

Major Oliver Smedley, chairman of the Free Trade Union and the Cheap Food League, spoke for both free traders and protectionists when he said: "After 500 years of political independence from Europe the British people are not going down on their knees to beg permission to join a newly-constituted Holy Roman Empire. The Government is not going to be allowed to achieve by subterfuge and treachery what Napoleon and Hitler failed to achieve by force of arms." There was a battle to be fought between the free traders and protectionists, he said, but for the present they must sink their differences in joint defence of the very right to contest that issue. It was obvious that the very mixed audience agreed.

Major Smedley also said: "It is in the interests of freedom throughout the world that Britain should remain, at whatever temporary cost, a free and sovereign country willing to trade freely with the people of every other country without discriminating on grounds of race, colour, religion or political creed. This is a great and noble aim, compared with which the desire to join the Common Market is seen as squalid, selfish, short-sighted, 'save our skins' protectionism."

Divide And Rule

ONE of the most powerfully divisive forces threatening free world unity. That is how the Common Market appears to Mr. Nate White, business and financial editor of the *Christian Science Monitor*. From the penetrating analysis he contributed to his paper, July 11, we quote these few paragraphs:—

"What has been forged under the Treaty of Rome in the Common Market is a tightly knit, tightly centralised, tightly directed, tightly controlled new bureaucracy, largely subject to France and Belgium, which is obviously attempting to restore the economic structure of the Holy Roman Empire to Europe . . .

"If the motive of the Common Market leaders was the unity of the free West, they would be doing everything to achieve this unity. But they are not. Everything they do tends to separate the major economic centres of the West from one another. The Common Market officials, specifically the president, Walter Hallstein, blandly say to the word that 'anyone can join' the Common Market. But then they proceed to set conditions which would destroy the British Commonwealth, isolate the United States, Japan, and the other nations of Europe which are not in the Common Market.

"Dr. Hallstein has achieved in a limited sense his objective of a 'new empire'. He still must get his single parliament, his single electorate, his single currency. So long as President De Gaulle of France and Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany are strong individual leaders of Europe, the Common Market can continue to set the terms of European trade. The Hallstein group knows that it must cement its control while these leaders are active in affairs . . .

"The British Commonwealth is the strongest economic power in the entire Western alliance. The nations in it

are multi-racial, multilingual, their geographic spread worldwide. Under no conditions should this Commonwealth be weakened. It should be strengthened to help protect the world against a more vicious force in Communist economic aggression. The United States should be the Commonwealth's principal advocate and supporter, for its own sake and that of free world unity."

Without a stronger, better relationship between the U.S.A. and the Commonwealth, the monopoly which the Common Market countries are seeking to build cannot be held in check, Mr. Nate believes, and the unity of the West will be vitiated. The Rome Treaty nations pay homage to European unity but by their actions they divide free Europe. Why? "The answer seems to be in the determination of the leaders of the Common Market nations to restore the Holy Roman Empire with all that that means."

Labour Free Trader

"I FAVOUR the greatest possible expansion of world trade, and in particular free trade in food and raw materials." Thus Mr. Douglas Jay, M.P. in a letter in *The Economist*, June 24. This Labour former Treasury Minister (Economic Secretary, 1947-50, Financial Secretary, 1950-51) was rebutting that journal's charge that there is something illiberal in those who have doubts about signing the Rome Treaty as it now stands. In part he wrote:—

"The present common external tariff of the Six (according to figures given me last month by the Board of Trade) provide as you are presumably aware, for the following import tariffs on the main foodstuffs: wheat, 20 per cent; beef, mutton and lamb, 20-24 per cent; cheese, 23 per cent; tea, 18-23 per cent. Certain raw materials, now tax-free would be taxed also. Since these taxes or corresponding import levies would apply to imports from the Commonwealth from which most of our food imports come, adherence to the present common market tariff would mean imposing these taxes on the bulk of foodstuffs imports into Britain. Food prices, the cost of living, and all our industrial and export costs must rise; and the distribution of real incomes would be shifted still further to the disadvantage of the poorest . . .

"In a recent issue you shocked me by advocating the Common Market food tariffs, as if this was just a minor technical point. Do you no longer believe in either social justice or free trade? Since the total value of imports on which the U.K. would raise tariffs (if we signed the present Rome Treaty) would vastly exceed those on which we should lower them, and since we should raise them against the greater part of the world, and lower them only against the Six, the result would be the biggest step towards protectionism taken since 1846. Do you really want this? If so, to call others illiberal is to use English in a way more reminiscent of Orwell than of Bagehot. But if not, if you want to keep tariff-free food imports, as I do, why not say so?"

"We are told that the Common Market External