

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 18. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 9, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Mr. Creech Jones, the Colonial Secretary, who is responsible for Palestine, is shocked and pained at the cold-blooded kidnapping, imprisonment, torture and murder of British sergeants near Nathania (the town of Nathan). Sobbing in chorus with him is Hagana, the Jewish army which refused to help to find them when they were still alive, and doubtless, Mr. Ben Hecht, who is collecting American money for further cause for sobbing. Mr. Creech Jones is so upset that if it happens many more times he will give someone a good hard slap—well, a slap, anyway. Doubtless this is much safer than recalling the statement of (if our memory serves us) Dr. Chaim Weizman: "The key of Palestine is not in the pocket of the British Government; it is in the hands of the Jews of New York."

The plain fact is that every British Government since 1917 is technically traitorous. What was the precise agreement made by Rufus Isaacs at Washington in 1916-17 is probably only known to a very small number of living men. That complete secrecy as to its main clauses was of the essence of the contract, is certain. Its objective, steadily pursued from long before that date to the present time, is the elimination of the British as an independent political force, and the use of the British armed forces to do the dirty work of Wall Street Jews, who *inter alia*, control the Palestine Corporation which is determined to control the Dead Sea and its fabulous chemical wealth.

Mr. Ernest Bevin must be aware, as every Foreign Secretary since 1921 must have been aware, that his difficulties arise from sources, not merely outside his control, but able to checkmate him at any point—*because of this secret understanding*. If there was a spark of political fire left in this country, its people would have that secret out in full view. But apparently, there isn't.

Not only are our present difficulties artificial, but any Fourth Form boy in a good Public School, if put into possession of the main facts, could arrive at a reasonably correct conclusion in regard to them. If we are to go on allowing Wall Street and Washington to dictate our policy and our actions, then our own efforts are powerless to improve our position. But if we are determined to improve our position, then the primary step to that end is to clean out the agents of the Financier-Socialist plot, who, for the most part, are not in the titular Government. And the next step is to lay bare the steps by which, both in 1916 and again in 1941, we were made to bear the whole weight, both financial and military, while "America" took her time and collected all the pickings, so that in both cases, she could "win the war" with a minimum of loss, then call for restitution. If the two great wars we have fought were really in the ultimate

defence of "America," as we claim that they were, then the allocation of costs should be proportionate. They are grotesquely disproportionate; and anyone not a potential traitor would make the rectification of this position the first item on our agenda.

To say that it cannot be done is simply to support the Whig industrialists and bankers who do not care what happens to this country if they can build more factories and force "the workers" into them.

A consideration of the preceding paragraphs must force any unprejudiced reader back onto the conclusion we have stressed previously—that the core of the problem is centralised sovereignty. No experienced individual is a starry-eyed idealist about human nature—its qualities range from far *infra-animal* to, in the ordinary sense and in the case of limited numbers, *supra-mundane*. And it appears to be beyond dispute that the majority, if not the first, is a long way from the second. Nevertheless, the majority does not consciously and understandingly demand, *e.g.*, war. War is the implementation of policy; if we are going to allow policy in this country, and the manipulation of the majority to implement it, to be monotheistic, it must in the nature of things be the incarnation of a function.

That is to say, there is no escape, in these circumstances, from tool-power politics.

"But the right faith is this, that we worship . . . Trinity in Unity . . . And in this Trinity, none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another.

"He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity."

The Association of Scientific Workers

The Association of Scientific Workers has appealed to the appropriate Minister to shorten the sentence of Dr. Philip Nunn May, who was imprisoned for spying on behalf of the U.S.S.R. The Minister declined to act at the present time, but promised to consider the Association's plea if it was put forward again when Dr. May had served two or three more years of his term of imprisonment.

Advisory

In reply to a question from Mr. Marples to the Minister of Food as to what women's organisations act in an advisory capacity to his Department, Dr. Edith Summerskill said that the Ministry of Food was in close touch with the Women's Group on Public Welfare. This group, she said, represented "some fifty of the more important women's organisations in the country."

—An all-purpose, omnibus utility two-way stretch model for biddable women only, no doubt.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 21, 1947.

East Midland Food Controller (Resignation)

Mr. Driberg asked the Minister of Food if his attention has been called to an anti-Semitic statement made by Brigadier Ford, East Midland Food Controller, to a party of German journalists paying an official visit to his region; and what action he is taking.

Mr. Hobson asked the Minister of Food if his attention has been called to the official statement, made by Brigadier V. T. R. Ford, Regional Food Controller, at Nottingham, to the effect that black-market offences are committed chiefly by Jews; and what disciplinary action he proposes to take.

Mr. Strachey: A full and careful official inquiry has been made into this matter. The report of this inquiry has established that Brigadier Ford made certain statements to a group of German journalists visiting this country, which could be construed as casting reflections on the Jewish race. He has assured those of my officers who conducted the inquiry that this was not his intention, and I accept this assurance. Nevertheless, it is essential that a divisional food officer, who is my chief representative in a region, should not only administer the affairs of his area impartially, but that his impartiality should be evident in everything that he does and says. I regret that the recent incident has shown a failure in this all-important requirement. Notwithstanding the satisfactory services which Brigadier Ford has rendered to the Ministry of Food in the past, I decided that I had to accept the recommendations of the official inquiry. Brigadier Ford has placed his resignation in my hands, and I have accepted it.

Mr. Driberg: While thanking my right hon. Friend for that very satisfactory reply, may I take it that steps will also be taken to remove from the minds of the German journalists concerned any impression they may have received that the heresies of Streicher and Goebbels have any official support in this country?

Mr. Strachey: I should hope that this careful inquiry into the matter, and the action following it, would have that effect.

Mr. Eden: I think the right hon. Gentleman referred to an inquiry which was instituted; are we to suppose that the findings of that inquiry, or part of them, will be made public? That would be desirable in view of the action taken.

Mr. Strachey: No, Sir. I wish to make it clear that the matter was dealt with under proper Civil Service procedure, and the relevant and responsible officers of my Department went into the case most carefully, and reported to me.

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson: While it is obviously desirable that racial feeling should not be introduced into this country—and we are all agreed on that—is not the balance being thrown in the wrong direction? If it is the case that a certain race are concerned with the majority of these offences, is it wrong to say so?

Mr. Strachey: No, Sir. If it could be proved, or any evidence were produced, that offences against food orders were committed by disproportionate numbers of any one particular race, I do not think anyone could object to the

facts being made public, but there is no evidence of that at all.

Mr. Nicholson rose—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Skinnard.

House of Commons: July 22, 1947.

Freedom of Association (I.L.O. Resolution)

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Minister of Labour whether he gave instructions to the British Government delegate at the I.L.O. Conference to vote against the resolution condemning the "closed shop," and whether, in view of the desirability of international co-operation in the suppression of such practices, he will give further instructions to the British delegate before the matter again comes before the conference.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Isaacs): There was no resolution condemning the "closed shop" before the recent International Labour Conference. I presume that the hon. Member is referring to the discussion on that paragraph of the resolution on freedom of association and industrial relations which relates to the validity of freely concluded collective agreements under which membership of a particular trade union is a condition of employment or continued employment. That paragraph forms part of an article of the resolution dealing in considerable detail with the right to organise and this article should be read as a whole. Read in this way, although its details did not entirely meet the views of all sections in the conference, the article commanded general agreement and was included in the resolution which was unanimously accepted by the conference in plenary session on 11th July and which, under my authority, the United Kingdom delegates supported. It is intended to embody the appropriate provisions of the resolution in one or more International Labour Conventions which will be the subject of discussion at the conferences in 1948 and 1949. The exact terms in which the provisions relating to the right to organise shall be incorporated in any convention will require the most careful examination.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: While thanking the right hon. Gentleman for that very full reply, may I ask whether it is not a fact that the British Government delegate voted against an amendment proposed by the Turkish delegate which would have put on record an emphatic condemnation of "closed shop" practices, and was that action taken on the right hon. Gentleman's advice?

Mr. Isaacs: The hon. Gentleman has not put that point to me in his Question. I have only a hazy recollection about it. There was some such action. If he will put down a Question about it, or even without putting it down, I will let him have the answer.

Mr. Assheton: Could the Minister tell us which way the employers' delegate voted and which way the workers' delegate voted?

Mr. Isaacs: So far as my recollection goes in this matter—I was not there when the actual vote was taken, but only during the opening discussion—I think it was by common agreement that no actual decision was taken. It was built into the wider resolution relating to freedom of association.

Mr. McAdam: Will the Minister consider asking the legal profession for its definition of the "closed shop"?

(Continued on page 7).

Workers' Educational Association

With the President of the London Trades' Union Council in the Chair, Sir Stafford Cripps addressed representatives of all branches and sections of Trade Unionism in the Great Hall, Caxton Hall, on July 22, 1947.

The audience was well-dressed and intelligent, and the Hall and the gallery were full.

The Chairman spoke for two minutes, saying he wished them to listen to Sir Stafford without making any comment. Questions would be answered later. They might not agree with all he had to say, but he wished them, as good Trade Unionists, to hear with an ever-open mind. He introduced the speaker.

Sir Stafford Cripps read his speech in a firm voice. The title was "Workers' Management."

He congratulated the Trades' Unions and the Association on the work so far accomplished, but there was a great deal to do; they were now entering a new era of trade unionism, and the need for education was greater than ever for all the tasks that lay before them. Trade Unionism was a very powerful force in this country, and this was the first workers' government to exercise authority and power. He said it was interesting to note that now a Labour government was in power the Opposition was altering its outlook towards the real people of the country, the workers, and he quoted at great length from the Industrial Charter recently issued which, he said, gave the gist of approach to the worker, also the acknowledgement that workers could be found who would be capable of taking managerial positions which had hitherto been fiercely guarded as the right of the so-called managerial class.

The worker was entitled to have a voice in industry; at present in some cases, the workers were properly represented on the Joint Industrial Councils, but these were not in existence in every factory. This would be remedied by the reports of the Working Parties which he had set up for every industry, and as a result of those reports, Development Committees were being set up, and the workers would have every opportunity of knowing exactly how the factories were run; they would play their part in advising, planning and consulting, they could see the books of the company if they wished.

A vast field had been opened up for intelligent and well-trained workers' representatives, and he described it as two ladders.

1. The ordinary administrative and technical ladder where the worker would leave the ordinary rank and work his way up through charge hand and foreman to manager—might be even higher.
2. A ladder wholly within trade unionism, whereby he would get a higher and higher representative post, but would not leave the ranks of the workers.

He illustrated this second "ladder" by saying that when a Commission was being sent to any of the Colonies he always made certain that a member of the Trade Union concerned was included.

But all this needed adequate training, and he hoped the Trades' Unions would seize the opportunity to select and help members to train for the new type of representative required by the Labour government. He was worried about the personnel for the Development Committees, he knew

there were good men in the Trades' Unions, but if he took those the Unions would be denuded of their leaders and would create a grave danger for the Movement which was now a strong political force, and would take a long time to build up.

Sir Stafford said it was a very critical period, they had to find the right people for the initial jobs; they must not fall down over them, as the success or failure would be tested by the country and the world at large.

His speech lasted fourteen minutes.

The first question asked was:

Q. If Sir Stafford considered the appointment of E. V. A. Herbert to Short Bros was a good one.

A. He himself had not had a great deal of experience in management, but he thought that Herbert had done the job extremely well. (Questioner, "Well we don't.")

Q. Could the speaker say what steps the Government were taking to train personnel.

A. He did not think it was a question of the Government taking the initial step, that should be done by the Trades' Unions, though the Ministry of Labour were holding courses at various centres, and during the war the Universities had collaborated to a large degree. He thought if they were approached something of the kind might be arranged.

Q. For the ordinary administrative and technical ladder, who would select the person for the training.

A. The individual would be selected by the Trades' Unions. ("Oh," said the questioner, "then you are trying to make another class, and the person concerned would belong to neither side.")

Q. Sir Stafford had said that workers would have a voice in industry; the Post Office, the oldest State-owned concern had no workers' representatives?

A. That question should be addressed to the Postmaster-General.

Q. The recently formed Coal Board, this was supposed to be a Labour Government then why were such huge salaries being paid to officials who did not know about mining, and big houses bought for them in different parts of the country. Also titles given and one representative now sitting in the House of Lords.

A. When a certain specialised knowledge was required, the salary offered must be comparable with that offered by private enterprise.

The above questions were the most interesting asked, and from the murmurs heard members were not satisfied with Sir Stafford's answers.

A word from the Chairman, and the meeting was opened to discussion. For the most part, this consisted of individual grouses and misunderstandings.

SCIENCE, LIBERTY AND PEACE

By ALDOUS HUXLEY.

PRICE 3/6. POSTAGE 2d.

Obtainable from:

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

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. 18. No. 23.

Saturday, August 9, 1947.

Mr. Hecht's Achievement

Now that some bricks have shattered a number of plate-glass windows in Liverpool, Birmingham and Manchester; now that Flint has declared (in letters man-high) that 'Hitler was right'; now that butchers in Birkenhead have refused to slaughter meat for Jews; now that a Jewish doctor in Liverpool has been assaulted and shops have been looted; in sum, now that there are in this country signs of an active mob antagonism to Jews, How does Mr. Ben Hecht feel about it all?

Does he feel that distinctive righteous glow that is said to visit a man fulfilled? For all this is Mr. Hecht's work, and that of the anonymous friends behind him, and he must not be allowed to escape the fact. For he will try to use these incidents as a justification of the atrocious stories that composed his confidence trick on the people of the United States—there is nothing like atrocity stories for drawing money from people's pockets—whereas they are the direct result of them.

For the murder of Sergeant Martin and Sergeant Paice has appalled this country as never since Dunkirk. The mob rioting is a direct outcome of the murders, and the murders were the direct outcome of Mr. Hecht's skilled propaganda technique and the active backing no less skilfully trained by his anonymous friends on the one hand and Mr. Stalin's anonymous friends on the other.

Several years ago, in the course of the war which many Jews presumed to be waged to save them from Hitler, a Jew prominent both in the Jewish and native communities in this country declared in so many words that the British Empire was marked out as the next focus of anti-semitism. It has needed strenuous efforts and close collaboration between Mr. Hecht and Mr. Stalin (as well as other agencies closer to us in this country) to bring this about; but neither then nor now has the purpose of this move been explicit. Yet it is clear to see: it is the final breakup of the British Empire. Mr. Ben Hecht's friends and Mr. Stalin's friends are eager to pouch the pieces. No community has ever yet withstood for long the blasting disruption of mob anti-semitism and rioting where the realistic consideration (let alone solution) of the root problem is precluded by the promoters. The German Empire was based on principles of which we cannot approve, principles near to those that govern Jewry itself (an eye for an eye, says Irgun, a tooth for a tooth—and hangs an innocent man for a guilty one: these are not Christian principles). Yet where is the German Empire today?

Mr. Hecht no doubt knew exactly what he was doing when he was doing it (otherwise he would have been a fool),

and he proceeded to *make* that which he professed to abhor. He deliberately *made* anti-semitism for his own purposes, without compunction sacrificing to them his fellow-racialists. The danger of his methods is more than that, however. The gag of silence for so long clamped down on the subject from above has been broken by simple-minded people with a grudge, throwing bricks. But there is nothing to show that their ring-leaders are simple-minded. Hooliganism has already spread from the grudge to the pleasure of loot irrespective of Jew or non-Jew. Mob-frenzy is a useful cover to some people, and to develop a habit of it would be exceedingly convenient to them. When a crowd surges round early in the evening 'waiting for something to happen', waiting, that is, for the "leader," there is no doubt that the "leader" will be provided. Mr. Stalin's friends take over, with a set of well-thought-out grievances for the mob to "remedy."

The mob-persecution of the 'little man' and the widening incidence of riots that might be expected to follow, are the reactions that best suit Mr. Hecht's purpose. The way to nullify his efforts is to turn them back on himself, to cause them to expose his own tactics and the tactics of his friends and of those before him who have used these methods to throw us into international wars. He and his friends are responsible for deliberately creating anti-semitism for use as a weapon. They must be branded with this responsibility. The awareness Mr. Hecht has aroused for his own ends must be used to unmask and indict the real war criminals, the shadowy figures we glimpse behind both sides of the war, fomenting the struggle for their own ends; and they must be branded with that responsibility. Then we shall be in a position to dissociate Great Britain from their machinations; and, repelling bribes, loans and threats of economic disasters, with such of our own riches as remain to us and our wealth of native invention we can develop honestly our tradition of freedom with responsibility and independence. As for the threat to the British Empire, the people of the dominions will no doubt have something to say about that—our tradition is very largely their tradition.

Could we do this, we should see far off, but nevertheless before us, a bearable life for each one of us, bountiful and unencumbered. With enough determination it could be done.

Remember ?

"Mr. Marshall two years ago was General Marshall, United States Chief-of-Staff. It was General Marshall who wired to General Eisenhower congratulating him on the capture by *American troops* of Brussels and Antwerp. It was General Marshall who ante-dated Field-Marshal Montgomery's appointment to the command in the Ardennes by three days, thereby suggesting that the initial success of the German counter-offensive was the British leader's responsibility. Marshall is as tough a man as is MacArthur, and as implacable an exponent of an opportunist and ruthless foreign policy. In December, 1945, the American State Department, under Mr. Byrnes, attempted to do a deal with Stalin. Had it succeeded, American goods in colossal quantities would have been poured into the voracious maws of the Soviet Union, and Britain would have been left to whistle for the crumbs..."

—PHILIP FAULCONBRIDGE in *London Tidings*, July 19, 1947.

“Election Without Representation”

By NORMAN WEBB

“In a hasty and factious effort to get rid of representation without election, it will be well if we eventually do not discover that we have only attained election without representation.”—Benjamin Disraeli in VINDICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

As a phenomenon, as something demanding an explanation in itself, and quite possibly the means of explaining much in the process of its own elucidation, and as an event of the first importance in the course of the nineteenth century, it is probable that nothing equals the extraordinary fact of a Jewish Prime Minister in aristocratic England.* But the nineteenth century canvas is so large and so kaleidoscopic that to get at its full significance would require exhaustive study, and no pretence is made here to do more than call attention to the matter, and to an excellent and established biography.

The circumstances which brought Disraeli to the surface of English politics were nothing less than the precipitation of what is called the Industrial Revolution; unquestionably one of the most abrupt alterations of apparently fixed circumstances that has ever struck a community of individuals minutely organised over a course of mainly static centuries for something quite different. Yet there is such a similarity—a similarity more real perhaps than apparent—in the situation in which we find ourselves today to that of exactly a hundred years ago, that from a practical point of view some examination of the circumstances and the man should be worth an effort. For as in the post-war confusion of the Eighteen Thirties and Forties a need was felt to strengthen and re-define the picture of organic England, twisted and warped by the unnatural strains and stresses of a major war effort, so today a great need is felt by thoughtful people everywhere—and in the unconscious of the unthoughtful also, maybe—to re-establish a sense of what this nation stands for, not only to the world at large, but to ourselves. There is an unmistakable longing for an authentic and authoritative voice to be raised above the hubbub of propaganda—most of it defamatory—on behalf of Great Britain and that British Empire which has come into being in the intervening years, to some extent at least as the direct result of what Disraeli then achieved; to define her required contribution and point out her rôle in helping to clear up the post-war mess, her own particular domestic mess even more than the international one, or perhaps as a preliminary to that. And if it is fated, now as then, to be achieved “party-politically,” that is, only at second-hand and confusedly and partially—for it may be that party politics still constitutes the nearest approach we have to “the voice of the People,” though Disraeli himself in the quotation at the head of this review casts some doubt on the authenticity of the vote—then better that way than not at all. In that case a study of the eighteen thirties and forties, and of the extraordinary “outsider” who then intervened in the domestic, as well as international welter of the post-Napoleonic period and succeeded in giving it at least a degree of meaning and direction, might be enlightening.

In fact, it would seem that the ruling parties of that day, Whig and Tory, were as involved and as mystified and

ignorant of their own real significance as are the political parties today, and no more clearly differentiated in their policies. Today, just as then, an acute and dispassionately appreciative “alien” might survey the field of our so apparently ferocious party differences as to the relative advantages of “being shot or boiled in oil,” with as open mind as did Disraeli a hundred odd years ago; and with his own ends in view hesitate as to which horse should have his money. Disraeli saw the party shadow-boxing for what it was worth, just as it appears to us today, partly disillusioned and half-hearted, and partly convinced and bitter; and for a time he even tried to enter politics as a sort of Independent, a political hermaphrodite, an unheard-of enormity for those days. He contested two elections in his adopted country of Buckinghamshire with no more backing than the friendship and goodwill of the heir of the local magnate, the Duke of Buckingham. But he was eventually convinced of the unrealistic idealism of attempting to avoid adopting either of two evils, instead of making up his mind which was the lesser and accepting it with the object of purging and improving it. So with the extraordinary Judao-Puritanical objectivism of his race which in his case was combined with other so-different and usually incompatible qualities, he faced his problem and adopted the Conservative cause with a semi-intellectual whole-heartedness that carried everything before it. As it appears to us at this distance, it was this simple elementary need “to get on,” impelling a mind exceptionally well-adjusted by circumstances to the job, that prompted Disraeli to his penetrating analysis of the party-political situation in England,—a situation which was in effect the international as much as the domestic situation—and gave an acuteness and clarity to his vision far beyond that of any other statesman, actual or potential, of the time. In the cold, adventurous light of his extreme need he yet passed over the tempting prizes hinted at by the City as the reward of their backing, and adopted the unorganised, but organic, cause of the Conservative landowners and yeomanry, which his prophetic instinct warned him must somehow be brought to include that of the “worker;” not only agricultural but as well that of the already huge proletarian Frankenstein created by the Industrial Revolution. Deliberately and consciously he constituted himself the spokesman of that inarticulate and essentially defenceless section of the nation of his adoption, at the time in more or less complete political eclipse, rather than enter the ranks of the immediately predominant Whigs, with their cosmopolitan affiliations and Netherlandish, Bank of England policy, which might naturally be supposed to have appealed to his inherited racial bias.

It is easy to laugh at the picture presented by Benjamin Disraeli, the Jewish novelist with political ambitions; his method of going about the exposition and capture of the English landed aristocracy, perhaps the most cynical and established institution in the whole civilised world of his day, was so extravagant and unlikely, so un-English, if it wasn't for the sobering thought that after all he succeeded. For the fact remains that he did capture it—even if the whole affair has an incredible atmosphere of unreality—and had our symbolic sovereign, the not-inconsiderable head of the greatest body politic of the time, and perhaps of history, metaphorically eating out of his hand. He commenced his campaign by getting himself not only tolerated but fully accepted in Georgian London society—still an eminently exclusive organisation,—mainly by way of his own successful novels and his father's curiously widespread literary reputation.

*The following notes are compiled exclusively from Vol. 1 of *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli* by W. F. MONEYPENNY.

For the grandson of an Hispano-Italian immigrant Jew this constituted a considerable achievement in itself, for Benjamin Disraeli I, even though he made money in the City, had made it in no convincingly overwhelming quantity, and his grandson was always in debt in the gentlemanly manner of the times. But Disraeli possessed an exceptionally fine edge of wit, combined with originality of mind, and a perfect and disarming good humour that almost entirely concealed his steely Jewish ambition and concentration of purpose. Besides, it must have seemed incredible, even to the cynical English aristocrats of the period, that anyone could be pursuing so undeviating a path of personal advancement in purple pantaloons and ringlets. Nevertheless, in the eventual Transformation Scene of Great Britain's imperial metamorphosis it was evident that the impossible had happened, for there he stood in the centre beside the Empress Queen of his own creation and in authentic alliance with her.

Was it just chance that Disraeli's political choice fell on the Conservative side of the hedge? Was he himself just an alien careerist? Such speculations suggest trains of thought that cannot be followed here. Yet there are circumstances in the background of his upbringing containing a bias not at all to be expected from his Hebraic origin. Isaac Disraeli, his father, had written in *An Enquiry into the Literary and Political Character of James I* a defence of the first Stuart against the printed prejudice of the Whig historians, and the same tenor was to be found in his later *Commentary on the Life and Reign of Charles I*; and Disraeli's own genealogical thesis, whether groundless or not seems uncertain, was that his ancestry was to be traced to landed Judaeo-Spanish aristocracy rather than the dispossessed Hebrew of tradition. Nevertheless, whatever the true balance of factors, the political course he then took appears in the light of history to have been what England most needed at that critical time, even if it only temporarily allayed the unbalanced delirium of her industrial fever. It is not therefore truly justifiable to speculate as to what would have been the Empire's course had the weight of his penetrating logic and the impulse of his oriental imagination been at the services of those terrific forces at work behind the facade of the Bank of England, because in a sense his choice was not fortuitous. Curious and unlikely as it may seem, his educational environment and his resulting temperament had cast him for the Conservative role and not for alliance with those somewhat credulous agents of High Finance, the Whig aristocrats—"consolled up to the neck" as Disraeli himself succinctly puts it—then in power in uneasy partnership with the Non-conformists and the puritan-minded City.

That Disraeli possessed philosophic principles, and had the will to apply them—the genuine desire to see the more nearly true and correct predominate over the less so—appears quite distinctly in his writings and his actions, particularly this one of his political choice. He saw clearly the treasonable and disloyal international impulse behind the Whigs and the insincere opportunism of their support and solicitude for the Dissenters. In his political tract *The Spirit of Whiggism*, he makes an illuminating generality in analysis of this unnatural alliance to the effect that "There is ever a union in a perverted sense between those who are beneath power and those who would be above it, and oligarchies and despotisms are usually established by the agency of a deluded multitude . . . Thus union of oligarchical wealth and mob poverty is the very essence of the Spirit of Whiggism." In other words, the seed of unconstitutional revolution is in the power-

complex, Satanism, and its soil and breeding ground is envy, and its mechanism is mob-control, the black art of pseudo-scientific Behaviourism or Mass-psychology. The situation is perennial, only the factions and their labels change. But its intensity is increased by the ease with which power is achieved, combined with the opportunity of divorcing it from its proper and restraining responsibility and obligation. The land-owning magnate, as such, just as the reigning sovereign, had not to any dangerous degree the opportunity of avoiding his obligations, living as he did in an open blaze of privilege. It was the secret and heady power inherent in the control of credit-creation and revealed by High Finance to the whiggish aristocrats through the newly established Bank of England and the unrestrained Industrial Revolution it was designed to promote that had seriously unbalanced the situation, as Disraeli clearly perceived. Today exactly the same unbalanced situation threatens in an even more intense degree than in the period following the Napoleonic wars. Little is changed, only the Whig oligarch has become the Big Business chief, the denationalised objectivity of his outlook often reinforced by the fact that he is British only by adoption, instead of cultural bias—a Melchett or a Sassoon, or a Whatsnotski,—although today, as a hundred years ago, there are also plenty of Englishmen born and bred "in the racket." And in place of the Puritan Dissenter, the dissatisfied, reforming neo-religionist, we have the equally reforming and Calvinistic products of the Fabian Society, the neo-Intellectuals of Socialism, incited to stir up and lead the genuinely under-privileged masses in the interests of a world dictatorship. "During the last five years," Disraeli says in the same tract, "the Whigs have been at war with the English Constitution." Is that not a perfectly just description of nine tenths of all the present Socialist parliamentary activity, whether of the Left or the Right? "At war with the English Constitution," anti-British, in short, and in the interest of an undeclared power who sees in British Constitutionalism a barrier to its ambitions. "Let Radicals well consider," he continues; and by Radicals one assumes he means those sincere, would-be Independents like himself, who feel so strongly the need of *constitutional* reform, "whether in attempting to achieve their avowed object, they are not in fact only assisting the *secret views*" (my emphasis) "of a party whose scheme is infinitely more adverse to their own than the existing system, whose genius, I believe, they entirely misconceive." Surely that warning is as entirely appropriate and necessary today as it was then? But whether or not there still exists any tangible and effective entity that may be appealed to in defence of British Constitutionalism, as turned out to be the case a hundred years ago, is something that has yet to be proved, and no doubt will be before very long, though the English spirit has had such a "pasting" this last hundred years as, one would think, nothing living could survive.

And so this astute Jew constituted himself England's advocate, and proceeded to build up the client of his selection, the hereditary peerage, in partnership, not rivalry, with the agriculturalist and the finance-created wage slaves of Industry, which as he clearly saw were otherwise and ultimately destined to be used against them. With this end in view he set out to explain the uses and virtues of the House of Lords to the electorate, and to place them in the national economy as the natural and hereditary defenders of the People, so that the balanced and organic sovereignty of England should not be thrown down, but supported and, as it were, projected by its

own weight—moral, mental, and material,—into the International sphere. The measure of his success is to be gauged by the history of what is known as the Victorian Era; a great age, notwithstanding all that has been said against it by the Little Englanders, its neo-Whig (Liberal) detractors. It was a time when the policy and culture of Great Britain—the English Way of Life,—even if in the process it got a trifle tarnished and warped and acquired, as was perhaps inevitable, a little of Disraeli's native garishness, did colour and give its name and, most important, its tolerant protection to a comparatively peaceful, and humane, and reasonable existence for the individual, white, black, or even politically Red, over an extraordinary wide area of this earth's surface. It is not suggested that he himself was the author and begetter of the Pax Britannica; but there can be no doubt that his influence in shaping and defining the particular form and direction which its expression ultimately took, was immense and probably decisive.

The danger that Disraeli's acute Hebrew mind perceived was that of single-chamber Government, *i.e.* a permanent and unchallengeable oligarchy represented by a complete fusion of landownership—the equivalent of our present day monopoly of natural resources, fuel, hydro-electricity, agriculture, minerals,—with Finance, and credit control represented by the Bank of England of which the contemporary version is our Big Business, or Cartelism, operating under the hidden or occult direction of international, and therefore anti-national, forces. It was to counter and balance this overwhelming coalition that he sought to build up that section of the hereditary aristocracy that was still loyally and nationally inclined and had not yet been weaned from its allegiance to the land, both in its abstract and concrete sense, and to show them their natural and national interests as bound up with the People of England, as such, both peasantry and "hired hand." What it would be useful to us to discover would be how Disraeli attained his object, in as far as it was attained. Was it a purely personal tour de force, an achievement of mere personality and political acumen; and if not, to what extent was it a triumph of repeatable political principle, and what was that principle?

Parliament

(Continued from page 2)

House of Commons: July 24, 1947.

FUEL AND POWER

Domestic Restrictions

Mr. John E. Haire asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether he is satisfied that domestic users are carrying out the restrictions imposed on the use of fuel during the present summer months; and if he will state his estimate of the amount of fuel saved to date.

Mr. Shinnwell: It is not possible to state whether in fact the summer restrictions on the use of gas and electricity are being fully observed by all consumers. Domestic consumers have been asked to economise in the use of gas and electricity this summer so as to enable the gas and electricity undertakings to use 2½ million tons less coal than they estimated they would consume during this period. So far, consumption of coal by these undertakings has been about 900,000 tons less than was estimated. The statistics available do not,

however, enable me to say how much of this saving has been due to the domestic consumer.

Mr. Haire: Does my right hon. Friend agree that, in view of the falling off in domestic fuel saving, there is again the necessity to remind consumers of their obligations in this matter, and to keep on repeating these reminders?

Mr. Shinnwell: The Fuel Economy Campaign will soon be in full swing, and we have enlisted the co-operation of a large number of womens' organisations and of the local authorities. There are, so far, very few refusals to co-operate, and I imagine that the activities of these bodies will be of great value.

IDENTITY CARDS (Production)

Sir William Darling asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has considered the case of John Bunyan, Wildwood Rise, Golders Green, who was, on 21st May, fined 10s. at Bow Street for failing to produce his identity card to a policeman who had reported him for a motor car obstruction in Great Queen Street; and, in view of the fact that Mr. Bunyan did produce his licence and insurance papers, if he will remit the fine in this case and instruct the Metropolitan Police that they are not to demand identity cards in future where other satisfactory proof of identity is tendered.

Mr. Ede: Mr. Bunyan committed an offence by failing to produce his identity card when asked to do so by a police officer in uniform, or within 48 hours at a police station, and it was only after he had made it clear at a subsequent interview with the police that his refusal was quite deliberate that proceedings were taken. I can find no grounds for recommending any remission of the penalty which the court thought it right to impose upon him for this offence.

Sir W. Darling: Does that answer mean that two years after the war it is implicit upon all citizens at all times to carry identity cards, or to be prepared to produce them within 48 hours at a police station?

Mr. Ede: That is the law of the land.

Mr. Hector Hughes: Would my right hon. Friend consider making a statement on the circumstances in which law abiding citizens must carry and produce their identity cards so long after the war?

Mr. Ede: I think the circumstances are well known.

Mr. Harrison: Would my right hon. Friend reply to the last part of the Question more deliberately than he has done?

Mr. Ede: No, Sir, I am not prepared to instruct the Metropolitan Police to do other than obey the law themselves.

ALDERNEY (Restoration Work)

Mr. Vane asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what sums of money have been spent on encouraging and subsidising communal farming in Alderney since the liberation; and what is the reason for the failure of this experiment.

Mr. Ede: The communal farm was established on the re-occupation of the island, not as an experiment in communal farming, but as the only means of rehabilitating the land, which, as a result of the island having been converted

into a fortress, had become unfit for cultivation. The work of rehabilitation is nearly completed, and, at the request of the islanders themselves, the communal farm is now being broken up with a view to the resumption of private farming. The net expenditure up to 4th July is £26,800.

Mr. Vane: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the sum of £26,000 is a charge against the National Exchequer, and, also, would he lay a report of this rather extraordinary farming operation in the Library of the House, so that hon. Members can judge for themselves?

Mr. Ede: This money was a contribution from the British Exchequer to help these people to get the island back into cultivation after it had been practically covered with concrete by the Germans. I have been to the island twice since I have been in office, and before the islanders returned, I met them in London and discussed the problem of their re-settlement with them. In the main, the arrangements carried out secured their approval.

Mr. Turton: Will the Minister make it clear whether the experiment of communal farming was conducted at the request of the farmers of Alderney?

Mr. Ede: I met the farming community of Alderney within a very few weeks, if not days, of taking office, and discussed with them the way in which the farming on the island was to be got going again, in view of the deplorable state of the island. They agreed, at that time, that the only way of restarting was by communal farming.

Major Haughton: Would the Home Secretary be willing to receive a deputation of representatives from the Channel Islands some time before the end of the year to discuss the many difficulties which have arisen there?

Mr. Ede: I go over to the Channel Islands to meet them; I do not ask them to meet me.

Economy Pamphlets (Distribution)

Mr. Dodds-Parker asked the Minister of Fuel and Power why he circularises all the inhabitants of villages where there are no supplies of gas or electricity with pamphlets from his Department indicating how gas and electric meters should be read; and whether such circulars are intended to indicate that such supplies will be available in these villages very shortly.

Mr. Shimwell: The distribution of these pamphlets was handled on a national basis by the General Post Office and it was not practicable to break down such distribution according to availability of fuel supplies. In order to make the leaflet applicable to all areas a section dealing with economy in the use of solid fuel was included. The answer to the second part of the Question is "No."

Ex-Official's Speech

Mr. Prescott asked the Minister of Fuel and Power whether permission was obtained from his Department for Mr. Noel Newsome, Chief Recruitment Officer of his Department, to address the conference at Buscot Park, Berkshire, of the conference of foreign Socialists, organised by the Fabian International Bureau.

Mr. Shimwell: No. Mr. Newsome ceased to be a member of the staff of my Department on 31st March last.

NOW AVAILABLE THROUGH K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS

I Chose Freedom

by Victor Kravchenko

PRICE: 15s. (Postage extra).

The Personal and Political Life of a Soviet Official.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System	7d.
The Use of Money	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.

ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...	21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster	7/6
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster	5/-

Communism in Action

U.S.A. House Document No. 754	2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
Protocols of Zion	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/-
Aberhart: Manning	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards ...	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick	6d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson ...	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne	3d.
This Freedom	9d.
The Beveridge Plot	3d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
Social Credit: An Explanation for New Readers 1½d. each, or 50 copies for 5/-.	

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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