another Communistic movement on foot, namely, the International Currency

Plan. Without their being consulted in any way, the peoples of the different countries are to be further and further strangled by international finance by having the issue of their money based upon gold, the bulk of which is in Fort Knox, U.S.A.

We pointed out in an early chapter that money is an order on goods; that money is a piece of paper with writing on it, and that this paper gets its value because goods can be picked up with it. We emphasised that the goods to be picked up give the backing to the money. But the international gangsters want money to have a different backing.

Now, let me take this case: E.G. has a poultry farm. He has a manageress, M.G. E.G. wants X to get a hen. He writes out a note to his manageress, saying: "Give Bearer, X, a hen." You see that the hen gave the backing to the note. Suppose that Dives comes along and says to E.G.: "I have a new scheme for all poultry farmers. It is going to be the new way of running things. I have a lump of gold buried in the earth in my back yard. You must not write out any notes unless you have a piece of my gold. In other words, only my gold is to give the backing to the note. You can borrow that gold from me. At least, if you pay me so much, I will let you have the use of that gold."

But E.G. has too much common sense, and in indignation he replies: "Your gold has absolutely nothing to do with my authority to write out notes for hens to be picked up. If I want to write out a note authorising anybody to pick up my hens, all I need is to have the hens. Your gold has absolutely nothing to do with it. If anyone wanted a hen and there were no hens about, I would look very foolish if I said to that person: 'Yes, there are no hens about. Still you can have one because Dives has a lump of gold buried in his back yard, and he will lend it to me.' So, then, Mr. Dives,



please keep your gold. I do not need your help and I do not want your interference. Your interference would act as a hindrance to me. If I agreed to base the issue of my notes on the gold you held or were willing to lend me, it would mean this: If someone came along to me to get a hen, instead of writing out a note straightaway authorising the picking up of the hen, I would be forced to see if you would lend me so much gold to give, as you contend, a backing to my note. Suppose you refused. Where would I be? Even if you lent me the gold, I would have to borrow it from you. For this I would have to give security plus interest. Suppose that all the gold you had was worth a £100. That would mean that only £100 worth of hens could be picked up and my production would be limited to that amount. So, to be candid with you, I distrust your plan. It is only a game to get me and other poultry farmers under your thumb. Your gold was once lying idle in the ground. At great expense, it was dug up and transported and then put back into the ground. Since you are the owner of that gold, you are anxious to trick me into agreeing to make your gold a basis for the issue of my notes."

That little story will help to throw light on another Communistic movement on foot, namely, the basing of international currency on gold.

Elsewhere, when speaking of the building of the house worth £1,000, I pointed out that that £1,000 got its value from the material and the labour of the workmen. The real wealth of a country consists in the goods of that country plus the work of its inhabitants. The money to be issued at any time depends for its existence upon those two factors, namely, the goods and the labour. The existence of the money has absolutely nothing to do with the amount of gold buried in the vault, either in that country or any other country.

You could get all that gold and tip it into the sea, and it would not and could not interfere with the production and picking up of the goods in any particular country.

In spite of that elementary fact, perfectly clear to all except those who do not want to see, there is a movement on foot to base the money issue in countries throughout the world, not on the goods and labour of the people in each country, but on gold, most of which is in a vault in Fort Knox in U.S.A., and is owned by international financiers.

We have said elsewhere that members of parliament are elected to place the wishes of their constituents before Parliament and to gain the ends desired by the electors. Now, if I hire a taxi and pay the driver to bring me somewhere, I insist upon getting there. I do not pay him and then let him drive me wherever he wills. Yet, this international currency movement is something set on foot to base each nation's money supply on gold. It is a trick to fool the people under the hope of post-war stabilisation of currency. So members of Parliament should oppose it tooth and nail.

In brief, the plan is: An international Board will be set up, containing members from the various nations concerned. A huge fund of billions of dollars will form the international currency, and these dollars will be based on gold. There are ostensible purposes for this scheme, e.g., to facilitate international trade, etc. The planners have as much heart as the dear old lady who put special cheese in the mouse trap because it was Christmas time.

To become a member, "Members are required to make initial payments to the fund of at least half the total subscription in GOLD CURRENCY or GOVERNMENT SECURITIES." As about 70 per cent.

of the world's gold is stored at Fort Knox, U.S.A., members will have to borrow the gold they need for membership. Obviously, at once member-nations are in debt to the owners of the gold.

Let us see the obvious result as regards Australia: Australia is a huge country with wealth beyond calculation. Suppose, for instance, on the principle of the building of that house worth £1,000, we wanted to produce 100,000 houses of that type. Then, if the labour is here and the material, our own Commonwealth Bank could issue the money necessary. But someone says: "We ought to use the gold in U.S.A. to give the backing to our Australian production." We Australians answer at once: "What has the gold in Fort Knox got to do with the money for buildings in Australia? Absolutely nothing." But, suppose we are forced to base the issue of our money on gold in U.S.A., what then? We would be handing ourselves over still further bound hand and foot to international finance.

We hear it suggested that the Government should control banking. Mr. Montague Norman is reported as saying that he would welcome such a scheme. So, at once, we must be on the look out for the nigger in the wood pile.

Suppose that I am the prize basher in a village. I am getting away with it for I have the crowd scared. Suppose that the police back me up. If that happens, then I become a double menace.

Now, the big Bankers at the present time are a menace to civilisation and are getting away with it. If the Government takes control of banking in the way pleasing to Mr. Montague Norman, then, what happens? The big Bankers will still control finance, but they will become a double menace because they will have the Government forces at their back.

The following illustration might help to show how

the issue of money should be regulated: I dip a thermometer into warm water. The heat of the water determines the height of the mercury; in other words, it controls the height of the mercury. But the height of the mercury does not control the heat of the water. Now, the amount of goods waiting to be picked up should determine the height of the financial barometer. It is these goods which should control the output of the money, and the control must come from nowhere else.

Or we can put things this way: In every country people are dying and are being born. The statistician takes note of all that. His figures are determined, are controlled by the number of deaths and births. But his figures do not determine how many people are to die or to be born.

Now, in every country things are being destroyed (consumed) and are also being produced (or waiting to be produced). It is the duty of a specially appointed civil servant just to calculate all this. These goods are what will control his figures. So, properly speaking, the control comes from the goods. In other words, the goods and not the civil servant will determine the amount of money to be issued in any particular year.

## **Communitic Professors of Economics**

We could never draw too much attention to those rapacious, financial cormorants aided and abetted by flunkey-minded politicians and sycophantic professors of economics who are more concerned with the placating of their own selfish cravings than with the interests of Australia or the British Empire. For impu-

dence, shameless mendacity and brazen-faced hypocrisy charmingly blended, it would be difficult to surpass these perfervid denouncers of Nazism who are continually drugging Australia with their two-penny clap-trap sort of propaganda. Every low device that most mean-minded tool can suggest is being used against Australian liberty. These political grasshoppers and time-serving ambitious salary-hunters are trying to rob us of our nationality. They are showing neither wisdom nor mercy nor tenderness nor intelligence. They are endeavouring to destroy every desire for national expression. They are seeking to rob us of our liberties, one by one.

If there is one thing we hate, it is hypocrisy and humbug. Now, at the present time, we are faced with a depth of hypocrisy that is too low for words—the post-war planning scheme of the professors of economics.

We have sent hundreds of thousands of men to fight for our very existence; to allow Australians to choose their own way of life and obedience; to prevent Hitler and his satellites from determining the fortunes of Australia and from reducing us to the status of Axis-controlled slaves. This declaration of purpose, again and again reiterated, has swept our citizens to arms and has spurred them on at immense sacrifice of blood and treasure to give battle with the enemy of our Empire.

Whilst Australian soldiers are fighting one set of gangsters abroad, another set of gangsters are entrenching themselves on the home front.

While the flower and promise of Australian manhood are being shot down in their struggle to keep inviolate our shores and to reap the blessings of democracy, we have in our midst a certain section of politicians and professors of economics—ugly blots on the

face of our fair creation—who are bent on nullifying the beneficent results of that war victory which we hope will be ours.

These dazzling democrats and accomplished artists in mendacity with greasy unctuousness have again and again mouthed oaths on the rights of people to democratic rule. They have wept with joy on the transcendent blessings of democracy as compared with the abysmal wickedness of the savage, brutal, bloodthirsty Hitler, ex-paper-hanger of Vienna. Yet, for what are these professors planning?

These very same arch-hypocrites of the nation, apparently without blushing, would like us to remain inactive and uncritical whilst our liberties are being curtailed more and more, especially after the cessation of hostilities.

Let us ever bear in mind that there are duties devolving upon public men exercising authority. Public authority is to be exercised in the interests of the people. Politics is not a game to be played for high stakes. It is a ministry instituted for the benefit of the people. Yet, if we search our political life with a lantern, we will discover that with some parliamentarians politics is a game played with a pack of lies. With some, the political life constitutes a training ground for corruption, bribery, dishonesty, intrigue, craftiness, equivocation, temporising, circumvention.

Politicians are the paid servants of the people. Let me put it this way: You own a business. You have a dangerous, unscrupulous business rival named Smith, who is doing all in his power to crush you. You pay me to run your business. I accept your handsome salary. But, unfaithful to my contract, I actually play into the hands of your business rival and directly or indirectly, if not both, I help to crush you. You wake up to what is going on. No one can blame you if you

reprimand me or dismiss me without further delay.

Now, politicians are the servants of the people, paid by the people to look after their affairs, but some of them would sell their grandmother. Unfaithful to those who put them into parliament, some of them are playing right into the hands of High Finance. Can their electors be blamed for sacking them at the next elections? Can the electors be blamed if in the meantime they inundate them with correspondence demanding a fulfilment of their promises? The unsuitable candidates who were itching to get into Parliament, were scratched at the poll. The same should be done with many a candidate for parliament.

But the professors of economics would like us to have confidence. Confidence in whom? The machinery of deception is so vast and so complicated that even good people find themselves manoeuvred on to the wrong side. Confidence in whom? In journalistic Jeremiahs who are paid to spread, not their own views but the views of the owners of the paper concerned. Confidence in whom? In those professors of economics who conveniently prefer to talk about the future rather than face the realities of the present.

Those of us whose memories are not particularly bad, remember the attitude of our professors of economics during the last depression. It would tax the ingenuity of the most sagacious fiend to invent a more bare-faced and wholesale destruction of goods. "You must economise! You must practice self-sacrifice!" screeched these tools of High Finance during the depression. In tearful pleadings they told the masses that they must economise at once and not waste money on homes for the needy or milk and fruit for the poor. The poor were urged to accept a miserable few shillings a week for dole, and they were expected to believe that this was the best that could be done for

them by a harassed and benevolent government. They were urged to be honest and not to steal in spite of their gnawing stomachs. But, at the same time, all those in high places were not honest.

A humorous suggestion was made on how to live on 1/10-1/4d. Sunday to Friday:-

Horse 1 lb. . . . .	3d.
Dog (spotted) 3/4 lb . . . . .	1/2 d.
Liver (cat's) 1/4 lb . . . . .	1/4d.
Sparrows (if caught). . . . .	.0d.
Oatmeal 6 lb . . . . .	6d.
Lard 2 lb . . . . .	6d.
Milk 2 tins. . . . .	3d.
Treacle 1 tin. . . . .	2-1/2d.
Eggs (dried). . . . .	.1d.
Curried Favour. . . . .	.0d.
Bog trotters. . . . .	.0d.
Stake in the country. . . . .	.0d.
P's and Q's . . . . .	.0d.
Salary Chops. . . . .	.0d.
Mutton Heads (any quantity). . . . .	.0d.
Dandelion Leaves, ad lib. . . . .	.0d.
Sorrel, ditto. . . . .	.0d.
Fresh Fruit (blackberries, billberries, wild straw- berries). . . . .	.0d.
Daisy leaf tea . . . . .	.0d.
Water (lots). . . . .	.0d.
Saturday	
Conglomeration Pie (from scraps). . . . .	.0d.
Teapot rinsings. . . . .	.0d.
	1/10-1/4d.

And whilst the needy were suffering the pangs of hunger, our University professors of economics, clad in purple and fine linen, were thriving on the spoils of a



desolate land; were preaching economy over a magnum of champagne; were disappearing out of one another's sight in the exquisite upholstery of their fashionable drawing rooms, or were strutting around the country, true specimens of civilization for the edification of the mere dregs of humanity.

Of course, these professors would have us believe that they were only extending the sphere of their influence and were working out their heavenly appointed destiny as the protectors of the oppressed and exploited in all corners of the globe.

The present-day professors of planning are akin to, if not in some cases identical with, the professors of economics of the last Depression. What is more: That same spirit which gave birth to their arrogance, ambition, tyranny and inhumanity, and guided them in the dark days of the last depression is with the economic professors today in all its naked horridness.

Not many weeks ago at Canberra, there was a gathering of Planners and would-be Planners. It was held under the nominal auspices of the so-called Australian Institute of Political Science. Let me here quote from the "New Times" of February 18th, 1944. They give the words of a Sydney press correspondent:-

"Canberra, Saturday.—A hundred thousand words, many of them delivered in broken accents, made a memorable gathering of the Professors' Picnic, or as it called itself, the Australian Institute of Political Science Summer School.

"In at least two ways, the official title was accurate. The discussions were political, and it was certainly summer at the time.

"Whether the school was Australian, whether it was scientific, and whether it was even a school, are matters which are open to question.

"For instance, the Count with a monocle was hardly Australian.

"And hardly Australian, in the fullest sense of the word, were the solid phalanx of "recent" Australians latterly citizens of European Axis countries—who advised us to abandon White Australia, codify our laws, and pull up our socks generally.

"Hardly Australian were the very noble sentiments expressed by the scholarly departmental heads who demanded that for our own sake we should perpetuate them in office, that we should submit to a loss of liberty out of which, as Dr. Lloyd Ross put it, a fuller liberty would emerge."

The professors of economics promise us a "new order". What kind of a "new order" may we expect? A world of misery and incalculable suffering to millions, a staggering debt to all the nations involved; a lower standard of life from which civilization will never arise.

So then, we are to have a continuation of regimentation and interference after the War. People will continue to lose their liberties one by one. Yet, by some type of inexplicable mental gymnastics, the professional planners would have us believe that by losing our liberty we are to gain it. On the same basis of reasoning, then, pickpockets and other staunch adherents to the "mine-thine" doctrine would be unqualified benefactors of mankind, because by arguing in the fashion of the professional economists, these other crooks could say that, by taking away people's money they are actually increasing its supply.

But to come to particulars—every type of rationing and coercion which is now on us in war time with, perhaps, more force than is necessary, will be prolonged after the war. The planners seem to take it for granted that there will be a dearth of material, al-

though, at the present time, to take one item, retail butchers have complained that their shops are full of meat which is unsaleable because there are not enough coupons. What would be said to the Railway Commissioners if the following were to happen? Suppose there are crowds at a railway station, waiting for the trains to take them. Empty trains are leaving the platform, and the trains are running empty because there is a shortage of railway tickets.

In point of fact, there will not be any shortage of goods that will require rationing. The materials will be there in the country, and men will be there to work, and there will be the genius of builders to direct. If here in Australia we can build such a world famed structure as the Sydney Harbour Bridge, why cannot we build houses for the submerged masses, to lift them out of the misery of soul-searing destitution?

In the islands which are inhabited by "savages," man and material are used whenever they are considered necessary. But, then the "savages" have no private banks, nor credit loans, nor interest, nor professors of economics such as we "civilised" people have.

No! the interference with peoples' rights will benefit, at least, two groups: It will benefit the hordes of government officials with their secretaries to secretaries to secretaries. It will benefit above all the communistic scheme to reduce the masses to the condition of cogs in a machine.

The professors' plan will not confine itself to what we shall eat or wear. It will go further. We shall be told where we are to live. Not only that, but the planners will decide for parents whether their children will be sent to Universities or relegated to work in coal mines or canning factories, or, to quote from "The Sentimental Bloke," their children might be "pastin'

labels in a pickle joint . . . A game that . . . any'ow, that ain't the point."

These professors, who go to Bedlam for their discretion, and across the River Styx for their principles, would have us believe that their planning is absolutely necessary for the domestic peace, happiness and prosperity of ordinary John Citizen. And if we fail to adopt their plan, then, according to them what might we expect? Misery, starvation, degradation, in all their native horror and grossness. Think of a heavy leaden day of dark oppression, with a multiplicity of wretchedness far beyond the powers of our imagination to conceive—all this, we are asked to believe, will be a faint picture of the lot in store for us if we refuse to give up the very thing for which our soldiers are fighting, namely, democracy.

Is it any wonder, then, that these proposals are steadily earning for the planners the scorn and opprobrium of the masses? Is it any wonder that there is a veritable mountain of distrust for these minions of High Finance, these skulking Hitlers in miniature, these arch-hypocrites of the nation?

To place such professors on the pedestals of honour is the most tragic farce that anyone could tolerate. It is an insult to common intelligence, not to speak of the insult it offers to Christianity and right living.

## **Hitler and the Jews**

As we are writing these pages there has been published in Australia a pamphlet entitled, "World Leaders Condemn Nazi Barbarism." It appeals to all and sundry to give whole-hearted opposition to Hitler in his diabolical treatment of the Jews. It speaks of a

mass protest meeting in Sydney on November 10th, 1942.

A full comment on this pamphlet would bring us far outside the scope of this book, but we shall give a few points which may be of value to our readers. It would be interesting to know how many of the Christian speakers spoke with their tongues in their cheeks.

I have already stated that Jews have as much right to live as anyone has. We are all God's creatures, and the race from which we are born, the time and place of our birth—all these things are something upon which no one is consulted. We all have love for our parents, brothers and sisters and children, as the case may be. And there is one common Father to us all, and that One is God in Heaven.

My point with regard to the Jews and their wrong treatment can be well illustrated by the following incident in the life of Pope Pius IX. Shortly after his coronation, Pope Pius IX was riding towards the Ghetto in Rome when his carriage was held up by the presence of a crowd of people in the street. They were surrounding a man who had fallen to the ground in a fit. "What is it?" asked the Pope. "Only a Jew," was the reply from a Christian standing nearby. "Is not a Jew a man and a brother?" said the Pope. And then he added. "Make way for us." His Holiness then stepped from his carriage.

The crowd made way for His Holiness to approach the fallen man. The man lay gasping on the ground, where no one would touch him. But His Holiness had a far different view of the situation. He took the man in his arms, brought him to his carriage, and gave orders to the coachman to drive to the home of the Jew. When the man had recovered, His Holiness departed. But, before departing, he gave him a present

of money, and he also gave him his blessing.

But supposing that a Jewish assassin had attacked the Papal carriage—in that case the coachman would have defended His Holiness regardless of the race of the assassin.

In looking upon that helpless Jew as a brother, His Holiness was only following in the footsteps of Christ, for Christ had laid it down that we are all brothers and that He took as being done to Himself what was done to the least of mankind:—"As long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to Me" (Matthew 25-40). Yet, although Christ was of a warm, kindly disposition, He was absolutely inflexible when it was a question of principle. With His tongue He lashed the oppressors of the poor.

As I point out elsewhere, we are all equal in some respects, but not equal in others. We all have a love for our race or country, and in our own modest way we may all think, our own country is the best. The British sing, "Britannia Rules the Waves." Ireland is "The Emerald Gem of the Western Ocean." Nippon is "The Land of the Rising Sun." We, Australians, sing of Australia as "Our Lovely Morning Land." Sydney people speak of "our harbour" (although it is God Who created such a beautiful harbour). The Innuits of the Canadian northern wastes and the Tuaregs of the Sahara regard themselves as "the People," and even the cannibals think themselves the most wonderful people in the world. So, in fairness, you cannot blame the Jews if they think that they are better than others. Neither can you blame a man who makes a large fortune by honest means. But how many make a fortune honestly?

But, although a man may stand up for his own country, he can go too far, and lay himself open to very hostile criticism. The traveller abroad who insists

upon telling everybody that "these foreigners" (but he happens to be the "foreigner") know nothing, and that things are done much better at home; that his own country could lick the rest of the world taken together, and that his own country is God's own country, while all other countries are places that God forgot all about—well, he adopts an attitude which is offensive.

Now, even the most one-eyed person knows that there are Jews (how many, I cannot say) who flock to a country and before long get control of the wealth of that country, and manage its affairs and behave in a most arrogant way towards the land that has sheltered them. It is known that Jews flocked to England, and when things became particularly dangerous they betook themselves to places of comparative safety.

When the natives of any particular country resent such alien domination, they are at once branded as anti-Jewish, anti-Semitic. But these natives do not adopt this attitude of resentment just because the aliens are Jews. They would resent with equal force any such domination coming from others, whether those others were Japanese or Chinamen, as actually happened in Australia in years gone by, in the case of Chinamen. And what about the American laws against the influx of Japanese into California?

Now, as regards Hitler's persecution of the Jews: there is no doubt that Hitler is an unprincipled scoundrel. Some say that in a Gangster Handicap he could give any tyrant twenty yards in a hundred, and win pulling up. And here let me add that, as regards Hitler's intellectual ability, there is enough evidence to prove he did not write "Mein Kampf," but that it is the work of several hands.

It is true that Hitler persecuted Jews who are innocent, and, for such treatment, one day he will be

arraigned before the tribunal of God. And people of Jewish sympathy are justified in raising a voice of protest against such diabolical conduct.

But, when, through Jewish agencies, Russia, Hungary, Mexico and Spain were being drenched in revolutionary blood, is it not strange no such representative meeting of protest was held in Sydney on behalf of the persecuted and suffering Russians, Hungarians, Mexicans and Spaniards? What prominence did the daily papers give to such atrocities? How many daily papers told us that Red Spain had to its Bolshevik credit 800,000 murders? How many Jews disassociated themselves from the infamous conduct of the persecuting Jew?

But why go back to these persecutions? What about the persecutions being carried on to-day in Germany? Because, undoubtedly, Hitler's doings against Christians in Germany to-day read like the ravings of a maniac. Anyone with even a nodding acquaintance of Nazi persecutions under the Third Reich knows of the wholesale arrests and imprisonments of Christian clergy and the closing of Christian schools and seminaries, a line of action very pleasing to the anti-God Jew.

As a test case, write a letter to the press condemning Hitler's persecutions of the Christians, and also get a friend to write a letter condemning Hitler's persecution of the Jews. Then see what happens. Which will get the more prominence?

If it is good Ethics for the Jews to condemn Nazis who are persecuting their Jewish brethren, then, we Christians are perfectly justified in condemning those Jews who are responsible for revolutions in Russia, Hungary, Mexico and Spain.

How many people did Hitler persecute? For answer to these questions most people have to rely on



the Jew-controlled press. How many people realise that most world news filters through two great European news agencies—the French Agence Havas and Reuter's Agency in Britain. The Havas agency was started by Charles Havas, a Portuguese Jew. Beer, another Jew, changed his name to Reuter, and built up the vast British Empire Service. So, then, newspaper readers look at the world very largely through Jewish spectacles.

I shall show later the diabolical cleverness of the big Jews in utilising Hitler's anti-Jewish spleen to further their own plans.

As we have already remarked, Hitler is merely a tool of International Finance to set things going in Europe.

You see, it is so easy for Jewish International finance to cause the war. Let us take the case of Germany. The Jewish Financier caused a state of unrest and discontent. We hear a lot about the bungling at the Treaty of Versailles, but only the very innocent would believe that the bungling was accidental. Those who arranged the last Peace Treaty did not want a lasting peace, because a peaceful world is of no use to the Communistic Jew. The framers of the Treaty produced a state of affairs which, in due time, would be certain to start a fresh war. Had Germany been properly treated, there would have been no fresh war. Had Germany been broken up into her original States, there would have been less chance of war, but Jewish Financiers at the Peace Conference opposed the splitting up of Germany. A section in Germany glory in war, and can easily be used by High Finance to start a world conflagration.

So, then, Hitler comes to power in Germany. Once he is armed, war starts. Then the International Jew, who armed him, calls to the world to stamp out Hitlerism.

There is not the slightest doubt that Hitler was financed from outside. He was financed from New York. He was financed by the Jew-controlled Bank of England. They helped Hitler to rewind the "Watch on the Rhine!"

Mr. Paul Einzig, one of the best informed writers on finance to-day, says, in "World Finance 1918—1936": "There can be no doubt that practically the whole of the free exchange available to Germany for the purchase of raw materials was supplied, directly or indirectly, by Great Britain. War materials which will eventually be used against this country could never have been produced but for the generosity with which Great Britain is giving her enemy free exchange for the purchase of raw materials. If the day of reckoning ever comes, the liberal attitude of the British Government in this matter may well be responsible for the lives of British soldiers and civilians."

In a speech to the Legislative Assembly in Queensland on the 12th September, 1940, the late Mr. Randolph Bedford, M.L.A., said:

"It is not possible, for instance, to visualise the Commonwealth Bank, restored to its original constitution and strengthened in it, as issuing its money to make loans to a probable enemy nation; but the Bank of England, a privately owned bank, which has been helped by Government stupidity to enormous control of British credit and its large share of international finance, sponsored a loan to Hitler's Germany early in 1939. Montague Norman's comment on this loan to Germany was: "We will have to give Germany a loan of fifty millions. We may never be paid back. But it will be a less loss than the fall of Nazism." Money has no country; the money mongers and the international bankers know no Mother Land."

We know that up to the very eve of war complaints

were being made in England that she was seriously depleting her stocks of copper and rubber so as to comply with the orders from Germany. What a glorious spectacle all this is!

But is it not true that Hitler has persecuted Jews? Yes, he has persecuted the little Jew, although some 400,000 Jews are still left there, some being his best spies in the Gestapo. For years the head of Hitler's secret service was Admiral Canaris, alias Moses Meyerbeer. But the big Jewish banker is still functioning there. Max Warburg is still in Hamburg, also Bleichroeder's, Mendellsohn & Co., J. Dreifuss & Co., Arnold Bros., Simon Hirschland and L. Berends and Sons.

But what about this persecution of the little Jew? It could suit Hitler, but it could be of much more value to the big Jew.

How could it suit Hitler? In this way: People may be in doubt as to Hitler's merits. They hear that he has persecuted the Jews (no distinction is given), and at once they say: "Well, Hitler is not so bad after all."

But the report of Hitler's persecution of the Jews can be of immense value to the International Jews. If the wind blows, John Citizen may complain, but wise Farmer Giles utilizes it with his windmill. Now, the big Jew makes use of Hitler's hatred of the little Jew. It is diabolical cleverness. Suggest to the masses that Jewish finance is at the back of Hitler, and at once you are confronted with the answer: "Impossible! Why, Hitler is actually persecuting the Jews." And so the masses are again led astray. To save their own faces, International Jewry will allow some of their lesser brethren to be persecuted. The International Jew has no particular love for the little Jew, and, after all, the High Command, when in search of victory, do not hesitate to sacrifice a few troops.

There is even every reason for suspecting that the

International Jew was actually behind Hitler in his persecution of the little Jew. Read Protocol No. 9. It says: "Nowadays, if any States raise a protest against us (i.e., the Jews), it is only pro forma at our discretion, and by our direction, for their anti-Semitism is indispensable to us for the management of our lesser brethren." (The lesser brethren are the little Jews).

But to where has Hitler "persecuted" the Jew? He has "persecuted" them to England and Australia.

Speaking of the influx of Jews into England, Douglas Reed says, in his book, "Nemesis": "The things that were best in England were being buried under an imported, alien way of life and way of thinking, that made itself more master of literature and the Press, the stage and the films, the radio and the menu, art, Parliamentary Debates—everything."

Douglas Reed goes on to say: "We were going to war again to keep England's shores inviolate, and at the same time we were opening these shores to an alien influx the like of which we had never seen. Maddest of all, the craziest thing that I ever saw, even in the mad house, 'Insanity Fair,' we were about to give these newcomers preferential treatment in our own land over the country's own sons; they were to be put into posts liberated by the young men who went off to war, and at the price of 'joining up' themselves they could even acquire British citizenship—but the condition of that 'joining up,' set out in black and white, was that they should never be sent to the front. Their lives were to be preserved at all costs, so that they could live in peace and prosperity in England after the war."

Can anyone, now, be so slow as not to see that Hitler, by his persecution of the Jew, is helping to spread world control by the Jewish race?

I would suggest another reason for maintaining that Hitler is not attacking the International Jewish Finan-

cier. Were he actually hostile to the Jewish Financier in the way that is popularly suggested, then, in my opinion, his earthly career would have long since been cut short.

Let me show the fate of some honest citizens who gave opposition to the money-lords: The New Deal events will show the Jewishness of the New Deal.

M. Goga, the Roumanian statesman who, as Prime Minister in January, 1938, took steps to restrict Jewish domination of his country, died suddenly in May, aged 57 years. The London "Free Press" of May said: "His sudden death from 'heart failure' during an intensive campaign against the Iron Guard, leaves the impression that his enemies may know more about his death than has been published."

Dr. W. A. Wirt, superintendent of schools at Gary, Indiana, is recorded by Omaha bulletin, "America in Danger," of March 13, 1938, as having died from heart failure the week before. Dr. Wirt, in 1934, gave evidence before a U.S. Congressional Committee that at a dinner party near Washington, leading New Deal officials had stated in his presence that their object was to overthrow the existing social order; unpayable debt was to be created so that the Government would have to take everything; President Roosevelt was only the Kerensky of the revolution, and would be replaced by a Stalin; until the job was done the press would be kept quiet by threats of censorship, and the farmers by doles.

Sabri Tobrak, called the "Hitler of Turkey," who had introduced anti-Jewish measures in the Turkish Parliament, was noted in the same bulletin as having died suddenly a few weeks before of a series of heart attacks at Istanbul, Turkey.

Mr. Louis T. McFadden, former U.S. Congressman and banker, and for many years chairman of the

House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee, succumbed suddenly to heart failure on October 1st, 1936, at the age of 60. Mr. McFadden, in many speeches in Congress, from 1932 to 1934, had accused certain Jewish international financiers of plundering and bankrupting the United States. Chicago "American Gentile" of October, 1936, said the medical term translated into plain terms gave "clogging of the blood" as the cause of death, "a condition," it added, "usually the result of poisoning when occurring in persons in perfect health."

"Pelley's Weekly" of October 14th, 1936, said Mr. McFadden had been shot at previously when alighting from a cab in Washington, the two bullets fired missing him and lodging in the structure of the cab. On another occasion he became violently ill at a political banquet in Washington, from what was diagnosed as poison. A physician present saved his life by at once procuring stomach pump and giving emergency treatment.

The Republican (Conservative) Party selected Mr. McFadden to open its election campaign in 1934, and the New York Yiddish paper, "Der Tog," on August 2nd, 1934, protested violently at the choice, saying: "Nobody in such a responsible position has yet dared to talk about Jews in such vile language as he did. . . . Does it (the Republican Party) really believe that in America such a provocation to Jewry could pass without punishment?"

Mr. McFadden was defeated at the Congressional elections in November, 1934, by a few hundred votes: at the previous election he had a majority of about 60,000. Kansas "Defender" of September, 1934, quoted "The Presbyterian" magazine as saying: "The Council of the American Jewish Congress is planning a State wide campaign against Mr. McFad-

den in Pennsylvania." James True, "Industrial Control Reports," said he was defeated by a "flood of Jewish money," stating also (4/10/36), that Mr. McFadden had informed him that as much as 20 dollars was paid for a single vote against him. The "Sentinel," American Jewish weekly of Chicago, on October 8th, 1936, announced Mr. McFadden's death under the heading: "Out of the Way."

Comment appeared at this time on other sudden deaths among public men known to be working against the excessive Jewish influence in the New Deal regime. "American Gentile" of October, 1936, noted the following five:

Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, supported the nomination of Mr. Roosevelt, but changed his view on discovering the influence at work. He was killed in an aeroplane crash.

Senator Huey Long, of Louisiana, an outspoken opponent of the New Deal, was shot dead in September, 1935, by a Jew named Weiss.

Senator Thomas Schall, of Minnesota, in January, 1935, exposed in the Senate the secret registration of Government corporations under the notorious Delaware corporation laws as channels for expending Federal funds exempt from jurisdiction of the Federal Courts. Senator Schall, who was blind, was some months later run down by a speeding truck in front of his home. Kansas "Revealer" (12/12/36) said: "Although he was badly injured, he was reported to be recovering, when several days later, he suddenly died. It is reliably reported that an element of mystery surrounded his passing."

Governor Allen, of Louisiana, right-hand man and supporter of Senator Huey Long, succumbed suddenly.

Former Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, who had

addressed a meeting of the Epworth League in Baltimore in the fall of 1936, urging resistance to the forces at work in the New Deal, and announcing his intention of starting next day a nation-wide speaking campaign on the subject, on returning home that night collapsed suddenly and died.

General Charles H. Sherrill, of New York, who opposed American withdrawal from the Olympic Games in Germany, as desired by Jewry, died suddenly of heart disease in Paris in June, 1936. An Edmondson bulletin said that, just before he sailed, General Sherrill had telephoned Mr. Edmondson to "carry on the good work" in his campaign against Jewish influence in the Government.

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to U.S.A. during the war until replaced by the Jewish Peer, Lord Reading, in January, 1918, did not live to reach England. His published letters show him as continually warning those in authority in Britain against certain Jewish machinations in U.S.A. against the Empire. En route to Britain, he stayed at Government House, Ottawa, and on February 14th, 1918, went out on skis with the Duke of Devonshire and two children, but did not over-exert himself. "That evening an interesting man came to dinner, and Spring-Rice talked freely, just like himself. By midnight he had gone to bed. An hour later Lady Spring-Rice from the next room heard a moaning, and came in to find him unconscious." He died painlessly in a few moments. Senator Lodge wrote saying the doctor in Washington who had attended him, regarded the death as inexplicable. He was in excellent health. The facts are set out in "The Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice" (1929).

M. Francois Coty, millionaire perfume manufacturer of Paris, in his newspaper, "Le Figaro," in 1932-



33, published a series of articles, some under his own name, exposing the doing of Jewish international financiers as allies of Bolshevism. The Jewish paper, "L'Universe Israelite," in September, 1933, announced that M. Coty had sent to the World Jewish Conference in Geneva a retraction of his articles. M. Coty died of "congestion of the brain" on July 27th, 1934. "Before his death," said London "Patriot" of August 2nd, 1934, "he was brought down financially by the enemies he had created for himself by his patriotism." His wife became intimate with a Roumanian Jew, whom she later married after being divorced by M. Coty, and this Jew subsequently became proprietor of "Le Figaro."

I do not know how many of the culprits in the above-mentioned mysterious deaths were arraigned before the Public Prosecutor. But, as regards political assassinations, let me quote Mrs. Nesta Webster.

Mrs. Webster (page 339, "The Surrender of an Empire"), commenting upon the assassination of Sir Lee Stack in the streets of Cairo, November 19, 1924, says: "It is a curious point that in the case of practically all political assassinations of recent years, the culprits have been found, usually on their own confession, to be members of a secret society which had ordered them to do the deed, yet in no case has the society in question been brought to book, nor have efforts ever apparently been made to discover its identity. The wretched instruments in every instance have paid the penalty, whilst their instigators have remained securely in the background. Is it not permissible to ask whether behind these crimes there may not be some power so formidable that even the administrators of justice dare not incur its vengeance?"

United action on the part of the masses must eventually defeat the Money-lords. As long as the patient

will suffer, the cruel will kick. If the people go on withholding or hesitating whether this is the time for action or that is the time; if, like Micawber, they "wait for something to turn up," their rights as citizens will be continually and emphatically disallowed, and the rapacious Money lords will continue to laugh at them as fools and kick them as slaves.

## **Six Million Jews Gassed by Hitler Oh, What a Joke!**

Whilst it cannot be denied that the Nazis (as happens in every war) did perpetrate atrocities, there is no foundation whatsoever for the belief that the Jews suffered any more than any other race from the effects of the war.

The story of the killing of six million Jews was concocted by Jewish propagandists, film producers and journalists. The Gentile world has not for one second been allowed to forget the six million gassed by Hitler! Even memorials have been erected to commemorate these millions.

Yet the story is absurd in the light of cold logic. It is pure fiction. Still, it is persistently plugged in the Jew-controlled press, radio and film. "Six million Jews Killed"! "Six Million Jews Killed"! "Six Million Jews Killed". This works out at nearly 3,000 per day, every day of the week for six years. Does it seem likely?

Einar Aberg Norrviken has a pamphlet—"The Falsehood About the Six Million Jews Said To Be Gassed By Hitler Exposed". Now, in round figures, in 1948 (ten years afterwards) there were 18,700,000 Jews. That is an increase of 3,000,000 Jews, but in that

period (the war period) 6,000,000 were gassed. This means that the increase should have been 9,000,000. For a population of 15,000,000 to increase by 9,000,000 in 10 years shows abnormal fecundity.

It is no wonder, then, that Aufbau, a Jewish weekly of New York, December 24th, 1948, described the whole six million story as a pure fabrication.

We are not told a word about the Christians slaughtered in the Jewish inspired Mexican Revolution; not a word about the 800,000 Christians who were the victims in the Jewish-inspired civil war in Spain; not a word about the Polish and Hungarian victims of Jewish persecution; not a word about the six million people who were starved to death in the Ukraine as victims of the food dumping plans of the Kremlin Jews; not a word about the dependants of the victims of Katyn Woods; not a word about the Jewish-fomented wars right down through the centuries; wars in which millions and millions of Christians have been slaughtered. Oh no! We hear only of the six million Jews! This persistent repetition would be sufficient in itself to make us suspect the truth of the charge.

I have just made mention of the Jew-fomented wars, for Jews have no regard for the welfare of the human race. They start and stop wars. They create panics. They produce booms. They pour the blood of millions on the ground without concern. They reduce the human race to slavery.

As I have stated elsewhere, if we consult approved authors, we find that all European Revolutions since the English one of 1688 (financed by the Belmonte family in Amsterdam) down to the present time, have been made possible by Jewish finance. If we consult such works as "Secret Powers Behind Revolution," by Vicomte de Poncins: "Le Peril Judeo-Maconni-

que," by Jouin; "Waters Flowing Eastwards," by Mrs. L. Fry; and books by Mrs. Nesta Webster—if we consult such works as these, we will find that Jewish finance prepared the way for revolution by secret societies and other underhand methods. And then, after the revolution was over, they gained for themselves more and more liberty, together with key positions in the ruling of the Government. Jewish finance has planned and started and paid for and gained by the wars throughout the same period.

The Rothschilds financed the Russians in their war against Japan. At the same time the Jew, Jacob Schiff, financed the Japanese. Half way through the war, the Rothschilds ceased financing the Russians. They sabotaged their lines of communication. Revolution then broke out in Russia, which was all part of the Jewish plan.

It is the old, old story; Jewish financiers (often the same firm) stirring up trouble on both sides, and financing both belligerent parties. The longer the war and the greater the slaughter and destruction, the better it was for the Jewish bankers.

At the Versailles Peace Conference, the Jew, Max Warburg, represented the Kaiser financially, and his brother Paul represented the U.S.A. In point of fact, there were so many American Jews at the Peace Conference in Versailles that people began to think that U.S.A. was a Jewish country which, out of love for Christians, had elected a Christian (Woodrow Wilson) as President.

To come back to the alleged slaughter of the six million Jews! How was the world deceived? Let me quote from "The World Conquerors" by Louis Marschanko (page 155).

"How, then, was the world deceived by the fiction of the extermination of six million Jews? Where were

the gas-chamber scenes and the dead bodies shown in the propaganda film, Todesmuhle (Mill of Death) actually photographed?

"At the end of 1945 new inmates appeared in the concentration camp of Dachau. But these were no longer Jews but some of the defeated German people—the "war criminals". They were ordered subsequently to build various additional auxiliary buildings with the greatest possible speed. But first of all, the horticultural beauties of the camps had to be destroyed because it would be rather difficult for the American cinema-going public to believe that the Jews were suffering amid nice gardens and flower-beds, especially when they came to the cinema in the anticipation of seeing horrors. Thus the workers received orders to dig a blood-pit with a drain pipe for draining off the blood, because it must be made to appear that here Jewish blood had been flowing in streams. The shower-baths, dressing rooms and reception halls had to be rebuilt so that they should appear like gas-chambers. For the sake of achieving this appearance a special separate concrete structure was built with small porthole-like openings, and these contraptions are still on show today purporting to demonstrate that the killing "death gas" was let in through these portholes. The captive workers also received orders to build "a special execution yard purporting to show where the victims were shot through the back of the neck".

"Philip Auerbach, who became Under-Secretary of State in the Bavarian Government, as well as the leader and acting head of German Jewry freed from the concentration camps, had the bright idea that there should be a "hanging tree" in the camp too. A big fir tree standing in the park was tidied up and embellished, and moreover, to the great luck of Auerbach, this tree had a stout branch projecting horizontally.

So the end of this branch was cut off and the remaining stub rubbed with ropes for a long while until it appeared highly polished and capable of providing evidence that every day hundreds of executed Jews had been hanged from this tree.

"The Jews converted this camp into a chamber of horrors and a memorial plaque was unveiled, the inscription on which says that 238,000 persons were cremated here. But the crematorium had only two furnaces. In order to cremate the alleged 238,000 bodies, these furnaces would have had to be kept going for three years without ever stopping, and in this case about 530 tons of human ashes would have been recovered.

Relying on the information received from a bribed Pole in 1949, an American Jewish C.I.C. Officer started excavations on a large scale in the camp vegetable garden. But despite all his tireless efforts and expenses, no ashes or Jewish bodies were found. Small wonder! Since one of the two furnaces of a crematorium had been built after the war for shooting the scenes from Todesmuhle.

Cardinal Faulhaber, the German Archbishop, informed the Americans that, during the air raids on Munich in September, 1944, thirty thousand people were killed. The Archbishop requested German Authorities at the time to cremate the bodies of these victims in the crematorium of Dachau, but unfortunately this plan could not be carried out. The crematorium having only one furnace was not able to cope with the bodies of the victims, nor could it have accommodated the alleged Jewish bodies either. The only bodies cremated were those of inmates who passed away naturally.

So readers will see the fabrication of facts and figures against the Germans to win false sympathy for the Jews.

Whilst all the other nations (Australia and America and Japan) involved in the War are looking for peace signs and are helping one another with finance, technology and industry, the Jews are the only ones to rekindle hatred and revenge. Secretly they are fomenting more and more hatred against the Christians wherever and whenever they can find an excuse that could be publicised by their control of the International Press.

And what about the Eichman trial! Will anyone explain how it could happen that, with all the International laws governing passport travel, Eichman was picked up somewhere in the Argentine and taken, not to a neutral country but to a country of Jewish choice to be tried by a Judge of Jewish selection? And not a word was printed in the International Press until he was securely imprisoned in Israel. What other nation would or could organize such banditry.

In the chapter—"Hitler and the Jews"—I pointed out where many opponents of Jewish machinations in U.S.A. died mysterious deaths. In this chapter I shall give readers more food for thought.

There is the case of GENERAL PATTON. The story is told at length in "World Conquerors" (by Louis Marschalko, page 144).

Briefly—General Patton, Commander of the U.S. Army invading Germany, thought of the Germans as the offspring of Satan. So far as he was aware, things were "so" because propagandists, journalists, and statesmen had said so. But he casually heard of the cruelties being inflicted upon the Germans by order of the Morgenthau plans.

The General was not prepared to put into effect and continue the Morgenthau plans, namely, to convert the internment camps and the prison camps of the Germans into an earthly hell. The General said:

"I have a little black book, and when I get back to the U.S.A., I am going to blow hell out of Everything."

It was not possible to convict Patton at Nuremberg, he was sentenced to death behind the scenes. Those who sat in judgement on him were the same Jews who had convicted the German leaders at Nuremberg. It is well known that on the order of CIC Agents, an "American" car crashed into Patton. As a result of this "accident", General Patton was injured. He was promptly transferred to an ambulance but on the way to the hospital the ambulance collided with a large American heavy lorry, and this time the General was killed. At the same moment something disappeared from his pocket which the World Conquerors had every reason to fear.

Let us now turn to that world figure, JOZSEF MINDSZENTY, Cardinal of Hungary. He had stood up for those Jews persecuted locally by the Nazis. Later on, he protested against the Jews' treatment of his own nationals. With the Jews such an action was an unforgivable crime. He became at once an "anti-Semite". So then, calumny and persecution were let loose upon him. His only "crime" was that he remained human and raised his voice against the persecution of his own people.

It was the Jew, MATYAS RAKOSI—ROTH, the Communist dictator, who entered the lists against him, whilst "ideologically" this campaign was led by JOZSEF REVAI, Minister of Education, whose real name was Moses Kahana. Those who produced faked evidence were IVAN BOLDIZSAR, alias BETTELHEIM, a Press Chief; REISSMAN, Chief of the Publicity Department, and GERA, alias GURNSWEIG, Deputy Propaganda Chief. HANNA and LASZLO SULNER who prepared "his" forged manuscripts were also Jews.



Colonel KRAFTANOV, the Soviet hangman, was brought specially from Moscow. Benjamin Peter-Auspitz, the chief interrogator, put him through the third degree; the Jew KARPATI-KRAUSZ, a wrestling champion, was his torturer; IMRE ZISPZER, the Jewish prison governor, sat next to him all the time, even during the court hearings; and finally, Balassa-Blaustin and Emil Weil administered stupefactive drugs to him.

The Primate of Hungary and the protector of Jewry thus became the victim of the Jews because he wished to prevent a campaign of revenge against his own nation.

## **Fascism is to be Condemned**

To some people the word "Fascist" is synonymous with a cut throat or a villain, but in reality, the word is perfectly harmless. It comes from the Latin word "Fasces," meaning a handful of rods bound together and with a small axe attached to the centre. It was to the Romans what the Sword of State is in a Royal Procession in England. In ancient Rome it was the symbol of authority. For Mussolini and his party "Fascism" means to convey to the world that they stand for Roman authority.

To-day the Fascist doctrine maintains that the State is everything and the individual nothing. According to Fascism, man exists for the benefit of society, and society does not exist for the benefit of man. Fascism is out and out Absolutism. It is a return to the ages of the despots. It destroys liberty of speech, liberty of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of election. Fascism overthrows the noblest ideas of mankind because it is a new form of slavery.

It may be of interest to show points in which Fascism and Communism harmonise, and also points on which they disagree.

You lend me a clock to be returned to you when you think fit. Brown comes along and says he lent it to me, and says he can take it away according to his own good pleasure. You and I object to his attitude, and rightly so. He tries to take it from me, but you and I protest most vehemently.

Now, our life together with all our rights—personal rights, political rights, economic rights—they all come to us from God. In point of fact, He has only lent them to us for just so long as He wills. At any moment God can take away my life with all these rights. The State has not given me those rights. Neither is the State free to take them away. (I am not referring to a case where, e.g., I commit murder).

But, according to Fascism and Communism, all our personal, political, religious and economic rights come to us from the State, and the State may, at any moment, take away these rights from us. So, then, in reality, the State (or the ruler of the State) becomes a usurper, and puts itself (or himself) in the place of God.

Fascism and Communism place all power—the power to make laws (legislative power), the power to carry them out (executive power), and the judicial power—they place all this in one man.

Fascism strives to preserve these dictatorial powers, wherever possible, by propaganda. Otherwise it uses violence. Communism adopts as its principle that "whatever helps the proletariat revolution is ethical (namely, the correct thing to do.)"

A democratic country is a country in which the will of the people is carried out; a country in which the people get the results that they want; a country in

which every institution and every social organisation is for the benefit of the people; a country in which people enjoy personal security and freedom to live their lives without undue influence.

Now, under Fascism and Communism there is not even a semblance of democracy, because in each we find (1) One party Government; (2) No freedom of speech or of the press, or freedom to criticise the Government or freedom to form assemblies. Yet, Communism actually boasts of its democracy.

With regard to the so-called freedom in Russia, hear the words of a former Soviet Commissar, and now repentant Communist, Morris Gordin, Chief of the Press Bureau of the Moscow International up to 1924. In his address in Detroit in 1932 he shows us how Marxism works out in practice. He says: "The Communist Party is a supreme trust, owning everything in Russia. . . . It is the fist which represents the Soviet ideology, brute power. . . . I looked into the matter, and I saw definitely that the voting of the resolutions and everything was not done by the rank and file of the Party. It was the Tcheka which told the Party what to do. . . . To-day, they suppress all free thought. They suppress not only thought. In fact, they have decapitated the nation. They took the head off the Russian people; they butchered every independent intellectual; they exiled hundreds of professors, and any man who tries to think for himself in any degree is an infidel. He is a counter-revolutionist if he does not agree with any Commissar in the Tcheka. In thinking, in writing, the military censorship tells you what to write, how to think, but, even more than—what to write upon what subjects. This means there is no science in Russia, but the science of revolution; there is no religion but the religion of Satan, of Leninism, and this forms the basis of Proletarian Kultur. . . .

To-day nobody is participating in the Soviet Government except the officials of it, the select henchmen of one man, Stalin, the bureaucrat, the Emperor of the Soviet dictatorship, the Czar of the Proletarian Red Empire."

Fascism is essentially national, and exults in sounding the praises of ancient Rome, and to regain lost prestige it exalts war. Communism aims at being international by the establishment of a World State. It used to preach peace, while at the same time it was forming a huge war machine for the "World Revolution."

Whilst Fascism normally uses peaceful means to form the political structure, Communism aims at the forceful overthrow of former political structures.

Whilst Fascism allows private property, Communism does away with private property.

Fascism allows economic classes to exist, and by outlawing strikes and lock-outs it does away with the struggles between the classes. But it does not remove the cause of any possible strikes. (How could strikers succeed with limited funds against big bosses—i.e., provided that strikers' funds are really limited?). Communism stops struggles between one class and another by the simple device of assassinating the "other class." It is as simple as the remedy for stopping a dog from barking on Sunday morning, you shoot him on Saturday night.

Fascism has a planned economy. Communism condemns what it is pleased to call the wage slavery under "the capitalistic system." Yet it gives us slavery under a Communistic dictator.

Communism is essentially atheistic and materialistic. Fascism in Italy stresses that there is something over and above the material side of life.

Fascism encourages religion, but as a matter of ex-

pediency. It encourages home life, but looks upon large families as useful for the supplying of soldiers for the army. Whereas, in Communism, the lowest morals are encouraged, and again, children are looked upon as something owned by the State for augmenting the ranks of the Red Army.

Can we be surprised, then, when we find the Holy Pontiff, Pope Pius IX., condemning Fascism? Let me take some quotations from his Encyclical Letter, "Non Abbiamo Bisogno" ("We Have No Need"): ". . . And we find ourselves confronted by a mass of authentic affirmations and not less authentic facts which reveal beyond the slightest possibility of doubt the resolve (already in great measure actually put into effect), to monopolise completely the young, from their tenderest years up to manhood and womanhood, for the exclusive advantage of a party and of a regime based on an ideology which clearly resolves itself into a true, pagan worship of the State—the Statolatry, which is no less in contrast with the natural rights of the family than it is in contradiction with the supernatural rights of the Church."

And elsewhere we have in the same Encyclical—"A conception of the State which makes the rising generations belong to it entirely without any exceptions from the tenderest years up to adult life, cannot be reconciled by a Catholic either with Catholic doctrine or with the natural rights of the family."

George Seldes, in "Sawdust Caesar," page 244-5, speaks of the famous reply of the Pope to Mussolini on the occasion of the visit of the professors and pupils of the College of Mondragone. In that reply to Mussolini, the Pope speaks of Mussolini as the devil.

And referring to the educational policy of Mussolini, his Holiness says: "We cannot admit that in its educational activities the State shall try to raise

up conquerors or encourage conquests. What one State does in this line all the other States can do. What would happen if all the States educate all their children for conquests?"

On page 253 of the same book, Seldes says: The Pope, like the King—it is no secret in Rome—remains anti-Fascist. He knows that his adversary is acting a part. He knows also that a dictatorship can disappear as suddenly as it is born. . . . The Pope's own verdict on Fascism is very simple: "Nothing built on violence ever endures," he says. The totalitarian or corporative State, in the opinion of Pius XI., remains "un-Christian."\*

With regard to the Pope's attitude to the Italian attack upon Abyssinia, let me quote from the late Cardinal Hinsley in a Preface to "The Pope Speaks" (Faber & Faber Ltd., London, 1940): "What about Abyssinia? Well, from the lips of Pius XI. I heard a public utterance to this effect—in a public audience the Christmas before the Abyssinian invasion. 'If all my efforts to prevent this barbarous tragedy prove unavailing, then I can only pray with the Psalmist, "Scatter the people that desire war".' Yet neither these words nor the verse which he quoted, expressly mentioning Abyssinia, "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands to God," appeared in the Italian press. To all the world the Pope is a father and a friend!"

Let us notice a few further historical facts with regard to Pope Pius XI and Abyssinia: (1) When Mussolini gave orders for the illumination of Rome to celebrate the Abyssinian victory, the only dark spot in Rome was the Vatican. . . . (2) When Mussolini ordered all bells in Italy to ring at 3.15 p.m. on the date of the conquest, the bells at the Vatican were

---

\* This was written before the downfall of "Sawdust Caesar."

silent. . . . (3) Pope Pius XI administered a rebuke to the Fascist press for distorting his address to the nurses on August 22nd, 1935. The address had been so distorted as to make it appear that His Holiness favoured the conquest. . . . (4) When Mussolini used strong efforts to have Pope Pius XI crown Victor Emmanuel as the Emperor of Abyssinia, His Holiness refused.

Before concluding these pages about Italy and Fascism, it were well to touch on the origin of the finance which keeps Italy going. The funds for the famous march on Rome in October, 1922, came from High Financiers. In the "New York Times" of October 30th, 1929, Signor Nitti, former Italian Premier, declared that Fascism was kept going only by being spoon-fed with loans from international bankers in Wall Street, U.S.A., secured on the best of Italian industries. It was the two Jews, Volpi and Pirelli, who financed the march on Rome.

## **Persecution of Religion in Russia**

Let me say something further with regard to the persecution of religion in Russia.

It is a well-known trick (a contemptible one, I grant) for a footballer to be told to "get" some prominent player in the opposing team. The "getting" of that player will make victory surer for the culprit's side. Now, the real enemy of Communism is religion. Those who believe in God, who maintain that Christ of the Gospels is God, who believe that man is more than a mere animal, but is destined for an after life, those who believe in the immortality of the soul, who believe in certain inalienable rights of man, who stand up for the sanctity of the home—those maintaining

such beliefs have no time for Communism, at least, when they realise the true meaning of Communism. So, then, we must not be surprised that Communism in Russia should have picked out the Churches and clergy for special attack.

Marx wrote: "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature . . . it is the opium of the people . . . the people cannot be really happy until it has been deprived of the illusory happiness by the abolition of religion." But we must get Marx's meaning.

Let me give a few details with regard to the slaughter of Churchmen in Russia:

From 1918-1920, 26 Archbishops and Bishops of the Orthodox Russian Church and 5,775 priests were massacred. The eyes of the Archbishop of Perm were put out and his face was then slashed, and his Grace was then buried alive. After enduring two months of penal servitude, the Archbishop of Tobolsk was drowned. The Archbishop of Varoneje was hanged before the altar of a church. In 1923 death sentence was passed on the Catholic Archbishop of Leningrad, Monsignor Cieplak, and on Monsignor Budkieviez. As a result of world-wide protests the Archbishop's sentence was commuted to solitary confinement, but protests on behalf of Monsignor Budkieviez were fruitless. The Monsignor was stripped, shot in the back of the head, and buried with nine criminals in one of Moscow's suburbs.

In the summer of 1923, 56 Archbishops and Bishops, most of the Orthodox Church, were held captives in different prisons. Archbishop Cieplak suffered the horrors of solitary confinement in a cell measuring six feet by eight.

In December, 1925, 50 Bishops were arrested. In January the following year the Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church was arrested with 500 of the clergy.



From 1917 to the spring of that year the Government had closed 364 churches in Leningrad alone. In the middle of 1927, nine Metropolitans, 25 Archbishops, and 83 Bishops were arrested and thrown into prison or taken into concentration camps, or sent in exile into Siberia or Turkestan or the Caucasus. No charges were made against them; they stood no trial. In the concentration camps the prelates were compelled to do all kinds of menial work.

In the history of the world we have seen one religion persecuting another, but the Communist movement in Russia aims at the destruction of anything supernatural in life.

With the coming of the five-year plans, anti-religious activities became intensified, and those who had any active belief in any form of religion had their physical and moral courage put to the test. W. H. Chamberlin, in "Russia's Iron Age," page 312, says: "The basic tenets of religion, its ministers and practitioners are ridiculed in cartoons, caricatures, posters, and moving-picture performances; denounced in books and magazines; satirised on the stage; held up to scorn and opprobrium in the anti-religious museums, which have now been installed in many of the most famous Russian churches and monasteries."

In 1917 there were about 896 Catholic Priests in Russia, and, according to a Russian paper issued in Warsaw, only 30 remained by 1936. The remainder had either been put to death or imprisoned or banished. It is well known that, to-day, practically no Priests remain at liberty in Russia. Even foreign priests are not allowed to enter the country.

We may well imagine what has happened to the churches and monasteries and convents in Russia. Some of the churches have been demolished, whilst others have been converted to other uses, namely,

anti-religious museums. Monasteries and convents have become the property of the nation, whilst ecclesiastical property is under the control of the local Soviets.

When one plan or set of plans fails, the Communists are ready to adopt another line of action. Every low, contemptible device that trickery can suggest is used by the Communists to fool the masses. So, then, of late we have had the famous Trojan Horse Policy. In classical literature, we are told how the enemy entered Troy by being concealed in a huge wooden horse.

Listen to the words of Dimitrov, the new General Secretary of the Seventh Communistic Congress. It appears in "International Correspondence" page 1036. Here are his words:

"Comrades, you remember the old legend of the taking of Troy. The Trojans had defended themselves from the attacking army by building impregnable walls around the city; and the attacking army, after suffering heavy losses, was only able to gain the victory when, with the aid of the famous wooden horse, it had penetrated into the city, into the very heart of the enemy."

So, then, the aim of Communism has not changed, though its tactics have changed. Here again let us quote Dimitrov:

"We are sometimes accused of departing from our Communistic principles. What stupidity! What blindness! We should not be Marxist or Leninist Revolutionaries, nor Disciples of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin if we were not capable of completely altering our tactics and our mode of action as circumstances may dictate. But all the deviations and all the ins and outs of our tactics are directed to a single end—the World Revolution." (Taken from the Verbatim

Report of the Seventh Congress, No. 39, page 1846).

From what we have just said it is obvious that the recent dissolution of the Comintern is only a Trojan Horse tactic.

But it might be said that Russia has, of late, modified her harsh treatment of the Church in Russia.

There is a little song which says:

"Mother dear, may I have a swim?  
Yes, my darling daughter.  
Hang your clothes upon the limb,  
But don't go near the water."

Now, that little song sums up fairly well Russia's so-called freedom of worship given at the present day. On analysis, it is all so much "window dressing." Russia as much as says: "You are free to worship, but just try it on." I might as well say to a child: "You are free to go to a picture house, but if you go in, look out for the consequences."

Article 124 of the new Soviet Constitution says: "In order to insure to citizens freedom of conscience, the Church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the State and the school from the Church. Freedom of worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda are recognised for all the citizens."

Now, let me examine that. The Constitution guarantees "freedom of worship" and "freedom of anti-religious propaganda." So then, a person can worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, provided he can find a church or a religious minister. But it is extremely difficult to find one. The Communist Party declared that at the end of the second five-year plan, namely, 1937, there would not be a single edifice in Russia consecrated to religion. The atheistic paper of Russia, entitled "Bezbojnik," of

May, 1935, when speaking of the churches, says: "We have closed all the opium shops." In January, 1936, Soviet newspapers declared that the last Catholic Priest in Odessa was cast into prison.

Although a person may worship God in Russia, he would not be allowed to establish a religious school or distribute pamphlets on religious subjects, nor broadcast religious talks, for all that would be "propaganda". But, on the contrary, the Communists have the right to propagandise against religion.

E. Perovsky recently wrote a book entitled: "Anti-religious Education of the Elementary Schools." In this book of 12 chapters he explains in strict didactic manner the various points to be assumed in anti-religious teaching. In the first chapter teachers are invited to raise the degree of anti-religious education to the very highest point.

We have spoken of the difficulty that would be met by anyone in trying to find a minister of religion. Even were he to find such a one, his chances of success would be practically nullified. Sunday is suppressed. Attendance at religious service during the week would be next to impossible, because the closest scrutiny is made of workers who absent themselves from work on Feast Days of the Church.

In the schools, by means of the cinema and newspapers and books, anti-God propaganda is being pushed on. It is difficult to realise fully the appalling results of the Communistic attitude towards religion and morality and family life. Sex vice has become rampant. In November, 1920, the U.S.S.R. became the first nation in the world's history to legalise abortion. The Abortus-Troyka was established, a State Commission to which a woman had to apply for a licence to be aborted. Oh, what a degradation of man, of whom Shakespeare says: "Oh, what a piece

of work is a man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a God! The beauty of the world, the paragon of animals!"

There is another trick that Communists in Russia are trying to put over the outside world: It is the attempt to form "fronts" with Catholics and Protestants. Now, readers know the meaning of confidence tricks. For instance, crooks will invite a greenhorn to put his money into some company that they are floating. The greenhorn is put in charge at a handsome salary of, for instance, £50. Everything goes well for the first week. Then, one morning, the "manager" wakes up to find that the company is non-existent and that all his hard-earned money has vanished into thin air like the baseless fabric of a dream. Or you have heard of card sharpers on a train journey. They will invite a stranger to join in a game of cards. For the first few games Simple Simon wins, but when the stakes have soared high, well—you know the rest. Now, Communism wants other religions to join with them and form "fronts". But let these other religions be suspicious of the confidence trick. Communism wants other bodies to join up with them, but, once the union is made, Communism is to take control.

Suppose that the following happened: The "boarders" at Pentridge or Dartmoor held a meeting in which they deplored the laxity of civilian conduct and wanted the ordinary law-abiding citizens to join with them in establishing and maintaining law and order and getting a fair deal for all in the community. You could imagine the roar of laughter from the law-abiding citizens. Any citizen who was not exactly ivory from the neck up, would say: "What is the game of these gaol-birds? Where is the catch?" They

would regard the proposal as worthy of being staged at a vaudeville show. Yet, on analysis, when Communism offers the outstretched hand to Catholics and Protestants, and asks them to form a Popular Front for the promotion of world well-being, what have you got? You have a crowd whose avowed gospel is one of slaughter and repression, seeking union with ordinary Christian citizens whose very nature revolts from such conduct. And whilst gaol-birds could really be anxious to uplift society, Communism is the avowed enemy of social well-being. So, then, when Communism stretches out its hand of friendship, it is offering an insult to anyone of normal intelligence.

Let me give the opening paragraph of a letter sent by the Communist party in New South Wales to the late Archbishop Kelly, of Sydney. The letter appeared in the Communist paper, "The Workers' Weekly" (14/10/38). "Your Grace,—We wish to express to Your Grace and to all our Catholic fellow citizens, our profound horror and anger over the acts of brutality and vandalism perpetrated by the Nazis against the Catholics of Vienna." But not a word of sympathy to Archbishop Kelly on the persecution of Catholics in Russia, Spain and Mexico.

I have said elsewhere that the Russian people are spiritually minded. Now, although religion has been banned in Russia by those who have tried to force materialism, still the country has become full of all manner of superstition. The "Pravda" of June 21, 1935, speaks of some of the citizens as resorting to bloody sacrifices. In the Ural region a holocaust of chickens was offered to a pagan deity. In another case an ass was offered.

## **These Schools for Communism**

At the time of writing our book we are horrified at the prospect of the establishing of Communistic schools in our midst, and to add to the horror, it has been suggested that a certain English Divine should come from abroad and lower himself by being present at such an inauguration.

Readers will have seen that Communism is something more than a "bread and butter movement." It has other aims. So in this chapter we shall give a few points for further consideration. These points will, of necessity, be given without any sequence of ideas. You see, there are in our midst people calling themselves Communists, and yet they are of such varied ideas.

With regard to the training of the future men and women, let me remark at once: Footballers who expect to win matches must be trained on the right lines. Now, boys and girls must be trained on the right Christian lines if they are to be good, upright citizens. God is the "Head Trainer." His way of doing things is the only correct way.

It is true that there are employers who are harsh and unrelenting in their treatment of their employees. And whilst these employers in question are drinking of the best at their champagne suppers, or are sinking out of one another's sight in the expensive upholstering of their fashionable drawing rooms, they teach the lower orders how to live economically. But not all employers are harsh.

It is equally true that there are employees who are unreasonable, ever ready to "put one over" on the

boss. But employer and employee are like the two blades of a pair of scissors. They must work together, and one cannot get on without the help of the other. To change the metaphor, they should be like the two brothers who were dentists, and pull together.

There are Communists who would pay a man according to the time he spent in working. What, then, about a medical operation lasting an hour? Would you pay the doctor by the hour in the same way as you would pay your gardener? If you pay a man by the time spent in the making of an article, then consider this case: A man spends a week making a clock, which happens to be a "dud." Another man spends a week making the perfect article. Would you give the same price for each clock?

A Communist may say that Christianity is a failure. To such a Communist I would say: "Suppose you were a doctor. I am sick. You give me a remedy which is sure to cure me, but I do not take it. I die. I am the failure. You are not the failure. Suppose my relatives denounce you in no uncertain terms as being a failure of a doctor. Suppose my relatives attack your home and smash it up crying out: "Medicine is all hooey. The medical profession is all hooey. Down with the doctors." Were they to speak and act in this way, what would you say? Now, Christ has given us the remedy for the ills of this life. He recommends fair treatment for all and sundry. He even goes so far as to place Himself in the position of the poor, taking as done to Himself what is done to them. If the remedy is not carried out, Christianity must not be blamed for it. Where is the logic in destroying churches erected to the honour of this Christ and God of the Gospels? And here let me add: If Christians act in an unseemly manner, they so act not because they are Christians, but in spite of their being Christians. Suppose a boy is



well reared by good parents, but turns out to be a blackguard. He so acts, not because of the good training of his parents, but in spite of it.

There are individual Communists who would put God out of their daily life altogether, and take no notice of His commands, regarding His commands as something which may be accepted or rejected. Now, suppose that a football team decided to have no captain, or to take no notice of the orders of the captain, each man being a law unto himself. You can imagine the chaos. Now, what will happen among men if God, the Captain of all men, is set aside?

Let me here remark that there are anti-Communists who object to the mention of God's name even in anti-Communist literature. Let me briefly comment: Not to mention God would be to play Hamlet without mention of the Prince of Denmark, or, let me put it this way: Take a kind, loving father of a large family for whom he has well provided. They live in his mansion and they enjoy his hospitality, for he supplies them with food and raiment. The children believe in treating one another with courtesy, but as for their kind loving father—well, no mention must be made of him or of their obligations towards him. Now, God is the Loving Father of the universe. We are His children. We should be good to one another, but it is gross neglect to try to exclude God from His own mansion where everything depends upon Him for its existence.

It may be said: "X has no right to own that mansion because no one should live in such luxury." My queries now are many. What is to be done with that mansion? Surely, you would not destroy it, because that would mean loss of real wealth. Would you sell it and give the money to the poor? But how far would that money go? Suppose you distributed £10,000 among 10,000 people: that would be only £1 each. But I have a fur-

ther difficulty. That new owner, also, should not be allowed to possess it, for if X has no right, neither has the new owner any right to it.

To those who say, "All men are equal," I reply: Why is it that only some men are fit to be captains of a football team? The answer is obvious. Because we are not all gifted in the same way. We must ever remember that we are all equal in some ways. We are all equal in so far as we are all God's children and are meant to get to heaven. We are all equal in so far as we must all keep God's law and the law of the land, no matter our state of life or the colour of our skin. We are all equal in that each and every one of us has certain God given rights which no one may take from us. But there are ways in which we are not all equal. We have not all the same ability, the same physical strength, the same fitness for leadership, etc., etc. Ask a well-to-do fashionable Communist to give his daughter in marriage to a worthless, drunken, ill-bred loafer. That father would object on the grounds that the proposed son-in-law was not on an equal scale with his daughter.

Communists are mischief-makers. Mischief-makers in a club are soon put out. Now, leaders of strikes are mostly mischief-makers, and whilst their poor dupes may be on the bread line, these leaders are well paid, and are surrounded with the good things of this life. Of course, there are occasions when it is lawful to strike.

Communism teaches that the individual is for the benefit of society. That is wrong. Society is for the benefit of the individual, but man is not for the benefit of society. If a man's trousers are too short, you lengthen them. You do not cut off his legs. Yet, Communistic tactics would cut off his legs. Again, if the baby does not like the milk, you boil it (that is,

you boil the milk, but not the baby). Yet Communistic tactics would boil the baby.

Education means development, and thorough education means development of the body and mind and soul. Every gaol-bird shows lack of development of soul. Now, let us consider this point. There are instructors for the development of the body and the development of the mind. Why, then not have clergy for the development of the soul?

If you give me something, you expect me to say, "Thank you." Yet the Godless do not thank God for His gifts.

Communists will sneer at the idea of looking forward to heavenly reward, and they will refer to such expectations as "Pie in the sky." Yet, young students will burn the midnight oil in the hope of getting good results in many years to come. Fruit growers will plant young trees expecting only after many years to gain the results of their labours. How, then, can it be called nonsense to do good on earth in the hope of receiving a heavenly reward that will last for ever?

We believe in having clean hands and clean bodies. Yet what about having a clean soul? Children in school are taught to listen to and have respect for their teacher. Yet, what about having respect for Jesus Christ, the greatest Teacher of all times? We extol the heroes of the world, but what about extolling Jesus Christ, the greatest Hero of all times?

We keep pictures and paintings of heroes, and, as we have seen in one Preface, in Red Square, in Moscow, the remains of Lenin were scientifically preserved, and thousands of ardent Communists looked upon him as a deity, and even made pilgrimages to his tomb. Yet, some Communists will regard as so much "muck" the pictures and statues representing our Lord, Jesus Christ.

Communitistic teachers will admire works of art—painting, sculpture—and they will speak in glowing terms of the artists or sculptors who were responsible for these works of genius. Yet, they will not speak a word in praise of the mind of the Divine Artificer of this world.

There are Communists who will celebrate Russian victories. Yet, they will not celebrate the greatest victory in history, the victory of Christ on Good Friday.

Communists will teach the ancient history of Rome and Greece, and they will speak of Roman and Grecian gods and goddesses (figments of the imagination). Yet they make no mention of (except to scoff at) the one true God of the universe Who always was and always will be.

Communists teach loyalty to unprincipled scoundrels. Yet, they will actually preach disloyalty to God, the King of Kings.

Communists will salute the red flag, but there is no salute (but only contempt) for the Christian Cross, reminding us of the true Cross on which Christ died for our redemption.

Communitistic teachers will speak of Plato, and Aristotle, and Julius Caesar, who lived before Christ, but they will try to reject the existence of that historic person, Jesus Christ, because, as they say, He is reported to have lived too many years ago.

There are Communists who will denounce the clergy for not standing up for the masses. But if any clergyman does stand up for them, then Communists will tell him he should keep to his own sphere and not meddle in politics. Let me add: The clergy in general hesitate to denounce the big banker because they are entangled in church debts. Yet the policy of silence is getting the masses further into the mire.

Some Communists will to-day deny God's existence, and tomorrow they will blame Him for not stopping the war. But if, as they say, God does not exist, how can He act?

Communitic teachers will say that there is no God because He cannot be seen. Yet, they will speak of the centre of the earth, although they have never seen it. They will speak of their lungs although they have never seen them.

Sarto, a Communitic tailor, says the world made itself and that religion is all nonsense. The sincerity of his remarks can be tested in the following manner:

Get him to make you a suit. When you come to take delivery say: "I need not pay you for making that suit. If, as you say, the world made itself, then you cannot find fault with me when I say that this suit made itself. Even if you did make it, you cannot object to me if I refuse to pay. It is true that religion commands us to pay our just debts, but you say that religion is all nonsense. So, the obligation to pay my debts is all nonsense.

"Religion obliges us to respect our neighbour's good name; not to injure his person, etc. But you say that religion is all nonsense. So you must not object if I vilify you, or if I man handle you."

A Communitic lawyer will say that religion is all nonsense. To such a person I would reply: "You are a lawyer. When you defend a client, you are trying to prove that he has observed the law of the land. If your client is taking action against another, you are trying to show that the other person has violated the law. Your actions show your solicitude for the observance of the law, that is, the law of the State, but religion is the law of God."

Communitic doctors will say that they have never seen the soul, although they have operated on the

human frame. But, then, they have never actually seen an electric current, neither have they seen the air.

Communitic teachers will say that the earth hurls itself through space. Yet if I throw a cricket ball at one of them and hit him, and tell him that it hurled itself through space—well, you know the rest!

Communists will say that the clergy have no right to voice their sentiments on politics. Yet, the clergy have to observe the laws of the land, and if they have the burdens of citizenship, why not also the privileges of citizenship?

Communitic teachers will say that we have no freedom of the will. So, then, deliberately smash the bicycle of a Communitic teacher and say: "Please, sir, I smashed your bike. I am sorry, but I could not help it." Say this, and then listen to his comment.

Communitic teachers will say that we are free thinkers. Then say this to such a teacher: "Mr. teacher, I think your mother is a scoundrel." If he does not strike you physically, he will give as his reply something like this: "You have no right to think in that way. My mother is a thorough lady, and you must think of her as she really and truly is."

Communitic teachers will say that the world evolved itself. So then, if it evolved itself, it evolved itself out of something or out of nothing. If it evolved itself out of something, who made that something? Because that something could not make itself.

If the Communist says it evolved from nothing, say to him something like this: "Suppose you are a carpenter and I lock you up in an empty room and ask you to make me a wooden boat. You will say, 'Where is the material to work upon?' Suppose you leave that locked room and you and I stand outside and we look at that room. I then tell you that a boat will be made in that room. You will laugh at my folly, because,

first of all, there is no builder in that room, and, secondly, because there is no material to work upon. Now, if there was once a condition of things, a complete blank, in which neither God nor material existed, how could the world come into existence?"

Communitistic teachers will say that "religion hinders the industrialisation of a country, stupefying the minds of men and workers by a belief in an immaterial God." Now, we have shown that the money-lords, by their control of finance, control the industrialisation of the world. The following of one's religion does not make a person poor. Let me put it this way: You live up to your religious beliefs. You deal honestly with all around you. Some others are unfair and dishonest in dealing with you, and you become poor. What has made you poor? It is the dishonesty, the want of religion, on the part of the other man.

If, as Communitistic teachers will maintain, religion keeps you poor, then these Communitistic teachers advise you to do the wrong thing and thereby become rich; but teachers are supposed to teach you to do the right thing.

Communitistic teachers will advise children to throw over religion. Now, as I have already shown, religion means simply this—believing and obeying God. What would the Communitistic teachers say if their pupils disbelieved and disobeyed them?

Communitistic teachers will say that everything in this world is material. Yet, tell a Communitistic teacher that he has not an idea in his head. Tell him this, and see how he reacts.

Communism pretends to have a great love for children. Yet, it aims at separating children from their parents, sometimes even under pretext of saving children from bombed areas. Such a separation is completely unnatural, and will produce Communism's

desired result—namely, the ruination of the home.

Communists will look upon the clergy as parasites. Now, suppose you were a doctor, and people neglected to consult you, although you were ever ready to help them. How would you like these same people to call you a parasite on the community? Yet, those who call the clergy parasites are the very ones who never avail themselves of the spiritual administration of the clergy.

Communists speak of a classless society, that is, one in which all are in the same grade. Now, fancy a football team in which every man was the captain, or a football team in which there was no captain or even a vice-captain! Fancy a workshop in which every man was a manager, or a workshop in which there was no boss!

A classless society (save the mark!). Without a doubt, Comrade Troyanski, the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, is a prominent member of a classless society, because he has a luxurious Embassy for diplomatic functions, and he hires a suite at the Waldorf-Astoria when he visits New York City.

A classless society! What would happen if the children in the school said to their Communistic teacher: "We are all on the same level with you. After all, you believe in a classless society."

A classless society! Here are two cables on the one day; one from London and one from New York, and both A.A.P.:

"London, May 25: At a great banquet at which Marshal Stalin entertained the United States Director of War Information (Mr. Elmer Davies) and 46 other British and American representatives, the menu included caviar, dried sturgeon, herring, roast beef, cold ham, galantine, salads, then wild fowl, chicken soup, Siberian salmon, snipe, turkey, strawberries,



coffee, cheese, fruit, sweets, nuts, liqueurs, red and white Georgian wines and vodka with hot pepper and champagne."

And "New York, May 25: The chairman of the Russian delegation to the International Food Conference at Hot Springs (Virginia) stated that Russia was not getting enough food from America through the Lease-Lend Agreement. He declared: The devastation and impoverishment of Russia as a result of the war will reach vast dimensions. Russia needs food now and will need it during the entire period of restoration of Soviet agriculture."

A Communist teacher may say: "How do you know God created the world? You did not see Him doing it." Yes, that is true, but a murder is committed. No one saw the murder taking place, and the murderer is not even arrested. Yet the police know that the victim was murdered, and they know it because they arrive at that conclusion from facts before them. Now, those who are honest with themselves must conclude that God made the world.

How can a Communistic teacher take an oath? An oath is the calling upon God to witness that what is said is true. But Communism denies that there is a God. So, a true Communist cannot call upon a being whom he believes to be non-existent. Neither can a Communist say, "good-bye," because "good-bye" means "God be with you."

Communism denies the existence of a soul, and Communistic teachers will tell children to think things over and they will see that they have no soul. But that attitude of "thinking things over" gives away the case for Communism. Let me explain: If a person wants to kick a football, he needs feet. If he is to play billiards, he needs hands. So, also, if he is to think, he needs something with which to do the thinking.

Now, he thinks with his soul. If his arms are cut off he can still think. If his ears and legs are cut off he can still think. But if he is killed he can no longer think, because his soul has left his body. So, then, when a Communist teacher says: "There is no soul. Think things over and you will see that there is no soul"—when he says that, he is like the man who says to somebody: "You have no brains at all. Use your brains and you will discover that what I say is correct."

Communism teaches that we must not call a thing our own if we have not produced it. So, then, we must not call our bodies our own, because we have not produced them.

In one Preface I said that the word "Capitalist" can be used in many ways.

Consider this case: A and B have equal chances in life. Each earns good money. A spends his money in drink and on races. B denies himself that form of pleasure. He builds a nice house, and has a good motor car, and at once a ne'er-do-well loafer will call him a Capitalist.

Communism maintains that no one has the right to private property. But in the Old Testament God forbade people to steal. If it is wrong to steal, then the other person must have a right to that object. Moreover, if you prevent a person from owning anything, you will crush his initiative, you will paralyse competition; you will stop all invention. For why should a man invent something which he will not be allowed to keep, or for which he will not receive a handsome reward?

Communism maintains that if the State wants anything, no matter what it is, the State has a right to it by fair means or foul. So it teaches us that the end justifies the means. Now, suppose Communist A is a

prominent member of a football team and is playing against a crowd of toughs who want to win at any cost. Now, according to Communist philosophy, the toughs will be justified in smashing up their opponents if it is necessary for the winning of the match. Let us suppose that A's leg is broken, and the toughs say: "That was necessary for the winning of the match." How would A take it? Or suppose this case: A murderer is brought up before a Communist judge. The murderer says in evidence: "You know, I wanted to get the victim's purse. He resisted. I killed him. It was the only way out. Your Honour, as a Communist, teaches that the end justifies the means." If that were to happen, what would the Communist judge say?

Let me point out the dangers that can arise from having the masses without property: Suppose I plough a paddock. Here there are three factors: (a) my energy, which belongs to me; (b) the plough, that is, the instrument which I use; and (c) the object worked upon, namely, the land.

Now, the energy is always my own. As regards the instrument, that is, the plough, it may be my own or it may belong to another. So also the third element, namely, the thing worked upon (in this case, the land), may be my own, or it may belong to another.

Hence, if I own my plough and my land, I am fairly independent. I say "fairly independent," because if I need money to get a start I will have to go to the bank for it, and that will involve security and interest. Moreover, if the goods I produced are to be sold, the purchasers will require money and, as we have already seen, the money supply depends upon the goodwill of the banker. But suppose I do not own my plough, and that it can be taken from me. Suppose also that I do not own my land, and that it can be taken from me at any moment. You see at once how precarious is

my existence. Over-night, I could be thrown out of work and be reduced to beggary.

There is another aspect of being entirely a wage earner. If a man is an owner, he has a sense of responsibility. If a man is entirely a wage earner, his being so can have a bad effect upon his character. If a man is a wage earner and has no desire to own some property, his aim in life can easily reduce itself to a desire for more wages, which will bring with it more and more amusement. Not only that, but it is a well-known fact that the country in which the majority are wage earners can easily become infected with revolutionary ideas. Whereas, if more people are owners, even in a small way, the country will be more stable.

Things are bad enough in a country if the bulk of people actually own nothing, but the situation is aggravated to the nth degree if people are actually forbidden to be owners, but must produce everything for the State, to be distributed by the State.

Even if things were to be actually divided among the people, the system would be unworkable, because it would be bristling with difficulties. Let me give a few: Suppose that A and B are the workers. A wastes his time. B works hard. The results are pooled. What then? Again, two men are workers. One is skilled and the other is unskilled. Obviously, they get different results. Yet you pool results. Or suppose you pay according to results. Then consider this case: Farmer A is forced to work on good land. Farmer B is forced to work on poor land. Each works as hard as the other, but the results are different. In fact, it could happen that the man on the poor land works harder than the other.

I come now to Communism's objection to the existence of Church property. Let me first take the clergyman's dwelling.

I suppose a clergyman must live somewhere. If he

had no abode, he might be arrested for vagrancy and then be a charge on the local rates. And, then, what would the Communists say to that? As regards the clothing of the clergy, if the clergy are well dressed, some Communists will find fault with them for not following in the footsteps of the poor Nazarene. If the clergymen are not well dressed, then some Communists will say that their shabbiness lowers the clerical flag.

Now, suppose that the children in a Communistic school make a present of a fountain pen to their teacher. I do not suppose that the teacher would object. So, then, he accepts. Does he give it to his successor? There is no need to answer. If others object to the Communist's acceptance, the Communistic teacher would soon reply: "Let them mind their own business. The money for the present came from the children and not from the critics."

Now, parishioners make a present of a house to the local clergyman, but the house is only for his use. The clergyman does not own it. And when the clergyman is changed to another place he does not bring that house with him. Neither may he sell it. It passes on automatically to his successor for his own use. Yet, you see some people going to the races and presenting the bookmaker with money with which to build a glorious home, and the bookmaker is the real owner of that dwelling. As regards the site of that parochial house and the material contained in it—well—it is only one of many houses in the district. Why should it be picked out for attack?

And now for the church building itself: It is built with the voluntary subscriptions of the people, and for their own use. So what it comes to is this: The parishioners build it for themselves. The local clergyman does not own it any more than the tram conductor owns the tram. The clergyman is in charge of that

church and retains for himself only a portion of the money collected, just as the conductor gets, at the week-end, only a portion of the money he collects.

As regards the land occupied by the church, it is only a mere pin's head as compared with all the land in the district. The bricks, mortar, etc., in the church building are only a crumb when put alongside all the bricks, mortar, etc., in the houses in the district, and this material in the church building is as nothing when compared with the untouched wealth of the earth—all of which comes from God. If, then, a church is built in God's honour, we are only giving back to Him a portion of the goods He has lavished on us.

Communists will say that the clergy do not work with pick and shovel. But neither do doctors, nor chemists, nor professors at universities. But Communists will say that doctors look after people's bodies. Yes, that is perfectly true. But the clergy look after people's souls, just as professors at the university look after people's minds.

Some Communists represent the clergy as salesmen selling lots that they have never seen, meaning by this, the rewards in heaven.

Now, in the first place, the clergy do not "sell" any lots anywhere. Just as the railway porter will tell you the train to a certain destination, in the same way the clergy will tell you the "train" you are to take if you wish to get to heaven. But they do more than merely point out the "train". They will help you get the "ticket" for the "train".

As regards the unseen nature of these lots, there is nothing incongruous about giving directions for the gaining of something which the clergy themselves have never seen. Booking clerks will sell tickets for stations they have never seen. A Tourist Bureau will give directions to places of health resort which the officials

themselves have never seen. But just as these stations and health resorts have been seen by others, so also Heaven has been seen by Christ Who is God. And note: A farmer will buy a springing cow for the sake of the milk which no one has yet seen. He will also sow seed for the sake of the crop which has not yet been seen by anybody.

It is sometimes said of a hopeless teacher of singing: "That fool ruined Y's voice." But what about Communistic schools in which a pupil's whole outlook on life is going to be ruined? Fancy contributing money for the building of such a school!

A little girl was once praying most fervently and she said: "Dear God, take care of Yourself, because if anything happened to You, we would all sink". What perfect theology in that remark! If there were no God, there would be no sun, no moon, no stars; there would be no earth and no human beings, not even the Communists who revile the name of God at every turn.

## **The So-Called New Morality**

Communitistic teachers extol the praises of what they will call "The New Morality" . . . and "Self Expression." And they will sneer at what they are pleased to call "outworn superstitions" . . . "rigid and obsolete creeds" . . . "restraints forged by our forefathers" . . . "man-made laws." But, on analysis, the "New Morality" proves to be the Old Immorality with a different label. After all, if you take last year's fish and label them "fresh out of the water," in spite of that label, the fish will still speak for themselves!

The average Christian, though he breaks the com-

mandments, will still acknowledge their existence, but advocates of the "New Morality" deny the very existence of such laws.

Let me as briefly as possible state why human beings must or must not act in a certain way. People know that they must do right and must avoid wrong. But what makes an act a right action? What makes an act a wrong act?

Let me put things this way: You are an architect. You wish a house of a certain type to be built, a house that will be a source of joy to you. It is to be modelled after a mansion you saw in your travels abroad. You have the plans, the instructions to be followed by the builder.

I am the builder whom you have chosen to do the job. I must act according to your instructions. I must not act according to my own feelings in the matter. I must not act in a certain way just because that certain way gives me pleasure. I must not say that it is a purely personal, private matter how I go about that job. If Mr. X comes along and tells me to ignore you and to do things my own way, I must not take any notice of Mr. X.

I act correctly when I act according to your instructions. I act incorrectly when I do not act in keeping with your instructions. And if I do not act in keeping with your instructions, I shall not build the house as you want me to build it.

If I build according to your instructions, you are pleased with my job, and you reward me by paying me the contract price.

If people ask me why I build after a certain fashion, I tell them that you have wished, willed to have a certain type of house. So, then, your will is the basic reason for my building in the way I do.

Now, God, the Divine Architect of the universe,



wants each one of us to build, to develop our souls into something beautiful. This spiritual beauty is to be modelled on God Himself Who is all Beauty. If we develop our soul into something beautiful, the result will be a source of joy to God. Not only that, but God will reward us for so acting, and the reward will be the joy of heaven forever.

God has instructions, plans which we are to follow if we are to develop our soul as He wants it done. His instructions are infallible, and if we go against those instructions, our souls will be disfigured and they will become something ugly to look upon.

We act morally (correctly) when we obey God's instructions. We act immorally (incorrectly) when we disobey His instructions.

So, then, in the affairs of our soul we must not do things our own way, even if doing things our own way gives us pleasure. We must not follow our own feelings in the matter. If a Mr. X comes along and tells us to ignore God's instructions, even then we must not take any notice of Mr. X.

If anyone asks us the basic reason why we must act in this way or that, we say that it is because God wishes, wills it to be "so."

If you want me to build a house according to your taste, you make known your instructions to me. Now, since God wants us to build a spiritual house of a certain type, He must make known His instructions, His plans to us. How does God give us the instructions which are to be followed if we are to build that spiritual "house" which will be a source of joy of Him and which will merit for us the eternal reward of Heaven?

In answering that question I am going to take the illustration of a notice put up in a field.

You own a field. You put up a notice board, and on it you write these words: "Trespassing forbidden."

I come across that notice. There are three things involved:—(a) The board bearing the words, (b) The words themselves, the notice, the command; and (c) The person who issued that command to keep out. You see, a command presupposes a person who gives a command. In this case, you gave the command, and you gave it because the field is yours. The command comes from you. It does not come from the words. It is through those words that you make known your wish.

Physically, I am free to go across the field, but I am not free morally. That is, I act wrongly when I go against your notice, and I act correctly when I obey your notice.

Suppose that going across that field would give me pleasure; suppose I have the impulse to go across; suppose that going across would be an advantage to me or an advantage to my neighbour; suppose that a Mr. X gives me permission to go across; suppose that I could go across secretly—in none of these cases may I lawfully go across your field.

Suppose I were justified in going across your field because it pleased me or suited me or was an advantage to me. Then, Al Capone would be justified in knocking me down and stealing my gold watch if the "operation" pleased him or suited him, etc., etc.

Suppose that the notice were up in the field for thirty years, its binding force would not be abolished or modified.

Now, let me apply all that to Morality, a question so much discussed by some Communists.

Let me remark without further delay: A building to be solid must be built on a solid foundation. Now, the code of morals must be something solid, stable, standardised. It would not do if to-day it were the correct thing to steal but the wrong thing to do to-

morrow. Neither would it do if it were wrong to steal in, e.g., Australia, but not wrong to steal in, e.g., France. But the binding force of actions demands that it comes from a solid source. So, then, if you were to tell me that it is custom which tells us what is the right thing, I answer: "Custom changes, allowing one thing to-day and the opposite to-morrow." Thus, murder could be right to-day but not the correct thing to do to-morrow.

I ask you to commit murder. At once something within you says: "You must not commit murder." Those words are a command. What precisely has taken place? Your conscience is a notice board, bearing those words: "You must not commit murder." Those words did not put themselves there. You did not put them there. You did not command yourself. God put those words there. They are a command. A command presupposes a person who issues the command; a duty presupposes a person to whom a thing is due; an obligation presupposes someone who is binding us; a law presupposes a law-giver. Now, it is God Who is the Commander, the Law-giver; He is the One Who is binding us.

If anyone says that the command to you came from yourself and that all commands to a person come from the person himself, then, see the logical conclusion: No commands could then come from without it means there is no such thing as authority, which means that the boss in a workshop has no right to order his employees, and parents have no right to order their children.

We act morally when we obey conscience telling us God's command; and we act immorally when we disobey God's command.

But suppose that I have the impulse to disobey this command made known to me through conscience;

suppose that my disobedience gives me momentary pleasure or is a source of gain to myself or to others. Even then, I must not disobey God's command made known to me through my conscience. Suppose that the State allowed me to follow my own bent contrary to my dictates of conscience. Such permission would be invalid because the State cannot permit what God would forbid.

If you were justified in doing a thing because it gave you pleasure, or because it were useful to you or to others, or because you had the impulse to do so, then, a thief would be justified in stealing your gold watch, if the stealing gave him pleasure or brought an advantage to him or to others, or if he had the impulse to steal.

We pass on now to consider why it is that God has this authority over us.

When you put up that notice in the field, you had a grip on me because the field was yours. Now, what "grip," if I may so speak, has God upon us that we must obey Him?

Suppose you pick up a piece of wood in the forest. It belongs to no one. With the aid of your penknife you make a tiny boat out of it. You call that boat your own because you made it. Moreover, you would not like anyone to damage that little boat because it is your property. In point of fact, you did not make the wood. Neither did any human being make it. It was made by God.

Or let me put things this way: You own a horse. You lend it to me. You expect me to give it proper food, proper treatment. Otherwise, it will grow weak and diseased and become an object ugly to look upon.

Now, God actually owns us. We are His live property. He owns our bodies. He owns our souls. He

made us out of nothing. Moreover, we depend upon Him for our very existence. We could not draw a breath without His co-operation.

Our bodies must have correct food if they are to develop. Our souls, too, must have correct food if they are to develop. God has lent us our souls and He expects us to treat our souls well, to give them the proper food, to keep them free from disease.

Now, if we go against God's commandments, what happens? We damage our souls and, then, instead of becoming an object of joy to Him, they become an object of displeasure to Him. But if we obey God's commands made known to us through conscience, then, our souls will develop into something beautiful; they will attain that ideal He wanted them to attain; they will be a joy for Him to behold, and He will reward us with the eternal joy of Heaven.

Advocates of the "New Morality" will deny the existence of God.

Now, in the first place, if there were no God there would be no world. Let us, however, prescind from that aspect of the case and look at things from another angle.

If we do away with God, we do away with all authority. The water in a stream always comes from higher up. It is the same with authority. It always comes from higher up. Now, all authority comes from God and is handed down from Him. For instance, the authority that the State lawfully uses comes from God. So, then, if there were no God, there would be no authority. And how could civilisation exist if there were no authority to keep people in check, if you had each citizen doing things as he pleased, doing things according to his own impulse? How could you expect harmony in such a state of affairs? It would be easier to get harmony during a Grand Final football match

played between bitter opponents, without their having an umpire to control the game.

It were well to add a few lines about the "out-of-datedness" of the Christian religion and of the commands of Christ.

My Communistic friend, Thompson, will denounce Religion as "all nonsense". Yet, he is honest in his business dealings. He is a kind father and a loving husband. So, then, all the while, though denouncing religion, he is following out some of religion's choicest tenets.

Again, we hear comparisons being made between the people of today and the people of centuries ago. Suppose: Twenty years ago I travelled by horse and jinker. Today, I do the same journey by motor-car. My means of travelling have changed; they have become modern, but I have not changed. I am the same person as I was twenty years ago. I have the same obligations both towards God and towards the State. I have still three stops in my organ—breakfast, dinner and tea! Although I now travel by car, I am not inferior to myself who twenty years ago travelled by "one horse-power." I am the very same being. And the General who today fights with up-to-date guns is not necessarily, in himself, a superior being to Caesar who fought with swords and spears.

To those who say that the teachings of Christ are out of date, we would observe: the people to whom Christ spoke were not of a species different from us. The crowds to whom Christ spoke contained listeners who were out-and-out sceptics; who sneered at and ridiculed a future life beyond the grave; who were out-and-out libertines who made a religion of lust. The people to whom Christ spoke were not of primitive morals; they were not simple-minded folk who were ready to believe anything He told them. Christ

spoke to the citizens of a proud Empire that had vast, complicated legislation and swift-moving armies; an Empire that counted its people with careful census, and kept accurate records of births and marriages.

Christ spoke and gave His Commandments in times that were startlingly like ours in very many ways. His days were days in which free love and divorce were rampant; when the poor were trodden down by unjust taxes; when they got sustenance (dole) under the form of "bread and circuses"; when the State looked upon itself as God; when the rights of the masses were disallowed; when people were mad for pleasure; when costly buildings were erected for their amusement. The world of the day of Christ contained big business-men whose trade was enormous. It was an age of monopolies, high prices, graft and falling birth-rate. And if Christ were to walk among us today, He would give exactly the same advice as He gave when He walked this earth so many centuries ago.

Christ's doctrines were hard of acceptance in His day. Some of His hearers looked upon Him as mad. But His doctrines were rejected because they interfered with the lawless lives of His hearers. And Christ's doctrines are rejected today by the advocates of "The New Morality", not because the hearers in question really believe them out of date, but for the simple reason that Christ's doctrines are a trenchant criticism of their lives of unbridled pleasure.

## **This Idea of Work at Any Cost**

We have already stated that this is the age of the machine. At the present moment (World War, No. 2) hundreds of thousands of our men (perhaps 800,000)

have been taken away from the producing area. Yet, in spite of that, food and clothing for all and munitions for the fighting forces are being produced in abundance. Our economic troubles in the past have not arisen from shortage of goods but only from faulty distribution of goods—a situation arising from the artificial shortage of a piece of paper with writing on it.

Let us deal with the pernicious idea of "work for work's sake".

People do not work for the sake of work. Work is only a means to an end. The object of work is to produce goods—goods that people really need, either for their country's own use or to export in exchange for goods they need from abroad. The object of work is to produce wealth. It is not the object of wealth to produce work. Common sense tells us to get the maximum result with a minimum of effort, and that wealth is to be measured by results and not by effort put forth. The object of invention is to save energy in production, to give mankind leisure for things of more importance, because man is a rational creature. He is something more than an animal destined for drudgery.

It must not be thought that I am looking on manual work as something lowering. To wrest the hidden treasures from the earth; to span the continent with railways; to keep the wheels of commerce revolving—surely, these are activities that are noble. Though it is true that the manual work of a country must be done by someone, no one can prove that each and everyone should be so engaged. Leisure is not necessarily idleness. Nor should work necessarily mean drudgery. There is work outside the manual sphere. Inventors, writers, etc., must have time for thinking out their ideas. Mankind benefits from the time spent by them in the working out of their plans "far from the madd'ing crowds' ignoble strife."



But the upholders of the doctrine "work for work's sake" believe people should have a life of drudgery. In plain English, they should become slaves.

Before coming to the consideration of some results of this doctrine, namely, work for work's sake, let us note the following:

In many cases unemployment could be called leisure, because frequently unemployment means that there is nothing to be done, for things are already done. By way of illustration, let me take the case of a tailor in a prosperous country town with a monopoly of the local trade. He makes on an average two suits a week at £5 each, and this average of two suits supplies the full needs of the men in the district. All this we shall suppose takes place in the year 1933.

In 1934, this tailor invents a machine for cutting out and making the suits. And now in two days he turns out these two suits which formerly took him five and a half days to complete. As a result of the invention, he has leisure for three and a half days a week. No one will speak of him as being unemployed, and the reason why they do not speak of him as being unemployed is because he is comfortable financially. Had he been working for another tailor who had dispensed with his services owing to this invention, then, he would be spoken of as unemployed, and the reason would be because he had no income.

Note, too, the difference between a hobby and work. B is a gardener by occupation and works many hours a day to gain a living. His occupation is called work. D, who is a man of independent means, takes up gardening as a hobby. He does exactly the same work as B and he may do it for the same length of time, but he does it from a different motive. Hence, his occupation is called a hobby. So the very same occupation under-

taken from different motives is, in one case, work, and in another case, a hobby.

If we are to have work at all costs, then we should scrap the machines. But this would be criminal, for such a line of action would destroy the inventive genius of man.

There are other logical conclusions from such a plan:

A rich harvest and the fertility of the soil mean that more things than usual are produced. Thus, less food-stuffs will be required next year, which means less labour and this in turn means less employment. So, in consistency, we should ask God not to send a bountiful harvest.

Notice another conclusion: We would be forced in consistency to destroy all machines and to go back to the Stone Age. We would send out men with scissors to clip the sheep. We would employ men to reap the harvest with scythes, and if this did not give enough employment, we would take away their scythe and supply them with pen-knives. Such action would mean more work, but there would be less result. Commonsense, however, tells us to get the maximum result with the minimum of effort, and that wealth is to be measured by the result and not by the effort put forth.

Perhaps some of our Federal members of Parliament will not object if I make a few suggestions to them apropos of this principle of work for work's sake. After all, they are in favour of the Four Freedoms of the Atlantic, and one of these Freedoms is freedom of speech.

These members of Parliament ought to dispense with their typing machines and get all their correspondence done in long hand writing. That would give more work.

Instead of having their hot-air effusions printed by the labor-saving device of printing machines, their speeches should all be written and copied and re-copied, as the Monks did with the Bible before the invention of printing.

Instead of conversing over the 'phone, they ought to scrap their telephones and employ countless messenger boys to bring the messages. On days when their lawns are to be trimmed, they should send out an army of gardeners with safety razors. After all, that would mean more and more employment. What would be wrong if these parliamentarians in question cut off their water supply and chose to send employees furnished with buckets to draw water from some neighbouring wells? Such a line of action may not be productive of good results, but certainly it will give plenty of work.

The dispensing with labour arising from the machine age raises the question. How is money to be distributed to pick up the products of the machine? A full reply would bring us outside the aim of this book, but, in a word, the government could introduce a scheme by which money could be distributed so as to enable people to buy the goods that are awaiting to be picked up.

There is in production a state of affairs called the "Purchasing Gap." Briefly, it means: When an article is produced to be sold, the wages given out in its production are the only available money to buy that article. Let me be more explicit; boots are manufactured and are for sale at £100. That retail price is made up of many factors, viz., the wages paid to the men in the factory (suppose, £30); plus cost of material in the boots; cost of wear and tear of machines; rent (if any) of building, etc., etc.

Now, it has been demonstrated that the only money

available to buy those boots is the wages (we are supposing £30). Thus, in the case under consideration, there is at large a deficit of £70 on that one article.

What is said of the boots can be said of any other article produced for sale, because the principle is the same.

Do not forget that this is the age of the machine. One man working with a machine can turn out the same amount of goods as required formerly the services of many men without such a machine. These men then are not needed. So, in a word, we have goods in abundance, produced by only a few wage earners.

Now, Brown is in need of money to buy the where-withal for his wife and family. The Government says to him: "Yes, Mr. Brown, we will see that you get money but it is on the condition that you work. No work, no money; and no money means no food for you and yours. As regards work, you must take any work we give and you must work wherever we direct you. In this particular case, we give you the job of making boots."

So, then, Brown proceeds to work in a boot factory. There are now extra boots (suppose, valued at £10) on the market. Brown's wages are £5. So, actually, the situation (the purchasing gap) in that particular case is worse than before Brown began.

Suppose that the Government builds, e.g., roads, and pays the workmen so much a week. See what happens then! As government finance is arranged to-day, that scheme will not help the situation. The money that the government will give out will be money raised either by (a) taxation or by (b) bank loans. If the money has come from taxation, the scheme does not mean a general increase of money in the community. It only means the transference of money from one pocket to another, that is, from the taxpayer's

pocket to the pocket of the working man. If the money paid by the government for such work (roads, etc.) comes from the banks by way of loans, then that borrowed money, plus interest, must be paid back to the banks.

The government could be its own bank and fill that purchasing gap by making grants to people, by giving pensions and bonuses, etc., etc.

It were well to note in passing: That text of Scripture—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." (Gen. iii, 19) only shows the deteriorated state of mankind after the Fall of Adam. It does not prohibit the use of the machine. Just as that other text—"In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children" (Gen. 3, 16) does not prohibit medical science from alleviating the pains of childbirth.

At once, I imagine I hear a cry of protest: "What! Money for nothing!" But to test the sincerity of the critics let us imagine the following case: Let us suppose that anyone calling at the nearest post office on a certain day would receive a bonus of £5. Many a citizen would be injured in the rush and prominent on the casualty list we would find those who never tire of denouncing this proposal of giving something for nothing.

We must not lose sight of this all-important fact: The comfortable standard of living to which we are all entitled is only a means to an end, because a man's true worth consists, not in money nor in the power that money yields, but in the unseen qualities of mind, heart and soul.

## **The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion**

In the next few pages we are going to give a few quotations from the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. As we have already stated, their origin is a mystery, but the most striking feature in connection with them is the deadly accuracy with which they are being fulfilled one by one.

Let me here give a few opinions as regards the accuracy of their fulfilment.

Mr. Henry Ford, in an interview in the New York "World" of February 1, 1921, said:

"The only statement I care to make about the Protocols is that they fit in with what is going on. They are sixteen years old, and they have fitted the world situation up to now. They fit it now."

The London "Morning Post" book, "The Cause of World Unrest" (Grant Richards, 1920), dwelt on the correspondence between Bolshevik methods and the plan laid down in the Protocols, saying: "We can only say that if the document is not genuine it is a very extraordinary forgery, since it predicts with certainty not only the fact but the manner and mechanism of a great revolution before the event."

In the "American Hebrew" of June 25, 1920, Mr. Herman Bernstein recorded the impression made by the Protocols on American citizens, saying:

"About a year ago a representative of the Department of Justice submitted to me a copy of the manuscript of 'The Jewish Peril' by Professor Nilus, and asked for my opinion of that work. . . . He said that some American Senators who had seen the manuscript were amazed to find that so many years ago a

scheme had been elaborated by the Jews which is now being carried out, and that Bolshevism had been planned years ago by Jews who sought to destroy the world."

It is a cause for wonder why a public malefactor should be immune from criticism just because he happens to be a Jew. To criticise adversely a Jew raises at once a cry—"Anti-semitic!" Yet, how can fair criticism of the Jews be anti-semitic whilst fair criticism of non-Jews is allowed to pass un-challenged? In spite of all this, it is well known that Jews persecute one another and refuse to associate with one another.

If certain Jews have done wrong, they have still done wrong even though many Jews are of unblemished character. Nor does it avail much to say that Jews have contributed much towards the world's progress. In spite of popular belief, Jews have seldom held the first place in the realms of painting, sculpture, philosophy, literature and science. Only on the stage and in music have they proved the equal of their Gentile competitors.

Mrs. Nesta Webster, speaking on this subject, says (*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Page 396); "Heine may be cited as a poet of the first water; Spinoza as a philosopher; Disraeli as a statesman; but it would be difficult to prolong the list . . . The fact is that the Jew is not usually a man of vast conceptions, nor endowed with great originality of mind. His skill consists rather in elaborating or in adapting other men's ideas and rendering them more effectual."

In the following list (by no means exhaustive) there is not one Jew: (Music)—Alessandro Scarlatti, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Liszt, Gounod . . . Painting)—Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Murillo, Raphael . . . (Writers, Poets)—Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe . . . (Philosophers)—St. Thomas Aquinas,

Bacon, Kant . . . (Astronomers)—La Place, Newton, Galileo, Cassini . . . (Electricity)—Galvani, Volta, Ampere, Coulomb, Faraday . . . (Chemistry)—Lavoisier . . . (Inventors)—Marconi, Edison, Stevenson, Watt, Gutenberg . . . (Medical Science)—Fallopio, Eustachio, Harvey, Malpighi, Stensen, Pasteur, Laennec.

I have given quotations from "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion". Let me give some more. They are taken from that book printed in recent years in New Zealand viz., "the World's Conundrum." I intersperse a few comments.

"Through the Press we have the power to influence while remaining ourselves in the shade; thanks to the Press we have got the gold in our hands, notwithstanding that we have had to gather it out of oceans of blood and tears." (Protocol No. 2).

The power of the Press is mighty. So is the power of the sub-Press. Here is an item, not in the daily papers. Readers may draw their own conclusions. It is from the English Returned Soldiers' Journal, "Reveille," of March 26th, 1945. It shows that the factories working for Hitler had not been bombed. It runs thus: "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."

In the foregoing Protocol mention was made of the control of gold. Here is an interesting item. It comes from "The Times," London, June 11th, 1945. "At one moment consignments of well over £150,000,000 of gold were on the high seas. In a single fortnight British liners, cruisers, and tramps took to the New World more gold than three generations of stately Spanish galleons once brought from the New World to the Old. The Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth went to sea with amounts of gold which would have made the world's insurance markets tremble in peace-time; small tramps . . . sailed unescorted from Durban to San Francisco with shipments appropriate to a trans-Atlantic liner. . . . Out of shipments of more than £1,000,000,000 . . . losses were only some £500,000 . . ."

"The administrators whom we shall choose from among the public, with strict regard to their capacity of servile obedience, will not be persons trained in the arts of government, and will therefore easily become pawns in our game in the hands of men of learning and genius who will be their advisers, specialists bred and reared from early childhood to rule the affairs of the whole world." (Protocol 2).

Here is a candid acknowledgment of deceit practised by the International gangsters: Professor Arnold Toynbee, in an address to the Fourth Annual Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations, in Copenhagen, June, 1931, said: "I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local National

States of our world, and all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands."

The Royal Institute was carefully evacuated to Oxford at the beginning of the Second World War, and its staff was paid by the British public, the public that suffered heavy casualties to preserve that sovereignty which the Institute sought to destroy.

Speaking of Jewish methods of using politicians to gain control Cecile de Tormay says: "They (i.e. the Jews) placed in front of them men of the country, blind, volatile, venal, perverse or stupid, who served as screens and knew nothing. They then worked in safety." (Quoted by "The Trail of the Serpent," page 128.)

I have yet to be convinced that the Jews, as a body, are genuinely in search of a National Home. Their having no country appeals to the simple-minded, but it suits International Jewry to have the Brethren well scattered, holding key positions all over the globe. And remember that, owing to the wide-spread Jewish control of Finance and the Press, the same plan for good or evil can be pushed simultaneously all over the world.

"We shall create by all the secret subterranean methods open to us and with the aid of gold which is all in our hands a universal, economic crisis whereby we shall throw upon the street whole mobs of workers simultaneously in all the countries of Europe." (Protocol No. 3).

The mention of the abuses to which gold will be put, turns our thoughts to the Bretton Woods Agreement. People in England and Australia have heard of the Agreement, but only the merest fraction know what it is all about.

Bretton Woods is the name of a town in New Hampshire, U.S.A., where the representatives of forty-

four nations met in July, 1944, to work out an international money scheme for the purpose of stabilising post-war International Trade. With few exceptions, these men were not appointed by their Governments.

We have already spoken of this Agreement (although the name was not mentioned) in the chapter on "International Currency," but here I shall add a few more thoughts.

The two World Wars have been won (?) by Britain, and these victories have ended in the establishing of the Financial World Empire. By accepting the Bretton Woods Agreement Britain has signed her own bankruptcy. The British House of Commons has been forced to accept this Agreement under threat of losing the American Loan which was aptly described as "gloomy," as a "hard bargain." It is a plot hatched, not by the American people, but by the Schiffs, Warburgs, Loeb's, Kuhns, etc. of Wall Street, U.S.A. Those nations committed to this Agreement come under the heel of grasping financial dictators. Booms and slumps can be brought about by them just as they will, and those committed to the Agreement can do nothing about it.

Let us hear Mr. Robert Boothby in the British House of Commons. He said: "If the House of Commons accepted Mr. Morgenthau's advice and ratified the Bretton Woods Agreement, it would deliver this country, bound hand and foot, to the Money Power represented by the vested interests of International Finance. It would prevent us from ever making any attempt at carrying out an internal expansionist policy designed to achieve full employment. It would deprive us of all the weapons with which we could protect ourselves from the consequences of an American depression. Last, but not least, it would subject us permanently to the economic domination of the United

States . . . . If we don't do what we are told by an international authority situated in the United States, we could have penal charges imposed on us for the payment of which we shall have—somehow—to find the dollars. We may even be blockaded by our own Dominions!"

"We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression (that is, by the aristocracy) when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces—Socialists, Anarchists, Communists. . . . By want and the envy and hate that it engenders we shall move the mobs and with their hands we shall wipe out all those that hinder us in our way." (Protocol 3).

Most movements to redress the wrong of workers have been begun, not by the workers themselves, but by the middle and upper classes. Moreover, Kings and the aristocracy of countries have been a barrier between Jewish High Finance and their prey, namely, the masses. When then, the masses slaughter the royalty and aristocracy, they are walking right into a trap set by Communistic High Finance. And these masses, after having been urged by International mischief-makers to disobey lawful authority, are forced to give obedience to these self-same International Financiers. And let me add: Revolutions are not necessarily the result of poverty. They are more artificial (that is, arranged) than is commonly suspected.

In "Secret Powers Behind Revolution" (p. 139) we see how the Russians walked into a trap by attacking the Russian Aristocracy. The Jews then stepped in and took control. The book says: "Russia was an obstacle which Bolshevism has destroyed. In the Soviet Revolution, the anarchy of the beginning, the pillage, the seizure of lands, was the peculiarly

Russian side. This anarchy rapidly gave place to Jewish organisation. To-day the Russians have no longer the right to say anything in their own country. To begin with, the Slav Anarchists have been promptly exterminated by the Jewish Bolsheviks." (Let me note: An anarchist seizes for himself. The socialist seizes for the Government).

Now, we see how the self-same line of action is being followed in East Central Europe to-day. Here is a report from the London "Patriot" of May 24th, 1945. It tells us that the Czech Press Service had issued the following, under date of May 11th, on the distressful state of East Central Europe. Here are the words:

"Regardless of all the political games and tricks which are going on at the present moment, nine European States, which were independent before the war, have already been incorporated in the Russian Soviet Union. They are: Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Roumania, Slovakia and Jugo-Slavia. Altogether they cover 507,390 square miles of territory and their aggregate populations number 87 million souls. In every one of these States, at the time of the Soviet occupation, a so-called National Government has been nominated in which the chief and executive power is in the hands of the Communists.

"All these countries are agrarian States, where the Soviet regime must be installed in the same manner as adopted in Russia after 1917. According to the directives given by Lenin to the Communists in 1917-1920, the policy of the victorious Bolsheviks in agrarian countries has two periods. In the first period, the Bolsheviks lead all the farmers against the owners of big estates with the promise of partitioning the estates and giving the land to the working farmers. In the second period, when the power of the big landowner is

destroyed and the power of the Communist strengthened, all the farmers must be deprived of their possession and collectivised."

All other governments are represented as worthless. Yet it is the Communistic Jewish Financier who has rendered other governments powerless owing to his own control.

"We shall create an intensified centralization of Government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences and liberties which have been permitted by the Goyim (Gentiles)". (Protocol No. 5).

In the same Protocol we find: "By all these means we shall so wear down the Goyim that they will be compelled to offer us International power of a nature that by its position will enable us without any violence gradually to absorb all the State forces of the world and to form a super-Government. In place of the rulers of today we shall set up a bogie which shall be called the Super-Government Administration. Its hands will reach out in all directions like nippers and its organisation will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the Nations of the world."

With diabolical cunning the big Financiers have created the impression in the minds of many in England that at last the people in Britain are free because they have gained the much sought after Monetary Reform. In point of fact, the Bank of England has grown more powerful than ever. Not only that, but the people in Britain are being enslaved more and more. But the daily Press here in Australia does not tell us how the people in England are being enslaved by the new Socialist Government which, by the

way, contains twenty-six Jews, five of whom are in the Cabinet. And the deplorable tragedy is this: It is the policy which had been adopted by Hitler in Germany, and, let me add, it is a policy which can easily be extended to Australia.

Let me now quote from more of the Protocols.

"In every possible way we must develop the significance of our super-Government by representing it as the protector and benefactor of all those who voluntarily submit to it." (Protocol 6).

"We shall surround our Government with a whole world of economists." (Protocol 8).

"We have fooled, bemused and corrupted the youth of the Goyim by rearing them in principles and theories which are known to us to be false although it is by us that they have been inculcated." (Protocol 9).

Any religious sect that stands up for the sanctity of the home and marriage and advocates Christian education is conferring a benefit on the whole State.

As organised religion is the great enemy of Communism, Communism will do all in its power to tear out religion from the hearts of the masses. Stalin helped to destroy religion in Russia by openly advocating promiscuity and abortion. Hitler trumped up all kinds of charges against Christian ministers of religion. Now, in our own very midst, at the moving picture shows the minds of our youth are moulded by people alien in interest and blood. These corrupters of youth know that the youth of today are the men and women of tomorrow. After all, the mind of youth receives impressions easily like soft wax, but it retains them like granite. The wide circulation of wicked literature weakens religion. And when people are convinced that religion is useless, they are at least indifferent when organised religion is attacked.

Poncins in "The Secret Powers Behind Revolution"

(page 184) quotes the Jew, Bernard Lazare (in his "Anti-Semitism") as giving the conviction of the Jews that "the world will not know happiness until it is subjected . . . to the empire of the Jews." The word anti-Semitic is decidedly misleading because the Semitic Race includes, amongst others, the Arabs.

\* \* \*

To say that there is a certain amount of good in Communism is unadulterated piffle. Communism has diabolical aims. Spectators at Australian football see the ball bounced in the middle. It is hit or kicked by a player to one of his own side. He passes it on to the half-forward line. It is then sent to the forward line and a goal is registered. All the bumping and shepherding and high marking and the kicking of the ball—all this has an ultimate plan, namely the registering of a goal. And Communism too has an ultimate plan.

Although Communism aims at the material destruction of Civilization, that is not its final purpose. Its final purpose, ultimate goal is the destruction of all honoured traditions, the obliteration of the Christian ideal. This disintegrating force is at work all around us—in literature, art, the daily press, the moving-picture world. So much is this campaign being aimed at the destruction of Christianity that we are justified in designating Communism as the offspring of Satan.

## **The Folly of Dialogue with Communists**

The man who gets a hair cut and puts on a new suit is still the same man in spite of outward appearances.



Now, there are many Charitable Christians and pseudo-intellectuals who believe that Communism is changing. But Communism is not changing. Its tactics may change and they do change, but Communism does not change. In every case Communism remains the same. Genuine co-operation with Communists is impossible because they co-operate only to destroy. What is more, Lenin said that sometimes it might be necessary to go one step backwards in order to go two steps forward.

It is well for us to bear all that in mind when we see the outstanding Communist, Roger Garaudy, inviting Christians to dialogue. Garaudy, the rhetorician for the Communist party in France, pretends to accept the message of Pope John 'Pacem in terris' which is directed to all men of good will, but the action of Garaudy is simply a technique to dull his enemy to sleep. How can there be goodwill in the Communist philosophy of savage or subtle brutality? If the Communists really believe in goodwill, let them demolish the Berlin wall or the Iron Curtain; let them open up the slave camps of Siberia.

And then the invitation to dialogue! Communistic dialogue is a clever tactic to involve woolly-minded people in useless and fruitless word exchanging much after the pattern of the endless disarmament talks at Geneva. Communists want talk and more talk so as to gain time.

If dialogue means a conversation, then the parties must use a common terminology. Among Christians who hold some beliefs in common a dialogue is truly possible and of profit. But Christians have no common terminology with dialecticians who proclaim peace whilst waging war; who proclaim peaceful co-existence whilst they are insidiously subverting a nation. Dialogue with Marxists is impossible. It is diametri-

cally contradictory to true dialogue. Communists leave God out of the picture and they place man as its centre and its goal. Christians want to talk about God, and man and in that order. Marxists want to talk about man and man, and in that order. Marxism offers dialogue on the basis of atheistic humanism alone; the total man and his development and perfection. Marxists would have us believe that this world is everything. They would hide the fact that Christians are in this world but are not of it. Christ Our Lord told us something far different from the Marxists. He taught us to look up to heaven and not to be enmeshed in the material things of this world. Our Divine Lord asked the question: "What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?" But for the Communists when a man dies, that is his total ending.

## **APPENDIX I**

### **"Stalin the terrible"**

A fifty-page pamphlet entitled "Stalin the Terrible," written by a former Commissar who served under the Soviet for two years, has been issued by the Defender Publishers of Wichita, Kansas, U.S.A. (price, 25 cents). The same author has written a companion pamphlet on Trotsky, noticed in the first issue of the "Examiner." That the author is near the truth in his statements as to the terrorised conditions of the Russian population is evidenced by the fact recorded in a Moscow news message of December 12, 1938, that in the recent Soviet elections only two seats out of 1143 were contested. The following extracts from the pamphlet give an idea of its general contents:

### **Georgia's Wild Tribes**

"As if to revenge the loss of her independence and seclusion from the outside world, it is this century-old country, Georgia, which has given to Russia its present dictator, Joseph Stalin. Born in 1879, in the provincial town of Gori, about fifty miles from the Georgian capital, Tiflis, Stalin grew up as wild as any child of the fierce mountain tribes of the country.

"Stalin's father, Vissarion Djugashvili, was the only cobbler in Gori. In his youth, the father shared the brigand life of the Ossetes, who lived north of Georgia. He abducted his wife from the Ossetes, then left the mountains, to settle down in town and resume the trade of his ancestors. . . . To-day Stalin is the ruler of

189 different nationalities, a total of more than 170 million people. . . .

". . . To anyone who, like me, has escaped from Soviet Russia, and has seen Bolshevism in its stark nudity, it is hard to understand how people in other countries, and especially the so-called intellectual, can see any signs of 'progress' in Russia. We fail to grasp how Presidents and Cabinets of foreign Governments can officially recognise Stalin and his band of subordinates, most of whom are ex-criminals; yes, not only recognise them as equals at banquets or State functions, but even entrust to them the most important institution the international powers ever have organised—the League of Nations.

## **Occult Powers at Work**

"We find herein a substantiation of the fact that an occult group of internationalists are feverishly working toward the enslavement of the entire world, including the United States of America.

". . . Lenin was too much of an abstract thinker to recognise the danger Stalin represented, until the latter had strongly entrenched himself with the Communist Party. Trotsky (Bronstein) was too conceited and self-confident to correctly appraise the qualities of the man whom he and other Bolshevik intellectuals despised and treated with contempt. . . .

"As head of the Soviet Government, Lenin lived only a few years. In his last hours he realised that in Stalin he had raised a man who would not hesitate to eliminate everyone who stood in his way.

". . . One of his first steps was to enforce the collectivisation of Russia's agriculture. His Jewish chief of Secret Police, Yagoda, accomplished this by slaughtering thousands of farmers and exiling millions

of others to prison camps, where they were compelled to open up new regions for future exploitation.

## **Bolshevik Serfdom**

"... This I wish to emphasise, however, that under Stalin, every citizen of Soviet Russia has become an absolute serf of the State. Humanity, like agriculture and industry, has been collectivised and forced to become a living mechanism to produce gold for the International hierarchy. The Soviet State has been made respectable in the eyes of a 'broad-minded' world. It is now a wonderfully productive country for the plotters and agents of revolutionary social reforms. These conspirators are the ones who draw their strength from it.

"The significant part of Stalin's purge is not the shooting of scores of prominent Bolsheviks. This merely proves that a divine hand of justice still avenges crimes against humanity. But, as far as the civilised world is concerned, the execution of a comparatively small number of former henchmen has stirred the world much more than the death of millions of men, women and children who have been starved to death throughout the period in the ten years of his absolute dictatorship.

## **All Speeches Written for Him**

"... the above, I am sure, will suffice to show what type of a man Stalin the Terrible actually is. If we consider that even today, after nearly forty years of revolutionary activity, he has all his speeches and articles written for him because of his incapability to acquire a more thorough elementary education; that he has refined his speech and manners only

enough to meet foreigners on rare occasions (he is noted for his vile language and mannerless behaviour when among his associates and friends), we can safely accept the report that the occult forces which utilise Communism to achieve their ends have found in Stalin the master despot who alone is capable of enforcing their will and commands. Stalin is a primitive Tamerlane, who finds fiendish delight in demonstrating that he, the erstwhile Kinto of Tiflis, is qualified to rule over 160 million Russians and millions of other Communists and sympathisers throughout the world, who have become his subjects through their affiliation with the Third Communist International.

"We can also visualise what would become of the world if Stalin and his Soviet Russia ever succeed in gaining power in other countries as they did over a part of Spain. Stalin himself proclaimed as late as March 29, 1937, that Soviet Russia would not be safe as long as there existed other Capitalist countries. A Communist regime cannot cease, therefore, to undermine conditions in countries which are not united with the Soviet Union under Stalin's Red Banner."

### **Soviet Diplomat Talks Says Russia is a Hell Upon Earth**

M. Theodor Butenko, Russian Charge d'Affaires in Bucharest, Roumania, fled to Italy in February, on being informed of his recall to Russia. After his arrival in Italy he wrote an indictment of the Soviet which was published in the "Giornale d'Italia" of February 17, 1938.

Declaring that he had parted for ever and with horror from the Bolsheviks, M. Butenko said:

"Old Russia, despite the defects of her mode of government, has remained to this day in the memory of the Russian population as an era of general abundance, of satisfaction, of free equilibrium of work and of individual initiative. . . . Exploiting the peasants' lowest instincts, Bolshevism promised them a part of the owners' great possessions to divide these among them."

## **Peasants' Servitude**

"In reality, Bolshevism has introduced in the Russian State the most awful servitude which human history has ever seen and registered. Against their will, by force of arms, by compulsion and other measures that are called administrative, the peasants are assembled in collective settlements (Kolks houses), which is equivalent to their complete spoliation of all rights regarding ownership of land, to the suppression of all private initiative, and to the conscription to collective drudgery. The peasants are forced to give to the State all they produce, dragging out their wretched existence for a miserable "paiok" (Share). They are forever bereft of any possibility of developing or increasing economic, agricultural, or domestic enterprise.

"The Bolsheviks had promised to give the workers the industries, mines, etc., and to make them 'masters of the country.' In reality, never had the working-class suffered such privations as those brought about by the so-called epoch of 'socialisation.'

"In place of former capitalists a new 'bourgeoisie' has been formed, composed of 100 per cent. Jews. Only an insignificant number of former Jewish capitalists have left Russia after the storm of revolution. All the other Jews residing in Russia enjoy the special protection of Stalin's most intimate adviser, the Jew Lazare Kaganovitch.

"And the big industries and factories, war products, railways, big and small trading, are virtually and effectively in the hands of the Jews, while the working-class figures only in the abstract as the 'patrons of economy.'

"The wives and families of Jews possess luxurious cars and country houses, spend the summer in the best climatic or bathing resorts in the Crimea and Caucasus, are dressed in costly Astrakhan coats; they wear jewels, gold bracelets and rings, send to Paris for their clothes and articles of luxury.

## **Famished Workers**

"Meanwhile the labourer, deluded by the revolution, drags on a famished existence. . . . I was able to talk with a great number of workmen who still remember life such as it was in former Russia. They remember it as a remote chimera; wages were then sufficient to guarantee them enough food and allow them to dress decently. Now the same clothes are worn for five or seven years. Meat has become a rare luxury; there are no drinks—neither vodka nor beer."

Speaking of the Ukraine, M. Butenko said: "The entire administration, the important posts controlling works in the region, are in the hands of Jews or of men faithfully devoted to Stalin, commissioned expressly from Moscow. Ukraine exists simply as a sort of colony of Moscow. The inhabitants of this land, once fertile and flourishing, suffer from almost permanent famine."

Mr. Eugene Lyons, from 1927 till about ten years later, American United Press correspondent in Moscow, has written a book called "Assignment in Utopia." It is about Russia, and it is one of the most condemnatory books ever published.



In his own book Mr. Lyons actually tells us that he was an enthusiastic Communist when he went to Russia. In taking a job with the capitalistic United Press he says he felt he would be in a strategic position to help the cause of Communism.

Here is his point of view at the finish: "In leaving Russia, my heart reached out in sympathy to the people. The masses had had a moment of intoxicating glory, when they marched and shouted and waved and felt themselves masters. Now they were under the heel of arbitrary power again, terrified by teeming threats; loss of bread rations, loss of their squalid 'living space,' loss of life. The peasants—the great majority of the nation—had won their land only to lose it again; then felt themselves indentured labourers slaving for absentee landlords in the Kremlin. At the top of this misery new privileged classes had emerged, a parvenu aristocracy, based on the power of life and death over their fellows.

## **One Great Gao!**

"Above all, I had the sense of leaving behind me a nation trapped. Trapped physically, with bloodhounds and machine guns guarding the frontiers, with a passport system to prevent them moving freely in the country. Trapped intellectually, with every thought prescribed and mental curiosity punished as heresy, trapped spiritually, through the need of practising hypocrisy as the first law of survival. There was no longer even the solace of martyrdom for the defiant; a technique had been evolved for breaking their spirit and dragging them into the limelight for slobbering confessions of guilt. The fact that these things had come to pass under the banners of 'socialism' only made them more ghastly."

Mr. Lyons says that during the Five Year Plan Russia was represented to the outside world as a hive of enthusiastic activity. "Yet the ordinary Russian was less interested in the fine promises of the plans than in his hope of finding another herring, another pound of potatoes. I saw men and women risk exile to concentration camps to obtain a little more milk for their infants."

## **Millions Doomed**

"I saw a handful of men in the Kremlin," Mr. Lyons says, "dooming, without hesitation, millions to extinction and tens of millions to inhuman wretchedness in the mystical delusion of their divine mission. Death sentences were reckoned by hundreds, and political prisoners by the hundred thousand."

In December, 1929, Stalin ordered the "liquidation of the kulaks as a class"—a kulak being any peasant who had not gone into a collective farm. "An imperious command," says Mr. Lyons, "to smash and disperse between five and ten million peasant men, and children as quickly and rapaciously as possible. Hell broke loose in 70,000 Russian villages. . . . A population as large as all Switzerland or Denmark was stripped clean of all belongings, herded with bayonets into cattle cars, and dumped weeks later in the lumber regions of the frozen North, the deserts of Central Asia, wherever labour was needed. Tens of thousands died of exposure, starvation and epidemic diseases while being transported."

An amazing story is told of "gold mining" in torture chambers. The Government sought to extract from the people everything they possessed in gold or silver—"valuta" for foreign exchanges. They offered to let Russians buy their way out of Russia for 500 roubles

if proletarians and 100 if non-proletarians. Few who applied were classified as proletarians. Russians abroad were told if they sent the amount relatives could go out. The money was paid in many cases, but Mr. Lyons says payment was no guarantee of the person concerned being allowed to leave Russia.

## **Moscow's Torture Chambers**

Finally, Mr. Lyons says, that people—down to servant girls suspected of having a single gold piece—were arrested and put under torture to extract valuta from them. "If a few people died of suffocation or pain, if most of the unfortunates were broken physically for life, if the minds of men and women snapped—well, slag and dross were to be expected from any mining operations. . . . All victims were warned never to mention to anyone what they had seen and suffered, on pain of being returned to the torture chambers. . . . The entire system was nicely calculated to reduce the strongest men and women, whether janitors or celebrated professors, to the common level of slobbering fear. . . . If physical torture failed to break some one, members of his family were brought in and tortured under his eyes.

## **Could Not Believe It**

"I could not bring myself to believe," says the author, "that the heads of the Communist Party countenanced such things. Only after the evidence piled up, year after year, was I driven to accept as horrible fact the 'gold mining' of the G.P.U. in all the ripeness of its corruption. . . . And the victims, with few exceptions, had come by their valuta legally, and even under Soviet law had every right to it!"

By the end of the Five Year Plan the proletariat had been reduced to silent obedience, with starvation as the only alternative. "Draconic decrees were minted almost weekly to discipline the common workers. One of them made a single day's absence from work punishable by loss of job, bread book and living space: tantamount to a sentence of slow death. An internal transport system far more stringent than the Czar's was announced, and is still in force. Under it a citizen was told where he must live, and he cannot leave that community without Government sanction."

### **Corpses Line Roads**

Of the famine in the Ukraine in 1933, Mr. Lyons says: "A few million dollars from Russia's gold reserves would have brought bread enough to head off the famine. A very minor diversion of money from machines would have saved millions of lives." The only steps taken were to conceal the famine.

"Together with all other foreign correspondents," says Mr. Lyons, "I had to conceal this supreme cruelty from the outside world. The Government forbade us to leave Moscow. But people coming in from the famine region told of the roads lined with corpses like stiff logs. . . . As the Soviet Government stopped the publication of vital statistics for the period in question, how many millions died will never be known; but estimates made by foreigners and Russians range from three to seven millions. The most rigorous censorship in all Russia's history kept us from reporting the famine until it was over."

### **Wholesale Butchery**

S. P. Melgounov, "La terreur rouge en Russie"

(The Red Terror in Russia), Payot, 1927, p. 161, tells the condition of the execution hall of the Cheka in Kief after the taking of the town by the Volunteer Army in August, 1919. His description is as follows:—

"All the cement floor of the great garage (the execution hall of the departmental Cheka of Kief) was flooded with blood. This blood was no longer flowing; it formed a layer of several inches; it was a horrible mixture of blood, brains, of pieces of skull, of tufts of hair and other human remains. All the walls riddled by thousands of bullets were bespattered with blood; pieces of brains and of scalps were sticking to them.

"A gutter twenty-five centimetres wide by twenty-five centimetres deep, and about ten metres long, ran from the centre of the garage towards a subterranean drain. This gutter along its whole length was full to the top of blood. . . . Usually, as soon as the massacre had taken place, the bodies were conveyed out of the town in motor lorries and buried beside the grave about which we have spoken. We found in a corner of the garden another grave which was older and contained about eighty bodies. Here we discovered on the bodies traces of cruelty and mutilations the most varied and unimaginable. Some bodies were disembowelled. Others had limbs chopped off. Some were literally hacked to pieces. Some had their eyes put out, and the head, face, neck and trunk covered with deep wounds. Further on we found a corpse with a wedge driven into the chest. Some had no tongues. In a corner of the grave we discovered a certain quantity of arms and legs."

PROFESSOR WATSON KIRK CONNELL, Head of the English Department in McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, wrote a powerful article entitled "Preface to San Francisco." It was featured by the

"Toronto Evening Telegram" on April 14th, 1945. We quote most of this article:

The impending defeat of Hitler's evil regime is something for which we have all worked and prayed for nearly six years. Nevertheless, lest there should be any thoughtless optimism over the impending San Francisco conference on world order, it is vital for Canadians to grasp firmly a few of the political realities behind the discussions there.

The crux of our problem is the open tendency of Stalin to dictate world settlement on his own terms, and the tendency of many Canadians to regard Soviet Russia as "progressive," "democratic" and "freedom-loving."

Now a stable basis of collaboration with Stalin is most important, but such collaboration does not require grovelling adulation and mendacious praise of tyranny.

Some of these Canadian hallelujah-singers will not mend their tune for any amount of evidence against their false performance, for their ambition looks forward to "blasting the foundations of the old society" and tasting the joys of power amid the wreckage.

Others, however, may merely have been misled by pro-Soviet propagandists (Harold J. Laski, the muddled Dean of Canterbury, Edgar Snow, Anna Luise Strong, Maurice Hindus, Raymond Arthur Davies, "et hoc genus omne"), and may still be open to a reasonable presentation of evidence.

For the purposes of the present article, I shall confine myself to one phase of the Soviet State and to one only: the grim reality of the Soviet political police force and its rule over millions of hapless victims.

It is important to realise from the outset that the U.S.S.R. is a "Police State," and that, regardless of prettily phrased Constitutions, all ordinarily democ-

raphic freedoms are automatically denied by that fact.

These police began as the "Cheka"; presently that malodorous name gave way to the initials O.G.P.U., and this in July, 1934, became the N.K.V.D., ("National Commissariat for Internal Affairs"). This vast organisation with a budget in 1937 as high as three billion roubles, controls all places of imprisonment in the U.S.S.R., including both gaols and concentration camps; it superintends all road-building, canal-building, and other engineering projects (regularly carried out by slave labour); and it maintains a check on the Red Army in order to purge any indication of independent thinking.

The existence of the concentration camps, and their forced labour, crops up even in the narratives of journalists and other observers consistently favourable to the Kremlin. Here are a few samples:

Wendell Wilkie, in his press articles of 1943, stated:

"We drove into Yakutsk in a heavy black Soviet limousine. Between the airfield and the town we looked for the usual concentration camp that we had seen in some other cities—half barbed wire fences, with sentry boxes at the corners."

Quentin Reynolds, in "Only the Stars are Neutral":

"A few miles outside of Kuibyshev we passed one of the big concentration camps reserved for political prisoners. Beyond that we saw a long line of them working on a new road . . . We winced, I think, because these 800 prisoners were women."

Philip Jordan, in his "Russian Glory":

"On the flat track opposite our window were perhaps thirty women guarded by a N.K.V.D. man with a tommy-gun. They were squatting like dummies there, and had not moved for hours, for against their exposed flanks the first snows of winter had driven

and there they now rested. One of the women had a baby in her arms. There was something terrible about them."

Walter Kerr, in his book, "The Russian Army," tells how men of a large American convoy with which he arrived in Murmansk had cheered the Russian dock workers and were shocked to receive no response:

"A few hours later we found out why the Russians had failed to acknowledge the cheer. They were prison labourers, far from their homes, guarded by police with rifles and fixed bayonets. I suppose they did not care whether any country sent supplies to Russia."

William L. White, in his "Report on the Russians," tells of overtaking a large column of workers on the road near Magnitogorsk:

"Two things are remarkable about it. The first thing is that, marching ahead of it, behind it, and on both sides, are military guards carrying rifles with fixed bayonets. The second thing is that the column itself consists of ragged women in makeshift sandals, who glance furtively at our car."

A letter of protest against Mr. White's account, signed by sixteen pro-soviet writers (including Raymond Arthur Davies, Jerome Davis and John Fischer), has recently been published, not in denial of the facts, but on the ground that the facts "can only be understood in terms of change and historical perspective."

The assumption, no doubt, is that there were concentration camps and forced labour in Russia before the Bolshevik revolution, and that the present regime, while carrying on traditions of slavery to which the Russians are accustomed, is gradually mitigating the system. But let us get down to figures:

In 1900-05, under the Czar, there were only 15,000 prisoners undergoing penal servitude in Russia; in 1913, there were 32,757, with only 5000 political



prisoners. On the other hand, all estimates of the prisoners of today run to many millions. The Polish Socialist, Victor Alter, out of a good deal of personal experience, estimated numbers as high as 12,000,000. Boris Souvarine, as of 1937, states, "15,000,000 condemned in various categories would probably be the number most in accord with the facts." In his book, "The Real Soviet Russia," David J. Dallin cites many other estimates, all high, including Alice Moats's "Blind Date with Mars" (20,000,000), and "The Nineteenth Century and After" (10,000,000 to 18,000,000).

Hapless human beings, more numerous than the entire population of Canada, are herded by the bayonets of the N.K.V.D. into slave-tasks where the death-rate is appalling.

Conditions in these camps and projects are described in great detail by David J. Dallin (op. cit., pp. 189—213), based on a very wide range of reports. The following are some excerpts from accounts by former inmates:

(a) (from a camp near Archangel): "We had to work in our own clothing. After two or three weeks, our suits were torn to pieces; the prisoners were half-naked. . . . After twelve or thirteen hours of work in the snow-covered forests, we used to return to the barracks thoroughly drenched. In the same rags we went to sleep. And after such nights we had to get up in the mornings in the same rags, cold, frozen, half dead. The prisoners could not wash. We used to work without respite. Sunday also was a working day."

(b) (From Kolyama, in Eastern Siberia): "Owing to the cold and dampness, most of them suffer from kidney trouble. They also suffer from swelling of the legs, open sores on legs, on arms, and around the ribs, as well as from scurvy. Many go blind. How high the

death rate is difficult to ascertain, but I know from one prisoner who was in my company that in his camp he belonged to a special group whose duties consisted only in digging graves."

(c) "A sad picture: Slowly, almost invisibly the mass of silent dirty men in torn clothing moves—going to work or returning from it. Every now and then someone in the crowd slips and falls on the snow or into the mud. Nobody stretches out a hand to the fallen; you have to save your own energy."

(d) "The conditions of work for men: Twelve working hours a day. Those who do not complete their assigned tasks within this time remain at work until they do. If the period over which someone failed to complete his task extends to over one week, he is considered guilty of deliberate sabotage. The prisoner is then locked in an isolation cell and condemned to death without trial."

Such is the state of "freedom" in the U.S.S.R.

What happens when the Soviets take over non-Soviet territory is still less clearly understood by most Canadians. An eloquent exhibit is an order to the N.K.V.D. in Lithuania, dated November 28, 1940, and now in the possession of the International Red Cross.

This order called for the prompt and systematic "liquidation" of all Lithuanian army officers, policemen, members of parliament, clergy, merchants, bankers, business men, higher civil servants, Red Cross workers, Polish refugees, and all other citizens of foreign countries. (I have the full text of the document on file). The sequel was thus reported to Churchill and Roosevelt by the spokesman of these three little States: "Tens of thousands of our people were murdered without trial, and more than 100,000 were deported in cattle trucks to Siberia or Central Asia . . . Families

were torn apart—wives separated from their husbands and children from their parents."

The situation on the return of the Soviets in 1944 was still more dreadful. On August 20, 1944, Mr. Salnais, the Minister of Latvia in Stockholm, reported to Mr. Zarins, Minister in London, by radiogram:

"During last week the number of Latvian refugees here increased by more than 200 persons, amongst them women and children, all fleeing German occupants as well as Bolshevik invaders. Latvian roads are full of refugees, their situation indescribably terrible. Refugees give evidence that both occupants—Germans in still occupied districts, and Bolsheviks in newly invaded places—apply most cruel terror and criminal methods by torturing and totally exterminating local population. . . . Information received directly from the underground organisation that on August 6 the Bolsheviks drove together on the field 630 inhabitants of Laudone and vicinity and killed them with machine guns, no consideration being given to children, old age or sex. Eye-witness, teacher K., escaped by simulating death and lying on ground among corpses till darkness. . . . The outrageous actions are completed not so much by the intruding (Red) army, which is worn out and demands provisions as by Cheka (N.K.V.D.) forces, who follow in the footsteps of the army."

In Poland, the N. K. V. D. has similarly taken over, and has filled such abattoir-camps as Majdanek with the heroic officers and men of the Polish Home Army.

Earlier, in 1939-41, the N. K. V. D. had deported 1,500,000 Polish citizens from Eastern Poland to slave-camps in Siberia and other parts of the U.S.S.R. and today the process has been resumed in full swing over the whole of Poland. Mass murder and deportation are the order of the day.

Why should so many Canadians—teachers, ministers, journalists, C.B.C. commentators, citizens in many walks of life—assume that, in all this, Russia is freedom-loving, progressive and more highly civilised than the rest of the world? In the Baltic States—where the absence of the Orthodox Church removes any need for phoney propaganda—the Soviets have been exterminating with equal ruthlessness the Protestant churches and clergy of Estonia and Latvia and the Catholics of Lithuania. Rule by the N.K.V.D. means the extinction of human freedom.

Do we Australians want anything like the above to happen here in our midst?

With regard to the Communists in Australia let me, with apologies to "The Mikado," say:

The "Commos" who in Aussie in very fervent tone,  
Have praise for things in Russia, but just none for their own—

We should put them on the List, and I'm sure they won't be missed.

## **APPENDIX II**

### **Jews and Vatican II**

In the sphere of business one company does not invite a rival company to come to its board meetings, and all this for obvious reasons. If these visitors were to be merely observers, that could be bad enough, but if they were going to make business suggestions, it could be fatal to the hosts. Let me here quote the warning issued by Benjamin Franklin. He is reported as being very hostile to Jews. According to the diaries of Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, one of the framers of the American Constitution, Franklin protested very strongly against the Jews. He is reported as saying at the Constitutional Convention:

"In whatever country Jews have settled in any great numbers, they have lowered its moral tone, depreciated its commercial integrity, and segregated themselves and not been assimilated; have sneered at and tried to undermine the Christian religion upon which that nation is founded, by objecting to its restrictions; have built up a State within a State, and, when opposed, have tried to strangle that country to death financially, as in the case of Spain and Portugal . . .

". . . If you do not exclude them from the United States in this Constitution, in less than 200 years they will have swarmed in such great numbers that they will dominate and devour the land and change our form of Government for which we Americans have shed our blood, given our life and substance and jeopardised our liberty. If you do not exclude them, in less than 200 years our descendants will be working in

the fields to furnish them substance, while they will be in the counting houses rubbing their hands. I warn you, gentlemen, that if you do not exclude the Jews for all time, your children will curse you in your grave. Jews, gentlemen, are Asiatics. Let them be born where they will or how many generations they are away from Asia, they will never be otherwise."

Now, anyone acquainted with the Jewish mentality towards Christianity must seriously ponder why they were invited to come to Vatican II even as observers. To come merely as observers would be bad enough, for you may rest assured that the envoys would be picked men, men of the shrewdest intelligence and high ranking as preachers and theologians. But common sense would tell you that Jews would not stop at being mere observers. The Christians would insist on making them feel at home. They might think it their duty to listen to their opinions in matters of religion.

Those in charge of Vatican affairs must have known of the Jews' views, their Christian-hating mentality. For the Jews have blackened the Catholic Church with the most ignominious calumnies. They have turned Catholic clergy into objects of ridicule and hatred. Added to this, let it be remembered that previous to the Vatican Council a book was published—"The Plot Against the Church". Obviously it was written by some Roman Clerics (Priests or Cardinals). In the book the author issues a timely, uncanny warning against Communistic infiltrators who, through the Vatican Council, were aiming at the destruction of the Catholic Church.

But apart from that, Vatican Council officials should have remembered that Jews are in control of most of the organized evil in the world, such as prostitution, liquor, international slavery and international money-changing, profiteering on wars, corruption in politics,

atheism in school systems, promotion of lewd propaganda through theatre and moving picture shows. So then, for the Jews to come merely as observers could be ~~decidedly~~ damaging to Christianity.

Centuries before, Innocent III issued a warning about their ingratitude. He was speaking of the admission of Jews into Christian cities. His Holiness said: "When they are admitted out of pity into familiar intercourse with Christians, they repay their hosts as the Proverb says, after the fashion of the rat hidden in the sack, or the snake in the bosom, or the burning brand in one's lap."

And even where Jewish converts to Christianity are concerned, the waters of Baptism do not always wash away the Jewishness from their hearts. One need only read of the career of the Maranos in Spain or the pages and pages of frightening revelations in that book—"The Plot Against the Church".

When Einstein was driven out of Germany, the Nazis declared that the distinguished Professor had not confined himself to mathematics, but had intrigued with Red Organisations. This was denied vigorously by his friends. People in U.S.A. opened their arms to the eminent exile and he was given a Chair in Princeton University. He was barely installed there when he associated himself with those who supported the persecution of Catholics in Spain. He joined in a petition to the U.S.A. Government to permit the exportation of arms to the Red Government in Spain.

Similarly, Freud after being allowed to live in peace in Catholic Austria was no sooner turned out by the Nazis than he announced publication of a new book, MOSES, which was definitely anti-Catholic.

And note: Whenever Jews are punished for subversive activities, the Jews call the prosecution persecution.

Let me here quote an article—"Zionism sways the Vatican Council" by Richard Bevan. The article appeared in "The New Patriot", Hollywood, California.

The Roman Catholic Church has made a number of policy decisions in this last decade, which have substantially modified the traditional Catholic viewpoint. Most important of these was the ecumenical announcement regarding the Jews. Richard Bevan here reveals that this pronouncement followed many years of Zionist scheming and manipulation.

\* \* \*

On 19th February, 1963, Frenchmen who picked up the daily newspaper *Le Monde* were able to read the following: "The international Jewish organization B'nai B'rith has expressed its desire to establish closer relations with the Catholic Church. The Jewish order has just submitted to the Vatican Council a declaration which affirms the responsibility of all mankind for the death of Christ. If this declaration is accepted by the Council, Mr. Label Katz, President of the international assembly of B'nai B'rith, has declared that the Jewish communities will seek the way to cooperate with the Catholic Church authorities." This was perhaps the first public news of a well planned campaign which had by that time already been underway for over three years, set in motion by the political organizations of Zionism to reverse the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, traditional opponent of Judaism for some nineteen centuries. Thus, as one Catholic leader expressed it, a thesis of the Sanhedrin entered upon the grounds hitherto sacred to the Holy Ghost, and the remains of Popes



Pio IX and Leon XIII quavered in their graves.

According to the popular romance, as portrayed in the press, the originator of this resolution was a certain Jules Isaac, a French Jew, whose book entitled "Jews and Israel" was published in 1948. The significance of the concept was that for nearly two thousand years since the death of Our Lord upon the Cross, Catholic tenets placed responsibility for the death of the Saviour upon the Jews. History clearly records that it was the Jews whom Christ had criticized above all others, and it was Jewish clamour that pressurized the Roman authorities to crucify Christ. Thus, as seen by Christians for nearly two thousand years, the Jews had killed the Christian Saviour, whose divinity they denied. Jules Isaac wished to contradict this doctrine and replace it instead with the doctrine that mankind as a whole was responsible for the murder of the Son of God and that no particular blame attached to the Jews. This latter concept is without historical substance, of course, and can only be maintained by a hypothetical "collective" responsibility of mankind for what the Jews did. As such, Jules Isaac proposed no less than a revolution of Catholic doctrine on a point which had been accepted since the very earliest beginning of the Church and which was clearly defined in the Gospels themselves. Some even said that Judaism was calling upon Christianity to reject by implication the validity of the New Testament.

An interview was arranged between Jules Isaac and Pope John XXIII. A personal audience with the Pope is not easy to obtain, even for a Catholic. But Jules Isaac represented the organised power of Zionism, and his audience was arranged by no less a personality than the Ambassador of France—that heavily Jewish dominated country. That was in 1960.

Then, in 1961, a certain Cardinal Bea presented a

memorandum to Pope John XXIII which proposed the formation of a Secretariat to study "Christian Unity." This was agreed to, and was established under the direction of Cardinal Bea himself. It is ironical to note that it was this same Secretariat that henceforth took over the development of Jewish-Christian relations.

The present author cannot speak with certainty regarding the ethnic origins of Cardinal Bea. By nationality he was a German, having been appointed a Cardinal by Pope John XXIII over the heads of many other senior German Bishops. But his surname would appear to derive from Beha, which has conclusively been equated with the Sephardic Beja, and Jews by this name are known to have migrated from Spain to Germany.

Criticism was raised against the Christian Unity Secretariat on other grounds as well, for it recommended Catholic participation in the "World Council of Churches", thus putting the Pope, by implication, on the same level as the head of any other religious group, however small, which might be represented thereon. At the same time many movements were afoot, which are still increasingly active, to reduce the influence of the Pope by a decentralization of power within the Church. This was and is much in demand amongst leftist Catholic clergy, particularly in America.

The next public step was a speech made by the Bishop of Guernavaca, a descendant of Sephardic Jews of the village of Cotija in Mexico, before the Vatican Council which suggested that the Catholic Church should approach Jews and Freemasons with a gesture of goodwill. Then, in February 1963, came a meeting between Cardinal Bea and Label A. Katz, President of B'nai B'rith from which date onwards a great deal of correspondence and communication

developed between the Vatican and the American Jewish Committee on the one hand, and the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith on the other. As "Look" magazine put it, the voice of ADL "was heard loud and clear in Rome". Rabbi Abram J. Heschel of New York's Jewish Theological Seminary, who had known Bea since Berlin in the 1930's, next travels to Rome to meet Bea, the latter having already had the opportunity to study propaganda being prepared and put out by the A.J.C., such as "The Image of the Jews in Catholic Teachings" and "Anti-Jewish elements in Catholic Liturgy".

About the same time, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, head of the World Conference of Jewish Organizations, also pressed their desires and aspirations for an amendment of Catholic doctrine upon the Pope, and the B'nai B'rith went so far as to request that Catholics delete all language from the Church services that could be deemed in any way anti—Semitic!

Of course, these Zionist wishes could not be met so easily. While the Church itself was pliable and its heavy investments in America were particularly vulnerable—especially in view of the leftist character of many American Catholic leaders—the Catholic liturgy had passed down through the centuries and was based upon the teachings of the early Christian Fathers. Even if it could be amended, the Gospels could not be amended, and the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John being divinely inspired, could not be tampered with in the easy way Zionists through the ages have occupied themselves re-writing history. According to the Gospels, the Jews were Christ killers, and the Catholic Church had held these views through the centuries. To change them now was not so easy.

To help make whatever changes were possible,

however, Cardinal Bea engaged Catholics of known Jewish origin to work with him at his Secretariat and this could surely be no mere accident. Notable in the Secretariat was Monsignor Osterreicher, who did more than anyone else to draw up the strong draft which was finally prepared to place before the Council. This was known as the decree of De Judaeis. At one of his earlier sermons in New York he is on record as having affirmed "we do not read any more the many declarations of Jesus Christ against his people in the Bible". In other words, Monsignor Osterreicher, converted Jew, sets himself up to accuse even Our Lord of anti-Semitism, and openly condemns Our Lord and rejects His Word.

Another converted Jew who worked with Cardinal Bea at the Secretariat, was Father Gregory Baum, who emigrated to Canada from Germany. Baum is the author of a book entitled "The Jews and the Gospel" in which he maintains that there are many anti-Jewish lines in the Bible and other Christian texts which comprise "a real collection of hatred"—and does not spare himself to criticize the Holy Writ.

As it became obvious that Pope John XXIII was determined to place before the Council a draft decree to exonerate the Jews from all guilt for the murder of Our Lord, the battle lines began to be drawn up. It became obvious that in Southern Italy and the Middle East, the consensus of Catholic opinion bitterly opposed any such modification of the Church's tenets, while in New York (where there are more Jews than in the whole of Israel) and in America generally, Catholic Church opinion was for accommodating the Jews.

Since it appeared that there might be an impasse, the Pope decided to put psychological pressure on those who were recalcitrant, by inviting observers

from other religions to attend the Council meeting, an unprecedented step, and this was eagerly accepted by the World Jewish Congress and other bodies.

Finally, the stage was set, and on March 31, 1963, Cardinal Bea made a secret visit to the offices of the American Jewish Committee in New York, from apartments in the Hotel Plaza where he was staying. No mention of this appeared in the press at that time.

Here he was greeted by a latter-day Sanhedrin, and the proposed campaign was discussed. Not long after this, the Rolf Hochhuth play, "The Deputy", opened in New York, depicting His Holiness Pope Pius XII as the Vicar of Christ who remained silent while Hitler massacred the Jews by untold millions. Here was not subtle psychological pressure but rather an excuse and opportunity for the Church to disavow the accusations made against Pope Pius XII by passing the required decree.

From then on there was discreet but real battle amongst the Cardinals and Bishops. The conservatives produced a 900 page book, entitled "The Plot Against the Church", detailing the entire subject from an historical and theological viewpoint, and circulated it to all of the 2,200 Cardinals and Bishops who would attend the Council. They also produced a shorter pamphlet entitled. "The Jews and the Council in the

Light of Tradition". But more powerful weapons were at hand to the Jews.

Through the cooperation of Cardinal Bea's Secretariat, the Zionist organizations were able to keep abreast of the long-drawn out struggle within the members of the Council; and since many Bishops in America had no means of knowing the latest developments in the struggle (which was not officially publicized within the Church) other than in the pages of the New York Times, the Zionists decided to publi-

cize their own angle on the struggle and thus influence the Bishops of the World through the media of the American Jewish Committee (experts at getting press space; took care of the publicity angle) and for almost the first time in history the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church found themselves being gently brain-washed by the ADL and AJC regarding secret policy decisions of the Catholic Church which were in fact no longer secret but were being published by known Zionists with the undoubted purpose of swaying the issue.

Meanwhile, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver was in contact with Cardinal Spellman who as a special service also promised to speak with the governments of the South American countries regarding Israel's wish to gain admission to the United Nations, and six members of the American Jewish Committee had an audience with Pope Paul VI, Pope John having died in the midst of all these negotiations.

One of the six members of the AJC who called on Pope Paul at this stage was Mrs. Leonard M. Sperry who had just endowed the Sperry Center for Intergroup Cooperation at the Pro Deo University in the Holy City! With Jews endowing centers for "Intergroup Cooperation" at the University of the Holy City, it was by now quite clear which way the wind was blowing—and which way also it is likely to blow in future. Then, to add additional pressure, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the Jew Arthur J. Goldberg, then still a Supreme Court Justice, was briefed by Rabbi Heschel to take time off from the Supreme Court and meet the Pope in a papal audience which the Pope agreed to grant. Cardinal Richard Cushing of Boston was also prevailed upon to arrange a further audience with the Pope for Rabbi Heschel himself, head of the American Jewish Committee.

Here indeed was a "summit meeting". This audience was only granted on the understanding that it should be kept secret: though why the Pope should request secrecy one cannot but wonder. One expects a Pope to speak out openly and firmly to all his people, not to conceal from them his meetings with the Jews.

Thus, despite opposition headed by the conservative Bishop of Segni in Italy, a resolution was finally passed. It was not so strong as that drafted by the Secretariat for "Christian Unity", in collaboration with the AJC and ADL but it sufficed. The vital difference was that while the ADL and AJC and the Catholic leaders of Jewish descent wished to contradict the Gospels and deny altogether Jewish responsibility for the death of Christ, the revised decree avoided this denial but openly declared that the Jews could not collectively be held responsible for deicide, and that anti-Semitism was to be deplored. The exact text must be regarded as a great triumph for the Jews. After nineteen hundred years of fierce battles with the Catholic Church, the Jews had at last persuaded the Church to renounce the teaching of centuries, disown its own past and reshape its outlook.

\* \* \*

Those good-hearted, innocent Christians who thought that they would soften Jewish obduracy towards Christianity by inviting them to the Vatican Council would be well advised to read the following which appeared in the Melbourne "Herald", November 29th, 1968. Centuries before, Our Lord had told the Apostles to have the prudence of serpents.

Here is the quotation "NEW YORK, Thurs.—The American Jewish Congress today protested to the U.S. Government for issuing a "religious" postage stamp to mark Christmas 1968.

"The letter said that Christmas stamps—introduced in 1962—were becoming increasingly religious in content.

"The stamps had changed over the years, the letter said, from relatively innocuous designs like holly wreaths to reproductions of paintings celebrating the dogma of the Virgin birth.

"By issuing stamps with religious motifs, the congress said, the Government sets a precedent for using its power and prestige to support the celebration of a religious holiday.

I wonder what the Jews wanted! Perhaps they wanted a picture of Pontius Pilate washing his hands, or Judas counting the thirty pieces of silver.

When one reads in "The Catholic Advocate", Melbourne, December 5th, 1968, in bold type—"U.S. Jews mourn Cardinal Bea", one is prepared to wonder why? Had he been a real opponent to the Jews instead of doing their bidding, he would have been bumped off. So then, personally, the Jews paid His Eminence a doubtful compliment. "The Cross and The Flag" (U.S.A. February, 1969) has this very interesting item on page 34:

"CARDINAL BEA who was a German Jesuit, has just died. He was the tool of the Jews and the spearhead for the Ecumenical movement and enjoyed the support and sympathy of those who were out to destroy Christian tradition and substitute Jewish tradition. It was revealed that he was born a Jew, although he became a cardinal in the Catholic Church.



## APPENDIX III

### Communism and Strikes

Since there is sound reason for maintaining that Communism is behind strikes, it may be of use to give here a special chapter, though not a lengthy one, on the folly of strikes.

It cannot be denied that at times it is the clear duty of men to strike. What is more, it cannot be denied that there have been strikes which are just in origin, fairly carried out and successful in issue; strikes which called forth superb qualities and admirable sacrifices. But how rare, how few and far between they have been! Most commonly they have proved a trap and a snare for the workers. They have earned the condemnation of all fair-minded men of both sides—Labour and Capital. "The strike is the worst of wars" writes M. Jules Simon, "it is civil war. It is nothing else but murder. They are always a cause of ruin without any compensation for the employers and, what is more, for a whole region or even a whole nation".

In fine, it would seem, that most strikes are a curse alike to workers and employers; they benefit neither class; they injure both. Usually they are a proof of weakness and admission of failure. They bring untold evil, moral and economic on the public at large. They do harm to intellectual advancement, every moral progress of a country. Strikes are madness—madness in the employers who provoke them, and in the workers who allow themselves to be provoked. Strikes mean wastage of virtue and peace and happiness. They resemble in turn the silly but romantic fights of the schoolboy;

of the drunken brawl of the n'er-do-well, the deadly vendetta of class hatred, the brutal combat of the gladiators. They imply passion and ignorance and discontent.

People should try to realize that the interdependence of citizen on citizen is something very real. Suffering and injury to one means suffering and injury to all, for that is the principle of solidarity. People should realize how closely knit are the interests, moral and economic, of each class and section of the city's population.

Strikes upset and disturb the minds and souls of men with the result that normal reasoning and sense terminate and are replaced by excitement, mental tension and ill-considered hasty opinions. The moral sense of man grows dull suddenly and men do and say things that in normal times would cause them to shudder.

The strike is sometimes described as the one sure weapon that a poor man can wield with success in the great war between Labour and Capital. Is this really true? Is it his only weapon? Is it not rather a clumsy, self-destructive weapon?

Mr. Phillip Snowden says: "A strike never did bring substantial gain to the workers. In the very nature of things, it is impossible that it should. It is a contest of endurance, and the work people are never so well fortified as the employers . . . strikes upon an extensive scale against federated employers are never successful when the employer makes the struggle 'a fight to a finish'."

Not only is the striker hurt, but the employer suffers too. His business is seriously interfered with and his mind is troubled with many anxieties. The capital that he has invested in his business lies idle, and brings him no profit. The machinery and premises in some

cases deteriorate. Goods are often held up, and being ill cared for, are ruined. He has to pay for watchmen and caretakers. His credit is injured at the bank, and he has to pay interest on money lent at sheer loss to himself. Competition grows stronger owing to his withdrawal from the race, and at such a time as he re-enters he will find himself at a hopeless disadvantage. Mr. Snowden tells us: "A strike leaves the relations between the two parties strained. The party which is beaten nurses a grievance, and it is only human if it watches for an opportunity to get its own back. Every workman who has taken part in a strike knows that for a long time after the end of the strike, the conditions in the workshop are not the same as before. After every strike a number of the former workmen are marked men, and sooner or later a reason is found for their dismissal. There is all the difference in the world between arguing the question of a change of wages between employers and workmen without a cessation of work, and making a change as a result of a strike. When a concession has not been given as a result of reason, there is invariably the attempt on the employer's part to take it out of the workmen. The apparent gains of a strike are seldom real gains."

Whether the suspicions of Mr. Snowden be true or not, it is certain that employers suffer from the ill will that still lasts after a strike.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out in detail inconveniences suffered by shopkeepers, master builders and wholesale merchants and others. In each case the four factors are present—1. Difficulty of getting material and supplies; 2. Roundabout and expensive transit routes; 3. Difficulty of getting work done; 4. Impossibility of getting contracts fulfilled.

Again, strangely enough, it is the good man, the honest worker, who suffers most. By nature, he is least

inclined to strike. He is ready and willing to work hard, is content with his pay and is prepared to bear patiently whatever trifling wrongs he might have to suffer, while at the same time taking reasonable steps to have them rectified. Naturally, he bewails his lot that he and his family should have to suffer at the dictates of "leaders" with whose views he may totally disagree.

And do not forget, that during a strike the moral equilibrium is upset. Respect for the integrity of the persons and goods of others is disregarded. Malicious injury is inflicted upon property, and persons are violently and brutally assaulted. Intimidation is practised on an enormous scale, and even in the sacred name of liberty. Coercion and terrorism follow "the red flag" although it is said to flutter only in the breath of freedom. False philosophical principles are swallowed without question. Slander prevails. Unfair attacks are made on the characters of employers and workers and even upon good labour leaders.

What are the gains, if any, of strikes? In other words, do strikes pay? Does the good which results compensate for the evil? Those who favour strikes frequently attribute to them the following gains—1. Rises in wages; 2. Shortening of hours; 3. Strengthening of worker's position.

On the other hand Mr. Snowden denies that a strike ever brought substantial gains to the workers. Probably the truth lies in the mean.

No doubt, in some cases, strikes have brought about improved conditions, both as regards pay and hours, for workers. In some cases, too, strikes had tended to unite the workers more, and to increase the moral power of their Unions. Still, such cases must be admitted to be distinctly exceptional. Although, in some cases, wages are increased, the increase is very small when compared with the loss entailed in winning it.

And as regards the General Strike—it has little to recommend it. It is infinitely harder to engineer than the partial strike. It awakens universal opposition. It has, so far, in France and Belgium and England failed invariably.

Let us see the mind of Pope Leo XIII, known as the poor man's Pope. The weapon that Leo XIII would like to see in the hands of workers is organization, the establishment of a good Labour press and the moderate exposition of their grievances.

In the sphere of industrial upheaval, how many stop to reflect that employer and employed are like the two blades of the scissors? You never see a scissors with only one blade. You could not cut anything with only one blade; at least, you could not get the same results. One blade needs the other. Like the two brothers who were dentists they should pull together! It is folly for the employer to antagonise the employee by giving unfair treatment. It is also folly for the employee to antagonise the employer by giving unfair treatment. Each should recognize that the prosperity of the other is necessary for his own welfare.

Let me here take a very simple illustration showing how the employed depends upon the employer. X, the employer, may know where there is a quarry containing stone. Were X to leave the stone there, unworked it would be unused, and the men who otherwise would be employed would be left idle. Supposing that X is enterprising. He borrows money from the bank, or he may have money of his own deposited in the bank. He now uses the money. He gives employment. The men have the hard work of quarrying the stone, but if they receive a fair wage, their troubles end when their day's work finishes. What of the employer? He may be walking around with his pipe in his mouth, or he may travel about in a flash motor

car. Still, he has all the worry of managing, the mental torture of seeing that things run smoothly, that there is a market for the output from the quarry, whereas the employee, if well-treated, has no further worry for the day when he knocks off work. But the worries of the employer never cease.

In the beginning of this book we showed that money was an order on goods. If the goods are there waiting to be picked up, then those controlling the issue of money should see to it that enough money is created and distributed for the picking up of the goods.

In every struggle between employer and employee, the employee is looking for more money from the boss. The employer has goods for sale and they cannot be sold because there's not enough money in circulation; but this supply of money is regulated by the big bankers. Strikes do not fill the money gap.

Where railway strikes are concerned, it could easily be shown that the shortage in money has arisen, in part, from the exorbitant amounts paid in interest on bank-borrowed money. If in the first place, the Government had been its own bank, it could have issued that money interest free.

In both these cases, the shortage of money is something which should never have occurred. If there is a failure in a wheat crop, there is a general shortage of a commodity, but money is not a commodity. It is only an order on goods, and if the goods are there waiting to be picked up, the money should be created. St. Paul in his letter to Timothy (1, Timothy 6-10) said: "For the desire of money is the root of all evils." But what about the evils arising from the banks' arbitrary issue of money? Meyer Amschell Rothschild summed up the power of the issuing of money when he said: "Give me control of the issue of a country's money and I care not what government makes its laws."

# Index

Acton, Lord . . . . .	2, 100	Fascism . . . . .	51
Adenauer . . . . .	7	Federal Union . . . . .	142
Allen, Governor . . . . .	171	Ford, Henry . . . . .	8, 81
Banks . . . . .	81	Franco . . . . .	7
BEA . . . . .	264	Garaudy . . . . .	237
Belloc, Hilaire . . . . .	50	Gassing of Jews . . . . .	177
Berne Trials . . . . .	8	Gregory, Guggenheim . . . . .	84
Bonar Law . . . . .	84	Gwynne . . . . .	105
Boris Brasol . . . . .	96	Hawtrey . . . . .	65
Bretton Woods . . . . .	21	Hiss . . . . .	12
Butenko . . . . .	91, 242	Hitler . . . . .	Passim
Cahill, E . . . . .	3	Hore-Belisha . . . . .	48
Cassel, Ernest . . . . .	11	Hungarian Freedom Fighters	7
Castro . . . . .	7	International Currency . . . . .	147
Chamberlain . . . . .	89	Jagoda . . . . .	110
Chambers, Whittaker . . . . .	12	Japan . . . . .	125
Chiang-Kai-Shek . . . . .	7	Johnson, Manning . . . . .	16
China . . . . .	124	Joly . . . . .	26
Churchill . . . . .	6, 80	Jouin . . . . .	97
Coty . . . . .	172	Kahn . . . . .	17
Cuba . . . . .	125	Kaiser . . . . .	55
Cutting, Bronson . . . . .	171	Kerensky . . . . .	93
Dachau . . . . .	177	Kimmell . . . . .	14
Das Capital . . . . .	240	Kitchener . . . . .	95
Denny, Ludwell . . . . .	80	Kitson . . . . .	79
Depression . . . . .	91	Laski . . . . .	21
Dialogue with Communists	236	Lenin . . . . .	26, 107
Disraeli . . . . .	5	Levy, Oscar . . . . .	5
Dumbarton Oaks . . . . .	21		
Eichmann . . . . .	179		
European Common Market	11		

Lincoln, Abraham . . . . .	79	Argentine . . . . .	103
Litvinoff . . . . .	27	Brazilian . . . . .	103
Lloyd George . . . . .	95	Chilian . . . . .	103
Long, Huey . . . . .	170	Denmark . . . . .	103
Lunatchaschy . . . . .	54	Hungary . . . . .	101
Lyons, Eugene . . . . .	90, 263	German . . . . .	102
		Mexican . . . . .	103
Machiavelli . . . . .	24	Roumanian . . . . .	104
Mannix, Daniel . . . . .	42, 83	Rhodesia . . . . .	124
Marsden, Victor . . . . .	105	Ritchie . . . . .	171
Marx . . . . .	21, 23	Roosevelt . . . . .	Passim
McCarthy . . . . .	12	Rothschild . . . . .	10
McFadden, Louis . . . . .	169		
McKenna . . . . .	64	Schall . . . . .	171
Mensdorff . . . . .	85	Schiff . . . . .	14, 93
Mindszenty . . . . .	180	Short, General . . . . .	14
Mussolini . . . . .	185	Schurz . . . . .	
		Sieff . . . . .	142
Nazism . . . . .	51	Spain . . . . .	99
New Deal . . . . .	51	Spring-Rice, Cecil . . . . .	84, 172
New Morality . . . . .	211	Stalin- . . . . .	Passim
Niemeyer, Otto . . . . .	84	Steinberg . . . . .	90
Norman, Montague . . . . .	84	Stormer . . . . .	5
		Strikes . . . . .	270
Oudendyk . . . . .	90		
		Taft . . . . .	93
Patton, General . . . . .	179	Tiflis Bank Robbery . . . . .	97
Pearl Harbour . . . . .	13	Trotsky . . . . .	54
P.E.P. . . . .	58, 134		
Pius, Pope XI. . . . .	28, 187	U.N.N.R.A . . . . .	11
Poland . . . . .	48	United Nations . . . . .	126
Poncins . . . . .	93		
Protocols . . . . .	8, 224	Vatican II. Jews and . . . . .	258
		Vickers . . . . .	95
Quadragesimo Anno . . . . .	83		
		Warburg . . . . .	97
Rathenau . . . . .	85	Webster, Nesta . . . . .	92
Reed, Douglas . . . . .	168	White . . . . .	20
Reuter . . . . .	4	Wickham, Steed . . . . .	
Revolution . . . . .		Williams, Mrs. . . . .	104
		Wilson, Woodrow . . . . .	78