

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 4.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

Work for Work's Sake

By RALPH L. DUCLOS,

President, The Douglas Social Credit Bureau of Canada, Inc.

The term "total employment" is vague and may easily mean any degree of existence leading to the work state. The average thinking person is not easily attracted by this term for he knows right well that Germany, Italy and Japan have had total employment for many years and the citizens of those countries have received progressively less and less of the good things of life and more and more of distress and slavery since its inception. He knows, too, that the negroes in the Southern States had "total employment" before they were liberated and that the penitentiaries of to-day enforce total employment upon their inmates.

All through history our ancestors have fought for liberation from various degrees of slavery. Our present liberties have been won at great cost and effort, yet we are being asked to surrender blithely those same precious freedoms.

The degree of slavery that is promised Canadians this time is "total employment." Whether or not the work is necessary, whether or not science and the power age could do the job better and faster: no matter how great an abundance of everything there might be—the "planners" are determined to hold us to the scarcity idea "if you don't labour neither shall you eat." They'll destroy the goods, dump them on foreign markets; give them away, like in war-time; sabotage production, but never, no, never, let Canadians have them "unless they work."

Is it possible that when this war is over, the heroes of Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, Hong Kong, and Dieppe must do like so many of their fathers, the heroes of Mons, Ypres, Passchendaele, and Vimy Ridge, did after the last fracas and exchange the weapons they used to defend democracy and freedom for a peace-time issue of picks and shovels? What a "freedom," what a "democracy" the "planners" are planning. Do we never learn? Must this war also be fought in vain?

The purpose of production is consumption. On this basis alone can we build a workable post-war economy and a permanent peace. Whatever work is necessary must be done but to base an economic system on "work" instead of production and consumption is not only highly dangerous but utterly futile. Thereby we would be trying to operate in an age of science, power and superabundance with the

antiquated methods of the age of scarcity. Like trying to fight a blitz with bows and arrows, we merely liquidate ourselves and that's what almost happened to us in the hungry thirties due to these same methods.

If we desire a "work state" after the war it shouldn't be difficult to achieve. We can create a work state like Hitler's and prepare for bigger and better wars. Hitler's was a gadget economy to create work. He built roads and war gadgets. We could build monuments for the leaders under whose misguidance we became so decadent that the Austrian house-painter believed we were easy pickings. We could also build gadgets—little gadgets to attach to big gadgets that could be used to build more little gadgets and so on *ad infinitum*.

Like the coral insect whose whole life is occupied building little grains of coral on to bigger pieces of coral. Who wants to be like a coral insect? Besides, coral is useful, islands and necklaces are made of it, but gadgets are worse than valueless unless they are useful to people who have the means to buy them.

As an alternative to the fore-going if we believe in work for work's sake, we can scrap the machines and intern the scientists and we'll have plenty of work to keep alive; or we might fall back on the good old political dodge of digging holes to fill ditches and then digging ditches to fill the holes—the pre-election pick and shovel economy. Like the story of the dear old lady who would kneel down and thank God each time it snowed "for it made work for the poor unemployed." In the work state even a beautiful sunny day is a curse.

The same lack of vision that prompted our leaders to cry "there is no money" in the hungry thirties now prompts them to shout "total employment" as the ultimate objective for our existence, our *raison d'être*. Once more while the children cry "for bread" these blind leaders of the blind offer them "a stone."

Let us be objective in dealing with the post-war problem. Leaving the methods to experts, what are the results we want after the war, in the economic field?

Canadians want access to the goods and services that Canada can produce or that Canada can obtain by exchanging its surplus products with other countries.

The Prime Minister, Mr. King, the Hon. J. L. Ilsley, Minister of Finance, and others have reiterated many times in the House of Commons that "We will make financially possible that which is physically possible," which, in simple language, means "what a nation can produce it can afford to use."

Since the hungry thirties when "there was no money"

to the present when by bankers' magic there is so much money we pay more taxes in one year than would finance the whole of Great War No. 1, our production has correspondingly increased. The all time pre-war high for Canadian production was valued at 4,100 million dollars (1928). This year the Government itself is spending solely for the war budget 3,300 millions (over and above ordinary expenditures), almost twice the total national production of 1,700 millions in the moneyless days of 1933.

Not only is the production problem solved, the problem of distribution is solved as well. We use what we need and give the balance to the enemy, *i.e.*, we shoot it at him. In war-time we have mass production and mass consumption. What we can do in war-time we can do in peace-time and if we don't like the outrageous taxes and pyramiding debts we can always fire the experts who advise the present methods and get new ones who have modern ideas on the matter.

The post-war problem of transforming war economy and production to peace-time needs and rehabilitating a million odd people into peace-time life is a tremendous one. Unless we keep in mind the desired results stated above we are liable to get lost in a labyrinth of regimentation, restrictions and "goose stepping" advocated by those who love to plan other's lives.

It should be obvious that if we can have a million and a quarter persons in the armed forces, war services and war production and still maintain a much higher general standard of living than formerly, in addition to using 45 per cent. of our production for war purposes—then surely our post-war prosperity should be unprecedentedly high if we insist on results rather than methods. If these results can be obtained by utilising the scientific productive methods of the power age, thereby eliminating a little of the work slavery from our existence, so much the better. The war might thereby be a blessing in disguise and usher in the Leisure State.

Even those who cry for the "total employment" of the work state, in the same breath insist that this war is being fought for freedom.

What freedom is there without leisure? Without leisure there can be no culture, for culture is the proper use of leisure. Without leisure you cannot enjoy any of the finer things of life—music, art, recreation, study. Without leisure you cannot think. Without leisure you cannot even worship. We enjoy all these freedoms only in ratio to our leisure from compulsory grind.

Freedom is the power to choose or refuse one thing at a time. Let that freedom of choice be extended to all Canadians when war ceases and "work" will be replaced by "vocations" to which people will gravitate as their sense of fitness impels them. They will then be occupied in the useful pursuits they love rather than being compelled to do "work" solely to avoid destitution and misery, no matter how distasteful to them or how useless that work may be. Glamourising drudgery by propaganda does not make it less onerous.

When this war is fought and won, if in the peace that follows Canadians do not get the tangible results they desire, results which are physically possible, then our efforts and sacrifices will indeed have been in vain and we shall have made but a mockery of Democracy and Freedom.

Social Credit in Quebec

At a meeting of Social Crediters in Quebec on December 13, the huge hall of the Palais Montcalm was packed with people who had travelled from all over the province. The report of this meeting in *Vers Demain* concludes:—

"We must face the Socialist tide which is rising, and face it otherwise than with a decrepit system, otherwise too than exclusively with the presentation of a new team of planners, who although they repudiate the term 'Socialism,' yet, unconsciously perhaps, have the same philosophy, and dream only of making humanity flow into moulds made by them.

"The Social Crediters of Canada are now sufficiently numerous and strong to throw themselves vigorously into the formation of that Electoral Union that, already eight years ago, Major Douglas declared to be the only means, in his opinion, of obtaining a Social Credit régime."

The New Head of Morgan's

Of Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, who has been elected chairman of the board of J. P. Morgan and Co., Inc., in succession to the late Mr. J. P. Morgan, *The Daily Telegraph* says:—"[he] is one of the most genial and widely informed personalities in the American financial world. He is the first man not a member of the Morgan family to preside over the famous banking firm.

"For many years he has been its chosen spokesman, meeting the Press whenever there was an announcement to be made. He also writes and speaks frequently on international topics. Particularly effective was his 'debunking' of Col. Lindbergh in an address to the New York Merchants' Association early in 1941.

"Mr. Tom Lamont started life after leaving Harvard on the staff of the *New York Tribune*—a training which, he says, has proved very useful.

"He joined the House of Morgan, then a private banking firm, as a partner in 1911 and played a leading part in aiding the financing of the Allied Governments during the last war. At the Versailles Peace Conference he acted as a representative of the United States Treasury and adviser to President Wilson on economic and financial matters.

"His first-hand experience of world economic problems was further increased in 1920, when, at the invitation of the State Department and the British and French Governments, he visited China and Japan to complete arrangements for assistance to China.

"In 1927 he again visited the Far East. Two years later he was one of the American delegates to the Young Plan conference on reparations in Paris."

Mr. Lamont has expressed approval of schemes for federal union and further centralisation of world power.

The Australian "Bill of Sale"

A correspondent in Australia writing on November 30, 1942, says:—

"We have just won a major victory against Dr. Evatt

and his 'Bill of Sale' [the proposals for a constitutional amendment to transfer some of the States' powers to the Commonwealth]. The position has been reversed; instead of his threatening to wipe out the States via a referendum and silence any critic with gaol, he has been sat back on his haunches by vigorous States and dynamic individuals—elements not comprehended by static-minded planners—and has been forced to ask for...the temporary transfer of powers needed by the Commonwealth Government for post-war reconstruction, for a limited time....

"The party system seems to be cracking under the strain of real issues, such as the Statute of Westminster and Evatt's 'Bill of Sale'.... which found protagonists and antagonists sitting on both sides of the House."

"WHAT NEVER? WELL, HARDLY EVER!"

"...a people which has pulled down and destroyed every repository of power which has dared to manifest itself for a thousand years... will never give itself over to control...."

—KENNETH DE COURCY, in *Review of World Affairs*, March, 1943.

The British when they clearly see
And recognise an enemy,
Can be relied on to destroy
Whatever force he may deploy.
And so the clever Money Lords—
Disguised in gowns and mortar-boards—
Have made a grand strategic plan
To mystify the common man.
Believing it the safer course
To rule by guile instead of force,
They offer him security
In part exchange for liberty,
And full employment at a wage—
For all a Briton's heritage.
Still blind with blood and tears and sweat
The British wriggle in the net;
But mice are gnawing holes of doubt
Which one fine day will let them out. EXCALIBUR.

CORRESPONDENCE

'The Representative's Job'

Sir,

Allow me to congratulate you on the publication of the excellent article entitled *The Representative's Job* which appeared in *The Social Crediter* on March 6. It made very encouraging, and at the same time very startling, not to say disquieting, reading. Encouraging because it showed us a group of citizens of one of the most war-ravaged towns of Britain tenaciously pursuing their task of 'making straight the paths' for the coming of Democracy, and startling because it revealed that every one of the four candidates for the post of Parliamentary Representative had a different conception of the duties involved.

The Lady who won the election, and who is associated intimately with party politics of the Right, promised to strive for the results set forward 'in my Election address' (approved, if not framed by, the Central Conservative Party Office) and in pursuance of these results she is at the moment writing

letters to *The Times* advocating a specific scheme for the revival of post war trade.

The lady who lost the election, and who has been connected with party politics of the Left since her early youth, has recently dissociated herself from Official Labour parties and appears to have been indebted for 'my policy' (put forward with the same unshakable belief in the Divine right of the politician to decide people's policies for them that characterises the famous Mis-leaders of the Continent) to no one except, perhaps, those 'responsible for my candidature,' with whom she promised to maintain a Committee, if elected. All those constituents who found themselves outside the charmed circle of 'Bristol Labour, Trade Union, Co-operative Societies, Liberal and Church leaders' were apparently to be disfranchised for as long as the Labour lady might keep her seat.

It should be pointed out in no uncertain language to Miss Jenny Lee and her colleagues that there is nothing in the British Constitution to sanction the representation in Parliament of any denomination, political, 'religious,' or otherwise, and further that from Magna Carta onwards the aim has been to safeguard the rights of minorities.

To turn now to the male aspirants to the post of People's Representative: Mr. Dunn was willing to represent the 'needs' of 'my electors' and promised 'to grasp the idea of the major issues before voting for them' which is exactly what 600 odd members, each paid 600 pounds out of the Electorate's money, have been doing for years without number, with the catastrophic results we are witnessing.

The fact that Mr. McNair, who alone showed an understanding of the true nature of a Representative's Job, *was not elected* shows clearly that the electors of the Bristol constituency in question were as guilty of confusing methods with policy, as the candidates who competed for this favour and until the electors learn to combine to put pressure on their Representative by demanding specific results, they have no reason to blame their Member for yielding to pressure from the agents of those hidden hereditary policy-makers who have taken an active hand in guiding the destinies of Britain since the fatal day when Sunderland advised William of Orange (placed on the English Throne by the gold of the Jewish banker Lopez of Amsterdam) to choose his Ministers from the party which had a majority in the House of Commons.

Yours etc.,

B. J.

March 20, 1943.

An abridged form of the article referred to above is available as a leaflet entitled *Job of a Representative*, price ½d. each (limited supply).

FORTHCOMING PUBLICATION:—

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS

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

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices: (Editorial and Business) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD,
LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Wavertree 435.

Vol. 10. No. 4.

Saturday, April 3, 1943.

ENFORCING ZIONISM

The sudden and powerful eruption of publicity (which began in the autumn of last year) for the sorrows of the Jews, deserves, perhaps, a more careful scrutiny than has generally been given to it.

Why has publicity amounting to propaganda singled out one race from the victims of German violence and passed over the sufferings of Belgians, Czechs, Dutch, French, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Norwegians, Poles and Russians? These also have been deported, tortured, killed, as is described, for instance, in the Molotoff Report and a recent report issued by the Polish authorities. But these bitter attempts to annihilate whole nations, as nations, are in our Press almost invariably subordinated to accounts of the terror inflicted on a common component of all of them—Jews.

It is understandable that Jews themselves should be concerned mainly with the distresses of their own race and religion, but the Christian public also is mesmerised to such an extent that a Christian prelate pleads in Parliament for negotiation with Hitler for the "rescue" of Jews, his very terminology excluding other refugees. This cry for rescue is the culmination of the whole campaign.

Suggestions as to what to do with the Jews after their rescue fall roughly into two categories.

It is suggested that they be admitted to this country or the Empire, either as temporary refugees or as recruits to the British race. Lord Wedgwood, in the House of Lords, and Mr. Silverman, in the House of Commons, have suggested that it should be open to all refugees, or at least those who will join the armed forces here, to take British Nationality. The occasion for this suggestion was the opportune appearance in Parliament of a Bill on the subject of our naturalisation laws, a Bill which, although ostensibly quite unconnected with the present refugee question, yet forms a hint and a kind of precedent. Its appearance at this moment is significant. Correspondence in *The Times*, too, has mooted the desirability of giving all aliens serving in the armed forces British Nationality, "as in the American Army." (The United States Government is reported by the *Jewish Chronicle* to be sending special representatives to various theatres of war to confer citizenship on soldiers in the American armed forces who were born in other countries, regardless of their nationality or race.) With these suggestions is associated a good deal of pressure less defined in direction although keen on humane grounds, and the recent

endeavours on the part of some journals and journalists to identify so-called anti-Semitism with pro-Hitlerism. The logical corollary to this proposition is the suggestion, also put forward—and rejected—in Parliament, to make anti-Semitism illegal.

The second faction of opinion, Jewish and otherwise, wants the refugee Jews to be let in to Palestine.

Palestine cannot possibly accommodate more than a few of the numbers contemplated except by displacing Arabs who have occupied that "much-promised land" for longer than the Jews ever did.

Among the unacknowledged purposes of this war Major Douglas has placed the break-up of British culture and the British Empire and the transfer of the headquarters of Jewish power to Palestine.

The nature of the British "Empire," which, for all its faults, is the greatest achievement in the association of peoples with the maximum of freedom so far attained, is assured by the perpetuation in the British peoples of a combination of characteristics and traditions peculiarly their own. To open the door of naturalisation to enormous numbers of refugees with ideas and traditions entirely opposed to our own would be to destroy the foundation on which our institutions and associations rest. Such a course, too, would fan into full flame the embers of that instinctive anti-Semitism which has been used so skilfully on the Continent as a weapon to enslave others than its nominal subjects. There are signs that even the suggestion of such a measure has provoked in our countrymen an automatic recoil which may thrust us into the measure which is presented as the only "alternative"—the admission of the refugees to Palestine. Zionists have seized this advantage with all the fervent oratory at their command.

To let the Jews into Palestine would antagonise Arab and Moslem opinion from Palestine to India. Axis propaganda already makes out that the United Nations are fighting exclusively for Jewish interests. In India, the Moslem bloc of opinion is an important element in a delicately balanced situation, and men of Moslem faith form the greater part of the native fighting forces. The effects of such an influence on the very nice equilibrium of affairs would be serious, perhaps fatal for India's interests in herself as well as for British interests in India. In any measure of chaos the United States emissaries would no doubt be present to help pick up the bits; at any rate, the source of a very great part of the pressure generated for admission of Jews to Palestine (as recorded in the *Jewish Chronicle*), both during and after the war, comes from the United States. Mr. Chaim Weizmann is there, holding meetings. Senators are signing manifestos. Mr. Willkie is urging Jewish congregations to "keep the lights burning in the temples." Feeling runs high—but so far none of the 48 States has been offered to the Jews to settle in.

Britain or Palestine—it is the old trick of a false alternative.

If it is necessary, in the course of saving Europe for the Europeans, to save the Europeans from Europe—and apart from the fact that such a proposition could only be put forward by a mentality which demands some non-immanent power to save it from itself—there are other places to which the Jews might go. Why not America? Or why not Madagascar?

PARLIAMENT

AID FOR REFUGEES

House of Lords: March 23, 1943

Viscount Cranborne: . . . The most reverend Primate himself and those noble Lords who followed him have painted a vivid and moving picture of the situation in Europe and of the odious persecutions which are being inflicted upon the Jews, the Czechoslovaks, the Poles, the Yugoslavs and the other subject peoples. For I think it would be a mistake to throw undue emphasis on the Jewish side of this question. We all admit it is perhaps the most horrible feature, but it is only a feature of a much bigger problem, and the problem must be faced as a whole. . . .

The most reverend Primate himself occupies a position of immense authority and responsibility. Everything that he says will be repeated and reported all over the world. And yet it seemed to me that he did not take sufficient account of essential factors in the situation which must inevitably limit unilateral action on our part. He talked of the inaction of His Majesty's Government, he said he regarded as irrelevant any reference to the steps which had been taken in the past by this country, and he mentioned figures which I think had been given to him in an interview he had at the Home Office . . . if I quote these figures again, which I propose to do, it is not for that purpose: it is to point to the inexorable fact that there is already an immense body of refugees both in this country and in the British Colonial territories overseas, and that this inevitably limits the further numbers that we can take in.

If I may take, first of all, this country, certainly I should have thought it could not be said that Great Britain had been backward in the taking in of refugees from Nazi oppression. Even before the war, in accordance with our traditional policy towards the victims of persecution, we had admitted from Germany and Austria alone over 50,000 adults, and many of these had children with them. There was also a further 13,000 children without adults. In addition, nearly 10,000 Czechoslovak nationals found refuge here in the twelve months which preceded the war. The refugee population of this country, therefore, at the moment of the outbreak of war, was 78,000, not counting children without parents.

Lord Wedgwood: Many of these have gone on already.

Viscount Cranborne: No, those were the ones which remained in this country at the outbreak of war. There had been a constantly fluctuating population. Some came in, others went out; it was a process which was going on the whole time. But 78,000 was the number that existed here when the war broke out. Now I should like to examine the intake of refugees since the start of the war. In 1940 we took in approximately 35,000—these figures are inevitably somewhat approximate—in 1941, when the conditions were much more difficult, we took in 13,000; and in 1942 we took in 15,000. These figures include 20,000 seamen. I want to be quite frank with the House, I do not want to overstate the case in any way. Of course, some of these seamen are not here the whole time. They are not a burden on our resources in the same way as ordinary refugees would be.

Lord Wedgwood: Some of them are not Jews.

Viscount Cranborne: The noble Lord must not regard

this as a Jewish problem. Every nation in Europe is being tortured by the Germans, and the noble Lord will only do the Jews themselves harm by taking that attitude. The figure does not include the members of the Allied Forces, which are very considerable in this country. This makes a total of a little over 60,000 refugees since the war. Adding the number of pre-war refugees and war refugees, we get a total of over 150,000 souls, all of whom have to be fed and cared for. If it is argued that we have ourselves, during that time, sent abroad very large numbers of troops who do not need to be fed in this country, I would remind your Lordships that they have got to be fed somewhere, and therefore they do not represent a reduction of our ration strength. I hope, in view of these figures which I have given, that we at any rate shall not be regarded as having been callous or unmindful of our obligations.

This country, as your Lordships know, is not self-supporting. It is dependent on supplies from abroad, and every ounce of food imported into this country at this moment is being brought in by the blood and sweat of British sailors. There must be limits, inevitably, whatever our wishes are, to the task we set these heroic men. The most reverend Primate talked at one stage of his speech as if we had ample supplies in this country. I understood him to say we were so well off for food that we could very easily receive as many refugees as were likely to get here. Does he really believe our situation is as easy as that? It is quite true that there is no definite shortage of food in this country at the present moment, but that is entirely due to the merchant seamen of this country, to the farmers, and, if I may say so, to the magnificent administration of my noble friend Lord Woolton. To suggest that there are large surplus supplies in this country is a most dangerous illusion.

Moreover, in war-time, the nation must preserve some reserve against the rainy day . . . at any moment we might have a bad spell, and we might have need of all our reserves if our production and power to wage war were not to be seriously and, perhaps, dangerously hampered. Were such a situation to arise, and a large number of refugees had been brought in, the Government would be very naturally and very rightly censured. . . .

If that is the situation which faces us here in this country, the difficulties are no less in the Colonial territories. There are not unlimited supplies, as the noble Lord, Lord Rochester, suggested in his speech. This is a subject about which I know something from my period in the Colonial Office. Take the case of East Africa. Before the war it had a white population of 30,000. Since the war the East African Colonies have received an additional white population, including Italian prisoners, of over 90,000. By an immense effort they have managed to feed this quadrupled population and maintain it, and in addition they are playing a large part in supplying our Armies in the Middle East. The present situation in East Africa, from the food point of view, is not a happy one. It is a very difficult one, and I understand, having made careful inquiries, that it is really undesirable to take any more refugees into East Africa at present. We hope the situation will improve, but the position is such that it would indeed be impossible at present to add to the numbers already there. In the case of India, the Government of India have taken, and are maintaining, where necessary, over 400,000 refugees in addition to the normal population. As the House will know from the statement

made not long ago, even in India the food situation at the present time is by no means easy. I could, if I wanted, multiply such examples both as regards Jamaica, the other West Indian islands, and Cyprus. In all those countries, at present, owing to the dislocation of the normal channels of trade, the food situation for the normal population is difficult.

Finally, I come to the case of Palestine which was mentioned by the noble Viscount, Lord Samuel. Here, as your Lordships know, we not only have an economic but a political problem. As it has fallen to my lot to explain again and again in this House, it is not possible for His Majesty's Government to go beyond the terms of policy approved by Parliament. I was very much surprised that the noble Viscount to-day should say that if His Majesty's Government took in more Jewish refugees into Palestine it would have no repercussion on the Arabs.

Viscount Samuel: I did not say it would have no repercussion. I said it would not be detrimental to their welfare. I appreciate the possibility of political repercussion.

Viscount Cranborne: That is the main point. I thought it was generally accepted in this House that you could not go beyond the terms of this policy because it would lead to immediate repercussions in the Middle East, and that is the case. Therefore we are limited to the principles laid down by that policy. What we can do, and what in my opinion we must do, in the cause of humanity, is to go to the absolute limit that that policy allows, and that is indeed what my right honourable friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies has already done. . . .

I should be deceiving the House if I suggested that the kind of proposals which have been put forward this afternoon by the most reverend Primate for unilateral action by this country present in themselves a way out of our difficulties. There is, my Lords, no evidence that any inducement such as he has suggested would encourage neutral nations in Europe to modify their refugee policy. Indeed, to press them would be likely at the present moment to cause them acute embarrassment and increase the difficulties of the situation. The neutral countries in Europe are few and they are themselves short of food, but in spite of their difficulties—and, I think it will be generally agreed, to their eternal credit—they are maintaining at the present time large numbers of refugees and more are constantly coming in from the occupied territories. If we ask them to take greatly increased numbers they are likely to require assurances that these refugees will be rapidly removed to another country of refuge, and immediately we shall come up against what is our main and our most intractable difficulty. We have ourselves alone nowhere at the present time to offer as a country of ultimate refuge for any substantial number of refugees. . . .

It is of course not true, as I think has been suggested this afternoon, that visas are not at present being granted. Take the case of the 2,000 Jewish children to which I think the most reverend Primate himself referred, and on which I know considerable misapprehension exists. It is constantly said in various quarters that visas were refused to these children, with the result that they were deported to Germany. I have been making inquiries into this case and I find that that is not a correct description of what happened. More visas were in fact available for these

children—and indeed not only for children from France but children from other occupied countries—than were in fact made use of. What happened was that the children could not come to this country for the very simple reason that the Germans and the Vichy authorities refused to grant exit permits. . . .

The noble Viscount, Lord Cecil of Chelwood, asked that we should make a declaration, if I understood him aright, that we would grant asylum to any refugee, to anyone flying from oppression, who chose to ask for it. We cannot do that because of the difficulties of our own national situation. But we are ready to do anything in our power. We are in fact at this moment admitting over 800 refugees a month, who have escaped from the occupied territories and many of whom are anxious to join in the common fight against the Germans and other Axis Powers. There is, however, a certain point beyond which, in this country, we cannot and will not go. The essential need—and this is the only real hope of a cure for this difficult and tragic situation—is to find somewhere where the refugees can be taken in without creating those dangers which face us.

Viscount Samuel: May I ask if the 800 refugees were persons who were going to join the Armed Forces?

Viscount Cranborne: Not all of them, but some were. I should think a good many were. . . .

The difficulties which stand in the way of all these limited proposals to which I have already referred seem to me to apply with even greater force to the tentative proposal put forward by the most reverend Primate. As I understand it, it was that we should approach Hitler and suggest that he should release so many Jews a month. I imagine that it was a slip of the tongue on his part to limit this proposal to Jews, because clearly, as I said before, it should apply equally to the other tortured peoples of Europe. I have the impression that the most reverend Primate had no very great hopes of this proposal himself, and that he mainly put it forward in order that it should be apparent both to ourselves and to the world that we had done all we could in the matter. He indicated that Hitler would probably refuse, in which case his guilt would be more evident to the world. I should have thought that Hitler's guilt was sufficiently visible to the world already. Supposing he did refuse to allow these Jews and other Europeans to come out, we might indeed feel more comfortable; but the miserable people themselves would not be advantaged. We should get a very barren satisfaction from that. If on the other hand Hitler agreed, contrary to our expectations, and we were unable to fulfil our side of the bargain, His Majesty's Government, my Lords, would rightly be accused of a breach of faith, and by no one more than by the most reverend Primate himself. We who are in the Government cannot salve our consciences as easily as that. We must put forward proposals which we ourselves believe practicable.

Therefore, the Government have been driven to the conclusion, for reasons which I have tried to state to your Lordships, that there is not much more we can do alone. Internationally, however, the matter has a different aspect.

His Majesty's Government therefore, as your Lordships

know, made an approach to the United States in January last and suggested an informal Conference. . . .

[The United States Government suggested action on the following basis:—]

First of all, they said that the refugee problem should not be considered as confined to any particular race or faith. With that I think we shall all be in the very fullest agreement. Secondly, they said that inter-Governmental collaboration should be sought for the accommodation of refugees as near as possible to the areas where they were at present receiving hospitality. That is of course intended to overcome the immense difficulties caused by the shortage of shipping. Thirdly, they said that plans should therefore be made for the maintenance of refugees in neutral countries in so far as there was transport to get them there. This would involve assurance of support and return to their native countries when the war ended. . . . His Majesty's Government accepted the suggestion for Anglo-American exploratory consultation and they agreed to the basis for discussion which I have just detailed to your Lordships. . . .

House of Commons: March 23, 1943

BRITISH ARMY

VERSES, "LESS NONSENSE"

Mr. Pritt asked the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Lieut.-Colonel Parkinson ordered to be distributed, on 24th February, 1943, to units under his command over 200 copies of a piece of verse entitled *Less Nonsense*, which is offensive to the Soviet Union and calculated to injure our friendship towards that country; that these copies were to be distributed on the scale of three copies for every unit down to batteries and companies, one copy for the officer's mess, one for the sergeants' mess, and one where it could be seen by the men; and whether he will take immediate steps to put a stop to this political activity and arrange that lectures on the Soviet Union be given to the units involved to counteract the effects of this propaganda?

Sir J. Grigg: I am making inquiries into this matter. On the facts as stated, I do not think the action of the Divisional Commander was at all suitable. The troops in the area in question are already getting lectures on Soviet Russia from both military and non-military sources besides a good deal of other material on the subject, and I doubt if any special steps are necessary.

Petty-Officer Alan Herbert: On a point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to raise an objection to the terms of this Question. I did not want to interfere with the putting of it. The hon. and learned Member for North Hammersmith (*Mr. Pritt*), having put this Question down, gave an interview to the Press in which he stated that I was the author of the verses named in this Question. I have no opportunity of knowing whether that is so, because he did not think fit to show me a copy of the verses and ask me to check them and say whether they were mine or not. I must, however, take his word for it, and, therefore, I must take exception to the description of the verses in the Question, to which he has committed himself as a statement of fact,

which I say is false, foolish and offensive.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. and learned Member who put the Question down was quite entitled to put it down in any terms he liked. He is responsible for it. It is not for me to deal with that matter.

Major-General Sir Alfred Knox: Is it not true that this poem contains nothing offensive to Soviet Russia, and is it not British patriotism from a British point of view?

Sir J. Grigg: I have been careful to express no opinion on the merits of the verses.

Commander Locker-Lampson: Can they be circulated as a White Paper?

Petty-Officer Herbert: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these verses, whatever their merits, were not directed against Russia at all, but against certain British citizens who are never happy unless they are running down their own country and the efforts of their own countrymen in the war?

A Victorian Backs Victoria

During the debate on the Commonwealth Powers Bill in the Victorian Legislative Assembly in December, 1942, considerable opposition was apparent. Members criticised from various angles this move further to centralise administrative power at Canberra without the consent of the electors. The most pertinent comment came from the Member for Hawthorn (*Mr. L. H. Hollins*), who said in the course of his speech:—

"Paragraph (a) of Clause 2 of the Bill provides for the reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services of the Commonwealth during the war, and the advancement of dependents of those members who have died, or have been disabled as a consequence of the war. Quite frankly, I cannot think of one single problem that we shall have to confront after the war, or one single difficulty that will be encountered in achieving the end outlined in paragraph (a) of clause 2, that cannot be overcome with finance. It may be suggested that we need huge housing schemes inaugurated in the Commonwealth, but I suggest that we, in Victoria, are better able to decide what kind of houses we want to build in this State than, say, the representatives of Queensland, Western Australia, or any other State. We know the local conditions, and I believe that in any scheme of housing, of public works, or of irrigation, or with any of the other undertakings confronting the States, the details should be considered by the State concerned, and the finance should be made available by the Commonwealth, as that Government can make it available under the Constitution at the present time.

"We do not want to be regimented. We do not want to be told that we must have a standard type of house throughout Australia. *We want individual freedom, in security, to choose or refuse anything.* We should be free as *individuals* to choose the kind of homes we want, and the kind of work to undertake, and I believe that those things can be achieved when finance is made available. I do not think for a moment that the States would oppose such a plan. It has been suggested that the Commonwealth Government might make the money available only under certain conditions that would not be acceptable to the States.

To my mind that is unreasonable. If the Commonwealth Parliament is prepared to make the money available for housing schemes, for irrigation, or for any other purpose, it is perfectly safe to leave the undertakings in the hands of the State Parliaments to decide how the programme shall be implemented in accordance with the wishes of the people of the State."

Policies and Plans

"Policies unfold or develop—plans are made for definite ends. You plan a mechanism. You cannot plan something which develops or grows like an organism. Man is an organism, and plans made now to fit him into a post-war jobs-for-all economy presuppose a static interlude.

"Plans of rehabilitation drawn up by the Men of Yesterday merely provide a political safety-valve and a sop to financial aspirations.

"Our policies will unfold as means and factors affecting them are discovered or improved. To make them operative we must of course back them with our vote."

—MAJOR A. H. JUKES, in *The Third Resolvent*.

To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

Affiliation to the Social Credit Secretariat, which was accorded to Groups of Social Crediters, has been replaced by a new relationship and all previously existing affiliations were terminated as from January 1, 1942. This new relationship is expressed in the following Form which Associations* desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members of Association

.....

.....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat†.

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy to every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Signature.....

A brief statement is also requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,
Director of Organisation
and Overseas Relations.

*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
- BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
- BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
- PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
- PRESTON D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., B. H. Ferguson, 46 Atherton Road, Fulwood, Preston.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
- STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.

Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), WOKING and WOODFORD. Enquiries concerning these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

AUSTRALIA

- New South Wales** Hon. Secretary.
- NEW SOUTH WALES D.S.C. Assoc.: WOMEN'S SECTION DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN (The above are closely allied) INFORMATION SHEET COWPER D.S.C. Group Miss Grace Marsden. W. H. Hand (Editor). J. McDonald.
- South Australia**
- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group C. H. Allen.
- QUEENSTOWN D.S.C. Group D. J. Munyard.
- GLENELG D.S.C. Group H. W. Lee.
- Western Australia**
- PERTH D.S.C. Group A. Cook.
- Queensland**
- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association A. W. Noakes.
- Victoria**
- COBURG S.C. Group A. J. O'Callaghan.
- NEW ZEALAND**
- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billinghamurst.
- SOUTH AFRICA**
- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.
- CANADA**
- VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group Mrs. Brooks.
- LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.