

ARE WE SERIOUS ABOUT
"RECONSTRUCTION"?
(Page 2)

THE WORLD-CURRENCY
TRAP (Page 3)

MAKING
PARLIAMENTARY
HISTORY IN GREAT
BRITAIN. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY **THE** PRICE—FOURPENCE
NEW TIMES

Vol. 9 No. 16 MELBOURNE, THURSDAY, APRIL 22 1943

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).

Should Party Politics Be Abolished?

Victorian M.L.A. Says "Yes" - And Gives Some Good Reasons

The above question was the subject of a very interesting debate, which took place in Melbourne on April 14, between Mr. L. H. Hollins (Independent M.L.A. for Hawthorn) and Mr. L. A. Chisholm (endorsed U.A.P. candidate for Hawthorn in the forthcoming State elections.) A large audience crowded the Hawthorn Hall, wherein the debate was held; indicating the strong public interest in this subject. Mr. Chisholm's argument ran along the well-worn lines already made familiar by Mr. R. G. Menzies and others, but the case put forward by Mr. Hollins should be of special interest to all those democrats who were unable to be present in his main address (limited to 15 minutes), Mr. Hollins said:—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentleman.— Party politics, as we know it in Australia today, is a method of government which divides the people into two or more closely organised and strongly disciplined hostile groups, bound to accept the direction of non-parliamentary bodies, and to support their party's policy regardless of conscience or country.

It should be abolished for two main reasons. First, it has failed to achieve a satisfactory social state after two hundred years' trial. Second, it is effectively preventing the use of better means to achieve this state.

Can Mr. Chisholm show either that party politics has secured a satisfactory state of society, or that it gives any reasonable promise of doing so? If he says yes, then why is a growing number of people of all kinds joining the Communists and forming other movements as a gesture of despair of reform by the major political parties? If no, then he admits that party politics has failed. It is, of course, common knowledge that the party system represented at first the triumph of a limited democracy over the despotic Stuart kings. But this triumph was short-lived.

Louis Kronenberger, in his recently published book, "Kings and Desperate Men," says:

"Anne's reign marks not only the end of the seventeenth century struggle between prince and Parliament, but the beginning of two centuries of struggle between men who go through the motions and men who pull the strings. Inside a dozen years the party system had been worked out. Inside a dozen years the

aristocratic formula had been absorbed into the oligarchical."

How true that is. The "struggle between men who go through the motions and men who pull the strings" has been going on ever since. Perhaps it is more in evidence to-day than ever before. The present growth of vested interests constitutes the greatest single threat to our democratic institutions.

Because the party system is essentially unchristian and stands for the conservation of sectional or selfish interests, it has been easy to divide the voters into warring political factions, using the slogan, "Unity is strength."

Motivated by selfish interests, each faction, secretly, if not openly, hopes to become so powerful that it can smash all opposition. Dominated by selfish people, these warring factions readily become the prey of vested interests, whose motto is: "divide and rule."

As recently as August 26, 1924, the "U.S.A. Bankers Magazine" stated:

"By dividing the voters through the political party system we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance. Thus, by discreet action we can secure for ourselves what has been so well planned and so successfully accomplished."

At this stage it must be admitted quite frankly that, despite the influence of vested interests, many great measures of political and economic reform have been introduced under the party system, but this has not been due to some inherent goodness in the system, but to the ever-growing revolt of the people against the impositions of party politics.

THAT MAN - POWER RAIDS

Are We On The Road To Dictatorship?

"I am not prepared to supply staff to luxury restaurants or coffee salons. I am only prepared to supply staffs to restaurants supplying meals to workers. A list of the staffs of authorised restaurants has been prepared and instructions have been given that labour must only be supplied to those restaurants. I have also submitted to the Minister for Labour, Mr. Ward, the question of what action should be taken on the employment of aliens in restaurants and hotels."

So spoke Mr. Belmore (Deputy Director-General of Man-Power), as reported in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of April 10. The same paper reports that "man-power officials made surprise RAIDS on Princes and Romanos restaurants simultaneously yesterday afternoon. Patrons were not allowed to leave without showing a notice from a man-power official instructing them to appear on Monday to EXPLAIN THEIR PRESENCE IN THE RESTAURANTS." The report goes on to state that the "man-power officials were satisfied with the raids."

So if you resent having to "explain your presence in a restaurant" you will have to take your afternoon-tea in your home or your office. There you are not likely to be molested by bullying bureaucrats, at least, not for the time being. Of course, "I" (the D.D.G. of M-P.), the inflated, bureaucratic, dictatorial "I," may decide at any time to go a step further and, with his PRESS-GANGS, invade your last sanctuary of human privacy—your home. The "I" that is not prepared to supply staffs here, the "I" that is only prepared

to supply staffs there, is bound to quaff deeper from the cup of that most exhilarating of all intoxicants—POWER.

Perhaps the scale on which war has to be waged, against the countries in which this mode of government originates, renders a limited measure of control and direction of man-power unavoidable. But surely we have gone well past the limit when respectable citizens, who wish to take afternoon-tea in a respectable and fashionable restaurant, may be subjected to the ignominy of interrogation by a pseudo-Gestapo who swoop down like a vice-squad descending on consorting criminals in an underworld dive. (Don't forget that the above-mentioned raids were not the first—or the last—of their kind. The Sydney Fish Markets were raided first—and there's no "luxury" there!)

It is well to remember that thousands of Germany's finest citizens were shot, and thousands more have died or are still rotting in the dreaded concentration camps, merely because they resisted, AFTER IT WAS TOO LATE, this very thing that asserts itself menacingly in our midst.

Are we not reaching the dangerous stage—of control for control's sake?

Is there to be no end to this interference with the liberty of the individual citizen?

When will some-one cry—"HALT"?

At what stage will our parliamentary representatives say—"This far and no farther"?

Electors should write to their respective representatives in Federal Parliament and DEMAND an answer to these questions.

—M.C.M.

Get This Straight!

"Whatever crushes individuality is despotism, by whatever name it may be called, and whether it professes to be enforcing the will of God or the instructions of men."

—John Stuart Mill.

The almost complete failure to "deliver the goods" has created an attitude of despair among the people, and, in the main, they no longer take any real interest in politics.

For this reason, therefore, party organisations have become little better than machines to conserve selfish interests. They put weak and selfish men into Parliament and keep them there so long as they are subservient to these interests.

The party machines require a great deal of money to keep them going but, as this is not forthcoming from the people, the party leaders are forced to accept funds from the very interests they profess to fight. **Democratic government under these conditions becomes a sham and a mockery.** That Mr. Chisholm's own party is under such domination is proved by Mr. Hollway, the party leader, in a statement to the press on November 13, 1941, in which he said:

"At present, a small coterie of not more than half a dozen who describe themselves as the National Union, had a complete stranglehold on a party which represented

400,000 Victorian voters, by reason of the fact that they alone controlled the whole of the party funds."

And again, in the same statement Mr. Hollway said:

"Democracy is in jeopardy, not only from external aggression, but also through the activities of such secret juntas of financial wire-pullers."

True though these statements are, neither Mr. Hollway or his party have taken any steps to end this sinister betrayal of 400,000 Victorian voters, because, without the backing of this secret junta, the party would become even less important than it is to-day.

Because political parties are the happy hunting ground for weak and selfish men, party members will ruthlessly attack those who dare to expose the racket of party politics, knowing full well that if the parties were to go they would have little chance of winning a place in any Parliament.

The main obstacles to true independents winning seats to-day are the powerful party organisations with huge funds; and

(Continued on page 3)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Press reports inform us that economist Coombs arrived at Washington with lawyer Evatt—right on time for the "technicians" pow-wow on the Gold-Standard (alias "Unita" or "Bancor"). Here we find an interesting line-up: Evatt, the legal luminary on constitutional matters connected with the implementation of the "Federal-Union" plot, and Coombs, who is in a position which could be used to facilitate the Gold-Standard plot. Electors will be well advised to tell their Federal Members—by writing to them immediately—to resist all attempts to embroil Australia in these international-bankers' plots, which can only bring disaster.

PROPAGANDA PRAYERS: The financiers' loan propagandists raided a hornets' nest among the clergy by suggesting that the "call to prayers" Sunday be used to boost investment in interest-bearing loans. Three prominent churchmen (Dr. Le Fanu, Dr. Robson and the Rev. R. C. Moore) joined issue against what they describe as the "sacrilegious and blasphemous aspect of associating prayers with finance"; but, by way of reconciliation of principles, the Anglican rector of Albany conducted a nonstop prayer session for the redemption of the church mortgage. We may yet find the Churches having a day of prayer for the redemption of the National Debt!

COMMONS COMICS: When Sir Kingsley Wood introduced the latest British Budget, which brings Britain's total war expenditure to about £16,000 millions, he stated that although some concessions would be made on direct income tax, the purchase tax would be increased by 100%, and other indirect taxes would be increased. Press reports state: "The budget was introduced with a laugh"—which just shows how lightly some politicians regard their employers' financial burdens.

REDS REBUKED: The British Labor Party has issued a booklet denouncing "British" Communists, in which it says: "Communists' actions are a record of hypocrisy and treachery to the workers of Europe; they are attempting to ride on the flood of world-wide admiration for the heroic Russian people and armies, and they endeavour to make it appear that refusal to co-operate with them is an insult to our Soviet Allies." That's also a pretty good description of the tactics of our local Red Fascists.

GOLD GOSSIP: The London "Sunday Observer" reports considerable criticism of the "American" world-currency proposals. The "Observer" describes them as a plan to "control world trade after the war," and one that does not offer anything different from the "old Gold Standard." Well, that's helpful, at any rate; but the report then states that the "British" (Keynes) "plan is an improvement, and is more favourably received." Presumably, it has not dawned on the "Observer" that the Keynes (bankers') plan is only a second barrel, just in case the first one arouses too much opposition.

BIG BOND BUY: An unnamed U.S. speculator is reported to have purchased £11 millions' worth of bonds. Assuming the interest rate corresponds with "ours," it means that the U.S. taxpayers will have to pay him approximately £330,000 per annum for ever and ever, Amen. By selling large parcels of Bonds, heavy administration and bookkeeping expenses are eliminated; which suggests that tremendous savings could be effected by selling the whole loan issue to one person or institution. For example, the Australian Commonwealth Bank could purchase each £100 million in one "buy." Better still, it could do so without

leaving one jot of crippling debt or recurring interest charges—thus automatically eliminating huge increases of taxation "arising from interest-bearing loans."

SUBSIDY SCHEME: Although the Federal Govts. proposed subsidy and price-fixing scheme leaves much to be desired, it is an admission of the failure of previous monetary methods. If properly operated, it will nail the bankers' lie that prices must always rise, automatically, when there is more money about. But providing the necessary subsidies from taxation, while holding prices down, will not improve the position of consumers in general, now or in the peace period. Consumers will simply pay increased costs through the Taxation Department instead of paying them through the shopkeepers. And they will have no option. However, the subsidy idea will clarify the money question, and focus attention on it; which should hasten the day.

BRITAIN'S BUDGET: £6000 millions sounds a colossal sum, but it could have been made available in any of the peace-and-depression years. It is boosted as a British record, yet it is not a remarkable sum when compared with Britain's capacity to produce real physical wealth. DIRECT taxation was not increased, but increases of INDIRECT taxation—especially 100% increase of the purchase tax—were announced. That can only mean that whilst the Government is professing concern about the inflation of living costs, they are deliberately inflating those prices not covered by the subsidy-control scheme.

SOCIALISATION SNUB: Following the political storm in Britain caused by taking over private industries under the smoke-screen of war, the Production Minister, Mr. Lyttleton, has given an assurance which is interpreted to mean "that there will be no further socialisation." British democrats will be somewhat relieved to have this statement, because it will permit them to get on with the war effort without increased hindrance by theoretical socialistic bureaucrats. However, more than an assurance is required to prevent our local socialistic fanatics from destroying the democratic set-up. The safest way is for electors to cut off their political incomes.

—O.B.H.

Lecture On The Facts About Depressions

An interesting talk will be delivered in the Melbourne suburb of Hawthorn on Wednesday evening next (April 28). It will take place in the Hawthorn Hall (corner of Burwood-road and Lauder-street—near Hawthorn Town Hall). The very able speaker on this occasion will be Mr. N. Worrell, and his subject will be, "THE FACTS About Depressions." Questions will be welcomed. The lecture has been arranged by the Hawthorn group of the N.W.R.M.

