

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 11. No. 9.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

MODERN SCIENCE (III)

It is easy to smelt small masses of pure silver with the aid of a small gas-jet and an ordinary blow-pipe kept in action by blowing with the breath. I recommend the experiment. The mass, which may be as large as a small hazel-nut, reddens, turns white, melts into an almost perfectly spherical globe, which glows, if the heating is continued, while a thin film of oxide begins to move over the surface. With care, this can be reduced, and the shining metal begins to emit light, until the hot mass is like a pearl enshrined in a thick pink 'atmosphere'. If the source of heat is then removed, this 'pearl' remains for a few seconds radiant and still, before the lustrous surface of the metal shows itself. Then, suddenly, the temperature within the solidifying mass is raised, and sharp spears of liquid silver dart through the solid envelope wherever the least trace of impurity is present.

Our present state of society is molten, and innumerable planners are devising for it a crust or envelope, smooth, uniform, polished. I have described what I think will happen to it. But our society is not a uniform metallic matrix. The flowing inner force is not inanimate, but living, and everything that is living is something which must be continually renewed. If the age in which we live is truly epochal (*epi, echein*), if it is with us to take hold upon the crust of fixity designed for us, the 'renewal' must be uncommonly active as the crucial moment approaches. I see it so. It is not enough in these articles to expose the fissures in the traditional institutions for the nourishment of the minds of men, through which degenerating influences have entered. One must show that there was something, and must be something still, behind the facade that is fissured. The reason why the corruption of the best is the worst sort of corruption is that it abolishes the only standard of measurement which is a valid standard for human judgment: it cuts off the long-end of the stuff together with the long-end of the tape.

Now I am certain that Douglas has put his finger on the crucial matter of our epoch (I mean that word) both positively and negatively, positively in his analysis of the economic system and negatively in the criticisms he has levelled against encyclopaedism. This is the question, and here all the pressure of 'Big' business, of government and the low cunning of plotters meets all the pressure there is (and how much there is remains to be seen) of the other side; whether part of the world can be rightly understood without reference to the whole. Alfred, Lord Tennyson, who often got one half of the story right, whatever happened to the other half, got half of this one right when he wrote:

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies;—

Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

A very useful *alibi*; but we are chiefly concerned at the moment with another issue. Man has no right to say, and it will not serve him if he does say it: "I cannot solve this problem; but I will tell you what I will do: the sentence in which the problem is stated falls naturally into two parts, one nominal and the other verbal: I'll undertake to solve the nominal part by showing you the thing named; but the verbal part deals with matters concerning the thing, not me, and obviously constitutes an entirely different matter." If any question is beyond you, it is beyond you, even if your very life depends upon the answer, and it is of no use to say that one half of the question is well within your competency to deal with. But this very assertion has been the assertion of a school of natural scientists for a long time, and it is the basis for most if not all of the expedients which are being advertised for trial at the present time. The more questionable it becomes, the louder its advocates. But there are others:— "Men of science since Newton have generally held that correct (even if in some respects limited) knowledge regarding physics can be combined with any views whatever on the fundamental questions of Being and Reality; that part of the world can be rightly understood without reference to the whole; that natural philosophy is independent of metaphysics. In a restricted sense this doctrine is true. The fact cannot be disputed that great discoveries regarding the behaviour of the external world have been made by workers whose investigations in their field of research were not related in their own minds to any interest or belief outside it. *But the effect of such segregated thinking has been to make science a departmental affair, having no influence on life and thought except indirectly through its applications. At the present time there is a movement in scientific circles aiming at securing for science a greater influence on human affairs, and even calling for a refounding of civilisation on a scientific basis; but its advocates do not always understand that, as a necessary condition for the possibility of such a reform, science must be reintegrated into a unity with philosophy and religion.*"* There are, of course, at least two religions; but I may perhaps suggest that, in all charity, the attention of Messrs. Ernest Brown and Butler, should be drawn to these words, and that they make quite sure that monotheistic Judaism is meant, before they commit themselves irrevocably to splitting the job of controlling science and thought in these islands between them.

To be Continued.

TUDOR JONES.

*From the presidential address of PROFESSOR E. T. WHITTAKER to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, October, 1942.

AGRICULTURE AND FOOD VALUES

*Extracts from the Debate in the House of Lords
on October 26, 1943.*

Lord Teviot rose to call attention to food values in relation to agricultural methods in view of their importance to the health of man, animal and plant; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, before I begin to deal with the Motion which stands on the Paper in my name, I wish to make a few general remarks. Your Lordships are well aware that the hospitals and similar institutions are full to overflowing, and this has been the case for many years; in fact, I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that all such organisations have a waiting list. . . . Then take the animals of our country. I do not think any of us who are connected in any way with agriculture can be other than perturbed at the number of diseases there are among our farm stocks. Take foot-and-mouth disease, Johne's disease, mastitis, abortion, swine fever and many others that one could mention. Lastly, I come to the crops. We are well aware that the diseases among our crops are legion. Yet it seems to me that we accept all these afflictions as part of our existence; and while immense sums are expended in trying to cure them, I am afraid there is no doubt whatever that disease is increasing.

Every day we hear a great deal about planning. The real object behind this Motion is to see that we put planning for the health of our people, the animals, the plants and the crops of our country, first. . . . [An American authority says] that every year among the population of the United States there are about 100,000,000 illnesses, serious or slight, and in the hospitals 700,000 beds are occupied every day in the year. The care of these patients requires the efforts of 145,000 doctors, 280,000 nurses or student-nurses, 60,000 dentists, and 150,000 pharmacists. It also necessitates 7,000 hospitals, 8,000 clinics, and 60,000 pharmacies. The public spend annually £143,000,000 on medicines, and medical care in all its forms costs about £700,000,000 per annum. Obviously, disease is a very heavy burden not only here but in the rest of the civilised world.

Now I come to my Motion. What is the cause of this terrible tragedy? From the evidence of very well-known authorities who have for years carried out extensive tests and experiments, the conclusion is that food is largely responsible. We hear a great deal about a balanced diet. With this naturally I am in entire agreement, but unless the components come from a healthy soil rich in humus, life-giving and disease-resisting properties must be deficient. This reminds me of a friend of mine who is a pharmacist, a man with whom I often talk on this subject. I asked him the other day, when I went into his shop, "Do you think that all of these tabloids that I see with their Vitamin A, Vitamin B, and so on, do any good?" He replied, "I suppose they may, but I like to take my vitamins and my proteins with my knife, spoon, and fork." I thought that was a very good way of putting it. But he is not done with the question then if the food which he is going to eat with his knife, spoon and fork is not grown from healthy soil. . . . the soil is our most precious asset and it has far too long been exploited for gain.

Throughout the world food has been sold a great deal too cheaply, and the soil, suffering from the strain upon it,

has had to be boosted up with stimulants. We all know how long we should last if we boosted up ourselves with stimulants. Thereby the soil has been robbed of its fertility without anything being put back. Over vast areas in the United States and in Canada there has been erosion. We all know about that. Where there has been an attempt by artificial means to combat this, the result has been worse still. . . . It is obvious in this, as in everything else, that quality means a great deal, and if we can eat food that is of good quality, and if the protein of that food is of good quality, then we are healthy. . . .

We all suffer from wrong nutrition on occasions, but even right nutrition and the proper diet must depend upon the component parts being grown in a healthy soil which will impart to the crops health and power to resist the disease that I have already shown your Lordships is prevalent all over the country. Surely crops doped with stimulants, dressings or sprays, cannot impart to those who partake of them resistance to disease if they have to be, if I may use the term, so much gingered up in order to exist. We know quite well that the soil which is impregnated in many cases with artificial means of keeping it going destroys the greatest friend of man in agriculture, and the greatest friend of mankind generally, and that is the earth worm. You put on some of these strong artificial manures and it means death to that worm straight away. So we have a sort of cycle—a healthy soil, a healthy plant, a healthy animal and then a healthy man, and it is the integrity of that life cycle which is so important. In fact so far as I can see it is the only hope, not only of this country, but of all the world in the future. . . .

I have just had sent to me this morning a short passage from a very distinguished man. If your Lordships will permit me to read it, he says this:

"While recognising the value of 'artificial' in crop production, the great reliance on artificial manures in common use insidiously impairs the health of the soil, pre-disposes to disease in the plants, with the resulting unfavourable influence on animal nutrition and the resistance of animals to disease, with in sequence a similar impairment in human nutrition and resistance."

What does medicine do about this? Medicine seems to me to be just a palliative. So far as I know, research is greatly concentrated on how to cure and not on how to prevent all this happening. There was suggested some time ago a Council of Nutrition. I hope it will be set up, and I am sincerely hoping, too, that such a Nutrition Council will take into very serious consideration, not what we shall all eat, but from whence it comes and how it is cultivated. If it does not, then in my view, and in the view of a great many others, it is just a waste of time.

I beg the Minister who is to reply to put forward to the Government a request that a Royal Commission or a Committee of Inquiry shall be set up to deal with these matters in order that we may somehow or other combat this really tragic state of affairs. I would respectfully suggest that the Ministry of Agriculture, and of course the Ministries of Health and Food, must be represented, and I would also very earnestly plead for the representation of many men who have been studying this subject for a good many years. I give as an instance Sir Robert McCarrison, Dr. Lionel Picton (of the County of Chester Local Medical and Panel Committee), Sir Albert Howard and also a Lady, Lady Eve Balfour, who has just written a most admirable book called *The Living Soil*. What I have been talking

about is not happening here only; it is happening also in all parts of the world such as New Zealand, South Africa, the United States, India and Assam. . . .

The Earl of Portsmouth: My Lords, at the beginning of his speech the noble Lord told us that planning should begin with the soil. In that I most heartily concur. . . .

. . . Vigorous abounding health, normal health, and not merely the average freedom from disease, can come only from proper treatment of the soil in the beginning although it may be that other things have also something to do with the matter. In our own country before this war the cost to the State of health—that does not include private patients of doctors or the people who put sixpence in the slot in the “pub” and get an aspirin tablet—was more than the total wholesale value of our home-produced foodstuffs, considerably more. If, therefore, there is complaint from time to time, when care is taken to prepare good food, that the cost of it is high, I would like to reply that the high cost of ill-health equals the low cost of food, and the low cost of food, as my noble friend has just said, equals exploitation of the soil.

. . . With lethal sprays we are destroying the soil's power of resistance and we are at the same time giving continuous doses of chemical food and chemical stimulants so that the infinite complex of bacterial and mycelial life in the soil is being upset, and we are upsetting the vitamins content, that is the capacity of the soil to produce food by destroying the humus within the soil itself. I wonder sometimes whether not only the sub-normal health from which the majority of our population suffers, and indeed the population in all the so-called civilised world, but even the birth-rate are not closely connected with this exploitation of the soil which has been going on so long.

If your Lordships will excuse me I would like to relate my own personal experience because I feel it is relevant to the argument. When I started to farm some twenty years ago I was thoroughly up to date with modern ideas, but gradually by trial and error—far more often, I may say, by error than by success—I revised all my previous notions. I found again and again that, despite what analysis proved, the quality of bought food was very low compared with the very genuine food value in my own home-grown food-stuffs. For instance, in a comparison between protein in beans and in oil-cakes, my beans won every time. The same thing was found in home-grown oats. The old analysis showed their food value to be very low, yet practical experience in feeding home-grown oats to my own cattle showed the value of the oats to be much higher than anything that could be bought, except the most expensive foods. I found that my animals had a bloom. That experience brought me back to the necessity of consulting nature instead of trying to beat her. I have come, therefore, through the very hard force of circumstance and by practical trial on my own land, to believe that there is more in the way we treat the soil than there is in any methods of trying to get the maximum out of the soil by artificial means. . . .

. . . Though very little may have been proven positively, if there are sufficient indications that there is more than a shadow of suspicion that our methods are wrong, we cannot afford to wait. We have had 150 years of harm through the workings of the industrial revolution. We have had 100 years, nearly, of exploitation of the soil. . . .

Lord Teviot, at the end of his speech, urged upon His

Majesty's Government the setting up of a Royal Commission. I would like to support that, and to express the hope that it would be a permanent Commission, not one that would dissolve after its first findings. Such a Commission might become the basis for continuous integrated research and the development of knowledge. But that will take long. The authors of *Biologists in search of Material* stress that it is almost impossible, in this country, to find a human being who may be described as normal, that is an individual of abounding physical health and with the fire of that health glowing and radiating from him. The great majority of our people are only sub-normal, although they may have nothing positively wrong with them. . . .

[The Earl of Portsmouth then urged the initiation of “a large-scale comprehensive experiment” involving “integrated research concerned with all types of plant and animal life and human beings as a community.”]

. . . I would like to conclude with a remarkable document from the Cheshire Panel Doctors Medical Testament. They say:

“That the use of the wastes of life in accordance with natural laws is at the root of national health, seems to us to issue from a contemplation of the whole subject. Even when wastes are returned to the land merely to get rid of them, they assert their power of conferring fertility. . . . It would seem that the marriage of agriculture to a foreign partner, chemistry, arranged by Baron Liebig in 1840, was a mistake. A more homely alliance would have been preferable—in our Cheshire proverb, ‘It is better to marry over the mixen than over the moor.’”

Lord Geddes: . . . Dr. Enid Charles has published the results of her examination into the demographic statistics and position of Prince Edward Island. It is relatively a small community, one of the provinces of Canada, peopled almost entirely by descendants of Western European stocks; the Scots form 44 per cent., the English about 21 per cent., and the Irish and French make up the rest. There we have a very high standard of health, an extraordinarily vigorous, active population, and, quite remarkably after fifty years of close examination, no fall whatever in the birth-rate. It is the only social organisation composed of Western Europeans which has not shown in the last fifty years a really sharp fall in the birth-rate.

. . . Prince Edward Island is surrounded by the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The population is engaged in fishing, farming and the rural trades and crafts. There are no great cities. The farming there is mixed, not like the farming in the prairie provinces of Canada. It is mixed farming, and it has always been carried out in the traditional manner, not using large quantities of artificial fertilizers, but using muck and the products of the sea. There we have this Scotto-Anglo-Erse-French population maintaining a standard of health, a standard of well-being and a standard of reproduction which is unique among Western Europeans at the present time. That is not a chance impression. . . . it is the result of one of the most beautiful pieces of demographic research that can be found anywhere. . . . We have got, therefore, in Prince Edward Island, a population living very much as the noble Lord, Lord Teviot, has suggested we all should live, drawing their food fresh from the sea and from the field in the traditional manner, living upon simple foodstuffs, the products of their own farms and fishing, and maintaining an extraordinarily good state of health and birth rate.

Continued on Page Six, Column Two.

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: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 11. No. 9.

Saturday, November 6, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The insanity of the Comprehensive Planning idea, as apart from its singularly vicious politics, is well illustrated by the researches of Edward Faulkner, the American agricultural expert, whose report entitled *Ploughman's Folly* may well prove to be one of the epoch-making books of the century. Faulkner appears to have demonstrated that the plough is the enemy both of agriculture and the soil, and that chemical fertilisers are wasteful and harmful. If his contentions are correct, all the premises of the agricultural Planners are worthless, and a Planned Agriculture would be as useless if based upon them, as a certain expensive bridge over an Indian river, which was barely completed before the river, by an alteration of course, left it two miles from the bank.

We have no doubt that the control of the British chemical industry by German-speaking Jews was an important stage in the series of misfortunes which have overtaken this country and the world since the latter part of the nineteenth century. As usual the responsibility rests directly on Finance. British chemists were second to none. Most of the *original* discoveries of analytical chemistry were made in Britain, including aniline dyes. But the bankers, as usual, adhered rigidly to the alleged motto of the Jewish Battalion in the last war, "No advance without security." And, of course, the British pioneer chemists had no financial security.

We have always been slightly puzzled by the fact that the combine which monopolises the chemical industry of the British Empire, paid, without any very obvious necessity, a colossal sum in tax on its registered capital. Its freedom from criticism and its favoured position in its connection with the "Labour" Party, P.E.P. and the London School of Economics are equally remarkable.

It would be interesting to know what proportion of the profits of this war, in its various ramifications of agriculture and otherwise, have gone to this trust. We do not, of course, make the elementary mistake of suggesting that the shareholders have greatly profited.

"Stalin is a realist . . . he is prepared to endure any losses . . . He is ruthless as regards the losses of his own

armies as long as he can obtain his objects."

—*War Commentary* by SIR HUBERT GOUGH.

This must be a great comfort to the "losses". Such an advance on "cannon-fodder."

In a Form of Acceptance sent to shareholders in respect of an allotment of new shares, Messrs. Richardson, Westgarth & Company Ltd., include the following paragraph:

"I/We declare that no one of the persons who will have any interest in the above-mentioned shares if and when allotted to me/us, is an enemy or enemy subject resident outside the United Kingdom or Palestine within the meaning of the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1939, and that this application is not made by me/us on behalf of or for the benefit of an enemy or enemy subject resident outside the United Kingdom or Palestine."

This appears to mean (a) That the United Kingdom and Palestine, as distinct from the Dominions or Colonies, are a legal identity; (b) That an enemy, or enemy subject if resident in Palestine or the United Kingdom, may, so far as this clause is concerned, be a shareholder in a company exclusively concerned with Admiralty and War production.

An entirely new conception of the nature of the government is being introduced by implication in the speeches of Socialist Ministers. In place of the British idea that the government exists to maintain every man in his rights, the completely alien assumption that the government has inherited the Divine Right of Kings and can adjust and dispense favours, patronage and property in accordance with its own ideas, is being tacitly inculcated.

The next Runnymede will not be so limited in extent.

New Metal Alloy

"... According to advices from Denver, remarkable claims are made for a new metal alloy. This alloy which has been named Nu-Lite, is said to be 40 per cent. lighter than aluminium and not liable to rust or corrode, of great tensile strength (up to 185,000 lb. to the square inch), and can be produced either in a malleable form or hard enough to cut glass, and not subject to embrittlement or crystallisation. A sheet $\frac{1}{8}$ inch thick proved to be bullet proof. The cost of manufacture is claimed to be 5c. to 30c. per lb. Patents on the process are pending, but the metallurgical formula is known only to the inventor."

—*The Times*, August 27, 1943.

PROFIT FOR EUROPE

According to a Reuter message from Washington, an official report by Mr. Howard A. Gray, U.S. chairman of the Coal Committee of the Combined Production and Resources Board and Combined Raw Materials Board, and Sir Henry Self, deputising for Captain Oliver Lyttelton in the U.S. as British member of the C.P.R.B., reveals that "the British are expected to furnish the necessary coal supply for North-Western Europe when the time comes."

PERSONALITIES

The *Review of World Affairs* suggests that the chairmanship of the Midland Bank is "in quiet preserve" for Sir John Anderson, and says that Mr. Lyttelton is considered to be Governor-designate of the Bank of England.

"NO KING BUT CAESAR"

With the sub-heading, "The Church as the Antidote to the Total Political State," the following article appeared in THE TABLET for October 30, and is here reproduced, by permission of the Editor of THE TABLET, for the information of our readers:—

The main issue of the twentieth century is the political issue. The Jews crying: "We have no King but Cæsar" prefigured this age more closely than any period since the heyday of that Roman Empire in which, whether they accepted or repudiated the Messiah, they did so in terms of secular politics, either thinking that the kingdom of Israel was to be restored again, or protesting their full, fearful acceptance of the Roman new order.

From the beginning the reaction of the Imperial Government to the Church and her Founder was one of suspicion lest this new thing might interfere with the ease and fullness of their political rule. We are still far from realising how universal, and how normal, it has been for ordinary men and women to live without any secure liberty under authorities which, being Church and State in one, covered the whole of life, either by networks of tribal custom or by the decrees and orders of rulers claiming a full divine sanction for their commands. That has been, overwhelmingly through history, the common structure of human society; and it is one to which the world is now rapidly returning, often under the impression that it is advancing towards something new and uplifting and hopeful. The great, unique, exception is the history of Europe since the foundation of the Catholic Church in the heart of the Roman Empire.

It proved an immense exception, because Europe grew immensely strong, spread over America and Australia and made an immense impact upon Asia and Africa, so that the principles and ideas which we sum up as "European civilisation" are present almost everywhere, and provide a syllabus or outline for social order all over the world. The great mission of the British Empire is to carry and plant and nurse these fruitful principles among peoples with no tradition of their own leading to liberty as the European tradition has led to it. Greece and Rome had their important contributions to make before the coming of the Church, but the state of the Roman Empire, the claims and titles and action of the Emperor, show how ephemeral and transient the influence of the Greek and Roman contribution would have been if left to itself. The liberty which the ancient thinkers sought to define and realise did not go deep, because it was envisaged in a setting of tribal religion; and where men rose toward more universal conceptions, those conceptions were not incarnated in institutions, and were therefore always very much at the mercy of what was concrete and institutional—States and rulers.

The Feast of Christ the King, which Pope Pius XI instituted, was intended to reaffirm a necessary and healthy dualism; to express in the most solemn way that there are boundaries beyond which the lawful authority of civil government must not seek to pass. It is, of course, an easy confusion made by many people to-day to treat some accidental advantage in the temporal order, which comes as a consequence of right belief and the acceptance of revealed truth, as the point and purpose for accepting the Gospel. The condemnation of the *Action Française* by the same Pope was precisely because Charles Maurras was presenting Catholicism as useful and indeed indispensable for the healthy national life of his people, treating religious truth as deriving its claim

to importance from its political by-products. Maurras was fighting against the extreme liberalism and individualism of the last century, and he therefore valued Catholicism for its social conscience, its sense of ordered values, and the high place it gives to government and to national tradition and the sense of a continuing national life. To-day, when men have been made conscious of the opposite dangers, of government being carried into every nook and cranny of human life, there is the complementary danger that they will come to value religion, and in particular the Church, as a protection of their liberty, as though that were the point and ground of her claim on their allegiance.

The Church to-day finds many new, and welcome, friends among people who have come to understand that the authoritative and rigid features in her constitution and history which were most full of scandal for the nineteenth century have, in fact, an integral and vital place in enabling her to withstand through the centuries the immense pressure of political authority, the continuing pull of the totalitarian current. But it is still quite common for men to think that religion is the stronger and better the less it is institutional; even if it is much less common for men now to assume that a disembodied religious feeling can in fact maintain itself in a world where other institutions, civil Governments, command not only physical power but psychological power as well.

It is entirely the wrong way to judge institutions simply to look at them in terms of the advantage which the men embodying them in each generation have derived from them. The relevance lies in what the existence of an institution has served to protect; the things it has prevented, and the things it has made possible. It should be taken for granted that the beneficiaries and officials of any institution or vested interest—and every enduring institution is also a vested interest—will tend to take advantage of their position, because it is the nature of man to want comfort and to want power, to be greedy and to be vain. But such abuse, whether venial or graver, is not a reason for abolishing institutions: it is only a reason for reforming them. This is one of the larger lessons of European history from the sixteenth century: that, bad as was the state of the Church, that badness meant that the Church ought to be reformed. It did not mean that the secular power ought to take over those fields of human life and conduct which, because of their direct moral significance, were rightly organised under an independent and universal religious institution, and not under territorial secular jurisdictions.

There is no more illuminating approach to the whole past of Europe, including Britain, than to see it, and to teach it in the schools, with the Bishop and not the King as the central figure, the great question in every century being who is to appoint the episcopate, and what the rôle of the Bishop in society is accepted as being. The Papacy is not only the chief bishopric; it is the bishopric of which the existence and vitality is essential for the independence and vitality of the episcopate everywhere. Secular rulers have always felt and seldom resisted the temptation to seek a complete control. They have not relished having in their domain persons of an authority and pre-eminence not dependent upon them, and it is the great mark of modern history that they have succeeded in so greatly diminishing, both in fact and in the popular imagination, the scope and reality of any other order than that political order over which they preside.

The English, who have strong visual imagination, think

of the Papacy in historical terms where they should think of it in logical terms. They ought to be primarily interested in and attached to the institution as an idea enriching human life, when they would understand it, much more than in historical memories fed to them through all the channels under the control of their temporal Government.

The Church, having a vital interest, for her own life and good estate, in resisting the totalitarian principle, becomes accordingly the champion of other forms of association when they, too, seek to establish their right to exist not by favour of a Government, but by right of what they do, and because they are the particular expressions and achievements whereby men exercise a right which inheres in human nature. What is at stake all the time is a definition of man, a theory about mankind. The high definition sees him as a social being, implicated by the mere fact of his existence in a wide number of relationships, from his direct and overriding relationship with God, extending in the human field through so much more than can be justly called politics. The low definition embraces everything under politics: the life of society, organised in and through the State, whether directly or through associations created by the State to play this or that minor part. It is extraordinary how many people lose sight of the degradation or lowering of man which comes from enthroning this conception, because they are dazzled by the idea of the benefits which political centralisation can organise. The truth is that much more is gained than is lost by recognising many centres of life and authority as corresponding to the fullness of human nature; and that the inevitable boundary disputes which will go on all the time between those different centres are a price to be paid, because only in multiplicity can there be freedom. This freedom is not itself the final end, or the cause or ground for recognising spiritual authority. That authority itself, just as it has its claims on the State, has its claims over men. It does not offer its teachings as a matter of predilection or fancy, but as a revelation of the duty of man. It proposes an interior discipline, of will, mind and body, which is proposed for voluntary acceptance, but is of its nature a discipline. Its great sanction is not here and now; but it can illustrate its claim that men are not as well placed as they fancy by the spectacle of the much harsher slaveries into which men at once fall who refuse it. There could be no greater commentary on the presumptuous infidelity which the eighteenth century made its title-deeds to a splendid future for mankind than the increasingly cruel servitudes which the sovereignty of secularised politics has extended over so many millions, in the course of our swift process of return towards the bondage of antiquity.

RECONSTRUCTION

The "Glasgow Evening Times"
Articles of May 1932

By Major C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 6d. (Postage extra)

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.

PARLIAMENT

Continued From Page Three.

Another paper by Dr. Enid Charles, who is now in the employ of the Canadian Government, . . . on the differential birth-rate in Canada, . . . shows something which I think is of extraordinary interest. The French people in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec have a very high birth-rate. They live in a traditional way in all those provinces. If, however, the French Canadians move to the wheat farms of the prairie provinces, their health declines and their birth-rate falls in some cases below the level of British stocks. . . .

What has happened? Those people have moved away from their traditional life and their traditional type of agriculture, and from their traditional association with the sea to a continental climate and to wheat farms where a large part of their food is similar, being imported, to the food in the towns and cities, and therefore their birth-rate falls abruptly and their health declines abruptly. . . . It is a most extraordinary thing that as soon as you get to a people of different stock origin, the Central Europeans, that is to say, the Eastern Germans, the Czechs, the Poles and the Rumanians—as soon as you get to the stock of Canada derived from those countries you find that the birth-rate rises as they go West; it is low in the East and high in the centre; and their health goes up, too, as far as I can make out the figures. And what clearly suggests itself to my mind as the line along which one has to look for an explanation would be that they are racially adapted to a continental climate, where the Western European is racially adapted to a maritime climate, and that we have thus got another factor coming into health.

. . . If you . . . work out the correlation of health and reproduction, which Dr. Charles does, you will find that only something between one-third and two-fifths of the variations in this manifestation of positive health can be accounted for by the environmental conditions, and that the rest, the two-thirds or three-fifths that is left, are not explained unless they have an association with the nutritional type with which the individual is by descent associated, and with the climate type with which again he is by descent associated. So that we have got a highly complex picture before us, and we find in it one of the factors, and a very important factor—this question of the origin of the food. But how far food, and food alone, is responsible for the ill-health of this or that population it is not possible to say definitely without complete demographic examination, and also external experimentation. . . .

. . . I do not know whether many of you are familiar with the Hawthorn experiments carried out by Harvard University, with Dr. Roethlisberger as chief examiner. They were carried out under the direction of Harvard at the Western Electric Works at Hawthorn. They were directed towards discovering how to get the greatest efficiency out of the workers, and they began, like all these management investigations, with a sort of gadget-loving lot of pseudo-scientists on the job. It always happens like this; they always turn up first! These experiments went on for ten solid years. They started off—it has nothing to do with health for the moment but that comes in later—with an attempt to get the greatest efficiency out of the girls working in the factory where the electric relays were made. In the best style they

fixed one shop as control, another shop as experiment, and they began jiggling around the benches. Output went up. They increased the light, and output went up. They increased the light a bit more, and output went up—it went up in both shops!

Then they started the bright idea—quite unusual in industrial psychology—of reducing the light. So they reduced the light—and output went up! A variety of other performances were gone through and, finally, what it came to was this, that the people working in the Hawthorn factory worked well when they felt important, and when they felt they were being appreciated; that made them happy. In other words, the human value of the people was what mattered. After many years the whole thing is worth reading, and perhaps the most reverend Primate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) might find a great deal of interest in it. It is all in Roethlisberger's book *Management and the Worker*, which goes tremendously into the social application of the matter. . . .

What we have found also in Northern Rhodesia, and what appears to be the case in Prince Edward Island is this, that the really surprising health which you find in these places, considering the conditions in which the people are living, is linked with a feeling of importance and of being cared for, and in connection with positive health there is no doubt that that has an enormous psychological value. . . .

[Lord Geddes urged an examination to try to discover what the people are doing, how they are, and how they are prospering, to find surer ground for many of the necessary social improvements too often at the present time directed by pseudo-scientists.

Viscount Bledisloe called for research on the interrelation between the morbid conditions of soil, plant, animal and human being.]

The Earl of Warwick: . . . the attitude of the general public to this particular subject is really staggering. The ordinary man in the street seems to believe that he can go on year after year; that he belongs to a particular civilisation unlike any of those which have preceded it, a civilisation which nothing can stop and which, apparently, is going eventually to reach Utopia. That may be possible, but I think your Lordships will agree that it is also, possibly, unlikely. In any case the enormous industrialisation that has taken place in our world, in what is really a minute of time, has created huge sections of the population who are totally ignorant of the soil from which we are sprung, and unless they are taught to know and understand it and to love and cherish it, then, to my mind, there is no question but that the fate of our civilisation will be exactly the same as that which befell Babylon, Egypt, and Rome.

We must possess self-knowledge and we must practice a humble and really statesmanlike method of approach to this subject if we are to get anywhere. It is no use continuing with these charming theories and political devices which are to-day perplexing the world with ideas for our post-war fashion of living. Man is made up of two things—his body and his soul which comes from God. It therefore follows that unless he can do away with nature, unless he can invent some methods of maintaining and reproducing life without recourse to nature, then surely he must try to marry the laws of God and the laws of nature instead of

perpetually trying, as he does to-day, to keep them at variance. Scientific knowledge, as was pointed out by Lord Geddes, may be a very dangerous thing. I am afraid that our generation has been inclined to lack the wisdom necessary to apply scientific knowledge. . . .

Scientific proof rests upon a series of experiments prolonged into infinity. There is really no such thing as scientific proof; there is only scientific probability. In dealing with all these subjects which concern dietetics for men, beast and soil, any experiment must perforce take a long time and, because we are concerned principally with the human body, any experiment will be very difficult to do. The noble Viscount, Lord Bledisloe, discussed the passing of phosphates through milk into the human body. Apart from our old friend the white rat, it is very difficult to do experiments except with the human body, which is apt to object to being treated in that way, so that our knowledge must perforce come slowly. I think, however, that if we take the whole cycle of nature, and then add those man-made discoveries which are most probably proven, always remembering their possible fallibility, we have a reasonable chance of continuing to exist, together with all those other organic bodies that are in the world; but, if we do not, I am sure—and I know that many of your Lordships are of the same opinion—that we are committing ourselves to a form of race suicide.

We all know the history of agricultural England, from the days of the Saxons and the Normans up through the village lands to the enclosures of the eighteenth century and the perfection of the rotation of crops introduced by Coke and Townsend. I suppose that that system exists to-day almost in the same form as it existed a hundred and fifty years ago, with the exception that probably since 1846 and the repeal of the Corn Laws it has not always been permitted to be properly carried out. I do not suppose that any really serious effects on our soil, although they existed, became noticeable until the twentieth century; but with the enormous strain which we have put on our soil in the last war, and to an even greater extent in this war, those effects are becoming very apparent. I am certain that at the end of this war the soil of this country will not resemble at all the soil of the country in the time of our Saxon forbears. That soil was an accumulation of the composting of thousands of years. It was rich in fibre, in lime, in nitrogen, and above all in vegetable humus. I do not suppose that the Englishman has ever put back into the soil as much as he took out. If, like the Chinese, he were to do so, I do not believe there is any reason why we should not continue to grow the straw crops which we have grown in the present war for an almost indefinite period. However, this is not and has not been the case, and we are faced to-day with the possibility of those difficulties which have so seriously affected the United States of America with their "dustbowls." The very short history of that country should enable us to realise the enormous speed with which such a catastrophe can occur once it has started. . . . Sir Robert McCarrison, who has been referred to several times to-day, made a remark about thatch straw which has always fascinated me. He said he had seen on many occasions that straw grown on soil rich in humus lasted ten years or longer in the thatch, but if grown on a similar soil which had been treated only with artificials it was rotten at the end of five years. We have heard all about the white rats, and how they can exist on potted vitamins, but cannot breed, and how the minute they

go back to absorbing those same vitamins from their natural sources they automatically regain their powers of growth and of reproduction. This must surely make it quite evident that there is some quality of the soil, both for beast and for man, which is not accounted for by the ordinary chemical ingredients—the proteins, fats, carbo-hydrates, minerals and vitamins—and that without that quality we are all doomed to sterility. It would be an awful thing that if through the few discoveries and inventions of our modern world this race was to condemn itself to extinction.

We keep on hearing to-day of these awful dehydrating plants being put up all over the country, and of some new vitamin having been discovered. We hear of the constant spraying of vegetables—tomatoes, fruit, and, in the last four or five years, ordinary beans. If these plants were grown on soil which was rich in humus, they would not need any poison sprays at all. I should like to quote what Sir Albert Howard has said on that subject:

“Insects and fungus are not the real causes of plant disease and only attack unsuitable varieties of crops improperly grown. Their true role in agriculture is that of censors for pointing out the crops which are imperfectly nourished. Disease resistance seems to be the natural reward of a healthy and well nourished protoplasm.”

... I would ... like to draw your Lordships' attention to what I suppose is the longest-term proof in our experience which I have been able to discover, which is the case of the Island of Barbados. I think about the turn of the century they were still renewing the fertility of their soil by the use of a system known as pen manuring, which was simply the use of vegetation with the waste from the live stock—oxen and mules and horses—on the island. When the West Indian Agricultural Commission came along they suggested that this process should be suspended, and that instead they should put on potash, nitrogen, and phosphates in chemical form. The first thing that happened was that the old variety of sugar cane, called the Bourbon variety, which they had used until then, began to suffer from a fungus disease and died out.

Since then none of the seedlings which have been used have proved entirely satisfactory. More and more artificial have been used in the soil and more and more virus diseases have manifested themselves. And, if that it not enough, the actual population of the island just before this war was showing signs of malnutrition, there was a great deal of unrest and rioting prevalent—all things which have never happened in the history of the island before. And yet, forty-two years ago one of our greatest agricultural experts warned the West Indian Agricultural Commission of that day exactly what would occur, and every one of the prophecies he made at that time has come true. That is a fairly long-term proof which we have to hand of what can take place when the soil loses its fertility. ... The first bulwark of our national safety here is our land. The first certain guarantee of the continuation of the great quality which has made the British nation what it is depends on our land, and I am sure that, if only we can keep the soil fertile, disease can and will disappear in plant, in beast, and in man.

[The Joint Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (The Duke of Norfolk) agreed to bring Lord Teviot's request for an inquiry or Royal Commission on the subject to the notice of the departments concerned.]

Motion for Papers, by leave, withdrawn.

SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	1½d.

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards...8d.	
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell.....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet)	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.)	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet).....	1d.
The Representative's Job	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.