

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 29. No. 11.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

The Social Credit Secretariat

The following was issued from the office of the Secretariat, Liverpool, dated October 18:—

“The meeting of which mention was made in *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* for October 11, 1952, (lines 4-7, column 1, page 2) will take place at 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, at 2 p.m. on Saturday, November 1, 1952, and I have pleasure in inviting you to attend.

“Invitations have been sent to the following:—

Directors of the Secretariat	Fellows of the Secretariat
Mrs. Geoffrey Dobbs.	*Mr. L. D. Byrne.
Mr. Hewlett Edwards.	(Mr. Gaudin).
Mr. R. B. Gaudin.	(Mr. Edwards).
Mr. H. R. Purchase.	Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs.
Mr. T. V. Holmes,	*Dr. B. W. Monahan
(Treasurer).	

Others:—

Mr. Pasco Langmaid (honorary accountant), Mr. A. Hamilton McIntyre, Mr. John Mitchell, Mrs. Palmer, Mr. J. Scott-Kyle, Mr. W. J. Sim, Dr. Basil Steele, Mr. Norman F. Webb.

“*To be informed *ad eundem* in the event of non-attendance, and additionally M. Louis Even.

“(Signed) TUDOR JONES.”

A note appended to the letter stressed that the character of the meeting was not “representative” in any current sense, and that the intention in calling it was correctly represented in *The Social Crediter* for October 11.

The meeting was held as called at 49, Prince Alfred Road, the following attending:—Dr. and Mrs. Geoffrey Dobbs, Mr. Hewlett Edwards, Mr. R. B. Gaudin, Mr. T. V. Holmes, Mr. Pasco Langmaid, Mr. A. Hamilton McIntyre, Mrs. Palmer, Mr. W. J. Sim, Dr. Basil Steele and Mr. Norman Webb.

A Statement, read by Dr. Tudor Jones and a brief account of later proceedings follows:—

Meeting

LIVERPOOL, November 1, 1952.

Statement

Dr. Tudor Jones said:—

Ladies and Gentlemen,

First I must thank you for your attendance here to-day. Some of you, I know, have come at considerable inconvenience. It was out of the question at the present time for me to address a meeting anywhere else but in Liverpool. For some of you a journey to Edinburgh or London would have

been much farther. Although all of you have been associated with the Social Credit Secretariat for many years, some of you have met today for the first time, although you are all well-known to each other by name and reputation. I think it is a good thing that you should know more of each other than that, and I wish it were possible for a close personal acquaintance between Social Crediters of this and other countries to be much more widely distributed, since there is no more powerful corrective to false estimation concerning the value of individual opinion than that of seeing and knowing the man or woman who holds it in the flesh.

In order that Byrne and Monahan, who are not here, may be exactly informed concerning what takes place to-day, I have, as you see, prepared this brief statement in a form which can be distributed, and, since this has been done, it will be printed so that all may share their knowledge equally.

A summary—if necessary an agreed summary—of later stages of the meeting will be prepared, and circulated similarly.

No records or documents pertaining to the *political* interests of the Secretariat were destroyed by the bombing which destroyed the Liverpool office during the War, and in looking back over the collection to refresh my memory of one or two facts, the one thing which stood out was the perfect consistency and continuity of the record. We have had our backs to the wall all the time. We have not been deflected from our course an inch; and the “vicissitudes” are all outside.

A first draft of this Statement included a short history of the Secretariat since its foundation by Douglas in 1933. This has been discarded, not because all the chief facts are fresh in your memories. I don't suppose they are. We have other things to do than review memories however pleasant, or unpleasant, and, for my part, after daily direct contact with the Secretariat since its formation, I must confess that I had forgotten a good deal. The peculiar and consistent reputation of the Secretariat is a fact which does not need a good memory to recall, and this characteristic of unchangeableness, of invincibility, of edge, like fine steel is remarkable. It has, of course, earned for the Secretariat a large measure of negative praise, enshrined in a collectivity of epithets—aloof, astringent, inflexible, uncompromising, austere, and so on, not all of which are wholly uncomplimentary, and some of which it joyfully shares with its founder. The integrity of the Secretariat, in the literal and best sense of the word, its high degree of integration, has been the despair of many, and, because they perceived its source, some at least have based their predictions concerning the future of Social Credit upon it, saying without qualification that the strong impulses of dis-integration ever present within what is called the Social Credit ‘movement’ would soon destroy it, once the majestic authority of Douglas himself was removed. I am resolved

that any account of these resurgent impulses is as unnecessary in this Statement as the historical details already discarded.

What, I think, should not be pushed into the background of our conscious thoughts at the present moment is the fact that among ourselves the notion of a permanent centrally-placed (not geographically centrally-placed, but effectively and morally centrally-placed) institution in relation to Social Credit has been strenuously and continuously resisted—for example by all those who have stood aside from participation in its activities, but also by many who have participated wholeheartedly while they regarded it as a temporary expedient, soon to disappear in a flood of general awakening, both uncontrollable and righteously impatient of control. Some of course, accepted it as part of the price they willingly paid for their reliance upon the judgment of Douglas. He related them to it; their judgment did not relate them to it. I have here used the word 'control.' This is, of course entirely the wrong word. 'Conservation' comes much nearer to the idea underlying the motive of a Secretariat.

A remarkable letter has been placed confidentially in my hand this week, the text of which puts this matter on a high level (which is incidentally the right level for the discussion of all matters of this kind, and the level the Secretariat prefers, not because it is 'high' but because it is right).

"Lately," says the writer, "I have fallen under the spell of the 'Cloud of Unknowing.' I was getting more and more dissatisfied with all my exterior activities, and felt the need of getting back to the Centre. My life is too much of the 'active' type for me ever to be a real contemplative, but one needs the Power House badly, and this 14th Century mystic opens a door for me. You have lost a leader, perhaps a personal friend in Douglas . . . Remember what Gamaliel said: 'If this is of God, it will come to something' . . . My prediction is that . . . things will begin to happen after his death. I don't think *The Social Crediter* (which someone, perhaps yourself, kindly sends me, and which I read through) or indeed any writing or speaking will move these 'evil men' who, I accept, are banded to destroy Christian civilisation and set up their nightmare State in its place. The issues are too spiritual. What I look for is that your leader will now at last be able to do something effective. Is this mystical nonsense? I do not think so. Did any man do anything in his lifetime?"

It is unnecessary to annotate this text in such a meeting as this.

Well, what's the answer? I don't want you to tell me the answer: What I am saying is that you may find you have to answer. I haven't.

I want to explain that.

You will have noticed that Mrs. Douglas's letter to us—the readers of *The Social Crediter* and myself—published to-day (November 1) contains a reference to me. Briefly, what I know of this matter is a note from Douglas dated September 3 saying: "If you will send me the form of words L.D.B. wants me to sign, I will consider it." I reported these words to Byrne, who wrote to Douglas either on September 19 or shortly before that date. In the Secretariat we had consistently set our faces against the accrediting of individuals by any form of words, as being morally an impossibility.

My very intimate association with Major Douglas began with an *order* (which I obeyed). It was followed not long afterwards by another order: "Sit here, and stay here." In course of time, my orders became a continuing order, conveyed in a more leisurely and elastic medium. The obedience was, of course, a voluntary obedience. At any time before September 29, I might have resigned my responsibility; but not afterwards. Not only am I not free any longer to resign the commission entrusted to me, but there is no one in this world to whom I could resign it if I would. However, there is one further point.

The last communication I received from Douglas written in his own hand (*i.e.*, not typed) was a pencilled note at the foot of a short memorandum asking him to comment on the corrected proof of the leaflet, "Social Credit in 1952." The words written by Douglas are those in heavy type, immediately added at the most suitable point of the article I could find: "'Politics is the art of the possible.' *Something* is demonstrably possible under the name of Social Credit. What is it, and is it Social Credit? Alternatively, what is not possible is not interesting."

Am I to extend the application to cover my own case and say that this defines the point at which I too may contract out? That may be a matter for decision at some future time, but, even so, it will be a matter for my decision, and the responsibility for it will also be mine.

There is, of course, a profound truth underlying a part at least of what was written in the letter I have read. It is as disastrous to magnify disproportionately the Second Person of the Trinity as to magnify the First disproportionately. Someone has said the latter is essentially the error of quietism, and, I think, rebellion the outcome of the former.

It is emphatically a part of my commission to continue the Secretariat.

It is said that he who sups with the Devil needs have a long spoon. The Secretariat does not willingly sup with the Devil. The Social Credit 'Movement,' on the contrary, sups with the Devil every day. The Secretariat must be its 'long spoon.' Unless I am greatly mistaken, there are many invitations to supper in preparation, if not indeed in the past. If you can recognise the monogram, you will know what to do—in accordance with individual policy, and philosophy. As Mr. A. L. Gibson says in *The Tablet*, Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy. Of the three excellent letters published before *The Tablet* closed the correspondence arising out of Mr. Paul Derrick's attack on Social Credit in its pages, two were from Mr. Gibson's pen. I will not analyse their construction publicly. The effect is to revive the technical discussion of earlier years. Other things conspire to do the same. Nevertheless, we shall have to consider with great care the galvanisation of conductors which have lain in the ground for a long time disconnected, both from the point of view of the philosophy which led to their inactivity and the sources of their sudden high tension. With God all things are possible (but only with God).

At this point I propose to leave you for a time. Doubtless you will have much to say to one another. Since a strict order will economise in time in that case, I suggest that you have a chairman, and for that purpose I nominate Mr. Hewlett Edwards. The needs of the Secretariat are increased without any alteration in their nature. For a long

time we have been saying that they are two in number: a sufficiency of income (which need not be large—certainly not larger than can easily be borne, without undue sacrifice by Social Crediters) and men. In my opinion, personnel takes precedence over money. Nothing can be done with either men or money alone. With the right men, we can I am sure render the Secretariat both effective and impregnable. (End of Statement.)

Although Dr. Tudor Jones did, in fact, leave the company for a short time later, it seemed to be preferred that he should remain after the conclusion of his Statement to participate in a general conversation which developed on an informal level. It was emphasised that the Social Credit Secretariat was in possession of the main assets of the movement, real, actual and potential; but also that what restraint had existed upon the development of dissident elements through Major Douglas's personal intervention had been removed, and that therefore the opponents of Social Credit, visible or concealed, were provided with a larger field of opportunity to exploit than hitherto. The consolidation of the Secretariat's position was therefore generally accepted as a first necessity and practical suggestions were volunteered for the attainment of this objective. It was agreed that a larger annual income would be required than had recently been collected and the Chairman, while assenting in principle, defined the conditions under which this should be sought. Strong approval was expressed concerning the limited size of the meeting arranged, which greatly facilitated free and clear expression of opinion. The Chairman thanked those present for their help and others who had written.

An open meeting will be arranged to take place in the near future, probably in London.

Dr. B. W. Monahan

We regret that Dr. Monahan has been involved in a motor accident on his way from Canberra to Melbourne, in which he received injuries which we understand are not serious.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 14, 1952.

Licensed Premises in New Towns Bill—Report.

New Clause.—(TIED HOUSES PROHIBITED IN NEW TOWNS.)

(*The debate continued: Mr. Geoffrey Bing is speaking:*)

The hon. and learned Gentleman, who takes a great interest in the licensing question, will remember that in April, 1950, in order to get a better beer, the brewers gave a pledge to Sir Stafford Cripps, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and this is what Sir Stafford said at the time:

“The brewers have given an assurance that the gravities of all beers will be increased by three degrees.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th April, 1950; Vol. 474, c. 71.]

Because of a certain unfamiliarity with the milieu with which

he was dealing, Sir Stafford Cripps may not have put upon the brewer's promise the value that some others of us would have put who know the brewers better.

In fact, the beers have been watered to quite a fantastic degree. Barclay's India pale ale only exceeds by .6 of 1 per cent. of alcohol the strength of beer which was permitted in the United States of America during prohibition. . .

Of these five beers, all of them except Charrington's were below average original gravity, which is 33 degrees. I do not know what the original gravity of bottled pale ale ought to be, but there is one hon. Gentleman here who does know, the senior member of the Brewers' Society Parliamentary Committee, the hon. Member for Wokingham. What does he say it ought to be? The figure that is given in the “Brewers' Almanac” is 55 degrees. That is supposed to be the pre-war strength of beer. I do not know whether that is correct, but perhaps the hon. Member will tell us what the original gravity of beer ought to be. I will give way if he likes. . . .

. . . If he does not know the right figure, may I put one other point to him? May I suggest to him that he and I should go out together and get a bottle of beer made by his own firm from one of his tied houses, seal it up together and send it to an analyst, on whom we can no doubt agree? If we do that, will he agree to have the result published?

This is a serious matter. It is a fraud on the Revenue. This is selling to the public water, and charging them the duty and putting it into their own pockets instead of handing it back to the State. This is what is being done. If the duty were 55 degrees—I do not know whether that is the right figure—it would be £16 1s. a gallon. On the stuff Meux's and Barclay's are selling, they pay only £7 15s. 4d. On the stuff that Taylor Walker's sell, they are paying only £8 8s. 7½d. On the stuff that Charrington's are selling, they are at least paying £10 1s. 9d. Look at it in this way. A Meux's or Barclay's house is making 20 per cent. more profit—23 per cent. to be accurate—on weaker beer, because they do not pay so much duty per barrel.

That is the case which I put up on the proposed new Clause. I want to urge it on the House once again. I suggest that this is a test of the good faith of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Are we to have any word from the right hon. and learned Gentleman, when he replies, to tell us that he will have the receptacles measured in which beer is sold by the people who have been pressing him to pass this Measure? Are the public to get any *quid pro quo*? Are they to know the gravity of the beer which they buy? Is there to be any check?

Would he care, before the Measure goes to another place, for the Government analyst to analyse the beer of the various people who will benefit by the Bill? The House should remember that there are certain small classes of brewer who will benefit by the Bill. Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman care to get the public analyst or the Government chemist to analyse these beers and to let us know which brewers are selling water and charging tax on it and which, like Charrington's, are comparatively honest?

If the Home Secretary is serious about monopolies, does he think that there is any more obvious monopoly than that of the tied house? Is he prepared to take any
(*continued on page 8.*)

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. 29. No. 11.

Saturday, November, 8, 1952.

From Week to Week

If anyone wants you to enrol in a "Forward Movement" ostensibly for "Social Credit," ask him exactly what he was doing for Social Credit between the years 1935 and 1952. Don't let him wriggle. Pursue your cross-examination until he whispers confidentially in your ear something which suggests that Jewry has much better *organisers* than the Gentiles have, that race is of relatively little importance in comparison with schemes, and that this was really Douglas's opinion all those long arduous years, although he forgot to say so. Then don't.

• • •

When you hear of the *Draft Scheme for Scotland* (re-published in *The Social Crediter* for January 2, 1943) mention *The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket* then being published contemporaneously in the same journal.

• • •

"There is reason to believe that at his death, even more than earlier, Douglas had the most sincere regard for Mr. Manning." The curious may see it in print if they think it worth while. The source is Edmonton, Alberta.

• • •

Correspondence in *The Daily Telegraph* records renewed criticism of the abolition of the right of a doctor to dispose of his practice. Incidentally, the Medical Policy Association has been mentioned more than once. Had this body been supported by the members of the Medical profession in proportion to the interest it aroused among them when the so-called National "Health" legislation was under discussion, the British Medical Association would have been out of business and there would have been no State Health Service. It is possible that patients might have been able to establish just contracts with their doctors, and able to pay them, without paying a large army of bureaucrats in addition, while doctors would have retained not only their freedom but their self-respect. Even more far-reaching consequences are possible. We welcome the Medical Policy Association to such publicity for righteous causes as still exists in England, but do not expect the flood tide will reach us—yet.

80

"Where Justice Weakens"

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,—Commander Geoffrey Bowles has touched a very real matter when he writes of weakening justice and the dire effects which must follow. The statement that "Where Justice weakens, civilisation sinks into barbarism and freedom into slavery" does not overstate the case.

Any active person, especially if he is also a motorist, can offer first hand evidence.

In petty and technical motoring offences it is generally accepted that it is cheaper to write pleading "guilty" and to pay up. One individual case may not seem of great moment but in the matter of justice every case is important and small things grow into big ones.

The importance of the matter will be appreciated if it is realised that patriotism—which should have its roots in a resolution to stand by one's fellow country-men—is closely interwoven with a belief in the integrity of the Institutions of the country to which one belongs.

To quote from the excellent summary of the position of "Social Credit" contained in the Interim Edition of October 25: "In the broadest terms the immediate objective is the destruction of the British Empire in the cultural sense."

If this is true, as we know it is, then it follows that one of the most effective ways of undermining a genuine love of Country is to destroy the belief in the integrity of its institutions in general and of justice in particular.

It may not be deliberate but just one of those things which is allowed to happen. It may well be that the rot started in orthodox economic teaching and just spread.

Your, etc.,

Sutton Coldfield, October 27.

P. R. MASSON.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 8.)

Mr. Bing: The right hon. and learned Gentleman will allow me to make this point: not only did I have that Motion on the Paper, supported by my own name, but I think it was supported by about 140 or 150 of my colleagues, and it was a Motion just to that effect.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: That leaves us with two interesting possibilities; one, that the hon. and learned Gentleman never put in an application to the Board of Trade such as the Act contemplates; or, secondly, that he did put it in and that the right hon. Member for Huyton turned it down for the nonsense it was. I do not mind; the hon. and learned Gentleman can have it either way. . . .

. . . I think the point which has been made is quite an amusing debating point about monopolies but not one which we can take very seriously. The major question is whether there is to be the opportunity of freedom of choice—and there has been no evidence brought forward to suggest that there will not be competition of public houses between different brewers—or whether we are to be limited to the beer of State breweries. That is the real question of monopoly. Apart from that, they are debating points, which disappear on touch. For these reasons I ask the House to reject this new Clause.

Question put, "That the Clause be read a Second time."
 The House divided: Ayes, 249; Noes, 268.

Disraeli and Neo-Toryism

by H. SWABEY

I was asked recently, in Washington, D.C., how much the British Empire had been sold for. The reference was to the deal between Disraeli and Rothschild, when the financier made a loan in connection with the Suez Canal. Accordingly, I referred to Monypenny and Buckle's *Life of Disraeli*, in the Preface to which Monypenny acknowledges that his "first duty is a grateful recognition of the unflinching kindness and confidence which Lord Rothschild and the other trustees have bestowed upon me since I began my . . . enterprise."

We learn that Israeli migrated from Italy to England "when Mr. Pelham, who was very favourable to the Jews, was Prime Minister" (from 1743), but that there was a reaction against Pelham's "patronage" which brought "the unexpected consequence of Mr. Pelham's favourable disposition to his [Israeli's] countymen in the disgraceful repeal of the Jew Bill which occurred a very few years after his arrival in this country." (Disraeli's *Memoir* of his father.) Blackstone took a dissimilar view of this repeal.

Israeli soon became D'Israeli, then Disraeli; his son Isaac begat Benjamin in 1804, on the 19th of Tebet, 5565; but Isaac was fined £40 by the synagogue for refusing to become a warden. He prudently waited until his father's death before having his name erased from the list of members, and in the next year, 1817, had Benjamin baptised: without which, "that strange political career . . . might well have been impossible." (Monypenny.) Jewish converts to Christianity appear to belong to two sorts: one kind are repudiated by their kith and kin, while the others of the *nuevos christianos* type retain their intimacies. Disraeli was not repudiated. He implied that his ancestors fled from Spain, or Portugal, before Torquemada.

When he was twenty, Disraeli lost heavily on speculations in Spanish American shares, incurring a debt of several thousand pounds, "not finally liquidated till nearly thirty years later . . . the beginning of financial embarrassments by which he was tormented through a great portion of his career." He was also employed by a financier, Powles, to avert the suspicion of parliament, and presumably of the public, from the speculative frenzy, and wrote two or three pamphlets commending the work of these mines. The two financiers then joined John Murray, the publisher, in the scheme of a daily paper; but *The Representative* did not long survive the financial panic at the end of 1825. It also failed.

Monypenny does not disguise the peculiar features of Disraeli, who showed the precocity of his race, and whose tour in the East (1830-1) enhanced "that Oriental tendency in his nature," which directed "the bold stroke of policy which laid the foundations of English ascendancy in Egypt, the Act which gave explicit form to the conception of an Indian Empire with the Sovereign of Great Britain at its head, and . . . the settlement imposed on Europe at the Berlin Congress." He had a "dæmonic ambition." Disraeli represents the journey as a triumphal progress, but one officers' mess referred to him as 'a bumptious Jew boy.' He retorted that 'these fellows are boys until they are majors.' He probably thought at Jerusalem that "the true aim of political

ambition . . . should be to win back the Holy Land for the chosen people . . . These early visions had a soil of genuine racial sentiment . . . He read his Bible . . . as a record of exclusive interest to the race to which he belonged."

He lost three elections as a Radical candidate, who intended to regenerate the People and Empire through Election by Ballot and Triennial Parliaments. "The fixed character of our English society, the consequence of our aristocratic institutions, renders a career difficult," he noted in his Diary. Monypenny remarks that the conflict between Asia and Europe "and all that they symbolise," ran through Disraeli's life. He opposed the Whigs consistently, whom he called *anti-national*, and moved over to the Tories or neo-Tories. He was quick enough to see that "a House of Commons, concentrating in itself the whole power of the the State . . . would . . . establish in this country a despotism of the most formidable and dangerous character." (Speech, 1834) He noted that "a faction, and generally a small one" caused revolutions, not the nation. But although he wrote much about the estates of the realm, he was more interested in restoring the balance of *parties*, and stated that the executive office might be obtained "by every subject of the land."

He liked peers, and allied himself with Lyndhurst, the friend of Baring, before the time of Bentinck. He attacked the Poor Law of 1834, because it made "poverty a crime." He was elected in 1837, and Monypenny notes that he was "conspicuous by his Jewish appearance" in Parliament. And as his social life is detailed, we find him frequently in the company of Rothschilds. "The most picturesque group was the Rothschilds. . . Last week we dined en famille with Mrs. Montefiore to meet Anthony Rothschild." He met other members of the tribe in Paris, where Hope and De Rothschild "could buy them all" (the richest Frenchmen). One of them accompanied him to the dinner of Guizot, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Baron Solomon outshone everyone in his sumptuousness. In London, he appeared anxious to "escape the dinner," of Anthony, but was soon at a fête of Mme. de Rothschild mère. Lionel soon rivalled the others, but it is surprising to find John Russell at one of these entertainments, "made to bring Disraeli and the Whig leaders together." In a letter congratulating Lionel on the birth of Leopold, he reports an interview with the French king. Monypenny considers that Sidonia, "an ideal Rothschild . . . is . . . perhaps as near to the deity of Disraeli's religion as we are ever likely to get." Sidonia did not dislike war because he worshipped the "God of Hosts." (*Comingsby*.)

Monypenny disclaims against the "bias" and "tyranny" of the Whig historians, (also against the Crimean War as "the most needless of our foreign adventure,") and shews Disraeli advocating contrary ideas. He was indeed given a hint to keep quiet when he opposed the "centralising tendency" of the Poor Law; he noted the "fallacy . . . that political rights would necessarily insure social happiness," and tried to recall the Tory party to "the principle of opposing everything like centralised government, and favouring in every way the distribution of power." He opposed the Education Board (1839), the germ of present state education, saying, "It was always the state, never society . . . By their system of state education, all would be thrown into the same mint . . . they would find that they had revolutionised the English character." He attempted to form a union between "the Conservative party and the Radical masses,

*Sir Nathaniel. †Lionel's brother.

... the only means by which we can preserve the Empire."

Financial difficulties swelled: in 1841 he owed more than £20,000 and was borrowing at 40 *per cent.* Peel gave him no position in his Government of that year, but in 1842 Disraeli found himself "the leader of a party" (Young England). But it took him three years before he achieved "the great object of my political career" (letter to Palmerston), which appeared to be to the discomfiture of Peel. The suspicion remains that he was playing Land against Industry for the benefit of Finance. Opposition to the Bank Charter Act (1844) is not recorded; Rothschild was one of his trustees.

In 1847, the election of Lionel Rothschild "forced to the front the question of Jewish disabilities, on which Bentinck and Disraeli held views very repugnant to the main body of their supporters." (Buckle is now writing.) Bentinck's speech and vote, "the honourable remnant of his old Whiggism," finished his leadership of the Country Party. Gladstone also supported Russell, "against what he knew to be the wishes of his constituents." Such was the state of representative government in the House of Commons. But the Lords rejected the Jewish Disabilities Bill for over ten years. Even then, the Jews had few friends inside the government "except Disraeli and the Prime Minister's son, Stanley." Baring and Peel had supported the bill, although Rothschild was "like most of the Jews of his day, a Liberal."

The next year Disraeli attacked the new commercial principle which had superceded the Imperial principle: "You may rest assured that, if you convert the senate into a counting-house, it will not be long before the nation degenerates into a factory. . . . These are the *longæ pacis mala.*" The muddled use of senate is notable: the Lord of Hosts was soon to come to the rescue. Peel was defeated, Bentinck died, and while intriguing for the leadership of the Opposition, in the House of Commons, he wrote of the future "struggle . . . between the aristocratic and democratic principles." Dizzy, of course, was to champion the democrats, or rather the country gentlemen so he became, a country gent, and increased his debts to some £40,000. Froude stated (in *The Earl of Beaconsfield*) that Disraeli 'received a large sum from a private hand' for Lord George Bentinck, but there was no trace of this business in the Beaconsfield papers. An elderly lady admirer of his race admittedly helped him, but not for some years.

Disraeli held office as Chancellor of the Exchequer for ten months in 1852, and had abandoned the cause of Protection. It is worth noting that the only terms on which Palmerston might have served with Derby were "vetoed by the Crown. Derby was not permitted by the Queen to offer Palmerston the lead of the House of Commons." The Queen then described the future Chancellor as "Mr. Disraeli (!)" He started a weekly newspaper, *The Press*, in which he made overtures to the Whig members of the Coalition Government. The Coalition vacillated into the Crimean War, which Gladstone insisted should be paid for from taxation to avoid loans. When this government fell (1855), Derby held back, much to Disraeli's annoyance, and Palmerston took the lead.

The last words Bentinck wrote were addressed to Disraeli, and concerned the Dockyard men: "every idle, inefficient, worthless fellow is kept on, for fear of his vote

being turned against the Government Candidate." This might be the first instance of *jobs for the boys.*

At the close of 1856, Derby wrote: "As to Disraeli's unpopularity, I see it and regret it." The intimacy of Mme. de Rothschild compensated the Disraelis during these days, and Disraeli wrote of his Paris mail that, while in France, his letters had to be forwarded to him, "which they were regularly by Rothschild's couriers."

He accused Palmerston of diverting "the attention of the people, from the consideration of their own affairs, to the distraction of foreign politics." And Disraeli announced a creditable policy for the 1857 election of, 'honourable peace, reduced taxation, and social improvement.' He lost the election quite heavily, but was delighted to see that "We shall now have a House of Commons with two parties and with definite opinions . . . All, the conceited individuals, who were what they styled themselves, 'independent,' have been swept away, obliterated, expunged. The state of affairs will be much more wholesome . . ." Disraeli evidently favoured Party thought, which can be just as pernicious as one-party dictation. Rothschild meanwhile was building a palace in Bucks, to furnish which he had for over fifteen years "had agents in every part of Europe, regardless of cost, collecting its contents."

The Indian Mutiny was another diversion, and Disraeli accused the governments of meddling with the native princes, property and religion, "since about 1848, when it was necessary that the revenue of the Government should be increased." He courageously deplored exaggerated reports of atrocities, and the spirit of revenge. Social life, meanwhile proceeded, and it was indeed "rather curious" to dine with Cardinal Wiseman at Lionel Rothschild's house!

Disraeli returned to office (1858-9), long enough this time to pass the Jew Bill, which admitted Rothschild to Parliament, and the India Bill. The colony of British Columbia was established, but money was refused for a trans-Canada railway. Perhaps Disraeli found the East more interesting and returns quicker. The modern Canadian watches his riches financed from U.S.A. But Palmerston and Russell combined to defeat the Reform Bill. It was no longer a question of *what* bills would be passed, but of *who* would pass them. Disraeli remarked: ". . . the question of the balance of power cannot be confined to Europe alone . . . It is for Europe, not for England, that my heart sinks." He was accused of trusting to 'what the Jews of Paris and London tell him' for his foreign information. This was not wholly true, but after the Franco-Austrian fracas, he met "at Rothschild's . . . the French Ambassador and the Austrian Minister." He picked up a pension of £2,000 a year on quitting office; but many Tories distrusted him at that time.

War with Russia over Poland was narrowly averted (1863), and Disraeli described in a letter to a friend the nervousness of the Rothschilds, who had that year loaned Italy thirty millions and Russia fifteen. He wrote in the October: "For the last three months it has been a struggle between the secret societies and the European millionaires. Rothschild hitherto has won." Disraeli refused to meet Garibaldi, and tried to keep England free from continental entanglements. Napoleon III often said that there were "two powers who hated old Europe: Russia and the United States of America."

Derby and Disraeli returned to office in 1866. Although Disraeli was still kept in touch with foreign affairs through the Rothschilds, he was chiefly occupied with Reform. And when the 1867 bill for rating household suffrage for the boroughs was passed (the counties followed in 1884), Derby asked: "Don't you see how we have dished the Whigs?" Coventry Patmore wrote bitterly of "the false English nobles, and their Jew." The Factory Acts and the federation of the North American colonies were also carried; the short sighted Radicals and economists suggested that these colonies should join the United States or "set up for themselves." Derby retired, and in 1868 Disraeli was able to announce, "Yes, I have climbed to the top of the greasy pole." He balanced there long enough to dispose of Chelmsford, the Lord Chancellor on the grounds of his incompetence. We may note, however, that Chelmsford "was among the bitterest and most persistent opponents of the Jewish cause." (Buckle), and Disraeli's comment: "I can't speak to the Lord Chancellor, for I lose my temper with him. . . . he does nothing for the party."

Gladstone, advancing *moral rights* against Disraeli's *principles*, used the Irish Church to dislodge him. Meanwhile, a descendant of William III's finance minister, Montagu "the trimmer," met Baron Lionel, and assumed the responsibility for Disraeli's debts, charging him three per cent instead of the ten he had been paying. Disraeli tried to learn through Lionel what Prussia intended: "The Berlin ministry have consulted another member of the family about ironclads. . . . Charles [Rothschild] is virtually Bismark." Buckle adds a hasty note that there has been no branch of the house of Rothschild in the German Empire since 1901. Charles telegraphed Lionel, "Tell your friend that from the 1st of May, army reduction here has been decided upon." Lionel lost his seat in 1868. A title for Mrs. Disraeli brought some consolation for Disraeli's loss of power after nine months, during which the Queen had usually prevailed in Church appointments over Disraeli's political candidates. (*e.g.* sops for the Low Church).

Disraeli opened the Central Conservative Office in 1872, the year when the Secret Ballot was introduced. Meanwhile, he received information from Lionel about a Bill, on which Gladstone spoke in Parliament two days later: Delane, Editor of *The Times*, had given Rothschild a preview of it. Disraeli became Prime Minister in 1874, but the Public Health Act or the Factory Acts, which reduced industrial slavery for women and children to 56 hours a week, are not relevant here. He wrote, in a letter of 1875: "N. Rothschild, who knows everything, told me yesterday about the coming article in *The Times* . . . by Lowe."

A French syndicate and the Khedive of Egypt roughly divided the Suez shares between them. Disraeli approached the French first, and, as Buckle puts it, "he invited in May (1874) the aid of the prince of financiers, his old friend Baron Lionel de Rothschild; with the result that Rothschild's eldest son,* M.P. for Aylesbury, and afterwards Lord Rothschild, went over to Paris . . ." Nothing came of it. Meanwhile, the Prince of Wales called on the dying Sir Anthony;† and Disraeli met the Leader of the Opposition (Hartington) at Lionel's house. Buckle places a picture of Baron Lionel opposite a letter of Disraeli to the Queen,

dated November 24, 1875, in which he reports the deal with the Khedive: ". . . Four millions sterling! And almost immediately. There was only one firm that could do it—Rothschilds. They behaved admirably; advanced the money at a low rate, and the entire interest of the Khedive is now yours, Madam." Lowe rashly complained of the two and a half *per cent.* commission, when Parliament's approval was asked, and soon found that his political career had ended.

Disraeli was not stupid enough to object to being called an imperialist. Gladstone, however, complained to Argyll of "Dizzy's crypto-Judaism. . . . The Jews of the East bitterly hate the Christians; who have not always used them well." But in spite of Bulgarian Atrocities, social life had to proceed, and the Prime Minister (Beaconsfield from 1876) enjoyed meeting the Prince of Wales and Roseberry at Ferdinand de Rothschild's house.

Turkey, in those days, was the Sick Man of Europe. The whole continent had not yet been reduced. Britain's neutrality in the Russo-Turkish dispute was conditional on respect for British interests: Eden would claim to have improved on this policy by preaching "morality"! At the Congress of Berlin, 1878, Beaconsfield blocked Russia's advance to the Mediterranean, and Bismark declared: "Der alte Jude, das ist der Mann," ("The old Jew, that's the man.") Bismark himself had attention. Disraeli kept various officials and friends including Lionel in touch with the Congress, and wrote to one of them: "The great banker of Berlin is Mr. Bleichröder. He was originally Rothschild's agent, but the Prussian Wars offered him so great opportunities, that he now almost seems to rival his former master. . . . Mr. Bleichröder is Bismarck's intimate, attends him every morning, and, according to his own account, is the only individual who dares to speak the truth to His Highness."

In the Afghan and Zulu wars, Beaconsfield, unlike F. D. Roosevelt, was in no hurry to find scapegoats. He referred to Princess Louise, in private letters, as "V-Queen" or even "Queen" of Canada. But Neo-Toryism found no remedy against the Agricultural Depression which, ironically enough, hit the land in the Peel-smasher's régime. The Queen weighed the characters of her generals—Wolsey for example—more accurately than her Minister. He lost Lionel—"one of my greatest friends and one of the ablest men I ever knew"—before his fall.

This event (1880) deprived him of a London home. But Alfred, Lionel's second son, came to the rescue and "placed at his disposal a suite of independent rooms in his beautiful house" (Buckle). Rothschilds, it seems, always come to the rescue. Here Beaconsfield met Randolph Churchill and the Prince of Wales. Disraeli records, ". . . there is to be a great Sassoon ball. P. of W. goes to Alfred's ball on Wednesday." And Buckle mentions that early in 1881, "The dinner at Alfred de Rothschild's was to meet the Prince of Wales." He records that at the funeral, "associated with Rose was the other executor, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, afterwards Lord Rothschild, Baron Lionel's eldest son."

Buckle indeed, who treated Disraeli most sympathetically, may have the last word: "The fundamental fact about Disraeli was that he was a Jew. He accepted Christianity, but he accepted it as the highest development of Judaism."

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

action, or is his only action in dealing with monopolies to be to impose a monopoly where one did not exist before? Is the Home Secretary serious about the small man? Is he not aware that the tenant who lives on the premises is one of those who have no security of tenure? Is the Home Secretary proposing to do anything about him? Is he serious about the amenities of the new towns, or is he just going to sell them to a brewer who sells bottled beer of an original gravity of 29 points?

My case is that there is a gross inflation of prices and that there is a fraud on the Revenue. Is the right hon. and learned Gentleman proposing to say: "I shall leave all these matters alone"? Is all that he is going to do, at the behest of and cheered on by the brewers, to make universal everywhere a scandal which cries out for remedy?

Mr. Leslie Hale (Oldham, West): I beg to second the Motion.

The Motion was so well moved and the points were so well covered by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Hornchurch (*Mr. Bing*) that there is very little I need add. . . .

. . . I was staggered and surprised by the figures from the analyst's certificate, which my hon. and learned Friend did not give but indicated to the House. I wish he would read those figures, because it is time that they were known.

Mr. Bing: If my hon. Friend really wants the figures of original gravity, which are the figures on which you pay duty, they are: Watney's Pale Ale, 32.1; Meux's London Pale Ale, 29.9; Charrington's Pale Ale, 37.1; Barclay's India Pale Ale, 29.7 and Taylor-Walker's Pale Ale, 31.5.

Mr. Hale: Those figures are practically conclusive evidence not only that nightingales do not sing in Berkley Square but that there is not even a good swallow. . . .

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: The only part of his [*Mr. Bing's*] speech which we have not heard a dozen times before was the part about certain investigations which he had made and the results which had been obtained by analysts. If these matters are accurate, as I understand it from a working recollection of the law they would disclose a criminal offence. The hon. and learned Gentleman comes here with charges of that kind, but when he has had information and when he has disclosed on so many hundreds of occasions his hatred and malice towards the brewers he is surely not going to try to convince us that there have been prosecutions about which he cannot tell us. He comes here with his account, but not a single case which has been brought to decision has he drawn to the attention of the House to justify the charge he has made.

Mr. Bing: The right hon. and learned Gentleman's recollection of the law is wrong. There is no offence in selling a beer of very low gravity; there is no offence whatsoever in selling beer of such low gravity that it does not contain any alcohol. If he cares to read the report of the Inspector of Weights and Measures for Kent he will find that the inspector calls attention to this fact and suggests that it might be made a criminal offence. It is because it is not a criminal offence and should be one that steps should be taken in that direction.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: During the course of his speech the hon. and learned Member said that there were sales of short measure and frauds on the Revenue. If those are not offences, somebody has been watering down the criminal law since I left the bar. The onus is on the hon. and learned Gentleman, as it is on anyone who makes charges, to make out a case. If the hon. and learned Gentleman comes here with accusations about criminal offences without any statistics as to prosecutions that have taken place or have been successful, he really cannot expect to have any more success with me than he had with the Home Secretary of the Government which he supported for six years.

Let me leave these rather vague and insubstantial imaginings and come to the real question, which is that of tied houses in the new towns. We are considering this problem as a matter affecting the new towns. In the case of the new towns, assuming for the moment that there were some basis for this attack—although none has been shown—the new towns are so protected by this Bill that they would be the last places where the suggestion would seem important.

If we consider the procedure in the new towns, the first safeguard rests with the development corporation. They will be, at least at first, the ground landlords of new licensed premises. They will be much concerned to ensure the success from every point of view of their new towns.

Then there will be the committee which will represent the development corporation and the licensing justices. It is difficult to imagine that they will encourage the continuance of abuses such as have been mentioned. . . .

. . . But I would point out, on this question which everyone is trying to approach on its merits, that my hon. Friend the Member for Blackley showed quite clearly two things: first, that even if there were a complete tie for the area and every house to which people could go was under the same tie—and that is almost impossible to imagine—even so there would be exactly the same degree of freedom as is possible under State management; and secondly, as my hon. Friend went on to show in what I thought was a most compelling argument, even if there were only two brewers within reasonable reach of the people, there is then twice the variety which exists under State management—and it goes on in the same proportion as the numbers increase.

The second point which nobody has faced is the practical limits within which one can introduce a number of varieties of draught beer in the houses; and I say that with great respect to hon. Members who, I am sure, have applied their minds to this problem as carefully as they can. My hon. and learned Friend dealt with that point and, as I say, it has been unanswered in our discussions. . . .

. . . But it is also an interesting fact that during the time of the late Government, for a period of about two years, when the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Act was functioning and the right hon. Member for Huyton (*Mr. H. Wilson*) was at the Board of Trade—not insusceptible, I should have thought, to the charms of the hon. and learned Gentleman—not once did the hon. and learned Gentleman suggest to his right hon. Friend that this would be a suitable matter for study by the new machinery.

(Concluded on page 4)