

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 30. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, AUGUST 1, 1953.

6d. Weekly.

A Scientist Takes a Hedge

At a time when so many who are 'youthful' by the calendar are rigid with premature senility, it is a pleasant sight to see one who has outlived the allotted span by several years taking a hedge in his stride and, indeed, in remarkable style. Professor F. Wood Jones, "Freddy" to hundreds if not thousands whom he can hardly remember, has devoted a life-time to the study of living things, and we hope he will not cease to crystallise the results of his observations with the appearance of the little work which Edward Arnold has just published under the title, *Trends of Life*.^{*} This is not a pious hope. It is a very earnest hope, for we do not think the author of *Arboreal Man*, to mention perhaps the best known of many major works on Anatomy, has finished thinking or completed saying what he has to say touching matters vital to the times in which we live. It is true the present book deals with 'trends'—its subject matter is largely drawn from the field of so-called 'evolutionary' science—; but it is also true that it touches at many points changes in life and society which owe their existence to what is more accurately and usefully described as a 'drive.'

A man who writes: "We must avoid . . ." implies that "we *can* avoid." If mankind is "enslaved by mechanistic teaching and mechanistic imagery" it is not through any process of the natural teaching of experience in alliance with the natural, reflex or unavoidable imprinting of images, but by something 'civilised' and complex into which conscious choice and direction enter. Enslavement implies enslavers. Of what use is it to write a book describing in terms of inevitability the goal towards which our steps are directed, unless redirection of our steps is within our power of choice? If the goal is desired, we can at most say that the grapes being forced down our gullets are sweet grapes; if undesired we can complain that they are sour. This seems to have more to do with the nature of grapes than with the nature of man. Man does not choose to constitute the sweet grapes sweet or the sour grapes sour; if he is capable of choice at all he chooses to reject the sour or to ingest the sour. Professor Wood Jones believes that the processes which constitute the phenomena of life are unique, and that it is not "real scientific knowledge" but avoidable prejudice which has begotten the *habit* of thinking differently. We by no means dissent from what we suppose he means; but we should be indebted, and we believe human thought would be enriched, if he would go deeper into this matter of "scientific knowledge." What is "real" scientific knowledge? The mind of man swings between extremes. On the one hand are the modern analytical symbolists who seem to have reached the conclusion that while it is doubtless possible to

mean a thing here and there, a few things out of a possible many, it is quite impossible with the ordinary means available to say what you do mean even when quite certainly you mean to; while on the other hand there is illogical and slipshod 'science' able to demonstrate by blasting the world to bits if necessary that it knows *something*, even if what it knows is destructive of all human knowledge at the point of application. Between these extremes, it seems to us Professor Wood Jones steers a middle, sensible course *intuitively*; but we do not suppose he would for a moment assent to the proposition that "real" scientific knowledge is "really" intuitive? Not that we object to his conclusions: the Darwinian Theory has for a long time seemed to us to be much more important (and sinister) as political propaganda than as a "scientific" answer to any question whatsoever. We are familiar with the litter of verbalisms and other manifestations of mental vice with which the way of discussion is strewn. We have observed the innumerable ways in which living creatures seem to resemble one another, structurally and functionally, with the same sets of organs placed in comparable positions relatively one set with another, with the like appearance of wanting to eat, sleep, escape pain, experience pleasure, the same apparent desire to live and to elude death. They are so much alike, so united by common features, so 'related' that some oddity of structure or behaviour immediately elicits surprise. If we ever had an aching desire to know how they (or we) all got there, or here, or wherever it is, it has long been submerged by the pressing necessity of discovering how to get "to anywhere out of this," and it may be the same with the rest, with all the worms, fishes and what not, for all we know. Evolution theory seems to be concerned with the demonstration that only by the intervention of problematical geological epochs is anything vitally interesting possible. To our unscientific but human intelligence, the biologists have not yet demonstrated that it is possible to answer any question whatsoever about living organisms except how to mutilate them with impunity—or one might say, how to kill them without getting caught—and how to represent their lives and our own as futile in the process.

Professor Wood Jones seems to have come to almost the same conclusion. He says "The belief that changes in living creatures have been brought about by natural agencies is the only workable hypothesis by which it is possible to give a *reasonable* (our emphasis) interpretation of all the observed facts of structure, adaptation, distribution and habits of plants and animals." He adopts this paraphrase of the expositors of evolution theory and goes on: "Stated thus, and this is the only possible interpretation of it, it loses some of its majestic implications of being a recondite

^{*}*Trends of Life* by F. Wood Jones, F.R.S., (London: Edward Arnold, 10/6 net).

(continued on page 7.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 1, 1953.

MINISTRY OF FOOD

Flour Improvers

Mr. Dodds asked the Minister of Food, in view of public concern, what progress has been made in prohibiting the use of agene in the treatment of flour for human consumption to conform with action taken in Canada, the United States of America, France, Belgium, Spain, Turkey, Greece and Switzerland, to protect the health of their people.

The Minister of Food (Major Lloyd George): I would refer the hon. Member to the reply I gave to my hon. Friend the Member for Spelthorne (Mr. Beresford Craddock) on 23rd February. It would be premature to take any action until the investigations referred to are completed.

Mr. Dodds: Is it not disgraceful that these investigations should have taken such a long time? Is the Minister not aware that there is great concern that tampering with the bread of the people is believed to be so bad that it is a menace to public health? Surely something more should be done. Does the Minister say that these other countries are wrong in banning it years ago?

Major Lloyd George: They did not ban it years ago. I am sure that the hon. Gentleman will appreciate that investigations into matters of this character are of tremendous importance and it is idle to pretend that they can be done quickly. With regard to the other countries, it is true that it is prohibited in 10 countries but it is allowed in nine others, and two permit another substance on which we are taking action.

Dr. Stross: Could the Minister tell us how long the investigations have now been under way? Is it 2½ or 3½ years?

Major Lloyd George: I do not think that the time has been as long as that, but I would remind the hon. Member of something else which occurred. We are examining as well as agene the gaseous substance which is used in America, because we are not yet satisfied about either of them.

Mr. Dodds: Will the Minister state how long he expects it to be before he can make a statement?

Major Lloyd George: I cannot promise the hon. Member a date, but I promise that I will do so as soon as I can.

Tea

Mr. Willey asked the Minister of Food what steps he intends to take to redress the substantial decline in imports of tea this year.

Major Lloyd George: The hon. Member may rest assured that the trade will take any steps necessary without prompting from me.

Mr. Willey: Is the right hon. and gallant Gentleman aware that so far this year we have imported 36 million lb. of tea less than last year, and considerably less than 1951, and that the trade is taking steps; it is increasing the price?

The price of cheaper teas was increased by 4d. only last Monday. Cannot the right hon. and gallant Gentleman intervene to do something, for he has caused the situation?

Foodstuffs (Calcium Content)

Dr. Stross asked the Minister of Food the amounts of calcium available in one pint of milk and 1 lb. of bread to which the statutory amount of chalk has been added; and the annual cost of adding 11,300 tons of chalk to bread.

Major Lloyd George: One pint of milk supplies 680 milligrams calcium; 1 lb. of bread, containing added calcium carbonate, 649 milligrams. The answer to the second part of the Question is about £50,000, which is the cost of treating flour costing £160 million.

Dr. Stross: In view of the fact that milk appears to contain a very large amount of natural calcium and as this is the best way of getting it into the nation's diet, would not the Minister agree to spend money at present expended on chalk to subsidise the milk so that the present surplus could be used for drinking?

Major Lloyd George: The amount of calcium costs £50,000. The extra milk to get the same amount of calcium would cost £180 million.

Dr. Stross: Does not the Minister agree that at least there is a principle that it is wiser to have more milk consumed and less chalk added to our flour?

Fish Products (Experiments)

Mr. Grimond asked the Minister of Food what information he has about the production of a food from fish meal and oil which can be used as a substitute for milk for children in backward countries; and what experiments in its production have yet been carried out in this country.

Major Lloyd George: I understand that at a recent meeting in Hull of a Working Party of the Food and Agriculture Organisation on Fish Products for use in Tropical Countries, the use of fish meal for direct human feeding in protein deficient areas was discussed and samples of high quality fish meals, developed both in this country and in Northern Europe, were submitted for selection for use in feeding trials in Latin America.

Mr. Grimond: While thanking the Minister for his reply, may I ask him if he can say whether it would not be a considerable advantage for the fishing industry if these trials were successful and whether the products would not command a fairly high price? If the experiments prove successful will he ensure that manufacturing processes are encouraged in this country?

Major Lloyd George: I will certainly do everything I can to assist in what, I think, is a very good experiment.

House of Commons: July 2, 1953.

Government Departments (Debt)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state, to the nearest £1,000,000, the amount of debt held

by Government Departments on 31st March, 1953, under the headings of Floating Debt and Other Internal Debts (excluding Bonds tendered for Death Duties), respectively.

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: I am afraid that this information is not yet available, but it will, as usual, be published in the National Debt Return later in the year.

Sir W. Smithers: When it is available, will my hon. Friend send me a copy?

Mr. Boyd-Carpenter: As I understand, my hon. Friend would be entitled to such a paper, but, if it will come with greater force from me, I shall be very glad to send it.

AGRICULTURE

Farmers (Grading Procedure)

Mr. Peart asked the Minister of Agriculture how many county committees have relinquished the grading of farmers as part of the farm survey procedure.

Sir T. Dugdale: Thirty-four, Sir.

Mr. Peart: In June of last year the Minister sent out a letter which was preceded by an important circular dealing with the farm survey. Does he not agree that these committees are acting wrongly, and will he take some action in the matter?

Sir T. Dugdale: No, Sir. The circular which I sent out altered the procedure so that the counties could themselves select the particular method they wished to adopt. As a result of that circular, 34 counties do not now grade their farms, A, B and C.

Advisory Service

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture the relationship between the National Agricultural Advisory Service and the county agricultural executive committee; and if he will take steps to ensure that no one shall be a member of both these committees.

Sir T. Dugdale: Members of the National Agricultural Advisory Service, who are civil servants, act as executive and advisory officers of county agricultural executive committees, and the chief officers of these committees and their district committees are normally drawn from the Service. Civil servants, whether members of the N.A.A.S. or not, are never appointed as members of county agricultural executive committees.

Sir W. Smithers: Is it not contrary to British justice that anyone who gives advice should be judge in a case where that advice is not followed?

Sir T. Dugdale: The members of the Advisory Service are in no way judges.

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture if he is aware that the full value of the National Agricultural Advisory Service is not being secured because farmers most in need of help and advice are afraid to call in officers of the Service because they fear that it will set in motion the dispossession functions of the county agricultural executive; and what action he will take to put an end to this.

Sir T. Dugdale: My hon. Friend's suggestion is entirely erroneous. So far from being afraid to call on the National Advisory Service, farmers of all kinds are steadily increasing their requests for help from the Service.

Sir W. Smithers: Will the Minister not stop these totalitarian methods of supervising and dispossessing farmers, especially when those farmers have no right of appeal to a traditional court of law?

Sir T. Dugdale: That has nothing whatever to do with the Question. The National Agricultural Advisory Service is there for the sole purpose of giving advice to farmers on the best means of cultivation and good husbandry.

Supply—Agriculture and Food Production

Sir Albert Braithwaite (Harrow, West): . . . Capital investment is a very serious item in the cost of production in farming today. One cannot go into a modern farm with hand labour, as used to happen in the old days, and expect to make it pay. One now has to provide all sorts of machinery, including drilling machinery, drying and preparing machinery, tractors of all kinds and cultivators of all kinds, in order to make a success of the land. The capital cost today is staggering.

I propose to give the Committee some idea of what it costs to produce certain items. When we talk of millions of pounds of agricultural production it does not mean anything. It means more when we break it down into the items. To reseed one acre of high-quality ley costs £12 to £15, to rear a two-year-old store beast costs £40 to £50, to produce an eight-score bacon pig costs about £18, and to produce a sheep costs £5. These figures are out of all relation to pre-war figures. What we have asked for by 1956 will impose upon our farmers an increased financial turnover of not less than £60 million to £70 million a year, and that cannot be done unless more money goes into the industry.

Where shall we get the money? The Chancellor had to make regulations about the bank overdraft which farmers had to have. Farming advances in 1951 totalled £203 million, but by May of this year they had dropped to £198 million. That means that there is £5 million less in the industry in 1953, when we want an increase, than in the previous year. At the same time the only source of long-term credit for the industry is the Agricultural Mortgage Corporation, and the Corporation's rates of interest have risen from 4½ to 5½ per cent., which adds to the cost of production. What is the Government going to do to provide more capital for the farming community?

The farmer turns over his total investment only once in every seventeen months. Most industries turn over their capital three or four times a year. The farmer has to wait a very long time. When we ask him to raise beef cattle, it is three years before he gets anything back again. How is he to finance himself during that time? What steps are the Government taking to enable the farmer to obtain the necessary credit to carry through the operation? These are pertinent questions which the Minister will have to answer if our agricultural production is to be improved to the extent

(continued on page 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. 23.

Saturday, August 1, 1953.

From Week to Week

"Mummy, daddy says Mr. Churchill . . .

"Sir Winston, darling."

"Yes, mummy, Sir Winston Churchill."

"Yes, darling; what does daddy say Sir Winston has done?"

"Oh, daddy says he's gone to Chequers for his daily double."

"Oh, does he?"

"Mummy, what's a daily double?"

"I think you've got mixed, dear."

"Mummy, mixed doubles? Mummy, isn't that tennis?"

"Yes, darling; mixed doubles has to do with tennis. It means there's a lady and a gentleman on each side."

"But, mummy, daddy talks about daily doubles when he's read the horse-racing."

"Yes, darling, that's betting."

"Mummy, do they have horse races at Chequers?"

"I don't think so, darling. It's where the Prime Minister lives."

"Then what will Mr. Churchill do there?"

"I don't know, darling. Daddy does not like Mr. Churchill."

"Sir Winston, Mummy."

"Yes, darling, Sir Winston Churchill."

"Mummy, what'll he be next?"

"I don't know, darling. He might be anything."

"Regent, mummy?"

"Oh, no; I don't think so darling."

"President, mummy?"

"Oh, no, darling, General Eisenhower is President."

"There doesn't seem to be anything more he can be, does there, mummy?"

"I don't know, darling. Anything might happen."

"That's what daddy says, mummy."

• • •

The Americans put things very neatly, don't they? We almost see daylight through the picture of the 'recalcitrant'

Dr. Rhee as the man in a droszky pursued by wolves, whose companions (Dr. Rhee's, not the wolves) vainly try to persuade him to jump rather than be pushed out, while the rest (including the one with the cigar) are ready with whips in their hands for the get-away.

There were, of course, two 'aggressions,' the North Korean attack in June, 1950, and the Red Chinese attack in 1951 declared so by the 'United Nations.' Dr. Rhee finds it peculiar that the gate-crashing ally of the first aggression should think of admitting the perpetrator of the second to membership of the Union which attracted his fire. Paul Jones says, in *Human Events*, that Rhee has cooled his heels in anterooms all over the world beginning with the Versailles Conference and knows every one of the dispossessed prime ministers and presidents who are "such a nuisance" to the United Nations Secretariat, "with their absurd petitions and their talk of rights." He suggests Churchill might get a letter of endorsement from Premier Mikolajczyk, "or, maybe, through a medium, the ghosts of Mikhailovitch and Benes might advise Dr. Rhee to go along quietly."

• • •

Mr. Frank Perkins chairman and managing director of F. Perkins, Ltd., diesel engine manufacturers of Peterborough, has said that in June a record production of 4,200 multi-cylinder engines was achieved and facilities had been provided to give the company a potential output equal to twice to-day's level. He added that "currency problems and import permits can bring to nought all the customer demand created by low cost production and outstanding sales and service facilities." *The Director* for July urges "a very strong consortium of leading merchant banking institutions" to finance export trade credits to buyers abroad, which are now "not made up until a few years later." Why finance consumption only abroad?

• • •

Says Lord Derby: "Television is probably the most important influence on the human mind since the invention of printing." Exactly. And therefore it comes within the field which calls periodically for Legislation. This, as Douglas pointed out, is the proper and the only proper field for the passing of new Statute Laws. The steam engine, the electric dynamo, the aeroplane, gunpowder, wireless, each in its own way so enhances the power of mankind as to effect progressively greater and greater changes in the distribution of Power in the community. Here is specially the occasion for deep study of the consequences likely to arise and for wise and just provision of safeguards that the hard-won victories of human culture shall not be reversed.

Instead we have gone far along the road towards a condition where an overworked and incompetent legislative machine, dominated by 'interests,' tries vainly to catch up on the effects, piecemeal, while the monstrous causes grow in range and power. It is these matters which belong to that aspect of human association which, physical in appearance is actually metaphysical: it belongs to the mind. And, most important to observe, it is precisely here that the State is *ultra vires*. Because this aspect of the television con-

(continued on page 8.)

Neglected Books

by DENIS GOACHER.

(Concluded.)

(4)

"It has often been observed with concern, that the study of the laws of our country hath been totally neglected in the usual education of English gentlemen."

"... they (parliamentarians) are not thus honourably distinguished from the rest of their fellow subjects, merely that they may privilege their persons, their estates, or their domestics; that they may list under party banners; may grant or withhold supplies; may vote with or vote against a popular or unpopular administration; but upon considerations far more interesting and important. They are the guardians of the English constitution; the makers, repealers, and interpreters of the English laws; delegated to watch, to check, and to avert every dangerous innovation, to propose, to adopt, and to cherish any solid and well weighed improvement; bound by every tie of nature, of honour and of religion, to transmit that constitution and those laws to their posterity, amended, if possible, at least without any derogation. *And how unbecoming must it appear in a member of the legislature to vote for a new law, who is utterly ignorant of the old! What kind of interpretation can he be enabled to give, who is a stranger to the text upon which he comments!*"

Considering the diffuseness of modern education and widespread ignorance of the basis of our civilisation, one wonders how many English people (in particular Members of Parliament) are familiar with, or have even read, the above memorable words. The first passage is from *Analysis of the Laws of England* by William Blackstone, pub. 1756, and the second from his amplification of that work, the *Commentaries on the Law of England*.[*] The 'Commentaries' were the first comprehensive exposition of the unwritten English Common Law, the basis of American Law, and are still set books for the intending lawyer; and yet the last edition listed on the British Museum catalogue is dated 1865 and for a good modern edition one has to send to America. Blackstone's eloquent assertion of the dangers arising from ignorance of the law among laymen and the legislature could scarcely have been more applicable to his own day than to ours. Now, when we are increasingly constrained by the rule of secular law, it is imperative that we should examine the basis of that law. It is one of the infamies of our educational system that such enquiries are not encouraged. Present day practising lawyers are inclined to be patronising about Blackstone and say he "has been

[*] Cp: "Law-Latin was a lost cause when Blackstone wrote in its defence. But his reasons throw light on his idea of the law: 'Law-Latin is in reality a mere technical language, calculated for eternal duration . . . and best suited to preserve those memorials which are intended for perpetual rules of action. . . . This technical Latin continued in use until subversion of our ancient constitution by Cromwell.' It was restored with Charles II. 'Thus it continued until about 1730.' It was suppressed by an Act 'that the common people might have knowledge and understanding of what was done for or against them. Which purpose, I fear, has not been answered; being apt to suspect that the people are now, after many years' experiment, altogether as ignorant in matters of law as before.'" (T.S.C., January 20, 1951.)

superseded," but they are usually only thinking of the technical application of our laws and not of the moral assumptions and implications of those laws. As an expositor of the latter Blackstone is still unrivalled.

While the majority of English and American people remain ignorant of the great body of wisdom and justice contained in the English Common Law, distortion of that law (either by 'amended' interpretations of the unwritten law or by the passing of new statutory laws) by succeeding governments will continue. As Brooks Adams has said, "Law is merely the expression of the will of the strongest for the time being, and therefore laws have no fixity, but shift from generation to generation."

Evidence of such 'shifts' is obvious in the history of the American constitution: such shifts have been more hidden but no less terrible in our own. Brooks Adams's observation would have seemed the extreme of cynicism to Blackstone writing a century and a half earlier: the latter would have been appalled by the measure of irresponsibility and ignorance in present day legislators.

The reader glancing through Blackstone for the first time will find much to startle him. "Statutes also are either declaratory of the common law, or remedial of some defects therein." Unless a citizen is familiar with the common law how can he judge of the felicity of a new statute? This particularly applies to citizens who are Members of Parliament. And one wonders how often this passage from *Of the Rights of Kings* has been pondered.

"He is also considered as the general of the kingdom, and may raise fleets and armies, build forts, appoint havens, erect beacons, *prohibit the exportation of arms and ammunition* . . . He is also the arbiter of domestic commerce, (*not of foreign which is regulated by the law of merchants*;) and is therefore entitled to the erection of public marts, the regulation of weights and measures, and the *coinage and legitimation of money*."

Above all perhaps, those parts of Blackstone dealing with the history and philosophy of law are the most essential, and an edition containing these sections is long overdue. It would be convenient not for the student (the student will always track down what he wants) but for the mildly curious citizen lacking the time to hunt through libraries. And if the schools gave some prominence to Blackstone there would not be so many adults to whom he is merely an obscure and unapproachable 18th century judge.

(5)

Our last book, *A Study of the Federal Reserve* by Eustace Mullins was published in the U.S.A. in 1952 and is unlikely ever to appear in England. Even if it did the stark title on the cover, 'Mullins on the Federal Reserve,' would stir few people beyond the half formulated query "What is the Federal Reserve?" In fact this grim cover conceals one of the most absorbing and 'thrilling' books to appear in the last 10 years. I use 'thrilling' advisedly—it reads like a superior 'who-dun it.' I would defy anyone to read these opening paragraphs and then put the book down.

"On the night of November 22, 1910, a crowd of newspaper reporters gathered at the Hoboken, New Jersey railway station. They had been tipped off that some very

highly-placed people were coming over to Hoboken from New York City to board a train and go away on a secret mission. What the mission might be, or who the personages involved, none of them knew, but they were certain that an extremely important event was in the making.

"Senator Nelson Aldrich entered the Station. Here was their proof. The reporters gathered around him. He was always extremely good copy, although he was noted for his brusqueness and the difficulty of getting a story from him. This was due to his tie up with the powerful Rubber Trust and the Tobacco Trust. As one of the coalition of five Republican Senators then ruling the Senate, Aldrich had used his elective position to enact a series of tariffs and laws favourable to his own interests, and had been denounced many times for his callous disregard of his oath of office as he devoted his power to the programme of international financier."

"Aldrich had recently returned from Europe with the National Monetary Commission, of which he was head. This was a Commission appointed by Congress in response to public feeling against big bankers after the artificial panic of 1907. The commission had been charged to make a thorough study of financial practises before formulating banking and currency reform legislation for Congress. It was pointed out at the time that such legislation seemed unlikely to offer genuine reform under the leadership of a man with Aldrich's known sympathies and employment, but Congress was blithely impervious to this criticism."

Mr. Mullins then goes on to relate how Aldrich and a group of big bankers headed by Paul Warburg went off to the most appropriately named 'Jekyll Island' "to write banking legislation which would protect their interests, legislation which would be publicized as a 'people's banking bill.'"

The mephistopheles of this sinister group, Paul Warburg, drew up what he called the 'Federal Reserve Plan.' Aldrich insisted on the bill being submitted to Congress as 'The Aldrich Plan.' What followed is almost too fantastic to be believed: the Aldrich Plan represented the Republican Party: as Aldrich was known to represent financial interest a "nationwide opposition sprang up against the Aldrich Plan. The outcry against it created an atmosphere favourable to passing the SAME PLAN under the sponsorship of Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party as the Federal Reserve Act of 1913."

That is what happened. When the Democratic Party submitted their bill Aldrich and his friends even went to the length of *publicly* denouncing it, to screen the fact that they were secretly behind it.

Now, what did this act mean? It meant that instead of the 'Independent Sub-Treasury System' which "supposedly had kept the United States' funds out of the hands of the great bankers" (because of this system "the bankers had precipitated the money panics of 1873, 1883 and 1907) there would be a bank monetary issue, the Federal Reserve, entirely *free* from Congressional control. This flatly contravened the Constitution Art. I, Sec. 8, Par. 5 which states that 'CONGRESS SHALL HAVE THE POWER TO COIN MONEY AND REGULATE THE VALUE THEREOF; AND OF FOREIGN COINS.'

Those who want to know the bearing of the Act on the two world wars and how it precipitated the stock market crash of 1929, must read the book. They will find much to astound them. They will for instance learn something about Mr. Bernard Baruch; there is a lot about the wonder financier who has testified that "all wars are economic in origin." Armed with such information the reader will find added significance in the fact that Mr. Winston Churchill, on his recent visit to America, stayed with Mr. Bernard Baruch: and that talks with General Eisenhower took place in Mr. Baruch's house.

This book is indispensable for anyone seeking the hidden movements of 20th century politics.

There is a connection between all five of these books. All have a bearing on language: writing becomes foggy, obscure, harmful only when the facts, the matter, the 'gestalt' are not clear to the author; when the writer has not probed to the roots of his subject. Brooks Adams, Korzybski, Mullins have all discovered truths; Adams and Mullins economic truths, Korzybski truths about the structure of our language. As a result they all have excellent prose styles. Probably not one of these three thought greatly about the art of writing but because they penetrated to the marrow of their subjects they wrote well. Wyndham Lewis has peered closely at the political structure beneath the bewildering surface of our society and the result is his magnificent pile-driving style. Strictly, of course, he should be considered in another category co-existently, being the only one of the five who is an artist, but the best in all writing is distinguished by this powerful correspondence between verity and clarity of speech. The majestic and beautiful periods of Blackstone would not have been possible had he not thoroughly understood his subject.

Truths are always difficult to find, the basic germinal facts are hidden, otherwise this earth would be a paradise. But there is a distinction between secrets which science has not yet divined and facts which, both deliberately and unwittingly, are kept hidden. There are *known* facts of economics, law, linguistics and psychology the possession of which is a danger to the wielders of power in this world. If the real facts of economics were generally known the vast system of financial trickery and dishonesty would be at an end: if the people knew their laws iniquitous legislation would not be possible: and if the findings of semantics and psychology were known the orator, the demagogue and the leader writer, would be stripped of their weapons.

And so it is not in the least strange that the most interesting books are often the most difficult to find. Knowledge of the kind contained in these five books would never be freely distributed, it endangers too many venal interests. Not that the average politician, lawyer or 'publisher' would admit this even to himself: he would protest hotly at the suggestion of any such censorship—the invisible 'index' has existed for too long. The origins of this terrible net of obscurantism have to be sought in history (and perverted history books make that a difficult task) for political power is now so great that the tycoon is often unaware of the meaning of his stratagems, the stratagems that were originally evolved to acquire power.

PARLIAMENT—

(continued from page 3.)

that we desire, and I believe that in another five years' time our agricultural production ought to be double what it was pre-war if we handle the problem properly.

I cannot believe that there will again be a surplus of food in the world, and, therefore, we shall have to rely very largely upon what we ourselves can produce here. Because of the increase in economic independence of other countries and the improvement in their standard of life, the commodities which were years ago sold on the open market are not now available. . . .

Sir Robert Boothby (Aberdeenshire, East): . . . There is to my mind no shadow of doubt that the surest and safest road to economic salvation for this country in the next 10 to 15 years is an increased production of food. We can argue as we like about balances of payments, convertibility and the rest of the economic nostrums with which we are being deaved, as we say in Scotland. Here is a clear issue: should we or should we not produce more food? To that question there can only be one answer.

At present it takes nearly half the earnings of our exporting industries to pay for our imports of food and drink alone. Nearly half of our total exports are used to pay for our imports of food and drink. This is all wrong. That being said, let us have a look at the achievement. Despite what the hon. Member for Wednesbury said, it is considerable. We are now producing more than double our pre-war output of coarse grains on about a 75 per cent. increase in acreage. That in itself is remarkable. We are producing all the milk we require, 100 per cent. We are producing 61 per cent. more potatoes than we did pre-war, and 55 per cent. more sugar beet, off acreages increased by only 37 per cent. and 22 per cent., respectively. That looks to me like a considerable increase in productivity.

The gross value of our agricultural output, our output of food, for 1952-53 was £1,120 million. If home production had been back during that year at the pre-war level, we should have had to spend another £400 million on imports of food from abroad, or suffered a very serious shortage of food for our people. The sum of £400 million is sizeable. It would have made a marked difference to the national balance of payments.

These are considerations we ought to bear in mind. On the other hand, beef, veal, mutton, lamb and pig meat production has increased by only 7 per cent. That is the bad side of the picture, as I see it. The fact remains that, with an index of net output standing at 50 per cent. above pre-war, we are still producing only half our total food requirements. That is not enough.

We may reasonably expect under the existing policies, and the progress we are making which the Minister of Agriculture outlined, to increase this to 60 per cent. and two-fifths over the next three years; but that still will not be enough. In my view we have to double our pre-war production over the next decade. This will involve a total expansion of current output by 40 per cent.

Therefore I say and I say it with emphasis and with no apology, that the present targets of the Government for agricultural production are too low. I would also agree with

the hon. Member for Wednesbury that there is no cause for complacency. Despite the enormous increase in mechanisation in this country since the war—a far greater comparable increase than has taken place in any other country—the contrast between our standards of farming and those of Denmark and Holland is at once disturbing and challenging, and we may as well face it. Both of these countries have a higher head of livestock per acre, and they have a better average quality—for example, Danish pigs—and yield, for example, Dutch cows.

This comparison is, admittedly, not quite fair, and I put this point to the hon. Member for Wednesbury in regard to Denmark and Holland. First, the economies of those two countries have been built round the farm; whereas the economy of this country has been built up round the factory. We are an industrial country, and they are concentrated and specialised agricultural countries. Second, they have been producing primarily for export; and third, they have concentrated on one or two items, which they do superbly. Therefore, it is not really quite fair to make the comparison between Danish farming and British farming, because the conditions, not of soil, nor of climate, but of environment and of economic policy, are so entirely different. . . .

(To be continued).

*A SCIENTIST TAKES A HEDGE—**(continued from page 1).*

pronouncement of science . . . It is obvious that the doctrine of evolution when stripped of its adventitious trappings of scientific verbalism, is something that everybody understands." It is by no means useless to press this home. But Professor Wood Jones's service extends farther. He examines the actual effect of man's actions on other creatures and finally upon himself. Very interestingly, he says there are degrees in domestication. "The dog is an example of a creature that man has rendered almost completely servile and subject to his wishes. Man has perpetuated three hundred different types of dogs and will certainly continue the business . . . The cat, on the other hand, though associated with man from prehistoric times, has never come so completely under man's domination as has the dog. Until comparatively recent times, when a race of cat fanciers has undertaken the control of the cat's mating, the animal has always shown a marked independence in arranging these matters for itself. The range of variety in cats is nothing like so great as is that in dogs and it is almost entirely confined to differences in coat colour and texture . . . Nor has the cat produced viable pathological forms in the way of bandy-legged, snub-nosed, goggle-eyes, or undershot freaks that have been perpetuated by selective breeding among dogs; and no variety depending for its oddity on foetal bone disease has become stereotyped." By domestication, man has made many animals unable to cope with life by themselves. "What man fails to realise is the fact that, under the conditions that he euphemistically terms Western civilisation, he has subjected himself to all the influences that domestication exerts upon other animals. It is impossible to discuss the status of modern man, or to make even a guess as to his possible future, unless we bear constantly in mind the fact that we are dealing with a domesticated animal. Man's

only distinction from other domesticated animals is that his mating is not, in modern social conditions, *habitually* (our emphasis) controlled by outside agencies."

In a final chapter of great cogency and directness, Professor Wood Jones, with his condition "constantly in mind," discusses Man and His Future. Too complete adaptation shuts the door to adaptability. There is hope only for the still unadapted. It is obvious to anyone who consciously puts his mind to it that complete adaptation, the obtainable limit of technological functionalism, man reduced to completely specialised (adapted) 'worker,' is the immediate objective of all propaganda and all 'statesmanship.' But it does not seem to us to be enough to say that this has just 'happened,' however useful it may be to describe what has happened faithfully—and of course completely enough to ensure that no factor is omitted which is open to adjustment. Professor Wood Jones writes as though he thought "the catastrophe" had already occurred. He adopts Trevelyan's suggestion of 1875 as the date. Probably that is as near as may be to the last stage of implantation of an avowedly amoral, *apparently* irreversible, centralised control over the use and development of the extra-physiological resources available to man. For the readers of this review, it is unnecessary to list the details. We agree that there is, for example, nothing whatsoever to justify the belief that the eighty *per cent.* of the population (if it is so much) who have 'benefited' from the immensely costly mass education of recent years enough to "acquire an insight into the accumulated knowledge to which modern Man is heir" have done so. We agree that it seems incredible "that a so-called Christian community should acquiesce in the publication, in an accepted scientific journal, of the views of a scientist on 'the economics of extermination,'" and we agree that "It seems even more incredible that a civilised human being could look forward to the progress of research in atomic fission that will ultimately reduce 'the killing cost to about twopence halfpenny a head.'" We agree that "If internal barbarism has not yet determined the downfall of Western civilisation, it is difficult to see what further agent is necessary to complete its ruin." The name of the "twopence half-penny" scientist is given as Fred Hoyle, and we believe the economic exterminator was our old friend A. V. Hill (C.H., *etc., etc., etc.*). We agree that "Modern wars originate in economic conditions and have no moral incentives other than the fictitious propaganda stories put forward by those in power in every combatant country as a stimulus to the people to wage war on the enemy under the belief that they are fighting for righteous ends." We agree that "since world economics are admittedly the basis of modern wars, it is worth while enquiring if the conduct of mankind is leading towards an alleviation of the economic strains of modern civilisation."

But, at this point, we would protest that we have made that 'worth while' enquiry, laid bare the salient features of the answer, and must report that the Great Age of Enlightenment 'couldn't care less.'

Whether this has anything to do with the fact that the cranial capacity of Neanderthal Man (? 98,000 B.C.) was 1,450 c.c. or 100 c.c. *more* than that of the dupes of television we cannot say. We have a suspicion that it hasn't; that it is merely a matter of misdirected zeal.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK— (continued from page 4.)
trovery is totally neglected, we have little faith in the efficacy of the remedies proposed. For what it is worth, we record, without comment, the names of the twelve friends of Lord Derby associated with him in his counter-move (apparently fortuitously) to the T.U.C.

They are Mr. Ronald Simms, prospective Conservative candidate for East Willesden, Lord Balfour of Inchrye, Professor George Catlin, the Dean of Chichester, Viscountess Davidson, Lord Fairfax of Cameron, Sir Ian Fraser, Colonel Sir Godfrey Llewellyn, Canon C. B. Mortlock, Professor Sir Arnold Plant, Major-General Sir Edward Spears, Miss Valerie Hobson and Viscountess Rhondda.

"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. . . . 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 . . ." (T.S.C. July 11.)

"Be sure, then, that an attempt will be made to get Lord Salisbury appointed Premier.

"It will not work. The notion is preposterous, even as a temporary solution. For not only does Salisbury's vision fail to match the job. Not only did he botch the talks in Washington. But the days when a Prime Minister can sit in the Lords are over." (The Sunday Express, July 26.)

We disapprove strongly of "Cross-bencher's" glib last sentence.

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.

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