

BRITISH SUPPLIES TO RUSSIA. Page 2
OPEN LETTER TO G. D. HEALY. Page 3
THE VICTORIAN ELECTIONS. Page 3
THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET. Page 4

EVERY FRIDAY **THE NEW TIMES** PRICE—FOURPENCE
Vol. 9. No. 22 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 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).

Is Milk Pasteurisation a Public Menace?

What's Behind the Move To Make It Compulsory?

There has been much talk in Melbourne recently about making the pasteurisation of milk compulsory. The idea has been given much favourable publicity in the daily press. According to the Melbourne "Herald," the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said, on May 24, that "the Government considered that pasteurisation was absolutely essential," and would "try to get additional equipment" for that purpose. Of course, that would be very nice for the suppliers of the expensive equipment, and for the big dairies, whose smaller competitors would be unable, financially, to instal such equipment, and would have to close down. But would it be good for the health of THE PEOPLE?

The "New Times" does not pretend to know the last word about the technical aspects of this question, but, to say the least of it, there seem to be two sides to it. The public is being told only ONE side. We ask: WHY? Last week we reported that certain facts, purporting to show that pasteurisation INCREASED deaths due to non-pulmonary tuberculosis, were made known in the British House of Commons, on February 10, by Dr. Russell Thomas. Now read the following article, which appeared in the April, 1938, issue of "Armchair Science," London:—

There is no substitute for clean, raw milk as a food so far as children are concerned. Science has not yet succeeded in providing, in the pasteurised variety, those essential qualities that are the only real foundation for a healthy child.

Unfortunately, many grossly distorted statements are current regarding our milk supply. If we are to believe the protagonists of the Pasteurisation-of-all-milk-at-all-costs party, raw milk is as good, or rather as bad, as rat poison—although, as the Minister of Agriculture recently stated, "the human race existed long before Pasteur was heard of."

The process of pasteurisation was debated in the House of Commons, and the suggestion made that no raw milk should be sold for human consumption. This would mean the installation of expensive machinery by every supplier, and if it should become compulsory there is little doubt that many small firms would shut down and the business pass into the hands of a few big dealers.

If we are to be compelled to drink pasteurised milk we should at least understand what pasteurisation means. It sets out to accomplish two things. Destruction of certain disease-carrying germs and the prevention of souring of milk. These results are obtained by keeping the milk at

a temperature of 145 degrees F. to 150 degrees F. for half an hour at least, and then reducing the temperature to not more than 55 degrees F.

It is undoubtedly beneficial to destroy dangerous germs, but pasteurisation does more than this: it kills off harmless and useful germs alike, and by subjecting the milk to high temperatures destroys some nutritive constituents.

With regard to the prevention of souring, sour raw milk is very widely used. It is given to invalids, being easily digested, laxative in its properties, and not unpleasant to take. But after pasteurisation the lactic acid bacilli are killed. The milk in consequence cannot become sour and quickly decomposes, while undesirable germs multiply very quickly.

Pasteurisation's great claim to popularity is the widespread belief, fostered by its supporters, that tuberculosis in children is caused by the harmful germs found in raw milk. Scientists have examined and tested thousands of milk samples, and experiments have been carried out on hundreds of animals in regard to this problem of disease-carrying by milk. But the one, vital fact, that seems to have been completely missed is that it is CLEAN, raw milk that is wanted. If this can be guaranteed no other

form of food for children can, or should be, allowed to take its place.

Dirty milk, of course, is, like any other form of impure food, a definite menace. But Certified Grade A Milk, produced under Government supervision and guaranteed absolutely clean, is available practically all over the country and is the dairy-farmer's answer to the pasteurisation zealots.

Recent figures published regarding the spread of tuberculosis by milk show, amongst other facts, that over a period of five years, during which time 750 children belonging to a special organisation received a pint of raw milk daily, one case only of the disease occurred. During a similar period when pasteurised milk had been given 14 cases were reported.

Besides destroying part of the vitamin C contained in raw milk, and encouraging growth of harmful bacteria, pasteurisation turns the sugar of milk, known as lactose, into beta-lactose—which is far more soluble, and therefore more rapidly absorbed into

the system, with the result that the child soon becomes hungry again.

Probably pasteurisation's worst offence is that it makes insoluble the major part of the calcium contained in raw milk. This frequently leads to rickets, bad teeth, and nervous troubles; for sufficient calcium content is vital to children, and with the loss of phosphorus, also associated with calcium, bone and brain formation suffer serious setbacks.

Pasteurisation also destroys 20 per cent. of the iodine present in raw milk, causes constipation, and, generally, takes from the milk its most vital qualities.

In face of these facts—which are undeniable—what has the Pasteurisation party to say? Instead of compelling dealers to set up expensive machinery for turning raw milk into something that is definitely NOT what it sets out to be—a nutritious, health-giving food—let them pass legislation making the dairy-farmers produce clean, raw milk—that is, milk pure to drink and with all its constituents unaltered.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

Mr. J. Darling, former Test Cricket captain, moved a motion in the Tasmanian Legislative Council "that the Powers Bill be read a second time—six months hence." The motion was designed to prevent the Government bringing forward the measure again, and was carried by eight votes to six. Quoting Mr. Darling on this, the Melbourne "Sun" of May 27 says that "he received a letter from Dr. Evatt flattering him on his cricketering ability and urging him to change his vote." A friend of his also received a letter from Dr. Evatt, urging him to change his vote. Commenting on this practice, Mr. Darling said that "it was one of the lowest things he had experienced in his career." It just goes to show the extent of the plot to centralise power at Canberra, and thus pave the way for the bankers' Federal Union or World Government.

VOTING TAX: Difficult as it is to believe, a Bill to impose a tax of 12/2 on all voters, as such, was debated in the U.S. House of Representatives—and, more remarkable than that, it was only defeated by 265 votes to 110. The "New York Times" described the measure as "contrary to the spirit of the U.S. Constitution"—yet 110 alleged democrats voted for it. It is reported that the measure would have disfranchised 10 million poor people—but, of course, would have swelled the revenue from which the bankers' interest is paid. The idea certainly never would have originated from the people, and as the financiers would be the obvious beneficiaries, it should not be difficult to identify the instigators—whilst those voting in favour of it could also be identified as their tools.

SOVIET SOCIALISM: After paying a worthy tribute to the "Red Army fighters," Paul Holt, of the London "Daily Express," is reported in the Melbourne "Sun" of May 29 as saying that "a fighting man gets only 10 roubles (about 6d.) a month, while an officer receives as much as 4000 roubles a month." Holt added that the average Red Army soldier, when questioned, says he expects the following New Order: "A bigger room in which to live, better shoes and food, movies, books, holidays, and no queues to stand in—a higher standard of living, with more leisure and a limited amount of freedom of speech." Well, that's the least they deserve, and it will be a big shock to many to learn that the socialistic system is so far behind the much-despised "capitalistic" system.

"FOOD BANK": Hot news comes from Hot Springs, Virginia, U.S.A., in connection with the conference on post-war food planning. Separated from a lot of hot air, the following recommendations stand out: "Expansion of production is recommended instead of restriction" and "the creation of a world body authorised to buy foodstuffs and to give foodstuffs to needy nations." Having regard to the mentality peculiar to bankers, it is somewhat unfortunate that the proposal is described as a "food bank plan," because it is beyond doubt that the money-shortage mania of bankers has in the past prevented many millions of people from obtaining enough food and most other commodities. If the people were given sufficient money to claim the goods there would be no need for the "food bank."

CHURCHILL'S CHATTER: Behind the press ballyhoo relative to Churchill's speech to the U.S. Congress, it seems that his big job was to endeavour to talk down the growing criticism of the plan to "beat Hitler first"—while Japan consolidates her position in the Pacific. There is the suggestion that Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin—as distinct from the military advisers—are determining such technical matters. Whether Churchill's skilful play with words has reconciled the critics or not remains to be seen; but the question arises whether politicians or practical military experts should determine military strategy.

UNION UPSTARTS: The concern of democratic unionists at the white-anting

of Communists appears to be well-founded, judging from the fact that the following amendment was defeated by only 93 votes to 72. "That unionists be recommended to support those A.L.P. socialists who support the Curtin Government." Apparently the Communists are quite satisfied that Curtin and Co. can be relied upon to replace our democratic society with their foreignism. It is about time the rank-and-file unionists realised that they are only being used as pawns by some of their place-seeking, power-lusting mis-leaders.

COMMO'S CRASH: Big-print press headlines inform us that Moscow has officially abandoned the world-government idea. It is suggested that this will tend towards better Allied relationships and dispose of the menace of international Communism. At all events, it appears, on the face of it, that the local Communists have lost their main sheet-anchor. On the other hand, there is the distinct possibility that the "Federal Union" world-government plotters have succeeded in convincing the Soviet leaders that by showing a common front under a new name they can get away with it with less odour attached to it. What's in a name, anyhow?

MANPOWER MUDDLE: Recent press announcements to the effect that "munition annexes may swing back to peace production" do not necessarily mean that the war promoters have decided to call it off. But it does seem to indicate that the commonsense of John Citizen is prevailing on their socialistic muddlers, whose one-track minds have overlooked the fact that the

(Continued on page 2)

THAT EX-SERVICEMEN'S PARTY

Mr. Brian Fitzpatrick, as a good "Leftist," has some very peculiar ideas about democracy. I would like to draw the attention of "New Times" readers to an extract from Mr. Fitzpatrick's article in "Smith's" of April 17. This article discusses the formation of the new National Service Group by certain Members of Parliament. In the course of his article, Mr. Fitzpatrick mentions the formation of the Ex-Servicemen's and Women's Political Party in Melbourne:—

"They did meet earlier than that. This time, they decided to change the name to Services and Citizens' Party. Then 60 of those present got up and marched out, singing 'Onward Christian Soldiers,' to another hall, where they re-formed a lily-white Ex-Servicemen's and Women's Political Association of Australia. There's democracy for you! The minority had obviously learned

how from Mr. Menzies' example of a few days before: When you're out-voted, go away and form another organisation!"

If my information is correct, the following is what happened: At a meeting held at the Assembly Hall, Melbourne, on Monday, April 5, the original name of the Ex-Servicemen's and Women's Political Party was changed to that of "The Services and Citizens' Party." This change of title was first suggested by Sir Keith Murdoch in the Melbourne "Herald." The change of name was achieved at the meeting on April 5 chiefly through the assistance of new members—mostly women. At this juncture some sixty returned soldiers left the meeting, marched up to Kelvin Hall, and declared themselves the original "Ex-Servicemen's and Women's Party." One of the original objects of this group was: "The first step towards (d) to be a reversion to its original status of the Commonwealth Bank; i.e., control by the Federal Government, not by the Bank of England as at present and as arranged by Sir Otto Niemeyer."

No wonder these men withdrew from an association which was perverting or abandoning the original objectives that claimed their allegiance. Irrespective of Mr. Fitzpatrick's sneering remarks, a real functioning democracy DOES allow people to withdraw from ANY association or enterprise with whose objectives or conditions they don't agree. Apparently Mr. Fitzpatrick thinks that sixty men should have stayed in a group which was perverted to work against their ideas. Still, as most "Leftists" are closely wedded to "sound finance," perhaps Mr. Fitzpatrick's attitude is understandable.

—Eric D. Butler.

Rubber From Japan!

"A news paragraph appearing in a recent issue of an American journal, stating that rubber from Malaya is being received in small quantities by Britain, is interesting. It would appear that Japan, 'holding the glorious East in fee,' has so much rubber she does not know what to do with it. Much as she would like to be able to send it to Germany, and much as Germany would like to receive it, Japan is unable to do so because the Allied Nations control the greater part of the sea, and therefore the rubber cannot be shipped to Germany. At the same time Japan is short of many things and is desirous of exchanging rubber for them. So the procedure being adopted is that Japan is supplying rubber to Russia, with whom she is at peace, and is receiving in exchange goods that she cannot produce herself. Russia, in turn, is sending some of the rubber to Britain. Japan obviously knows that portion of the rubber is reaching her enemy. The news item does not say what Russia is sending in return, but it probably consists of foodstuffs. The trade is being carried on through the Russian Siberian ports, including Vladivostok."

—"The Radiator," official organ of the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria, May 15

All Tarred With The Same Brush!

"The Bank of N.S.W. lately circularised its branches, instructing them that the anti-Labor 'Bulletin' would be supplied each week. It stated also that copies would be paid for by a department of the bank.

"All branches received this circular. It is believed that between 600 and 700 copies are sold in this way per week.

"That works out at around £1000 per year.

"Evidently sales are falling off and this subsidy is desperately needed. Besides, its propaganda is too useful to bankers to be lost."

—"Progress," Sydney, May 14

"Progress" is published by the N.S.W. section of the Australian Labor Party, and its contents clearly reveal that it is virtually an organ of the Communist Party.

Hardly a week has passed without the Sydney "Bulletin's" financial writer demanding greater financial sacrifices from the lower income group. The LABOR Government yielded to such pressure WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

THE FRUSTRATION OF PRODUCTION OF MOTOR FUEL IN AUSTRALIA

(Continued from last issue.)

Hereunder we publish a further instalment from the remarkable sixpenny booklet by A. W. Noakes, the title of which is the same as the above heading, and which may be obtained from The Electoral Campaign, 142 Adelaide-street, Brisbane. Last week's instalment concluded with an extract from a speech made in the Federal Parliament on November 23, 1939, by Mr. Patterson, the Member for Gippsland, who referred to some of the initial difficulties encountered at the Lakes Entrance Field. Still speaking of the same oil-field, Mr. Patterson continued as follows:—

"I wish to be scrupulously fair, both to the Oil Advisory Committee and the Minister. I take it that the reason for the delay was that, in the interim, the Oil Advisory Committee had prepared and presented to the Minister a report which embraced a very much larger prospect than the original one to which I have referred. The report was released by the Minister very promptly on the 6th December last. I shall endeavour to summarise its main points.

"The Oil Advisory Committee said: 'On a conservative estimate it may be stated that the total oil content of the sand within the area containing the oil-producing bore holes is not less than 150,000,000 gallons—a quantity sufficiently great to make imperative the full testing of the field in accordance with the best practice in use to-day.

"The Oil Advisory Committee also said, in reference to the particular bore which had been put down and sealed from the ingress of water: 'It was found that the oil sands were free from water, and the water bearing beds were below. Moreover, these oil sands are "dead," that is to say, the oil is under no natural pressure which would compel it to flow into the bore-hole.'

"This fact changed the whole aspect of the problem. The Oil Advisory Committee went on in its report to indicate that in its opinion the proper way in which to recover the oil from this field—which, it said, was under no natural pressure—was by re-pressuring. It gave instances of the success which had attended that process in other parts of the world, one instance noted in this report being in the Island of Zante, in the Mediterranean, where production had been increased from 1½ tons to 300 tons a day by this method.

"I should like to say in passing that while it may be true that the pressure of natural gas in this field is insufficient rapidly to re-fill a bore from which oil is being quickly pumped, it is nevertheless far from being dead; in fact, it is definitely under some considerable natural pressure, because in the Inmay well a column of oil has risen some 327 feet, and is still rising at the rate of about 4 feet a day. A height of 327 feet, calculated on the diameter of the casing of that well, represents nearly 30 cwt. of oil, and that is standing on the 25 square inches at the bottom of the hole, which really means that there is a pressure of 140 lbs. to the square inch. That oil is coming through the oil sands against a pressure of 140 lbs. to the square inch. There is another well nearby known as "Mack's Well," from which oil actually

flows. At the top of that well, a pipe of small diameter has been fitted, with a tap attached. If that tap be turned on, oil will freely flow from it for some considerable time. That oil rises from a depth of some 1200 ft. Therefore, it can be seen that the pressure which it has to overcome is about 500 lbs. to the square inch. At Lakes Entrance, a substantial quantity of gas exudes from taps used in connection with a water supply drawn from a water strata below the oil strata. I have seen a light put to them, and the resultant flame is almost like that of a blast lamp. This shows that there is at least some gas pressure in this field.

"The report of the Oil Advisory Committee went on to say that before re-pressuring would be practical the old bore holes, of which there are some 30 odd, would need to be sealed up, because, if left in their present condition, they would act as escape valves for the pressure of air or

gas. The report also states that the whole of the area would need to be brought under one control; there would need to be unified control. It further pointed out that State Government action would be involved, to enable larger leases to be taken up by companies, and, indeed, to compel individual lease or license holders to cooperate or combine in a re-pressuring programme. It also stated that it would be costly to seal up these old bores in order to control the water. Estimates were given of the probable cost, varying from £55,000 to £80,000. As a mere layman, I find it difficult to believe that this task would cost anything like so much.

"I believe that it could be attempted in the first place on a comparatively small scale. With respect to this, the Oil Advisory Committee said:—

"We consider, however, that the known extent of the oil bearing sands at Lakes Entrance is sufficiently great to justify the large expenditure necessary."

"In regard to unified control, a substantial degree of consolidation of interests has already been secured, and the coping stone has now been placed upon this essential requirement by the recent passage through the Legislative Assembly of Victoria of legislation for this purpose—legislation which, I believe, fills the bill completely with respect to what is required for re-pressuring."

(To be continued.)

BRITISH SUPPLIES TO RUSSIA

From Mr. Lyttelton's speech (21/2/43) emerges the fact that Britain, from the 1st October, 1941, to 31/12/42, sent Russia the astonishing total of over 6000 tanks and 'planes (i.e., even more than the United States, which sent an additional total of 5800 over the same period). This is one more conclusive answer to the German propaganda story that Britain is not giving the maximum aid to Russia on account of ideological differences. The following is a background of the British achievement:—

Supplies sent: Seventeen hours after the Nazis attacked Russia (22/6/41) Churchill pledged the maximum British aid—inside one week the first supplies were already despatched—e.g., 500,000 pairs of boots. Three months later (2/10/41) the first formal supply protocol was signed covering the period to 30/6/42—supplies were financed by £35 million sterling British credits to Russia. Before its expiry Britain offered supplies for a further twelve months, to 30/6/43, and a second supply protocol was signed 27/7/42—this time Britain promised supplies cash free under British Lease-Lend. Thus two years' supplies to Russia were financed entirely by Britain.

From 1st October, 1941, to 31/12/42 Britain sent Russia 3080 planes, 2974 tanks, 4000 lorries, 70 million rounds of small arms ammunition, 3000 tons of medical supplies (including 1,500,000 surgical instruments, over one million garments, 500,000 blankets, 150 tons of drugs, and 97 X-ray units), 50,000 tons of Britain's "infinitely precious stocks of rubber" (Lyttelton, 21/2/43), a huge quantity of great-coat cloth ("enough was sent in four days to stretch from the Black Sea to the White Sea"—Mr. Oliver Stanley,

21/2/43), and three million pairs of boots. Also part of the following supplies sent jointly with the United States: 831 thousand tons of metals and machine tools, one million tons of sugar, and 2,500,000 tons of wheat and flour.

Routes used: Britain not merely made the above supplies available, but made sure that they got there by the following two routes:

First, the Northern route. Despite the world-wide calls on the British Navy, Britain supplied the greater part of 19 large convoys arriving at Murmansk by 31/1/42. During the first supply protocol to 30/6/42, Britain was almost solely responsible for the transporting of supplies by this route, 90 per cent, of all ships used being British; also Britain sent the R.A.F. wing to cover the unloading at Murmansk (return to Britain announced 1/3/42). How Britain fulfilled the pledge to Russia in this period is shown by the average load handled per dock worker at Murmansk per working day in the first half of 1942. In January, 5.1 tons; April, 5.2 tons; May, 9.3 tons; June, nearly 10 tons.

Second the Southern route. In addition to supplying the British Eighth and Ninth and Tenth armies around the Cape, and partly supporting the entire Near East, the British Navy carried immense supplies to the Persian Gulf for Russia, while Britain secured overland route through Persia. Already in the summer of 1941 Britain supplied 100 locomotives per week, and the Southern Railway workshops alone despatched 1000 waggons to Persia by 10/11/41. On this route alone British supplies increased fourfold from December to May, 1942. Clearly the British ability to send supplies simultaneously over a 2000 miles Northern, and a 13,000 miles Southern route is itself a tremendous achievement, even without allowing for the quantity of these supplies.

What it means to Russia: The British tanks sent to Russia alone were sufficient to equip nearly 15 armoured divisions at the German strength of 200 tanks per division—i.e., sufficient to completely set off no less than half the largest armoured force Germany has ever deployed against Russia. British planes sent were probably double the largest first line air force Germany has ever used in Russia—i.e., sufficient to equip over 205 squadrons at the German strength of 15 planes per squadron. Small wonder that Litvinov (12/1/42) said: "There is no manner of doubt that the contribution of both war and food supplies has played no small part in making it possible for the Soviet troops to deal mighty blows at the Fascist invaders, and that the Red Army and Soviet people deeply appreciate the help received from Great Britain."

Moreover, all the above supplies refer only to the United Kingdom, thus excluding the British Empire supplies—e.g., Canada early in 1942 was sending tanks at the rate of nearly 100 a month to the U.S.S.R., and also excludes, of course, all direct British fighting assistance—e.g., the R.A.F. attack on the Renault factory in France (3/3/42), which cost Germany tanks for four to six armoured divisions, and the British naval blockade pins down some two million German workers otherwise available at the Russian front. The British Army's prisoners taken in Africa were alone sufficient far more than to replace the entire 33,000 men in the German Army wiped out at Stalingrad. Finally, all British supplies to Russia were sent at the same time as the large British reciprocal aid to the United States.

(Note.—The supplies referred to in this article refer only to actual deliveries.)

—The "Times," Sydney, March 18, 1943. (Figures quoted are from official sources, and were collected by the Royal Empire Society.)

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

civilian effort is the base of the war effort. Of course, the coming election may have influenced the return to sanity—and temporarily suspended the march of socialism; but it will surely require a power of windy electioneering orations to make the people forget their narrow escape—and the earlier dangerous bungling of the undisciplined bankers' Party (U.A.P.-C.P.) hacks.

POPULATION PRATTLE: The logical consequences of the "State" and other busy-bodies assuming the prerogative of the individual's natural jurisdiction in the matter of pro-creation is found in the following German socialistic edict: "Under a new marriage law, childless marriages may now be dissolved." As usual, the "justification" for this is the identical reason advanced by our local would-be birth planners—namely, to breed humans merely for the purpose of defending the country. If that is the only reason for breeding children, the extinction of the race would be more humane and intelligent.

CLOSED COURTS: Commenting on the practice of closing our law courts to the public, Judge Clancy of N.S.W. said: "Few of us could feel safe if our liberties depended upon evidence given in secrecy by somebody who was promised immunity from publicity." This raises a very vital principle of British justice, and has a special application to National Security prosecutions, under which the informants can endanger the liberty of citizens through no other reason than personal or political animus. The closed court is a menace and a travesty of justice which should be resisted.

FOOD FRONT: Quoting Sir Earle Page's statement that "crops were rotting in the ground because of transport shortage and the refusal of the Supply Department to pay reasonable prices for same, the Melbourne "Sun" of May 22 points out "that owing to Government bungling this country is not producing enough meat, vegetables or dairy produce for the needs of its inhabitants—and this in spite of the startling array of Boards, Councils and Directorates." It does demonstrate that Governments, Boards and Commissions do not produce food, and it does prove beyond any reasonable doubt that State control (socialism) can only be accurately described as Public Enemy Number One.

POWER PERIL: The proposal to surrender more State Government powers to the Federal Parliament is not yet dead—as evidenced by the following statement by Mr. Cain, unopposed State Labour candidate: "Labour would strongly support further powers being given to the Commonwealth Parliament." This was reported in at least one daily paper in black type the day after nominations closed; which is very significant. Moreover, it indicates that so long as the Labor Party Bosses approve this totalitarian trend towards the concentration of political power the electors' wishes are of no real consequence to them.

TAX TAKERS: The Bankers' Collection Agency, described by the daily press as "Chiffley's Flying Squad," are snooping down on persons suspected of evading tax-payments—much of which are earmarked for interest payments to the private money-counterfeiters (banks). We have indeed reached a high degree of totalitarianism. We have the manpower press-gangs taking forcible possession of our bodies, and the tax-gangs seizing our incomes. Ned Kelly did at least offer the alternatives of "your money or your life"; but he was old-fashioned—the modern practice is to demand both.

PARTY PLOTS: The South African elections have been in the news, and it was reported that the Parties intend to allocate the constituencies on a pro-rata Party basis. How democratic! All Parties declare they will win the war if elected, and they are all for "social security"; but the gem of gems is found in the declaration that "soldiers on the battle fronts will vote for Parties, not candidates." It sounds like an all-in fight against Independents, and presumably the Parties—not the candidates—will receive the salaries attached to the positions!

—O.B.H.

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

(Obtainable from New Times Limited, Box 1226 G.P.O., Melbourne.)

"THE ENEMY WITHIN THE EMPIRE," A short history of the Bank of England. Price, 6d. Postage 1/4d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1/4d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

"New Times" Subscription Rates

Our charges for supplying and posting the "New Times" direct to your home every week are as follows:—

Three months, 5/-; Six months, 10/-; Twelve months, £1 (HALF rates for members of the A.I.F., C.M.F., R.A.N., R.A.A.F., etc.).

Payments must be made in advance and sent direct to New Times Limited, Box 1226 G.P.O., Melbourne.

ANTI-CONSCRIPTION ACTIVITIES

The honorary secretary of the No-Conscription Campaign (Room 4, Temperance Hall Buildings, 172 Russell Street, Melbourne) has sent a letter worded as follows to each of the candidates in the forthcoming Victorian elections:—

Dear Sir,—I have been advised that you have nominated for the seat in the Legislative Assembly. The person who is returned to represent the people of this electorate must be one who desires to do his utmost for the welfare of those people. He must be honest and democratic, and must vigorously oppose any legislation which will remove from them freedom and liberty, which is their birthright.

Therefore, we of the above organisation believe that you should declare your attitude to the Defence (Citizen Military Forces) Bill, which was recently passed by the Federal Parliament. This Bill amended Section 49 of the Defence Act to permit conscripted men of the Militia Forces to be sent beyond the bounds of Australia and the Mandated territories.

This imposes upon the people, for the first time in Australian history, conscription for overseas service, and is a violation of the wishes of the Australian people as expressed at the two referendums of 1916 and 1917. It may be argued that conscription is a Federal matter, and as such is no concern of State Parliamentarians, but we feel that this is a matter of vital importance, affecting all Australian citizens of present and future generations, and that every man who desires to represent the people in any capacity should make known his views, and that his stand on conscription is a clear indication of his attitude to Democracy. This feeling is augmented by the fact that although, with a few exceptions, every member of the Federal Parliament promised his electors that he would not be a party to the introduction of overseas conscription, only one man kept that promise and voted against the Bill.

If members of Parliament are to be free to violate their election pledges at will, then democratic government is a meaningless phrase, and we are living under a system of Fascism. Therefore, you will rea-

lise that it is necessary for every candidate at the coming elections to inform his electors of his attitude to the legislation.

The No Conscription Campaign will assist you in this, as it is intended to publish this letter, together with the reply received, in the press. Should you fail to reply by Tuesday, June 8th, it will be taken as an indication that you do not intend to reply, and will be publicised as such. A similar letter to this has been sent to each of your opponents, and I am eagerly awaiting your reply.

—Yours faithfully, LESLIE B. HARSANT, Hon. Secretary.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE UNITED DEMOCRATS, of 17 Wymouth Street, Adelaide.)

Social Crediters throughout the Empire will feel deep regret at the passing of Mr. Aberhart. His dynamic personality and power of oratory, together with his high character and representative ability, made him the focal point of Social Credit action in Alberta. The following cable was sent from Adelaide to the Chief Secretary of the Alberta Government: "United Democrats deeply regret your loss, extend sympathy to relatives and people of Alberta."—M. R. W. Lee, Hon. Secretary.

New World Reconstruction Movement.

"A HECKLE HOUR"

Christ Church Hall, Punt Road, South Yarra,

Wednesday, June 9, at 8 p.m.

SUBJECT: "What is the Best Plan for Avoiding a Depression."

Excellent Speakers. Come and Ask Questions. —Advt.

An Open Letter to Mr. G. D. Healy, Melbourne Chamber of Commerce

Dear Sir,—Apparently it is considered by newspaper editors or managements that some inherent quality of profound truth and wisdom resides in the presidential (perhaps pontifical would be a more suitable adjective) addresses of bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of which you made a pronouncement last week.

It is noteworthy that, notwithstanding the acute shortage of newsprint, with the consequent pressure on space in the daily newspapers, whole columns—in some cases almost a full page—can be made available for publicising addresses emanating from chairman of Banks, Insurance Companies, and associations similar to that which you represent. These addresses, though they vary in the style of presentation, are marked by a few outstanding features which are common to them all.

All of them warn us of the perils of inflation—perils which assume a greater menace in periods of war than in periods generally spoken of as "normal."

Now, "inflation" is a word which has been used so indiscriminately—in many cases even unscrupulously—that when any proposals are advanced based on the belief that a financial system should reflect physical facts—and surely no system which fails in this regard can truthfully be called "sound"—such proposals are forthwith condemned as "inflationary." In other words, orthodox financial policy is represented as being the policy, departure from the practices of which inevitably leads to "inflation."

But the truth—as can be demonstrated—is the very reverse. Inflation is a process which is inseparable from the operation of the financial system which you defend and evidently regard as "sound." Men in positions such as you occupy seldom mention the dangers of Deflation, though this is fraught with consequences equally as catastrophic as inflation. And the tragic fact is that we are NEVER free from the evil effects of either, for alternating periods of inflation and deflation are integral factors in the operation of the system which you would not allow to be tampered with.

So long as we refuse to face up to well-proven facts; so long as we persist in the belief that this financial system must be preserved inviolate—we can no more hope to extirpate the recurring phenomena of inflation and deflation than we could expect to prevent the alternation of the seasons. That, Mr. Healy, is a fact, not an opinion.

I noted your reference to "theoretical meanderers" along the easy path of credit expansion. I submit, Sir, that it would have been far more to the point had you stated precisely who the "theoretical meanderers" are, and what is the nature of their theories—theories by which the Government of the day and those responsible for maintaining the currency on a "sound" basis should not be unduly influenced. You appear to overlook the possibility that even you may be a "theoretical meanderer." You declare that if the recommendations of such people were acted upon and found wanting it would not cost them anything, "but might bring ruin to many thousands."

As your reference to these "recommendations" is, like your description as "theoretical meanderers" of those by whom they are made, vague and nebulous, it is not possible to estimate the extent to which such recommendations, if acted upon, might bring ruin. "Sound" finance produces bankruptcy (or ruin) almost daily.

I fully agree with you as to the undesirability of proposals which would "bring ruin to many thousands." But, Mr. Healy, you appear to entirely forget the many thousands who were completely ruined in the depression of the "nineties," in the more recent "great" depression of 1929-1933 and now, finally, those whose lives and homes, and all the things they hold dear, have been broken up, desolated, and shattered in the holocaust of death and destruction now sweeping the world. And, Mr. Healy, all the foregoing ruin has been brought about as the inevitable outcome of the continued operation of a financial system which has long since outlived any usefulness it may ever have had, and which is the very antithesis of "sound," by which term it is erroneously described.

In the light of the afore-mentioned facts, in view of the prevailing chaotic and unspeakably cruel world conditions, can you, Sir, dare to suggest that any greater havoc could possibly have been wrought by adoption of the proposals of those whom you stigmatise as "theoretical meanderers" along the easy path of credit expansion.

Your address, which, presumably, reflects the mental attitude of your Chamber, is in marked and depressing contrast to the enlightened, progressive, and constructive report issued by a special committee of the Council of the London Chamber of Commerce. The following extract from the report is quoted for your information: "It was widely admitted that there was something radically wrong with our economic system. It was absurd that nations should be desperately anxious to export more of their real wealth to other nations than they received in return. It was equally absurd that men in want of the necessities of life should be denied THE MONEY with which to buy them because there was a superabundance of those necessities, and therefore their services were not required to make more. The limiting factor in the production of real wealth was the failure to distribute to would-be consumers enough MONEY to buy the POTENTIAL output. Mass production implied mass consumption. Whilst there had been an amazing revolution in the science of production, no commensurate change had taken place in the FINANCIAL MECHANISM FOR THE PROVISION OF PURCHASING POWER."

You declare that when the war ends "the business world" will have to "exert itself to prevent continuance of the present bureaucratic control of business," and add that, "despite all denials from time to time, there had been ample evidence that the nationalisation and socialisation of industry would be pressed."

Do you not realise, Mr. Healy, that continuance of the system of production based on private initiative and enterprise IS INCOMPATIBLE with continuance of the distributive system under which industry is becoming increasingly subject to financial domination? The trend towards monopolistic ownership and its concomitant, ever-increasing centralisation of control, in the form of large-scale amalgamations and mergers, which have been taking place during the past two decades, must ultimately culminate in the emergence of one vast bureaucratically - controlled monopoly—viz., the State. That is the culmination for which the controllers of finance are plotting. The training of the bureaucracy by whom the future World Socialist State was to be controlled, was the avowed purpose for which the London School of Economics was endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, an international financier.

The trend toward the growth of monopoly and the centralised control of industry is unquestionably the product of financial considerations; it has resulted in the consolidation by finance of its overlord-

ship of industry; and, if the conspiracy to set up an international bank, with full control over currency and credit throughout the world should succeed, finance will have established complete world hegemony. It will then be too late to talk about preventing "continuance of the present bureaucratic control of business."

This letter, Mr. Healy, is written in the earnest hope that it may help you and other men, who, like you, hold positions of influence and great opportunity, to realise that the "revolution in the science of production," to which the report of the London Chamber of Commerce drew attention, calls not only for the commensurate change in the financial mechanism for the provision of purchasing power advocated by that body, but also for a revolution of mental attitude. We cannot have a return to pre-1939 conditions. Nor should we wish for it.

If the people to whom you refer as "theoretical meanderers" are those who contend that the whole community, including business and industry, should burst the fetters of orthodox finance, I would submit, Sir, that, in attempting to discredit them, you are rendering your country a disservice rather than a service. You are also discrediting your own standing as a man of intelligence. For, the truth is that if we continue to allow an effete, discredited, and fraudulent system of finance to dominate our individual and corporate life, not only will ruin be brought to many thousands in the future, as in the past, when the bankers have ordered the policy of deflation to be applied, but, in addition, the World Bank conspiracy, which I have mentioned, will succeed, and with its success, the values of truth, justice, and liberty, for the securing and extension of which our armed forces are fighting, will be lost. In that event, even if Hitler and all his forces are annihilated, Hitlerism will have gained a victory.

—I am, yours truly, J. BRADSHAW,
A.F.I.A. June 1st, 1943.

THE VICTORIAN ELECTIONS

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

Sir,—Elections are shortly to be held in the State of Victoria, and very many people are wondering how they should vote. Several have actually approached me on the subject. My advice has been that they forget what is called the "policy speech" of the three parties, and have regard only to the policy which they themselves desire. After all, it is the PEOPLE who should determine public policy, not a few persons meeting as a Labor Conference, the National Union, or a Country Convention. In each of these cases the outlook is coloured by sectional interests, and at the back of it all is a scheme to keep the community divided into contending factions.

A brief review of what has already happened in connection with this election will substantiate what I have said. Each party professes a burning desire to serve the people as a whole, and the desire is so hot that it seeks to consume other aspiring servants. The leader of the Labor Party indicated what his party would do if returned with a majority, quite regardless of the fact that there is an anti-Labor majority in "the Legislative Council. He also gave no indication whatever as to how he would get the finance to do any more than is being done now. There are only three ways at present in which the State Governments can get money, and they are (a) from ordinary revenue, (b) from Federal grants, and (c) from borrowing. The last two are under Federal control, and the first is buoyant only because of Federal spending. Mr. Cain and his party will therefore do only what they are "permitted" to do, and the permission will depend on Federal Finance and the Legislative Council. It will not depend, as it should, on the resources of the State and the desires of the Victorian people.

Mr. Dunstan, leader of the "Country" party, did something similar. He enunciated a programme of a few items which should have had attention long ago, and then complained that some of his items had been pinched by another party. Apparently we are to judge Government actions not by the good they bring the

community, but by the political colour of the Government in office at the time. He also branded the Labor Party as a "city" party, and thus deliberately sought to set the country people in personal conflict with those residing in the metropolis. This sort of thing brings no benefit to either group, but is a delight to the heart of the schemers behind the scenes, who know that so long as the community is thus divided it will be easy to keep it in subjection.

Mr. Hollway, leader of the so-called "United Australia" Party, was perhaps a little more realistic than the others, but only a very little. He is reported to have said this: "I can see no conflict of ideas which would prevent an all-party Government in Victoria. U.A.P. policy differs from that of the Government or of Labor mainly in that it gave a statement of political principles rather than an ambitious programme which conditions made it impossible to carry out." In a general summing up he declared that if his party was returned with a majority it would "do what it could" to improve conditions in the community. Note that particularly. It would do what it could, and, like the other parties, that would depend upon Federal Finance and the Legislative Council. So we see that whatever party may be returned, it will simply mean the selection of a different jockey for the same old niddy. Remember what Sir Bertram Stevens said when he was Premier of New South Wales? "We are now ready to proceed with developmental work as courageously as our bankers will allow!"

Forgetting the various policy speeches, each of us should make personal contact, if practicable, with the candidates in our particular electorate to find out whether his or her first loyalty is to the electors or to a "party." If to the former, then we should next find out what he or she proposes to do to obtain financial independence for State Governments, because, without financial independence, they cannot have administrative independence. If they are not ready to tackle this issue, then they are no good as representatives, and should be discarded. Candidates who stand for the transfer of additional powers to the Federal Parliament should be required to explain why the Federal Parliament fails to make use of the financial power it already possesses, as were it to do so there would be no occasion whatever for other powers. In any case, such candidates should also be requested to quote the constitutional authority under which State Parliaments can transfer powers vested in the PEOPLE.

It seems to me we shall have to make it an individual matter as distinct from a party matter.

—Yours, etc., BRUCE H. BROWN, 189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2 30th May, 1943.

U.E.A. NOTES

(From the United Electors of Australia, 343 Little Collins St., Melbourne)

The following "Pledge and Undertaking Form" has been forwarded to each candidate in the State Elections, for signature:

"I quite agree with the contention that Members of Parliament are sent there for the express purpose of giving effect to the WILL of the people. This being so, I have no hesitation in undertaking to give effect to the wishes of the majority of electors for the division of.....as manifested by them and conveyed to me as a Member of Parliament; provided only that the carrying out of such wishes is physically and constitutionally possible."

Where possible the reaction of candidates will be published, but meanwhile campaigners should use each election meeting to ask the candidate if he (or she), if elected, is prepared to represent only the wishes of his electors. This is a vital question with tremendous propaganda value. It will trip up more candidates than any other question—so don't fail to put it.

—O. B. Heatley, Campaign Director.

Son of Mr. Bruce H. Brown Makes Supreme Sacrifice

It is with profound regret that we record the death, on active service, of Sgt-Pilot John Maxwell Brown, younger son of Mr. Bruce H. Brown. Sgt-Pilot Brown's death occurred on May 24 in Algeria, as a result of an aircraft accident during combat exercises. He was 21 years old.

In addition to Mr. Brown's many friends in monetary reform circles, we know that thousands of "New Times" readers throughout Australia, who only know him through his writings, will join with us in extending heart-felt sympathy to himself and his wife in their time of great sorrow.

Political Awakening

Due mainly to the efforts of Messrs. G. Ormsby, G. Bengssten and F. Helms, a political study group has been formed in the South Gippsland township of Stony Creek. The group has held several meetings, and, considering the comparatively small number of people living within reasonable distance of the township, the attendance has been most encouraging to the convenors. The objective of the group is to arouse political interest in THEIR OWN LOCALITY on matters local, State, and Federal. The actions of the district parliamentary representatives (State and Federal) will be observed and discussed, local publicity will be arranged, and last, but most important, the members of the group will express their approval or otherwise as individuals to their Members of Parliament. Small groups of actionists, such as the Stony Creek residents, have a greater chance of causing real political awakening than "mass" meetings, together with the usual "bally-hoo" and "eminent" speakers. Other country districts please note! —E.J.G.

WEST AUSTRALIAN NOTES

(From THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN, of 81 Barrack Street, Perth)

All social creditors in West Australia will wish to express their sincere regrets at the unexpected demise of Mr. William Aberhart, Premier of Alberta who has put up such a gallant fight for the rights and liberties of his fellow men; but they will be confident that his efforts have not been in vain.

—Wm. F. Andrews, Hon. Secretary.

NEW BOOKLET

"THE TRAGEDY OF HUMAN EFFORT."
(Major Douglas's Liverpool Speech, 1936)
Recommended by the Social Credit Secretariat as specially suitable for distribution at the present time.
Price: 7d. each, 4/6 per dozen, post free.
Obtainable from: The Electoral Campaign, N.S.W. (Women's Division), 3rd Floor, 296 Pitt Street, Sydney.

Responsibility for election comment is accepted by H. Allsop, McEwan House, Melb.

FRANK DEVLIN

For
Better Tailoring

THREE-GARMENT SUIT

Hand-Tailored to Order

ALL-WOOL
WORSTEDS
from

£7/7/- 42 Coupons

ELIZABETH HOUSE,
Second Floor
340 LITTLE COLLINS ST.

MELBOURNE
Phone: M 5177

THE TWO SAUCES

FOR THE GANDER:

"Is it my duty to go to the war or is it my duty not to go? The answers to those questions cannot be made on a public platform. Those questions relate to a man's intimate and personal and family affairs and, in consequence, I, in facing those problems, problems of intense difficulty, found myself, for reasons which were and are compelling, unable to join the infantry of the A.I.F."

—Mr. R. G. Menzies ("Hansard," 20/4/1939).

FOR THE GOOSE:

(From the Militia Bill debate defining the boundaries up to which Australian men may be forced to fight and men and women to work.)

... for a substantial period of time ahead the manpower resources of the country do not permit of the employment of the Militia to an extent greater than suggested in the proposed boundaries."

—Dr. Evatt, 5/2/1943

"I believe this is a deplorable Bill ... the moment you draw a line on the map, the moment you say there is no capacity to use the Citizen Militia Forces beyond that line ... you make it impossible to have one united fighting force which can go wherever the High Command wants it to go."

—Mr. R. G. Menzies ("Hansard," 11/2/1943).

THE HISTORY YOU DID NOT LEARN AT SCHOOL

By ERIC D. BUTLER. (Continued from last issue.)

The part played by Jews in the development of banking is so well known that there is only need to make a passing reference to this fact. The Jewish financiers started their practices in England immediately upon their arrival with William the Conqueror in 1066. But it was during the Crusades that they reaped their first big harvest. Noblemen desirous of going to the Crusades were forced to pawn their properties to Jewish financiers in order to obtain sufficient finance.

The inevitable result was a growing feeling against the Jews. Several clauses of Magna Charta dealt with debts owing to the Jews, and reveal the strong feeling against their practices. In 1290 Edward I. had all Jews removed from the country. The Knights Templars, a secret organisation with many characteristics of our modern international banking houses, was declared illegal in 1312.

In 1581 we see the first attempt by foreign bankers to regain admittance to England. The suggestion came from a certain Christopher Hagenbuck, who petitioned Queen Elizabeth in Italian to be allowed to establish a National Bank for providing "easy money." Hagenbuck was undoubtedly familiar with the practices of the Bank of Saint George in Italy.

Early in the seventeenth century we see the rising power of the Puritans, drawing their main inspiration from the Jewish philosophy of the Old Testament. It is not my purpose here to deny abuses which prevailed during the reigns of James I. and Charles I. But to suggest that Charles fought a Parliament representing the people of England is the greatest nonsense taught in our schools.

Before proceeding, let us face this issue: Can any honest person suggest that even the position to-day—when the people are at least nominally represented in Parliament, but anonymous financiers, controlling all Parties, rob the people through taxation to pay interest on counterfeit credit—is any indication of the people having escaped from tyranny? At least King Charles accepted personal responsibility for his actions; and circumstances over which he had no control forced him to tax the rich to keep the Navy at fighting strength. To suggest that secret government by financiers is an actual advance on absolute monarchy is one of the greatest delusions ever foisted on the English people. No doubt representative government had to begin as it did, but let us not gloss over the fact that Parliament was used by unscrupulous men to further their own interests, NOT the interests of the people.

Cromwell received large financial backing from the Amsterdam Jews. In 1655 the Jews were allowed to re-enter England and pave the way for the modern banking system and stock exchange.

The return of Charles II. in 1660 was the direct result of the growing revulsion of the English people against Cromwell's military dictatorship. But the now powerful London financiers were determined either to control Charles, or to destroy him. They reckoned without Charles, and one of the great dramas in English history was fought out: The Monarchy versus The Money Power. Charles appeared to be strengthening his position considerably when his death took place in 1685. James II., his brother, was not acceptable to the financiers, and the fact that he was a Catholic was used to

foment religious prejudices. Heavy backing was given to Charles II.'s bastard son, the Duke of Monmouth, in his rebellion against James. But it wasn't successful. James was a weaker and less discreet character than his brother, and eventually was forced to abandon the throne in 1688. But let us return to Charles II., and study more closely what really took place during his significant reign. And it was really a remarkable reign in more ways than one. It saw further foundations of Britain's colonial Empire laid, and it saw the thorough organisation of the naval might of Britain—facts which our orthodox historians slur over.

THE "EXTRAVAGANCE" OF CHARLES.

The school historians have alleged that the financial difficulties of Charles II. were the result of his extravagances, particularly on his mistresses. This is a legend which has been shown as lying nonsense by the researches of Mr. A. Bryant, in his "Charles II."

A special committee investigated the financial needs of Charles soon after he returned to England. It stated that the King would require the minimum sum of £1,200,000 for State purposes, etc. But Parliament never voted more than £800,000. Charles was driven to obtaining the deficit where possible. Crown lands were sold; even financial help was received from Charles's cousin, Louis XIV., King of France. But, worse than all, Charles was borrowing from the London bankers, and paying an average rate of interest of 8 per cent.

Anyone interested in the manner in which Charles was reduced to financial difficulty by the Money Power, will find the following extract from Dr. Shaw's "Calendar of Treasury Books," very illuminating:

"With our modern system of annual budgets, estimates and supplementary estimates, we are so far removed from the seventeenth century practice and theory that we cannot conceive it possible. It is this want of proper sense of historical perspective that has produced the accepted Whig view of Charles II.'s reign—a view which is as mean in its psychology as it is gross and palpable in its ignorance."

One of the first acts of Charles when he returned to England was to recall a man by the name of Blondeau from France and make him Engineer of the Mint. The reason for this was: During Cromwell's reign, many men sought to make an easy living

by what was known as clipping coins. The supply of money was thus greater than productivity, the result being real inflation. There was a need to stop counterfeiting. Pierre Blondeau arrived in England in 1649, with an instrument for coining milled-edged coins, and thus making clipping impossible. Although a Parliamentary Committee reported favourably on his device, nothing was done for the next seven years. Blondeau attacked the administration of the Mint, stating that the Mint officials were themselves issuing light coins and pocketing the profits of their roguery. Blondeau's device would have prevented this. Eventually, in 1656 he was allowed to stamp some new coins, but, according to the British historian, Feaveryear, in "Pound Sterling," Cromwell, "probably for political reasons," did not issue them; Blondeau retired to France in disgust.

Charles, as I have said, recalled Blondeau. As far as we can learn, Charles de-

sired to have more purchasing-power without a rise in the price levels. Production was rapidly increasing with the opening of the roads. (Improved transport was a major factor in increasing Britain's production at this time). The "clippers" were put down. Only milled-edged coins were to be issued in future. But Charles forgot to call in all old coins, the result being that the "clippers" now started melting down the new coins and issuing them as "antique" coins of short weight.

Charles then decided upon the use of paper money to increase the nation's monetary supplies. In order that there would be as much paper money as possible in proportion to metal coinage, so that the public would become used to it, Charles, unlike our modern economists, sought first to get rid of as much gold and silver as possible out of the country. I wonder what Professor Copland would have thought of such an ideal! (To be continued.)

THIS "INSULARITY"

(Continued from last issue.)

Leaving out the question of Russia for the moment, on Mr. Chakotin's own showing Nazi Germany is the direct outcome of the systematic application of Objective Psychology—the very fruit of Pavlov's tree. The roots, of course, stretch far further; back to Paganism and, who knows, the primeval slime. But the methods by which National-Socialism was established, all clearly enunciated in "Mein Kampf" and freely quoted by Mr. Chakotin, are taken from the extensive literature built up primarily round Pavlov's work on "conditioned reflexes," which constitutes, to quote Mr. Chakotin, "... the practical science of the direction of other people through the action of influences designed with reference to their physical mechanism." [My emphasis.]

Stripped of its scientific language, and to go no further back, this is just our old comrade, Mesmer—who, incidentally, came from Germany.

According to this science there are four primary instincts common to the animal world from the amoeba up to yours truly, upon which "conditioned reflexes," or groups of these, can be built up. In an ascending scale of power and importance, they are:—(1) Maternity, embracing Christianity, and, strangely enough, Science; and (2) Sexuality, which is shared between Freud with his Oedipus-complex, and Art. We have passed through the eras of the predominance of these two stages, and are actually emerging from (2) Nutrition (Capitalism and Economics represented by Karl Marx, who mistook it for the dominant instinct), and with the help of Lenin and Hitler, "the two greatest propagandists of our time," have entered (1) Struggle (some struggle!) and Domination, primacy of which over all the other instincts is proved by the fact that salivation in animals at the sight of food stops instantly at the threat to life.

Now, all of this, while it is most ingeniously elaborated, strikes me as rather theoretical. That it works—in a manner, and up to a point, must be admitted as proved by the stark fact of Nazi Germany today, which one must conclude gives satisfaction to somebody since it persists. That somebody is apparently not Mr. Chakotin (or, if we are to believe them, the Bhoys of the "B.B.C."), who refuses to accept Nazi Germany as proof of anything but the innate (absolute) depravity of Hitler and National Socialism. This refusal appears, on the face of it, unreasonable in one who, like Mr. Chakotin, has such faith in the methods employed by Hitler. Would he not even admit their potentiality in the hands of big business corporations bent on planting their mass-produced products on an income-starved world in competition with their kind? To me it looks as though such a "science" would naturally arise, or should we say, become possible, under the necessity to meet, and by some means defeat states of frustration which, arising in the physical world of Supply and Distribution (No. 3, Economics, in Mr. Chakotin's catalogue), are even more terribly reflected in the world of mind (metaphysics), which not surprisingly is omitted altogether from the list.

In spite of his protests, however, it is obvious from this book, that in the hands of Hitler and Goebbels and with the credit backing of men like Fritz Thyssen and institutions such as Kuhn, Loeb and Company, and the Bank of England, the technique worked out on the above formula achieved such wonders in the Germany of the Nineteen Thirties as fill Mr. Chakotin with indignant and almost hysterical admiration. The chapters dealing with the wild political war between Hitler's National Socialists and the Social Democrats, who had the backing of Russia, in the tragic period following the Wall Street Collapse, is very illuminating. Taking place, as it did, among a people whose "reflexes" had been "conditioned" since the days of Frederick the Great, who instituted the goose-step, its success is not perhaps so greatly to be wondered at. The nation would have been reduced by defeat and despair and unemployment (six million there were!) to a state of apathy and paralysed initiative bordering on the cataleptic condition which Pavlov found to be most susceptible to suggestion. Indeed, one can pity the poor Germans, with two ardent and bitterly opposed exponents of Experimental Psychology, marching and counter-marching across their

dazed emotions.

Here is an extract from a report compiled by one of the most enthusiastic members of the Iron Front, as the Socialists who supported the Social Democrat party in the elections of 1932 styled themselves. It deals with the election in Hesse. "... Better still, were the reports such as this from our agents: 'Since the "chalk campaign" started everyone here has been transfixed.' ... At last we were able to be seen at full strength.' ... A guerilla war of symbols and pictures raged in Hesse, taking the most singular forms. It was only with this development that the enemy began to find means of combating our symbol, destroying it or making fun of it. We replied promptly. In several places they tried to turn our arrows into umbrellas, which were regarded as a middle-class emblem. We barred them a second time thus restoring our symbol. They destroyed the effect of the arrows by pointing them at both ends; we changed the new points into feathers, and once more restored our symbol. They drew three broken arrows with a swastika on top of them; we changed their picture to a rain of arrows pouring on the swastika, and again we had the last word. They drew a hand held up against the arrows, writing below it 'Halt!' We lengthened the arrows through the hand and wrote beneath: 'We shall get the better of you, anyway!' And so on, breathlessly. My reaction to it is to recall that they give out chalks in kindergartens to keep the children occupied.

Perusing Mr. Chakotin's earnest, excited pages one is reminded acutely of Douglas's statement of his conviction that nothing but the Anglo-Saxon character stood between this civilisation and chaos. Is that an arrogant statement? It is simple enough to be true, anyway. Dialectical Materialism appears to me remarkably like disintegration—just loss of character and identity, Anglo-Saxon, or what-have-you. Which suggests that if some of us do not discover a reason for hanging together we shall all hang separately.

—N. F. Webb, in the "Social Crediter" (England).

NEW PAMPHLET

What is Democracy? What is Totalitarianism? What is Communism? What is Socialism? What is National Socialism? What is Fascism? What is the choice before us?

All these questions are answered, briefly and clearly, but in a fundamental way, in the excellent pamphlet, "DEMOCRACY AND THE ISMS," which is available from The United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, 343 Little Collins-street, Melbourne, C.I. Price: One shilling per dozen (postage 1½d.).

Every democrat should get at least a dozen copies, and circulate them as widely as possible. ORDER NOW.

AVAILABLE SHORTLY Major Douglas's Latest

The new series of articles by C. H. Douglas, entitled "The 'Land for the (chosen) People' Racket," now appearing in the "New Times," is also being published in book form by The Democratic Federation of Youth, Room 9, Floor 3, 296a Pitt-street, Sydney, N.S.W., to whom orders and remittances, for copies of the book, should be addressed.

Price: 2/- (plus postage).

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

Printed by M. F. Canavan, 25 Cullinton-road, Hartwell, for The New Times Ltd., McEwan House, Melbourne.

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

By C. H. DOUGLAS, in the "Social Crediter," England. (Continued from last issue.)

In "Freedom and Planning," the document issued in 1931 by Mr. Israel Moses Sieff's organisation, P.E.P., which appears to have supplanted the Government of Great Britain, just as the "New Deal" appropriated the American Government, through what Lord Hewart called "administrative lawlessness," the following illuminating passages may be found:—

The Farmer: The development of an organised system will lead to a profound modification of the traditional individualism of outlook of the dairy farmer."

"Whether we like it or not, the individual farmer will be **forced by events** [our emphasis] to **submit** to far-reaching changes of outlook and methods." (It may be remembered that the Russian farmer who was "planned" did not like it, and was "liquidated" in millions by Mr. Sieff's co-racialists.)

The Landowner: "Planned economy . . . must clearly involve drastic inroads upon the **rights** [our emphasis] of **individual** ownership of land." "This is not to say that land nationalisation in the **ordinary sense of the term** [our emphasis] is either necessary or desirable. Far from it. Nothing would be gained (by whom?) by substituting the State as Landlord. What is required . . . is transfer of ownership of large blocks of land, not necessarily of all the land of the country, but certainly a large part of it, into the hands of the proposed Statutory Bodies and Public Utility Bodies and of the Land Trusts."

"It would be possible further, in a number of cases (the Chosen People) to leave management undisturbed, together with the enjoyment of the amenities which at present go with ownership, subject to the transfer of title to the Corporations or Trusts."

The full beauty of these proposals only becomes revealed as they are carefully examined and thoroughly understood.

The first point to notice is that the rights of ownership are expressly mentioned and are not abrogated, they are transferred. To anyone who has taken the small amount of trouble necessary to penetrate the conjuring trick of "Public" ownership, it is obvious that the powers will be transferred to anonymous bondholders, who will exercise them

through bureaucrats, whose advancement will depend on their alacrity in anticipating the wishes of their masters.

But "nationalisation" is recognised as an awkward threat to grinding taxation, so that "Public Bodies" and "Land Trusts" (Forestry Commissions, National Trusts and out-and-out Land Companies) are to be interposed. A writer in a popular Sunday newspaper, writing of the acquisition of a large block of land by the National Trust, began the articles by the words "Hundreds of thousands of people in this country do not realise that they are large landowners." Now, isn't that odd?

It is a safe rule in assessing the true objective of the "Planners" measures to examine the arrangements made in forming the thirty-seven Central Banks which have been constituted since 1918. These, of course, are an integral and primary stage in the more open "Planning" now in progress, and were formed with a clear relationship to a resumption of hostilities which would form the cover for the consummation of the World State.

The first point to notice is that, from the Bank of International Settlements to the smallest South American Republic, these banks are granted extra-territoriality. Whether the Bank of "England" is "de jure" extra-territorial I do not know. But the answers given to questions in regard to it, in the House of Commons, make it quite plain that it is "de facto" extra-territorial.

The same idea can be seen in operation all the way through this "World Plan"—to organise institutions of overwhelming power, operated by officials themselves having no power of initiative, bound by Precedent and Regulation. Then you control the King's Regulations, and there you are—on paper. You have disfranchised everyone. (All rights reserved.) (To be continued.)