

**NATIONAL
SOCIALISM NOW**

by

William Joyce



**NATIONAL
SOCIALISM NOW**

BY

WILLIAM JOYCE

First Impression, September, 1937

WILLIAM JOYCE (Lord Haw-Haw)



OTHER BOOKS BY WILLIAM JOYCE

Dictatorship

Facism and Jewry

CONTENTS.

Page

CHAPTER I.

The meaning of National Socialism—The Unity of the People—The menace of Class War and Snobbery—True Values - - - - 1

CHAPTER II.

Principles of Government—Leadership—Representation of the People—The National-Socialist Structure of Government - - - - 7

CHAPTER III.

The Purpose of Government—Need of economic revolution — Production — Consumption — Finance and the people—Markets—Machinery and shorter hours—Scientific regulation as opposed to Laissez-faire—Co-operatives and private traders—Private property and the Marxist argument—Particular Industries—Imperial co-operation - - 21

CHAPTER IV.

The Imperial principle—Intensive as opposed to extensive Empire—Imperial Trade—Common Empire representation — India — Ireland — Imperial self-sufficiency - - - - 41

CHAPTER V.

Foreign Policy—Armaments—Pacifism—The conspiracy for war—Russian ambitions—Friendship with Germany—End of the struggle for international markets—The case of Jewish interests - - 48

CHAPTER VI.

Necessity to use legal and constitutional methods—Philosophy of National Socialism—Religious freedom—Conclusion - - - - 55

CHAPTER I.

*The meaning of National Socialism—The unity of the people—
The menace of Class War and Snobbery—True values.*

We deal with National Socialism for Britain ; for we are British. Our League is entirely British ; and to win the victory for National Socialism here, we must work hard enough to be excused the inspiring task of describing National Socialism elsewhere.

Of course, the name of Adolf Hitler will always be linked with National Socialism ; and the name of Marconi will be linked with radio ; the former is more necessary than the latter, which has established itself as a household fact, although it represents one of the few astounding inventions that did not arise from our soil and our people.

National Socialism, however, no matter who may use the term or feel the spirit first, must arise from soil and people or not at all. It springs from no temporary grievance, but from the revolutionary yearning of the people to cast off the chains of gross, sordid, democratic materialism without having to put on the shackles of Marxian Materialism, which would be identical with the chains cast off.

The matter touches our own British people, who cannot be debarred from sharing in a spirit of revolt which is confined to no one nation. Therefore, in true respect for the German Leader's gallant achievement against international Jewish finance and its other self—international Jewish Communism, I would gladly say, " Heil Hitler ! " and at once part company with him, realising what a pitiable insult it is to such a great man to try to flatter him with an imitation which he has always disdained. His way is for Germany, ours is for Britain ; let us tread our paths with mutual respect, which is rarely increased by borrowing.

" Nationalism " and " Socialism " are two terms separately understood in our land. The words are now as English as any other. Separately, they will have to go ; only in combination, standing for the one great reality, can they

have meaning for the man who, beyond loving his country, loves the people of his own race who inhabit his land.

"Nationalism" has meant a devotion to the Crown, the flag, the abstract idea of Britain, and other values less glorious.

"Socialism" has, according to Mr. Brailsford, been given some hundreds of meanings; but it has meant a devotion to the masses of the working people, to better conditions of life for them, and to other values less glorious.

If we discard "in both cases" the "other values less glorious," may Heaven forgive the euphemism, we have left before us certain principles which, so far from being opposed, are not only compatible but clearly and absolutely in agreement.

The mystery is that Nationalism and Socialism should have remained separate for so long. That mystery is solved only when we realise that our "other values less glorious" have embraced useless butchery, foolish jealousy, inane snobbery, prostitution of patriotic fervour to Jewish interests, the hatreds of Class War, the sacrifice of the British Worker to the oppression of international finance and his asphyxia in the miasma of Marx. Of these two terms that we are considering, it is always the sinister connotations and never the decent that have caused disruption and suffering. The moral is to build on what is good and to leave less glorious values alone for a while. We shall then begin to understand how absurd it is to regard true Socialism as in any way dependent on internationalism; and we shall see how stupid it is to describe as true Nationalism any sentiment or doctrine which ignores or fails to cure the sufferings of our people in the mass.

Nationalism and Socialism must be either one blessing or twin curses.

Nationalism stands for the nation and Socialism for the people. Unless the people be identical with the nation, all politics and all statecraft are a waste of time. People without a nation are a helpless flock or, like the Jews, a perpetual nuisance; a nation without people is an abstract nothing or a historical ghost.

Nation and people must be one ; there must be no division amongst the people themselves. Wars of class and party are calculated to make such division, and thus they are evil in themselves.

Hegel thought that a nation must have a soul of its own ; many thinkers refuse to believe that the people who are so vital individually must be dead collectively. At any rate, it is true that human society, unless the victim of anarchy, tends to organise. A nation or people must be a living organism, no more to be divided than the human organism, in which division means disease or death. This principle may be described by some as totalitarian, and by others as organic ; but the term "organic" will suit us very well. In an organism, no part can be considered without reference to the whole ; otherwise it dies. Nor can the whole be considered without reference to its parts, whilst the whole itself expresses much more than the mere sum of its parts, because the life principle runs throughout.

May this discursion into philosophy be forgiven ; but it is necessary to show why the National Socialist demands real thorough union of the people, to free them from class and party strife and the bitterest feelings of discord and hatred. Unless a man can say "My country stands for me," it is hard to expect him to say for an indefinite period "I stand for my country." This is the mistake that the Tory party has made for generations.

An unemployed victim, made wretched by the system, grinding a barrel organ in the gutter, piteously showing the faded and tattered remnants of his war-ribbons, does not see in each penny superciliously dropped the Land of Heroes promised to him in the throes of the struggle which ruined him. Nor is his patriotic fervour likely to rise if some majestic Lady Bountiful offers him twopence and the advice : "There you are. We shall soon have a war with Germany, and then you won't be unemployed any more, my good man." To curse the Communists is easy, virtuous, and needful ; but it would be far more effective to destroy them not with bell, book and candle, but by giving every worthy citizen a reason to be thankful to his country. Let the real wounds

of the people be healed, and the deportation of a few hundred Oriental criminals will suffice for ever to silence Communism in this country.

Moreover, as any organism requires both sense and means of direction, so a people requires leadership and government. The purpose of leadership is to give direction, and that of government is above all to prevent the liberty of some from becoming the enslavement of others.

A people without good leaders is a poor thing without purpose, direction, or desirable goal. Authority is necessary in all human affairs. But any man who aspires to be a leader must always remember the essential truth that a leader never in the end gets more loyalty than he gives. The whole being of loyalty is mutual good faith. Hence there is one and the same obligation on the leaders and the led. The led must think always of the nation; and the leaders must think always of the people. Whilst this bond holds there will be firm accord.

This conception of national unity utterly renounces the practice of snobbery and the enjoyment of riches without service. It has no place for the ludicrous notion that nobility can be by patent conferred on a Prime Minister's cronies. If they must be rewarded for hours of faithful entertainment, let them be paid in cash at the patron's expense; but to incribe their names in Debrett is to make a laughing stock of the whole peerage. Some fellow of little mark undertakes to eulogize a Premier in a periodical journal; in the course of time, his conscientious objections being forgotten, he emerges as Lord Somebody of Hurtwood. Fit he may be to join a throng of profiteers and newsvendors, though not the decent newsvendors in the streets.

The trouble is that all these spoilt children of fortune have to be treated as eminently superior persons, when every man with a molecule of self-respect knows they are not superior at all. Thus a very distorted notion of merit spreads through the whole body of the people. Without reference to any particular example, it will be agreed that cringing and cunning have been known in many cases to produce wondrous success. Many persons have come to enjoy their mead of

bowing and scraping by simply doing nothing, or by giving themselves the trouble to be born.

Clearly it is impossible to end class war if every species of social injustice is to be dressed up in the cloak of nobility, if social superiority is to be divorced from honour and even intelligence. There is, in fact, no basis for the organic harmonised state other than the rule that reward is due to merit and to that alone.

Where every man knows that service and merit will not pass unrewarded, and what is even more important, that responsibility will be granted only to ability and high character, the chief cause of class hatred is eradicated without any violence to morality.

Thus we National Socialists have but one question to ask concerning any man's class. It is this: "Does he love and serve his country and people?" If the answer is in the affirmative, the man belongs to one class, if in the negative, he belongs to another. There are the two classes that National Socialism recognises. There is no question here of equality; men were not born equal, and could not remain equal, if they were so in the beginning; but any man who loves and serves his country should be proud to be in the same class with the rest who do so. To distinguished service, distinction is due. Let this principle be observed, and even the least fortunate of men need not consider his misfortune permanent.

If the possession of wealth is to be dependent on merit and service, you may well ask "What is to become of hereditary wealth or fortune?" Here the right principle is not to forbid a man to make provision for his family, but to see that the family justifies the provision which has been made. To benefit one's offspring is a natural and providential tendency which supplies a great incentive to effort. The inheritance of wealth by individuals may be a national advantage. A long line of good tilling yeoman, for example, can profit not only the soil but the nation by the vigour and cleanliness of its stamina. Nor can it be denied that Death Duties on land have broken up agricultural estates and put nothing serviceable in their place. On the other hand,

absentee landlords who care nothing for their tenants are a wicked anomaly. Mayfair night clubs and Left Book Clubs provide unearned and unprofitable recreation for many spoilt darlings who can show no moral claim to the wealth that they hold.

Thus we return to the law that inheritance must be justified by service, which may take many forms beyond the economic. One who does not live on his estate and carefully tend it can serve the people in administration or culture. If it be said that discrimination is hard to apply, the answer is that a state which cannot value the work of its citizens is an incompetent and silly state. A Government armed with the full authority of the people can soon find the means of discrimination against heirs who think that society was made for their convenience and act accordingly. There must be, of course, an honest tribunal; but such a thing is surely not beyond the capacity of a great people like ours to produce. If it is, we might as well abandon the struggle now.

In short, we attack neither the principle nor the stability of the family but that degeneracy which enables some to live entirely on the deeds of their forbears. The National Socialist state will give abundant opportunities to serve; they must be taken.

You have now some idea as to how the irritants of class struggle may be removed. The removal of the great cause depends on the provision of a plenty which can be produced. It is always wrong to teach that general benefit can come from internal warfare; but once the cause and the irritants have gone, it should be a felony to teach disunity as a political creed.

A people thoroughly united as an organic being has its own charter of freedom from the insolence of the snob, from the impudence of the Jewish pedlar of class war, and from the immorality of the few who would selfishly exploit the many. Such a charter of freedom is well worth having.

CHAPTER II.

Principles of government—Leadership—Representation of the people—Liberty of the people—The National Socialist structure of government.

While the political system remains unaltered, it will be impossible to change radically the economic situation. First, the existing order of Parliamentary incumbents is too closely linked to High Finance to desire revolutionary change; so much is even true of the Labour Party, which has expelled more than one valuable member for having dared to expect Socialism within his own lifetime. Secondly, this democratic Party System is not intended to be an instrument of fundamental change; on the contrary, it is obviously intended to keep things as they are. The Leader of the Opposition is paid £2,000 a year to prevent the Government from doing what it pretends to think right. So much for the moral sincerity of the politicians! Even the Sermon on the Mount does not require us to pay our enemies. The answer may be: "But there is no enmity in the House of Commons."

This answer may be taken as true; but it does not explain why the best of friends should pretend to engage in Homeric struggle and Hibernian vituperation in order to win elections. From beginning to end, the keynote of the whole performance is callous hypocrisy. The sham fights of Westminster are meant to make the people think that somebody is caring for their interests; otherwise there might be hell to pay; it is more economical to pay the Leader of the Opposition.

Space is too precious to waste on a full denunciation of the decaying Social-Democratic Party System. Contrast all the promises made to ex-servicemen with the miserable performance. Compare Baldwin's promises to maintain our power in India with his betrayal of that sub-continent to a handful of babus and fakirs paid by the masters of Indian slave-labour to drive the British out of India. Think of the piercing shriek which arose in August, 1931—"Save the Pound," and the subsequent employment by the victorious saviours of £350,000,000 to break the exchange

value which they had pronounced to be the sign-manual of salvation. Think of progressive disarmament followed by the idiotic attempt to bully Mussolini and the consequent collapse of British prestige throughout the world. View the distress in the coalfields side by side with the established possibility of employing 95,000 miners in the production of oil from coal; remember that for weeks the subject of Parliamentary discussion was the nice question as to whether the child of an unemployed British man was worth two shillings or three shillings a week, and, good reader, you will have the measure of our Party System. Government, forsooth, of the people, by the people, for the people! One glance at the state of agriculture and the stranglehold of the foreigner on our home market is enough to show us a victimisation of the people, by the politicians, for the international financiers. Exactly the same evil is reflected in the pouring into unemployed Lancashire of cotton goods made by Eastern slaves for the profit of Eastern millionaires, whilst the Lancashire sky has become blue because the fires that stayed alight for decades have at last gone out. These great wrongs no democratic party even promises to right. Tories defend international capital, Reds defend international proletarianism; but the wrong cannot be righted till internationalism of every sort is ruled completely out of the question. Internationalism contains no formula for the putting of Britain first. For this reason alone, the old parties have failed and must, in the future, fail more conspicuously still; the most important caution is not to discriminate between them; a new generation with a virile outlook can do something better than discriminate between various types of rottenness.

It is now clear that the National Socialist has no apology to make for his decision to end the Parliamentary farce. Constitutionally, and in perfect loyalty to the Crown as the symbol of Britain's continuous majesty, the National Socialist proposes to make such changes in the system of Government as are necessary to produce the required changes in our system of living. Government divorced from economic facts is useless; such gigantic developments have occurred in the last century that it is presumptuous to defend a form

of government which crystallised more than a hundred years ago and was even then quite unfitted to cope with the economic problems of the day, trivial as they were in comparison with those of our own time.

The present system, apart from its archaic incompetence, lacks the essential characteristics of all true government, namely effective leadership and genuine representation of the people. The first is missing because the political leader is but the slave of international money interests, paying his antagonist to preserve deadlock. The second is missing because if the voice of the people were heard, it would say "Move on there!" But no move is made.

Leadership is of immeasurable importance; it makes much of the difference between a body of men and a flock of sheep; sheep, indeed, have certain instinctive tendencies which, combined with a providential lack of intelligence, make them happier than a leaderless flock of human beings.

In all human affairs, from the management of a fish and chip shop to the navigation of an ocean liner, from the playing of football to the conduct of a railway system, authority and discipline are necessary. How foolish it is, then, to maintain that in the conduct of the state alone, authority and discipline are needless. Further, most men are concerned to obtain what freedom they can, and in the process are most apt to deny a fair share of freedom to others; thus it comes about that by discipline and discipline alone can a fair share of freedom be guaranteed to the mass of people. Robinson Crusoe lost a considerable portion of his freedom as soon as Friday landed on his island; and the great congestion of population in certain parts of this globe to-day makes disciplined regulation the only alternative to anarchic stampede.

Time was when the tenth rate philosophical hacks of the Industrial Revolution taught that government should have no part whatever in the direction of economic affairs. This doctrine of "Laissez Faire" has given place to the public conviction that the duty of a government is to supply, so far as it can, the needs of the people. The conviction is right; but it is also implies that the rulers of a nation must have the authority to act.

The National Socialist principle is that those who are to lead should be chosen by the people and answerable to the people, but that, having been appointed, they should have the fullest authority to lead and so discharge their duty to the nation. To impose on a leader or leaders the burden of the Party System is farcical; as well have no leaders at all.

At this point, it may be objected that National Socialism strives to set up a dictatorship. There is no use in playing with words. National Socialism will certainly smash the crumbling edifice of social democracy; and if dictatorship is the principle that a people should arm its chosen leaders with absolute power to express its will, it is a principle which must be upheld. If, on the other hand dictatorship is identified with tyranny or with the government of the people against their will, it is condemned on the ground that it violates the first principle of national unity. Likewise, it is well to beware of that secret kind of dictatorship, whereby a servant of the Crown can get rid of the monarch in a weekend without consulting anybody but a few nattering old prelates and a group of newspaper merchants. More damnable still is the dictatorship of international and Jewish finance which despotically regulates what is and is not to appear on the breakfast table. Let those who rail at National Socialist leadership first rid themselves of the real tyrannies that oppress them, and we may have a little more belief in the devotion to Liberty which they profess.

Above all, let us consider what liberty the ordinary man chiefly wants. On this subject, a great National Socialist, Thomas Carlyle, has written as follows :

“ Liberty? The true liberty of a man you would say consists in his finding out, or being forced to find out, the right path and to walk thereon. To learn or to be taught what work he actually was able for, and then by permission, persuasion, and even compulsion, to set about doing of the same. That is the true blessedness, honour, ‘liberty,’ and maximum of well being. If liberty be not that, I for one have small care about liberty.”

In our time, of course, people need neither persuasion nor compulsion. They are crying out for opportunity. The liberty to eat, to buy clothes, to be properly housed is inestimably more important to our millions of workers than the liberty to write a letter to the "Times" or the liberty to stand at a street corner on a windy night damning everything in general before an audience of raindrops. Some fat, smug, internationalist Burger, who has never had an hour's hunger in his life can easily from the depths of his armchair aver that the institutions of free speech and Free Press (God save the mark) are the sacred values that every worker must be prepared to defend with his own life.

In truth, liberty means nothing at all unless it means the right to eat and drink, to be clad, and to gain reward through merit. To the millions of unemployed, underpaid, and under-nourished in Britain to-day; the Pharisees declaim: "Your liberty is in danger." They really should say: "Our liberty is in danger if you realise how we are exploiting you."

The greatest freedom of all is security from the fear of hunger, poverty, ruin. Many are those who, whilst in receipt of an income which the very poor would call good, are beset with the awful responsibility of "keeping up appearances," with the problem of "making ends meet," and what is infinitely worse, the knowledge that this mediocre comfort may any day be shattered by a curt notice from the Managing Director or by the sudden failure of some enterprise which had seemed very securely founded. The shallow thinkers who make the most noise with their tinny generalisations have never stopped to consider this aspect of the question, have never actually paused to ask how many of their fellow countrymen live under the shadow of the "sack" or of professional failure.

Thus, in a state which should be prosperous beyond the bounds of computation, there stalks the nerve-racking fear amongst millions that the little they have may be taken away from them. Fear, stark fear is the motivating force in the lives of tens of thousands of harassed black-coated workers and hundreds of thousands of workers who toil

with their hands. Now never let it be said that the best results of human endeavour come from fear. That I absolutely refuse to believe. Even if it were true that the mass of the people were so actuated, and that would be a disgrace, the better type of man would, out of love or hope, strike forth heroic acts most utterly beyond the capacity of fear to produce. Fear indeed says "Thou shalt not"; love, hope, honour, any high ideal says "Thou shalt." There is the difference. There is the great division between a population cowed with fear and a nation daring to be great, and in its courage reaching heights of human greatness and attaining levels of creative intellect categorically beyond the poor creature whose whole education is one extended "Thou shalt not." Fear is the most horrible enemy of man, and the most hideous distorter of his countenance divine. To be free is to be fearless; but as even the stoutest heart might quail before the ordeals of an unemployed man in one of our big cities, let us not expect too much from mankind and see that if man is to be reasonably brave, we must remove some of the grosser causes of fear.

The chief clamour against authority to-day is raised by those who have it and abuse it; the one thing that they most fear is the establishment of an authority over them that will prevent them from exploiting the people who suffer from their economic tyranny. In British National Socialism there is no principle that leadership must be confined to one person. The formal symbol of unity in a single person can best be represented by the Crown freed from its entourage of nagging bishops and intriguing partymen. In this respect England differs from Germany, deserted by the Hohenzollern and enabled to find her formal expression in the singularly great personality of Adolf Hitler. In Italy the Royal House had nothing like the tradition or symbolic strength of our own. Weakened as our monarchy has recently been, it is strong enough to stand in a new and healthy environment, which National Socialism can provide.

Therefore the National Socialist is interested in authoritative leadership rather than in the production of one sole leader. The men who bring National Socialism to the electors of

Britain will have their leaders ; and when the people have approved of the policy these leaders will be required to assume responsibility not only for the National Socialist organisation, but, in the ordinary constitutional way, for the country. Having been appointed, they must have power to act ; periodically the people as a whole must pass judgment on them by vote ; and if they be found unsatisfactory, the responsibility of appointing new ministers rests constitutionally not with any political group, but with the King himself.

Should the National Socialist system be approved but the leaders disapproved, it would obviously be the obligation of the Crown to select the new Ministers from the National Socialist ranks. National Socialism has no duty to make provision for its own demise. We recommend what we think right and want it to be permanent ; but we do make every provision that could be made to prevent leadership from degenerating into tyranny. More there is no right to expect. Unlike the democrat, we are not anxious to explain how a system can be demolished even before it is constructed ; but it is vital that the people shall be able to get rid of leaders and representatives in whom they have lost confidence, because the great work which National Socialism proposes cannot be done without mutual trust, an example of which prevails in Germany between Adolf Hitler and the greatest majority of German citizens ever to have voted.

To judge entirely by our own experience, it is better to give leadership open legitimate authority than to have Party leaders intriguing round every corner in the hope of keeping their wretched parties together by all the devices of chicanery, bribery, intimidation, and make-believe known to the grammar of democracy.

The second essential of government, genuine representation of the people, demands the abolition of the corrupt and mischievous party system, the eternal cockfight in which the cocks do not fight and—spectacle sublime—agree to differ. To be represented, the people do not need a mob of professional contradictors who agree only as to the danger of doing anything. The function of representatives is to say that the people want and, subject to mature informed judgment, to see that they get it, where it can be got.

The principles of good representation are simple in the extreme, and they have nothing to do with the present system, in which no member for an agricultural area dare ask for the exclusion of foreign foodstuffs and no member for Lancashire dare ask for the repeal of the disastrous India Act.

The very nature of representation is that it should be well informed and that representatives who have to take decisions should take them in the light of personal experience. Knowledge is the indispensable guide to sound judgment, and experience is the most reliable guide to the kind of knowledge which concerns the affairs of everyday life. We mainly ask, then, that when a representative of the people arises to talk, he should represent somebody in particular and not seek to perform the impossible feat of representing everybody in general. This consideration leads to the demand for the representation in the national assembly of each trade and profession by those of its own choice.

Some will at once say that here at any rate is quite perceptible the cloven hoof of Mussolini, though, in fact, the Corporate State has received an almost affectionate welcome from all sorts of people who know little of National Socialism and like it less. Certain of our portentous Mayfair snobs have even toyed with the gruesome idea of a democratic Corporate State. Let them proceed. The concept of functional representation, the notion that men should know before they talk, is found firmly expressed in the Guild System which held sway in the later Middle Ages in Britain. Then was a trade or craft seen as something worthy of art, as something to be held in trust with price, and as an element given its due and honoured place in the life and counsels of the nation.

As a nation we have a love for maxims which scarcely rise above the level of platitudes. They infuriate the foreigner but serve to console us for all our imperfections. One of them, far juster than most, is "Give a man a job to do and let him do it." Strangely enough it has never occurred to the moralisers to say: "Give a man a job to do, let him do it, and then let him talk about it." Yet herein lies the meaning of representation, if it is to have any meaning at all. This, at least, is the code of National Socialism.

Therefore Guild Representation in the National Socialist State will rest upon the following general bases :

- I. Each trade or profession shall have its own elected Guild Council to discuss and settle its own problems, subject to the limits imposed by the National welfare, of which the government is the guardian.
- II. All who work shall be registered within the Guild proper to their calling and shall be empowered to elect to the House of Commons members of their own Guild whose merit as workers and whose character render them faithful and capable representatives. The House of Commons will thus serve as a Council of Guilds, dealing with all those economic and vocational problems too extensive or too weighty for solution by a single Guild.
- III. In those Guilds concerned with industry, employers and employed shall have equal representation; and the same principle shall govern the election of members to Parliament.

It is appropriate here to refer to the position of the Trades Unions in the National Socialist State. National Socialism, so far from being opposed to the Trade Union principle, is determined not only to preserve Trades Unions, but to give them a status in government which will enable them to serve the employed effectively without resorting to the weapon of the strike, which, like that of the lock-out, is a form of instrument which nobody except the Communist agitator would regard as something in itself desirable. Strikes and lockouts have more often than not proved wasteful and destructive, though without strikes the condition of many workers would have been inhuman. No solution of an industrial problem should ever decrease production of needed goods ; otherwise the people must suffer.

Instead, however, of writing an essay on a subject thoroughly explored by Trade Unionists, let us steer straight to the point. In the Guild System, the Trades Unions shall be responsible for the election to the Guilds and to Parliament of those who are to represent the employed. Thus, at one stroke, the Trades Unions acquire in the counsels of the nation equal legal and constitutional, economic and political influence with the employers. Each worker is registered in the appropriate Guild ; and membership of his Trade

Union is compulsory. Since the state, by regulation to be described later, must assure high purchasing power and good conditions of labour to the employed, it becomes quite needless for the Trades Unions to fight the battle that they have been fighting for a century. Their prime objective is attained. It is still, however, necessary for them to speak and act for the employed within the Guild Structure, and the employers, of course, will have to form suitable organisations of their own for a similar purpose.

No clearer recognition could be given to the Trades Unions than their legal and parliamentary right to represent the employed. This very consideration renders it all the more necessary that they should rid themselves or be rid of opportunists who batten on their membership in order to gain political honours and to carve out a notorious career at the expense of those who contribute to their success and are forgotten the moment it is gained. In the new Trades Unionism, portentous humbugs must play no part. Every Trade Unionist will know what is here meant; and every decent Trade Unionist is sick and tired of being deceived by carpet-bag politicians and fellows who forget that they have been engine drivers as soon as they become members of Parliament.

The Trade Union shall be no institution for the kindly upbringing of would-be politicians; it shall be the authoritative body concerned with the conditions and desires of the employed, whom it represents from day to day in the Guild, and on terms of fearless equality in Parliament.

The House of Commons will thus be an assembly of men who know their work and have power to legislate on all matters affecting the professions, trades, and vocations of the people, subject to the right of the people's government to intervene where general interests are in danger of being sacrificed to particular interests and to make laws, by Order in Council, for the welfare of the people as a whole. Without these necessary powers a government of the people could not govern; nor could it guarantee that action should not be prejudiced by lengthy discussion.

To appreciate the representative character of this National Socialist House of Commons, it is only necessary to quote

the following astounding report from the "Morning Post" of June 4th, 1937.

"On a point of honour, Old Harrovians will rally round the Government in the House of Commons to-day . . . It is the Fourth of June at Eton, and the Government, anticipating a general exodus of old Etonian members, numbering over 100, have included in their Whip a reminder to this effect, and earnestly requesting non-Etonians to fill the breach. The Whips, I understand, are confident that the Harrow School motto, "Stet fortuna domus," will stand between them and defeat on a division. In party circles last night this had been freely translated "The Government must not be let down." In any event there is little cause for alarm."

Stet Fortuna domus might also be freely translated: "Long live the Stock Exchange." The celebration could not, we presume, be deferred till Saturday, lest some of the Old Boys might find it embarrassing to bring their prayer-shawls to sunny Windsor. Should any Old Etonian ever read this book, he may be annoyed; but he should bethink himself that nothing is more injurious to his "Alma Mater" than the type of emetic rubbish that we have quoted, rubbish, however, which shows clearly enough what a very representative place St. Stephen's is.

Reverting to the question of real representation, we must deny the old and groundless charge that National Socialism would crush women's representation. Where women work in industry, they shall have the same rights as men in the election of Guild and Parliamentary representatives.

It is necessary also to recognise frankly that the task of bearing and bringing up a family is no less important to the race than any other, and that therefore a truly representative system must give expression and power to the mother, who, if like most women, can be represented neither by a blue-stocking nor by a Transatlantic noblewoman clinging to the principle vice which the American people renounced through fear of poison.

A Guild will therefore be formed to express nationally the importance and the rights of those who are responsible for the home, which, after all, is the very basis of the greater part of our conduct. Women will so be given the legal power

to deal with scandals of racial importance such as maternal and infant mortality. Effect must be given to the principle that the great discoveries and achievements of science should be open to every mother, regardless of her economic circumstances. Where the nation demands strong, healthy citizens, there can be no discrimination between rich and poor; but the application of wealth and science to this particular, though tremendous, problem is eminently one for women themselves, who, after all the excesses and sacrifices of the suffragettes, have now a vote just as useless to them as to the menfolk. Women may sometimes condescend to discuss subjects that they do not understand; but they always seem glad to discuss what they do understand. Here is their opportunity, offered by National Socialism alone.

National Socialism demands that all should live in the service of the nation; and National Socialism must therefore secure, so far as it can, that all are fit to give this service. It follows that the care of mother and child is a responsibility superior to every consideration of economy; for to stint here is the classic example of false economy.

During this examination of the need for constitutional reform, nothing has so far been said about the House of Lords. It is time to speak in no uncertain terms. The National Socialist League has no use for such an anachronism. In 1911, this noble assembly died; Lord Rosebery, the only decent Liberal politician within living memory, said that rather than embarrass His Majesty's Government, he would vote for the Parliament Act, leave the House, and never again darken their Lordships' portals with his shadow. The epitaph was wisely pronounced; for never since that time has the House of Peers done aught but set the final seal of respectability on the most heinous crimes of the House of Commons, as for example, the India Act. An assembly that initiates naught and forbids naught, but nevertheless discusses, can have no effect beyond that of wasting time that must be valuable to somebody, if not to Their Lordships.

It is not to be inferred that National Socialism is opposed to the granting of titles for merit. There is something in the genius of the British people which appreciates such a

practice, though millions of workers would like to know how Citrine and Mond earned their inclusion in the ranks of the noble. Let honours be paid where they are due ; but let a legislative assembly be fit in character and in ability to do its work. Of course, what democracy never can realise is that the work of government should always be viewed as a harsh responsibility and never as a source of emolument or elevation in the scale of privileged snobbery.

Therefore the House of Lords will be reconstituted as a Second Chamber, giving representation to all those aspects of the National life which cannot be classed as economic. For those aspects which are economic, ample provision is made in the House of Commons. Imperial and foreign affairs, the Services, the Universities, and the various Christian religious denominations, art, science, general culture are all subjects which should come within the scope of an enlightened and hygienic Second Chamber. The hereditary element may well be lost, though if the son of a senator shows as much capability as his father, his inclusion in the House would be a National advantage. In plain language, we admit that much is to be said for the principle of heredity ; but unless it justifies itself in the issue, it is science that is being insulted and not heredity. The House will be appointed by the Crown on the advice of the elected leaders of the people in consultation with the House of Commons, and will consist of technicians whose interests are too specific and whose specialisation is too detailed to render them suitable as representatives of mankind in the mass, and of men whose experience fits them to judge upon matters of imperial and foreign importance, and upon questions affecting all those very many national activities which may not properly be called commercial. This second Chamber will very rarely sit as a whole, but from the wealth of knowledge and experience which it contains, it will be able to provide select bodies of men to advise the Government and enable the leaders of the people to decide wisely and act promptly in all those matters not appropriate to the business of the House of Commons, which will be entirely free from any interference on the part of the Second Chamber. This assembly, without being able to impose its will on the nation, can be of supreme value in providing for the people's leaders the knowledge and experience essential to sound judgment.

Its functions supply the answer to the common criticism that a legislature of experts is apt to degenerate into a committee of pedants.

It will now be seen that the National Socialist idea of representation is, like the ideal nation, organic, embracing every kind of activity profitable to the people. The heaviest insistence is laid throughout on the fitness of men to speak for those whose interests they have in keeping. Ended is the silly spectacle of a number of professors of nothing in particular rushing for a brief but hurricane stay into some constituency, to be forgotten by all so soon as the most plausible is elected.

Much more could be written on the subject of representation, including a detailed account of the manner in which the country must be zoned and the trades categorised in order that Guild and Parliamentary elections may give the electors the opportunity of personally knowing their representatives; but this is matter for a detailed treatise and not for a general survey intended only to outline the main principles on which the whole system is to depend.

In our opinion, there is no purpose to be served by elaborating details until the general nature of the system is accepted; moreover, in working out the particulars, it will be the aim of the National Socialist League to obtain all possible help from those who are to operate the plan itself. If the advice of experts is valuable at any stage, it is valuable in the beginning; and we are not going to make the initial mistake of proposing to teach experts their business. We have given the data for the creation of a system in which every craftsman can use his skill and knowledge to the full. Consider these data carefully, note their superiority to the outworn bases of the present Parliamentary farce, and if you have any useful contribution to make in the nature of detailed administration, make it to us, and do not afterwards accuse National Socialism of having produced a complete and intricate machine of government without having stopped to ask the people for good advice.

Instead of dallying now with the niceties of Constitution making, it is better to show how National Socialism will, through this improved system of government, benefit the people, on whom it relies and in whose destiny it believes.

CHAPTER III.

The purpose of government—Need of economic revolution—Production—Consumption—Finance and the people—Markets—Machinery and shorter hours—Scientific regulation as opposed to Laissez Faire—Co-operatives and private traders—Private property and the Marxist argument—Particular industries—Imperial co-operation.

In the last chapter, we were occupied with systems of government; but the form of government should never be an end in itself.

The end of government is to improve spiritually and materially the lot of the people. The prince or magistrate who believes that no more improvement is possible must be regarded as a public nuisance.

Material improvement shall be considered first; the poor are tired of being told that they have a monopoly of virtue; the unemployed are sick of being assured that their ordeals must bring out all that is best in them; and the floating by some capitalist Holyman of "Return to Christianity, Ltd.," promises little dividend to the lambs and sheep now waiting to be fed.

You are to be spared a lengthy analysis of your country's economic situation. If you believe that all is well and that we are more prosperous than ever before, you speak for your dear smug self and obviously have no motive for desiring change, unless you have an eye for the deluge which is on its way.

If allowance be made for the great gaps in the official register, we have some two millions of unemployed. These people have only one certainty—that of being condemned to scientific starvation unless something happens. Said one well clad interrupter to me recently: "But they have 17/- a week. Where else would they be so well treated?" Shades of Sodom and Gomorrah! A comfortable citizen's drink allowance would be cramped at that. Three shillings a week is the allowance for a child, which is supposed to grow up strong enough to bear arms for the sake of usury.

Apart from the unemployment, there are millions of our countrymen underpaid. It has even been testified by such a reliable authority as Sir John Orr that 13½ millions of our people are under-nourished; nor will this scientific and impartial estimate be challenged by those who in London, Manchester, and Barnsley, on the Tyneside, in the Black Country, and in rural districts see housewives pinching, scraping, and worrying in the vain attempt to get enough food on to the table. Men go to jail for stealing a bottle of milk when their children are ill of malnutrition, and mothers commit suicide because they cannot live to see their children suffer without hope of relief.

A word must be said too for the professional classes and the so-called Black-Coated workers who, though not generally attacked by the rigours of poverty, are haunted day and night by their insecurity, that nerve-twisting enemy of every man who lives on his income and has no certainty that the income will not rudely stop.

Likewise entitled to consideration are the manufacturers and farmers who have seen their business ruined by the flood of foreign goods constantly pouring into markets that should be ours, and the small independent traders dying in the last ditch from the assault of the great Jewish chain stores.

If all these victims join in a paean of praise for "Things as they are," we can only suppose that their reason has been affected by their suffering, or that there is some cause which bids them conceal their true feelings.

One can describe grievances indefinitely; one can stray for ever in the morasses of economic discussion, "and find no end in wandering mazes lost." Therefore, to be true to our old motto "Steer Straight," we will at once name the National Socialist remedies for unemployment, poverty, and insecurity.

They are, in principle, as follows:—

1. The production of goods must be raised to that level at which the needs of the people can be satisfied.
2. The buying power of the people must be raised to that level at which they can purchase the goods that they need.

3. Money being essential to buying power, finance and credit must be made to serve the people through the control of their government, designed to raise wages and salaries, thereby vastly increasing the home market.
4. The markets of Britain and her Empire must belong absolutely to the British and Imperial peoples.
5. To cope with the displacement of manpower by machinery, there must be instituted a shorter working day, whereby all able-bodied men may be employed at a high rate of wages guaranteed by the increase in production.
6. Prices, wages, rents, and all economic elements must be scientifically apportioned in the interests of the people as a whole, individual enterprise being protected by the State.
7. Private property must be regarded as a right to be defended and fortified by the recognition that it is a right to be shared by all good citizens.

Each of these propositions can bear some analysis and explanation ; and it is therefore proposed to give each a little section denoted by numerals corresponding to those above.

1. All wealth consists of goods which can be so consumed or used as to satisfy needs, and any economic argument which does not begin with the production of wealth is a waste of time. Many sincere Socialists have made fools of themselves by troubling incessantly about the distribution of wealth which exists and ignoring the fact that by no possible process of redistribution could the existing quantity of wealth satisfy legitimate needs. Unless enough is produced, some, probably many, must go short. Until enough is produced, it must be utterly impossible to provide the people with what they require.

In fact it is not disputed that in our own country and Empire, more wealth could be created. Nor can it be denied that if some tidal commotion swallowed up everthing but

this quarter of the earth's surface, there would be no reason for its inhabitants to fear starvation; for the natural resources which they have not developed must be at least ten times as great as those that they have put to use.

Nearly two centuries of scientific discovery and a hundred years of engineering technique have laid nature at the mercy of men, who can now tear from her boldly and relentlessly what he needs. Such at least is our position, favoured as we are beyond most other nations. The age-old struggle of man to wrest from the grip of nature what he must have for life and well-being has drawn to a close. To-day Nature is all right; it is men who keep men from the fruits they could enjoy.

Nobody but the poor laments scarcity; and lament as the poor may, wheat is ruthlessly burnt each year, coffee is destroyed, and fish are flung back into the sea. Spindles are scrapped, and blast furnaces closed down. A visitor from another planet, unless it were the Star of Zion, would surely exclaim: "Why in the name of everything sacred do these people suffer from shortage and at the same time busily set about destroying the wealth that they have?" This is the question that imperatively must be answered; otherwise let us sit down and suffer with the happiness of lunatic martyrdom.

Gloom, despair, pessimism and hopelessness are common enough; such feelings would be justified only if our resources were exhausted.

As they are not even more than skimmed, let the first consideration be their proper development. Were we only to produce from our own coal the oil that we consume, 95,000 miners and 35,000 other workers could be employed within a few months.

The financing of increased production is a special subject which shall presently receive clear treatment, but grasp the fact that finance is secondary; the brutal message resounding in our ears to-day is PRODUCE OR STARVE. Money, deeds, bonds, mortgages are all far subordinate to this one message, our acceptance of which is the condition of our

survival as a race and as individuals, if any of us should be so conceited as to want to survive the race to which we belong.

The problem may be hard, you surmise ; but unless it is solved, no other problem is worth examining.

2. Whenever a protest is made against the wanton destruction of real wealth, the stock reply is : " Well, we have no market in which to sell." Similarly, if one dares to advance increased production as the first condition of sane economics, one is told : " Ah ! but what is the use of increasing output, if there are no markets to absorb it." By this sage philosophy, a people is kept in chains, and the formula is so often repeated that an absurdity which ought to be self-evident is not noticed. If, indeed, there is one fact that shrieks to the high heavens for redress, it is the fact that there can be no markets unless people have the money to buy. This perpetual moan for markets continues day and night without any apparent realisation of what a market is.

A market consists of two elements only : the desire to buy goods, and the money wherewith to buy them. The desire is certainly present in our own land, as the misery and hardship of millions can testify. The money is not present. Hence we are instructed that because the people cannot afford to buy, goods must not be produced. Production, we are commanded, must be kept down to the level of the money that happens to be in circulation. Production is based not on the needs but on the poverty of our countrymen. A system so crazy, unjust and immoral is tolerated only because all the great instruments of propaganda lie within the hands of those who exploit it. The crime is international, and the greatest exploiter is the international Jew, who controls alike the financial method and the Communism which serves his internationalism as a first line of defence. Ranting rubbish about private property has nothing to do with the question.

That the required market may exist, there must be a great and general increase in buying power through the raising of workers' wages and salaries. The only moral standard of

production is the needs of the people, so long as national resources can be made to yield more. Truly it is foolish to produce goods which cannot be bought; and the solution therefore is to enable them to be bought by putting money into circulation amongst those who desire to purchase.

Base money in circulation on the volume of production and the volume of production on the needs of the people. Then and then alone can adequate consumption of wealth take place.

Our bourgeois merchants and internationalist political pandars must learn, somehow or other, that when tremendous markets can be created here, it is derogatory to the national prestige to send simpering amateur ambassadors abroad in the hope that by adopting fancy dress or some other peculiarity they may persuade the foreigner to cause unemployment in his country merely to produce employment in ours. If the idea is to persuade the foreigner to buy from us what he does not want, it is to be feared that God will not help us. Champagne may bubble and rose petals bestrew the footwear of some itinerant scion of declining nobility, but no benefit will accrue to us.

It is an ignoble shame that when there are so many millions here who want to be customers, they should be ignored, whilst every variety of seductive flattery and fawning civility is wasted on the foreigner.

The time is now at hand when we must make our own markets or do without. The latter alternative would not commend itself to a louse of intelligence moderate for its kind.

3. To produce enough and consume it is the objective set by National Socialism. So far this most obvious necessity has been snatched from our grasp by the Harpy called Money. This little monster has been presented as the sole obstacle to the practicability of our scheme. Unhappily, the general public does not yet realise that money is a mere token raised by crime and superstition to the level of a god whose feet, trunk, and arms are to-day made of paper.

Until money really represents goods and becomes the absolute slave of the people, no fundamental reform can be made. Until it is reduced to its proper and petty little place as the faithful and convenient token of actual goods that it represents, it is we who must occupy the position of slaves.

Before, however, describing a scientific monetary system, we must make two observations quite important to the task of increasing the production and consumption of wealth.

First, it must be noted that even in the present wretched circumstances, some employers, like Ford, have been able to pay good wages and charge low prices. They have, in fact, found it profitable to do so, until the ugly hand of unscrupulous competition has made itself felt.

Where these benefits have occurred, they have been due to the nature of modern mass production. The law thereof is easy to understand; in certain industries, the costs of labour do not rise in proportion to output, the volume of which depends more and more on mechanical efficiency but less and less on manual labour.

To produce 200 units may cost twice as much as the production of 100 units. Probably the cost of producing 2,000 units will not be double that of producing 1,000; and it is likely that 92,000 units will not cost appreciably more than 90,000. Now the reason is inherent in the nature of modern machinery; for overhead expenses and labour costs being paid, a few extra revolutions of a wheel add nothing to the latter, but something to the total volume produced. If, then, we consider these 2,000 units produced at practically no extra cost, the question arises: "Should they be distributed or destroyed?" Men like Ford have been in favour of their distribution; but for this purpose a market was necessary. Ford himself helped to create one by paying higher wages and encouraging his employees to have cars. Anyhow, the 2,000 surplus may be given away, sold or destroyed. If they are given away, there will be some dislocation in the market, unless discrimination is used. If sold, they can be added to the general mass on sale in such a way as to reduce the general price, or the general price may remain the same if intending buyers have had a wage increase. If they are destroyed, a crime is committed.

If follows, therefore, that over the field of mechanised industry in general, under conditions of mass production, increase of output does not necessarily mean proportionate increase in cost of production, and therefore the advantage given to us by mechanical methods can be used to increase production and to increase consumption through either a raising of wages or a lowering of prices. It is not, however, contended that this process can go far enough to cure all our economic ills; and until cut-throat competition is abolished, it can hardly go at all. Nevertheless, this method of increasing production and consumption can be used in conjunction with others.

Our second preliminary consideration is that vast quantities of credit exist in Britain without being available for the purposes of increasing production and raising wages. The Banks control probably £250,000,000 used for no purpose at all.

When the British countryside is parched with drought, and the farmer is faced with ruin, £2,000,000 can be raised for the irrigation of Palestine. £40,000,000 can be found for France in the twinkling of an eye; £12,000,000 can be raised for Russia on the understanding that if the Bolsheviks do not pay the lenders, the British taxpayers must. So it was with the great India 6% loan. In the course of a few decades, the Rothschilds can place £120,000,000 of British credit in Brazil, and yet we are assured that no money is available for the production from British coal of even that quantity of oil necessary for the fighting services of the nation.

In plain language, there is plenty of money and credit for the foreigner, particularly if he is favoured of Israel, but our occupation is to be that of whistling jigs to a milestone.

National Socialism will quite transform this scene. Every penny of British credit shall be used for Britain and not one penny for the foreigner. Foreign loans and investments shall stop. If this country is good enough to inhabit, it is good enough to finance.

Nationalisation of the Banks would be a waste of time; bundles of deeds and script are not our quest. But there

must be that national control of banking and credit which will ensure that all available finance shall be used to promote greater production and greater consumption.

Strange though it may seem, there are many white and patriotic bankers to-day who would not pretend to be satisfied with the situation; but they would say: "Our first duty is to our clients, who leave their money with us. We dare not lend in Britain; we cannot get security, and we have no reason to believe that if we finance production, the goods can be sold. Now, as to our foreign transactions, we usually have the guarantee of the Government or a great lending house, so that we have nothing to fear." To this kind of banker, we must reply that we understand him, but that the security of a National Socialist government will enable him to disgorge and that with increased buying power and the exclusion of the foreigner from British markets, he will have no reason for isolating credit instruments, nor will he be permitted to do so; as to his clients, the Government will see that they are not disappointed.

Whilst it is a matter of common sense to insist that existing credit instruments be used in the first place, and whilst it is elementary justice to stop financing the foreigner, the fact must now be faced that the indispensable condition of National Socialist economics is a managed currency, whereby money and goods are properly correlated.

The principles of a sound managed currency are as follows:

1. The purpose of money is to enable goods to be distributed.
2. There must be enough money in circulation to enable the people to purchase the goods they need.
3. Credit is a promise to pay, and its chief purpose is to enable goods to be produced in advance of demand.
4. To produce goods, the producer needs money to pay his labour, and credit to procure his materials of production. The main fact here is that if a producer can be guaranteed the certainty of selling his goods at a reasonable price, he is free to go ahead.

5. A Managed Currency is the issue by the Government of tokens which act as money or credit, enabling the producer to produce in anticipation of a certain market and the general public to constitute that market through its possession of the right number of tokens.
6. The amount of currency must vary with circumstances. As production increases, the quantity of money in circulation must increase in order to avoid price fluctuation.
7. The honest producer is given the security of a market by the Government; the consumer is given through wages and salaries the buying power which constitutes this security.

From the above principles, it follows that the Government should issue money tokens through employers to employed. Such an issue increases the amount of money in circulation; but it is in no sense whatever inflation, because the tokens are issued only in consideration of increased production. That is to say, the extra money has a backing in goods, unit for unit, on a calculated basis. In the early stages, if supply lagged behind demand, price control would be indispensable, but price control is in any case a permanent feature of National Socialist policy.

Goods may be divided into those which are intended for immediate consumption and those which must be set aside to serve as the basis of further production. The Government can easily do two things. It can keep in circulation enough money to balance goods of the first kind, provided prices be regulated; and it can back with the security of the nation the producer who requires goods of the second kind for his work. A cheque for £1,000,000 is only a promise to pay. Such a cheque would start a big enterprise, but there is no reason why the promise of a Government should be less valid than that of a Bank or of an individual. Note most carefully that when the manufacturer has sold his goods, he needs the promise no longer; he has the cash. Thus the big problem is to tide over the producer from the beginning of his venture to the time when it has matured in sales. Here the security of the Nation is quite as good as that of a bank.

It is not suggested that the Government should replace the banks, which, provided their terms and activities be controlled, can play their part in the task, but it is imperative that the Government should do that which the banks plead inability to do, namely guarantee security to the producer and wages to the employed. Therefore, if a manufacturer is willing to produce goods that are needed, it is possible for the Government to make him the medium through which new currency is issued, by supplying him with money tokens which enable him to secure his supplies and to create purchasing power among his employees by paying high wages. As the amount of money in circulation is based on the amount of production, the more goods the workers make the higher their wages become. In thus issuing currency, the Government is not making a loan, but is creating a market for greater production. Needless to say, the manufacturer or other producer who is so assisted, is to be legally held responsible for the payment to his workers of that portion of the issue which the Government may deem necessary, as also for the production of a stipulated quantity of goods.

In essence the system which we outline is opposed to inflation, because currency is to be issued only against goods and regulated in amount according to the needs of the people.

Though this principle of currency is necessary to revolution, it is not so drastically unprecedented as some may imagine. It involves no idea of a National Dividend paid to Bill Smith and Philip Sassoon alike. In fact, before a Jubilee, a Christmas, or a Coronation, an extra issue of currency notes is made at the present time, and in consequence greater spending and higher employment become temporarily possible. "Business" is said to be "good." Whilst the process of thus stimulating trade is only microscopic, we may well ask why the powers that be should restrict these little orgies so arbitrarily to a few days a year, or a few weeks a year if a monarch unhappily dies. According to the current philosophy, indeed, such outbursts must be atoned for by periods of frugality and thirst. But why? If a government, with the banks, can increase the currency to provide a public spectacle, why not to provide

permanently better conditions for the people. Usury of the most vulgar description is the customary answer.

Currency is a subject to be viewed in close relationship with taxation; for taxation can best be considered as a means whereby government can earmark for its own use a certain proportion of the wealth created each year. Under a system of increased production, this proportion would diminish; there would be more wealth in existence, and the burden on the individual would be reduced. Indeed a government financing production through a managed currency would be able, if it seemed best, to reserve part of the wealth produced by making a charge on currency issued to producers. Whether or not this method be adopted, it is certain a system wherein money was based on goods and production was increased would enable the government to find a revenue without ruining estates through death duties or clinging to the unsatisfactory device of import duties. In taxing the nation, the government must take a realist view and think in terms not of usury but of goods.

In general, we may envy the savages their common sense. If, on some barbaric isle, the money is based on a shell standard, and some poor fool, perhaps a demented banker, goes and drops half the shells irrecoverably into the water, do the chiefs and witch-doctors hold a conclave and decide that everybody must live on half of what he previously consumed, though fishing, hunting and tilling be as productive as ever? The pundits who made such a suggestion would, as like as not, follow the shells into the water. Otherwise some great anthropologist would delight us with the tale of this people's superstition. Yet it is we who are superstitious; and whereas in a few pages it is not possible to survey completely the whole question of money, we have stated the impregnable truths which will kill a superstition profitable only to the international financiers who impose it upon us.

In concluding this section, I must beg you to remember one fact in the light of which every monetary question must be seen. The wealth of a nation consists in goods, services, and the spirit of her people. The moment that money is regarded as wealth, true perspective is lost and the experience of centuries destroyed.

If people only realised that wealth lay in the soil and in their own efforts, the reign of Shylock would be over.

4. As Nationalists, we reject the theory of international trade, which in any case is crawling to the mortuary, and as Socialists, we want all available work for our own people.

That stupid internationalism has made fools of us. Here for a century, we have seen the edifying sight of good Trades Union officials protesting manfully against the undercutting of Englishman's wages by Englishmen, denouncing, in righteous indignation the Scab and the Blackleg. Yet, even in our own time, there is not one word from them about the undercutting of Englishmen's wages by the foreigner. As to the Scab or Blackleg, if he be not British, he is hailed as an A.I, 100%, gilt-edged Comrade.

If 400 Englishmen walk into a Burnley factory and offer to work at one fifth the Union rate, and if they are engaged to do so at the expense of 400 sacked Unionists, a life and death strike is the least that we have to expect. Bloodshed would not be out of the question.

But let 400 Japanese some thousands of miles away perform exactly the same low trick, and the Union Leaders will rise to pronounce their blessing on the institution of Free Trade, although their displaced followers will be walking the streets in destitution; and presumably, if the Japanese, with the help of their financial slave-drivers took the trouble to come to Burnley and perform there, we should still hear hymns of praise ascending from our International Socialists.

The simple fact is that if Englishmen should be protected from each other, they have a double right to protection from the foreigner, and were it not for the power of international Jewish finance which pays the social-democratic piper, we should hear a very different tune from the supposed custodians of the workers, who can maintain no real custody of British working interests until they renounce internationalism root and branch.

Science has annihilated time and distance; so much we realise whenever we listen to the radio. Factories and plant

can now be set up in any part of the world. Uncle Isaac therefore has his work done where labour is cheapest to get, and we white people are left quite unable to compete with the sort of labour that he employs, be it in Japan, India or Whitechapel. The one way of taking a little joy out of his life and putting a little more into our own, is to exclude absolutely the products of this sweated labour.

National Socialism proposes not to use tariffs but to exclude absolutely from Britain all foreign goods of a kind that can be produced here. "British markets for British labour" is a maxim of elementary common sense.

In agriculture, the farmer, if given the necessary organisation and credit, which National Socialism can supply, will be able to double his produce in three years' time. This fact was proved at a recent meeting of the British Association. Now, if foreign food be entirely excluded, the British farmer can replace it. At the present rate of consumption, it would be necessary to import from the Empire as much food as we now import; but, since one of the prime objects of the whole policy is to increase consumption to the extent of the people's needs, it follows that we must buy in much greater quantity from the Empire, despite the fact that our British agriculture will have doubled its output. The British farmer is given first place in his own market; and what he cannot supply must come from the Empire, which, through its greater trade with us, will be in a position to buy more of our goods in exchange for the only great and valuable market in raw materials and foodstuffs awaiting the Imperial countries to-day.

The old objection that such a policy would raise prices has no validity here; for under a system of managed currency, the buying power of the nation is deliberately adjusted to meet circumstances. It can never be a mistake to use the wealth which belongs to us. Through our improved commercial relationship with the Imperial countries, out of necessity and of choice there will arise an economic organisation capable of giving independence to one quarter of the earth's population. Bear in mind that our Empire is scarcely 10% developed; but its development is a duty awaiting us, and

if we could do so much to develop foreign lands, we must extend our financial system to develop what belongs to the Imperial peoples.

It may now be asked: "What will happen to the man who invests his money in the Argentine and is paid his dividend in the form of Argentine meat imported into Britain?" In faith, we are mildly sorry for him, but his way of making a living is neither nice nor useful, and he must find some other. Little investors who suffer are entitled to expect some compensation from out the great increase of production which National Socialism will bring; but men who expect to make large fortunes by putting British people out of work have no place in the National Socialist state. If they have to work for a living, no moral injustice will be done.

Naturally the change from international to Imperial trade could not be accomplished in a week; during the transitional period, trading with foreign nations would still be necessary; this business would be transacted on the basis of barter, our purchases being made only from our customers; and certainly it would not be necessary to tolerate for a single week the absurd situation of many year's standing whereby Britain buys twice as much as she sells, nor would the credit and capital needed by Britain be sent abroad for private profit.

It is often said that economic nationalism means war; this question will be examined in another chapter, but if our neighbours want to prevent us from cultivating our own garden, they must fight for the privilege of stopping us.

5. Machinery steadily displaces man-power. Now, a machine minded by two men may produce in a day as much as fifty men could have produced in the same time at the beginning of the century. If this process is to continue it may be that in 50 years time, 10,000 men will be able to produce all the requirements of the nation by pulling levers and pressing buttons. Should such a stage be reached, will millions stand by unemployed and therefore unable to consume the proceeds of marvellous science? It seems unlikely, and it would be monstrously unjust.

The truth is that manual labour no longer determines the amount of production, but in the present era of civilisation, it must be the criterion of distribution.

The age of leisure is not yet; but, to solve the problem of unemployment, the working day must be shortened, so that every honest, able-bodied citizen can take his turn. This proposal emphatically does not mean a reduction in wages; on the contrary, the amount for distribution is to be enormously increased through the mechanical efficiency at our disposal. A shorter working day for the individual does not imply lower production by the individual. Instead, the amount of production can be raised, because it depends on the machine and not on the number of hours worked by individuals. Produce enough to distribute, and men will receive enough whatever number of hours they work, just as, to our common knowledge, some people receive substantial incomes for doing nothing at all.

Science has placed a great instrument of liberty in our hands. Its proper use can give to all an employment which will be properly rewarded because in the task they will create enough to satisfy their needs.

6. National Socialism demands control of production and the scientific apportionment of prices, wages, rents, interest, and all economic elements, because there is no other way of establishing the first justification of private property, namely that all shall have enough of it.

To raise wages would be futile, if private individuals were empowered so to raise prices that the worker found himself no better off than before. It is likewise useless to raise a man's salary by £100 a year, if his rent is to be raised by a like amount. Nor can the state allow men to borrow money on terms destined to cripple them.

Through the well-informed and competent Guilds the Government will substitute scientific regulation for the mad and immoral cut-throat competition which has become such a characteristic feature of the present system.

Private enterprise indeed is to be encouraged. Keen personal interest is a stimulus that no Government can afford to overlook; but there is a world of difference between private enterprise operating within the controlled limits of collective well-being and private enterprise, crashing about in competitive warfare and dealing blow after blow at the honest trader who refuses to stoop to the cut-price methods so typical of the Hebrew commercial method.

Regulation can assure markets both for the private trader and the co-operative organisations, but only at the expense of the great foreign controlled Chain Stores, for which there is no place in any country whose people are adequately paid.

It is a fallacy to regard the private trader and Co-operative enterprise as necessarily inimical. The removal of the chain-store menace and the general increase of purchasing power which National Socialism demands would provide a market sufficient for both. Co-operative organisations would, of course, like the private trader, have to conform with the economic regulation of trade. They would, with the private trader, have their representation in a Distributive Guild, which among other functions would exercise that of eliminating the speculative middle-man who performs no service to production or distribution, but who buys goods which he never sees, to sell them at a profit without adding anything to their value or accessibility.

Needless to say, the Co-operative undertaking would in no sense be a political body; neither would it be encouraged or permitted to act as a competitive sales organisation dealing with non-members, but viewed as an organisation existing for the benefit of its own members, it would be approved by the National Socialist Government as a perfectly legitimate system of trading.

We have thus to break for ever with the cruel old *Laissez-faire* doctrine of "Each for himself and the Devil take the hindmost," "Buy in the cheapest market to sell in the dearest," and "Pinch your neighbour where you can." These doctrines are as outworn as the Communist reaction which they provoked. It is foolish, for example, to denounce profit, which, properly viewed, is only the wage of organising

ability or the reward of creative intellect; but it is just as foolish to defend an unlimited profit made by opportunism at the expense of worthy men and women. To be opposed with all ferocity is the notion that a man should be free to profit by the destruction of his fellow countrymen provided that he does not actually steal. To be stoutly maintained is the principle that organising ability is deserving of its wage, and that creative intellect, as a rare and priceless quality, merits the highest rewards that the nation can afford.

7. National Socialism will maintain private property within the limits of national welfare and scientific regulation.

What the crass, sordid, materialistic, biassed Marxist will not see is that the capacity to satisfy the needs of man depends upon greater production.

Let us take a simple equation :

If x is the employee's share of wealth and y is the amount received by the employer and others,

$$x + y = \text{Total wealth produced } (t).$$

Let us give values :

$$\begin{array}{r} x + y = t \\ 50 \quad 50 \quad 100 \end{array}$$

Now the Marxist may contend and rightly that the employee (or "worker," if we include the professions) absolutely needs 100 or t . So be it. Let us double production, and then our evaluated equation becomes :

$$\begin{array}{r} x + y = t \\ 100 \quad 100 \quad 200 \end{array}$$

Thus the problem is solved, and if we treble production the worker will get more than the Marxist demands. As to the old tag that labour creates all values, it must be realised that creative intellect, the effortless discovery, for example, of the Law of Gravity, means more to the advance of civilisation than any degree of concerted sweating labour. This, of course, the materialist cannot understand. If you bring me a pebble that you have polished for thirty days, I may not want it, and all your labour has no value for me. Tell me a funny story, and it may bring you a glass of bitter. So much for the verminous old Jew, Marx.

After all, we know our own countrymen well enough to say that if all their needs are provided, they will not lie awake pining o'nights because somebody has made a modest profit. Only the race of Mr. Mordecai Marx is capable of such deep solicitude.

We have thus sketched a general economic system, as to the details of which many questions will arise. If the principles are accepted and thought provoked, we are well satisfied. Detailed application is beyond the scope of this little book; but the following results can be foreseen.

British agriculture will double its home-market and so be enabled to improve the whole condition of the people who live on the countryside. The British farmer, having first claim on British credit, will emerge from his long period of suffering, to take his place as the chief provider of the nation's food, without which it starves.

The coal industry will have more than scientific organisation. It will have an increased home-market because the great increase in the production of wealth will make heavy demands upon it. It will have also the benefit of the extraction from British coal of the nation's needs in oil, thus becoming able to employ more than 90,000 extra miners, whose wages, like those of all workers, will be protected by law.

The cotton trade will benefit by the exclusion of Japanese cotton goods from Britain and the Crown Colonies, the exclusion from Britain of the cheap products of Indian slave labour, and the resumption in India of a British control which will sweep away the barriers between Lancashire and a great market which she did so much to create.

Shipping will not only have the benefit of national finance for the proper equipment of the best merchant fleet in the world, but the great advantage of extensive, long-distance Empire trading in which foreign competition will be allowed to play no part.

In short and in general, we shall, with the co-operation of Empire, be making full use, for the first time in history, of the greatest resources and potentialities ever to have been placed within the grasp of any people. And as we think of what can be achieved, there arises one sentimental thought at least. At last there is lifting the fog of that haunting conscience in which we were brought up—the thought ever lingering in the background—that when we were young a million men laid down their lives for our land. That sacrifice and the tortures of those who were spared for the trials of peace can find no atonement in the memorials and monuments set up in our cities, towns, and quiet little villages. Words of praise are cheap in that they fall from the lips of fair and foul alike. Deeds are costly, because they mean the living of a life in service. Our own great privilege in this generation is to repay sacrifice and to make amends for ingratitude by striking an everlasting memorial of British valour and building a monument of happy prosperity which our children's children can salute in the proud knowledge that the bones of heroes have been paid the only honour that could justify their heroism.

CHAPTER IV.

The Imperial principle—Intensive as opposed to extensive Empire—Imperial Trade—Common Empire representation—India—Ireland—Imperial self-sufficiency.

Our National Socialist League is openly and unashamedly Imperialist. In Empire we see the power to bring harmony, co-operation, integration, justice and prosperity to one quarter of the earth's whole population. Fools who pretend that internationalism is the one grand thing in the world, are always the very first to champion the intense and misguided nationalism of a Gandhi or a De Valera. That one quarter of the earth's people should work for a common cause in peace and harmony would be an achievement far greater than any internationalist would seriously project; and should this great system be in close and friendly relationship with National Socialism in Europe, the world would possess an infinitely more powerful unifying force than any addled brains of Geneva could conceive.

To bring together, to weld into a system, in a word, to integrate, is a forward movement in civilisation. To split up, to disrupt, to break into little pieces is a backward movement; nor was this fact ever more clearly demonstrated than in the Treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, and Trianon. All then that tends to knit our Empire more closely together is progressive and good; all that tends to break it up is retrogressive and bad.

If, of course, Imperialism means land-grabbing, it is not to be encouraged, but for us it has no such meaning. We do not need another square foot of Imperial land. What we had in 1914 would be quite good enough, if real use were made of it. Instead, the old microcephalic Tories, who alone had a good word to say for an Empire which they have so largely surrendered, seem to believe in getting more and more territory without making any use of it except to swell the fortunes of a Joel or a Barnato. Such is the tragedy of their conception, which even now has them bargaining with Uncle Sam for the exclusion of New Zealand from British markets. The Dominions have been so consistently

sacrificed to the foreigner by successive British Governments that their loyalty, though badly strained, is one of the most marvellous examples of fidelity in the whole of human history.

Our attitude towards the Dominions was made clear in the last chapter, and if they are wise, they will not only benefit by our financial system, but will adopt it. An Imperial organisation which is economically self-sufficient is one of the greatest contributions that can be made to world peace; for the full development of its own resources will enable the Empire to withdraw from that competition for international markets which has been such a pregnant cause of war in years past.

Britain will rely on the Dominions and Colonies for the foodstuffs and the raw materials which she herself cannot produce. It is expected that therefore the Dominions will give her manufactures greater markets. It is not expected that they will abandon secondary industries which they have started; but it is certain that they will not emphasize these subsidiary activities to the detriment of the vast food and raw material interests on which Dominion peoples substantially depend. We alone can give them great markets and secure markets, which they have too much common sense to refuse. A certain type of democratic politician may object, but there is every sign that the Dominion peoples regard their politicians with slightly less reverence than we regard ours.

The Statue of Westminster, that political abortion making provision for the dissolution of Empire, must be repealed; yet it is no part of our policy to interfere with the internal affairs of self-governing Dominions or to detract from their self-governing status. We can, in politics and economics, set an example which they might well follow. Beyond that we can only await the results of the National Socialist feeling which is now spreading throughout the Empire. Certain it is that our much more intimate trading relationship with the imperial countries will demand closer co-operation and discussion than have hitherto been customary; and it is not too much to hope that in London there will be a permanent assembly of Imperial representatives to work out

and supervise the system of Imperial economic unity, or autarchy, as some call it. Such an assembly, together with Imperial representatives in the Second Chamber, could form the basis of an Imperial Parliament, which might well arise as the identity of economic interests leads to a desire for closer political co-operation among Imperial countries. With regard to the Dominions, as to everything, National Socialist policy is not reactionary but unifying, and it would be inconsistent to demand an organic Britain without desiring an organic Empire.

Whereas there is no thought of interfering with the status accorded to the Dominions, the British administration of Crown Colonies must in no way be impaired, and every tendency in the direction of increasing unity is to be welcomed and encouraged. In particular, for example, the wish of the two Rhodesias to unite should be granted.

A problem vital to the British Empire is that of India. It seems heartless and presumptuous to try in a few lines to settle the fate of that mighty sub-continent without which the British Empire is but a name. My only excuse, apart from that of space, is that elsewhere, as some of my readers will remember, I have set down in some detail my analysis of the problem.

To spare a delicate introduction, no words need be minced. The wretched India Act must be repealed, and in its place must come a stronger British control than has ever existed in the past.

India is not a nation, and Indians are not a race. To those poor little dreamy creatures who slobber the slogan—"India for the Indians," we reply: "Which India and what Indians? The India of the Princes or the India of the Babus—the India of Clive and Hastings or the India of Sassoon and Tata? The millions of Moslems, or the millions of Hindus who would gladly cut their throats if they dared—the warlike Sikhs or the soft Bengalis, the wild tribesmen of the North-West Frontier or the million depressed creatures whom only Britain can save from the lot of the dog?" The fact is that, as the accursed India Act is already beginning to show, only a stern British rule can preserve the elementary necessity of law and order.

Nothing more shameful has ever been known in the history of Empires than that we who have given three centuries of work, blood, and ability to create what is good in India should have had the results of our work filched from us by Tory politicians who have yielded to the noisy fakirs and the chattering babus because behind these ludicrous creatures there stands the power of international Jewish finance which grinds down and exploits day by day, the poor sweated Indian worker in the cotton mills of Bombay, Ahmenabad, and other places too numerous to mention, not to benefit India or Lancashire, but to turn the sweat of slaves into filthy lucre. It need hardly be said that a National Socialist Government would stop this crime at once, just as it would throw the Indian cotton market free and open to Lancashire, whose products are so much wanted in India that huge tariffs are necessary to keep the people from buying them; and these tariffs serve but to shelter the most odious exploitation. They add nothing to the comfort of the workers but much to the profits of the financiers, who can sell cheap enough when Lancashire is the market.

India, indeed, is an empire of immense potential wealth, and National Socialism would apply to her the same monetary policy as that applied to Britain. By cutting the claws of the bunya or moneylender, Britain could render to India a service that would obliterate Gandhi in an hour. India's greatest task is to feed her 350,000,000 people. As in the past we have irrigated millions of acres, bringing the waters of life to whole peoples who would otherwise have died, so in the future we can bring the waters of scientific finance to bear on Indian soil that her peoples may live a new life. In this great task, and not in professional agitation, Indians of ability will show their talents.

Against the development of India's great resources there stand superstition, prejudice, ignorance and vested interests. Only an iron authority can break through these barriers with the help of enlightened India subjects. A National Socialist government is well suited to the purpose. Lest it be thought that we contemplate obligations on one side only, it is right to mention that Lancashire would be fully and properly

equipped to spin Indian cotton and that India would be entitled to her proportionate share of the British market in raw materials.

This policy is drastic ; its enactment may need some force ; but it will need far less force than will be required to save the people of India if the headlong rush towards terrorism and anarchy is not abruptly checked. In any case, to protect the people of the North-West alone, we shall have to forget Abyssinia and use all the force that may be needful to shield peaceful and innocent Indians from the havoc that the marauders would deal out but for the power of British arms ; it is, however, the mark of an imbecile to argue that we should bear such a responsibility without corresponding authority.

Lastly, the ambitions of the Romanoffs have been revived, and the day is not distant when Russia will seek to profit by our past mistakes. Already Bolshevik propaganda in India has reached formidable dimensions. Against that day we must be prepared, and the best form of preparation is a complete control of the sub-continent, in co-operation with the Princes, who have everything to lose by our withdrawal.

If this policy seems brutal, it has at least the merit of being understood ; and a little plain speaking in India a few years ago would have saved many lives and much trouble. The Oriental likes a strong ruler ; for a government that shuffles, hesitates, and takes refuge in double-meaning phrases, he has no use ; and he is right. By this time, even our politicians who happen to be of Western blood should have realised that they are no match for the Orient in games of cunning. Straight words are understood, and others are appreciated at their true value.

As to the perpetual and mournful question of Ireland, there is little to be said. First, however, the English people must remember that Ireland has given them some of their best soldiers, sailors, Empire-builders, and writers. Amongst the Irish, there is a martial caste which has given generation after generation of sacrifice to the winning of laurels for Britain. Those who survive will ever bear in mind the conviction that the King has no better subjects. The motto

Quis separabit? conjures up not only the vision of the Irish Guards going over the top or the Royal Irish being decimated at Delville, but memories of Burke and Goldsmith, Wellington, Roberts, and even that remarkable man Bernard Shaw. What is so welded together in race and tradition is not to be burst asunder. Rather than that Ireland should separate from England, it were better that Englishmen should accept an Irish government, which would no doubt pay off some old scores, but which at least would be too much for the Hebrew optimist.

Let the Treaty of 1922 stand, but let it stand for both parties. England has undertaken not to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Free State. So be it. There must, however, be no rupture of the treaty, and Britain cannot afford to recognise an Irish Republic. The actual measures to be taken against secession must depend on circumstances; and may the occasion to use them never arise at all. Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, and an attack on her would have to be resisted precisely as an attack on Kent or Yorkshire. We shall not lose perspective, however, if we remember two facts. If many Irishmen were sick of democratic government from Westminster, their malady was very like our own. Secondly, if there is any talk of different races and traditions, the brave old Connaughts alone shed enough blood to drown such differences. The English are unhappily given to compromise. Compromise is the only form of treachery that the Irishman is never prepared to pardon; had this truth been realised in the beginning, Kathleen ni Houlihan would not have shed so many tears. Enough! When our English people show real self-respect, they may once again help to guide a people whose humblest representative is always prepared to assume the responsibilities of a king and feel the part.

Thus we demand an Empire united and indivisible, the proudest, greatest, and wealthiest structure in the whole world. That unity can come in a day is not to be expected. Economically we want nothing like Empire Free Trade, which would be Empire Free Chaos; but rather the trading relations within the Empire must be so adjusted as to allow

scientifically apportioned markets to all, in order that each component part may derive the greatest advantage from the whole. Foreigners' privileges, like the Congo Basin Treaties must be scrapped.

Our Empire is of us and for us. Apart from certain mandated territories, in which our sovereignty is only a League of Nations fiction, we have one quarter of the earth's surface. With the remaining three quarters other nations can do as they please. What we do with our own is a matter for the Imperial peoples. The spirit of our fathers will teach us how to guard our destiny.

CHAPTER V.

Foreign policy—Armaments—Pacifism—The conspiracy for war—Russian ambitions—Friendship with Germany—End of the struggle for international markets—The case of Jewish interests.

With a view to foreign policy, the first maxim is that Britain must be strong enough to defend her responsibilities and her Empire. First-class obligations demand first-class armaments and nothing less. The men who have allowed Britain to degenerate to the level of a fifth-class power would, in a more sensible age, have been impeached. Certainly war is wanted by no decent man, and it can very easily be avoided, but only if the whole world knows that Britain can make good her words with deeds.

Who encouraged disarmament to the point at which Baldwin and Mussolini made England the laughing stock of the world? Why, of course, the political crimps of Judah and moral anarchy, who wanted no army at all until there occurred to them the thrice scaly thought of getting Englishmen to fight a war to make Germany safe for Jewry. For years the crimps aforesaid, dribbling old prelates, verminous Bloomsburgians, myopic printers' hacks, and every sort of meddling old woman, male and otherwise, joined in neurotic crusades of Pacifism, designed, of course, to weaken the Empire. Now, however, these curious doves have moulted and dropped their olive-branches. They all want war, because certain regenerated nations seem more dangerous to Jewish international finance than does Britain.

Let us survey the delightful peace programme of the professional pacifists :

1. War with Franco to make Spain safe for Don Moses Rosenberg, his heirs and successors.
2. War with Italy, to make Abyssinia safe for the black dictator—Selassie, Lion of Judah.
3. War with Hitler, to make Germany safe for the Jews.
4. War with Japan, to make Northern China safe for bandits.

It has not been made clear whether we are to wage these wars consecutively or concurrently. There seem to be two schools of thought on that point. The professors are a little perplexed as to whom they should advise us to attack first.

Perhaps an attack upon them would solve the whole problem.

Thus the dirty little red rag which has been carried at so many thousands of Peace Meetings is revealed as the bloody destruction order of at least a million young British men in the cause of the Jewish Finance which regenerated nations will not tolerate.

The way to avoid war is simple enough. National Socialist Britain in firm friendship with National Socialist Germany can keep the world at peace. Britain and Germany, particularly with the assistance of Italy, can form against Bolshevism and international finance, twin Jewish manifestations, a bulwark much too strong to invite attack.

Let there be no mistake about one fact; Russia to-day is preparing to help herself to the British Empire which she believes to be disintegrating; for no other purpose was there concluded the pact whereby she and Turkey absolutely control the Eastern Mediterranean. Here is the resurrection of an old covetousness.

The world is the battle ground of two forces: those who would internationally exploit the masses of all peoples for their own unclean profit, and those who say: "Our nation has the right to be free. Our soil belongs to us; we will make use of it, and we will not be bound in the chains of international usury. We work for ourselves and not for the international exploiter." To the latter force, we must belong; for the words are our words, the thought is our thought, and the will is our will.

Mark you, peaceful reader, if there is any way to concord between nations, it lies in a common philosophy, whereby the same great ideals are shared by different nations, and because they are shared, differences which would otherwise lead to anger and war are seen in their true proportion.

Most of the ex-servicemen who read these lines believe that the war with Germany ended in 1918, and they know that the Germany of to-day is not the Germany of 1914; they are entitled in a special degree, and they have already spoken through Edward Windsor, who, in their name, demanded friendly understanding with the German people.

Our friendship with Germany would do more than aught else to diminish the risk of war. It is vital, of course, that we should attend to our own affairs; nor could we be interested in any secondary quarrel of a foreign power; but if Soviet Russia tries to smash Germany, she will be trying to smash the whole of the West, and if Germany need help in hurling Orientals back to the Orient, she is entitled to receive it from those who prefer white manhood and government to any other. The fact is, however, that Russia can be made to learn her place without war. Weakness alone will provoke her attack.

It is needless to perform a post-mortem on the decaying corpse of the League of Nations, which was never more than an expression of the basest internationalism embracing alike such types as Messrs. Eden and Litvinov-Finkelstein. Suffice it to say that National Socialist policy requires neither isolation nor entanglements.

On the one hand, we cannot allow Jewish internationalism to sweep away what is valuable in modern Europe; on the other hand, we must restrict the use of British force to cases where the interests of Britain are clearly involved, as they would be if an attempt were made to impose Bolshevism on Europe by force. We are interested primarily in minding our own business, though a Russian scheme of aggrandizement involving India or Western Europe would in fact be our concern.

From the days of the Revolution Russia has been financed by great New York banking firms; she has been armed by their money; and she is being used by them as the last but most powerful weapon in the armoury of internationalism. Some Jews have recently suffered in Russia. This fact is not surprising in so much as something was bound to happen

when Jews held 85% of all important executive positions in a country where anti-Jewish feeling is traditional. The Slav has resisted the Jew before and failed; he will fail again, because the Slavonic temperament makes the Russian easy Jewish prey; thus, apart from occasional upheavals, Russia is likely to remain the striking force of Jewish financial imperialism.

It is sometimes stated that Anglo-German friendship must be based on the restitution to Germany of her lost colonies. As I have written before, if we made use of our 1914 Empire, we should have enough and far more than anybody else. In the so-called mandated ex-German territories, we do not to-day even enjoy preferential trading advantages, and if Germany needs room to expand, no surrender of our prestige is involved in the restitution to her of what does not legally belong to us. Tory clubmen, of course, would beamingly surrender India, but die fighting in the last ditch to prevent Germany from resuming possession of territories which are not recognised as part of our Empire. It is much too early to seek a solution by formula. Mutual accessibility of essential raw materials between National Socialist states might remove much of the difficulty. All we say here is that when the problem is discussed by National Socialist Britain with National Socialist Germany, we can at least guarantee that it will be settled peacefully; and that is all that a good pacifist can desire. Those funny pacifists who suddenly become ultra-imperialists may relish the task of leading a White-chapel army across the Rhine; then, again, they may not.

What is vital is that we should be able to preserve and defend our own, whilst combining with peoples of like ideals to make sure that the freedom we win shall not be lost by division at a critical moment in the ranks of those who regard Marx and Shylock with equal disfavour. The mere fact that Jewry so wants us to fight Germany is the best proof in the world of the need for Anglo-German friendship. If this foreign policy be condemned, we can at least congratulate ourselves on being pacifists who have no conscientious objection to a necessary fight, but who regard as a damnable crime a war in any interest but our own.

The right to peace was earned by the war generation. It is the heritage of the new generation. Let us guard it in strength, and whenever any troublesome foreign question arises, apply the sound, hard test: "For whose benefit?" Then look for the Seal of David, or the Star of Zion.

National Socialist and Fascist peoples will try to make themselves entirely independent of international finance; therefore the International Financier will try to crush them, and he is incessantly trying to make Britain a party to the plot. Hence the Anti-German propaganda waged by the tremendous forces of Jewry in Britain. Our duty is firm resistance to this propaganda and the people who wage it in the hope of bloodshed other than their own.

National self-sufficiency will enable us not only to withdraw from the struggle for international markets, but will also restrict our responsibilities to our interests; for example, Britain will have no cause to resent or oppose the extension of Japanese influence in Northern China. Likewise, a frank recognition of Mussolini's gains would at once promote peace with Italy and save the Duce from adopting the incongruous and unconvincing role of Chief Moslem. Let it not be forgotten that the ill-will felt in Italy against Britain to-day has been created by the Jewish controlled Press of this country. Hitler has shown more patience than Mussolini, probably because he has seen more of the Jews, and is in any case an admirer of our race.

It is not inappropriate to close a chapter on foreign policy with some reference to the Jewish race, though a large volume would be required to do the subject justice. The question is pre-eminently racial, and religion does not enter into it; the Jew who professes Christianity is rather less convincing than his orthodox brother. The Hebrews are distinctly a race, possessing greater unity and cohesion than nearly all others. Their salient characteristic is inveterate materialism, and those of them who keep sweat-shops can never understand that the Aryan has an absolute right to decline competition with them in order to enjoy the leisure and recreation which belong to the man who does not live for the sole purpose of getting the best of others.

Now this Jewish race, with its communal ties and its intimate bonds of relationship, is a community within a community, restricting to its own members, so far as possible, all advantages that can be grasped or won from the non-Jewish public. This Jewish state within our midst has gained such prodigious control over business, politics, press, and films, that in conjunction with Jewry overseas it can mould finance, politics and even the public taste into whatever shapes its arrogant supremacy requires. International Finance is controlled by great Jewish moneylenders and Communism is propagated by Jewish agitators who are at one fundamentally with the powerful capitalists of their race in desiring an international world order, which would, of course, give universal sovereignty to the only international race in existence.

If 350,000 Norwegians settled here, replaced the British merchant street by street, acquired supreme power in the city, annexed the tailoring and furnishing trades, bought the press, almost monopolised the films, took charge of great government departments, and generally favoured their own people before ours, much as we admire the Norwegians, we should be glad to get rid of them.

Many of the Hebrews in Britain to-day must be accommodated elsewhere. They cannot be given paramount power in Palestine without injustice to the Arabs, though such Jewish immigration into Palestine as occurs might well be reserved for Jews within the Empire. There are, however, great tracts of territory in this world wherein the necessary accommodation could be found; and the Jew who intends to remain in Britain must not only renounce all allegiance to his own community, but must be able to prove that he has performed to the state some service which would merit continued hospitality.

The Jews are nowhere so nearly related to us as the Norwegians; one has but to read the "Jewish Chronicle" in order to perceive that at heart and in mind they are of the East and have a racial identity of their own. The right attitude for Britain to adopt is not to persecute, not

necessarily to hate, but simply and frankly to recognize them as a foreign people to be considered like any other foreign people, and to be placed on an appropriate territorial basis, with such exception as the state would make in the case of any well-disposed foreigner whose presence could harm nobody and benefit some. Naturally, the first right of all employment in Britain belongs to the British people.

This is the greatest foreign problem of all; for when certain Jews find that they cannot persuade us to fight Germany, Soviet Russia will take an increasing and by no means benevolent interest in the British Empire.

Britain has few friends at present; the German offer of friendship is still open. To refuse it would be historic folly.

CHAPTER VI.

Necessity to use legal and constitutional methods—Philosophy of National Socialism—Religious freedom—Conclusion.

In concluding this outline of National Socialist policy, two important observations must be made.

First, it is only by legal and constitutional methods, in loyalty to the Crown, that any changes of magnitude are to be wrought in Britain. What the people will not concede to argument, they will not concede to force. Also a National Socialist Government must depend for the enactment of its policy on the enthusiastic co-operation of the people; hence the employment of force as a means to power would violate the prime condition on which power could be usefully exercised. National Socialism has to win the hearts of British men and women. It cannot fail to do so, but if it did fail, its purpose would be lost.

Secondly, the whole philosophy of National Socialism is ruthlessly opposed to materialism. National Socialist philosophy teaches the supremacy of the human will over material obstacles. Communism, on the other hand, in line with the materialist or "Behaviorist" schools of psychology, teaches that man is the slave of his environment and is made or marred thereby. An instance of this doctrine is the Marxist interpretation of history as a series of events having purely economic causes. Marx could never have been acquainted with the Irish people, whose love, hatred, spite, and sacrifice proceed with such a lofty indifference to economic considerations.

The Marxist, in his Labour Theory of Value, tries to classify in the one category the plodding labour of the third-year student and the effortless discoveries of the genius. It cannot be done. Both creative intellect and organising ability are different in kind from mere intellectual effort, which is often great in proportion to the smallness of its results. Genius, indeed, is, in one sense, an infinite capacity for getting things done without taking pains. In plain, the National Socialist holds that man is something more than a bundle of

nervous reflexes or a physico-chemical machine. There is much in him that is mechanical, but unless he can rise above it, he fails to be anything but a Marxian man, poor fellow.

Philosophically, then, National Socialism proclaims the triumph of man over environment and mere natural difficulties ; still more, the National Socialist laughs at the gloomy theory of determinism propounded by such sages as Spengler, who write of cycles in civilisation and hold, with Baldwin of Bewdly, that all Empires must decay. That empires and civilisations have hitherto crumbled and fallen is undisputed knowledge, but the National Socialist is not content that his order shall live as long as possible ; he is determined that it shall live for ever. In the whole world, there is no power or obstacle that he regards as unconquerable. He is the true rebel, the divinely inspired revolutionary, who lives to make destiny, not to be enslaved by it. Only greater forces than human can claim his submission.

Because he demands the organic nation, he will be unjustly accused of making a god of the state. On the contrary, he sees in the state only the best means to greater human welfare. In matters of religion, the priests are welcome to full sway, provided that they content themselves with the enormous task of spiritually ministering to their flocks. The National Socialist is too bold to regard his instrument as a deity, but he is wise enough to see that each citizen must be linked in mutual loyalty with the rest. His ambitions are national, because it is futile for any man to instruct neighbouring households in virtue until his own homestead can set a practical example. He is practical, and prefers a possible achievement within the limits of his own territory to a vain aspiration for the territories of others.

Love of country has so far been the classic virtue of those with reason for their love ; now that reason must be extended to all of our blood and race, and patriotism so long identified with the fortunate will be identified with all.

For all of us British people, there is a land in which we have played our part, great or humble, in the drama of life, a land where we have had our happy days, as well as the sad.

We generally forget the spring morning, with the splendid sun sparkling on the dew in the green fields, the white lanes with their smiling hedges in summer, the rich tint of the leaves in the declining autumn afternoon, the first nip of winter, the English Christmas with our nearest and dearest, the mists on the fens, the gigantic bustle of our great cities, the fire-breathing giants of the night in the Black Country or by South Shields, the long, snaky monsters that bring happiness, sorrow, hope or anxiety into Euston or King's Cross, the ocean battering away at the rocks of Devon, the Cockney, with his Shoreditch barrow, making fun of every moment in his struggling little life, the broad Mersey restively bringing the challenge of the sea into the heart of Liverpool, the godly majesty of the Highlands, the serene power in the mountains of North Wales, even the rain blending so strangely with the romance of our early days, when, as children we played in it—all these things are most often out of our minds; but if it ever happens to us to see the chalk cliffs receding for the last time as the water widens between us and our homeland, then the memories will come in a choking flood, and we shall know our land when it is too late.

This is the land for which better than we have died. For it, we are asked not to die but to live; it is ours, it belongs to us in every spiritual and sensuous way; it must be ours in every other way, completely and utterly ours, not for some but for all of us. Know this truth, feel it, live it, and the victory shall be ours.

Some there are who will call the sentiment cheap; but it has been again and again redeemed in the blood of heroes, ✓ whose spirit the cheap alone can never understand.

CHRISTIAN MARTYR OF WORLD WAR 11

The remains of William Joyce are to be exhumed from Londons Wandsworth Prison where he was executed, and buried at Galway In the Irish Republic. Joyce was hanged on Jan. 3, 1946 on a trumped-up "treason" charge stemming from his ardent opposition to the senseless slaughter of Aryan lives in World War 11. An American by birth, Joyce had an Irish father and an English mother. He was only 39 when he died.

Joyce's last words were: *"In death, as in life, I defy the Jews, who caused this last war: and I defy the power of Darkness which they represent. I warn the British people against the aggressive imperialism of the Soviet Union. May Britain be great once again; and in the hour of the great est danger to the West, may the standard of the Swastika be raised from the dust, crowned with the historic words: 'In spite of everything, you have been victorious:' I am proud to die for my ideas; and I am sorry for the sons of Britain who have died without knowing why."*

#