THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19. No. 26. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1948. 6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

In connection with the disruptive tactics which are evident in *The Canadian Social Crediter* under its new control, it is interesting to revert to the letter to Mr. Aberhart which appears on p. 134 of *The Alberta Experiment*:

> " . . . it has been agreed for a long time that if Aberhart comes in, in Alberta, that their plan would be to separate him from Douglas and urge him bit by bit into co-operation with the banks, and then put in Banking Committees to control the finance of the Province as in Newfoundland."

It will be remembered that this programme was carried out to the letter by the appointment of Mr. Robert Magor as Chief Adviser. (Mr. Magor was the representative of the banks in the suspension of the Newfoundland Constitution also). Mr. Aberhart, however, learnt quickly, and the later stages of the scheme went astray.

All the evidence goes to suggest that a concerted attack on genuine Social Credit, partly frontal, as in the libel action against the Melbourne (Australia) *New Times* and partly by the support of the spurious State Socialist policies under the lead of the Manning Government in Alberta, is now well under way. We regard this as the surest possible indication that the policy we have pursued is sound and effective, and the venomous objections to anything "negative" which the so-called Alberta Social Credit League has sponsored, constitute a proof that they don't like it, and that it is effective where it will do the most good.

Nothing would suit the Planners better than not to be exposed.

• • •

If Mr. Attlee and his Administrators cannot see the connection between their difficulties with Chili and the Argentine, and their attacks on Franco Spain, we do not suppose anything we could say would clear their vision. For this, the P.B.P. will, as usual, pay.

• • •

THE FOOD SHORTAGE SWINDLE

"London, December 10, 1947. Ships from Australia and the Argentine, which should be at sea again, are still unloading food in London because there is no cold storage room.

"The *Daily Express* adds that cold storage warehouses around London are so full of meat, turkeys, poultry, butter, eggs and apples that meat ships have been told to go slow in discharging cargoes.

"Delays are costing hundreds of pounds a day in dock dues and loss of time, but the Ministry of Food, which admitted last Monday that the hold-up is still general, now says that 'discharge is now going ahead from all ships. We are taking apples from store to make room for meat.' "—*Melbourne Herald*, December 10, 1947.

It will be noticed that in all the nationalisation of this and that which is wrecking the economic structure of the country, there is not a whisper of nationalising the most dangerous monopoly of all—the chemical industry. Or is it that "nationalising" is merely a polite word for "chemicalising"? And what is the relation between Dead Sea minerals and our present situation as the world's Aunt Sally? Mond-Turnerism?

• • •

European currencies and U.S. dollars are now quoted in terms of gold louis, sovereigns and U.S. gold eagles in the reports from the Paris money market, which will of course be copied in London.

Well, we hope you think it is worth six years' war, and a Socialist Government.

• • •

The phrase "Unemployment has been taken from the street to the bench", which is circulating in industrial quarters, is one more instance of that curious, hell-bent, stupidity which seems to afflict us. In the much-pilloried depression of 1929-32 (criminal enough in all conscience) the unemployed suffered both in morale and otherwise, not least by the Socialist-coined misuse of the word "dole" for the unemployment insurance to which the sufferers had contributed. But by far the greater proportion of the population was not unemployed even then, and their morale did not suffer from that most vicious habit, "putting in time". But the determination of the Financier-Socialist Administration to make the whole population punch the clock, irrespective of what they do when they get past the time office, has generalised the demoralisation which then was local, although the seeds of it had long been sown by the Trades Unions with their ca'canny policy—probably suggested by aliens.

• • •

SO NOW WE KNOW

"In an interview with the *Jewish Chronicle*, during his visit to this country in 1931, Mr. Gandhi said: 'I have a world of friends among the Jews. In South Africa I was surrounded by Jews, and I have had a Jewish shorthand writer and typist who was regarded more as a member of the family. I visited the synagogue in Johannesburg during Passover and went to the house of my Jewish friends every night . . . ' "—*The Jewish Chronicle*, February 6, 1948.

"Speechmaker, you speak too late. Just a little time ago you would have been able to believe in your speech, now you no longer can. For, a moment ago, you saw as I did, that the State is no longer led; the stokers still pile in the coal, but the leaders have now only the semblance of control over the madly racing machines. And in this moment, as you speak, you can hear as I do that the levers of economics are beginning to sound in an unusual way; the masters smile at you with superior assurance, but death is already in their hearts."—Martin Buber, *I And Thou.*

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: February 9, 1948.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

The Minister of Health (Mr. Aneurin Bevan): . . . I now come to the Amendment, . . .

Sir Arthur Salter (Oxford University): Would the right hon. Gentleman add reality to the wise decision he has just announced by modifying the remarks he made the other day as to the absence of security in the ballot?

Mr. Bevan: Why? Surely it is the accepted democratic practice that when people are asked to give votes affecting their professional future and their employment in or outside the State's service, they should do it secretly, without their names being disclosed.

Sir A. Salter: Do not the present arrangements assure secrecy so far as compatible with notifying the authenticity of the vote? Is it not ridiculous to imply that there is intimidation of the kind to end which secrecy in the electoral ballot was introduced?

Mr. Bevan: This is a complete digression from the argument I was making and to which I am anxious to return. The sting in the Amendment is, of course, that it leaves out the last part of the Motion. If Members opposite think there is anything in the Act which interferes with the freedom of choice, they should say so; we should hear it. If they think there is anything in the Act, scheme, or terms of remuneration, which prejudices the doctor-patient relationship, we should hear it. So far, we have not. We do not object, and never have, to the doctors expressing their opinions freely; we do not object to the B.M.A. recommending their doctors not to take service under this scheme.

What we do take serious objection to is to organised sabotage of an Act of Parliament. We desire to know from the Opposition whether they support that. Do they support the B.M.A. organising resistance on July 5, because I would warn them that the beginning of that road might look very pleasant but the end would be exceedingly unpleasant, not only for us but for Members opposite. [An HON. MEMBER: "Is that a threat?"] It must be clear to everybody that if there is one thing we must assert it is the sovereignty of Parliament over any section of the community. We have not yet made B.M.A. House into another revising Chamber. We have never accepted the position that this House can be dictated to by any section of the community.

We do concur in the right of any section of the community to try to persuade the House of Commons to change its mind. That is perfectly sound. The position we are taking up is that the B.M.A. have exceeded their just constitutional limitations, and that the best thing they can do now is to put on record their opinion that while they may disagree with the Act in this or that particular, or in general if they wish, nevertheless, they will loyally accept the decision of Parliament and continue to agitate for such revisions as they think proper. . . .

Mr. R. A. Butler (Saffron Walden): . . . I want now to deal with his [the Minister of Health's] main point, which is that of the sovereignty of Parliament. In a speech at Pontypridd the Minister referred to the will of Parliament. He said:

> "Parliament has spoken; the country now awaits and expects the co-operation of the medical world."

Does the Minister—he is a prominent dialectician—consider that the doctors are sabotaging Parliament by expressing their opinion? Why does he say deliberately that the doctors are flouting it by their actions [*Interruption*]. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would like to express his opinion?

Mr. Bevan: The right hon. Gentleman is making his speech with even fewer scruples than usual. I never said that the doctors were sabotaging an Act of Parliament by expressing their opinions. I did not say "the doctors" at all. I said that the B.M.A. were sabotaging the Bill by encouraging doctors not to enter the Service. I said that they were organising collective sabotage of an Act, that they were actually organising collective abstention from participating in the Act, and that is sabotage.

Mr. Butler: I gave the right hon. Gentleman a chance to explain himself, but when he comes to the Box in answer to an opportunity to interrupt and says that it is collective sabotage of Parliament, that is a much stronger term than I used. We have from the Minister his statement that the doctors are indulging in collective sabotage of the Act. [*Interruption.*] That is what he said. Why then does he put specifically in his Act an opportunity to the doctors to state their opinions, because he must know that unless he obtains the co-operation of the doctors the scheme will not work? The Minister cannot escape by dialectics. My conclusion is inevitably that the only escape is by agreement.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer . . . has made a speech in the North of England in which he said:

> "There are certain groups of people who seem to think that their own interests and opinions ought to over-rule the decisions of the nation."

What are the decisions of the nation? The decisions of the nation are that there shall be a National Health Scheme and that doctors shall be free to come in. That is specifically in the Act. Whether I take the words of the right hon. Gentleman or the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I am driven to the only conclusion to which one can possibly come in this dispute—which I am as anxious as anybody else to try to solve—that doctors must agree to the terms and conditions and the Act gives them the opportuunity to do so . . .

Sir Ernest Graham-Little (London University): . . . I propose to demonstrate that neither the staff nor the buildings can be provided by the appointed day or, for that matter, in any near foreseeable future. . . . The first note of alarm in the medical profession was sounded by the Beveridge Report, published in 1942, and accentuated by the Labour Party pronouncement in 1943 that a State salaried medical service was the objective of the Labour Party. From 1943 to the present time meeting after meeting of the representative body has recorded practically unanimous opposition to a full-time salaried service. The membership of the B.M.A. jumped from 40,000 in 1940-42 to 54,000 this year. That enormous increase was due to the resolve of the rank and file of the profession to resist a salaried service. It is rather instructive to note that the Medical Practitioners' Union—a body which supports a State medical service, and which is indeed, the only medical organisation recognised as a trade union and affiliated to the Trades Union Council—dropped in membership from 7,000 to 4,000 in the same period. Surely, that must convince even unwilling hon. Members of the real feeling in the medical profession. . . .

. . . On January 8, 1948, three weeks ago, the Minister announced in a circular that, while he regarded the establish-

ment of health centres as a key feature in the general reconstruction of the country's health services, their provision must be postponed indefinitely on account of the building stringency. . . .

Mr. David Eccles (Chippenham): . . . The negotiations between the Minister and the doctors are, or rather they might have been, a landmark in the British experiment to combine national planning with individual freedom. The whole world is watching us to see whether Great Britain can make a success of what the Government call democratic planning. The National Health Service challenges the sincerity and the competence of the democratic planners. Here is a great common enterprise to provide care and treatment for everyone when they are sick. In fairness to the doctors—the Minister mentioned it himself—one must remember that for 25 years they have wanted to make big changes in the Health Service. When the Act came before the House the general public welcomed it wholeheartedly.

That Act, as my right hon. Friend has said, declares that the doctors are free to enter or to stay out. It therefore lays upon the Minister the obligation, which at the time he welcomed, to negotiate the terms on which the doctors are to serve.

. . . The essence of democratic planning laid down by Ministers opposite is to give those who are to carry out the plan a share in its making and to persuade them of their own free will to devote themselves to its success. What applies to economic policy applies to the National Health Service. This is a test of the Government's ability to achieve that reconciliation between liberty and order which the Prime Minister says is an ideal of Socialism.

Mr. Mitchison: Will the hon. Gentleman allow me?

Mr. Eccles: If the Government fail to bring the doctors willingly into its service, Socialist Ministers will have to stop pretending that they know how to plan democratically. I do not doubt that the Prime Minister has great faith that it is possible to plan democratically in this country. I thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had it also, until I read his remarks in Edinburgh. It is clear from the course of the negotiations and from his speech here today that the Minister of Health does not have the same faith. He has not shown that it really makes a difference to him whether the Health Service starts off with the doctors on his side or against him. All that his words amount to is that the plan must go through on his terms.

. . . I listened to the Minister, and I still do not know why he has acted as he has and has refused to meet the doctors halfway on two or three of these points. He had to make only two concessions to them, and most of them would have come into the service willingly. He should have given them a firm assurance that it was not the desire of the Labour Party sooner or later to turn the profession into a full-time salaried service, and he should have met them on the question of appeals. By his statement today the Minister makes the position on appeals better, but the doctors feel so strongly on this point that some further step to meet them would be well worth while.

. . . What was the Minister up to when he behaved like a dictator to the doctors? Was he, as the song says, simply:

"Doing what comes naturally"—

or was he deliberately picking a quarrel? There was a letter in *The Times*, which has been referred to by the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hale), from Dr. Guy Dain describing the course of those negotiations. The Minister never challenged the accuracy of that description. The conclusion from that letter is clear. Sometime last autumn the Minister changed his mind and decided deliberately to pick a quarrel with this great section of the independent middle class. Listening today to the Minister's Jacobin eloquence, I found every confirmation of that conclusion. I was reminded that in history, in the early stages of all great revolutionary movements, stormy characters have thrust themselves forward who have known that they thrive best on trouble. They have known that to catch big fish they must first muddy the water. . . .

. . . If the Minister is looking forward to fresh trouble, as I believe he is, the doctors are looking back to their professional traditions. That is an attitude which ardent Socialists, even Socialist doctors, are not likely to undertand.

. . . We must face the fact that a general practitioner whose conscience tells him to stay out of the service stands to lose a capital sum which in most cases would be of great importance to himself and his family. The capital value of his practice will disappear. A Minister with a keen sense of worldly values might well calculate that by July 5 most of these practitioners will have counted the pounds, shillings and pence and will sign upon his dotted line; but supposing this mixture of bribes and threats does not come off? Supposing that a large majority of the doctors prefer their professional traditions to the Minister's money? What happens then? Then the Health Service, which in conciliatory hands might have been launched in an atmosphere of general goodwill, will get off to a prejudiced and embittered start.

No one ought to make light of professional standards and traditions. It is very dangerous to play with standards of conduct by which men have learned to govern their daily actions. We do not behave well by nature. When we behave well, it is because we have accepted certain standards, as rules of thumb for our action. Destroy those standards, and there is no telling where the deterioration in conduct will stop. The professional standards of British medicine have been built up, tried by experience, honoured and greatly loved for very many years, incidentally for far more years than there has been a Conservative Party and therefore still more than there has been a Labour Party.

At the very centre of these traditions is the family doctor's conception of the proper and intimate relation between himself and his patient. I know it is possible to make a debating attack on the doctor-patient relation. The hon. Member for Maldon (Mr. Driberg), writing in the Sunday papers, described it as all nonsense which could easily be debunked. If the hon. Gentleman wants to make such an attack, let him wait until he is sick and then it will be odds beyond arithmetic that he will pray the doctor to think of no one but his patient.

When the profession's whole future is not in danger we do not hear much about their traditions and we hear still less about their politics, but I agree with one hon. Member who said that doctors—I would say, successful doctors—have very little time for politics. My father used to say that a doctor only went on the hustings when he had not enough patients to keep him in his surgery. I think there are honourable exceptions to that, but by and large it is true, and therefore it is all the more significant that this dispute between the

(*continued on page* 7.)

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. 19. *No.* 26. *Saturday, February* 28, 1948.

Sir S. Cripps and the Price Level

Perhaps the first gleam of economic sanity which has been emitted by an Administration based on the London School of Economics, proceeds from Sir Stafford Cripps in his plea for a lower price level. It is quite true that his reasons are unsound; it would be phenomenal if they were not. But the sheer impact of hard fact appears to have driven him to recognise that the "combatting inflation" is only difficult if you are determined not to lower prices. The fundamental idea in the minds of the Plotters is that as few people as possible shall have monetary means of independence; high prices take everyone's money at a rate proportional to the price level; and "full employment" becomes the alternative to starvation. But there are technical reasons, well known to the readers of this review, why the product of "full employment" cannot be absorbed if all monetary costs go into prices; Sir Stafford Cripps may not, probably does not, understand the process, but he is becoming acquainted with the fact. Social Crediters can sit and watch with some interest for the next move, which is with him, what time they observe the contortions of a moralist wrestling with a managed currency.

Unfortunately, with that desperate fatuity which seems to dog all our actions nowadays, the purely technical matter of prices and purchasing power is being snarled by admixture with Trades-Union-Employers co-operation to rob the consumer (Mond-Turnerism), much as to say that the T.U.C. has a vested interest in the multiplication table. It is not incompetence from which we are suffering; Mr. Churchill's incursion into party politics is just the stock-in-trade of the Taper-Tadpole era. All the assumptions of our Governmental system are faulty; the equalitarianism, the majority principle, the perversion of finance to politics, the subordination of spiritual values to gadget production and genuine religion to a tinsel evolutionary theory, specially tricked out to serve the interests of our deadliest enemies, quite naturally and inevitably eventuate in a *de facto* Constitution suitable to a policy under which we pass from tragedy to tyranny and back again to tragedy.

There is no short cut out of this situation; it has been allowed to run too far. But the first step is open and responsible voting. Those people who have welcomed all the philosophical claptrap of the Lib-Lab era because it pandered to "the aim of the harlot throughout the ages—power without responsibility"—are beginning to realise that what they have got is responsibility without power. The relegation of the Trades Unions to subservience to the natural laws of technology, instead of their present monstrous rôle as an uncontrolled Monopoly which would not be tolerated in any other social essential, is one of the matters which can only be dealt with on the basis of re-orientation by a revivified religion (binding *back to reality*).

The Race Factor

Our excellent contemporary, *London Tidings,* has an anonymous comment on House of Lords reform which includes the only convincing argument against the hereditary principle which has come to our notice. After drawing attention to the connection between the words "Statesman" and "estatesman", and the training in statesmanship which the children of a great House imbibed in their childhood, the author points out that this argument for the hereditary principle does not hold to any great extent since the break-up of the large estates; and we agree. But in our opinion this hereditary factor is quite essential; without going so far as D'Israeli in claiming that "race is all" we are confident that no country can disregard the race factor but at its deadly peril. It is grimly funny that the Marquis of Reading (Isaacs), having recently succeeded the first Isaacs in the House of Lords, where the Liberal party is led by his co-racialist Samuel and the Socialist party by his co-racialist Rothschild, is advocating the abolition of the herediary principle, no doubt because it introduces a risk, if nowadays a small risk, of competition from intuitive statesmen. Is our new Second Chamber to descend from Marconi?

The problem which is posed by this situation is not an easy one; and it is none too early that it should receive concentrated and conscious attention. Of one thing we are confident; the hereditary territorial landlord cannot be replaced by the industrial tycoon, whether "nationalised" or not. One reason for this is the almost consistent failure of industrialists as political administrators; a second is that the end of the industrial era is in sight for those who are not blinded by current jargon.

"Power Tends To Corrupt"

I quote it [Lord Acton's dictum] again, to give it to you in full, and in its context. Acton was not only a great historian—one of the greatest of modern times—but he was also a very sincere and consistent Christian.

The famous sentence occurs in a letter he wrote to Bishop Creighton about the latter's *History of the Papacy,* which Acton had reviewed in a periodical edited by Creighton. Acton had found in Creighton's history what he called "a spirit of retrospective indulgence and reverence for the operation of authority," and he insisted that historians "maintain morality as the sole impartial criterion of men and things, and the only one on which honest minds can be made to agree."

In his letter to Creighton, Acton was more explicit. He said, "I cannot accept your canon that we are to judge Pope and King unlike other men, with a favourable presumption that they did no wrong. If there is any presumption it is the other way, against the holders of power, increasing as the power increases. Historic responsibility has to make up for the want of legal responsibility. Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority, still more when you superadd the tendency or the certainty of corruption by authority. There is no worse heresy than that the office sanctifies the holder of it."—Mr. Herbert Read in *The Listener,* March 27, 1947.

"FEBRUARY, 1848" *

By NORMAN F. WEBB

". . . the great contention between the patriotic and the cosmopolitan principles . . . which has hardly begun, and in which issue of the fate of this island as a community depends."
—BENJAMIN DISRAELI.

The present have all the appearance of being crucial and tremendous times; and so they are. But to the inhabitants of other epochs upon which we look back as being comparatively stable, their particular age seemed equally cataclysmic and full of threatening change. Take Victorian England, regarded as one of the most confident periods in history, when railways were being projected all over the land; get down to the genuine, personal impressions of the times, and you find the same feeling of razor-edge balance.

In a series of sketches one has been attempting to analyze the reactions of Benjamin Disraeli, one of the most sensitive and remarkable minds of his day, to contemporary events; events, the centenary of which we are, as it were, celebrating this year. By a conjunction of circumstances of every possible kind—race, period, temperament, upbringing, situation,—Disraeli was placed where he could view the contemporary scene to the best advantage, and with the most complete equipment of knowledge at his disposal of any man of his day. The scene, like our own, was one of heightened crisis, both financial and political, culminating, if things historical can ever be said to culminate, in the concerted, and in most cases abortive, political risings which occurred all over Europe, in this very month of February, 1848,—just one hundred years ago. Then, as now, England as the prototype of what he calls "the patriotic principle," appeared, to Disraeli at least, as the focus of attack, and the defender of his own pet philosophy of Race. "Progress and reaction are but words to mystify the million," he says in his *Life of Lord George Bentinck*. "They are phrases, not facts. All is race, . . . The principle of race is the key of history. . . . Entirely opposed to the equality of men and similar abstract dogmas, which have destroyed ancient societies without creating a substitute."

This represents the extremely complex area of Disraeli's character, in which his intensive racial breeding contends with the limpid quality of the adopted political loyalty which ruled all his active and social ife. In his novels, however, the Jew sometimes looks out, and the slightly hysterical voice of the social outcast is heard in remarkable contrast to that of the British statesman. In *Tancred*, which contains the bulk of his original theories regarding Christianity, while his aristocratic High-Church hero is ruminating over the ruins of past material splendour in the Middle East, the author, as it were, blows up. "And yet some flat-nosed Frank, full of bustle and puffed up with self-conceit (a race spawned perhaps in the swamps of some Northern forest hardly yet cleared), talks of Progress! Progress to what, and from whence? Amid . . . the wreck of great cities . . . and populations destroyed, the European talks of Progress, because by an ingenious application of some scientific acquirements he has established a society which has mistaken comfort for civilization."

How true, and at the same time how false that is! How very near to the fact, and at the same time how far wide of the mark, as a summing-up of the whole achievement of Christianity! The Victorian idea of Inevitable Progress was closely associated with the cult of applied science and its achievements, which was supposed in some unexplained way to have disposed of the Christian thesis. Disraeli refused to go with the tide. He was not against physics, as such, but he was against the extravagant claims made for it, and the popular hash called Darwinism; hence the famous remark in his speech at Oxford in 1864 as to the alternative theories of our descent from apes or angels, that if it was a question of one or the other, he was "on the side of the angels," hence the nonsense he puts into the mouth of Lady Constance Dawlish in *Tancred*. Disraeli has been reading "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation," by Robert Chambers, published in 1844, a book praised by Darwin as paving the way for his own "analogous views." Lady Dawlish prattles of a similar work, "You know, all is development. The principle is perpetually going on. First there was nothing. Then there was something; then I forget the next, I think there were shells, then fish; then we came. Let me see, did we come next? Never mind, we came at last. And the next change, there will be something very superior to us."

How humorous and unsentimentally British that sounds! In *Endymion*, Baron Sergius reviews the various European nationalities, Teutons, Latins, Celts, Slavs, and observes, "The Semites now exercise a vast influence over affairs by their smallest, though peculiar family, the Jews. There is no race gifted with so much tenacity and such skill in organisation. These qualities have given them unprecedented hold over property and illimitable credit. As you advance in life and get experienced in affairs, the Jews will cross you everywhere. They have long been stealing into our secret diplomacy, which they have almost appropriated; in another quarter of a century they will claim a share in open government . . . language and religion do not make a race—there is only one thing that makes a race, and that is blood."

Which of the two Disraelis is it that speaks here? One can hardly say. Actually he is referring to his own inherent race of Israel; but most of what he says might be applied equally to the Anglo-Saxon; and is so applied by him on many occasions. We all of us contain within ourselves the elements of a precarious duality. That is part of the excitement of living, we ride two steeds at once, and the problem is to keep them from going in contrary directions. It is fascinating to watch this feat being performed by a masterhand at the game. Disraeli, as an effective British statesman was perhaps as consistent and unified as any that ever lived. But within himself, potentially, he represented the profoundest division in the civilized world, no less than that of the two principles which he cites as at deadly variance, the Patriotic and Cosmopolitan—individual variety and collective standardisation, in the national sphere—on the reconciliation of which, he insisted, the fate of England depended. It is for us to look back at the man and his actual achievements, and judge if the marvellous degree of reconciliation and unity of purpose he brought about within himself was not nationally translated into the actual affairs of Britain and the Empire wihin the limits of his opportunity—for it must be remembered that Disraeli was an old and tired man, as well as a somewhat stale and habituated parliamentarian, before he was permitted to come to office and power.

The contrast here mentioned, is displayed in his novel *Tancred*, where his High Church aristocratic hero discourses philosophically with the Lebanese Emir, Fahredean, with his Semitic and megalomaniacal longing for world-hegemony. "If one could only have faith in something," the Emir laments, "and conquer the world." And Tancred replies, "I find

* From *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli* by F. W. Moneypenny.

no charm in conquering the world to establish a dynasty . . . It has a precipitate tendency to decay. One should conquer the world to enshrine, not a man, but an idea . . . But what idea?" The answer to the riddle lies in the East, according to the Arabian; England, Christendom, is finished. "The game is in our hands, if we only have the energy. There is a combination that would entirely change the whole face of the world, and bring back the Empire to the East. . . . Let the Queen of England quit a petty and exhausted position . . . collect a great fleet, stow away all her treasures . . . be accompanied by all her Court and chief people and translate the seat of her Empire from London to Delhi. . . . We will acknowledge the Empress of India as our suzerain, and secure for her the Levantine coast. If she likes she shall have Alexandria, as she has Malta." In reading that one must keep in mind that it was all an imaginative projection on the part of a man who subsequently took the chief hand in realizing a great part of it. For that reason alone, although he is not there in person to achieve it, it would be wise to examine all Disraeli's statements along this line, even though they come from a somewhat turgid novel.

Tancred epitomises Disraeli's theory of the ultimate compatability, even identity, of the Jewish and Christian faiths; a reflection of his own inner degree of reconciliation. And he finishes the above remarkable anticipation of events, with a plea for "the sublime and solacing doctrine of theocratic equality."

"Work out a great religious Truth on the Persian and Mesopotamian plains, the most exuberant soil in the world" —Just how exuberant the geological prospectors had not yet discovered!—"and the scantiest population; it would revivify Asia. . . . The European comfort which they call civilisation is confined to a very small space; the island of Great Britain, France, and the course of a single river, the Rhine. The greater part of Europe is as dead as Asia, without the consolation of her climate and the influence of immortal tradition."

To Disraeli, it was because this great solution, spoken of above, was still wanting that the convulsions of 1848 broke out. Christendom will not permit Jewry to make its constructive and essential contribution to the solving of the social problems its own doctrines have created. So in insane reaction the Jews are driven to the systematic destruction of society in combination with its lowest Gentile elements; their racial genius for imaginative organisation is suppressed and driven underground and perverted to the formation of the minority of psychological and social failures into a trained army for the fomenting of universal trouble and the overthrow of that evolving Order in which they are denied a constructive part. Sidonia, the Jewish financier, in the novel, *Comingsby,* whose model is said to be found in Lord Rothschild, and his place of business, Sequin Court, to be a picture of the famous Rothschild business establishment in New Court, St. Swithins, speaks of the essential Jew as "monarchical in sentiment, deeply religious and essentially Tory; yet their present disabilities drive them into the same rank as the levellers and latitudinarians, and each generation they must become more powerful and more dangerous in the society which provokes their hostility." In that convincing analysis, is laid open for all to read by one of the most gifted Jews that ever lived, the complete, though admittedly only circumstantial, proof of the origin of the *Proctocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.* As Sidonia sees it—and for Sidonia we may legitimately substitute Disraeli himself—it is useless to expect that any persecution can crush "those who have successively baffled the Pharoahs, Nebuchadnezzar, and the Feudal Ages . . . No penal laws, no physical torture can effect that a superior race should be absorbed into an inferior or be destroyed by it. . . . They may be persecuted, but they cannot be dispersed except by the brutal ignorance of some mongrel breed, that brandishes faggots and howls extermination, but is itself exterminated by the immutable law of nature which is fatal to curs."

There, according to Disraeli's theories, speaks the conscious aristocrat. And the terrible confirmation of his pronouncement can be seen, if we so choose, in the spectacle of Central Europe today, just one hundred years later. But what he so strangely fails to see, is that it is only aristocracy in the abstract—Breeding with a capital B—because it is aristocracy without responsibility, or self assurance, which are its distinguishing features; potential aristocracy, if you like, but aristocracy that has yet to prove itself as such, and still labours under a powerful and self-destructive inferiority complex. Sidonia continues: "In every great movement in Europe the Jews have played, and play, a principal part. The first Jesuits were Jews; that mysterious Russian diplomacy that so alarms Western Europe is organised by Jews. Jews almost monopolize the professional chairs in Germany, and are thence preparing that mighty revolution of which so little is known in England as yet, but which will in fact be a second Reformation. . . . Jews are to be found among the leading ministers in every state in Europe. . . . All modern philosophy springs from Spinoza. . . ." And so on, more or less convincingly, but in a mounting strain of semi-hysteria that culminates in the fatuous elevation of Mendelssohn to the chief place among composers.

Disraeli himself was under no illusion as to the organisational springs of the February revolutions of 1848, any more than he was as to the part played by Jew-controlled Grand Orient Freemasonry seventy years before in starting the so-called French Revolution. The fall of the reinstated monarchy in France on February 24 was the signal for risings all over Europe from Sicily to Denmark. Louis Philippe's abdication, which was followed by that of the Emperor of Austria, was precipitated out of the significantly trivial occurrence of the prohibition of a banquet of the National Guard. A colonel was shot, and panic and chaos suddenly descended on Paris apparently from nowhere; just as a similar coup might have arisen, and no doubt was intended, if the French strikes last Autumn had attained the hold in the country for which the Jew-controlled Communist organization all over the Continent were waiting. "The French disturbance," writes Disraeli, "was not a great popular movement. It was a discontent which required nothing more for its solution than a change of ministry; but the sovereign and his subjects were in a sudden confusion. *The secret societies are always vigilant and always prepared. They took society by surprise . . .* " And then he adds: "The two characteristics of these confederations, which now cover Europe like a network, are war against property and hatred of the Semitic revelation. . . . " That is Disraeli's way of referring to Christianity. "Alone the secret societies can disturb, but they cannot control Europe. Acting in unison with a great popular movement, they may destroy society, as they did at the end of the last century." For "popular movement", read Communism, or Naziism, or Socialism, which all, and equally, spell opportunity to the mind bent on Pure Destruction!

In a letter to Frances Ann, Lady Londonderry, dated May Day, 1848, he writes: "Have you yet recovered from the great catastrophe? . . . The King of France in a Surrey villa. Metternich in a Hanover Square Hotel, the Prince of Prussia (afterwards the Emperor William I) at Lady Palmerston's. . . . Affairs, *on dit*, are worse in Germany than in France . . . nothing resists. Fifty mad professors in Frankfurt calling themselves a Diet, self-appointed, have actually invaded Denmark and will not conclude their labours till they have established a Federal Republic like the U.S.A. . . . The fact is the elements of government do not exist in the greater part of Europe and we are destroying them pretty quickly in England. *Russia alone develops herself, and will develop herself still more in the great struggle which is perhaps nearer than we imagine.*" (The emphasis is added.) "Once destroy the English aristocracy, and enthrone the commercial principle as omnipotent in this island, and there will be no repelling force which can prevent the Slavonians conquering the whole of the South of Europe. I look upon France as quite exhausted; insolvent in purse and soul." And then with what is perhaps an anticipation of the present rise of the issue of Dominion Status for Northern Ireland, he adds with a touch of Disraelian gallantry: "In all this confusion Ireland may rise from its ashes; it will repudiate the commercial principle, and you will become a feudal princess in your Tower of Garron."

PARLIAMENT—*continued from page* 3.

Minister and the profession should have aroused such intense feelings of a political kind. I would like to examine those feelings.

First and foremost the doctors are thinking of their patients to whom they give their working lives. This representative committee—which is after all a much wider body than just the little B.M.A. clique which is constantly being talked about; most of the leaders of the profession whom we honour are either on it or have said they agree with it—is convinced that the Health Service would be a better service if its counter proposals were accepted. [HON. MEMBERS: "What are they?" They are in the documents. Any hon. Member can read the comments on the Minister's proposals, they have all been published. They believe in their opinions with deep sincerity. No one knows that better than the Minister, and if he were here I would put this point to him: the Minister might have all the logic in the world on his side but even then, how could he make a success of the Health Service without the goodwill of the medical profession? It is worth his while to be reasonable and see if he can meet the doctors on one or two of these points.

. . . I do not want to go further into the old argument about goodwill because I regard that as closed, but it is of interest to ask, why is it that since the Act was passed the opposition of the doctors on this question of the sale of practices has hardened? It is very significant, because the House of Commons voted a large sum of money to pay compensation to the doctors for the loss of their goodwill, yet it is a fact that their opposition to this part of the Act has hardened. I cannot expect the House to agree with the argument I propose to make on this subject but it is right that someone should make it.

The possession of a capital asset, like a house or the goodwill of a medical practice, is a powerful aid to a man's independence. The possession of property serves sometimes as a refuge from arbitrary interference, sometimes as a platform on to which a man can climb and make his voice heard above the crowd. The doctors have a special reason of their own for valuing this kind of independence. They have found out that in their profession, when new methods of treatment or additions to medical knowledge are first brought forward, they often meet with opposition. The possibility of retreating to the independence of general practice has encouraged many a salaried worker and many a research worker to keep on in the face of hostility, not only from lay bodies, but from senior members of their own profession. That is the first reason why the doctors value this kind of independence. Secondly, the doctors have come to value their independence —which is bound up with a capital asset and payment by results—as something of great importance to the middle class.

I do not think we can understand why the opposition of the doctors to the Minister has increased unless we see the Minister's recent obstinacy as one of a series of blows delivered by this Government against the middle class. Houses are not to be built for sale; the purchasing power of professional incomes goes steadily down—[AN HON. MEMBER: "So does everybody else's]—the basic petrol ration is abolished; university seats in this House are to disappear; and now there is talk of a capital levy which will hit those people for whom the Secretary of State for War does not care a "tinker's cuss." All this looks like a concerted attack upon the middle class. A month or two ago in Washington I was discussing this problem with a wise American. I wish I had been able to ask him if I might use his name. He was showing me how, even in the United States, the middle class is being squeezed out between high taxation and high prices, and he summed up his anxiety by saying that a democracy which consisted only of a proletariat and civil servants would cease to be a society of free men. . . . I believe that to be profoundly true. History teaches me that a numerous body of independent men and women, who owe the Government nothing but their taxes, and are well off enough to shape their own lives, are the leaven in the democratic lump. Where would the Labour Government be without their recruits from the middle class? I am not now concerned with the politics of these people, I want to go deeper; I am concerned with their power to resist bribery and bullying——

Mr. Mitchinson: On a point of Order. Has this anything to do with the Motion before the House?

Mr. Eccles: I was saying that these independent people are valuable to society because they are able to resist bribery and bullying and to initiate those experiments in thought and action which make progress possible. Instinctively the doctors have come to realise that these values, which are their values, are now in danger.

So it happens that the Minister of Health, by his brutal tactics, has roused 40,000 British men and women to defend the freedom of action and the freedom of conscience of all their fellow citizens. This is a large body and whatever they may do in the plebiscite they want the service to succeed. Of that I am certain. Very few concessions from the Minister, and they would enter that service with pride and hope. All the Minister has to do is to give way over the basic salary, the appeal and the negative directions. If the Minister stands firm and if the Government insists in elbowing their way into the place of the doctor's conscience, if that conscience is no longer in the doctor's breast but in some committee room in Whitehall, then we must expect this

dispute, which could be easily settled by goodwill, to become a political battle of historical importance. . . . I hope and pray that that will not happen. . . .

Mr. Richard Law (Kensington, South): . . . What is the will of Parliament? There is very great confusion about that. I think that anybody sitting in the Gallery or, indeed, on the Floor of the House who listened to the Minister this afternoon, would have come to the conclusion that it was the will of Parliament that the doctors and dentists should be compelled to enter the National Health Service. Anyone who read the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Edinburgh on Saturday would come to the same conclusion —that Parliament had laid it down that doctors were under compulsion to enter the National Health Service. [HON. MEMBERS: "Nonsense."] It is all very well for hon. Members opposite to say "Nonsense," but let them listen to what the Chancellor, in fact, said:

"If democracy is to survive in this country, the minority must conform to the reasonable wishes of the majority and we must all subordinate our own interest to those of the nation."

He went on to say:

"There is a dangerous spirit abroad among certain groups who seem to think their own interests and opinions ought to overrule the decisions of the nation. Such an attitude appears to be adopted by the leaders of the doctors at this moment. . . ."

It cannot possibly be maintained in the light of what is contained in the National Health Service Act, and in the light of the repeated pledges which the Minister himself has given, that if the doctors refuse to go into the national health service on grounds of judgment and of conscience, they are flouting the will of Parliament. In fact, they are only exercising a right to a freedom of choice which Parliament has expressly guaranteed to them. It is of importance that hon. Members opposite, and the great general public outside, should realise that fact. It would be a different matter if there was any question of the doctors refusing to succour the sick. There is no question of that. It cannot be said from any reading of the Act or any interpretation of the various undertakings that the Minister has given us, that if one, or 1,000 or 50,000 doctors refused to accept service under the scheme, they are flouting the will of Parliament.

I would like to discuss the attitude of the Minister on this point, because it seems to be a little ambiguous. The burden of his speech this afternoon was that the British Medical Association did not represent the doctors and were gulling and deceiving the doctors and pulling the wool over the doctors' eyes. [HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear."] If hon. Members opposite really believe that the medical profession of this country is so gullible that it cannot form a judgment on an issue of this kind, complicated as it is, I must say that it is a bad look-out for the health service in any case. The right hon. Gentleman made some play with this question of the open poll. He said that it was the antithesis of democracy. I am not sure whether I have used his exact words. He said that it was undemocratic and that it laid the way open to intimidation. In reply to my right hon. Friend the Senior burgess for Oxford University (Sir A. Salter) he repeated the answer which he gave in the House of Commons the other day. If it will not be unparliamentary for me to do so I say that when the Minister takes that attitude it is really the most absolute humbug.

If the Minister thinks that the open ballot is undemocratic, I would ask him how otherwise the collective opinion of the medical profession could be discovered. Would he think it more democratic to have a ballot that was not signed? If the British Medical Association had issued ballot forms to be returned without any signature or means of identification, surely the right hon. Gentleman would have said that the ballot was cooked? And he would have been quite right, because it would have been open to anyone to get hold of a form and to fill in the answer they liked. . . .

. . . The Minister must have known perfectly well that the plebiscite would be in this form.

Mr. Bevan: Oh, no. The former plebiscites taken by the B.M.A. have been for the purpose of collecting opinions. This present plebiscite is for the purpose of determining action.

Mr. Law: That really is a distinction without a difference, from the point of view of this argument, and it is a confession, out of the Minister's own mouth, what sheer humbug this point on which he has laid so much stress really is. . . .

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Wootton, Liverpool.