

THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS

THE NEW TIMES

YAFFLE ON
HEREDITY
(See Page 3)

A NON-PARTY, NON-SECTARIAN, WEEKLY NEWSPAPER EXPOSING THE CAUSES, THE INSTITUTIONS, AND
THE INDIVIDUALS THAT KEEP US POOR IN THE MIDST OF PLENTY

Vol. 4. No. 24.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1938.

Every Friday

MELB. HERALD'S MODERN MIRACLE —OF INVENTION And Low Watermark In Journalism

REV. IRVING BENSON AND MONEY

How Can Women Be Such Fools?

New Times SHOPPING GUIDE and Business Directory

PATRONISE THESE
ADVERTISERS.

Their advertisement helps your paper. Say you saw it in the "New Times."

GENERAL

INDUSTRIAL ADHESIVES Pty. Ltd., 155 Yarra St. Cold Glues, Dextrine.

"LEUKOL." By far the most up-to-date Toothpaste. No Toothache. No Extractions. No Pyorrhoea. 80,000 packages sold without advertising. Send 2/- to W. Winford, Waterdale Rd., N.21.



MELBOURNE

ABBOTSFORD.

HOLLINS, A. R., 405 Victoria St. Motor Repairs of all kinds. J 2047.

ALBERT PARK.

GROCERIES. C. Paten (cor. Page & Boyd Sts.). Wood, Coal & Coke. Orders called for and delivered.

ASCOT VALE.

A. J. AMESS, 390 Mt Alexander Rd. (Next Tram Sheds.) Motor Garage. Just Price Discount—Repairs and Supplies.

AUBURN.

BLACK CAT LIBRARY and Ladies Hairdrr. 639 Burw'd Rd. Haw. 1779

BLACKBURN.

"A" GRADE MOTOR ENGINEERS Station Garage, Whitehorse Road. WX 1490.

HAIRDRESSER and Tobacconist. Ladies' and Gents'. Wright, 122 South Parade.

MOTOR REPAIRS. Straton's. Better Service. Lower Cost. WX 8748.

PAINTER, PAPERHANGER, etc. G. B. COLLIER, 8 Wolseley Cres.

BOX HILL.

ALL Electrical and Radio Needs. G. G. Foster, W'horse Rd. WX2581.

BOOT REPAIRS. Work Guaranteed W. Tolley, 975 W'horse Road.

BOX HILL FURNISHING CO. 247-9 Station St. Cash or Terms. CHAS.

L. COX, TAILOR. Men's and Boys' Wear. 285 Station St.

CHEMIST. F. Cheshire, For Your Prescriptions. 270 Station Street.

COOL DRINKS, Sweets, Smokes. R. Dannock, 1124 Whitehorse Road.

CYCLE SHOP and Oxywelding. "Alwin" Station St., South of Rly.

DRAPERY. For Smart Styles and a Fair Deal, TAIT'S Corner Stores

DRESSMAKER. Mrs. Evans. Station St., opp. Baptist Church.

ELECTRICAL & RADIO. Holliday. Opp Stn. Sales, Repairs. WX 2677.

FURNITURE REMOVERS. Gill Bros., 254 Station St. WX2073

GROCER. W. M. Anderson, 14 Main St. WX 1233.

HAIRDRESSER and Tobacconist. L. Larsen, Station St., opp. Gilpin's.

ICE & FUEL. J. Underwood. 440 & 770 Station Street. WX 2547.

IRONMONGER & SPORTS STORE. F. P. Park, 10 Main St. WX1290.

MARS LAUNDRY CO. WX 2662 Pick up & Deliver. Quality G'teed.

RENNIE'S BLUE TAXIS. WX1946 City Prices. Day and Night Service

TAILOR. J. G. Penson, 227 Station Street. Suits Hand Made from 95/-.

W. A. MOODY. 1014 W'horse Rd. Fruit, Vegetables Delivered Daily.

WATCHMAKER and Jeweller. Barnes. 32 Main Street. Repairs.

CAMBERWELL.

SPORTS DEPOT & Leather Goods. E. Goslin, 777 Burke Rd. Haw. 4900.

CARNEGIE.

P. A. McWHINNEY, Grocer, Confectioner. Opposite State School.

CITY

A TAILORED SUIT at moderate Price. Dress Suits. DOYLE. C. Wentworth House, 203 Collins St.

(Continued on page 3.)

LOAVES AND FISHES

A Modern Miracle. . Of Invention

"Mrs. Brown's husband earns the basic wage of £3/17/- a week. They have three children: Jimmie, 12; Jean, 10; and little Mary, 5. Every week Mrs. Brown has 25/- and anything she can get from the bone and bottle man to buy food. With great care and forethought she manages to keep within this amount."

This is the preamble to a three-column article featured in the Melbourne *Herald* for Tuesday, June 7. Those who have not already had the interesting experience of reading the article are advised to acquire a copy for intensive study. As an indoor amusement it will be found more absorbing than crossword puzzles.

There is a charming photograph, presumably of Mrs. Brown herself in the kitchen. If she does not look like the mother of three, the eldest a boy of twelve, that is a tribute either to the camera's art or to the simple and nutritious meals she plans for her brood. She is shown engaged in the difficult art of chick-sexing . . . at least, we think it must be this, as she buys eggs at 18 for 2/3, whereas the retail price at Queen Victoria Market last Saturday was 2/- to 2/3 per dozen.

Keen Buying

Many housewives pride themselves on their ability to buy. The smartest of them is just a fool to Mrs. Brown, as shown by her detailed budget for the current week. Let us investigate.

In the best Swiss Family Robinson style, she started last week with a few things on hand. We quote verbatim:

"Last week she started out with 25/- and 3d from the 'bottle-oh.' On her store shelves she had a little baking soda (at 2d. a lb.), a few junket tablets from a tube of 24 for 7½d, a few ounces each of gelatin, curry powder, pepper (cayenne, because it is more wholesome), salt, garlic, and about an ounce of cream of tartar. Also half a pound of tea (they use 4 ounces a week), 1/2 lb. prunes, 1/2lb. sultanas, 1/2lb. lima beans and some home-made jam."

To add to these she had her 25/- and 3d from the bottle-oh. She began by dividing her money into five amounts of 5/- each, allotted for bread and other cereals, milk and cheese, meat and eggs, fruit and vegetables, and fats, sugar and other sundries. Why so careful a domestic economist should not include cheese in the protein group, the meat and eggs, is not quite clear; but that is only a minor discrepancy amidst a welter of inexplicables.

For example, the admirable Mrs. Brown manages to purchase 17 lbs. of potatoes for 1/-. The current price for medium and inferior greysoils, in an over-supplied market (we do not think she would aim as high as £7 a ton Carmen redsoils), is £6 a ton wholesale, or 19 lbs. for 1/-. Similarly, she pays only 3d for 6 lbs. of onions. The current price of onions is £8/10/- a ton wholesale, which works out at 6½ lbs. for 6d., or, roughly, twice the price which she pays retail. Again, she buys cheese at 6d a lb. retail, when the wholesale market price for new cheeses is 10½d. lb., and 11½ to 1/2 a lb. for matured cheese. Her tomatoes cost 2d a lb., and her bananas 6d a dozen. The Queen Victoria Market retail prices on Saturday last for these items are 4½ to 5d, and 10 to 12 a 1/- respectively.

Fiction Stranger Than Fact

It may be that Mrs. Brown naturally buys the lowest grades of goods: being forced to do this by circumstances. Even allowing this, the process she quotes are phenomenally lower than normal market prices, and they look

suspiciously like fiction, or some sort of Freudian wish-fulfilment. If Mrs. Brown is able to buy the quantity of food set out for a maximum of 25/-, and does not buy offal or condemned goods, then she is buying at about 20 per cent, less than normal people are able to do. This suggests that she is either super-normal or the creation of a fertile imagination.

If Mrs. Brown really exists, and performs her weekly miracle, she is wasted as the wife of a basic-wage earner. Such talents should properly be at the disposal of the nation. If, on the other hand, she is a fictional character—a perfectly legitimate device in journalism—the *Herald* Special Correspondent does not appreciate the necessity for artistic verisimilitude in fantastic literary compositions.

Diet Theories Go West

By judicious use of the stockpot, vegetable waters and bacon rinds, Mrs. Brown has "plenty of liquid rich in mineral salts for soups and gravies, and extra money is not needed for tonics, patent medicines and pick-me-ups." She and her husband have only two fears, debt and illness, and they avoid these "by paying cash for everything, and obeying sensible rules of health and eating balanced meals."

If the suspicions previously voiced are not justified, and Mrs. Brown and her family really exist, then this is proof that the dietitians and food specialists are completely haywire. Her menus for the week are given in comparative detail; and on those lines she has reared her children to the ages of 12, 10 and 5 years respectively. How she has done this is more intriguing than the mystery of the "Marie Celeste."

By the deft acquisition of inordinate supplies of potatoes and onions for insignificant sums, and cheese and meat at knockout prices, Mrs. Brown provides a diet, which seems reasonably adequate in calories per person. The proportion of proteins to carbohydrates seems to be fairly satisfactory. What does, however, appear worthy of closer examination, is the supply of fresh fruit to the growing family.

According to the week's menus, Mr. Brown has fruit as part of a meal on 4 days, Mrs. Brown on 5 days, and Jimmie, Jean and Mary on 4 days. In passing, it is noticeable that on Monday Jimmie and Jean have "a peach each" with their lunch. No item in the list of expenditure provides for peaches, which is not surprising, as the month is June. It sounds as though the great brain behind the article slipped a cog in mentioning these out-of-season and extra-budgetary peaches.

Omitting the exotic items, there are 21 meals during the week at which fruit is provided. Now let us look at the quantities in the budget. They amount in all to 1 dozen bananas at 6d, and 3 lbs. of Jonathans at 6d the lot, or a total of 1/-. This is an average of a little over one-halfpenny worth of fruit per person at the meal where fruit is included. Actually, Mr. Brown and the children, having fruit at 4 meals each during the week, get fruit to the value of 2.28 pence each week. Mrs. Brown is a little better off. She gets fruit at 5 meals, valued at 2.85 pence per week.

Exit the Alkaline Reserve

Even admitting the sterling qualities of Mrs. Brown as a fruit

buyer, the quantity is just as startling as the expenditure per head per week. One dozen bananas of the size currently retailed at 16 for 1/- weigh under 2½ lbs gross weight. Bananas at 6d a dozen, as purchased by Mrs. Brown, could hardly weigh any more. With the 3 lbs. of Jonathans, this makes a total of 5 ½ lbs., including the skins and cores. Divided by 21 individual meals, this gives an average of 4.2 ounces of fruit per head per meal. If Mrs. Brown discards the banana skins and apple cores, or puts them into the witches' cauldron (hereinbefore referred to as the stock-pot), the amount of edible fruit per head per meal is reduced to about 3 ounces, and the total intake per person per week is about 12 ounces.

According to leading dietitians, such an amount of fresh fruit is very much less than the desirable minimum, and is probably insufficient to provide either the alkaline reserve or the accessory food factors necessary to maintain reasonable good health. Despite this, Mr. and Mrs. Brown have, on their own showing, succeeded in avoiding illness for themselves and their children "by obeying the sensible rules of health and eating balanced meals."

An ounce of practice being worth a ton of theory, this experience of the Brown family should be given full consideration in the future study of dietetics, for the fresh fruit advocates seem demonstrably astray in their recommendations.

Further Inaccuracies

There are many other mistakes in the article. In fact, it is as full of bloomers as an old-time draper's shop. We will, however, leave some of these for our readers to discover for themselves, commenting only upon the remarkable salmon trout at 9d., which feeds five persons and still leaves enough to provide little Mary with fish balls for lunch the following day, and the providential existence of Mrs. Next-Door, with a lemon-tree, the fruit from which she exchanges with Mrs. Brown for home-made jam. Where the fruit and sugar come from for making the jam is not stated. Perhaps the bottle-oh produces a series of threepences; but where do the bottles come from? The only container left over from last week's budget is a cocoa-tin, and no bottles of any kind were purchased. Furthermore, Mrs. Brown does not appear to be the sort to buy bottled goods, as she knows that the cost of the bottle is always loaded on to the price.

It should not be necessary to labour the point any further. If fact, the article does not give the whole truth and nothing but the truth. If fiction, the article is insufficiently accurate to bear the impress of truth, and fills in its apparent objective: to show that living on the basic wage is really possible. Whatever the intentions of the writer, whether he wrote didactically or simply to amuse and divert, he has hardly succeeded.

Upon reflection, articles such as that one are likely to do far more harm than good. In the first place, insofar as they are believed by readers to be true and accurate, they are calculated to cause dissension in homes where struggling housewives find they cannot feed five on 35/- let alone 25/-. In the second place, even if they are not believed to be true, they purport

to set an example of thrift and economy for housewives to follow. If such example was, in fact, followed, or any sort of concerted attempt was made to follow it, the result would be simply disastrous. Retail shops, where meat, eggs, fruit and vegetables are commonly sold, would be deserted for the markets. First quality goods would be passed over for the cheaper and inferior grades. Three-quarters of the stock in grocers' shops would be left to rot on the shelves, and the factories, which supply such goods, would be rendered idle, with a consequent increase in the number of the unemployed. Such drastic reduction in fruit consumption would beggar the orchardists, who are not so far off from that state even under existing conditions.

The Correct Approach

Other natural results, which would flow from following such advice, are not difficult to visualise. It is merely common sense to see that any large-scale reduction in consumption would cause endless confusion and hardship, if unaccompanied by compensatory alteration to our system of measuring our wealth in terms of debt.

By all means let us change our mode of living if it means an improvement in the standard of national health. But a policy of unnecessary economy in the use of goods which are abundant, and the supply of which can easily be increased without appreciable effort, is a policy of despair, bred of ignorance of the fundamentals of rational economics. Why reduce consumption to the level required by a system which keeps the only costless thing, money, in short supply? Why not try the other angle of approach, and equate the money supply to the real wealth, actual and potential, of the country?

A wholesale reduction in consumption is the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire; and the quickest way to make the proprietors of the *Herald* realise this is to stop buying their paper for a few weeks. If carried out on a large scale, the lesson would be a salutary one.

Loaves and Fishes

The *Herald* article, with its patent inaccuracies in prices, reminded us rather forcibly of the Negro preacher telling of the miracle of the loaves and fishes. Unfortunately, he got the figures mixed, and stated that five people were fed with 5000 loaves and 2000 fishes. One of the congregation laughed. The preacher corrected his mistake, and the man laughed again. The preacher admonished the interrupter, who said: "That's not a miracle. I could do that myself." When the astonished preacher asked how, he replied: "I'd feed them with what was left over from the first time."

DON'T SPEND A PENNY—without consulting the "New Times" Shopping Guide.

SHOULD PARENTS BE BLAMED? Notes on the Problem of Heredity

By YAFFLE, in "Reynolds News."

Let us consider the question of heredity, fitness for marriage, and whatnot.

I will take as my text the recent case of a young Dorset woman whose marriage was postponed for inquiries into her mental fitness.

The local squire opposed the bans on the grounds that the girl might be mentally defective. According to the press, his evidence was that she had been backward at school. The mother, on the other hand, asserted that she had proved capable of looking after a home.

We are here confronted with two distinct questions:

(1) Do backward parents have backward children?

(2) Is backwardness at school a sign of mental deficiency?

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss whether the State actually requires intelligent children. *It has been argued that in these days of mechanisation and rearmament, the ruling class would prefer a population with a completely blank mind.* But that is not the subject of my discourse. Let us proceed.

With regard to question (1): Science is still in doubt as to the relative influence of heredity and environment. There is no way of telling whether a child's character is predestined by its parentage or whether the poor little beggar gets like that afterwards.

Thus, the modern child does not know whether to blame its parents, its nurse, or its teacher, a fact that frequently causes it to enter upon adult life with the handicap of a mind clouded by indecision.

When the poet, in a moment of self-defence, observed, "Poets are born, not made," his excuse was scientifically groundless. But the editor was equally incorrect when he retorted, "Why lay the blame on your poor father and mother?"

Even the influence of environ-

ment is uncertain, for, while some children imitate their parents, others react against them and become the exact opposite, the little cusses.

CONSERVATIVES BREED SOCIALIST SONS.

Like is continually begetting unlike. We see examples of this all around us. Conservative statesmen have Socialist sons, musicians give birth to crooners, and / *have even known a great economist whose son, in defiance of both heredity and environment, grew up with some vestiges of common sense.*

Some attempt is made to explain this by the Freudian theory that every son starts life by unconsciously hating his father. He may not be aware of it; he may even be under the impression that the old boy has points. But down in his Unconscious, he regards the old Dad as an excrescence and a blister.

For this reason, I gather, the first question the psychoanalyst puts to his patient is, "When did you first hate your father?"

Even if this theory is correct, it does not help us much in forecasting the subsequent character and abilities of the child, for the young Dad-strafer may either grow up the opposite of his old man, in order to make a pleasant contrast, or grow up like him, only more so, by way of getting his own back.

Let us take two simple examples. There was Professor Schmeinpels, the eminent biologist, who electrified the scientific world by the discovery that if you remove the stomach from a rat it fails to extract the full nourishment from its food. He was the son of a famous sportsman. In that case the son was clearly repeating the father, but going one better.

In contrast to this, however, there was the man who founded the Be Kind To Insects League, and left the family fortune to a Home for Orphan Mice. His son

DOCTORS! WAKE-UP!

Have a good think about the future scale of medical fees after Mr. Casey and his "old school tie" knights have wreaked their damage on an honourable profession through national insurance. It will be something like this: "Knight" Surgeons, 100-200 guineas for 1 to 2 hours work. "Fellow" Surgeons, 40-100 guineas for 1 to 2 hours work. "Ordinary" Surgeons, 15-40 guineas for 1 to 2 hours work. "Knight" Physicians, 5-25 guineas per consultation of 30 minutes to 1 hour.

"Fellow" Physicians, 5-10 guineas per consultation of 30 minutes to 1 hour.

"Ordinary" Physicians, 2-3 guineas per examination. Panel Doctors, 11/- per annum for everything medical.

Another aspect of the joke is that the "knights" and "fellows" will operate by appointment only, thus allowing them to allocate their time to suit their own convenience and without having to rush about from place to place. The patients will come to THEM. The panel doctors will have to go to the patients and be available 24 hours a day for 365 days a year. Why such a difference, when all doctors are giving only Energy multiplied by Time? Is it that "knights" and "fellows" have a different kind of energy?

It is all designed to prove that MONEY is terribly scarce when there is neither rhyme nor reason in allowing it to be scarce. Future graduates will be faced with the position that they will not be able to get into the higher grades on ability alone, but will have to pass a personal selection on social and other grounds by the privately appointed "censors."

Your only hope is to notify your member of the Federal Parliament that unless he votes against these national insurance measures you will vote against HIM when the next election takes place.

began by inventing a popular Insecticide, passed from that to pheasants and foxes, and finally became a big game hunter, being responsible for the complete extinction of five different species of overseas fauna. This was a clear case of reaction.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR STATESMEN

In the case of great statesmen, it is particularly difficult to determine what parental qualifications go to produce them. Choose, for example, any three great men who control the destinies of the Empire:

Specimen 1. —A Cabinet Minister who says that the only way to

security is to make more armaments than anyone else;

Specimen 2. —A Chancellor of the Exchequer who, when there is an abundance of goods and a shortage of money to buy them with, says that our inability to buy them is due to a blizzard;

Specimen 3. —An Economist who says that the way to make consumption meet production is to reduce production.

Now, here are three common cases, drawn from everyday life; yet so limited is our knowledge of parental cause and effect, that it is impossible to say whether the parents of these great men were abnormally intelligent or—er—not. Personally, I should have a bob each way.

Further, we permit these people to marry and have children. Though I admit that occasionally, after reading the speech of a great man, and learning that he has a family, the citizen is surprised into exclaiming, "Good Gosh! Has it got young?"

SHOULD WE CHOOSE OUR RULERS FROM BACKWARD PUPILS?

With regard to Question 2—whether backwardness at school is a sign of mental deficiency—there is a conflict of opinion.

Reflecting that our leading politicians, business men and financiers consist largely of men who are known to have done well at school, many people, observing the present state of the world, are inclined to suggest that, by way of experiment, we choose our rulers from the sons of backward pupils.

Some people even go so far as to reward their children for being at the bottom of the class, on the grounds that they are less likely to become politicians or financiers.

Force is given to the argument by the case I have mentioned. Here is a girl who was backward at school, but who knew how to manage a home. The education of our statesmen appears only to have taught them how to get homes broken up.

However, as I have said, we are not yet in a position to judge cause and effect with regard to parentage and education. I knew a man who did very well at school. He won all the prizes and became a distinguished scientist, crowning a brilliant career by inventing a gas, which can burn through any gasmask. His marriage was not opposed, and he was not regarded as mentally defective.

Though of course, his parents may have been...

New Times SHOPPING GUIDE and Business Directory

PATRONISE THESE
ADVERTISERS.

Their advertisement helps your paper. Say you saw it in the "New Times."

MELBOURNE (Cont.)

(Continued from page 2.)

ATTENTION! NavturaVegetarian Guest House. Accom. State & Inter. Guests. Haw. 74. BLINDS of every sort. Car curtains repaired. T. Pettit, 235a Queen St. CAKES, PASTRY, etc. Home Made "Clovelly," The Block, Elizabeth St. Cent. 256. DAVIS, 568 Bourke St. Royal Medal Milkery, Separators, Engines DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT BOOKSHOP, 166 Lit. Collins St. GINGER JAR CAPE, 238 Flinders Lane (4 doors from Swanston St.). Best 3-course meal in city.

JAS. JENNINGS, 211 Queen St., and 6 Regent Arc. Optician, 73 years est. Testing Free.

MAISON MERLIN, Natl. Bk. Bldg., 271 Col. St. Ladies' Hairdressers. OPTICIAN and Hearing Aids. M. L. COLECHIN, Champion House, 4th Floor, 57 Swanston St. F 5566. OPTICIAN, J. H. Buckham, J.P. Nat. Bk. Ch., 271 Collins St. C. 831. PRINTING. E. E. GUNN. Off 600 Lit. Bourke St. Cent. 6021. QUICK SERVICE TOBACCO KIOSK, Equitable Place. Buy your Smokes here!

TAILOR, High Class; H. Stackpoole. Lang Arc., off 333 Lons. St. WATCHMAKER and Jeweller. M. Chapman, CAPITOL HSE, 6 yrs. Hardy Bros. in charge Repair Dept.

DARLING.

ESTATE AGENT, J. White, 1 Illova St. UY 6521.

ELSTERNWICK.

BRIDGE & SON. Men's & Boys' Wear. Opp. Station. Phone L 5383. RADIO & ELECT'L SERVICES Mackintosh's, 72 Glenh'tly Rd. L 4588.

FAIRFIELD.

BUTCHER, 93 Station Street. Arthur B. Heath Solicits Your Patronage.

FOOTSCRAY.

BOOT REPAIRS. A. A. Taylor Station Ramp, While U Wait S'vice! MASSEY'S GARAGE, W'town Rd. The Home of Motor Reconditioning

GLENFERRIE.

OPTICIAN, W. W. Nicholls, 100 Glenferrie Rd. Haw. 5845. SUITS to order from 70/- . H. 6818. A. Sutherland, 184 Glenferrie Rd.

HAMPTON.

BEAUTY SALON, Norma Bell, 33 Hampton St., next P.O. XW2160 BOOKSELLER, S. J. Endacott, 75 Hampton St., for all book needs.

CHEMIST, Rod Burgess, 156a Hampton St. XW 2424.

HAIRDRESSER, Ladies and Gents. R. STEWART, 68 Hampton St. HOME MADE CAKES. BEAN'S, 140 Hampton St. XW1787. TAILOR, R. W. Simpson, Railway Walk. Suits Hand Made from 95/-.

IVANHOE.

BOOT REPAIRS. J. Fraser solicits your custom. 130 Upper H'berg Rd.

P. A. MORRIS & CO.

PTY. LTD.
EYESIGHT SPECIALISTS, PRACTICAL OPTICIANS.
"YORK HOUSE" BASEMENT, 298 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE.
*Phone: Central 8400.
And at 80 MARSHALL ST., IVANHOE.
*Phone: Ivanhoe 88.

UPHOLSTERER. Blinds & Bedding. Duke's, 111 H'berg Rd. Ivan. 626.

KEW.

ANDERSON'S, 141 High St. Authorised Newsagent. Haw. BUTCHER, S. Daw. High Street, Opp. Union St. Satisfaction, S'vice. C. KENNEDY, Grocer. Haw. 229. Opp. Cemetery Clock, Parkhill Rd. DRY CLEANING, Depot & Library A.I. Fraser, 182 High St. E. WHITE 109 High Street Confectioner and Smokes. FLORIST, "Mayfair," Haw. 1452 Cotham Rd., near Glenferrie Rd. GIFTS, & All Jewellery Repairs. Old Gold Bought. Greaves, opp. Rialto

OPEN LETTER TO THE FEDERAL MEMBER FOR BENDIGO

Mr. George James Rankin, D.S.O., V.D., M.P., Federal Parliament House, Canberra.

Dear Mr. Rankin, —

We did not have a representative at the Odd fellows' dinner at Bendigo during last weekend, and, consequently, have only the newspaper report of the proceedings to go on. According to the "Argus" of June 13, you responded to the toast of "Parliament," and said that "vested interests were very much worried about National Insurance"; that "you had received 54 letters in one day on the subject from doctors, chemists, lodges and Christian Scientists"; and that "you hoped nothing would be done to block the passage of the Bill, because, if National Insurance were dropped now it might not be attempted again for many years." This attitude on your part comes as an unpleasant surprise to many of those who voted for you and worked for you. They believed they were getting a man who would represent in Parliament the views and desires of his constituents, and not a yes-man for the financial institutions.

When you referred to "vested interests" being worried, who exactly did you have in mind? Did you mean the millions of employees who would receive less in their pay envelopes, and who, if they lost their employment, would have their income reduced from the already inadequate basic wage to approximately £1 per week—i.e., an immediate substantial deterioration in their standard of living and an ultimate deterioration of no less than 75 per cent? When considering this it should be remembered that more than half of the electors voted for the Labour programme, which was op-posed to the proposals now before Parliament. That being so, why are you shedding crocodile tears at the possibility of something being rejected when the citizens have very good reasons for not wanting it?

And why make a song about the number of people who write to you on matters of public importance? If you object to that, you are not obliged to retain your seat in Parliament. You have been sent there as one of the community's servants, and each and every one of your constituents has the absolute right not only to approach you, but also to expect prompt and courteous attention to the matters placed before you. The fact that you are receiving so many letters is the healthiest sign for the establishment of true democracy in Australia, and we suggest that you would be well advised to foster that tendency. At long last your constituents are waking up, and you may depend upon it that important events will take place when they become fully awake.

In what respect would it be regrettable if National Insurance were dropped now and not attempted again for many years? Would it upset the farming and trading community, who would have customers with more purchasing power than could possibly be the case under National Insurance? Would it upset the employees in general, who would not have deductions they can ill-spare made from their wages? Would it upset the general taxpayer, who would not have to face insurance taxation on top of existing tax burdens, which have already reached breaking point?

To come down to realities, can you name any section of society, other than the money controllers, who will get actual benefit from the Bill now before the Federal Parliament? What will the Bill "insure"? Will the old-age pensioners, invalids, and those depending on insurance payments be assured that the money they receive in the time of their greatest need will have a satisfactory purchasing value, or will they be further robbed through high prices? Will the quantity of money available to the people in general be increased or will we merely have the redistribution of the present inadequate quantity? A shortage can never be overcome by juggling the short supply.

No, Mr. Rankin. It is not a bankers' plan for the perpetuation of poverty we want. It is a money supply equal to the prices the people have to pay and if you wish to be returned again at the next elections you cannot start too soon to oppose this National Insurance ramp, and insist that the people's financial needs must be immediately and adequately met. -- Yours faithfully,

THE NEW TIMES

THE NEW TIMES

Published every Friday by New Times Ltd., Elizabeth House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Streets, Melbourne, C.I. Postal Address: Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Telephone: M 5384.

Vol. 4. No. 24.
FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1938.

A Low Watermark in Journalism

"Get money; still get money, boy; No matter by what means."
—Ben Jonson.

It is all very well for Ben Jonson to give advice like that, away back in the seventeenth century. The general idea is quite good, but the second line is likely to cause a spot of trouble. Ben didn't have any knowledge of our Crimes Act, which shows a marked dislike for the people who are not fussy as to the means whereby they acquire the root of all evil. Shakespeare was a little more cautious. He said, "Put money in thy purse," but he made no sinister suggestions as to how or where to get it.

To come from the sublime to the twentieth century, our musings upon the subject of money were prompted by the Melbourne *Herald*. Last week, in two consecutive issues, it featured a remark made by Mr. T. Latham, father of the Chief Justice of Australia, and Victorian delegate to the Methodist Conference in Adelaide.

Mr. Latham claimed that money making is one of the easiest things in the world, but that he had always been afraid to do it. "I have seen other men 'grow rich,'" he said, "and they have deteriorated. Who knows that I would not have done the same? Life has always been very beautiful and happy for me, and I would not change it."

Deterioration is a wide and rather elastic term. The venerable old gentleman assures us that he has not deteriorated; but we feel that in common humanity and fellow feeling, he hardly rates 100 per cent. If he has not spent his beautiful and happy life on a light-house, or in some sequestered spot like Tierra del Fuego, he would know that there is a large and complicated Act, known as the Commonwealth Bankruptcy Act. His distinguished son, the Chief Justice, knows of it, even if he doesn't. And a happy glance at the beautiful Commonwealth Year Book for 1937 would show that no fewer than 1713 persons failed last year in that super-easy pastime of making money, and were forced to take refuge in the more facile

hobby of filing their schedules in bankruptcy.

In the very same newspaper where Mr. Latham said his Pollyanna piece, there is a report of the progress of the Ward and Co. bankruptcy. In that case, creditors to the tune of £112,000 have so far received nothing from the estate. It is, however, expected that they will receive three pence in the pound this month, as about £1000 is available for distribution. The failure of Ward and Co. took place over a year ago.

No doubt, the creditors would be grateful to Mr. Latham if he would show them how to get the other 19/9, for otherwise, the outlook is not promising. We think they would even be prepared to risk deterioration to get back what used to be theirs, and to attempt with it to achieve a beautiful and happy life.

Actually we are not deeply concerned with the platitudes of a harmless old man. What we do think is a shade indelicate is that the *Herald* should feature, as an item of interest, such a presumptuous piece of balderdash, and, in the succeeding issue, follow it up with a photograph of Mr. Latham, and repeat his remarks. One would have thought that the unfortunate experience of Theodore Fink, Esq., back in the "eighties" would have made him a little chary of advertising the fact that it is "one of the easiest things in the world" to pay 20/- in the £.

We admit that to make money as(?) the banksters do it, with pen and ink in a bank ledger, is one of the easiest things in the world. It is almost as easy as ruining a prosperous business by calling in an overdraft without cause. But such feats of "ledgerdemain" are reserved for the privileged few. Other really easy methods, such as counterfeiting and forgery, are called felonies. They certainly bring with them economic security, at his Majesty's expense for fifteen years; but the life is neither beautiful nor happy.

The *Herald*, as a newspaper, has never been signalled either by its leadership or its decency and reticence; but there are surely limits beyond which gratuitous insult should not proceed. Amongst its 217,523 readers there are probably 200,000 who have suffered directly or indirectly from a money system, which survives only by continual forced sales below financial cost. Most of them believe that they are helpless to alter the position. The least that the *Herald*—itself a shining example of an anti-social monopoly of the most pernicious kind—can do, is to be less blatantly derisive of those whom it helps to despoil.

An Amazing Invention

Mr. William George Howard Finch, an English inventor, has just patented in America a new invention called the radio newspaper. Within a year anyone possessing a radio set and thirty-five dollars will be able to receive printed information and pictures in his own home. This invention will print news, pictures and drawings in the home at the rate of five feet per hour, and is being used experimentally by 23 big radio

stations in America, transmitting thirty feet of reading matter between midnight and 6 a.m. The weekly cost to the user is 39 cents in paper and power.

It is stated that the device is guarded by one of the most elaborate patent structures ever known. This is not surprising, as many inventions, far less likely to wreck the economic system than this one, have been deliberately sabotaged by the existing monopolies. The curious and inexplicable accidents which happen to non-combine oil wells; the new diamond fields which somehow always come into the hands of the one group; the improvements in plant and process which are bought up for destruction or suppression by existing monopolies; these are matters of history. It is, in fact, extremely dangerous to invent anything, which may send existing plant and equipment out of date. If you do, you are obliged to part with your invention at a low price to those who wish not to use, but to destroy; or else be prepared to spend the rest of your days trying to avoid the thug, the poisoner or death by misadventure.

This may sound exaggerated, but there is more than a grain of truth in it. Obviously evidence of what we allege is not easy to acquire, but a great deal of evidence, mainly circumstantial and hearsay, has been published on the subject, and if anything at all is certain, it is that it is unreasonable to dismiss all this evidence as mere fabrication.

To return to Mr. Finch's invention . . . here is something of extreme danger to vested interests, and to the present economic structure. In Australia alone approximately £6,000,000 is locked up in plant, machinery, land and buildings in the newspaper and periodical industry. Eight thousand seven hundred employees are engaged in it, receiving in wages over £2,220,000 per annum. It would be impossible to estimate the number of persons directly and indirectly dependent upon the continuance of the newspaper industry for the continuance of their livelihood. For example, advertising agencies, the motor trade, ink and paper manufacturers, process engravers, and their employees are all intimately connected with the newspaper industry.

It must, therefore, be abundantly clear that any invention which may to any considerable degree replace the newspaper in the home would cause the utmost concern to those who mould public opinion by their virtual monopoly of the world's newspapers. It is true that most newspaper magnates have a greedy finger in the radio pie, but they would not willingly see millions of pounds of existing plant and machinery scrapped, nor would they view without alarm the unemployment, which would result from an immediate adoption of Mr. Finch's invention. The economic system is hard enough to control as it is without adding further complications.

We wish Mr. Finch every success, and congratulate him upon his achievement. At the same time, we fear that his device will not be in use within a year, as hoped, nor within several years. In fact, we would not be surprised if all mention of it disappears from the news, or if he comes to and untimely end.

THE RELATION OF ECONOMICS TO CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY—PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

By C. J. M.

The study of English constitutional history can be most enlightening to a student who will not suffer himself to be led, as it were, on the (business) end of a halter. If he studies this subject independently, he begins to wonder whether, after all, we English-speaking people can be living in an age of democracy, as we are supposed to believe.

De Facto Sovereignty and Economic Supremacy

The vicissitudes of England's career, which generally resolve themselves into a conflict for the possession of legal and (more important) political sovereignty, have ever been discolored by economic considerations, from the feudal doctrine and practice of vesting the ownership of all land in the Crown—at a time when the Crown was strong—even down to the institution, in 1698, of a Civil List for the doling out to the King of his annual pocket-money. *Note especially* that this civil list pullulated just six years after the establishment of the Bank of England. Concerning this bank, and more particularly its origin, much can be deduced from the facts of constitutional history, and our deductions will inevitably lead to the conviction that the word "democracy" is but a smoke-screen to hide the nefarious activities of a small but immensely powerful plutocracy.

The purport of the foregoing remarks has been to suggest the cardinal truth that *de facto* sovereignty is synonymous with economic supremacy. In this regard, let us consider the Bank of England.

Maitland, the most illustrious of our constitutional historians, in his monumental lectures on "The Constitutional History of England" (at p. 438), says:

"Back in the Middle Ages we find our kings large borrowers . . . At all times it is difficult enough to get money from the king—one cannot sue him. A flagrant case occurs under Charles II. The London goldsmiths (the goldsmiths of those days were, also the bankers) had lent Charles about £13,000 . . . Suddenly the Exchequer was shut against them . . . It was extremely doubtful whether these bankers had any remedy, except by petition of right, and to that remedy they could not come, except by the king's fiat." From this extract it will be seen that the *de jure*, or legal sovereignty was "in the King." But subsequent developments amply proved in whose hands "lay the real supremacy."

Enter the National Debt

Maitland (op. cit., p. 439): "In 1692 there was pressing need for a large sum for the French War, and in that year it is usual to date the *foundation of the national debt*, a debt contracted upon the security of Act of Parliament. A million was to be borrowed. New duties were to be imposed for ninety-nine years upon beer and other liquors . . . Each subscriber of £100 was to have an annuity of £10 for life . . . You will observe that only a particular fund was pledged, *not the revenue in general* . . ."

The Bank of England

Thus was the Bank of England formed, built on a debt of one million pounds. Now that million pounds (which may or may not have been entirely in currency) was only obtainable from the bankers. They were, in truth holding the reins; so firmly, indeed, that by *Act of Parliament* on every £100, they were to receive £10 per year for life. Now note this fact, that the Bank of England being a juristic, corporate person enjoys immortality until dissolved by statute. Therefore, the term "for

life" in effect means "forever." What an immense discrepancy between amount loaned and amount repayable! As Maitland remarks: ". . . The national debt grew rapidly. . . . In 1817 it was above £840,000,000. . . ."

And that, mark you, from a mere million pounds. The situation is a perpetual outrage of equity. A million was loaned (to the Crown, which was legally sovereign, and should thus have had no need to subordinate itself to a subject), and, in all justice when the annuities had been paid to the extent of a million, plus a reasonable amount of interest (if any at all was reasonable in the circumstances), the whole debt should have disappeared. But, as has been seen, it was "for life," and the life of a corporation is very, very long—especially when it can practically determine the length of its own existence.

That debt has grown, by the application of an arbitrary arithmetical principle of compound interest, as also by the legal principle of corporate personality, to thousands of times its original dimensions. The position is at once criminal and ridiculous.

However, it supports the assertion that *de jure* sovereignty is nugatory when opposed by economic force, and demonstrates that any division of the two must lead to a constitutional antinomy, which effectually strangles the national life.

After the Present Plutocracy

That is the position of England and her Empire today. We have been born into a plutocracy, which smites us from the shadows—a nightmare that oppresses us in a perpetual dream of ignorance, produced by misrepresentation. The activity of reformers will dispel the incubus at last, but there will have to be a scrapping of many legal theories, which do not admit of practical democracy.

Particularly will the theory of sovereignty have to be reshaped, so that it will admit that legal supremacy resides in the body of electors.

And all this change in theory will of necessity be preceded by a transfer of political effectiveness from the few to the many. It means a return to something like the Grecian ideal of democracy wherein all free citizens were enlightened on all matters relative to their own government. There are but two differences between our ideal and that of the Greeks. They had a system of slavery, whereas we have one of machinery: both secure similar ends for those that are free—viz., leisure and liberty to think of other things than the worry of tomorrow. The second difference is that our civilisation has available to it the moral principles enunciated by Christ. This latter, if it were allowed to be the spiritual basis of material beneficence, would save our world from too great preoccupation with things material. Philosophy then would be immeasurably superior even to that of ancient Greece, whose standard of ethics admitted of slavery.

A Crusade

For us who know the truth, there is a God-given duty of teaching those who know it not. For our model we have Jesus Christ Himself, who was betrayed for thirty pieces of silver, and was crucified because He spoke the truth, in opposition to established evil. He died, but He left it for us, however to be worthy of redemption. If we are worthy we will drive the moneychangers from the temple, which is the world; we will make our constitutional history one to inspire future generations—not to render them contemptuous of our littleness.

THE PRINTED WORD
in
Pamphlets, Booklets, Leaf-lets,
Weeklies, Monthlies, Annuals,
Newspapers, Magazines, or
Books
EXCELLENTLY AND
ECONOMICALLY
PRODUCED
BY
THE ADVOCATE PRESS
143-151 a'BECKETT ST.,
MELBOURNE

THE DOCTOR SAID TO THE MAJOR

By "The Man Who Listened In," in "The Mirror" (New Zealand).

"Do you know, Doctor," said the Major, over the coffee and cigars the other evening, "I think I have located the exact point of origin of all the Empire's post-war troubles, extending right down to the present day."

"Indeed!" replied the Doctor. "Sunsports, or something like that, I suppose? I wonder if you will ever drop using that obsolete word, 'Empire.' It rather jars on me."

"No," said the Major; "not sunspots. It all dates back to a shed in Hyde Park, London, which I passed many times when on leave during the war. They had some artist fellow at work in there, starting a new stunt called camouflaging. You took a pot of paint and daubed a thing over, and made it look like something it wasn't."

"What!" exclaimed the Doctor. "You think Epstein's statues and the new art have put things off the rails? I must confess myself that I have found it a little difficult to attain a correct appreciation of modern art."

"It is not art I am talking about," said the Major, "but camouflage. We started this camouflage habit during the war, and we cannot get away from it. It is like the drug habit. The addict has to go back for more. He tries to live on it, and it can't be done."

"But what particular form of camouflaging are you referring to?" queried the Doctor. "They are not painting ships to look like jigsaw puzzles nowadays. I thought the whole thing was over and done with long ago."

"It is over so far as the ships go," said the Major. "But it is the principle. They have taken the principle and applied it to everything."

"I do wish you would be specific," rejoined the Doctor. "I will admit, if you like, that a lot of fair young things are walking about with camouflaged complexions, but if it fell to your lot to see these complexions in their native state I think you would agree that this can only be regarded as a boon to the public. What do you refer to particularly?"

"Have you ever heard of a thing called Planned Economy?" asked the Major.

"To be sure," replied the Doctor. "It has been my favourite study for a year past. I think, Major, if you would take up a study of Planned Economy, instead of the study of camouflage, you would find it much more profitable. It is the coming movement, and universally approved by all parties."

"I don't like it," said the Major.

"Ah!" smiled the Doctor. "That shows you have not really studied it. If you had you would at once realise that the only alternative to the present economic chaos is some order consciously planned."

"What do you call an order consciously planned?" asked the Major. "Well," replied the Doctor, "it means planning out things so that our national resources are utilised to the full and everybody gets his share."

"And what is his share?" inquired the Major.

"What he needs: what it is good for him to have," answered the Doctor.

"Do you mean he gets what he wants?" asked the Major.

"I mean," said the Doctor, "that he gets what is socially beneficial to him? In a Planned Economy," he continued, "You will naturally have a National Planning Council. This council will look over the situation to see what needs doing in the best interests of all. It will then lay down the lines of a National Plan and call for the willing cooperation of all in carrying out this plan."

It is a voluntary affair, then: you cooperate if you feel like it; if you don't you stand out. Is that the idea? Asked the Major. "Are the non-cooperators free to carry on

as they choose, or what do you do with them?"

"The Planning Council must naturally have power to carry through its plan, otherwise you could get nowhere in laying down a New Order," explained the Doctor. "It is the same as the motor regulations—everybody has to obey them. Any coercion is for the public benefit."

"Humph!" said the Major. "You mean for what the Planning Council considers is the public benefit?"

"But, my dear sir," emphasised the Doctor, who appeared somewhat nettled, "you surely do not consider that every man is at present free to get what he wants out of the existing social order, do you?"

He would, be free enough if he had the money," retorted the Major.

"Another fallacious idea," said the Doctor. "The mere issue of money will solve no economic problem."

"I think it would solve the problem of paying bills," said the Major, "and that appears to be the most acute economic problem in New Zealand today."

"Under planning, with proper regulation of production and State control of the monetary system," explained the Doctor, "a balance will be preserved between all these things. You should read some of the books on Planning, and you will find all the details very clearly worked out. There is an excellent one by G. D. H. Cole that I shall be pleased to lend to you."

"G. D. H. Cole?" mused the Major. "Isn't that the Socialist or Communist chap; something at one of the universities in the Old Country? I read something of his somewhere about the only cure being to make an end of capitalism, and have the workers overthrow the whole social order. Is that the man?"

"The fact that Cole may have leanings in the direction you mention," said the Doctor, "in no wise detracts from the fact that he is a most eminent economist, or from the clarity of his analysis in these intricate matter, in which laymen, such as ourselves, find expert guidance so helpful. Planning is

the only alternative to Communism. I think you will find that is so if you examine our economic position."

"But, as far as I can gather," said the Major, "our friend Cole, for instance, is not looking for alternatives to Communism. He seems to be mighty close to being out after Communism itself. Now you come to mention it, I seem to have recollections of having heard something about a Plan in Russia—a Five-Year Plan I think they called it. I suppose this Planned Economy does not, by any chance, happen to be camouflaged Communism, dressed up in a new packet, nice and respectable, that you might take and drop down inside the Church of England, for example, without anybody being unduly alarmed?"

The Doctor laughed heartily. "There is no connection, I assure you," he explained, "between Planning and Communism. Britain has taken up Planning. Why, you will find plenty of Conservatives thoroughly convinced that Planning must come. Look at Walter Elliot, Britain's Minister for Agriculture; no one has taken to Planned Economy more ardently than he, a Conservative and a member of the National Government."

"Still," pondered the Major, "if the British National Government takes up with Ramsay MacDonald, and Ramsay MacDonald says, as he did not so long ago, that he has abandoned none of his old principles, it looks to me that these National Conservatives have only to go one step on after that to take up Communism. This National Planning Council you talk about is bound to be a dictatorship anyway, from what you were saying. They tell us off to go and do so-and-so, and we have to go and do it, or we don't get any food tickets; That is the broad idea, isn't it?"

"A certain amount of compulsion may, of course, be necessary," admitted the Doctor. "That is inevitable in all these great changes. A certain sacrifice of liberty must be made for the common good. But it will only be in respect of economic matters; in respect of the material mechanism of life. There will be no interference at all with spiritual freedom."

"I see," reflected the Major. "Spiritual freedom will remain inviolate. The Planning Council will lay down what each farmer is to produce, how much he is to produce, where he is to sell, and what he is to get for what he sells. I

have noticed also that part of Planned Economy is to have everybody pay in the money they do not spend to a great investment trust, which will invest it in accordance with the National Plan. So the Planners will in this way decide what new ventures are to be started, and by whom. Then I see they have been talking of licensing and regulating retailers to sell goods from the planned factories, turning out planned quantities of planned products to be sold at planned prices. That is the general idea, isn't it?"

"In a broad way, yes," agreed the Doctor. "Everything is arranged to meet the needs of the community in the most efficient manner and without waste. The consumer will, of course, be left perfectly free to buy as he pleases."

"Quite so," said the Major. "The people will be free to buy what the Planners put on sale at the prices the Planners fix, free to wear such garments as the Planners provide, free to live in such houses as the Planners choose to erect, and to spend their time working on such things as the Planners desire to have labour applied to, and their leisure in such amusements as the Planners decree. Apart from these slight coercions on the economic side, the people will have complete spiritual freedom. Is that the idea?"

"Exactly," said the Doctor, "or perhaps I should say, pretty nearly."

"In that case," added the Major, "can you tell me just what spiritual freedom the individual will have except the freedom to die if he doesn't like doing what the Planners order him to do?"

"Oh, of course," ejaculated the Doctor, "you can pull anything to pieces if you set out to decay it in a hypercritical spirit! But do not forget that some of the greatest minds of the day have been working out these ideas. They are the only thing that will save the world from Communism."

"But, bless my soul and body, sir!" retorted the Major, "they are nothing but Communism!" The whole thing is simply the Russian Five-Year Plan dressed up, with a few frills thrown in. Planned Economy is just another name for what you had with Negro slaves on a cotton plantation. The Negroes did what they were told to do by the Planning Authority, and they got what the Authority considered was socially beneficial for them to have. It is just a reversion to

Serfdom, back on the other side of Feudalism."

"My dear Major," sighed the Doctor, "your economic ideas are just about contemporary with Noah and the ark. You really should make some effort to keep abreast of the times: we live in an age of progress and evolution."

"Perhaps so," said the Major. "I should prefer to live in one of common sense and Christianity myself. What we really live in, as I was trying to tell you when you dragged me off on to this Planned Economy—was that we live in an Age of Camouflage. Look at it, sir. They start off before the war forming huge, oppressive combines and monopolies, commonly known as trusts. These great concerns, with immense money behind them, begin ruthlessly smashing up small businesses. Laws are passed to curb them, and their whole proceedings stink in the nostrils of the people. Then we have a war, and after it is over the public is told that something called rationalisation is the very last thing. The papers are full of it. And what is it? Just trusts and combines under a new name, with a few daubs of paint stuck over the thing."

"Rationalisation," observed the Doctor, "is a very wonderful thing."

"It is, indeed," said the Major. "It is wonderful how they brought the public to swallow it. Well, they get so far with it, and then, to make a job of it, they wrap it up in a new parcel labelled Planned Economy, and off it goes again."

"So it really seems that nothing at all is any good, and everything is a trap? Am I to take it that this interesting conclusion represents your final position on economic matters?" inquired the Doctor. "You have nothing whatever to offer on the constructive side?" "All I am telling you," replied the Major, "is this—that the whole bedrock basis of this Planning is unsound. The rock-bottom idea of Planning is to limit production in order to raise prices. Planning means quotas to keep food out of England. Planning means rooting up cotton and burning wheat in the United States; throwing coffee beans into the sea in Brazil. That was the idea behind the Dairy Commission report to bolsheive the farmers of New Zealand in the name of Planned Economy; a quarter of a million cows to be killed off for a start. There are a lot of fancy theorists itching to start this (Continued on page 8.)"

YOUR HELP IS NEEDED!

If you wish to assist the "New Times" in its fight for justice, security, and freedom for all our people; if you desire to help it in exposing those who are the enemies of the people, you can best do so by providing the financial ammunition which will enable the paper to build up the greatest possible circulation in the shortest possible time.

Shareholders incur no other liability than payment in full for the shares applied for and allotted to them.

All shares are ordinary shares of £1 each.

You may apply for any number of shares from one upwards.

MINIMUM terms of purchase are 10 per cent. (2/- per share) with application, 10 per cent, on allotment, and balance at 10 per cent, per month.

To The Secretary, New Times Ltd., Elizabeth House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Sts., MELBOURNE, C.1.

Sir,—

I hereby make application for ordinary shares of £1 each in New Times Limited and I agree to be bound by its Articles and Memorandum of Association.

I enclose herewith £..... being payment in full/part payment [on account of these shares.

Name in full.....Address.....

Date..... Signature.....

THE REV. C. IRVING BENSON AND MONEY

A Clergyman Offended by Truth

A Letter to the Editor from BRUCE H. BROWN.

Sir, —Some of your readers may disapprove of public criticism of individual clergymen, and at least one has expressed the view that, while it may be (possible to "win" such men, it is useless trying to coerce them. As a general rule, that attitude is undoubtedly correct and is effective with most men, but what is the correct procedure when a man who preaches Christianity and publicly professes to practice it refuses to recognise facts? Is he a man to argue with or a menace to be fought?

Insane or Criminal or What?

A man who does harm to others without being conscious that he is doing harm is termed insane. Such a person is taken into custody, not to be punished, but to be cared for, because he knows no better and if left to himself will become a danger to society. On the other hand, a man who does harm to the community while in possession of his senses is termed a criminal, and he is taken into custody for punishment. At first, a man of the latter type is treated with leniency, but when he goes on doing injury and refuses to heed repeated warnings he is declared an habitual criminal and a public menace. The question we should ask ourselves is whether this principle is any different fundamentally when we come to consider the case of a minister of the Gospel who holds a position of influence in the community and yet consistently dodges his responsibilities, with consequent injury to great numbers of the human family.

What if a Policeman Did It?

What would we say of a policeman if, when passing a house, he was informed that a burglar was inside ransacking the premises and yet walked on refusing to take any notice? What would be the difference between the attitude of that policeman and the attitude of a clergyman who has his attention repeatedly drawn to the fact that a small section of society is robbing and plundering, and even defying the natural laws of God and man, and yet goes on adulating and co-operating with that section and with those who represent it? That is the position in which we see the Rev. C. Irving Benson, and the fact that a majority of the people do not yet realise the truth of the position is all the more reason why we should relentlessly call pointed attention to it.

His Sphere of Influence

Those who live in Melbourne already know of Mr. Benson and

the spheres of his influence, but, for the benefit of readers living in other States, it should be explained that he has had a somewhat meteoric rise in the ministry of the Methodist Church. He is the Superintendent of the Wesley Mission in Melbourne, which is recognised as the leading Methodist church of Victoria and Tasmania. He also writes regularly for Sir Keith Murdoch's Melbourne *Herald*, and, in addition, is under contract to the Australian Broadcasting Commission to conduct the "Questions and Answers" session every Sunday. An enlarged photograph of himself in colours has been regularly exhibited in a prominent position in one of Melbourne's busiest streets. (This, of course, may have been intended only to advertise the splendid photography.) Many people think highly of him, and many others not so highly. From the point of view of organised charity he is a first-class beggar, and does a great amount of work for the temporary alleviation of distress. Unfortunately, in this respect he seems content to go on doing this patching work, instead of insisting on measures to remove the cause of the distress. He tries to modify the effects of an evil, but refuses to attack the evil itself. Inquiries also suggest that he is himself free from the greatest cause of human unhappiness—financial worry.

A Lady Writes to Him

One of your lady readers sent a letter to Mr. Benson, covering a copy of the *New Times* containing my comment on the misuse of the Wesley pulpit. In my opinion it was a splendid letter, and I think you and your readers will be interested in its contents, as follows:

"Dear Mr. Benson, —I read the attached page in this week's *New Times* with interest, and am entirely in accord with the views expressed by Mr. Bruce H. Brown on the subjects for discussion by the majority of speakers at the P.S.A. at Wesley Church. Invariably the persons permitted to speak are those who advocate the continuation of the status quo, which inflicts such hardship on at least 70 per cent, of the population of this wonderful country. As far as I know, none of the reformers (even among the clergy in Melbourne) have the pulpit at Wesley Church offered to them to refute some of the statements put forward by the politicians.

"Any thoughtful person must realise that in a country capable of such boundless production as Australia is, there is something wrong with a system which permits such widespread malnutrition and misery among its people.

"As a Sunday school teacher of many years' standing in Melbourne and suburbs, I have observed the falling off in the attendance at Sunday schools, and, in conversation with senior scholars who have ceased attending, I have learnt that the thoughtful ones have attached themselves to groups where matters of reform and the betterment of the people generally (particularly the poor) are discussed.

"As Professor Woodruff suggests, study circles on the causes of the world's ills, and the application of Christianity to the great social questions of the day, are urgently needed, but how few of our clergy advocate these studies or endeavour to enlighten their congregations on such matters.

"I also suggest that, for the enlightenment of the busy women of the congregation, if such books as Stanley Jones's 'The Christ of the Mount,' McMurray's 'Creative Society,' and the pamphlets on Peace by A. A. Milne, Canon Dick Sheppard and Sir Norman Angel were read and discussed during sewing meetings, constructive thought would be stimulated."

The Gentleman Answers

For that valuable support I extend my sincere thanks to the lady concerned, and hope her splendid effort will be an inspiration to many other Womenfolk to do the same. It is clear to me that she wrote as a Christian lady believing that she was addressing a Christian gentleman, yet not any of her views or constructive suggestions were deemed worthy by the latter of so much as an acknowledgment. They were completely ignored, and the nature of the reply indicates annoyance that she should have agreed with the criticism I offered. His reply was as follows:

"Dear Madam, - - The article which you have forwarded has no claim to be regarded seriously. It is sufficient to point out the bias of the writer by mentioning that two persons whom he applauds—the Rev. R. Wilson Macaulay and the Rev. J. T. Lawton have both spoken at our Pleasant Sunday Afternoon - - the former quite frequently. He also deliberately omits the challenging speech of Mr. Curtin, Leader of the Federal Opposition, on 'Wealth and Poverty.'—Yours most truly,
"C. IRVING BENSON."

This letter from the reverend gentleman strengthens my growing belief that he is not altogether scrupulous and more intent in securing approval in certain social quarters than in doing anything really worthwhile for the permanent benefit of humanity. He is satisfied to take part in gathering up the debris, instead of helping to check the black hand that spreads it. Not only so, but he does not hesitate even to indulge in inexcusable misrepresentation to suit his own ends.

A Charge of Bias

In his letter he charges me with bias, and says it is proved by the fact that two gentlemen for whom I expressed respect have actually spoken from the Wesley pulpit on Sunday afternoon; also by the fact that I "deliberately" omitted reference to the isolated appearance at the P.S.A. of Mr. Curtin, the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament. If you will refer to the letter from myself, as it appeared in the issue of May 27, you will see at once that the names quoted related to the year 1930, and to the misuse of the Wesley pulpit in that year for the purpose of preparing the people for the imposition of the fraudulent Premiers' Plan. Neither Mr. Wilson Macaulay nor Mr. Lawton spoke from the Wesley P.S.A. during that year, and neither of them has appeared since with anything like the frequency with which supporters and defenders of the existing fraudulent system of finance have appeared. Indeed, it is true to say that no one at all has actually told the people from that pulpit the truth about money or of the irrefutable fact that our disgraceful slum conditions, the

serious lack of hospital accommodation, the spread of malnutrition, the neglect of the unfortunate people needing after-care treatment, the destruction of food while thousands of human beings literally starve, and the increasing demands on charitable organisations, are all due to our failure to write sufficient figures in the nation's money-books. Even if the two gentlemen mentioned have spoken occasionally, what hope have they of undoing the damage brought about by others who appear almost as a regular thing and give their hearers an entirely false conception of the situation? In the same way, what impression could we expect Mr. Curtin to make if for one appearance on his part there are ten appearances of the Caseys, the Menzies, the Paynes, and so on?

Does the Sun Shine?

It would seem that the word "bias" has been used by Mr. Benson without much thought. Had I set out to give a list of the speakers and omitted those whose inclusion might have weakened my case, it would have been dishonesty, not bias. The inference from his letter is that, while he cannot challenge the accuracy of what I said, he thinks it should all be disregarded because I did not say a lot more! It is almost the same as saying we should not take seriously the fact that the sun shines because those who say that it does shine have omitted reference to its other features. Whether we take it seriously or not, the sun will continue to shine on the earth, and in the same way the premises of

the criticism made against the Wesley Church and those responsible for its management will remain sound even though Mr. Benson may tell himself they needn't be taken seriously. The probability is that unless he takes notice of the facts they will operate later to confound him, and he will then have none but himself to thank if he is ostracised by an outraged but awakened community. Already the bank controllers have set in motion measures which will again intensify the poverty of the people and lead to untold and unnecessary physical suffering, and unless the clergymen come out and raise their voices against this crime they can only expect to be looked upon and treated as enemies of the people.

Has Been Informed of the Fraud

Documentary evidence in my possession shows clearly that the Rev. C. Irving Benson has had the fraud of the monetary system clearly pointed out to him on more than one occasion. He has been shown that we as citizens are being taxed heavily and otherwise imposed upon to pay huge tribute in interest on money that does not exist at all. Despite this, he continues to make his pulpit available to men advocating still further tribute at the community's expense by way of the greatest confidence trick in history. Space does not permit me to go into that side of the question in this letter, but, all being well, it will have attention next week. —Yours faithfully,

BRUCE H BROWN

WANTED TO BUY

By H.A.H.

Ten pounds to an average chap like you or me is a lot of money to have—that is, of course, £10 that is not earmarked by final notices for rates, taxes, instalments on the wireless set, car, perambulator, or the little plot in the cemetery where you hope to lie in peace when you have escaped beyond the clutches of the debt-finance octopus. Should you ever be in that happy position (having £10, not lying in the cemetery), you will, doubtless, do as I did—sit down and think out how you are going to spend it. But do not do as I did—sit down before a blazing fire—it may have unexpected results.

I must have dozed off, because a man in his right senses would have known what to expect.

I toyed with the idea of what that ten pounds would buy. It would buy this, and that, and the other. So many things I needed, and not a thing beyond the realms of reason and common sense!

Suddenly a bright idea struck me—why not advertise in the press that I had £10 to spend, and insert a list of things in which I, as a prospective consumer, was interested? No sooner said than done, and I was in the office of the *Daily Dope* interviewing an official. Fact of the matter is, I was overwhelmed by the sales talk of that gentleman. In the first place, my ideas had been rather modest, but, upon his pointing out that I need not confine myself to cash payment, but could stipulate that the £10 I had to spend be a deposit on what I required, my list expanded enormously, until I had booked a lot of space.

I informed all and sundry who had goods to the value of £10, or who would take the said £10 as a deposit on some article which they had for sale, according to the list of articles set out, that they were at liberty to present themselves at my address within the next week.

I must confess that the list was a most comprehensive affair, and ranged from microscopes and skim milk pumps to material for a new pigsty; new hats for the wife, a collection of volumes by Professor Copland, and an autographed oil painting of the Hon. J. A. Lyons; a secondhand

car, a couple of new suits and a pedigreed Jersey bull. But why worry you with all that? Draw up a list of your own, but, by gad, don't advertise it!

The next day, after the *Daily Dope* came out, they started to come. They rolled up in all sorts of contraptions -- buggies, cars, pushbikes, motorbikes and on foot.

I was surrounded by a jabbering mass of salesmen, all talking "nineteen to the dozen" and anxious to get hold of that £10, or some part of it, in exchange for their goods.

This had been reduced from so-and-so, and that from something else. This was a special line for cash buyers only, and that was a sample article that could not, positively, be repeated at the price.

They begged and exhorted me to buy this and that, and the whole place was cluttered up with goods. I was so confused by the din that I could not make up my mind what to buy. Some of them got annoyed and said I was wasting their time if I did not want to buy. Whereupon I retorted that they had wasted a whole lot of mine by sticking up advertisements all over the place at which I had to look when I had no money to spend, and by sending me scores of catalogues every year, which invariably got pitched into the fire because of the same complaint.

Night fell and most of them wandered off. A few enterprising ones camped on the place.

The next morning a fresh batch began to arrive, and the business started all over again. In the middle of the morning, when I had about made up my mind to pay a deposit on a nice-looking Jersey bull, the mailman arrived with a letter from the *Daily Dope*. Enclosed was a bill for £10/2/6.

I woke up with a start - a red-hot cinder had burnt a hole in my sock!

Who said there is no deficiency of purchasing power? Let Professor Copland, or some other of his school, insert an advertisement for goods, any description, to the value covered by ten pounds deposit. May the good Lord preserve him!

TAXATION

(A SIGN OF SERVITUDE)

and

NATIONAL INSURANCE

(A MESMERISM BY SYMBOLS)

No student of economics or monetary reform, no person opposed to our ever-increasing load of taxation, no one who wishes to understand what national insurance really implies, should fail to secure a copy of this frank and complete exposure by a master of the subjects, Mr. Bruce H. Brown.

You will find "Taxation And National Insurance" direct, simple and convincing.

Price 1/- posted 1/1

Available from

NEW TIMES LIMITED
ELIZABETH HOUSE
MELBOURNE

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

REV. REGINALD KIRBY AND OUR OPEN LETTER

Sir, —I appreciate the tone of your "open letter" in the current issue of the *New Times*, and know that you will permit me to give, not a "reply," because it does not call for such, but a little amplification of the points I raised in my sermon of June 5. The paragraph you quoted came towards the end of the address. Its implications rested upon what had preceded— viz., the Christian view of what the Crucifixion implies concerning the love of God in face of the manifest inequalities, injustices and sorrows of life, and what Paul taught regarding the new synthesis of character achieved by the Cross through faith. *On the basis of these claims of faith*, I urged a new world order could be created. As you rightly say, the qualification is that these things exist for those who accept the Christian Faith and, rightly and primarily, the Cross of Christ does bridge the gap between man and God. You then insist "the Cross of Christ will never bridge the gap between man and man while men are separated from each other, and from the necessities of life, by a fraudulent system of finance." Quite. May I respectfully suggest that, amid the hum of editorial activities, you re-think the points I raised in the light of what the Cross of Christ means to the Christian?

You will agree, I feel sure, that, ultimately, what determines the nature of a civilisation depends upon the "values" dominating the minds and lives of its citizens. In the long run ideals, motives and spiritual aspirations mould the mind of a people. This, I believe, can and must be true on a world-scale. So, to return to the points you question.

(1) Race is not necessarily the cause of conflict. Aggrey, himself black, rightly affirmed that God could play upon white notes, as well as black. In a recent edition of "World Dominion" (an authoritative missionary quarterly), it was stated that even amid pressure of war, Chinese Christians are praying for Japan, and praying, too, that they themselves may be kept from hatred. A Chinese Christian has preached in my own pulpit, and when in Berlin I preached to a gathering of Germans, and had fellowship with them. If you are still asking the question, who *does* want war? I think you might consider it answered by saying, "Those whose minds are not governed by the mind of Christ, and whose 'values' are not those of the Cross (interested Bible reader, cp., Eph. iv. 18), whether financiers, preachers, politicians, press magnates or dictators.

(2) The juxtaposition of peoples, or the reverse, need not divide men. My citation of the British Empire was, I think, apposite, Canada abuts America, yet there is little feeling of antagonism. But I would waive the illustration

while insisting on the principle, which is that mutual antagonisms are not bred of nearness or the reverse, but by something deeper; what Bismarck called "the imponderables."

(3) Economics, as such, are not the cause of divergences. You grow a little heated here, and rightly, if you think I take the point of view with which you credit me. The word economics (I need hardly remind you) refers to *any* system relative to the practical science of the production and distribution of wealth. I should not think of uttering such a foolishness that "because there is food and clothing enough and to spare for all" there are no divergences between men in the economic sphere." There are, admitted and tragically. But behind *any* system lie the minds and wills, passions and prejudices, fears and grasping of those who brought it into being, and by whose active or passive acquiescence it is maintained. I think you do me less than justice when you affirm that I am saying nothing about that! Sloth, selfishness, willingness to blame others and let them suffer rather than ourselves are the spiritual causes of any evil system. And they must be attached side by side with (and even more strongly than) the system to which they give rise. When you recommend to my earnest consideration that the Cross of Christ has nothing at all to do with the matter, so far as 99.99 per cent. of the people are concerned, I begin to feel a little heated, because I believe that the very reason why so many are not "sharing adequately in the plenty" and "have no say at all in the management of the money system" is because *others* are not actuated by the spirit to which Christ's view of God, and death on the Cross, gives rise. This is not an attempt to evade the problems of our times, but an earnest desire, in which I believe you share, to get at least a glimpse of *ultimate* causes.

If I may be permitted to stress the first word in your letter, which you put in capitals, I would ask you, too, to re-think the matter, in the light of Christ's word in Matt, xxv., 18-19, and John iii., 5.

Once more, thanks for the tone of your letter—it may be that we are nearer to each other than you think—but I am sure that if, according to my light, I put the emphasis where Christ did, I shall not go far wrong. —Yours faithfully,

REGINALD KIRBY.
Collins. St. Baptist Church,
Melbourne, 13/6/38

[We are pleased to receive this letter from Mr. Kirby, and equally pleased to publish it. Although he began to feel a little heated over our statement that "the Cross of Christ has nothing at all to do with the matter, so far as 99.99 per cent. of the people are concerned," he then went on to agree with it. He admits that it is because "others" are not actuated by the right spirit that so many are not sharing in the plenty. That is

precisely what we say. It is these "others," the .01 per cent, who dictate and control the economic conditions for the 99.99 per cent., and we have far less faith in the possibility of securing a change of heart in these "others" than in the power of the votes of the 99.99 per cent, if they will join together and demand what they want and what they know to be physically possible.—Ed., N.T.]

ANOTHER SOCIAL CREDITER ON OXFORD GROUP CRITICISM

Sir, —I wish to express my sincere appreciation of the article referring to the Oxford Group, which appeared in your issue of May 13 last.

Social Crediters are greatly indebted to the writers for so logically and temperately setting out some points that hinder full sympathy and co-operation.

The subsequent article by Mr. Bruce Brown has given timely warning of the menace caused by politicians and financiers, who are out to exploit the movement solely for personal and selfish advantage.

Between them any sincere workers in the Oxford Group and Social Crediters in the past, there has been mutual sympathy and good-will, but it must be regretfully stated that there is another type of grouper that never allows any opportunity to pass of belittling, ridiculing or misrepresenting Social Credit activities.

It is this section (which includes many clergymen) that is responsible for promoting mistrust and misunderstanding.

Did space or inclination permit, much more might be said in giving instances of this, but this letter is penned with the object of promoting understanding, and, so far as is possible, co-operation.

All are agreed that sin has been much in evidence since the days of Adam, but quite a number of disputes have arisen from time to time as to whom were the sinners and whom the saints. Quite often history's verdict has reversed previous decisions, and removed a stigma from many so-called sinners and the crowns from many so-called saints. This will serve as an introduction to some of the group's propositions, the application of which creates difficulties to the average man.

When slavery was rife many years ago, could anyone with understanding have dared to say that the unfortunate Africans were in the mess they were in because of THEIR sin?

Such an assertion would have been just as unfair and incorrect as is the accusation today that we victims of the iniquitous money system that prevails are in that fix because of our sin.

The manipulators of the money system that holds the world in thrall today began their nefarious operations long before the present generation was born, and, as has been previously pointed out, we are the victims and not the perpetrators.

Another of their propositions creates difficulties in connection with the question of Local Option. The temperance bodies and the Churches today are urging people to vote "No Licence" at the forthcoming poll. If their proposition, that "to change the system without changing the people is merely to carry over to the new the disease that killed the old" is correct, how can the Oxford Group conscientiously do other than oppose the temperance party and, the Churches on this matter? Or, at least, should they not in order to show absolute honesty and consistency either decide to oppose the poll being taken or abstain from voting one way or the other?

Either action would be the logical application of their theory, and, whichever of these courses they

took, would give much joy to publicans, brewery shareholders and bibulous sinners.

As both bodies are genuinely desirous of uplifting humanity out of the mess it is in, it is to be hoped that Social Crediters and Oxford Groupers will endeavour to remove difficulties and give to each other mutual help and encouragement.

"LOCAL OPTION."
Sandringham, Melbourne.

BIRTH CONTROL FOR THE POOR?

Sir, —In your issue of the 10th inst., Dr. V. H. Wallace asks this question: "What is going to happen to poor people with families while a more equitable distribution of wealth is being brought about?"

I wonder if Dr. Wallace has heard of or remembers the time (I remember it well) when the Great Western Railway in England changed from a gauge of 6 ft. to one of 4 ft. 8½ in.

It was done in a single night. Everything was prepared beforehand and an immense number of men worked throughout the whole night, then the next morning traffic was as usual, but on the narrow instead of the broad gauge.

That is how it can be done!

"ACTIONS, NOT WORDS."
Coburg, Melbourne.

A SUGGESTION

Sir, —As a suggestion to other readers) I would like to beg of you a small space in the *New Times*.

Some few months ago a few readers in the city of Heidelberg desired to support the *New Times* by becoming shareholders. A "New Times Share Group" was formed, and a nominal sum of two shillings a month per member was decided upon. As soon as one pound was collected a share was purchased.

Also, readers who were able to pay in full were drawn into the group, which has to its credit at the present twelve shares with an early promise of three others.

I hope, Mr. Editor, that this letter will encourage other readers to form groups (at once), and so help to place the *New Times* beyond the fear of financial stress. W. DIXON.

P.S. —If any reader in the city of Heidelberg reads this letter and desires to give their support, will they please get in touch with W. Dixon, Adamson-street, Heidelberg, Victoria.

New Times SHOPPING GUIDE and Business Directory

PATRONISE THESE ADVERTISERS.

Their advertisement helps your paper. Say you saw it in the "New Times."

MELBOURNE (Cont.)

(Continued from page 8.)

KEW.
IMPERIAL DAIRY. R. H. Kent. 9 Brougham Street. Haw. 3243.
LADIES' Hairdresser. Haw. 5605.
"Burnie Salon," 81 Cotham Rd. M. J. MARTIN, 157 High St. Haw. 3794. Shoe Store, Shoe Repairs.
MOTOR GARAGE. Kew Junction Service Station, Cr. High & Denmark Streets. Haw. 6457. RADIO EXPERT. J. G. Littlewood, 267 High St. Also Elec. Applncs.

KEW EAST.
WATCH, CLOCK & JEWELLERY REPAIRS. I. Pink, 16 Oswin St.
WICKER & Pram Repairs. L. Pav-itt, 2 Hale St. Pick up and deliver.

MORELAND.
BOOT REPAIRS. J. T. Nolan, Holmes St., 4 drs. Moreland Rd.

NORTHCOTE.
GRAY JOHNSON Pty. Ltd. Leading Land and Estate Agents. 742 High Street, Thornbury.

PARKDALE.
RADIO REPAIRS AND SALES. C. Barnett, 19 Herbert St. XW2031.

SANDRINGHAM.
A. RYAN, opp. Stn., Shoe Repairs. Tennis Racquets Restring from 7/6.
BIGGS & LOMAS, Tailors. First-class Workmanship. Suit Club.
CONFECTIONERY and SMOKES. Gibson's, Bay Rd., opp. Theatre.
GROCERS. McKAY & WHITE, Bay Rd., opp. Theatre. XW 1924.
HAIRDRESSER and Tobacconist. A. E. Giddings, 18 Station St.
HOME MADE CAKES. I. TAYLOR, 81 Bay Rd. XW8048.
LIBRARY. 5000 BOOKS. COUTIE'S NEWSAGENCY.

ST. KILDA.
HARVEY'S COFFEE GARDEN. Sweets. Smokes. 227 Barkly Street

SPRINGVALE.
DAIRY, M. Bowler. Buckingham Ave. R. MACKAY & SONS. General Storekeepers. UM 9269.

WILLIAMSTOWN.
DON B. FISKEN, Baker. 122 Douglas Parade.
DUNSTAN, DAIRYMAN, 18 Station Rd. Phone, W'town 124.
HAIRDRESSER and Tobacconist. C. Tomkins, 165 Nelson Pl., 76 Ferguson Street.

WINDSOR.
E. COOKE, 49 Chapel St. W. 8044. High Class Butcher (Cash).

TO OUR READERS—

You may obtain your copy of "THE NEW TIMES" from any authorised newsagent. Should your agent not have supplies, please ask him to communicate direct with New Times Ltd., Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C 1. (phone M 5384.

If you wish to have your copy posted direct from this office please complete the form below and mail it, accompanied by remittance payable to New Times Ltd.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

To New Times Ltd.,
Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne, C.1
Please forward me "The New Times" for.....
months, beginning with issue dated.....193..
cheque
I enclose postal note for the sum of.....
money order

Name.....

Full Postal Address:.....

The subscription rate to THE NEW TIMES is 15/- for 12 months; 7/6 for 6 months; 3/9 for 3 months, post-free.

In Aid of the T. J. Moore Memorial Fund
A DANCE
at the
Cathedral Hall, Brunswick Street, Fitzroy
TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1938
8 p.m. until 2 a.m. SUBSCRIPTION, 3/6
TICKETS OBTAINABLE AT THE NEW TIMES OFFICE

HOW CAN WOMEN BE SUCH FOOLS?

A Question for Every Mother

By ERIC BUTLER

After seeing the newsreels of the Barcelona bombings, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of President Roosevelt, asked: "How can we be such fools as to go on senselessly taking human life this way?" She added: "Why the women in every nation do not rise and refuse to bring children into this kind of world is beyond my understanding . . . isn't it perfectly stupid for women to go on having babies just to see them killed?" This is a pertinent question which should be carefully and thoughtfully considered by every woman, because they are the creators of life, and if the sacrifices and suffering which they undergo are not going to be in vain, they should be vitally concerned as to what will be the ultimate result of that creation. Although it may appear almost brutal to say so, the cruel fact remains that at the present time the great majority of those creations are either semi-starved (i.e., correct meaning of malnutrition) in their early development—or, if they do develop physically, they are then looked upon as admirable specimens to be trained in the finer arts of murdering innocent women and children overseas. Let me hasten to point out that of course this procedure is justified in the sacred names of "democracy" and "patriotism." Women, you must immediately take a clear view of this present situation—you must realise that you are the great sheet anchor of a crumbling civilisation, a "civilisation" which appears to be mostly concerned with smashing down and destroying all that is good. Surely, as creators, this onward march of frenzied destruction and orgy of human suffering calls for an effective protest from you, who at least still possess the virtue of understanding human suffering.

Or are you going to scream hysterically for God, King and Country as your boys are torn from your arms and march away to destruction—in order to be turned loose under the whip of lying propaganda upon the boys of other mothers. And what for? In order to maintain a foul economic system which causes war externally—or, worse still, but not so spectacular—internal economic war. This internal war is the attack upon the individual by a murderous system, and the casualties of this internal war can be most graphically seen in the figures of malnutrition, crime, bankruptcies, suicides, etc. Surely the appalling, futile human suffering produced by both these kinds of war is going to stir the womanhood of the nation to such an extent that they will join effectively in the rising tide of protest against this state of affairs. Why should your children suffer in a world of easily produced plenty? Join the Electoral Campaign in demanding that your children, the finest produce in the land, are going to get a fair deal. If, however, you are going to continue producing life to be subjected to a living hell, without making some effort to improve these conditions, you are betraying the fundamental urge of womanhood—that urge being creation.

Women—what a glorious opportunity you now have! As creators of life you are revered by every decent man, but if you would now become the creators of a new society, where the realisation of ideals will become an actuality, you will have accomplished the crowning feat of your contributions to the posterity of the human race.

ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN NOTES

VICTORIA

The Electoral Campaign is a mechanism, which assures the true functioning of Democracy. It is, in fact, an unofficial referendum or plebiscite. The Campaign at present being conducted virtually throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations has for its objective the Abolition of Poverty. Its vehicle of expression is the Elector's Demand and Undertaking form, which, when signed, conveys the individual elector's instructions to his or her Parliamentary Representative that the Representative represent the elector's command to Parliament that Poverty be Abolished.

"Parliament exists to make the WILL of the People prevail," is a principle. That no individual consciously WILLS to live in insecurity when there is visible abundance is axiomatic. The axiom proves a departure from principle; that existing Government is not democratic—that it is a lie. The Electoral Campaign restores the principle and thereby destroys the iniquitous Party System, or Government for sectional interests as against national interests.

The Campaign permits the Nation to become coherent and articulate on a common objective—to dictate policy to Parliament, and Parliament's duty is to have such policy implemented. To enable it to do so, Parliament is clothed with sovereign power, to obtain the best brains for its purpose; to enact laws; and to employ sanctions.

KOOYONG CAMPAIGN.—The organising of the Hawthorn Town Hall meeting is running smoothly to schedule, and the stage is being set for a big meeting which will forge another link in the chain to bring the member for Kooyong under the direct control of his electors. All supporters are being urged to bring all their friends to hear the message of democracy. Arrangements are being made now for the Kew meeting a fortnight later, and all those supporters who can help are required to get in touch with headquarters. Eric Butler reports that street speaking was very successful last Friday night, and that all those desirous of getting experience should be at Glenferrie station at 8 o'clock this Friday night. Some new talent is being developed, which will be a definite asset to the movement.

All workers are urged to be present at the Glenferrie station next Sunday morning at 10 o'clock for a big drive with handbills and copies of the *New Times*. This is very important, and all will be welcome.

HENTY CAMPAIGN.—The first series of meetings in this electorate will take place at McKinnon on Monday, June 20. Eric Butler will be the speaker.

ERIC BUTLER addressed the St. Kilda Labor Party during the week, and, judging from re-

ports, caused a bit of a sensation. Slowly the education of the electors is taking place. As we go to press, Eric leaves for a country meeting at Narre Warren.

BRUCE H. BROWN DINNER.—Those desirous of being present at this dinner are requested to send in their applications for tickets immediately. The dinner will take place at the Griffith Royal Arcade Cafe, 31 Little Collins-street. The date is Monday, June 27.

DONALD.—A report from Donald indicates that they are carrying on the good work in that part of the world. All other country centres are urged to send in regular reports.

WEST AUSTRALIA

POSTER CAMPAIGN.—One of the cheapest and yet most valuable forms of publicity available today is the poster form of advertising. By this method one can not only contact large numbers of people, but can also interest many to whom other forms of appeal fail. With this object in view, the State Director of Campaign, Mr. V. J. Dury, is desirous of launching a poster campaign, and to do this in a manner that will bring the results required he needs £25.

This is a new and important step in the carrying on of the campaign, and deserves all the support that members can possibly give. If you wish to bring this effort to successful fruition, regard your contribution as urgently required and forward it at once to the funds of the Poster Campaign.

COUNTRY WOMEN SUPPORT ABOLITION OF POVERTY.—The Merredin Zone Council of the Country Women's Association, at its recent conference, passed the following resolution:

"That the C.W.A. support the Abolition of Poverty Campaign and asks General Headquarters to give a definite lead in this matter."

These women, by giving a lead that must soon be followed by all other women's organisations throughout Australia, have shown by their action that they realise the criminal folly of poverty in the midst of plenty, and intend to do something to see that it ceases.

After all, women, who are the budget-keepers of the home and the mothers of the race, realise what poverty really is and what it means to the physical, mental and moral development of their families, and will not continue to tolerate the present system much longer. The Merredin Women's Association is to be congratulated upon its action.

DISTRIBUTION OF NO. 3 LEAFLET.—Mr. Dave Byers, of the Koolinda Group, although on vacation, is not idle. During the week he made a visit to the Fremantle waterfront and distributed 1000 of the No. 3 leaflets. The people of the Port Town

are becoming very Campaign-minded.

FORTNIGHTLY MEETINGS.—The last was held in the rooms at Headquarters on Thursday evening, June 9. The address was given by Mr. Richard Rush-ton. A general discussion followed. These meetings are now a regular feature every second Thursday.

BRIDGE EVENING.—The bridge, card and monopoly evenings are growing in popularity, and are held every second Saturday in the rooms of the Advance Business College. A dainty supper is served and the cost is only 1/-, the profits going to the funds of the Campaign. The date of the next evening is Saturday, June 18. All are welcome.

CAPTAIN JAMES IN HOSPITAL.—It is reported with regret that Captain James is once again back in hospital. All friends are sincerely trusting that this time his recovery will be both speedy and definite.

WE WOULD REMIND readers once again that full stocks of propaganda-leaflets, books and other literature are on hand, particulars of which can be had upon application at the Office, Room 31, Bon Marche Buildings, Barrack Street, Perth.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

CONVENTION.—The annual convention of the United Democrats will be held at their rooms, 17 Waymouth-street, Adelaide, on Saturday afternoon, July 2.

All financial members are entitled to be present and to vote. There are some important questions to be discussed, apart from electing officers for the ensuing year.

DIZZY VIRTUES OF COMPOUND INTEREST

"It is characteristic of the dizzy virtues of compound interest that they are not at all dizzy at the start. It is only after they have been in operation a certain time that they show any disposition to become marvellous and to transcend the bounds of the physically possible. But now that the increments of indebtedness are mounting up, it is hardly a sufficient defence of the system to say that it served the country well in the past, and only needs to be left alone to work further miracles in the future. A single grain of corn, doubled as many times as there are squares on a chess-board, represents more corn than the present population of the world could consume in a period longer than that covered by the records of history; whereas doubled only half that number of times it would scarcely suffice to give London a square meal. This means that a system might show no signs of breakdown for a century, and yet become absolutely impossible during the course of the next."

—Professor Frederick Soddy.

'THE DOCTOR SAID TO THE MAJOR'

(Continued from page 5.)

business here. This refusal of God's bounty is nothing but abominable un-Christian wickedness!"

"Pray calm yourself; do not let us become excited," begged the Doctor. "Economics have nothing to do with Christianity, anyway." "Well, sir," continued the Major, "I see in the papers that farmers in Planned Britain today have to pay a licence fee of £5 per acre for every new acre put down in potatoes that was not in potatoes the year before. Under one of Mr. Roosevelt's Planned Economy laws last year no one was allowed to sell potatoes in the United States except in a sealed container with a Government stamp. To get the Government stamp the farmer had to pay 45 cents a bushel. No farmer could get the stamps unless a potato production quota had been allotted to him, and nobody got a potato quota unless he had grown potatoes in previous seasons. For a first offence under this law the penalty was a thousand-dollar fine; for a second offence, a year in gaol or another thousand-dollar fine, or both. It is a crime to grow food under Planned Economy!"

"The sole object of all these things," said the Doctor, "is simply to give the potato growers an adequate return for their labour." "Rubbish!" exclaimed the Major. "Why did the potato grower cease to get an adequate return? Why did all the other producers also cease to get an adequate return? Because, by a deliberate contraction of currency and credit, the means of payment was withdrawn from the hands of the people. What is the remedy? To restore that which was taken away. To undo this atrocious crime against the nation. Do that, and you restore to the people their equities in their homes and farms that represented in many cases their life-long savings. Do that and you bring back values to a profitable point. Keep values steady at a fully profitable point by monetary control, and you at once give free play to the enterprise and initiative of the people, and you will have all the prosperity you want. No one would then give you a thank-you for trying to ram the country into a crazy strait-jacket of Planned Economy."

"Do you know, Major," said the Doctor, "you have got it all completely upside-down. If you will read any authoritative book on Planning, you will see that all these things which you—and I, too—so keenly desire will automatically become attainable after we have adopted a Planned Economy." "Precisely," said the Major. "A piece of cheese is put on the hook as the bait to bring the mice into the trap. It is effective in many cases, as every housekeeper knows. But the real point for the wise mouse is: *Is cheese attainable without going into mouse-traps to get it?*"

PORTIA'S SPEECH (Modern Version)

Paraphrased by W. F. Allen, with apologies to Shakespeare. "The quality of finance is not strained, It droppeth as the gentle bomb from heaven upon the folk beneath; It is twice curst—it curseth him that gives and him that takes; 'Tis mightiest in the mightiest. . . . It overcomes the throned monarch, and takes away his crown. Money's sceptre shows the force of temporal power The attribute to awe and devilry, Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings; But finance is above all kingly sway; 'Tis a fear that clutches at the heart of kings; A bold affront to God Himself. It's earthly power is e'er opposed to God's. . . . It's mercy cannot season Justice.

ELECTORS OF KOOYONG!

Hear

DR. JOHN DALE: BRUCE H. BROWN

and

ERIC D. BUTLER

Launching

THE KOOYONG CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH POVERTY

Hawthorn TOWN HALL, June 21, 8 p.m.

Chairman: COUNCILLOR J.W. GEORGE