

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 28. No. 13.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. and abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Unilever Limited distributes a quarterly illustrated magazine priced at 2/6 on the cover. What proportion of the recipients pay this or any other price we have no means of knowing. "Progress," which is the name of the publication, describes the sort of suggestion conveyed through the medium of its articles, an increasing proportion of which seem to us to be written by people who do not obviously owe any allegiance to either Unilevers or Big Business (unless the latter is understood as, we hope, Social Crediters understand it). We may mention Mr. Bertrand Russell, Sir Hector Hetherington and Professor Zuckerman. A concern of recent development is the nature and uses of money, an interest introduced in a characteristically useless fashion by Mr. Bertrand Russell six months ago and extended by "J. de Blank" at the close of last year. Entitled "Money—A Measure of Value?", Mr. de Blank's article belonged to the "optimistic" variety of excursions into monetary theory—"It *should* not be beyond the ingenuity . . ." etc. It ended: "Where there is a will there is a way. The way to remedy the crying injustice of the present archaic method must, and can, be found." In other words the sense of realism is distinctly less than that exhibited by the *Punch* cartoon of December 15, 1920, depicting Mr. Chamberlain as a counter-jumper confronted by a matronly Britannia. The subscription, "The Boblet," is followed by the following fragment of conversation:—

Britannia (counting her change): 'What's this?'

Our Mr. Chamberlain: 'That, Madam, is the new shilling.'

It has more alloy than the old, but the same purchasing power.'

Britannia: 'Purchasing weakness, you mean.'

• • •

On June 18 Memorial Gates will be presented to the University of Glasgow to commemorate the fifth centenary of that institution. The gates are inscribed with twenty-eight names, commencing with that of James II, of men and women who have contributed to the fame of the University during the five-hundred years of its existence. We wonder whether some of them would be as flattered as Unilevers ought to be by the article on "Trusts and Foundations in the New Social Order" which the present administrative head of the University has written. It seems to us to go to the root of our present discontents that an alternative *policy* to that which, admittedly, is being worked to the accompaniment of such creaks and groans, is lightly passed over by Unilever's supporters, without exception. "To produce more from less material." To produce more

from poorer material. Industry is "the tree." "The tree" must not be starved or damaged.

"Some," writes Professor Zuckerman, "who are temperamentally [*sic*] opposed to such a view, may make the rejoinder that in fact it is the application of scientific knowledge to the affairs of men that has got the world into the economic mess in which we are now immersed. If it has, there nevertheless does not seem to be any alternative to the view that the further application of science has got to get us out of the mess—even though the solution it may provide of existing difficulties lead to new, and possibly even worse problems."

Would anyone in his senses swallow that?—The whole world is swallowing it.

• • •

We receive divergent reports concerning the 'official' attitude to the advertising of bread and flour as "Agene-free." There may be something in the suggestion that premeditated vagueness is thought by the 'authorities' to be conducive to inaction by the public. On the other hand, we are assured that action in the public interest is about to be taken. The British Housewives' League has addressed the Prime Minister on the subject of the team of four British scientists alleged to have been sent recently to the United States to study the fluoridation of water supplies, which has evoked public resentment at Kilmarnock. It is asserted that the equipment necessary for chlorination, fluoridation and ageneisation is a monopoly.

We notice that Sir Edward Mellanby, formerly Secretary of the Medical Research Council, has become interested (as reviewer of an American book) in 'civilised' food. He admits that "we are playing with a potentially dangerous procedure and it is time the public took an interest in the matter. There is plenty of evidence on the medical side that we are making some serious mistakes in our present living habits, and these must be tracked down."

• • •

The Times on May 14 resumed its reports of the trial of the action, previously mentioned in these columns, against Imperial Chemical Industries Limited, Dr. James Armit, chairman of the company's Wilton works, Mr. Harold Octavius Smith and Dr. Cecil John Cronshaw, personnel directors of the company, for conspiracy. After an absence of two and a half hours, the jury returned a verdict for the defendants, and judgment was accordingly given for them.

The jury added a rider, which was read out by the Judge, as follows:—"We returned a verdict of Not Guilty because we have failed to find evidence that either of the other defendants have joined in Dr. Armit's obvious intent to cause injury to the plaintiff."

PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: April 23, 1952.**

Telephone Facilities

Mr. William Shepherd asked the Under-Secretary of State for Air the amount of the telephone account of his Department in the United Kingdom for the latest available year; and how many local and trunk calls, respectively, were represented by this sum.

Mr. Ward: Since payment in cash is not made to the General Post Office for telephone facilities provided for Government Departments in the United Kingdom, no accounts are rendered, nor are any details available to my Department of the numbers of local or trunk calls made.

Mr. Shepherd: Does not my hon. Friend think that in the interests of economy, an attempt at accounting ought to be made, since it is commonly asserted that the waste of telephone service by the Air Ministry is colossal?

Mr. Ward: It is important to bear in mind that the vast bulk of the expenditure is on the radar chain, the meteorological services, flying control and that sort of thing and a relatively small part on telephones. I understand that the general question of a cash recovery by the Post Office from Government Departments is at present under consideration by the Treasury.

Malaya (Jungle Defoliation)

Mr. T. Driberg asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that chemical spray is being used in Malaya for destroying undergrowth; and what steps he is taking to ensure that food crops are not destroyed at the same time.

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: As the Government of the Federation of Malaya have announced, experiments are taking place with a non-toxic weed-killer to defoliate the jungle, mainly at roadsides. Experiments are also being carried out into the use of this weed-killer to destroy terrorist food crops in jungle clearings. The experiments appear likely to be successful.

Mr. Driberg: In answer to the previous Question, did not the right hon. Gentleman admit that there is also destruction of food crops which, he said, "might fall into terrorists' hands"? Does not that mean food crops generally, in villages near the jungle? If that is so, does it not mean that the method now used to get two-thirds of the people of Malaya on our side is the method of starving villagers, women and children?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: The hon. Member must not read more into my answer than I have given. It appears to the Government and to the High Commissioner in Malaya, in whom we have entire and growing confidence, that a measure of this kind may well help to bring the present intolerable war in Malaya to a speedier end. We believe that these

experiments, which, we hope, will be successful, may play a major part in helping to bring this calamitous war to a conclusion.

Mr. Maurice Edelman: Is not this inadvertent form of vicarious punishment contrary to the principles of natural justice, and is not this technique of direct terrorism both immoral and ineffective?

Mr. Lennox-Boyd: I do not know what the hon. Member means by "inadvertent form." The experiments which it is proposed to conduct, are either to clear areas on the side of the roads, from which many of our own race and fellow citizens in Malaya are being murdered regularly, or to prevent foodstuffs falling into the hands of the bandits who, otherwise, will murder our fellow citizens.

House of Lords: April 30, 1952.

Food Production

Lord Woolton: . . . Feeding-stuffs are really one of our major problems. A ton of bacon, grown on home-produced feeding-stuffs, saves the country £200 in overseas expenditure. Already the Minister of Agriculture has offered financial inducements to plough up old pastures, and I am glad to say that his offer has met with a very gratifying response. We hope that farmers will rely upon better grass management and better conservation and use of our ample output of fine grass to make dairy herds less dependent upon imported coarse grains. The Hannah Dairy Research Institute in Scotland, one of the sections of the Lord President's scientific responsibilities, is running a dairy farm solely on the feeding-stuffs grown on the farm. How important this is can be judged from the fact that only about one-half of the food that our cows at present eat is grass. The rest has either to be grown specially for them in this country or to be bought abroad and imported at a heavy cost in foreign exchange. We go to all this trouble and expense in spite of the fact that we are told that, without losing any milk or beef, the greater part of the other feeding-stuffs that cattle eat could perfectly well be replaced by grass. I hope your Lordships will forgive this trespass into the technicalities of feeding-stuffs, but its relation to our dollar exchange is the reason why I have raised it. I hope that is a sufficient excuse.

Now let me turn to the Annual Review which we have just concluded. I say quite frankly that we have faced up to the problem of trying to give encouragement to the small farmer. Your Lordships are well aware of the extent to which this industry is in the hands of people cultivating small acreages and people of small means. I do not know whether the urban population of this country recognises how small are the resources of so very many of these farmers in the amount of land they are cultivating. No fewer than 90 per cent. of our farms in the United Kingdom are under 150 acres in extent and—a figure that surprised me when I first heard it—67 per cent. are under fifty acres. We have tried to give farmers confidence and particularly, through the fixing of prices, confidence to produce more meat—if your Lordships will forgive me for saying so, both pink meat and red meat, meat from pigs and sheep, as well as meat from cattle. . . .

*The two answers to questions following antedate the extracts printed last week from the Debate on Transport Fare Increases (April 28).

. . . The following figures show the downward trends which have caused us much concern, and which afford every reason for seeking to give confidence to the farmers. The September returns of 1951 show that the number of cattle under one year old had declined during the year from 2,138,000 to 1,938,000. According to the June returns, the tillage acreage fell from 12,825,000 in 1950 to 12,215,000 in 1951. There is general agreement that over four years the food for animals derived from our grass can be increased by 15 per cent., and that at the same time the yields of other crops can be increased by at least 5 per cent. On this basis there is scope for rearing, for instance, between 300,000 and 400,000 more calves annually for beef production, continuing the increase in our sheep population, and at the same time releasing more grassland—another 1,000,000 acres after June next—for tillage. This might well build up an increase in the production of meat by some 250,000 tons (mainly pig meat) by the fourth year, with further increases in beef and mutton to follow. . . .

Viscount Bledisloe: . . . What I want to emphasise most of all, is the supreme importance of the greater self-sufficiency of the British farm. The noble Earl and other noble Lords to-day have referred to the importance of grass. During the last ten years there has been a positive revolution in British farming, owing to the discovery that grass (and under that heading I am inclined to include clover and other leguminous herbage) at, we will say, no more than six to eight inches high, is not only an extremely valuable crop, equivalent, when dried, to the cattle cakes upon which we used to depend for the fattening of our animals and the main supply of concentrated food for our dairy cattle, but, when properly fertilised, with due regard for the balance of fertility, can be made to provide for the needs of our livestock to the extent of 50 per cent. more than was contemplated ten years ago. It is in that direction—if I may venture to suggest it—that I think we can perform the greatest service to the consumers of this country. Make all possible use you can of herbage, particularly ley herbage—which, by the way, does not interfere with the rotation of cereal and other arable crops. Make all the use you can in this country, of herbage, controlled grazing, the drying of grass (if farmers have the necessary capital available for this), silage and, particularly in the matter of self-sufficiency, such crops on arable land as beans, peas, and lucerne.

I wish to say only a few words more. I had hoped that a noble Lord hailing from Worcestershire would make some reference to fruit. It may be suggested that fruit is not an essential food, but certainly it conduces very materially to the health of our population. I am bound to say that, in the West of England at any rate, we have not been fairly treated, in my judgement, in the matter of the production not merely of plums but, very particularly, of dessert apples. That is mainly because the bottom was knocked out of the market last December by large importations of fruit from overseas, and, so far as Worcestershire was concerned, the importation of large quantities of plums from the Continent of Europe. Another adverse factor was the non-availability of containers, made of tinsplate or otherwise, for preserving purposes. An immense amount of valuable fruit was lost to the public during the last twelve months because of these importations, which were so detrimental to our own fruit growers, and because of the lack of containers. I hope that

this matter will be considered by the Government, especially in view of the fact that in certain areas—the Vale of the Severn, in which I live, is one of them—a considerable number of new fruit growers have put the whole of their little capital into what is undoubtedly a very attractive and, seen prospectively, profitable industry, and many of them have already gone out of business. Certainly no further encouragement is given to new and potential fruit growers by reason of this unfortunate policy of deluging our markets with competitive products from overseas.

I ask your Lordships to forgive me for addressing you at such length. It is all very well for Lord Cranworth to speak as though he were advanced in age. Of course, compared to me, he is positively a young man. In case I may not have further opportunities of addressing your Lordships in regard to a subject to which, I think I may say without exaggeration, I have devoted practically the whole of a long life, I am taking this opportunity of doing so now. My Lords, a hundred years ago Britain had no rival in the world in the supremacy of her agriculture. If her successive Governments display courage, vision and a full consciousness of the potentialities of science, and enlightened human enterprise, she will regain that position. God grant that it may not be too late!

House of Lords: May 1, 1952.

Lord Rennell: . . . The fact of the matter is that at the present moment farming in this country presents rather a dismal picture of an industry with declining output, and this at a time when it is vital to have increased production, on account not only of our balance of payments but also of the whole future of our population.

. . . The population of the high-consuming countries is increasing far more rapidly than had been expected. In particular, one of the prognostications which was made ten to fifteen years ago was that by the end of this decade the population of the United States would have achieved a stable level. It has, of course, done nothing of the sort. The reasons why it has not done so are interesting. The explanation is unknown, but instead of a population turnover per century of three generations, the turnover is now four, as a result of the young age of marriage, which averages something under twenty-five.

The second point which arises from that is that the average family in the United States, which was two and was expected to decline below two, is now two and a half. The same increase of population in the high-consuming countries is reflected in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and in practically every country in Europe except this country. The consequence is that those countries, being either wholly or growingly industrialised, are all potentially larger consumers of world food. What has been happening since the war is perfectly clear evidence that that is, in fact, taking place.

May I, with all respect, differ from the noble Viscount, Lord Hudson, on one particular point? The United States to-day is, I believe, a net importer of food and not a net exporter of food. What is even more important, so far as meat is concerned, is that in the last two years the United

(continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free:

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENtral 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: SEFton Park 435.

Vol. 28. No. 13.

Saturday, May 24, 1952.

Sovereignty

Our readers will have noticed that two cases of alleged conspiracy have been before Judges sitting in the Queen's Bench Division and the Chancery Division respectively of the High Court of Justice at the same time: one an action brought by an ex-employee of I.C.I. against several defendants (he failed), and the other an action by the proprietors of the *Dundee Advertiser*, D. C. Thomson & Co., Ltd., against Mr. Arthur Deakin, general secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union, Mr. John Wood and Mr. G. E. Intin, the trade group secretary and regional secretary respectively of the union, and Mr. Richard W. Briginshaw, general secretary of the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants, to restrain them "from doing any further act with a view to causing a breach or breaches" by firms or persons of specific contracts. At the time of our going to press, further motions were under postponement, but, since it is not our intention to comment, but to draw attention only to the nature of the case, we do so. The issue is one of sovereignty. It happens that eight other instances of action of some kind—newspaper articles, speeches, and so on: not actions at the bar of justice but actions at the bar of opinion—have been brought to our notice during the days covered by reports of the High Court cases. These have concerned in one way or another United States policy relatively to what were formerly sovereign states. So we have simultaneously the individual, the group and the national aspects of sovereignty before public notice at the same time. This is not fortuitous. We have asked before: "Is anything fixed or do we stand or fall by a shifting standard, parliamentary, legal, conventional in one form or another? In other words is the only sovereignty that of a majority, a mass, however constituted: a majority as expressed by present day methods?" In whatever form, this is the overriding problem.

Mrs. Blakey and the Ministry

The *Sunday Dispatch* for May 18 published the following from the pen of Mr. Anthony Hunter:—

"Living in a cottage in the remote hamlet of Great Easton, Essex, is a young war-widow who has defied two Governments and three Food Ministers. For over a year she has lived without a ration book. And the Ministry of Food can do nothing about it.

"She intends to continue doing so until the Government grants a request which she has been making to politi-

cal leaders since 1949. The request? Permission to keep, slaughter, and eat her own sheep.

"Mrs. Mary Blakey, the woman who has taken on Whitehall single-handed, comes from farming stock in rural Lancashire. She is 39 with a daughter at boarding-school, and is an active member of the British Housewives' League.

"She believes that man has a 'constitutional right to feed himself' and that the Slaughtering Acts which prevent all but the Government from killing for food are a breach of Common Law.

"So she has thrown away her ration book because, she says, 'if I live without rations I am obviously entitled to find my own.'

"How does a housewife live without a ration book?' Mrs. Blakey told me how she has managed for more than a year in defence of her principle.

"I live on the fat of the land,' she said with a smile.

"Behind her cottage is a little cottage garden. Here Mrs. Blakey grows rows of cabbages, lettuce, spinach, and beans, and turnips and onions and swedes.

"I am not a vegetarian,' she told me, 'but I like vegetables and I manage to have plenty of them all the year round.'

"Then the chicken. Recently, after visiting the Ministry, she found that her allowance of balancer meal for feeding fowls had been stopped at the local food office as she 'was not a holder of a ration document.' But the hens are doing well on kitchen scraps. 'So I have plenty of eggs,' she told me.

"Tea? 'I don't like it and there is plenty of coffee.' Absence of sugar also fails to worry Mrs. Blakey. She has a hive of bees and plenty of honey. Then, if that is not enough, there is plenty of golden syrup at the grocer's shop run by the licensee of the 'local.'

"Fats present a slight difficulty, but by no means an insuperable one to Mrs. Blakey. First, there is off-ration peanut butter. Then a shilling's-worth of marrow bones from the butcher make 'first-class soup' and, boiled down, 'all the dripping and cooking fat I am likely to want.'

"Mrs. Blakey varies her diet with plenty of fish and off-ration cheese from the grocer's, and then, of course, there is the fruit, all grown in the back garden.

"Meat? 'That is the big rub,' Mrs. Blakey agreed. 'I don't miss the bacon and I can always get a tin of it off the ration if I have a craving. Then, of course, there are plenty of tinned meats if I really want them. The trouble is that they are expensive. But then so is meat, unless you rear your own—and the Government will not let me do that.'

Control of "Truth"

According to the *Sunday Express*, Ronald Staples, described as "one of Britain's foremost taxation experts," head of a publishing firm, has acquired a majority shareholding in *Truth*. The paragraphist remarks: "With much celebration, he announced last year the publication of a quarterly magazine, *Foyer*, which had Lord Harewood, Sacheverell Sitwell and Sir Steuart Wilson on the editorial board. It folded up after two issues,"

The Power of the Word

By BEATRICE C. BEST

To conjure with words is a common enough phrase, the implications of which nevertheless are not always sufficiently realised. Their importance and significance today, however, are such as should seriously engage our attention.

According to the dictionary to conjure means (a) to enjoin solemnly, (b) to practice charms or tricks. Conjurament means enchantment, and a conjurer, an enchanter. To conjure, therefore, has attached to it an element of magic and deceit.

In entertainments where efforts to separate appearance from reality, which is of the very essence of conjuring, are made, the deceit is tacitly acknowledged and accepted by both the conjurer and his audience. The magic may then be said to be White and the conjurer a White Magician. But where a conscious policy of deception is pursued, and the efforts to separate appearance from reality deliberately concealed in pursuit of such a policy, then the deception comes within the category of Black Magic and the one who practises it a Black Magician.

From this fundamental difference two others of importance arise. The White Magician or conjurer, requires certain tangible and visible apparatus to assist him in his performance, he also himself remains visible and to the fore. He is essentially a showman, his aim being to *entertain* by displaying his powers of trickery and deception. By contrast, the Black Magician conjures solely with words or formulas, himself remaining concealed and anonymous. For his object is to *obtain power* by means of trickery and deception; it is, therefore, of primary importance that no suspicion of trickery should be aroused in his intended victims, who must be completely taken in by the illusion of reality presented to them.

In an introduction on the life and times of Saint Catherine of Sienna, Algar Thorold writes: "In modern times the formula, an abstraction such as 'capital' or the 'rights of man' has largely taken the place of the individual as a plastic force."* "... even Napoleon was conquered at last rather by a conspiracy of the slowly developing anonymous forces of his time than by the superior skill or strength of an individual rival."

It would be interesting to compile a list of these various words and formulas. Chosen, one must suppose, by "the anonymous forces" they will be such as to produce the illusions and enchantments best calculated to act as a "plastic force" for moulding the minds of their intended victims to the form required to assist them in their designs, or "conspiracy."

Perhaps the most important, and one much in use today, is the "inevitable trends" formula; because tending, as it does, by its fatalistic assumption to discourage the exercise of initiative, both in thought and action, it facilitates the smooth carrying out of plans necessary to implement and embody these designs. But when, on the other hand, active co-operation is required the word Freedom, of ancient line-

age, it still the most favoured, for it appeals to one of man's deepest instincts, and can therefore be most readily relied upon to incite to action. It always works, and its magic and potency never decline. It also possesses the dangerous virtue of rallying and enlisting followers, for it can be calculated to arouse an enthusiasm that tends to inhibit reflection, and thus can be used by the "anonymous forces" to lead in any direction they choose. Again and again it has led to wars and revolutions, and its magical power can be gauged by the fact that after two world wars fought in its name the freedom for which they were fought has progressively declined. Thus the word freedom has been enlisted to effect its own destruction!

This use of the discarnate word—discarnate because separated from its substance and reality—has, when effective, a further result, important and indeed essential to the furtherance of the plans of the "anonymous forces"; for it constitutes a direct attack on the intelligence, and is calculated to bring about its disintegration. To return to the common conjurer; were the adult members of his audience really deceived by his tricks and devices their intelligence would be on the level of the children they had brought with them to be entertained—a level proper to the immaturity of a child, but improper to the point of imbecility in the grown man. As, however, the aim of the White Magician is to create an illusion, not to delude, to deceive the eye not the mind of his audience, his art is innocuous, and the result of its exercise relatively harmless. But the conjurer with words, the Black Magician, aims to invade the mind and to delude it. It is the art of possession and, if successful, its results are demoniacal. Here the meaning of "to enjoin solemnly" comes into its own, with the arts of oratory, rhetoric and exhortation, employed to dazzle and distract the mind, and finally subject it and condition it to accept whatever is put before it. The object, as suggested, is one of *disincarnation*, the end being to empty words of their true content, and render them meaningless. They can then be made to mean anything and to point in any direction, and so wield unlimited power.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Social Credit meets with hostility or suffers under a conspiracy of silence; for by its means Social Credit shows us the way to obtain the one freedom never mentioned by the "anonymous powers," namely, the freedom to choose. Without this freedom man remains in a state of slavery whether four freedoms or forty are conceded to him. The giver or conceiver of the freedoms, which can also be withdrawn, remains the master, and those to whom he gives them are, and remain, his slaves though they may not so regard themselves, and if the master is generous may not even feel the yoke. But *freedom to choose* is the one freedom that alone *sets man free*, and by so doing joins appearance to reality and thus gives substance to the word, clothes it with flesh, incarnates it. To have freedom is not the same thing as to be free. Here the verb 'to be' takes precedence over the verb 'to have'—the adverb free over the noun freedom—the statement 'I am' over the one 'I have'—'being' over 'having.'

It is significant that Christ did not say, I will give you freedom, but "The truth shall make you free." Freedom thus becomes an attribute of personality, and not an adjunct, or addition to personality. Its power then become invincible.

At this point the moralist may object that the means

*Saint Catherine herself would seem to confirm this assertion in the following statement to be found in her dialogue: "... through words alone, have come revolutions of states, and destructions of cities, and many homicides and other evils, . . ."

to enable us to realise freedom of choice will not of necessity set us free. We can still be the slaves of our passions, bad habits, wrong desires and so forth. Such misuse or abuse of freedom, however, does not alter our *status*. We remain our own agents, encroach on our own domain. It should be recalled that the Prodigal Son was free to return to his Father, and, having done so, found that he had not lost his status of sonship.

Hence it can be seen how essential it is for the "anonymous forces" to oppose the power of the incarnate word, and by the power of the word robbed of its meaning and rendered discarnate, prevent this "return" and the realisation of sonship that awaits it.

An interesting confirmation of Mr. Thorold's claim that "anonymous forces" have largely taken the place of the individual in the moulding of history can be found in a statement of Mr. T. S. Eliot's quoted in a debate on education in the House of Lords on March 19. In this, Mr. Eliot referred to "vast impersonal forces which in our modern society are a necessary convenience of thought and the study of which tends to obscure the study of human beings." There is an important difference, however, between the two claims, for the words "anonymous," "conspiracy," "formulas" and "abstractions" in Mr. Thorold's do at least imply the exist-

ence of a person or persons behind these "forces"; operating them, conspiring, deciding on the "formulas," the "abstractions," the use of which will best suit their purpose. One is therefore entitled to enquire what Mr. Eliot meant by "impersonal forces," and why they are a "necessary convenience of thought" in "our modern" or in any society. Did Mr. Eliot mean anything, or could it be thought that he was 'talking through his hat,' otherwise just conjuring with words? That it is a convenience to these "forces" to be represented as "impersonal" one may well suppose; no better formula for preserving their anonymity could be devised. But does Mr. Eliot *really* believe that, for instance, the economic "blitz" that knocked the world sidewise between the two world wars was due to "impersonal forces"? Does he really believe that trade slumps, inflation, unrepayable debt, penalising taxation, 'poverty in the midst of plenty' and ensuing wars and revolutions, and all their consequent miseries and devastations are due to these same "impersonal forces"? If Mr. Eliot was referring to the forces of nature and the phenomena of floods, droughts, famine and such-like disasters, then too much is known today about the part man has played and is playing in the 'rape of the earth'* for their designation as "impersonal forces" to be regarded as anything but misleading.†

Mr. Eliot's quoted statement dealt with the question and with the teaching of history. If his reference to "vast impersonal forces" represents his considered and convinced opinion then it can be justly regarded as an example of what someone has called: "the inanity of thought divorced from fact," and one is left wondering whether 'history' as taught by the 'historians' has been, and is, anything more than a "tale told by an idiot," or the "bunk" that Mr. Henry Ford declared it to be.

In *The Social Crediter* of February 23, a quotation from the French runs, in part, as follows: "Le mot le plus précieux de notre langue? Eh bien, mon enfant, c'est le mot Qui, employé interrogativement . . ." It might be suggested that "le mot" Pourquoi, also "employé interrogativement" could profitably be made to follow it, and that the answer to both might be found in the words "Quis beneficet." In any case it can be conclusively stated that until we become generally aware of the existence of these words, and of the importance that should be attached to them and to efforts to discover their answers, we may find that in our fight against the evil 'thing' that oppresses mankind we may be just striking against the empty air, or, for all we know, actually assisting in the tactics of the enemy.

*A part forced on him more often than not by reason of financial stringency and obligation, or by governmental planning, instigated, assisted and controlled by its financial backers.

†In *The House of Exile* by Nora Waln the author recounts how the floods in China, which in one case she witnessed, were caused by the failure of the Government to reconstruct dams and bridges etc., which had fallen into disrepair. Representations made to the Government, and warnings as to what could be expected were persistently and consistently ignored.

SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND

"The situation relatively to ourselves is like that which presents itself to a military leader when his forces, which have been pinned down by one or another of all those conditions of warfare which it is the aim of an enemy to invent or to use, are suddenly released and available for a new disposition. Such opportunities are of short duration. Whatever we may be able to do to meet this contingency, we hope and believe our readers will co-operate. The Social Credit Expansion Fund (disbursed only on the authority of Major Douglas) is an instrument which ensures one form of such potential co-operation. Trained man-power is as important, and useless without it." (*The Social Crediter*, November 3, 1951).

To the Treasurer,
Social Credit Expansion Fund,
c/o The Social Credit Secretariat,
7, Victoria Street, LIVERPOOL, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : as a donation towards THE SOCIAL CREDIT EXPANSION FUND, to be expended by the Administrators at the sole discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

N.B.—Cheques should in all cases be crossed:—"A/c payee: Williams Deacon's Bank, Ltd., Exchange Flags, Liverpool, 2."

THE NEW AGE. January, 1925 to December, 1935.

What offers? Please write K.R.P. Publications, 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

States has been a net importer of meat. That gives considerable food for thought. The meat growing areas of the world are not very considerable. There are some which can still be developed. But if the United States and Canada, from being net exporters of meat and other products, become net importers of meat—there is no question of Canada being a net importer of other foods at the moment—the prospects of imported food supplies in this country vanish into thin air.

The remedy is to secure a development of meat supplies in other parts of the world, of which notably Australia and New Zealand are the most important. An increase in meat supplies from New Zealand is in fact taking place. On the other hand, the prospect of more meat from Australia is rapidly disappearing. I quote from a Report made by the Commonwealth Committee which investigated the development of the North-west. . . .

. . . Even assuming that we have a balance of payments which would allow us to buy meat, we shall find ourselves in a position in which meat will not be available to be bought—not only in those Commonwealth countries which should produce a great deal more, but also in Eire. The meat from Eire is to-day being sent to feed the United States and the United States Army, and is also being exported to other European countries, because the price which the Ministry of Food are prepared to pay for that meat does not compare favourably with what other people are prepared to pay. We must reconcile ourselves to the fact to which the noble Viscount, Lord Hudson, and other speakers have referred, that prices of food products, and especially of meat, are to-day a great deal too low. Reckoned in terms of gold value after a depreciated pound, the price of 15d. per lb. for Australian beef, seaboard, is quite ridiculous. If, therefore, we find that we are not able to get meat from overseas countries, because we are not prepared to pay to encourage meat producers to produce it, and if we find that world consumers are going to take off the meat that we might get, we shall be left in the position of having to produce the meat that we may expect for the next twenty years, substantially, if not wholly, in this country; and if it is not produced here we shall not get it.

. . . I am speaking of land which obviously can produce more.

I believe there are two ways in which this can be done. One is—and this is especially applicable to hill farms or high farms—to take a leaf out of the book of our friends in Australia, where certain land improvements, notably fencing (these are very necessary adjuncts to the development of hill farming), access roads and water are regarded and are treated for tax purposes as annual outgoings in the farm budget. They are not subject to improvement charge. . . . The second proposal that I have in mind, and which I should like to see developed, is that the improvement of land should be undertaken by the Government. I do not mean that this should be done compulsorily, but that it should be done by the Government where both the owner and the occupier, or the owner or the occupier, wish to see the improvement carried out but are neither willing themselves to contract a personal debt nor in possession of capital to start the improvement. . . .

Lord Lovat: . . . First, I should like to turn briefly to the question of overseas food production and to the efforts that have been made by this country to promote further food production, at our expense. These efforts were inaugurated by various bodies who, I am afraid, up till now have not altogether satisfied public opinion. I am not going to dwell at any length on anything like the Groundnuts Scheme or the Gambia Egg Scheme, or even the Queensland situation which I hear is rapidly deteriorating. All these schemes have gone wrong, and I think the public money expended on them might well have been spent on agriculture at home. I should like to make the point that, while distance lends enchantment, it is not necessarily correct to suppose that there are vast untapped areas in countries overseas which are still capable of producing large supplies of meat at cheap prices which can be consumed by the 50,000,000 people in this island. That is an entirely fallacious theory. If we are to spend public money, the taxpayers' money, on these rather random and often quite impractical ventures overseas, I humbly suggest that something in the nature of a pilot scheme might be floated on an experimental basis before millions of pounds of money are thrown away in a completely futile venture.

I should like now to turn to the position at home. When I left a few weeks ago I think we were still importing horse-meat. We are the only country to do so in Europe to-day. This meat is imported from Europe—I may say from Germany. I believe that in the interval a few reindeer have been introduced into Scotland. But that is not going to be the answer to our food problem. In this Island there are 65,000,000 acres of land, of which only two-thirds, or slightly over 40,000,000 acres, are actually producing food; there remain something like 18,000,000 or 20,000,000 acres. I am not speaking of marginal land; it can really be called hill land, of which by far the greater part is in Scotland, which remains completely untapped.

I join issue with the noble Viscount, Lord Hudson, in his speech, when he said that he had no great brief for a long-term policy. Of course, he was speaking of his immediate problems in farming down in Wiltshire, but his problems, naturally, are not the problems of hill farmers. Hill farming has suffered throughout the last 100 years by lack of a policy and lack of confidence. I should like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for his assurance that, in effect, there will be a long-term policy which will enable us, as hill farmers (I am speaking now for Scotland) to launch out and develop the potential which is unquestionably there but which has never been tapped to its uttermost because of lack of confidence. While I speak of hill farming, may I ask the Government to ensure that less misuse of land—not only hill land, but arable land—is practised by those experts (and here, like Henry Ford, I would say, "Heaven protect me from the experts!") who are in charge of our future and our increased agricultural potential.

It is shocking to think it is only in the last three or four years that the Government have realised that there is a meat shortage in this country. At the end of the war many of us who have to travel abroad to earn our living voiced the fear that this meat shortage would become apparent, and it was only in 1946 that the Hill Farming Act was placed on the Statute Book, thereby bolstering up the sheep population and the sheep farming, which had

fallen to a dangerously low level. Even to-day, as other noble Lords have already said, we are several million sheep below pre-war standard, despite the realisation of our great shortages. But surely beef is even more important than mutton, and the beef producers on the hill farms have had absolutely no assistance. I speak as perhaps one of the largest hill farmers, and I have had to carry out my fairly extensive work of breeding cattle on the hills without any such assistance as was available to the black-faced sheep farmers and hill farmers under the terms of the 1946 Act, which gave a 50 per cent. grant to sheep farmers.

I should like to illustrate the importance of a policy, by witnessing the extraordinarily successful way in which the Irish Free State has tackled this farming problem. I am sure I am not offending anyone here present of Irish extraction when I say that as a race the Irish are certainly not very distinguished agriculturists, in the sense of working their arable land. But they have realised that they have grass and constant rainfall, and in Ireland we see a country which is not only supplying beef to the United States, Canada and Europe, but is also sending over to the British Isles somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400,000 store cattle annually. This in itself is a remarkable contribution to the nation's food supply. I am confident that Scotland could do the same, but, in my part of the country at any rate, we see glen after glen and hillside after hillside being taken over either by the Forestry Commission or for hydro-electric developments which involve the flooding of fields, and, to my mind, misusing the land. I will not cite instances to show the cumulative effect of this misuse, but it is becoming more evident all the time in respect of arable land, especially in view of the building of houses and schools, and the laying-out of playing fields, aerodromes and rifle ranges. These things constitute an enormous source of interference with production, and the cumulative effect is such that it is difficult to foresee what is going to happen in the future with world population growing at the speed at which it is growing to-day.

As an example of the importance which is attached to land abroad, I would point out that it is, in fact, a crime, both in Scandinavia and in Switzerland, to drown land. I am told that in Holland it is impossible to build a house if the site suggested is one which can be cultivated, and that there are people today actually living on the canals of Holland who have not been able to get permission to build houses because of the acute land hunger. We, at home, have not realised to the full how vitally important every acre is to our population. We have the lowest acreage in proportion to population of any country in the world, and these precious acres are steadily diminishing. I hope the Government will take steps to remedy this carelessness—the need to do so does not seem to have been appreciated by their predecessors—for this land is a heritage which will be of supreme importance to us in the future.

Lord Chorley: . . . What the noble Lord, Lord Lovat,

said about hill farming in Scotland is also true of hill farming in the Lake District, the Pennines and North Wales. Undoubtedly hill farming has been the Cindarella of farming over recent years, when a great deal has been done for farmers who farm in much more favourable conditions in better parts of the country. Until recently, hill farmers have been left very much in the lurch. Not only have they a difficult occupation in trying surroundings but, as the noble Lord, Lord Lovat, pointed out, their position is made more difficult by the inroads which have been made onto their lands, particularly by the Forestry Commissioners. In the Lake District several famous farms which have bred sheep that have won prize after prize at all the shows over the last hundred years are now under conifers. I appreciate the need for timber, but I think we are now realising that food comes even before timber, and that we must have woollen clothes on our backs even before we have timber for the construction of houses. Obviously, there is a real conflict of interest between these two demands on the land, and there is no question that so far the hill farmer has had the worst of the game.

. . . I think there cannot be much doubt that, if we really pull ourselves together, and determine to use our land as well as the people of Denmark, which is not naturally a fertile country, have done over the last hundred years or so, the food production of this country could be tremendously increased. Holland, which is even nearer, is another country where large acreages have been brought into fertile production over the last few hundred years, acreages which were previously lying at the bottom of the sea. Can any noble Lord doubt that if, for example, the Wash, an area of shallow sea which is larger than some English counties, were situated in Holland, that it would have been brought into rich agricultural production many years ago? Of course, a good deal of useful work has been done around the Wash, but it is being done much too slowly, and I think the situation has now arrived when we should take these great engineering problems in hand and press for their solution much more strenuously than we have done in the past. . . .

(To be continued.)

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE BIG IDEA
Price 2/6 (Postage extra)

**PROGRAMME FOR THE
THIRD WORLD WAR**

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

**THE "LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN)
PEOPLE" RACKET**

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool 2.

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

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

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

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-