

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Stella, Marchioness of Reading, (Mrs. Rufus Isaacs), has been appointed by the "Labour" Government a Governor of the "B."B.C.

Waal, waal, waal.

Mr. B. K. Sandwell who said "it would be necessary to bring all the people to a diminution of their loyalty to the Crown" has been appointed a Governor of the "Canadian" Broadcasting Company. My, my.

"It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. . . the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fools' paradise, lapped in a false sense of security, which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idols defence."

—Dr. Arnold Toynbee, Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House).

"... some witnesses holding strategic positions have made the significant statement under oath that they had a loyalty which took priority over the loyalty owed by them to their own country, and for that reason they acted as they did."

—Second Interim Report of the Royal Commission: Espionage and Official Secrets to Russia. *Hansard* (Canada) March 10, 1946.

There is a Canadian Institute of International Affairs which is closely interlocked with the (defunct) League of Nations Union, both of which are Masonic in origin and affiliations, in England and Canada. They have been a major cause of war.

We have received a copy of Bill No. 76 of 1946 of the Alberta Legislature, entitled "An Act Respecting the Rights of Alberta Citizens."

This proposed legislation covers so much ground that it partakes of the nature of an enabling act, and as such, invites comment some of which would of necessity be critical.

We defer this, however, since parts of the Bill are in essence identical with the Legislation disallowed by Mr. Mackenzie King's Federal Government nearly ten years ago, and, unless a fresh tactic is in contemplation, the same fate would appear to be in store for it. Whatever its intrinsic merits, it will form a basis for discussion at a moment when fundamental issues are at stake.

Even those fortunate people who consider matters of serious political import "not quite nice," and much better not discussed, must surely have noticed one simple fact.

It is the kind of fact easily grasped, because it merely involves the ability to recognise a word after you have heard it, or read it, a few dozen times. The word is "Student," and it occurs in almost every report of anti-British, or (what is practically the same thing) Communist-Socialist riots and demonstrations. It would be too much to ask of these fortunate people that they should consider in this connection the stress laid by Communists (and Miss Ellen Wilkinson) on the unimportance of mature humanity, and the unique virtues of inexperienced youth, but they might consider the remarks of Mr. Solon Low in the Canadian House of Commons on March 19, 1946:—

"There seems to have been little difficulty for Communists and others of very doubtful loyalties to secure high, important, and key positions in the Government Service. If we could find out how, we might also find out how so many of their ilk have secured key positions on University staffs. . . It must have struck thousands of Canadian readers as peculiar that so many of the suspects already charged with serious offences were either on the staff of, or were graduates of, McGill University. That is not surprising when I think of some of the heads of that University, and of the fact that for some years back there has been definite information that the institution is a 'red' hotbed."

McGill University is one of the most richly endowed Universities in the world, its patrons being of late years almost exclusively international millionaires. It has derived lustre in the past from the residence there of such famous scientists as Professor Rutherford. Its present Principal is Dr. Cyril James, late of the London School of Economics.

It must be quite evident to any unprejudiced observer that the traditional British sympathy for the under-dog has been twisted, not to the true benefit of the dog, but to the destruction of the British, and the substitution of scorpions for dog-whips.

There is a sense, to which we have referred in reference to Miss Ellen Wilkinson, in which this is "the century of the common man (and woman)" and the results can be seen in Germany and Russia. It is largely the sense referred to by John Buchan as "that degeneration of the democratic theory which imagines that there is a peculiar inspiration in the opinions of the ignorant."

We should much prefer to substitute, in Lord Tweedsmuir's observation, the word "irresponsible" for "ignorant." Ignorance implies a certain blindness to facts, but its anti-thesis has come to mean very much what the American considered to be the domain of political economy "knowin' a whole lot of what ain't so."

Now, whatever may be the theoretical desideratum, it is quite certain that practical politics is committed to making

something which can properly be called democracy into a workable system. Great Britain became great and ninety *per cent.* of its people happy, under a system which was not democracy, and that system has been eaten away by a plot of such scope and subtlety that, like a building whose essential timbers have been infected with dry rot, it is practically impossible to repair the damage without extensive and poisonous fumigation. The analogy is not comprehensive, because British political, economic and social culture was organic, unlike the various "planned" economies. And the dry rot is easily identifiable as being the deadly fungus, power without responsibility. And the cure for this is to be clear and certain that no man has a right to legislate for another *unless he is willing to assume the major penalty of failure.* If he is asked to legislate, as in the case of a doctor who is asked to prescribe, that is another matter.

We are much concerned to notice what appears to be a flagrant transgression of these principles, doubtless from pure inadvertence, in the prominent part assumed by Mr. Manning, the Premier of Alberta in the activities of the Zionists in Edmonton. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that as a private individual, Mr. Manning is the sole judge of his own lawful activities. But as Premier of Alberta, of course, he is not.

The usual strategy is being employed by the CCF (International Socialist) Party, of whom Mr. Elmer Roper is the local leader, to obscure the essential alliance between international finance, international socialism, and supra-national Jewry, and its implacable hostility to, and fear of Social Credit by branding it as "Anti-Semitic." Mr. Roper may not have heard that Arabs are Semites, but Mr. Manning if we are to believe the *Edmonton Bulletin* appears to have allowed himself to be stampeded, and has joined the Canadian Palestine Committee for the furtherance of Zionist aims, an organisation which is properly called anti-Semitic and pro-Judaic, doubtless as an indication of broadmindedness.

There are many aspects of this situation which are of immense importance; but the point on which we wish to concentrate for the moment is that if the support of the Premier of Alberta to the Zionists has no weight, it should be withheld; and if it has, then Mr. Manning is exercising power without responsibility.

It has been well said that a man's judgment can be no better than his knowledge of the facts. While the ammunition of pro and anti-Zionism does tend to be emotional and therefore facile, we can assure anyone who is interested that it is most unlikely that the true implications of the question can be picked up by listening to an itinerant lecturer employed by the "Canadian" Palestine Committee, which incidentally, appears to have close affiliations with the Canadian-Soviet Friendship League.

For the present, we leave the matter there.

A Word of Advice

"Every morning you read your favourite newspaper. It's a good paper in its way. It gives you the news. It gives you very readable views. It tells you what you ought to think—perhaps what you *want* to think.

"Year in, year out, you read your favourite newspaper—or swap it for another that turns out to be not so very different. Of course you take it with a grain of salt. You laugh at its little exaggerations, its sensations, its scoops.

You smile at its political prejudices. Maybe, you even get angry when it writes patronisingly about . . .

"Still, when you're chatting by the fire or arguing over a glass of beer, whose views—whose values—do you find yourself expressing . . ." "Well, you certainly need your daily paper these days. But what about an antidote? . . ."

We should be inclined to commend this material even if it had been written and distributed to increase the circulation of *The Times* (which—"believe it or not"—is not the case).

Yale Buys Estate

Yale University is reported to be entering the N.Y.C. real estate market "at its flood-tide . . . with a score or so of millions" and to be "in plain favour for the Marxist fallacies" at the same time. Another way of ensuring that, whoever owned the land, the staff and students of Yale didn't, would be to tax it.

The Tate Gallery

After creating a scene at the re-opening of the Tate Gallery last week, Mr. Frank Emanuel, 81 year old Vice-President of the Society of Graphic Art explained, "these works violate nature; they violate art and craftsmanship. I made a similar protest against the exhibition of Picasso's and Matisse's works at the Victoria and Albert Museum recently." The works he complained of were by the French artists Rouault and Braque, exhibited under the auspices of the British Council, La Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles and L'Association Française d'Action Artistique.

Archbishop of Liverpool on Foreign Affairs

Dr. Downey, Archbishop of Liverpool, addressed a large meeting in the Piction Hall, Liverpool, on April 11, under the auspices of the Catholic Social Guild. The *Liverpool Daily Post* of the following morning did not, so far as we could discover, print a report, and reports from other sources are not yet to hand. Since the address appears to have carried the discussion of the Church's attitude to an international organisation a stage further, a fragmentary report is undesirable, and we reserve comment at least until it may have been possible to study closely the Archbishop's actual words.

One opinion expressed was that "The main liberties of the Subject should be embodied in every national constitution."

Where Is It?

It is well known to those who are more or less professionally concerned with verifying their references that a wide range of books is available for their purpose. Such sources are less well-known to others whose interests have been different. Most public libraries possess the following:

The Encyclopædia Britannica.

The Annual Register, a register, published annually, of the events of allegedly chief interest or importance.

The Dictionary of National Biography (with additions).
Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable—a classic.

Burton Stevenson's Book of Quotations, 1934.

The Almanac de Gotha.
 Minerva, a directory of the world's certificated.
 The Directory of Company Directors.
 The Statesman's Year-book.
 Cruden's Concordance with the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha.
 Roget's Thesaurus (a list of English words arranged according to their meanings, instead of in the order of their initial letters: amusing to read, but not of much use, for 'it draws the venturesome to be solicited to snatch from the wrong filigree'—or, as we should say, 'it leads the unwary to be persuaded to pick from the wrong basket'.)

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, April 2, 1946.

**INTERNATIONAL FUND AND BANK
 (SAVANNAH CONFERENCE)**

Lieut.-Colonel Nigel Birch asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he has any statement to make on the meeting of the World Bank and Fund at Savannah.

Mr. Norman Smith asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has received a report from the British delegation to the meeting at Savannah, Georgia, at which the World Bank and World Fund were set up; and will he make a statement thereon.

Mr. H. Morrison: I will circulate a statement with the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Following is the statement:

I am glad to be able to tell the House that the new twin institutions, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, were duly inaugurated at the first meeting of the Boards of their Governors, which took place at Savannah, Georgia, from 8 to 18 March under the Chairmanship of the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, Mr. Vinson, who is U.S. Governor of both institutions. The United Kingdom Governor is Lord Keynes. The five countries having the largest quotas (or subscriptions), which, in the absence of Russia, are the U.S.A., the United Kingdom, France, China and India, are entitled to nominate their own executive directors. The United Kingdom executive directors have not yet been appointed. The other member countries are entitled to elect seven executive directors between them for each institution. The elections held at Savannah resulted as follows:

For the Fund, Mr. Rasminsky (Canada), Dr. Bruins (Netherlands), Mr. Mladek, (Czechoslovakia), M. Gutt (Belgium), Zaki Bey Saad (Egypt), Mr. Santos Filho (Brazil) and Mr. Gomez (Mexico); for the Bank, Mr. Bryce (Canada), Mr. Beyen (Netherlands), Mr. Baranski (Poland), M. Gutt (Belgium), Mr. Varvaressos (Greece), Mr. Moller (Chile) and Mr. Machado (Cuba).

It has been provided that the executive directors shall meet and take office about May 1 next, when it is hoped to proceed with the election of a managing director of the Bank and a president for the Fund, who will thereafter proceed to the appointment of other staff. Especially in the case of the Bank it is important that the necessary preliminaries to active operation should be completed as soon as possible, so that the institutions can play their intended part in assisting the problems of world reconstruction.

Decisions were taken as to their site, which, at the

request of the United States, will be at Washington, and also as to the functions and remuneration of the executive directors. Denmark was admitted to both bodies and her quota fixed. The main work of the meetings was concerned with the organisation of the institutions, so that all necessary powers would have been accorded to the executive directors to enable them to proceed at the earliest possible date to bring the institutions into active operation.

It was also decided that the first annual meeting of the governors should take place in September of this year. Meanwhile a Procedure Committee of twelve governors has been set up under the chairmanship of the Governor for the United States and the vice-chairmanship of the governor for the United Kingdom, to be available until the next annual meeting for consultation about the future business of the governors at the discretion of the Chairman, normally by correspondence, and also, if it proves convenient, by convening immediately before the annual meeting.

Although the main work of the meetings was thus concerned with organisation, a gathering of this kind of the financial experts of many countries provided a most useful opportunity for informal exchanges of views on many of the problems confronting the countries represented at the meetings. From the reports of the Conference, which the members of the British Delegation have given me, it is clear that the cause of international cooperation over the economic and financial field has been considerably helped forward by the atmosphere and outcome of this Conference.

I intend shortly to issue a White Paper containing the bye-laws of the two institutions and other significant votes passed by the conference.

April 3, 1946.

BRITISH BASES (CONTROL)

Mr. Emrys Hughes asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is now prepared to place all British naval, military, and air bases in the Mediterranean and elsewhere under international control; and if he will submit such proposals to an early conference of U.N.O.

Mr. Bevin: The future organisation of international security under the United Nations is the subject of Article 43 of the United Nations Charter. In accordance with the directive issued by the Security Council, the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations is at present studying the detailed arrangements required to give effect to the broad provisions in Article 43.

April 4, 1946.

GLASS

Mr. Hobson asked the Minister of Works the production of sheet and plate glass for the periods January, 1945, to January, 1946, and January, 1938, to January, 1939, by manufacturers in Britain; and the number of firms engaged therein.

Mr. Tomlinson: The production of sheet and plate glass in the calendar years 1938 and 1945 in terms of square feet was as follows:

		Sheet.	Plate.
1938	110,737,830	17,701,100
1945	203,624,550	20,187,400

Only one firm is engaged in this production.

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. 16. No. 7.

Saturday, April 20, 1946.

'Gospel'

We think we understand the intention of a reader of *The Social Crediter* who says that readers generally believe that everything which appears in its pages is 'gospel'.

In these days any reader anywhere ought to be thankful if he could (rightly) believe that anything which appears in any paper is 'gospel,' and satisfied if he is (again rightly) assured that he knows which bit of which paper is deserving of the flippant yet sufficiently descriptive epithet.

But we are counselled to make it clear which bits (according to at least our opinion) are 'gospel,' unless we are so rash as to encourage the excess of faith attributed to 'readers generally.' We aren't. We appreciate the difficulty. Indeed we appreciate many difficulties, and if they do not depress us it must be that we are not depressable. Obviously, without making confusion worse confounded, we cannot label every paragraph with an indication of the exact number of marks we think it should earn in the 'gospel' stakes. We say so, with a recollection, of spring-time freshness, concerning our predicament, in days bygone, days of unmeliorated severity, if we altered a comma of our valued contributor's sentence. And sometimes (the dead past, this) we did more than alter a comma: and, moreover we are only speaking of our valued contributor in the singular because of our appreciation of our enormity, giving due consideration to our offences one at a time. In matters of arithmetic, it may be permissible to cross out a four where there is a two in the copy, and so when things are axiomatic editorial dictatorship may be unaccompanied by the attendant evils we still ascribe to dictatorships of all kinds terrestrial. Social Credit has already done a great deal to what is vaguely called 'thought,' and we are not sure that one of the things it has done is not to extend the sphere of the axiomatic. Or perhaps this is only something seen anew in the stronger illumination in which we are now wont to examine things. In any case it has recently been observed that a great many things the world is prone to accept as axiomatic are not axiomatic. On the other hand, there is correspondingly a variation in the number of axioms which members of the community, and even members of the Social Credit movement, are prepared to recognise. To coin a phrase, these, it seems to us, may be called instances of the 'pragmatically axiomatic.' Recognition of their axiomatic nature depends upon clear and conscious understanding of the meaning of the terms. But even to say that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another is not axiomatic unless both the sayer and the hearer understands the signification of 'equal'—and of the other words as well. So perhaps there is not much in our notion that we have enlarged the sphere of the axiomatic. We are aware that some things are true, and we are also aware that some true things are

complex at least in regard to the means available for representing them. We have grown up, and more and more the world of our interest is an adult's world, not an adolescent's. A constant feature accompanying growth in living things is differentiation. And, for our present purpose, differentiation affects the progress of even our contributors towards a recognition of even truths which concern us very nearly. And so, we cannot 'line them up' any longer. We can say (but rarely, without doing more harm than good) "This is not our opinion." We can (and we do) omit references to views altogether which we believe to be harmful or unsound; but when we do print what seems to us worthy of distribution, we feel bound to print all of it, while reserving the right to prompt the better nature of contributors concerning the smaller matters of the law.

What is signed in *The Social Crediter* is the opinion of the man who writes it, and we give it currency because we believe it deserves currency. What is unsigned is either the policy of the Secretariat (an organisation formed to distribute Major Douglas's advice and to assist the application of it), or is attributed matter published for the information of our readers and to direct their attention to matters which might suitably occupy it, to increase their effectiveness in line with what we understand to be their policy as well as ours.

Degradation

"It was the boast of the citizens of Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, that before the war their city had the highest production of books per head of the population of any town of Europe, and hence, presumably, in the world. Besides their own authors and poets, the best of the world's classics, particularly the classics of English literature, were translated into the Slovene tongue. Book production was outstanding, and the bookbinder's craft of an excellence comparable with that of the oldest centres of European culture. The nation itself, largely peasant, claimed almost no illiteracy, and in many farmers' homes can be seen the type of book which one would sooner expect to find on the shelves of the scholar. Since the war the story is different. During the latter half of 1945 there were virtually no books produced. This cannot be attributed to war damage. . . It is due to the fact that the Government has been acquiring, by fair means or foul, every printing press in the city, as well as all stocks of printing paper. . ."—*The Tablet*, March 30.

Byres Before Houses

Plans have been approved by Ayr County Council for the construction of a new byre and dairy at Monktonhill Farm, Ayr, belonging to the Scottish C.W.S. Estimated cost is £27,000, a building licence having already been granted. The council are remonstrating against the granting of a licence for work involving such a sum, for work other than housing, without prior consultation with them.

—*The Farmer and Stockbreeder*, April 2.

AD GUSTUM

The New Statesman and Nation in the issue of April 13, records the qualities (*sic*) it would commend in the persons of Governors for the "B" B.C., and complains of those appointed. . . "they are safe, colourless and eminently respectable."

Vansittartism

The following are further extracts from the Debate in the House of Lords on March 12 on Provisions for Security. The speaker followed Lord Vansittart (*The Social Crediter*, April 13, 1946). Lord Ailwyn, supporting the Motion said:—

I think the House is indebted to the noble Lord for bringing to your Lordships' notice these supremely important matters. His eloquence, as usual, makes it difficult for those who follow him. My interest and concern in this matter of security have led me on two former occasions in the last twelve or thirteen months to submit certain information and put certain proposals before your Lordships. On both occasions the country was still in the grip of total war, and the measures which I then ventured to advocate for the better security of the community are to-day mercifully no longer applicable. My protest, which I am reluctantly compelled to repeat to-day, against the employment of considerable numbers of German nationals in our Government Departments and in other walks of our public life, brought upon my luckless head a storm of disapproval from the Liberal Benches when the noble Marquess, Lord Reading, whom I am glad to see in his place, poured scorn upon the views which I then expressed and with great eloquence and a somewhat caustic wit, vigorously assailed me for my lack of charity towards those Germans resident in this country. It was a brilliant performance displaying great histrionic qualities, as it was empowered only—

The Marquess of Reading: What does the noble Lord mean by "histrionic"—that it was put on?

Lord Ailwyn: The word "histrionic" is one which the noble Marquess will understand as well as I do. It struck me as being empowered by this histrionic quality, and certain misrepresentations and distortions of what was actually said. The difference between us, of course, was fundamental. The argument for the alien was being most ably expounded in that quarter of the House while I was more interested in putting the case of this country, of the Englishman. My Lords, I still am. I should like to ask the noble and learned Lord who sits on the Woolsack why it is necessary to-day for numbers of un-naturalised Germans to be employed in our Government Departments. I am aware that Defence Regulation No. 60D authorises their temporary employment if, firstly, they have special qualifications and if, secondly (and this is the point I would particularly stress), no suitably qualified British subjects are readily available. Well, it is conceivable, of course, that during the war, with its immense call on man-power, there were not readily available sufficiently qualified British subjects. But to-day, with demobilisation in full swing, can it possibly be said that that situation still exists? I am most anxious not to overstate this case, and I readily admit that from the point of view of security to-day the employment of these Germans is not of such importance as it might have been if war was still being waged.

From a long-term point of view, I ask your Lordships to consider whether it is wise, with the world in its present unsettled state, and whether it is fair and just to our own people that foreigners and ex-enemy German nationals in particular should be employed in our public service? It may well be that we shall hear from the Government that there is no intention of retaining this Defence Regulation 60D for very much longer. It certainly is very difficult to understand why it should not be repealed forthwith. I should be most

grateful if the Lord Chancellor would give the House some information on this matter. I went into very considerable detail and invited your Lordships and the Government to consider the matter last May. The only satisfaction I received from the Government spokesman was a series of waspish remarks accusing me of making grossly exaggerated statements and of raising a hare. He then made the suggestion that the matter should not be brought up for discussion in your Lordships' House, and then finally made to me the improper request that I should refrain from bringing up this question again.

The Earl of Munster: In the usual terms.

Lord Ailwyn: I beg your pardon?

The Earl of Munster: If the noble Lord had read the concluding remarks of what I said last May, he would observe that what I told him then was that he should not bring up the same question again with the same remarks he employed on that occasion. I have no reason to withdraw now and I certainly have no intention of doing so.

Lord Ailwyn: The noble Earl might wait until I ask him to withdraw. Ever since I have had the honour of being a member of your Lordships' House I have tried not to make exaggerated statements. I am far happier sitting in my place and imbibing the wisdom, gathering the pearls which form from your Lordships' lips—some of them. But when I am moved to leave my safe refuge and rise to address your Lordships, I try to be objective and to have my facts well documented. I do hope the noble Earl, Lord Munster, may be disposed to agree in retrospect that the emission of slang is not the happiest way of replying in Parliamentary debate, and incidentally that your Lordships' House is a very suitable and proper forum for these matters of security to be discussed. The noble Earl at the end of that debate remarked to me "Depend upon it, when you are met with rudeness in a Government reply you may be sure you have got under their skin." My Lords, I would not like to get under anybody's skin; it sounds a most uncomfortable performance!

What I am concerned to do is to bring to the notice of the Government of the day a situation which is distasteful to people of this country. I was assured on that former occasion—and indeed in February, 1945, when I first raised this question—that the employment of aliens in Government Departments would never prejudice the employment of our own people. I have to say that information which has come my way, entirely unsolicited and unsought by me, appears on the face of it to refute that assurance. So I am left in that sore state of perplexity in this matter to which 2,000 years ago Pontius Pilate gave expression when he cried "What is truth?" Because of that perplexity and because of my real disquiet in this matter, I do ask for a very solemn assurance from His Majesty's Government that the most searching vigilance may be applied and observed in this matter, to see that under no conditions whatever the employment of these aliens and ex-enemy aliens shall ever be allowed to prejudice the employment of our own people. I am persuaded that none of your Lordships will under-estimate the importance of this matter.

Before passing to my next point, I want to register a mild protest at the unsatisfactory form of reply one gets from the Government to a straight question. I asked a week or two ago the same question that was asked in another

place in January, 1945, and asked by me last May, to wit: "How many unnaturalised Germans are employed in our Government Departments?" The same stereotyped form of reply was given on both former occasions, the only difference being the numbers quoted. Those numbers, by the way, progressively increased. In January, 1945, the figure was 66; in May, 1945, it was 83; and in February, 1946, it was 97. One wonders why. The Treasury, appearing anxious to cover itself, did not say that ninety-seven are actually employed but said "Consent has been given in the case of ninety-seven persons of German nationality." To make it still more disingenuous and evasive they said, "In some of these cases employment has been terminated." That is what I call a rather tortuous reply and I ask the Government if in future we may have a straight, plain answer to a plain question. There is a further point I wish to put before the House which is exercising many other minds besides my own. Is it wise or desirable, that large numbers of aliens and Germans in particular, should be allowed to change their names to British names? What are the qualifying conditions governing these changes, these metamorphoses? You meet a Mr. Shaw and find that yesterday he was Herr Schwabacher, or a Mr. Graham who was Herr Steinberger or Mr. Ian Stewart Menzies who yesterday was Herr Hans Menzinger.

The Earl of Munster: No, no.

Lord Ailwyn: The noble Earl says no. I can repeat the names. With Germany's record as fresh in our memory as it is—and as for our better security I hope it may so long remain—it does seem to me, in spite of one remark in the admirable speech of the noble Lord, Lord Lindsay, last Thursday, an intolerable position. There was only one point on which I disagreed with Lord Lindsay and that was when he said that one of the greatest qualities of the English is that they have short memories. It is one of their greatest qualities that they do not remember at the time when the situation demands that they should do so. It is unfair to take a sentence out of its context, and I want to say that in my own humble opinion a very long memory is required in all our dealing with Germany. It seems to me intolerable that German nationals should be allowed to live in this country masquerading under British names, and I for one should like to see the Government take a strong line in this matter and prohibit these people from changing their surnames into English, Scottish, Welsh or Irish names for a period of ten or even twenty-five years. There is no prejudice in such a proposal. It seems to me it is stark commonsense and facing up to reality and, I suggest to your Lordships, a due regard for the dignity of this country. Someone wrote the other day, "What is wrong with a country that has so little pride in its ancestry as to permit such prostitution?" There will be many who will agree with that view.

I am a little tired of being told that these things are in accordance with the traditions and customs of this country. I find myself unable to accept that line of argument. I have as much reverence for tradition in the real sense of the word as other noble Lords, but to-day we are slowly and painfully emerging from the devastation and agony of the second of two world wars brought about by Germany. Are we really to accept the axiom that what we did in the spacious days of the past when happiness and security reigned supreme in our land, we must always continue to do? *Autres temps, autres moeurs.* Let us not confuse the word "tradition" with "quixotry" and let us guard against allowing what someone

called the other day that national characteristic of ours—extreme tolerance—to degenerate into a vice. I was greatly interested to see the report of a Motion moved in your Lordships' House in 1918 by a very distinguished sailor, Lord Beresford, under whom I had the honour to serve as a midshipman forty years ago. He, too, asked for information about aliens employed in Government offices and on the number of Germans who had been permitted to change their names. In the course of his remarks he observed that he thought he voiced public sentiment when he objected to Germans being employed by the Government and that as taxpayers who pay these people salaries, we are entitled to know the names and character of the people whom we employ. I can only say that I am glad to find myself in such good company but I am pained to notice that in the course of the debate he too while receiving very considerable support from noble Lords was given nevertheless unsatisfactory replies from the Government of the day. History repeats itself, but as your Lordships know "sailors don't care."

There is one other point. I desire to draw attention once more to the alteration in the nationality rule for the admission of candidates to His Majesty's Civil Service. It was contained in a Civil Service Commission Regulation dated November 21, 1944. By this revision permanent appointment to the British Civil Service is 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." There is one qualification. The appointment of a naturalised British subject to the Foreign Office and to the three Service Ministries shall be subject to the consent of the political heads of those Departments. May I draw your Lordships' attention to the implications of this regulation? The majority of Germans now living in this country have fulfilled the residential qualification and have now only to apply for, and be granted, naturalisation to become eligible for permanent appointments in His Majesty's Civil Service. Bearing in mind that implication it would appear to my uninstructed mind that Parliamentary approval should have been sought for such a measure. I may be entirely wrong in this, in which case I shall no doubt be corrected. Nevertheless, this change was made in an unobtrusive way and the public was suddenly made aware of the fact that key posts in our public service were no longer reserved for British-born subjects. Apart from the impropriety, in my view, of such a measure, the question of security is clearly involved. . . .

The Earl of Munster: . . . I stated on the previous occasion that, if His Majesty's Government were satisfied that the existing powers which they possessed to control the entry of aliens into this country were insufficient they would not hesitate to come to Parliament and to ask Parliament to grant them additional powers, however drastic and however severe those powers may be. I would, indeed, ask the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack if that is still the case, that if His Majesty's Government feel they have insufficient powers, they will come to Parliament and ask Parliament to give additional powers. These aliens of enemy nationality who came to this country at the beginning of the war were all interned when France fell. Each and every case was considered on its merits, and the individual was released only if the Secretary of State was satisfied that his or her sympathies lay with the Allied cause. . . .

I am perfectly satisfied that none of those foreigners in this country to-day, of enemy nationality, who came here to avoid the persecutions and the terrors to which they were subject in their own country, have been guilty of espionage or of efforts to undermine the security of the State. I am saying nothing about the Englishmen to whom the noble Lord, Lord Vansittart, referred in the course of his speech. I am wondering if I might ask the Lord Chancellor whether these foreigners of enemy nationality, who are at the moment in this country, are being encouraged to return to their own countries when the danger to their lives has ceased and when the totalitarian Governments from which they fled in 1939 or before have been wound up.

Finally I would like to make a very brief remark on the position of naturalisation. A short time ago—at the end of last month—the Home Secretary announced in another place that it was intended to widen the scope of naturalisation, and amongst those who might send in claims to be naturalised as British subjects were a large number of foreigners who had served in one capacity or another in the service of the Crown. Personally, speaking entirely for myself, I have no objection. It is a proposal which I frequently persuaded my right honourable friend the former Home Secretary, the present Lord President of the Council, to agree to, and I am glad to think that my persuasive powers have had some effect upon His Majesty's present Government. I understand it is intended that those individuals who have served in the Armed Forces or who have priority to the claim for naturalisation on the ground of their contribution to the war effort or to the economic welfare of the country, will be carefully considered and, indeed, will receive very favourable consideration on any demand they put forward. Now who were these aliens who were employed, not necessarily in the Armed Forces, but in the Government Departments, and whom the noble Lord, Lord Ailwyn, held so much to ridicule and contempt?

Lord Ailwyn: Would the noble Earl repeat that? Ridicule and contempt of whom?

Earl of Munster: I said that the noble Lord held up these individual enemy aliens who were employed in Government Departments to ridicule and contempt, and said that they should never be so employed. Will he disagree with that? I do not think so. Now who were these enemy aliens? The noble Lord should surely know better than I do, being a gallant naval officer, that certainly one if not two of these enemy aliens who were employed at the Admiralty throughout the whole period of the war were vital to one scheme the Admiralty had in mind. Is it proper, is it right, to turn round now to ridicule the services which they rendered to this country during the time of the last war? Those men who were employed in the Civil Service—and the figure which the noble Lord gave was the maximum that had been employed; they may not all have been employed at the same time—were taken into the service because of their particular qualifications, because of the views which we knew they held and the knowledge which we knew they possessed of some particular subject which was vital to the success of the scheme we were putting through at that time. I have no hesitation in saying that the views I expressed last May on behalf of His Majesty's Government are the views which I believe, and I certainly hope, the present Government hold. I have no reason whatever, in spite of

the remarks made by the noble Lord, Lord Ailwyn, to withdraw one word or to express regret to your Lordships that I made the remarks I did on that occasion.

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Jowitt): My Lords I cannot hope to remember all the questions which have been asked in the course of this discussion, but I will do the best I can to answer, at any rate, some of them. . . .

Now I come to the noble Lord, Lord Ailwyn, who enlightened what is after all a dull subject. He asked why it is necessary to have unnaturalised Germans in Government Departments and what is the statutory authority. Regulation 60D of the Defence Regulations, which is now continued by the Supplies and Services (Transitional Powers) Act, 1945, makes it lawful to employ them so long as there are no equally suitable British subjects. I will try to explain why to the noble Lord, because I have not the slightest desire not to give him a candid answer. It is difficult for this reason, that it is easy to find out in how many cases consent to employment has been given, but unless you go through and check up each person and see whether he or she is still employed, you cannot say how many are still employed. I can say that the number is 160, but that includes enemy, neutral or stateless aliens who have been employed with Treasury consent. Without finding out what is the life history of each of the 160, it follows that I cannot tell him whether all the 160 are still so employed. . . .

“What check is there on Germans in this country changing their names to British ones?” Under Defence Regulation 20 (1) it is an offence for any alien to change his name without the authorisation of the Secretary of State. Consent was given occasionally during the war to aliens who were serving in order that they might conceal their real identity, so that if they did fall into enemy hands they would not be penalised. Subject to that, consent has been given only in a very few cases. If an alien has become naturalised, however, then as I read the British Nationality Act of 1914, he has all the rights of a British subject and can change his name just as much as any of us can change our names.

DIPLOMATIC PRIVILEGES AND UNITED NATIONS BILL

In the House of Commons on April 5, 1946, Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, The Minister of State, said in relation to the United Nations Bill: “It is not the only legislation which the Charter may require us in due course to introduce. Articles 104 and 105 impose on every member the obligation to grant to the United Nations legal capacity, and to give to its officials and the representatives of Member States, the privileges and immunities they need for what the Charter calls “the independent exercise of their functions.” . . . but, in due course, our adherence to this Convention may involve some small Amendments to the existing Diplomatic Privileges Act, and I may have to come back to the House for that.

“Under Article 43 of the Charter, the Security Council is to negotiate agreements with Member States about the Armed Forces and the military facilities which each of the Member States will contribute to the United Nations for the purpose of preventing or suppressing aggression.”

The Arthurian Legend

THE ORIGINS

"The mystery of Arthur's end is as nothing to the mystery of his beginning. Next to the Devil, King Arthur is the person most usually associated with Seats, Craggs, Castles, and other topographical features of Great Britain; but while the ancient name is everywhere, the ancient records and traditions are nowhere. Old English literature, even the *Chronicle*, knows nothing of Arthur. To find any mention of him earlier than the twelfth century we must turn to Wales, where, in a few obscure poems, a difficult prose story, and two dry Latin chronicles, we find the first written references, meagre and casual, but indicating traces of ancient tradition. The earliest is in *Historia Britonum*, ascribed to Nynniaw (*Lat.* Nennius), a Welshman who copied and freely edited a collection of brief notes on early British history and geography gathered from various sources. The original compilation has been dated as early as 679 and the recension made by Nennius as late as 826. The chronicle is very short (although it begins with Adam) and it deals mainly with the Romans and Saxons. The whole reference to Arthur is the passage that follows, describing the battle of Mount Badon in 516. Gildas, who was a youth in that year, also gives an account of the battle; but the only hero he mentions is 'Ambrosius Aurelianus, a modest man, who of all the Roman nation was then alone in the confusion of this troubled period by chance left alive'."

1. NENNIUS.

At that time, the Saxons greatly increased in Britain, both in strength and numbers. And Octa, after the death of his father, Hengist, came from the sinistral part of the island to the kingdom of Kent, and from him have proceeded all the kings of that province, to the present period.

Then it was, that the magnanimous Arthur, with all the kings and military force of Britain, fought against the Saxons. And though there were many more noble than himself, yet he was twelve times chosen their commander, and was as often conqueror. The first battle in which he was engaged, was at the mouth of the river Gleni. The second, third, fourth, and fifth, were on another river, by the Britons called Duglas, in the region Linuis. The sixth, on the river Bassas. The seventh in the wood Celdion, which the Britons call Cat Coit Celdion. The eighth was near Guinnion castle, where Arthur bore the image of the Holy Virgin, mother of God, upon his shoulders, and through the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the holy Mary, put the Saxons to flight, and pursued them the whole day with great slaughter. The ninth was at the City of Legion, which is called Cair Lion. The tenth was on the banks of the river Trat Treuroit. The eleventh was on the mountain Breguoin, which we call Cat Bregion. The twelfth was a most severe contest, when Arthur penetrated to the hill of Badon. In this engagement, nine hundred and forty fell by his hand alone, no one but the Lord affording him assistance. In all these engagements the Britons were successful. For no strength can avail against the will of the Almighty.

Translated by W. Gunn, revised by J. A. Giles in *Six Old English Chronicles*. — George Sampson: *Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse*.

WANTED. Social Crediter desires to rent country cottage, preferably near sea. Offers to sell considered. Particulars to E.J.P., c/o. *The Social Crediter*.

For Sale. Two golden cocker spaniel puppies, born February 10, 1946: Bitches, beautiful specimens, Tree Top and Earnside strains, parents registered K.C. 7 guineas each. 15 per cent. of receipts to go to the funds of The Social Credit Secretariat. Apply to Milburn, 'Glendhu,' Luib, Perthshire.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
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.
Social Credit Principles.....	(reprinting)

ALSO

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.
Why You Are Short of Coal by Aims of Industry.....	6d.
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.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
A Comprehensive Medical Service (Reprinted from <i>The Tablet</i>).....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

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