

ON OTHER
PAGES

ANOTHER MAJOR
VICTORY FOR
"PRESSURE POLITICS"
(See Page Four.)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

PRICE FOURPENCE

Vol. 8 No. 31 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1942

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

Now, when our
land to ruin's
brink is verging,

In God's name,
let us speak while
there is time!

Now, when the
padlocks for our
lips are forging,
Silence is crime.

Whittier (1807-1892).

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA

Beware Of Anti-British Propaganda

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

The "Indian Problem" has been brought vividly before the public since the Japanese entered the war in view of the much-discussed idea of giving India Home Rule, and the torrent of anti-British propaganda which paints a harrowing picture of "British exploitation" in India, I have decided to write several articles on this matter.

These articles may help to counteract the misleading material being issued from sources controlled by the international finance-socialists. Needless to say, we will see the same destructive work of Communism and the Jewish financiers that we have witnessed in other parts of the world.

Major C. H. Douglas, who was engaged as an engineer on irrigation, schemes in India, has summed the matter up very ably in one of his articles recently published in these columns:

"Now, it is difficult for anyone who is not familiar with India to understand that it is perhaps there that the clearest indication of the war of the international Jew against British culture can be perceived. What is being attacked and undermined in India is prestige, and prestige is a basis of credit. To put the matter another way, the Indian problem can be reduced in essence to a battle between prestige based on character, and prestige based on money—real human

credit in conflict with the golden calf. . . ."

(We have seen examples of this here in Australia. American officers have been able to get things accomplished quickly in some cases because they have the power to write out cheques. But Australians could also have paddocks for aerodromes cleared in short time if they were empowered to write cheques. Because the Americans have been able to obtain results faster than Australians is no reflection on the ability of Australians. But many people, who know nothing about the banking swindle, have attacked Australian prestige because they have been apparently overshadowed by visiting officials.)

"It may perhaps be remarked in passing that, taking the condition of India into consideration, British administration in India between 1857 and say, 1900, was probably the finest example of successful Imperial Rule which the world has ever seen. It could not be, and it was not desirable that in the nature of things it should be, permanent, but it was as far removed from the picture of soulless tyranny which was persistently circulated amongst people who had never been within ten thousand miles of it" (such as the Communists and Goebbels) "as the fantastic figures of 'thousands of British officials battering on a downtrodden peasantry' were from the fact that the Indian Civil Service never reached a figure of 1500 Europeans, and is now less than five hundred in number, British policy in India is not quite so safe from criticism, for the simple reason that it was primarily a financial and mercantile policy. But even in this, there is little which was peculiar to India."

The admittedly bad conditions in

India are the result of a financial policy which has been responsible for the undermining of the British people. Lord Reading, the Jewish financier, who played such a treacherous role as a financial adviser to the British Government during and after the last war, played quite an important part in India. The British people didn't introduce the Central Reserve Bank into India. That was the work of Niemeyer. Financial dictatorship has been the major cause of the "Indian Problem," a cause which Goebbels, the Communists and Gandhi ignore.

SHOULD THE BRITISH LEAVE INDIA?

All fair-minded people have always agreed that Home Rule for India is a desirable thing. But, as most students of India know, it is not a question of the British Government giving the Indians "Liberty," but how to give them liberty. Let me be quite emphatic on this point: you cannot give anyone liberty. People can only obtain liberty, political and economic,

(Continued on page 5.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Practical British engineers have invented a device which enables 'planes to land safely under the worst possible conditions. This gadget is being used under actual service conditions, and is described as a miracle invention. So much for the inspired boloney about decadent Britain. And be it further noted that theoretical planners and economists played no part in this achievement.

ALLIED CONTROL: In commenting on the question of a generalissimo for the Allied Armies, the London "Daily Mirror" realistically points out that "Few Americans have yet had any actual experience; their ability, however great, had not been tested beyond the examination room." The "Mirror," in commenting on the propaganda against British ability, says "Such views are an insult to the British Army, and, if persisted in, would do extensive harm to morale." It is pleasing to note such a reply, however belated, to the obviously inspired anti-British propaganda.

LABOUR CAMPS: An alarming report of conditions under which the Allied Works Council compels men to work is found in "Smith's Weekly" of August 1. The report states that men in the 50 years group are conscripted, and compelled to live under conditions which are a menace to health. They have to mix with "pinky" and "metho" addicts, there is no sanitation, and only nasty, roughly served food. Usually that sort of picture is served up when describing the way of life under Hitler; in fact, that which we are fighting against. Well, so it is; therefore this totalitarian symptom must be curbed now, to prevent it from developing into the full-fledged Gestapo concentration camp in the post-war period.

WAR SLOGANS: Some of our war slogans display an appalling lack of psychological finesse. For example: "The enemy will not borrow your money—he will take it." The implication here is that only your enemy takes your money—which instantly conjures up visions of the tax-gatherer. Now consider another slogan: "Fight, Work, or Perish." This forcefully epitomises our peace-time activities. It is to be hoped that no subtle sabotage is intended by our highly-paid official propagandists.

DRUG BOOSTING: During the past few months a tremendous propaganda barrage has been put over in the form of free write-up advertisements for a drug known as "Sulfanilamide"—which, apparently, cures all ailments excepting financial disorders. This drug, which appears to have some uses, is a highly dangerous substance produced by the heavy chemical group, and can only be obtained through chemists—if you have a doctor's prescription. Hence it provides a 100 per cent, proprietary for these people, which helps to explain the terrific boost behind it. By contrast, another discovery, known as "Chlorophyl," which is a much more remarkable natural substance—almost costless and accessible to all—has not received a mention. Moral; Beware of the booster and the boosted.

SCIENCE AND WAR: The War Cabinet, has decided to set up a Scientific Bureau (not a bureau of scientists) to hitch science to war. The Bureau will consist of a director and others, who will be under the direction of that super-scientist, Mr. Dedman. The propounders of the idea are unperformed theoretical scientists, and it's a safe bet there won't be any practical scientists in the team. There is, however, one hopeful aspect of this Bureau—as yet no economists have been nominated!

MONEY MESS: The Government is reported, in the Melbourne "Sun" of July 24, as being very concerned because the savings banks have invested considerable sums in war loans (fixed deposits), which are liable to be called for by depositors immediately. So, in order to protect the bankers from the possibility of this (call-up) it is anxious to devise a means whereby private depositors will undertake to deposit all surplus deposits for fixed terms. Thus the

(Continued on page 6.)

MR. BLACKBURN, M.H.R., REPORTS TO HIS EMPLOYERS

STRIKING CONTRAST TO UNDEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE OF MR. MENZIES, M.H.R.

On Sunday, July 26, a number of electors assembled in the Labour Hall, Sheffield-street, Coburg, to hear the Federal Member for Bourke explain the work already done this year and answer questions.

Mr. Blackburn said that, in his opinion, the coal mining difficulties had been magnified, partly by the publicity given by the daily newspapers, and partly by the Prime Minister's dictatorial pose. The policy now adopted of making the unions responsible for the conduct of their members and giving them ample disciplinary powers, had been suggested by Mr. Blackburn months ago. It would then have had more success than it is likely to have now. The speaker said that while Australian writers and speakers talked of America as a land without industrial disputes, Americans deplored their own country's condition and urged every-one to follow Britain, where, in turn, we found that there was much more industrial trouble than in Australia.

PRESERVING FREEDOM

Mr. Blackburn said that the chief task which he had set himself is to work to preserve that measure of freedom of speaking, writing and meeting that is the only thing which makes Britain and Australia better and more worthwhile than Germany and Italy. To surrender our own liberties to an Australian dictatorship was the first step towards surrender to a foreign dictatorship. It did not matter whether one approved or disapproved of another's opinions.

Each has a right freely to express himself and society has a right to hear new teachings, to examine them, and, if it thinks fit to accept them. This was the paramount consideration. If we dislike the opinions of others, let us put them down by argument. If we try to put them down in any other way we shall be treated as admitting that we have no argument against them.

The speaker traversed the work of the 1942 session of Federal Parliament, and answered questions. The meeting, which lasted about two hours, closed with a vote of thanks to the speaker. Similar meetings are to be convened by him every quarter. Mr. Chas. Mutton, M.L.A., presided.

ELECTORS' OPPORTUNITY

The electors of Coburg and Bourke are in the happy and unique position of having both the Federal and State Representatives answerable to the electors and to no one else. They are doing a good job and it is now up to the electors of these constituencies to do their part by giving them full support, by attending the quarterly meetings which both representatives convene, and writing to them often—they will appreciate such letters, as they are anxious to know their electors' will. They are not thought-readers.

ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA

Reprinted from the book of that name, by Eugene Lyons, formerly the United Press correspondent in Moscow, etc.

(Continued from last issue.)

BOOK I. PRELUDE TO MOSCOW

1. Revolt Against Ugliness (contd.)

I thought myself a "Socialist" almost as soon as I thought at all, and years before I had heard of the Communist Manifesto. Congressman Meyer London, the shrill personification of the East Side yearning for Justice, loomed much larger on my horizon than Karl Marx. Long before I learned the standardised proofs that Capitalism is doomed, I knew for a certainty that the whole world was one battle ground, contested between fat-bellied Capitalists and downtrodden Workers, and that victory for the Workers, for my side, was inevitable. The coming triumph was at most a matter of chronology, and life's one duty was to bring the date nearer. The class struggle was not an academic formula or a political slogan. It seemed to me as real as my friends and school and the burden of the monthly rent and gas bills. It was something much too obvious to need explaining or defending, let alone proving.

My memory can conjure up no one moment of thunderous illumination when the rightness and certainty of the socialist future of eternal justice and equality were revealed to me. In our multifarious world of dreams and ugliness, a boy soaked up a social faith, if he was built that way, as naturally and imperceptibly as his schoolmates and blockmates soaked up the tough-guy philosophy or the success-at-any-price philosophy. By a sort of social osmosis.

As a child, down in a stinking steerage hole full of vermin and vomit, in one of the foul ships which, at that time, dumped cargoes of bewildered immigrants on the American shores, I treasured a vision of the fairyland called America. I shut my eyes and saw it clearly—the glittering streets, the happy faces, the new, shiny land stocked with beauty. That lovely vision broke sickeningly on the garbage cans of the Corlears Hook section of New York. The spectres of "slack" seasons, of strikes for a living wage, of illness that cut off all earnings for a large family—the sight of my father's cadaverous face after a long day at the machine (it was a curiously handsome and sensitive face under the mask of bottomless fatigue)—those were less horrible when viewed as aspects of the perpetual class hostilities and as prelude to an ineffable triumph.

Our ant-heap was infested with street gangs. But I found myself somehow enrolled in a "Socialist Sunday School" on East Broadway, run by the Workmen's Circle. The hymns we chanted were: "Arise, ye prisoners of starvation, Arise ye wretched of the earth!" and "The People's flag is deepest red." One May Day I stood on a platform and recited a lugubrious poem about a beggar boy which began:

"Alone in the cold and dreary street,

With my torn old clothes and bare cold feet."

Among those who heard me was a beautiful child of seven, with curls to her shoulders. I was all of thirteen, with the weight of suffering humanity on my thin shoulders and a volume of Dostoevsky under my arm. Ten years later this girl became my wife. Twenty-four years later, because the sad rhymes about the beggar boy had become a tradition in the family, our daughter made me recite them in the inappropriate setting of the Ethical Culture School.

From the Socialist Sunday School I graduated naturally into the "Yipsels," the Young People's Socialist League, where we debated weighty questions and took courses in Marx and Spencer, and distributed leaflets for socialist candidates without the slightest hope of their election.

The highest reach of anxious parental hope in homes like mine was

to turn sons into doctors and lawyers, and to marry off daughters to doctors and lawyers. In affectionate moments, proud relatives, impressed by my seriousness and report cards, tried the prefix "Dr." before my name, and miraculously, it always fitted nicely. The sacrifice involved in sending me to high school and then to college, rather than into the factory, practically made my eventual emergence as a physician or lawyer a duty—a very onerous duty. The fact that neither calling stirred me to enthusiasm made me feel a good deal of an ingrate towards my parents and towards my elder brother, who, since the age of thirteen, had been among the sweated legions bending over sewing machine. But I had no stomach for the professional respectability to which they aspired for me. Ostensibly I was being primed for the law. But my dreams were of writing, not as a means of making a living, but as a weapon on my side of the class war. My parents' sacrifices consisted in dispensing with my potential contribution to the family income and in providing me with, food, clothing and shelter. But it could not easily be extended to include bugaboo items of car-fares and occasional expenses. By working after school hours I managed to earn these myself. At one tragic juncture, internal politics ousted me from a night job at the Educational Alliance, and the lack of a single dollar a week threatened to cut short my high school career. That sum, advanced for ten weeks running by Adolph Nash, my Scout-master, helped a little to patch up

the faith in social work which the ouster had shattered.

By the end of the ten weeks, I was earning three dollars a week as "assistant professor" to a teacher of English in the hurry-up of printery schools for adults. My function was chiefly the correction of examination papers on literary subjects about which I knew precisely nothing. One night I would remain up, hurriedly digesting "As You Like It" in preparation for a set of test papers, another night it might be "Hamlet" or "Siles Mamer." This "professorship" I retained for two or three years, despite profound ignorance of the subjects my employer taught, and even deeper ignorance of certain alarming predictions on his part which he described as "hedonism." I looked up the word in dictionaries and warded off his occasional experimental sallies in my direction (luckily his hedonism was not insistent, but I did not understand what it was all about until many years later. This brand of hedonism was one of the few weeds that did not find root in our slum soil.

The Russian Revolution, in March 1917 was, for most of the boys in my college freshman classes, just one more headline in a time replete with startling news. For a few of us, it was the rapturous harbinger of that Great Change in the glow of which we had warmed our spirits. Kerensky, Lvov, Miliukov, fraternisation between Russian and German soldiers, the rise of Soviets—great names and great events, amidst the fumes of inspired rhetoric. Even the confusion was heart-warming, because it sparkled with words and phrases learned in the Socialist Sunday schools, shouted in the Meyer London campaign, debated in the Yipsel circles. Our intimate, esoteric language suddenly holding the centre of the world stage! The exultant realisation that our thinking and dreaming had become history so

ASSOCIATION TO DEFEND BRITISH CULTURE

At a meeting of readers of this paper, held in a Melbourne suburban home on Saturday evening, July 25, it was enthusiastically agreed to encourage as many individuals as possible to associate actively for the purpose of defending British culture.

The forming of this association is the outcome of considerable discussion by a group of young social crediters during recent weeks. The association has no Leader, Committee or any semblance to the usual organisation—a fundamental idea is to get away from organisation-itis.

The Association has issued the following statement:—

The individuals comprising this Association to Defend British Culture have decided to associate for an agreed objective: to use every effort to analyse, understand and oppose all attacks on British culture.

These individuals are convinced that—

(1) The Anglo-Saxon communities, in spite of their many obvious faults, are comprised of people who are the last great bulwark against world-tyranny.

(2) There is a world-wide attack, of which the present war is a part, to destroy the culture of the British people, a culture which is inseparably bound up with the sanctity of the individual.

(3) A small number of individuals, prepared to work hard to grasp the full implications of what is being attempted, and the correct way in which to defeat this plan of destruction, can play a tremendous part in saving civilisation.

(4) The enemy is International Finance, but using methods of attack other than the present banking system.

The individuals of this Association believe that, mainly through a lack of knowledge, a great number of monetary reformers do not fully understand the issues involved.

They have, therefore, decided to fit themselves for the task of giving specialised advice and information which will give rise to constructive

ACTION. They are not concerned about numbers, mass meetings, or great publicity. They are concerned with contacting people, particularly young people, who would care to associate in this work. They desire to build soundly from a small beginning. A comprehensive course of study is to be undertaken. It is hoped that correspondence work can be done with individuals not living in Melbourne. Each individual is expected to help with lectures; also essays on various aspects of the work studied will give many individuals the experience and confidence to ACT on their own initiative. The following is the study course:

(1) History of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Its real contribution to civilisation. How the Money Power exploited this development of the "British Experiment."

(2) English Literature.

(3) Australian Literature.

(4) Australian History. The Growth of the Money Power in Australia.

(5) International Affairs. A special study of the "Jewish Question," and the "Alberta Experiment."

(6) Social credit philosophy and technique.

Notes on lectures will be forwarded to each member. This self-imposed task will be hard work. Only people who appreciate this, and who are prepared to associate with people of a similar outlook, are asked to participate. Any reader interested may communicate with Miss Barbara J. Browne, 71 Jordan Street, East Malvern, Melbourne,

soon! We hummed the new Russian "Hymn to Freedom," and we hummed the "International" at Socialist lectures and dances, blissfully unaware that the two melodies were locked in life and death combat.

Then came yet great names and greater events: Lenin, Trotzky, Zinovev, Sinolny Institute, and the battleship "Aurora," the surrender of Windsor Palace. The Bolshevik seizure of power in the name of the Soviets seemed confirmation of the new era born eight months before. We envied the men and women who lived and fought within the circles of light shed by the heroes of the triumphant class war. We decked the revolution in the opalescent raiment of our visions. A Fatherland at last, and a focus of our hopes.

Our New York lives seemed hatefully prosaic by contrast with the poetry of victorious revolution. The draft . . . slackers . . . Liberty Bonds . . . Liberty cabbage . . . "Give until it hurts" . . . "Goodbye Broadway, Hello France" . . . It all seemed a stupid burlesque in the blinding light of events in Russia. Stupidest of all were the college classes, the marching and saluting and bayonet drills of the Students Army Training Corps, into which we had been herded.

For some of us, Armistice, for all the hysteria and noise, was an anticlimax, because there had been Brest-Litovsk.

Soon after I was demobilised and presented with an honourable discharge. I heard Norman Thomas speak. I can recall neither the occasion of the meeting, nor what he said, but only my inner-excitement. I carried away the revelation that the Russian revolution had no boundaries, since it was the initial stage of the world revolution.

The fight against capitalists in America, the battle to restore freedom to political prisoners and conscientious objectors, were just part of the world-wide defence of the Russian Revolution. I am not certain that Thomas said these things. More likely they were my private deductions from the fervour with which he depicted the "capitalist injustice" around us.

On the very day when I removed my army uniform, I wrote my first publicity story for the Workers' Defence Union, organised by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, with offices at the Rand School. Day after day, I composed these stories, destined for the New York "Call" and other radical publications, recounting the sufferings of I.W.W.'s and other political prisoners, the depredations of the Department of Justice on a rampage, the havoc being wrought by the American Legion. It was a time of raids on radicals, "Treat-em-rough" hooliganism, and mass deportations. Tales of horror poured in upon our Workers' Defence Union.

Our work seemed to me an intrinsic, inseparable part of the civil wars being fought out then in the land of the Soviets. It was all part of the Russian revolution and was, despite the cruelty and the sufferings, curiously exhilarating—like the exhilaration of war. And when I left my parents' home in Brooklyn for a shabby furnished room on lower Second-avenue, that, too, seemed part of the imminent world revolution. Society and I were coming of age at the same

(Continued on page 3)

BEAVERBROOK

The "Sunday Times," for April 26, contained a reasonably outspoken leading article picking up two points of a speech made in New York by Lord Beaverbrook. The first concerned Lord Beaverbrook's unqualified advice to "strike recklessly," and the second his handling of a rumour (not, says the "Sunday Times," published by important American papers and not by English papers at all) that "Mr. Churchill will fall before summer is out." The "Sunday Times" thinks the Prime Minister's close friend and associate might have denied it himself instead of asking American audiences to do it for him.

FRAUDULENT DEPRESSIONS

Will We Take Another?

(A letter to the Editor from Bruce H. Brown)

(Continued from last issue.)

Sir, We have seen that after the last war the financiers were allowed to take complete control: that at a conference in Brussels in 1920 they decided that credit was to be contracted, i.e., that the people were to have less purchasing power; that in the same year Mr. Montagu Norman, from an American banking house, was in charge of the Bank of England that immediately after his appointment deflation became the financial policy for the British Empire (deflation is merely another name for depression); that the private banks, taking their lead from the Bank of "England" commenced to withdraw credit from the Australian people, and to transform "prosperity" into adversity; that Sir Denison Miller, then Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, came to the rescue of the people, by issuing an additional £23 million between June and December, thus preventing the development of depression conditions as planned by the bankers; that Sir Denison Miller died in 1923 that steps were immediately taken through the Federal Parliament to transfer control of the Bank to a Board, whose members were recruited from private financial institutions; that in 1927 the Bank of England sent its agent, Sir Ernest Harvey, to take the steps necessary to convert the Commonwealth Bank into a Central Bank, working as part of the world-wide banking oligarchy instituted by Paul Warburg through the Federal Reserve System, with headquarters in

New York; and that, to ensure that Australian Governments were effectively trussed, the Loan Council was established as the sole "borrowing" authority. The principal tools of the foreign financiers in this base betrayal of the Australian people were Stanley Melbourne Bruce, Earl Christmas Grafton Page, and John Greig Latham. All things thus being so nicely arranged, the international gang decided that loans to Governments were to cease, interest rates were to rise, Government securities were to be disposed of, and overdrafts were to be cancelled. This meant that money became scarce and the money market "tight." Through inability to obtain, finance Governments were FORCED to abandon their development programmes, reduce allowances to old age and invalid pensioners, cut salaries and wages, and increase taxation. Business men were obliged to slacken hands, economise feverishly, and in many cases to surrender their assets to the very people who had imposed such financial conditions upon them. Between 1929 and 1931 bankruptcies were more than doubled, suicides rose at an alarming rate, the marriage rate fell sharply, unemployment jumped up to 32 per cent., and evidence of stagnation was to be seen on all sides. All these things hap-

pened despite the fact that our productive ability was greater than ever. There is not the slightest doubt that the bankers' policy of deflation was responsible for the chaos, and if we continue to allow the bankers to determine financial policy and impose it upon us there is not the slightest doubt that there will be more chaos after the war. Indeed, the financial "authorities" are already endeavouring to persuade us that another depression after the war is not only certain, but that it will be good for us!

The very trend of events should cause us to ponder over the past. Read carefully the words of the Prime Minister, as uttered in the House of Representatives in 1931, when the Premiers' Plan was under discussion. Here they are: "Recently there came a VERY SUDDEN DROP in the price of exportable commodities, together with a complete cessation of borrowing overseas, and these two factors have greatly aggravated the financial and economic depression. The Government has endeavoured during the last year or two to arrest the deflation which has been going on. WE HAVE ENDEAVOURED TO PREVAIL UPON THE BANKS TO EXTEND CREDIT IN ORDER THAT UNEMPLOYMENT MIGHT BE ARRESTED. Failing to obtain bank credit, part of the plan was to pass a fiduciary notes bill to assist the wheat farmers and the unemployed, but that measure was rejected in another place." The words "another place" mean the Senate! Doubtless you have noticed the special reference to the SUDDEN DROP IN PRICES and the cessation of BORROWING overseas. Both were brought

about by action on the part of the Bank of England, and the "technique" followed is described in paragraph 93 of the report of the Monetary and Banking Commission, previously quoted in these letters.

The fiduciary notes proposal was thrown out by the Senate, then led by George Foster Pearce, who has since been knighted and specially cared for through the agency of highly remunerative political appointments. Sir George arranged for Sir Robert Gibson, then Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board, to be brought to the Bar of the House to tell our representatives that more purchasing power would be harmful at a time when goods were rotting because people could not buy. It was after the rejection of the fiduciary Notes Bill that the Commonwealth Bank Board issued its ultimatum to both Federal and State Governments that failing observance of the Board's orders further credit would be stopped. The Governments meekly surrendered to the Board, and accepted the so-called Premiers' Plan, whose sponsors, including the great Professors Copland and Giblin, pathetically believed that the shortage of buying power would be rectified by further limiting the quantity of money in circulation. The same Board is still in control of the Governments of Australia, and the same Professors Copland and Giblin, still official "advisers"! The last-named is also a member of the Bank Board. The legislation which gave effect to this extra deflationary plan is officially styled "The Financial Emergency Act." The significance of that should be carefully noted. It was a FINANCIAL emergency. There was no production emergency.

At that time Mr. E. G. Theodore was Federal Treasurer. His name is again being frequently mentioned, but this time in connection with the Allied Works Council, which some people fear is designed to maintain conditions of slavery after the military conflict ceases. That, however, is a matter for separate consideration. All the same, I am one of those who had respect for him when he was Treasurer, and think it proper to repeat word for word what he said in the Commonwealth Parliament in the course of the Premiers' Plan debate, as follows:

"We cannot afford to ignore the dreadful consequences in which the Great War involved the world. It is well to remember that eight million men were killed, twenty million were wounded, many millions of others were gassed, shell shocked and otherwise incapacitated, and that within a year or two following the war ten million people in various countries died from a mysterious influenza epidemic. The signing of the peace treaty did not end the consequences of the war nor discharge its costs. We are still bearing the burden of those costs, and some of them are reflected in troubles which are afflicting the nation to-day."

Mr. John Beasley interjected: "And shall we not continue to do that under the scheme that is proposed?"

Mr. Theodore answered: "Undoubtedly; if our existing financial arrangements remain unaltered, we shall continue to be oppressed by these troubles."

Yours faithfully,

BRUCE H. BROWN.

189 Hotham St.,
East Melbourne.
August 2, 1942

(To be continued.)

ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA

(Continued from page 2.)

time! The world was casting off its capitalist shackles and I was casting off the shackles of home and school at the same time. The coincidence of course, was a marvel of marvels, even if no one realised the mystic significance of that juncture of events except myself. The thrill of seeing my name in print, secretly cherished, was no selfish indulgence, as with some of my literary friends, since my writing was for the cause. Such is the towering egotism of youth, even in its most altruistic poses.

There was that May Day, in 1919, a day of blood and terror and excruciating pain, of helpless anger. Workers' parades were smashed, radicals were brutally mauled, gaols were crowded. The telephone rang continuously to apprise us of more raids, more brutality, more arrests. Late that afternoon the patriotic marauders swarmed through the Rand School, clambering up fire-escapes. A metal workers' union shared our offices. I can still see the burly workman with an iron, weight in his hairy first waiting tensely at the door for the first Legionnaire who forced it open. Only the accident that they overlooked our room prevented another serious casualty.

Yet that appalling day was touched with rapture. We felt ourselves in the thick of a great struggle for Justice, only a few of us, but pitting our faith against something monstrous. We had just emerged from another battle and the lull was sweet.

There was a separate rapture for me. The others in the office may have been aware of her—"Little Sunshine," one of the men nicknamed her. But in my eyes she was the loveliest thing ever created. She came to the office that evening in a middy blouse and a red tam, and she remembered how I had recited "Nobody's Child" centuries ago. She was now nearly fifteen, radiant and electrically vivacious, and picked out on the typewriter words more wonderful than anything Shakespeare or Goethe had ever put together.

"Dear Comrade Eugene? I like you. Do you like me? Yours truly, Billy."

(To be continued.)

WILL MEDICAL BOARD SECURE STRANGLEHOLD ON DIETITIANS?

The Dietitians' Bill, hurriedly introduced in the Victorian Legislative Assembly by the Minister of Public Health, on Wednesday of last week, met with a very hostile reception from certain sections of the House, who were obviously suspicious of its real purpose.

Mr. Tunnecliffe, member for Collingwood, proposed an adjournment of one month, to give members sufficient time to assimilate the contents, which he described as "full of crudities of the grossest kind"; but only one week was granted.

Further commenting on the "extraordinary manner" in which the Bill had been presented, and the "little information" that had been given about its contents, Mr. Tunnecliffe asked why the Bill had been thrown on the table of the House when all were concerned with the war overseas, and the Government had promised not to bring forward any proposal of a debatable character. Powerful pressure had obviously been brought to bear on them. The Bill would strike at a very vital principle in the domestic life of the community, since thousands of people all over the State were submitting themselves to dietetic treatment.

Mr. Michaelis here interjected that dietitians were "quacks," and received the reply, "There is no evidence that these dietitians are quacks." Continuing, Mr. Tunnecliffe expressed the hope that some of these dietitians would consult with him, and promised to give them "the best service I am capable of."

Mrs. Weber (Ind.) spoke feelingly on behalf of the pioneers of dietetics, in whose work she had always taken a personal interest. Other members who spoke against the Bill included Mr. Macfarlan, who condemned it in no uncertain terms as "so rotten that it should be thrown out immediately"—a sentiment that will be endorsed by all readers of this paper who believe in fair play.

Now that the Bill had been tabled, its secret intent seems very clear. Although its ostensible sponsor asserts that established dietitians would graciously be allowed to register, they would certainly be put under the supreme control of yet another obnoxious Board, apparently to be composed exclusively of doctors, nurses, and orthodox dietitians who have graduated from the University. These gentry are mostly hostile to the "natural" school of dietetic thought, and would probably lose no opportunity of put-

ting the screws on once they took control of affairs. No young men or women would be allowed to train as dietitians except along orthodox lines, with the result that original thought will be considerably stifled in this State.

Our Victorian readers, especially those who have been restored to health and efficiency by the so-called "quacks," should lose no time in raising the voice of protest against this iniquitous Bill — by writing to their respective representatives in the State Parliament.

Registration is the noose, garlanded with flowers, into which the dietitian is directed to put his head so that the slip-knot can be tightened more quickly and effectively. We believe, with the outspoken Mr. Macfarlan, that the Bill is rotten to the core. Do your bit now and help to throw it out.

Here is one sample of the electors' letters being sent to members of the Victorian Parliament:—

To....., M.L.A.
Member for

Dear Sir,—In connection with the Dietitians Bill, it is my desire that no action should be taken to restrict my freedom in consulting any dietitian or naturopath of my own choice and that these men be left absolutely free from medical control.

Naturopathic procedure is entirely incompatible with the practice of medicine, therefore these two bodies of practitioners could not work in harmony.

Should you fail to carry out my wishes in this matter, I reserve the right to withhold my support at the next elections.

Yours faithfully,

Name

Address.....

FEDERAL RE-UNION

"Among those present were Mr. Harry Hopkins, Mr. William Bullitt, Mr. Robert Murphy (recent Counsellor to the Embassy in Paris), Mr. Clarence Streit, Mrs. Morgenthau, and the new Canadian Minister.

"Mr. Roosevelt's remarks on Federal Union, sheltering British destroyers, the fall of France, pan-American defence, the necessity for winning the war, and diverse American reactions to all these topics convinced me that he was a very sensible man."

—"My Hosts the Roosevelts," by Phillis Bentley, in "Cavalcade Digest," December, 1941.

The New Times

A non-party, non-sectarian, non-sectional weekly newspaper, advocating political and economic democracy, and exposing the causes, the institutions and the individuals that keep us poor in the midst of plenty.

Published every Friday by New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Elizabeth and Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.1. Postal Address: Box 1226, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU2834.

Vol. 8

FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1942

No. 31

Another Major Victory For "Pressure Politics"

The announcement in the daily press that the Government will drop its 4% profit-limit scheme must have been read with mixed feelings by one R. G. Menzies, who was the object of certain comment appearing on the front page of our last issue and who, by the way, was once Prime Minister of Australia.

No doubt Mr. Menzies has objections to the scheme. So has the "New Times." Where he presumably has the effrontery to differ diametrically from us is in the matter of HOW the scheme was defeated. The fact that "pressure politics" was used, was, no doubt, deemed "humiliating" (to politicians of the Menzies type) by Mr. Menzies. On the other hand, we welcome the scheme's defeat mainly **because** "pressure politics" WAS used.

Of course, some may say that it was **not** defeated by the use of "pressure politics," as electoral campaigners use that term—i.e., by electors as such writing letters to their respective parliamentary representatives; but by the usual forms of pressure exerted by "vested interests." However, this contention is disproved by the fact that so many big companies, after fruitlessly trying the other methods for a considerable time, found they had to circularise their numerous shareholders and ask them to act **as individuals** by writing to their **respective** representatives at Canberra. Hard-headed business executives and "men of the world" would not have incurred this further trouble and expense, involving what some of them, like Mr. Menzies, may have regarded as a "humiliating" concession to the principles of real democracy, if a victory was already reasonably assured. The fact that they did it, and it quickly succeeded, is yet another striking tribute to the effectiveness of this democratic form of "pressure politics."

The remaining objection in this instance, that the letter-writers, though numerous, were a minority of electors, only emphasises the effectiveness of the letter-writing: if a minority of electors succeeded in forcing a dictatorial Government to scrap one of its most cherished plans, what could a majority do? The answer is—anything they chose to do.

If there was anything undemocratic about a minority getting what they wanted in this way, it was the majority who were undemocratic, not the minority. If the majority wanted the scheme—and there is no direct evidence, whatever that they did—then it was their **democratic duty** to write to their parliamentary representatives and say so. Had they done so, it is obvious that the scheme would have been implemented instead of being scrapped.

Another fallacy that should be mentioned briefly in this connection is the proposition that if a section of the community get some economic benefit it is necessarily gained at the expense of others. The general answer to the proposition is that it can only apply, if at all, to a condition of unavoidable scarcity—and modern "civilised" communities do not normally experience such a condition—far from it! The specific answer is that such an economic benefit, by increasing incentive and efficiency, will usually result in a **nett** increase of the community's output.

Last week we gave some indication of the connection between the "Electoral Campaign" and the effective opposition to the 4% profit-limit scheme. Shortly before this issue "went to press" we received more information, for which we lacked the necessary space. We hope to have space for it, and some further comment, next week.

DEMOCRATIC PRESSURE IN BRISTOL

A recent sequence of events in Bristol is a good instance of how individuals, faced with the disenfranchisement—local as well as national—brought about under war conditions, are remaking the link between electors and representatives, the mechanism for the transmission of policy which alone makes the democratic machine an instrument of democracy:—

In 1940-41 there was a heavy loss of rateable value due to the heavy blitzes on the centre of the town. In February, 1942 the Chairman of the Finance Committee stated that it would be necessary to increase rates by 2/10½ to meet the fall in revenue. During February and March many complaints were published in the local Press that the proposed measure was unfair, and it was linked with

the fact that there are no elections in war time, and on March 5 a letter appeared prominently and with a good headline in the "Bristol Evening Post" suggesting that electors in each ward should organise a demand on Councillors, as their representatives, to stop the rate increase. A week later the Finance Committee announced that there would be no rise in rates in this half-year. A letter on the origin of loan charges and bank overdrafts published in the local press shortly after was answered by one thanking the correspondent and giving particulars of the City's loan charges, which the Chairman of the Finance Committee "visualised" in future as comprising 19/6 out of a 20/ rate. Subsequently a Rate-payers' League was formed—to keep Councillors "in touch with opinion." Representatives from each street were to meet and see how much they had in common, and then do something about it.

THE ESSENTIALS OF A DEMOCRATIC COMMUNITY

A Dialogue Broadcast from 7HO Hobart, at 6.30 p.m. on Sunday July 26, by THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN SPEAKERS.

B.—Last Sunday night you put over a very provocative talk; you set us all thinking, and I was very----

J.—Was very annoyed and didn't like it, and so switched on to another station to get some soothing syrup.

B.—No, I was not annoyed. I was surprised at the statements you made.

J.—Why?

B.—You are the chairman of an organisation upholding the idea of the democratic way of life and you seemed to pour ridicule on the whole idea.

J.—How did you come to that conclusion?

B.—Well, here are your own statements; let them speak for themselves. You said: "The greatest achievements of men still remain the achievement of individuals. No committee of men ever produced a great literary work, a great painting, or a great piece of music, and I make bold to say they never will. Even in practical affairs, no one would be so stupid as to suggest the running of a business or an army by means of a committee." Now then, what does that mean if it doesn't mean that committees are of no use; that, if a job has to be done, get one man and put him in charge of the job. Did you mean that, or didn't you?

J.—Of course I meant that; its the usual thing to do and the right thing to do.

B.—And you object to dictators?

J.—Of course I object.

B.—Well, what is a one-man-control but a dictatorship?

J.—It is a dictatorship up to a point.

B.—Up to what point? Either you have a dictator or you don't have a dictator.

J.—That sounds all very logical, but let's talk about facts: The facts of human experience. Let us take the running of a ship; it is run by the captain. Let us call him the autocrat in charge. Can you imagine a ship run by a committee?

B.—No, I can't.

J.—Well, what's wrong with that?

B.—Nothing much wrong, but what about our vaunted democratic way of life? If we cannot have democratic control over a ship what can we have control over?

J.—The captain is in charge of the administration of the ship; he is held solely responsible, and therefore he must have complete control.

B.—Naturally.

J.—But the policy behind the ship is not controlled by the captain.

B.—What do you mean by the policy?

J.—I mean the direction in which the ship should sail.

B.—Who controls that?

J.—When you or other passengers buy a ticket from Hobart to Sydney in a certain ship, you decide the direction that ship should sail. You decide the general policy of the ship.

B.—I see, the administration is autocratic, under the control of one man; the general direction is decided by the passengers—the policy is democratic.

J.—The two always exist side by side.

B.—The people make the choice of direction; the expert or autocrat carries out the work.

J.—And all the confusion of thought which you find prevalent among socialists and business-men is due to their inability to see clearly the difference between policy and administration.

B.—Some people want the experts to control everything—the policy and the administration.

J.—Others want the people to control everything: deciding what has to be done and also how it is to be done.

B.—Obviously both are wrong. Both are impracticable.

J.—And you can show quite easily that both are wrong. For example: Suppose I call a taxi and say to the

driver: "Take me to North Hobart." And then I say: "As I am paying for this trip. I am going to drive your car." What do you think the driver would say?

B.—I don't know what he would say in actual words, but his meaning would be that he is in charge of the car and he would not let any other person drive it.

J.—And he would be quite right.

B.—I suppose you would call him the expert or autocrat in charge.

J.—But if I asked the driver to take me to North Hobart and he said: "I am in charge of this job and I am going to take you to "South Hobart," he would be in the wrong.

B.—Of course he would. He would be the expert turned dictator!

J.—So in actual daily experience, when people spend money they give orders to experts.

B.—We have, an autocracy of producers serving a democracy of consumers.

J.—The people decide what they want and the experts carry out the job.

B.—The people, when they spend their money, decide the general policy of the country, and the experts do the work.

J.—The policy is democratic and the administration is autocratic.

B.—Of course, in actual practice, it is not so easy to say where policy ends and administration begins.

J.—Nothing is very easy when you come to practical politics but that doesn't mean that we should have the chaos we have to-day.

B.—In a democratic state the people should decide the policy carried out by the experts in charge of administration.

J.—And they should also decide the men who are to be responsible for carrying out the policy.

B.—Our members of Parliament are responsible for seeing the people's policy is carried out. The actual administration of the work is under the control of experts—

J.—Who are under the control of Parliament. The trouble arises when a small group of men want to decide what the people ought to have in every sphere of activity—men who want to decide the kind of education we are to have, the kind of houses we should live in, the kind of bread we should eat and what we should do with our leisure time.

B.—The temperance worker has every right to special knowledge
(Continued on page 5)

THE SLAVE TRADE

Mr. Donald Innes, of Huddersfield (Eng.), draws attention to an innocent-looking and apparently useful booklet entitled "You and the Call-up," which has been written by a solicitor, Robert S. W. Pollard, and published by the Blandford Press. The booklet, intended to explain the individual's liability under the compulsory service, essential work and conscientious objection orders, begins with an introduction containing the following:—

"We cannot foresee if there will be complete legal freedom, to choose one's occupation after the war. One may, however, express the hope that a consciousness of an **obligation to serve** the community will continue to be recognised in peace-time by every citizen."

The emphasis is not Mr. Pollard's. Whatever one may do, another, having in mind Hazlitt's dictum that "Corporate bodies are more corrupt and profligate than individuals, because they have more power to do mischief, and are less amenable to disgrace or punishment," and that, in any case, the only justification for the organisation of the community is service to, not from, the individual, may have better hopes than Mr. Pollard's.

THE BIG IDEA

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Crediter" (Eng.)

(Continued from last issue.)

The idea of a political majority is clearly part of the ideology of war, and closely associated with the "Fuehrerprinzip"—the conception of society as an army progressing under the orders of a General. "God is on the side of the Big Battalions." How much if any, reality, is there in this proposition?

Now the first point to observe is that it finds no support in history. If the outcome, of the present Bedlam should result in victory for size, and the rule of the world pass to mere populations, whether German, Russian, or American, it will be something entirely new.

Greece, Rome, Venice, Spain, Holland, England, all of them small, have all, in their turn, set the fashion in civilisation, and, in every case, their eminence has not only been in the midst of far greater, and in many cases, opposing populations, but has, for the most part, been most clearly marked at a period when the disparity in numbers was greatest.

Admittedly, this day of splendour has been to a much greater extent than is commonly realised, a mone-

tary phenomenon. But to say that, is completely to miss the most important lesson which can be deduced from history. That lesson is that the increment of association is greatest where the association is most flexible, or to put it another way, money has been, in the past, the most flexible voting system ever devised, enabling the voter to change his policy and to hold an election every five minutes.

It really does not require much intelligence to realise that the idea of a permanent majority involves the permanent disfranchisement of everyone concerned. If I have £500, and can go to a builder and give him my plans for a house, and "vote" my £500 to him, I get action in accordance with my wishes. But if all

building is nationalised, I am disfranchised.

This question of the disfranchisement of the individual from minute to minute goes straight to the roots of the war. It is the technique of centralisation of power, and it must be remembered that there is no such thing as the destruction of power. Power, once centralised, cannot be used while centralised for anything but the ends of the organisation in which it has been centralised. Have you ever known of a Government Department relinquishing power?

It is obvious that a majority is only a specialised and deceptive word for the "Fuehrerprinzip." No majority can act without a Leader. When an individual resigns power to a leader, he resigns it primarily to be used against him. To the extent that the "Fuehrerprinzip" has been effective, the present state of the world is the result of the "Fuehrerprinzip." You can't have it both ways—either the device is ineffective, or the results are catastrophic.

This is easily verifiable. Nations have been moving towards totalitarianism in various forms since the French Revolution and the reign of Frederick the "Great." Contemporaneously, wars have been becoming more obviously planned, more destructive, and more certainly the steps to still greater wars and more totalitarianism. The answer is simplicity itself—the restriction of the leader principle to "ad hoc" purposes. So far from Russia, Germany and Italy, the New Deal and P.E.P. indicating advance towards a better world, they are exhibits of the operation of a policy which has brought the world to the edge of destruction—if not over it. A majority ceases to have any validity when it is led to an objective its component individuals do not understand, or when a dissentient minority is forced to accompany it.

I hope no one will run away with the idea that all this is highly theoretical. It is the most deadly practical subject to which attention can be drawn at this time.

Collectivism, economic and political, is the policy of the Supernational Forces. Its fundamental objective is the Slave World, ruled by a Praetorian Guard in the employ of a

the Government is removing incentive to further effort, that is a serious obstacle, and we have to make our voices heard until the obstacle is removed.

B.—What about a policy for peace time?

J.—We know that this country can produce sufficient food, clothes and houses, and education and other services for the entire population; then our policy is to see that all obstacles to the distribution of these goods and services are removed.

B.—But how is such an end to be attained?

J.—Once we are certain such an end can be attained then we must refuse to be satisfied with any excuses and demand results.

B.—But how can the people make their voices heard?

J.—People are clamouring for action—for the other person to act; but action must come from the individual. One man can gather a small group of men and elect a spokesman: these groups can join with other small groups, and so on, and gradually acquire the experience of voluntary co-operation in important matters. At present the people have no cohesion, no link with each other. They have no way of making their voice heard, except through political parties, and you know how much value these have been, you know the mess they have got us into.

B.—Can you suggest a first step.

J.—Let those who are interested in action warn others of the difficulties which lie ahead of them.

B.—How can they do that?

J.—By distributing in this town a copy of Eric Butler's booklet, "The Enemy Within The Empire," price 6d., obtainable at the E.C. office, 101 Collins Street, Hobart. If this great little booklet does not urge people to do something, then they must be dead.

Ruling Race. It has no chance whatever of success, but it has a real chance of setting back the clock of human happiness by hundreds of years.

Inherent in the subject is the importance of optimum size, and the consequent dangers of megalomania.

(To be continued.)

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA

(Continued from page 1.)

by consciously working for it as individuals. So it is utter rot to talk about giving 400 million Indians liberty, when the great bulk of them have never even heard of the word. There is ample evidence to show that the British have attempted to show the Indians how they can obtain political democracy. Dr. Edmund D. Lucas, who has lived in India for over thirty years and is an authority on Indian politics, has written:

"India's political position is now somewhere between that of a dependency and that of a dominion. The recent Government of India Act, 1935, has two distinct parts. The first part deals with the provinces, grants them a large measure of autonomy, widens the franchise for those who elect the provincial councils, and puts the entire provincial administration under the control of Indian Premiers and Ministers, who represent and are responsible to the major party in the Legislative Council. Thus a democratic system of government is already in operation in all eleven of the British provinces of India, which are in a sense equivalent to our States or even more like the Canadian Provinces. In eight of them the Indian National Congress, which is the party headed by Messrs. Gandhi and Nehru, is in control of the Government."

When the lawyer-socialist, Cripps, recently visited India to offer the Indians complete "self-government," even the press admitted that 99 per cent, of the Indians had never heard, or were likely to hear, of Cripps. Cripps offered Gandhi, the English-trained lawyer, complete "self-government." The whole proposition was nonsense, a typical product of the legal mind, because Gandhi no more represents the great majority of the Indians than I do. The National Indian Congress has never had more than a "paper" affiliation of four and a half millions out of the four hundred million Indians. Further, as we will see later, it has been influenced to a great extent by forces outside India.

The proposals of socialist Cripps would mean a central dictatorship in India by Mr. Gandhi and his immediate followers, a great majority of whom have been educated in England, and thus regard themselves "competent" to rule the majority of their fellow Indians, even if this majority doesn't approve of them. Significantly enough, the powerful financial forces connected with the Indian Central Bank are rather disposed towards "self-government" for India. Perhaps this is not surprising when we recall a statement made by Mr. Gubhas Chandra Bose, head of the extremists in the Congress Party: "I want to see India becoming Socialistic—combining the best of Communism, Fascism, and President Roosevelt's New Deal."

But all this doesn't answer the question about the British remaining in India. I am convinced that Britain would be committing a great folly to leave India at the present juncture. It is unrealistic to argue about whether British administrators should be in India or not. The British are there, and to suggest that they leave now would almost be equal to asking the Australian people to leave Australia and give it back to the blacks. The past has been full of great mistakes. But we must think of the present. Chaos would reign supreme in India if Britain withdrew now; and either Japan or Germany might gain control. Many people do not know that at least 100,000,000 Indians, the Moslems, are bitterly opposed to Mr. Gandhi and the Hindus. The better elements realise that India will be lost if the British withdraw from India now; that is why hundreds of thousands of Indians are volunteering to join the British Army; they realise that they have a greater chance of obtaining complete liberty from the British than from the Japanese or the Germans.

(To be continued.)

The Essentials of a Democratic Community—Continued

about beer, but he has no right to try to compel men by force not to drink beer.

J.—Of course not. When a minority forces restrictive legislation on the majority, actually they are using brute force to compel people to live as the minority thinks fit.

B.—You believe that it is the "puritan" element in the community which is destroying democratic Government by encouraging Parliament to use compulsion in so many things?

J.—I believe the "puritan" element, is a very disruptive element; their standards are not human standards, and as no community is ever likely to conform to their standards; everybody is suspect; everybody has to be reformed, to be watched and policed and legislated against.

B.—And so we arrive at the Police State.

J.—These "puritans" are the people who encourage autocratic Governments.

B.—Men get pleasure in drinking beer and in smoking tobacco—

J.—Therefore, such things are evil!

B.—It is "wrong" to drink, therefore it must be taxed!

J.—It is wrong to smoke tobacco, therefore tobacco must be taxed!

B.—It is wrong to have a motor car, therefore petrol must be taxed!

J.—It is wrong to live above the bread-line, therefore all incomes over the poverty level must be taxed!

B.—It is wrong to be idle, therefore idle men must starve!

J.—It is wrong to be successful, therefore penalise the successful man by taxation!

B.—And so we arrive at the State of Mediocrity.

J.—Anyone who rises above the dull level is held suspect. Thus it comes about that the noisy "puritans" and so-called planners are convenient tools used to prepare the way for every piece of restrictive legislation that is forced through Parliament.

B.—If you can persuade the people that anything they want is bad for them, then you can smash the whole foundations of democratic Government. But how can you persuade people to believe that what they want is bad for them?

J.—By taxation?

B.—How's that?

J.—If you can persuade all those on the lower incomes that they can receive no social benefits except through more taxation, then these people are naturally quite pleased when the higher incomes group are stung for extra taxes.

B.—And of course those who are being stung resent it and, therefore, are opposed to any further social legislation.

J.—And so you split the country into hostile political camps—

B.—Fighting over taxation.

J.—And every year taxes keep on increasing.

B.—In peace time and in war time.

J.—During depressions and during so-called prosperity.

B.—It is a permanent policy.

J.—It is a policy that finally must break up all attempts at voluntary co-operation.

B.—But why that?

J.—No member of Parliament has ever asked me if I wished to have my taxes increased.

B.—But you are only in the minority.

J.—I doubt that. But even if I were in the minority, democratic Government does not give the majority the right to persecute or penalise a minority. And where an important section of the people feel that they are being heavily penalised and that they have no say in the Government of the country they will not co-operate.

B.—You believe, then, that if the people got together and demanded a policy which is to the advantage of everyone, the Government would have to carry it out?

J.—Undoubtedly.

B.—Do you believe there is such a policy?

J.—Certainly I do. I do not believe in criticising persons or institutions unless I know for certain there is something better available to take their place.

B.—What is that something?

J.—I believe that any job can be done quickly and well if men are offered the necessary inducement.

B.—Obviously.

J.—Obvious to you, but not so obvious to those people who want prodigious efforts performed for nothing.

B.—You mean that the reduction of profits and the taxing of wages is destroying the war effort.

J.—Everybody knows that. Here you have a small section who are willing to sacrifice all efforts in order to fit their cranky theories, in order to limit all profit.

B.—Where does that get us?

J.—Well, if people want results let them demand results and not kill everything by insisting on pushing their theories.

B.—But how are we to agree on what results we want.

J.—The first job we want done is to win the war, and to increase production. The Government's job is to do that. If we find out that anything holds up the war effort our job is to see that the Government removes the obstacle. If we find that

BIG N.W.R.M. MEETING IN THE MELBOURNE TOWN HALL

The prelude to this meeting held on July 28, was the delightful organ music rendered by D. A. E. Floyd. Before the chairman opened the meeting, the British and American National Anthems were played by an Air Force Band.

Cr. B. Longfield, J.P., in opening the meeting, referred briefly to the origins and growth of the N.W.R.M. After his preliminary remarks proceeded to give an account of the machinations of the International Bankers showing how on their own avowed statement of policy, they have conspired together to impoverish and enslave the people of all countries, using the political party system to divide the people and cause them to fight among themselves on issues of no importance. Cr. Longfield also showed how the Bank of England had been instrumental in whittling away the defences of Great Britain while it gave every assistance to Nazi Germany. It was not generally known, he added, that his Bank is a privately-owned corporation, the real owners of which are never disclosed, and that it also makes its own income tax assessment.

The secretary, Mr. Cutting, in a spirited address, referred briefly to the principles embodied in the N.W.R.M. Charter; one of which is the proclamation that economic security must be the inalienable right of every man, woman and child, to be guaranteed by Act of Parliament. Civilisation had reached the crossroads, he said, and decisions had to be made shortly which would affect the destiny of our people for generations to come. He appealed to those present to think, unite, and act now, or be faced with another war in 25 years, which would undoubtedly extinguish civilisation altogether. He stated that the struggle for survival now vested in the power of money was a major cause of the world crisis, and that money had to become a means of exchange, not a thing to be bought and sold and have power over all men and all nations, before real brotherhood could exist between men.

Following this address, a copy of the N.W.R.M. Charter was presented to 26 young women, representing the "Free Nations." The presentations were made by the vice-president of the New World Reconstruction Movement, Mrs. I. H. Moss, C.B.E., J.P.

Mr. Bruce H. Brown, whose views are already well known to readers of this paper, gave a most informative address, demonstrating conclusively that, under the existing financial system, a new and better world is utterly impossible. He declared that no person who lacks an understanding of the nature of Money, the source of Money, how it is created, and who owns it when it is created, is competent to discuss intelligently any of the problems which beset us. He proceeded to enlighten the audience on those points, in a witty and telling address.

Rev. J. T. Lawton, M.A., spoke of the tragedy which has descended upon the world because of the policies pursued by Governments after the war of 1914-18, stressing the truth that, unless our civilisation is to collapse in complete ruin, many policies hitherto adhered to must be reversed.

Senator Darcey, who was the concluding speaker, dealt with the political set-up, and gave the audience much information, familiar to "New Times" readers, from his first-hand knowledge of Parliamentary affairs. He made a plea for the use of national credit through the Commonwealth Bank, and deplored the tendency of the Government to destroy incentive.

The meeting closed with the passing

**THE "NEW TIMES"
IS OBTAINABLE
AT
ALL AUTHORISED
NEWSAGENTS**

of a resolution moved by Mr. Bruce Brown, seconded by the Rev. J. T. Lawton, and carried unanimously as follows:-

"That this mass meeting of Melbourne citizens urges the Federal Parliament to remove all financial obstacles to a maximum war effort, and to post-war reconstruction by taking immediate action in accordance with the finding of the Royal Commission on the Monetary and Banking System, wherein it is stated the Commonwealth Bank can lend to Governments or to others in a variety of ways, and it can even make money available to Governments or to others free of charge. Furthermore, with the object of raising the morale of citizens and fighting men to the highest possible level, we call upon the Federal Government to take immediate action to ensure that financial and economic security shall be the inalienable right of every man, woman and child, and shall be guaranteed by the Commonwealth constitution."

Although the meeting was attended by more than 3000 citizens showing that an important cross-section of public opinion was represented, it was noticed that the so-called "free" press almost entirely ignored it. One morning paper (the "Age") published a very brief and slightly inaccurate account of it which, at best, was poor journalism, referring to the enthusiastic reception given the speakers and what they said as "Escapism." Needless to add, this unit of the "free" press made no attempt to disprove the statements of the speakers. Nor did any of the papers mention the names of the well-known citizens associated with the meeting.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

war of finance goes on to the detriment of the real war. All these moves are designed to hide the fact that the Federal Government has the power and the facilities to provide its own finance. Incidentally, it is the bankers themselves using the Government to foster this idea.

LEGALISED LOOT is the title of a Melbourne "Sun" sub-leader of July 27, describing the decision on "uniform" taxation. The writer indulges in a tirade on how the thrifty State of Victoria will be penalised. No reference is made to the deeper implication of the move, namely, the further centralisation of financial power into the hands of a few men who, by operating the machinery of finance, turning off the money tap here, there and anywhere they see fit, control the destiny of the people and the policy of Parliament. It is just another move in the war of the Banks v. the People.

"OVER - PRODUCTION": Because several hundred U.S. war plants are likely to be curtailed, the Melbourne "Sun" of July 25 informs us that the administration is alarmed lest the public misunderstand the position. The ingenious official explanation is: "American ingenuity has outstripped itself. Fifteen plants are now doing the work of 25—therefore 10 must be closed." It's certainly a novel excuse, and one which our local planners will appreciate. There's plenty of excuses for war time under-production, but not many for over-production.

COAL MESS: In Britain, as in Australia, theoretical planners have brought chaos and disaster, as evidenced by the following report from the London "Daily Mail": "The nation is anxiously looking for results from the Government plans for increasing coal production. So far, there is no evidence that this has been achieved; there is still no sign of any serious Government move to return, miners from the Army to the pits—which experts believe is the real remedy." The Government seems to

Letters to the Editor

THE POLICY OF THE N.W.R.M.

Sir, I attended a large public meeting conducted by the New World Reconstruction Movement in the Melbourne Town Hall on Tuesday, July 28. When I read the advertisements stating that Mr. Bruce Brown, Senator Darcey, and Rev. J. T. Lawton were to be the chief speakers, I concluded that the N.W.R.M. must have much in common with the "New Times" policy, and with Social Credit. Much time, money and thought had apparently been devoted to the preparation for the meeting by men and women who really desire to put an end to the present frustrations, and to ensure that the peace, when it comes will not be a repetition of the "peace" (?) that followed the previous edition of the World War.

However, after listening to the various speakers on the platform, I am of the opinion that, whilst this organisation is in agreement with us in so far as monetary questions are concerned, and are prepared to invite speakers to expose the financial swindle, it was very apparent that, apart from financial reform there is very little in common between the policy of the N.W.R.M. and Social Crediters or the "New Times."

I fear there is little or no hope of their ever achieving their objective by the method they are adopting. Far too much attention is paid to abstractions and little or no attention to realities. As an indication of this one speaker, who appears to be the guiding spirit and is certainly the dynamics of the movement, made this amazing statement when explaining the policy of the N.W.R.M.: "We are

not attacking individuals, but we are attacking the system." If this speaker will give a little more thought to this statement he must surely realise that fighting "systems" does not constitute a threat or a danger to those who operate and determine the policy of the "system". On the contrary, they will welcome such tilting at windmills, involving large expenditure of time, energy and money (they may even assist) in holding large public meetings and passing resolutions, which do not pin the blame on any individual.

Perhaps this gentleman could tell me how I can fight something abstract, or tell me what a system looks like, if it can speak or be spoken to, how I will recognise it when I come across it, or whether I could secure a photograph of it for reference.

Systems are made by men, and men control them and determine policy; so, if we do not like the system, we must attack the individuals who are responsible for implementing it. (Please note, I cannot refer to a system as "He" or "She", but must say "It.") If the speaker was struck by a car, would he blame the car, and sue IT for damages, or would he seek out the responsible individual?

The people at the Town Hall were treated to a beautiful display of pageantry, symbolizing the unity of the nations (I hope this is not symbolical of Federal Union), and to an exposure of financial control, but were not told how this latter state of affairs can be altered. The public were invited to buy charters, become members, subscribe finance, pass resolutions, and look forward to the next meeting. Not a word about responsibility or initiative on the part either our paid M.'sP. or the electors.

I fully expected that the people present at the meeting would be asked to write to their respective members of Parliament, and tell them that they were expected to give effect to the terms of the resolution. I would point out that no matter how desirable the objectives of the N.W.R.M. may appear to be, it still is not democratic to impose those objectives upon the people. Real democracy means that the experts and the representatives give the people the result that they (the people) want. Whether the experts think it is good or bad for the people is beside the point.

The N.W.R.M. says that "Democracy has never been tried." True and it never will be tried until the individual elector recognises and shoulders his personal responsibility, and exercises his initiative sufficiently to tell his representatives in the Municipal, State and Federal spheres what he does or does not want, and refuses to allow groups or organisations, no matter how well-meaning, to impose their will upon him. Then, and not until then, will you have "Government of the People, for the People and by the People."—Yours, etc.

F. C. PAICE.
Coburg.

A DEMOCRAT'S LAMENT

Sir—I am sick. Not physically, but mentally. Sick of a Government that told us that there was no need to pile up huge debts to finance this war, but have increased the National Debt to the tune of over £160 million since they have been in power; that tells us of the Freedom and Democracy we are fighting for, and manufactures weak, unconvincing reasons for over-riding that Freedom; that institutes unnecessary Boards, Commissions and Committees to make sure that we only use as much of OUR Country's products as they think fit and give the Government control of all these products; a Government that is FORCING Bureaucratic Socialism on the Australian people with brazen disregard of their wishes.

Yes, Mr. Editor, I am sick of all these things, but there are two things that upset my mental health even more.

Firstly, these Manpower Regulations that cut away the very legs on which REAL DEMOCRACY stands; the right of the individual to work where or with whom he will, or to employ whom he will; these morale-sapping regulations that compel you to work for the Allied

(Continued on page 7)

HOUSING PROBLEM

It is estimated that 3,000,000 new homes will be needed in Britain to make up for the interruption of the yearly average of 350,000 new houses, war-time marriages and blitz damage. "Temporary homes built on the sectionalised system would seem essential," said Mr. A. E. Wade, general secretary of the House-builders' Association of Great Britain, with reference to discussions between the building industry and the Government on plans to build 500,000 temporary homes after the war. "We cannot hope to catch up with the building lag for some years," he said.

An International Federal Union Government would be given complete control over finance, and would thus control every aspect of people's economic lives. The British Empire as a Commonwealth of sovereign and free peoples would be destroyed. This is the greatest threat existing to democracy and the British Empire.

CHARTER OR CAMOUFLAGE?

One of Man's favourite diversions since the dawn of time seems to have been that of planning "New World Orders." When the cave-man coveted his neighbours cave, or his wife—or both—he was wont to indulge in a spot of "New Order" Planning—and club-swinging exercises.

Sometimes his post-war plans went astray, owing to his neighbour having "slicker" New Order Plans—or better clubs, Unhappily for the world, almost all the notable "New Order" planners—Alexander, Napoleon, Hitler, and others, seem to have inherited the cave-man's proclivities toward robbery, cruelty and murder.

The horrors associated with Axis methods of warfare have given an impetus to post-war planning, and decently-minded people everywhere are dreaming and planning for the inauguration of an "order" under which war, will be eliminated, and security and prosperity assured. Although a few highly placed politicians and others have deprecated post-war planning as "premature," dearly bought experience teaches that it is not only desirable, but imperative, that this task should be immediately undertaken.

At the conclusion of the last war, the world was "caught on the hop," and ill-advised, hasty post-war action produced that pitiful abortion known as the League of Nations. The disillusionment which followed on its failure has brought a more critical and sober frame of mind in respect to New World Order planning and planners. When, in August last, spreading press headlines informed the world that a new declaration of the rights of men and nations had been formulated by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt, the announcement aroused little more than languid interest. A few hysterical folk hailed it as a Millennium prelude, but their enthusiasm received a chilling douche when it was later on, revealed that Mr. Montagu Norman had been a member of the select marine party. Whether Montagu was invited, or had invited himself, has not yet been disclosed.

In any case, he seems to have revealed his well-known skill with the landing-net, for on this occasion the big ones didn't get away. (When Montagu writes his autobiography, the chapter entitled, "Bagging Statesmen," should provide some interesting reading matter.) Probably the Money Magicians had not forgotten that, in earlier days, both Churchill and Roosevelt had thrown a missile or two at their Joss-House, and had deputed Montagu to prevent any sacrilegious

repetition and steer their frail ship through perilous waters.

Space considerations will not allow of a detailed review of the Atlantic Charter, but it can be said that it merits neither the excessive praise nor the sweeping condemnation meted out by some of its critics. Like the proverbial curate's egg, it is quite good in parts, but on the whole is a deceptive and disappointing document.

The best "parts" are to be found in the first half. It opens auspiciously with the signatories' statement that their countries seek no territorial or other aggrandisement, nor territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. The rights of all people to choose the form of Government under which they will live is to be respected, and access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world is to be granted to all States—victor or vanquished. This should remove possible causes of discontent and friction, although in the latter clause the phrase, "with due respect to existing obligations," introduces an element of uncertainty as to its scope and value.

At first sight, the next or 5th clause seems charmingly innocent and innocuous. It states, "They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration of all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security."

Remembering the presence of Mr. Montagu Norman at the conference table, and his expressed disbelief in the permanence of anything but a pauper world, one is inclined to wonder if a miracle had taken place, and the leopard had indeed changed his spots.

In the past, Mr. Montagu Norman's efforts have been in the direction of lowering labour standards, fostering economic chaos and social insecurity, and the condition in which the world finds itself to-day indicates that he

and his financial associates have not laboured in vain.

Proof of the fact that the leopard has not changed his spots is given in a subsequent clause, which states, *inter alia*, "no future peace can be maintained, if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside their own frontiers." This is another glaring instance of casting blame on the effects instead of the real causes.

Maintenance of land, sea, and air armaments is the concomitant or result of the maintenance of a financial system which deprives nations of sufficient purchasing power to purchase their own products, and prompts them to use military power to force other nations to accept them.

To expect that Mr. Montagu Norman would lend assistance to any scheme for abolishing the present financial system would be as stupid as to commission a brewery director to frame a genuine plan for prohibition.

The wording of the Atlantic Charter gives evidence that Montagu has a deft touch in the way of sabotage.

No matter how honourable the intentions of its nominal sponsors were, recent events show that it is being used as a "camouflage net," to hide and aid the activities of those who are working for the accomplishment of Federal Union—the Bankers' Charter. In connection with the treaty recently signed between Britain and Russia, cables stated that it had been drawn up in keeping with the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter.

It was significant, however, that the loan granted to Russia embodied the usual interest weighted principles of the present financial system.

The 5th clause in the Atlantic Charter, referring to collaboration of all nations in the economic field, is practically identical with the proposals set out in Federal Union literature. Like the League of Nations, the Atlantic Charter is merely a further proof of the folly of attempting to build a new and stable social order without first abolishing the financial ramp which has wrecked the present one.

—"Stirrem."

Letters to the Editor

(Continued from page 6)

Works Council, if they want you, under any conditions in any place, or for any remuneration the Works Council decides—if you be a doctor and the Council's representative tells you to dig drains, then dig drains you must; these regulations, that exude a very strong stench of the concentration camp methods adopted by our Fascist enemies, that together with the military conscription, are causing the lack of manpower to work our farms and food industries, thereby causing the shortage of essential foodstuffs we are experiencing, although they are so necessary to the health of every man, woman and child in the community.

Secondly, I am sick to know that there are hundreds, even thousands, of people who feel the same way about these regulations as I do, but do NOT act to have them removed, and so once again make Australia a REAL DEMOCRACY—people whose Members of Parliament are only too anxious to know their wishes and "plump for them in Parliament" without considering it "humiliating" (despite Mr. Menzies' views in this regard).

Mr. Editor, surely it is not too much to ask these people to assist me to overcome this sickness of heart and mind. Thanking you for this opportunity.—Yours, etc.

FRED. W. ELLIOTT (Jnr.).
Malvern, Vic.

Gestapo Tactics in Australia!

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—Whoever would believe the Labor Government's plank of Arbitration was a sham: merely hollow hypocrisy? Yet it would seem so. It may be too much in our democracy to expect justice, but one does hesitate to accept the Government's contempt for the considered opinion of a Full Court finding in the recent Conspiracy Trial, without having serious misgivings for the future of Australians.

Apparently the Court issued instructions, through the Solicitor-General, for the persons arraigned in the various States to be tried, each case on its merits. Here in West Australia this course was adopted. Two of those charged were found guilty and given

lections will, in future, fall far below that which has been achieved in the past.

Under these circumstances, your Council is urged to co-operate in the resolution set out above, and to communicate with the State Member for your electorate accordingly. I will esteem it a favour if you will kindly advise me of action taken by your Council herein.

—Yours faithfully, Thos H. Webster, Shire Clerk.

suitable sentences. The remaining two were acquitted, but not released. Oh, dear no, that is far too much to expect!

Now consider this. The Government authorised the trial. But why this farce, since it does not abide by the finding of the Full Court? It would seem that the jurisdiction of a Full Court is acceptable only should it coincide with the wishes of the Government. That any Government should ride rough shod over one of the most cherished principles of democracy is intolerable. If we fight for freedom, such action will not help us, rather will it cause dissension in our ranks.

The Government should take immediate steps to rectify this situation. That a man might be seized, thrown into prison, and detained without charge for six weeks, and without trial for three months, and then, when acquitted by the Full Court, be still detained indefinitely, has no justification in the most perverted state of democracy. If this procedure is permitted under any National Security Act, then that Act should be immediately deleted from the Statute Book. A guilty man deserves sentence, but a man acquitted of a trumped-up police charge should be promptly released.

The injustice of this particular case is magnified by the sufferings of this man's wife and four little children.

If people have a sense of decency and justice, this case in point, of Edward C. Quicke, dairy farmer, of Balingup, W.A., should awaken a feeling of revulsion and disgust with leaders who so misuse their power, so that they will demand that the path of justice be followed.

—Yours etc., A. C. Quicke, Kulin, WA.

FREE PRESS

"The Economist" concedes that the principle of concealing names of shareholders under nominee holdings is a bad one for any so-called public company, and is far worse when it is adopted by a Press which prides itself on its candour and independence. "The Economist," it is noticed, prefers to disclose "Truth's" shareholders rather than its own, an instance, possibly, of "candour." "It is not necessary that the press should be free, what is necessary is that it should be free from corrupt pressure." It is unnecessary to say that this is not a quotation from "The Economist."

MR. T. C. STOTT, M.P.,
will give the Luncheon Address
on August 14, at
The United Democrats'
Headquarters, 17 Waymouth
Street, Adelaide.

DEBT BURDEN ON COUNCILS

RELIEF SOUGHT IN NEW SOUTH WALES

The Willimbong Shire Council has issued the following circular-letter to all Municipal and Shire Councils throughout New South Wales:

WILLIMBONG SHIRE COUNCIL.

Council Chambers,
Leeton, N.S.W.
July 23 1942

Loan Commitments of Councils.

Dear Sir,—I am directed to ask if your Council will be so good as to consider whether it is prepared to co-operate with my Council in the following resolution:—

"That the Minister for Local Government and Housing be requested to take such steps as may be necessary to suspend the repayment by Council of loans, together with interest thereon, for the duration of the war, and that, in support of this request, the attention of the Minister be invited to the heavy demands now made upon Council and its Staff by the Federal and State Governments in connection with the War Effort."

My Council is aware that every Local Governing Body in the State is, at the present time, doing its utmost to assist the nation's War Effort, and that this assistance is, in many cases, imposing a severe strain upon the Council's resources.

The Council has been called upon to incur heavy expenditure in con-

nection with National Emergency Services in particular, while further expense has been incurred in giving effect to the Premier's appeal to country areas to produce charcoal.

The entire road-making equipment of this Shire has been hired by various constructing authorities for the purpose of building defence works, with the result that works connected with the maintenance of roadways have to be carried out by horse-drawn graders and vehicles—a reversion to the methods of a quarter of a century ago, but at to-day's costs.

My Council, like yours, has been appealed to on many occasions to undertake work which, three years ago would have been regarded as being quite outside its ordinary activities, but, in every case, it has responded to the call and has done the very best it could, notwithstanding the extra costs involved and the strain placed upon its administrative staff.

The increased burden of taxation for war purposes must inevitably mean that Councils will have greater difficulty in collecting rates and charges due to them, and it may be expected that the percentage of col-

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

From the United Democrats, 17 Waymouth Street, Adelaide.

Annual Meeting: This was easily one of the best ever held in these rooms, although the attendance, slightly larger than last year, was still not quite what it could have been.

The president, Mr. M. E. Dodd, in his report, gave a brief resume of the year's activities, and referred to the disconcerting effect of the war with Japan. Mr. Dodd also pointed to the fact that the defeat of the Fadden Government had raised the hopes of many monetary reformers for big things from a Labor Government. That also made our work harder. But now people were beginning to be a little wary of Labor's "reforms" (taxation, for instance). We were reminded that our aim is "freedom and security."

Mr. Dodd paid a tribute to the efforts of the executive, which had met regularly each fortnight throughout the year. He said that the lunch-hour meetings had been very encouraging of late; and special thanks were due to Mrs. Polkinghorne for arranging for speakers. A suggestion for the future was that for one week in three no address be arranged for, but in its place informal talks amongst the members and friends.

Concluding on a hopeful note, the president said that things were moving our way and in any case there was no turning back for us, for we were the "Custodians of great truths."

The secretary said that he was particularly grateful for the assistance of Mr. Day, as treasurer; for even with the valuable assistance of Mrs. Hopcraft in the office, the work was still rather heavy. The secretary was very glad to know that the bookkeeping was in good hands while the treasurer managed that side of the work. Thanks were also due to Mr. C. H. Allen, who had regularly attended the office at midday on Saturdays. Special mention was also made of Mr. Brooks, who for several years had distributed the "New Eras" and "New Times" to the city bookstalls.

Referring to possible suggestions by members regarding the desirability for launching a big campaign, the secretary said that, unless at least five strong men come forward to organise it, it was quite out of the question with the present limitations on time. In any case, when we hear ideas for a big campaign it might be as well to first ask ourselves what's "The Big Idea"? Large social movements, revolutions and what-not, that do not arise out of small things—the little movements of individuals—are unreal and untrue to the essence of Democracy. They are foreign to its very nature—worse, they are diametrically opposed to it. Such big movements that do not arise out of the activities

of individuals would obviously and inevitably be imposed on individuals.

All the recent writings of Douglas point to the great evil of power divorced from responsibility. And until the United Democrats, and the Social Credit Movement as a whole, realises this individual responsibility, and the collective power that results from acting up to it, they are not ready to conduct any big campaign.

The secretary also concluded with a note of hope, due to his observation of increased interest in our ideas. "The Victory Road" has made many more friends for us.

In presenting the treasurer's report, Mr. Day gave us some of the best domestic news of the day. A copy of the balance-sheet is being sent to all members. Here it is merely necessary to note that we are in that happy position that should we have to "wind up," we should be able to pay a small "dividend." Mr. C. H. Baker, a past vice-president, said that he had been connected with the Movement for at least ten years, and he was pleased to say that this report was the best yet. The report shows that we have put out nearly £500 worth of literature for the year. In view of this, a present vice-president said that it would be a tragedy if we were not able to continue with that work. Mr. Day said that he considered his work, which he admitted was heavy, was not done merely to keep our doors open, but to "keep our vision, before us."

Our Policy for the coming year. This is simply summed up in a motion submitted by Mr. C. H. Baker (though what the motion implies is not so simple). It is: "That our policy for the next six months be as close as possible in accord with that laid down by the Liverpool Secretariat." (Carried.)

Election of Officers. All officers were re-elected with the exception of one vice-president, who was not present.

"Victory Road" Booklet Fund: This was started for the purpose of putting ourselves in a position to distribute free, particularly to city business men, copies of this booklet. This work is at present being done by Mr. F. J. W. Lock, a new member who has been doing a little organising for us lately. When the annual meeting opened, the fund stood at 15s. When we left for home that night, it stood at over £8. That's good work. Further contributions will be welcome.

We have had a worth-while year. You and I and all the others, can make the year that lies ahead a better one. Let's start now, shall we?

—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Sec.

PEOPLE'S CHARTER

Copies of the People's Charter for Responsible Government, published in recent issues of the "New Times" are now available at 1/6 per hundred from the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I.

Call or write for a hundred TODAY. Urge each of your acquaintances to sign and forward one. This is important!

The Truth About Taxation

The financial requirements of Governments are largely supplied by private bankers who create what they lend at practically no cost to themselves. Nearly half of the taxes we pay is used for the payment of interest on these loans. As the Commonwealth Bank can make such bank-money available to the Government free of any charge, such taxation is unnecessary. Tell your Member of Parliament that you object to unnecessary taxation.

IMmobilisation of Industry

Refuting an article in "The Economist," "as misleading in a general picture which it draws of the management of the [coal] industry as it is incorrect in its individual statements," Mr. A. W. Lee, Director of the Mining Association of Great Britain, compares the output of saleable coal per shift in 1916, the last years before Government control, when the figure was 1941 cwt, with the output in the control years, 1908 17.23, 14.96 and 14.36 cwt.

The figures for the last two years, he says, were effected by the introduction of the seven-hour day as from the middle of 1919; but, by 1922, the industry under private management had restored the rate of output per person per shift under the seven-hour day to 18 cwt. It is also stated that in a number of cases in which men have been transferred from pits with a low rate of output (usually in financial difficulties) to pits with higher rates of output, additional output has not in fact been obtained. "The Economist's" "plan" had suggested that replenishment of labour force should be deferred until another experiment in temporary nationalisation had been tried. The critic says "the adoption of such a course would spell disaster."

U.E.A. ACTION

Recent developments, in the form of public companies accepting the "Electoral Campaign" in their fight against the 4 per cent, profit limit should hearten supporters and inspire them to greater efforts. We hope it will inspire you to actively join in our efforts to obtain political and economic democracy—and to frustrate the enemies of democracy endeavouring to completely enmesh us in the slave state.

The merit or otherwise of the profit limitation question is beside the point. The action of important companies in using their organisations to further the "Electoral Campaign" idea has a tremendous educative value in so far as it encourages people to develop individual initiative, and to regard their Parliamentary representatives simply as their paid spokesmen in Parliament. There is no danger in this move; rest assured that the people will not want anything undesirable, despite the efforts of a servile press to lead or stampede along false paths. Campaigners can take the credit for this development, as the reward for long, patient and arduous work; but do not let up for one split second, let us go on and on in the task of enlightenment, let us even go harder and let each one resolve to obtain at least "one convert a day." Your fellow citizens, in the darkness and doubt of the present times, are willing to listen to the spoken and written word, and to receive our ideas—and remember the onus is on you to select the correct approach, so get busy and talk, and talk, and circulate those books and that literature stowed away at home, loafing in the cupboard. Don't give it away, lend it or sell it; the appreciation will be the greater. If you are not already an actionist, become one and swing in behind the "United Electors Campaign"; make contact with other campaigners, and help each other. Melbourne supporters are advised that Mr. Elliott has undertaken to assist anyone desirous of forming a local group to extend this idea; so let us know if you need any assistance—drop a line to the Hon. Secretary, United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne.

OPPOSE INSOLENC

The "proletariat" consists of a number of individuals. The "proletariat" cannot dictate, but individuals can. Write to your Member of Parliament and tell him that you object to the dictatorship of Government Boards. Bureaucracy is an Insolent dictatorship.

"NEW TIMES" SHOPPING GUIDE AND BUSINESS DIRECTORY

PATRONISE THESE ADVERTISERS. Their Advertisement Helps Your Paper. Say You Saw It in the "New Times."

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

BLACKBURN.
"A" GRADE MOTOR ENGINEERS, Station Garage, Whitehorse Road, WX 1430.

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

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

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

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

FURNITURE REMOVERS. Gill Bros., 254 Station St. WX 2073.

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

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

IRONMONGER & SPORTS STORE, F. P. Park, 10 Main St. WX 1290.

WATCHMAKER and Jeweller. Barnes, 82 Main Street. Repairs.

CITY.
BLINDS of every sort. Car curtains repaired. T. Pettit, 235a Queen St.

CAKES, PASTRY, etc. Home-made "Clovelly," The Block, Elizabeth Street. Cent. 255.

DAVIS, 563 Bourke Street. Royal Medal Milkery, Separators, Engines.

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT BOOKSHOP, 166 Lit. Collins St.

ELECTRO-PLATING.—Nickel, Silver and Chromium Plating. Highest Grade Work only. W. R. SPEAKMAN, 69 Latrobe St., Melbourne.

MAISON MERLIN, Natl. Bk. Bldg., 271 Collins St. Ladies' Hairdressers.

OPTICIAN and Hearing Aids. 4th Floor, 57 Swanston St. F 5566.

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

FOOTSCRAY.
BOOT REPAIRS. A. A. Taylor, Station Ramp, While U Wait Service.

NU-BAKE. Bakers and Pastry-cooks, opp. Woolworths. Best bread, 8d. large. Down with the profiteer.

GLENFERRIE.
OPTICIAN, W. W. Nicholls. 100 Glenferrie Road. Haw. 5845.

SUITS to order from 70/-. H 5813. A. Sutherland, 184 Glenferrie Road.

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

UPHOLSTERER, Blinds and Bedding. Duke's, 11 H'berg Road. Ivan. 626.

KEW.
ANDERSON'S, 141 High St. Authorised Newsagent. Haw. 1145.

C. KENNEDY, Grocer, Haw. 229. Opp. Cemetery Clock, Parkhill Rd.

DRY CLEANING, Depot & Library. A. I. Fraser, 182 High St. H 3733.

E. WHITE, 109 High Street. Confectionery and Smokes.

GIFTS, and All Jewellery Repairs. Old Gold Bought. Greaves, opp. Rialto.

IMPERIAL DAIRY, R. H. Kent, 9 Brougham Street. Haw. 3243.

MOTOR GARAGE, Kew Junction Service Station, Cr. High and Denmark Streets. Haw. 6455.

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

NORTH FITZROY.
KEITH PARLON, The Fitzroy Tailor, 45 Best Street. JW 1555.

SANDRINGHAM.
A. RYAN, opp. Stn., Shoe Repairs. Tennis Racquets Restring from 7/6.

GROCERY, MCKAY & WHITE, Bay Rd., opp. Theatre. XW 1924.

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.
DUNSTAN, DAIRYMAN. 28 Station Rd. Phone: W'town 124.

Printed by M. F. CONNOR, 25 Cullinor-road, Hartwell, for the New Times Limited, McEwan House, Melbourne.