

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 26.

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

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1943.

6d. Weekly.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Probably the most important event of recent weeks is the recall of Litvinov (more correctly, Moseiwitch Wallach, or Finkelstein) from the post of Russian Ambassador to Washington. In conjunction with the recall of Maisky (more correctly, Steinmann) from the London Embassy, the change of emphasis is unmistakable. The sobs of the "B".B.C. in announcing the change almost shook our receiver from its moorings.

Exactly why our clamourers for a "second front" feel that it is our business to take Germany off the back of Russia, while Russia makes it unmistakably plain that she is fighting for Russia, and for no one else, and that if we have a war on with Japan, it's just too bad, we have never been able to see. But there are a lot of things about this war we have never been able to see, including our escape from German invasion in June, 1940, and the insane attack of Germany on Russia. But if anyone knows, it is Litvinov and Maisky; and perhaps Stalin wants to know, too.

Owing to the religious nature of the subject, the "B".B.C. very properly devotes a considerable portion of its Sunday bulletins to a recital of Money saving. We feel that the service should open with the text, "Take no thought for the morrow," include a short dissertation on "Bankers create the means of payment out of nothing" (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, published in Chicago), and end with the hymn, "Whatever, Lord, we lend to thee, repaid a thousand fold will be" (subject to tax where the lender is not a banker).

"There is scarcely a day but what our American chauffeur, Charlie Giliberti, is approached on the streets by some American who has taken out Soviet citizenship and who pleads that he intercede with the American authorities to help him to get back home. A thousand Communists came here in 1934-35 from Austria, and took up citizenship in the promised land, cannot get out, and are all bending every effort to get back home." — *Mission to Moscow*, p. 82.

Couldn't the Fabians be induced to go to Russia and take up citizenship?

"I stressed to Maisky that the Soviet Union as the second largest producer of gold of the world, had a very real interest in the world price of gold and that it was in their interest to co-operate with Secretary Morgenthau in his efforts to sustain the world gold market."

— *Mission to Moscow* by JOSEPH E. DAVIES, p. 106.

Lord Louis Mountbatten has been appointed Commander-in-Chief in South Eastern Asia.

He married the favourite grand-daughter of Sir Ernest Cassel.

We don't know who General "Ike" Eisenheuer married.

Of course it has always to be remembered that outstanding Generalissimos as, for instance, Napoleon and his opposite number, Wellington, are dangerous political competitors after a great war. This risk seems remote; but there are seconds-in-command.

Most of the morning papers published a photograph showing pilots back from the large and rather costly raid on Berlin, reporting to an "intelligence" officer. One of the figures in the picture had curly hair and a bulbous nose. Guess which.

Mrs. Roosevelt has gone to New Zealand. Well, New York was called New Amsterdam to begin with, wasn't it? Why not New Long Island?

"Fishing-trips" are popular just now. Cod-fish?

OUR MASTERS: The L.M.S. Railway has requested Dundee and Glasgow to arrange their annual holiday so that it will be more convenient to the L.M.S. Railway. This is regarded as the first move in a request to Dundee and Glasgow to go somewhere where their journey won't be really necessary.

### "That Men may Live for their own Sake"

"Since the Monarch is full of love for men, as was before touched upon, he will have all men good, which cannot be if they live under perverted constitutions: wherefore the Philosopher\* in his Politics saith, *That in a perverted Commonwealth the good man is a bad citizen; but in a rightful one good man and good citizen are convertible terms.* And the aim of such rightful Commonwealths is liberty, to wit, that men may live for their own sake. For citizens are not for the sake of the Consuls, nor a nation for the King; but contrariwise the Consuls are for the sake of the citizens, the King for the sake of the nation. For as a Commonwealth is not subordinate to laws, but laws to the Commonwealth; so men who live according to law are not for the service of the law-giver, but he for theirs; which is the Philosopher's opinion in that which he hath left us

\*Aristotle.

concerning the present matter. Hence it is plain also that though a Consul or King in regard of means be the lord of others, yet in regard of the end they are the servants of others: and most of all the Monarch, who without doubt is to be deemed the servant of all."

— DANTE, *De Monarchia*.

### TAXATION WITHIN FEDERAL SYSTEMS

A committee of experts from the United States Treasury, which in April completed a report on inter-governmental fiscal relations, concluded, from a survey of foreign inter-governmental relations, that none of the federal states have yet found a thoroughly satisfactory system for co-ordinating federal systems.

Extracts from the report show that the friction generated by taxation tends to weld federations together under a highly centralised and powerful government:

"Where countries have made a radical revision in financial relations in recent years, they have not followed any one pattern. Argentina chose a system based on shared taxes; Brazil chose separation of sources. The Canadian royal commission urged a block grant. Australia has been experimenting with joint federal state administration.

"No panacea has been found. The fact that Australia has been fairly successful with fixed and unmarked grants, where Canada has permitted the same device to become a political football, is further evidence there is no self-operating system. . . .

"Australia's comparative success with co-operative administration—both between federal and state authorities and among states—indicates this may accomplish more than any rigid system of shared taxes, fixed grants or division of tax sources in reconciling conflicts. . . ."

The committee found that Canada had not made as much progress toward 'resolving' the 'conflict' between dominion and provincial taxation as had Australia.

"Four provinces," it says, "turned over collection of their income taxes to dominion officials before the dominion took over the tax completely. Three of these provinces had permitted deduction of dominion income taxes for income for provincial purposes.

"Against these credits is a long list of dominion-provincial quarrels. The country is faced, of course, with very real differences in economic interests from one province to the other but the same seems to be true of Australia. There seems to be agreement that Australia has gone farther than Canada in reconciling conflicts but the reason for the difference is not clear."

In general, the Washington committee found that the centralising forces have been at work in federal governments, in the Australian Commonwealth, the Union of South Africa, Canada and the United States.

In its studies on Canada the Commission relied largely on the Rowell-Sirois report on Dominion-Provincial Relations.

### Utopian Prediction

"Futurism . . . cannot foresee the free part of human action; it can only foresee the servile part. It is not a question of whether the prediction is optimistic or pessimistic, it is a question of the nature of prediction itself."

— G. K. CHESTERTON.

## NEW YORK

From *Who are the Americans?* by W. DWIGHT WHITNEY:—

"The 'Empire State' with about 10 per cent. [13,000,000] of the nation's population pays a quarter of the income taxes of the country. About half the population lives in the City of New York . . . the Jewish population is the largest single element. . . . [about 40 per cent.]

"When the emigrants from Russia, Poland and other Slav countries are taken into account, perhaps half the population traces its origins to Eastern Europe. . . .

"New York is, in fact, three worlds. . . .

"The first is the world of the great financiers and industrialists of Wall Street. . . . They are fundamentally of Anglo-Saxon origin. . . . [but] a respectable though diminishing position in the banking world is occupied by the descendants of the old German-Jewish banking families who left Frankfort and other German cities a century ago—the Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Lehmans, the Seligmans and the Speyers. . . .

"The second New York world is the world of the 'cloak and suit trades' or 'garment industry' and the related world of fashion, advertising and amusement—in other words, the world of *distribution*, as opposed to production or financing. This is the Jewish world, predominantly so both as to employers and as to workers. It has provided New York with a sort of star-spangled entertainment and night life, on a scale so glittering and yet so inexpensive that it has exceeded Paris and finds no parallel in London.

"The Third world is the world of the City Government [Tammany Hall]. This is the preserve of the ruling classes, the Irishmen. . . . [who] provide . . . practically all the public officials."

" . . . the newspapers of New York City are little read outside a radius of 200 miles from the city, . . . the leaders in the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune* though frequently quoted in the columns of the London Press and in the news releases of the B.B.C. are, in fact, never read in nine-tenths of America, and are very rarely read even in New York."

• • •

From *Waters Flowing Eastward* by L. FRY:—

"An excellent illustration of a Jewish community in the twentieth century is found in the account of the organisation of the 'Kehillah' [diminutive of 'Kahal'] in New York City in 1909 . . . in the *Jewish Communal Register* (N.Y. 1919).

" . . . the immediate cause of its creation was 'the statement of the police commissioner, General Bingham, that the Jews contributed fifty per cent. of the criminals of New York City' . . . 'of New York's sixty per cent. Gentile population, none can buy meat not prepared according to Jewish ritual . . . 'meat so killed brings prices far in excess of those paid for ordinary meat. . . ."

" . . . When the Kehillah was organised in 1909 the control rested with a group of German-Jews including Jacob Schiff. . . ."

## The Ministry of Labour & the Paint Industry

A letter of May 10 last from the Ministry of Labour which threatened the withdrawal of *all* labour from Paint firms not on privileged lists (*i.e.*, from some 360 firms) has been cancelled.

This is the result of the aid given unstintingly by Members of Parliament, after an abortive interview with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour unsupported by M.P.s, in interviewing not only Sir Andrew Duncan, Minister of Supply, but also Mr. Bevin himself. They listened to and saw the evidence, and appreciated the unfairness of the proposals, with the result that a standstill order was issued saying that no labour is to be withdrawn from these firms before September 1; that a tribunal representing both the employers and employees besides a Ministry of Labour official as Chairman should be set up in every district to hear appeals and that in any case labour was not to be taken from any business to such an extent as to compel a close down. A cross section taken at random from a large number of small firms showed that they had lost 50 per cent. of their employees, which contradicts the suggestion by the Ministry of Labour that the Paint Industry has not given its share to the war effort—any way, as far as the smaller firms are concerned. Many of the large firms have probably increased their labour and thus from a privileged position may be using their protected labour to produce materials inessential (in the sense of war needs), without interference. For instance, large quantities of distemper emanating chiefly from these privileged firms are now coming on the market. This is now being looked into, for obviously the best source of labour is from the larger firms. In fact the attempt to penalise the smaller manufacturers not chiefly on direct government work is likely to have a salutary boomerang effect.

## The Objection to Planning

*The first of the following letters appeared in THE SCOTSMAN of August 23, the second in the same journal on August 26:—*

Sir,

The question of post-war planning concerns, on the one side, the few, the "planners," and, on the other, the many, the "planned for." It would seem from your correspondence that the planners are dissatisfied with the apathy of the "planned for." But have the planners really asked themselves the question, "What are we planning for?" Model cottages, schools, public parks, and so on, are surely means to an end, not ends in themselves.

Imagine asking a man the Catechism question, "What is the chief end of man?" or, if he did not understand that, simply "What do you want from life?" If he replied, "To live as comfortably as possible; to work as short a time for as much money as I can get; to have the least possible responsibility for the upbringing of my children, or for their support, or that of any aged or sick relative; to have my pleasures arranged for me with as little effort to myself as possible," I imagine most people would be shocked at such a grossly selfish materialist outlook. But that life is precisely what the "planners" are offering the "planned for," even if they call it good housing, short hours, high wages,

crèches, schools, pensions, and so on.

People are better than that, and so the planners' "paradise" fails to evoke enthusiasm because it does not answer the real human need for a worthy ideal for life, an "end" for man. The same people who are apathetic about planning a "heaven upon earth" will volunteer cheerfully for difficult, dangerous and unpleasant jobs, be enthusiastic for creeds that offer their followers not comfort but sacrifice. This may be surprising (and awkward for the materialist), but it is human nature, and must be taken into account.

Your correspondent "Neptune" puts down the lack of public enthusiasm for "planning" to fear of his being "let down," and Mrs. Westwater to lack of understanding, but I venture to think the real reason is more profound. The planners must show us that good housing, schools, pensions, *etc.*, are necessary means to some known and desirable end, or, to put it more simply, tell us what they are planning for. The people ask for bread, but the sugary cake offered by the planners looks suspiciously like a disguised stone. They are too wise to "bite."

I am, *etc.*,

SITA M. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF.

August 24, 1943.

Sir,

In concurring with the wise letter of your correspondent, Miss S. M. Scott-Moncrieff, in your issue of August 23, perhaps I may be permitted to carry her argument a stage further.

There is really only one major issue at stake in the world to-day. All others are derivatives. That issue is whether, or no, it is possible to impose a Utopia from above, a proposition which involves a standardised human being whom it would be incorrect to call an individual. The planning to which, in my opinion fortunately, so many people object is planning which takes this question as having been settled in the affirmative.

The opposite conception is that each human being is to some extent unique, and that the common interest is best served by assisting him to work out his own Utopia, and to discourage him from imposing it on his neighbour. That is why we are fighting Hitler, and why the more advertised planners in our midst would be well advised not to assume that the major issue is *chose jugée*.

It is, unfortunately, true that no way has so far been explored which avoids the dilemma that the more obvious methods of resistance to aggression, either in the form of international war or internal planning by the supreme State, involve a surrender to the principle of Utopianism. This is clearly recognised by our planners, who have said, in so many words, that only in war, or under threat of war, would the British people and Government allow their destinies to be taken out of their own hands. But to say that the way has not been explored, is not to say that there is no way.

The ideal of the Utopians was fully dramatised by Kipling in his story, *As easy as A. B. C.* If the issues of life were decided by logic, his plan would go through.

Fortunately they are not.

I am, *etc.*,

C. H. DOUGLAS.

August 24, 1943.

## 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. 26.

Saturday, September 4, 1943.

### SENTIMENT

The distinction between means and ends in Social Credit Politics is fundamental, and there is nothing peculiar about it.

Intelligence may provide the means for adding up a sum; but it does not supply the motive. This arises from the character of the individual, which is his policy. McDougall distinguishes between the sentiments and the emotions on the ground that the emotions are ways of functioning; whereas the sentiments are facts of *structure*, which endure in a more or less quiescent condition between the occasions upon which the emotions are brought into activity. There is the emotion of anger; but the sentiment of hatred. If I recognised such a thing as class anger, I might believe in class hatred, an enduring structural difference "enduring between the occasions upon which" the anger boils over. I recognise the anger of the craftsman forced to suffer the blithe antics of the genteel unskilled, and I understand that this proceeds from the enduring structure of the mind of the craftsman. But that structure is a cultural structure, not a class structure, and if there is anything corresponding to it in the political structure it is in line with the caste system, not with the class system. The class war is a cultural war upside-down (Satanic). It is artificial, which is to say, false. But it is also fostered. The current wave of apology proceeding from quarters conscious of being, perhaps, in a measure over-privileged stamps them. The apology is for pseudo success. "I trust that my ermine is not out of place?"—"Not at all! it's you, not the ermine. The ermine would be quite in place if you were quite in place, and if you had tended the ermine, and had not let it become moth-eaten!" *Noblesse oblige*. If you succeed in getting a wider outlook under the rules, surely that shows the view was worth getting?

The social sentiments are at least as real as the emotions which they nourish in individuals. The counterfeit must be sifted from the genuine; and real sentiments must be clothed in concrete and modern forms. Words and phrases which have been touched by the magic wand of the enemy must be redistilled, and the viable Idea restored. Sentiments, like emotions, can be objectivised. The advice to every one who aspires to political importance is the same: "If you don't want to waste your life, find means for embodying your sentiments in a form which all men will recognise as also the embodiment of theirs." This is a creative requirement, and is the 'corrected' version of 'getting together.' Many half-awakened people with, doubtless, excellent intentions, are snatching at the outward, visible signs of past graces:

husks of what once were wheat. The purely static repetition of even sound ideas will not do. 'Tradition' will not save us; nor will 'democracy.' The people of this country cares not a damn about either. It is true that no one ever built a house but by laying one brick on another. It is also true that no one ever layed all the bricks on top of one another at once.

T. J.

### British North America Bill

In the Debate on the British North America Bill,\* which passed its second and third readings on July 22, 1943, Mr. Mander (Wolverhampton, East) asked the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, Mr. Attlee, to what extent there appeared to be any difference of opinion among the Provinces on this Measure, as he had received a communication from the Dominion of Canada pointing out that the Measure was objected to by one Province and met with a certain amount of opposition in the two Canadian Houses of Parliament. Mr. Maxton (Glasgow, Bridgeton) also asked what opposition was expressed.

Mr. Attlee said that he had no detailed information with regard to the Debate in the Canadian Houses of Parliament nor had he information as to any Province objecting to the measure. He found it difficult to look behind the fact that the matter was brought to the British House on an Address voted by both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Maxton retorted: "This is a question of tampering with the Constitution. I think the view held by most people would be that when you are starting to interfere with a Constitution it should not be done if there is a substantial minority objecting. All I want to know is whether there was a substantial minority, and the right hon. Gentleman tells us he is absolutely uninformed on the subject."

Mr. Stephen (Glasgow, Camlachie) pointed out that the fact that the Statute of Westminster laid it down that the British House had to give its assent to any such changes also showed that the House had a certain interest to see that minorities were not simply steam-rolled by the majorities. He added, "I think the right hon. Gentleman might have taken the trouble to inform himself a little more fully as to the position in Canada. He seems to know very little about it."

Sir Edward Grigg (Altrincham) suggested that it was really improper for the House to question the discretion of a sovereign Parliament in the Commonwealth of Nations, and Mr. Price (Forest of Dean) supported him. Mr. Edmund Harvey (Combined English Universities) pointed out that the whole question depended on Section 7 (1), of the Act of Westminster, which was expressly put in at the request of Canada in order to protect the interests of certain minorities in Canada who at that period desired that in the event of any change being requested by the Canadian Parliament which they themselves did not unite in, there would remain the possibility of the British Parliament protecting the interests of the minority. British Members would wish, in the present circumstances, without needless Debate, to agree to the request of the Canadian Parliament, but the provision remained in the Statute of Westminster until Canada desired an alteration.

\*See *The Social Crediter*, August 7, for the passage of this Bill through the House of Lords.

## ENEMY ALIENS

[Extracts are given below of a debate which took place in the House of Lords on July 8, 1918, on a Notice by the late Lord Beresford of which the following is the substance:

"To call attention to the number of uninterned aliens in the country and to ask whether a Return can be given of uninterned aliens; whether a Return can be given of the number of aliens who were naturalised since the war; if it can be stated how many naturalised aliens are employed in Government offices;... can a Return be given of the number of Germans who have changed their names in the last five years, and whether enemy aliens are now permitted to change their names;... and to move for papers."

Reference to some particular cases is omitted both from the above Notice and from the following extracts:—]

Lord Beresford:... The official report of these aliens, as far as I understand is this. There are 12,600 uninterned aliens, and 6,600 of these are Germans. It is of the Germans that I desire particularly to speak... The Return says that they have 3,000 British wives. I want to know how many Englishmen have German wives. That has not been stated in any Return. I see no return of women aliens, yet they are far more dangerous than men. In this sort of work they are far cleverer, much more energetic, and much more likely than men are to get and to give news....

Germans are in every Department of the State. What I mean by "a German" is a German with a German father and a German mother. That is what I mean by a person of German origin. He is a German and always will be a German, whatever he professes. In addition, Germans are in every financial department, every industrial department, and every commercial department....

Germans are doing important work in the gun factories, they have immense influence in Parliament and in society, and high social position gives a certain amount of power....

What should we call Englishmen supposing they became naturalised Germans, who loudly proclaimed their undying patriotism in Germany, and cited as proofs their subscription to war charities, and spoke of what they had done for Germany's interests financially, while casually omitting to say that they had benefitted by the financial transactions? What should we call those Englishmen? We should call them traitors. They would be traitors to their own country, and I maintain that those Germans who came over here and have done these things, are traitors to their own country. Personally I have no use for any traitors, no matter whom they may be nor to what country they belong.

...I believe the Deutsche Bank and the Dresdener Bank still remain open, and possess all their power of propaganda for after the war. I have asked the Government if they will give us a list of the names of those who have shares and stocks in these banks. Let us know who they are. If they are British, well and good. If they are Germans or naturalised Germans I think it is very bad....

.... In regard to this question of the change of names and naturalisation, I ask your Lordships to reflect how dangerous it has been, and how dangerous it will be if we do not alter it. I would remind you of Trebitsch Lincoln, who was a confessed spy, and one of the people who were doing their best to smash this country. He actually got into our Parliament; yet that law remains unchanged at this moment. Then there is a man called Oscar Guiseman,

who is naturalised. A year ago he changed his name to Rutland. I do not know if my noble Friend the Duke approves of that. I certainly should not like to see "Guiseman" changed to "Beresford." I should consider it an insult. Why should he not keep his own name and not interfere with these old British names? He and his wife are now on the Parliamentary List of Electors, and there is no reason why this fellow should not get into Parliament the same as Lincoln did. Your Lordships laugh but it is a serious thing. Lincoln did get into Parliament and he went there to try and undermine British interests....

... This is dated June 24, and is from a gentleman who lives at Oatlands—"The whole place was raised to a state of frenzy, not only on account of the man Weiss and of what he did, but on account of the extraordinary apathy and inaction of the Government. It was most disconcerting to see residents goaded into suggesting that a riot should be organised in order to make the Government do their duty." He ends up by saying—"Do the Government realise that their apathy is driving the people to a state of desperation at their inexplicable leniency to aliens?"... I ask for a Return of those (aliens) naturalised since the war. That has not been made public yet. The Government have been far too lax. It has been far too easy to arrange the naturalisation of a German, and British citizenship has been bought far too cheaply....

I ask for a Return of naturalised aliens serving in Government Offices. That, I know will be difficult. There are a great number of them, and there are a great number of Government Offices and I think I voice the sentiment of the public when I say that we object to anybody being employed by the Government who has a German mother and a German father. There you have a straight line. We do not want to impugn their honesty; I do impugn their patriotism, because they are not patriotic to their own people. It is nothing to me to say that they are patriotic to my country; I do not want them. Let them go to their own country and be patriotic there. Why should not the public know about these people? After all we are taxed; the public pay for these people. Why should not they know the character and names of the people whom they employ? I think this is a very moderate demand, and a demand that should be acceded to....

... I want to know the number of Germans who have changed their names. Why should they change their name? Is it for our benefit or for their own? Let them stick to their own names; and if the Government wish to let them change their names, let them put after their names what they were before and let the public know who they are. You gain an enormous advantage by having a good old honest English name—an advantage over some of our own people. I find that many of these Germans have changed their names several times, and I should like to have a list of those Germans. Further, a very large number of Germans since the war began have suddenly become Swiss; I should like to know the names of those. I have a list of fifty here who have changed their names since the war began.... Adolph Schineberg became Alfred Leslie—this man I particularly object to, because my mother's name was Leslie, and I hope he will change his name back again—James Schwarz became James Maddocks; Simha Seinbach became Samuel Stonebrook; Lionel Woolfson became Lionel Wilson. All these names that I have read out have been changed

in the year 1918, and I want the men to change them back again. . . .

. . . I claim that the birthright of "British-born" should not be jeopardised by the unwanted intrusion of people of enemy origin, many of whom have broken their contract. One of the saddest times in my life was some twenty years ago when I stood at the dock-head of a great ocean going seaport whence great ships went to sea. There I saw two ships of heavy tonnage. One was taking abroad the finest specimens of British manhood—artisans, mechanics and agricultural labourers; the other was discharging into our country the scum of Europe. It is from this that we have suffered. Therefore I hope that the naturalisation laws will be altered, and that we shall not in the future send our best away and receive in return such aliens as I have described.

*Viscount St. Davids:* . . . It was in the first days of the war that Germans were naturalised. There were some gross cases. There was the grossest case of all of a man who is known to have a son fighting against this country, and I believe in justification of his naturalisation it was said that if he was not naturalised, British credit would suffer. I do not know who said it; I do not know what argument he used; but it could not have been used by any man who knew the City, in good faith. The Public Trustee might have been put in charge of that man's business, as he has been placed in charge of other businesses. He could have carried it on and no business interest in this country would have suffered if that man had been put in prison with other Germans. . . .

. . . This man who was naturalised has a son fighting against us. No British interest was gained by his naturalisation—to say so was a lie. We want that naturalisation upset. Does the noble and learned Lord [Lord Buckmaster] agree with us? He does not agree.

. . . I do not say much about interned Germans and uninterned foreigners, because I believe most of those who are left out have been carefully sifted, and that a great many of them have been found to be merely nominal Germans. They are Alsations, Lorrainers, Czechs and Italians from Austria who hate our enemies worse than we do ourselves. What I do deal with are the aliens who have not been interned because they have been naturalised; these men call themselves British citizens. . . . the burden of the proof of whose loyalty ought to be cast upon them. The Government must take action. What we want is a change in the law. We want the law so altered that naturalisation of late years—

## The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Price 2s. (Postage extra).

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

10 or 20 years; I should like to look into the matter before I decided how long—should be revoked *en masse*, and the cases should then be taken one by one, and a list prepared and naturalisation granted when it was thought right. But before that happened the list of the people who were to be naturalised should lie upon the Table of the House of Commons and upon the Table of this House, and every Member of Parliament should have the right on a vote to say whether these people were in his judgment fit men to be British citizens like ourselves. . . .

*The Earl of Meath:* My Lords, I am very grateful to the noble and learned Lord, Lord Buckmaster, for his speech, because ever since the beginning of the war, and especially during the time when he was in the Government, I have been approached by people saying there is a "Hidden Hand," and that there was some influence working in favour of the Germans, otherwise the things which have occurred would not occur. I myself have always thought this. I listened to the speech of the noble and learned Lord, and however much he may say he did not say this and he did not say that, the purport of his speech was in sympathy with the Germans in this country; and therefore I am not at all astonished at the popular feeling that there are influences in high places which have in the past, whatever they may do in the present, acted in the interests of Germans, and especially of rich Germans.

I do not suppose that there is anybody in your Lordship's House who has been so much in Germany as myself. I was educated there; I was a diplomatist there on two occasions; I have lived there a great deal otherwise, and many of my friends are Germans. The German has to do what he is told, and every German is more or less under the Government. Consequently he has his duty to do to his country, which he must place before any other. Lord St. Davids said that if he were a Briton in Germany and were naturalised he would do everything he possibly could to assist England. I agree. Consequently, why should we imagine for a moment that every German in this country is not as patriotic as we ourselves should be in similar circumstances, and not doing what he can for his own country; I do not blame the German; I think his attitude is absolutely correct.

The noble and learned Lord, Lord Parmoor, made a strong case about our national honour. His speech reminded me of a story about the Crimean war which I once read in Kinglake. Some British soldiers were in a battery, the rampart of which was so high that they could not fire over it. The Russians swarmed round and jumped down amidst our men. There was one private fighting at that moment with six Russians hanging on to him; he had two down but they were clutching his legs, and he began kicking the Russian, on which the sergeant in the true British way, said, "Smith, don't kick a man when he is down." . . .

*Lord Sydenham:* My Lords, may I detain you for a very few minutes and bring back the debate to the facts. There are three great German banks in the City of London which are not wound up yet, and it is the opinion of all the financiers to whom I have spoken in the City, that those banks could have been wound up, or steps taken which did not involve the attendance of a great number of German clerks, many months ago. The managers, who are free to walk about London, are extremely able Germans who have a great deal of secret knowledge. Two of them have found

their way into the Police-Courts—in one case without the smallest personal discredit to the manager—but it is very curious that in both cases the actual occupation of these managers was not allowed to be published in the Press reports. They were called “persons of great importance in the City,” or some phrase of that kind. Why was there this reticence?

I could give a very large number of instances of apparent tenderness to Germans. I have had, my Lords; on three or four occasions to bring the cases of certain firms before you, and no doubt I have bored the House to distraction. I have achieved some small success and got a firm stopped in its operation in India, but it is still in full operation in the City of London to-day. Meanwhile very often little consideration is shown to purely British people. There is a distinguished member of your Lordships’ House whose residence was thoroughly searched for wireless apparatus, and I am sure that nothing was less likely to be found in that house. As your Lordships know, the offices of the National Party, which is not exactly a German Party were also thoroughly searched with a view to finding anonymous letters, which I think we generally agree are never of any use to anybody. The aliens restriction Order published this year deals with the question of change of name, to which my noble and gallant friend referred. That Order seems to give very considerable powers. By Clause 25A (1):—

“An alien enemy shall not for any purpose assume or use, or purport to assume or use or continue the assumption or use of, any name other than that by which he was ordinarily known at the date of the commencement of the war.”

This all seems very satisfactory; but there is a very large loophole. Clause 25A (4) says:—

“A Secretary of State may, if it appear desirable in any particular case, grant an exemption from the provisions of this Article.”

Now, can there be any case in which, during this war at least, it can be desirable that a German should be allowed to change his name? and it is only under this Clause in cases where it seems to a Secretary of State that this course is desirable that the change can be allowed. . . .

. . . It is believed by a very large number of people that an important clue to this protection is to be sought in the Marconi Scandal, and this belief is supported by the fact, which cannot be denied, that there have been three attempts to get to the bottom of those scandals, and in every one of those cases inquiry has been shut down in circumstances which, if you look into them seem to be extremely peculiar. There also would appear to be some reluctance to carry out full investigations in the Courts of Law; and it may be a mere coincidence, but some honours were given to persons who have shown no alacrity about getting at the facts of that case. I think this has produced a very unfortunate and even painful expression. . . .

*The Earl of Mayo:* . . . But what I wish to say—and I feel that I voice public opinion—is that we do not want these Germans in our businesses, we do not want them to carry on business in this country and make money out of Englishmen, and occupy positions which Englishmen ought to fill. . . . Are these Germans dangerous to the State? Many people in this country believe they are. Then Lord Buckmaster said that they came to this country because they were oppressed in their own country. They came to this country but not only for this reason but to live comfortably

and make money out of Englishmen, and to control a great many of our businesses. They not only controlled a great many of our businesses in this country, but very nearly controlled the whole metal business of the world; and we want to put an end to that. . . .

. . . Why did they naturalise themselves, and why did they naturalise themselves when war broke out? They naturalised themselves in order to live in this country and to make money out of Englishmen.

[In replying to Lord Beresford’s Questions Viscount Sandhurst refused to commit himself to a statement of policy in regard to the employment of aliens, confirmed the estimate of the number of interned aliens, submitted that a nominal Return of alien enemies exempt from internment or repatriation would involve an expenditure of time and labour which would hardly be justifiable and added that while since the beginning of the war persons of enemy nationality had been prohibited from changing their names, the Home Office had no information as to how many changed their names before the war.

Lord Beresford, concluding, expressed dissatisfaction with the incompleteness of reply and added: “. . . I desire that all naturalised aliens should have their naturalisation papers revoked, and that the papers should then be carefully examined by a competent Court, and given back only to those about whom there is no doubt. . . .”]

## LEGAL DEFINITION OF THE JEWISH FAITH

[The following paragraphs are from the JEWISH CHRONICLE of August 13, 1943.]

The effect of a clause in a will forfeiting a legacy if the beneficiary married a person “not of Jewish parentage and of the Jewish faith” was the subject of a recent decision by the House of Lords (Clayton v. Ramsden 1943 : 1 All-England Law Reports 16. Reported later in Law Reports 1943 Appeal cases 320).

Their Lordships held that “Jewish parentage” meant of the “Jewish race” and that this was too vague to enable such a condition to be upheld. Accordingly it was unnecessary for the purposes of the will in question to decide as to whether the term “Jewish faith” was sufficiently certain to enable a condition dependent upon those words to be upheld. Lord Wright as to this latter point, dissented from the majority and observed that he did not see why “Jewish faith” should not connote a specific fact equally with “Christian faith” and why it was not sufficiently clear and distinct to identify a specific set of facts to which it may be applied.

The current (July) number of the *Law Quarterly Review* (a review which has established a claim to the privilege of commenting with the greatest freedom on the judgments of the most important tribunals in the land) contains in its series of “Notes” on the recent development of case law a “Note” by Mr. Bertram B. Benas in criticism both of the observations made in the course of the case, and of those contained in a “Note” in the former (April) number of the *Review*, the April “Note” agreeing with the views expressed by some of their Lordships as to the indefiniteness of the term “Jewish faith.”

Mr. Benas expresses respectful doubt whether “‘Jewish race’ would have entered into the consideration at all but

for the prominence given to the so-called 'Aryan' and 'Semitic' racial classifications by Continental ideologies bringing these matters into current discussion and parlance" and adds that "in this country for long 'Jew' has meant in the words of the Statutes of England 'a person professing the Jewish religion' (see *Keren Kayemeth Le Jisroel Ltd. v. Inland Revenue Commissioners* reported in the Law Reports 1931 2 King's Bench Division 465 at p. 494)," and questions how otherwise a Jew could "enjoy the benefits of the Statutes or sections of the Statutes enacted in his behalf." He challenges the view expressed in the "Note" in the former number that the differences between various forms of Judaism constitute them separate religions and submits that the differences are no greater than those between different forms of Christianity. The "Note" concludes with a statement as to the Jewish legal criteria of being a Jew, based upon material provided by a Jewish Rabbinical authority.

The statement as to the Jewish legal criteria of being a Jew, referred to in the above passage from the *Jewish Chronicle*, runs as follows:—

"I am indebted to a learned Orthodox Rabbi, one of those 'excercent' in the Jewish law in this country, sometime a member of the Rabbinical Commission constituted under 23 & 24 Geo. 5, c. 3, for the Jewish legal criteria of being a Jew. It is an established principle of Jewish law that in cases of intermarriage between Jew and Gentile the offspring is regarded as belonging to the same community as the mother. . . . This takes the genealogy of the person one generation back, but some point may be reached when it is to be asked, or it might be contended even at the stage of the mother, how is the ancestress proved to be or capable of being identified as a Jewess. The answer is that there is in Jewish law a principle allowing marriage to be substantiated by common acceptance. . . . This principle is comparable to the 'Marriage by Reputation' in English legal practice. Normally, then, identification as a Jew is a process provided for in Jewish legal practice. It will be noted that 'race' *per se* does not enter into the matter, for even the mother on this principle might be of non-Jewish descent provided she herself was accepted as a Jewess—Ruth, not a Jewess by race, was progenitress of King David. A Rabbi of 'Reformed Judaism' in a recent broadcast emphasised the fundamental unity of Judaism notwithstanding differences of interpretation. . . ."

### THE AMERICAN BEVERIDGE

"The New Deal ace-in-the-hole with labour, however, is the cradle-to-the-grave security program submitted by the National Resources Planning Board. . . . It represents the projected extension of the New Deal into post-war planning. . . . The N.R.P.B. programme was largely the work of Dr. Evaline M. Burns, director of research for the Board. She recently foreswore her British nativity to become a citizen of the United States. She studied under Laski at the London School of Economics and is a close associate of David K. Niles, who lives at the White House and is to be one of the architects of the fourth term blue-print. In 1932 Mrs. Burns wrote a pamphlet entitled *Socialist Planning and a Socialist Program*. . . . Niles went to Washington from Boston, where for many years he directed the Ford Hall Forum. A disciple of the Laski School of Economics, he

208

is now regarded as Hopkins's most confidential lieutenant and therefore powerful also among the President's lieutenants."

— CHARLES HURD in *Roosevelt's Fourth Term Strategy*, in *The American Mercury*, June, 1943.

### SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is now in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit, together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N.6.

### BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	3/6
Credit Power and Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea .....	2/6
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket .....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort .....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy .....	7d.
The Use of Money .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.

#### ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold .....	4/6
Hitler's Policy is a Jewish Policy by Borge Jensen and P. R. Masson .....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne .....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance .....	4d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee .....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards .....	8d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt .....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus .....	3d.
The Attack on Local Government by John Mitchell .....	9d. doz.; 50 for 2/6
Carthorse Conditions for All (the Beveridge Report issue of <i>The Social Crediter</i> ) .....	2d.
The Voters' Policy as applied to the Beveridge Report (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	2d.
World Review; The Jeffrey Professor of Political Economy, Etc., (containing Financing of a Long- Term Production Cycle, reprinted from <i>The Social Crediter</i> of November 28, 1942.) .....	1d.
Cross-section of Bristol discusses Work (Bristol Voters' Policy Association leaflet) .....	1d.
The Job of a Representative .....	½d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15.