

these have been on the wrong basis anyhow, depending on preferences and discrimination. The Commonwealth was built up on the capital-accumulating propensity of Britain. That came from buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest. This capital the Commonwealth is crying out for today. Britain can no longer provide it.

But she could start to accumulate again if she adopted the right policies: not, however, by merely substituting discrimination in favour of Europe against the Commonwealth for discrimination in favour of the Commonwealth against Europe. It is discrimination itself which is wrong. The answer is in a gradual lowering of tariffs through the enforcement of the unconditional most favoured nation clause.

For my part, I much prefer the fragmentation of economic power to its concentration in a few large and powerful blocs. If we must have wars, let them be little ones.

Yours faithfully,  
OLIVER SMEDLEY,  
Chairman.

Keep Britain Out Campaign, London.

## RAMPANT PROTECTION

SIR, — At present, the prices of many articles when imported from Common Market countries are considerably higher here than there. I am convinced that if we join this Market the British manufacturers concerned will not willingly forego this protection. They will be able, by linking up with trade associations or comparable organisations in Europe, to maintain prices at a monopolistic level. In fact an increase in cartelisation is beyond dispute.

We should not be concerned with the success or otherwise of the Common Market or the Schumann Iron & Steel Plan but with the inalienable right of individuals to exchange freely the products of their labour. There is no need for Ministers of State to fly a shuttle service between Great Britain and Europe in order to achieve free trade.

If the whole world by international agreement became a Common Market, and tariff barriers disappeared, protection would still be rampant. Price stabilisation schemes, subsidies, levies, fiscal manipulation, authoritarian economic planning and land monopoly, all part of the domestic political scene throughout the world, would continue and so ensure that the Common Market is not a *Free Market*.

Contrary to reports all is not well in the "Six." German car manufacturers are in trouble for raising their prices; French farmers are protesting against low prices, and strikes are prevalent.

The whole set-up is a cunning protectionist plot based on the universal fear of communism.

Yours faithfully,  
STEPHEN MARTIN.  
Fordingbridge, Hants.

AUGUST & SEPTEMBER, 1962.

## ONE HAPPY FAMILY

THE latest round of Market ministerial meetings, which are now averaging two a day in Brussels, is showing that after ten years of Community life the six still feel as free as ever to give vent to their national emotions.

The Dutch have been claiming that Dutch administrators have a far greater sense of integrity than Italians. The French are fighting like wildcats to keep essentially nationalistic, or possibly even imperialistic, links with the 16 former French African territories and for something similar to imperial preferences on Sahara oil.

The Belgians, partly to please some very nationalist-minded Belgian trade union leaders, have been trying to take back some of the powers they gave to the High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community for controlling coal prices in Belgium. Certain non-community-minded Belgians are smuggling butter from Holland to the tune of 6,000 tons a year in violation of Community rules.

The Germans and the French are locked in a nationalistic argument about which has the right to force the other to change its farm prices.

France, according to the Belgians, is beginning to exploit the clash between French-speaking Belgians and the Flemish by encouraging French Belgians to establish closer links with France.

But this does not mean that the House of Europe is in danger of falling. The patriotic demonstrations are looked upon by the Six as part of the Community game. As Mr. Pisani, General de Gaulle's Minister of Agriculture — and a former professor of gymnastics—says during every big crisis, "We in the Common Market are condemned to agree." *Daily Telegraph*, June 26.

## EARLY VERSION OF E.E.C.

SIR, — Some overseas correspondents who suggest that British Free Traders should support the Common Market as a partial acknowledgement of free trade principles, are not fully aware, I suspect, of the completely protectionist view of the nature of trade implicit in all the publicised arguments of the English Marketeers. If Free Traders as a body support Great Britain's entry it will be assumed that they endorse the idea of trade as a collectivist operation, requiring almost as much state organisation and direction as a military campaign. On this premise the Free Trade case becomes untenable and protectionist fallacies are confirmed. The Liberal Party, in its present enthusiasm for the Common Market, virtually expels Free Traders from its ranks.

Although we cannot exactly foretell future events, past experience does suggest in what direction Free Traders can most usefully exert their influence.

Under the persuasion of Alexander Hamilton a common tariff was substituted for the various State tariffs of the American Union. In accord with modern expertise  
(continued on inside back cover)