

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

The Urge To War Some Further Thoughts on The New Deal

By NORMAN F. WEBB

In this book* of Mr. Flynn's one gets a retrospective glimpse of the New Deal in the United States as an event, a more or less isolated phase in an almost incomprehensibly vast world-movement, that is of considerable value in the present crisis; for any degree of prescience at all is dependent on some estimate of what has gone before. What was the sequence?

There was the financial crash on Wall Street in 1929, to what extent consciously precipitated it is hard to say, and then came the Democratic victory with Roosevelt at its head in 1933, at the height of the subsequent panic when the smaller banks all over the country were failing like popping chestnuts. This was the New Deal proper; the early days of the experiment, when we first heard of the Brains Trust, with General Hugh Johnson, Henry Morgenthau and Henry Wallace, sponsored by such august names as Bernard Baruch and Sol Bloom, along with Dr. Murray Butler of Columbia University, New York's equivalent for the London School of Economics. Mr. Flynn describes it not ineptly, as a vast and sprawling attempt to insinuate Fascist Italy into the United States.

Like all centrally controlled experiments, it represented an immense expenditure of money for little or no return. This was the period of the N.R.A. (National Recovery Administration), and the A.A.A. (Agricultural Adjustments Administration), organisations set up to perform the double and mutually exclusive functions of curtailing production and increasing work. This they attempted to do using the public credit to obtain loans from the community's banks and financial institutions to finance capital expenditure and public works of all kinds at the expense of consumer goods, and, in the case of agriculture, actually paying the producers of consumable goods not to produce. There was little evident result from all this except an enormous increase in public debt, and as early as 1934, a commission of investigation had been set up, and a report issued condemning both administrations. In May 1935, the Supreme Court, by a unanimous decision that included Justice Brandeis held that the N.R.A. was unconstitutional.

It was this decision, no doubt, that led Roosevelt in 1936 to introduce a bill dealing with the selection of Judges to the Supreme Court. It was an ill-judged and crude attack on the constitution, and threatened to split the Democratic Party from top to bottom, and he was forced to climb down, authorising his then Vice-President Garner to capitulate for him. According to Judge Summers, who was by no means unsympathetic to Roosevelt, this defeat almost unhinged his reason. When the Supreme Court condemned

several of his early New Deal proposals he accused its members of "unco-operativeness," and showed his ignorance of constitutionalism by suggesting to Justice Hughs that he should consult with the President before coming to such decisions, and that he, Roosevelt, was prepared to consult members of the Court on political matters.

At the time that Roosevelt came to power, in 1932, it was estimated that there were almost eleven and a half millions unemployed in the States. By June 1937, at the beginning of the Second Term of Office, this had been reduced to four and a half millions, by the expenditure of immense sums of public credit standing in the national ledgers as a debit in favour of the Federal Reserve Board and the financial institutions of the country. But by November of 1937 the unemployment figure had risen again to seven millions, and the Second New Deal was wallowing in the trough of depression and failure. Gradually the original, and relatively better men disappeared, and Roosevelt was left, as are all dictators sooner or later, surrounded by psychopants and go-getters. Internal differences were fierce, and he was pulled this way and that. On one point only they were all agreed, and that was on the spending of public money; for money is material power, and they were all power-mongers in their various ways. With Socialism the genuine urge really to cure social ills is negligible, for they constitute the excuse for the spending of public money; abnormal conditions demand special measures, necessitating special expenditure. Mr. Flynn pithily describes the growth of an immense Bureaucracy under threatening conditions; the semi-intellectual from the State university, in the heady whirl of Washington, finding himself "standing by a beautifully carved colonial fireplace in Georgetown, with a caviar hors d'oeuvre in one hand and a martini cocktail in the other, discussing with Assistant-Secretary So-and-so or Commissioner Whats-his-name what shall be done with the potato crop, or the new situation in China. It is ravishing . . . it is intoxicating . . . Roosevelt has seen the light . . . The era of Permanent Crisis is now established. Oh, happy crisis! Oh, blessed catastrophe!" That was the beginning, "and," concludes Mr. Flynn "after June 1941, when Hitler turned on his partner Stalin, those bureaus became resting places for droves of Communist termites, who used their position to further the interests of Soviet Russia."

Mr. Flynn's account of the Great Conferences—Moscow, Teheran, Yalta, etc., is interesting and entirely confirmatory of the Social Credit conclusions. He attributes their initiation entirely to Roosevelt, and all the realism displayed at them to Stalin and Churchill. According to him all chance of putting up an effective resistance to Stalin's exacting demands was defeated by Roosevelt's obsession with the idea of the United Nations Organisation, to win Stalin over to which he was prepared to give away almost everything, including British interests and the whole Eastern situation. At Teheran Roosevelt and the Americans were housed at the Russian embassy, where Stalin was accessible to private talks.

*The Roosevelt Myth, by John T. Flynn.

As he told his son Elliott, "In between, Uncle Joe and I had a few words, too, just the two of us." This was on the Chinese Communist issue; as he said, they couldn't do much about it "while Winnie was about."

He describes a grim interlude at the dinner given at the Russian Embassy, taken from Elliott Roosevelt's book, when Stalin, among the endless toasts, raised his glass and said: "To the swiftest possible justice to all German war criminals—justice before a firing squad. I drink to our unity in dispatching them as quickly as we catch them—there must be at least 50,000 of them." Churchill instantly jumped up and protested that such mass-murder was contrary to the British sense of justice. Roosevelt, instead of supporting him, or at least trying to mollify him, suggested in a jocular vein that instead of 50,000 "we should settle on a smaller number, say 49,500." The Russians and Americans all laughed. Stalin was delighted, and called for an opinion from Elliott who, according to his own account, "rose unsteadily to his feet, saying, 'Our armies will settle the matter for those 50,000 and perhaps 100,000 more.'" Stalin, laughing, walked right round the table and, putting his arm round Elliott's shoulder, drank to him. Churchill, furious, pointed a finger at Elliott, crying, "Are you interested in damaging the relations between the allies? Do you know what you are saying?" Elliott comments that he has good reason for believing that Churchill never forgot the incident, "but that his father was greatly amused at it, as it proved that he and Stalin, like Harry Hopkins and Stalin, were buddies." And incidentally, the plans for the subsequent American withdrawal from China had been laid.

What stands out so clearly all through this book—not to its author, who is quite oblivious to the fact, but to any intelligent Social Crediter—is the unremitting pressure, the awful insistence implicit in orthodox finance towards ever-increasing sabotage, that ultimately can find satisfaction in nothing less than that the arch-destroyer, war. If society submits to an arbitrary edict, under which its members are fated either to be unable to consume all they themselves produce, or alternatively are forced to produce more than they want to consume, some other market must be provided; and the moon not yet being available, the only really adequate one to be found is in modern mechanised and atomised warfare.

Under the renewed threat of wide-spread unemployment in the United States in 1938, it is evident that the influences round Roosevelt were already casting envious eyes at Great Britain's and Nazi Germany's relatively "healthy" employment figures under the stimulus of the Armaments Race. And that in spite of the Neutrality Act and Roosevelt's election pledges that he would see that no American boy was mixed up in Europe's squalid disagreements, there are signs that the policy of isolationism was beginning to be deliberately discredited. Along with this, the idea of the United Nations and the World Authority—our own Anthony Eden's New Order—which by the time of the Teheran meeting had become an obsession with Roosevelt, was being built up in his impressionable mind. All this, dreadful as it may sound, is inherent in the forces that, pre-eminently were behind the President of the United States. Adherents of the old, academic, ways of economic thought—or should we say victims, rather than adherents?—which insists on ignoring the obvious facts of an expanding (mentally unfolding) universe, are bound to approach every problem presented to them from the negative, inhibitory angle.

Guardians of a superceded and therefore "dead" belief, life, which is by its nature expansive, seems to them like a threatening flood, something to be controlled in every conceivable direction. Hence the urge towards centralisation, and the entirely erroneous "necessity," as they see it, for constantly extended *control* in every possible, or impossible, direction; monopoly of the power to enforce and prohibit. This frenzy—for it really can be called nothing else—invariably crystallised into the "vision," or obsession, of a single World Authority, controlling the only atomically-equipped surface, air and underwater force permitted. As a human, intellectual *plan*, it is chimerical; an inverted idea of the millenium. But through what convulsions has society in general to pass before it is purged of the illusion, and permitted by some such *real advance* in social mechanism as the Douglas Proposals supply, again to derive its natural and proper impulse from the sum of individual activity; that so-called self-seeking commonsense which is the closest contact that we have with the source of Real Wisdom, in place of centrally controlled mass-hysteria?

(To be continued)

Money Pamphlets by Pound*

By G. D. GILLING-SMITH

(continued)

There are to be six of these pamphlets appearing at half a crown each and a subsequent volume of selections from Pound's Rome broadcasts at three shillings and six pence. The first, "An Introduction to the Economic Nature of the United States" has just appeared. In it Ezra, as usual, does not set out to prove any economic theory by abstract "logical" argument. A true born teacher, he selects events and comments on them in such a way as to jolt his readers into thinking about them along the right lines, applying the same principles that motivated his translations from Confucius—"to help those who want to *begin* thinking." True to his frequently expressed maxim he gives us something 'to move, to teach, and to delight' as opposed to the majority of writings that ever touch on the subject of economics which, as he would say, seem to have as their aim 'to mislead, to bamboozle and to bore.' In his second paragraph he has some important observations to make on the treatment of history—"I do not believe that the method of historiography has progressed much since the days when Confucius selected the documents of the old kingdoms, and condensed his conclusions in the Testament. Aristotle towards the end of his life arrived at a similar method, in his collection of Greek State Constitutions. Voltaire used the human method which hinges on chance and the personal element. A prince eats a pudding and dies of acute indigestion at a critical moment. Caesar Borgia said: 'I had anticipated everything except being bedridden the day my father died.' Michelet analyses the motives of different social groups and tells us that the manual labourer wants to own a shop because he thinks that shopkeepers don't work. Another method consists in analysing certain mechanisms invented to humbug the public. Perhaps it is the renewal of the Aristotelian tendency but, in any event, it is suitable for the present narrative, and I am following it in this essay or definition, of the struggle between the people and the usurers, or financiers, in the colonies, and

*Introduction to the *Economic Nature of the United States*. Ezra Pound. (London: Peter Russell, 1950).

then in the United States of North America . . . History, as seen by a Monetary Economist, is a continuous struggle between producers and non-producers, and those who try to make a living by inserting a false system of book-keeping between the producers and their just recompense . . . History taken as a lesson, and taking into account the difference between certainty and supposition, would be an *exposition of the nature of events*, rather than a chronicle of names. Some events can be known only after centuries. We know for example that Parasina d'Este incurred certain expenditures which were paid from the Ducal Treasury of Ferrara . . . A signed letter proves what the writer wanted the recipient to believe on such and such a day. But the clarity of an idea remains among the *ascertained* facts. The definition of an idea, as observed by someone who understands the events of the day, may shed more light on the historical process than many volumes."

"The usual frauds of book-keeping, monopoly, *etc.*, have been known since the beginning of history, and it is precisely for this reason that the usurers are opposed to classical studies. Aristotle in his *Politics I. 4/5*, relates how Thales, wishing to show how a philosopher could easily 'make money' if he had nothing better to do, foreseeing a bumper crop of olives, hired by paying a small deposit, all the olive presses on the islands of Miletus and Chios. When the abundant harvest arrived, everybody went to see Thales. Aristotle remarks that this is a common business practice. And the Exchange frauds are, nearly all of them, variants on this theme—artificial scarcity of grain and of merchandise, artificial scarcity of money, that is, scarcity of the key to all other exchanges."

In a paragraph headed 'Proverbs and Wisdom' he then turns to the American scene—"The struggle between the Producers and the Falsifiers of Book-keeping was clearly seen and understood by the Fathers of the Republic. Their wisdom is recorded in the pungent phrase—"The safest place of deposit is in the pants of the people." . . . From the War of Secession up to now, the economic history of the United States has consisted of a series of exchange manoeuvres in New York and Chicago; attempts to impose monopolies, corners, variations in the prices of the shares of new industries, and of the means of transportation. . . . The Americans have chosen this game instead of bull-fighting . . . In 1869, Gould, Fisk and others almost succeeded in monopolising the available gold in New York. Roosevelt followed Jim Fisk." Of the background against which these operations were carried on, Ezra draws attention to the formation of a national type on a basis of similarity of taste rather than on a racial basis—"Those who wanted material gain emigrated to America. Those of a milder nature, the contemplative, the sentimental, those more attached to their soil and home, remained in Europe . . . The younger sons of England went in the 1600's, but after 1800 emigrants from England diminished.

"The Puritans were Bible-crazy, but they did not bring the Hebrew scriptures only. The culture of Adams and Jefferson is a Latin culture with a mixture of Greek. . . . A handful of people who lived on little and did not run into debit brought to, and preserved in America, a rather high, severe culture, and a civic sense nourished by the traditions of English legal liberty, that is by the centuries-long conquest in which the traditions of North European tribes and Roman Law converge. . . .

"The American tragedy is a continuous history of waste

—waste first of the natural abundance, then waste of the new abundance offered by the machine. . . . This had no immediate effect on the prosperity of the inhabitants because of nature's abundance. The usurers, now called financiers, plotted against abundance. To understand the effect of the American system, it is necessary to refer to the monopoly of Thales and then take up the thread of the so-called 'reform' or protestant schism, seen from the economic angle. The Protestants did not wish to pay ecclesiastical taxes to Rome, and to the priests for their rites. The Bible was invented as a substitute-priest. The Canonical prohibition against usury disappeared. Polite society did not consider usury as Dante did, that is, damned to the same circle of Hell as the sodomites, both acting against the potential abundance of nature.

"The Catholic economy had proclaimed the doctrine of the just price. Monopoly is a manoeuvre against the just price. One can speculate only on condition of market oscillation.

"The employers naturally tried to get their work done for the least possible price. The working-men, in self-defence, asked for the suffrage. The people won the war against the Bank in the U.S. between 1830 and 1840 but, with the new waves of European work hands, the quality of the electorate declined, and demagoguery undertook to corrupt it." Referring again to this often misrepresented elimination of the national debt in America in the 1830's when Jackson and Van Buren were in the White House, he notes, in a brief chronological table, that in 1836 the National Treasury, having an active balance, distributed this money to the different states (The famous dissolution of the National Bank). Then he adds in a footnote—"Without going back to the legendary Mohammedan Calif, those who, because of ignorance, shouted that C. H. Douglas's proposal of a National Dividend was a scandal and a novelty, may consider the following facts: Massachusetts distributed its share of the money to the various cities and towns; Boston used it for current expenses; Salem built a Municipal Building; Groton repaired a bridge, and Maine made a per capita distribution."

But though Jackson and Van Buren knew what they were doing, as is illustrated amply by their correspondence and the autobiography of the latter, which was not published until 20 or 30 years ago, both often quoted in the Cantos, there was not sufficient general awareness of the significance of their actions for the victory to be consolidated. The Californian Gold Rush of 1849 and the Civil War of 1861-5 restored the supremacy of the usurers with a vengeance (the period when most of the present-day financial dynasties succeeded to their phenomenal millions). Generally summing up, Ezra says that the people rebelled against the London usurers and instituted a government in America. "This government fell prey to the resident usurers who kept in touch with the arch-usurers of the mother-country. Belmont used to represent the Rothschild, *etc.* Today the Main Office is in New York, the Branch Office is in London. The ubiquity of the victims does not matter, and the Head Office maintains a high degree of mobility.

(To be continued)

"Doomed to Sterility"

"A civilisation which cannot burst through its current abstractions is doomed to sterility after a very limited period of progress."—Whitehead.

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. 24. No. 26.

Saturday, August 26, 1950.

From Week to Week

We have on several occasions expressed our sympathy, at least, with many of the fundamental propositions of "Christian Science," as well as our respect for its organ, "The Christian Science Monitor." We trust to be absolved, therefore, from any desire to attack either of them, as such.

But we think that an article in the magazine section of the "Monitor" of July 15 by the Editor, Mr. Erwin D. Canham requires serious and not wholly complimentary attention.

It is entitled "The Authentic Revolution" and both the title and the argument recall to us a much abler exposition of the same theme by Charles Ferguson about thirty years ago, under the title of "The Revolution Absolute"—a book which nevertheless embodied the same misconceptions. They were dealt with in "The Delusion of Super-Production" which appeared in "The English Review" in 1918.

That Mr. Canham assumes it to be axiomatic that the citizens of the United States are superior to those of other countries (who he concedes share the Western tradition) is both commonplace and perhaps not very important. But it has this effect—that it shifts the emphasis of the defects or perversions of "Westernism," which are principally American, just as it shifts the *genius loci* of it, which is predominantly European, and principally English.

Now, the fundamental nature of the "Authentic Revolution" is not what Mr. Canham says it is, but that *potentially it transfers labour from the backs of men to the machines. The contribution of the United States to that situation is the defication of Full Employment; camouflaged Communism.*

It is not, we think illogical that Mr. Canham links up his faulty economic thesis with a large woodcut of the Common (or Cahmon) Man, bearing aloft a scroll emblazoned with an extract from Jefferson's Constitution, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal." So far from being a self-evident truth, that is, subject to what we have to say later, self-evident nonsense which any village elementary schoolmistress would ridicule. Such progress as poor humanity has made, we owe to the uncommon man. Two of the words employed, however bear such wide implications that their definition may be critical.

The first to notice is the use of the word "created" instead of the more obvious word "born." Jefferson expressly avoids stating that men are *born* equal which *may* imply that he knew that they were not (Jefferson was a high Freemason) but were in various stages of evolution. And the second is the word equal. Only homogeneous articles

can be "equal," and mankind is not homogeneous. Jefferson's Constitution is a political, not an analytical document; probably quite well suited to its times, but of limited application to a country not in the least like that of the United States of his day.

We hope Mr. Canham will absolve us from any desire to be offensive when we say that the explanation of our major difficulties is to be found in the truth of the old saying that if you put beggars on horseback, they will ride to the devil. The traditions which Americans pretend to deride, which are themselves the basis of Westernism and the proofs of human inequality, are of slow uneven growth; and only those traditions can form a bulwark not merely against tyranny, but against entropy, the "running down" to a dead level which is the fundamental Law of the Universe. For the lack of these traditions, the United States as a force has vulgarised and de-graded everything it has touched.

We can agree that this is the Century of the Common (Cahmon, or Vulgar) Man. Indeed it is. *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice.*

• • •

"... But by far the greatest of the brotherhoods is that of the Freemasons; whether we look at its long existence, its widespread influence, or the grandeur of the principles it professes. Born and carried on in mystery, its secret is still supposed to be inviolate, though there are some of the uninitiated who profanely declare that they know it. . . . Strasbourg formed the headquarters of the Society. . . ."
 —Chambers Journal, April 1869.

• • •

Mr Dulles' statement recently that the U.S.A. would probably be a semi-military nation for the next 12 to 15 years, inevitably recalls the late George Orwell's brilliant book, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In this, totalitarianism thrives in a perpetual atmosphere of war, in which Oceania, East-asia and Eurasia are chronically engaged. Of course, no one really knows whether there is a war or not; and it does not matter, because it does not make any particular difference. The Party is in control, and what it says is current fact and past history.

The promptness with which Mr. Truman has asked for and apparently obtained "emergency" powers of planning and control make it quite plain that Russia was built up as a military threat just for that reason. We seem to be headed for a permanent state of "war or threat of war," while the One Worlders consolidate their grip.—*Australian Social Crediter*.

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

PRICE 2/- (Postage 3d.)

Obtainable from:

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

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 20, 1950.

Tomato and Cucumber Marketing Scheme

(continued)

Mr. Crosland (Gloucestershire, South): I am glad that we have had this protest from this side of the House tonight. I should like to support it, although from a rather different point of view, since I do not have a Co-op. interest or grow tomatoes. It is a very sad thing that we should have had a scheme of this kind from a Labour Government. I do not agree that the scheme was implicit in the 1949 Act. That Act certainly gave permission for this draft scheme to be put forward, but there was nothing in it which laid down, in this sort of detail, the kind of scheme being put forward tonight here. Therefore, it is consistent for us to criticise the details of this scheme, as such details are not explicit in the Act of last year.

It is a sad thing that we should have a scheme from a Labour Government which sets up what is a producers' monopoly, with full powers over prices, over output, and over new entry into the industry. It certainly seems to me to be a sad thing, although I can see some arguments in favour of the scheme. But a scheme like this is giving full monopoly powers to a private body of producers. I would not have been surprised if a scheme of this sort had been put forward by the other side of the House and been opposed from this side. It is the other side of the House which has consistently supported, for example, retail price maintenance, and which was responsible for agricultural marketing Acts before the war. [HON. MEMBERS: "No."] The Labour Party were responsible for one Agricultural Marketing Act, in 1931, which was admittedly an interim Act, and was the beginning of that helpful policy which the party had not time to put into full operation because it was thrown out.

That a scheme such as this comes from this side of the House is a great surprise. . . .

At the cost of running into trouble, I think it is important to ask what is the motive behind this scheme, because it is evidently a restrictive motive. No one pretends that the National Farmers' Union, or the tomato growers, or anyone else, want these powers over prices or output to be brought into operation today. If this scheme goes through we shall not have a scheme for the control of prices and output brought into operation this year or next year. It is evident that this scheme is wanted as a protection against the day when there may be conditions of greater over-supply, as the producers think, than there are at the moment.

It is clear, I think, from the last two speeches, and from all the speeches of hon. Members opposite, that the general thought behind the scheme is an attempt by the producers to organise themselves, as they think, in a satisfactory way, into a coherent body like this, so that their claim for the control and restriction of imports of tomatoes will be stronger. . . . This is not a very convincing protection for the consumer at all. If the Government envisage that the industry is always to put forward schemes so innocuous that the Minister will always approve them, that is one thing; but if the Minister envisages the producers frequently putting forward schemes so restrictive that even the Ministry of Agriculture would object, then it would have been better not to have set up a producers' body in the first place, but a body nominated by the Minister.

If the Government take the view that, while we have

the present Minister and the present Parliamentary Secretary in their offices, everything is all right, I would remind them that we must face the realities of the future. It is a regrettable fact that we cannot regard them as permanent safeguards for the consumer and that, when we have a Tory Minister of Agriculture and a Tory Parliamentary Secretary, we may have a very much more restrictive scheme.

The last point which I make about the safeguarding of the consumer is this: if we set up a producers' marketing scheme of this sort it clearly strengthens the bargaining position of the industry against the Ministry. Quite obviously, the producers will have a far stronger chance of imposing their views on the Minister. I would end by again relating this particular scheme to a more general point. It seems to me the sort of scheme which might have been in place 15 years ago. The Marketing Acts of before the war had a certain justification in the then prevailing economic conditions. If this had been produced 15 years ago we on this side of the House would have given it more sympathetic consideration because then one had low prices and falling markets; but in days of full employment and expanding markets and demand, it seems to me to be wrongly conceived. There might have been a place for it in pre-war days, but it is decidedly out of place with expanding demand, and it is for that reason that I voice this disquiet.

Mrs. Castle (Blackburn, East): . . . It is quite remarkable that, although we are discussing a commodity which has considerable health-giving properties, and which adds enormously to the variety of diet in the ordinary homes throughout the country, a plentitude of which in the larders of the housewives is vital to the health and well-being of the consumers, we have not had an atom of an expression of concern by hon. Gentlemen opposite about the effect of the Order and whether it is going to be detrimental to the interests of the consumers and the housewives. I suggest that everything we have heard from hon. Gentlemen opposite proves once again how they are ready to jettison light-heartedly the interests of the consumers when any sectional claim is before the House. They have established tonight once and for all that they are the last party in the country to have any claim to represent the housewives of Britain.

When speaking here tonight—and I speak with some anxiety about the effects of this Order—I fully appreciate that the genuine interests of the consumer must be linked with the genuine interests of the producers and that there should not be a clash. It is not in a spirit of clash that I criticise this Order. I appreciate fully the point of view expressed by my hon. Friend the Member for Norfolk, South-West (Mr. Dye). I agree that this Order is an advance on the pre-war situation. I am delighted to find that there is at last recognition on the other side that the free play of the market ruins the grower on the one hand without benefiting the consumer on the other. . . . When my hon. Friend the Member for Norfolk, South-West, says that the growers have a right to this, it is rather misrepresenting the situation. It is not that the growers have been clamouring for the right to organise. The difficulty has been to try and convince the growers of the value of organisation.

Mr. Joynson-Hicks (Chichester): Does the hon. Lady realise that the scheme has been in the Ministry for two years and the growers have been waiting all that time?

Mrs. Castle: I am sure that the hon. Member knows that the N.F.U. has had an enormous amount of difficulty

with the backwood growers to get them to agree even to this form of organisation.

I welcome this step forward. I wish there had been more organisation. There would have been less difficulty for the housewife if there had been more producer co-operatives and a more rationalised system. One of the difficulties the housewife has been suffering from is the lack of marketing intelligence, which has led growers one year, when there is a good price for a certain vegetable, to rush in and grow it without any consultation, with the result that the bottom falls out of the market the next year and they all stop growing it, with the result that there is a famine for the housewife.

I quite agree that there must be some order and regulation brought into this industry. I am not opposing this Order or criticising it because I want to go back to the pre-war chaos. I believe that the regulation of private enterprise is a necessity. I am glad that hon. Members opposite now agree about that. I am asking the question: Regulation in whose interest? That is my concern when I look at this Order. We have to be very careful, when we do go forward to try to bring order out of chaos by regulation, to try and strike a fair and legitimate balance between the producer, on the one hand, and the consumer, on the other.

I want to see a grand liaison between the two. . . . This scheme does not seek to remedy one of the most important factors existing at the moment. It does nothing to remedy the situation of too many middlemen handling the products, sending up the price, and getting the products into the hands of the housewife stale and expensive. While it does not remedy these things it is not helping the grower, because it is to the advantage of the grower that we should close the gap between the price which the producer gets and the price which the housewife has to pay for it. Day after day we have brought forward in this House examples of growers not getting proper prices, having to abandon their crops, whether of strawberries or other things, and yet we housewives know that the prices demanded in the shops are such that we have to cut down our demand by half. . . .

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas Williams): The first thing I want to say to hon. Members on this side—with one exception—is that agricultural marketing schemes are an essential part of Government policy. The Labour Party not only passed the original Act in 1931, but it was the 1945 Labour Government that passed the Agricultural Marketing Act, 1949, which brought it up-to-date. Some of my hon. Friends supported the 1949 Act and at least one who has spoken in this Debate supported also the 1931 Act. I shall refer to that later. So, from the very beginning, and contrary to most of the assertions made from these benches, we realised that if schemes were to be successful, then the boards must have adequate powers. Some of the powers the boards will never be called upon to use.

But we also understood and appreciated that the consumers must be adequately safeguarded. It may very well be that the 1931 Act did not provide all the safeguards that some people thought should be provided, but at least it provided for a Consumers' Council of seven persons, one of whom must be appointed after consultation with the Co-operative movement, for the purpose of watching the development of marketing schemes, and reporting to the appropriate Minister any action that appeared to them to be inimical to the consumers' interests. The Minister was able to submit any such complaints to a committee of

investigation, and several cases were submitted to a committee of investigation. A public inquiry was held, all the facts were brought out and on the result of the inquiry the Minister could act.

Under the 1949 Act, quite contrary to all that one would have gathered from the speeches made from these benches, we not only have a consumers' council which can make representations to the appropriate Minister, but any person in the land can complain to the Minister, and if he is satisfied that a *prima facie* case is made out that the consumers' interests are being adversely affected, he can then submit a complaint from the individual to a committee of investigation on similar lines as the consumers' council.

Moreover, the Minister can appoint not less than two, or not more than one-fifth, of the members of any Board. . . . [By] Section 4 of the Act, where, as is well known by anyone who knows anything at all about the subject, if there is any price determination by a marketing board which the Minister feels is inimical to the interests of the consumers, he has the power to say "stop," and the marketing board cannot go on from that point until, if they so wish, the matter has been submitted to a committee of investigation. . .

Wool (Prices and Marketing)

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas Williams): I beg to move,

"That the Agriculture Act (Extension of First Schedule) (Wool) Order, 1950, dated 10th July, 1950, a copy of which was laid before this House on 11th July, be approved."

. . . His Majesty's Government have made it a condition, precedent to the adding of wool to the list of commodities for which prices are guaranteed, that producers should devise some suitable co-operative organisation of their own for the efficient marketing of wool and for the administration of the guarantee. The United Kingdom Wool Marketing Scheme was framed on that understanding, and, in addition, it has been agreed with the Farmers' Unions in the United Kingdom, who are sponsoring the scheme, that the following financial arrangements relating to the wool clip shall apply: At the annual February review the guaranteed average price for fleece wool for the year starting 1st May following will be negotiated; The Government will guarantee this average price per lb. for all wool clipped in that year plus an allowance per lb. for marketing costs.

This allowance for marketing will be based initially on the actual costs incurred by the Ministry of Agriculture in the marketing of the United Kingdom wool clip and, for the first five years, will be at the rate of 3¼d. per lb.

The Marketing Board will draw up each year a schedule of maximum prices for each type of wool which will be so calculated as to produce in the aggregate result the average price, exclusive of marketing costs, guaranteed by the Government. If the Board's calculations are inaccurate, it will be at their risk and will not affect the Government's guarantee. The Marketing Board will maintain complete records of all transactions, including sales, and will make these available at all times to the Agricultural Departments. . . .

The Joint Under-Secretary of State for Scotland (Mr. Thomas Fraser): . . . This seems to have been the co-operators night out. On the earlier Order the co-operators on this side were criticising the provisions of another marketing scheme, and during the last half hour Members opposite have been criticising this scheme on much the same grounds. The hon. Member for Thirsk and Malton (Mr. Turton)

claimed that the scheme would not be satisfactory unless the producers had freedom of choice. The hon. Member said that there were too many merchants, and that we wanted efficiency in marketing and distribution. He wanted to build up this colossus. That sounds rather strange coming from the other side. We are always being accused of wanting to eliminate the activities of the small units. . . .

On this question of choice of merchant, it does seem to me to be clear that if the Wool Marketing Board is to do the job for which Parliament is asking to appoint it, it will of necessity require to control the agencies through which the wool shall be marketed. It is up to them to get the most efficient method of marketing the wool. Some considerations have been advanced during the discussion tonight which would weigh in determining through which agency the wool will be marketed.

One must have regard to transport considerations; to the ability of the merchant to handle the quantity of wool he may be asked to take, to storage accommodation, and to the merchant's ability to grade the wool, and so on. . . . I think it was the hon. Member for West Perth who asked me what would happen if a regional committee decided to give complete freedom of choice. As I understand it, the position then would be that the request would go to the Board, and the Board would have to modify the scheme to give this complete freedom of choice. That would mean that the Board would have to go to the Minister. So it is for the committee to make up its mind in the first place.

Mr. Macdonald (Roxburgh and Selkirk): Would it not give far greater protection to the producers to have complete freedom of choice?

Mr. Fraser: I do not think it fair for the hon. Member to come into the Chamber at 1-30 a.m. without having heard the earlier part of the Debate, and then ask that question. I have said quite clearly that the Board must have control and that there cannot be complete freedom of choice of merchant. Otherwise, the scheme would not work. . . .

House of Commons: July 24, 1950.

Food Supplies (Sugar)

Sir Ian Fraser asked the Minister of Food whether he will now announce a date for the end of sugar rationing.

The Minister of Food (Mr. Maurice Webb): No, Sir.

Sir I. Fraser: But is it not time that the right hon. Gentleman did?

Eggs

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter asked the Minister of Food what is the average period elapsing between the laying of an egg and the retail sale of that egg.

Mr. Webb: A fair average time would be about 2½ weeks.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Does the right hon. Gentleman recall that, before the war, there were a large number of eggs sold as newly laid, which meant less than seven days old, and is he not aware that the figure he has given to the House indicates that there has been an increase of time between the hen and the consumer, with generally disastrous effects on the egg?

Mr. Webb: I recall some of these eggs; the smell lingers in my nostrils even now. The point is that, short of having

an inspector to watch every hen, I cannot guarantee that every egg we sell, is, in fact, newly laid. The point we have to concern ourselves with is collection, and, as has already been said, the average time taken between the point of collection and sale is between seven and nine days.

Mr. Baldwin: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the fault does not lie with the hen and that it is not necessary to have an inspector to watch every hen? The fault is in the time taken between the packing station and the consumer, and not between the hen and the packing station.

Sir William Darling: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider licensing the primary producers in cases where they give an undertaking to supply the consumer direct?

Mr. Webb: If hon. Members on the other side want to go back on the marketing schemes, for the introduction of which they claim credit, that is another matter altogether.

Mr. Nabarro: Can the Minister say how he reconciles the period of between seven and nine days with the fact that eggs in increasing number are going to grocers in a rotten, green and magotty condition?

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: Has the right hon. Gentleman considered dealing with the matter by increasing the frequency of collection? Is he not aware that a very considerable part of the egg's life is spent before collection?

Mr. Webb: I think that is getting the thing down to sensible proportions. Bad eggs are no new phenomenon at all; they have always been part of our civilisation. If we could have some practical proposal to meet the requirements of the marketing scheme, with which hon. Members opposite would agree, and which would improve collection, I should be glad to consider it and do my best to carry it out.

Egg Substitute

Mr. Braine asked the Minister of Food from what countries animal blood plasma used as substitute for eggs is imported; what tests are made to ensure its fitness for human consumption; and whether he is satisfied that the slaughtering of animals for this purpose is carried out under proper supervision.

Mr. Webb: Imports so far have come from Denmark only, but small quantities are also expected from Holland later in the year. A veterinary certificate that the product is derived from healthy animals and that slaughtering was carried out under proper supervision, must accompany all consignments, and this stipulation is most stringently applied.

Windward Islands (Constitutional Reform)

Mr. J. Hynd asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement about constitutional reform in the Windward Islands.

Mr. J. Griffiths: I have agreed to a number of reforms which it is intended to introduce into the constitution of the four Windward Island Colonies. The Reforms include universal adult suffrage; the abolition of property and income qualifications for candidates for election to the Legislative Councils; changes in the composition of the Legislative Councils so as to give a majority of elected members; and a change in the composition of the Executive Council of each Colony whereby a minority of elected members will be elected to the Executive Council by the whole Legislative Council in each Colony.

"Boycott Election" Proposal

Top of the column in *The Scotsman* for August 14, under a double-column headline, "Boycott Next Election Proposal," the following appeared signed "T.G.S., Inverness-shire.":—

"Mr. Ivor Brown suggests in a recent article in your columns that Covenanters should be asked to vote against all Government candidates, whichever side is in office, although, as he remarks, this would put a great strain on those with strong party ties. If the people of Scotland are not allowed to express their opinion on this question of Home Rule by a plebiscite or similar means, would it not be more practicable, in place of Mr. Brown's suggestion, to call on all Covenanters to abstain from voting or taking any part in the next General Election? In short: boycott the election: let it fizzle out, in Scotland, like a damp squib.

"Not much has been asked of Covenanters, so far. Here is something which all could do. We should, no doubt, be called 'traitors to democracy' and so forth, but it does not seem that democracy is worth much to Scotland anyway. It would be poetic justice if, not being allowed to give an opinion on this one question, we should refuse to do so on such others as may be put to us at a General Election. Incidentally, the drop in the number of persons voting, in Scotland, would provide an indication, on the conservative side, of what the result of a plebiscite would have been. The Government would thus have, willy nilly, given us, in some degree, the plebiscite it had previously denied to us.

"It would be interesting to know what others think of this truly infamous proposal!"

The Octo-Puss in Short

No more will our colourful crusaders of the pen be able to make our flesh creep and our scalps bristle with talk of octopus (octopi, octopuses—this last feline improvement so many added dreads in the plural). Dr. Rees (of the British Museum) has been writing to *The Times* to white-wash the squiddy brother of Frankenstein, Gorgon and other monsters, saying the eight-armed inspirer of awe and repugnance is a harmless fellow, libelled by Denys de Montfort and Victor Hugo, "the former an unscrupulous rascal." No more with the giant *poulpe* draw down into the purple deep our English men-of-war!

"At the other extreme we have writers on the harmless octopus whose theme is: 'Take it by the scruff of the neck and carry it ashore.' This is much nearer the truth. Very small specimens can be treated in this fashion, but it is not quite so easy to deal with large ones, which may weigh up to 50lb., and have an arm span of 7ft. There are occasional reports of divers having encounters with these large specimens in the Mediterranean, and it is probable in these instances that the octopuses are only defending their lairs from intruders."

A British Protest

The Honorary Secretary of the Royal Anthropological Institute, Mr. William Fagg, writes to *The Times* of August 15:—

"May I, on behalf of the Royal Anthropological Institute, refer to the important 'Statement by Experts on Race Problems,' published by Unesco and summarized in your issue of July 18? Inquiries made by this institute since then among

leading British physical anthropologists show that, while there is general agreement with its main thesis—that there is no scientific justification for racial discrimination—many or most anthropologists consider controversial a number of incidental statements made in the document. It is felt that the inclusion of views based on insufficient evidence in a document of this kind does less than justice to the great cause itself and to the unanimity with which all reputable anthropologists could agree upon the essential points which need to be reiterated if science is to make its proper contribution to the abatement of racialism."

Under a "display" headline, containing the description, "Conclusions of Eminent Scientists" in the third and fourth lines, *The Scotsman* for July 18 gave "the eminent scientists" names as follows:—Professor Ernest Beaglehole (New Zealand), Professor Juan Comas (Mexico), Professor Costa Pinto (Brazil), Professor Franklin Frazier (United States), Professor Morris Ginsberg (Britain), Dr. Humayun Kadir (India), Professor Levi-Strauss (France), Professor Ashley Montagu (United States); and (revisers), Professors Hadley Cantril, E. G. Conklin, Gunnar Dahlberg, Theodosius Dobzhansky, L. C. Dunn, Donald Hager, Julian Huxley, Otto Klineberg, Wilbert Moore, H. J. Muller, Gunnar Myrdal and Joseph Needham.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage.....	7/-
Introduction to Social Credit	
by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Human Ecology by Thomas Robertson	21/-
Odlum v. Stratton	
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans	
by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.