

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 5.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

When, as in a recent speech by Sir Stafford Cripps, it is suggested that the extended use of "Planning," with a capital, and central control, is the basis of the victory (if there is a victory) over Germany, and that it is thereby demonstrated that "Planning" and Central Control is the magic formula for the Brave New World, there are, we think, two legitimate, alternative conclusions to be drawn, and two only. The first is that the speaker is merely talking to a brief, a habit easy to lawyers, and the second and probably the true one, is that he has no conception of the real meaning of what he is saying.

During the first (1914-1918) phase of this war Russia, a country of 190,000,000 inhabitants was paralysed. Immense quantities of material, as in this latter phase, were supplied to Russia by Great Britain, but were not used. Thanks to the fact that it was under British command, the British Expeditionary Force was not sacrificed, and the Channel ports were held. The populations of France and Great Britain about equalled the Central Powers. It is true, of course, that America inevitably won the war, but she did little of the fighting. Germany was beaten in four years, and would have stayed beaten, if centralised international finance had not been determined that the war should be resumed to impose Central Control on the world.

In the second (1939-194—) phase of the war, Germany is not finally beaten in the sixth year, with a Russia against her which has had the primary object, under totalitarian central control, of preparing for war for over twenty years, a Britain which narrowly escaped the fate of a Central Command under Gamelin, and a United States kicked into the war in 1941. Disregarding "resistance" movements, the major populations arrayed against Germany's eighty millions amount to more than three hundred and eight millions directly, and nearly twice as many indirectly. If Sir Stafford Cripps, or anyone else, claims that even in war, the virtues of unlimited centralisation have been demonstrated, they will claim anything, probable or improbable.

But in fact, it is exactly in those matters in which "planning" is impossible that the key to victory will be found, if anywhere. There has been a spate of verbiage as to the various "turning-points" of the war, but no historian will be found to deny that without the victory of the little band of Fighter pilots over the *Luftwaffe* in 1940, nothing subsequently done by Russia or the United States would have stopped Hitler. Does Sir Stafford Cripps think that victory was due to P.E.P.? Did the Socialists design the Spitfire or the Hurricane?

No one ever knows exactly how much waste and confusion a Socialist state involves because, as in the case of

Russia, everything is done to make comparison impossible and to distort such facts as are available. But the waste of man-power directly due to Government control in this country at the present time probably exceeds that of any previous period in our history. But it is paid waste, so no one complains seriously.

• • •

"The lead in this matter was taken, however, by intellectuals who stood free of the confusion caused by adherence to a gospel. . . . To me, those wholesale murders, and the abject confession of the show victims, brutal and shameful as they were, presented a less dread menace to the march of civilisation than the abdication of moral intelligence by those in other countries who were perfectly free, and whose natural duty it was to judge and condemn them. Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, George Bernard Shaw, Max Lerner, Freda Kirchwey, Henry Morse Lovett, Robert S. Lynd, Heywood Brown, Lillian Wald, Harold Laski, Dorothy Parker, George Soule, Upton Sinclair, H. G. Wells, Vida Scudder, Alice Stone Blackwell, John Kingsbury, Vincent Sheean, Waldo Frank, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, Rev. Hewlett Johnson (Dean of Canterbury), the Rev. Harry F. Ward, Franz Boas, Stephen S. Wise, Albert Einstein. The list is too long to recite, but I want to make it plain that I am talking about real people."

—Max Eastman, *Morals and Politics*.

• • •

The fatuity of Nationalised Managed Money is well illustrated by the procedure adopted in the "acquisition" of coal by the Coal Commission, amusingly referred to as "the Nation."

Private owners of coal inevitably employed mining engineers to survey and check the coal mined, and these surveyors were of course paid by them and represented their interests.

When the Coal Act (1938) legalised the compulsory acquisition of property in coal, at a date which showed remarkable prescience in regard to war prospects, it provided that a claim by the owner should be submitted by a certain date, which ensured that the claim must inevitably be prepared by someone already familiar with the property, *i.e.*, the owner's mining surveyor. To ensure this, further, the expenses of the mining surveyor were provided for by the *Government*.

Obviously, the mining surveyor had nothing further to look for to the private owner whose property he was now about to value; but to relieve him of personal anxiety for his future, he was in many cases transferred to the service of the Coal Commission *after he had made his valuation for the original owner*. No expense spared.

PARLIAMENT

House of Lords: February 27, 1945.

ENEMY AGENTS AND PROPAGANDA

Lord Vansittart rose to ask His Majesty's Government whether they will now begin to consider and devise better means than those which existed before the war to protect this country from the infiltration of enemy agents and propaganda; to make suggestions; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: ... some of the old abuses will begin to start up again when the shooting war is over.

While I am glad to see that the greater part of the refugees and immigrants have behaved very well during this war and have taken no part in politics, there has been a minority which has fought every yard of the road right up to Yalta. And if these things are done in war-time we may expect an aggravation of them in peace-time. Anyhow I submit we should be prepared. As to the remedies they are not so easy to find. I would suggest a few. I know very well that the Home Office may greatly improve upon them and enlarge them if it will give its mind to the subject, and I hope it will. In the first place I would suggest that there should be a fairly drastic revision of the machinery of naturalisation. I do not think that so important a topic should be the whole domain of the Home Office although it must naturally be the dominant department. I think I am right in saying that during the whole of the eight years I was head of the Foreign Office no question of naturalisation was ever referred to me. I never knew what was being done, and mostly I only learnt of accomplished facts perhaps months or years afterwards. In some cases, had I known earlier, I would certainly have objected. I would suggest that we could improve our machinery by remitting matters of naturalisation to an Inter-Departmental Committee presided over of course by a representative of the Home Office and including representatives of the Foreign Office, of the three fighting Services who will have acquired a good deal of experience during the war and before, and I think also representatives of the Board of Education and the Board of Trade.

Secondly, I would suggest that it should not only be made an offence but a very serious offence for any person or body to bring into this country without the licence and authorisation of His Majesty's Government any funds or subsidies for the purposes of politics or propaganda, or indeed for religious, cultural or charitable purposes either. You will be obliged to include those latter categories because otherwise we shall be outwitted by camouflage when the time comes. Some people may urge that that would interfere with the importation of subsidies sent by Allied Governments to Allied bodies. That would not necessarily be the case because the Government would always be able to grant licence and authority. My whole point is that in all these matters it is essential that His Majesty's Government should be aware not only of the fact but of the amount and the purpose of the subsidy. That ought to be disclosed.

Thirdly, it will be necessary to restrict or partially to close as many frontiers as possible until we are better equipped than in pre-war days to deal with post-war undesirables. . .

Lord Ailwyn: My Lords, one always listens to the speeches of the noble Lord with the greatest interest. I have

long admired his dialectical skill, his literary prowess, and, with certain reservations to which I shall refer later, I have found myself in considerable sympathy with his recommendations and his policy generally towards Germany. His Motion this afternoon deals with a vitally important question and one to which we should clearly give our very closest attention. Having been absent from your Lordships' House during the major part of the war and finding myself ill-informed on many matters, I have lately taken pains to acquaint myself, in so far as it is possible for a private individual to acquaint himself, with the situation regarding enemy aliens and refugees in this country with special reference to their conditions of entry, the restrictions under which they live and the precautions taken to prevent or discover any action taken or meditated by them which would be detrimental to the safety of the Realm—in other words, subversive activity.

I find that there are some 40,000 Germans and something in the nature of 15,000 to 20,000 Austrians resident in this country to-day. I am told that the great majority of these were admitted in the years 1938, 1939 and 1940. On entry they were broadly divided into three categories. Group A were interned forthwith, Group B were subject to suspicion and were to be interned if need arose, Group C were considered harmless. All uninterned aliens have to notify within 48 hours to the local police any change of address or occupation. To put it more realistically, and rather more baldly, one finds that in the middle of the greatest war of history, after five and a half years of fighting for our lives, fighting indeed for the salvation of decency, morality and freedom throughout the civilised world against the most implacable and ruthless enemy the world has even seen, we are content to allow 40,000 of that enemy's nationals to live among us, to set up business in this country, actually to work in our Government Departments and, generally speaking, to enjoy every facility that the State has to offer. Verily, my Lords, we are a strange and quixotic people.

I am frankly appalled at the potential dangers of the situation. The noble Lords' Motion this afternoon refers to the future dangers of infiltration of enemy agents and propaganda under the conditions existing before the war and existing to-day. But is he satisfied that there are no enemy agents living here to-day in our midst? If he is not so satisfied, does he consider that the measures in existence are sufficient for them to be rounded up? Holding the key position at the Foreign Office that he did for so many years between the two wars he presumably had the closest contact with all the Security Departments and was no doubt consulted on all matters relative to security, although I have noted his remark that as regards naturalisation he was not quite in the picture as he should have been. It will be interesting to know whether he was in the habit of making representations to His Majesty's Government during those years, informing them that he was not satisfied that security regulations were adequate and asking for a tightening up all round.

As for propaganda, the noble Lord is in a peculiarly strong position to assess the actual and potential dangers of this insidious form of activity through his connexion, as I understand it, with a German organisation in this country named "The Fight for Freedom Publishing Company, Limited" and his collaboration with its German director—a connexion upon which, as I have given notice to the noble

Lord, I shall venture to make a few remarks in a moment or two. Most of your Lordships are probably aware of the fact that there are many German-run organisations which are now established in London. I have the names of many of them here, but I will not weary your Lordships by enumerating them. Suffice it to say that they come broadly under two main groups—The Free German Movement and the German Social Democratic Party. The majority of the other organisations are affiliated in one way or another with one or other of these main groups.

Now I am not foolish enough to suppose that among these 40,000 Germans in Britain to-day there are not many perfectly harmless, genuinely unfortunate people, living quietly and inoffensively in the country which has given them refuge. On the contrary, I am quite sure that there are many decent, peace-loving folk among them. But we are living in a period of total war, locked in a death grapple with the most cruel and savage enemy the world has ever seen—an enemy guilty of the most abominable horrors and unmentionable obscenities and bestialities that the mind of man can conceive. We are approaching, as we believe and hope, the end of the actual fighting in the field, but nobody in his senses, I suggest, can contemplate a sudden cessation of danger and conflict upon the score of the "Cease Fire" alone. Rather is it probable that we shall be entering upon a period requiring the utmost vigilance and the maximum of precaution in a world of anarchy, peopled by the hungry, the homeless and the despairing. No relaxation of precautionary measures will be possible, as I see it, for many many months—if not years—after the armistice, if, indeed, there turns out to be such a thing as an armistice at all. To have 40,000 Germans living in our midst, in the circumstances, is, I suggest, a very grave responsibility which has been shouldered by His Majesty's Government.

Whatever the precautions, however efficiently and tirelessly the security people and the Police carry out their work, a risk, an avoidable risk, and, in my view, an unjustifiable risk is being taken, and has been taken all these years, in the non-internment of all German nationals. No lesser measure is commensurate with the dangers which we have been fortunate enough to survive and those still to be surmounted. There is no great hardship in internment. At least there need be none. We want nothing in the nature of concentration camps as practised by our enemy in Germany and, until recently, in the occupied countries. What I am suggesting is a perfectly humane but complete efficient restraint. Why is it that we are harsher with our own people than we are with our enemies? It seems quite fantastic to me. We incarcerate our own men and women under Regulation 18B, if the Minister for Home Security has reason to think that the safety of the realm is imperilled by their being at large. I make no complaint of that, for I am one of those who think that it is necessary in a war such as this to arm the Government with some such powerful instrument for the better preservation of the safety of the community.

Why, then, are we so kind and considerate to the Germans? It does not make sense to me. I know an elderly English lady, residing in the country, who is unfortunate enough to be married to an Italian. The husband was recalled to Italy shortly before the war. This lady—as patriotic a person as anyone in the country—when I last visited her, was living under duress, with instructions to report at intervals to the local police, and unable even to go

to London for the day without a special police permit. Imagine the anguish of that to a patriotic English woman. I do not know if there has been any relaxation in this particular case since the capitulation of Italy. Truly we are a queer people. Can any of your Lordships conceive of a situation in Germany with 40,000 Britishers living at large in that country during a world war? Can you conceive of seventeen of those Britishers working at the German Admiralty, four at the German War Office, two at the German Air Ministry and more, to the number of sixty-six in full time employment in other Government Departments? The mind boggles at such a situation. But that is the position of Germans living in this country to-day. I care not whether they are Stateless, naturalised or of German nationality—I do not care what their qualifications may be. Any alien of German birth should have been rigidly excluded from all Government Departments and, in my view, while we are fighting for our lives, they should have been interned.

I understand that at the time of Dunkirk there was a general internment of all German aliens, but that subsequently many of them were released on condition that they joined the Pioneer Corps. Some of these, later, fell sick and were discharged. I am told that they were not re-interned and are now back living at large. I think I am right in saying that during the last war no Germans were allowed to join the Armed Forces, and that the vast majority of them were interned for the duration. Why are we prepared to run risks to-day which we were unwilling to run thirty years ago? And, apart altogether from the security aspect—your Lordships will pardon this digression—what is going to be the reaction of our own fighting men when, in due course, they return for demobilisation and re-entry into civil life, and find countless Germans firmly established in business in this country. Have the Government got this particular angle of the subject in their minds? One only hopes that the prospect of full employment for our own men and women is not going to be jeopardised by the retention of these aliens in this country for one day longer than necessary once hostilities are ended.

Finally, I would say this. The noble Lord, Lord Vansittart, has long been accepted by the British people as the leader of the Anti-German Movement in this country. We are accustomed to listen to his speeches and to read his books and articles, emphasising the German danger and the need for doing this and that, so that we shall never again be caught napping or be hoodwinked. He has powerful support from both the Press and the public. Personally I have been a willing disciple of his, and can trace my own thorough distaste for everything German largely to his teaching. But doubts have been expressed, doubts which I for one largely share, as to the wisdom of certain points in the announced policy of his "Win the Peace" movement, in particular those points advocating certain approved loans for Germany and the acquisition by Germany of commercial planes after the war. Many of us, in the light of our experience after the last war, gravely disapprove of such policies. This is not, of course, the occasion to debate such a matter. My point is not that one dislikes such a policy but that it appears to run counter to all the noble Lord's warnings and teachings and, what is far worse, it is being attributed in certain quarters to the influence of the Stateless German whom I mentioned earlier in my speech, with whom the noble Lord is said to be collaborating. In view

(Continued on page 7)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

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

One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

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

Vol. 14. No. 5.

Saturday, April 7, 1945.

Die Partei in England

The professional politician is distinguished by high competency in an odious task from the amateur politician, who, up to now, has displayed sheer incompetency in a task in itself commendable enough, the task of getting the better of professionals. Why we should regard the same game as odious when seen from one side and commendable when seen from the other ought not to need explanation. The reason is that politicians are *elected*, and the notion that sane *electors* would *elect* (which means *choose*) someone to diddle them is absurd. To be merely a highly competent diddler is odious; to be highly competent in thwarting the diddler isn't.

A far larger number of electors is conscious of the diffi-

THE SIZE OF CIVIL SERVICE WHICH
SUITED THE BANK OF ENGLAND IN
1931 WILL SUIT US NOW

REFUSE TO VOTE FOR ANY CANDIDATE
WHO DOES NOT PUT THE REDUCTION
OF THE CIVIL STAFFS TO 20% BELOW
THE 1931 FIGURE as THE FIRST ITEM ON
HIS AGENDA

Pay them if necessary: but don't pay them to
put Great Britain in irons

THE POWER OF THE BUREAUCRACY
MUST BE REDUCED

culty now than has ever before been the case; but there is, as yet, little evidence that more than a negligible proportion of them know what to do about it. The British electorate is now confronted with *Die Partei* transplanted to British soil; and does not know how to handle it.

The talk is all of 'disfranchisement,' without there being any clear recognition that a man's being able to vote for one of any number you like of candidates who all entertain the same policy, and not to be able to vote for an alternative (and any alternative) policy *is* to be disfranchised.

Quite naturally, this perception of the need for 'enfranchisement' is clearest among those who have been best

trained in politics during the war years, namely the doctors. They have repudiated the policy of 'Nationalisation,' but, because of their failure to control the agenda of their 'representatives,' they see themselves already sold to the Minister through the back door of methods, and threatened with a choice between Mr. Churchill as the arch planner and socialiser of their profession or the leaderless Socialists in an undistinguishable rôle.

If nothing else did, the doubts cast by *The Economist* on Mr. Churchill's meaning should warn them not to waste time in idle speculation. Mr. Churchill might "stop using phrases that mean the opposite of what they say." He might be quite correctly paraphrased as saying, "Never was there a time when so much was planned and projected with so little hope of being turned from paper into action." (Both suggestions are from *The Economist* of March 24). Whether Mr. Churchill is "papering over his own and everybody else's lack of general principles" (*The Economist* again), or whether he isn't, the course of action before both the doctors and the public is the same, namely to assert their own principles and enunciate a policy, even if it is only a negative policy.

Admittedly, it would be an awkward bridge to cross, when the election comes, to find that whether the elector walks on the Right or keeps to the Left the bridge leads straight to an entanglement he does not wish to enter. If he should find himself in that predicament, whatever else there might remain for him to do, crossing his bridge at all will not serve his purpose. The point is, however, that he has not reached this bridge yet, and need not reach it if he will but take his bridges one at a time and as he comes to them. It is to discourage him from doing this that what has now come to be well-known as 'the inevitability technique' was elaborated. It is, apparently, a real albeit an absurd, manifestation of British pluck to say, "Since we're going straight to Hell, we may as well go now and get it over." But that's only so for electors. Politicians have another way, namely, "You wait and see where we're going: we haven't got there yet." Their certainty of the correctness of their strategy (from their point of view) is in no way better shown than in their sensitiveness to any sign of a disposition among the electors to imitate it. The first bridge for electors is therefore repudiation of the 'chosen' policy and clear enunciation of their own.

MACDONOUGH'S SONG

Whether the State can loose and bind
In Heaven as well as on Earth:
If it be wiser to kill mankind
Before or after the birth—
These are matters of high concern
Where State-kept schoolmen are;
But Holy State (we have lived to learn)
Endeth in Holy War.

• • •
Whatsoever, for any cause,
Seeketh to take or give,
Power above or beyond the Laws,
Suffer it not to live!
Holy State or Holy King—
Or Holy People's Will—
Have no truck with the senseless thing.
Order the guns and kill!
—Rudyard Kipling (1912).

Marshes of Invasion (II)

Poland. The early Polish kingdom was unique in its possession of a Parliament which had grown organically out of the Slavonic tribal system. At the general assemblies of the Slavonic tribes, all the members met and decided their affairs according to the principle of unanimity. By the sixteenth century the Kingdom of Poland had developed a full-fledged parliamentary system consisting of King (elective) Senate (higher nobles) and the General Sejm (nobles and gentry). No legislation was valid if one member objected, or vetoed it (*liberum veto*). The custom that the King could introduce 'nothing new' (*nihil novi*) became the law of the land in 1505. The towns played little or no part in the deliberations of Parliament.*

There was obviously something here which deserved the attention of planners of 'city-states.' The Crusades had 'persecuted' the Jews of Western Europe eastwards and the bulk of them had settled in the Kingdom of Poland. 'Rejoice Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' were the kind of inscriptions found on early Polish coins, and this "proves conclusively"† that "Jews were already in the reign of Mieczyslaw III in charge of the coinage of Great and Little Poland." Three years after the Federation of Poland and Lithuania at Lublin in 1569 an appointed of Solomon Ashkenazi—who was the Sultan's Foreign Minister and Prince of Exiled Jewry—ascended the throne of Poland. The continued election of foreign, mostly German, princes, and the penetration of the Jews into the country villages where they became lease-holders and factors of the nobility, are steps of the descent towards the first partition of 1772 carried out by Prussia (Frederic the 'Great' was financed by Messrs. Itzig, Ephraim and Co.) by Austria (The Empress Maria Theresa detested the Jews but her legislation concerning them is held up as a model by Jewish writers) and by Russia (under Catherine the Great, a German princess, 'a broader conception of the rights of the Jews obtained'). As a result of the first partition the White Russian territory with its vast Jewish population was annexed by Russia. The statement 'that notwithstanding Catherine's liberal ideas the perplexing Jewish question in Russia originated at the time of the first partition of Poland'‡ leaves no room for doubt that there is the most intimate connection between the Polish tragedy and the Jewish Question. The second partition of Poland coincided with the beginning of that restrictive anti-Jewish Czarist legislation which gradually built up the Chinese wall of the modern 'Pale,' as real to a people whose only fatherland is the Law, the Talmud, as though it had been built of stone. As partition succeeded partition, the unfortunate Gentiles of Poland followed their Jewish 'minorities' into the 'Russian' Captivity, and a superficial community of interests was created between them. But from the outset there were differences. The Jew could get out of his 'Pale' by giving up his membership of the synagogue and by joining certain guilds, etc., and his captivity was at an end. There were prosperous Jewish communities in all the large Russian cities who would welcome, on conditions, a persecuted brother from the 'Pale'. But what

*cf. *The Social Crediter*, January 6, 1945: 'It must be obvious to anyone not bemused by the current manias, that a State merely requires a few massive and generally agreed laws, only changed after the greatest consideration and deliberation.'

†*Jewish Encyclopaedia: Poland.*

‡*Jewish Encyclopaedia: Russia.*

appeared to the Yiddish-speaking population of Poland as the 'freedom' of Moscow, Odessa and St. Petersburg seemed to the gentile Pole as ignominious exile. The patriotic dream of the restoration of the ancient Polish Kingdom (which had kept the towns in their place) differed widely from that of the Ghetto Jews who yearned for their eternal City of God. They had associates and sympathisers in many and unexpected quarters. At the early meetings in London of the First International, attended by Karl Marx and representatives of British Masonry, the resurrection of independent Poland was a standing item of the agenda.

During the first phase of the present war, the gentile and Jewish sections of Russian-dominated Poland once again appeared to the world as brethren in misfortune. Members of the same families fought each other on the Eastern front, and the war ravaged the cities and countryside of Poland. But once again there were differences. As the Czarist armies were slowly driven eastwards the Russian High Command, traditionally anti-Jewish, and disinclined to tolerate a proverbially treacherous element of the population just in the rear of their armies, ordered wholesale deportations of the Jews from the northern sector of the Pale to the south. These deportations often degenerated into pogroms, and the ghettos were pillaged and sacked by the gentile populations.

M. Paléologue, the last French Ambassador to the Court of St. Petersburg, reports in his *Memoirs** a conversation with a financier of the Warsaw district, in June 1916:—"The problem of Poland means more than one surprise in store for those who have to negotiate the peace. It is the habit to look at this problem from the national point of view only...but when the hour for practical decisions arrives, you will see two factors of vital importance stand out in the very foreground, the factor of socialism and the Jewish factor...the manufacturing districts of Sosnowice, Tomaszov, Dombova, Lublin, Radaom, Zgierz, are developing with extraordinary rapidity. The proletariat is very strongly organised in those regions...it has not the slightest interest in the historic visions of the great Polish patriots. In the approaching resurrection of Poland it sees nothing but an opportunity of realising its economic and social programme...Nor will the Jews fail to play a great part. They share the views of the Polish social-democracy, but they also have a special and exclusively Jewish organisation; they will act as a Jewish proletariat...all the Polish ghettos are hotbeds of anarchy."

This forecast proved accurate. At the Peace Conference the deep-lying differences at once made themselves felt. It is now obvious that the Versailles States, like the pre-fabricated houses we are promised, were not designed to last more than a specified number of years. From the outset 'democratic' Poland was a House Divided. Dr. Emil Dillon, for 20 years *Daily Telegraph* correspondent at St. Petersburg, wrote in his "Paris Peace Conference" p. 67:—"The head of the Polish delegation, Roman Dmowski, a picturesque and forcible speaker...appeared at the Conference under all the disadvantages that could be heaped upon a man who had incurred the resentment of the most powerful international body of modern times. He had the misfortune to have the Jews of the world as his adversaries!...As the Hebrew population of Poland, dis-

*Maurice Paléologue: *An Ambassador's Memoirs*. London, 1924. Vol. II.

believing in the resurrection of that nation, had long since struck up a cordial understanding with the States that held it in bondage, the gifted author of a book on the 'Foundations of Nationalism' ... was regarded by the Hebrew elements of the population as an irreconcilable enemy... In the United States where the Jewish community is numerous and influential M. Dmowski found spokes in his wheel at every stage of the journey and in Paris, too, he had to full-front a tremendous opposition."

Mr. Lloyd George, surrounded by the Mondes, Samuels, Isaacs and Sassoons, was, as always, on the side of the Big Battalions of Internationalism and opposed to true nationalism. Dr. Dillon says, (p. 161):—

"As the British Premier was not credited with any profound or original ideas about the severing and soldering of East European territories, the authorship of the powerful and successful opposition to the allotment of Danzig to Poland was rightly or wrongly ascribed not to him but to what is euphemistically termed 'International Finance,' lurking in the background, whose interest in Poland was obviously keen, and whose influence on the Supreme Council was believed to be far-reaching. The same explanation was currently suggested for the fixed resolve of Mr. Lloyd George not to assign Upper Silesia to Poland without a plebiscite... the Premier's wish was opposed by the official body of experts appointed to report on the matter... thereupon the personnel of the commission was changed—and the Prime Minister finally won his point."

Dr. Dillon, who was present at the Peace Conference, noticed furthermore that France's plan "was to make of Poland a wall between Germany and Russia," while the other two Conference Leaders, Lloyd George and Wilson, wanted "to transform it into a bridge between the two countries." In the event it was the 'bridge-builders' who won. In the 'new' Poland there were three million people—10 per cent. of the entire population—belonging to the race which for two thousand years has been building 'bridges' between nations, and what was more natural than they should have demanded, and got, a private stairway leading from their 'material' home in Poland to their 'spiritual' habitat at Geneva-New-York-Jerusalem.

"The special Treaty imposed on her obliges her to accord free transit to Allied goods and certain privileges to her Jewish minority; to accept the supervision and intervention of the League of Nations, which the Poles contend mean in their case an Anglo-Saxon-Jewish association." (Dillon: p. 224.)

No election in 'new' Poland (which hastened to erect statues of President Wilson and his *alter ego* Colonel House) could be held on a Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath. The year after Versailles the Judeo-Soviet Government—in whose departments were numerous Jews from the former Polish Pale, invaded Polish territory, the 'Bolshevik' slogan being 'Over the corpse of Poland to world revolution.' As no reinforcements crossed over 'the bridges' from Geneva to Poland the attack had to be repelled in the old-fashioned blood and iron way. The outstanding military figure which emerged from the first Soviet-Polish war was, according to Marshal Foch, General Sikorski.

Very soon there appeared some ugly fissures in the stucco façade of the new Republic. In 1924 the 'Government' obtained emergency powers to enable it to implement

the advice of Sir Edward Hilton Young, acting for the Bank of 'England.' The resulting balanced budgets brought depression and bankruptcies, and the stage was set for the entrance of Marshal Pilsudski, who liquidated the last trappings of constitutionalism. Professor Kemmerer arrived from America with advice from the Washington-Wall Street High Command: a seventy million loan to 'Poland' was 'America's' contribution to the crisis. There was from now on a permanent American economic adviser attached to the Board of the Bank of 'Poland'; and this brings us to the outbreak of the present war.

General Sikorski, who had been in political eclipse during the 'American'-dominated Pilsudski-Beck period, 1926-39, of which he strongly disapproved, became leader of the Polish *émigré* Government established first in Paris, and then in London. His Ministry of Information began in 1940 the publication of a *Polish Fortnightly Review*, and in the same year Sikorski's secretary, Dr. J. H. Rettinger, wrote a book which was 'a concise encyclopaedia of things Polish.' In this official literature an important place is reserved for the treatment of the Jewish Problem. It has a chapter to itself in Dr. Rettinger's book. He quotes Mr. V. Jabotynski, the founder of the New Zionist Organisation as follows: (p. 65):—

"The fundamental cause of the Jewish tragedy does not lie in the fact that the other nations are ill-disposed to us... the essence of the matter is that the Jewish nation (consciously, sub-consciously and unconsciously) has always aimed at social autonomy and for that reason could never adapt itself to any foreign social structure."†

The specifically 'religious' rights which the Jewish administrations—the Cahals—had enjoyed throughout the centuries were confirmed by Presidential Decree in 1927. The *Polish Fortnightly Review* comments: "The stipulations of this decree confer on the Jewish religious communities a competence much broader than that of purely religious activities." To put it briefly the Jews demanded, and got, special rights over and above those enjoyed by their Polish fellow-citizens. How did they use them? Dr. Rettinger says (p. 67):—

"In countries which have a preponderance of agricultural population, the concentration of two-thirds of the Jewish population within the cities and the Jewish ownership of two-thirds of trade and one-fourth of industry and handicrafts cannot but lead to perturbations in the economic structure of the State."

From July 1941 when he entered into an alliance with Soviet Russia in spite of the Soviet Invasion of Polish territory 1939-40 which constituted at the same time the fourth Russo-German partition of Poland, General Sikorski never ceased to demand the release of his compatriots from the Russian concentration camps. The story of his fruitless efforts, culminating in the suggestion that the Red Cross should investigate the Katyn Massacre is well-known, and ably told by Miss Keun, H. W. Henderson‡ and others. The rupture between the Soviet Government and the London Poles took place in April, 1943, as a direct consequence of General Sikorski's legitimate demands. Two months later the Leader of the exiled Polish Government and the General-

†J. H. Rettinger: *All About Poland*, Minerva Publishing Co. Ltd., London, 1940

‡Ten Questions About Poland.

issimo of the Polish armies was killed in an air-crash, after a visit to his troops in the Middle East. The pilot of his plane was W. O. Lewis Zalsberg, a Jew of, presumably, Russo-Polish origin, who was born and bred in the East End of London.

At that moment the German invasion had engulfed the entire 'Pale.' According to the *Polish Fortnightly Review* (September 1, 1941, an issue entirely devoted to the "Legal Position of the Jews in Poland"), the German administration re-introduced many of the Czar's ghetto-regulations for the chief towns of the Pale. The Jews received only half the rations allotted to the gentiles, and all Jews and Jewesses were obliged to wear a distinctive badge bearing that same Star of David which adorns the uniforms of 'Soviet' soldiers and 'American' army-lorries and fighter planes.

But once again invasion was met by counter-invasion and the Soviet armies crossed, for the third time since the 'Peace' of Versailles, the Polish frontiers, this time as 'liberators.' In Soviet Russia there is, as we know, death punishment for anything which can be construed as anti-semitism, and to the inhabitants of the 'German'-created ghettos at least, the Soviet hosts appeared as real deliverers whatever feelings they may have inspired in the breasts of the genuine Poles. The seat of the Moscow puppet-government is Lublin, of 'federation' fame, and from Lublin is at present being broadcast the 'names and addresses of Jewish survivors who desire to contact relatives in other parts of the world.'"* On the other hand: "According to news reaching London from Poland the power rests there in fact in the hands of the Soviet Political Police (N.K.V.D.) Under the cloak of the seemingly Polish administration [Lublin], the N.K.V.D. arrests and deports people." [They demand] "the surrender of all wireless sets and of wireless equipment."†

As in 1939 (and in 1914 and 1772), the Pale in its entirety is ruled by a 'Russian' Police-Bureaucracy. The Curzon-line settlement ensures that this administrative pattern is left undisturbed. The difference between the sway of the White Czar and that of his Red successor is the simple one that during the administration of the former the bulk of the Jews suffered heavy legal disabilities and were at the mercy of the Ochrana, the Czar's secret police, while during the reign of the latter the position is reversed: Jews are everywhere ensconced in positions of bureaucratic irresponsibility while the gentiles have been despoiled of every right to 'Life liberty and the pursuit of happiness.' The gentile has been 'empaled' and his passport depends on an alien police-force: "The strictest police control has been extended to the whole population. No-one is permitted to leave his domicile without a special safe-conduct." B. J.

ACCIDENT OR DESIGN?

"Much of Europe is a heap of rubble with a dispossessed mass of a hurt, despairing humanity aimlessly picking over the ruins. . . So chaotic is continental Europe that it is uncertain whether any of the great political forces now in existence will succeed in controlling. . ."

— *Review of World Affairs*, March 28.

**Hansard*, February 1, 1945.

†*The Weekly Review*, February 8, 1945.

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

of the noble Lord's prominent position in this country this is an unhealthy state of affairs, and may well undermine the faith and the trust of the British public. Doubts develop into suspicions, suspicions into accusations, and there follow public meetings expressing dissatisfaction and concern.

Let me say to the noble Lord, with great respect, that it is no good his being content to ignore these things. It is not enough to wave them aside contemptuously as coming from supremely unimportant persons. An answer is due to the great public who trust him. If the noble Lord is working with this German, no doubt he is entirely convinced of his complete honesty and integrity; but he cannot be sure, he cannot be 100 per cent. certain. We know from the noble Lord's writings and speeches the diabolical cleverness and cunning of German agents. What a superlative triumph if an enemy agent could get himself taken at his face value, worm his way into the confidence of the Anti-German Movement in this country, and contrive to mould and modify their policy by actually becoming a close confidential adviser of, and collaborator with, its leader! If the noble Lord were a private individual, it would be an unwarranted interference and impertinence on my part to question in any way the company he keeps, and I should doubtless receive the snub which would be my due. But the noble Lord is not a private individual; he is a great public figure, and the British public are entitled to know whether their champion and monitor in the Anti-German policy of this country is or is not admitting Germans to his inner councils.

I apologise for the length of my remarks and for an occasional digression from the actual terms of the Motion. My excuse is that I have felt for some time that these things needed saying. I waited in vain for some noble Lord of far greater standing than a humble Back Bencher like myself to make this appeal to the noble Lord. The world has suffered too much at the hands of Germany and her rulers. I should like to see this country purged and cleansed of the Teuton touch. Above all must our Anti-German policy be kept free from any taint of the sinister German touch. I hope that the noble Lord, when he comes to reply, will give the assurance for which I have asked. I have great pleasure in supporting the Motion which he has put before the House. For the reasons I have given, I press the Government to re-examine the question of the internment of German nationals in this country, and I particularly urge the need of their repatriation at the earliest possible moment on the conclusion of hostilities.

Lord Vansittart: My Lords, since I embarked on a career of "anti-Germanity" I have been called a very great number of different names, most of them, I think, unfit for repetition at this moment or in this place, but I always felt that it would be only a matter of time before, as the next crack out of the box, I was called a Moderate, and I think the blow has fallen this afternoon. In claiming my right to reply to the noble Lord, Lord Ailwyn, on the subject, I fear I shall have to take up a little of your Lordships' time, but perhaps the subject-matter may be fairly interesting. There is evidently a great difference between us, and I am glad of the opportunity to make it clear.

I have never said that there is no such thing as a good

German; I have very good reason for knowing the contrary. Before the war, for example, I had some personal contacts with men in key positions who supplied me, not officially but personally, with information of the very highest value. They did that because they knew that I knew the Germans were going to make war, and they thought they would strengthen my hands by feeding me with information from the horse's mouth. Those men took great risks and they got mighty little thanks, except from me. I honour my debts, and I am pleased to do so in public. I mention this because the noble Lord, if I understood him aright, suggested the sweeping internment of 40,000 Germans at a blow. It would have been very rough treatment indeed to give men like that the highly negative reward of internment as a recognition of their services. I do not think that argument can be really seriously sustained.

He went on, I think, to make some further references to Germans in this country at this moment, and he mentioned an organisation called "The Fight for Freedom." Now, during the war—and again I apologise for dwelling on this subject at such length, but it is none of my doing—I have met a few good Germans of another and different category. Perhaps I had better tell the House what I understand by the expression "a good German." By that I mean an Anti-German, a German that is anti-everything that has been done in the field of foreign and military policy by the Second Reich, by the Weimar Republic and by the Third Reich. It is a very simple definition. I have met in the organisation to which he referred a few Germans of that calibre and category. I have met three or four outside, and that I think is about the lot. But it is something to go on with. The noble Lord is wrong, however, in thinking I am a member of that organisation. I am not. It is a Left Wing organisation. He is wrong also in thinking or affirming that it is a German organisation. It is not. The great bulk of its members are composed of leading Socialists among our Allies. The rest are composed of leading members of British trade unions.

Now, all these people, British, Dutch, Norwegians, Belgians, Poles, Czechs, have written a great number of very excellent pamphlets which tear the last shreds of illusion away from the last seventy-five years of German history. I do not think anybody can claim to be fully informed of what went on inside Europe in that period unless they have at least a nodding acquaintance with those writings and, perhaps I might add, some of my own. People of those nationalities know a great deal of the secret history, or rather I should say the inner history, of Europe, for it is no great secret. So do I, and it would be very foolish if I did not, from time to time, keep contact with them all. I think the public has derived some benefit from what we have written in our different spheres. I am rather afraid from what the noble Lord has said that he may perhaps have been paying just a little too much attention to the manoeuvres of certain people who were members of the Anglo-German Fellowship and attenders at rallies and are now trying to cover themselves by a simulacrum of exaggerated Germanophobia. They are running quite true to their old form by endeavouring to discredit anybody who knows a little too much about them. I should have thought that allegation from such highly-tainted sources might have well been disregarded.

The noble Lord also, I think, challenged me on two points in the programme of my movement. He got them,

of course, all wrong. He appeared to think I advocated loans for Germany and commercial planes. I have said exactly the contrary. I have said they should not have any without the consent of the Inter-Allied Governments, and it is highly unlikely they will get them...

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
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.