

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 27 No. 16.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 14d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1951

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

It was whispered in our ear, when we suggested that we were moving towards the supercession of Parliament, that "and that might not be a bad thing, either!" The whisperer was one of the middle hierarchy of the "Conservative" Party.

• • •
"Rule From Below. . . . This is a very unwholesome state of affairs." (*The Tablet*, December 8.)

• • •
"The constitutional scales of these days will shortly break down, for we have established them with a certain lack of accurate balance in order that they may oscillate incessantly until they wear through the pivot on which they turn. The *goyim* are under the impression that they have welded them sufficiently strong and they have all along kept on expecting that the scales would come into equilibrium. . . . We have made a gulf between the far-seeing Sovereign Power and the blind force of the people so that both have lost all meaning, for like the blind man and his stick, both are powerless apart."

"Liberalism produced Constitutional States, which took the place of what was the only safeguard of the *goyim*, namely Despotism; and a constitution, as you well know, is nothing else but a school of discords,"

" . . . we shall obtain the power of destroying little by little, step by step, all that at the outset when we enter on our rights, we are compelled to introduce into the constitutions of States to prepare for the transition to an imperceptible abolition of every kind of constitution, and then the time is come to turn every form of government into our despotism." (*The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.)

• • •
"We have had our electioneering. Now we are trying to get together because we are one country and face anxious times." (Mr. Winston Churchill to the boys of Harrow School, December 7.)

"The conclusion of the debate, with MR. CHURCHILL'S spontaneous tribute to the most statesmanlike speech by MR. SHINWELL, must have made many of those present reflect on the unreality of much of the party skirmishing during the past month." *The Times*, December 8.

• • •
"There are deeper similarities between the American and Russian economic systems and methods—all means, not ends—than either people would care to confess." (*The Times Literary Supplement*, December 7.)

• • •
"The peoples of Asia. . . . All these countries need

written Constitutions; and several strong classes, each acting as a counterpoise to the other. Only so could there begin to be some of that basic sense of security which the Americans can take for granted. But it is the strongest trend of the times to destroy all written legal safeguards, and the mentality that understands and supports them." (*The Tablet*, December 8.)

• • •
The discussion goes step by step with the pressure:—
"As everyone knows, the British Prime Minister will arrive here—silver tongue and all—after the first of the year. No one is under any illusions about what he is after. . . . Senator Johnson and his colleagues can effectively 'stop Churchill' by simply saying, 'We do not need English atomic bases.'" (*Frank C. Hanighen in Human Events*, Washington D.C.)

• • •
"In the footsteps of the recent Lever Debenture stock issue," the offer of £5 million 4½% Mortgage Debentures of the Manchester Ship Canal Company attracted so little 'money' that "market expectations are that underwriters will be asked to take up over 75 per cent. of the issue." (*Liverpool Daily Post*.)

Mason's Reply

As reported last week, Dr. H. S. Box communicated to the Press an open letter of protest, which he had sent to the Earl of Scarbrough, Grand Master, United Lodge of Masons in England. Dr. Box complained that the Dean of Battle, the Very Rev. A. T. A. Naylor, "intervened" in a proctorial election by attacking him in a circular letter to the electors of the diocese of Chichester.

The Earl of Scarbrough has given the *Church Times* permission to reprint his reply to Dr. Box:—

Dear Sir,—I write to acknowledge your letter of November 26, addressed to me. Your letter is, however, concerned with the proctorial election for the diocese of Chichester, and that is not a matter on which I have a right or desire to express an opinion.

With regard to the letter which you enclosed, I can only take cognizance of complaints referred to me by a Freemason.

Yours truly,

SCARBROUGH.

Sandbeck Park, Rotherham.

"Bursting"

"Huge Stocks of Scotch in New York's bursting warehouses—a million gallons more than last year. Reasons: Britain's dollar drive, brisk Canadian competition, and the effort to 'beat' the November 1 tax rise—which was spoiled by the dock strike." *The Daily Express*.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, November 19, 1951.

Foreign Affairs

(Continued.)

Mr. Christopher Hollis (Devizes): . . . I think it is most important that we should approach the problem of supra-national authorities from no doctrinaire point of view. I have myself very little use for the person who thinks it necessary to approve of every suggested supra-national authority simply because it is such, or for the person who thinks it necessary to disapprove of every supra-national authority simply because it is such. Each must be considered on its own merits. Also, we must keep our minds open to the changing merits.

Suppose, for instance, that the experiment of a European army meets with success and, as a result, we get a European budget, and that it should be found necessary and possible that there should be something in the nature of a European Government to make the budget, then, obviously, all sorts of things would have to be done on a European scale that it would be impracticable to do on a European scale at present. It is important that these questions should be debated in general, and I think that it is particularly important that they should be debated at the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, because that Council of Europe has, of course, the advantage or disadvantage, as the case may be, by contrast with every other European body, that the people go there who are not representatives of Government, and, indeed, not representatives of majority parties. That very fact may perhaps cause hon. Members opposite to look at it now with greater favour than they did in the past.

As hon. Members know, the greatest example of a supra-national authority up to the present is the example of the Schuman Plan, and there was a very useful debate on the Schuman Plan at the Council of Europe last May. It was interesting from many points of view, and particularly in revealing the wide divergences of opinion on that plan between people of the Socialist faith. British Socialists attacked the plan on the ground that it set up a supra-national authority at all. French Socialists approved the plan. German Socialists attacked it on the ground that the supra-national authority was not strong enough. M. Reynaud, the French statesman, very fairly commented that the only example of successful nationalisation in post-war Europe was the nationalisation of Socialism.

Anyway, we have moved on from that, and the case has been put that, now that the Schuman Plan has been adopted, it should be considered whether there are other things fitted for similar supra-national authorities, for which supra-national authorities should be set up. A scheme for a supra-national authority for transport has been drawn up, and that scheme has, apparently, not met with very great favour, and is unlikely to be adopted, at any rate, in anything like the form that it at present holds. A suggestion also has been made, very largely by our French friends, to set up a supra-national authority in agriculture. M. Pflimlin, until recently French Minister of Agriculture, has circulated all European Governments to see what they think of it as Governments, and M. Charpentier has presented it at Strasbourg to see if the people there will accept it.

The supra-national authority planned for agriculture is, roughly, that a supra-national authority should be set up which would regulate the production and prices of agricultural commodities, and it is hoped to establish eventually what is called a single market for all Western Europe. It is on that plan that I should like to make just a few observations.

There seem to me to be three things that we ought usefully bear in mind. The first point I would make is that it does not seem to me useful to argue on the mere analogy of the Schuman Plan, whatever the virtues or vices of the Schuman Plan. Iron and potatoes are very different things. What is good enough for iron is not necessarily good enough for potatoes. In particular, the iron industry, as we know has been concentrated, by the nature of things, into the hands of a comparatively few producers who have traditionally all sorts of international relations with one another. The machinery that may be adapted for running that industry would not necessarily be well adapted to imposing itself as the authority for the agricultural industry, in which the work is in the hands of many hundreds of thousands of peasants scattered throughout all Europe.

The difficulty about all these supra-national authorities, of course, is that, rightly or wrongly, there is no supra-national government. If and when there is, the problem will be very different indeed. At present there is not. A supra-national authority issues its decrees, but it will fall to the national Governments to enforce those decrees, and it does not seem reasonable to expect that they will have more success in enforcing the decrees of a supra-national authority than they have in enforcing their own decrees, and, to put it mildly, some of them have not had complete success in planning their own national agriculture. That is the first point.

The second point to bear in mind is what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Stirling said in a slightly different context. It seems fantastic in the modern world to talk as though the normal problem in agriculture is how to get rid of a surplus, in this world of growing population, and eroding soil. The surplus is obviously an abnormal problem. The normal problem is to produce sufficient food to feed this very rapidly growing population.

The third point which we ought to bear in mind is this, and it is a point which is relevant to all considerations about European unity. No one is a stronger supporter of European unity than I am, in the sense that I want to emphasise in every way the great cultural unity which binds together the nations of Western Europe. When, however, we look at this matter from the economic point of view, Europe, in many ways, is not an economic unit at all. The countries of Europe produce much too nearly the same sort of thing. In nothing is that more true than in agriculture.

The great problem is that all the countries of Europe are in deficit at present to the U.S.A. Supposing we broke down every barrier between them it would not follow that they would not all be in deficit together. As the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire, East (Mr. Boothby) once said, "If you have a lot of deficits, you do not get rid of them by adding them together." Europe and the Commonwealth, associated together, will, I think, be something in the nature of an economic unit, which may well get free from dependence on the U.S.A., but Europe alone, whether one or twenty countries, is not, in the nature of things, an economic unit. If we built up a single European market with one single

tariff barrier around the whole European Continent, although we did it in the name of the liberalisation of trade, we should, I think, interfere with a great deal more trade than we would liberalise.

One of the most useful discussions which took place at the recent meeting of the Council of Europe was whether we could, in some way, associate, in the first instance as observers, the countries of the Commonwealth with the deliberations of the Council of Europe. I hope that these discussions may prove fruitful. Nothing would be more likely to make them prove unfruitful than to give, for instance, the Australians the impression that they would at once come under the control of some European authority which would regulate say the number of sheep which they were able to shear. Therefore, we must consider very carefully before we associate ourselves with any scheme such as that which will have to be considered by the Council of Europe next week. . . .

Mr. Desmond Donnelly (Pembroke): The hon. Member for Devizes (*Mr. Hollis*) has made a closely reasoned argument for the extension of the federal principle in Europe to co-operate with the Commonwealth as a whole.

Mr. Hollis: I did not say a word about federalisation.

Mr. Donnelly: I apologise to the hon. Gentleman if I have misrepresented him.

Major H. Legge-Bourke (Isle of Ely): . . . I believe that all Foreign Secretaries should face up to the fact that they must have some long-term objective, and it is my belief that the objective of any Foreign Secretary of this country must always be the greatest possible measure of national sovereignty consistent with the necessary alliances and friendships of the time. That, I believe, is the greatest task facing my right hon. Friend at the present moment. I do not believe that over the last six years the people of this country have really known, still less had confidence in, what was the foreign policy of His Majesty's Government. I think it is a fair criticism to make that such a policy did not exist.

It is not a foreign policy merely to say that we believe in the United Nations. The United Nations is not a policy, nor is it an objective of policy. Were it a reality, it might possibly be a method of conducting a policy, as the right hon. and learned Member for Montgomery (*Mr. C. Davies*) said today. I think that is the purpose of the United Nations, as I understand it, but there is a great deal of confusion of thought as to what is its purpose today.

The same day as my right hon. Friend made his speech in Paris, *Mr. Lester Pearson*, the Canadian Minister for External Affairs, is reported as having said that he feared for the fate of the United Nations unless steps were taken to reduce the threat of war. As I have always understood it the purpose of the United Nations was to prevent the threat of war, and yet here we have a leading statesman of the Commonwealth saying that the instrument has become more important than that which it was intended to prevent. Neither is peace a sufficient objective of foreign policy. There are many forms of peace and our conception is utterly different from that of the Polit-buro, just as it was different from that of Hitler. British peace must be founded on justice and on the true liberty of the subject, which embraces peace and liberty of mind, if it is to be lasting. None of these things apply to the Russian peace as it exists today. . . .

. . . We all know the United Nations organisation is very far from working as well as it ought to work. It is

essential that we work with the United States and the fact that the United States places great importance on the idea of the United Nations makes it imperative that we work alongside her. I believe that when the Foreign Secretary goes to the United Nations he has to make his first consideration always the protection of British interests.

It is because I believe that that is his main duty there that I would suggest two things to him: first that the proceedings of the Security Council and of the Assembly should be held in private and not in the full glare of publicity. . . .

Secondly, I hope that the Foreign Secretary will not allow himself or anyone else to believe that the Soviet Union will ever see reason unless those who think along our lines go along with us to parley with the Soviet Union after having first agreed among themselves what line they are to take. Some hon. Member in the course of the Debate—I think it was the right hon. Member for East Stirling (*Mr. Woodburn*)—said he did not wish to see the United Nations become simply a ganging-up of the anti-Communist countries. My feeling is that both my right hon. Friend and the former Foreign Secretary have shown us quite clearly that there is this vast gulf between the East and the West and that if we pretend either at the United Nations or anywhere else that it does not exist we are deceiving ourselves and those who send us there.

Therefore, I hope we shall face the fact that the world, alas, is divided, and it would be just as stupid to pretend that it was not as to suppose that the two sides in this House were agreed upon the future of the iron and steel industry. I believe the Soviet Union takes it as a sign of weakness for us to go to discussions as though we believed that the Soviet Union would remain a member a minute longer than it served its purpose to do so, and I hope the Foreign Secretary will not imagine that the Soviet Union serves any purpose other than her own in remaining a member of the United Nations.

Our hope and that of the world depends upon the British Commonwealth and Empire making itself as strong in its own right and in its own might as possible. My right hon. Friend will achieve very little unless he and the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations work side by side at every stage. I believe one has been a rifleman and the other a grenadier. I do not mind to which tune they march or to what tempo, whether they go to the "The old '95" or "The Grenadiers

(Continued on page 7).

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937
is again on sale.

12/- net.

"The standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit"—*The Social Crediter*.

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

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. 27. No. 16.

Saturday, December 15, 1951.

Heresy and the Eastern Churches

According to Vladimir Solovyev, in "Russia and the Universal Church," all the early heresies were supported by Byzantine Emperors because they were, all of them, variations on a single theme, an attempt to maintain within Christendom the absolutism of the previous pagan state.

"The fundamental truth and distinctive idea of Christianity is the perfect union of the divine and human individually achieved in Christ and finding its social realisation in Christian humanity. . . ." Heresy attacked this perfect unity "precisely in order to undermine the living bond between Church and State, and to confer upon the latter an absolute independence."

Arianism was supported by the Emperor Valeas. Shortly, its doctrine was that Christ is not consubstantial with the Father. Nature and man remain apart from Divinity. The human state may therefore rightly keep its independence. Nestorianism was much the same. The distinction of natures was extended to a distinction of persons. The humanity of Christ constituted a person complete in Himself, only related with God. Therefore the state is similarly separate from religion. Religion retired to the monasteries, and the forum reverted to paganism.

Monophysitism taught that the humanity in Jesus Christ became absorbed in the divinity. This appears to be the opposite to the former but arrives at the same conclusion. The Incarnation is a past event and nature and man are excluded from the Divine. "Christ has borne away to heaven all that was his and has abandoned the earth to Caesar." Both Nestorianism and Monophysitism were supported by Theodosius II.

Monothelitism denied the human will in the God-Man. This amounted to a denial of human freedom, advocating passiveness. The General Council concerned pronounced that the two wills were harmonised in Jesus Christ. Iconoclasm is a form of denial that the divinity can be sensibly expressed or externally manifest. Its advocate was Leo the Isaurian.

The bodily nature being suppressed, an over-emphasised asceticism followed as a result. John the Faster foreshadowed Mr. Gandhi.

Although the heresies noted here were abjured by the Eastern Church they had entered into the life of the Empire, inculcating a philosophy the policies of which could only lead to the disintegration which eventually brought about its downfall. The church had capitulated to Caesar. Its subsequent history is complicated, but as far as the Russian Branch is concerned it is noteworthy that a Government document issued in 1885 stated that its authority had been resigned to the Czar. That act was no doubt an important

factor in the events that were so soon to follow.

H.W.

"On the Brink"

"Those who have come back to Britain from the recent series of negotiations at Paris, Strásbourg, and Rome are appalled at the utter lack of awareness in this country of the tremendous historical drama that is being enacted in these months in Western Europe.

"Five facts must be clearly understood, unless we are to miss the point of what is happening.

"First, Western Europe is on the brink of Federation. 'European Army' and 'European Defence Community' are mild and misleading euphemisms for this gigantic fact. The plain truth is that States which have one army can no longer have several foreign policies; nor can they, at a time when defence costs so much, have several fiscal policies. The States that are to pool their armies—France, Western Germany, Italy, and the Low Countries—will by that very act decide to scrap more than a thousand years of separate history and become one State again, as they were under Charlemagne.

"It is a tremendous and awe-inspiring decision to take. But the Governments of M. Pleven, Dr. Adénauer, and Signor de Gasperi now stand or fall on their decision to create that common army, with all its implications. They have passed the point of no return.

"Secondly, although on the brink of achievement, Federation may yet miscarry. With the Governments committed, the decision is now passing to the Parliaments and people and finding them unprepared. It has come as a shock to people to find what seemed so long a distant ideal turned into an immediate matter for decision here and now, and to find that 'pooling sovereignty' means letting 'foreigners' govern them and decide their taxes and their conditions of service. . . .

"Thirdly, the choice in Western Europe is therefore not between Federation and co-operation as at present, but between Federation and a return to extreme nationalism. . . .

"Fourthly, British policy is at present helping the enemies and hindering the friends of European Federation, and if Federation fails, Britain will be left without a friend on the Continent. . . .

"Fifthly, if the failure of Europe to unite is attributable to Britain, it would also earn us American censure and estrangement. . . ." *The Observer*, December 9.

"Lebensbejahung"?

To The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,

In the beautiful Edington Lecture which we heard last evening we were told by the learned speaker that the Cosmical number is a pure number.

May we "take it" then, that only purity is meant or will "work," and this for a guidance in no pious sense, for our lives?

Thus unadulterated food, a pure blood stream is "indicated," to say nothing of a just price.

Yours truly,
 Geraldine Starky.

Torrington, Devon, December 5.

Huxley versus Lanarck*

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

(Conclusion)

The revival of the flagging interest in evolution in recent years has been very largely the work of the 'Mendelist-Morganist' school of geneticists of which Dr. Huxley is a protagonist. There is no scientific reason why the study of genetics need be developed in relation to the theory of evolution, and used to prove that a satisfactory mechanism of evolution exists; the necessity is psychological; the process is assumed to occur and therefore a mechanism must be found for it. The use of the word 'evolution' with two meanings helps to cover this up. In recent years a good deal of light has been thrown on the ways in which new forms of life may arise and perpetuate themselves in nature, and the mere process of gradual change so brought about is commonly referred to as 'evolution' by scientists who hope to avoid being drawn into the philosophical arguments which raged so furiously in the past on the subject. In this sense, of course, 'evolution' is merely a word describing a fact; but this is not the 'great sweep of evolution,' the 'major unifying concept' which is the basis of evolutionary humanism, and which Dr. Huxley wants to see made the basis of biological education, and which would 'consolidate the scientific position' of the west as against the Michurinism of the east.

The general effect of the selection-pressure of the changing physical world on variations in the mechanism of heredity provides a scientific explanation of that broad trend in the living world which parallels the increasing entropy of the physical world; the general mixing up and sorting out and selective elimination and extinction of genes, and of the kinds or organisms bearing them. It provides no explanation whatever of the alleged grand advance from the first animated molecule to man, continued in the progress of human society, which is the big idea providing the enthusiasm and driving force behind the philosophy of scientific humanism shared by both Huxley and Lysenko.

When Dr. Huxley writes (p.206):

"Life is a process, the process that is technically styled organic evolution. The course of the process follows certain rules and laws, and it is operated by certain mechanisms (notably Natural Selection working by way of neo-Mendelian inheritance). Thus the over-all aim of biology is to understand the process of evolution."

he is expressing a fervid conviction very natural in a Huxley, but in support of which the scientific evidence is on the whole and always has been, negative.

A statement of this sort in a popular book slurs over the fact that science has been abandoned here for philosophy, ignores the philosophical arguments which have been going on for half a century until they have reached an impasse, and merely advances the philosophically unconvincing views of the writer under the cloak of science. What is so dangerous is the attempt to erect this particular philosophy of evolutionary humanism into a scientific orthodoxy by identifying it with 'science.' To agree with it is called 'scientific,' to disagree with it 'un-scientific.' To produce evidence in its favour which later turns out to be in error is still 'scientific,' to adduce

evidence against it the factual nature of which is never challenged is still 'unscientific.' It is still 'scientific' to believe that the mechanism of heredity accounts for 'progressive' evolution, and to seek ever more complex proofs of it, although the great bulk of the facts point in the opposite direction; it is still 'scientific' to believe in the spontaneous generation of living from non-living matter, provided the date and the scale of the thing are pushed back beyond the possibility of the disproof which has always attended thorough investigation of this supposition; these things are 'scientific' only because they are logically necessary to the Huxleyite philosophy, which, being fundamentally too weak to fight under its own colours, depends now for its survival on the sanctions of the State and the Super-State in the indoctrination of the young, and of the 'lay' public.

Fratricidal strife is usually the most bitter, and the violence of the acrimony which has developed between the upholders of Soviet and western 'genetics' need not obscure the fact that the bifurcation is a very recent one, and seems to be a minor bi-product of the sharpening of the struggle for power between the eastern and western socialists. A few years ago they all graded imperceptibly into each other and were very matey together in their general opposition to superstition (meaning religion) reaction (meaning opposition) and so on. The Soviet was the Great Progressive Example of Scientific Government, and anybody who doubted it was a reactionary. Certain people, notably Professor Haldane, must have been subjected to a very painful form of the mental 'splits' through being situated at the exact point of the developing dichotomy. Altogether the division is very much less radical than anyone might suppose who reads the diatribes on one side or the other. It is merely that the Soviet Government has taken that logical last step which is possible only to totalitarian regimes. Mendelism never did provide much justification for the progressivist philosophy which is the basis of socialism, either in the biological or the social-logical field, but the facts it deals with are rather complex, and their significance can very easily be inverted under cover of a cloud of occult statistical symbolism. Nevertheless, the very idea of relatively determined hereditary differences, apparently harmless at the non-human level, is liable to come into conflict with the revolutionary doctrine of the fraternity and equality of Man and the Unity of Mankind which lies at the basis of humanism. The attitude of even the most orthodox 'Mendelist-Morganists' towards racial or hereditary differences among men reveals that many of them have already begun to move towards the Lysenkoist attitude in their stress on the importance of environment rather than heredity in human affairs. The fact that the Nazi reaction went to the opposite extreme is supporting evidence.

But to maintain (implicitly, never, of course, explicitly) one position for man, and another for the rest of the animals is an unstable position for those who believe that Man is merely an 'advanced' animal. The only stable and logical position is to extend the fraternity, equality and educability of Man to cover the rest of life; and if Mendelism gets in the way, Mendelism must go. Anyway Mendel was a monk, and therefore a reactionary, and the preliminary 'debunking' of his work, by the assertion that his results were 'cooked' even if his conclusions were a lucky guess, has already started among 'western' geneticists.

It seems very unlikely that western geneticists will be able successfully to defend the integrity of their science unless

*This title, which is not the author's choice, is retained to avoid confusion. (Editor.)

they abandon the philosophy which when all opposition to it is removed, has shown itself incompatible with that integrity. The following extract from a statement by the Praesidium of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, quoted by Dr. Huxley (p.39) shows the end-point towards which, despite his protesting kicks and struggles, the 'trend' of scientific humanism is inexorably carrying him:

"Michurin's materialist direction in biology is the only acceptable form of science, because it is based . . . on the revolutionary principle of changing Nature for the benefit of the people. Weissmannite-Morganist idealist teaching is pseudo-scientific, because it is founded on the notion of the divine origin of the world and assumes eternal and unalterable scientific laws. The struggle between the two ideas has taken the form of the ideological class-struggle between socialism and capitalism."

To accuse the western geneticists, such as Messrs Morgan, Muller, Haldane, Huxley, Darlington, Harland, Hogben of being believers in divine origin and eternal laws (not to mention capitalism!) is a piece of naughtiness well calculated to make them dance with rage, and outdo each other in proving their innocence, and their superiority to the Michurinists as materialists, Nature-changers, socialists, etc. . . . But in fact, if we disinfect the word 'divine,' and re-invert it so that it means what it always has meant to those who use it legitimately: something concerned with reality, not with unreality, with a reasonable faith, and not with an unreasonable superstition; then we find the modern Mendelists hanging on to the divine origin of things (in other words, reality) by those extremely slender threads called chromosomes, which carry a good deal of the material basis of heredity and which, though mutable, are mutable only according to their nature, and not entirely as human beings may wish. Let us hope that their grip holds, or perhaps one should say that non-disjunction occurs.

Meanwhile, it is difficult not to enjoy the sight of people who have succeeded so considerably in establishing their own philosophy as 'scientific' by throwing 'pejorative adjectives' such as 'unscientific,' 'superstitious' and so on at anyone who disagrees with them, now subjected to a hail of similar adjectives from those who have carried their beliefs just a shade further, and who have got rid of that 'limit feeling' due to 'denial of man's capacity to remake the nature of animals and plants'* which has such a suffocating effect on the really progressive humanist in the later stages of his affliction.

The bewilderment of Dr. Huxley at finding his own evolutionary views stigmatised as 'a veiled form of clericalism' and as a belief in 'the divine origin of the world' and even in a sort of special creation, is obviously genuine, for he cannot maintain his opinions and at the same time admit to himself that adherence to any form of 'nature' or 'reality' not subject to human control ultimately lays itself open to these charges.

But the accusation is perfectly logical. If Man is the ultimate product of the unrolling of the potentialities of the physical world he must be of a consistent nature with the rest, and has power over it by reason of his knowing mind. Knowledge is power; science is knowledge; scientific man is

the boss of mankind and of all lower forms of being. There can be no exceptions to this, for to admit exceptions is to admit the super-natural. The nature of things is the nature of man, or something lower and less than and comprised within the nature of man, something which he has passed on his way up. To admit that things have their own nature which must be observed and yielded to, which is distinct from and not entirely subject to and malleable by the nature of man is to open the door to the admission of powers equal or superior to the power of man, powers which are not on the ladder of evolution, and which are beyond the purview of science. But in practice every admission of a fact is an admission of the limitation of man, and introduces that dreadful 'limit feeling' which is the basis of all humility, worship, and religion, and which is rejected by the cult of scientific humanism. There must be no limits not even the sky.

The result is paradoxical. It has now been forgotten that modern science grew out of Christendom, although it has been diverging from its origin with immense acceleration. But the great difference between classical and modern science, which has made the latter so relatively mighty in works, whether good or bad, was just that humble adherence to facts—to the nature of other things and other creatures than man and his ideas—which arose from a Christian view of the world.

With the progressive abandonment of this attitude and the return to an anthropocentric point of view, appropriately enough under the synonym of 'humanism,' science, as we know it, is on the way out, and magic and superstition and the occult 'sciences' (or rather 'arts', or techniques, or technologies) are on the way in again. There is a great deal in common between the practices of mediaeval witchcraft and those of many modern scientists, but unfortunately the great capital of knowledge bequeathed by the real science of humble faith has armed the modern occultist with a power many times multiplied as compared with that of his predecessor, and the prestige and credit of science has been to a very large extent appropriated by its modern magical counterpart.

For instance, the development of the 'atomic' bomb has been the outstanding example in recent years of the exercise of the occult arts; artificial insemination (a.i.d.) appears to have been also a practice of mediaeval witchcraft (incubi and succubi); the modern attitude to drugs, vitamins, hormones and biochemistry generally surpasses in superstition that which was attached to the use of herbs and simples in the days of the doctrine of signatures. Dr. Huxley appears to disapprove of the fact that the work of the physiologist Lena Stern (artificial resuscitation of electrocuted dogs) is 'out of favour' even in Soviet Russia (see addendum, p.195); and there seems to be no reason of faith or morals for disbelieving the allegation that certain human physiologists are interested in the effecting of an ape-human cross. An Act was passed by the last Parliament to repeal the Witchcraft Act 1735 and to legalise necromancy provided it is genuine and in good faith, while increasing the penalties on the 'fraudulent' medium; that is, if a medium honestly believes that he or she is calling up spirits from the vasty deep and holding converse with them, and can convince others that this is genuinely occurring, then it is legal, but if he or she is merely practising a little conjuring, then it is punishable more heavily than before. But indeed, when that 'limit feeling' is got rid of, there appear to be no limits.

*Y. Zhdanov's letter to Stalin, *Pravda*, Aug. 7, 1948, quoted by Dr. Huxley, Postscript II, p. 233.

PARLIAMENT— (continued from page 3).

March," but so long as they march together that is the important thing.

The problems which confront us are not only political but, as other hon. members, including the hon. Member for Wednesbury, have mentioned, they are also economic. Just as in 1932 we felt that our hopes for our future rested upon the fullest possible co-operation between the countries of the British Empire, so today the same is true. As islanders it is perhaps natural that we should suppose that the disadvantages of losing the protection that the English Channel used to give us in the days before the aeroplane and the controlled projectile can be rectified by an immediate embarkation on to an international ship of State.

I believe that just as the Foreign Secretary recommended a procedure by limited objectives, so we must proceed by limited methods. Before we can hope for a successful performance at the concert of all nations we must first of all allow the Commonwealth orchestra, all members of which have at least rehearsed the same music, to make its contribution, and I hope very much that that contribution will be played double forte.

To go to the United Nations ignoring the fact that the Commonwealth possesses a really common wealth of resources, loyalties and outlook can, I believe, only lead to the impression in other people's minds that we have lost faith in those great ideals for which we used to stand. So far from our having lost our belief in these things, I believe they still remain the great hope for our future generations. The question is not, shall Britain lead again? The question is, when shall Britain lead again? I believe the Commonwealth is ready, and it is up to us in this nation to give the lead.

Flour (Agene Process)

Dr. Stross asked the Minister of Food whether he has noted that every animal of every species, fed with methionine sulphoximine, the active principle of agenised flour, has shown severe toxic symptoms; and whether he will take this further evidence into consideration, and prohibit the agene process for improving flour as a matter of urgent public interest

Major Lloyd George: I am advised that, while pure methionine sulphoximine has caused toxic symptoms in the six animal species to which it has been fed in relatively large amounts, it has not caused such symptoms when ingested at the levels at which it is present in a diet containing normal quantities of agenised flour. Nevertheless, as I stated in my reply to the hon. Member for Huntingdon (Mr. Renton) on 12th November, it has been decided that the agene treatment of flour should be discontinued as soon as a suitable substitute has been agreed on.

Emulsifiers

Dr Stross asked the Minister of Food whether he will

give a list of the chemical emulsifiers used in the baking industry in the replacement of natural fats.

Major Lloyd George: The baking industry is using emulsifiers, usually in association with natural fats, to make the best use of the limited supply of fat available. I am informed that glyceryl monostearate is by far the most widely used emulsifier, and that it is chemically related to and usually prepared from natural fat.

House of Commons: November 21, 1951.

U. S. Air Force: (British Bases)

Mr. Emrys Hughes asked the Prime Minister if he will now take steps to terminate the arrangement by which United States atom bombers are based in this country, in view of the dangers of retaliatory bombing to the people living in the crowded cities of Britain.

The Prime Minister: Certain bases and facilities in the United Kingdom were made available by the late Government to the United States Air Force for the common defence of the United Kingdom and the other countries who are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. This arrangement will continue so long as it is needed in the general interest of world peace and security.

Mr. Hughes: When this arrangement was entered into, was not the right hon. Gentleman highly critical—[HON. MEMBERS: "No."]—because of the dangers it meant to the civil population of this country? Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to sacrifice the civilian population of this country to American strategy?

The Prime Minister: When this arrangement was made we, then on the Opposition side of the House, supported the Government in the matter and we shared with them, having regard to the difference between Government and Opposition, a large measure of responsibility for this extremely important and, I think I characterised it, "formidable" act.

Sugar Supplies and Prices

Mr. Bernard Braine asked the Minister of Food how much sugar was purchased by his Department in 1950 and 1951 from Commonwealth sources and non-Commonwealth sources, respectively.

Major Lloyd George: The quantity of sugar purchased by my Department was as follows:

		1950 tons	1951 tons
Commonwealth sources	1,662,000	1,490,000
Foreign	1,372,000	1,452,000

Mr. Gerald Nabarro: Can my right hon. and gallant Friend give the House an assurance that he is taking from British Guiana, Mauritius and Jamaica every ton of sugar that those Colonies can offer to the Mother Country?

Major Lloyd George: There is an agreement, as my hon. Friend knows, which is now being discussed by which we are taking as much as we possibly can, and the total this year which shows that the Commonwealth figure is down is due to the disastrous trouble in Australia when we lost so much sugar.

Lady Tweedsmuir: Can my right hon. and gallant

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD. 5/-

Friend say whether Jamaica has delivered the full amount of sugar expected?

Major Lloyd George: I cannot answer that without notice, but I think she has.

Lieut.-Colonel Lipton: When are private buyers to be sent out to find the sugar?

Hon. Members: Answer.

Major Lloyd George: The answer to that is, the sooner the better.

Mr. Gordon Walker: Do I understand the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to mean that he wants to bring to as early an end as possible the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement?

Major Lloyd George: I most emphatically deny any such thing.

Hon. Members: What does it mean?

Major Lloyd George: I rather gathered that the hon. and gallant Gentleman's remark was that he was looking for sources of sugar other than what we have today.

Central African Territories: (Federation Scheme)

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Oliver Lyttelton): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement about Central Africa.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are convinced of the urgent need to secure the closer association of the three Central African territories; and they believe that this would best be achieved by federation, which they regard as the only form of closer association likely to meet the requirements of Central Africa.

As the House will be aware, a conference attended by my predecessor and the former Secretary of State for Commonwealth relations, and by representatives of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, was held at Victoria Falls in September to consider the scheme for federation of the three territories put forward by the London conference of officials last March.

His Majesty's Government have studied the statement issued at the conclusion of the Victoria Falls Conference, the text of which is being made available today in a Command Paper (Cmd. 8411) and are in full agreement with it. In their view the recommendations of the London conference of officials achieve the two essential aims of any scheme of closer association; they provide effective and representative machinery, both executive and legislative, for the handling of common Central African problems, and they contain full and adequate safeguards for African interests.

His Majesty's Government would accordingly favour a scheme of federation between the three territories on the general lines recommended in the officials' report. They believe that such a scheme would be in the best interests of the African as well as the other inhabitants of the territories. They recognise that African opinion in the two northern territories has declared itself opposed to the proposals in the officials' report; but they trust that, in the light of the assurances agreed upon at the Victoria Falls Conference, and of the economic and other advantages of closer association, Africans will be prepared to accept them.

The assurances agreed upon at the Victoria Falls Con-

ference are, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, of great importance. It was unanimously agreed that, in any further consideration of proposals for federation, land and land settlement questions, as well as the political advancement of the peoples of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, both in local and territorial government, must remain as at present—subject to the ultimate authority of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom—the responsibility of the territorial Government and Legislature in each territory and not of any federal authority.

It was also unanimously agreed that the Protectorate status of the two northern territories should be accepted and preserved, and that this excluded any consideration now or in the future of the amalgamation of the three Central African territories, unless a majority of the inhabitants of the three territories desired it. His Majesty's Government fully endorse these conclusions, and in any federal scheme would ensure that these rights should be formally embodied in the constitution.

His Majesty's Government take the view that the statement of the Victoria Falls Conference which excludes amalgamation of the three Central African territories without the consent of the majority of the inhabitants, should apply equally to amalgamation of any two of the territories or any part of them.

His Majesty's Government wish, finally, to draw attention to two other conclusions of the Victoria Falls Conference. First, there was general agreement that economic and political partnership between Europeans and Africans is the only policy under which federation could be brought about in the conditions of Central Africa, and that any scheme of closer association would have to give full effect to that principle. Second, the Conference expressed grave concern at the dangers which would flow from any weakening or dilution of the British connection and British traditions and principles in the three territories and agreed that they should be so strengthened as to ensure that they should continue to prevail. His Majesty's Government regard these conclusions as of the utmost importance.

His Majesty's Government are most anxious that there should be no delay in reaching final conclusions on the future relations of the Central African territories. The Victoria Falls Conference agreed that before decisions could be taken by Governments further discussion within each territory and between the four Governments would be required. The Conference therefore adjourned, and expressed the hope that it could reassemble in London about the middle of 1952. His Majesty's Government endorse this hope and propose that the resumed conference should take place about July of next year. They will do all they can to help ensure that the intervening period is used to the best advantage for the necessary discussions in Central Africa.

(To be continued.)

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

Published by the proprietors, K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.