

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 17.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 20, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: June 10, 1953.

Processed Foods

Lord Teviot rose to call attention to the high percentage of processed and chemically treated foods now consumed, and to ask Her Majesty's Government to do everything possible to increase the availability of fresh food for the people and the furtherance of supply of home-killed food and home-grown food; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: . . . Taking into consideration the effect of unsuitable food on animals, and indeed on human beings, there seems to be no question that in regard to almost all illnesses food is the most important question. I am a trustee of, I suppose, the biggest clinic in this country, and the number of people who come in for special diet is very large. To me, being a laymen, that shows that something is wrong with the "tummy." If food is going to put that trouble right, it is probably caused by wrong food. I feel that this question should be tackled at once. I know something is happening in the direction I desire, but certainly not enough. In order to give your Lordships some justification for my having the temerity to raise this question in your Lordships' House, I have with me the Report of the Ministry of Health, which some of your Lordships may have read, covering the period April 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951. With your Lordships' permission, I shall give a few quotations and conclusions arrived at in this very important Paper which is set out for the Minister of Health and is signed by a well-known man in the medical world, Mr. John A. Charles.

Let us take one question which is very much stressed in this Report, the question of dysentery and its increase. I will not weary your Lordships with many statistics, but taking 1950 and 1951, the Report shows that while the number of cases notified in 1950 was 17,286, in 1951 it was 28,590. That has very much disturbed the learned gentleman who compiled this Report. I should like also to read your Lordships quite short quotations from other parts of this Report dealing with various subjects. On page 19, there arises the question of stillbirths, and this is what the Report says:

"The lack of progress in reducing the stillbirth rate in the last two or three years must be regarded as disappointing and, in fact, disturbing; particularly when compared with the rapid reduction that was achieved between 1936 and 1948. Intensified efforts are needed to combat the causes of stillbirths and it may be that the first step will be to determine more accurately what these causes are, in this field our knowledge is inadequate."

That, my Lords, is a very important and forthright statement.

The next question, I should like to quote here concerns the deplorable situation with regard to cancer. I will not give your Lordships the figures; they are deplorable, and show a marked increase. Then I come to page 51. Here I find something which appeals to me very much, because it is bang on the subject which I am discussing. In a comprehensive table are set out statistics with regard to outbreaks and family outbreaks of food poisoning in 1951. It shows that infection comes in a far greater percentage from certain types of food than from others. Take canned fish. The total number of outbreaks given is 15. For processed fish the figure is 1. For shellfish the total is 2, and for fish generally it is 4. But please note that the number for canned fish is 15. Meat comes next. The total number of outbreaks due to canned meat was 25, and to processed and made-up meat 114. Then figures are given for fresh meat and gravy. The figure is 1 in each instance. Exactly the same sort of proportions are found with regard to other foods. In the case of fresh vegetables and canned vegetables, for instance, it is shown that there was one outbreak due to fresh vegetables, while 2 were due to canned vegetables.

Here I am going to make a suggestion to my noble friend, and perhaps I may put it this way. We go to a shop wishing to buy something to eat which is tinned—it may be that we have nothing else in the house and are obliged to buy something. Our purchase is contained in a tin. There is no mark on that tin to indicate the vintage, so to speak, of the contents. Your Lordships will be aware that there are certain baby foods which are not to be used when a certain time has elapsed after their manufacture. I make this suggestion to my noble friend. It would not cost very much to the manufacturer of these tinned or processed foods if relevant dates were put on the tins so that you would know that, like your wine, the food was of a certain vintage. I think that would stop a great deal of the use of tinned food. In some cases we do not know the age of the tinned stuff we buy. It may be five, ten, fifteen or twenty years old. It is all very well to say, "Oh, but of course it is hermetically sealed." I am one of those who do not believe for one moment that tinned food does not deteriorate with age. Passing to page 54 of the Report, we find further matter of considerable interest in this connection. I am afraid that this afternoon I am going to speak for a longer time than I usually do, but I feel that this is a matter with which one should deal pretty exhaustively. On page 54 the question of the notification of food poisoning is dealt with. I would draw your Lordships' attention to this passage:

"For notification of food poisoning to be of full value it must be prompt and of all cases of gastro-intestinal illness. But in his subsequent investigations the medical officer of health may,

not infrequently, find that despite the best efforts of the bacteriologist and himself, there is a substantial incidence of gastro-intestinal illness of sudden onset in patients from whom no pathogenic organism can be recovered nor any vehicle of infection incriminated."

This is going on all the time; it is all wrong. We were not meant to be like this. I feel that what I have already quoted justifies my raising this question in your Lordships' House to-day.

I have just a few more remarks to make with regard to this Report. On page 61, the question of poisoning in school meals, curiously enough, is dealt with. There appears to be a distinct indication that a careful investigation should be made into this subject. That is the conclusion one draws from the results shown. Finally, I come to page 111 of the Report. On this page we are given information on a subject which is occupying the attention of a great many people, and I propose to say just a few sentences about it—I refer to the question of premature infant birth. Apparently that is occurring to a very serious extent. My noble friend on the Opposition Front Bench must know all about this. Certainly, the figures given here show that there are far too many premature births and far too many children born underweight. Percentages are given of children of weights such as 5½ lb. and so on. I will not weary your Lordships with all the figures; you will find them on page 111. To me they demonstrate that the mothers are undernourished or not properly nourished. Many other important questions are, of course, dealt with in the Report, and many of them, in my view, justify me in bringing up this matter to-day.

I do not intend to weary your Lordships by speaking upon my pet subject, except to say just a few words about it in passing—I refer, of course, to bread. My noble friend Lord Hankey has a Motion on the Order Paper about that. He is going to deal with the question of the composition of our bread. No one knows more about it than he does, so I shall only touch very lightly upon it. I hope that on this topic we shall have the benefit of the opinion of noble Lords who are members of the medical profession. I believe that in the rise of agene and other so-called improvers we find one of the great dangers to the general health of the people. We are still using agene in the making of bread. That is a matter with which Lord Hankey will deal, but my noble friend Lord Derwent, who cannot be hear to-day, told me that I might make a few remarks which he had intended to make. I understand that Lady Derwent had been ill for some time. She was never well; there was always something wrong with her. Finally, it was decided that she should have a most thorough examination with a view to finding out what really was wrong with her. It was discovered that she was suffering from agene poisoning. As I have said, Lord Derwent cannot be here to-day but he told me that he would be very glad if I mentioned that fact. The curious thing is that one of the reasons they found out the cause of the trouble was that when Lady Derwent went to France her condition began to improve. When she returned to this country, her doctors told her not to touch national bread. They also said to her, "Never eat anything made out of national flour which has in it agene and these various chemical improvers." Lady Derwent followed their directions, and as a result she has since then been improving all the time. Her physicians are of opinion that the improvement in her

(continued on page 7.)

Liberation by Social Credit

Points from the address given by M. LOUIS EVEN, Director-General of Social Credit in French Canada, to the Front Universitaire de Montreal on April 21, 1953.

(Continued.)

(Quotations marked by asterisks are re-translations from the French.)

THE PROBLEM OF TODAY: DISTRIBUTION

In 1918 Mackenzie King, who was not yet chief of the Liberal Party, wrote a book called *Industry and Humanity*. In it one reads:

"Man, and no longer nature, is now master of the situation. The problem, of boundless size, of the possibility of producing anything, is already solved. The progress of human intelligence has brought this about. It can certainly be left to human intelligence to find an equitable solution to the problem of distribution!" (Page 103.)[*]

In the same year the Scottish engineer Major C. H. Douglas gave to the world the Social Credit formula for an exact and just solution of the problem of distribution.

Douglas, too, declared that production, as such, presented no difficulty. He wrote:

"The economic system can be compared with a machine the purpose of which is to satisfy the needs of humanity. The productive part of the machine is very efficient; but the distributive part is terribly inadequate." [*]

But Major Douglas did not confine himself to hoping that human intelligence would find a solution to the problem of distribution: he offered that solution.

Neither Mackenzie King, during his long term as Prime Minister of Canada, nor, up to now, any other government having uncontested sovereign power, has judged it relevant to adopt this solution. They have preferred to undergo depressions, to depend on wars to give back the life-blood of the economy, to rely on State planning or to manipulate tax-money, by miserly allocations made on conditions, and accompanied by enquiries and a cold bureaucracy the financing of which tends to dry up the springs of production.

Douglas's solution regiments nothing, confiscates nothing, centralises nothing, dictates nothing and in no way impedes private initiative and enterprise. It impinges only on an instrument social by nature: the money mechanism. It sets out not to take money from those who have some; nor to lay down the use to be made of money by those who receive it: but simply to make the issue, volume and cancellation of money (or its modern synonym, credit) [†] conform to the facts of a free production and a free consumption.

A SIMPLE SYSTEM OF ACCOUNTING

Modern money lends itself particularly well to this reform of a purely financial nature.

Even if, in times past, money itself has been an intermediate commodity, it is now no more than figures, cyphers; and finance is only simple book-keeping.

In the book quoted above, Mackenzie King wrote, with much truth:

[†]Only one aspect of credit, the monetary aspect, may be said to be 'synonymous' with money.—Editor, T.S.C.

"Money, that is figures inscribed in ledgers, signs and figures printed on metal or paper." [*]

It is, indeed, figures written in registers, in the ledgers of bankers, to the credit of depositors or borrowers, which are used for 90 *per cent.* of commercial transactions. By simple transfer from one account to another. Written book-keeping; script money.

As for the metal coins and rectangles of paper bearing figures and designs they too are a sort of book-keeping: not written, the figures passing from one hand to another instead of from one account to another. I debit myself with the dollar bill I pass to my merchant, and my merchant then credits himself with it. He has the disposition of it, just as he disposes the credit to his account in the bank.

Nobody thinks of the intrinsic value of the paper ticket or the silver or nickel coins they receive in exchange for goods, work or services. It is the productive capacity of a community that confers value on the figures. They are accepted without hesitation because we have confidence in the things that the production system can provide for which they may be exchanged.

THE ABSURDITY OF A FIGURE-SHORTAGE

But if modern money consists of figures, there is surely not the slightest reason to lack figures where these relate to a productive capacity that only awaits the commands expressed by these figures.

In pre-war years of unemployment Mackenzie King must have been deeply humiliated to have to say that the country lacked the figures which would permit needs to be satisfied with goods, and which would allow the unemployed to partake of a flood of goods. Mackenzie King knew better; but, alas! the author become Prime Minister of his country had lost his wings: he was bound!

Again, if modern finance is an affair of book-keeping, nothing can excuse bad book-keeping, false to the facts that it should record. Nothing should hinder the expression in the form of credit of the value of production to the extent that it comes into existence, and the expression of its disappearance in the form of an equivalent debit, which recalls and cancels the figures to which the credit has given rise.

And if finance was, as it ought to be, an exact reflection of reality, following precisely the movement of wealth, never would a country that enriches itself more than it impoverishes itself express its financial situation by a national debit.

And if figures can be employed to give a proper reflection of the creation of goods, nothing would be easier than to establish a fair way of sharing and distributing wealth. This is what Social Credit proposes to do by the periodic distribution to every person, of a certain number of figures—which are money—and which would guarantee to each person at least the bare minimum of subsistence.

This is the least that a member of society, a *shareholder*, has the right to expect from his society in a country which has surplus production on its hands.

But if modern money consists of figures representing real possibilities, it is inconceivable that public bodies should be obliged to renounce perfectly practicable projects merely because they are short of these figures.

And it is inconceivable that we should rest immobile

before our own natural wealth until alien writers of figures allow us to enrol in their service so that they receive tribute from our government and carry off our wealth, extracted and manufactured by our effort.

This point is most relevant to the question asked by the *Front Universitaire*: "How will Social Credit contribute to our economic liberation?"

In a Social Credit régime the purely financial problem would not exist, at least for people in association. Everything that is physically possible would become, automatically, financially possible as soon as the decision to do it was taken. All new production, in fact, would be financed by corresponding emissions of [financial] credit; and the credit thus put into circulation would be recalled and cancelled only at the rate of disappearance (by depreciation, destruction, consumption) of the wealth produced.

No need, therefore, for what is called 'foreign capital,' nor even for 'capital' in the current sense of the word, to produce in this country what it is physically possible to produce here. What perspectives this proposition opens up to those who are indignant at seeing their rich country treated like an economic colony of alien masters!

On this question of 'capital' as on that of money, Mackenzie King was perfectly informed. He wrote in his work (p. 130):

"Money and credit are not themselves capital. They only become so in virtue of the right conferred by their possession; they confer a power of seizure because they are exchangeable for goods and services."

To allow the exploitation of our resources by "foreign capital" is literally to invite the foreigner to seize our wealth.

But if our country itself issued figures based on the increase in riches brought about by our own people working on our own natural resources, that would be quite another matter. The money would pay for the work done and permit the workers to exchange their product for those of other producers.

True capital is the natural wealth given by God together with the capacity to exploit it found in the brain, and hands of men, and their acquired techniques. The rest is nothing but figures—figures which must be made to conform to realities, and not *vice versa*.

That is why Major Douglas wrote, in the same year as Mackenzie King, in 1918:

"All new production must be financed, not by savings deriving from old production, but by new credits. And these credits must not be withdrawn except to the extent that there is consumption or depreciation of wealth." [*]

Douglas did not content himself with holding forth and laying down conditions, he passed on to consequences. Which is why his doctrine is so vitally dynamic. Put into operation it would quickly change the face of the economy without harming anyone except those exploiters who by their dictatorial control of money and credit paralyse humanity and cast it into debt.

In an economy with an integrated financial system, with the flow of production unimpeded and responding to demand, with first necessities guaranteed in accordance with the capacity of the production system, Social Credit would in-

(continued on pages 4 and 7.)

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. 17.

Saturday, June 20, 1953.

From Week to Week

The House of Lords Debate on processed foods from which extracts appear in this issue occupies 68 columns of the Official Report. Unusual tenacity marked several of the speeches. At one point, Lord Horder was interrupted to draw attention to the fact that his defence of the *status quo* was inaudible.

• • •

"The friendship and unanimity recorded by the Commonwealth Conference were indeed a good augury in regard to foreign relations." (*Sunday Times*.)

"Let us face the facts. Another Empire Conference has failed.

"The statement drawn up in the names of the seven Premiers of the Empire is the same old collection of evasions that we have had before." (*Sunday Express*.)

The witch-doctors differ just like 'real' doctors.

• • •

The *Church Times* says it should not be past the wit of man to make wealth possible without war. It isn't.

• • •

As we anticipated, the first-choice ballots in the British Columbia general election indicated that the 'Social Credit' Government would be returned with an increased following. Second choices will be counted on June 30. *The Times* says the increase in the party's popular vote is from 7 to 36 per cent. "An invasion of Social Credit forces from Alberta and British Columbia" into Manitoba has not resulted in the election of a single member so far. The election in Manitoba was the first test since the break-up of the Coalition Government in 1950, the Liberal Progressive Party maintaining its previous position.

• • •

According to the *News Chronicle*, Cheshire farmers have refused to carry out the annual survey of farms in their area. Sixteen of them have resigned from the South Cheshire Area Agricultural Executive Committee because "we refuse to snoop on our neighbours."

"The revolt," says the newspaper, "began at a meeting of the area committee in Nantwich."

Mr. W. G. Young of Rope Bank moved that a resolution be sent to the County Committee.

But the chairman, Mr. Tom Bourne, of Inglewood, Park Road, Nantwich, refused to accept the resolution, and said anyone unwilling to act as a surveyor must resign from the committee.

"We refuse to be intimidated by threats that the work will be done by officials if we don't do it," said Mr. Young, and left the meeting. Fifteen other members—more than half of those present—followed him.

LIBERATION BY SOCIAL CREDIT—

(continued from page 3.)

Introduce into the world a factor unknown till now: economic security for all.

It is economic security, and not opulence, that really constitutes temporal wealth, for only by such security is the spirit released from the incessant, gnawing, material cares of the day, to turn freely towards the more truly and specifically human values.

Liberty begins with the satisfaction of first things. To prefer freedom to the necessities of life is heroism: it cannot be demanded from many, or for long. On the other hand, to accept fetters to get more, when one already has enough, is a debasing materialism practised by too many half-wits but abhorred by those who want to free their country and their brothers.

FOR POLITICAL FREEDOM

The *Front Universitaire* asks if Social Credit would also bring an element of political freedom. This is to imply the existence of a political dictatorship, a dictatorship of conditional concessions, of party, of patronage, of a privileged aristocracy and so on.

The first condition of political liberation is to have at least an elite of citizens with the mentality of free men. Then to spread this mentality throughout the population. The present economic system contributes scarcely anything to this. Can one expect an increase of free men from a society of the depersonalised proletariat, automatons, individuals deprived of their power to make decisions, which the present economic system produces in every town, all the time. Where are possible leaders among those swallowed each day in enormous factories, there to repeat what gestures they are told to, producing they don't know what for they don't know whom, denuded of all, even of the tools they handle, always at the mercy of conditions they can in no way control?

Under a Social Credit régime, man would not be debased in proportion as matter was dignified. Technique of production would continue to improve. But production would not be directed nor controlled by an aristocracy of money, an irresponsible plutocracy of humanity. Industry would not concern itself with finding "capital" and competence and responsibility would take the initiative in direction.

The wage-slave system of today would soon become past history.

(continued on page 7.)

And so to Nuremberg*

by

DRYDEN GILLING SMITH.

(Concluded.)

The statutes governing the Nuremberg procedure were drawn up at a four power meeting in London, in August, 1945, at which Maxwell Fyfe represented Great Britain, Mr. Jackson the U.S.A., M. Gros, France and General Nikitchenko, Russia. Fyfe and Niki later became chief prosecutors so they were naturally interested in working out a procedure which would enable them to appear to the best advantage. "Article 3 denied both the prosecution and the defence the right to challenge the jurisdiction of the court or its members . . . Article 6 established the right of the court to condemn persons, whether as individuals or as members of an organisation, for crimes against peace and conspiracy to wage war." Article 8 stated that superior orders were no valid defence for crimes committed by members of the armed forces, and Article 9 gave the court the right to declare any organisation a criminal one. "Proven charges against individual members of an organisation could be adduced as evidence of the criminal nature of the organisation itself." The converse was then applied, that anyone who had been a member of that organisation was thereby proved a criminal, unless he could prove the contrary. This conception of collective guilt led in turn to the formation of denazification courts "which have probably done more damage to the conception of law than has yet been appreciated. Millions of people have been placed under an assumption of guilt which they have had to disprove individually in totally inadequate hearings. This has led to a form of juridical chaos, the moral and political effects of which will weigh on the German people for years to come." Exactly the same methods were used as the 'people's courts' which had been set up in the final anti-bourgeois years of nazi rule.

"Whenever the defence protested against the unfair advantage which the charter seemed to accord the prosecution, we were reminded that we were lucky to get any trial at all, and that the allies would have been justified in summarily shooting those whom they considered war criminals as a retaliation for the methods employed by the Third Reich. This attitude had a certain logic. However in the same breath we were told that we were being subjected to the normal legal procedure, the nations, whose captives, we were, believing in the true processes of law. The trial was praised as a model of Anglo-Saxon justice . . . The choice was between legal procedure and the old cry of 'an eye for an eye . . .' You cannot have it both ways." This curious argument of the prosecutions that because the Nazis had abandoned legal procedure, they were not really entitled to a fair trial, and were only getting a trial at all as a special favour, is parallel to the argument that because a man accused of murder or theft has abandoned legal behaviour *he* is not entitled to a fair trial. The mere existence of courts of law indicates a state of society in which this line of argument has been abandoned. We see from this how far back the Nuremberg 'justice men' have taken us.

"The day before the trial began, the combined defence lawyers submitted a memorandum in which they claimed that the first point of the indictment, that of crimes against peace, had no foundation in international law and therefore contravened *the first requirement of jurisprudence: That no punishment could be exacted if no law existed at the time the crime in question was committed* (my emphasis). The memorandum then pointed out that the court was made up of representatives of states who were a party to the dispute, and requested that its constitution should first be examined by a body of undisputed authority in international law. These requests were turned down by article 3 of the Statute, which forbade its competence to be questioned."

As for the production of documents and witnesses; the prosecution had seized before the trial anything which they thought might be of use to it. None of this was available to the accused, so the prosecution were in a position to suppress any evidence which it might find embarrassing. The accused did not know what documents the prosecution possessed, or what witnesses were still alive. Any request for further documents had to be made *via* the prosecution weeks in advance, allowing the prosecution time to counter any new evidence or make use of it themselves. The difficulty of calling any further witnesses was that this invariably led to the latter being arrested and brought to Nuremberg for cross-examination by the prosecution. •

Any attempt by the defence to prove that their judges had employed exactly the same methods as those of which the Germans were accused (such as the Russian attack on Poland in 1939) was immediately ruled out of order by the Court. "We are not *interested in what the allies may have done*," was Lord Justice Lawrence's stock parrot cry. Only on one occasion did the court make an exception, and this was on U-boat warfare. Admiral Nimitz gave evidence that American submarines had also received orders to sink all enemy ships on sight. The court therefore ruled that although such procedure was against international law, it would be struck out of the indictment against Admiral Doenitz, since it had been practised by both sides. Therefore, apart from any question of justice, it would only have been consistent of the court to remove from the indictment all those 'crimes' to which any of the judges had been a party.

However the defence was not usually allowed to make any reference to the part played by an allied country in bringing about or in prosecuting the war. It had to inform the prosecution in advance of the reasons for bringing up any piece of evidence it might use "to prevent the making of political speeches." Mr. Justice Jackson let the cat out of the bag at one session: "I really think that this trial, if it should get into an argument over the political and economic causes of this war, could do infinite harm, both in Europe, which I don't know well, and in America, which I know fairly well. If we should have a prolonged controversy over whether Germany invaded Norway a few jumps ahead of a British invasion of Norway, or whether France in declaring war was the real aggressor, this trial can do infinite harm for those countries with the people of the United States. And the same is true of our Russian relationships." There you have the clear-cut admission that an accurate evaluation of the evidence was the furthest possible remove from the court's aims. These aims are here admitted

*Franz von Papen—Memoirs, André Deutsch, London, 1952.

as the provision of suitable propaganda in the allied countries. Even the publicity to a discussion of the behaviour of various allied governments was thought to be dangerous. It might provoke too many people into asking themselves what interests the war had actually served. The Russian General Nikitchenko pointedly asked "Is it supposed (*sic*), then, to condemn aggression or initiation of war, or to condemn specifically aggressions started by the Nazis? If the attempt is to have a general definition, that would not be agreeable."

The Russians made it quite clear that they considered it a party trial, on the lines of their own mass purges for 'deviationism.' A man's country or actions had nothing to do with the issue; viewed by Communist Party Standards, National Socialism was a heresy, and since the Russians considered the war to be waged purely and simply in the interests of Nazism (which they call Fascism) anybody who fought on the German side was *ergo* a "Fascist," *ergo* a heretic. Maxwell Fyfe accepted the same axiom, insisting to von Papen that because he remained in office under the Nazis he *must* have been a strong Nazi sympathiser. Maxwell Fyfe showed, that, like his countryman Morrison, he refused to recognise any distinction between country and political party, therefore, admitting that he also conceived of the war as a struggle between Communism [plus allied odds and ends (Churchill-Morrison coalition)] and Nazism. The prosecution convinced the accused that the trial was one of political heresy. "Most of my co-defendants," said von Papen, "and indeed many of the defence counsel, were convinced that this had become a political trial with a pre-conceived verdict and that therefore no acquittals were possible."

The trials were therefore no different from the vengeance exercised by the French occupation troops who lost their heads, and burned down the towns which they found intact in the Black Forest at the end of the war. The emotions displayed were primitive as well as blindly stupid, for the simple reason that they themselves were the people who would have to occupy the ruins. However, the Nuremberg, procedure, though on the surface not so unpleasant, was much more insidious because it undermined the whole conception of law, which takes hundreds of years to build up.

Von Papen recognises that the reason why people in many countries accepted the Nuremberg business without demur, was that they felt that certain things had happened which should not go unpunished for fear they should be repeated in even worse form. Most of these people have no greater conception of law than "what the government says," and had such a woolly idea of politics in any case that they merely had to be shown pictures of concentration camps, have a vague idea that something like a law case was going on followed up by some sort of executions, and they would be contented that "justice was being done." What is far less pardonable is that a man so well versed in British legal traditions as Maxwell Fyfe should have been a party to such a proceeding.

What had aroused most people was the lawless behaviour of the S.S. and similar bodies. This had revolted even the main body of the Nazis, as we have seen through the attitude of the Bismarck group which organised the attempt on Hitler's life. Since the Germans themselves had been the main victims of the S.S., they would have been quite capable of taking the necessary action against those accused

of specific crimes. This should not have been mixed up with anything absurd like 'crimes against peace' and should not have been a party business as were the later denazification courts. By turning the bulk of the nation into criminals; and, by making a man's innocence or guilt depend on which party he belonged to rather than upon his own actions, the case for the prosecution became so diffuse and flabby as to make the sifting out and dealing with genuine criminals impossible and almost certain to raise the latter to the rank of martyrs of the defeat. Von Papen suggests that if it were felt necessary to have a code of international criminal law, this should have been drawn up and *then incorporated in the criminal law of each member state which accepted it*. Only after these steps had been taken should any attempt be made to apply the provisions of an international criminal law.

After acquittal by the Nuremberg tribunal, von Papen was re-arrested by the Bavarian civil police, acting under the orders of the Bavarian Minister, President Herr Hoegner, who had spent the Hitler years in Switzerland. He was making use of the system which the Nazis had introduced of re-arresting a man if his acquittal by a regular court did not meet with their approval. In January, 1947, von Papen was brought up for trial before the Denazification court. This consisted of seven members. The President, Dr. Sachs, and his deputy were Jews who had been deprived of their appointments during the Nazi era. There was one Communist, one Liberal, two Social Democrats, and one Christian Democrat. There were only two lawyers in this assembly, both of them Social Democrats. The trial was then conducted as a coalition of victorious parties and Jews, *qua* parties and Jews, against anyone they disliked, a mere repetition of the 'Victors' Justice' instituted at Nuremberg. "The court finally condemned me to eight years in a labour camp, the confiscation of all my property, with the exception of five thousand marks, and lifelong deprivation of civic rights. The costs of the trial, in any case, absorbed almost the whole of my remaining fortune."

He was sent to three concentration camps in turn, finishing up at the notorious Regensburg, where one of his fellow prisoners, a demented ex-S.S. man, attacked him and almost beat him to death. The S.S. man had been behaving like this for some time and it was only after he had caused extensive injuries to many prisoners that he was removed to a lunatic asylum.

The Jew, Sachs, became acting Denazification Minister and had power to quash any sentences or appeals. In 1949 von Papen appealed against his sentence and found the court calmer and less hysterical than in 1947. However one of its members warned his counsel that Sachs would immediately prevent any acquittal by having von Papen re-arrested and brought up for another trial. His counsel therefore appealed for a remission of sentence. The new court was hard put to it not to acquit him altogether, but, bearing in mind the circumstances, it reduced his sentence so that he was released, though still deprived of civic rights for life, and placed under certain restrictions for the next five years.

Von Papen says that he had particularly unpleasant memories of the 'Special Branch,' those American officers

who supervised the concentration camps for denazification prisoners, and were in charge of 'political re-education.' Most of them were "first generation Americans, not of Anglo-Saxon origin, and with strong leftist leanings. They did everything they could to make my life more miserable than it was already" . . .

"Post-war propaganda endeavoured to elevate Germany's Communists and Socialists as the only resistance forces and guardians of democracy. The Morgenthau Plan, even in its modified application, provided the basis for appointing Communists to administrative positions, as prosecutors and judges in the denazification courts and as licensees of the reborn newspapers . . . The working classes were regarded as the embodiment of resistance to Hitler. The truth is that as long as peace reigned and as long as they—the great mass of workers—were assured of employment and the possibility of social betterment, they solidly supported Hitler's still undefined ends . . . Those with Marxist tendencies became victims of their own theories of the superiority of the state over individual minds." After the early years of the Hitler regime and "particularly towards the end of the war, the evidence shows that active resistance came far more from representatives of the right than from the left."

Near the end of his book von Papen tells us that the history which he has written is not a personal vindication, but an attempt to give those now making political decisions, a correct appraisal of the events which have brought the European countries to their present condition, so that they may have a better understanding of the matter with which they are dealing. Whatever were the intentions of the European powers, the war only brought about the transfer of the balance of power to two new centres, Russia and America. "It might have been possible to prevent the attachment of China to the Soviet bloc if the European nations had recognised more quickly the forces at work in Asia. The time for such a decision is now past." . . .

"When I first sat down to write an account of my life, I had just finished reading the Confessions of St. Augustine. Unfortunately the courage he displayed in tracing his own errors is a gift denied to most ordinary men. Perhaps my critics will bear this thought in mind. Autobiographies can never be truly objective. They can only be a personal contribution to the mosaic of contemporary history, and our sins of omission and commission must be viewed against the events of the time. Although I have criticised my opponents, I have not sought to excuse myself."

LIBERATION BY SOCIAL CREDIT—

(continued from page 4.)

With first necessities guaranteed by the dividend for all, free men would emerge. Free men are not the stuff of slaves, or serfs.

The industrialist will soon find out that he must change his formula and look for associates rather than hirelings: able and interested associates, no longer employees who must choose between accepting the conditions offered,—or the pangs of hunger. Wage-slaves will make way for associates.

Men so freed economically will be badly served politi-

cally: what appeal would the parties retain for people who no longer had to cringe for bread, and no longer respected them?

More, an essential part of the technique of Social Credit, the price adjustment, would keep every citizen and every housewife who went to the shops up to date in the economic situation of their country. The periodic announcement of the Price Discount would be a true resume of the balance-sheet, concretely understandable for whoever bought anything at a retail shop. Every citizen would know the reason for the Price Discount would be a true résumé of the balance-of production, and what proportion to the public services he received. There would be no need for these facts to be lost in the labyrinths of finance.

From economic democracy to political democracy there is no more than the distance between the eye that sees and the tongue that speaks.

If one wants an idea of tomorrow's citizen under a Social Credit regime, take a look at the Social Crediters in white berets to be found on every road in New-France. Not yet economically free, they have yet broken their fetters by the vision they have of a Social Credit world. . . . Scarcely making a living for their families, they cheerfully sacrifice their chance of winning more in order to work to gain freedom for all. By its philosophy alone, even before being put into application, Social Credit already makes free men, with character, with a high sense of individual responsibility in the building of an earthly City more worthy of Christians and those who are civilised. With these men,—and not with those who have a beaten dog complex, or go in perpetual fear, or who 'let George do it'—one can hope to free the country from all that, both in the economic and political orders, weighs uselessly on their lives and their families.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 2.)

health is entirely due to this change of diet, and that her illness resulted from the poison which she had accumulated in her system through eating bread made from national flour. I was in Edinburgh the other day and visited a shop which some of your Lordships may know. It is that great shop where is sold the finest quality shortbread. At that establishment there is displayed a notice which reads:

"No flour is used in these premises which has been treated." I had not time then to inquire just what that notice meant, but I think it really means that they see to it that the flour they use has not been, in my term, doped with various chemicals. I believe that my noble friend Lord Hankey has something to say about the Scottish views on this subject.

Some of your Lordships know that a Committee is sitting at the present time, the Zuckerman Committee. I will not quote the terms of reference but give you the headline—"Working Party on precautionary measures against toxic chemicals used in agriculture: risks to wild life." I hope that perhaps this learned Committee will go into the question of whether poisonous sprays used on crops infiltrate into the human being. I have seen people who have eaten fruit that has been sprayed and who have undoubtedly been poisoned thereby. With great respect to my noble friend,

Lord Carrington, who is going to reply, I suggest that an investigation into this question should be started at once. We know quite well the dangers of these sprays. The noble Lord, Lord Carrington, will recollect that when we had in this House the Agriculture (Poisonous Substances) Bill it was said that three people had already been killed by using these sprays. The Bill laid down that protective clothing had to be worn when these sprays were used. I remember asking him then what would happen if I were walking along a lane beside a field that was being sprayed and there was a wind blowing: what would happen to me with no protection? The answer was, "Oh, you would get only a little of it." But I do not want any of it. . . .

. . . I am certain that an enormous amount of food is sent to Covent Garden that could easily be utilised without its going anywhere near that place at all. I hope my noble friend will take that point into consideration and obviate these long trips and the stale food which is the result of them.

We now keep boys and girls at school up to fifteen years of age, and up to sixteen, if they so desire. Instead of lecturing them about sex, for goodness sake lecture them on food and how they should eat, what they should eat and how to take care of their bodies. I think that would be a very good substitute for these ridiculous ideas about sex the poor kids get hold of. Let us brush out all that and put in food and how to take care of their bodies, which would be of the greatest advantage to them in after life.

Without encroaching, I hope, on what my noble friend Lord Hankey is going to say, I want to get in another word on bread. I do not know whether the new wheat flour is actually on the market, but I should like to see some competent body investigate it. I want to stress that this should be a Committee composed of members who are men of experience in deficiency diseases. A great deal is said in this Report about deficiency diseases—and the Report is not by me, it is by the Ministry of Health: this is the latest thing they have produced. I should like to see this body composed of members of the Medical Research Council, the Nutrition Society, the Ministry of Health, the British Medical Association and the Society of Medical Officers of Health, and with no representatives of vested interests at all on it. We must not have any of those; it must be made up purely of scientists and experienced medical men. I say that with great emphasis.

The degradation of our daily bread has reached a stage which makes it vital that a halt should be called at once. In my view, the wheat germ and wheat germ oil should never be taken out of bread, and we all know it is. I should like to give your Lordships some figures from this Report on the effect on women of the removal of the wheat germ oil and Vitamin E from flour. With women taking wheat germ oil, the number of cases of threatened abortion was 100; with those not taking it, 166; abortion, among women taking the wheat germ oil, 30; among those not taking it, 150; premature birth, 37 among women taking the wheat germ oil, and 71 among those not taking it; toxæmia, among women taking the wheat germ oil, 21 cases; not taking it, 100; still-births, 4 among those taking it, and 23 among those not taking it. In this book it is laid down that the synthetic vitamin has been proved valueless in the treatment of spontaneous miscarriages in women. Wheat germ oil is of

number one importance. I was talking about this subject some time ago to a well-known breeder of horses, and he said that they always give wheat germ oil to the brood mares. Surely, we should see to it that our women get it, too. Some of your Lordships may know of the well-known Cheshire panel doctor, with whom I am familiar. When barren couples come to see him, the first question asked is, "What do you eat?" In 99 cases out of 100 when he is told what is eaten, he says: "How can you expect to produce life if you do not eat it?" The people are put on a proper diet, and in due course there is happiness in the home. . . .

. . . There are far too many people making fortunes out of tampering with natural food that the Almighty meant us to eat; and there are far too many people making vast sums out of the antidotes to eating these bad foods. My Lords, I beg to move for Papers.

(To be continued.)

THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

by C. H. Douglas.

This book is the last of the contributions to the understanding of world politics written during the war of 1939-1945 by the author of SOCIAL CREDIT. The series began with THIS 'AMERICAN' BUSINESS (August, 1940) and continued and expanded with THE BIG IDEA (1942), THE 'LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE' RACKET (1943), and, PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR (1943).

There is no comparable commentary on the causes of the war and the ultimate seat of responsibility for the threat to civilisation and even the continuance of human life, which outlasts the coming of "Peace," by any writer in any country.

It embodies an analysis of the policy now known as *Mond-Turnerism*.

8/6 net.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD., LIVERPOOL, 2.

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