

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 24. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Whether because he has mediumistic capabilities to an outstanding degree or because there is something besides mountebank in his constitution, Bernard Shaw once wrote a play called *Saint Joan*, not the least merit of which is the important if platitudinous question put by Joan to Couchon: "What other judgment can I judge by but my own?" Because no other answer is possible than that no one can borrow judgment from someone else, or, if one could and used it one would not be judging at all but merely reporting someone else's judgment, many people, doubtless Bernard Shaw himself among them, are self-deceived into thinking that the "right" of individual judgment—which is quite a different thing from the *fact* of individual judgment—is substantiated.

These matters need some attention at the present time, a bad time, and getting worse generally, but, we are assured, better sporadically. It is the spores that interest us. If the world can be said to have a mind, and not be altogether out of its mind, this mind is in too damaged a condition to undertake any task more exacting than the most feeble attempt to co-operate in (not to promote) its own recovery. It isn't fit to promote *anything*, and would be very dangerous if it were. There's no joy in Heaven over it. What joy there is envisages something else—something which, most certainly is not the "proletariat." The "proletariat" doesn't weigh anything one way or another. The joy in Heaven does not envisage it. It envisages something entirely different: mustard. We shall postpone our jubilation until someone else sees the mountain move.

"A very droll spectacle it was in the last [the seventeenth—Editor, *T.S.C.*] century to behold the impotent efforts the English made for the establishment of a democracy. As those who had a share in the direction of public affairs were void of all virtue, as their ambition was inflam'd by the success of the most daring of their members (Cromwell), as the spirit of a faction was suppressed only by that of a succeeding faction, the government was constantly changing: the people amazed at so many revolutions, sought everywhere for a democracy without being able to find it. At length after a series of tumultuary motions and violent shocks, they were obliged to have recourse to the very government which they had so odiously proscribed.

"When Sylla wanted to restore *Rome* to her liberty, this unhappy city was incapable of receiving it. She had some feeble remains of virtue, and as this was every day diminishing, instead of being roused out of her lethargy, by Caesar, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, Domitian, she rivited every day her chains; the blows she struck were levelled against the tyrants, but not at the tyranny.

"The politic Greeks who lived under a popular government, knew no other support but virtue. The modern in-

habitants of that country are entirely taken up with manufactures, commerce, finances, riches and luxury.

"When virtue is banished, ambition invades the hearts of those who are disposed to receive it, and avarice possesses the whole community. The desires now change their objects; what they are formed of before, becomes indifferent; they were free, while under the restraint of laws, they will now be free to act against law, and as every citizen is like a slave escaped from his master's house, what was a maxim of equity, they call rigour; what was a rule of action, they call restraint; and to precaution they give the name of fear. Frugality, and not the thirst for gain, now passes for avarice. Formerly the wealth of individuals constituted the public treasure; but now the public treasure is become the patrimony of private persons. The members of the commonwealth riot on the public spoils, and its strength is only the power of some citizens, and the licentiousness of the whole community."

Yes, M. de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu. He wrote in "a library as long as a cricket pitch"—well, there's a good deal to cricket. What would he have written in a caravan, fed by book clubs, left and right, through the highly selective hands of a circulating library? The world has had a long childhood. Would St. Augustine have included "economic heretics" among those of whom he said: "Heretics were given us that we might not remain in infancy.?"

The Fuchs Case Statement by Lord Chancellor

In the House of Lords on April 5, the Lord Chancellor, Viscount Jowitt, said:—"My Lords, I wish to correct a point of fact arising out of a speech which I made last week on the Motion of the noble Lord, Lord Vansittart. I then said that there was no truth in certain statements which had been made in the Press about the Fuchs case. The fact is that in a notebook belonging to a man who was one of those examined by The Canadian Royal Commission there did appear amongst a long list of other names, the name of Klaus Fuchs. This notebook, together with other relevant material, was promptly made available to us by the Canadian authorities. Subsequent events have, of course, attached a significance to that name which it did not then bear. As I was, when I made my speech, imperfectly informed on this particular, I thought I owed it to your Lordships and to the Press to make this correction."

For correct information concerning the Constitution of
THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT,
Social Crediters and others are invited to apply for
the Statement published in July, 1949, (*postage 1d.*)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: March 28, 1950.

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): . . . I remember that during the last Parliament not to go too far back, I made a speech at Fulton which became the object of a Motion of Censure signed, I think, by more than 100 Members of the Socialist Party. But shortly afterwards, the policy I had advocated was adopted on both sides of the Atlantic and by all parties in this House. . . .

The Prime Minister also complained that such a question as that of Germany aiding in Western defence should have been "injected"—that is the word he used, "injected"—into a Debate on defence, but that was surely its natural and obvious place in the first instance. . . . I said nothing about the rearmament of Germany or about recreating the German Army, but I see no reason why the Germans should not aid in the defence of their own country and of Western Europe, or why British, American, French and German soldiers should not stand in the line together on honourable terms of comradeship as part of a combined system of defence. . . . We are presently to have a meeting at Strasbourg of the Council of Europe and the Assembly where, we trust, in spite of all that has happened, French and German hands will be clasped in concord. I recommend to the House that we should do all in our power to encourage and promote Franco-German reconciliation as an approach to unity, or even perhaps some form, in some aspects, of union. . . .

. . . But France, after her tribulations and in her present disturbed condition, may not be strong enough to accomplish single-handed her mission. That is why the intimate and inseparable relationship between Britain and France and between the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations and France must be affirmed and asserted continually in the most effective manner. France and Britain, both sorely distressed, can combine together and, thus joined, have the superior power to raise Germany, even more shattered, to an equal rank and to lasting association with them.

Then these three countries, helping each other, conscious of their future united greatness, forgetting ancient feuds and the horrible deeds and tragedies of the past, can make the core or the nucleus upon which all the other civilised democracies of Europe, bond or free, can one day rally and combine. Woe be it to anyone in the free world, who, by lack of understanding, or by lack of good-will, or by lack of world hope, or any more flagrant fault or blunder, obstructs or delays this essential combination.

There was a time when men thought that the conception of a United States of Europe would be resented by the United States of America, but now we have the American people, with their own heavy burdens to bear, sacrificing themselves and using all their power and authority to bring about this very system. In this lies the hope of the Western world and its power to promote beneficial solutions, perhaps, of what happens in Asia.

I do not wish to fall into vague generalities. Let me, therefore, express our policy as I see it in a single sentence. Britain and France united should stretch forth hands of friendship to Germany, and thus, if successful, enable Europe to live again. . . .

. . . Almost the same time that I spoke in the defence

Debate a statement was being made by General de Gaulle on Franco-German relations. As the House knows, I have not always seen eye to eye with that patriotic Frenchman, who represented in the war more than any other man the will to live of France. Certainly there is no one in France who could have opposed with more vigour and injurious effect the reconciliation between the French and German people. He represents the most powerful forces which could have been arrayed on the wrong side. But what did he say? He spoke of the proposal which Dr. Adenauer had just made for an economic union between France and Germany. I shall read his words. He said:

"I have followed for 30 years the ideas of the German Chancellor. In what this good German has said I have found the echo of the call of Europe."

Relations between the two countries must be viewed against a European background. In short the grand design of Charlemagne must be re-adapted to modern conditions. . . .

Mr. Blackburn (Birmingham, Northfield): . . . Some new approach is needed, as has been said by almost every independent expert on the subject, if we are to have any hope of averting what is a manifest drift—we hope not a drift towards war, but nevertheless a manifest drift.

I want to put forward one or two practical considerations. The first is this. I think that we have been far too greatly overshadowed by the United States of America. Although it was vital for the Foreign Secretary to keep the United States of America with us, and although I personally have great admiration for the way he did it, I feel that our point of view is not sufficiently considered. The other day, the Prime Minister quoted a very important book by Dr. Vannevar Bush. In the first place, that book is already out of date because the Soviet Union developed the atomic bomb years before Dr. Vannevar Bush expected them to do so. I can give my right hon. Friend the specific quotations if he wants them; I have them with me. In the second place, the book was manifestly written from the point of view of the United States of America.

Let us at least remember this vital fact. We have at the moment in East Anglia squadrons of American bombers which, to everybody's knowledge, and to the knowledge of the Soviet Union, could carry atomic bombs to Moscow. In other words, we have been willing to accept the position of being the front line of defence in the whole concept of Western Union and American Western Union Defence. Now that is a tremendous contribution upon our part towards this whole cause, and I do not believe that in the defence sphere we have yet received adequate recompense for it from the United States.

I am not putting this forward in any defeatist spirit. For while the British Isles are more vulnerable to atomic attack than any country in the world, it is nevertheless true, in my opinion, that the British Commonwealth and Empire as a whole will survive best out of the three major powers in the event of the appalling catastrophe of an atomic war. We in the British Isles are the most vulnerable country, but the Commonwealth and Empire as a whole is the least vulnerable Power because it is the most widely dispersed. Therefore, we have every right to speak and to expect our views to be heard. The Prime Minister said the other day, when asked about this: "Well, observe what I have done in the past. I was responsible for promoting the Atomic Energy Commission at the conference which I called with President Truman and Mr. Mackenzie King." I think we all agree; but the point is that nothing has been done since the deadlock; and, in fact, the deadlock took place in 1947.

A somewhat embarrassing fact is that the Soviet Union have gone much further in the direction of co-operation in the field of atomic energy than most people appear to realise. I speak as a very strongly anti-Soviet Member of this side of the House, as I think my hon. Friends will agree, but we must tell the truth about this matter because it seems to me vital that we should face it. I have here the exact proposals made on 11th June, 1947, by Mr. Gromyko, and they seem to me to go a very long way indeed. Let me read the first:

"The mining of raw materials and every stage of atomic production should be under strict international control."

That seems a fairly reasonable proposal which could be considered, and which could be a basis for discussion anyway. I do not want to go through them all, but a very important proposal is the seventh:

"The inspectors"—

these are international inspectors—

"should have the right of free access to all mining and production facilities, and should be allowed to weigh, measure and analyse atomic raw materials and finished products."

There are also in the Soviet proposals provisions for what I might describe as snap inspections; that is to say, provided reasonable cause was shown by any Power, under the Soviet proposals it would be possible for the international inspectors to go and inspect factories without prior specific notice having been given to the Power in question.

In other words—it is a most embarrassing fact, but it is so—the main difference between the Soviet Union and ourselves in relation to the proposals of the Soviet Union and the Baruch proposals is this—and it is diverting: that the United States and ourselves insist on absolute internationalisation of all atomic production, and the Soviet Union takes its stand upon national sovereignty and says "We cannot except anything quite so revolutionary as that." That in fact, is the main distinction between the United States on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. I therefore appeal to the Foreign Secretary: Let us face this problem; let us face it with a full knowledge of the facts; and let us face it with less secrecy.

Again, another rather extraordinary fact is that this country, unwittingly, through certain atomic scientists gave the whole of the secrets to the Soviet Union while we were refraining from giving those secrets to New Zealand, or France, or to our own natural allies. I therefore beg the Foreign Secretary to put the cards on the table face upwards in this matter. For instance, let us know where we stand in relation to the Soviet Union. . . .

I accept the fact that the Soviet Union in the past have not shown themselves very anxious to keep agreements, but it is no good going to a conference with anyone on that basis. We have to go on the basis that there are some methods by which we can succeed in persuading the Soviet Union to do what they do not want to do. I was reading quite recently the book by Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State at the time of Yalta. It is an interesting book in defence of Yalta. Having read it, I came to the conclusion that although many mistakes were made at Yalta—and many of my hon. Friends, certainly the Minister of Health, took the view at the time that many mistakes were made—President Roosevelt and the right hon. Gentleman did persuade Stalin to agree to certain steps which he did not desire to be taken. I will give only one instance, the proposals for free elections in Poland, which enabled Mikolajczyk, against the

wishes of perhaps the majority of the Poles here, to go to Poland as Deputy Prime Minister. All that was part of these very difficult Yalta negotiations. I cannot believe for one moment that Stalin wanted him to go back to Poland, but he was prepared to negotiate. Unfortunately, the book shows that very soon after the end of Yalta he was sending telegrams to President Roosevelt alleging that General Eisenhower in Italy was "ratting" on the agreements which the right hon Gentleman, President Roosevelt and Stalin had concluded.

. . . Therefore, surely it is absolutely vital for us to get at the two or three men who actually control the Soviet Union. We do not get at these men even by conversations through the Russian ambassadors, nor by discussions at the United Nations, which have as their primary object a propaganda value, as the Foreign Secretary has so often said. I quite agree that the dangers are immense of entering into an agreement which the other side will not keep, but the stakes are so great that we must make our moral position unassailable. . . .

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeenshire, East): . . . I do not want to strike a depressing note in this Debate; but I must say that I found myself in complete agreement—or rather in substantial agreement—with my hon. Friend the Member for Preston, North (Mr. Amery) who said, in his admirable maiden speech, that we are in fact now fighting the third world war. I think that we are in the middle of it. It is a war which, although not hot, is total. Our problem is, therefore, not so much one of preventing war as one of making peace. What we have to do is to try to bring this war to an end.

There is no longer any doubt about the present object of Soviet policy. It is, to be quite brief and pointed, the conquest of the world. As a matter of fact, there has not been any doubt about it since 1945, except for those who have not wanted to believe it and have, therefore, refused to believe it. It has been constantly reiterated in theory and furthered in practice. For those who had any lingering doubts or hopes, the policy, and the theory on which it is based, was announced to the world in three comprehensive speeches of profound and far-reaching importance in the autumn of 1947—in the speech of Vyshinsky at U.N.O. on 18th September; in the speech of Zhdanov to the conference of the Cominform in the same month; and in the speech of Molotov on 6th November at the anniversary of the Revolution. Their proclaimed objective was the seizure of monopolistic power by the Communists, over as wide an area and as rapidly as possible; and the establishment of Communist régimes on "the only and best pattern"—to use their own phrase—that of the Soviet Union. Therefore, Tito is out.

The method is now familiar to us. It is the method of the Trojan horse. And it has, in practice, been enormously successful. I think that we should face up to that. I want to give one very short quotation to the House from a book by Mr. James Burnham, who himself had rather close associations with the Communists at one period in the past and therefore knows a good deal about them. The quotation is this:

"On the basis of the full evidence, Communism may be summarily defined as a world-wide conspiratorial movement for the conquest of a monopoly of power in the era of capitalist decline. Politically it is based upon terror and mass deception; economically it is, or at least tends to be, collectivist; socially it is totalitarian."

(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. 24. No. 7. Saturday, April 15, 1950.

The Social Credit Secretariat in Canada

Following upon the establishment of the Social Credit Secretariat in Canada, the following statement was issued to the Press on March 30 by Mr. L. D. Byrne, the Chairman:—

"The sole authority on Social Credit which is recognised as such by the world-wide Social Credit Movement is The Social Credit Secretariat through which the advice of Major C. H. Douglas is made available.

"Until two years ago the Social Credit Movement in Canada maintained a liaison with The Social Credit Secretariat and the world Movement through the Alberta Social Credit Board which was abolished by the Alberta Government at that time. Since then the Movement proper in this country—namely those subscribing to the policy of Social Credit as enunciated by Major C. H. Douglas—have progressively disassociated themselves from the field of party politics, thus bringing the Movement in Canada into line with the rest of the world Social Credit Movement.

"In response to the requests of organised sections of the Social Credit Movement in Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia, Major C. H. Douglas and The Social Credit Secretariat have approved the establishment of The Social Credit Secretariat in Canada. This will operate through a Chairman and Board of Directors as the authoritative channel in Canada for the dissemination of information and advice on all matters of Social Credit policy.

"The Social Credit Secretariat in Canada will be affiliated and work closely with the parent body—The Social Credit Secretariat. It will be a strictly non-party non-sectional organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, whether purporting to be Social Credit or otherwise. Its function will be to further Social Credit policy and its services will be available to all.

"The Social Credit Movement in Canada will comprise those organisations, groups and unattached persons who have entered voluntarily into association to further a common policy through affiliation with the Social Credit Secretariat in Canada, thereby being linked with the world Social Credit Movement. Affiliation will not be open to organisations or groups attached to any political party organisation, nor will these be recognised as forming any part of the Social Credit Movement in Canada.

(Signed) "L. D. Byrne,
 "Chairman,
 "Social Credit Secretariat in Canada."

Genesis of the "Rotten Borough"

Reviewing *The Elizabethan House of Commons*, by J. E. Neale, J. M. Lalley writes in *Human Events* (Washington, D.C.):—

"The current parliamentary crisis in Great Britain gives to Professor Neale's book something more than mere anti-

quarian interest, for it was in the course of the ten parliaments of the 55-year reign of Queen Elizabeth that the House of Commons began to emerge as the dominant element of the English political system. The prerogative of the crown was not, in Elizabeth's time, seriously attacked, although by the end of the reign the rising sentiment against it had become powerful enough to be noticed by Cecil. But the supine and subservient attitude of the Commons under the earlier Tudors had now disappeared. The members spoke their minds, and some of them boldly continued their debates outside the chamber. In 1585 the Queen told them angrily that it had been brought to her notice that 'Parliament matters was common table-talk at ordinaries,' meaning at taverns and public eating-places, and Cecil complained that he had even heard them talked of in the streets.

"Throughout the Sixteenth Century the number of seats in Commons had been increased from 286 to 462, partly through the enfranchisement of Cheshire, Monmouthshire and Wales, but chiefly through a rapid increase of boroughs. The reasons for this proliferation of boroughs are not clear. According to Professor Neale the purpose was not, as formerly supposed, to pack the Parliaments in favour of a dynasty that had, after all, only shaky claims to legitimacy. On this point his study of various borough contests appears to sustain him. The increase in representation, however, does not seem to reflect the growing self assertion of the 'new man'; that is to say, of the class of gentry which had come into great wealth and power through the distribution of the monastic estates, replacing the feudal nobility which had very largely destroyed itself in the Fifteenth Century civil wars or had perished on the scaffold after the Reformation. It was in Elizabeth's time that the generality of borough councils ceased to return local burgesses and elected instead candidates from the gentry, nominated by the court or by some powerful patron. Here, evidently, was the genesis of the 'rotten borough' system, so favourable to the rule of Parliamentary oligarchies, which persisted until the great Reform Act of 1832. Nevertheless, according to Professor Neale, it was a development of tremendous importance to British liberty, for he believes that a parliament in which timid tradesmen were predominant would not have defied the majesty and power of the Stuart king, as did the strong-minded squires of the Parliament of Pym. It was also at this time that the practice, rare but not unknown in the Middle Ages, of returning "foreigners," or persons not resident in the borough, became general. That peripatetic politician, Sir Walter Raleigh, for example, represented a half-dozen different constituencies in the course of his parliamentary career. The ultimate effect of the practice, however, says our professor, was to give the members of Commons a national rather than a provincial attitude towards politics.

"The county seats were of course still preferred, since the possession of one was in itself a certificate of high gentility. Where a single powerful family dominated a county, one or both seats were regarded as its perquisites. But in many counties there were commoners of several eminent families, so that vigorous contests were by no means infrequent. The suffrage was limited to freeholders of property worth 40 shillings or more, a substantial sum in those days; but in both borough and county elections there was often high-handed manipulations by the local sheriffs. These practices, apparently, continued until the House in the reign of James I took upon itself, apparently without constitutional warrant, the power to unseat members fraudulently elected."

Communism in Canada and Elsewhere

By FREDERIC DAVIDSON*

(Continued)

THE ORIGIN OF COMMUNISM

What we are witnessing now, strange as it may seem, in Russia, Spain and elsewhere, is a continuance of the French Revolution. It bobbed up in 1848 in France, Germany and Italy, again in the French Commune of 1871, in the abortive Russian Revolution of 1905, in the Kerensky and Bolshevik Revolutions in Russia, 1917, and is now being attempted on a world-wide scale, A.D., 1937.

Without delving into the roots of this subversive movement, which spread back into the Middle Ages and even farther, let me say that the French uprising of 1789 was brought about by secret societies: the Jacobins, the Orient Grand Lodge of Free Masonry and, most secret of all, the Jewish Society of the Illuminati, which merged with the Grand Orient, established higher and more secret degrees and worked for the overthrow of civilisation. This was in 1776; its principal implement was "scarcity in the midst of plenty," according to the slogan of to-day. This scarcity was, of course, artificially produced on the one hand by speculation in grain and other foods, on the other by destroying grain by burning it or throwing it into the water, and in this connection we might recall the destruction of crops by order of President Roosevelt. Not until 1878 did British Masonry sever its connection with the Orient Grand Lodge, when it was found that the latter denied the Great Architect of the Universe and the immortality of the soul. Incidentally, this is why Mussolini closed the Palazzo Giustiniano in Rome, headquarters of the Grand Lodge, and why Hitler has banned it in Germany.

Babeuf, the forerunner of Marx, proposed to Robespierre and Marat that they should at once kill off fifteen million Frenchmen, the upper and middle classes, so that there would not be so many mouths to feed. They did kill one and a half millions, and in Russia to date some thirty millions have been killed by executions, slave-driving and artificial famines.

But it was Adam Weishaupt, a Bavarian half-Jew, who took five years to produce a plan embodying all the subversive ideas of the past into a system for wrecking Christian civilisation, and on May 1, 1776, launched his Order of the Illuminati, one of the most devilish sects in the history of the world, which is still evilly active to-day, behind secret societies, under various names and disguises, and even right here in Toronto. This is the plan of Communism. Marx was not original; he borrowed the plan, holus-bolus, from Weishaupt, who in turn had been utilized by Babeuf. And this is why May 1 is Labour Day in Europe.

We have heard of the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. These are the secret directions for the world revolution and the taking over of the same. The Jews have tried to make out that these are not genuine, but the fact is that they were followed almost to the letter by the Bolshevik Revolution, and are being followed to-day even in Canada, and any one caught with a copy in Russia is immediately shot.

You will have gathered that the man behind Communism

—and the depression—is the Jew. Now, I do not say that all Jews are in this plot, but it is distinctly a Jewish movement; at least 75 per cent. of its leaders are Jews. Here we must make a distinction between Eastern and Western Jews—Ashkenazim and Sephardim—the former are the guilty parties, and they constitute about 90 per cent. of the whole. These are the Jews of Germany, Poland, Russia and the Orient. They are mixed with Tartar and Mongol blood. The Sephardim, the 10 per cent., of Spain, France, Italy and Holland, are of purer race and usually loyal to the country of their adoption. The Ashkenazim are historically atheist. I refer to the Jewish writer, Scholem Asch, in his book, *The Three Cities*.

The chief secret books of the Jews are the Qabala and the Talmud, and particularly the Zohar, the most sacred and secret book of the Qabala, in which it is stated that only Jews are human, Gentiles being beasts in human form, created to serve Jews, who are to possess world dominion. All but Jews are the descendants of Adam and Eve with devils. The Talmud is a code of laws governing the Jews' daily life, and one of its pleasing precepts is that a Jew may rob and leave to die a Gentile without doing wrong. From this derives the Soviet law that to kill a counter-revolutionary is legal, ethical murder.

That the Russian Revolution was Jewish was proved by Victor Marsden, correspondent in Russia for the London *Morning Post*, before, during and after the Revolution. He lists the names of those who took over after November 7, 1917. Out of 545 members of this dictatorship, 454 were Jews, only 23 being Russians. To-day of the 59 members of the Central Executive Committee of the Comintern, 56 are Jews, while the other three are married to Jewesses and their children speak Yiddish. But this is not all. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, 1925 edition, there were then 158,400,000 people in Russia, of whom 7,800,000 were Jews. Yet the *Jewish Annual Chronicle* of January 6, 1933, states: "Over one-third of the Jews in Russia have become officials." Anti-Semitism is counter-revolutionary and punishable by death. The red, five-pointed star, symbol of Jewry, is seen everywhere beside the hammer and sickle. Out of 17 Russian ambassadors and ministers in 1935 and 1936, only three were Russians, the rest being Jews. Maisky and Kagan (Cohen) are the Russian representatives on the non-intervention committee to-day in London. Litvinov, the Jewish Foreign Commissar of Russia and late President of the Council of the League of Nations, is a man with eight aliases and a criminal record—he led a gang to rob the Bank of Tiflis in 1906, when 32 persons were killed—not to speak of his responsibility for the millions of executions following the revolution, in which he took part. To-day Morris (Marcel) Rosenberg, U.S.S.R., is one of the two permanent Under-Secretaries of the League of Nations, and just now is enjoying a leave of absence to direct the Communist Government in Spain. Incidentally, his salary is twelve thousand dollars, plus an entertainment allowance, a portion of which sums Canada is privileged to contribute.

And not alone from Russia do Jews go forth as ambassadors. Isador Straus was, until a few months ago, the American Ambassador to France. Kemerer, another Jew, is French Ambassador to Tokio, while Fulvio Suvich, still another, is Italian Ambassador to Washington, and the half-Jew, Bullitt, was America's first Ambassador to the Soviet and is now Ambassador at Paris.

The fact is, Jews are in key positions everywhere, and

*Published in Toronto in 1937, we have received this material from the widow of the author, and warmly thank her for this courtesy. Noting the date, readers will observe the appositeness to present conditions.

in places they are fostering revolution. In France you have Leon Blum, Cachin, Delbos and "Cot." In Spain, Trotsky, Kun, Giral, Caballero, Brodsky, Neumann and Rosenberg have succeeded one another. Mussolini is surrounded by Jews, Sarfatti, Jung, Ivo Levy, Goldmann, Volpi, Uccelli, etc. 75 per cent. of Roosevelt's brain trust is Jew; in England the Jews hold titles and posts of highest confidence, such as the Under-Secretaryship for Air, held by Sir Philip Sassoon, one of whose grandmothers was a Rothschild. Even here we have Jew members of Parliaments, and our Ontario Minister of Welfare is a Russian Jew.

The B'nai Brith—Sons of the Covenant—a Jewish secret society, flourishes here, and its Grand Master was Karl Radek, editor of the *Izvestia* in Moscow, who has just now undergone a camouflaged trial.

The Jews are the only international race, hence the internationalisation of to-day, an attempt to break down national patriotism and tradition, to destroy the special contribution that each country makes to civilisation, and to Judaize the world.

There are many lines of attack: Hollywood, Theosophy, Nudism, Father Divine, Christian Socialism, false Humanitarianism, Share-the-Wealth of Huey Long and Townsend, Aberhart, Atheism, Basic English. Behind all these and many others you will find the Jew.

And while on the one hand there is, day by day, propaganda to enhance the prestige of the Jew—and you will have noticed how every day in every way he and his doings are played up, which was not the case ten or even five years ago—at the same time there is a conspiracy of silence as to the truth about him. I could not get these statements published in any Toronto paper, perhaps in any Canadian paper. Mr. Isaac Killam owned the *Mail and Empire*; the *Mail and Empire*, it was publicly asserted, owned 750 shares in the *Globe*; while the *Telegram* is said to have owned seventeen hundred shares in the latter, and I am wondering whether the *Star* does not own stock in its contemporaries. This, not to speak of the agencies which furnish cooked news or withhold news.

Pending the armed outbreak which is planned, the most dangerous feature of the whole thing in Canada is the infiltration of a Socialist mentality among our people, which would lead us to doubt whether we ought not to give away our property, traditions, and even our persons, to a Jewish League of Nations or Jewish bureaucracy. Well, let us now see what the plot has accomplished since the outbreak of 1917 in Russia.

I have shown that Jews have taken possession of Russia and are using it as a springboard from which to leap at the throat of the world.

In Mexico, religion is persecuted. On January 9, 1935, Mexico established two new departments in her schools, Socialism and Atheism. The Governor of the State of Tabasco re-named his three sons Lenin, Lucifer and Satan. Now a decree has been issued confiscating all private property, and, of course, it is common knowledge that Mexico is helping the Spanish Reds. South America has had, and partly still is having, a terrible time with Communism. Rosita Forbes, in her book, *Eight Republics in Search of a Future*, shows how Uruguay, with the help of emissaries from Moscow, set up a Soviet, only to find that all business stopped, including food supply; forty-million-pound railways, built with British money, had no haulage, and the

country became a paradise for workers—with no work. But Uruguay, and the others, have largely repented. Uruguay ejected the Soviet minister when she found he was organising a Communist revolt in Brazil from his legation in Montevideo. A secret circular sent by the Communist International in Moscow to its agents in South America sets out the plan for promoting revolution in Brazil. The bare-faced cynicism displayed is startling, even to those hardened to Communist methods. It is cunningly devised to meet local prejudice and conditions; to inflame one area against another and to produce chaos:

Nationalism to be emphasised instead of internationalism;

Communism not to be mentioned;

No attack on religion or family, so as not to offend Roman Catholic opinion;

Funds provided by the Communist International;

Propaganda in favour of separatism in Sao Paulo, but against separatism in Rio;

North to be inflamed against South and South against North;

Classes to be incited against one another.

What Communism has done in Spain we can see from day to day.

What it is trying to do in France can be seen by the alliance with God-less Russia, by the stay-in-strikes, by the efforts to aid the Red Government in Spain and by the composition of the French Government itself, mentioned above. I could write at length of the atrocities of the Cuban Revolution, of the official record of Communist crimes in Germany before the advent of Hitler, in the book by Adolph Ehrh, entitled *Armed Uprising* with authentic photographs; I could tell of conditions in Italy before the arrival of Mussolini, when factory managers were fed to the furnaces by stay-in workers: I could recall the British General Strike of 1926, financed by Moscow; I could tell of the frightful cruelties at this moment going on in the Communist-controlled portion of China, but all these things are matters more or less of common knowledge.

In conclusion, let us examine briefly the difference between Communism and Fascism. The present tactics on the part of the Communists are either to group these together or to pretend that Fascism is the real danger, and that they are the only anti-Fascists, our only defenders against it. The truth is that both Fascism and Communism are Socialism, but Communism is international, while Fascism is national. Both place universal control in the hands of a few, but Fascism retains the western traditions of law, family, property, morality and religion, which Communism rejects. Fascism is opposed to the class struggle—it still respects the fact of its nationals to their traditions, language, to decent marriage, private property, religion, the right and duty to have a stake in the country. It guards inheritance, thus in Italy there are no succession duties, whereas in Russia there is nothing to succeed to. Fascism does, however, yoke everybody together in defence of a national group. Fascism in Italy is based on corporations or guilds of industries and services, composed of both employers and employees who vote, but, of course, there is only one party; the Parliamentary system is abolished. In Germany, likewise, the vote is individual. In the last election some seventeen hundred thousand voted against Hitler, but, of course, they are not

popular. No conscientious objectors are allowed; the state is an entity.

The real nature of the Governments of Italy and Germany is that of a hierarchy, a form of government which the Church of Rome has found successful through the centuries. Russia is the same, though the purpose is an inverted one. The idea is: a place for everyone and everyone in his place, though in Russia there is only a place for a member of the Communist party—4,000,000 out of 170,000,000.

Now, if in Germany Jews have been opposed, it was in the first instance not because they were Jews, but because they were Communists. In 1932 and before March 1933, these Communists, in their attempt to arrive, committed all sorts of atrocities, many of which are officially recorded. Einstein was expelled because he was a member of three Communist organisations, which he also supported financially. None the less, Jews are still tolerated in Germany, synagogues are open, they carry on business, they have their own schools, which, of course, they pay for.

If now in Germany the Catholic Church has been opposed, it was not because of religion, but because the Catholic Church was in politics as the Centrist party. Similarly, any opposition to Lutheran churches has been because they presumed to interfere in politics, as the United Church has done here, on behalf of Socialism. The so-called Pagan movement, which has only some ten thousand followers out of sixty-five million, is not an effort to destroy religion; it is a patriotic effort to revive old German myths of heroes and demi-gods of the German past, to create a German ceremonial, somewhat like the Shinto of Japan, which, contrary to popular belief, is not a religion, but a maintenance of remembrance of heroic ancestors—witness how we to-day deposit wreaths on cenotaphs and the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. In Japan there is a shrine in the heart of Tokio to the memory of forty knights who sacrificed their lives to maintain the Empire. In Germany people are remembering the battle of Teutoburger Wald, where Germans, under the insignia of Odin, defeated Rome in the last contest for Germanic soil.

Fascism is the reaction from Communism; Communism causes Fascism. If there were no Communism there would be no Fascism, and the inner reason is this: Under democracy Communism is free to organise, to propagandise, to bore from within, to buy support, to stage strikes and demonstrations. Authority is needed to stop this, and Fascism means authority.

Of course, any authority to survive must rest upon the freely given confidence of the governed. Our democratic powers, if properly used, are enough to enable us to control the alien in our midst and to destroy the monster of Communism.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3).

On balance, we have been losing this cold war for the last five years. I think the main reason for this is that we have, to a very great extent, misconceived its character. We have been, genuinely and inevitably, concerned about this atom bomb, under whose shadow we live; but I think our pre-occupation with atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs has given us a rather false sense of perspective. This struggle for world power, in which we are inextricably involved, may well be a very long-term business indeed. Violence has been used, is being used, and will be used; but I think it highly problematical that atomic violence will ever be used. I agree completely with the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of

the Opposition when he said that the existence of the atomic bomb is in fact a great deterrent to total hot war. I believe that to be profoundly true. Also, we must remember that the Soviets believe that time is on their side, I think, and hope, that they may be wrong; but they think it. They await with some confidence the collapse of the Western world. In the meantime they will continue the struggle by the methods that have already proved so successful.

I now want to examine for a few moments what I believe to be the causes of our failure, the causes of our losing this struggle, by and large, over the last five years. Here again, I find myself in agreement with my hon. Friend the Member for Preston, North. I think one of the main causes is that we have not been fighting. I really do believe that in this very rough world one has got to fight to live. If Benes had fought in 1938 or 1948, Czechoslovakia would not have been subjugated, first by Hitler and then by Stalin; and would be a free democracy today. He did not fight on either occasion.

We ourselves have only stood up to the Communists twice since the war—in Greece and in Berlin—and on both occasions we have beaten them at their own game. This is an interesting point, and I think it has a bearing on the morale of those who are today manning the outposts of Western democracy. We have a lot of chaps, some of them in the Services and some in the Civil Service, around the periphery of Western Europe and all over the place; and they are subjected to a barrage of propaganda and to pressures of every sort and kind. I do not think they get enough support from us. I do not think there is enough blast from the other side. I do not think they are given the confidence which they should be made to feel from the knowledge that not only are we just as strong as the Communists, but we are infinitely better in every kind of way. I think we have allowed too much to go by default. We ought to launch a propaganda offensive; we have been far too much on the defensive in these last years all over the world.

Secondly, I think our faith is still not strong enough. Our opponents are dedicated men. Their leaders understand what is at stake; and all their energies, resources and determination are fixed upon their goal, which is a monopoly of power. To this end all else is subordinated—the individual, law, freedom, ethics, the family, art, literature, science and religion. All within such a framework, and against this background, democracy, as we understand it in the West, becomes completely meaningless. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the gulf yawns between us. The Communists believe that ends justify any means; and we believe if we believe anything, that no ideal end justifies absolute power over the lives of individual human beings, or the infliction of one iota of avoidable suffering on human beings.

Until we achieve a decisive victory in this struggle for world power, I confess that I see little point in coming to formal agreements with these people, unless we are clear in our own minds that they will keep them only as long as it suits them to do so. In that respect they are not at present markedly dissimilar from Hitler. The much-abused Protocol of Yalta asserted the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live. That was accepted by the Soviet Government; and, if they had honoured their pledge, either in the letter or the spirit, Roumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany would not today be enslaved. I believe that the most decisive victory that we could win would be the achievement of a democratic Western Union of such

strength that no potential aggressor would dare to attack it; and I think it can be done. I think we can only win this struggle by faith and works. It may take us five years; it may take a generation, or even longer. We have all got to brace ourselves for a long ordeal of cold, but total, war before we can make peace; and we must win that victory before we can have that peace.

On the subject of faith, I will only say that no creed which can effectively counter the Communist ideology can be based on the rational materialism of the 19th century, because that is the base from which Marxism itself stems. We must go deeper. I think that Koestler got to the root of the matter when he said that there is a whole realm which starts where logic ends; and that unaided reason is a defective compass which leads us on such a winding course that we end by losing the vision of our goal.

The subject of works brings me to the third cause of our failure. For five long years we have had no comprehensive foreign policy. In Soviet policy, nothing is unrelated; in Western policy, nothing has been related for the past five years. It is all piecemeal. . . . I am not going to ask him to allow Germany to re-arm at this stage. I have a much milder request to make. It is that, as a first step, he should stop blowing up their factories and shipyards. That, I think, would be very helpful. It does not achieve any useful purpose; and, with a maladroitness that is almost inconceivable, he has contrived to saddle this country with the sole responsibility. I do not know how he managed it, but he has managed it.

This brings me to my last point—the issue of Western Union. I say quite frankly that I would like to see a Pact of European Union; and the creation of a European Political Authority, with limited competence but defined powers. If such a union is to have any reality, it must include both Great Britain and Germany. There is no doubt about that. Then, of course, if the thing works, the defence problem will solve itself. If it does not, nothing will be solved. . . .

. . . Any serious attempt at European economic integration—and here I agree with my colleague in the Council of Europe, the hon. Member for Coventry, North (Mr. Edelman) who spoke recently—presupposes some kind of currency clearing system, some co-ordination of monetary policies, reciprocal trade and payment agreements on a limited multilateral basis, and the development of the basic industries by means of planned international investment. We all concur in that view. I do not think it involves any hold-up of the liberalisation of trade, which can go on at the same time; but it is the antithesis not only of the kind of planned national Socialism which we have been having from the present Government, but also of what may be called *laissez-faire*. It requires an extension of the sterling area and of the preferential system; in one word, discrimination. This was clearly recognised by the Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg last summer.

We must face up to the fact that, until quite recently, the main objective of American economic policy has been to break up the sterling area; and to revert to a system of free multilateral trade, based on the free convertibility of currencies, non-discrimination, and a fixed parity between the pound sterling, the dollar, and gold. That has been the ideal. They have already begun to see the light, and are gradually giving it up; but the ideal still swings along at any rate in the State Department and in the Treasury. It is under American pressure that we have signed these agreements at Geneva, Annecy and Havana and have chiselled

our system of Imperial Preference; and an extension of narrow bilateral agreements has been the inevitable result.

The time has come to tell the Americans quite frankly that we are not prepared either to sabotage the sterling area, or to return to the international economic anarchy which prevailed in the 19th century, and for a number of years between the two wars. The conditions which supported that system no longer exist. I am old enough to remember the days prior to 1931 when international trade became a ruthless pursuit of gold, when the main object of each separate country was to export its own unemployment to others, and when every ton of coal cut in Europe—in Germany, in Poland, in Belgium, and in this country—was subsequently sold at below production cost, although the wages of the miners throughout Europe were almost at starvation level. . . .

Is that what we want to go back to? If so, it would be the end of Western Union, and of western civilisation. It is precisely what the Communists are praying for, and banking on. They know that there cannot be economic warfare and political friendship; and that if the Western World is now going back to cut-throat international competition, based on free non-discriminatory multilateral trade, the Western World will fall asunder.

The answer to the problem is to be found neither in a return to a policy of *laissez-faire* nor in a continuation of planned national Socialism. It is to be found in constructive co-operation and compromise. . . .

(We hold over the reply to the Debate by Mr. Bevin, while recording the following recent remark by James P. Warburg:—"We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The only question is whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest.")

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Introduction to Social Credit by Bryan W. Monahan	5/- (cloth 8/6)
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).
From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.