

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 1.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

As distinct from the conception of it held by many people who do not read us, and some others who are unused to the premises from which it proceeds, this review is not written or published to support or advocate patent remedies, financial or otherwise. In order to clarify this rather important attitude (because we have renounced all belief in quantity, and pin our faith on quality) it is necessary to reiterate our belief that most, if not all of our present discontents proceed from quack remedies. The present financial system is quackery, the collectivism at which it aims is quackery. Sir Stafford Cripps in his administration of it is a vicious quack, the whole philosophy of mass-production, with its ancillaries, the export drive, austerity, full employment; not to mention liberty, equality, fraternity as put forward in the framework of d'markrazi, are Satanic quackery, and those who advocate these *consciously* are the spawn of Satan.

It is easy to comment on all this that we are claiming that the whole regiment is out of step except our Johnnie. But in fact, that is not so. Quite a number of voices are raised with the same instinctive protest, but in a majority of cases, perhaps nearly every case, these protests go from a complaint to a remedy which is worse than useless. This is where the point is missed. We most of us think we can make a better Heaven and Earth than the Creator. Our specific contention in these pages, is not, in essence dissimilar to the claim of genuine religion. What is required, and all that in essence is required, to restore social health, is a binding-back to reality. We are trying to live comfortably in a world which does not exist in the true sense. When the Social Credit Movement advocated certain financial adjustments, they were advocated because they involved truth in accountancy, as they still do. But the powers that be in this world do not want truth in accountancy—it is the very last thing they want. They do not want truth in anything—a simple statement of fact which can be verified by anyone who will consider official propaganda, which is a mass of lies. "Ye are of your Father, the Devil. He was a liar, and the Father of it."

It is our unshakeable opinion that the human individual is infinitely various, and that it is in the nature of things, of reality, that his external circumstance should reflect his internal realities. A rigid State organisation is of all conceivable forms of society that which is furthest from the reality of Creation. That is not a matter of terminology; it applies just as much, and perhaps more to the Empire of Business, whether Chemical Cartel, "B".B.C., or Coal Board, as to the Ministry of Agriculture.

The steps to health are now many and various. Some

and perhaps even yet, *when they are practicable*, some of the more important are financial.

We are taking none of them.

• • •

Easily the most sinister aspect of current affairs is the co-operation of so-called "worker" revolutionary movements and (in the background but in complete control) the highest circles of international finance. And amongst the more extraordinary phenomena which accompany Mond-Turnerism under its various names and myriad aliases, is Sir William Wiseman, Bt., partner in Kuhn Loeb & Co.

Messrs. Kuhn Loeb, a firm dominated for many years by Jacob Schiff, the Strausses and the Warburgs, opposite numbers of Sir Ernest Cassel, appear to run world revolution as a business, highly lucrative in every way, just as similar firms ran South American revolutions in the nineteenth century. Sir William Wiseman, 10th Baronet, for some not very obvious reason Chief British Adviser on American Affairs at the 1918 Peace Conference, then moved over to a partnership in the New York firm, who hardly troubled to conceal their decisive role in the murderous Russian Revolution, and their disastrous domination of the Peace Conference.

General van Horne Moseley, in giving evidence before the Committee on un-American Activities, put on record the following extract from a confidential report, presumably to Congress, from a Mr. J. E. Campbell, dated April 26, 1939 (a date obviously connected with forcing Great Britain into war):

"This, gentlemen, is the Meramus Plan. It might interest you to know that we have tried to find Moseley's price. We even tried to arrange a meeting at Sir Bill's office, but were unsuccessful. Other means will be used to render him harmless, as we cannot tolerate his actions."

General Moseley was on Pershing's Staff in France in the 1918 war and subsequently G.O. Commanding U.S. Southern Army. His mother was an Englishwoman.

• • •

We have frequently expressed the opinion that there is a subtle connection between the suppression of wine and spirits as beverages, and the projected slave world. But every ounce of influence we could exert would go to discourage permanently the purchase of Scotch whisky from the monopoly which controls the policy of its marketing. We are quite aware that all trade is now a barely concealed conspiracy against the public, and that the idea that the consumer can leave his interest in the hands of either the manufacturer or his blood-brothers the socialist-financier politicians is childish; but we can think of no more immediately effective protest against the proceedings of the whisky trade than to make it clear that they can take their whisky to the Americans whose interests they have been serving for

the past ten years, or more, we don't want it.

There is one infallible test for crime; *Quis beneficiat?* There is not a whisky monger in these islands who has not benefitted by the conditions in which he has acquiesced at least, although we hope and believe that the benefit will be temporary. We have been sold down the river as no great country was ever sold before, and the worst sufferers have been the best of our native stock (as was intended). Possibly the remnant is too apathetic, or too poisoned, to protest; if not, some treason trials and subsequent hangings are overdue.

The Ulster Elections

The following letter addressed to THE OBSERVER has not to our knowledge appeared therein:—

Sir,—Though protest is not much use in this world, I do sincerely wish to make one in the interests of sane and reasonable values. It is admitted, I think, that the news headings in a paper, their position and emphasis, are regarded as an indication of the relative importance of events reported. There was a General Election in Northern Ireland last week, which had very considerable, if not vital, constitutional implications, not only for the six counties, but for you in Great Britain, and even more, perhaps, for the British Commonwealth.

Those are the simple facts; which, I believe, are significant just because they are simple, and ignore august international bodies or appeals for votes to obscure Central American Republics who never heard of Ireland. They may even be said to ignore political factions here, at home, and to speak direct to the individual citizens of Great Britain and the British Empire, which it appears, is due for liquidation. The actual electioneering was no more abusive and polemical—perhaps rather less—than the average British party contest. Admittedly, the Labour candidates got no hearing, but then they didn't really know what to say on the real issue of the Election, Partition; so, while it was regrettable that they were shouted down, beyond that fact it was no great matter. The suggestions of intimidation and Iron Curtain methods that come from across the Border are childish.

Those are the facts and, while I am not a journalist, I submit they are news, and more—good news—to those who value their British nationality and culture. Nevertheless, the casual, and even average, reader of your excellent journal, which has graced my doorstep on Sundays for many years, might never have guessed that such a thing as an Ulster election had taken place,—an Election with an average voting percentage of over 80 *per cent.* (the United States Presidential Election percentage was 52, I think), and an overwhelming majority vote in favour of simple loyalty to the British throne and constitution, as against all international ideologies of every kind.

In reference to all the above, *The Observer* has a short paragraph—one of eight under "Comment"—dealing very justly, with one aspect of the matter. And a note on page five by Pendennis, under "Table Talk", accompanied by a photo of Sir Basil Brooke, which while attributing energy and progressiveness to Mr. Costello, comments, "There is always a ring of the past in everything Sir Basil does and says." Beyond that, I read in double-column heavy type headings in the middle of the front page: "Irish Terms for Atlantic Pact. End Partition First." And then, below, "Trick Poll in Ulster," and below that again, "New Struggle Feared."

I am sure that such misleading emphasis as that represents must have happened by mistake. And I know you will agree with me that it does considerable injustice to the situation, unintentionally depressing a group of loyal fellow-citizens in a difficult situation not of their own seeking, and encouraging the President of Eire in what the commentator on your editorial page rightly calls his intransigence. "Having voted himself out of the Empire," he goes on, "she has done her best to intervene in these elections—in the internal affairs of a foreign country in fact."

You may regard this letter as addressed to your private ear, but I cannot help thinking its publication might go some distance in righting what I must regard as an unintentional wrong.

Yours sincerely,

NORMAN F. WEBB.

February 14, 1949.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: February 21, 1949.

MILK (Special Designations) BILL (*Lords*)

Order for Second Reading read.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food (Dr. Summerskill): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

It is my good fortune today to move the Second Reading of a Bill which at times during the last 20 years I had despaired of ever seeing on the Statute Book. . . .

. . . I feel that the country owes Professor G. S. Wilson a great debt of gratitude for his work in this field. A recent estimate by him puts the number of deaths that can be attributed to milk infected by the tubercle bacillus at about 1,500 annually and many more thousands are crippled. Our orthopaedic hospitals throughout the country are filled with small children lying in splints sometimes for months, sometimes for years, suffering from surgical tuberculosis which can be attributed to infected milk. So far as the child population is concerned, the percentage of deaths is 10 times greater in rural areas where, of course, more milk is drunk raw than in London. This may surprise many hon. Members who are proud of the milk covered with cream which is obtained straight from the cow in rural areas. Many are ignorant of the fact that in that thick creamy milk lurks the virulent tubercle bacillus. [An HON. MEMBER: "Not only creamy milk."] I am suggesting that the cream disguises it.

The Cattle Diseases Committee estimated that about 40 *per cent.* of the dairy cows in this country would react to the tuberculin test, indicating that they were infected with tuberculosis, and that about 0.5 of milch cows suffer from udder tuberculosis and excrete active tubercle in their milk. Hon. Members will know that there are other diseases also which we are anxious to eradicate, but again this will take a lot of time and, then again, pasteurisation is essential. There is contagious abortion and mastitis. These are common, and recent estimates of the incidence of these diseases show that probably some 20 *per cent.* of the cows in this country are infected with the former disease, and that 2 *per cent.* are excreting dangerous organisms in their milk which infect human beings with undulant fever. . . .

. . . I say—and I say this having obtained the best advice

possible—that the pasteurisation of milk, if carried out efficiently and under proper conditions, destroys all pathogenic organisms in milk.

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): And everything else too.

Dr. Summerskill: The hon. Gentleman must not interrupt; he will have plenty of time afterwards. . . . At the present time some 70 per cent. of the quantities of milk sold for liquid consumption are subject to some form of heat treatment in this country.

Vice-Admiral Taylor (Paddington, South): Before the right hon. Lady leaves that point, will she state whether pasteurisation has any adverse effect on the milk?

Dr. Summerskill: No. I think the hon. and gallant Gentleman will agree that Professor Wilson is probably the greatest authority on this subject in the country, and he says that it has practically no effect on the nutritional value of milk.

Now I want to deal with some of the details of the Bill. The Bill limits the sale of milk by retail in areas to be specified by the Minister of Food to the classes of milk which are sold under a special designation. The restrictions also apply to the supply of milk free of charge under the Welfare Foods (Milk) Scheme, and the Milk-in-Schools Scheme, and to the sale or supply of milk to catering establishments, hotels, restaurants, institutions and schools.

The approved specially designated milks will be T.T. (certified) milk—this designation may be changed to T.T. (farm bottled), because T.T. (certified) simply means that the milk is bottled on the farm; T.T. milk, and accredited milk derived from a single herd. I am sure my hon. Friend the Member for Barking, who wrote an excellent article recently in *The New Statesman and Nation*, will agree that it is an important step forward to insist that accredited milk should come from one herd only, because it is then possible to trace any infected milk. Then there will be pasteurised milk and sterilised milk in England and Wales; and in Scotland certified milk, T.T. milk, standard milk derived from a single herd, pasteurised milk and sterilised milk. Standard milk in Scotland is equivalent to our accredited milk in this country although hon. Members from Scotland will suggest that it is a little superior.

Descriptions of these milks and the conditions which must be complied with before they can be sold under the designation, will be set out in the regulations. Hon. Members have asked me why the descriptions that I have just read out and the conditions which must be complied with should not be included in the Bill. It may be necessary to change these classes, and it is much easier from the administrative point of view to change the regulations than to bring an Amending Bill to this House. The recognition of accredited milk and standard milk as specially designated milks will be restricted to a period of five years from the commencement of the Act. As hon. Members know, accredited milk and standard milk do not reach the standard of safety which we now expect. However, as many farmers during the past few years have incurred a great deal of expense in trying to comply with those conditions which we have laid down for people who produce accredited milk, we feel they should be given a reasonable time to grade up their herds to T.T. standard.

The limitations which I have described will not apply

to the sale or supply of milk by a producer to his agricultural employees in cases where he does not also sell milk by retail. Should hon. Members object to this provision, they must recognise that when a Bill becomes an Act of Parliament the next step is to ensure that that Act is enforced. It is difficult to compel the producer of milk to supply his employees with a designated milk unless, of course, he himself supplies a designated milk. We all know that the employees on a particular farm who are supplied with milk may be dipping into the bucket and taking it themselves every day. It might be very doubtful whether they would be prepared to wait for that milk to be designated and then brought back to the farm. . . .

Although we shall look at the country as a whole, the policy will in the first place be applied to groups of large urban areas and then extended, as far as is practicable, to rural areas. An appointed day will be fixed on whether the provisions of the Bill will apply to each area having regard to the special conditions obtaining in the area. Before an area is specified, of course, a survey will be made of the pasteurisation facilities available. Where they are insufficient to provide for the pasteurisation of all non-designated raw milk sold in the area the distributors will be asked to increase their facilities and producer-retailers of non-designated raw milk will be encouraged to upgrade their milk to T.T. standard or to arrange for their milk to be pasteurised.

Mr. Elwyn Jones (Plaistow): Can the Parliamentary Secretary give any indication of how soon the scheme will apply to the country as a whole?

Dr. Summerskill: Probably the first area may be specified in a year or 18 months.

Mr. Elwyn Jones: Does the right hon. Lady mean merely the first area and not the whole of the country?

Dr. Summerskill: Yes, Sir. For the country as a whole it may be five or 10 years. The hon. Gentleman must not be too depressed about that. The fight for this Measure has been going on to my knowledge for 25 years. One of the first speeches I made in my political career was on this subject. Indeed, I may go so far as to say that this is my finest hour. The Minister himself will have the power to operate heat treatment plant or to arrange for local authorities or other persons to provide plant in any area in which there are insufficient facilities to provide adequate quantities of heat treated milk.

In the existing regulations there are no penalties for the infringement of licence conditions. The sale of special designated milk today is voluntary and if a vendor infringes the conditions the only sanction provided is the suspension or revocation of his licence. The effect today of the revocation of a licence is to prevent the holder of the licence from selling milk under special designation, but this does not mean that he is prevented from selling milk. He can then revert to selling raw milk, as he has done in the past, and apart, perhaps, from losing a little goodwill his business will not be damaged in any way. When, however, the restrictions imposed by this Bill are in operation, the revocation of a licence held by a retail distributor, in a specified area, would mean the closing of his business, because all the milk in that particular area would be designated and he would be unable to sell raw milk. . . .

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFton Park 435.

Vol. 22. No. 1.

Saturday, March 5, 1949.

Church and State

The article, sometimes referred to as the 'leading' article from some misunderstanding of our constitution, which customarily appears on this page serves a variety of purposes, and we apply it this week to the recording of so much as *The Times* vouchsafes concerning the raising in a more acute form than usual of the question of Church and State at the spring session of the Church Assembly last week.

It will be apparent to readers that (to use a phrase which conveys a sufficiently wide suggestion, and one we have employed before) The Agenda is open for additions. Whether events are providing the additions or whether we are is immaterial retrospectively though not prospectively.

In Scotland, *The Scotsman* has been giving daily publicity to the discussion of the attitude of the Church (of Scotland) to politics, under the form of its attitude to Communism, and to the Rev. Dr. George F. MacLeod falls the credit of asserting that the political order can be redeemed only by what Christian people do about it, not by what they think about it. "What personal action does this Communist challenge demand from me?" was, he said, the question of real urgency. We shall see what the answer is.

In England, the interest centres in an amendment moved by Lord Selborne and carried "with only a few dissentients" (*The Times*) to a more radical motion by Mr. G. W. Currie. We give both the amendment and the motion which it displaced:—

LORD SELBORNE: "That the Assembly, while valuing the establishment of the Church of England as an expression of the nation's recognition of religion, nevertheless is of opinion that the present form of it impedes the fulfilment of the responsibilities of the Church as a spiritual society and therefore instructs the standing committee to appoint a small commission to draw up resolutions on changes desirable in the relationship between Church and State and to present them to the Assembly for consideration at an early date."

MR. CURRIE: "That the Assembly regards the existing connection between the Church and State as an infringement of the spiritual freedom without which the Church of England is unable to fulfil her obligations, and respectfully requests the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to initiate such steps as appear to be most likely to secure the spiritual freedom desired."

The point so closely touches the whole question of the Constitution that we think the points put forward in discussion should be briefly placed on record. They are not exhaustive, needless to say.

Lord Selborne said all the world forces against Christianity would rejoice and exult if the word went forth that the Church of England had been disestablished. With this the Archbishop of York agreed, saying that only as a last resort should the Church ask for disestablishment. As reported by *The Times*, he went on to say:—

"The Church has not got the full control that a spiritual body should have. They were exposed to the taunt that they broke the law—as they did—when they departed from the services in the Prayer-book and for years the lower courts had been paralysed in their action in questions of doctrine and worship because the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was not accepted by the consciences of the clergy or a considerable number of the laity.

"Totalitarianism was on the ascendancy and it would be possible for a Government hostile to the Church to use its powers to bring the Church into subordination to it and use it as an engine for promulgating its own ends. It was easy to say this could not happen here but 20 years ago they might have said that certain things would not have happened in Hungary, Poland, and elsewhere. In our House of Commons they could not claim a majority of Church people, nor could they claim the nation as a whole was Christian."

The Archbishop of Canterbury agreed "with all that the Archbishop of York had said."

Mr. Currie's motion was supported by Canon J. Brierley (Lichfield), whose arguments are not reported by *The Times*.

Dresden

"The fourth anniversary of the Anglo-American destruction of Dresden has been celebrated in the Eastern zone of Germany by a burst of Soviet propaganda, reciting this and other sins of the West. Oddly enough—or perhaps not so oddly—an anti-Semitic paper in this country seizes on the same horrible episode, attributing it to the Elders of Zion. Now, the fact that both anti-Semites and Communists seek to exploit our bombing of Dresden should not blind us to the fact that it was an atrocity; our atrocity. In these pages two years ago, we described how British and American bombers (the Americans had far the greater responsibility) attacked a city which had virtually no military value, literally burned to death many thousands of non-combatants including war-wounded, and demolished most of Dresden's famous cultural monuments. While reflecting on this sombre fact, we picked up a remarkable report by Justice Robert H. Jackson on the Nuremberg process. Last Saturday the State Department released the report, a thick volume containing the minutes of the negotiations between the various members of the International War Crimes Tribunal, preliminary to the Nuremberg trials. The justices were laying down the rules of procedure and defining the nature of the crimes. On July 25, 1945, at a session of the Tribunal, the members were discussing a draft defining violations of the rules of war, for which violations they were unctuously preparing to try the German leaders. But, at the last moment, Justice Jackson apparently discovered that 'judging in our own cause' might involve some embarrassments. So, (page 380 of the Report) we find him saying: '... we have left out of our draft the destruction of villages and towns, because I have seen the villages and towns of Germany. I think that you will have great difficulty distinguishing between the military necessity for that kind of destruction from some done by the Germans, assuming the war to be legitimate. It seems to me those subjects invite recriminations that would not be useful in the trial.' We leave to our readers the privilege of examining the rich implications of such a statement."—*Not Merely Gossip* (Supplement to *Human Events*) Washington, D.C.

Fact or 'Fiat': A Note on Reciprocity

By BEATRICE C. BEST

"... if a complex piece of mechanism goes slightly wrong, the practical mechanic on the spot can often tinker about and put it right. If, however, it goes wildy and extravagantly wrong you have often to send for the expert who understands what really makes the wheels go round. And the troubles of modern man go back a long way. They go back to that sharp change of mind which he took at the Renaissance. Prior to that event there was at the back of the minds of European men the conception of life as a balance. Since that event he has conceived of it as a race, a conception which has been shared by nearly all his famous teachers in economics and philosophy."

The above recent statement raises important and interesting questions, ignored by its author, without consideration of which it is difficult to see how the statement, as it stands, can be substantiated, or be thought of as having any rhyme or reason. Why, for instance, did this "sharp change of mind" from the conception from life as a 'balance' to life as a 'race' take place? Was the change purely freakish and meaningless, a wholly capricious event, a bolt from the blue as it were? Can we believe that men's "famous teachers in economics and philosophy" merely "shared" passively in this new conception? Surely more might have been expected of them than unquestioning acquiescence in such a momentous change. A teacher is called upon to teach, and one can hardly help suspecting that these "famous teachers" fostered the change. If not, and if "the troubles of modern man" can be traced to it (and so, presumably, started at the time of the change) why did they not condemn it, and seek to find the cause or causes of it? Amongst all of them could not one expert have been found who understood what really made "the wheels go round"? And did no one of them enquire whether this fatal "change" was due to a fortuitous change of circumstances, or an intended and purposive change? And if the latter by what man or body of men was the change inaugurated? And to what end?

A final question must be asked, and that is why did the author of the statement ignore the fact that a man has arisen who understands "what really makes the wheels go round," and why man's troubles are due to his conception of life as a race (an ever swifter and fiercer race, more and more exports) rather than as a balance? And further, why was the fact ignored that this teacher has shown that the balance can be re-established—allowing it ever really did exist—and by what means this can be achieved today?

All true and fruitful relationship depends upon a state of reciprocity existing, and maintained, between the two sides or partners to the relationship, whatever the nature of the relationship may be, or upon whatever level it is found to exist. The measure of the perfection of the relationship depends upon the degree of reciprocity that is attained. Certain conditions must, however, be observed before this state of reciprocity can be realised, or considered to have validity. The contracting or participating partners must be free to choose and enter into the relationship, and they must be actuated by their mutual desire and will to do so. No third party can intervene and, by contrivance or manipulation, succeed in creating any but a manufactured counterfeit, devoid of vitality.

The economic plane is concerned with the relationship between production and consumption, or more properly be-

tween producer and consumer, and, for a true and fruitful relationship to result from this partnership a state of reciprocity, or what might here be called balance, must exist between them.

The perfect instrument that has been discovered, or invented, for establishing this state of reciprocity between producer and consumer is money, since money allows for, or renders possible that freedom of choice which is essential, and without which no true co-operation with its mutual advantage is possible.

There should be only one controlling factor, on the economic plane, governing or regulating this reciprocal relationship, and that is the force and regulating power of facts.*

It would be useless, of course, for the consumer to demand goods for which the raw material did not exist, or which industry could not produce. Subject, however, to this controlling factor, and given the desire and will both of the consumer to consume and the producer to produce, and the freedom obtained by means of money to register this will and this desire a condition of reciprocity (ensuring balance) could exist on the economic plane. This, it can be reasonably argued, would result in the peace and prosperity and the absence of fatal conflict supposed to be, and vociferously claimed to be the aims of the ruling powers to-day.

It is, however, the purpose of the ruler to rule and govern others, and, if it be true that appetite grows on what it feeds, to extend his power. So it would be against his purpose to allow facts and natural law to direct the course of events, it would mean the virtual abdication of his own authority. Whether or not, then, the intention of the ruler is beneficent the freedom and independence of others are inimical to him. Thus, money, used as an instrument of freedom and independence, is an obstacle to his aim and purpose and must, therefore, be turned into an instrument of Government. For this it was found necessary to gain control of the instrument.

The Industrial Revolution with its need for capital development served the Money Power well, for, by increasing opportunities for debt creation, it helped to extend the area of control exercised by that power. At the same time the decreasing need for man's paid labour resulting from technological advances in industrial methods, joined to the inexorable rule of no job, no pay, otherwise the fetish of 'full employment,' increased the dependence of the worker on the State, understood as an agent of the Money Power. Logically, the final result of continuing such a process would be the stoppage and collapse of Industry, with a plethora of goods to sell on the one hand and a complete dearth of buyers, for all practical purposes, on the other. All possible reciprocal relationship between producer and consumer would be brought to an end. 'Overproduction' and 'Poverty in the midst of Plenty' were pointers in that direction. They also created an awkward situation, *tending towards enlightenment*. Something had to be done about it.

It may be said at this juncture that all this could have been taken as read: that the, miscalled, 'breakdown of the money system' is a truism today to which the crop of monetary reformers that has sprung up bears witness. The point it is intended to emphasise, however, is not the fact of the 'breakdown,' but the fact of how well this 'breakdown'

*Only thus can "the establishment of a just relationship between the mind and things" (Francis Bacon) be brought about.

has served and serves the powers that be. For money still retains its *potency* as an instrument of freedom, it possesses as it were, the property of a two-edged sword, and dividends, whether derived from savings, or inheritance, still allow those who receive them a certain measure of freedom and independence. So, if it did not over-rate their intelligence, it might be supposed that the rift—the cause of the ‘breakdown’—its inevitable widening, and its inexorable and disastrous consequences were foreseen, intended, and fostered by these Powers.

Because it was clear that some way had to be devised to contrive a state of reciprocity, or balance, between production and consumption to keep the wheels of industry revolving at all. This was necessary whatever purpose was assigned to production; whether it was for use, or profit, or both, or in order to give employment.

It took, through the agency of governments, various methods of destruction and restriction, with two world wars, and the threat of a third, to reduce the plenty to a state of scarcity, or illusion of scarcity, and so bring the feared and hated phrase ‘Poverty in the midst of Plenty,’ into ridicule and contempt. In this way it became possible for governments to plant in the mind of the community a belief in the necessity for rationing, and to foist upon it a planned system of innumerable regulations and controls, and so establish a *false and faked reciprocity* between consumption and production. Thus the ‘breakdown’ of the money system was instrumental in helping the government to introduce the coupon, or permit system; one destructive of the individual’s freedom of choice, and of his power to exercise initiative and a sense of responsibility.

These drastic methods were also found necessary to prevent the already existent knowledge spreading of the way by which, by observing a strict regard for facts and respect for natural law, and by a realistic(*) use of money, the distribution of plenty could have been effected, and a state of a true reciprocity established between producers and consumers, one allowing the individual freedom of choice and the exercise of initiative and responsibility. This way, the Social Credit way, the only way, being the exact opposite of the way of Principalities and Powers, is their greatest menace. Truly, *Demon est Deus inversus*.

It can therefore be said that man is faced today—and the choice this time would appear to be final—with the alternative of government according to fiat, or government according to fact. This means, in reality, the choice of subservience to the rules of men, or willing obedience to the laws of God.

It is worse than useless, and the height of delusion to look to governments themselves, whatever title they may assume, to choose the Social Credit way—the way of freedom—to restore, or establish, a condition of balance. They would not cut the ground from beneath their feet by such means; nor, even if they wished, would they be permitted to do so by the Higher Powers directing their policies.

The people alone can secure their own emancipation, but for this enlightenment is necessary.

There are some who look to an elite to lead and guide the people; experience teaches one, however, that the members of such a class are more concerned with ideas than

(*)Realistic, that is, in relation to the true purpose and proper function of money, instead of, as now, to the policies and over-riding purpose of those who control it.

with the truth that should inform ideas, and so no hope lies there.

To those who distrust the people an occasion may be recalled when, *left to themselves*, it was noted that “The common people heard Him gladly.” It was only when the people were turned into a mob by subversive and satanic propaganda that it cried out: “Crucify Him!”

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby): To oppose this Bill is extremely difficult, but to support it with enthusiasm is just as difficult. One’s attitude towards the Bill depends on what one wants to get. What this Bill sets out to get is clean pasteurised milk. What I want to get is something different; it is clean unpasteurised milk. For, while it may be true that pasteurisation destroys the bacillus of bovine tuberculosis, it is also true in my experience—and, I believe, in the experience of every country—that it destroys half the food value of the milk itself—[HON. MEMBERS: “No.”] I expected that I should get that chorus, but it so happens that when in London I live on pasteurised milk, and when in the country I live on unpasteurised milk.

Mr. Manning: That is when the hon. Gentleman loses his voice.

Mr. Brown: The cause of my recent loss of voice was sustained irritation at irrelevant interruptions from that side of the House. It is a fact that a child that will peak and pine on ordinary pasteurised milk, will, in a few weeks, flourish on ordinary cows’ milk.

Dr. Haden Guest (Islington, North): Does the hon. Gentleman say that he peaks and pines when in London? We have not noticed it.

Mr. Brown: I should like to pass from my afflictions to animal diseases. The experience of mothers in regard to their children is that there is all the difference in the world, from a nutritive point of view, between clean unpasteurised milk and clean pasteurised milk.

Dr. Guest: Rubbish.

Mr. Brown: If we are going to conduct the argument on that level, I will not address myself to the hon. Gentleman opposite.

Mr. John Lewis (Bolton): Is not the hon. Gentleman capable of appreciating that by means of the application of a scientific principle of examination of milk, both before and after pasteurisation, it is possible for experts to tell whether or not it has lost any of its nutritional value?

Mr. Brown: It was not really necessary to interrupt me to point out the obvious. It is also true that scientific investigation can prove with certainty that we are well fed on the number of calories we are getting, but nobody feels like it? There is a profound difference between clean pasteurised milk and unclean pasteurised milk. What I want to get is clean unpasteurised milk, and we shall only get that when we tackle the problem at all points.

To get clean milk, we have to start with the water supply on the farm, and in that connection I immediately pay tribute to this Government for having done a great deal towards improving water supplies to farms. But it is a fact that there are literally thousands of farms which are still without water, except natural spring water, and thousands more without proper drinking troughs, so that the cattle stand in

the pond from which they are drinking. That is where we must start to try to get clean milk. Then we must deal with the farm buildings. Many of the buildings on English farms are in a deplorable state. I do not agree with the hon. Member who said that the addition in the price paid for T.T. milk as against the price paid for ordinary milk would result in any period of time that I can foresee, in the scrapping of insanitary farm buildings, and their replacement by modern cow sheds. When considering the cost of scrapping out-of-date insanitary buildings and replacing them with modern cowsheds which will run into many thousands of pounds, it will be realised how long it will be before we reach that situation. I had a price quoted the other day for a cow shed to house 20 cows. The figure quoted was nearly £2,000. It would take many gallons of milk at an extra cost of 2d. a gallon to meet that cost, to say nothing of the interest which one would have to pay until the cost was paid off.

The next important thing is clean handling. What is the good of having T.T. milk and putting it in the same churn as accredited milk, or accredited milk in the same churn as ordinary milk? These are some of the points we must look at if we are to get clean milk.

And we shall never get clean milk unless we are as ruthless in dealing with tuberculosis in cows as we are in dealing with foot-and-mouth disease. When we deal with foot-and-mouth disease, we recognise that it is a disease which will spread very rapidly, and we make quite sure that the farmers shall have no financial interest whatever in keeping alive a cow which is suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. The cow is destroyed, and we pay the farmer the value of the cow. Thereby we manage to keep down the incidence of foot-and-mouth disease in Britain. The hon. Member for Barking (Mr. Hastings) quoted some figures about the degree of tuberculosis-free herds in America, and the figure he gave was 99.5 per cent. But in America they do with tubercular cows what we do with cows suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. They destroy the tubercular cow, and they compensate the farmer for the loss of it, so that no farmer is under a financial temptation to keep a tubercular cow supplying milk when it obviously ought not to be.

I hold the view that by the adoption of this Bill we may very easily slow down or divert our attention from what seem to me to be the three or four important points that I have made in the direction of getting clean tuberculosis-free but unpasteurised milk. That is what I want to see in England, and I see no reason why that should take 15 years, provided we tackle it as ruthlessly as they have done in America. It was notorious, during the war, that it was an offence for an American soldier to drink English milk. So poor a view did they take of the disease laden qualities of English milk, that it was a military offence for the American soldier to drink it, even if it was pasteurised. That suggests that the American scientists, who presumably advise the American Government, do not regard pasteurisation as the answer to the problem.

Mr. Orr-Ewing: I hope the hon. Gentleman is not being unfair again—

Mr. Brown: I hope not.

Mr. Orr-Ewing: —but surely part of the reason was that we had not the milk with which to supply the American Army?

Mr. Brown: It is certainly true that if we had tried to feed all the American troops, on top of our own, there would

have been a great shortage of milk, but that does not explain why it was made a military offence to drink English milk. It was an offence to buy it and to drink it because of the American view of the quality of our milk. That is a disgraceful situation. The right hon. Lady in her opening speech said that 40 per cent. of our cattle would react positively to tuberculosis tests, and that 20 per cent. were afflicted with mastitis and undulant fever germs, and other things. Those figures are a positive disgrace to our country—not merely a disgrace to us here now, but to all those who in the past have dealt with this problem.

I am anxious to see the problem tackled. It can be tackled first, by still further extending clean water supplies, and secondly, by making it financially possible for the farmer to reconstruct his buildings. I hear rumours that there may be some proposal of that kind in the programme upon which the Labour Party will fight the next Election; I very much hope so. Next, we have to ensure cleanliness of handling at all stages. And finally there must be a ruthless elimination of tubercular animals. I do not regard this as a good Bill. It should be regarded as a *faute de mieux*—something which we are obliged to do to prevent infection of people by tubercular milk. But it is not the real answer to our problem. Therefore, while I obviously cannot vote against the Bill—and I hope it will get a Second Reading—I hope its effect will not be to divert our attention from the deeper and more important problems.

Sir William Darling (Edinburgh, South): I see only one Scottish hon. Member in front of me, the right hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Strachey). If there were more Scottish Members here perhaps I should have hesitated to say that this is really an intermediate Measure, which does not alter the fact that Scottish agriculture is being dragged at the tail of a dirty English cow. That indeed is a fact. This, at best, is an intermediate Measure. It aims at dealing with the problem of unsatisfactory milk. I have not yet heard it said in this Debate that pasteurisation necessarily cleans milk. It may make it wholesome milk, but it does not make it clean milk. It is still dirty.

The second point is that this Measure, as has been pointed out by the hon. Member for Rugby (Mr. W. J. Brown), discourages the very rapid progress which has been made elsewhere in the development of non-tubercular herds. The effect of this Measure will be that these very rapid improvements will be discouraged. As has already been said in the Debate, only 10 per cent. of the herds in England are non-tubercular. Scotland is very far ahead of England in this matter and in Scotland 35 per cent. of the herds are non-tubercular. In Wales, showing that it is not necessarily a quality of the character of the Scottish people but something quite different, the percentage is 27 per cent.

I wish the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland (Sir B. Neven-Spence) were here because I am informed that his constituency has the supreme honour in this field, for non-tubercular herds in the Shetlands are 100 per cent. In Bute the figure is 86 per cent., in Ayrshire 85 per cent., in Cardigan 86 per cent., and in Carmarthen 69 per cent. These figures show that a policy of non-tubercular herds is not impossible and in considering this Bill we must weigh against its advantages the possible discouragement of the development of non-tubercular herds in other places. I repeat that this Measure might be described as an endeavour to drag Scotland and Wales at the tail of a dirty English cow and these

figures I have given justify my comment in that sense. . . .

Another aspect of this Bill which has been subject to criticism is its effect upon the producer-retailer of milk. My hon. Friend the Member for Weston-super-Mare (Mr. Orr-Ewing) has already referred to this point. I think the effect of this Measure will be that of a further elimination of the small producer-retailer. He has a very important and valuable contribution to make to the milk supply of this country but if he is to be associated, as he must be, with the erection, maintenance and payment for these pasteurisation plants I am inclined to think that his activities will be further circumscribed and that the hon. Lady . . . will be gratified no doubt by the direction of this Bill, . . . which will increase the power of the Co-operative societies and also the large multiple firms as distributors, but as a result of which the place of the small retailer will be less and less, individualism will disappear and Socialism will be triumphant. . . .

. . . I must point out that England and Scotland are two different countries. I have protested in this House, and will continue to protest as long as I am permitted to do so, against these composite Bills. This Bill deals with Scottish and English agriculture. They are entirely different. In England, according to the standard of the Bill, it is 90 per cent. inefficient; in Scotland it is 65 per cent. inefficient. There should be a separate Bill for Scotland. . . .

Major Legge-Bourke (Isle of Ely): . . . None of us can deny the fact that it is desirable that as many people as possible shall have safe milk. I say "safe" rather than "clean" because pasteurisation will not make milk clean if it has been produced in dirty surroundings. During the Debate the suggestion has cropped up—it may crop up more in the official world afterwards—that tuberculin tested milk should be mixed with pasteurised milk and that it should be pasteurised as well as non-tuberculin tested milk. Since 1945 I have started a small Jersey tuberculin tested herd. That is not a particularly easy thing to start, particularly if the people involved in it have not been used to tuberculin tested procedure. Apart from the capital expenditure which is considerable, many old ways have to be unlearned as well as new ways learnt, and it is often harder to unlearn an old method than to learn something new. All this involves the farmer in a considerable amount of expense, time and patience. If we are to find that after all this expenditure of time, patience and capital, the milk produced by these tuberculin tested herds has to be pasteurised as well, I know what my reaction will be, and I am certain that it will be the reaction of many farmers who have done what I have. They will say, "Very well, we will chuck all the rules and regulations, produce as much milk as we can, take no trouble about the quality and then have it pasteurised and leave it at that." That is the last thing that the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary want. I hope that we shall not hear any more of the suggestion that tuberculin tested should be pooled with other milk. . . .

. . . As to pasteurisation, I have here a reprint of an article which appeared in the "Medical World" in 1938. There was an interesting point in it. It said:

"We find that most authorities advise the giving of orange juice to infants fed entirely on pasteurised milk."

The reason given for that was that pasteurised milk tended—I do not say it actually produced it—to produce scurvy. The latest figures I can find are for 1945 and I am glad to have discovered that there were only three babies between

six months and 12 months who died from scurvy in Great Britain in that year.

I think it is important for us to realise that pasteurisation does something to the milk that is not altogether to the good, and it has to be compensated for in some way. During the war years, and since, there has been a plentiful supply of orange juice for babies, and I assume that it is considered by the nutritional experts to be necessary. I hope we shall have an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that the researches made into this matter confirm him in his decision to go ahead with pasteurisation, and that we shall not neglect to provide what is considered by the experts to be necessary if pasteurisation is adopted.

I believe that pasteurisation is the wrong end to start . . .

The Minister of Food (Mr. Strachey): . . . The hon. Member for Rugby (Mr. W. J. Brown) was, I think, most critical of any hon. Members, because he had strong objections to pasteurisation. He made a statement, which I would not wish to let go without contradiction in this House, that half the food value of milk was destroyed by pasteurisation. He was challenged to produce any evidence in support of that statement and he produced none, but told us that he was just asserting that. That is all he was doing. Let me assure him and the House that it is not the case. It really is known what pasteurisation does to milk. It does do something; it reduces—and the hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Ely (Major Legge-Bourke) was on this point—it reduces the vitamin "C" content, slightly. If there is a vitamin "C" shortage from other sources, for instance if children cannot be supplied with oranges, or some other suitable source, that is a disadvantage, but, so far as science can show, that is the only ill effect of pasteurisation and that, of course, is not a nutritional effect in the strict sense of the word. It is a gross misrepresentation to suggest that pasteurisation has any serious nutritional effect on milk.

That does not mean, of course, that we do not agree with many of the statements made about the desirability of what was suggested, perhaps as an alternative course, although I do not think it a true alternative, of eliminating the tubercular reactors among the herd and getting attested herds generally throughout the country. Of course, that is highly desirable and the financial inducements, which are the way of getting that result, are quite unaffected by this Bill. . . .

" . . . Major Douglas possesses one of the most penetrating intellects of our time; he has a profound knowledge of the 'set-up' behind governments—and he is fearless—a combination of gifts most rare in a time-serving world."

—Truth.

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

by C. H. DOUGLAS

8/6 NET.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 7, VICTORIA STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.