

BRITISH WAR SUPPLIES
TO U.S.A. (Page 2)

THE CHAMBER OF "COM-
MERCE." (Page 3)

U.E.A. STATE ELECTION
GUIDE. (Page 4)

THE PARTY SYSTEM IS
BREAKING UP. (Page 4)

EVERY FRIDAY

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 9 No. 23 MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 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).

The "Argus's" Attack on Pressure Politics United Electors' Reply

Apparently the non-party Electoral Campaign—sometimes loosely described as Pressure Politics—is "getting under the skins" of the Power-Lusters in general, and the Party Bosses in particular. The latest evidence of this, which is most encouraging, is the leading article in the Melbourne "Argus" of June 2, in which a venomous attack was made on the Electoral Campaign idea (suitably distorted, of course), with misleading special references to the latest election-time moves of two movements with headquarters in Melbourne—namely, the United Electors of Australia, an Electoral Campaign movement well-known to most of our readers, and the No Conscription Campaign, an organisation specially and specifically opposed to conscription for military service overseas.

Those two movements have entirely separate origins, and they have different objectives and personnel; but the No Conscription Campaign, although not an Electoral Campaign movement as such, has been using "pressure politics," and therefore shared the reactionary rebuke of the "Argus." Next week we may devote further space to the "Argus's" outburst—and the supporting remarks of the Victorian U.A.P. leader, Mr. Holloway, published in the "Argus" a day later. For the present we publish the official reply of the United Electors, sent by the president, Dr. John Dale, to the editor of the "Argus" on Tuesday of this week:—

(To the Editor, the "Argus.")
PRESSURE POLITICS.

Sir,—Your leading article on the above subject (2/6/43), in addition to unjustly imputing base motives to the body known as the "United Electors of Australia," also questions the right of such bodies to stimulate public interest and awareness on political issues. We trust, therefore, that since you have levelled charges of "organised political terrorism" against this body, you will permit us the opportunity of reply.

Your article suggests that electors can and should obtain the legislation they require only from one or other of the existing political parties, despite the fact that each and all of the parties have, after many years, failed to produce satisfactory results.

If it is an act of "terrorism" for the "United Electors" to seek an assurance from candidates that if elected they "will represent only the will of the majority of

their constituents" and not that of outside organisations, this body is certainly guilty—and proud of it!

Regarding the "Letter Forms" campaign through which electors voluntarily direct their representative as to what he is to represent: if this is underhanded, undemocratic or unconstitutional, it is indeed news—news which presumably has hitherto been available only to those who move in the rarified atmosphere of the editorial sanctum.

It may interest you to know that 66% of the candidates who have replied to our question are prepared to "represent the wishes of the majority of their constituents"—which certainly does not indicate that you are pleading their cause—against "pressure politics."

Further, electors obviously should not vote for a candidate unwilling to obey his electors. Under such circumstances you are certainly not pleading the electors' cause. Therefore, the question arises—

" POLITICAL PLOT CONDEMNED "

In its issue of May 27, the "Dandenong Advertiser" (Victoria) says in a front page report that "although the opposing political parties had agreed not to oppose him, Mr. Francis Field, M.L.A., who has successfully represented the Dandenong electorate for nearly six years, finds himself opposed by an Independent candidate—Mrs. G. M. Roberts." The paper goes on to explain that Mr. Field's inability to attend to parliamentary matters has been due to his absence and preoccupation in the administrative section of the R.A.A.F.

The objection that Dandenong electors have thereby been deprived of representation is anticipated by the statement that another M.L.A. "has been looking after the interests of Dandenong"—ignoring four vital facts: that the electors were not consulted about this arrangement, that they could hold no sanctions whatever over the other M.L.A., that they and other taxpayers were paying a full parliamentary salary for a little spare-time "representation," and that the other M.L.A.'s electors were deprived of full-time representation. The following contributed report appeared less prominently in the same issue of the "Advertiser," under the above heading:—

To protest against "the electioneering truce between the major political parties," a meeting of citizens, convened by Mr. W. Caird Wilson, was held at the Federal Dining-rooms, Dandenong, on Thursday night last.

The chair was occupied by Mr. F. Ward, who, in a preamble, stated that the feelings of the electors had been outraged by the politically dishonest attempt of the party managers to preserve the present strength of the respective parties in the Legislative Assembly. The political system was being brought into ridicule and disgrace, not by the electors, nor as a result of any fault of the electors, unless the fact was that of indifference, but by the selfishness and folly of politicians and their associates. Mr. Ward reminded the meeting that political corruption had ruined France, and said that party politics were corrupting and ruining Australia. Impudent party managers had conspired to cheat the electors. They had arranged among themselves who should make and administer the laws; thus the elective system, the basis of democratic government, was assailed. He was not suggesting that the sitting member was the author of this iniquitous agreement, but if the member remained silent, his condonation would be his condemnation.

Continuing, Mr. Ward said that the more inexcusable the offence the more plausible the excuse, and the excuse for this particularly inexcusable offence was that the sitting member was a serving man. That was an appeal to our sentiments. It was an emotional appeal, aimed at our heads through softer hearts. It ignored the fact that a member was elected for a specified term, that Parliamentary duties were a solemn obligation, an undertaking to serve, not an opportunity to reap a personal advantage.

The speaker remarked that the loss of his seat did not deprive a serving member of his duties to his constituents, as he had already abrogated those duties by accepting others. He would only be a loser if he regarded his seat as a prize, not to be given up lightly, a means for personal gain, not necessarily direct financial gain, but possibly power, social distinction, or unnamed privileges, of which the ordinary, or unsuspecting, elector had no knowledge. He was afraid that the motive of service was becoming a thing of the past; it was the motive of reward that was debasing our political institutions. To appeal to the sportsmanship of Australians, not to displace a sitting member, was an unworthy one.

Whether the serving member was a front-line soldier, using cold steel, or an administrative officer on the home front, made no difference to the general principles, said Mr. Ward. He thought it was an ignoble victory that had to be won by the elimination of one's competitors. The electors were asked to retain a member, not to return one; they were asked to admit that a certain person had acquired a vested right in a seat in Parliament. It was a reversion to the "Rotten Borough" system. What a prospect for our children and our children's children! The sacrifice of our vote was too much to be asked of us. The right was not ours to give away. We were trustees, enjoying blessings won for us by our British forefathers. It was our duty to pass them on, unimpaired, to future generations of Australians.

The following resolution was carried:— "That this meeting expresses disapproval of election pacts which restrict the number of candidates, and will not support any candidate who is a party to such a pact.

whose cause are you pleading when you attack the "United Electors" and the technique of "pressure politics"?

An example of "Parties" giving the people what they do NOT want is the defunct 1936 National Insurance Bill. It will be remembered that all "parties" supported the legislation, which was duly enacted. But the electors, using the "Electoral Campaign" technique, told their respective members they did NOT want it, and their members quite correctly obeyed their instructions and prevented the Act from operating.

We say that it is the prerogative of the electors (employers) to instruct their representatives (servants), and the prerogative of the Members to obey—or resign.

We believe, rightly or wrongly, that in this manner a functioning democracy can be achieved. By democracy we mean "a society wherein the people consciously get what they want within the limits of physical possibilities."

Many issues arise which are not covered by election policies, on which Members can only be directed by "letter contact." Moreover, many laws and regulations are found irksome and unwanted by the people. Here again the most effective method of seeking the repeal of such laws—as distinct from flouting them—is the

"letter form"; and be it said to the credit of most Members, they appreciate the public interest in so far as it enables them to know what is required of them.

Of course, there are some Members who believe that the people should "leave it to them"—which is precisely what Hitler told the German people, who accepted the idea, to their sorrow.

I trust this will make it quite clear that the "United Electors of Australia" is not actuated by such ignoble motives as those imputed by your leader writer, whose unjustified attack can be explained by lack of thought or a proper knowledge of our objectives and activities.

It should be mentioned that the "United Electors" includes many thousands of loyal citizens, among whom are honoured men who hold eminent positions in the worlds of science, medicine, and letters. Some of these have lost loved ones in the fight for freedom and democracy now being waged by our armed forces.

Thanking you for your willingness to provide an opportunity to refute the charges made against us, and to make it quite clear that the sum total of the "United Electors" objectives is simply to bring into being a functioning democracy.—I am, yours faithfully, John Dale, president.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

MYSTERY MAN: Reuter's correspondent in Zurich reports that Dr. Schacht has been RETIRED. The correspondent describes this banker as the REAL POWER behind Hitler, and says that, "as President of the Reichsbank he consistently sought the friendship and co-operation of BRITISH BANKERS." Judging by the millions of pounds the Bank of "England" made available to Hitler for WAR MATERIALS, before the war, he was highly successful! Doubtless, all the bankers concerned in such "war promotion" will face the "Bar of Justice"—or will it merely be the more popular form of Bar?

CLOTHES COSTS: Discussing increased clothing prices, practical manufacturers are reported in the press of May 11 thus: "Government direction had failed to give any appreciable cheapening of costs; often the restrictions meant that material was simply wasted—and, finally, the sales tax had been increased to 12½%." The restrictions bungle is bad enough; but when the Government deliberately increases prices by 12½%, it is obviously unadulterated hypocrisy for them to denounce profiteering or to pretend they are endeavouring to prevent inflated prices.

MANPOWER MUDDLE: An analysis of the manpower situation, appearing in J. T. Lang's "Century" of May 14, shows that Australia has 11.5% of her population under arms, Britain has 10%, while U.S. has set a maximum of only 8%. The "Century" blames Australia's manpower conscription for the food shortage and other break-downs. The same issue of "Century" also condemns military conscription, but, strangely enough, supports compulsory Unionism. This is not consistent with the usual standard of Lang's logic.

PRODUCTION PROBLEMS: The Melbourne "Sun" of May 31 reports that "1250 men in a West Virginia synthetic rubber plant are producing an annual equivalent of 16 million tyres. . . . To produce the same amount of crude rubber, 90,000 men would be required." This means that 88,750 men can be freed for other war tasks—and in peace-time for leisure, provided, of course, that their incomes are not cut off. This example can be multiplied many times, and yet many uninformed people foolishly say that our production system is inefficient, and should be scrapped. It is beyond doubt that adequate incomes is the real peace-time problem, not production.

PARTY POLITICS: Under the heading of "Election Pointers," the Murdoch Press reports all the marvellous things the "Parties" are going to do, if returned, but quite overlooking the fact that the same Parties promised the same things at the last elections. Unfortunately, only a few electorates have an independent or non-party candidate offering for the job of re-presenting the electors' demands in Parliament.

EDUCATOR'S ERROR: Economist C. R. Badger, who was propelled into the position of "director of University extension lectures," is reported as saying that "compulsory part-time adult education should be an essential part of post-war plans." Experienced teachers know that "a desire to learn" is essential for success, and that if the desire exists compulsion is unnecessary. It is rather queer how some teachers want compulsory education; Union Bosses want compulsory Unionism; politicians want compulsory voting; churchmen want compulsory abstinence; militarists want compulsory

military service, etc., etc. If this trend continues, individual initiative will be compulsorily eliminated.

POWER PERIL: Commenting on the powers held under National Security Regulations, Justice Halse Rogers said that "if the Premier (Mr. McKell) had the power the Crown claimed he had, he was as effective a dictator as any Continental dictator." Later in this connection, the Justice Sir Frederick Jordan, said, "The new Regulations were deliberately vague to deter injured persons from challenging their validity." Commenting on this, Herr Curtin said that "if Commonwealth authority were not sufficient he would look into the matter." The conflict thus becomes: the people (employers) versus power-lusting politicians (employees).

CHURCH CHANGES: Speaking at the N.S.W. Presbyterian Assembly, Dr. R. G. MacIntyre said: "We buried the unknown warrior in Westminster Abbey and shouted the slogan, 'A land fit for heroes to live in,' but instead we made a land for the unemployed to idle in and starve on a pittance based on a rotten economic basis." Continuing, he said, "the Church had its opportunity after the last war and missed it." Well, what about this war to catch up the lost opportunity? If certain churchmen will cease prattling about Christianity, and practise it by denouncing the rotten financial system and demanding that it provide adequate incomes, minus the un-Christian debt and interest burden, they may yet enjoy the Kingdom of Heaven.

WORDY WAR: The N.Y. "World Telegram," among other criticisms of Churchill's orations, is reported in our daily press as saying, "Words have come to mean very little; the only convincing argument is military action." The "Journal American" says: "The abolition of the Comintern is meaningless, as Russia intends to dominate Europe after the defeat of Germany, when Britain and U.S. are engaged in fighting Japan." From this it would seem the "world-planners" are in a dilemma because of possible "double-crossing."

BREAD BUNGLER: Bread zoning, according to the theoretical socialists, has resulted in a saving of £195,460 per year. But the victims of zoning, the housewives, are paying up to 11½d. for a 4lb. loaf—and in many cases are getting inferior bread. An interesting report on this matter is contained in the Melbourne "Sun" of June 2, which says that "the most mysterious position is that the only places where prices have been lowered is certain country towns where zoning does not operate." Now we can expect the Planners to zone the said country towns—to bring the price UP to the zoned level.

(Continued on page 4)

BRITISH WAR SUPPLIES TO U.S.A.

March 11 was the second anniversary of the Lease-Lend Act—in Roosevelt's words, "an Act to promote the defence of the United States." The following article, reprinted from the Sydney "Times," March 18, 1943, describes how, by reciprocal Lease-Lend, Britain has contributed to the defence of America. The figures quoted are from official sources, and were collected by the Royal Empire Society:—

Despite the constant invasion threat from Europe 20 miles away, Britain shipped invaluable defence materials 3000 miles to help defend the American continent immediately it was threatened by attack.

Examples: The United States was seriously short of ammunition plants in 1941-'42, so Britain tore up from British factories 400 machines with a monthly capacity of nearly a quarter of a million shells, shipped twelve complete shell-making plants to the United States, and further renounced the entire output of three Canadian shell factories (later she also turned over the output of several British ordnance factories for the United States troops overseas), while Canada made her own direct gift of half a million shell cases to the United States.

America lacked anti-aircraft defences—Britain shipped the complete equipment from an anti-aircraft gun barrel factory (the largest gun factory in the United Kingdom), sent the anti-aircraft guns now defending the Panama Canal and the United States east coast cities, also 6000 barrage balloons for the United States west coast, further, complete equipment designs for radio location and other secret British inventions which Edward Stettinius (head of the Lend-Lease Department of the U.S.A.) described (24/1/43) as "among the most important aids we have received from the United Kingdom."

(Note.—United States anti-aircraft guns ranged to 20,000 feet, but Japanese Zeros were bombing from 30,000 feet. British anti-aircraft guns sent to the United States had a range of 32,000 feet.)

When America was threatened by U-boat sinkings off the Atlantic coast, Britain sent British coastal command planes with crews, destroyers, corvettes, and trawlers from the British Navy, in addition to Lease-Lend British-built corvettes to the United States Navy.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S STATEMENT.

Yet Britain's direct assistance to American territorial defence is probably minute compared with the incalculable indirect assistance through literally putting the United States war industry on its feet before Lend-Lease: direct British capital assistance to United States manufacturers totalled 200 million dollars, and altogether Britain spent some 3000 million dollars in the United States. Thus Roosevelt (11/9/42), in his sixth report to Congress on the Lend-Lease operations, said:

"Before the Lend-Lease Act was passed British Allied orders, together with the Lend-Lease orders which followed, were largely responsible for the initial expansion of our war production facilities without which the United States war programme would not be as far along as it is." Also, "our own army and navy have been immeasurably helped by the diversions to them of considerable amounts of material so financed."

Referring to total British Empire cash purchases in the United States since 3/9/39 the United States Office of War Information (3/9/42) made a striking point: these purchases "are about 7000 million dollars, a great deal more than the United States Lend-Lease deliveries to the British so far." At four dollars to £, that equals £1,750,000,000.

BRITAIN MOVES U.S. TROOPS.

In addition to aid given on United States territory Britain was largely responsible for the moving of the United States forces out of the western hemisphere for overseas defence of the United States. The United States Office of War Information said: "Britain's merchant fleet is much larger than America's. Many American troops moving abroad to fighting fronts travel on British ships."

Admiral Land added (8/2/43): "Most of our large troop movements would not be possible but for Britain's large troop carriers—in fact, we shall require very heavy assistance from Britain this year." The British ships already used in transport of United States forces include the Queen Elizabeth (85,000 gross tons) and Queen Mary (83,000 gross tons), the two largest liners in the world, while Britain supplied two-thirds of 50 war ships and supply ships used in the North African armada.

OVERSEAS DEFENCE OF U.S.A.

Despite the magnitude of British aid, the most important British assistance only begins where the North Atlantic voyage of the United States forces ends—in Britain. The total value of the construction and facilities programme undertaken by Britain on behalf of the United States forces already stands at 600 million dollars (30 per cent. of all the United States expenditure in Britain and France in 1914-'18), excluding huge services of impossible value. Since the United States troops only arrived when British resources were already 100 per cent. mobilised, facilities to the above values represent the colossal British effort in terms of limited manpower, housing, machinery, food, and fighting equipment.

Manpower.—With a minimum number of civilian workers left available for military construction after the call up, Britain put two-thirds on work for the United States forces (according to Office of War Information, 3/9/42), and postponed the army call-up of a further 28,000 building workers in July, 1942, for the same purpose—this excludes

thousands of British civilians employed by the United States forces themselves—e.g., 5000 experienced personnel in one air force depot alone.

Housing.—The total British storage space turned over to the United States alone totals 20,000,000 square feet, equivalent to 37 per cent. of all floor space that Britain won for the war effort by closing 2500 civilian factories under the concentration of industry scheme—five of the depots transferred include two of the largest in the world, one with 1,500,000 square feet floor space. In addition, British hospitals with bed capacity of 800,000 were transferred.

Machinery.—Apart from British ordnance factories, whose output has been assigned to the United States forces, workshops turned over included 1000 machines previously working for Britain.

Food.—For 1943 Britain has promised the United States forces 290 million pounds of food, including 100 million of flour, 51 million of vegetables, fruits and jams, 40 million of potatoes, 155 million of sugar—and the sugar alone is equivalent to one month's rations for 60 per cent. of Britain's population.

EQUIPMENT OF U.S. TROOPS

Fighting Equipment.—Britain supplied the United States forces in North Africa with 25-pounder field guns, 3800 tons of ammunition for a complete United States division, 160 Spitfires, 500,000 anti-tank mines and grenades, 100 miles of portable airfield runways, 30,000 tons of engineering equipment, and medical supplies for several hundred thousands of United States troops, etc., while the United States forces in Europe also received 70,000 rounds of six-inch shells, 15,000 bombs, 1000 parachutes, 300,000 camouflage nets, etc. In addition, all United States troops with the British First Army in Tunisia were supplied by Britain with equipment common to them and British formations.

(Note.—The United States had no modern field guns for use in North Africa, so the equipment was supplied by Britain.)

Although the above facts show a tremendous British contribution to United States defence, even they exclude the huge supplies from British Dominions (Australia and New Zealand supply nearly all the food for United States armies in the south and south-west Pacific, to date 200,000 tons), also supplies to the United States forces in British colonies for which the United Kingdom Government pays, and, of course, all direct fighting assistance by the British forces, particularly the British Navy, in defence of the United States.

REVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY

By R. G. McCLYMONT. (Condensed from "Reveille," R.S.L. journal, Sydney, May 1.)

Alarmed by our legislators' eager acceptance of Fascistic doctrines in implementing their policy of total mobilisation for war; apprehensive of the inverted pyramid of public debt incurred by the failure of such a mobilisation to implement the basic necessity of adherence to the essential principle of equality of sacrifice, Texas (Qld.) Sub-branch of the R.S.L. recently formulated exploratory proposals designed to back pedal our way into a democratic State, in which the individual, instead of being a pawn in the game, would regain even a greater degree of importance and independence than enjoyed in happier days.

It is obvious, to all close observers, that a stupendous effort will be required to throw the present machinery of government into reverse gear. In the struggle for security, powerful sections of our industrial life are organised into pressure groups, each bent on pushing the executives of our present parliamentary system to intrude still further into the field of control, until our position will shortly become indistinguishable from the internal condition of enemy countries. Under such conditions the slogan that this is a war for the free peoples, is surely a delusion and a snare.

The elements comprised by these pressure groups are perfectly oblivious to the fact that Government, by its own efforts, does not produce wealth. . . .

The time has surely come, therefore, to arrange democratically the minimum requirements for the sustenance of all, admit them to an equal partnership in the products of this machine age to this extent, retire gracefully from this field, leaving the tax gatherer to tame those bent on exploitation, arming him with full authority to seek out, and attack, the accumulation of secret reserves.

This degree of economic and social security must be attained to prevent our fighting men being forced into labour camps, working for dole wages, in the years ahead.

Further, it is imperative that action should be taken against the present financial oligarchy, whose main preoccupation is the preservation of the pre-war value of investment. If our war-time financial policy is inflationary in character, the natural corollary of currency depreciation must not be arrested if equality of sacrifice means anything, for otherwise those unfortunates who have borrowed a guinea pig will have to return a fat porker.

Recently there had come news also that a conference of Treasury officials from allied countries has been called in Washington to formulate a policy on post-war currency. . . . One is entitled to suspect

that this conference will be mainly concerned with status quo currency value in order to preserve the assets of the financial interests—behind the scenes, as usual.

On the Home wireless at the moment listeners will have noted a bevy of professors employed instructing the people how necessary post-war control will be, and how comfortably the collars will fit. Of course, they infer these controls are only of a temporary nature. Reviewing the past, however, we see how easy it is to induce a power-hungry executive to assume more and more power, how often, in world history, extreme measures have had to be adopted to remove such shackles.

"The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." We have allowed these words to become a platitude, a dead phrase. They must be vitalised, must be a slogan, an inspiration, if we little people are to live in freedom and security.

Bertrand Russell, a noted economist and writer on social problems, in an excellent essay, "The Taming of Power," begins auspiciously with this quotation:—

"In passing by the side of Mount Thai, Confucius came upon a woman who was weeping bitterly by a grave. The Master pressed forward and drove quickly to her; then he sent Tze-lu to question her. 'Your wailing,' said he, 'is that of one who has suffered sorrow on sorrow.' She replied: 'That is so. Once my husband's father was killed here by a tiger. My husband was also killed, and now my son has died in the same way.' The Master said: 'Why do you not leave this place?' The answer was, 'There is no oppressive Government here.' The Master then said: 'Remember this, my children, oppressive government is more terrible than tigers.'"

Government by decrees and regulations, whether of Fascistic or Communistic origin, must not be allowed to usurp the right of government by the people, and, vulture-like, get its talons in the flesh of citizens aspiring to a true and free democracy.

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 consisted of an extract from a speech made in the Federal Parliament on November 23, 1939, by Mr. Patterson, the Member for Gippsland, who referred to the Lakes Entrance oil-field. Speaking of the same field, he continued:—

"In the concluding portion of the report [of the Oil Advisory Committee] the following paragraph appeared:—

"Provided that some effective means can be found for treating the whole field as a single unit in a manner conforming with the requirements of State legislation, we shall be prepared to recommend that the Commonwealth should give financial assistance to the repressuring scheme here discussed. Pending the introduction of the repressuring scheme, we consider that no financial assistance should be given to the drilling of further holes in any part of the Lakes Entrance area. Lakes Entrance is one of the very few areas within Australian territory in which oil has been definitely proved to occur, and it is our considered opinion that there is a reasonable prospect of rendering the field productive by dealing with it as a whole, and adopting modern methods of repressuring in order to augment, if possible, a yield that is insignificant while no recourse is had to this method, which has proved effective elsewhere."

"In another part of the report, the Oil Advisory Committee made the following observations: 'We are of the considered opinion that existing interests are not equipped either financially or technically to perform the operations necessary to carry this proposal into effect.'

"The Oil Advisory Committee apparently favours the major oil companies, because of their financial strength and technical experience. I hold no brief for any oil companies, either large or small. I am extremely anxious that, for the sake of Australia, this area should be developed, but I consider that a small company which has been sufficiently game to expend some £20,000 in the search of oil, and has been the first to tap oil without water in this area, should be given an opportunity to see what it can do with a repressuring scheme. Moreover, I understand that it is prepared to form a much larger and stronger company, and to obtain the best technical advice available, if it is given the reasonable initial encouragement recommended by the Oil Advisory Committee in the report from which I have quoted.

"An examination of cores from some of these bores has been made by an officer of the State Mines Department, Mr. Croll,

B.Sc., as to the permeability of the oil-bearing sandstones. I shall here briefly quote from his report. He said: "these tests reveal that the permeability is of an order which compares favourably with that in fields where repressuring has been successfully applied."

"Mr. Croll estimated the saturation with oil at 1 per cent. Referring to repressuring, he said: 'The tests have disclosed no reason why such a scheme could not be put into operation.'

"He went on to say: 'On the other hand, they have not altered the speculative nature of the scheme.'

"I should say that whilst there may be something speculative about attempting, by repressuring methods, to bring to the surface oil that is known to exist, surely it must be conceded that it is less speculative than the spending of tens of thousands of pounds in the search for oil in places where it may not exist. The Chairman of the Oil Advisory Committee has now revised his original estimate of 150,000,000 gallons, and says that he believes that there are only 41,000,000 gallons in this area, though he freely admits that the grounds for assessing the oil content at this figure are somewhat flimsy. It is no secret that the most complete differences of opinion exist between the geologists and the oil-drilling experts among the Commonwealth Government's advisers. There is a difference of opinion between the chairman, who is a geologist, and the Department's oil-drilling expert. The search has reached a stage when it is more a matter for experts with drilling and repressuring experience than for the geologists. Let us, however, put the estimated cost at the highest figure, and see what result we get. Assuming that the cost of preparing the field for repressuring would be £80,000, and that the oil content of the field would be no more than 41,000,000 gallons, and that only 10 per cent. is recovered, it would, even on that most pessimistic basis, cost the Government only 48d. a gallon. I point out that the Commonwealth Government to-day is prepared, to sacrifice 5½d. a gallon revenue on every gallon of petrol produced from shale for the next 25 years. It may be said in reply to that argument that that is for petrol, whereas the Gippsland field would be producing crude oil. I admit that; but I am assured that the crude oil at Lakes Entrance is actually more valuable, gallon for gallon, than is imported petrol. It contains 45 per cent. of good diesel oil. We know that the use of diesel oil is rapidly increasing because from its power can be produced cheaply. I know that it is possible with diesel oil to plough an acre of land at a fuel cost of 8d. and every gallon of diesel oil used releases a gallon of petrol for use for other purposes. There is 40 per cent. of high quality lubricating oil in the crude oil from Lakes Entrance, and lubricating oil is very much more valuable than petrol.

"Finally, there is 15 per cent. of bitumen in the oil. The Country Roads Board in Victoria—I do not know what the positions is in other States—urgently needs 10,000 tons of bitumen and cannot get it, with the result that its maintenance and construction works on the roads are proceeding under very great difficulty. Unless bitumen supplies can be obtained, it is probable that roads will fall into disrepair. . . . The deal of unemployment will be caused. The bitumen found in the oil obtained at Lakes Entrance is admittedly of excellent quality for road making. I mention this in order to show that even the so-called residue from the oil can be made to serve a valuable purpose."

(To be continued.)

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 1½d. (4/- per dozen, post free.)

"THE MONEY POWER VERSUS DEMOCRACY." The best "hand-book" for Australian democrats. Price, 9d. Postage 1½d. (6/- per dozen, post free.)

AVAILABLE SHORTLY Major Douglas's Latest

The new series of articles by C. H. Douglas, entitled "The Land for The (chosen) People's 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 CHAMBER OF "COMMERCE"

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

Sir,—In my younger days I looked upon the Chamber of Commerce as a body of honorable and representative men who had been specially selected because of their commercial ability to advance the interests of all men engaged in commerce. Their job, I thought, was to improve the conditions for trading and to facilitate commercial transactions. I have since found that the very reverse is the case, and this causes me to wonder how it is that so many business houses still accept the "Chamber" as an authoritative body.

In your last issue, Mr. J. Bradshaw, A.F.I.A., wrote an excellent Open Letter to Mr. G. D. Healy, formerly Chairman of the Associated Banks and continuously connected prominently with the "Chamber." That same Mr. Healy was also a co-worker with Professor Copland in having the fraudulent Premiers' Plan imposed upon us. That made conditions extra good for the business man, yes? The most charitable thing we can say of him now is that he did not then understand the difference between the real thing called wealth and the phoney thing called money, and so he thought the former should be subservient to the latter! But we don't want that imbecile idea to be encouraged any longer.

As Mr. Bradshaw pointed out, the shortage of newsprint has not so far prevented the Chamber of Commerce and similar bodies from obtaining a whole page of the morning newspaper for the publication of the annual speech of their president, and these speeches always contain "advice" to the Government of the day regarding "trends" in finance. At one time they told us we had been too extravagant and must, therefore, "pay the price." At another time "confidence" had run away, and until it came back again we must expect to remain in the doldrums. This gave place to the wail that we had been living beyond our "means" and must, consequently, tighten our belts. The latest dirge is that we now have far too much spending power and that unless we surrender it or joyfully submit to having it taken from us very serious results will follow. When we reflect upon what has happened during the last few years it is obvious that the whole set-up is intended to provide just another mouth-piece for the controllers of financial policy, and exists to facilitate the imposition of the plans of the trading banks irrespective of their effects upon the community in general or upon commerce in particular.

From the time I commenced to investigate the working of the financial system I have noticed that bankers and "presidents" have consistently opposed "spending" except when limited spending fitted in with the policy of the trading banks. That "excessive" spending is now necessary for war purposes, and the people in general are realising for the first time that money, after all, is not very difficult to produce, is becoming an occasion for apprehension on the part of those who hitherto have wielded power over us through acceptance, of the superstition that the stuff was something sacred and scarce. Hence the anxiety to spread the canard that curtailment of spending power is essential for the war effort.

This brings to mind a letter which I sent to the Chamber in 1935, and readers may be interested in its contents. This letter was sent at a time when the Chamber was calling out for "economy" and a reduction of

taxation! Even though thousands of men were unemployed, governments were spending too much! Here is the text of the letter:

"Reference to official publications will show that when government expenditure WAS reduced between 1929 and 1931, bankruptcies increased by more than 100 per cent., suicides increased from 700 to 900, unemployment increased from 8 per cent. to 30 per cent., marriages declined from 7.5 per thousand to 5.9 per thousand, and poverty, misery and destitution spread in all directions. When government expenditure was resumed, it had the immediate effect of improving all these things. I, therefore, respectfully submit to you that unless additional money is being circulated in the community from government sources it is not possible for industry to survive, because otherwise there is no fund from which interest and profit can be drawn. In these circumstances may I suggest for your earnest consideration that instead of agitating for a reduction of government expenditure you should be demanding a change of method by which governments OBTAIN money to spend."

The letter was not acknowledged. Up to the outbreak of war the total revenue obtained from Income Tax, Land Tax, Estate Duties, Sales Tax, Unemployment Tax, Motor Car Tax, and Entertainment Tax was not sufficient to cover interest alone! How will it be after the war? The simple truth is that governments MUST "spend" or otherwise distribute huge sums after the war, and what we have to do is to see that the Federal Parliament requires that money to be provided by the Commonwealth Bank without interest.

Any organisations or groups of people working against that objective should be regarded as enemies of society. It is high time the Chamber of Commerce became a Chamber of Commerce instead of a stooge for those who have exercised a private monopoly of the public credit.

—Yours faithfully, BRUCE H. BROWN,
189 Hotham-street, East Melbourne, C.2,
June 6, 1943.

THE HISTORY YOU DID NOT LEARN AT SCHOOL

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

During this period there was growing up an increasing trade between England and India. But this trade was a peculiar one: The Indians had no great desire for European goods, but they loved gold and silver; so the trade between England and India at that time was one of goods against gold and silver. Davenant, the well-known economic writer of those times, estimated that, at the end of the seventeenth century, over £100,000,000 in gold and silver had been "carried away and sunk in the East Indies."

Like our gold fanatics of to-day, Davenant believed this to be a great loss to England. He said that Europe would "be richer by full one-third if that trade had never been discovered." But, from a realistic point of view, the Indian trade was one of pure gain to England. England was obtaining real wealth for useless metal, and using an increasing amount of paper money instead of metal money. King Charles II. apparently had a clear appreciation of this fact, and removed all restrictions on the export of gold and silver, and generally encouraged the East India Company by all the means in his power.

Let us now look at the manner in which Charles issued his paper money. He couldn't issue notes like the Treasury notes that are used to-day. Public opinion would have been against such a move.

Being in debt, he did as his predecessors had also done: he issued his creditors with notched pieces of wood, which the creditors re-presented when the taxes came in, and in return for which they received the cash due to them. But Charles evolved the plan of making his notched pieces of wood negotiable. Later, he paid his debts in negotiable paper orders instead. These orders were to be used as money. When a given date arrived, whoever found himself in possession of one of the paper orders

could bring it to the Treasury and obtain cash. Of course, Charles (like modern Governments) was merely postponing final settlement of his debts. He was giving I.O.U.s. The holder of an I.O.U. would believe that, at a future date, he could obtain cash for his paper. He had a feeling of security. Charles found that he was never likely, upon any given date, to be asked to pay out all his liabilities in cash. He tried to do exactly what the bankers are doing to-day, except that he did not seek to LEND extra purchasing-power into circulation. They are lending privately manufactured money—bank credit—against a small reserve of cash, knowing that it is unlikely that, at any given date, every depositor will want his money in cash. Charles would have, no doubt, eventually issued his paper orders frankly as paper money, giving the impression that, upon a demand which would rarely eventuate, he would convert all paper money into gold. It is ironical, as Dr. Shaw, the great authority on this subject, points out, the private banking system did this during the next century, thus usurping the prerogative of the Monarchy. But the "historians" term that "progress."

Had Charles's experiment of issuing new money, WITHOUT NEW DEBT, against increasing productivity, succeeded, Britain may have never surrendered to the debt system, under which private individuals lend us new money as a perpetual interest-bearing debt World history would have been different if Charles had been successful in showing that the King (or other

constitutional authority responsible to the people) should issue the nation's money supply against increasing productivity.

But Charles failed. Why? The goldsmiths—the early bankers—already had Charles deeply in their debt. By devious methods they contrived to discredit Charles's paper orders. In the middle of the Dutch War, 1672, Charles found his creditors reluctant to accept his paper orders. Charles rightly said that, as the goldsmiths' propaganda was the cause of this reluctance, and as the war had to go on, he would postpone his past debts to the goldsmiths for twelve months, and taxes would be devoted entirely to the war effort. I wish that "our" Government would do this to-day! Charles was willing to meet all paper orders in possession of contractors, etc. Then the "tragedy" occurred! The news of the King's stoppage of payments to the goldsmiths made many people wonder if the goldsmiths had cash to meet their promises. The people demanded their cash, but, as

the early bankers, like the bankers of today, were lending ten times what they possessed in cash, there was general panic. The goldsmiths had to suspend payment. (Back in 1667 there had been talk about a "run on the banks," but Charles had come to their rescue by pledging that he would punctually pay their loans in cash.) A large number of poor people suffered in 1672, but the country's general prosperity was not unpaired. By 1674 a great trade expansion started, and continued for the rest of Charles's reign. But Charles was blamed for the episode of 1672. And he had many enemies masquerading as friends. One of these was the infamous Earl of Shaftesbury, who, when a member of Charles's Cabinet in 1672, had seen the paper-money scheme tried. He later proved a useful tool in the hands of the rapidly-growing Money Power, which, through its influence in Parliament, was able to prevent Charles making any further experiments in finance. (To be continued.)

THE "LAND FOR THE (Chosen) PEOPLE" RACKET

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

The subject of industrial sabotage—the destruction of valuable material, goods, and products—has received much attention during the past twenty-five years, and its place in current political economy is both well known and reasonably well understood by students of that alleged science. But there are certain curious aspects of generalised sabotage which have an important bearing on the land question, and I am doubtful whether their nature is at all widely recognised. I refer to the mass slaughter of animals, not for food, but in accord with some prevalent, and quite probably evanescent, theory.

To illustrate the peculiar characteristics of this organised life-sabotage, which runs parallel to the human sabotage of mechanised war, it is instructive to take, out of many, three instances which I have chosen consciously as presenting at first sight a good case for the saboteurs, if we accept the present civilisation as a basis of policy. These are: (1) Rabbit extermination; (2) Red (Highland) Deer destruction; (3) The slaughter of immense numbers of valuable cattle on the appearance of a small number of cases of foot-and-mouth disease.

I can imagine many people whose knowledge of the country is either theoretical, or wholly financial, observing at once that anyone who will defend the wild rabbit must be merely perverse. Perhaps; there are odd features about this wild rabbit business, however. The first of these is that, like the red deer, the rabbit is indigenous to these islands. Until the Ground Game Act of 1880, which is popularly supposed to have caused the death by apoplexy of a large number of sporting squires, I do not think that the rabbit figured in history or legislation other than as game to be reserved for the landowner. The point I have in mind is that, although far fewer persons had the right to destroy rabbits and the penalties for the destruction of them by unauthorised persons were incredibly severe and barbaric (suggesting that they were highly valued), there is no record, so far as I am aware, that they were a special nuisance, or that they increased unduly—rather a remarkable fact in view of the prolific breeding rate of the rabbit.

"But, my dear fellow," observes Mr. Pink-Geranium, O.B.E. (ne Rosenblum), of Whitehall, "what has all that got to do with it? Don't you know that rabbits are destructive to crops? I have here a report (sponsored by a really international, my dear fellow, chemical combine, which makes cyanide for exterminating rabbits and human beings) which puts the matter beyond doubt." To this the obvious reply is that all the rabbits in Christendom have not destroyed as much food in a century as Mr. Pink-Geranium and his London-School-of-Economics policies have destroyed in the last ten years, and that if these policies are to prevail, why not let the rabbits save the trouble of sowing, reaping, storing, and then burning the millions of bushels of wheat Mr. Pink-Geranium won't let anyone buy? To pretend that the rabbit eats only crops, and has no contra-account, is typical.

There is, of course, the alternative of cyaniding Mr. Pink-Geranium.

The red-deer racket is even more confusing. Most of the propaganda in connection with it seems to be emitted by the London Scottish domiciled in the wild fastnesses of St. John's Wood. For some time the public, which mostly believes that a deer forest is an impenetrable thicket of valuable hardwoods, was sprayed with complaints as to the number of sheep which weren't grazed in Scotland because of the deer whose only excuse was to provide blood-sports for the effete rich. (The complaint of owners of deer forests for many years has been that they have to employ paid hunters, because so many people who like stalking, dislike shooting.) Not one, but several, landowners offered to give large tracts of deer-land to nominees of the agitators, on the single condition that they would pay the taxes, and farm the land. Not a single acceptance was obtained. Then, at the expense of the general public, not of the agitators, several thousand sheep were placed by "Public Bodies" on deer forests expropriated by taxation. Most of the sheep died—at public expense. It has been demonstrated that, at high levels, even if it is only a question of weight of animal food grown, deer are more productive than sheep.

But the subject becomes more involved the further you look into it. Not only is the human population of Scotland decreasing (by nearly one per cent. in the last census decade), but it is becoming overwhelmingly an urban population, nearly a quarter of it being comprised in one city—Glasgow.

As an obvious consequence (even if no other factors were involved, which is far from being the case) there are fewer families to work even existing workable land. What is the argument, then? Are the deer on the high----- driving the population into the towns and even out of the country? Is there any evidence whatever (more especially since the spectacular failure of forced evacuation) that even if given free land, any considerable proportion of the urban population would, or could, work the high tops? If so, I have not heard of it. Can it be that the red deer is the very symbol of freedom, and so, hateful to Mr. Pink-Geranium? Perhaps I may disclaim, at this juncture, any intention or desire to pose as an agricultural expert in the sense that, I have no doubt, Lord Lymington or Lord Northbourne are agricultural experts. But I am very doubtful whether the politics of land has any connection with that kind of "expertise," or I should leave it with them.

So long as it is clear to anyone of ordinary common sense that the outstanding intention of the present time is not scientifically organised production, but scientifically organised destruction, nothing will convince me that much real unavoidable scarcity exists, or that any improvement of either productive process or organisation is the primary necessity.

You do not cure sabotage by more sabotage, and better technique in the employment of bad intention simply involves bigger and better sabotage. Our problem is better effective intention.

I do not believe that Mr. Pink-Geranium, O.B.E., his clan, and his Fabian friends, really care two debased kopecks about the land, but it is something with which to confuse the issues. If they did care, they would have had a land of their own, long ago. But they recognise that land, the money system, and the police are the raw-material of control, and control they are determined to have. They also recognise that a majority is always ruled by a minority, and it is therefore essential that the legal title to these things shall be taken from a minority and vested in a majority—the "Public."

The heavy-handed, crude, mass methods of a Government Department are wholly unsuited to land administration. But they can, and do, sabotage humanised management. (All rights reserved.)

(To be continued.)

Planners' Meeting

A public meeting has been convened by the Melbourne University Commerce Graduates' Association, at which Professor Copland is billed to tell "what the authorities are aiming at"—and to answer questions. Business men may obtain admission tickets from Mr. H. S. Simpson, Bank of Australasia Building, 396 Collins St., Melbourne. Early application is advisable. It is interesting to note that "in order to enable a franker interchange of views, part of the meeting will be held in camera"; but it is not clear whether or not the entry tickets admit the holder to the "camera" part of the programme. It should be interesting to learn what the authorities are aiming at. Professor Copland will lead the discussion. It will be helpful if somebody with a knowledge of real economics is there to lead him. The meeting will be held in the small hall at the Melbourne Town Hall, next Monday, June 14.

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.1. 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.

U.E.A. STATE ELECTION GUIDE

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

In order to ascertain the attitude of political candidates towards their electors, the following, covering letter and "Pledge and Undertaking" form were sent to all candidates for the State elections:

COVERING LETTER: "Dear Sir,—The purpose of the U.E.A. is to provide electors with the opportunity of conveying to Parliament, through their Parliamentary representatives, that which they want Parliament to bring into effect. The Electors' wishes will be made manifest by the signatures to Letter Forms. My executive wishes to know if you are prepared to re-present the WILL of the majority of your constituents if conveyed to you in the above manner. We would be glad to receive the accompanying drafted letter, bearing your signature of acquiescence. If not received within ten days, it will be understood that you are not prepared to represent the wishes of the people as set out in the said Letter Forms."

Pledge and Undertaking Form sent for signature: "The Secretary, United Electors of Australia: Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the..... and wish to inform you that 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. (Signed)....."

Candidates' Reactions: Some candidates did not reply. Some signed with reservations which invalidated the "Undertaking," and such signatures are regarded as unsatisfactory and classified as not signed. Space does not permit publishing evasive replies or degrees of partial acceptance, but hereunder are the names of candidates who have unconditionally accepted the "Pledge and Undertaking" form; the names being preceded by the names of the electorates in black type, arranged alphabetically:—

Ballarat: Rowe, E. J. Benambra; Andrews, F. J. Brighton; Warren, J. H. Clifton Hill; Matthews, A. J. Collingwood; King, W.; Tunnecliffe, T. Caulfield; Hughes, A. A. Coburg; Rasmussen, H. G.; McDonald, D. Castlemaine and Kyneton; Hodson, W. D. **Dandenong:** Roberts, Mrs. G. M.; Field, F. Essendon; Dodds, A. A. Footscray; Thorne, R. H.; Hansen, A. M.; Lowe, A. E. Grant; Ladd, H. H. **Gippsland West:** Goulding, B. J. Hawthorn; Hollins, L. H. **Melbourne:** Sommerville, J. Nuna-wading; Gray, R. J. Oakleigh; Reid, S. H. Ouyen; Johnston, R. B.; Stawell and Ararat; Morton, E. **St. Kilda:** Bennett, Miss M.; Pace, Miss E. A. Toorak; Kennett C. E. Williamstown; Paine, C. A. Warrnambool; McDonald, J. A. Waranga; Finnigan, P. Waihalla; Whiteacre, J.; White, D. T.; Kaepfel, D. A.

THE PARTY SYSTEM IS BREAKING UP

What Will Replace It?

By ERIC D. BUTLER

The time is opportune for a review of the political situation in Australia. Never before have we had the confusion of thought, and the feeling of uncertainty about the future that we have at present. It is a tribute to the character of the Australian people that they have the will to wage a hard war, believing that somehow, someday, they will be able to clean up the internal confusion and get back to some semblance of sanity. There is little doubt that the present situation in this country is the result of the causes which this journal has been warning the Australian people about for years past. One thing emerges clearly from the present confused position: the party position is breaking up in Australia. Let us look at the following points:

(1) The Australian Labor Party is split openly on the Militia issue; some of its better-informed members at Canberra are dissatisfied with Curtin's refusal to get to grips with the financial question; the Communists are rapidly entrenching themselves within the Labor movement, much to the discomfort of many Labor supporters. Lang's expulsion from the N.S.W. Labor Party has resulted in that gentleman conducting a campaign of criticism which, to say the least of it, must be having a damaging effect upon the loyalty of many Labor supporters to Curtin and Evatt. On top of all this, there is a little growing opposition to Labor's attempt to introduce "socialism in our time." Bureaucracy is running mad, and the people's wrath is increasing daily.

(2) The recent formation of a certain group within the U.A.P. gives ample evidence of the fact that, internally, the U.A.P. has been divided for some time. Archie Cameron very truthfully said some time ago that Australia was cursed with a government which wouldn't govern and an Opposition which wouldn't oppose. But the reported aims of the new National Service Group offer no hope. While we could do with a little more criticism of, and opposition to, the introduction of socialism, we don't want anything savouring of Nationalism Socialism. Mr. Menzies once stated that he was a "practical socialist."

While talking about the necessity of preventing the total elimination of the small business man, Mr. Menzies actively supports the very system which automatically produces bigger and bigger monopolies. The inevitable result must ultimately be one big monopoly—the State. Anyone who cannot see that the logical final result of the present system is State Socialism, is ignorant of the world of reality.

Members of the U.A.P. who have not joined the National Service Group are pledged to Mr. Hughes's leadership. I presume that these members are opponents of socialism and collectivism. It seems remarkable that their leader should be the man who, in "The Case for Labor," wrote: "Complete collectivism, when we get that far, will appear the most ordinary, natural and inevitable thing in the world to those who live under it..... Modern socialism is coming now, and it will not fail." But like Mr. Lyons, Mr. Hughes changed. Mr. Hughes was placed in charge of the Nationalist Party after the last war. When this failed, and after the Scullin Government had been discredited, a new party, the U.A.P., with former-Laborite Lyons in charge, was launched. Many citizens are now asking significant questions about Mr. Curtin. It is no secret that the U.A.P. was very worried about Mr. Curtin's possible defeat at the last elections. But I doubt whether the "powers-that-be" could rally sufficient public support for a "new" party under the leadership of either Curtin or Menzies.

(3) The only thing to be said about the Federal Country Party is that it is appar-

ently unable or unwilling to prevent the destruction of the primary producers by both the banks and the crazy policy of the "new bureaucracy." Government control of primary production—i.e., socialism—is the only outcome of the present Government policy. Country Party representatives will have some explaining to do at the coming Federal elections.

But nothing can alter the fact that the major parties are rapidly disintegrating. We have seen a crop of new parties, all of which must help to take votes away from the present parties. The general situation is very similar to that in France from the end of the last war to the capitulation in this war. The situation is fraught with great dangers—but, I do believe, also full of possibilities

"THE NEW TYRANNY"

"Hungary is a particularly good example of the country which produces the Jew who is a good Hungarian to-day, good Englishman to-morrow, good German next week, good Chinese next month, and which in my view still affords the best example to-day where the Jew, by this method of squeeze-out collaboration, rises to heights of influence and affluence far beyond his deserts and his numbers."

"... In 1938, the Jews in Hungary were richer and more powerfully established than ever before. ... On paper, as always, the proportion of the Jews to the population was very small—about 600,000, or 6.5 per cent., of the total, including confessing Jews, baptised Jews, and half-Jews.

"In this matter of the Jews, figures are great prevaricators, for the actual picture that Hungary presented to the human eye was a completely different one. It was a picture of Jewish predominance, in very many walks of life, out of all proportion to their numbers, even assuming that these were much greater than the statistics showed. They were a group with a standard of well-being and power far above any other in the country.

"They owned 46 per cent of all industrial undertakings. They manned 70 per cent, of the boards of all companies representing big business. On the boards of the leading banking-houses their share was between 75 and 80 per cent.; 67.2 per cent, of private brokers and 36 per cent, of banking clerks were Jews. They had even gained possession of 11.7 per cent, of all land in Hungary. ...

"Of the bigger estates, 17.6 per cent, were in Jewish hands; 34.4 per cent, of all doctors were Jews, 49.2 per cent, of all lawyers, 31.6 per cent, of all journalists. In Budapest, the capital, where between a quarter and a third of the entire population is Jewish, the proportion was much higher.

if social creditors accept their responsibilities. They alone possess the knowledge of what must be done. The danger is that the growing unrest resulting in the formation of many new parties will be used to introduce some type of "National" Government, under some "suitable" new "Leader," which will be a virtual dictatorship. There is nothing more certain than the fact that something drastic will happen if the present situation is allowed to continue.

In such a situation as now exists, when people are becoming disillusioned about the party system, social creditors can bring before the people the practical and democratic principle that electors should unite and control their individual representatives; that electors should refuse to be divided on unimportant red-herring matters, but should unite in putting a stop to the present internal confusion and start demanding constructive results. The fact should be driven home clearly and forcefully to all members of Parliament that they must seek to serve the people if they desire to retain their seats in Parliament.

The break-up of the party system will be of no benefit unless complete power is obtained by the electors as a result of the break-up. Social Creditors have the responsibility of showing the people how to use that power. If they don't, nothing is surer than the superseding of the party system by an even worse tyranny. Finance has used every political crisis in this country to strengthen its own position. It is high time that the people had a victory.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

(Continued from page 1.)

WORK WORRIES: The United Nations' food conference at Hot Springs has concluded with one or two interesting recommendations. One urges social legislation to provide "all people with food free or at low prices." Presumably it did not dawn on the conference that adequate food has been available—provided people had the money with which to purchase it. The next recommendation relates to the "work disease," declaring that "each nation shall promote full employment." Presumably it is through work that the "food-money" is to be "found." Well, all intelligent persons know there never was any shortage of non-essential work, but rather a shortage of money to even pay for essential work. The real problem is "how to get more income to the people without charging it into industrial costs"—and the hot air from Hot Springs has not touched this question.

SOCIALIST STOCKINGS: The Dedman Suit, now happily in the dustbin of unworkable ideas, has been supplanted by the Dedman Stocking, which, according to the Melbourne "Sun," practical women and manufacturers describe as "a sheer waste of money, and the product of interference and muddling not excused by labour or material shortages." Manufacturers say that "if not subjected to inept bureaucratic interference, they could, without disorganising the war effort, produce a far more serviceable and attractive article." Women victims of this Socialistic bungling say that the Dedman Stocking is ill-fitting, and on that account wrinkles, and this, in turn, causes excessive wear." If the women get busy with personal letters to their paid political servants and insist that they will not tolerate such nonsense, another of "Dedman's Duds" will quickly be interred with his ill-famed "Suits." —O. B. H.

"PRESSURE POLITICS" AND THE "ARGUS"

(To the Editor.)

Sir.—I see by the paper ("Argus" leader, 2/6/43) that applicants for positions as hired representatives of the free and enlightened electors in Victoria are being pressed for an answer to a very pointed question before their names are placed on the community's payroll. The leading article is headed "Pressure Politics," which the "Argus" writer interprets, variously, as "organised political terrorism," "blackmail" and a "trick . . . as ancient as it is discreditable." These nasty aspersions are prefaced, and considered to be justified, by a sort of axiomatic supposition that in our electoral system there is ample scope for all electors to choose the Parliamentary representation they desire, in that they are free to vote as they like. This supposition is clearly false, for a rapidly increasing proportion of electors now prefer a representative who undertakes to represent his electors and unless that undertaking be given by at least one candidate in each electorate all electors are not free to vote as they like. Moreover, without such an understanding the electors' freedom of choice is not only restricted by the limited field of "starters" and "owners' colours," but is further confined to the one day on which they are permitted to back their fancies—and that one day's restricted "freedom" is all the "Argus" mentor thinks they should get until the next election day rolls along.

It is encouraging to learn that pressure politics has drawn blood (or bile) already, and still more encouraging to find, alongside the larger patch of blood (or bile) displayed in the "Argus" leading article, the text for to-day, which, as printed, reads: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man OWETH that shall he also reap." (My emphasis.) Does this mean that the bankers are about to transfer our overdrafts from the debit to the credit side? I am afraid the answer is in the negative.

—Yours, etc., F. H. AULT, Melbourne.

Social Science Lectures

There is room for improved attendances at these fortnightly lectures, which are held at the rooms of the United Electors of Australia, McEwan House, Little Collins St., Melbourne. "Leadership and Democracy" is the title of the next discussion on Wednesday next, June 16, at 8 p.m. Keep the date free and come along.

Anti-Conscription Meeting

The Essendon Group of the No Conscription Campaign will hold a public meeting in the Old Manse, St. John's, Mt. Alexander Road, Essendon, on Friday next, June 18, at 8 p.m. Mr. Maurice Blackburn and Mr. J. McKellar will be the speakers.

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.

"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.

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

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