

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 29. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1952.

6d. Weekly.

### From Week to Week

“What Makes an Economist?” (Title of the Inaugural Lecture of Dr. G. L. S. Shackle, Brunner Professor of Economic Science in the University of Liverpool).

• • •

Possibly more briefly than the Professor, we reply:—  
“Subservience to a group of international conspirators commonly designated ‘Finance’ makes an Economist, and human reason and humane protest cannot unmake him.”

• • •

There is a precision and a flavour about law books which we recommend to the jaded palates of newspaper readers (as the “B.” B.C. says ‘everywhere’). What could be better than this to define the meaning of those of us who cannot find words to discriminate between fools (those *rarae aves* of governments) and knaves:—“The wilful wrongdoer is liable because he desires to do the harm; the negligent wrongdoer is liable because he does not sufficiently desire to avoid it”?

• • •

Contemporaneously, professors of Law are demanding reform of the codification of the criminal law (on economic and preventive grounds), the journalists are demanding more policemen (10,000 in London at a cost of £1,000 a year apiece) and the juries are convicting more and more criminals. £2,000,000 worth of goods are stolen annually on British Railways. “The nature and effects of the new incidence of crime are unquestionably a national menace.” (*The Times*.) Flogging is again in demand.

The Deputy Chief Clerk of the Thames Magistrates’ Court, Mr. J. T. Taylor, says *The Times* does not reach to the root of the matter, and we agree. He says it is no less than “the wholesale break-down in public morality in the past 15 years, amply demonstrated by criminal statistics. This break-down has resulted not only in the recent outbreak of crimes of violence but also in the appearance before the courts of many formerly blameless citizens who have succumbed to the temptation to indulge in petty larceny of one form or another. This itself follows as a logical consequence from the inordinate increase in the number of absolute offences—an increase which has made this class of offence, formerly the exception to the general rule that *actus non facit reum nisi mens sit rea*, into the most common class, with the true criminal offence as the exception.

“For example, it was undoubtedly necessary for the safety of all during the war that blackout regulations should be made and enforced, but under those regulations, the householder who accidentally allowed a chink of light to escape was liable to punishment equal to that of the person who deliberately showed a light to assist the enemy. Liability

of this kind meant that the mental ingredient of the offence, for so long equally necessary as a criminal act, was at a discount, and resulted in many pleading guilty with long pleas in mitigation. They were, of course, rightly reported by the Press, and so the man in the street developed a hitherto unknown tolerance towards breaches of the law, and the reputation of the *corpus* of the criminal law fell. The snowball grows and the black marketeer and smuggler are no longer the subjects of the obloquy they formerly knew.”

But is even this “the root of the matter”?

It is even in the text books that “there is little question that at present the sentiment of retributive indignation is deficient rather than excessive and requires stimulation rather than restraint.”

• • •

Again we agree. But why concentrate attention so exclusively on crimes which most of us are tempted to commit, such as murder and the like (even if, fortified by a high state of culture in alliance with a diminishing sense of indignation, we resist the temptation), and turn our eyes from the major offences which we have no opportunity of committing such as selling an empire down the river (Treason plus Treasonable Conspiracy), or conspiring to set up a nationalised bank on such terms as now obtain (fraudulent conversion on the largest possible scale—with, if the bailiffs are engaged, a distinct touch of Highway Robbery with Violence)?

In this connection observe a curious effect of the best legal definition of “crime,” that it is “an offence the penalty for which is remissible only by the Crown if at all,” when you come to consider the growing number of offences suffered with an increasing “deficiency of retributive indignation” by us at the hands of a “Crown” wholly in the possession of Her Majesty’s Ministers. If the Attorney General but winks at the Public Prosecutor, you pay, and if the Public Prosecutor but winks at the Attorney General you pay; and if they both wink you have had it!

### THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By

C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Revised and Enlarged Edition published in 1937

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.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: October 20, 1952.

### Milk

*Mr. Dodds* asked the Minister of Food if, in view of the concern about the deterioration in the quality of milk, he will take steps to ensure an absolute minimum for the compositional quality of milk, below which it would be an offence to sell milk, instead of the presumed standard in operation at present.

*Major Lloyd George*: I must ask the hon. Member to await the report of the Working Party on Quality Milk Production who are studying this matter.

*Mr. Dodds*: Will the Minister bear in mind that the overwhelming evidence from the National Dairymen's Association and the spokesmen of the county councils is that the standard of milk is seriously deteriorating?

*Major Lloyd George*: It is the purpose of this Committee to investigate that and on their report will be determined what further action will be taken.

*Lieut.-Colonel Lipton* asked the Minister of Food to what extent adequate supplies of fresh milk will be available for liquid consumption during the winter months?

*Major Lloyd George*: Provided there are no abnormal weather conditions, supplies of fresh milk should be sufficient to meet the normal demand for liquid consumption.

*Lieut.-Colonel Lipton*: How does the Minister explain the fact that pasteurised and non-pasteurised milk have been mixed together before sale to the public, and that milk 49 or more hours old has been distributed?

*Major Lloyd George*: That is not the question which the hon. and gallant Gentleman asked me. It was whether there would be enough milk available during the winter months, and I said that there was no reason to suppose there would not be.

*Mr. Dodds*: Does not the Minister agree that putting up the price of milk recently has saved there being a scarcity of milk, because many people cannot afford the milk?

*Major Lloyd George*: I am very glad to have an opportunity of refuting that statement completely. The actual short-take of milk from 19th September to about 7th October was purely seasonal. It happens every year. Consumption this year is practically the same as it was last year.

*Mr. Willey*: Would the Minister agree that every month since the price increase has shown a fall, and that it has averaged between 3 million and 5 million gallons of milk per month?

*Major Lloyd George*: No, Sir. The seasonal shortage

this year, which is the ordinary seasonal shortage shows a loss of about 5 per cent. The estimated consumption this year compared with last year is practically the same.

### Flour Improvers

*Dr. Stross* asked the Minister of Food which flour improvers other than chlorine dioxide he has considered as possible substitutes for nitrogen trichloride; and which, he has been advised, is the most desirable.

*Major Lloyd George*: The examination of possible alternatives to the agene process has not yet been completed. Until I have the report of this examination I cannot add to what I said to the hon. Member on the subject on 31st March.

*Dr. Stross*: Will the Minister not accept, however, that it has been a very long time since this investigation began, and would he in any event accept this guiding principle, that there should be no introduction into the bodies of human beings of any chemicals which are foreign to, and not normally found in, human beings?

*Major Lloyd George*: I should hate to accept that principle, because I do not know whether it could be worked. The hon. Gentleman asked me to agree that there should not be introduced into the bodies of human beings any chemicals not normally found in human beings, but I am not sufficiently a technician to accept that. I must point out to the hon. Gentleman, however, that the last time he asked me this question I told him that my information was that the investigation would take a considerable time and that I did not expect to get the report before the end of the year. I still hope that that is the date by which I will get it.

*Colonel Gomme-Duncan*: Would my right hon. and gallant Friend go into this again, because this interference by chemists and the so-called improvement of flour is becoming a very great danger? How can pure flour be improved?

*Major Lloyd George*: I would not know about that, but that is what this inquiry is supposed to tell me. I understand that this process has been used in flour making for over 50 years, but to make quite certain that there is no risk attached to it this committee is making a most careful investigation not only into agene but into possible alternatives.

*Dr. Stross*: Would the Minister at least answer me on this point, has his Department considered the use of ascorbic acid?

*Major Lloyd George*: I do not know about that particular one, but there are all sorts of alternatives before these gentlemen, and that is why it takes such a long time. Tests over a long period of time have to be taken before we dare take any risk in the matter.

*Dr. Stross* asked the Minister of Food to what extent there has been a change over from the use of nitrogen trichloride as a flour improver; and whether he can now say when nitrogen trichloride will no longer be in use.

*Major Lloyd George*: I have no precise information of the extent to which particular flour improvers are used and until I have the results of the investigations now in progress I cannot make any statement about the future.

*Dr. Stross*: Can the Minister tell us whether it is roughly

## SOCIAL CREDIT IN 1952

(Leaflet reprinted from *The Social Crediter*.)

Price 1d.

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

5 per cent., about 1 per cent., per year, since the Government originally stated that this change would take place? If so, does he not think that that is rather slow in connection with the use of a substance which is admittedly dangerous to some animals and possibly dangerous to human beings?

*Major Lloyd George:* The hon. Gentleman is probably in a far better position than I am to judge about the length of time, but I was advised by the technicians over a year ago that it would take a year to test it, and, therefore, I cannot anticipate their decision. It is getting on towards the end of the year and I hope at that time to be in possession of the necessary information.

### Chocolate Bars (Weight)

*Mrs. Mann* asked the Minister of Food how far regulations are now in force compelling chocolate manufacturers to sell chocolate bars by weight.

*Major Lloyd George:* There are no regulations which require manufacturers to sell chocolate bars by weight, but controlled retail prices for each product are based on average net weight.

*Mrs. Mann:* Is the Minister aware that this is a perfect example of what happens when de-control takes place? Children are being robbed—[HON. MEMBERS: "Oh."]—as the 2 oz. bar does not now weigh 2 oz. Is the Minister aware that eight 2 oz. bars of chocolate with tinfoil and wrapping now weigh only 13 oz.? Is he further aware that coupons for 16 oz. have to be given up for 13 oz. of chocolate? Will he do something about it?

### Plum and Damson Crops

*Mr. Nabarro* asked the Minister of Agriculture the approximate tonnage of the United Kingdom plum and damson crop during 1952 compared with 1950 and 1951; the approximate orchard acreage figures in each of the three years raising plums and damsons; and the approximate tonnage and percentage of the 1952 crop remaining unsold and wasted.

*Sir T. Dugdale:* The plum and damson crop this year has been exceptionally heavy, with a gross yield of marketable fruit on the trees roughly estimated at 200,000 tons, compared with 120,000 tons in 1951 and 70,000 in 1950. There are no firm figures for plum and damson acreages in the years cited, but the area appears to have declined at a rate of 3 per cent. per annum between 1950 and 1952. About 60,000 tons, or 30 per cent., of the 1952 crop is estimated to have remained unsold.

*House of Commons: October 21, 1952.*

### £ Sterling (Purchasing Value)

*Lieut.-Colonel Lipton* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to what extent the purchasing power of the £ has varied during the past year.

*Mr. R. A. Butler:* On the basis of the Interim Index of Retail Prices, the internal purchasing power of the £ fell by 1s. 3d., during the year to September, 1952, the latest date for which figures are available.

*Sir I. Fraser* asked the Financial Secretary to the

Treasury what, taking 1945 as 20s., was the purchasing power of the £ in November, 1951, and at the latest convenient date.

*The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. John Boyd-Carpenter):* The internal purchasing power of the £ was 14s. 3d. in November, 1951, and 13s. 6d. in September, 1952, based on the National Income White Paper price index for all consumers' goods and services for the period 1945-51, and the Ministry of Labour Interim Index of Retail Prices for the period January to September, 1952.

*Dr. King:* Is that what the right hon. Gentleman means by "repairing the hole in the £"?

*Mr. Boyd-Carpenter:* I have nothing to add to the very full answers which my right hon. Friend gave, as the hon. Member may recall, to Questions Nos. 7 and 19.

### Agriculture (Poisonous Substances) Bill

[Lords]

Order for Second Reading read.

*The Minister of Agriculture (Sir Thomas Dugdale):* . . . This Bill deals with technical matters affecting the safety of workers in agriculture that have been studied by expert committees, first of all by the Gowers Committee on Health, Welfare and Safety in Non-Industrial Employment, and then in more detail by the Zuckerman Working Party on Toxic Chemicals in Agriculture, which was set up by the former Minister of Agriculture.

The Bill itself is designed to carry out the recommendations made by these bodies. . . .

The need for precautionary measures arises out of the increasing use in agriculture of certain poisonous substances used as insecticides or weed killers mainly by spraying. There are, no doubt risks involved to the health of the workers using them, and we have to see that these are given the greatest practical measure of protection. This Bill will allow Ministers of Agriculture to make regulations for that purpose.

. . . A further important aspect, on which much apprehension has been expressed, is the probable effect of the use of these substances on the wild life which is present when the spray is employed or which feeds on the crops shortly afterwards. It appears that the only solution is to find an insecticide which is not toxic to mammals or birds. This is one of the aspects upon which the Agricultural Research Council are concentrating. If such a substance can be found, the danger to operators, to consumers whether human or livestock, and to wild life will be avoided.

I would emphasise that the Government are well aware of the dangers that may result from the use of new substances of this kind before their full effects over the whole field of Nature can be accurately known and assessed. We have accepted the conclusion of the Zuckerman working party that the use of these substances must go forward. The Government are seeking to ensure that all the possible repercussions of their widespread use are carefully studied so as to reduce the risks as far as possible.

. . . Nevertheless, it is clear that these risks exist. I think it is generally accepted in all parts of the House and

(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. 29. No. 13.

Saturday, November 22, 1952.

### Correspondence\*

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

Sir,

The assumption that we have built an organisation free from internal as well as external interference is saying a mighty lot . . . The great danger today is the making of concessions to opinion. We have true and good men, and our job is to see that Social Credit is not watered down.

I enjoyed the point you made when you put together the articles dealing with the Social Credit Secretariat—"Whenever we have asked help, we have not done so in vain. We have not done so often. In organic growth two phases are observable:—a shooting-up phase and a filling-out phase. It has been remarked by physiologists that they seem to occur in the human family at the most inappropriate times having regard to external circumstances. Whether that is so or not in the Social Credit case, we have completed a period of *mental fattening* (very noticeably against the inclinations of a minority considerable on account of its pretensions, and its qualities of articulation)."

In regard to your point, "We have completed a period of mental fattening," I can remember reading *Realistic Constitutionalism* shortly after it came out. At the time I read it without a full understanding, but now, along with other Social Crediters, I can read it with a better realisation of what it really means.

We have had a study-group at our Perth Headquarters for the last five months. Mr. Strang gave us a fuller under-

\*Having admitted this burst of letter-writing to our columns, may we say why, and also why we do not do so more often?

The first letter and the second (not actually published, but indicated by its main content) are from Australia and Canada. They reveal just how closely *The Social Crediter* is read so far away from us, and how great is the zeal to establish its principles. The third, submitted in the form of an article, exhibits the same zeal though perhaps in a more academic form. We are certain Mr. Purchase does not mean the inference to be drawn from his words that "all unpopular men are honest," or alternatively "if anyone likes you, you are a bad lot." Uncompromisingly, we must guard against ourselves from Nemesi, a goddess prone to cast her victims upon the flaming bridges their have burned.

To answer the second question: We receive very many letters intended for publication. They are sharply divisible into two classes, laudatory and hostile. We do not print the latter because their writers do not bear more than a tiny fraction of the cost. We do not print the former because we know that, however it might appear to the reader or to the writer, it would be we not they who had chosen from among an infinity of available phrases the phrases which fit the editorial need. As Cobbett said: It is a sad thing to fall among editors,

standing of Social Credit from its monetary aspect, and we are now studying L. D. Byrne's *Philosophy of Social Credit*.

Out of that class we have now six young men with a thorough grip of Social Credit and its implications.

Mr. Strang has stressed to us the fact that we must do nothing for the sake of expediency: everything we do as Social Crediters must be clean and above board. We are an educational advisory group giving people advice on how to get the results they really want. . . .

Yours, etc.,

Dave Byers.

East Freemantle,  
 Western Australia,  
 October 11.

A Canadian correspondent writes for permission to distribute multiple copies of paragraphs from the article, "The Church Militant," (*T.S.C.* September 27) in which, replying to a correspondent who sent in a pamphlet by Fr. Max Pribilla, S.J., *The Right to Resist*, and asked whether the Social Credit movement was a "Resistance Movement," it was stated:—

"The Social Credit 'Movement' has no constitution. The Social Credit Secretariat is constituted as a channel for advice with the objective of effecting social stability 'by the integration of means and ends.' It is within its competency to advise individuals, and it cannot therefore be beyond its competency to advise States. It is not constituted to resist States; but its effect is to resist states of instability. Since the advice it may disseminate concerns the welfare of individuals in society, in accordance with principles which are implicit in the nature of Social Credit, the range of its *interest* is as wide as the life of man in society. The objective of changing life in society is a reformist objective. The Social Credit Movement is not a reformist movement, and it has always been compromised by those who, because they are at heart reformists, endeavour to cover it with a reformist cloak.

"The distinction drawn is the distinction between antagonistic aspirations. Much of the fear of Social Credit which exists arises from the presumption that its adherents aspire to become law-givers, wresting from the ruling oligarchy the credit weapon which protects and sustains their power, seizing it for themselves. The Judaeo-Masonic Philosophy (and therefore policy) derives from the dogma that there is no alternative; that Power cannot, by its nature, be distributed. The demonstration of Social Credit is that it can be distributed, and must be if human society is to continue. The distribution of Power is the antithesis of the assumption of Power. There is no place for law-givers: the Law is *given*, and has but to be discovered progressively—and obeyed. When this is done, there will be order: the Social Order."

Sir,

#### A DILEMMA

It may as well be stated at the outset that this [article], despite its brevity, is unsatisfactory. It puts a question that is unanswerable and poses a dilemma that cannot be resolved. Nevertheless, both the question and the dilemma must frequently have exercised the minds of most Social Crediters for many years.

(continued on page 8.)

## Shifting Sands

By BEATRICE C. BEST

In an early essay by the late Ellis McTaggart entitled *The Further Determination of the Absolute* published in his *Philosophical Studies* the following provocative and challenging statements are to be found. "As a guide to life, the knowledge of the absolutely desirable end is, no doubt, not without drawbacks. Christ's remark, 'Be ye perfect, even as your father in heaven is perfect' reveals a fundamentally wrong principle." And a few lines further we read, "An attempt to live up to the *Summum Bonum*, without regard to present circumstances, will be not only useless, but, in all probability, actually injurious. The true course of our development at present is mostly by thesis and antithesis, and an attempt to become virtuous as the crow flies will only lead us into some *cul de sac* from which we shall have to retrace our steps."

These arbitrary statements can hardly be accepted on *a priori* grounds without consideration or question.

We are not told, for instance, what is the "fundamentally wrong principle" revealed by Christ's remark and subsequent statements do not expose it.<sup>[1]</sup> What, for example is meant by "an attempt to live up to *Summum Bonum*, without regard to present circumstances . . . ."? What are we supposed to understand here by the designation "present"? The circumstances in which McTaggart was living at the time: our own circumstances: circumstances that will be present at some future time, near or far? Or are we to suppose there will come a time when circumstances will be such as may prove useful in a direct attempt to live up to the *Summum Bonum*? Further, what are we to understand by a *regard* to circumstances? Acquiescence in them, acceptance of them, otherwise a following of 'inevitable trends'? Or does such regard involve a critical attitude, a recognition of our responsibility to alter or direct them? May not the course of our development or advance towards perfection—whatever its nature, whether by means of a zig-zag course, or as the crow flies—actually demand such alteration or direction? We are not told. One cannot help asking also, why an attempt to live up to the *Summum Bonum* "as the crow flies" is necessarily more likely to lead us into some *cul de sac* than advance by means of a course of development from thesis to antithesis.

These questions which, it is claimed, McTaggart's statements give rise to, make them and the dialectical course of development deduced from them, impossible to accept as, in themselves, self evident statements of fact.

It may seem a far cry from McTaggart to an article entitled *A Valuable Pamphlet* published in *People's Post* for July; but on reflection a parallel drawn between them may not appear extravagant. The article purports to be a review of a pamphlet entitled, *The People's Purse* by Mr. Marshall Hattersley. Only reference to the pamphlet itself could tell how far the article represents fairly Mr. Hattersley's views on the subject of Social Credit; it does, however, show what the author himself thinks, and he appears to be inspired by Mr. Hattersley.

[1] Actually Christ's remark can hardly be said to adumbrate a principle, being more in the nature of a command or an admonition.

Thus we are informed that "Mr. Hattersley has always been one of the ablest and most progressive members [*sic*] of the Social Credit movement and quite free from the narrow doctrinaire intolerance which has rendered some other Social Crediters incapable of co-operating in a friendly way with monetary reformers belonging to other schools of thought, or of modifying and adapting their ideas to changing conditions or to new light thrown on the financial system."

Here can be found the distrust shown by McTaggart of the direct way—"as the crow flies" to perfection. Though the method, one of friendly co-operation with other schools of thought—which might appropriately be called the eclectic way—differs from the dialectical way approved of by McTaggart it suffers from the same disadvantage. For there seems no reason to suppose that either way would ever reach its goal, unless its goal is envisaged quite differently from what we are led to presume.

In the charge brought against "some other Social Crediters" of being "unable" to adapt their ideas to changing conditions, there can be found a parallel to the regard paid to "present circumstances" enjoined by McTaggart. For there is the same apparent absence of any suspicion that opposing powers may be manipulating conditions to serve an alien end, and that adaptation to them serves their purpose admirably, and it precisely what they seek to bring about.

Turning to the matter of the review in question, it is not surprising to find that the author—having based his ideas of Social Credit on such shifting sands, and repudiated the "narrow doctrinaire intolerance" of some other Social Crediters—makes some curious statements on the subject of Social Credit itself.

For instance, he tells us that "Mr. Hattersley . . . feels [*sic*] that the National Dividend would have to be financed from taxation," and he adds: "an idea which would give cold shivers to the orthodox Social Crediter . . ." In this last he is correct, for the orthodox Social Crediter would, firstly, point out that, from the technical point of view, Social Credit is a question of arithmetic—a sum; strictly, a matter of accountancy, and you do not *feel* whether a sum is right or not, you make the necessary calculations and find out. Secondly, the orthodox Social Crediter would endeavour to show that, in the nature of the case, a National Dividend could not be paid out of taxation. A National Dividend paid out of a robbing of Peter and Paul to pay Paul method, or as it would then be a robbing of both to pay them both, would constitute a contradiction in terms. Such payment would be in the nature of a 'dole' or 'pension,' that is, 'state aid' in one form or another, with its accompanying strictures and controls, and could not possibly guarantee to its recipient the independence warranted and secured, *ipso facto*, by a National Dividend.

We also find it stated that "Mr. Hattersley feels [again!] that an adaptation of the rationing system might possibly provide the thin edge of a wedge introducing the National Dividend idea, ration cards, not only giving people the right to claim goods if they have the money, but also, in a measure at any rate, operating as an actual gift of purchasing power in addition." But, one may reasonably ask, if, in spite of Mr. Hattersley's feeling, facts were found to warrant the gift why not in the form of money itself? The

answer, here suggested, is that money, within its jurisdiction, gives freedom of choice, and freedom of choice is anathema to the powers that be. And the thin end of the wedge proposed by Mr. Hattersley as a device to introduce "The National Dividend idea" could also be used by these same powers as a device to abolish the use of money altogether, and replace it by the dictatorship of a rationing system pure and simple. Signs are not wanting of such an intention, and one may conjecture that plans for carrying it out are being kept in cold storage until such time as, by means of propaganda and the manipulation of events, we have been sufficiently conditioned to accept them.

"Mr. Hattersley," we read, "comments in an interesting manner on the way in which the war has modified the position of poverty in the midst of potential abundance which was characteristic of this country during the inter-war period." But the interesting and important point to observe is the nature and character of the modification effected, and this Mr. Hattersley appears to ignore, for we read next that: "He feels confident, however, that abundance will return if re-armament should slacken . . ." Yet what should be noted is the fact that we still have abundance both actual and potential, only it is now more than ever an abundance produced and distributed for the purpose of defeat, destruction and death, and not for life and more abundant life.

What ground, therefore, exists for confidence? Why should re-armament slacken when the abundance it produces presents no problem of distribution: when it proves such a useful aid to full employment; when it provides an excuse for planning and rationing and their consequent overriding jurisdiction and endless controls? Why should it slacken when it can be used to increase taxation and inflation, those twin burdens designed for the subduing and subjection of mankind?

In his review of Herr von Papen's memoirs, Mr. Harold Nicolson made the following remarks: "He desired to bring back to Germany the old Christian ethic which had been destroyed by defeat and inflation." And a little later: "Herr von Papen failed to realise that he, with his Christian ethics was being used both as a screen and a tool by evil men."

Defeat and inflation, *versus* the Christian ethic, and the Christian ethic used as a screen behind which to plot and plan its defeat!

But what Herr von Papen failed also to realise and Mr. Nicolson himself apparently fails to perceive is the method employed to bring this about, and to forge these weapons of destruction; a method so diabolical yet withal so simple that it excites ones reluctant admiration.

Plainly stated it works as follows: first, purloin a nation's credit, then, write it up as interest-bearing debt; *at the same time contrive that the debt shall be both unrepayable and irredeemable*, and the people of that nation and, in the end, the people's of the world will become, unwittingly, your helpless slaves. The method is undeviating and direct and admits of no compromise. Its potency and range increase with use,<sup>[1]</sup> and while the results of its application are dramatic and terrible, its operations are secret and hidden; thus these results can be made to take on the appearance of the working out of natural economic laws, so that even the

[1] "... the world debt is now increasing as the fourth power of time . . ." *Money and the Price System*, Major C. H. Douglas.

'experts'—those not actually conniving—can be deceived. It therefore creates a situation and an impasse from which, apparently no contracting out and no escape is possible; for all attempts at rectification *within its rules* merely serve in the end to tighten its stranglehold. Its diabolical nature assists, for when exposed it raises a barrier of incredulity and carries no conviction. It seems, to the ordinary decent citizen, too bad to be true; yet for the purpose and end for which it has been devised, namely the subordination of mankind to an alien and inimical power, it is perfect and infallible.

At the end of the first world war, Major Douglas discovered the nature and cause of this impasse, and also discerned and devised the only way of escape from it and from the bondage in which it holds us.

It is a way to the freedom of the individual which also admits of no compromise, and is as direct and undeviating as the way to world slavery it exposes and opposes. Hence no gibe of doctrinaire intolerance, or charge of a lack of friendly co-operation can discredit or obscure it in the eyes of those who have once seen it.

---



---

#### PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

in the country that, over a large part of this field at any rate, the recommended precautions should have statutory backing and that definite obligations should be placed on those concerned, both employers and employees.

We shall propose to make regulations at an early date after the passing of the Bill on the lines of the voluntary precautions already recommended. . . .

*Colonel Alan Gomme-Duncan* (Perth and East Perthshire): I do not in any way wish to oppose the passage of this Bill, but in connection with it I want to make one or two remarks. We should not be doing our duty as a Legislature if we did not add this Bill to the list of Acts which have been passed in years gone by to protect workers in all industries. The distribution of poisons on the land is a recent practice. We can all recall the tragic case which occurred not long ago, where one or two men died as a result of distributing these poisons on the land. We wish to avoid a repetition of that at all costs and I am glad that time has been found, even at this late stage of the Session for legislation which seeks to avoid such tragedies.

Having said that, let me go on to say that in this little Bill of a few pages and few Clauses is contained the most perfect and abject confession of the failure of man to use the fruits of the earth as he should. The fact that we have to squirt poisons about the countryside is not an evidence of advancing civilisation but of a return to the darkest ages. The fact that we have to squirt poisons on a growing plant means that we have neglected the soil in which that plant grows. The reason for this Bill is the complete stupidity of man in dealing with the soil, which is the very basis of his life.

All over the countryside today we have ever more plentiful crops. We take credit for that, but increasingly we have to take chemical action either to make those crops grow or to prevent them from being destroyed by pests. It is no use scientists or doctors trying to tell me or any other per-

son with common sense that if we squirt poisons on the leaves of a plant they do not get down to the roots, especially if those roots happen to be potatoes. I am convinced that a large number of the new and growing illnesses which we have to meet not only in this country but all over the world today are largely due to the increasing use of poisons in the growing of food and in its protection when it has been grown.

I feel sure that this Bill would never have been necessary if we had been a really civilised nation—not that we are any more to blame than any other country—but mankind is playing the fool with what he depends on most, which is the soil. The fact that we need this Bill is the greatest indictment of so-called civilisation which we could possibly have. While I hope that we shall pass this Bill quickly because in the circumstances it is necessary, at the same time I hope we shall remember what caused those circumstances and, before it is too late, take steps to prevent their recurrence.

*Mr. Anthony Hurd (Newbury):* I, too, wish to support this Bill, because it is desirable and necessary that those who have to work with these highly toxic sprays should be required to take the necessary precautions to safeguard their health. I cannot go all the way with my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Perth and East Perthshire (Colonel Gomme-Duncan) in his "back to nature" call in farming. After all, if we were to let nature have full scope in the way of locusts, aphides, and so on, we should not be growing anything like the crops that we succeed in growing and which we desperately need today. We have to use science to control some of the enemies of man when they take his crops, otherwise we should be a still more hungry world than we are.

What concerns me is that this Bill does not go nearly far enough. We are taking action to safeguard the health of those men employed by contractors and farmers who are using two types of spray—the dinitro compounds and the organo-phosphorus compounds. Both of them are recognised as deadly poisons if they are used consistently, that is to say, if a man is in contact with them day after day. What we are not doing under this Bill—and I am not happy about the omission—is to prevent the use of these two groups of sprays until such time as the scientists can offer us alternative and equally effective methods of dealing with weeds and insects.

After all, we grew perfectly good crops of Brussels sprouts before we ever heard of the organo-phosphorus compounds now used to kill the aphides which prey on that crop. Similarly, we grew very good arable crops without using dinitro weed killers. When one receives reports, such as I have had within the last fortnight, showing the effect of these particular sprays on wild life, it makes one feel that we are not going far enough in this Bill.

In my hand I hold an account of the death roll on one field of Brussels sprouts of 46½ acres. Within a day or two of the spraying of that crop with one of the organo-phosphorus insecticides there was a death roll of 175 animals. It is a horrible record. Included in it were 19 partridges, 10 pheasants, 129 wild birds such as blackbirds, finches and tits, and seven rabbits, two hares, two rats, four mice, one grey squirrel, one stoat, making a total of 175 dead animals picked up in this one field of Brussels sprouts. I have no doubt that if a search had been made of the hedgerows there further casualties would have been discovered.

There is another consideration. We are using these sprays under conditions which are not controlled. The other day a train companion told me of his experience in Norfolk. Walking through a woodland plantation he found a strip completely dead right across the middle. He could not make out what had happened. It looked like poisonous spray defect, but it could not be drift. What had happened? He thought it out and confirmed that what had happened was that a helicopter using this poisonous spray had emptied its tank over this woodland on the way back to the depot.

That is a terrifying prospect. Supposing it had happened to empty its tank over a party of children coming out of school. As I see it, we cannot afford to use these highly efficient but desperately toxic sprays unless we have a much closer control over their use. I would like to see the Minister insist that the scientists who work with the Agricultural Research Council press ahead as fast as possible with their search for alternatives to these very toxic groups of sprays, the dinitro and the organo-phosphorus. Until such time as the scientists can offer us alternatives I would feel much happier if we prohibited the use of these two types of spray.

It does not amount to a great deal. I am told that they amount to only about 10 per cent. of all the weed spraying and insecticide spraying which is done. If it is only that small proportion it will not have any harmful effect on agriculture to be denied the use of these two groups of spray for a few years longer. I ask the Minister to consider this problem very carefully and to take action before we have a terrible fatality which will force the Minister of the day to take action.

Having expressed this view, I give this Bill my blessing. It certainly does a very desirable thing in protecting the men actually working with the sprays. That is all to the good, but there are wider considerations to be taken into account.

*Sir T. Dugdale:* With the leave of the House, I would say that I am grateful to my hon. Friends for their speeches, because I am particularly interested in all these problems and it is a good thing that there should be on the record examples of what is taking place.

To my hon. Friend the Member for Newbury (Mr. Hurd) I would say that it is estimated that over 2½ million acres were sprayed with weed killers this year and over 90 per cent. of the acreage sprayed was dealt with by hormone weed killers, which are not very poisonous. The Bill deals with those who are employees in agriculture and under Clause 1 (3, a) there is power if necessary to put a general prevention on the use of any weed killer if it is thought desirable.

*Mr. Hurd:* Would my right hon. Friend say a word about the work which we hope the Agricultural Research Council is undertaking to find alternatives?

*Sir T. Dugdale:* I did mention that in my speech. They are working very closely now in trying to find an alternative to this very dangerous weed killer. If they can find an equally effective weed killer without the danger, then not only the workers but animal and plant life will be protected.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Committed to a Committee of the whole House.—[*Mr. Oakshott.*]

### Introducing "The Social Crediter"

In introducing *The Social Crediter* to prospective new readers, it is suggested that numbers containing articles and paragraphs of special appeal might be used. Some recent instances are listed below. Copies are available at sixpence each, post paid to any address, from K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool 2:—

- Jan. 5—Treachery in the Middle East.  
 Feb. 2—Usurpation of function by Insurance Companies, (C. H. Douglas).  
 „ 9—Lord Lovatt on "Sheep and Cattle Production."  
 Mar. 1—Canada a Kingdom? (Mrs. Davidson's letter to a Toronto newspaper).  
 „ 8—Mr. Sam Bronfman's protégé and N.A.T.O. (Quoted from Mr. A. K. Chesterton)  
 May 3—Monarchy (Norman F. Webb).  
 „ 10—A Speech by the Duke of Bedford.  
 „ 24—The Power of the Word (Mrs. Best).  
 June 7—From Week to Week ("To confound schism").  
 „ 14—Reuters (Eustace Mullins).  
 „ 28—From Week to Week ("Alberta the darling of Wall Street").  
 July 5, 12, 19—Not in Confidence (Norman F. Webb).  
 „ 26—Trade Union Oligarchy.  
 Aug. 2—Decline of Rome (*Conclusion*) (H. Swabey).  
 „ 9—Statemanship (Norman F. Webb).  
 „ 16—Full Employment (R.L.N.).  
 „ 23—Social Credit in 1952.  
 „ 30—Realistic Constitutionalism (C. H. Douglas).  
 Sept. 6—Test Cases (Mr. Lyle Wicks B.C. and Lord Hailsham).  
 „ 13—Decline of Parliament (T. G. Bowles, 1901).  
 „ 20—Wizard's Sabbath (British Columbia).  
 „ 27—Italian Bankers in Medieval England (D. Gilling Smith).  
 The Church Militant.  
 Oct. 4—Italian Bankers (*continued*).  
 „ 11—Continuity (Letter from Dr. Tudor Jones).  
 „ 18—The Church, The State, and Lord Acton (Viscount Hailsham).

### CORRESPONDENCE— (continued from page 4.)

Probably all of us at some time or other have wondered how Social Credit could be made popular. This possibility necessitates the existence of some man or men, preferably one man, who can make himself popular. Unfortunately, however, popularity does not mix very well with knowledge of Social Credit. Looking round the main figures in the Secretariat there is not one, and never has been one, who was popular or had the qualifications to become popular. The reason is, of course, obvious. Popularity requires a deficiency in intellectual honesty, or its complete absence. If the reader will try and think of all the men who in history have gained popularity he is not likely to find a single one of whom it can be said that he possessed intellectual honesty.

Now we Social Crediters are seeking the Truth. To become popular we would have to descend from that high level and would immediately become something other than Social Crediters. The fact must be faced that popularity is a weapon used by our enemies and that it cannot be used by us. Social Credit when once introduced will, of

of course, be very popular. It is precisely what every sane individual is aiming at. It is what untold millions are hoping for, without being able to formulate their wishes, and without grasping that Social Credit is what they want. But that is an entirely different story to making Social Credit popular in advance of its introduction. The question "How can Social Credit be made popular?" is therefore one of those questions that must of necessity remain unanswered. The hope that some man in the Social Credit movement will also become a popular figure in the political world has to be abandoned. There have been in history many such unanswerable questions and insoluble dilemmas. For instance there is our old friend the Unemployment Problem. That too, is insoluble, without bigger and better wars being constantly engineered, thus solving practically nothing and creating a thousand fresh problems.

We Social Crediters, however, know something about ultimate reality, about the laws of nature in their fundamental aspect. For that reason we also know that when a question is unanswerable then that is evidence that either the wrong question has been put or that the question has been put in the wrong way. The problem of "Unemployment" is of course that it is not a problem at all, that the real problem is something entirely different. The old criticism of the Social Credit Secretariat having avoided or failed to achieve popularity in the ordinary sense of the word as now used is therefore unfair and merely indicates a failure to grasp the true function of the Secretariat. The question to put is an entirely different one. The real question is how can Social Credit be introduced? That is what we are really aiming at. The Electoral campaign to a certain extent tested the possibility of making Social Credit popular. We learnt a great deal from it. Major Douglas finally decided that it was premature, that the public were not yet ready for it. It also showed us that popularity was not something we should aim at.

There is before us an example. Mr. Aberhart came as near as anything to combining prominence in Social Credit and popularity. His technical knowledge of Social Credit was somewhat limited but he did attain a certain local popularity. The fact that so many people on the spot seemed to think that Mr. Manning is not only his political but also his spiritual successor is sufficient proof to show that in one sense Mr. Aberhart failed in his mission. Those optimists clearly have not grasped the fundamentals of Social Credit. One of the most outstanding characteristics of the Secretariat, its individual members, and its followers, has been their open-mindedness. We have experimented, frequently been successful, but always learned from our failures. Let us, therefore, have before our eyes constantly the one question, how is Social Credit to be brought about? Let us remember that this is the aim, and let us not confuse any means with that end.

There are two statements by Major Douglas that at the moment should be borne in mind. One is that it is better to do nothing than to do the wrong thing. Misdirection of energy is bound to assist the enemy. The other statement was that of all the various branches of the Social Credit movement only the Secretariat was working along lines likely to produce the desired result.

H. R. PURCHASE.