The word "equality" derives from a root which is allied to the word, "which," and implies separateness. "E-quality" means "non-separateness" and if "equality of race" means anything at all, it means that race does not exist, which is just clotted nonsense.

The policy of claiming equality for all is directly linked with the French and Russian revolutions, and is the most incredibly clever device for assuring the Dictatorship over the Proletariat that the mind of man ever conceived—if the mind of man did conceive it.

The only good argument for "Union Now" has not, so far as we are aware, been used. It is that open Government of this country by Washington for the next twenty years could not conceivably be more disastrous to once-great Britain than covert Government by Wall Street has been for the past twenty years.

The distinguished American publicist, Mr. Herbert Agar, who said at a luncheon in London, a week or so ago, that there could be no greater disservice to Anglo-American relations than to pretend that we are satisfied with them at the present time, is a wise and honest man.

The fact is that Americans are almost, but not quite, as much in the grip of Orientals as we are. The Oriental does not understand cringing, or rather he does understand it in his own way. The nauseating rubbish about Anglo-Saxon unity of ideals merely has the effect of encouraging the Orientals who control the United States to put on the screw still further.

The United States is about as much Anglo-Saxon as Monte Carlo, but there would be no difficulty in maintaining the most friendly relations if the pretence were not made continually that e.g., Messrs. Solly Blum, Felix Frankfurter, James Warburg et al, who direct U.S. politics, spend their spare time in dreaming of the sweet little thatched village in England where their dear old grandparents didn't live.

The brain-waves of Mr. H. C. Wells become more amazing as time passes. His latest blue-print for the millennium is to concentrate all sanctions—i.e., all power of enforcement, aerial, naval, military, and police in a World Federation, and to provide protection for the individual against this concentrated power by a Declaration of the Rights of Man. Yes, he's quite serious about it, and can find a Sunday paper to print it.

Socialism merely consists in the gospel of grab—grab your neighbour's initiative, grab his opportunities, grab his ideas, and eventually grab his identity. The only new thing about it is its name.
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From Week to Week

There is a strangely and greatly neglected aspect of the human psyche which we should not disregard: the faculty of intuition. Everyone is—or used to be—familiar with feminine intuition, but on the whole took it as one of the regrettable oddities of womankind, otherwise not to be taken seriously. Nevertheless, the intuitions of women on particular occasions and in themselves have to be taken seriously. They amount, too frequently to be neglected, to the comprehension of a situation in the apparent absence of any evidence on which a conclusion could be based. They are taken lightly, on the other hand, because they are most often concerned with the peccadillos of domestic life which, in the understanding of men, appear to be of inferior significance to the problems of collective mankind. But in fact to real women domestic life is life, and in consequence their intuitive perception of threats to its stability are of the highest significance, because they are so frequently true.

The curious phenomenon of intersexuality should be enough to show that despite superficial differences the fundamental human nature of men and women is the same. Intuition is a human faculty: it is only the emphasis placed on its conclusions that differs between the sexes. A woman will regard an intuition as a revealed truth, and act accordingly; a man will look for rational evidence to justify his acts, without admitting that his looking is motivated by his intuition.

One of the most significant phenomena of contemporary events is the supreme confidence of leading Communists in the ultimate ‘victory’ of Communism: a confidence well exemplified in Mr. Krushchev’s statement: “History is on our side; we will bury you.” This is undoubtedly an intuitive judgment (its sincerity, as opposed to propaganda, is hardly to be doubted), because it has the force of a religious conviction, while apparently derived from completely materialistic premises by an equally materialistic logic.

Dr. C. G. Jung defines intuition as ‘that psychological function which transmits perception in an unconscious way.’* In a book published more than a decade later† he shows on what unconscious perceptions Mr. Krushchev’s confidence is founded. Dr. Jung’s thesis—it is really more than a thesis, being in the main the presentation of established psychological facts—is that the emphasis on collectivism is so damaging to the individual as an individual as to accelerate the progress of collectivism, but with such a distortion of the individual human psyche as to make ultimate catastrophe certain. It is this catastrophe, intuitively perceived, which Mr. Krushchev misinterprets as ‘victory,’ and the burial he envisages is much more likely to be the entombment of mankind. Mr. Krushchev is riding on more dangerous forces—much more psychological than physical—than his preoccupation with the problems of power can allow him to comprehend. Dr. Jung demonstrates, rather than proves, the existence of metaphysical forces. Now everything ultimately depends on that existence. Logic virtually depends on the selection of its premises, and in consequence the most imposing logical construction will be devastated by an incorrect exclusion of a premise. It is precisely that devastation that lies before us. The primacy of the metaphysical is the lesson of history, arrogantly ignored in the apparent triumph of strictly contemporary ‘science.’ What Scripture calls “the Judgment” is an intuitive perception of the consequence of setting up materialism in opposition to metaphysical reality. It is imagination, or spirit, or a metaphysical force—at least, something other than entropic physical forces—which has transformed the world: it always has been decisive, and always will be.

This ‘force, or this reality—it is difficult to give it a suitable name in this context—has, so to speak, generated history. To Mr. Krushchev’s conscious mind, however, history is brought about by the “dialectic” (assisted in modern times by the Communist Party); his unconscious mind on the other hand, is intuitively aware of metaphysical reality, and it is this that gives him that religious conviction which these days almost exclusively characterises the Communist. C. H. Douglas, like Dr. Jung, was consciously aware of metaphysical reality, and so realised that not victory but calamity must be the outcome of progressive centralisation. And, by recognising the validity of intuition, we get a further confirmation in Mr. Krushchev’s otherwise hardly explicable confidence.

Government Debt

“The truth is, that the system which has been pursued in England from the time of the Revolution [Whig], the system of Government Debt, is a system which begins by producing its own overthow, and that of the state along with it. It draws property into great masses; it gives cunning the superiority over industry; it makes agriculture a subject of adventure; it puts down all small cultivators. . . .”—William Cobbett: The Progress of a Ploughboy, p. 10.

† The Undiscovered Self.
The "Trend" Toward World Government  
(From Our Canadian Correspondent)

It will be recalled that Dean Acheson, former U.S. Secretary for Foreign Affairs, was implicated in the investigation of pro-Communist activities at the time of the trial of Alger Hiss. That was about ten years ago. Acheson is now newsworthy again and is reported in the daily press as proposing a shift in Western policy to pull Western Europe and North America together into a united front on all political, economic and military issues. "He urges united and indivisible military efforts, the pooling of economic resources and the mutual quest of political aims." (The Calgary Herald, October 3, 1959). In other words, Western-World Government.

The most radical aspect of Acheson's plan was that of a super council. He said that there have been many international councils in the past but that none was a policy-making body. Members of all previous councils have had to await instructions from their governments to take action.

Thus the strategy is to fight centralisation with centralisation—the Communist bloc with pyramidal control can mobilize a military-economic-political totalitarian offensive. Let the West do the same. (This bears some similarity to the policy of Baruch—Acheson's mentor—of ten years ago, for world control and development of atomic energy.)

Acheson's revival before the public is especially interesting because at the same time similar proposals began popping up in the press from other quarters over the Western world. "The plan (of Acheson) is similar in many ways to one put forward by Lester B. Pearson, former Canadian External Affairs Minister, calling for NATO to extend its power into fields other than military." (The Calgary Herald, October 3, 1959).

Again, Mr. Pearson is reported as stating in Vancouver: "I hope that we can build a super structure on that (The U.N. Emergency Force), build a police force available when the U.N. wants to use it." (The Edmonton Journal, September 25, 1959).

Next, State Secretary Herter said that another question that must be looked into (following Krushchev's suggestion of international controls) is the possibility of an international police force to preserve peace should the nations ever agree on total disarmament. "The Edmonton Journal, September 23, 1959.

Undoubtedly, at the time he made the proposals, Kruschev realised that the question was being brought to the fore.

Prime Minister J. G. Diefenbaker, in his address to the Canadian Bar Association, September 4, 1959, backed the same horse. His address was on "The Rule of Law in International Affairs." "The establishment of an International Police Force would be a further step in the maintenance of the Rule of Law internationally." Mr. Diefenbaker has great faith in the Rule of Law (with capitals). "An international Police Force is still the hope of an assured world peace, but to become a mighty instrument in the maintenance of the Rule of Law it has yet to receive more than vocal approbation among world leaders."

Then the 'Grand Old Man,' Sir Winston Churchill, "suggested in Woodford, England, that an international police force should accompany any agreement among nations to disarm." (The Calgary Albertan, September 30, 1959).

What is appalling about these statements is that they pretend to be profound. Actually they are the kind of remarks that could be expected from the man in the street unversed in international politics. They indicate no acquaintance with the penetrating analyses of the "World government and World police force" idea which have been made. In fact, the impression is that all the above figures are speaking to a directive.

Following hard upon these, two more items followed. "Harry S. Truman said that Soviet Premier Kruschev's total disarmament plan is the most important development of recent days." (The Windsor Daily Star, October 17, 1959). And U.S. delegate Henry Cabot Lodge called for a United Nations study of a system of international and domestic police forces to preserve peace in the event of total world disarmament. (The Edmonton Journal, October 14, 1959).

One of the undoubtedly able minds which has examined the idea of World Government is George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union. He gives three reasons (and we add a fourth) why the frictions arising between national governments have little chance of being replaced by the legal rules and restraints of World Law (Documents of Modern Political Thought: Uteley and Maclure Cambridge University Press).

(1) Contrary to what he suggests, the rather woolly, if not wild, Western mind finds it not unreasonable for nations to have aspirations which are highly important and legitimate to them. The assumption that these should be quashed if they threaten the orderliness of international life, is unjustifiable from the standpoint of justice. Freezing the status quo may appear to set up peace, stability, order. In the long run it may well do the opposite.

In this connection a quotation from British Columbian well-known newspaper columnist, Bruce Hutchinson, is of interest: "For a free society can never be painless or single. It must be controversial, often painful and always multiple. By definition it is a society of struggle between economic groups, political groups and above all, groups of ideas. Once a society achieves complete agreement under an all wise state it is no longer a free society and within it no man can be really free. Freedom can be bought only at the price of uninterrupted struggle within nations as between nations." (The Edmonton Journal, July 19, 1959). It follows that national sovereignty is necessary if real progress is to be made.

(2) World law would ignore "those means of the projection of power and coercion over other peoples, which bypass institutional forms entirely or even exploit them against themselves, such as ideological attack, intimidation, penetration, and disguised seizure of the institutional paraphernalia of sovereignty."

In regard to this, has the United Nations or its agencies ever helped resist the incursion of Communist infiltration into non-communist countries? Does it appear warranted to expect it to do so?
Again it is possible to imagine actual personal rights degenerating here as they have in some middle European countries where intimidation rules in the lives of all persons to a great extent. How likely is it that a multi-state police force would reverse the situation or keep it from arising?

(3) The idea of a world police force assumes that fair and just sanctions would then exist against the state showing bad behaviour. Kennan says: "It forgets that . . . the wider the coalition the more difficult it becomes to retain political unity and general agreement on the purpose and effects of what is being done." He gives the instance of Korea — "joint military operations against an aggressor have different meanings for each participant and raise specific political issues for each one which are extraneous to the action in question and affect many other facets of international life." A more recent example is that of Tibet.

(4) World law as it exists in the minds of the preceding speakers would presuppose world government. It is assumed that this would be representative government. The delegates would represent the national governments, who in turn would represent the electors.

Probably, it is pretty nearly correct to say that the real government we get can be defined as the resultant of every bit of effective pressure acting upon it. It is possible that Lester Pearson's Liberal Party may have lost an election in Canada two years ago partly because of the public's dissatisfaction over Suez. But if so, it is likely that he was unlucky. Most of the time the public can be handled without too much difficulty by good publicity: Frankly we distrust the turn would represent the electors.

To sum up, the hub and centre, the reason for being, of any system of law is, primarily, justice. Order also, but order is secondary. But in the minds of the proponents of world law and world government, order comes first.

Kennan concludes after his three points above that in the U.N. the same situation holds with regard to balance of power as did and would hold without it. But the fact is camouflaged. There arises a greater tendency to rate as a high skill the ability to manipulate behind verbiage. By implication he suggests that we are no better-off than when the nations depended on international alliances and relationships between the more powerful states.

Undoubtedly peace is a vital question. It is not the same world as it was twenty, thirty, fifty years ago. There is need for co-operation and understanding on as wide a plane as possible. But world government is the prefabricated answer of a high power promotional policy.

D. STEWART.
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The Roosevelt Myth

"... while Wallace was paying out hundreds of millions to kill millions of hogs, burn oats, plow-under cotton, the Department of Agriculture issued a pamphlet telling the nation that the great problem of our time was our failure to produce enough food to provide the [U.S.] people with a mere subsistence diet . . . we had men burning oats when we were importing oats from abroad on a huge scale, killing pigs while increasing our imports of lard, cutting corn production and importing 30 millions of bushels of corn from abroad.—The Roosevelt Myth, John T. Flynn, p. 49.

"In the United States and Great Britain powerful influences inside both Governments operating under the tolerance extended to the Reds, got the confidence of both Churchill and Roosevelt.

"Truman was nominated (as Vice-President) with 1,100 votes to only 66 for Wallace but not until Sydney Hillman (Schmuel Gilman) had approved the change.

"Churchill, a far more experienced diplomat than Roosevelt and also far more realistic, wanted to save from Stalin's grasp as much of the Southern Balkans as possible . . . Churchill was not fooled by Stalin and Stalin knew it, and that is why they were at each others throats . . . "

"Roosevelt and Stalin agreed that Manchuria would remain with China and that Stalin and he would back Chiang against the British . . . After that, the way must have seemed wide open to Stalin for all his plans. Here was Roosevelt suggesting a secret deal between himself and Stalin against Churchill, just as he had suggested a secret deal between himself and Chiang against Churchill and as he was later to make a secret deal between himself and Stalin against Chiang."—Ibid, p.p. various.

"From the London School of Economics came an organisation to advance Political and Economic Planning—P.E.P. This was a scheme for fascist planning through a national Council of Agriculture, a National Council for Industry, a National Council for Transport, all to be statutory bodies with powers to govern their special provinces of business. The chairman of this group was Israel Moses Sieff. He turned up as a special consultant to O.P.A. in 1941. The place was full of these boys.—Ibid, p. 315-6.

"The rules and directives issued were frequently beyond the power of the human mind to understand. Here is an example:—

"The maximum price which a manufacturer may charge to any class of purchasers for any packaged cosmetic priced under the general maximum price regulation shall be the maximum price established under the general price regulation for sales of such packaged cosmetics by him to a purchaser of the same class."—Ibid, p. 317.