THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 12. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1951. 6d. Weekly.

A Question of Relationship

The question of the relationship between truth and fact is one of pre-eminent importance. There is, in general parlance, a kind of tacit acknowledgement that, in the sense of perfect agreement, the two are one; and we say, 'the fact of the matter is,' or 'the truth of the matter is,' without feeling called on to discriminate.

There exists, nevertheless, an essential difference between them, which difference, however, seals and confirms the relationship and renders it fruitful. For fact has an important rôle to play in regard to truth. One may express it best perhaps by saying that the function of fact is to demonstrate or actualise truth. Fact is, as it were , the handmaid of truth which itself has a more passive rôle to play, existing in the mind and heart of those who perceive it, *awaiting* manifestation. It is here that danger lies, and vigilance is needed. For the nature of a fact is such that it can be handled, manipulated, and distorted. It can thus be isolated and torn from the truth to which it rightly belongs. So handled it can be pressed into the service of those whose interest it is to conceal the truth, and whose end can only be obtained by lies and misrepresentation. It can also be made to contradict itself, and to appear in the guise of conflicting facts creating a state of disorder and chaos, useful to those wishing to impose their own orders and directions.

The most disruptive form or aspect this variance between facts has taken is that of the fact of poverty and destitution amid the fact of plenty. So long as this state can be misrepresented as proving that the poor are poor because the rich are rich all is well, and a 'soak the rich' policy of taxation, and schemes of public and private charity appear to be justified. But it is difficult to maintain this useful fiction as plenty becomes abundance, abundance superabundance, and superabundance 'unwanted surpluses,' for the difficulties increase and the position tends to become scandalous. It also supplies incontrovertible proof of the fact—insisted on by Major Douglas—that the 'problem' is one of distribution, which presents no real problem in a state of plenty beyond that of giving people the means—*i.e., money*—to claim it. This is fatal to the Planner as a condition of scarcity is essential for him to obtain the power to plan and control both production and distribution. Consequently it is found necessary to reduce the fact of plenty and prevent it arising. Acts of direct sabotage are employed, but war is the most effective means to this end. For one thing war can be made by propaganda, to appeal to certain noble instincts in man such as love of country, defence of the weak, dethronement of tyranny and so forth, all calculated to arouse more enthusiasm than orders to burn wheat, plough in cotton, destroy cattle, etc. It also serves the double purpose of distracting the mind and preventing it from detecting the real policy being pursued, and also convincing it that scarcity must be the inevitable result of such means. From that point it is easy to persuade the people that a system of rationing and controls is logical and necessary, and the Planner comes triumphantly into his own. Incidentally, the creation of an army of bureaucrats to operate the plans helps to relieve the unemployment problem, and also creates a vested interest in planning, so, from the Planner's point of view, everything in the garden is lovely.

This all too familiar picture is drawn to raise the question of why man has allowed and is allowing this obscene trick to be played on him, and why those who suffer from it feel no sense of outrage, and those who profit no sense of shame.* (Suggest to anyone that all should receive a National Dividend if you want to arouse a sense of outrage; but tell them that wheat was being burnt while people went hungry and their reaction will be a kind of shocked equanimity, and a comfortable feeling that anyway that can no longer be happening because now we have a state of 'scarcity!')

It is submitted here that, fundamentally, the reason for this extraordinary reaction—or want of reaction—is because man is unable or unwilling to see and understand himself, primarily, as an inheritor. But unless man believes himself to be the creator of the universe (is not this the temptation "Ye shall be as gods" that lured man from paradise?) there is always the *given* thing: the earth and the fulness thereof, and man's intelligence by means of which he puts these things to his own use, and by research and discovery develops and transforms them, thereby increasing their utility for himself and suceeding generations. Nevertheless the *given* thing, the gift, is by implication ignored or denied, and man sees himself, primarily, as a functionary, a worker.

Social Credit can therefore claim the distinction of being based upon the immutable truth of inheritance. Moreover, it can claim the further distinction that we owe to its author the discovery of the fact that endorses and confirms this truth, so that within Social Credit itself we find that absolute relationship and alliance between truth and fact which alone enables the truth to be realised and experienced. For it was the detection of a 'flaw' in the price or accounting system causing a gap to appear between purchasing power and prices that disclosed what might be called the very stuff of the inheritance, and contradicted the assumption of orthodoxy that costs in industry were automatically self liquidating. No attempt is made therefore in Social Credit to rectify the gap or flaw, to contrive to abolish it. On the contrary, it is used as the basis for the remedy. For it supplies, as it were, the means or the where-with-all for the technical proposals necessary for the distribution of the inheritance.

The economy is the acme of perfection. Nothing is lost, nothing discarded, nothing wasted. The very fact, the thing, which, while ignored or denied, acts as a menace and a curse, binding man to servitude, when acknowledged becomes the

* These last do not include the instigators and controllers of the situation who are beyond any sense of shame.

means of his deliverance, and is seen to be a benediction and a blessing.* Indeed it is difficult to see what could be done without it to realise and actualise the truth of man's inheritance, and raise his status, *at once,* from that of a servant to that of an heir.

The simplicity of Social Credit distinguishes it also from every other economic and political reform whether of right or left. For all these, being based on the assumption that industry is, or should be, or must be *made* to be self-liquidating, and that man must be fully employed, are merely variants of the efforts and schemes designed to force facts to fit this assumption. All therefore involving, as they must, plans for supercapital production, whether for New Deals, militarisation or for developing the 'backward countries' plunge man into ever increasing debt and taxation. This forcible manipulation of facts in furtherance of a purpose inimical to man, and in disregard and denial of the truth, is leading man into a realm of fantasy and illusion, and creating that state of dementia into which the world is being ever more rapidly driven. Only however, when facts are left *to speak for themselves*—it has been said that facts act as though they were in the pay of Social Credit—do they lead to the truth which embodies them and which they are designed to manifest, and hence to a state of sanity and enlightenment.

But simplicity is suspect, and arouses opposition. Man has been taught to see some virtue, in the hard, the difficult, the long and tortuous way to achievement. Probably it ministers to his vanity. He is, at any rate, inclined to despise the short cut, the easy way, the line of least resistance. Nevertheless the *right* line of least resistance—there is a wrong one, and it is not denied that difficulties may be encountered in finding the right one—is the only intelligent and efficient one to take. Otherwise one behaves like the ant that strives again and again to climb over an obstacle when it could so much more easily and quickly get round it.

The strange thing to be observed, however, is that Social Credit changes nothing, alters nothing; only a factor in the situation hitherto ignored is utilised. But the result is a change so radical that everything is changed. And the nature of the change is religious, because it is a binding back to reality.

BEATRICE C. BEST.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: April 30, 1951.

European Agricultural Pool

Mr. E. L. Mallalieu asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has accepted the invitation from the French Government to discuss the possibility of a European Agricultural Pool; and whether he has any statement to make about this proposal.

Mr. Younger: The invitation from the French Government is now being considered, and a reply will be sent in the near future. I suggest that my hon. Friend puts down a further Question next week.

Education (Independent Schools)

Major Hicks-Beach asked the Minister of Education the number of boys and girls at present being educated at schools under his jurisdiction without any call on public funds.

Mr. Tomlinson: I estimate that there are about 500,000 children attending independent schools in England and Wales. Some of these children's fees are paid in whole or in part by local education authorities, but I cannot at present state the numbers.

House of Commons: *May* 1, 1951.

Lea Copse, Finchampstead

Mr. Remnant asked the Minister of Local Government and Planning whether he proposes to hold a public inquiry into the proposed compulsory acquisition of Lea Copse, Finchampstead, as a mortar and grenade range.

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir; I have consulted my right hon. Friend the Minister of Agriculture, who does not support the objections raised by two farmers to this proposal.

Mr. Remnant: Is the Minister aware that, whereas the local authorities have been consulted, neither of the two farmers whose land he proposes to take has even been officially notified by the Service Ministry that his land is to be taken? In view of this gross unfairness, will the right hon. Gentleman please reconsider whether the proper method, in order to give fairness to these and to other people, is to hold a public inquiry so that they can voice their objections?

Mr. Dalton: The hon. Member and I have had some correspondence about this and I think he will agree that I have tried to be helpful. The difficulty with regard to these alternative sites is that in the view of the Ministry of Agriculture there is less objection to this site than to the various alternatives, and therefore that Ministry are not prepared to support objections on agricultural grounds.

Mr. Remnant: If the Minister were to ask his right hon. Friend, he would know that no representative of the Ministry of Agriculture has been over the ground.

Major Legge-Bourke: Are we to understand from the right hon. Gentleman's original answer that any local inquiry can now be held only if a Ministry supports private individuals? Does not this deny the right of a private individual to an inquiry?

Mr. Dalton: No, Sir, it does not. There was a White Paper on the acquisition of land for the Services, and all those interested in the progress of the defence programme are anxious to cut out unnecessary delays in inquiries. I am trying in that way to assist the Service Ministers. If the Service Ministers want this land—even if it is of agricultural importance—and the Minister of Agriculture thinks there is less objection to it from his point of view than there is to land anywhere else, then I think the Service Department had better have the land.

Defence Programme (Raw Materials and Production)

Colonel Cyril Banks (Pudsey): . . . In my part of the world I have visited a few companies and talked to some people recently about the position in which I find myself in my company. We all know that some of the commodities that we use in our businesses suddenly ceased, and we were told that they were not available. This may be amusing to hon. Members opposite, but they should have a crack at it themselves. We did not get the materials. We went to the

* One cannot help recalling here St. Augustine's cry "O felix culpa."

normal channels and tried to get the materials to finish orders for export and for home production, but we were told that we could not have such commodities, not even one-third of the quantity we required to keep us going.

Yesterday I asked a certain firm in my constituency to give me the facts, so that when I came here I could put them forward without fear of contradiction. They used to use 1,000 tons of pig iron a month. It is not a big firm. At present, due to the delivery position, they must suffer a 25 *per cent.* reduction from now to the end of the year. A further foundry, only three miles away, on Wednesday last phoned my organisation to inquire if we could help them to acquire some pig iron to keep their factory going. They said that if they could not get it they would have to close their foundry.

I have read the White Paper, and I notice that we want a 4 *per cent.* increase in production in this country. It is all very nice to print these things, but if the Minister comes near my constituency he will find the same story in every firm using metal at the present time. The foundry to which I have referred will, within five weeks, be closed for 75 *per cent.* of its time. One foundry closed two days last week. What is the position with regard to other metals than those used in foundries, such as sheet steel? The position is far worse there, and the people in my division who normally use that metal cannot get it.

Mr. G. R. Strauss: I hope the hon. and gallant Member will tell the House in what way the Government or I are responsible for the shortage of sheet steel or pig iron.

Colonel Banks: I will. I propose to tell the House how a firm was given an allocation from the Ministry for a certain period and, much to their surprise, obtained all they wanted for that period. When, however, they went to the supplier, they were told, "The Ministry can give you that allocation but we cannot supply you. We have not got the metal." [HON. MEMBERS: "That is not the Government's fault."] But the Minister tells us in the House that the raw materials position is fine, and his Department gives us statistics which do not agree with the facts. It is time we had some realism in this matter. It is time the Minister told us where we stand on raw materials. We are entitled to know it, as are the manufacturers.

Let us take the question of dustbins or garbage cans, as the Americans call them. The Minister knows perfectly well that for export or anything else they can only be painted. If they are galvanised it must be for the Ministry of Food, to contain food. Those are the conditions under which industry is working today. The raw material position is serious. The Minister said nothing of what he was going to do about nickel and nickel bearing steel, but we have got that problem coming—and before long, too.

I happened to be at a dinner two weeks ago last Saturday, when a speech was delivered by one of the country's steel producers. He said, "If you want to know about the position in nickel steel, there is nothing for you; nor can you get the substitutes we used during the war, because we have not got them either." The Minister nods his head, so that it is true that we have not got these nickel substitutes. He knows that he must face the problem of the restriction of nickel steel in the near future. If he does not, our rearmament programme will be affected.

What about the people in industry who are using them and demanding them? The Minister said that we could carry out the defence programme. Can we? The Ministers who resigned last week were quite right in what they said—we cannot achieve what has been laid down. Certainly, judging by my part of the world, it cannot be done. I hope the Minister will tell my right hon. Friend the Member for Warwick and Leamington the real facts about raw materials, what actually is the true position throughout the country, so that we in industry may know and do the best we can to carry on.

Mr. Jack Jones (Rotherham): . . . It is easy to talk about going down the mines; and it is very easy to stay away from the mines. But our miners are the king pins in the situation. Make no mistake about that. The hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Eccles) said today that we have gold which is useless. Once some of us went about the country saying that coal was more important than gold. We were laughed at, but we were correct. Now we can afford to bury gold, and we have not sufficient coal to meet our needs.

How are we to get our raw materials? If the Minister of Fuel and Power could give us another 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 tons more, how easy it would be to get sulphuric acid, to make our contracts with Sweden to get pyrites—to get our industries' requirement of sulphuric acid. But we have not sufficient coal, and we know the cause—because we have full employment, which makes a great demand for coal, because of our busy factories, our busy steel mills, and so on. Yet. hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite think they can get more coal than we—with all their history in the mines behind them. It would be a tragedy for this country if, by some miracle, they were returned to power, for coal production would go down and down.

As for scrap, there is no further scrap in Germany available easily to be got. As I said 12 months ago in the House and from this very place, if we decide to rearm Germany, Germany is perfectly entitled to say, "If we are to rearm to off-set the menace of Communism we are entitled to produce more steel not only for armament purposes but for the rehabilitation of our civil conditions." Germany will not easily allow scrap to leave her country.

I turn to America. I have personally smelted hundreds of thousands of tons of steel scrap that America exported. America is no longer an exporter, but an importer and buyer, and a powerful bidder because of her colossal manufacturing capacity, and because she has the goods with which to pay. These facts constitute vast problems—and the Opposition think they can solve them by putting down miserable Amendments of this description.

The hon. Member for Hallam talked about the position in Sheffield. It takes rich ore from Sweden to help. Last year 9,000,000 tons were brought from abroad, and it is a fact that the price of that ore is going up, the cost of freight is going up, the cost of coal is going up. The reason is that what is good for John Bull, and what is good for Mr. Miner and Mr. Steel Worker, is good also for Mr. Belgium, and Mr. France and Mr. Anybody else. These are facts which the Government cannot control.

. . . We must make full use of our own indigenous raw materials. Whether we like it or not, the position will become very serious. We must make good use of our indigenous raw materials— our labour, our skill, our brawn, our coal, our iron ore and so on. If we fail to do that then, of course, we

(*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* 7*s.* 6*d.*

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

Vol. 26. *No.* 12. *Saturday, May* 19, 1951.

From Week to Week

There are signs that The Gang is beginning to regard with quite undisturbed placidity (it may never have been disturbed) the unprecedented reaction to General MacArthur's dismissal and return to the United States. Assuming that he was a uniquely placed rebel against Washington (for which read Wall Street, *etc.*), which is a large assumption, his fate, which is admittedly yet to be recorded, seems more likely to be a confirmation of the view that the day of the Hero is over than anything else. The Gang has learnt what to do with Heroes, if, indeed, there was ever a time when it didn't. Miracles are due; but not the sort of miracle envisaged by the sudden emergence of a Leader of any description. Mobs (and all large aggregations of men are mobs) may come near to accrediting a Leader; but they will be drawn off, and their failure converted into an instrument of their further frustration. On this point we believe Mr. Hanighen in *Human Events* summarises the position perfectly: —

"What is the meaning of this extraordinary phenomenon—MacArthur's capture of the American people? . . . . The times are troubled. A combination of angry discontents —about taxes, controls, mismanagement at home and abroad —have been distilled by the advent of MacArthur into a resounding protest against the incumbent Administration and is alchemized suddenly into cheers for the General. Possibly, at first, MacArthur had little to do with it. For months his stock was low. But—almost like a law of physics—as the prestige of Truman descended, MacArthur's mounted. Something like that happened. We are not sure—for this historic phenomenon is difficult to analyze and may provide arguments for historians for years to come.

"There is another way of looking at it. About two decades ago, the ruling business class was ousted and a revolution began. For nigh on two decades, the new ruling class, the intelligentsia and their allies the politicians, has shaped foreign as well as domestic policies. By skilful techniques of thought control, and by juggling the two balls of 'security' and 'foreign danger' the intelligentsia have held the masses and maintained themselves in power. So skilfully have they moved, indeed, that the masses have been lulled to accept the most incredible foreign adventures . . . .

"But how was the protecting shield of thought control pierced? Well, some 250,000 'press agents' in uniform in Korea wrote home and told their story. Meanwhile some magnificent crusades in portions of the Press helped, to which were added some persuasive voices from Capitol Hill; and finally plain common sense among the people struggled to the top. Thus was the propaganda web of lies broken. In short, something like that helped create the extraordinary phenomenon of the hero's return. . . . Will it 'fade away?' It is not likely to fade soon. It may set off another revolution to replace that of the two last decades. Or, on the other hand, the highly organized machine of idea control of the intelligentsia might capture, or at least alter it. Its greatest advantage is that the business class has failed to create its own intelligentsia, its own ideas and its own machinery for propagation. Why that is so—is quite another story. Meanwhile, the MacArthur phenomenon poses another question—can a leader so warmly acclaimed by the masses continue to confound the machine?"

• • •

It is "quite another story"—and by quite another story we mean one which does not admit the business class as competitors in the sorry game of minding everybody else's business but its own. It ceased to mind its own business when it borrowed the rule-book of Finance.

Winston Churchill (on Mr. Baruch's advice?) has, it seems, only postponed his visit to America until the timing has improved. When his journey takes place it will be a marvellous show—with a retinue of well over a dozen, family, servants, secretaries, *etc.* And why? Clearly, it is all arranged, whatever it is.

• • •

The report of the Ministry of Agriculture on Toxic Chemicals in Agriculture under the Chairmanship of "Solly" Zuckerman, son-in-law of Stella, Lady Reading, and food-substitute planner in chief, has been published.

• • •

Mr. Hannah is getting, on the whole, an exceptionally good press. From this distance, we cannot see dummy, which makes us hope all the more devoutly that Mr. Hannah has the ace; his own hand, so far, in *Theology* and elsewhere has been scintillating with Kings and Queens. The test will be Convocation.

• • •

We believe that few, even of our worst enemies, accuse us of being *incurably* optimistic (a concession for which we are duly grateful); but we confess to being considerably impressed by the courageous words of Mr. Martin Lindsay (Wellington and Sandhurst, a battalion commander in the Second Phase of the World War, in which he served with distinction in Norway and North-West Europe; Member of Parliament for Solihull). Mr. Lindsay contributes a centre-page article to *The Observer* for May 13 urging the adoption of the Secret Ballot for M.P.s. The choice of medium is something we frankly do not understand. However, the following opinions, actually printed in this popular (though not with us) newspaper, stand on their own inherent quality and have our emphatic endorsement: —"It is . . . ironical to realise that Members of Parliament to-day are by no means always free to cast their votes in the best interests of the nation, as they judge these to be. For to vote against the party line on a major issue means expulsion from public life; and Members have no greater desire to be martyrs than anyone else. Only the ability to vote in secret can restore their freedom of action, and no measure of Parliamentary reform is more necessary to-day. . . . .

"So the great decisions would once again be made *by Parliament,* and no longer by a caucus. The secret vote would

(*Continued on page* 6.)

Monroe

by H. SWABEY.

When James Monroe (1758-1831) was a child, Camden, the Lord Chancellor and Chatham were unsucessfully opposing the Stamp Act. Accordingly, at eighteen he was a volunteer and had been promoted Lieutenant-Colonel when he was twenty-two. Here is some advice that Judge Joseph Jones gave him then: " If Mr. Wythe means to pursue Mr. Blackstone's method, I should think you ought to attend him from the commencement of his course." Monroe's intimacy with Jefferson lasted for fifty years. He became successively a delegate to the Assembly of Virginia, a member of the executive council an dof the fourth, fifth and sixth Congresses of Confederation, as well as of the Convention of Virginia which adopted the U.S. Constitution. He was a delegate in Congress 1783-6. He opposed the Constitution in 1788 on the grounds that there were no adequate checks on the exercise of power, and that once the President was elected " he may be elected for ever." As a Senator, 1790-94, he was " particularly hostile to Hamilton. . . . He was opposed to the measures which were being carried for establishing on a sound basis the national finances." He was Governor of Virginia, and President 1817-25.

Just before Monroe left to be Ambassador to France, the state of opinion in Congress is exemplified in D. C. Gilman's book *James Monroe* by extracts from letters of Congressman Coit. He wrote of " dissatisfaction . . . at the funding system and bank especially "; of the hinted confiscation of British debts, of the embargo, of " the jealousies which exist in the Southern States respecting the funding system. . . ." When Monroe arrived just after Robespierre's fall (1794) " not another civilised nation upon earth " had a recognised representative in France: Monroe helped Lafayette and Tom Paine, both prisoners, and the latter came to live with him. He called Jay's treaty with Great Britain " the most shameful transaction." He was recalled, 1796, to his considerable annoyance. One of his severe critics wrote of this period: " The time had not yet come when American statesmen were to be purchased for money."

Monroe came into personal collision with Hamilton, and was irritated that his dispatches concerning Jacobins were published. Calling them "that misguided club" he wrote of them: "That club was as unlike the patriotic societies in America as light is to darkness, the former being a society that had absolutely annihilated all other government in France, and whose denunciations carried immediately any of the deputies to the scaffold. . . ."

Jefferson sent Monroe to France in 1803 to help in the purchase of the outlet to the Gulf of Mexico, and within a month of his arrival he was able " to report with his colleague the purchase of Louisiana." France was (Gilman) " in want of money, and predisposed to build up in America a power which should rival England." The price was eighty million francs. The author calls it, probably the largest transaction in real estate which the world has ever known. As U.S. was " in good credit at Amsterdam," the money was paid easily, and Napoleon " thought that two or three hundred years later American influence might be overpowering."

Monroe was sent to England in the next year to deal with " impressment of seamen, blockade, and the search of our vessels." Lord Holland wrote of Monroe's " predilection " for France and aversion to England: " A nearer view of the consular and imperial government of France, and of our Constitution in England, converted him from both these opinions. ' I find,' said he to me, ' your monarchy more republican than monarchical, and the French Republic infinitely more monarchical than your monarchy.' " Lord Holland implied that Jefferson refused to ratify a treaty which would have " prevented a war " with the real purpose " of defeating Mr. Monroe's views on the presidentship." Jefferson, however, seems to have fostered Monroe's career. There were further incidents, and " the famous ' orders in council,' full of menace to American commerce, were passed." Monroe returned to America in 1807 to be Governor. In London he had negotiated with six successive foreign secretaries.

In 1811 he entered Madison's cabinet as secretary of state, and war broke out with England the next year, after Percival's declaration that " England could not listen to the pretensions of neutral nations." Monroe had pleaded: " It is the interest of the belligerents to mitigate the calamities of war. . . . The present war has been oppressive beyond example by its duration, and by the desolation it has spread throughout Europe. It is highly important that it should assume at least a milder character." But this was total war. He protested to Madison, when the Secretary at War assumed a military command: " The departments of the Government, being recognised by the Constitution, have appropriate duties under it as organs of the executive will; they contain records of its transactions, and are in that sense checks on the Executive. If the Secretary of War leaves the seat of government . . . there ceases to be a check on executive power as to military operations; indeed, the executive power as known to the Constitution is destroyed; the whole is transferred from the Executive to the general at the head of the army." He also protested against conscription. In 1814, Washington fell and was burned, and Monroe was made Secretary at War.

In 1817—the year after the peace of Ghent—Monroe was President, and his administration was known as " the era of good feeling." The qualifications of his Secretary of State are worth noting. John Quincy Adams had had " a liberal academic education and had participated in public affairs to an unusual extent." He had been to Paris with his father, to St. Petersburg as private secretary, and had been minister to Holland, Prussia, Russia and England. Monroe "did not regard the existence of parties as necessary to free governments." In 1819, the Floridas were purchased from Spain. On the question of the admission of Missouri, he wrote: " I shall weigh well the injunctions of the Constitution, which, when clear and distinct to my mind, will be conclusive with me." Adams would have preferred " a Convention of the States to revise and amend the Constitution. This would have produced a new Union of thirteen or fourteen States unpolluted by slavery . ." Monroe vetoed the Cumberland Road bill, on the ground that Congress had no constitutional right to execute a system of internal improvements, but suggested a constitutional amendment.

Lafayette, after his visit (1824-5) sent Monroe a commentary on Montesquieu, " the most advanced theoretical point of the science." During the contest for his successor, Monroe avoided all interference, for " it was not considered decorous in the Executive to make itself a partisan in a presidential or any other election. . . . They are obsolete opinions now."

The President announced the Monroe Doctrine in his

message of 1823. It was (1890) "still regarded as fundamental law." Monroe said that the U.S. "are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonisation by any European powers. . . . In the wars of European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so . . . we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. . . . Our policy in regard to Europe . . . is . . . to consider the government *de facto* the legitimate government for us." Gilman makes the point that Monroe was merely enunciating the policy which Washington, Adams, Jefferson and others had regarded as fundamental. Jefferson stressed the fundamental maxim "never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe . . . . never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs." Canning's dictum ("I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old") has been used to suggest that he was the author of the Monroe doctrine.

Monroe was "always on his guard against using his official station for the benefit of any relative." A contemporary called has manner "quiet and dignified." Jefferson said that he was so honest that "if you turned his soul inside out there would not be a spot on it." Judge Watson said that it was his habit "to bow and speak to the humblest slave whom he passed as respectfully as if he had been the first gentleman in the neighbourhood." He further "thought it incumbent on him to have nothing to do with party politics." Monroe wrote (1830), "From the close of our Revolution we have looked to the extinction of the public debt as a period of peculiar felicity. There is, I believe, no other government or people in existence who are thus blessed." It could not be said, observed a contemporary, that his administration "had either been supported or opposed by any party associations or on any party principles." He spoke of "the rapid extinguishment of the debt. . . and the repeal of the internal taxes," in his message of 1817, and of "the rapid reduction of the public debt" in 1820. In 1819 he noted "the contraction of bank circulation and depression of industry." A note of Washington appears, on Monroe's report as ambassador, as follows: "The Judiciary of the U.S. interpret it otherwise; over whom the Executive have no control."

Gilman's work is not a Republican tract. It suggests rather the ghastly perversion of U.S. politics that has occurred since the sedate Monroe's time. America has changed as much as the Germany of Bach has changed, or the England of Blackstone, or the France of Montesquieu. It would be childish to suggest that, in the main, it was a change for the better.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (*Continued from page* 4)

restore a truer conception of democracy by reducing the power of the Cabinet oligarchy. For this reason every Administration of whatever party would fight this proposal to the death. If ever a Government were seriously threatened by the protagonists of this reform, the Whips would crack as never before. Now if only we could have a secret vote to decide upon whether or not to have a secret vote . . . . .!"

Credo quia impossibile?

Whose Festival?

The Festival of Britain celebrates, amongst other things, the centenary of the Great Exhibition of 1851, a project which the issue of *The Jewish Chronicle* for April 27, informs us was "designed by the noble-minded Prince Albert to promote the cause of universal peace and human brotherhood."

That "Great Exhibition of Works of Industry of All Nations" reflected, says Mr. Hugh Harris in the article quoted, the general optimism of those Victorian times and "appealed irresistibly to the Jewish consciousness."

The Anglo-Jewish community had special reasons for their optimism: their long-drawn out fight for civil emancipation was reaching a climax and there could seem little doubt as to the final outcome. We learn that "in 1851 the struggle for the removal of Jewish disabilities was entering upon a critical and decisive stage. Baron Lionel de Rothschild had twice been elected M.P. by the City of London, but was still debarred by the terms of the Parliamentary oath from taking his seat. Lord John Russell, the Liberal Prime Minister, had twice succeeded in passing an Emancipation Bill through the Commons, but it had each time been rejected by the Lords. An eloquent champion of the Jewish cause was Benjamin Disraeli, the leader of the Conservative Party, who but for baptism in childhood, would have been excluded from Parliament.

"On May 1, 1851, the very day of Queen Victoria's opening of the Great Exhibition in Hyde Park, the Emancipation Bill once more passed its second reading in the Commons, but when it reached the Lords it was again rejected . . . In June, Alderman David Salomons was elected M.P. for Greenwich; and in July, without taking the oath, he voted and spoke in the Commons—until compelled to withdraw . . . these stirring Parliamentary events of 1851 form the background to Jewish participation in the Great Exhibition."

The Jewish Chronicle of a century ago commented on the opening of the Exhibition as follows: —

"Therein Royalty taught a lesson of religious equality; for there was seen a Jew, Baron Lionel de Rothschild, as one of the treasurers of this great undertaking. . . . There were seen also the nobles of the land mixing with the plebeian; and Jew, Christian and Turk met, inter-mingling with the gay and cheerful throng, showing how men of difference in religious creed and in political sentiments, could meet in friendly and brotherly conclave, to assist in carrying out the world's great wonder. . . ."

When the appointment of Baron Lionel de Rothschild as one of the treasurers of the Exhibition had been announced in the preceding year, *The Jewish Chronicle* had asked: "Will the Lords again reject the man whom the Queen thus delighteth to honour?"

From the discreetly influential position of treasurers to the Great Exhibition of 1851, the Rothschild Dynasty and the forces at their command, have, by 1951, advanced to a point where every major public occasion, such as the Giant Fun Fair at Battersea, must needs be determined, in almost every detail, by their cosmopolitan flair for "neutralising" national cultures.

During the last year *The Jewish Chronicle* has given

ample " coverage " to the coming Festival. One week we learnt that a certain Jewish company had been given the contract for erecting a certain number of buildings; the next week we were informed that Jewish tailoring interests had contributed decisively to the cut of the kind of uniform to be worn by the young ladies in attendance at the Festival. There was, however, little or no comment on the curious accountancy which compelled the Festival Gardens Ltd. to ask the Government for a few more millions a few weeks before the scheduled opening of the Fair, an event which resulted in the resignation of the Civil Servant in charge, and his temporary replacement by a Major Joseph.

In an eve-of-the-Festival article entitled " The Jews and the Festival," *The Jewish Chronicle* (April 20) sums up, as it were, the last year's scattered information on the Jewish Contribution to the Battersea Revels, as follows: —

" Jewish architects have played a major role either in the design or interior displays of some of the outstanding sections of the Exhibition. The interior display of the Dome of Discovery was designed by Misha Black, O.B.E., while the chief assistant of the architect of the Dome is Mr. F. Tischler. Mr. Black, who came to this country from Russia, is the head of a group of architects, whose task it was to design the display. Together with Mr. Gibson, Mr. Black was also responsible for the Regatta Restaurant . . . for the decoration of the Bailey Bridge, with revolving, wind-operated pylons, and other features.

" The Power and Production Section, a welded, tubular steel frame was designed by Mr. G. Grenfell Baines, in collaboration with Mr. H. J. Reifenberg. An equally imposing section, the Home and Gardens, was designed by Mr. Bronek Katz . . . the 1951 Bar, a small luxury bar set in a garden overlooking the Thames was designed by Mr. Leonard Menasseh. Mr. Misha Black was also the co-ordinating architect of one section of the South Bank Exhibition.

" A special attraction near the Home and Gardens is the great female figure in bronze by Jacob Epstein. It may also be recalled that the emblem for the Festival was designed by Mr. Abraham Games."

From the personal column entitled " Incidentally " (of the same issue) we gather that Mr. Joseph Horovitz, the youngest conductor in " Britain," will conduct the Daily Concerts of the Amphitheatre Orchestra, while the " deep and golden " voice of Miss Hilary Black, for seven hours at a stretch, will "give crowd directions" to the gay and cheerful throngs intermingling amongst the pavilions of Messrs. Black, Katz and Reifenberg.

" To mark the opening of the Festival of Britain, the Chief Rabbi is writing to all Ministers asking them to devote their sermon on Sabbath, May 5, to the theme of the Festival, and to have appropriate psalms recited during the service."—(*The Jewish Chronicle,* April 27).

We are justified in wondering what particular stage in the Jewish Emancipation from Gentile Bondage, what triumph of the Synagogue over the Christian population and the powerless gentiles unable to derive any benefit from the technical marvels found under the Dome of Discovery is being celebrated by the current re-enactment of the "world's greatest wonder " of precisely a hundred years ago.

B.J.

PARLIAMENT. (*Continued from page* 3)

shall fail in our objective, and the social services will suffer—the things about which we quarrel will suffer.

. . . What we are trying to do is an almost impossible task—trying to maintain a decent standard of living and super-impose on it a vast armament programme. We cannot succeed unless—unless what? Unless everbody in this country pulls together—and everybody in the free world, including our American friends. As the House knows, I had the privilege of going to America in 1942. . . . I say to my American brothers in the trade union movement that they have no right to expect the men, women and children of this country once again to sink below a decent standard of living while they live on a higher standard than is necessary for the maintenance of good health. They have no right to do that if we are all in this world task together.

As the House knows, a short time ago I was in Persia—in Abadan itself. I speak Arabic. I have been accused of being " the Arabs' Member "—but although I could take part in those debates, I do not. I talked at Abadan to a 15-year-old boy. He said, " You have got a God in your country?" I said, " Yes." He asked, " You worship your God in your country?" I replied, " Yes." " You believe that God gave you your coal in your country?" he asked, and I answered, " Yes." " You thank God for the coal you have in your country?" he asked me, and I replied, " Yes." " We think our God gave us our oil in Persia," he said, " and you want to take it from us." That was what the Tudeh Party was teaching in the trade union schools at Abadan, and they were pumping all this Communist ideology into the people.

It is a great problem, a vast problem. It is a greater problem that we are tackling now than any we have tackled in British history, greater because the menace is greater than ever it was in the past. I want to speak to our American friends without any dubiety. Unless they are prepared to make sacrifices at this time, unless they are prepared to sacrifice raw materials to enable us to build up the armament programme and bring it into being to offset Communism, Communism will get closer to them, and the day of the domination of America by Communism will draw much closer. I say that to them in no uncertain terms. It is not a matter of party politics, of party spite and party spleen. It is a matter of the people of this country saying to each other as Britons and patriots, " This thing must be." That demands the best from us all, steel workers, miners, Ministers and everybody else.

Mr. A. R. W. Low (Blackpool, North): With the spirit the closing part of the hon. Gentleman's speech I find myself in agreement, except for his attitude towards American feelings about the difficulties which he rightly thinks may face us as this re-armament programme gets under way. There seems to me to be no evidence at all that the Americans are likely to behave in a way to do to us that damage which the hon. Gentleman imagined. Their whole history since the war, their Marshall Aid, their Four Point programme, and finally the declaration which the President agreed with the Prime Minister himself in Washington last December, all go to show that the Americans will treat us as partners if we treat them as partners in this great undertaking.

Mr. Jack Jones: Although I did not give way, perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman would be good enough to let me put this simple question. Is it not a fact that in the last

few weeks, because we failed to find sufficient coal, pyrites which we have in contract with I.C.I., Widnes, has been taken away to America in British ships and paid for with American coal? Is that the sort of action we want to see?

Mr. Eden: That is not true.

Mr. Jones: It is true.

Mr. Low: I do not know whether that is a fact or not, but I do know that the Americans have themselves put on a great many controls, and have given the Prime Minister a pledge in the declaration which he and the President signed last December, and I am prepared to stand upon that. . . .

The Minister of Defence (Mr. Shinwell): . . . Let there be no mistake about it, we are going ahead to provide our contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty plan for the defence of the West.

That is our plain intention. We have never made any secret of the fact that to fulfil our obligations there must be some interference with our civil economy and some reduction in our standard of living. Anyone who tries to persuade the public that in these times freedom can be defended without sacrifices and without hardships is deceiving himself and our people and is doing a grave disservice to the nation. We believe that the nation will recognise what its true interests are and where its duties lie, and that it will be prepared to shoulder whatever burdens those duties demand.

In view of the case that is now presented, of the earnestness of our intentions, of the discussions which have taken place over many months, of the efforts we have made to co-ordinate the supplies of raw materials and machine tools, I venture the opinion that the Amendment on the Order Paper was designed for one purpose only and that is to seek to widen any cleavage that might exist in the ranks of this party. I beg to assure the Leader of the Opposition——

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): I do not want the right hon. Gentlman's assurance.

Mr. Shinwell: The right hon. Gentleman will have my assurance, whether he likes it or not.

Mr. Churchill: I do not value it and do not want it.

Mr. Shinwell: We know all the right hon. Gentleman's tricks.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided: Ayes, 305; Noes, 292.

NATIONAL FINANCE

Member's Salary Value

Major Beamish asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the present value of an M.P.'s salary, taking into account the fall in the value of the £ sterling since salaries were raised to £1,000 a year subject to tax.

Mr. Gaitskell: On the basis of expenditure over the whole field of expenditure on consumer goods and services the purchasing power of the £ has decreased by about 21 per cent. since 1946. A salary of £1,000 is, therefore, worth about £790 compared with 1946.

House of Commons: May 2, 1951.

Syrup

Mr. Dodds asked the Minister of Food what is the quantity of sugar that would be required annually to restore the 10 per cent. sugar cut made in January, 1950, to the manufacturers of syrup and treacle; and what would this average per ration book.

Mr. F. Willey: Seven thousand three hundred tons of refined sugar would be required to restore the 1950 cut in syrup production, and would represent about five oz. of sugar per ration book per annum.

Mr. Dodds: As demand greatly exceeds the supply of this relatively cheap and wholesome food, may I ask my hon. Friend if his Department would consider sympathetically the restoration of the cut as soon as possible?

Mr. Willey: As I explained to my hon. Friend last time, the present consumption of syrup is about twice what it was before the war. We regard syrup as an alternative to sugar, but we believe that housewives prefer sugar.

Mr. De la Bère: Why not let us have something we want.

Meat

Mr. Ivor Owen Thomas asked the Minister of Food how the prices for meat under the new Argentine agreement compare with prices for meat offered to us by private traders in other countries.

Mr. Willey: We have received in recent months a number of offers from European sources of frozen beef mainly of South American origin. These have been at prices varying from £130 per ton delivered German frontier to £197.29 per ton ex store Hamburg. The prices we have now agreed with Argentina for meat of similar quality are less than the lowest of these offers, after taking into account the cost of bringing the meat to this country.

Mr. Thomas: Can my hon. Friend give us information to enable a comparison to be made between the prices for meat supplied by the Argentine to other countries and the prices we have to pay under the present agreement?

Mr. Willey: We have a little information about prices paid to the Argentine by other countries. We know, for example, that Germany paid £140 per ton for 2,400 tons of frozen beef. The highest price which we pay for similar beef being £132 per ton.

Mr. Turton: As the average price at present is £125 per ton, why did not the Minister accept, last January, the average price of £120 per ton, which is far less than these other prices?

Mr. Pickthorn: Can the Minister tell the House whether the price paid by Germany, to which he referred in terms of pounds, was actually paid in sterling, or whether the number of pounds he gave to the House is the result of a calculation?

Mr. Willey: The price I have given to the House is the result of a calculation.

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