

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 14. No. 13.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1945.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

The Province of Quebec has a population very approximately equal to that of Scotland, with the further similarity that nearly half of it is concentrated in one town, Montreal, as in Glasgow in the case of Scotland.

The most powerful broadcasting station is CKAC which "sells time," and the Union des Electeurs, the Quebec Electoral Campaign, for some time purchased time for Social Credit talks. In January, 1944, however, CKAC, controlled of course by the "C".B.C. notified l'Union that no more time would be allotted to it. *Sixteen thousand* letters of protest were received by the broadcasting authority. The Social Credit broadcasts have been resumed.

The whole weight of Socialist-Communist activity in the Province is in Montreal. It has been steadily working against Social Credit, but has been powerless to stop the resumption of the broadcasts.

Two items in the leader-page articles in the *Sunday Times* of May 20 are worthy of attention and comment. The first, in an analysis of the Coal Problem (which can easily be seen to be a focus of infection everywhere) is basic to the exposure of the "bad management" argument. After pointing out that the output in 1943 is practically the same per man-shift as in 1913 (1.03 tons to 1.016 tons) while in 1943 69 *per cent.* of the coal got is machine cut, while in 1913 only eight *per cent.* was so cut, the author points out that in the U.S., which is held up as an example of efficiency, the percentage of the total of employes actually working at the coal face is sixty, while in Great Britain, it is only twenty. The interesting point about these very important figures is that the higher American output per shift *merely corresponds to the ratio of productive to non-productive labour.* The whole effort of British Trades Union policy tends to drive up non-productive labour. The Trades Union is a Labour Cartel to keep up prices.

The second item, which occurs in a survey of Europe, is best put in the words of its author, "Scrutator":—

"Prominent everywhere among the ex-resistance leaders are the Communists. The hall-mark of their party, now as before the war, is not any special outfit of principles or politics, but simply that they are the agents within their respective countries of the Russian Government, eager to do whatever Moscow wants."

Now, accepting this statement as correct, and we have world-wide confirmation of it, does anyone seriously suggest that *Russians* are so distributed over the world's surface, and are so enthusiastic about their system when they are abroad, that they form the nuclei the powerful Communist movements found in every *industrialised* country? If not

"Moscow" clearly must be a word for a world-policy. Who controls Moscow and the policy?

An eminent American lawyer, Mr. McDermott, evidently working along the lines of Lord Hewart, has made an exhaustive study of State Socialism in Germany and its parallel movements in the United States. He tabulated the following "Twelve Steps into State Socialism."

1. The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.
2. The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.
3. The centralised government while appearing in form to represent the people must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.
4. Constitutional guarantees must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as out-moded and as obstructions to progress.
5. Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined. Let me pause to say that these various steps as thus enumerated are not necessarily undertaken in the order in which they are here listed. In fact, the subordination of the lawyers and of the courts is likely to be one of the early steps taken by those interested in setting up a National Socialistic regime. As has recently been well said. "There is no place for the lawyer in the totalitarian state." Lawyers as champions of the peoples' rights must be suppressed at an early stage.
6. The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.
7. Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit are thus completely within the control of government.
8. A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire nation.
9. A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive so that the public may not begin to rely upon their own resources.

10. Governmental bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men and not of laws.

11. The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control, to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

12. To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee, and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent.

Mr. McDermott points out the "deadly parallel between national socialism in Germany and what has transpired in the United States."

For sheer bestial vulgarity, the broadcast by the so-called British Broadcasting Corporation with its hives of "German" Jews, of the "eye-witness" account of the suicide of Himmler, surely touches low-water mark. Himmler may have been, and probably was, a repulsive scoundrel; but not so repulsive as the minds which can pander to a debauched public by describing his end. If there were no other reason, and there are many, for revoking the charter of this dangerous misinterpreter of British culture, this is sufficient.

On Educating our Masters

"A Committee, under Sir Arnold McNair's chairmanship, representing the Universities on the one hand and the Accountancy profession on the other, has prepared a scheme by which accountants can accomplish some of their professional training in the Universities."

The Economist (May 5, p. 576) from which the above statement is taken, comments:

"Accountants have, in recent decades, been working themselves into a more and more commanding position in all sections of the business world, and it is clearly imperative, as was said in another connection, that we should educate our masters. And in general, this move back towards the virtues of a broad education and a catholic competence is a refreshing change from the contrary tendency so frequently exemplified in recent years, to set up ever more watertight compartments, each jealously guarded by a set of exclusive 'professional' qualifications."

⁶ The special course for accountants is to consist of two main subjects, economics and accountancy (not hitherto regarded as a university subject) and three minor subjects, law, a modern language, and "a course in the study of Government." *The Economist* further remarks: "If the process of drawing the universities and the professional bodies closer together merely results in accountancy being taught in a quadrangle rather than in an office, then it is unlikely that either the universities or the profession will gain very much," and goes on to urge that "any good university degree, not only one in accountancy and economics" should be accepted, and that "the skill of the profession would not be likely to suffer, and its wisdom would greatly gain."

If, in fact, the Universities were places wherein "a

catholic competence" and "a right relation between the mind and things" were developed, the limitations of *The Economist's* comment would be less obvious. If it were true that the main function of the Universities is the study of ends rather than means, the addition of accountancy to a curriculum which has hitherto neglected anything approaching a realistic study of the subject of money would be a most valuable gain. But the author of *The Economist's* article is very well aware that this is not so, and that we are hard on the heels of the American and, he might have added, the pre-Nazi German, Universities in their degeneration into technical and commercial high schools in which technique is studied to the exclusion of policy.

It may be presumed that the author of this article has himself had a University education, and his acceptance, without comment or objection, of the position that accountants should occupy "a more and more commanding position in all sections of the business world" and being therefore "our masters" should have a broad and liberal education, is in itself a typical example of the results of such education.

It should be noted that the general effect of the article is to express approval and support for a move which is obviously in the wrong direction, under cover of a subsidiary criticism which most people of sense will recognise as sound, and which does, in fact, follow the current fashion among 'educationists' of condemning 'over-specialisation,' while approving, and acceding to, with no more than verbal qualifications, every fresh step in that direction.

The Goodenough report on Medical education provides a type specimen of this technique. Courses in physical and biological science, *with a definite medical bias*, as well as in psychology and statistical method, are to be forced into an already crowded curriculum for the Second Medical Examination, presumably at the expense of the subjects taught at present. This is to be preceded by a First Examination in *the general principles of science* to the exclusion of "the acquisition of factual information." This is supposed to lay the basis of a sound general education upon which the later 'vocational' and factual knowledge may be built. I have not yet met any teacher of science who claimed to be able to teach 'the general principles of science,' but in any case early over-generalisation is no cure for later over-specialisation; nor is the addition of smatterings of additional subjects, all taught with the same 'vocational' bias. The only result will be, to quote *The Economist's* article referring to the American system "that the professional training is delayed and diluted, while the basic educational process... is ignored" or as Major Douglas puts it (*Programme for the Third World War*, p. 30) "Could any more Satanic method be devised of hindering the human individual from profiting by experience than to ensure that he is incapable of applying any unwarped intelligence to it!"

It is becoming increasingly clear that the accountants are merely the van of a rush of professions and trades which are going to demand a University education for their members. The aim, as *The Economist* says, is that the educational process (*i.e.*, the insulation of the individual from normal experience) should be continued to the age of 21, and that it "should continue to be an education and not an apprenticeship." The Bachelor's degree is to replace the School Certificate as the pre-requisite for any type of professional, business, or managerial appointment.

The 'trends' towards vocational and 'useful' rather than theoretical education, and the 'liberal' reaction against it

represented by *The Economist's* article, are by no means incompatible. The first results in that fragmentation of knowledge which produces the technician, unconscious of and unable to assess policy—a useful tool, but of a rather low order. The second involves inculcation of the managerial attitude, chiefly by suggestion and implication, but now increasingly overtly, especially in economics and the so-called social 'sciences.' This is essential for 'key' personnel, such as accountants, whose knowledge of the operations of the money system, unless side-tracked in advance, might be expected to lead, as it has in the past, to unwelcome exposures of the purpose behind it. The choice by the McNair Committee of economics (the primary focus of the political perversion of the Universities), law, and "the study of Government" to accompany the University course in accountancy represents a somewhat cautious and conservative attitude of leaving nothing to chance. *The Economist* can afford to be more progressive, and to take account of the widespread 'socialisation' of almost the whole of the academic range of subjects. Social Physics, Social Chemistry, Social Mathematics, Social History, Social Linguistics, Social Biology (this last to be taught in schools!) have now all been with us for some years, and represent steps towards the third stage, characteristic of the Nazi and Marxist Universities, in which open indoctrination with the dominant philosophy is the only thing permitted.

Evidently the Universities are now regarded as 'safe' ground upon which the young may be let loose with reasonable certainty that their thoughts will be channelled in the same direction. Formal freedom of opinion persists, but selection committees do not let many people with 'awkward' views slip through their fingers into positions of influence. However, until the considerable number of elderly people with experience of intellectual liberty have died off, formal freedom of opinion can scarcely be dispensed with; and so long as that survives, there remains always the possibility of that type of miracle of individual initiative which the Planners are unable to plan for.

There is also the perennial probability that the Planners themselves will make a serious mistake. It is even possible that they are doing it now, and that the spate of reports, programmes, syllabuses, curricula, which are pouring out from our educational Planners, much as White Papers and Bills are pouring out from Whitehall, just when everyone else is suffering from the effects of prolonged strain and exhaustion, is itself a little too much, and will result in something approaching a breakdown in our increasingly rigid and inert 'educational' system; or if not a breakdown, a state of intense irritation and awareness of what is being imposed upon us which may yet break some of the barriers to effective action and release the energies necessary for a return to sanity. C. G. D.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 15, 1945.

GERMAN JEWISH REFUGEES (REPATRIATION)

Mr. Austin Hopkinson asked the Prime Minister whether in view of the destruction of National Socialism, arrangements can be made for the immediate repatriation of all Jewish refugees who had been the victims of persecution in their country of origin.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): No, Sir. Quite apart from other considerations there would be very considerable practical difficulties in carrying out this suggestion.

Mr. Hopkinson: Are we to take it that the frequent assurance given by Home Secretaries in previous days that these men were to be repatriated at the earliest possible moment still remains the policy of the Government?

The Prime Minister: It still remains the desire, but Europe is in a state of frightful confusion at the moment. Many things are not cleared up there, and I think we had better try and give vent to our policy and good intentions with due regard to practical.

Mr. Silverman: Would the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that it would be difficult to conceive of a more cruel procedure than to take people who have lost everything they have—their homes, their relatives, their children, all the things that made life decent and possible—and compel them, against their will, to go back to the scene of those crimes?

The Prime Minister: I agree with that.

Commander Locker-Lampson: It would be most unfair to send them back.

Mr. Lipson: Can my right hon. Friend give an assurance that it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to differentiate between Jews and other people?

The Prime Minister: Having regard to the altogether exceptional brutality and horrible inflictions imposed upon the Jewish people, I should not go so far as to say that special efforts will not be made to meet hard cases.

Earl Winterton: Will my right hon. Friend make it clear that, in general, it is the policy of His Majesty's Government, in dealing with refugees, not to differentiate between Jewish and non-Jewish refugees, because to do so might encourage anti-Semitism?

The Prime Minister: I think that is a very sensible comment on any looseness in my supplementary replies.

House of Commons: May 16, 1945.

DEMobilISATION (ALLIED ARMY SERVICE)

Mr. G. Strauss (Lambeth, North): We have been considering to-day the broad problems of demobilisation and resettlement. The point I want to bring before the House on the Motion for the Adjournment is a small one—a matter of detail connected with the demobilisation scheme. I am impelled to do so for two reasons. One is that it affects a certain number of men, who are now serving in the British Army, who have served previously in one of the Allied Armies, and many of whom, I know from personal inquiry, have served the Allied cause gallantly. It appears to me that they are suffering an injustice, and that is why I bring it forward, although the number of people involved is very small...

The Secretary of State for War (Sir James Grigg): The hon. Member for North Lambeth (Mr. G. Strauss) produced two cases of men who had served in the French Foreign Legion and then, afterwards, in the British Army. Those must be very exceptional cases, and I would not mind wagering a small sum they are the only two cases of that particular kind involved. But there are a number

(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. 13.

Saturday, June 2, 1945.

The Political Crisis

"The bureaucracy, whose power of obstruction such instances illustrate, is fast becoming the greatest Austrian problem. The nationalisation of railways has increased the number of officials by leaps and bounds, and has rendered reform imperative. . . But no one has much hope of real reform. Every official appointed becomes a kind of vested interest. . . A special body of politico-economic doctrine was formulated by writers and professors like Martini and Sonnenfels, the latter a savant of Jewish extraction. Sonnenfels enunciated the theory that in the interest of the State, the Police must control all manifestations of public life. The 'Era of Enlightenment' had dawned. . . the Freemasons and other secret societies took their place and flourished exceedingly."

— *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, Wickham Steed, p. 85.

As Austria, so elsewhere. It is little short of astounding, that with a whole world of examples to point the moral, it is still not clear to the majority that what the world is perishing from is Government—not Tory Government and not even Left Government, although, from its nature, Left Government will be finally fatal, but just Government.

But, in the coming elections in this country, we shall see whether our doom is sealed or whether the native intuition still survives. Whatever "programmes" are advanced by the "Labour," *i.e.*, Judaeo-Masonic Party, or by the "Conservative," *i.e.*, Masonic-Judaic Party, the real issue is going to be—do we have more or less government, by more or fewer bureaucrats? The upper bureaucrats are in no doubt. They are telling us what they will allow us to do, what we shall be allowed to eat, and to whom they are going to give our property, for years ahead. Well, maybe. It has brought down one great country after another, and it may be that we also are to be hanged with Red Tape. The Marquis de Luchet, writing at the time of the French Revolution remarks, "Deluded people, learn that there exists a conspiracy in favour of despotism against liberty, of incapacity against talent, of vice against virtue, of ignorance against enlightenment. This society aims at governing the world. Its object is universal domination. This plan may seem extraordinary, incredible—yes, but not chimerical!—no such calamity has ever yet befallen the world" . . . "There has been formed under cover of the deepest darkness a society of a new type of beings who know without seeing each other, who understand each other without personal explanations, who serve each other without friendship. This society has as its object, the government of the world."

— *Essai sur la secte des Illuminées*.

The General Election

While the many difficulties in the path of individual Social Crediters are understood, and, indeed, shared by the personnel of the Secretariat, these are of a general nature and affect in the same way the members and followers of the political parties engaged in the present struggle. Admittedly, the great parties and their half-concealed escorts and allies, freemasonic and otherwise, have monopolistic forces such as the press and the "British" Broadcasting Corporation which do a great part of the work for them. Social Crediters are not asked to elaborate a force of comparable magnitude; but rather to pursue energetically (*i.e.*, as energetically as their opponents) the only rational course of action which can, in existing circumstances, prevail against so immense a power.

Pre-conceived ideas concerning the nature of the results which it is hoped to achieve should be submitted to examination. It is suggested that, if this is done, morale will be fortified considerably, effectiveness increased, and disappointment avoided, with resulting headway towards the establishment of a just and workable order of society.

Concerning Secretariat documents, it is deemed expedient to say that a general permission is given to quote from or to reproduce, by printing, duplicating or otherwise, specified documents and papers emanating from the Social Credit Secretariat, *viz.*, *The Social Crediter* newspaper, the Leaflets, *Electoral Canvass for an Anti-Bureaucratic Representation* and *The Issue*, the article, *Don't Waste Your Vote!* by C. G. D., and the form which followed it in our issue of May 5, subject to the following qualifications:

(1) In the case of all quotations from the published work of Major C. H. Douglas, the source must be given.

(2) The Social Credit Secretariat asks that the advice communicated by its agency shall in all cases be distributed correctly and as completely as possible, having regard to its applicability to the situation which has presented itself. The only weapon which is not in the hands of our opponents is the Truth. It is an essential element in correct tactics, therefore, that there should be general recognition of the fact that the object is not persuasion, or art (in the sense of cunning) or salesman-ship; but Exposure.

One important application of this concerns those calculations, too often indulged in by electors, which aim to distinguish between two or more courses which are equally repugnant, on some ground of presumed expediency. If no opportunity is given to the electors to vote for a policy, they cannot vote for a policy, and every vote cast is a vote against themselves. Those cases of which the Social Credit Secretariat is advising the public, through the appropriate channels, in which a candidate is so offensive to national tradition and culture as to make his defeat a positive gain to national security, are not of this nature.

No one should delude himself that, even in small matters, he can outwit the opposition. The opposition has no case, and is, so far, triumphant chiefly because of the cleverness with which the situation is *misrepresented*. The case against tyranny needs only to be presented, in order that it should prevail.

The Contribution of 'Johannesburg' to World-Peace (I)

"The Freedom previously enjoyed by Great Britain in regard to Foreign Policy disappeared with the entry of the U.S.A. into the war. And President Wilson was influenced preponderatingly by German Jews such as Jacob Schiff."

— C. H. Douglas, *The Brief for the Prosecution*.

The three hundred men "all of whom know one another, who choose their successors from their entourage" and who are alleged to control Europe and the world are faced with the difficulty of presenting a disillusioned and sceptical world with an Eternal Peace for the second time within the life-span of the same generation. Their difficulties are not rendered less by the fact that the number of reliable 'world'-politicians is strictly limited, so that some of the performers of the Paris drama of 1919 have to play the same parts over again, and the parts of dead brother-politicians as well.

If there is one thing more than another which distinguishes the Old Faithfuls it is an ardent admiration for the politico-military events of 1870-71. This admiration embraces both the efforts of Bismarck and William Hohenzollern acting for the Rothschild-Bleichroeders as well as the good work done in Italy by Cavour on behalf of the same 'Frankfort'-directed interests. The centralised Great-Germany of 1870, the first step towards that United States of Europe for which European Masonry has worked *openly* since 1919, must be kept United whatever else has to be 'dismembered.'

The leading Whig-historian of England, Mr. Trevelyan, wrote an article *If We Want to Keep the Peace Won* in McClure's Magazine in December, 1914 (significant date), reprinted in New York on March 18, 1944. He said:—

"Germany also was united on a national basis, but there the healing process stopped. . . the war of 1870, though it did well in uniting Germany, did ill in putting a stop to any further liberationist movements on the national principle."

Mr. Trevelyan here expresses the same point of view as that of Jacob Schiff, of Frankfort-New York, who had been asked to comment on the Third German Peace Note of 1918, and did so to the effect that if only the crust of autocracy was removed and "the German people would have the courage to establish a Republican form of Government" all would be well. This was, moreover, the official 'line' at the Conference, and it was obediently toed by all the prominent political Masons assembled at Paris in 1919. The Socialists and Zionists, the shock-troops of world-Masonry, were among the staunchest upholders of the Unity of the New German Republic, whose Constitution was drafted by the Jewish lawyer, Hugo Preuss, and at the head of which had been placed a Socialist saddler by the name of Ebert. It is significant that the strongest opposition to General Foch's demand for the creation of an independent Rhineland Republic comprising the Rhenish-Westphalian territory, the original home of the Vehm Secret Tribunals as well as of that Jew-backed German Heavy Industry which financed Hitler, should have come from the local 'Labour' movement.

It is equally significant that British 'Labour' having learnt nothing and, apparently, forgotten everything, even to-day, as a quarter of a century ago, maintains an official policy of hands-off the Bismarckian Reich. Thus prominent

Anglo-Jewish Leftists like Mr. Gollancz (*vide* "Shall Our Children Live Or Die"), Mr. Laski (cf. his declaration at Labour Party Conferences which he dominates), Mr. I. M. Sieff (*vide* 'Planning' No. 182: "Hitler has succeeded in creating the basis of European Unity, etc."), and their Gentile collaborationists, such as Mr. H. N. Brailsford (*vide* his correspondence to *The Times*), the crypto-Socialist Lord Hinchingbrooke (*vide* his speeches at 'United States of Europe' meetings, London 1944, where M. Massigli the present French Ambassador, also spoke), and others are united in deploring the methods by which the Extended German Unity was brought about, but are equally united in applauding the *result*, a result which it is hoped that 'the Americans,' assisted by ex-underground Jewish burgomasters and prison-superintendents, as in Cologne, will do their best to consolidate.

During the last phase of the world war there has appeared (contemporaneously with 'American'-produced films extolling the Soviet Paradise and the 'Idealism' of President Wilson) a spate of books dealing with the lessons to be learnt from the Second Versailles. The majority of leftist writers are quick to acknowledge the debt of gratitude they think our generation ought to feel for General Smuts, who with Botha, another ex-Boer leader, appeared at Paris as Plenipotentiary of that South African Union of which he is generally considered the Grand Architect. Most of these works help to reinforce the impression conveyed by the head lines of the world press, from which the name of Smuts appears so often, that "Smuts is the wisest man in the world," and many readers will have noticed that it has been etiquette during the second phase of the world war to have most Great Coming Events foreshadowed through the mouth of the Veteran War Hero of the Veld.

Thus Mr. Harold Nicolson, M.P., B.B.C., *etc.*, whose *Peace-Making*, 1919 was first published in 1933, and republished in 1943, found the General Smuts of 1919 "armed, gentle, and aware of present and future horizons beyond my ken." Another journalist-politician, Mr. A. Howden Smith quotes in his arrogantly Pan-American book *Mr. House of Texas*, first published in 1943, Colonel House's remark that Smuts "was one of the few men in the Government who did not seem tired" and Mr. Smith himself is of opinion that Smuts "had the best mind of the Britishers." There must be some reason for this widely diffused appreciation of our enigmatic Dutch-African statesman: Jan Christian Smuts is the son of Jacobus Abraham Smuts, a Calvinist Boer of the Veld. Mr. H. C. Armstrong writes in *Grey Steel: J. C. Smuts, A Study in Arrogance* (London 1937) that Smuts "had a personal liking for the Jews; he liked them around him. They had the same background as his own people: the Dutch of the Veld and the Jews of the Desert. They had the same characteristics. Both were sour bitter people . . . with their lives based on religion learned from the same book—the Old Testament."

Like Abraham Lincoln, and a host of other 'saviours' and 'founders' of centralised Federations, the architect of the Union of South Africa began his career as a lawyer. He was a student of law at Cape Town, and Cambridge, England, but unpopular, particularly in Cambridge, with his fellows, and as a practising lawyer he achieved little success.

Rhodes was, according to Mr. Armstrong, the object of Smuts' youthful hero-worship, and Rhodes we know was

the shop window Gentile front of Alfred Beit, the Berlin-born Jew through whom the London Rothschilds effected the amalgamation first of the Kimberley diamond mines, and, a decade or so later, of the gold mines of the Johannesburg sector. Other members of the Rhodes-Beit group were Lionel Phillips, of London, Barney Barnato (alias Henry Isaacs of the East End of London), Sigmund Neumann (later known as Newman). "It is not too much to say," writes Mr. Paul H. Emden in *Jews of Britain* (London 1944) "that Jews were responsible for the Johannesburg we know to-day." The Johannesburg 'we know to-day' can boast a record number of gold-mining companies, Masonic lodges and Jewish synagogues.

There followed, in the middle of the nineties, the curious incident known as the Jameson Raid, the repercussions of which were to prove far-reaching: "There is not the least doubt that this rash affair at the turn of the year 1895 to 1896, however clumsy, was the first step towards the Union of South Africa." (*Jews of Britain*, p. 425).

The raid proved to the world that local 'nationalist' uprisings may be inspired by non-local super-national agencies. It was already at the time obvious to intelligent observers, of which Mr. Wickham Steed, later Editor of *The Times* was one, that the conspiracy assisted the cause of Pan-germanism by uniting the Afrikaners in a solid bloc against 'the English,' who were already the object of intense hatred in Kaiser Wilhelm's increasingly Prussianised Second Reich. Mr. Wickham Steed writes in *Through Thirty Years* (Vol. 1, p. 68):—

"In point of fact, Germany had long been intriguing with President Krueger, whose object was to make of the Transvaal the Prussia of South African unity. He took Prussia as his model and looked to her for help. Cecil Rhodes, his great antagonist, desired, on the contrary, to federate the South African States under the British flag."

In other words, both Krueger and his ostensible 'antagonist' wanted to impose a strong centralised government on the various provinces of South Africa, with the only difference that Krueger's scheme was to be directed (by 'Frankfort') via Berlin while Rhodes' project was to be controlled (by 'Frankfort') via the City of London. (At a banquet in 1895 in honour of the Kaiser's birthday Krueger had stated that it was time to link Germany with the South African Republic by ties of the closest friendship "such as were natural between father and child.") From their long experience with the English the powers of 'Frankfort' realised perfectly well that the integrity of England is such that even English Civil Servants have a way of modifying by their not-too-bureaucratic approach to things any policy dictated by International Finance-Police Headquarters, and they therefore took great care, as we shall see, to retain as many German, Dutch, or German-Jewish administrators as possible when the time came to put the projected 'Union' into practice.

But we must return to the Jameson Raid and Smuts. It is noteworthy that Smuts entered the Johannesburg Bar in the very year of the Raid, which was to prove a turning point, or so it appeared, in his life. His admiration for the English, as represented by the Rhodes-Beit group, had up till then known no limitations. He had toured the country telling people that the rumours of an English rebellion against the Boer Government were entirely unfounded; but the rebellion took place, misfired, and showed up the true

nature of Mr. Smuts's 'English' friends. There was the revealing publication of the letters exchanged between the leading conspirators, Phillips and Beit,* in the Cape Blue Book: "My dear Beit... naturally whatever we do must be done through others... we must spend our money in trying to improve the Raad [Parliament]... I will also see whether it is not possible without creating unnecessary alarm here, or active steps in Praetoria, to get the companies to possess themselves of a few rifles"; and there was Beit's admission before the Commission of Enquiry in London that he had spent vast sums "in preparation for an armed uprising," the sentence to death of the conspirators; the commutation of the death-sentence into fines through the vigorous action of Barnato-Isaacs who threatened the Government with closing down his vast Johannesburg businesses if his co-racialists were not set free, and finally the emigration of the prominent conspirators to London where they settled down in Park Lane, entered the highest society until they, after a suitable interval had elapsed, returned to their 'interests' in South Africa.

Smuts felt, or behaved as though he felt, that the English had played him false, and he now turned to his own folk, the Afrikaners, to whom he never tired of preaching that "it is the English who have aroused the national hatreds. They have set the veld on fire" (Armstrong, op. cit. p. 61). In the year 1898 Smuts was made State Attorney of Krueger's Transvaal Government, as a reward no doubt, for his written defence of Krueger's dictatorial interference with the findings of the Transvaal courts. His defence brought down a storm of abuse on his head and he was accused by his colleagues of helping "a corrupt government to declare itself above the law." (op. cit. p. 68). In the same year the Rev. Herz, a New York Rabbi who was born in Slovakia, arrived in the Transvaal, to conduct the services in one of the numerous synagogues of Johannesburg. The following year he was banished from the Transvaal by Krueger for his pro-British sympathies and was conducted to the frontier by the anti-British State Attorney, Mr. Jan Christian Smuts. Rabbi Herz returned to the Transvaal after the Boer War when the country was under a British administration.

As Krueger's State Attorney, Smuts now began to lay the foundation of the South African edition of that Universal Police-Terror State the growth of which we have witnessed as war has succeeded war. "He set agents, and agents of the worst type of blackguard, to ferret out the abuses of the liquor trade and the illicit gold-selling. He brought in, one after the other a series of criminal laws with drastic penalties." (op. cit. 72).

Smuts was present at the pre-Boer-War negotiations with Lord Milner at Middleburg. While Botha was inclined to compromise, Smuts was rigid and unyielding. There followed the long drawn out Boer war during which Smuts distinguished himself as a guerilla-leader. At the ensuing Peace Conference at Vereeniging—a Dutch word denoting 'Union' and 'Peace' with obvious Masonic associations—he admitted to his fellow-fighters that "he was one of those who provoked this war. I accept the responsibility, and it gives me the right to speak." (op. cit. p. 137.) One evening when a deadlock had set in Kitchener drew Smuts quietly out of the room and said: "Look here, Smuts... my

*The present Sir Alfred Beit is, according to *The Scotsman* of February 8, 1945, the treasurer of the crypto-Socialist Parliamentary group known as Tory Reform.

opinion is that in two years time a *Liberal* Government will come into power [in England] and it will grant you a Constitution for South Africa." (op. cit. p. 137.)

There was also present at Vereeniging a Russian-born Jew, Sammy Marks, who spoke better Dutch than English but preferred to correspond in Hebrew. Marks was a gold-magnate who, according to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, was on terms of intimacy with the generals of both sides and "played no unimportant part at the Peace Conference."

During the brief interregnum of British rule in the Transvaal, Lord Milner's administration was the constant butt for Smuts's anti-British jibes. Then the Liberals in England, *i.e.*, the Mond-Samuel-Isaacs-Rothschild group, gave their blessing to the introduction of self-rule in the Transvaal. Smuts was made Colonial Secretary, and Botha, his Boer colleague of the war, Prime Minister. Smuts immediately set to work to 'Federate' his province with the other South African territories, and in this he was greatly assisted by the very members of Lord Milner's 'kindergarten' which he had so lavishly abused during the 'British' period. There was Mr. Philip Kerr who appeared as Lloyd George's confidential secretary in Paris in 1919, and who, as Lord Lothian, represented Great Britain at Washington at the outbreak of World War II. He "conceived many of the ideas and organised much of the propaganda." There was further the erudite and industrious Lionel Curtis whose life-work has been to advocate the Federation of the British Empire; who took a leading part in founding the Royal Society of International Affairs at Paris in 1919 and who, later, from the cloistered calm of Oxford, wartime headquarters of 'Chatham House,' has issued a series of Federal Union pamphlets much applauded by the Press, from *The Times* upwards. As a consequence of all this brotherly collaboration the Union of South Africa came into being in 1909. But "hard on the heels of the original optimism of the people there came reaction. Each province had made great sacrifices for the Union; they now asked what they had gained: the taxes were no less... they suspected the Transvaal meant to dominate; already Botha was Prime Minister, Smuts had three posts, and Hull, the Treasurer, was from Johannesburg." (op. cit. p. 207.)

B. J.

(To be concluded.)

PARLIAMENT

(Continued from page 3)

of other cases in this category of people who have served previously in foreign Armies and are now serving in the British Army, and they fall into three very well-marked categories... Then there is the case of a number of Jews who deserted from the Polish Army in 1943. Now I have assumed—and I think my assumption is not very far wrong—that the cases which the hon. Member for North Lambeth (Mr. G. Strauss) really has in mind are the third class.

Mr. Strauss: Not a bit.

Sir J. Grigg: These are the men who in 1943 found service in the Polish Army so distasteful that they deserted. I believe that their leader came to London and got into touch with the hon. Member—at any rate great pressure was put upon the Government by him to take more of them than we actually took into the British Army. The early deserters only were taken into the British Army at

the request of the Polish Government, and on the recommendation of the Foreign Office. Personally, I have had the greatest doubts as to the wisdom of this step and so, evidently, had the other people concerned, because the later demands for acceptance into the British Army were refused. The suggestion now—apart from these two people who had service in the Foreign Legion—is that these deserters from the Polish Army should count all their service in the Polish Army for purposes of priority of release from the British Army under the age and service scheme and, presumably, for all the monetary benefits which accrue on account of service.

Mr. Strauss: I did not suggest that.

Sir J. Grigg: In the first place, let me say that, although this proposal would involve considerable administrative difficulties, I do not propose to found any argument on that; I propose to rely on the intrinsic merits or, as I think, the absence of merits. The hon. Member has quoted from my original answer. I am very sorry if it displeases him, but I remain of my opinion still...

House of Commons: May 17, 1945.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES BILL—COMMITTEE

Mr. Austin Hopkinson: I would like to support this Amendment. The hon. Member for Daventry (Mr. Manningham-Buller) has said pretty nearly all that has to be said, but he has put it in a very delicate manner having regard to the feelings that already exist in regard to many of the aliens already in our midst. In certain parts of the country, not least in industrial Lancashire, there is growing up a very dangerous feeling indeed that aliens, some of enemy origin, are having a very much better time during the war than the native-born working population, and have taken privileges to themselves to which they are not entitled. At such a period, suddenly to propose that any sort of person from Central or Eastern Europe who happens to have fled to this country and has been taken in out of sheer pity because his or her life was in danger—or they said it was—are to be subsidised at the expense of our own people and encouraged to breed is utterly wrong in my view. Feeling is growing in the country, and the one thing we have to try to prevent here is those scenes of persecution which have disgraced other countries. The trouble is blowing up the whole time and, unless this Amendment is accepted, that feeling will extend considerably and danger will arise. I do ask the Committee to consider what this really means—that everybody in this country is to be taxed to encourage a lot of foreigners to come and breed here.

(After other speakers.)

Mr. A. Hopkinson: I should explain that all the instances I had in mind were those of Germans.

Mr. Bevan: Supposing they were. I have never heard such absurdities as have come from the hon. Gentleman when we know very well that in almost every branch of medicine and every walk of life we are the beneficiaries of distinguished Germans...

Mr. Harold Nicolson (Leicester, West): ... I wish to speak with moderation, but, after what we have heard from the hon. Member for Mossley (Mr. Hopkinson), it is almost impossible to speak with moderation. He has interjected

into this issue a degree of venom to which one can only reply in a somewhat acidulated form. If we are going to adopt racial theories, borrowed from the Nazis, to assume that there can be in this country citizens paying British taxes, assuming all the rights of duties of British subjects, and none of the rights of other British subjects; . . .

House of Commons: May 18, 1945.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES BILL—COMMITTEE

Miss Rathbone: . . . There are those who fear that if we give too much encouragement to aliens, we might eventually be flooded with aliens. That is a completely illusory fear. Anyone interested in this question has only to read the admirable pamphlet issued recently by P.E.P. entitled "Are Refugees An Asset" to— . . . (interruption from the Chair).

If they read the pamphlet I referred to a moment ago, which is based chiefly on official figures, they will see that the number of refugees who want to settle here and become naturalised is estimated to be about 40,000, or fewer than one in 1,000 of our native population. Some of the refugees are too old to have dependent children and it would be an act of cruelty not to allow them to remain here. Some are children who know no other home than this country, no other language than ours, many have risked their lives during this war for this country and others have brought with them expert knowledge of their own industries which they have placed at our disposal. It would be madness, when this country has hanging over it the shadow of a declining population— . . .

SEVERN BARRAGE AND HYDRO-ELECTRIC SCHEME

Sir Stanley Reed (Aylesbury): I offer no apology for asking the attention of the House for a short period to the main features of the Report on the Severn Barrage and Hydro-electric Scheme, which was issued under the auspices of the Minister of Fuel and Power and published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, and which is now available to Members. I have no hesitation in raising the matter because I hope that I will convince those Members who are here that this Report relates to a matter of great national importance. I feel a certain special personal interest in it, because I know every inch of the country which is embraced in this scheme, and I was for many years connected with the greatest hydro-electric projects in the world on both the productive and distributive sides. . .

I will not give the House any figures because they are not always very convincing, but the main features of the report were that it was found to be a practicable scheme; that it came easily within the range of engineering experience and knowledge and that it would have no prejudicial effect on the navigation of the river, either above or below the barrage; on the contrary it would rather improve navigable conditions above the barrage. This scheme was estimated to produce 1,610,000,000 kilowatt hours of electrical energy at a cost of only two-thirds of the comparable cost of steam production in a modern coal-fired station. Also to save a million tons of coal a year. When we take that figure it is significant to note that the price of coal—I do not wish to make my hon. Friend blush—was then 16s. a ton. One feature of that report which was not quite so desirable was

that it embraced many ancillary projects—a new road across the Severn, a railway bridge, and a harbour and dock area above the barrage—projects which naturally brought in many authorities to be consulted. There were other influences, too, which were brought to bear upon its post-ponement, so that report, which was a comprehensive investigation into a great engineering project, joined the dusty heaps of buried treasure which encumber our archives. I make bold to say that very few hon. Members here have ever heard of its existence.

In justice to my right hon. Friend the Minister of Fuel and Power, I must pay this tribute to him, that when I drew his attention to this scheme and to this report in a letter to *The Times* newspaper he was quick to appreciate its importance and took immediate action to have the scheme re-examined. A most authoritative body of engineers was set up to examine this scheme in every detail and to submit a report. That report is now before us. It endorses in effect all the main conclusions of the earlier body, the Brabazon Committee, while applying modifications to embody the latest practice. . . Although they were able to reduce the period of construction from 14 years to eight years, and the rate of interest went from 4 *per cent.* to 3 *per cent.*, owing to the fantastic rise in prices the cost of the barrage work alone rose from £24,000,000 to £40,000,000. On the other hand, the output of energy was raised from 1,610,000,000 kilowatt hours to 2,365,000,000 kilowatt hours by cutting out the storage system. . .

I think the House will agree that our views on this Report will be very largely coloured by our views on the future of the coal industry in this country, and that must be a matter on which every man is entitled to his own opinion. I only express my own opinion for what it is worth. I view the coal position in this country with intense and increasing anxiety. Our industry was largely built up on an ample supply of cheap coal. I am not certain whether the coal supply will ever be ample or even sufficient in the future; it will certainly not be cheap. . .

For a century British engineering led the world in railways, steamships, in the design of the Forth Bridge, in tunnelling the bowels of the earth here and in America and in the construction of our wonderful tube system. In the last few years everybody seems to have got the impression that America only is the land of big-scale enterprise. For 1,000 people who can tell you about the Grand Coulee and Muscle Shoals, not one can tell you much about the magnificent work of the Indus Barrage or the hydro-electric and irrigation works which our engineers have constructed all over India. . .

BOOKS TO READ

Pressure on our space is responsible for the occasional omission of the list of "Books to Read" on Social Credit. A list will be sent to enquirers on request.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

Liverpool.