From Week to Week

Perhaps the salient feature of the present world situation is that Great Britain ("Britain") is in the remarkable position of being without a friend in any current controversy. Just what really is our policy in regard to Palestine, no-one seems to know; but, whatever it is, it has succeeded in antagonising Jews, Arabs, and Mr. Ben Hecht. What we contemplate for India when Mr. Nehru seeks refuge in Wall Street is not clear; but everyone is agreed that as a performance our post-war handling of him is only paralleled by Mr. Kerensky's display of statesmanship in the Russian Revolution.

Mr. Attlee's Administration seems equally unhappy at home; nobody loves him and everyone feels that a country which will tolerate his Aneurin Bevans and Emanuel Shinwells must be decrepit or it would take action.

Yet in this connection, it must be recalled that Mr. Attlee himself is far more honest than many of his detractors. In 1934 he declared that "we," the Labour Party, had quite determined that they were not the Party of the people of this country, but of the world. Since then, of course, it has been made plain that the world does not include infra-tinkers-cusses. It is doubtless true that he was speaking for the benefit of his predominantly alien supporters, whether in this country or elsewhere; but so far as we are aware, he spoke in English, and he ought to have received attention. Because he gave no indication, and no assurance, that any part of the world outside this country would pay any attention to him; and, in the event, no-one outside this country, and a rapidly decreasing number of people inside it does pay any attention to him. What he has succeeded in doing, as anyone outside the detestable Fabian atmosphere knew would be done, is to facilitate the enslavement of his constituents for the benefit of his hidden financiers.

In placing Mr. Attlee for the moment in the pillory, we have no illusions in regard to the part played by the alleged Conservatives in the armistice period. A very considerable amount of effort was devoted by Social Crediters to uncovering the continuity of the Whig influence from the South African War onwards, and Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, Mr. Harold Macmillan, and in fact, the whole operative framework of the party which smugly allows itself to be labelled "Tory" are nearly pure-bred Whigs. We have previously referred to what is perhaps the outstanding historical novel of this century, the American Mr. Kenneth Roberts's Oliver Wiswell and his explanation of the loss of the American Colonies, the inhabitants of which were preponderatingly loyal, but it is so germane to the present position that we give his estimate of the Whigs at some length:

Why shouldn't you find Howe's behaviour unfathomable? For years, in this country, [England] the Whigs were in power, and had things their own way. All good Whigs had splendid government positions, and had splendid salaries for doing nothing. The Whigs are out in the cold, Oliver, and they don't like it... They're doing everything on earth to get back into power again. They're attacking the Tory party in every possible way, and stopping at nothing. The Tory Party is the Government, Oliver; so every Whig is against the Government. The rebels in America are against the Government; therefore the Whigs support the rebels. That's the only reason Pitt and Burke make speeches in favour of the rebels—to embarrass the Government. If the rebels should be defeated, the Tory Government would have been successful; the Tories would remain in power... The English don't like to admit it, but... the Whigs, in their attempt to get back into power, aren't even hesitating to wreck the British Empire... Nearly every member of the Whig party, in Parliament, for purely political reasons, has seized every opportunity to give aid and comfort to the enemies of his country. Never in any nation has anything been more distasteful than the malignant and daringly outspoken treason of the English Whigs... General Howe is a Whig. (pp. 384-5).

Compare Mr. Roberts's description of the eighteenth century Whig with the Socialists. It is only necessary to understand that Whig (largely Jew) strategy has been refined to control both parties (so that in fact the Parliamentary division is not Labour v. Conservative, but P.E.P.-Fabian v. Back Bench) to perceive that the mass-migration of "Liberals" to "Conservatism" when the Whig tool, Lloyd-George, had served his purpose while wrecking his party, led by Alfred Moritz Mond not to mention the Rothschild espousal of "Labour", was primarily designed to ensure that "Mr. Attlee" would have a free run in his solicitude for the alien, whether within or without our gates.

In the Sunday Express of February 8, appears an article by the Marquis of Reading (Isaacs) attacking the hereditary principle of the House of Lords. We have previously referred to a similar attack by Lord Samuel (Samuel). The connection between these attacks and Whiggism, and their resultant, whether conscious or not, in the submergence of the British, ought to receive the attention which it deserves.

PARLIAMENT


Safety Campaigns (Posters)

Major Tufton Beamish asked the Minister of Transport what is the object of the large number of posters displayed by his Department in many parts of the country saying "Get Home Safe and Sound"; what has been the cost to the taxpayers involved in this particular poster campaign; and whether he is satisfied that the posters have achieved the desired effect.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (Mr. James Callaghan): The posters to which the hon.
Member refers are part of the national road safety propaganda campaign and have cost about £50,000. I think that the campaign is having a good effect.

Major Beamish: Generally we all want to get home safe and sound in any case, and is not this a very good example of quite unnecessary waste of the taxpayers' money and of paper?

Mr. Callaghan: As to the point raised by the first part of the question, 125,000 people were killed or injured on the roads between April and November, 1947. As far as paper is concerned, if that is what the hon. and gallant Member is after, he should go and talk to the Conservative Central Office about some of their rather vapid posters which are disfiguring the hoardings.

Sir William Darling: Can the hon. Gentleman say how he reasons that persons who will not pay attention to oncoming traffic will read posters?

Mr. Callaghan: I prefer in this case to rely on statistics, and when a campaign was not being run nine years ago the number of killed and injured on the roads for the same period was 40,000 more.

Economic Secretary to the Treasury

Major Legge-Bourke asked the Prime Minister if he is now in a position to make his promised statement on the creation of the office of Economic Secretary to the Treasury.

The Prime Minister: My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in addition to his traditional responsibility for financial policy, is now responsible also for those functions with which he was previously charged as Minister for Economic Affairs in the general co-ordination of the economic policy of the Government. He is assisted by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury in his normal departmental functions connected with financial policy, administration and procedure, including Parliamentary financial procedure, financial control of Supply services and establishments, and revenue and exchange control administration.

In his new functions the Chancellor is assisted by the Economic Secretary to the Treasury, who is thus concerned with the general economic policy and planning, including the economic aspects of Treasury supply work, overseas financial negotiations and internal financial planning. Both the Financial Secretary and the Economic Secretary, therefore, play a part, under the Chancellor, in the formation of general financial and taxation policy.

The Central Planning Staff under Sir Edwin Plowden, and the staff of the former office of the Minister for Economic Affairs, retain their identity, but now form part of the Treasury organisation, and discharge their general co-ordinating functions under the direction of the Chancellor. They maintain close touch with the Economic Section of the Treasury Public Relations Office which, however, will remain part of the Treasury public relations officer. This title has been abolished.

The Prime Minister: In reply to a Question by me on December 15 last about the general economic planning arrangements of the Government?

The Prime Minister: It is in reply to a Question by the hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Ely (Major Legge-Bourke).

Dispossessed Farmers

Sir W. Smithers asked the Minister of Agriculture how many of the 474,343 acres under the control of county agricultural committees were taken compulsorily from dispossessed farmers and smallholders.

Mr. T. Williams: I regret that the information is not readily available, and I do not consider that the expenditure of time and labour involved in searching local and central records, dating back over eight years, would be justified.

Anti-Social Trusts and Combines

Mr. C. Poole asked the President of the Board of Trade whether it is the Government's intention to introduce legislation during the present session of Parliament to deal with trusts and combines which pursue anti-social practices.

Mr. Belcher: My right hon. Friend hopes to introduce a Bill this Session, if Parliamentary time permits.


Employment—Directed Persons

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore asked the Minister of Labour how many men and women have been directed to employment by his Department, and under what circumstances, since the Order came into force.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Isaacs): I assume the hon. and gallant Member is referring to the Control of Engagement Order, 1947, which came into force on October 6, 1947. Between that date and December 31, 1947, directions under Defence Regulation 58A (1) were issued to 12 men and three women to take essential work. These figures exclude directions issued to workers normally employed in agriculture.

like the planning staff, provides its interdepartmental services under the Chancellor's direction. In addition to providing a general economic information service, it now provides information on financial subjects previously dealt with by the Treasury public relations officer. This title has been abolished. Its holder will, however, continue to provide information on Civil Service subjects as a member of the Treasury General Establishments Division, and will work in close conjunction with the Economic Information Unit.

Major Legge-Bourke: While thanking the Prime Minister for the fullness of his answer, may I ask whether he can give an assurance that, as a result of the creation of the office mentioned in the Question, there is no conflict with the decision taken in 1944 to separate the Foreign Service from the rest of the Civil Service, with particular reference to the Economic Section of the Foreign Office?

The Prime Minister: The hon. and gallant Gentleman will see, if he studies my answer, that the Foreign Office does not come into it at all.

Lieut.-Colonel Lipton: Is the statement which we have just heard from my right hon. Friend the statement which he promised to make in reply to a Question by me on December 15 last about the general economic planning arrangements of the Government?

The Prime Minister: It is in reply to a Question by the hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Ely (Major Legge-Bourke).
and coalmining, requiring them to remain within their industry.

Sir T. Moore: If the Minister has found his powers of direction so unnecessary, why did he seek them in the first instance?

Mr. Isaacs: Powers have been necessary to fill this number of jobs. As I have previously pointed out to the House, I was quite satisfied that the vast number of workers in this country would respond to the guidance offered to them and not wait for direction.

Sir Waldron Smithers: Does not the Minister realise that dictatorship will not work in England?

British Market Research Bureau

Sir David Maxwell Fyfe asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury to what extent the British Market Research Bureau, Limited, of 6, Grafton Street, London, W.1, is supported by public funds; to what extent its activities have been sponsored by the Government; and what type of information it has compiled for the Government.

Mr. Glenvil Hall: It is not supported by public funds. It is a commercial firm employed on a commercial basis from time to time by Government Departments to survey certain aspects of public opinion and behaviour. Examples of such work are surveys of the state of retailers' stocks for the Board of Trade, of the working of the points rationing scheme for the Ministry of Food, and of the number of persons who read the Highway Code.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: Can the right hon. Gentleman reconcile that answer with the fact that on Merseyside their questions were, "What do you think of reform of the House of Lords?" and "How will you vote at the next Election?" Is that done with Government Department support?

Mr. Glenvil Hall: I have no knowledge of the questions quoted by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. I cannot imagine them fitting in with the answer I have given.

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: In view of the right hon. Gentleman's last admission, will he cause inquiries to be made into the questions asked?

Mr. Glenvil Hall: I certainly will; but I find it very difficult to believe that the questions which have now been quoted to the House by the right hon. and learned Gentleman have anything to do with the inquiries to which I have referred.

Dr. Stephen Taylor: Is my hon. Friend aware that this firm, besides Government work, does jobs for newspapers and other bodies?

Sir D. Maxwell Fyfe: In view of the unsatisfactory nature of the reply, I beg to give notice that I shall ask leave to raise the matter on the Adjournment at the earliest possible opportunity.


Post Office, Deliveries (Delay)

Sir W. Smithers asked the Postmaster-General if he has considered details of delay in delivery in letters which have been sent to him from Mr. Groves of Sunderland; and if he will make a statement.

Mr. Wilfred Paling: I have had before me nine cases of delay to postal packets occurring over the last 18 months brought under notice by Mr. Groves; in a tenth case he commenced the expeditious handling of a packet notwithstanding its incorrect address. I regret the inconvenience caused by these delays which, with one exception due to a wrong address, were caused by mismanagement at one stage or another in course of post, and I look for an improvement following upon the attention which has been directed to them.

Mr. Bossom asked the Postmaster-General why letters which formerly were delivered around London in 24 hours now frequently take 48 hours or longer.

Mr. Wilfred Paling: I am not aware of any deterioration in the postal service such as is suggested, but if the hon. Member will let me have details of any particular cases he may have in mind, I shall be happy to investigate them.

Mr. Assheton asked the Postmaster-General what is the explanation of the delay in the delivery of letters to Messrs. Hurst-Brown, Buckmaster, and Peter Hicks, of Kent House, Telegraph Street, E.C.2, to which reference is made in the firm's letter to him of January 27.

Mr. Wilfred Paling: Detailed inquiry has failed to ascertain the cause of the delay to the three letters in question, and it can only be assumed that they were mistreated at the delivery Post Office. The delay was certainly abnormal and I hope there will be no further similar failure. I much regret the inconvenience and annoyance caused.


Petrol Supplies, British Empire (Allocations)

Mr. Grimston asked the Minister of Fuel and Power if, having regard to the fact that the British Empire is treated as a whole with regard to petrol supplies, and that, all parts of the Empire, with the exception of the United Kingdom, enjoy either basic ration or are free of petrol rationing, he will consider with the other Governments concerned the possibility of a re-allocation of supplies in such a manner as to permit of the re-introduction of a small basic ration in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Gaitskell: As I have explained to the hon. Member, this matter has already been discussed with the Commonwealth Governments, who fully appreciate the necessity of reducing petrol consumption and all forms of dollar expenditure. The extent to which, and the way in which, this is being achieved, must depend largely on local circumstances.

Mr. Grimston: Is the Minister aware that a few years ago his predecessor, when asked for relaxations in this country, said that that could not be entertained because one had to bear in mind the Commonwealth position? Why is it that it does not work the other way round, as many parts of the Commonwealth still have a basic ration, whereas it has been taken away altogether over here?

Mr. Gaitskell: I am sure the hon. Member would not wish to suggest that any of the Commonwealth Governments are not doing their duty in this matter.

Mr. Grimston: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that that is not the point, and that is not my suggestion? My suggestion is—and I ask him to consider this—that the Government here are ready to refuse increases in petrol because they say conditions in the Commonwealth must be
Minerva's Owl?

It was quite clear to an observer in the House of Commons on February 9 that there is no conflict of principle between the Government and the Opposition.

Mr. Bevan had not the slightest difficulty in proving that the National Health Service Act was not his child but that paternity could more reasonably be attributed to the British Medical Association itself whose own Medical Planning Commission incriminated all three parties.

Quite rightly Mr. Bevan said that it could not be his personality alone which made the Act unacceptable to the “diehards of the medical profession,” since Mr. Ernest Brown had produced a fiercer child, Mr. Willink one little less fierce, whilst his surely should be the darling of them all.

He was, therefore, in a position to charge the leaders of the B.M.A. with misleading their Members and to get away with it in the House because both the Conservative and Liberal Parties were unable to provide an effective opposition.

Those who have studied the history of this Act know quite well that the B.M.A. is now being pushed so strongly from behind by its members that it has had to get off the fence. Whether it is truly representing their policy is a matter of opinion depending upon just assessment of that policy.

By the time this is published the plebiscite will be on the point of closing, if indeed it has not already closed, and thanks to Mr. Bevan we forecast a big adverse majority.

It is fortunate for the medical profession and the country that it is Mr. Bevan who is Minister of Health. Had it been Mr. Willink with the prestige of Mr. Winston Churchill behind him, the doctors would no doubt have been lured into the trap. But traps may still be laid for them.

With Mr. Bevan at the Ministry of Health the string and the stick and the sieve are more obvious.

Between now and July 5 every device both of flattery and of intimidation will be used. The Debate itself was a threat and the only good thing to be said for the Opposition was that they denounced it as such, but as this was obvious and they let everything else go by default their participation in the debate could give no encouragement to those optimists who look for an alternative Government.

The most encouraging event of the moment is the open recognition at last that “what is really at issue is the power of certification.” By its clear statement of this fact, The Tablet has proved itself in the forefront of political newspapers.
Political ‘Saints’ and the Destruction of Empires

By BORGE JENSEN

The suggestive comparison drawn in your issue of January 31, the day after the assassination of Gandhi, between the part played by the Mahatma in speeding the liquidation of the British administration of India with that of Rasputin in bringing about the downfall of Imperial Russia has been further underlined by the shock which ran out at Birla House, New Delhi, on January 30. You wrote:

“Gandhi himself appears to have been like Rasputin, mediumistic; and it is more than probable that he has little or no understanding of the politics in the interest of which he is so useful.”

On the following day, February 1, Mr. R. G. Casey, Governor of Bengal from 1944 to 1946, wrote in the Sunday Times:

“I found that no catalogue of his qualities or of his achievements was sufficient to explain his influence over the people. I asked him straight how he explained it, but although he was willing to discuss the matter, he could throw no real light upon it.”

Mr. Casey who for some years had been Federal Treasurer of Australia but had no former experience of India, was justifiably struck by the power of Gandhi who, we are told, only had to write a letter to the ringleaders of a terrorist underground movement to bring protracted riots to an abrupt end, and to make the leaders yield themselves up to the Bengal police. Gandhi confided to the Governor-General that he made no claims “to great learning or great intellectual power.”

In the case of Rasputin, contemporary records agree that his intellectual powers did not exceed those of the average wandering ‘Holy Man’ of his day. His only surviving intellectual effort, My Thoughts and Reflections (1915) is a collection of scriptural texts and homely proverbs strung together by his very commonplace reflections thereon. The reputation of the book did not survive its author who was assassinated towards the end of 1916. He always maintained that the fate of Holy Russia was intimately connected with his own.

His murder was greeted by the Russian people with universal rejoicing, but it soon became evident that they had entirely misjudged the political importance of Rasputin.

“The Reign of Rasputin” (the significantly misleading title which M. Rodzianko, President of the Imperial Duma, gave to his absorbing study of those fateful years) did not come to an end with Rasputin’s death. Things continued to go from bad to worse; and the rate at which evil things befell the Russian people was even increased. Sir Samuel Hoare (Lord Templewood), head of the British Secret Mission to Russia during 1916-1917, admits in his book the “Fourth Seal” that in the report which he sent home on Rasputin’s death on January 1, 1917:

“... he fell into two errors common to the great majority of the Russians, firstly that Rasputin was the incarnation of the Devil, and secondly that his death would liberate the forces of heaven.”

—The Last Days of the Romanovs: Robert Wilton

The legend of Rasputin had been assiduously ‘built up’ by the Occult Powers whose instrument he was:

“Political propaganda had represented Rasputin as a monster of iniquity and occult powers, whereby he held the Empress under his thralldom. The dossier kills this legend. It is nothing more... she was merely an ignorant tool.” (Ibid).

Mr. Wilton maintains that all the foremost supporters and friends of the ‘saint’ were of German orientation with the pro-German Count Witte, who was married to a Jewess, as his arch-apologist. This fact would have lent colour to that other profound popular misconception concerning the pro-Germanism of the Empress, (the publication of their intimate letters has later completely cleared the Czar and the Czarina on this score) which tended to identify the Court with the ‘Dark Forces of the Rear.’ Mr. Wilton asks:

“Who magnified Rasputin before the war? The Cologne Gazette said: The Germans had almost as much to do with the Rasputin scandal as they had to do with Lenin and the exploits of his hundred Jews.” p. 43.

In the reports which Sir Samuel Hoare continued to send home during the early months of 1917 he reveals that amongst Rasputin’s intimate associates were Rubinstein and Manus, Jewish speculators and subversives, and Putiloff, owner of the greatest armament works, and manager of the Russo-Asiatic Bank. The Putiloff combine would seem to have worked in co-operation with Vickers-Armstrong (the Cassel-financed British Armaments trust) with a view to hastening the final defeat of the Imperial armies. Rodzianko believed that some of the sabotaging tactics employed by the Putiloff works was done with the assistance of Rasputin. The ‘saint’ certainly appears to have been busy in many spheres of action, but all his activities point to the same source of inspiration:

“What has always struck me as a curious observation were the connections which they had with the Secret Police, the Secret State Police of Russia has never ceased to perfect its organization and increase its numbers since the night when Rasputin’s murderers flung his corpse into the waters of the Neva. It is a well-known fact that the key positions of the

Adapting itself to the demands of successive Masonic-Liberal and Bolshevist-Totalitarian regimes, the Secret State Police of Russia has never ceased to ‘perfect its organization and increase its numbers’ since the night when Rasputin’s murderers flung his corpse into the waters of the Neva. It is a well-known fact that the key positions of the

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

Page 5

Saturday, February 21, 1948.
'Russian' Secret Police have been in the hands of the sons of Israel since the early days of the Ogpu, when Jurovski was its universally abhorred Chief. This was the inevitable corollary of the Liberation of the Jews from their ghettos in March and their resumption of complete power through the 'Soviets' in October. Like the 'Balfour' Declaration which was announced in the same month, the 'Soviet' Revolution was but an 'incident in a far-reaching scheme' to use the famous words of Mr. Marshall, of Kuhn, Loeb and Co.

The end of the Monarchy was brought about by the Russian Revolution skilfully fomented and managed by the Zionists. They had made elaborate plans for it, and, to quote Leo Motzkin, "the general Zionist organisation had sanctioned participation in the revolutionary movement as early as the summer of 1905, in the course of the 7th Zionist Congress, and at its Helsingfors Conference in the fall of 1906 adopted a platform to that effect." (Memorah, 1917, p. 216) "Zionism, Militant Christian Patriots Publication, London, 1936).

Members of the leading German Jewish banking houses of Oppenheimer and Warburg were the official 'German' leaders of the Zionist movement before 1914 when the Zionist headquarters were domiciled in Berlin. During the early part of the war the Zionist headquarters were moved to New York, but Otto Warburg remained in Berlin, assisting in common with his kinsmen of Hamburg and New York the launching of the Communist-Zionist Revolution of 1917:

"The downfall of the tsardom of Russia was undoubtedly one of the greatest events in the world's history. Russia entered into a period of revolution which seemed to bring with it all the blessings of right and liberty. The restrictions affecting nationalities and creeds were removed. But far from destroying Zionism, the new liberty gave it an immense stimulus." N. Sokolow History of Zionism, p. 38).

The links which connect the 'Soviet' Revolution of 1917 which was hailed with enthusiasm by the leading 'Labour' politicians of England and the foremost Jewish Bankers of Wall Street with the present upheaval in India, are numerous but, like the activities of Rasputin, they can without much difficulty, be traced back to a central source of inspiration.

Major Douglas wrote in The Big Idea, pp. 45-46:

"Lord Reading [Rufus Isaacs] headed a delegation to Washington which resulted in the entry of America, with the cooperation of Kuhn, Loeb, into the war on the side of the Allies, and the turning of the scale against Germany . . ."

"What was the exact nature and scope of the bargain concluded by Lord Reading in 1917, we shall probably never know. That it was aimed at the elimination of the British Empire, is certain. Beyond making the United Kingdom responsible for the payment in gold for all sums credited as the price of goods supplied whether to Britain or any other Ally, some kind of effective control over every aspect of British life and policy was imposed. The Bank of England was placed under an American "adviser" and an obviously nominated permanent Governor; an Irish "settlement" which placed, as we are now witnessing, a potential enemy across every aspect of British life and policy was imposed. The restrictions affecting nationalities and creeds were removed. But far from destroying Zionism, the new liberty gave it an immense stimulus." N. Sokolow History of Zionism, p. 38).

The end of the Monarchy was brought about by the Russian Revolution skilfully fomented and managed by the Zionists. They had made elaborate plans for it, and, to quote Leo Motzkin, "the general Zionist organisation had sanctioned participation in the revolutionary movement as early as the summer of 1905, in the course of the 7th Zionist Congress, and at its Helsingfors Conference in the fall of 1906 adopted a platform to that effect." (Memorah, 1917, p. 216) "Zionism, Militant Christian Patriots Publication, London, 1936).

Major Douglas wrote in The Big Idea, pp. 45-46:

"Lord Reading [Rufus Isaacs] headed a delegation to Washington which resulted in the entry of America, with the cooperation of Kuhn, Loeb, into the war on the side of the Allies, and the turning of the scale against Germany . . ."

"What was the exact nature and scope of the bargain concluded by Lord Reading in 1917, we shall probably never know. That it was aimed at the elimination of the British Empire, is certain. Beyond making the United Kingdom responsible for the payment in gold for all sums credited as the price of goods supplied whether to Britain or any other Ally, some kind of effective control over every aspect of British life and policy was imposed. The Bank of England was placed under an American "adviser" and an obviously nominated permanent Governor; an Irish "settlement" which placed, as we are now witnessing, a potential enemy across every aspect of British life and policy was imposed. The restrictions affecting nationalities and creeds were removed. But far from destroying Zionism, the new liberty gave it an immense stimulus." N. Sokolow History of Zionism, p. 38).

"As to India, no body of people had done more than the Labour Party to hasten the realisation of Moscow's principal aim, severance from the British Empire, though publicly advocating only the first step to this end, self-government or Home Rule. In this task it had been ably seconded by the Theosophical Society, whose leading members were large shareholders in the Victoria House Printing Company by which their official organ, The Daily Herald, was produced, and who habitually provided a platform for advocates of Indian "Home Rule."

For some years after the war Mr. Sigfried Sassoon was the literary Editor of The Daily Herald. He is a descendant of the Prince of the Captivity, the leader of Exiled Jewry who in the early 19th century removed the exilarchal court from Baghdad to Bombay, from which city several generations of Sassoons, following a well-laid scheme of dispersion, set out to conquer the world for the sort of ideals preached by the learned Talmudists who flourished in the Exilarch's Court. We know that Sassoon's control of the opium trade was one of the means necessary to implement those ideals.

Hacham Chaim Jehudi, leading Talmudist of the Sassoon-controlled community of Bombay, was for many years the intimate advisor of Gandhi, the leading advisor of the leading politicians of the Congress movement. (vide: Die Zeit, August, 1931).

In London the Sassoons had inter-married with the Rothschilds towards the end of the 19th century, and during the Edwardian period the London Sassoons acted as hosts, on behalf of the King-Emperor, to the Princes of India. The London Rothschilds dominated the well-known group, the Schusters, the Speyers, etc., who had all come, like themselves, from Frankfort-on-the-Main under cover of those 'Napoleonic' wars which their group had financed. Major Douglas writes: (The Big Idea, p. 46)

"During the most critical period the Finance Minister of India was Sir George Schuster. It is not unimportant to notice that the present Secretary of State for India (1942) is Mr. Leo S. Amery, a colleague on the Board of Messrs. Marks and Spencer of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff.

While Mrs. Rebecca Sieff is the leading lady of 'British' female Zionism, Mr. Amery, a high-degree Freemason, belongs to the pro-Zionist 'Conservative' group which counts Mr. Churchill, Mr. Duff Cooper and Mr. Eden amongst its
members. Sir George Schuster, who has for some time past been giving technical advice to Sir Stafford Cripps’s ‘working parties’ and is the author of the book *India and Democracy*, was supported in his work for Indian ‘democracy’ by members of the Kisch family. Sir Cecil Hermann Kisch, who is married to Myra, daughter of Rabbi Marcus Adler, has occupied important positions in the Financial Department of the India Office, the League of Nations and the London School of Economics. His brother, Lieut.-Col. Frederick Hermann Kisch, who was a partner of Keyser and Co., the London correspondents of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., was also Chairman of the Palestine Zionist executive and one of the Zionist colonies in Palestine bears his name.

During the years when European politics were dominated by the threat of the ‘Nazi’ movement, whose activities gave such an enormous fillip to Zionist activity everywhere, Indian politics were over-shadowed by the growing power of the Congress Party.

Summing up the policy of Gandhi, Mr. Leo S. Amery, Secretary for India from 1940-45 wrote in an article which appeared in the *London Evening Standard* on the day of Gandhi’s murder:

“It was revolutionary in substance but non-violent in method. The revolutionary aspect lay in his absolute refusal to compromise on any solution that did not involve the immediate termination of British rule and its direct replacement by the Congress party, which, as he told the Round Table Conference ‘alone represents the whole of India and all its minorities.’”

From the questions asked in the House of Commons on May 6, 1946, it appeared that the sitting Indian Legislative Assembly with whose ‘leaders’ British labour Ministers, sharing Gandhi’s view of its right to speak for all of India, exclusively nominated, had been elected by one fifth of one per cent. of British India.

Mr. J. C. French writes in an article *India Deadlock*, which appeared in the *National Review*, 1941:

“Since 1930 every Congressman has taken a yearly oath demanding independence for India and separation from the Empire. In October, 1939, to avoid taking part in the war effort, it made its Ministers resign, and a year later, in October, 1940, under the guidance of Mr. Gandhi, it started an agitation against it, and all its leaders are now in goal.”

In his *America’s Role in Asia*, Mr. H. P. Howard writes:

“The Congress Party is backed and financed by such industrial magnates as the Birla Brothers . . . every boycott of British goods has been of advantage to these industrialists . . . the industrialists agree with lowering living standards.”

In *The Social Crediter* for December 28, 1946, there appeared the following passage:

“Amongst the inveterate enemies of the British in India, and the channel through which a good deal of the seditious propaganda against us has been financed and distributed are the Birlas, Hindu millionaire textile manufacturers, and the Tatas, Parsee steel and hydro-electric monopolists. The latter have been the most venomous, and have been intriguing with Wall Street for fifty years at least.

“The Tatas have concluded an agreement by which they become industrialists agree with lowering living standards.”

“The Birlas are taking over the local production of a large British automobile cartel. They probably control the so-called Congress Party.”

In 1945 Mlle. Eve Curie published a book dealing with her wartime experiences, *Journey Among the Warriors*, from which we quote the following:

“One of Mr. Gandhi’s secretaries . . . welcomed me in the hall of the expensive-looking mansion that belonged to this wealthiest of supporters of the Congress Party: Mr. Birla . . . by mysterious ways Mr. Gandhi was extremely impressive . . . The atmosphere of Birla House well reflected Mr. Gandhi’s double-life, in which politics and selflessly have an equal share. The place served as headquarters for the Congress as well as sanctuary for an apostate.

“The climax of the crisis came on Sunday, March 29, at 6 p.m. when the British Envoy (Sir Stafford Cripps) made public the text of the proposals . . . I recognized several familiar faces in the hall . . . in the centre seat, the quiet elderly man who never failed to raise pointed arguments on behalf of Indian Big Business . . .

“Early in 1945 there was published a memorandum called the ‘Fifteen Year Plan’. It had been drawn up, writes Mr. Frank Clune (*Song of India*, Sidney, 1946) by eight Bombay industrialists

“. . . not all of whom are Tata directors—but they are all ‘big business’ men . . . The authors assume that the Government of India on the termination of the war, or shortly after ‘will have full freedom in economic matters’ . . . publication of the plan was a Bombay bombshell. Government spokesmen labelled it a ‘non-official plan and said it was sound in parts. Disciples of Gandhi said it was just what the Mahatma had been advocating for years . . .

“It is interesting to note that in the long letter of exposition which the ‘Keep Left Group’ during the ‘Foreign-Policy’ rebellion of November, 1946*, sent to Mr. Attlee there is nothing but praise for the Government’s policy in India:

“In India, in particular, the Government have made one of the most significant contributions to Indian, and to world peace that has ever been made by any British Government. Pains-taking and constructive negotiations accompanied by a real initiative—have provided a complete answer . . .

“One of the moves towards final ‘Independence’ was the appointment of the sister of Pandit Nehru as ambassadress to Moscow. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself had shortly before declared that India’s future hope was a Socialism based on the principles of the Soviet Union. (The booklets of Calcutta and Bombay are filled with the books of Beatrice and Sydney Webb and their disciples on both sides of the Atlantic).

“Early in 1947, Lord Wavell, one of the most eminent of British, perhaps of the world’s, generals was recalled, before the end of his term as Viceroy, from the scene of civil war which large parts of India already then presented. Lord Wavell is of old English stock, and knows India intimately. He was succeeded by that typical ‘Labour’ apologist, Lord Louis Mountbatten who had little knowledge and slight experience of India and who until 1917 was known as Prince Louis Franz of Battenberg. He is the grand-son of Louis IV, Grand Duke of Hesse, and the nephew of Alexandra Feodorovna, (nee Princess of Hesse) the last Empress of all the Russias and the protector of Rasputin. His wife, Edwina, is the grand-daughter of Sir Ernest Cassel, the friend and business associate of Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., New York. His elder brother, the late Marquess of Milford Haven was a director of Marks and Spencer.

“One of the first acts of the new Viceroy was to invite

Gandhi to the Viceregal Lodge and in the shady recesses of its grounds Lord Mountbatten, innocent of all the traditional reserve and dignity which has characterized His Majesty’s representatives in the past, chatted informally with the leading official subverter of the British order in India, for hour after hour.

In hurricane tempo there followed a series of decisions which culminated in the partition of British India into the Dominions of India and Pakistan. Mr. L. S. Amery wrote (Evening Standard, January 30, 1948):

... and it is not surprising that Gandhi’s domination over Congress played no small part in the eventual result of Mr. Jinnah and his Moslem followers not to come in, under any terms, under a federal Government dominated by the Hindu majority.

The News Review contributed a special issue (August 14, 1947) to India’s ‘Day of Destiny’:

“The final phase of this historic change has been accomplished by the hustling methods of India’s last Viceroy—Viscount Mountbatten of Burma, Queen Victoria’s great-grandson.”

On August 15, 1947, Lord Mountbatten took the oath as first Governor-General of the new Dominion of India. He said:

“At this historic moment let us never forget that all that India owed to Mahatma Gandhi—the architect of her freedom through non-violence.”

The Evening Standard, August 29, commented:

“What India owes to the architect of freedom through non-violence can now be seen. It is massacre and pillage, misery and destruction, rape and torture . . . in India the Government have chosen the path of folly. The result is grief and woe.”

The rest is recent and well-known history, and, the wheel having turned full circle, we come back to the assassination at Birla house of ‘the greatest citizen of India’, ‘the architect of his country’s freedom’, to use the language of the ‘popular’ press everywhere. The Marquess of Linlithgow, former Viceroy of India and present Chairman of the Midland Bank commented that “with Gandhi dead, nothing in India will ever be the same.”

We do not hesitate to prophecy, however, that with the Birlas, Tatas, Sassoons, Rothschilds, Crossmans, Levis, Schusters still active things in India will, as in Russia after the death of Rasputin, continue to go on as before, i.e., from bad to worse, but again, as in Russia of 1916-17, the rate at which evil things will befall the common man of India, and elsewhere, may well be considerably speeded up.

Even before the Mahatma’s corpse had been burnt and his ashes strewn over the holy rivers of India, his political disciples of the Indian Congress have discovered that the murder of their spiritual leader was part of a vast underground plot against them all. If revolutionary history teaches us anything it is this that the discovery of vast underground plots are invariably followed by an increase in the number of the police and the further perfection of its organization. Vatel, a Congress leader who in recent months has conducted a vigorous campaign to ‘induce’ the Princes to ‘join’ the Congress-dominated Dominion informs the world that the police have the matter well in hand and that no effort will be spared to bring the criminals to judgement. Shades of the last days of the Holy Russian Empire. Poor Mother India.