

Modules, mark three.

Job-casualties of the class war.

At recent conferences, tv viewers were able to see trade union bigwigs among others simultaneously demanding more jobs and a more vigorous prosecution of the class war, denouncing what they call "class collaboration" as a form of treason. Let them make up their minds: you cannot have both class warfare and more jobs, or even as many jobs.

Jobs are a social relationship between worker, employer and consumer. They imply collaboration at every stage. Where employers suspect militancy, not the natural desire for the worker to get as much as he can out of the bargain, but treatment of the employer as enemy, and the class struggle as a crusade, he will go elsewhere. If the government lures the employer with grants, they are liable to get Deloreans. The bona fide employer, even if he sets up in militant areas, is more liable than others to falter and eventually close down. If the state set up factories and mines, they will make losses at the expense of other people's jobs.

There is no way out: jobs are the first casualties of the class war.

More

By contrast, we stand for one nation. When D'sraeli proclaimed the aspiration of one nation, it seemed a fantasy. A century on, we can see how much progress we have made, and how much remains to be done. History is a rough sea, not easy to set a course through. But see how far we have gone towards one nation: in the way people dress, travel - cars, air-travel - the way they shop, their educational opportunity.

One nation means jobs, class war means unemployment and poverty. I do not believe that many ordinary workers want class war. But they are responsible for those politicians and trade union notables who represent them, or misrepresent them. The silent majority must speak up, or suffer the consequences.

End of module

sherman, module, 8/10.

Britain's greatness.

For centuries, from the seventeenth century on, we were the greatest country in the world. Not the most populous, we were never that, but the greatest.

We led the world in science, philosophy, trade and industry, the arts of war and peace, constitutional advance, care for the sick and needy, by the standards of those times. Other peoples admired and wished to emulate us, for our liberties under the law, for the industriousness of our people of all classes, for our self-discipline and sense of responsibility, for the honesty of our public and private life, compared with all other nations at the time.

At one time, a quarter of the world was ruled from London, with a minimum of force and a maximum of benefit. Few of the peoples who at one time or another lived under the Union Jack were as well off before or have been as well off since.

More.

shermod Britain's greatness, page two

We are the same people; we could be as as great again. The constraints lie within us, particularly the mean-spiritidness of socialism, with its bitter warped hatred of all that is best in this country, its institutions, the guardians of law and order, the men and women of enterprise, the freedom from regimentation.

We have no cause to be defensive. We wish to make things better still, as previous generations did, to lead the world again instead of following it. This is the message.....

End of shermod Britain's greatness.

MODULE- Tightly-knit communities.

We are asked to keep mines open at enormous cost in order to maintain tightly-knit communities. At first sight, it seems appealing, but let us use our heads as well as our hearts.

In the first place, the whole history of Britain has been a history of change, including changed pattern of settlement. Most of the mining communities concerned were built in the early nineteenth century, to be near coal seams when the only means of locomotion for most people was by foot.

Since then, the journey to work has expanded. Many workers own cars. Bus travel is cheap. In the South, people travel further to work in order to maximise their own opportunity. Should we condemn miners to a form of residential and occupational serfdom?

The communities are far from ideal. In some parts of the country socialist local authorities tried hard to decant the inhabitants of these mining villages to larger settlements, where they would enjoy better amenities, and enjoy wider employment opportunities. A good deal of public money was spent on this. What kind of life can they enjoy in an isolated one-class village.

More

I remember how in Greater London, socialists were always in favour of building council housing in middle class areas. They said it was bad for us to live in what they called "middle class ghettos". Yet they want to keep miners' in miners's ghettos, cut off not only from people of other social classes, but even from workers in other trades. What are they really after?

We are Conservatives, with a capital C. But they are reactionaries, which ever way you spell it.

End of module.