

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 19.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 14, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

We think that the widest possible circulation should be given to a little booklet issued at 6d by *Aims of Industry* and entitled *Why you are short of Coal* not only because of its intrinsic interest, but because it ought to convince anyone prepared to consider it objectively that coal is an acute problem because cartels are an acute problem, not because there is any fundamental difficulty in getting coal. As Mr. Austin Hopkinson very wisely remarked in the House of Commons on June 13, it is the political aspect of cartels rather than the economic aspect which is dangerous. Mr. Hopkinson rather overstated the economic aspect because he is studiously averse from criticism of finance, but his main point is incontestable.

It has always been recognised that coal, in Great Britain particularly, is an ideal point at which to attack society, and there are two significant facts in connection with the "Labour" side of the coal business. The first is that the local Trades Union branches are called Lodges, and are nearly identical with the local Masonic Lodges; and the second is that Freemasonry recommends, as one of the means to the overthrow of society, the exaggeration of the dignity and honour to be shown to labour (Official Instructions given by the President and Orator to Recipient of 33rd Degree, quoted by M. Paul Rosen in *Satan et Cie* p. 254). It would be difficult to over-emphasise the importance of this latter factor, because it is the key to nearly everything which is going on in the world to-day, and like so many other things, is an inversion of the Curse of Adam.

The *Miners' Next Step*, quoted in the booklet, is quite open as to its objective, and the methods by which that objective is to be achieved. It is to ruin everybody connected with the coal industry except "the workers," and "to build up an organisation that will take over the mining industry and carry it on in the interest of the workers." (Article XIV.) That is to say, the miners are to seize the coal by economic sabotage, and 800,000 individuals *rigidly controlled by a cartel* are to be placed in a position *to sell this country overnight*. And in the meantime to hold the rest of the population up to ransom on any terms which seem good to the super-cartel in the background.

The claim of the Co-operative Societies, which do not pay Income Tax on their dividends to customers (which they are anxious always to be known by the special and affectionate name of "divi.") that, because their dividends are treated as a "Trade Expense" by a special and arbitrary ruling, they are different in essence from the dividend of a limited company, borders very closely on impudence. Their "divi" is paid out of an excess of collective prices over

collective costs, exactly as is the dividend of an ordinary company; if they sold at cost, there would be no "divi." No one seems to know—or they do not tell—what proportion of profits actually are returned to Co-operative customers as dividends. But it is either very small, and the profits which never reach their shareholders are colossal, or Co-operative Societies are being provided with funds for political reasons by the Bank of "England."

There is nothing startling or original about the co-operative system in itself, and nothing objectionable. But the Co-operative Wholesale Society is a cartel and is openly and unashamedly a political cartel. The kind of politics it favours is well illustrated by a heavily leaded headline in the *Co-operative News* of June 23 "How the Corporal defeated the Lieut. Colonel." It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the ranks in question had nothing whatever to do with the matter at issue.

Anyone who will ponder over the preceding paragraphs must recognise the appalling psychology which we have allowed to develop. "Rank" is achievement; the heraldic term for a coat-of-arms, is "achievement"; and without going into the complications involved by what can comprehensively—not merely in the conventional sense—be called the sale of honours, which are the tribute which hypocrisy pays to virtue, rank marks an exceptional performance either personal or hereditary. And we have now got to that stage when achievement is ridiculed; when anyone above the status of non-commissioned officer either in civil, social, or official life is *ipso facto* an enemy. We have had, and still have, a dislike of the idea commonly expressed by "a change of heart"; what we perceive, in common with many others, is that we have to deal with nothing less than a complete world of mis-education and misdirection. Unless we are much mistaken, the worst consequences are still to come.

Speaking at Fettes College, Edinburgh on Founders Day, June 30, Viscount Simon (no doubt forgetting he was supposed to be honouring an individual) said "Institutions are much greater things really than individuals."

We should not venture to assess the relative size of Viscount Simon and any institution, but considered as a generalisation, we can hardly imagine any statement at the same time more fatuous, and more significant. The noble Viscount would no doubt contend that institutional Christianity is more important than Christ, the thoroughbred racehorse than the Godolphin Arab, and the Cabinet than the mentality and character of the men who compose it. In so doing, he would be merely expressing his faith in the superiority of the Group Spirit, the *Anima Mundi*, the Old Adam, to the "twice-born" self-conscious entity.

It is necessary to emphasise this idea, because every catastrophe, without exception, is directly or indirectly traceable to it. War, industrial strife, poverty—anyone can complete the list—are only possible because some institutional interest is considered superior in importance to free individuality. No institution is merely the sum of the individuals composing it; *it is the progressive product of that factor in the make-up of each individual composing it which serves the purposes of the Anima Mundi, and eventually, it can be broken and dissipated by one Individual.* "Be of good cheer, I [not we] have overcome the World."

How anyone who really pretends to any study of world affairs can fail to see that the imposition of the semi-State Capitalist Management Control society is of extra- or super-national origin, we cannot understand. Obviously, Russia is the focus now that Germany is down and out; but only because Russia disposes of 200,000,000 semi-barbaric slaves. There is a heart to this conspiracy: and until that heart is cut out, the outcome of one devastating war after another is of little importance.

The death of Mr. Curtin, the Australian Socialist Prime Minister, was pressed into the service of this amazing plot by the "B."B.C., which delivered an election address on his virtues on Polling Day. We have never seen much to admire in Mr. Curtin, with his indecent haste to cut the British painter, and what is more important, we have never met an Australian whose opinion differed much from our own. But what is mere apostasy from British allegiance to the "British" Broadcasting Corporation?

"The Pilgrim Fathers, who came here in 1620, were true friends of liberty... But the Puritan Fathers, who settled Massachusetts Bay eight years later, were another breed of cats. They established a colony so cruel and so bigoted that it's without precedent or parallel in any Protestant country... The persecution that drove Puritans out of England was nothing by comparison with the persecution practised here by those same Puritans."

— *Oliver Wiswell* by Kenneth Roberts, p. 36.

How many people in this country or America distinguish between the Pilgrim Fathers and the Puritan Fathers? And of those, how many realise that had it not been for the Puritan Fathers, the rabble that they inspired, and the secret powers which utilised both of them, the insane policies of the Hanoverian Georges would have been frustrated by a Union of the best elements in both England and America, and in all probability the wars of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century would have been averted?

Has it struck you that it is rather remarkable that "Independence Day," July 4, should be advertised by demonstrations, not merely in England but in dozens of countries which don't know, and don't care whether the majority of Americans wanted "independence" (which they didn't) or were better off by it, (which they weren't). The American Revolution was only incidentally a war of "Independence." It was primarily a Civil War.

And how many Americans realise that they have

served their turn, and that their meteoric rise is to be transferred to "Russia?"

The workings of d'markrazi are well illustrated by the uninterrupted functioning of Mr. Mackenzie King as Prime Minister of Canada, although defeated at the polls and without a seat in Parliament. The situation is worsened by the complete identification of Canadian policy during the past ten years with the special views of Mr. King, so that his defeat was not only a personal defeat, it was a "political" defeat. Does Mr. King worry? Obviously not.

The "B."B.C. is clearly very anxious that King Leopold of the Belgians should abdicate. Why?

Uranium

According to the *Liverpool Echo*, Commander Herbert Agar, special assistant to the American Ambassador, speaking at Clifton College speech day, said, "If the war had gone on for another six months it was quite possible that this planet would have ceased to exist, because it was probable that someone would have learned to break the atom without controlling it.

"There was a danger that the Germans would learn how to split it first, and our scientists gave the date as August 6 of this year.

"I sincerely believe that in a very few years the human being will know how to destroy the human race."

The American's account is materially different from that current earlier (March, 1945), to which reference has been made in "From Week to Week," which was that the controlled degradation of uranium to lead had been effected by British and American workers in Canada, that an intense anaemia afflicted those working on the problem, and that it was not intended to use the immense energy available for war purposes during the present phase of the world war.

"Labour" in Australia

Canberra, June 2.

The *Canberra Times* of May 1 had this item; "A report in the Victorian country papers stated that the Victorian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) had said that at a recent conference he attended in Canberra his attention had 'been arrested by the sight of approximately seventy men seated around and nearly all wearing red ties. I was informed they were theorists and advisers to the Federal Government.'" Labour is evidently to be dismissed at the next elections; but by then the dirty jobs will have been done, and the public will have been herded into the 'Liberal' pen; but the red-tied 'theorists' who were there before will be 'advising' still.

New ration books are being issued to-day and to-morrow, in exchange for completed 'Occupational Survey Cards.' The sorting of these will occupy so much time that it is clear that the information collected can have no bearing on the remainder of the Pacific hostilities. The Labour movement sabotages a similar survey in (I think) 1938, on the ground that it would lead to industrial conscription.

German Nationals in Great Britain

(The speech of Lord Ailwyn in the House of Lords on May 2 last, and selected passages from the Official Report of the debate occupy more space than was anticipated when completion was promised with this issue. Lord Ailwyn, the first part of whose speech appeared in *The Social Crediter* last week, continued as follows:—)

I have been dealing this afternoon with the security aspect of this problem, but the economic aspect should not be forgotten. I will do no more than briefly touch upon this, as I have no wish to detain your Lordships too long. While I am very well aware of the fact that numbers of refugees have started industries in this country and have given employment to British workmen, I am equally well aware, as the Government, of course, are, that such cases form only a small fraction of the 40,000 Germans resident in this country to-day. I find myself unable to accept the statement from the Government Bench the other day that the chance of full employment for our own fighting men on their return home is not going to be prejudiced by the retention of these thousands of aliens here in this country, firmly established in business and employment in small trades, in professional classes, in journalism, in domestic service and so on. While I am speaking of this economic aspect I should perhaps say that that is, of course, applicable to aliens generally in this country. My Motion which I have tried to stick to, relates to Germans.

I have only lately been made aware of a still more, to me, disturbing situation—a revised nationality rule for appointments in the British Civil Service. The nationality rule, which I got from the Civil Service Commission at Burlington House, says that these appointments are now open to a naturalised British subject who has resided in His Majesty's Dominions and/or been employed elsewhere in the service of the Crown for at least five years' out of the last eight years preceding the date of his appointment. You will realise that by this revision in nationality rules, which is dated November 21, 1944, the majority of the 40,000 Germans resident in this country have now fulfilled the residential qualifications, and on signing a naturalisation paper are now eligible for permanent appointments in His Majesty's Civil Service. One would have thought that at least the British Civil Service might have been kept secure from this alien infiltration and reserved exclusively for our own people. A certain well-known weekly journal remarks on this in the following terms:

"The situation is not one to be treated with complacency, since it is surely scandalous, with so many native Britons ordinarily available for employment, that posts in the British public service should go to aliens the sole test of whose loyalty has been the signing of naturalisation papers."

I shall be glad if the noble Earl who is to reply will say what circumstances have impelled this alteration in the nationality rule and in what way this is likely to benefit this country or the British people.

I have made lists of the numbers of Germans who have received British nationality in the last ten or twelve years. From the year 1933, broadly speaking, about 150 per year have received British nationality. In 1939 there were 390. In 1940, when we were at war, there were still 208 Germans who received British nationality. Then in 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944 there was an almost complete cessation though not absolutely complete: the numbers were eighteen, twenty, fifteen and nine. Those are Germans who

received British nationality. With regard to the 40,000 Germans now here—unnaturalised Germans—I only hope that the measure proposed by my noble friend Lord Denham yesterday, that naturalisation should cease for a generation, if not two, will be seriously considered by His Majesty's Government, as this Civil Service situation is, to me, most disturbing. Then there is the question of housing. No stressing in your Lordships' House is necessary as to the seriousness of the housing problem. Indeed, as we all know, it is the greatest economic anxiety of all of those with which we are faced. How are we to justify to our sailors, soldiers and airmen the occupation by these people of hundreds and thousands of houses and flats, if you take England as a whole, while they themselves can find no possible or suitable dwelling, if indeed they are able to find a roof to cover their heads?

I hope I have said enough—and I have tried not to overstate this question—to show how urgently necessary it is that enemy aliens at least who have come here since 1933 shall not be allowed to reside indefinitely in this country. On a former occasion I urged the repatriation of German nationals at the earliest possible moment on the conclusion of hostilities. To-day, when one reads the appalling devastation being wrought on German cities, towns and villages as a result of the criminal lunacy of the German Government in refusing to acknowledge defeat, it may well be impracticable to send these people back to the chaotic conditions that must be prevailing and are likely to prevail on a vastly increased and progressive scale in the coming weeks. I certainly should not propose to-day to send them back to starve or with very little hope of finding a house or employment, but the time will come when chaos will give place to some form of order and persecution and tyranny will be no more. Germany will have to be rebuilt and if there is any truth in the Press reports that Russia will demand large numbers of Germans—I have seen two millions mentioned, but have no idea if there is any truth in that figure—for repairing the damage to Russian towns and cities, it is to be expected that every possible German will be required for the restoration of Germany. Alternatively, has His Majesty's Government approached the Governments of our Dominions and Colonies and perhaps those of other countries with a view to ascertaining whether any of them will be willing to accept a certain number of these German nationals after the war?

Our men will be coming back in due course and there will be no room and no place for parasites in this country. An Englishman neither expects nor desires those offers of hospitality which it is natural for him to offer. All he expects is a reasonable code of behaviour and decent standards of good manners from those whom he has befriended. What he does not like, and what he will not easily tolerate, is any meddling in his private affairs. He likes to be king in his own castle, master in his own home. If a neighbour's house catches fire and is burnt out he will offer the victim shelter in his own house, but he does not expect him to remain there indefinitely. After the conflagration has subsided and the house has been taken in hand for repairs and made fit for habitation again, he expects his guest to show some signs of returning to his own place. If, instead of any such sign or intention, his visitor begins to invade his kitchen and tells his cook how the vegetables should be prepared, and later, proceeds to tender his advice

(Continued on page 6)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 14. No. 19.

Saturday, July 14, 1945.

The Catastrophic Phase

"There will probably come well within the lives of the present generation, a period at which the blind forces of destruction will appear to be in the ascendant. It does not seem to me to be necessary that this should be so, but it does seem to be probable. There is, at the moment, no party, group, or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society. This being the case, we are merely witnesses to a succession of rear-guard actions on the part of the so-called Conservative elements in Society, elements which themselves seem incapable, or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rear-guard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked. While this process is alone active, there seems to be no sound justification for optimism; but it is difficult to believe that the whole world is so bereft of sanity that a pause for reflection is too much to hope for, pending a final resignation to utter catastrophe.

"When that pause occurs mankind will have reached one of those crises which no doubt have frequently been reached before, but which so far have failed to avert the fall of humanity back into an era of barbarism out of which new civilisations have slowly and painfully risen.

"The position will be tremendous in its importance. A comparatively short period will probably serve to decide whether we are to master the mighty economic and social machine that we have created, or whether it is to master us; and during that period a small impetus from a body of men who know what to do and how to do it, may make the difference between yet one more retreat into the Dark Ages, or the emergence into the full light of a day of such splendour as we can at present only envisage dimly."

We doubt whether any which Douglas has written are better known than those words, which have for so long, in the book *Social Credit*, testified to the completeness and authenticity of its writer's message.

According to *The Sunday Times* for July 8, "there is no sure evidence on which to base" any forecast of the result of the election now to all intents and purposes concluded, and if the common expectation that a 'National Conservative' Government will be returned with a reduced majority is not realised, it might seem that the sand of

Time has run out. But we shall see, doubtless, what we can do about it.

If the "growing social unrest and resentment" have not swept ungovernable forces up into the seat of power, we have a short time, which certainly cannot be measured in the normal five years of the duration of a parliament, and may be a matter of weeks rather than of months, to turn to account the unadvertised but, we are confident, remarkable impression we have made steadily during the years and noticeably during the election. For the moment we repeat the advice that every friend discovered during the past campaign should be enlisted for the impending struggle.

"There Has Emerged"

"We believe the election has done much more harm than good to the standing of politicians and political life in the eyes of the great unpolitical majority. It has been undignified, not very scrupulous, and full of irrelevancies thrown forward in the hope of exciting prejudice. But there has emerged from the welter a very real and lasting issue, the relationship of political parties to parliament and the electorate. It was the genius of the British parliament in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and well into the nineteenth, that the party organisation was always relatively weak. The strength of the institution was the individual member, a representative and not a delegate, not responsible to any outside body except his constituents. In the latter part of the nineteenth century there came in the caucus, and the party organisation, which the Socialists, as is but natural, have carried much further than anyone else, until the position of an M.P. has become something entirely different in their eyes to what it was a hundred or even fifty years ago. The over-organised and over-ambitious party has been the affliction of so many continental countries that the burden of proof is very much with those who claim any merit for this progressive denial of individual responsibility and reliance upon majority executive decisions. In this country we talk very easily about parliamentary government, and forget how many pitfalls there are and in how many ways parliaments can be ruined."

—*The Tablet*, July 7.

"The Sunday Express"

The Sunday Express "would rather have honest, outspoken, provocative writers expressing their views under their own names than stooges advocating a case in which they have no conviction." The newspaper "likes free speech, free thought, and free journalism." Even the Paper Controller is all for an expansion of the sales of *The Sunday Express* on these lines. "If men are first-rate they should be allowed the fullest freedom to write as they feel"—unless?

The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket

By C. H. DOUGLAS
 Price 2s. (Postage extra).

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

“Social Credit” in New Zealand

The article, “Socialism in New Zealand,” which appeared in *The Social Crediter* for June 30, from a correspondent in the Dominion, was followed immediately by a personal letter implementing the declared intention of the writer, for some months past, to review the Social Credit position in his country. The text of the letter, with few excisions, the place of which is indicated, is as follows:—

Brown’s Bay, Auckland.
June, 15.

This is a post-script to the matter written and posted a couple of days ago. I have just come across a copy of a resolution which we carried at our Auckland District Social Credit Council some months ago. It explains itself. We received no reply, and, so far as I have heard it was not read to the Wellington Conference. Here it is:—

That in declining with thanks the invitation to send a delegate from the Auckland Douglas Social Credit Association District Council to the Conference to be held at Wellington by the organisation existing under the title of the Social Credit Movement of New Zealand, we have in mind that this latter organisation, while freely making use of the term “Social Credit” has in the past shown itself to be not in accord with the policy advice given by Major Douglas and his Secretariat for the purpose of releasing Social Credit as a practical reality. The Auckland Social Credit Council on the other hand, having carefully studied the writings and advice of Major Douglas and his associates, and having over a period of years, found this advice to be well founded and progressively confirmed by events, have felt that it is merely commonsense on our part to endeavour to follow the tactics of these proven experts in preference to those of an almost opposite nature coming from an organisation which, over a period of years, has succeeded in moving nothing more useful than resolutions.

It will not be forgotten that, a year ago, we of this Auckland Douglas Social Credit Council, having re-affirmed adherence to the policy and general advice of Major Douglas, sent a number of delegates to the so-called ‘Social Credit Conference’ in Wellington to ascertain whether other organisations there represented similarly desired to further this same policy. A motion brought forward at the commencement of that Conference “That we re-affirm as our policy that of Major Douglas and his Secretariat as set out through their official organ, *The Social Crediter* from week to week” was not permitted by the President to be put to the vote. Further, as reported back to the Auckland Movement—both verbally and in typewritten form—the National President clearly expressed himself as not in accord with Major Douglas on various major points of policy. In addition other members of the Advisory Board and other delegates present clearly showed themselves as being not in accord with the major policy advice of Douglas. Whatever doubt remained as to the accuracy of this presentation of the situation seems effectually to have been removed by subsequent written and printed matter issuing from these same sources. Finally may we recall that, after exhaustive discussions of these matters, and having heard further from the National Secretary who visited Auckland for the purpose, the Auckland Movement resolved to dissociate itself from the New Zealand organisation which embodied the Wellington Headquarters Group on

the ground that no useful purpose could be served by associating with and contributing to an organisation with whom we have no common policy. As we since have not been made aware of any change of policy on the part of the organisation concerned, there could now be no reason for sending a delegate to their forthcoming conference. Our views concerning the proposal to form or support any particular political party are too well known to require restatement, while the proposal to duplicate in New Zealand the English Secretariat does not seem to merit serious discussion.

Rather a lengthy resolution, but I felt we should try to make the position as clear as possible.

They formed their Social Credit political party and their ‘Secretariat’—with their ludicrous ‘directors’ of this and that. There is little occasion for wondering why nothing worth while has been happening here. But we must thank you for the unerring manner in which you have all along correctly summed up things in New Zealand. I heartily agree with all that *The Social Crediter* has said of our failures and of our responsibility for keeping a Socialist Government in power. Prior to the 1938 elections I endeavoured to get the “Movement” moving to oust the Government because of their deliberate double-crossing on the policy on which they obtained our support in 1935. I started with the Wellington Group. Fred Jordan who was National President at that time—sabotaged the first meeting. I went to Sydney soon after so had no chance to do anything further then. He is again president of the opposing “movement.”

Now that printing and other restrictions may be expected to be eased we may be able to do something. So far I have had to work entirely alone except for support from Mr. Parker and for the reason that I don’t seem to have found a group available—the few really sound ones are somewhat spread around, and I myself am some miles out of the city. Consequently the most I have tried to do is to write to the press as often as possible, and, when opportunity offers to debunk the political party plans of the alleged Social Crediters—and of course work on appropriate people within reach.

Just now there is a move to nationalise the Bank of New Zealand. I have been writing in opposition to nationalisation of banks—and particularly combating this fool idea so prevalent amongst self-styled social crediters here...

I have a feeling that only in England could have been found a group capable of backing up Major Douglas as has the Secretariat, and I feel greatly impressed when I reflect that the man who has, whether they like it or not—and they certainly don’t!—upset the plotting of centuries by engineering a renaissance of human intelligence is still alive and sparking vigorously on all cylinders before our eyes. From a recent letter Major Douglas sent to Bullock and of which a copy has been posted up in the Auckland rooms, it would seem plain enough that old Schickelgruber’s bombers did their best. We in New Zealand owe an abject apology that we have achieved so little with so much—and candidly I lose patience with the maudlin mentalities who have battered on to the mere term “Social Credit” but can never grasp any significance behind it greater than a mere money mechanism and even this many of them fail properly to understand—or those others, quite numerous, who think they see in it a glamorous opportunity to achieve personal limelight and power in the field of politics. Their

miserable egos come to life and clamour at the prospect, they affect a nauseating piety and noble, selfless determination to sacrifice themselves. They develop a passion to "educate" everyone but themselves and become bitterly intolerant of any inquiry into the merits of their doctrine or the efficiency of their methods. Not unnaturally in such circumstances any aspect of the doctrine, to which they have become devoted, which does not seem to assist—or which even may hinder—their unrecognised or unadmitted real objective, which is political power and prestige, is conveniently overlooked—or, if it be forced under their notice, they will fiercely oppose it, and hate the individual who thus forces them into having to do so. I notice the last sentence in Major Douglas's recent letter is to the effect that nothing can stop social credit except its advocates.

I have frequently thought of setting out to write a history of the "Movement" in New Zealand within the limits of my own personal experience. It would be enlightening, and I think might be helpful to future efforts—it would be a pretty sordid tale of intrigue and petty double-crossing.

I want to mention that the matter sent to the Auckland group from time to time by Mr. Hewlett Edwards has been remarkably enlightening—particularly while I was having my somewhat prolonged fight with the politicians who tried desperately to prevent our seceding from the Wellington show. I was able at each vital stage to quote the Secretariat explicitly on each disputed point forcing the political ones openly to repudiate the Secretariat, or revise their attitude. The repudiationists include Marks of Wanganui. At the conference he said "Douglas for philosophy yes—but for tactics, no!" (Philosophy can be so much more elastic and elusive than positive action on carefully defined lines) . . .

—FRANK N. ROBSON.

GERMANS IN ENGLAND (Continued from page 3)

to his host as to how to manage and run his own household; and if on top of that the Englishman is expecting his own children to return home very shortly and requires for their accommodation the rooms occupied by his guests, then I suggest it is not unreasonable that he should wish to speed the parting guest. I do not underestimate the difficulties of this task nor the immensity of the problem but it has got to be solved in fairness and justice to our own people.

The complexities of the economic aspect in any case do not obtain on the security side, which is the main theme of my remarks this afternoon. I submit again that aliens of German birth should be rigidly excluded from employment in our Government Departments and from such highly important and confidential work as I have mentioned. Equally dangerous, in my view even perhaps more so than actual participation in our war effort, is the psychological influence which Germans can exert through their association with British officials who influence policy. It is this psychological infiltration which is really the most sinister thing and one sees it in almost every sphere of our national life—Government Departments, B.B.C., the Press, the universities, the factories and so on. More and more they appear to be penetrating into positions where they are able to exert a pernicious influence. Germans have been used, and so far as I know are still being used, by the Ministry of Information to address British audiences all over the country on the plea, as I understand it, that as they have experience

of German ways they will carry great weight. The fact that whatever anti-Nazi stuff they put across, they are nevertheless all pro-Germans and are given this wonderful opportunity from the platform to organise sympathy as they call it once more for Germany, seems to be completely ignored. Is it necessary to employ Germans for this propaganda work when there can be no lack of Britons who can be used for this purpose? Many Germans have joined our Fighting Services. All honour to them as individuals. But numbers of them have been given commissions. Is it right, is it desirable that Germans shall be put in charge and command of British soldiers?

One could multiply examples of German infiltration throughout the length and breadth of this land of ours, but I will not weary your Lordships further. By all means let us, in the words of the noble Viscount, Lord Templewood, not depart from the ancient tradition of this country which has always been an asylum for those fleeing from injustice and terror on the Continent. But let us use discrimination in this matter, let us temper this mercy with vision and judgment if we wish to win the peace after we have won the war and if we wish to prevent the world being bathed in blood for a third time in our lives, which would mean the final destruction of civilisation through the infamy of Germany and her rulers. I beg to move.

The Marquess of Reading: My Lords, the noble Lord concluded his series of remarks on this subject by suggesting that discrimination should be used in considering this problem. I am inclined to commend his own words to his own notice. He was very insistent in the earlier stages of his speech in stating that he was speaking with complete detachment and without any prejudice of any kind. Let me say at once that the attack which he seemed to fear he might have to ward off because of the sentiments which he has expressed this afternoon lay not on the basis of Anti-Semitism. No such charge would proceed from me. I am perfectly content to assume that no consideration of that kind entered into anything that he had said, and that the remarks with which he entertained your Lordships over a considerable period of time were due entirely to a complete failure to apprehend the situation with which he was attempting to deal. He has at various stages of his oration poured over himself not merely the milk but the clotted cream of human kindness, showing with what sympathy he approached this slightly delicate question. Yet, was there much kindness in his speech? Was there much sympathy, was there much humanity, was there much understanding of this difficult and heart-rending problem, with which he was attempting to deal?

I think your Lordships will realise that I would not stand here taking the opposite line to that which the noble Lord has taken, whatever considerations influenced me, unless I was satisfied that my advocacy of the point of view that I proposed to put was not in conflict with the interests of this country. The noble Lord, disclaiming all prejudice, all hostility, talked about parasites—the parasites, presumably, who gave a very welcome reinforcement to British industry during the war at a time when we were driven to our last point in shortage of man-power; the parasites who have fought and died in the British Army; the parasites who walk about in British uniform, wearing British campaign medals and British decorations for gallantry. These are your parasites, your dangerous enemies in your midst. Your Lordships, I think, will forgive me if I speak

with perhaps a little heat on one subject, and I will endeavour to deal with the rest with more detachment. It is deplorable that the noble Lord should turn his attack upon these young men—and I know them—who are serving as commissioned officers in the British Army and endeavour to stir up hostility among the men whom they so ably command. The noble Lord is a professional sailor. I have only been on occasion an amateur soldier, but I do know that if an officer is a bad officer his men will not follow him and that if the men will not follow an officer it is the commanding officer's business to get rid of that officer there and then. Facilities for doing so with great expedition are not lacking in the Army to-day. For all the milk of human kindness that was a regrettable statement. . .

Something like 90 per cent. of the 40,000 people of whom he spoke are Jews who, if they had not been in this country, would have been in Dachau, or Belsen, or Buchenwald. . .

It will be a satisfaction to the noble Lord to know that even in the relatively static condition of transport in war-time, with all the difficulties that have inevitably been in the way of emigration, not less than 10,000 quitted this country as emigrants bound for countries overseas. When facilities offer again no doubt many more will wish to take advantage of opportunities to emigrate to other countries. But is it right to assume that the rest will want to go back to Germany? How can they go back to Germany? It is not just that very little of Germany is being left from day to day, but that, as I said before, everything that made their lives has gone; their homes have gone, their businesses have gone, worst of all their families have gone. All roots which may once have bound them to Germany have been once and for all effectively cut. Will they therefore want so eagerly to make propaganda in this country in order that they may live in easier conditions on their return to Germany, if, indeed, a few of them have any intention of going back to Germany at all? What are they making propaganda for? . . .

The noble Lord talked about the B.B.C. monitoring system. I happened to know, at the beginning of the war, something about that system. The noble Lord's particular friend does not seem to have been very happy in his environment, and I should think it was a good thing that he, and those who worked with him, were separated. . .

The next aspect with which the noble Lord dealt was the economic aspect. His argument relating to this aspect is a very easy one of which to make use. It will be well received by certain sections of the Press, and well received by a certain section of the public which shares, with various degrees of ardour, the noble Lord's views. I understand it to be the view of the Government that so far from being over-stocked with labour after the war we shall still be short of labour. If that is so, we may yet find that there is as useful employment for these people in industry after the war as there has been during the war. The noble Lord waved aside rather contemptuously these poor factories which these people have put up. I am told that some 450 factories have been started in this country by refugees, and that they employ some 20,000 to 30,000 British workpeople. If the noble Lord objects so strongly to British troops being commanded by refugee officers, I wonder that he does not object to British workpeople being employed by refugees. Perhaps he will consider that point when he

comes to make his next speech on the subject. As I say, 20,000 to 30,000 workpeople are employed. There are 40,000 refugees. Take away the children and the old people and the men in the Forces: is not the balance perhaps even now on the side of the refugees having given more employment than they have taken?

And when more materials are available and these factories can increase their output, is there not some value, when our export trade is going to be all-important to us in the future, in having people who are prepared to develop their factories and to put at our disposal their knowledge of the export trade which used to be German, and which we shall be very glad to get, in order that it may contribute something to the establishment of the economic position of this country at the end of the war? Let me give two instances. The centre of the fur trade used to be Leipzig, but even before the war the centre was being transferred almost entirely to this country. That was entirely the work of the "parasites." The toy trade had begun before the war to build itself up here. I do not imagine that Nuremberg will be a very suitable centre for it after the war comes to an end. It used to be a very considerable trade, with very considerable exports, and it may not be without value to us to secure at least a portion of that trade in the days after the war. . .

The Earl of Munster: . . . Most of the Government's speech has, fortunately, been made by the noble Marquess opposite, and therefore I shall not have to delay the House for any length of time in replying to what I thought were the grossly exaggerated statements made by the noble Lord, Lord Ailwyn. . .

We are fortunate in this House in having with us to-day the noble Viscount, Lord Templewood, who was the British Minister responsible for introducing the policy which allowed these German nationals to come to this country. He at any rate had no hatred for these people, and I am glad to think that I was associated with the noble Viscount as being a member of that Government which supported him in the action which he took.

The noble Lord fears that these Germans in this country were engaged in activities of a dangerous character. Let me see if I can explain to him and to the House exactly what happened at the beginning of the war. As soon as the war broke out the case of each German national in this country was considered by a tribunal or by a regional advisory council, and no one was left at large if there was any reason to think that his liberty would be dangerous to national security and to the State. . .

In this connexion the noble Lord cited the case of Ernst Meissner, which was reported in the Press on March 14-15 last, and the noble Lord read from a newspaper cutting those portions of the case which were likely to catch the public eye. But what is the story of Ernst Meissner? It is not the least difficult of the cases of those German refugees in this country. In fact, he was not a refugee from Nazi oppression at all, but he was a German who was unwilling to fight for the Nazis, and who by impersonating a British soldier or sailor on the field of battle was brought to this country as a prisoner of war. Inquiries were made to confirm certain statements which he had given and his impersonation was discovered. The man was arrested and he is now serving a sentence of imprisonment and has been recommended for deportation. But if it would be any

happiness to my noble friend, let me assure him that the evidence is quite clear. He did no harm whatever to this country while he was at liberty.

The noble Lord went on to ask how many unnaturalised Germans were employed in Government Departments. Let me read to him and to your Lordships a statement which was made by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury on January 26 last. The statement which I shall read is identical, except that I have altered the figures. What did my right honourable friend state? He said:

"Under Defence Regulation 60D aliens may be temporarily employed in the Government service if they possess special qualifications, and there are no suitably qualified British subjects readily available for employment in the post concerned. Specific Treasury consent is required for the employment of an enemy alien in any non-industrial post, and that consent—"

the noble Lord will note that it is only consent to employ—"has been given in the case of eighty-three persons of German nationality, or who are now Stateless but were formerly of German nationality... In some of those cases their employment has already been terminated."

I am not in a position to give the noble Lord the actual number employed to-day, but what I can give him is the information which I have just read out, that the Treasury have given consent from the outbreak of war up to date for eighty-three persons of German nationality to be employed in Government Departments.

Viscount Elibank: Why? I ask the noble Earl, why? What were the reasons? Could they not find suitable British subjects to take their place?

The Earl of Munster: I read out, I thought quite clearly, and I endeavoured to emphasise the point: provided there are no suitably qualified British subjects available. I do not think my noble friend can have been listening.

Now I turn to the question of the B.B.C. I am not able to-day to answer the question which the noble Lord asked me as to what is the position between the B.B.C. and His Majesty's Government. It seems to me to be some distance away from the subject of aliens. The policy of the B.B.C. with regard to the employment of aliens is in accordance with the relaxation rules applied to temporary civil servants in 1941. The noble Lord will notice how careful the Government are on all these questions, and there is no complacency. Aliens are employed by the B.B.C. on a temporary basis provided they possess special qualifications or experience which fit them for the post in question and again that no qualified British labour is available at the time of their employment. Aliens are, however, excluded from certain important posts on the output side: that is to say, editors, sub-editors, language supervisors and switch centres; and in fact they are excluded from many other posts where it is considered imperative that control should be exercised by a British subject and by a British subject only.

(To be concluded)

A Teacher of Art on Simplification

"A number of readers have suggested that it might be possible to simplify the language employed in those parts of the book written for the child. As far as possible this demand has been met. But the author would point out that there are times when simple writing involves the use of words which may convey to the child a general, rather than a specific image of the idea to be apprehended.

The author has found, in his own classes, that the use of a good dictionary and an encouragement to consult with the teacher in moments of real difficulty, have proved adequate to the needs of the average child."

—O. J. Tonks, *Colour Practice in Schools*.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

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

ALSO

The Bankers of London by Percy Arnold.....	4/6
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
The Dangers Inherent in the Proposed Schemes for International Money Units by R. Gaudin...4d. ea.; 3/6 doz.	
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Beveridge-Hopkinson Debate.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Issue: Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation.....1d. each; 3/6 a hundred.	
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.
The Representative's Job.....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.