

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 8. No. 1.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper  
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, MARCH 14, 1942.

6d. Weekly.

## THE BIG IDEA (IX)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

If the Social Credit Government of Alberta had done nothing—and it has done many things—to justify its existence, the demonstration afforded by its enemies of one fundamental factor in the world situation would still have made it a landmark in human history.

That factor, completely demonstrated by the actions of the Canadian Federal Government in Disallowing every Act of the Provincial Legislature directed to the inauguration of Social Credit, is that the Secret Government is determined to keep the world in turmoil until its own rule is supreme, so that one uninformed mob may be mobilised against another, should either become dangerous. I do not think that anyone who will take the trouble to consider the actions of the Canadian Federal Government, can fail to apprehend exactly why centralisation, Federal Union, and other "Bigger and Better" Governments are the most deadly menace with which humanity is faced to-day. There could hardly be a more concise picture of the events which followed the demand of the largest majority ever obtained by a Canadian Provincial Government that it should be allowed to deal with its own difficulties, than that contained in the following statement issued by an authoritative source in Alberta:—

### Credit of Alberta Regulation Act

#### *Why passed*

1. Because there was widespread poverty and distress throughout Alberta.
2. Because Alberta, one of the richest provinces in the Dominion could produce abundance for her people.
3. Because the only reason why Alberta's people were living in poverty was the lack of purchasing power.
4. Because such purchasing power should be made available to the people by using their own credit, as would enable them to obtain, at all times, what they wanted.
5. Because this could be done by a scientific balancing between money and goods produced.
6. Because control of Credit being in the words of Hon. McKenzie King, "A public matter not of interest to bankers alone, but of direct concern to every citizen," credit policy should be vested in an authority responsible to the representatives of the people.
7. Because banks, being manufacturers of credit and functioning as public utility concerns, supplying a service of primary and vital importance to the lives of the citizens of Alberta should be licensed and subjected to supervision only in regard to policy—the results they provide, and unless

the people of Alberta can use the resources of their own Province as they desire, and determine the results which shall accrue to them, they have no property and civil right in the full sense. (Banking administration being under Federal Jurisdiction was in no matter affected by the Act.)

#### *What happened*

Disallowed by Federal Government August 17, 1937.

#### *What it would have done*

1. Would have secured the results demanded by the People—a lower cost to live, and monthly dividends.
2. Would have provided markets for Alberta manufacturers and traders.
3. Would have led to tremendous industrial development in manufacturing Alberta goods by processing Alberta produce.
4. Would have resulted in rapidly absorbing every unemployed person into useful employment and relieved the aged and infirm of the necessity of working for a living.
5. Would have led to increased business activity in which industrialists, wholesalers, retailers, and banks would all have benefitted.
6. Would have enabled taxation to be reduced drastically.
7. Would have made it possible to deal with the debt problems.

### Bank Taxation Act

#### *Why passed*

1. Because under the present system, the Government has one source of revenue only—Taxation.
2. Because the people of Alberta are already taxed beyond their ability to pay.
3. Because banks are the only institutions claiming the legal right to monetise the credit of The People to such an extent that they create and issue monetary credits many times in excess of the legal tender money they hold.
5. Because banks can thereby create money out of nothing.
6. Because the present method of taxation of individuals is confiscatory and unnecessary.

#### *What happened*

Assent withheld by Lieutenant Governor. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court of Canada. Appeal by Province from Supreme Court decision to Privy Council dismissed.

*What it would have done*

1. Would place over Two Million Dollars new money in circulation.

2. Would have permitted an equal amount, otherwise paid in taxes, to remain in the ordinary channels of industry, thus aiding employment and acting as a tremendous impetus to business generally, or,

3. Would have enabled the Government to embark on a six million dollar highway and market roads programme under the three way Dominion-Provincial-Municipal plan, or,

4. Would have provided a hospital and medical service in districts where those are not available, or,

5. Would have set up a fund for Crop Insurance, or,

6. Would have given decreased School Taxes.

7. Would have provided increased purchasing power for the People of Alberta.

**Reduction and Settlement of Debt Act***Why passed*

1. Because under the present financial system debt cannot be paid without creating new and larger debts. The People of Alberta possess only about 20c. for every \$.00 of debt—this they owe to the banks, and they can get no money except as a debt to the bankers.

2. Because private debts, largely due to accumulated interest, had increased to such an extent that they were out of all proportion to value received.

3. Because many outstanding debts had been incurred during the war and immediate post-war years when values were high.

4. Because the original debt had already in many cases, been paid in interest charges while the principal remained unchanged or showed little reduction.

5. Because people could no longer continue to pay interest of 8 to 10 per cent.

6. Because financial corporations refused to recognise that the inability of people to meet their obligations, was due to lack of adequate returns on what they produced.

8. Because no people or country can prosper and progress so long as they labour under a burden of those who deal in money as a commodity.

*What happened*

Declared *ultra vires* of the Province by the Courts.

*What it would have done*

1. Would have established a basis of settlement for all outstanding debts.

2. Would have reduced all debt incurred previous to July, 1932, by applying all interest paid from that date to the passing of the act on reduction of principal.

3. Would have settled definitely question involved in debts which had become uncollectable.

4. Would have led to a restoration of confidence and encouraged those who, through no fault of their own were living in poverty and struggling against odds which they could not possibly overcome.

**Act to Ensure Publication of Accurate News Information***Why passed*

1. Because the control of news and the control of credit are both exercised by the financial interests.

2. Because "The freedom of the press" has become license to distort news, misrepresent facts and withhold information from the public.

3. Because this anti-social aspect of the press, under inspired direction, is being used to thwart the people of Alberta in their struggle against finance.

*What happened*

Assent withheld by Lieutenant-Governor. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court of Canada. In the appeal of the Province of Alberta from decision of Supreme Court of Canada, the Privy Council refused to hear Alberta's argument by their counsel.

*What it would have done*

1. Would have ensured that all newspapers in Alberta would publish all the facts in their news reports of Government matters so far as this was possible, and if from any cause false statements appeared, equal space would be given for authoritative correction.

2. Would have ensured that the same information which every publisher demands from correspondents to his columns, i.e. the names of contributors of articles, would be available to The People when demanded by their representatives.

**Home Owners Security Act***Why passed*

1. Because under stress of world conditions and a falsified financial system, over which individuals had no control, many were forced to mortgage their homes.

2. Because conditions had changed since these loans were received so that commodity and labour prices bore little relation to the continued high price of money.

3. Because there was grave danger of many Alberta Citizens losing their homes.

4. Because in most cases, these homes represented the total life savings of many people.

5. Because it is just as much the duty of any Government to protect the homes of individual members of Society against the confiscatory practices of unscrupulous money-lenders as it is to defend its people against the invasion of a foreign aggressor.

6. Because there can be no Sanctity of Contract which does not recognise that human life has, at least, as much value as considerations of "money."

*What happened*

Disallowed by Mackenzie-King Government, June 15, 1938.

*What it would have done*

1. Would have prohibited foreclosures or sale under mortgage proceedings of any farm home.

2. Would have prohibited foreclosure or sale under

mortgage proceedings of any home in a town, city or village, unless the plaintiff first deposited \$2,000 with the Court which would be paid to the owner if dispossessed to enable him to purchase another home.

3. Would have induced debtor and creditor alike to seek equitable basis of settlement through medium of the Debt Adjustment Board.

4. Would have enabled home-owners to enter into new contracts commensurate with their present ability to pay.

### Security Tax Act—1938

#### Why passed

1. Because the Government required additional revenue for one year to replace the loss of revenue from the Bank Taxation Act before the Privy Council.

2. Because the additional revenue was essential to provide the people with the benefits they needed.

3. Because it was equitable that equitable companies and similar institutions should make good some of the taxation they have escaped for years.

4. Because the Government is pledged to the people to remove the burden of taxation from individuals, and until we gain control of our credit resources, this can be done only by transferring it to institutions which are better able to bear it.

#### What happened

Disallowed by Mackenzie-King Government, June 15, 1938.

#### What it would have done

1. Would have realised \$1,500,000—sufficient revenue to balance the Provincial Budget.

2. Would have helped the Government considerably to give tax relief, to provide additional relief projects, increase School Grants, and undertake many other benefits planned for the people.

### Credit of Alberta Regulation Act, (1937 Amendment)

#### Why passed

Because Credit of Alberta Regulation Act had been disallowed by the Dominion Government.

#### What happened

Assent withheld by Lieutenant-Governor. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court of Canada. In the appeal of the Province of Alberta from decision of Supreme Court of Canada, the Privy Council refused to hear Alberta's argument by their counsel.

#### What it would have done

Would have brought all the benefits of the Credit of Alberta Regulation Act, which it supplanted.

### Democratic Victory or The Slave State?

By L. D. BYRNE.

PRICE: FOURPENCE.

From K.R.P. Publications Limited,  
49, Prince Alfred Rd., Liverpool, 15.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

The news, if correct, that "Ezra Pound has become America's Lord Haw-Haw," broadcasting regularly from Rome, is disappointing, and reveals once more that it is not enough to embrace some correct views about money in order to function as an apostle of the New Age. Only America's Fifth Columnists will listen to 'truth' from Rome, and much that Ezra Pound has already broadcast (notably the allegation that Germany's economic system is 'unorthodox') is not truth. All economic systems are wholly orthodox which wrest the determination of policy from the hands of individuals generally, and concentrate it in the hands of a minority. Not even Ezra would be allowed to persuade the American public to apply correct methods for winning the war.

Who abolished the office of Master-General of the Ordnance at the War office? *Truth* says that ardent reformer, Mr. Hore-Belisha, did, three years ago, and remarks that it is an amazing thing that there is nobody on the Army Council with any specialised knowledge of weapons, armour, mechanisation, aircraft, bombs or ammunition, on the technical side. "O bless'd reformers, not in vain...!"

The following letter, received almost simultaneously with the news of the end of the battle of Java, has more than the melancholy interest of a letter read in lamentable circumstances unforeseen by the writer. A vigorous Social Credit movement on correct lines twenty years ago was a better practical proposition in a "smaller" country than in the land of origin of our ideas, and, as Douglas wrote in *Warning Democracy*, "... modern scientific civilisation is irresistible in war... Any community, nation or continent which will successfully put these principles [Social Credit] into operation will either compel imitation from the rest of the world, or will reduce any attack upon its principles to the relative position of a mob of bushmen armed with bows and arrows." The members of the *Nederlandsch-Indische Nieuw-Economische Studiegroep*, to whom we send greetings in adversity, at least know by what means alone their promised liberation from an alien yoke may be made certain:—

"Dear Sirs,

"In July 1940 we have started here an organisation called Netherland East India New Economic Studygroup. It concerns itself with the study of new economics and the propaganda of new economic thinking. It issues a monthly journal *Na den Oorlog*. A copy of it we are sending you as printed matter.

"During this year we have already made considerable advance with the spreading of the new ideas.

"... You would oblige us much by authorising me to reprint translated articles in your journal in our monthly. The source, of course, will always be mentioned.

"Wishing you every success and awaiting with interest your reply, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

E. H. F. VAN DER LELY."

Editor of *Na den Oorlog*.

Bandoeng, November 13, 1941.

## 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. 8. No. 1.

Saturday, March 14, 1942.

### THE PROPHETIC WEDDING

(Mr. Ezekiel Cripps-Eden and Miss Jeremiah Eden-Cripps).

*The Economist* has turned match-maker. The marriage is to be purely a *mariage de politique*—or so it might appear—but we are warned that the more primordial of matchmakers are very “subtil,” and remember what befell them that Did Eat in obedience to him that Did Whisper.

“The principles of economic democracy are said to be dangerously controversial, and must therefore be ignored,” says *The Economist*. Thus, goes on the journal, “by a crowning paradox of irony, the State will not allow itself to seek a positive unity for fear of disturbing the defensive unity that carried the nation through the agony of 1940. If there were a prophet in the land, he would turn his thunders against all such frustrating futilities.”

“And the Lord God” reads Genesis, “called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou?”

“And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself; and by a crowning paradox of irony, I had to listen to Sir Henry Strakosch and Mr. Geoffrey Crowther, and could not clothe myself.”

Yet there is no evidence that *The Economist* is about to command the Old Adam of the State to eat of the tree whereof it has commanded him that he should not eat; though to the greedy ears of the Economic Reform Club it might sound like that. If the correct principles of economic democracy are still ‘said to be’ dangerous, and ‘must therefore be ignored,’ the false principles are by no means to be ignored; but a Prophet is to arise to preach them.

There are seductive whispers. For example, “The need is not to impose the views of a scheming minority on a passive mass, but to translate into a burning faith the inarticulate beliefs of a people that is as great and as creative as ever it was. The need is not for a break with the past, but for a return to the native tradition of clear thinking and courage, of lucidity and daring, of bold action for moderate ends.” “Prave ‘orts!” as Parson Hugh called them in *The Merry Wives*, and what deference they show for our way of putting things! *The Economist* proceeds to get over them. There are, it says, two opposing groups (but not *really* opposing; ‘really at one’), the State Planners and the Believers in Individual Genius and Enterprise. These twain, which are ‘really at one,’ must be made so. “Here is the opportunity for the Prophet.” Yet the ‘Prophet,’ as *The Economist* envisages him, is still in the Womb of Time, and a mighty feat of political obstetrics is called for to fish the lusty youngster out. The biologically

accurate mind of *The Economist* goes back a stage. If still unconceived (though not inconceivable) the offspring must have parents. And our Prophet (not ours; *The Economist’s*) is evidently still unconceived. “Any two men can agree if they can sufficiently dilute their beliefs until they reach the agreed consistency of water, until there is nothing left from either belief that could possibly offend the other.” How true.

But the unborn Prophet “must take from each side not what is most inoffensive, but what is most effective and dynamic, and from the marriage of principles as opposite as male and female breed a new birth with life of its own.”

Little Master Left-Right is to share papa’s enthusiasm for abolishing poverty (papa did not, by the bye, take his chance when it was offered to him: *The Economist* didn’t like the idea then) and mama’s hatred of tyranny and oppression. (Very prettily said.) But “where is he to be found?”, this Prophet, asks *The Economist*. We must really let Genesis speak for itself:—

“Some men are born prophets, some achieve prophesy, and some have prophesy thrust upon them. The present state of public affairs, with its party bankruptcy and political vacuum, is thrusting the rôle, if not of Prophet, then certainly of Spokesman, on two men. One is Sir Stafford Cripps, who can prophesy to the Left. The other is Mr. Anthony Eden, who can prophesy to the Right.”

The Barclay’s Bank Order, in other words.

In the recent debate on the Food situation Major G. Lloyd George mentioned that about one-third of family purchases of foods are now assisted by government subsidy. That the subsidy is payed from taxation money or money obligingly lent by the banks goes without saying—at present. Nevertheless the precedent for the *mechanism* of subsidising goods is as firmly set as that for subsidising the consumer, established before the war by the payment of old age pensions and the “dole.”

Yes, why should the Jews of all people be permitted to set up their own private courts of first instance to deal with Black Market racketeers among themselves, handing over to the police only those malefactors they do not deal with by ‘business pressure’ or ‘social ostracism’?

The following extract from the programme of The Strand Theatre appeared in *Truth* last week:—

“By arrangement with Lionel L. Falck, *Albion Operas Limited* present Offenbach’s *Tales of Hoffman*. Production: George Kirsta. Musical Director and Conductor: Walter Susskind. Assistant Conductor: H. F. Redlich. Costumes: Katja Krassin. Men’s suits: L & H. Nathan, Ltd. General Manager: Alfred A. Kalmus. Secretary: Suzanne Czech. The very talented artists who appear include Ernest Urbach, Julius Gutman, George Israel, Hilde Zweig, Alice Schaeffer, and Sara Luzita.”

Yes, *Albion Operas*.

### THE RUSSIAN PARADISE

“Russia has for more than a decade been accumulating enormous masses of arms and equipment at the expense of its population’s standard of living, which is still very far below other European standards.” —A Central European Correspondent in *The Economist*.

## “To Use Words Wrongly - -”

By R. L. N.

It has for some time been plain that there is a deliberate attempt on foot to pervert or debase certain words in the language. “Thrift” is an obvious example. So, too, is the word “democracy,” which is currently being used by the Press and the radio to signify a levelling of class distinction, as though it meant “equality” or “fraternity.” Thus it is common to hear of “our democratic Army,” so-called merely because a person of social importance receives no especial privileges and may have to take orders from someone socially inferior. This may be an excellent thing, but it has nothing to do with democracy which means simply, “rule by the will of the people.” That does not signify, as is often pretended, that all men are equal; they are not. It means that each individual’s desires are allowed equal weight in determining the policy of the community.

Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates the statement that “to use words wrongly is not only a fault in itself; it also creates evil in the soul.” (—*Phaedo*, 115.) He is not here speaking of “the persistent dissemination of misinformation” but of something a great deal more subtle. False propaganda is an obvious enemy we have long fought; the misuse of words works at a lower level of consciousness and is the more deadly weapon on that account. The evil Plato refers to is a slow but cumulative distortion of reality in minds for which the word-label has been perverted.

To bring about a distortion of reality, thus gaining possession of the “soul” of the subject, was known in mediaeval times as black magic; the distortion was brought about by drugs, by hypnotism (crystal and ink-pool gazing), by shattering experiences (the Black Mass), and by forms of words (“spells”). It could be plausibly argued that all four methods are still in use—certainly we have modern equivalents for the second and third—but we are here concerned only with the last.

This method operates by perverting the meaning of words, the processes of thought, the perception of reality, and finally the springs of action, so that at last the victim no longer knows what he wants, much less how to get it. Moreover, like the hypnotised subject, he has no idea that he is under any sort of control, and black magic is for him mere fairy-tale stuff no modern person can be expected to take seriously.

Well, we need not quarrel over a name: the reality of the phenomenon can be proved up to the hilt. Ask an unemployed man what he wants; he will reply, “Work,” as though every sane man since history began had not sought to reduce his toil to a minimum. You think there is no such thing as fetishism to-day? Speak to a socialist about nationalisation. Taboo? Ask a City Editor about banking policy. And observe the futile anger that is the first reaction when each is called on to justify by logical argument his implanted opinions.

Black magic has its rewards, otherwise it would have had no dupes; the user of narcotics finds a pleasure in his escape from reality. Such rewards have this in common: the addict loses his initiative and sense of reality, and becomes more and more dependent upon the avenue of escape that has been opened up. The reward operates to increase the control of the “magician.”

The rewards of our present brand of black magic take

the form of a relief of the hardships suffered by the poorer members of the community. Mr. Belloc has pointed out that the first step towards establishing the Servile State was taken by the Workmen’s Compensation Act, which ended all pretence of a contract freely entered into by two equal contracting parties. The need for education has been met, not by placing every parent or student in a position to command the education he requires, but by the provision of a standardised and centrally controlled instruction. Medical attention and the relief of indigence are given similarly—in kind, within strict limits, and under a centralised control. And the field of these operations is continually being increased. Freedom of choice is thus abolished, with the result that the sense of responsibility becomes atrophied in large masses of the people. It is a process of pauperisation that can only result in a general loss of initiative, and a growing submissiveness to State decree.

Contrast the results of this method of relieving distress with those obtainable through distributing to every citizen the growing flow of communal wealth by means of a basic money income, inalienable so that any mistakes made in its spending can be rectified later. The recipient is placed in control of his own life, his initiative and sense of responsibility increase, and he is continually gaining an increased appreciation of reality through his experiences. His whole attitude of mind changes. A properly functioning democracy will be the logical outcome as regards the social structure, but such an attitude goes further.

It is, in fact, faith—faith in the capacity of human beings in association to obtain whatever they may desire. Such a faith is not merely believing as an intellectual exercise; it is an innate and instinctive confidence, a certainty expressing itself in thought, character and action. It *knows* it has only to ask anything in the right way in order to receive, that the correct action will always produce the desired result, that if Nature (reality) does not respond to our demand it is only because we have, temporarily, been unable or unwilling to ask in the correct way. The truly scientific attitude is an instance in a specialised sphere; here faith has literally moved mountains, and it has only to be applied to other problems to achieve similar results.

This attitude of mind, this perception of reality, this faith is Social Credit. It is the only safe defence against black magic.

## “-- But You Can’t Make Him Drink.”

By B. M. PALMER

Recent correspondence in *The Times* concerning adult education reminds one of the song parodied by Mr. James Thurber:—

“What are the Leftists saying,  
Sister, to you and me?”

Mr. Thurber, who, surely must be one of the ‘real Americans,’ points out in his amusing book *Let Your Mind Alone*, that the Leftists fall naturally into two classes, (a) those who believe that the worker should be taught beforehand why there must be a Revolution, and, (b) those who think he should be taught afterwards why there was one.

But they all agree that the Worker should be taught.



Mr. Thurber thinks the Worker might do well to attend a gathering of Leftist Intellectuals and having reverently removed his hat sit quietly and try to understand what is being said, since all this mental activity obviously concerns him very nearly.

The trouble is that he won't take even the Brains Trust seriously. Here is a glorious feast for the mind, spread out for him once a week, or twice, if he listens to the recording for the Forces, or three times if he can speak Welsh, and yet he persists in treating the whole thing with levity. What was that he said? "You may lead . . ."

But the Englishman (sorry, Worker) has always been conspicuous for ingratitude. And when one thinks of all the self sacrificing effort which at this very moment is being expended on his behalf, without any hope of any reward on earth, beginning with a clear explanation of why he must pay income tax—!

The letter writers are agreed on one point, that we are to be "an educated democracy." That brings us to the question "What is education?" and it is on this that the fundamental discord centres. The Worker's idea of education is not that of the correspondents to *The Times*, or, it is obvious, these gentlemen would not have such difficulty in getting their way. The writer of this article would not presume to make any statement concerning the *real* wishes of the men and women who have been deluded into accepting the title of mere functionaries, beyond the emphatic assertion that they have never been in a position to discover their own true desires; and that until they are, no amount of so-called education will be anything but a veneer.

The close of the Archbishop's speech in the House of Lords is reported thus in *The Times*:—

"The coping-stone of the whole system was adult education. Increasingly it would be regarded as constituting the real test of the value of the education that had gone before. He hoped that every effort would be made to enable men and women of every class to enter in the fullest way into the heritage of knowledge, literature, and thought bequeathed to us from the past. (Cheers.)"

With that one sees no reason to disagree, and might even join in the cheers provided that there was a real prospect of the freedom of the *complete* cultural inheritance being made available to all, not just given out in dribs and drabs at the times and places chosen by the directors of economic policy. Yet this cannot be done while men and women are functionaries only, whose sole means of gaining a livelihood is to sell their labour as a commodity in the labour market, where, in times other than war-time, the demand for labour is rapidly decreasing although the amount of goods and services produced is, or might be, greater than ever before. While such conditions exist no one can be free.

The Archbishop defined education as the development of the whole personality, body, mind and spirit. The suspect word here is "development," since no indication is given as to the nature of the development, and who shall control it. But to the majority of the worthy letter writers it would never occur that their own conception of the nature of that development is not the correct one, and they unconsciously imply the whole of their own philosophy when they use the word. This is made plain in the letters of Sir Richard Livingstone and the Dean of Norwich, but brought to completion in the philosophy of the communist poet,

Stephen Spender (February 25). He states that he is in entire agreement with the President of Corpus Christi, and proceeds to show the logical conclusion to which the President's views must lead. There is no fault in the reasoning, and it is hoped that Mr. Spender's letter will cause these Christian dignitaries closely to examine their own assumptions. For what Mr. Spender advocates is the dictatorship of the intelligentsia *who have already made up their minds what is good for the people.*

Two extracts are quoted from his long letter, which was given a conspicuous place on the leading article page.

"... there is an essential connection between adult education and moral in totalitarian war waged by a democracy. The clue to the bad moral in England existing at present in large sections of the people is the lack of interchange of ideas, and common principles of understanding between the people who direct the war and those who are directed. This is specially true of the industrial workers and of civilian defence. Totalitarian war requires total co-operation of the whole consciousness of the whole society at war, so far as this is possible. In Russia the gulf between the directors and the directed is bridged by the political commissars; in Germany by the *Gauleiters*. In England we seem to think that it is sufficient to shout across this gulf through the impersonal organs of the Press and the wireless. . . ."

"To my mind the function corresponding to that of political commissar in a democracy should be the education officer, who already exists in the Army. But there should be education officers in factories, in civilian defence, and perhaps even in civilian life. Their aims should be threefold: to make the people understand the tasks that face us as a people sharing common aims, principles, and opportunities; to gain conscious co-operation in the farthest aims of the war and the ensuing peace; to equip the individual to be educated, socially responsible, and endowed with the principles of a less anarchic form of post-war society."

Whether the church dignitaries are pleased to envisage this prospect of Christian England must be left for them to decide, but it would be as well for them to understand that they are doing nothing to indicate another path for their flocks.

Mr. Spender is completely convinced that the Russian people are better educated than the British who "have got to raise themselves to a higher mental level, and to a greater understanding of the principles of democracy and co-operation."

"Levels" are curious things. Mr. Spender is probably right from his own point of view, though "democratisation" would have expressed his meaning more nearly.

There are some of us who thank God that the Englishman is not, and is never likely to be, on the level desired by Mr. Spender. We know the attitude of our Worker to the Leftist Intellectual. He may remove his hat at the beginning of the lecture, but he does not stay long, and when next seen will be in a far more congenial place (if open). Furthermore we are convinced that despite his shocking lack of interest in the culture held out to him he knows far more about democracy than any number of Russians. By the way, should the Germans be included among those who understand democracy? It seems that the *Gauleiters* are "on the same level" as the political commissars.

## Points from Parliament

MARCH 3.

Oral Answers to Questions (25 columns)

### UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES

#### ECONOMIC RELATIONS

*Squadron-Leader Donner* asked the Prime Minister whether he will give an assurance that, in the forthcoming discussions with the Government of the United States of America for the promotion of mutually advantageous economic relations, His Majesty's Government will not disregard Article 4 of the Atlantic Charter, which refers to existing obligations?

*Mr. Attlee*: Yes, Sir.

*Squadron-Leader Donner*: Why did my right hon. Friend refer to the elimination of Imperial preference?

*Mr. Attlee*: If my hon. and gallant Friend will read the statement, he will see exactly how far it went.

#### IMPERIAL PREFERENCE

*Squadron-Leader Donner* asked the Prime Minister whether he will give an assurance that, in the forthcoming negotiations with the Government of the United States of America, the Imperial Preference arrangements now in force will not be eliminated or substantially reduced without the previous consent of this House?

*Mr. Attlee*: Yes, Sir. The legislation relating to Imperial Preference cannot in any event be altered except by further legislation.

*Earl Winterton*: Is it not a fact that in view of the status of the Dominions under the Statute of Westminster, these arrangements cannot be altered without the assent of the Dominions concerned; since the arrangements have the status of a treaty?

*Mr. Attlee*: The Noble Lord is perfectly right.

*Sir H. Williams*: Is it not a fact that this agreement is not a treaty at all?

*Mr. Stephen*: Does the right hon. Gentleman not realise that what he is saying now means that the Atlantic Charter is without meaning?

*Mr. Attlee*: The hon. Member is entirely wrong. The Atlantic Charter lays down certain principles. The following-out of those principles has to be worked out between the Powers concerned. There is absolutely nothing in the statement I have made which runs contrary to that.

*Sir Percy Harris*: Are the Dominions not just as anxious as we are to have friendly economic relations in future with the United States? Cannot the post-war Government be free to consider all economic questions on their merits, without prejudice?

*Mr. Attlee*: The right hon. Gentleman is perfectly right.

### SUPPLY: MINISTRY OF FOOD (83 columns)

*Mr. MacLaren* (Burslem): . . . . Speaking of the British Restaurants and the canteen system, he [the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Food] said that he hoped that after the war they would not be dissolved. Immediately a cheer ran through the House. I agree that when we are at war it is necessary to do something to cope with the food situation, but I should be very depressed to think that after

the war is over we have to enter into a sort of State-feeding fraternity, rather than to have independent people feeding themselves in comfortable homes. In saying that, I am not condoning what has been going on for a long time, in the form of an attempt by some people to monopolise the restaurant business. . . .

*Mr. Beverley Baxter* (Wood Green): . . . . I wish to tread on thin ice for a few moments. I rather hesitate to do so, because one does not want to hurt unnecessarily or to make the blunder of indicting a race. . . .

The Jewish community, towards which this House has always maintained historic friendship and consideration, should exert itself in this regard [concerning black markets]. There are aliens from Europe who have found their best means of activity in making money in these black markets. There are British-born Jewish people in this to far too great an extent. I do not want to go further than that. I appeal to the great Jewish community, to whom we owe much and who owe us much, to bring every pressure they can rather than bring upon themselves those things which would be bad for them and unworthy of this nation. . . .

*Mr. Evelyn Walkden* (Doncaster): . . . . I would say to my hon. Friend the Member for Wood Green (*Mr. Baxter*) that the beginning of the black market in Covent Garden and Spitalfields Market did not concern Jews at all. It began with our own people, and their ill-gotten gains were transferred to hotels, restaurants and cafes galore in London in plain vans and private cars.

*Mr. Baxter*: I would be very sorry if from what I said the Jews alone were made to blame. What I said was that the repercussions on the Jews were such that they should be more careful. . . .

MARCH 4.

Oral Answers to Questions (37 columns)

### SHIPBUILDING CAPACITY

*Mr. Lawson* asked the First Lord of the Admiralty the number of shipyards in the United Kingdom closed and sterilised by National Shipbuilding Securities, Limited, which have been reopened for shipbuilding since the war began; and the number still remaining closed?

*Mr. Alexander*: For the reasons given by my hon. Friend the Civil Lord in a reply to the hon. Member for Govan (*Mr. Maclean*) on December 10, 1940, I am not prepared to give detailed information on the subject of British shipbuilding capacity.

*Mr. A. Edwards*: Is it true that the gentleman responsible for Shipbuilding Securities, who destroyed our capacity to build ships, is still responsible for shipbuilding?

*Mr. Alexander*: I have already pointed out that it is not a question of an individual, but of the arrangements within the industry carried through by National Shipbuilding Securities, Limited.

Written Answers (10 columns)

### NATIONAL WAR EFFORT

#### REGIONAL PRODUCTION BOARDS

*Major Lyons* asked the Minister of Supply whether, in considering a reconstitution of the Regional Production Boards, he will bear in mind that, if quick decisions are to be reached and economy in time, effort and cost obtained, there is an urgent necessity of some form of decentralised

financial control and supervision, and act accordingly?

*Sir A. Duncan:* I will represent this as soon as possible to my right hon. Friend the Minister of State.

## MARCH 5.

Written Answers (17 columns)

### MILITARY SERVICE

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (STAFFS).

*Wing-Commander James* asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury whether he will publish, at the earliest convenient date and periodically thereafter, a table showing, by Ministries and age-groups, the number of medically fit men of military age, exclusive of established pre-war civil servants, employed in each Ministry?

*Captain Crookshank:* No, Sir. The amount of work involved in compiling this table would be considerable and so far as I am aware no useful purpose would be served by undertaking it.

### Supply: Report—Woman-Power (82 columns)

*Miss Horsbrugh:* ... I think that as we go on further into the summer, and as people get more accustomed to the idea, they will take advantage more of the nurseries, but the fact is that in the meantime they do not. I got the figures as far as I could get them at present. In one list of districts, out of 2,884 places there is an average attendance of 1,597. At Stockport a nursery was opened with 60 places. The average daily attendance in February was eight and two other nurseries are in preparation. We put that down as the number required at the beginning. They are not being filled at present, but again I think that gradually people will come to use the nurseries more. In Cardiff there are two nurseries, each with 20 places. The average daily attendance at one is seven and at the other 11. At Swansea there are two nurseries with 40 places. The average daily attendance at each is six. At Wrexham a nursery was opened on 1st December and the average daily attendance has been four.

*Mrs. Rathbone (Bodmin):* I am very interested to hear the figures of places where nursery schools are not being properly used, but surely this is the result of lack of leadership by the Department. If you are in favour of war nurseries, surely you can make the public war nursery minded. There are enormous benefits to be had in the way of education and discipline, which the mothers could not give in war-time. If a proper lead was given, the mothers would use the nurseries.

*Miss Horsbrugh:* I believe the chief reasons why they are not used are the bad weather and the fear of infection. Our scheme is to be ahead with nurseries in the expectation that people will steadily use the nurseries more as required. In the meantime we have to face the facts, but we are not stopping progress. We are going on building more nurseries. ...

*Mrs. Hardie (Glasgow, Springburn):* ... I have not had any complaints from women who have been moved from unnecessary work in shops and offices to necessary war work. Though many of them must have felt sore about it, no one has yet complained to me. But what they do feel aggrieved about, particularly in Scotland, is that young women are being needlessly removed from the neighbourhood of their

own homes, although work is available for them there, and sent to work in other parts of the country. I was pleased to note that the Parliamentary Secretary said that he does not like the word "mobile." I am getting to dislike it very much. It has become a kind of a joke among the young women in Scotland. They say to one another, "You are mobile, so it's 'Over the Border' for you." I suggest that the Minister of Labour should tell his officials to get rid of the obsession that if a girl happens to be unmarried, she must go somewhere else to get a job, although jobs may be available in her own area.

I have a number of cases here. ... [*Mrs. Hardie then gave several instances of such transfers and their results for the individuals concerned.*]

She [another girl from Glasgow] had the choice of going to Stevenston or Wales—Wales. It is like the old game of American Post, in which you change round from one place to another. I suggest that this idea of mobility has become too much of an obsession with the Ministry, and that their insistence upon it is absolutely ridiculous. These women who are being told that they must go to other districts know that there are many munition works in and around Glasgow which are short of employees and would be glad to have them, but they are not allowed to take the jobs because, say the Ministry, there might be some women living in Glasgow who could not be sent away from home, and the jobs must be left for them. Therefore the girls are simply sent away. I do not think that is the best method of providing jobs for women.

I have here a letter from a lady in the Highlands. She is a very strong Scottish nationalist, and she says that the way the Ministry are treating Scottish girls is a good thing, from her point of view, because it might make them all into Scottish nationalists. Her complaint is that girls are being pulled away from the Highlands and sent down to English factories, while places in the North of Scotland are filled with English women. I have sent this letter to the Ministry, and I did not expect a reply, but the Ministry said that no women were sent from England to work in Scotland. The point is that the English women evacuate themselves. I expect they are married women. Hon. Members will be surprised at the number of women who went from the Midlands when the blitz came. ...

If war work is available in the district where the girls live, why do you not let them have it? We hear a lot about married women and the kind of billeting in which other women look after the children; the thing is just silly. Leave the women with the young children at home to look after those children. I have been very much concerned about the health of girls in the factories. The rate for tuberculosis and for many other ailments are up. If the girls are living in homes, where they are not properly looked after, that is the result. It is all very well to give girls a canteen—that is all to the good—but if they are living with landladies who do not study diet very much or do not try to make it up to the girls as a mother would, there is bound to be a bad effect upon health. If a girl is very unhappy and homesick, it affects her work as well as her health. When somebody came to tell me about Scottish girls in a Birmingham factory staying away from work, I answered, "If a Scottish girl lost her work for three days, and her wages, she must have been dashed uncomfortable." ...