

atomic waste p. 4

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1953.

6d Weekly.

### Elizabeth II and The Second Elizabethans

#### God Gave the Queen.

We quote Arthur Bryant from the approved souvenir programme published by gracious permission of Her Majesty the Queen for the Coronation:—

"Our Queen . . . is descended from a long line of those who have represented the unity of our country through every hour of her history. She is the descendant of Alfred—the lonely King who saved England by his courage and Christendom by his example, and, single-handed, re-created civilization in a ruined land. She is the descendant of the great Norman who, though he conquered England, made her the first national kingdom of Europe. She is the descendant of the Angevin genius who established the Common Law; of Edward I, father of our Parliament; of his heroic adversary, Robert Bruce, who preserved in the teeth of all the odds the separate nationhood of his country and, by preventing an enforced union of the crowns of England and Scotland, made possible that fruitful and voluntary one under another of our Queen's ancestors. She is the descendant of the first and wisest of the Tudors, of the patriot princes who preserved the unity of Wales. One of her ancestors commanded the English at Crécy and another at Dettingen. Another was the 'Queen of Hearts' for whose nuptials Shakespeare's *Tempest* was staged and, perhaps, written. She is the great-great-grandchild of Queen Victoria, and the granddaughter and daughter of the beloved Sovereigns who symbolized Britain's resistance and victory in the two greatest wars of her history."

The Poet Laureate asks that sunlight bless her days, the fair Spring of her beginning Ripen to all things worth the winning—

"May this old land revive and be  
"Again a star set in the sea,  
"A Kingdom fit for such as She  
"With glories yet undreamt."

Mr. Arthur Bryant opines that "We have long divested [the Crown] of political responsibility and have evolved

other institutions to resolve political contests and express our political will."

The Whitsun air is charged with strange scents. Strains of unearthly music mix with the clang of chromium plate and the notes, shrill or dull, of plastics. The *Church Times*, through the pen of the Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge, and the verse of the Immortal Bard, quotes Richard II to Elizabeth II: the corrupt and imbecile tail of a dynasty to the hope of the New Age.

"Not all the water in the rude, rough sea  
"Can wash the balm from an anointed king . . ."

#### Enter Salisbury

(" . . . discomfort guides my tongue  
"And bids me speak of nothing but despair.  
"One day too late, I fear me, noble lord,  
"Hath clouded all thy happy days on earth:  
"O, call back yesterday, bid time return, . . .")

There was a Salisbury then, of "weak arm," "To-day, to-day, unhappy day, too late." Richard II.\* Act iii, Scene ii).

Whereas, between 1901 and the present year, there was but one work which could be dignified by the epithet 'scholarly' (i.e., competent)—Legg's *English Coronation Records*—dealing with the Coronation Service, every magazine and newspaper is to-day agog with information, some muddled, some sound, to cater for a supposed demand to understand what all the fuss surrounding the ritual of an institution, crippled or outworn or resurgent according to taste, is about.

The most lively impetuosity explains 'the real meaning' of that which has been stripped of the last vestige of meaning; the most polished casuistry mobilises its forces to explain how that which is emptied of political significance can transcend in political significance the whole of politics. The Whigs, having invented for themselves an engine of political warfare called "The Machinery of the Constitution" endeavour to hallow it by claiming the ritual of the Coronation as a cog in its wheels, themselves the more hallowed by greasing with a legendary holy oil. This is not flippancy, nor is the sentiment ours. Turn from *The Times* of next week to *The Times* for September 9, 1831 (both Whig). The date is that for the day after the Coronation of William IV and Queen Adelaide. "What," asked the leader-writer, "can be more revoltingly compounded of the worst dregs of Popery and feudalism, than

\*Richard II, 1377-1399. The present Earldom of Salisbury was not created until 1605 (Marquess, 1789).

a prodigious number of the quackeries played off in the course of King William's coronation? What a fuss with palls, ingots and spurs, swords and oil for anointing (greasing) their sacred Majesties! and whipping on and off of mantles and all the rest of it."

Sir Shane Leslie calls the coronation "the greatest ceremony surviving in the Old World." He points out that with William and Mary "The Sovereign was now entirely the puppet of the State, the divine right was abolished and the kingly character became even less a *mixta persona* (priest and king) than ever." Next week, 'the greatest ceremony' will be conducted with more stupendous pageantry before an incomparably greater audience than ever before in its history. No pageant of the past will rival it. And in the hearts of many of those nearest to its central figure will be a deep sense of shame for their involuntary attachment to an impulse of unknown origin, an obeisance to an idol of the market place—a hidden idol usurping the seat of Authority.

Observe the points to which attention is directed by His Royal Highness the Duke of Windsor in Lord Beaverbrook's paper. "The last time I saw my brother Bertie at Buckingham Palace he remarked almost despairingly: 'If this kind of thing goes on at its present rate I may one day find myself in the unenviable position of being the last private landowner in the country.'" The Crown is "isolated"; the monarch (the English Sovereign is not a monarch) "marooned." Not even the Marquess of Salisbury would dissent. Yet the most significant observation related is this:—

"I well remember the circumstances of my niece's birth.

"The year was 1926 . . .

"My parents were at Windsor castle. They hurried immediately to the Yorks' house on Bruton-street in London to welcome their grandchild.

"They were overjoyed, and wrote me all about the baby. But their joy at this happy family event was almost immediately clouded by a grave national crisis.

"Ten days after the birth of this future Queen the coal miners of Britain struck.

"Shortly afterwards the Trades Union Congress called a nation-wide strike in sympathy with the miners, thereby paralysing the whole country. All transportation stopped; factories were idle for lack of power.

"The general strike was over by the time she was three weeks old. Still, it was an ominous birthright for a royal Princess destined to reign 26 years later over a people still bearing the scars of a social conflict that may not yet have run its course."

Our readers may feel a slight shock of surprise to see *The Brief for the Prosecution* brought so near to the topic of the Coronation of Elizabeth II. Did they know how near that work lies to every feature of the new reign, they might be asking to be fed with a still greater understanding instead of for presentations in Basic English of what they already know. We are happy to know that at least a discarded Prince of the Royal House shares with us the knowledge that the conflict between Mond-Turnerism and human society has not yet run its course.

(To be concluded.)

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 4, 1953.

### Foreign Affairs

*Lieut.-Colonel Walter Elliot* (Glasgow, Kelvingrove):

. . . What the right hon. Gentleman said was of very great interest, because it seemed to me to prove that at this moment there is a most interesting thing happening in the House. The currents are beginning to run across the House. That is the stage which one reaches at slack water. When the tide is coming to the full, when the rising tide is flowing or an ebb tide is racing out, then the great currents run clearly. But here the tide is on the turn. It may well be that a period of great interest has arrived, particularly in foreign affairs.

. . . We are now in a position, however, where all world politics are coming under review. I have great sympathy with the right hon. Member for Bassetlaw in his emphasis on the position of Germany. After all, Europe is still one of the key points of the world and the position of Germany is still the key question in Europe. . . .

. . . The present comparative period of calm should be seized upon by those interested, and particularly by her eastern neighbours, to see whether some composition cannot be reached now. The right hon. Member for Bassetlaw said that there was no frontier at present that could be the subject of a Locarno Treaty. But it is also true, as he said, that the Locarno frontiers were the results of a treaty. The present lull may not last very long. It should be used to attempt to come to some composition between adversaries.

None of us who visited Germany recently could help but be struck by the swelling strength that was becoming apparent in that country, the evidence of inordinate labour there, and the fact that her 10 million refugees have been made a source of strength and not a weakness to her today. This great flood of hands that has come in has been set to work. It has reinforced rather than weakened the country. At present, there is a growing consciousness of power and strength in that country; of which we and her neighbours would do well to take note before the time is too late.

A year ago when we went to Germany and we said, "What will you give for German unity?" the German Left said, "A lot," and the German Right said, "A little." Now both sides say "Nothing. Keep off the grass." There is there a danger to the world.

*Mr. Crossman*: Hear, hear.

*Lieut.-Colonel Elliot*: I fully agree with the hon. Member for Coventry, East (*Mr. Crossman*), who was with me on that visit and who wrote most apprehensively of what he saw. There is a great danger to the world in that attitude, and it is the duty of statesmen to try to reconcile it. I welcome, therefore, with all my heart the Prime Minister's suggestion of talks between high level heads. The heads are all, of course, prisoners of their own declarations and conscious of great injustices under which their countries have laboured. But a treaty of peace is a condoning of injustice and an abandonment of many claims that have been made. These things have to be done to bring about a treaty of peace. It is for the Soviet rulers,

among others, to realise that they must put up with a great deal, if peace is to be brought back again to the world and there is to be no feeling that the world is simply marking time while we fill up the vials of wrath, while we compress the springs of action until Germany, one of the greatest fighting races that has ever existed, begins again her march to the East.

Those of us who saw members of the General Staff in Germany saw again that resolute, objective, calm set of men who, for hundreds of years now, have formed a caste in their own country. They were sitting there with the same confident feeling that, sooner or later, the tide would float the boat off the rocks and that they would go again on their journeys. Meanwhile, they were collecting the charts and the soundings and maps for new voyages upon which, under their command, Germany, sooner or later, would embark. If that frame of mind is to be dissipated, it must be dissipated by statesmanship which is willing to concede as well as to insist. That will be the task of statesmen in the immediate future if it is to be done at all.

None of us could believe, after the 1914-18 war, that after the hammering and battering that the central Powers had taken they would be ever fit for war again within the lifetime of any living men. The whole constitution of the League of Nations was based on the prospect of a six months' delay. There was no veto on war; there was merely the provision for a six months' delay. People thought that war was so horrible to the whole world that, given six months to face it, the public opinion of the world would make war impossible. We saw how rapidly, in the 'thirties, the tide flowed over those marks and submerged them. The tide is flowing again today.

One of the features of the human race is that it is not afraid of things. I wish it were more afraid of things. It is filled with the most desperate courage. That is what makes me believe in the immortal soul. No finite being could be such a fool as the human race is unless it drew its lunacy from realms far outside those of everyday calculation. It would be impossible otherwise to conceive such an assembly of wild and crazy creatures as *homo sapiens*. I would call him *homo robustus*; I do not think he is entitled to be called *sapiens*. He cannot be frightened.

The Germans who, heaven knows, had enough to frighten them in the First World War, marched out in the Second in the same spirit of a *frische froliche Krieg* in which the Kaiser's soldiers set off on their marches in 1914. Today, the danger is, that with 10 million refugees who have nothing to lose they start with a corps of people who are very willing

DR. AND MRS. C. G. DOBBS would welcome, for periods up to a week or ten days during August, 1953, a few people as (expense-sharing) guests who would be interested in combining a holiday in North Wales with a serious study of Social Credit. Applicants should be annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter*, or strongly recommended by social crediters of long standing.

Enquiries should be made to Mrs. C. G. Dobbs, Bodifyr, Bangor, Caernarvonshire.

to go on a venture which may indeed bring a very great and increased danger to the world.

I am interested in, but not specially afraid of, the problems of the East. In the East men are being driven by a more terrible devil than Marx; they are being driven by Malthus, the old English clergyman who saw all these possibilities long, long ago. It is quite true that there is danger from hungry men—and the East is getting hungrier—but these hungry men grow weaker, not stronger. Germany is not getting hungrier. She is getting better fed. One can go there and see the rising standard of living and judge whether these are not people of whom we have every reason to be more apprehensive than of the peoples of the East.

The peoples of the East deserve attention; they deserve help. In the last 20 years their standard of living has fallen from 2,000 to 1,700 calories, which is below the maintenance value of a ration. This may lead to misery, collapse and desperation, but it does not lead to a successful aggression. The danger lies in the strong, vigorous, well-fed Westerner—master of the arts and the engineering sciences. These are the people who can dig guns out of the ground, who can bring fertilisers out of the air, harness water falls and revitalise all the coal mines of Germany in a decade. Russia would be well advised to watch what is going on on her frontier and not to believe that she can dispose of that danger by war. I do not think it will be possible for her to do so.

... The movement in the Kremlin is an interesting change and it may be possible to take advantage of it. In doing so it should be remembered that a most unstable condition has been produced in the centre of Europe, one which will not permanently endure. As the right hon. Member for Bassetlaw said, present frontiers have been challenged by both German parties—by the Left as well as the Right—in the centre of Europe.

Let us, then, agree with our adversary while we are in the way with time. Let us bend every effort to bring about a favourable response to these problems. But let us remember that these great moments do not endure. One is here; let us seize it while it is possible.

Mr. R. H. S. Crossman (Coventry, East): . . . I warn the House that if we violate their sovereignty by making these demands on the Egyptians we shall not be able to enforce them without the occupation of the whole of Egypt. We cannot leave 80,000 men in the middle of the desert surrounded by barbed wire and without any Egyptian labour. The Egyptian labour would be withdrawn. They have already withdrawn 25,000 people, and the last 9,000 will be withdrawn very soon. Are we to leave our men for 10 years in the desert, surrounded by barbed wire, with their stores being pilfered? It looks very fine to talk about standing up to the Egyptians. It looked fine to talk about standing up to the Jews.

The fundamental fact about us is, that this country does not in the last resort stand up for denying sovereignty to a small people. In the end we always give way. The trouble is we always give way too late—or rather too late in the Middle East although we hit the right time in India.

(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. 30. No. 14.

Saturday, May 30, 1953.

### From Week to Week

Can anyone suggest to us why our 'Conservative' leaders, as though by the sheer force of deeply ingrained habit, reiterate "I (We) do not know. I (We) should like to know," when questions are asked to which literally everyone of sound mind knows the answer? When, to use a phrase which though technical everyone now understands, "Operation Failure" is seen by unwise persistence in the face of unsound advice to lead inevitably to disaster, do they say that "Persistence in Operation Failure is the only thing that can possibly lead to success" and that there is no known answer to the "question" this necessity raises?

Quite obviously, the Marquess of Salisbury has at last acquired enough insight into the working of the policy of Indefinitely Expanding Industry (work for work's sake) to know that a Welfare State which approximates to his own definition of a welfare state, as something which has behind it the impulse described in the First Epistle of St. John as that of those who do not unnecessarily reserve the bowels of their compassion, is incompatible with it.

In the House of Lords on May 20, Lord Salisbury said: "I recall a remark made to me not long ago by an American about labour-saving devices in his country. He said that labour-saving devices had become so essential to the modern housewife that she and her husband had to work twelve hours a day to earn the money to buy them." Quoting from a newspaper he said: "There are two to two and a half million married women, between 20 and 49, at work in this country to-day, an unprecedented number in peace time. About one and a quarter million are mothers; over 10 per cent. of these mothers are at work in the first five years of marriage. This means 10 per cent. of all children under five are affected. After five years the proportion of mothers at work increases until it reaches 24 per cent. after fifteen years of marriage."

These, he said, are 'formidable figures'—as they are. They are not 'inevitable from an economic point of view,' as he asserted, unless an economic point of view is one which envisages the impossibility of refraining from actions which yield the opposite result to that advanced as the reason for their perfectly voluntary performance. Industry expands because clever people contrive to expand it against heavy odds. A man who could be better off if he desisted from his exertions can desist; and a collectivity called a nation can, if its politicians will let it, do the same, with advantage to themselves as well as to everyone else.

Lord Salisbury believes (he is quite right in doing so) that there is "a very real danger that the Welfare State itself (paradoxical though this may appear) may impose too heavy a burden on its own beneficiaries." He is not right when he says that he would be misleading their Lordships' House if he told them that the best way to cut down a tree is to cut it down. Their Lordships would believe him—some of them are still owners of trees. The best way to relieve a country of the dire consequences which result from acceptance by statesmen of the doctrine that the sole end of man is the expansion of Industry is the repudiation by statesmen of this fantastic doctrine. When they do so a New Age will have begun.

We may be wrong; but if recent press disclosures are anything to go by we doubt the efficacy of a secret ballot for the election of trade union officials to counter communist pressure. But, if adopted for trade unions why should not trade unionists move for a secret ballot for the Division Lobbies—and an open ballot for electors?

The *Irish Times* has reviewed at length a book published last winter in Germany with a title the English equivalent of which is *The Future Has Already Begun*. The author, Robert Jungk, is a German journalist who has been working in America for the past five years. Circulation in Germany is said to have been advanced by a critical review by the *Neue Zuercher Zeitung*. To judge from the Irish review, the work is the Teutonic equivalent, factual and 'documentary' of *Animal Farm*, with, however, a special application to the economics and sociology of atomic energy. "Is America Destroying Herself in Her Atom-Age?" is the heading of the *Irish Times's* review. Herr Jungk has no faith in the human qualities of Americans, which he thinks are insufficient to enable them to stand up to the vast impersonal forces released by America's technical civilisation. "It can be done" is enough justification for doing anything, however disastrous the consequences. The writer is fascinated by atomic developments, the burial grounds for atomic waste, for instance. What will happen if the signs disappear that mark off these dangerous areas, and future generations forget the exact sites?

"At Hanford an expert tells him that atomic waste with its deadly radiations is a bigger long term problem than the international control of atomic weapons. In future, mankind would have to live with the life-destroying forces it released when it interfered with Nature."

We have received the text of an address by Colonel E. S. Grogan, Member of the Kenya Legislative Council for Nairobi West, at Nairobi on April 29, together with a report of an interview with him by a reporter of the *East African Standard*. Colonel Grogan suggests departure from traditional standards of British colonial administration are responsible for the development of a psycho-pathological state of mind among the Kikuyu. "The Native Land Trust

(continued on page 8.)

## The Economy of Athens

by H. SWABEY

Augustus Boeckh wrote *The Public Economy of Athens* in 1817. It was translated into English in 1842, and distributed as a school prize. Boeckh understood something of the power of money. He begins by noting that the intellectual faculties cannot produce action without force, "the direction and combination of which are wholly at the disposal of money; that mighty spring by which the whole machinery of human energies is set in motion."

Delphi functioned as a central treasury, or bank, and the treasures were dispersed by Pericles and by the wars. Then Alexander brought a quantity back from the East, out of which he subsidised Aristotle's researches. We read of a Jew purchasing the revenues of three districts (Coelosyria, Phoenicia and Judæa) for 16,000 talents, when the talent was worth about £250. In addition, "many Grecian States" had local coins of copper and iron for internal circulation. Athens apparently considered, or implemented, a State monopoly of lead, which tripled its price.

The adult male population of Attica, it is worth noting, consisted of a mere twenty thousand, apart from the slaves. They commended agriculture and rather looked down on commerce, but industry flourished and the debt laws were severe. (Solon frowned on the export of food.) Boeckh remarks, however, that to the ancients, "the state embraced and governed all relations between man and man"; it was a time long "before the security of persons and property was held to be the sole object of government." The interfering spirit, which led Athens to block trade from Boeotia and Megara, provoked the Peloponnesian war.

Boeckh states that the necessities of life were upon the whole cheaper than in 1817, although the Persian wars resulted in a great rise of prices. Insurance was extended to slaves. Attica produced two thirds of her corn, and might have suffered scarcity "if judicious arrangements had not been devised." Britain at one time understood how to make judicious arrangements. Athens fortified Sunium and provided a convoy if necessary, not, we may be sure, under the command of a Spartan admiral. Only a third of the imported corn could be re-exported, and monopoly was a capital offence. Nevertheless, "the corn-dealers . . . who were for the most part aliens, raised the price of corn by competition in bad times. Lysias cannot say enough of the villainy of these usurers, who were then as much detested as they are in modern times. They bought up the corn under the pretence of providing for the interest of the people. The public loss was their gain; and so much did they rejoice at the occurrence of any national calamity, that they never failed to have the first intelligence of it; or else they fabricated some disastrous news. [cf. peace-scares.] Nor did even the merchants make any profit by it, a circumstance upon which much stress is laid by the modern teachers of political economy in favour of engrossing: on the contrary they suffered severe injury from the combinations of the corn-dealers and their continual persecution." So they had Mond-Turnerism.

The *Protocols*, and other organs of propaganda, have stressed the need to abolish classical study. Perhaps Boeckh is on the Index. We may contrast the ability of Elizabeth

I to translate Ovid with the vulgarity of modern rulers, paste-board or otherwise.\* Something of course replaces the classical discipline. New York is the world headquarters of pornography and prize fighting, while Moscow churns out another type of mental corrosive. Philistinism and Marxism both destroy the individual, or soften him up to accept control from the top. The classics of Europe or China serve to burnish the mind, as well as suggesting precedents to avoid or follow.

Boeckh mentions free distributions of corn on particular occasions, adding that, "The presents in particular, which were at times made to the people from foreign parts, were distributed gratis." When the state of Lampascus fixed the price of barley-meal, the citizens had to pay half as much again as the state expected a profit. Wine sold at an amazingly low price, but we hear of no Alcoholics Anonymous societies (they are trying to float a drugs anonymous in the West) such as has followed on Prohibition and Liquor Control Boards. The Greeks would eat beans out of their shells as a remedy against drunkenness, a comedian states.

A family of four could just live ("get by") on £15 a year, Boeckh reckons. The Troezenians gave a small pension to the old men, women and children who had fled from Athens at the time of the invasion of Xerxes. Xenophon, says Boeckh, "in his Treatise upon the Revenues, understood perfectly that it was necessary to promote the welfare of individuals." But after the Peloponnesian War, citizens who were accustomed to better things "were compelled to maintain themselves by working for daily wages at any manual labour."

Rates of interest varied from 12 to 18 *per cent.* normally, and appeared "to have a common origin with rent." This however is a high rate for natural increase. Solon removed the creditor's right over the body of a debtor; and the measure called the Seisachtheia, shaking of burdens, seems in some cases to have extinguished debts altogether. The bankers "to a certain degree obtained possession of a monopoly . . . generally of a low origin, they became possessed of great credit . . . shown by the great wealth of Pasion, whose bank annually produced a net profit of 100 minas. . . . The Athenian bankers obtained 36 *per cent.*" The common usurers made even more, and 25% a day was recorded. Owing to their greed and severity, "the bankers and money-lenders drew upon themselves the merited hatred of all, as being the most infamous of human beings." He refers to the speech of Demosthenes against Stephan. In other states, agricultural implements could not be taken in pawn, which implies that the Athenian bankers did not scruple to deprive a man of the tools of his trade.

Loans on bottomry ("so odious at Rome") provided another side-line, and you were lucky to obtain an advance at 20% for the sailing season. House rents were probably not so exorbitant. Foreigners, it may be noted, were debarred from owning houses or land.

Turning to public finance, Boeckh appears to deplore the absence of "Dutch" finance in Athens. We may recall that Jefferson said that a loan was tyrannical if it ran for more than 19 years, as this would involve taxation *without consent* for posterity. Boeckh says that, "In every Greek

\*Royalty, of course, "reigns but does not rule" (Churchill).

state the finances were in the hands of the sovereign power; and at Athens the legislation on financial matters belonged to the people, the administration of them to the supreme council. . . . In the progress of time, the faulty management of the finances of Athens essentially contributed to the destruction of the state. . . . Immoderate exertions and excesses equally render a state and an individual incapable of performing their proper functions . . . after the age of Pericles the administration of the finances became of greater importance, and the expenses of the state increased as public principle declined." State tutelage, or despotism, varies of course in indirect proportion with personal responsibility and competence.

Acknowledgments for money lent were called *cheirographs*, the identical word used of the documents which the Jews in England kept in chests before their expulsion. This hardly supports the theory that they were driven to money lending by Christian persecution, as at least it demonstrates the antiquity of the craft.

A Senate of 500 members administered the revenues and were responsible to the people, and they supported the infirm at public cost. The people elected the public treasurer for four years by a shew of hands, who was still subject to the law and the people. We read of him distributing confiscated property. Despite a heavy bureaucracy of clerks and checking-clerks, they all embezzled. Even Pericles was said to have started the Samian war to avoid an enquiry.

*(To be concluded)*

#### PARLIAMENT—

*(continued from page 3.)*

I urge this House in all seriousness not to be carried away by these arguments which sound so fine now but which will not look so fine in three months' time when the consequences of them, military and political, come upon us.

There is one serious objection to evacuation, and it is one which worries me a great deal. It is the problem of Israel. Here is a profound problem for any conscientious Englishman. Can we withdraw from the Suez Canal and hand over the base to the Egyptians without setting alight the second round of the war against Israel? If the Prime Minister had told me there was a deadlock in the negotiations with General Neguib, because he had laid down as a condition of our evacuation that it should not be taken as an opportunity to begin the second round of that war, I should have backed the Prime Minister through thick and thin, and I should have said, "Of course we cannot come out of Suez without an absolute assurance from the Egyptians that that base will not be used for offensive action against Israel."

I may be asked, "What are words worth?" It is a question that has to be asked. Suppose we got a signature to an undertaking that there was not to be an attack on Israel. Here is a real problem. Suppose that General Neguib's Government do, as I believe they will do, an honest job of dividing up the land amongst the Egyptian people. That will not of itself raise the standard of living of the Egyptians. In 10 years' time the Egyptians will be faced with an insoluble economic problem. Then there will be a temptation to export the problem and to start on the second

round of the war against the Jews. We could not possibly tolerate any withdrawal from Suez unless we took every possible precaution against that possibility. We must prevent that war. The Prime Minister himself yesterday uttered generous words about Israel. He at least is someone who has a right to say those generous things about Israel. But he must give his words reality.

There are two ways of setting about this problem. The first is to make our evacuation of Egypt depend upon this assurance, and to say that if the Egyptians break it British and American economic aid to Egypt will be broken off. The Egyptians are fairly hard headed people. We should make our evacuation, and our economic and military aid conditional upon their not undertaking a foreign adventure.

Another consideration is this. I have always had a great doubt whether such a concentration as we have in that Zone of all kinds of stores and troops is very relevant to modern strategy. I have always believed in the principle of dispersion. I do not think it is safe in a world of atomic warfare to have that huge concentration. Those who have been there must know the danger. Two atomic bombs would finish it off. Let that concentration be dispersed, and I suggest that it should be partly dispersed into the Gaza strip. It was part of Palestine, but it was occupied by the Egyptian Army. It contains 130,000 Arab refugees in a few miles of dreary sand dunes.

If we have a small number of British troops in the Gaza strip we could be certain that the Egyptians would not go to blows with Israel. Egypt is not going to involve herself in a war with British troops. The presence of British troops in the Gaza strip and taking over the refugees and using them for the work there is the way in which we can help to solve the relationship between Israel and her neighbour. Good relations between Israel and her neighbour are not going to come about merely by talking about them. We have to convince the Arab world that we are not there solely for oil and strategy. The fundamental basis of any defence of the Middle East must be our acceptance of the principle of evacuation from the Canal Zone.

. . . In conclusion I should like to say a word on the other great issue which the Prime Minister raised and that is our relations with America. I think that there is no one in this House who fails to recognise the need for a real Anglo-American partnership, but a lot of us have been disturbed by a fatal tendency in the last three years. No British initiative has been possible without the prior consent of America. It was almost as though every speech that was made in Westminster had to be read in Washington before it was passed for approval. I congratulate the Prime Minister on having broken down a very bad two or three years' precedent.

. . . If we are to be politically independent, we must have economic independence, and that will mean a great deal of self-sacrifice in this country, a great deal of discrimination and not being too angry with the Americans because they stop us selling our goods in the U.S.A. We must assume they will not let us export to them very freely. Moreover, the purchase of arms as an alternative to dollar aid is a deadly policy, because we find as a result large sections of our engineering industry dependent on American re-armament and acquiring a vested interest in the cold

war. If we are economically in that position we shall not have a policy which is in favour of peace.

In the second place, if we are to be independent of America and become a partner on equal terms we have to accept the social revolution in Asia and Africa and co-operate with it wholeheartedly. It is no good a Tory Prime Minister saying that he is going to have an independent line, when his policy in Africa adds to our military commitments day by day. How many troops shall we need to make good the Prime Minister's threats and occupy Cairo? How many for bashing down the Kikuyu? How many for holding down Africans in a Central African Federation? To try to reaffirm white ascendancy is impossible without becoming a satellite of America. It is impossible without a gigantic armament bill for this country—which the U.S.A. must pay.

The same is true of Asia. I was delighted to hear the leader of the Opposition say what we all know is true, that Ho Chi Minh heads the real national movement in Indo-China. Do not let us be hypocritical about it. It is time to tell the French and the Americans that they are fighting an unjust war in Indo-China. If the French had done the right thing, Indo-China today would stand alongside Indonesia, and Burma. Ho Chi Minh and his rebels are not Communist by nature but by compulsion. They are driven to be Communists in order to get national liberation.

If we accept the Chinese revolution we must accept the Indo-Chinese revolution and tell our friends not to waste millions of dollars on preserving a few square miles round Saigon under French protection. . . .

*House of Commons: May 13, 1953.*

### **Therapeutic Substances (Prevention of Misuse Bill)**

[Lords]

Order for Second Reading read.

*The Minister of Health (Mr. Ian Macleod):* I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

I propose to take only a few minutes in commending to the House this Bill, which, in effect, has only two Clauses. The object of the first Clause is to extend the scope of the Penicillin Act, 1947, which has been found to be too narrow in that it applies only to what are known as the group of antibiotics. . . .

. . . I come to the new part of this Bill—Clause 2, which is known popularly as the "penicillin for pigs" Clause. . . .

*Dr. Barnett Stross (Stoke-on-Trent, Central):* I think that this is a very important Bill in respect of both its two main Clauses. We entirely agree that, so far as the first Clause is concerned, the Minister has every right to ask that the community should entrust his Department with the care of public health in the way which the right hon. Gentleman suggested in his remarks; for it is certainly true that we have not seen the end of these new substances which will come on to the market, and which may be very potent to stave off disease, or to cure it and save life, and which are very dangerous if wrongly applied by people who do not understand either the quantities or the proper mode of application.

In addition, in the Bill, the Minister gives Parliament the safeguard of being able to object to the Statutory Instrument which he must bring forward, and I think we are, therefore, doubly safeguarded. In the first place, we would have said, "You must take this power," and, in the second, it is quite right that we should have the right to have a look at the matter again.

The second Clause is very interesting and exciting for we are really treading into strange country. The Minister spoke only of pigs and pig-meal, but he should have said that the pig-meal, to be ideal, must not be intermittently fed but should be of the "creeping feed" type. The right hon. Gentleman forgot table poultry, which really come in as well, for we are satisfied that the same technique can be used for the more rapid putting-on of weight or fattening of table poultry.

This is not, indeed, what the late H. G. Wells would have termed the "food of the gods," for, although the animal grows more quickly there is no evidence that it will grow bigger than the normal size, and it is at a certain stage of the development of the animal that the best results are obtained. There is a tendency in the later stages of the animal's life for the benefits to be less apparent and the increase in weight from the utilisation of the food taken to be not so apparent as in the earlier stages. I hope that some of our scientists will later do something even better than this. I do not know if we shall be using penicillin because we do not make enough aureomycin ourselves, but the figures for aureomycin are better than those for penicillin, and there is some evidence that the former will be very useful when we have it in sufficient quantities.

Something that the scientists might do to help the country is to find some method whereby all these humble animals like fowls and pigs could be induced to put on weight in the same way as hibernating animals, which can go to sleep and do nothing at all but yet grow fat on it. I have never known any hon. Member of this House putting on weight while resting. I am speaking of the hibernating animals, and I have in mind such creatures as the squirrel. We know that they can change their metabolism because they give off less carbon dioxide while asleep and retain some of the carbon atoms. These they synthesise with water-vapour and thus form glycogen, which they store in their livers or convert to fat. If we can find a method by which we can achieve this, we shall have solved our food problems, but a solution does not seem likely at the moment.

Both in the debate today and in another place much point has been made in reference to penicillin and resistant organisms as well as allergy in man. There cannot be any allergy in man if it is true that the animal excretes any penicillin out of its system through its kidneys. All that is needed is that the penicillin be not given in the last two days before slaughter.

As to the question of resistant bacteria, I am not so sure that the reports that have been made by the Medical Research Council are 100 per cent. correct, but one has in mind something like this. The mode by means of which these animals are able to utilise their food better and put on weight assumes that bacteria are active in the alimentary system.

Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that one of the factors which gives us this beneficent result is that

bacteria are enabled to synthesise Vitamin B.12, which is a growth factor. Or let us suppose that the bacteria which normally destroy the growth factor are themselves destroyed by penicillin. For example, some growth factors we know are amino acids like lysine or tryptophane, or Vitamin B.12. I hope I am making myself clear to hon. Members; it is not a difficult matter in reality. The alimentary system is full of bacteria of many types. Some of them synthesise and manufacture the growth factor. Others, on the other hand, have a putrifying and destructive influence and would destroy Vitamin B.12 or the amino acids which we get from proteins. Thirdly, there are others which produce toxins and make the animal ill.

It may be that penicillin works in one of three ways; either by curing the animal of an endemic illness and allowing it, therefore, to grow faster, which is, of course, one of the thoughts in the minds of those who know more about it than I do—the Agricultural Research Council; or it may be that the growth factor is in part synthesised through fermentation by other forms of bacteria; or thirdly, that organisms inimical to the presence of growth factors are directly destroyed by the antibiotic. I am not sure that it would be fair to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to answer these technical details. I will acquit her if she does not.

But aureomycin in sufficient quantities will give a sterile gut. That means that, sooner or later, if pigs are fed and rendered clean in this way new types of bacteria may evolve and thrive which are resistant to the penicillin which the pigs are eating regularly in their food. That point is clear. Should that arise, it would mean, first, that we should lose the benefits that we are now about to gain because in such cases the pigs would tend to cease to be able to make use of penicillin for improving their growth and the better utilisation of the food we given them. The other factor is that if there be migration of the bacteria to humans we may find ourselves in trouble. I do not want to frighten anybody, but these are the matters we must look at. As the hon. Member for Putney (Mr. Linstead) said, we are treading on strange and new territory.

As I said earlier, we may also expect a better return of table poultry as a result of this Bill. It is estimated that the food saved in bringing the pig to the bacon stage by using penicillin amounts to 46 lb. and the amount saved by using aureomycin to 68 lb. I can remember it more easily in this way, that, by and large, one can save 5 per cent. of the food needed to bring the animal to, say, 180 lb. weight. What is still more interesting and surprising one can save 10 per cent. of the time.

In the case of aureomycin, 25 days can be saved, whereas in the case of penicillin only 12 days are saved. The cost of doing this is very little because antibiotics cost roughly, I believe, about 1s. 3d. a gram, and, as we have heard, only two or three parts in a million of antibiotic is required in the food. This means only a few grams per ton. I see no danger of a black market in penicillin if it is properly prepared before being handed over to the farmer, either as a mixture from which he will be unable to extract the penicillin, or mixed with the meal in cwt. bags, as suggested in another place. In any case, penicillin is very cheap and anyone who needs it can get it from his doctor. Its cost retail is about 2s. or 2s. 3d. for 100,000 or 250,000 units. Therefore, I

cannot see that there is any purpose in thinking in terms of its irregular use.

With regard to the care that should be taken, we should remember an experiment made in America which gave the lead in so much of this work nowadays. They found that another chemical substance, an oestrogen, a type of ovarian hormone, could be used to fatten table poultry. It produced birds with large breasts which were very succulent, and they made a much greater delicacy on the table. What they did not know, of course, when they offered those birds to people in expensive restaurants, and no doubt to Senators and Congressmen, was that the oestrogen remains in the breast of the chicken and causes, in men only, I am glad to say, sterility which is a very serious matter. [*Laughter.*] We may well laugh at it, but I think we are lucky that that particular experiment was not made in this country.

. . . I welcome this Bill wholeheartedly because it is one of the examples of science offering help to the community as a whole. I sincerely hope that we shall find richer and more varied ways by means of which food can be increased, not only for our own people, but, through our experiments, for people all over the world. It is certain that if we can conquer the problem of world hunger or of an insufficiency of food we shall have done something that will allow us, when time has gone by, to say that we have some reason to be proud of ourselves.

. . . Would it be fair to say that there is a specific benefit of a financial nature to the pig-breeder? Is it not true that, as a result of the saving of feedingstuffs, he gains about 10s. 6d. in the penicillin-fed pigs and 18s. in the aureomycin-fed pigs?

*Mr. Nugent:* It would be most unwise for me to try to confirm specific figures, but in general terms there is a cash advantage to the pig fattener or the table poultry fattener in using these substances. I must not stray far into the fascinating field opened by the hon. Member as to exactly what is the effect of an antibiotic. . . .

### Mr. Hewlett Edwards

Readers will be glad to hear that Mr. Hewlett Edwards whose recent illness was announced is progressing favourably.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK *(continued from page 4.)*

Ordinance excluded the Native Land Units from the category of Crown Land (in a Crown Colony!) leading to a tribal sense of exclusion from subjection to the unquestioned authority of the 'Crown.' He suggests that a primitive tribe (still practising ritual cannibalism like the Kikuyu) instinctively needs a nucleus of tribal psychical emanation and the Kikuyu have filled the chamber evacuated by the Crown with the mythical figure of our "dearly beloved Kenyatta" (*sic*) a Britain-distorted and Moscow-inspired remarkable personality.

Resumption by the Crown under Clause 69 of the Native Land Trust Ordinance would "exorcise" "our dearly beloved Kenyatta."

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