

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 19.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, JULY 8, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

Free Making

Some Thoughts on the Fiction of the Class Struggle.

By Norman F. Webb.

PART I.

Those who have understood and accepted Major Douglas's economic and social philosophy, and have openly identified themselves with it, have naturally done so in the hope of seeing its legislative and financial suggestions put into practice. Unfortunately that has not happened. Nevertheless, even while society in general seems as far as ever from realising the material advantages which Social Credit holds out, we must record that there are immediate and very great benefits to the individual Social Crediter notwithstanding. This, of course, is not peculiar to Social Credit but is the experience of all those who are genuinely interested in the realisation of any particular aspect of Truth. This is a fact of tremendous importance, and we must take care that long familiarity with our beliefs, or too great concern with their organisation does not lead to forgetfulness on our part of its organic effect on ourselves, which, being internal or, as the psychologists put it, subjective, does not make the same intellectual impression even on ourselves, as an infinitely lesser degree of external or objective evidence would. To argue that as long as the effects are there our consciousness of them is not important, is not altogether correct, because experience goes to demonstrate the psychological fact that unacknowledged benefits of every kind are liable to dry up at the source: a truth that lies behind the efficacy of what is called prayer.

One can be reminded usefully of all this by a comparative newcomer to the philosophy, as recently happened in a discussion regarding the difficulties experienced in trying to convey the Social Credit idea to one's fellows, in which the word *freedom* was used to describe one of the most immediate effects made by it upon oneself. To carry this analysis a bit further; this freedom or free-making—of the spirit presumably; in modern language psychological liberation,—acts in two opposite directions within the mind. In one case as a freedom *from* something inhibiting or disabling, something enslaving, and in the other direction *towards* an enlarged ability. To deal first with the negative aspect, the one most likely to be uppermost in the circumstances of the particular discussions which have touched off this train of thought, the fact that the Social Credit analysis demonstrates so clearly the entire wrongness of the universally current explanation of the cause of the economic ills from which society is suffering, frees us from the danger of falling victims to any of the prevailing ideologies, all of which being based on those wrong assumptions are counsels of despair in face of what seem in consequence to be insoluble problems, bringing apathy to the human spirit and embittering our social outlook.

The results to us personally of this liberating know-

ledge are tremendous and not easily realized and expressed. To be supplied with a logical and constructive and impersonal picture of our modern industrial society, in place of the inconsequent and destructive and enflaming explanation that is the peculiar gift of Marxism, amounts to a great deal more than a mere change of political emphasis. It is radical, not only as to the problem and its solution; but even more so as to our outlook, our general concept of Life itself. For the analysis of the Monetary System supplied by the Social Credit textbooks effectively disposes of the economic theories on which the dangerous and socially destructive belief in the inevitability of the class struggle, as it is called, is built up and sustained, since it removes all reason for the supposed cause, which is scarcity. In addition, it refutes the socially disintegrating and baseless accusation that the economic mess that so obviously exists could possibly be the conscious doing of one section of society; what is known as the capitalistic or bourgeois class, who are said to exploit the wage-earners, keeping them deliberately ignorant and misinformed.

Regarded with an unprejudiced eye, it does seem incredible at this late date, and after all that has happened since 1914, that such a childish and palpably false theory should still persist, and be accepted among adult and so-called educated people as a serious philosophic and economic explanation of the situation in which industrialized society finds itself. Even allowing for the wrong-headedness of current educational practice which, whether with intention or not, is obviously calculated to produce mental inconsequence and childish—as distinct from childlike—thinking in the community, it seems hard to believe that such superficial ideas could have remained acceptable for so long—a hundred and two years since the publication of Marx's *Communist Manifesto*,—had not some inconceivably deep-laid and subtle scheme existed for its preservation; some organised and carefully-calculated system of mental “conditioning”, a regime as satanically long-term and patiently comprehensive as that outlined in what are known as *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, that much-repudiated compilation which, whatever may be its real origin, contains proposals for the deliberate demoralisation of the Western educational system that have in the intervening period been almost completely realised.

Whether by occult means or not however, the fact remains that the economic truths which Social Credit expounds have continued to be successfully hidden from the general public up to the present time; and assumptions and explanations of the most outrageous wrongheadedness, to be put over almost without protest on a bemused public. For even a hundred years ago, when Karl Marx was writing at a time when the reciprocating steam-engine was quite highly developed, to propound that insufficient real wealth to meet the whole of society's needs constituted the primary and almost only social problem, indicates either wilful and deliberate misrepresentation on the part of the propounders or

else an extreme degree of blindness, extending to those who accepted the proposition. But for society to be still of that mind today and still convinced that the only lesson to be learned from our modern, gadget-stricken and potentially over-productive civilisation, is that the quantity of real and financial wealth is strictly limited and a subject for bitter political dispute and even open warfare, does almost suggest what must really in some mysterious way have taken place, a general softening of the brain on the part of the individuals composing it. That seems a shocking thing to say, but for anyone who has had the good fortune to be freed from this blindness it is the only adequate description of what has occurred. This represents the cost to civilization of the Marxian victory to date; the almost total loss of collective reason, or ability to think straight as concerns economics and all that flows from that. How has it happened?

The only credible explanation, it would seem, must be based on the principle of the wish being father to the thought. The aim of the Marxist, whatever it may be, obviously demands that individuals must believe in the inevitability of social conflict and division, the fiction of the Class War. For that aim or wish to be realised (to be thought into existence) there must be something to fight over; and since men will not fight for a thing unless it is in short supply, they must be made to believe in the inevitability of scarcity. What other explanation can there be? And if we ask what is this aim of the Marxists that makes such strange and unwelcome demands, the only logical deduction must be that it is centralised control of society, because that is what it all inevitably leads to. So that whether the threat of scarcity is a fact or not; whether individuals, without something essential to physical existence such as food to fight for, will still fight or not, is quite beside the point. The centralization of governmental control must be completed, and for that purpose society must be kept in the belief that conflict, open and/or concealed, between its members—both as individuals and as organised, closely-knit and therefore tyrannous corporations or unions—for possession of this limited supply of material wealth is inevitable, unavoidable, and therefore, as we say, natural.

That, fantastic though it may seem when so analysed, will be found to represent fairly correctly the conditions of the Marxian faith. A synthetic one, as we see, since it is to be realised in spite of facts and therefore demands a long and socially disastrous train of subterfuges and misrepresentation leading up to it. It is, in fact, not a creed, but a plan, with determination in place of faith as its inspiration. But unfortunately all this is hidden from those who are under its influence, *i.e.* are its slaves, and for whom it and all its inevitable consequences represent the fixed destiny or fate of this present society. As its adherents are compelled to see it, there is but one way out of the dilemma arising from the social differences and disagreements between individual and individual, and between the individual and his associations, and that is to acquiesce in the transfer of their irreconcilable claim to the hands of a mutually agreed third party called the State, along with all the sanctions represented by control of the Police and Armed Forces; authorising it, through its executive, the government, to make an equal and arbitrary share-out whatever there may be, on their behalf.

If, in fact, that was the correct and real picture of our economic and political situation at the present time, both

as to the problem and the solution forced upon us by it, it would in itself be quite sufficient to make the more thinking citizen despair of the future of our civilisation, and the less fortunate positively embittered against those who appear to be making a good thing, materially speaking, out of it for themselves, and who refuse to relinquish any of what they have managed to acquire except under compulsion. It should not surprise us if it even went some way in the case of these last to reconcile them to the unwelcome suggestion of the Police State, and as we can see, that actually has taken place over large areas of industry. But, as a matter of fact, that is by no means the most demoralising feature of the situation as explained by the Marxists. More embittering and very much more subtle and far-reaching in its effects is the dark picture it presents of our own and our neighbours human nature, and its depressing unteachability. We are given a view of man that shows him as wilfully non-cooperative, and naturally aggressive and acquisitive, and as determined to succeed individually at any cost, and in spite of the popular and officially inculcated belief that all individual prosperity and achievement is inevitably at the expense of the rest of the community. In consequence we are left with the demoralizing conclusion that every economic man and each one severally, is the natural foe of all his fellows. For that is the only possible conclusion regarding current social behaviour that we can logically arrive at if scarcity, actual or potential, is really the dominant feature and problem of society, in accordance with the Marxist philosophy of the materially limited and finite nature of wealth.

What has been said above is in analysis of the *philosophy* and policy of avowed Marxists. How deeply that philosophy has penetrated society in general one is not prepared to say. That is a question for each individual to ask himself and get an answer from his own inner conscience. But it should be obvious that the Marxist *policy* is the effective policy of the civilised world at the present time, in which all governments acquiesce whether or not their individual members believe it, *i.e.* consciously subscribe to the philosophical outlook which gives rise to it. Marxism, in spite of the fact that it is in Europe that it has been allowed to develop, is undoubtedly and in the widest, as well as the most concentrated and direct sense, an attack upon Western, Christian civilisation and values. If that is so the attitude of Western statesmanship, and of the public in general is, to say the least of it, ambiguous, if not actually disloyal. There is a sense in which it might be truly said that the West had no attitude towards it at all, but remains mentally and spiritually inert and uncomprehending, rather like a sick animal infested with parasites.

In the attitude of Social Credit towards Marxism, on the other hand, there has never been the least hesitancy or doubt. The large and growing number of those who publicly condemn the Marxian philosophy, including churchmen, philosophical writers, politicians, journalists, are only echoing warnings which Social Crediters have been trying to make their fellows listen to for years. But such denunciation goes a very short way and means comparatively little by itself. Where the body of writings that comprise what we term Social Credit differs from all other so-called attacks on Marxism, is in the fact that it comes to grips with it *at all* points; and especially with Socialist policy which, of course, is the effective spearhead of the Marxian philosophy of scarcity. This is what Social Crediters have always squarely faced, and what society in general must eventually face; the

fact that, instead of the centralised government which they are told is made essential and must therefore be created if starvation is to be staved off and a just apportionment or rationing carried out, existing because of scarcity, actual or threatened, it is the scarcity that is being created because of the need of the State, *i.e.* to justify it and its abnormal growth.

It is useless to try and understand what is happening in the political world today, not only in Russia under the name of Communism, but all over the civilised world under the name of Socialism, without facing the above fact and accepting it, for all its absurdity. It represents the working out of its logical conclusion of the "philosophy" of materialism, the idea that material energy is the basis of everything, whatever we mean by everything. To those holding this belief—we who think differently might put it, are enslaved by it,—might is right; to want something, as you might justly say, *badly* enough, constitutes a right to have it if you can. It is a right which is superior to everything else, including the wants of your neighbour, and even facts. If you want centralisation of government sufficiently—that is, consider it sufficiently necessary for your particular purpose; which may, of course, be for what you conceive to be the good of humanity—and scarcity is essential for the achievement of your object, then scarcity must be created if it does not actually exist, even by means of war, if no other way is apparent, as a now-notorious memo issued shortly before the war by P.E.P. the Political and Economic Planning group, suggested.

Surely such a philosophical creed demands something more than mere philosophical criticism and condemnation? When it has developed into a direct political challenge to Western civilisation, we might surely expect Western civilisation to develop a direct and positive defence, not primarily military, but political? Up to the present Social Credit stands quite unsupported in this respect, as far as any deliberate and conscious movement is concerned. It alone has put forward any constructive political and social counter proposals based on flat contradiction of Socialist statements. Social Crediters do not deny that scarcity of real wealth could be artificially created; our generation has touched the fringe of it in two world wars, and a third, with atomic accompaniments, might quite conceivably make it chronic as far as this civilisation was concerned. But Social Crediters deny as energetically as they can that it is either an essential or a *natural* condition of modern, technological society, in just the same way that they flatly deny real efficacy to strong, centralised government as such, so long as a society understands technically how to avoid scarcity, which ours manifestly does.

It can be said, then—from one angle at least—that the whole matter at issue between the Socialist creed and that of Social Credit can be reduced to this concrete question: are scarcity and want and all that goes along with them a natural condition of life on this planet, or are they not? The Marxists say they are; are essential—in the sense that the policy they want so badly demands them and therefore they must be made natural—and so they legislate accordingly, with centralised government as their philosophy and compulsory sharing of scarcity as their policy. Social Crediters believe they are not natural and would legislate accordingly, with freedom as their philosophy and the equitable (not equal) distribution of abundance as their policy.

(To be continued)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 26, 1950.

Schuman Plan

Major Legge-Bourke (Isle of Ely): The hon. Member for Attercliffe (Mr. J. Hynd) said in the course of his remarks that what he wanted was some form of federalism in Europe because he believed that to be based on democratic lines. He said also that there has been a certain amount of party play in the Debate today; I would remind him that perhaps one of the reasons for that is that now the House is fundamentally opposed as a matter of principle so far as foreign affairs, as well as home affairs, are concerned. That used not to be the case, and if the speech which I make today could be devoid of any party feeling at all, I should be only too glad; but if the Labour Party choose to say the sort of thing which they have said in their document *European Unity*, I think that they must be answered. Any document which presents the passage which I am about to read is certainly liable to produce party politics in foreign affairs. The document says:

"In particular, the peoples"—

that is, of all Europe—

"must be able to decide the investment policies of the basic industries. Joint planning means nothing unless the industries in each country are required to fit their investment programmes into a European plan. The Labour Party is convinced that nothing less than public ownership can ensure this fully."

[HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."] I am interested to have the "Hear, hears" from the other side, because they show that there is an attempt at party domination by the Labour Party so far as foreign affairs are concerned. So long as that is so, it is inevitable that we should see party politics in foreign affairs Debates. If the Labour Party take the view that they do, it is a good thing that it should be reflected in the House.

We are today debating the wisdom of whether or not we should set out on a voyage the end of which we cannot possibly see and which as yet is lost in the haze of hazard and speculation. We have however, had some pointers this afternoon and also in the White Paper which the Government have published. In Document 2, for instance—that is, the famous letter of May 9 from the French Government—there appears this sentence:

"The pooling of coal and steel production should immediately provide for the setting up of common foundations for economic development as a first step in the federation of Europe."

The three opening speeches of this Debate have each taken rather a different line so far as federation is concerned. My right hon. Friend the Member for Warwick and Leamington (Mr. Eden) produced what I considered in all humility to be a brilliant indictment of the Government's handling of this matter, but he did not say one way or the other whether he was ultimately in favour of federation. The right hon. and learned Member for Montgomery (Mr. C. Davies) did say so. He supported what the Prime Minister used to say before the war; he said that he was in favour of federation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer did not say whether he was in favour of federation, but it was perfectly obvious that he was sufficiently endorsing the Labour Party's document *European Unity* to give the impression that in the end he was certainly only in favour

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 24. No. 19.

Saturday, July 8, 1950.

From Week to Week

It is with great regret that we hear of the death of Captain Rushworth, M.P. (New Zealand).

Captain Rushworth was born in New Zealand but educated at Rugby, and was, we believe, a contemporary there of Mr. Charles North, M.L.A. (Western Australia), both of them being most effective and influential advocates of Social Credit policy in their respective legislatures.

Captain Rushworth fought with the New Zealand Division (Anzac) in the First World War, receiving severe wounds from which he never wholly recovered. Although in almost constant pain, his unremitting efforts contributed largely to the great success of the visit of Major Douglas to New Zealand in 1933.

Perhaps the most ominous feature of the Korean episode is the re-emergence of the well-known U.S. technique of outraged morality accompanied by just sufficient investment in the struggle ("Too little and too late") to ensure its continuance to the point where interference on a large scale is cheap, fairly safe, and highly lucrative.

As we have previously suggested, this policy was developed on laboratorial scale in the nineteenth century in the South American Republics to an extent which made it available for use in the Grand Plan to take over the British Empire in 1914. There were obvious crudities; but its spectacular success is undeniable. The second phase, the conquest of Europe, is not complete but the strategy is easily discernible; and it would now appear that it contemplates the annexation of Asia more or less contemporaneously. Or has the pace been forced? Is Southern Korea a well-spun minnow? If U.S. *Infantry* become involved, we shall know.

"One may define the Welfare State as extensive expenditure of public funds to provide free or below-cost services and subsidies to selected groups of citizens. The idea is at least as old as Pericles, outstanding Athenian statesman of the Fifth Century B.C. Pericles had been running behind a candidate for public office who possessed more private means. Then, as Plutarch tells the story: 'He turned to the distribution of the public moneys; and in a short time having bought the people over, what with moneys allowed for shows and for service on juries, and what with other forms of pay and largess, he made use of them against the council of Areopagus of which he himself was no member.' . . . And it is not recorded that Pericles ever lost an election after he had hit on the ingenious device of buying

up the people with their own money."—W. H. Chamberlin, in *Human Events*.

Mr. Chamberlin doubtless knows, though he does not say, that the rise of Pericles ushered in the Decline and Fall of Greece.

Many hard things have been said of Lord Beaverbrook and some of them may be justified. But no one could contend either that he is a hypocrite or lacking in a certain stark clarity of vision which accepts the world of affairs as an all-in contest with no holds barred; and in addition is imbued with a genuine belief in the greatness of the British Empire, its pragmatic value to the world at large, and the reality of the conspiracy against it and its constituent peoples.

His newspapers are rendering quite inestimable service in their attack on the so-called Schuman Plan, which Lord Beaverbrook himself quite correctly classes as the third and possibly decisive attack on the remaining liberties of the British. . . .

The hired *claque* of the general press is clearly worried; and a note of uncertainty is plainly audible in the later comment, a note which will not be purified by the debate in the Commons on the Conservative Motion.

It is not too much to say that Mr. Eden, in particular, is dynamiting his Party's prospects by his attitude; his speeches suggest that not merely he has learnt nothing since the days of the fatal Baldwin, but that he supposes that the *Comité des Forges*, the French conspirators, has learnt nothing either; and we find ourselves in the remarkable position of looking to the Trades Unions with the aid of Lord Beaverbrook; to save the remaining assets of these islands both from the Government and the International Finance behind it.

In stigmatising Lord Samuel's Liberties of the Subject Bill as "setting forth a string of spurious remedies to deal with a very real problem," the Lord Chancellor probably indicated in a peculiarly British way his recognition and dislike of the real object of the Bill, which is to protect the Jew from the consequences of his actions. The technique of burying discriminative legislation under a mass of unexceptionable provisions is typically Oriental; and Lord Jowett's dislike of it is in the best tradition of his high office.

We're So Short of Food

Says *The Lancet* for June 24:—

"Biologists, veterinarians, physiologists, and doctors have all contributed to the study of fertility; and for some years now representatives of these disciplines have held an annual conference to exchange views and lighten each other's way. The seventh of these conferences was held on June 16 and 17 in the Zoological Society's house in London, and the mating of so many fertile minds was then blessed with the birth of a new scientific body—the Society for the Study of Fertility. Mr. A. S. Parkes, D.Sc., F.R.S., the first president, remarked, at the annual dinner, that the society had provided itself with a human secretary, an animal secretary, and a treasurer of doubtful status—a pleasantry which was accepted without rancour by Dr. G. L. M. Swyer, Mr. Arthur Walton, Ph.D., and Dr. W. J. Tindall, the officers in question. . . ."

CONINGSBY.

By H. S. SWABEY

Few people would read this book, written in 1844, because of its artistic merit. The school boy affections, of which too much is made altogether, suggest that the purpose of education is to keep students "old boys", or "old girls", and to dip them in a group outlook, instead of developing the adult mind.

But *Coningsby* is the first in Disraeli's political trilogy, which is interspersed with comment that goes a good deal deeper than politics on the Bedchamber Plot level. A. Maurois makes one or two significant remarks on the author: "Disraeli had always felt for Bolingbroke, who at the beginning of the eighteenth century developed a policy based upon the assumption that an opposition was essential between the landed aristocracy of a country and its bankers and men of business. He had attacked the party system and praised the splendour of the 'Patriot King' who should govern as well as reign. . . . This democratic Toryism formed the power of the kings of France against a nobility always in revolt against the throne: it was manifest in the domestic policy of Bonaparte. . . . Disraeli wanted to prove that the Jews are essentially a conservative race, but persecutions have turned them into rebels." In his Preface, Disraeli says, "The Church is a sacred corporation for the promulgation in Europe of certain Asian principles . . . some attempt should be made to do justice to the race which had founded Christianity. . . . The main purpose of *Coningsby* was to vindicate the just claim of the Tory party to be the popular political confederation of the country."

There are several contradictions in Disraeli's treatment, but these are due rather to the inherent contradiction within Judaism—between tribal and ethical—than to lack of intelligence on his part. The jumble is particularly involved when he tries to fuse Judaism and Christianity. But this does not invalidate Disraeli's particular judgments. "If Charles I had hanged all the Catholic priests that Parliament petitioned him to execute, he would never have lost his 'Crown,' he writes; for when the Roman Catholics "were persecuted by puritanical Parliaments, it was the Sovereign and the Church of England that intervened to shield [them] from the dark and relentless bigotry of Calvinism". Yet it was the puritans who admitted Disraeli's forebears into Britain.

He has as little patience with a "Venetian" aristocracy as had Mirabeau: "Distinction is the basis of aristocracy. . . . We owe the English peerage to the spoliation of the Church, the sale of its honours by the elder Stewarts, and the borough-mongering of our own times. . . . a second chamber is a valuable institution for any member with no distinction", and "An unmixed race of first rate organisation is the aristocracy of nature." *Coningsby* himself asks, however, "Is not the revising wisdom of a senate a salutary check?"

He says of Pitt's successors: "This factious league had shuffled themselves into power by clinging to the skirts of a great minister, the last of the Tory statesmen, who, in the emergencies of his latter years, had been forced to relinquish Toryism. His successors inherited all his errors, they exaggerated, caricatured them. . . . The Congress of Vienna remains the eternal monument of their diplomatic knowledge and political sagacity: the creation of two kingdoms already erased from the map of Europe. . . . Now commenced the Condition of England Question. . . . During

25 years, every influence that can develop the energies and resources of a nation had been acting on the British Isles: an illimitable currency, the supreme control obtained by man over mechanical power. The peace came, the people found themselves without guides. Like all weak men, they had recourse to what they called strong measures. . . . Conquerors of the world, in the art of self government they had become children." In 1832 "the House of Commons passed a vote which virtually assured its supremacy, revealed the fallen position of the House of Lords, and seemed to lay for ever the fluttering phantom of regal prerogative."

Disraeli probably wrote these novels in something of a pique for not being preferred to office by Peel in 1841, yet his strictures on "conservatism" were valid enough. Peel's Tamworth Manifesto of 1834 was "an attempt to construct a party without principles. . . . There was shouting about conservative principles, but what will you conserve? The prerogatives of the Crown, provided they are not exercised; the independence of the House of Lords provided it is not asserted; the Ecclesiastical estate, provided it is regulated by a commission of laymen. Conservatism assumes in theory that everything established should be maintained, but adopts in practise that everything established is indefensible: they produce the 'best bargain'.

"The time has gone by for Tory Governments; what the country requires is a sound Conservative Government"

"I understand; Tory men and Whig measures"

This resulted in "A Crown robbed of its prerogatives, a Church controlled by a commission, an Aristocracy that does not lead. . . . the Crown has become a cipher, the Church a sect, the Nobility drones and the People drudges."

Disraeli was in a privileged position to handle the touchy subject of Race, as he could hardly be accused of instigating sadism. The Sidonia family is evidently based on the Rothschilds. "During the disorders of the Peninsular War, [Sidonia] made a large fortune by military contracts. At the peace, prescient of the great financial future of Europe, this Sidonia resolved to emigrate to England. He staked all he was worth on the Waterloo loan, and the event made him one of the greatest capitalists of Europe. Sidonia had foreseen that Europe must require capital to carry on peace. He reaped the due reward of his sagacity. Europe did require money and Sidonia was ready to lend it to Europe. France wanted some; Austria more; Prussia a little; Russia a few millions. He had established a brother, or person in whom he could confide, in most of the principal capitals. He was lord and master of the money-market of the world, and of course virtually lord and master of everything else. Monarchs and ministers of all countries were guided by his suggestions. . . . in the height of his prosperity, he suddenly died." Nathan Meyer, who settled in London, had his brothers distributed in this way: Anselme stayed in Frankfort to supervise the bank his father had founded; Salomon settled at Vienna; Charles at Naples; James at Paris. Disraeli did not mention that England adopted the gold standard in 1816.

Young Sidonia takes up the story: "The minister cannot pay the interest on national debt and has applied to us. Can anything be more absurd than that a nation should apply to an individual to maintain its credit and its existence as an empire? . . . You find the once loyal Hebrew in the same ranks as the leveller and latitudinarian, yet the Jews are essentially Tories. Every generation they must

become more powerful and more dangerous to the society which is hostile to them. . . . The Jewish mind exercises a vast influence over the affairs of Europe. The first Jesuits were Jews. Mysterious Russian diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organised by Jews. The mighty revolution preparing in Germany is entirely under the auspices of Jews": He enumerates various ministers, and adds, "The world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes." In addition to financial and political hegemony, he mentions the philosophers Maimonides and Spinoza, and concludes, "The ear, the voice, the fancy have endowed us with almost the exclusive privilege of MUSIC."

The claim to exercise irresponsible power was not really very creditable, nor was the suggestion that *nuevos Christianos*, or baptized Jews, had a large share in the government of Spain, for this country was notorious for atrocities committed in the search for gold and silver in "New Spain". It has taken our generation, indeed, to exceed these atrocities. Perhaps for this reason Disraeli tried to invest Sidonia with authority, of which power is the opposite or *deus inversus*.

Disraeli fully understood the use of the press. "God made man in his own image, but the public is made by Newspapers, M.P.s, Excise Officers, Poor Law Guardians. . . . An educated nation recoils from the imperfect vicariate of a representative government. Your House of Commons has absorbed all other powers in the State, and will probably fall more rapidly than it rose. Public opinion has a more direct organ. The Printing Press is a political element unknown to classical or feudal times. It absorbs in a great degree the duties of Sovereign, Priest, Parliament; it controls, it educates, it discusses. . . . Opinion is now supreme and Opinion speaks in print. The representation of the Press is far more complete than the representation of Parliament."

It is almost superfluous to add that the wireless and cinema most efficiently supplement press education, that they have a particular hold on the female mind, or that "the somewhat hard and literal character of English life, its masculine vigour and active intelligence" have succumbed to wet rot. Mr. Wyndham Lewis has made a study of this evolution. (The suburb, apparently, is the modern 'feminine' heaven!)

Before Coningsby comes in for his inevitable fortune, he makes this not unworthy remark: "Let me see authority once more honoured, property acknowledging that labour is his twin brother, and that the essence of all tenure is the performance of duty."

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3).

of European co-operation at the price of every nation in Europe being Socialist.

The subsequent interchange of notes which is published in the White Paper has shown very clearly that to the French it was a prerequisite in their minds that any nation coming to the conference should accept the aim of the deliberations; and that aim is stated quite clearly to be the first step in the federation of Europe. Whether or not a common aim is the same thing as an agreement upon principles as to how to achieve that aim is another matter—I will try to deal with that presently—but at least it is clear that agreement as to the aim has been demanded throughout by the French.

Are we agreed in this House that such an aim is desirable? The Government say that they are not prepared to pre-judge the issue, but as to whether an agreement about aims is the same as one about principles, it seems to me that the most significant document in the White Paper is Document 9, which describes the conversation between the Minister of State and the French Ambassador. There His Majesty's Government made quite clear that they are not prejudging the principle, and, in fact, are prepared to enter into discussions with the object of finding a practical method of applying the principle. My own view is that the Government are right in saying that they cannot accept in advance the principle and in implying that to accept the aim is in effect to accept the principle.

My quarrel with the Government is not that they have stood out against committing themselves in principle, but that what they are doing is in effect to accept the aim. In the communiqué of June 3 they have welcomed the French note of May 9, and it is that note which contains the statement of the ultimate aim, the federation of Europe. Today the Amendment in the name of the Government asks us to endorse that welcome to the note of 9th May.

As you may have suspected, Mr. Speaker, I am no federalist, and I will try briefly to tell the House why. The nature of men, as I see it, is occasioned by many factors, not least their race, the geography of their countries and the climate in which they live. There are, I believe, limits to which such factors can be ignored. I do not believe that common interests or even common fears are enough; there must also be common sympathies and common characteristics. Whilst those exist in the United Kingdom and in the United States, they do not exist in Europe. It is, as Disraeli once said, a matter of traditionary influences being allowed to operate. I will read a quotation from the life of Lord George Bentinck, which is the biography Disraeli wrote in which, in discussing this, he said:

"It is very desirable that the people of England should arrive at some conclusions as to the conditions on which the Government of Europe can be carried on. They will, perhaps after due reflection discover that ancient communities like the European must be governed either by traditionary influences or by military force. Those who in the ardour of their renovation imagine that there is a third mode and that our societies can be reconstituted on the great transatlantic model will find that when they have destroyed the transitionary influences there will be peculiar features in their body politic which do not obtain in the social standard which they imitate and these may be described as elements of destruction. . . . In this state of affairs, after a due course of paroxysms, for the sake of maintaining order and securing the rights of industry, the State quits the senate and takes refuge in the camp."

It seems to me that that quotation is singularly apposite to M. Schuman's proposal. I believe that federation in Europe can never work because, although the geography is very often the same, there is not sufficient common ground in sympathy and characteristics to make it work. To hold out hopes of federation I therefore consider to be dishonest at this time, and I feel there is no greater sin in government than falsely raising people's hopes that something can be achieved which is from the very outset impossible or impracticable.

Federation of European nations, even of the six attending the conference, seems to me to be both impracticable and incapable of establishing what is the real aim of federation—a real solidarity against Russian Communism. The surest barrier, I believe, against Russian Communism is a close alliance—and that is quite a different matter from federation

—a close alliance between States organised in ways most suited to their own people. It may be argued that the Brussels Treaty and the North Atlantic Pact are expressions of a more closely-knit coagulation of command than a mere alliance. That may be true, but what goes for strategic defence does not necessarily go for things political, for armed forces are not to be run democratically, however much hon. Members may think they may be.

Let us be in no doubt that the purpose of pooling steel and coal production, although in itself an economic step, is in fact political. It is a means towards federation as far as the French are concerned, and perhaps others, and by setting up an economic high authority we should also be setting up a political high authority. Just as all international authorities tend to be, it will, if it is to do its work, tend to be totalitarian; and if it does not work it will be a waste of time setting it up. In the French note of 9th May, published in the White Paper, we also find the words:

“This production will be offered to the world as a whole without distinction or exception.”

Is that to be welcomed? I say it is to be deplored by a nation such as ours, a great nation standing as it does at the head of a great Empire and Commonwealth, with whom we not only have common loyalty, but also deep and abiding obligations to give them preferences in our trading relations.

So much, then, for my objections to the idea of federation and this high authority. My course so far on the Government Amendment is quite clear. It is to vote against it and to show as clearly as I can that not only do I not welcome the French note of 9th May, but also that I am rigidly opposed to even discussing methods which I deplore.

May I turn to the original Motion? That Motion at least does not express any welcome to the French note. [*Interruption.*] I will not go into it in detail, but it does not express in detail any welcome to the French note; it requests His Majesty's Government to accept M. Schuman's invitation to take part in the talks. The argument for doing this is, I understand from my right hon. Friend the Member for Warwick and Leamington (Mr. Eden) and my hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Mr. Eccles), that as the talks are taking place anyway, we should be there to keep an eye and ear on what France is doing. I do not doubt that my right hon. and hon. Friends are deeply sincere in their desire to see no more war in Europe, or anywhere else, and I would join them in that. I do not doubt that they are anxious to see Britain taking a lead in Europe, which is crying out for leadership, and I do not doubt that there would be calamitous results if France and Western Germany should take the side of Soviet Russia.

I do not doubt that some method will have to be found to ensure an even flow of products from the great industries of Britain and Europe, not only of steel and coal. I think it is an over-simplification to say that if we do not go to this conference the whole thing is over and we will never have any more say in Europe. But, because I have opposed the State taking over British industries, even more I deplore the very idea of establishing, or trying to establish, some new form of international control which could bind Governments and which would work only if all men were perfect—in which case it would be utterly unnecessary. The Motion before us has safeguards. If the Plan is not practicable, we shall

reserve freedom of action. But I submit that no plan which aims at the establishment of a high authority that can bind Governments can, in my view, ever be practical with men as imperfect as they are, save in the cause of setting up an international tyranny and totalitarianism.

I am on record in this House and in my constituency during the Election as having said that the United Nations organisation ought to be wound up. I say it again today. I say it because not one single member of the United Nations has been elected by the nations of the world. Even if they had been, I should still not approve of it. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members may laugh, but I wish to point out the way in which the world is going at the moment. My reasons are that statesmen are elected by their own countries to suit those countries and not to suit the countries whose future they will be deciding at U.N.O. Another objection is that a system in which men are elected by one nation to deliberate on the affairs of another is in itself totalitarian, if it works, and chaotic when it does not work; and as it is not working at the moment we have chaos.

The United Nations organisation, as was the League before it, was set up to restrict the operation of national sovereignty. That in itself may or may not have been desirable at the time it was done. But what has happened? As did Germany in the League, so Russia in U.N.O. has used an organisation set up to limit all national sovereignties in order to increase her own. Let no one imagine that Russia would remain a member for one moment longer than it served her purpose to do so. Let no one fail to see that the purpose of Russia since the Revolution has been to increase her national sovereignty until she becomes the ruler of the world. It is that organisation which the French desire to see sending an accredited representative to the high authority, the supra-national authority.

What, then, must other members of the United Nations do? They have but one safe course, and that is to increase their own national sovereignty as rapidly as possible. I do not believe that Great Britain can ever fully restore hers 100 per cent. What she can and ought to do is to base herself upon the sovereignty of the British Commonwealth and Empire, and restore that to the maximum she can achieve. The rôle of the Conservative Party, I think, is quite clear. Surely it is to make absolutely plain that it will not countenance, still less discuss, any steps which from the outset will restrict the right of Britain to make whatever arrangements she cares to make with other members of the Commonwealth. From the very outset, from the French note of 9th May, this idea of the pooling of steel and coal production is inevitably an interference with that right. Therefore, the rôle of the Conservative Party is to declare here and now that it will play no part in the construction of a body which must be as unconstitutional as it is undemocratic and which must, if it is to achieve the aim visualised, automatically interfere with the British Commonwealth.

Let no one imagine that if, as I hope, we refuse to take any part in these negotiations, we can stand idly by. We should, without delay, negotiate with our Dominions with a view to their taking all the steel and coal we can let them have; but that will not meet their full needs—it will fall short by about 3 million tons. It is for that reason that Britain must keep on close relations with the United States and never forget that she is a European Power as well as an

Imperial Power. That is why the document of the Labour Party on European unity is so wrong. The Socialist Party ostrich is to bury its head in the British Socialist sandpit, until it emerges as completely bereft of industrial plumage as the head of the author of that document is devoid of hair.

We must play a part in Europe, indeed we must play the lead. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members may laugh, but I believe that one is sent to this House to say what one thinks, and that is what I am attempting to do. If Britain is to lead Europe she must be as mighty in her own political strength as possible. She will not lead Europe, or anyone else, by hurrying off to a concert, for which she is already late, there to play a flat second fiddle under the baton of a third-rate Svengali in an overture that ought never to have been written.

I cannot support the Motion of my right hon. Friend and I hope that I have made my reasons clear. Let him not think that I am any less fervent in my belief that the hope of Britain is the return of a Conservative Government. But let him know this, too; it must be a Government that is Conservative abroad as well as at home. It must be a Government that will take no chances about the future of the British Commonwealth. It must be a Government that holds certain things sacrosanct. I hope it will be a Government that will not sap the energies of our own people by attempting the impossible task of bringing about a state of affairs in Europe contrary to all the traditionary influences of the nations that form that continent. As was said in this House a long time ago:

"The world is governed by conciliation, compromise, influence, varied interests, the recognition of the rights of others, coupled with the assertion of our own."

Upon the assertion of the rights of Great Britain, with all her great ability in conciliation and compromise, and with all her varied interests, hangs the peace of the world. Let the Conservative Party speak first, not for a Western Union that few understand and which can never materialise on a basis of federation; let it speak for all those many millions of our people who, though they wish the whole world well, are first proud to call themselves subjects of His Majesty, to whose Crown they give their first loyalty.

(To be continued)

Electricity Planners In Question

The following appeared in *The Times* for June 30:—

"Sir,—The choice before Wales is not, as Mr. Eilian would have us believe, between electricity on the one hand and the beauty of the mountains on the other. It has been carefully stated many times, and it is merely tendentious not to acknowledge that more electricity can be provided for North Wales in a shorter time by a distant coal-fired generating station than by the proposed hydro-electricity scheme. The North Wales national park can remain untouched and Welshmen can have electricity. If Mr. Eilian examined more closely the electrical engineers' reasons for wanting a water generating scheme, he might learn to doubt his own fancy of 'the promise that it holds for a healthier and happier land.'

"Yours faithfully,

GERALD HAYTHORNTHWAITE.

"Endcliffe Vale House, Ranmoor, Sheffield, 10."

To and Fro

The President of the Scottish Housewives' Association writes to the *Dundee Courier* of June 29 as follows:—

"... I should like to know just how largely responsible the B.M.A. is for the present-day chaotic conditions pertaining to the service and to the general practitioner in particular.

"According to the following reply received from the semi-secret organisation known as P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) the responsibility seems to lie with the B.M.A.

"We are indeed seized of the importance of improving the status of general practitioners. About two years ago we did draw up a synopsis for such a study, which we discussed with the B.M.A. We were especially interested at that time in the possible development of group practice.

"The B.M.A. showed great interest in this idea; so great indeed that they eventually decided to do the study themselves. As it is a central part of our policy not to duplicate the efforts of other bodies, provided we are satisfied that the job is being well done, we decided to abandon the idea. At some appropriate time in the future we shall be coming back to the problem of the health services generally, and in the course of this we shall undoubtedly need to have a look at the special problems of the general practitioner."

"May I appeal to the doctors to keep a watching brief?"

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	3/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	13d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage..	7/-
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson	21/-
Odium v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.