

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 20.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 11, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Doubtless some millions of gallons have still to flow under (or over) the traditional bridges before the suggestion is publicly canvassed that the choice of Robert Arthur James Gascoyne-Cecil, Marquess of Salisbury, as Prime Minister to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, would be a fitting sign that the Second Elizabethan Age had truly dawned. Fantastic in itself, the alleged motive for the proposal is even more so. Ancient wit never showed to better advantage than in Minerva's choice of an emblem, which, as every collector of coins as well as 'every schoolboy' knows, was no other than the Little Owl, a bird the most ridiculous in its vain antics, particularly when surprised or annoyed, of all birds. Philosophers, who thought themselves thus cherished, explain the incongruous symbolism intelligibly as well as charitably to themselves:—

Minerva's Owl—the certain sign
That goddesses may cloak
Their deem affection and design
Like ordinary folk.

Political caucusses, however, are not goddesses. They are not even gods. Lord Salisbury is a Whig. We have had Whig governments masquerading under various names continuously since Cromwell. Everyone of them has facilitated the decay of Christian Society by undermining England (not the 'British Empire')—its most authentic modern exemplar. A New Age will begin when Whig Government is ended, not when it is continued under still another alias. Substitution of policies (a trick played upon the collectivity) is the counterpart of impersonation, a crime against the individual and the state. We agree that "an unknown factor has now entered Britain's affairs," and that "No one can yet judge what the effect of the Coronation has been, or will be." Mr. Kingsley Martin, who found the Communion Service of the Coronation "a bore," and his fellow travellers who desire the Crown to be streamlined as an instrument of Mond-Turnerism, may be confident or apprehensive—we do not know. It is not serviceable to advertise a struggle while at the same time suppressing all knowledge of what it is about. Two consequences ensue inevitably: (1) the dice are loaded upon the throw of which the teams are chosen, and (2) the stakeholders are the only possible beneficiaries.

The American surgeon to whose clinic Mr. Anthony Eden had to go to get well has died. Mr. Eden is now at the Rhode Island home of a daughter of the late Otto Kahn and her husband, himself a grandson of Thomas

Fortune Ryan, an American financier. The Ryans were in London for the Coronation and are here still, so the *Daily Telegraph* says. Bolshevik Russia thought so highly of the late Mrs. Otto Kahn that they fêted her with the ceremony due to an Empress under the Czars. Eden is claimed as a British Israelite. Even so, one would not think he needed grooming.

Judge Richard Willes, of Derby, wrote to *The Times* of June 24:—

"To say of any Judge that he 'holds office during the pleasure of the Crown,' though technically correct, is dangerously misleading. This does not, of course, mean the pleasure of her Majesty. It means the pleasure of some one or other of her Ministers. In these days of autocratic departmental administration conflict between the judiciary and the executive, though happily rare, is by no means unthinkable. The consequence of judicial insecurity in office cannot safely be ignored.

"In his dissenting judgment in the case of *Conway v. Wade* in 1908, Lord Justice Farwell used these words: 'The struggle for individual freedom began before Magna Carta and was enunciated in one of its provisions, "No free man shall be seized, or imprisoned, or dispossessed, or outlawed, or in any manner brought to ruin." It was possible for the Courts in former times to defend individual freedom against the aggression of kings and barons, because the defence rested upon the law which the Courts administered. It is not possible for the Courts so to do if Parliament so alters the law as to destroy liberty, for the Courts can only administer the law. Parliament cannot make evil good, but it can make it not actionable.'

"In face of this truth is it not important that all Judges during their judicial life should be immune from departmental dismissal the necessity or justification for which they have not even a right to question?"

While congratulating Mr. Manning upon his escape, with police assistance, from the irregular attentions of the wild women of North Britain, we would ask him to attend closely to our model English newspaper, *The Times*, which, whatever else it does to offend us, is never guilty of the lie direct. In England, among the 'better class' newspapers certainly, the direct lie is always avoided. What is said is undeniable. What isn't said is either in the waste-paper basket (the daily half-ton by weight) or still in the reporter's note-book. When *The Times* discerns "esoteric Socialism"

(continued on page 8.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 10, 1953.

(The Debate Continued.)

Fertilisers

Mr. Hurd asked the Minister of Materials if, in view of the decision to free fertilisers from control from 1st July next, he will give an estimate of prospective supplies; and to what extent the use of fertilisers has increased during the past three years.

Sir A. Salter: It is expected that the supplies of fertilisers available next season will be sufficient to meet the requirements estimated by my right hon. Friend the Minister of Agriculture. These requirements are for phosphatic fertilisers having a phosphoric acid content of 400,000 tons, potassic fertilisers having a potash content of 210,000 tons and nitrogenous fertilisers having a nitrogen content of 235,000 tons. It is estimated that the use of fertilisers for the season ending on 30th June will show an increase of 8 per cent. and 10 per cent., respectively, for nitrogen and potash over the average of the past three years, with no change for phosphates.

Marketing Schemes (Small Farmers)

Mr. de Freitas asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he will introduce legislation so that in any future marketing scheme poll the views of the small farmers shall be adequately represented.

Sir T. Dugdale: No, Sir. I see no reason to think that the present Acts fail to provide for adequate representation of the views of small farmers.

Mr. de Freitas: Is the Minister aware that in the recent fruit poll the views of the majority of farmers failed merely because the minority comprised farmers with the larger area?

Sir T. Dugdale: No, I do not accept that. Only about

11,000 out of 17,000 registered producers voted. Had the small producers voted for the scheme in large numbers it would probably have gone through.

Mr. de Freitas: Would the Minister accept my supplementary if instead of "the majority of farmers" I said that the majority of those voting failed against a minority who voted because that minority had the larger area?

Sir T. Dugdale: No, I cannot accept that. The present legislation on this point has been approved by all parties and I think it would be the greatest mistake to alter it. A two-thirds majority, in both numbers and acreage, is required in respect of any particular commodity. I believe that that is sufficient in the interests of all concerned.

Mr. G. Brown: Was not the real trouble with the recent scheme that even had it gone through it would not have been a marketing scheme, so it did not attract anybody's attention?

House of Commons: June 16, 1953.

Rainfall (Research)

Mr. de Freitas asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works, as representing the Lord President of the Council, whether he is aware of the need for further research into the possibilities of regulating the rainfall on this country by making certain rain clouds discharge their rain over the sea; and what action he is taking?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Works (Mr. Hugh Molson): As part of the research into the processes of rainfall in this country experiments have been carried out from time to time on the seeding of clouds. The results of these experiments, and of similar experiments in other countries, have shown that certain types of cloud can be made to produce rain and, conversely, that in some circumstances limited sheets of cloud can be dispersed. We are, however, still a long way from a complete understanding of the physics of natural rain.

The hon. Member's objective of making certain rain clouds discharge their rain over the sea would involve further complications. I am advised that, because of the natural processes giving rise to the extensive cloud and rain areas which are common here, any practicable application of the present techniques of dispersing cloud could have little effect in protecting any particular area of this country from rain. Developments in other countries are being closely followed by the Meteorological Office, which will also continue its investigations into the basic processes.

Mr. de Freitas: Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware that I know full well that the present technique would not succeed, hence my Question about the need for further research? Would the hon. Gentleman remind the Lord President that however good our climate here may be and the excellence of its products, animal and vegetable, shows that it is a good climate, we should not neglect the possibility of mitigating the occasional extremes of excessive rain and drought?

Mr. Molson: The hon. Gentleman will appreciate that this process is more effective in causing rain to fall where it is required than in preventing rain from falling where it

By C. H. DOUGLAS.

THE BIG IDEA

Price 2/6 (Postage extra)

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

THE "LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE" RACKET

Price 2/- (Postage extra)

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

is not required. My noble Friend is of the opinion that in this country we have not the same urgent need for research into this method as may perhaps exist in other countries.

Mr. Assheton: Has my hon. Friend thought of the appalling responsibilities that would fall upon any Minister who had to decide whether it was to rain or not on a particular place?

Mr. Molson: I have no doubt at all that that is a problem which will present itself at some time in the future, but at the present time we are still quite unable to make rain fall or to prevent it from falling where it does.

Mr. Mikardo: Will the hon. Gentleman advise the Lord President that future experiments should be concentrated into periods when Test matches are being played?

Mr. Molson: I am afraid that in the nature of scientific experiments it is difficult to limit experiments to the time when these sporting events are taking place.

Mr. Hollis: Even though it may seem that there is a good deal too much rain in London and Nottingham, there are other parts of the country where there is not sufficient rain. If my hon. Friend has any to dispose of, will he put some of it on my garden?

Official Correspondence (Rubber Stamps)

Mr. Osborne asked the Prime Minister if, in view of the dangers of abuse, he will forbid the use of rubber stamp signatures by all Ministers of the Crown and senior civil servants.

The Prime Minister: Sir, there is no doubt a strong feeling against bureaucracy and rubber stamps, but in view of the growing number of people who take an interest in public affairs and of the still increasing complexity of administration it would not be possible to issue an all-embracing veto of the kind my hon. Friend suggests. I should add however that it is not the practice of Ministers or senior civil servants to use rubber stamp signatures, except on carbon copies of their letters, or purely routine communications where large numbers are involved.

Mr. Osborne: Will the Prime Minister use his influence with local government officials—[HON. MEMBERS: "That is another Question."] I protest at this interruption, Mr. Speaker, for Scottish hon. Members have had a lot of time this afternoon. Will the Prime Minister use his influence with senior local government officials to get them to observe this rule of good manners and ensure that rubber stamp signatures are not used, especially on correspondence to Members of Parliament?

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing in the Question about local government officials.

Mid-Ocean Club, Bermuda

Mr. Mikardo asked the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the Mid-Ocean Club in Bermuda, where he is to meet President Eisenhower, debars Jews from membership and refuses accommodation to them as transient guests; and whether, in order to indicate his disapproval of this form of

discrimination, he will seek to have the venue of the conference changed.

The Prime Minister: I am assured that the Mid-Ocean Club does not debar Jews from membership.

Mr. Mikardo: Is the Prime Minister aware that the evidence which lies behind this Question has been most carefully examined and authenticated and includes an affidavit, and if I sent him copies of the evidence will he be good enough to look at it?

The Prime Minister: Certainly, Sir, but I did not give the answer to the Question without having before me the names of two gentlemen of Jewish extraction and Jewish faith who are members of the club.

Mr. Mikardo: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the New York representative of the club has stated clearly in reply to an inquiry that the club will not accept Jewish people and that I have an affidavit to this effect? Will he look into the matter further?

The Prime Minister: My information is to the contrary. I will gladly accept any additional contribution to the facts at issue.

Mr. S. Silverman: Unless the right hon. Gentleman is completely satisfied that my hon. Friend is wrong, will he at least take steps to avoid any embarrassing incidents by making sure that the noble Lord the Joint Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his Government does not form part of the delegation?

The Prime Minister: Really, I do not see the point of that supplementary question. We have happily got well above senseless and malignant anti-Semitism in this country. Why make such a point?

Ministry of Food

Marmalade and Jam (Standards)

Dr. Stross asked the Minister of Food when the term "Full Fruit Standards," as applied to jam, will cease to be used; and whether sulphur dioxide is still used in the preservation of the fruit pulp which is later artificially dyed.

Major Lloyd George: The use of the term "Full Fruit Standards" jam will no longer be required when the Food Standards (Preserve) Order, 1953, comes into force at various dates between September this year and May, 1954. The answer to the second part of the Question is "Yes."

Dr. Stross: Does the Minister mean that when this term is no longer used sulphur dioxide will no longer be used and will be forbidden in the way it was before the war?

Major Lloyd George: No, but it is still an offence to use anything which is injurious.

Dr. Stross: May I press the Minister further? It was always accepted that it was injurious to use sulphur dioxide for fruit preservation. That is why the Ministry forbade it before the war. When is the Minister going to do that again?

Major Lloyd George: I am prepared to look into that question, but the fact is that when jam is boiled the sulphur dioxide disappears.

(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. 20.

Saturday, July 11, 1953.

The Struggle for Europe

As Sir Winston tries to organise meetings of World Powers, Chester Wilmot's warning that the Russians regard international conferences as "opportunities for the recognition of situations which have already been created by the exercise of power, not as occasions for the negotiation of reasonable settlements," might be heeded. He adds that in the American view, "even good empires must be bad." Mr. Wilmot is also the first *popular* expositor to point out F. D. Roosevelt's mistakes. Whether they were mistakes or originated with Roosevelt is another matter.

Churchill's appeal to Stalin, that "world prosperity for the masses is only attainable by our trinity," opens the long book. Mr. Wilmot wishes to discover "what caused the destruction of the European balance of power which Britain went to war to maintain . . . and how Stalin succeeded in obtaining from Roosevelt and Churchill what he had failed to obtain from Churchill."

At Washington in May, 1942, Molotov pressed Roosevelt for an answer about a Second Front. Roosevelt asked General Marshall whether developments warranted telling Stalin that a Second Front was being prepared, and Marshall said yes. "*The President then authorised Mr. Molotov to inform Mr. Stalin that we expect the formation of a Second Front this year.*" (Author's italics.)

At Casablanca in January, 1943, Sir Winston endorsed Roosevelt's formula of Unconditional Surrender. It disregarded "the effect upon post-war Europe of a fight to the finish . . . Goebbels had delivered into his hands a propaganda weapon of incalculable power." Mr. Wilmot demonstrates that the formula did not just "pop into" Roosevelt's head, as he claimed, but that it was discussed beforehand. Doubtless the President's advisers primed him on other points to make sure that the peace would be lost. The prospect of heavy casualties at no time seems to have shocked the President.

"During 1943 . . . Churchill became increasingly concerned about the necessity of restraining Stalin's ambitions." F.D.R. did not allay this concern at Teheran in November when he had a hunch that he could handle Stalin, "if I give him everything I possibly can and ask nothing from him in return." As the author expresses it, "The overall strategy of the Western powers had been diverted away from

the area of Soviet aspirations. The Teheran Conference . . . adjusted the political balance of post-war Europe in favour of the Soviet Union . . . Roosevelt apparently accepted almost with equanimity the prospect of Russia dominating the Continent." Even General Mark Clark is quoted in support: "The weakening of the campaign in Italy in order to invade Southern France, instead of pushing on into the Balkans, was one of the outstanding political mistakes of the War. . . . Stalin knew exactly what he wanted in a political as well as a military way; and the thing he wanted most was to keep us out of the Balkans."

The author gives many graphic details of the fighting from Normandy to the end which detract a good deal from most military reputations. "Montgomery's approach was scientific; theirs was emotional." Moreover, Eisenhower's indecision and Patton's insubordination allowed the Germans to recover some strength against the West. Then the publication of the Morgenthau plan, on which Roosevelt and Churchill had agreed at Quebec in September, 1944, gave the Germans the courage of desperation. Indiscriminate area bombing further convinced the Germans that they would be destroyed anyway, and rallied the People and the Army to the Party.

These factors, Mr. Wilmot continues in a chapter he calls *Stalin's Greatest Victory*, enabled the Russian forces to press on at a speed which surprised them. Roosevelt and Churchill met at Malta, on their way to Yalta, and the President showed himself "as anxious as ever to avoid making commitments or giving the Russians any reason to think that they were dealing with an Anglo-American alliance . . . the British delegation were dismayed to find that their American colleagues were less suspicious of Russia's post-war intentions than they were of Britain's."

Stalin's gains at Yalta included wide concessions in Asia, Poland and Germany; he obliged the President about UNO.

As Germany was collapsing, "Churchill stressed the political importance of the capture of Berlin by Allied forces" to Eisenhower on the telephone, but the general halted his forces at the Elbe. He told the Soviet High Command that he was stopping for logistic reasons; but in fact he was pursuing a phantom called the National Redoubt. He also halted Patton short of Prague.

Mr. Wilmot concludes that Stalin was from the outset "determined to exploit the situation created by the Second World War in order to advance Russia's imperial ambitions." Early in 1942, Mr. Churchill was pressing Roosevelt to recognise all Russia's western claims, which included all the small Baltic states. The worse the Russian situation, the greater concessions she received. The system was never reversed by her allies. As a result, she extended her boundaries 600 miles south west and 750 miles west. "The Americans had to find out for themselves that to strive for victory alone is not enough and that the balance of power must be the basis of peace . . . the policy which miscarried was American rather than British in origin."

Perhaps Mr. Wilmot may one day consider whether "the policy" really miscarried and if a basis of peace was really the aim of the policy.

H.S.

Bread

The following details, excepting those in square brackets, are taken from *Who's Who*:—EDWARD CHARLES DODDS:—[M.B., B.S., (London) 1922], Ph.D., 1924, M.D., London, 1926, M.V.O., 1929, D.Sc., London, 1932, F.R.C.P., 1933, F.I.C., F.R.S.E., [1941], F.R.S., 1942; Courtauld Professor of Biochemistry in the University of London; Director of the Courthold Institute of Biochemistry at Middlesex Hospital since 1925; late Pathologist to the Royal National Orthopædic Hospital; born 1899, only son of late Ralph Edward and Jane Dodds, Darlington and London; married 1924, Constance Elizabeth, only daughter of late J. T. and Katherine Jordan, Darlington; one son. Educated: Harrow County School; Middlesex Hospital Medical School. Goulstonian Lecturer, Royal College of Physicians, 1934; Harvey Lecturer, New York University, 1935; West London Medal for Therapeutics, West London Medical Society, 1938; Cantor Lecturer, Royal Society of Arts, 1939; Cameron Prizeman, University of Edinburgh, 1940; William Julius Mickle Fellowship, University of London; Charles L. Mayer Prize, 1946, Walker Prize, 1946, Royal College of Surgeons; Garton Prize and Medal, British Cancer Campaign, 1948; Berzelius Medal, Swedish Medical Society; Medals of the Universities of Ghent and Brussels, of French and English learned societies in 1951 and 1952; Hon. Member of French, Danish, American, British, Chilean and Spanish learned societies; Chairman of the Executive Committee of the British Empire Cancer Campaign. Editor, *Journal of Endocrinology*. Publications: *Recent Advances in Medicine* (with G. E. Beaumont); *Chemical and Physiological Properties of Internal Secretions* (with F. Dickens); *The Laboratory in Surgical Practice* (with L. E. H. Whitby); . . . etc.

Simultaneously with the full publication of the Sanderson-Wells Lecture, "Chemicals and Food: A Reconsideration," delivered at the Middlesex Hospital on May 20 by Professor E. C. Dodds, *The Lancet* on June 20 published a leading article on "Bread."

The effect of Professor Dodds's address is indicated by the following quotation from his Conclusion:—"Discussions in many places show that there is a group of people—often highly scientific people with well-balanced outlooks—who feel that the addition of chemicals to food is fundamentally unsound and that our aim should be to abolish any form of chemical treatment or addition to food. The argument is an unsophisticated one, based on the grounds that 'Nature has provided the food, and who are we to interfere?' But why should we apply this type of argument to only one aspect of our existence? If we are to adopt a 'hands off Nature' attitude towards food, then logically we should adopt it towards all other aspects of living. We certainly should not live in towns, and possibly we should not wear clothes. It seems to me . . . it is reasonable to accept . . . advances in the technology of food—always with the proviso that the procedures are controlled as fully as possible . . ."

The Lancet's leading article has since been acclaimed, justifiably in our opinion, as a reassertion of the independence and courage with which the founder of the journal, Wakley, a hundred years ago startled the medical world and, in defiance of the danger of prosecution for libel, shook it, indeed, to its foundations.

We deem it to be a hopeful sign that both in the correspondence (June 27) and in *The Lancet's* original article the idea of Science as 'the pimp of industry' has by no means been obscured. Dr. Leitner, for example, asks:—"Have we to put up with agene and other 'improvers' on a national scale only because the small baker in this country has been replaced by big-scale 'plant bakeries'?", while Dr. K. E. Barlow, of Ipswich, is disturbed by the suggestion that the "vast capital investments of the milling trade" may eventuate in a food policy to which a high national morbidity is incidental, but cannot be expected to contribute financially to investigation of the results, which was Professor Dodds's view. Expressed thus, or as a demand that "the public must question the whole structure and administration of the moneys on which research depends," there is nothing to which to take exception; but Dr. Barlow seems to prefer that the accused should himself conduct the police enquiries to prevent the bill from being sent to the deceased. There are still better arrangements possible. Dr. Barlow should consult the Medical Policy Association: his understandable mistrust of the British Medical Association is perhaps indicated in his choice of the *Lancet* as a medium of publicity!

THE ARTICLE

The *Lancet* reviews the history of agene but does not confine itself, fortunately, to this bye-product of big business (and big-politics). So it begins with 1917, when the Food (War) Committee of the Royal Society noted the nutritive superiority of the 90% extraction milled wheat "at a time when the importance of vitamins was but dimly appreciated." Within a fortnight of the Armistice (1918), the Government reverted to a lower extraction rate to release approximately 18,000 tons of "wheat offal" to feed pigs, etc. The *Lancet* says outright that it finds it hard to believe that health has been the first consideration in again reverting to a lower extraction, even if there are 'compensating safeguards.' A 'new and fundamental' departure was made during the second world war. This was the well-known 'fortification' notion, recommended by Mr. (now Sir Robert) Boothby who said it was "hailed by scientists everywhere as a great advance." The *Lancet* looks quizzically at the certificate. With the technicalities of adulteration we have nothing to do. Thiamine, nicotinic acid and even iron, greatly as we appreciate the ironical, have nothing to do with us, much as they may dog the steps of technicologists bent upon the defence of either the individual or the vested interest. But the *Lancet* opines that the conference convened by the Food Ministry in 1945, which included Lord Horder, the late Sir Jack Drummond and Sir Edward Melanby, as well as Professor Dodds (for the National Association of British and Irish Millers) compromised for the sake of unanimity. This feature of committee management is understandable to us, and is, indeed, very much our business. Yet, in spite of the compromises for the sake of unanimity, there were, the *Lancet* thinks, some 'important statements.' Among these was the statement that "the very definite view [was] expressed by the official medical and scientific members of the conference that a return to white flour, such as was commonly in use before the war, would be thoroughly bad for the nation's health." The opinion was further underlined, and "limiting consideration to what is desirable and ignoring whether it is practicable or enforceable," the conference was

not prepared to differ from the view that "natural food is to be preferred to food reinforced with so-called synthetic vitamins." The conference was against 'reinforcement.'

Now, "the uninstructed haste of 1918" is replaced by arrangements both "cautious and complex." The *Lancet* puts the material question, however, whether "there is in fact any intention to add more than the three 'token' nutrients." It mentions three non-'token' nutrients, and further and alarmingly distinguishes between identifiable and non-identifiable nutrients, the latter of which the adulterators *couldn't* add even if they wanted to do so. The *Lancet* concludes by remarking that "In the times of poverty and scarcity, such as may lie ahead of us, good bread is the chief nutritional safeguard of the Western peoples. Yet mainly, it seems, for the sake of economic or commercial convenience, the public are once again to be encouraged to cultivate a taste for an inferior product." "Prave 'orts," as Parson Hugh would most certainly have said. Braver still, the *Lancet* does not leave Professor Dodds (the representative in 1945 of the National Association of British and Irish Millers) unanswered. It says:—"In his Sanderson-Wells lecture which we publish this week, Professor Dodds launches a brilliant counter-attack against those of us who demand 'natural' food. Certainly few would nowadays care to maintain that the seeds of wheat, maize, and rice were primarily and perfectly devised for the nutrition of mankind and must therefore be eaten exactly as provided by Nature. Most of us, when driven by his arguments, will go so far as to agree with Professor Dodds that in the modern world wheat and the like should not be regarded as sacrosanct entities but rather as food materials to be adapted to our purposes as may seem best for the satisfaction or preservation of our urban communities. Even so, having lived satisfactorily on natural foods for hundreds of thousands of years, we may fairly plead for the least possible interference with their character. Professor Dodds can easily persuade us that refrigeration, or heating or sterilisation are essential; but it is sound instinct that makes us unwilling to accept the chemical treatment of food as comparable with these traditional physical methods. Moreover, food chemistry is a new technique, and even the kind of elaborate animal experiments that Professor Dodds envisages would be a sketchy basis for chemical alteration of any of the basic nutrients of a nation. All sensible people will accept what is necessary; but the duty of proving that some chemical must be added to a traditional food rests squarely on the people who add it and the Government who authorise its addition. As regards the agene treatment of flour, this duty remains undischarged; and the speech of the Government spokesman in the Lords reflects once again the attitude which Sir Edward Melanby described two years ago as 'disturbing, not only in itself, but because it indicates a reluctance to consider seriously the wider problem of chemical manipulation of food and its relation to health and disease.'"

If the *Lancet* advances at this rate, it may soon land itself on the threshold of the Mond-Turner agreement of 1926, the source of the wilderness they call peace,

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

Flour (Chalk Content)

Dr. Stross asked the Minister of Food the total amount of chalk which is added to flour in any given year; and from what source the chalk is obtained.

Major Lloyd George: In the 12 months ended 23rd May, 1953, 11,369 tons of calcium carbonate were added to National flour. The whole of the supplies conformed to the specifications of the British Pharmacopoeia and were obtained from home sources.

Dr. Stross: Is the Minister aware that a great deal of discussion is going on whether there is any need to add chalk to our flour today, and that the original views are suspect? Can he say whether his Department are doing anything to check up on this problem and see whether we could not possibly now do without this substance?

Major Lloyd George: The hon. Gentleman knows as well as I do that there is very seldom unanimity on these particular points. He will also recollect that this was the result of the work of the committee of 1941. The reason that it is still being maintained is because there is a proved deficiency of calcium intake in our diet.

Dr. Stross: Does not the Minister agree that recent experiments in South Africa have shown that the work in 1941 may well be not as accurate as we should like it to be and may not justify the use of 11,000 tons of chalk in our flour each and every year? Will not the Minister's Department look at the question once more?

Major Lloyd George: I am always prepared to look at important matters of this sort, but it is admitted that there is a very serious shortage of calcium intake.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan: Is the Minister aware that it will cause a great deal of alarm in this country if people think that thousands of tons of chalk are put into bread? Is he also aware that if one has full wheat one does not require chalk?

Defence Expenditure

Mr. Harold Davies asked the Prime Minister if he will present the House with a White Paper outlining Her Majesty's Government's policy to meet the economic repercussions of a slowing down of the tempo of armaments production.

The Prime Minister: There is no evidence that adjustments in the United Kingdom Defence Production Programme are having any such economic consequences as would justify the issue of a White Paper. Actual defence expenditure, including production expenditure, has not been reduced. The estimate for production and research in 1953-54 is £746 million against £652 million in 1952-53. The economic policy of the Government has of course been fully debated on the Budget.

Mr. Davies: While thanking the Prime Minister for that answer, and admitting that, maybe, defence expenditure has not at present dropped quite so much, might I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that it would be a very precarious economic position if the country only depended upon exports from the armament industry? Also,

is he aware that the Oil and Materials Secretariat has said that there is an unlimited market for oil equipment in Asia, and that we are proud of the progress of that industry and also the petro-chemical industry? Will he press at the Bermuda Conference for freedom on the trade routes and in the markets of Asia and Eastern Europe?

The Prime Minister: I shall be able to consider the supplementary question better when I have had the advantage of reading it in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Mr. Lee: Has the Prime Minister seen the report of the speech made by Mr. Holt, the Australian Minister of Labour, at Geneva yesterday in which he said there was no international realism in this matter and that the end of the war in Korea could be the start of depression on a world-wide scale? Will the Government begin to plan now for a change in our production in order to give our engineering industry an opportunity to readjust itself?

The Prime Minister: I have not had the advantage of reading the statement referred to.

British Military Inventions (U.S.A.)

Mr. Wyatt asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Defence the conditions governing the giving of information to the United States of America about British military inventions; and whether he will arrange that, in future, such information will not be given unless payment and full acknowledgement is made for those British military inventions adopted, either in whole or in part, by the United States Government.

Mr. Birch: The conditions are set out in an agreement between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States published as Command 8757. Her Majesty's Government regard them as satisfactory.

Mr. Wyatt: Is not the hon. Gentleman aware that there is considerable dissatisfaction among British military inventors because they are continually inventing new devices to do with warfare which are taken over by the Americans, and sometimes some slight adjustment is made and no royalties are paid and no acknowledgement is given, and the invention is then claimed as an American invention?

Mr. Birch: The agreement provides for the protection of private rights and, in particular, sets up a Technical Property Committee which is a forum for discussing such cases as the hon. Member has in mind.

Mr. Wyatt: It is not only a private question. This applies also to inventions made under the official auspices of the Government.

Mr. Birch: Under the agreement these are freely exchanged between the two Governments.

Constitution (London Conference)

Mr. Brockway asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will make a statement regarding the invitations which have been sent for the London conference on the Nigerian Constitution.

Mr. J. Johnson asked the Secretary for State for the Colonies whether there will be a preliminary conference in Lagos upon the proposed constitutional changes in Nigeria, before the full conference in London.

Mr. Lyttelton: The invitations which were sent to representatives of all three regions of Nigeria asked them to attend a conference in London for a full exchange of views on the methods by which the redrafting of the Constitution should be undertaken, and on the interests which should be consulted in the process. These invitations have so far been accepted by the National Independence Party and the Northern People's Congress. Mr. Awolowo and Dr. Azikiwe declined, but as I informed the House on 10th June, the Governor has since explained to them more fully the purpose of the London talks and has appealed to them to reconsider their decisions.

Their replies to this appeal suggest that they might be prepared to attend the London talks provided certain changes are made in the basis of representation and provided the main purpose of the London talks is "to consider those defects in the present constitution which make it unworkable, and to amend or revise the constitution in the light of such consideration."

In view of this latest letter the Governor now hopes to persuade the leaders of the three major parties to meet him at a very early date to discuss how the gap thus narrowed can be closed, so that the Nigerian representatives attending the London talks may duly represent both majority and minority interests and carry the confidence of the Nigerian people.

Foreigners (British Naturalisation)

Mr. Steward asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many people of foreign origin have been given British naturalisation each year since 1935.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: Following are the figures of certificates of naturalisation granted and registered during the period 1st January, 1935, to 31st May, 1953:

1935	1,902
1936	2,267
1937	1,804
1938	2,158
1939	2,588
1940	1,496
1941	1,980
1942	747
1943	541
1944	549
1945	604
1946	3,630
1947	17,742
1948	15,108
1949	9,593
1950	7,033
1951	4,332
1952	3,529
1953 (to 31st May)	1,370
						78,973

The Tablet and Sponsored Television

We have given the serious attention it deserves to *The Tablet's* front page article on sponsored television, entitled "Monopoly of a Medium," which appeared in *The Tablet* for July 4. For its just appreciation of many vital issues, in which we are at least as concerned as is *The Tablet*, we commend it to close study. Attention is drawn, for example, to a circular announcing the imminent publication of a *Vernon Bartlett Newsletter*. The broadcasting member of Parliament describes his qualifications:

"Either for the *News Chronicle* of London, or the British Broadcasting Corporation, I have interviewed most of the world's leaders, and have attended many of the most important international conferences . . . I have delivered several thousands of broadcasts in English, German, French or Italian."

After a word of solid comfort, *The Tablet* points out that "the great reason why [Mr. Bartlett] was so constantly employed was that his views, which may be described as Left of centre, found favour with those in the BBC who decided who should interpret international affairs to their millions." "It is difficult for a monopoly not to build up its own chosen figures." Quite so. We are even more antipathetic to monopoly than is *The Tablet*, and, in addition, are not influenced by our "looking forward in the future to enjoying our own means of reaching very large audiences," as is the religious minority for which *The Tablet* writes. As an instrument to secure the ascendancy of truth, we deem the objective to be illusory.

Glancing towards the "surprising" and "depressing" alliance of Anglican Archbishops and university Vice-Chancellors in favour of monopoly—"just this once" as it were—*The Tablet* remarks that "It would surely be better if the authorities in the world of education would refrain from setting a bad intellectual example of complete indifference to the great principle that is at stake . . ." *The Tablet* professes to believe that technical invention "will be found to work more and more against the principle of monopoly, even if that principle prevails for a season," and counsels that the new medium be left "open and free."

It seems to us that the otherwise impeccable logic of our contemporary's argument rests upon the same false premise as did the argument for classical *laissez-faire*, of which, indeed, it is but a particular application. The point is one on which we have continuously experienced difficulty in making ourselves understood—to *The Tablet*, it seems, as much as to anyone else. This may be an occasion for improving the position. *Laissez-faire* could have worked perfectly if there had not been a financial system the practical objective of which was to make the product of industry un-saleable on any terms but its own. Similarly, technical invention may work more and more against monopoly if it is freed from control by monopoly, not otherwise. To divide the administration of television between the 'public' and the 'private' branches of overriding monopoly is not to 'free' it. Unfortunately, it is 'free' in exactly the same sense that a man-eating tiger is 'free' in the jungle (until it is shot); so, in the last analysis, *The Tablet's* argument reduces itself to the same absurdity as that expressed in the statement that a man-eating tiger is best controlled 'from the inside';—"We must get into it."

FROM WEEK TO WEEK (Continued from page 1)

in the Canadian "Social Credit" Party programme, it says and means both words. Incidentally, Mr. George Drew's promise that, if returned to office in the Federal Parliament next month, he would reduce taxation by \$500m. a year, without touching pensions, family allowances, and other social security benefits or impairing the efficiency of the armed forces, strikes a chord; though we cannot see why he should not have adopted the simple and unequivocal phraseology of the Electoral Campaign. *The Times* says Mr. Drew has not yet "shown how this can be done." Mr. Drew should reserve the demonstration until he is empowered to do it. Then, he should do it, thereby further dissociating himself, as does *The Times* from "esoteric Socialism" in the process.

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.