

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 3. No. 6.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Postage (home and abroad) 3d.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21st, 1939.

6d. Weekly.

UNCLE SAM AND THE BEAR

Pre (1914) War Relations between Russia and America

The following official account of the diplomatic relations between the U.S.A. and Russia (which is taken from the American work of reference *Americana*) may fittingly be prefaced by two quotations from the *Encyclopaedia of Jewish Knowledge*. The first is under the heading of United States of America:

"The gradual movement of the Jews from the Eastern to the Western hemi-sphere, so that within three hundred years almost one third of the Jewish people have settled in the American continent is one of the most significant facts in Jewish history . . . there are now 4,228,029 (of which 1,765,000 are to be found in New York city) Jews in the U.S.A."

And the second under the heading of Soviet Russia:

"Before the advent of the Soviet Regime Russia had about 7,000,000 Jews. The secession of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Bessarabia, Finland and Estonia reduced this number to one third . . . it may be assumed that the Jewish population in the Soviet to-day consist of 3,200,000 exclusive of those who, while of Jewish origin, refuse to be classed as Jews."

The U.S.A. and Russia are then the chief depositories of Jewry and this fact would seem to shed some light on the past enigmatic (diplomatic) relationship between the two countries.

Here is the account from *Americana*:

"The U.S.A. and Russia, with their many striking examples of similarities and contrasts have between them some curious and interesting sympathies . . .

"Although connection between the U.S.A. and Russia was slight they continued to remain on good terms and on several occasions before 1861 acted in harmony in the Far East, where both secured advantage for English and French victories, which opened China to intercourse with the commercial powers. [It was about this time that the founders of the House of Sassoon, of Baghdad and Bombay, penetrated to Hongkong, Shanghai and Yokohama, acquiring the monopoly of the opium trade. They opened a branch in London where they later inter-married with the House of Rothschild.]

"In 1858-60 there was conference and friendly co-operation as to joint interests in China.

"In December, 1859 Russia was sounded on negotiations for the cessation of Alaska for \$6,000,000, which the Russian Government regarded as inadequate but as

meriting deliberation.

"In 1861 the two Governments agreed to co-operate in establishing cable-connections between St. Petersburg and San Francisco.

"A fitting climax to this strange paradoxical friendship appeared in the negotiations resulting in a treaty of 1867 for the transference of Alaska which . . . surprised the diplomatists of the Old World. [*Disraeli*: "That mysterious Russian diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried out by Jews"!]

"After 1890 earlier friendly relations gradually changed and after 1898 [Jacob Schiff started his thirty-year-propaganda war against the Czar's Government in the early nineties] became increasingly unsatisfactory."

The reason was

"the aggressiveness of the Russian diplomacy and the increasingly reactionary spirit of the Government authorities shown in severe treatment of the Poles and the Jews, many of whom emigrated to the U.S.A."

They carried with them:

"Their tales of woe to spread a hatred of the land from which they had fled . . . In 1903 following the horrible massacre of Kishenev . . . the Washington government brought the subject into publicity by an unusual and unsuccessful inquiry whether the Russian Government would receive a petition from the American Jews.

"In the Russo-Japanese war American public opinion favoured Japan to a high point of enthusiasm [*Schiff*: "Can it be expected that the influence of the American Jew upon public opinion will be exerted to the advantage of the country which systematically degraded his brethren in race?"] causing considerable astonishment and anger to many conservative Russians.

"At the close of the war bitter feelings were softened . . . by American sympathy for reform in Russia. [There were several Jews in the Duma which was established after the war in 1905].

But the sympathy did not last long:

"The dispute in regard to non-admission of American Jews into Russia . . . finally led to American abrogation of the Russo-American commercial treaty of 1832 on January 1st, 1913.

POST-WAR RUSSIAN RELATIONS

The Russian Revolution occurred in 1917, and resulted

at first in a government of republican form, the premier of which was Alexander Kerenski. This lasted for three months, and then it was swept aside to give place to a government of completely Bolshevik conviction.

Americana says of this:

"The overthrow of the Tsarist regime and the setting up in its stead of a provisional Government was hailed with more or less delight by the American Administration [*Jacob Schiff to Kerenski's Foreign Minister: 'God Bless you.'*] President Wilson losing no time in recognising the new Government, sent a delegation to Russia . . . a loan of \$187,000,000 was placed at the new regime's disposal. But in November came the second revolution . . . hoping to keep Russia in the war the American Government extended 'friendly greetings' to the Soviet . . . he [Wilson] assured Russia of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under a constitution of her own choosing.

"Boris Bakmetiev, who had been accredited to Washington as an Ambassador by the Kerenski regime continued to be recognized by the state department in that capacity until the summer of 1922, nearly five years after his Government had ceased to exist. He was permitted to draw on the unexpended balance of the fund that had been placed at the disposal of the Kerenski Government and out of this fund even paid the expenses of the non-existing Government's delegation to the Paris Peace Conference.

"In June, 1920, the State department lifted the ban on trade with the Soviet Union with the specific proviso that no political recognition was implied.

"By the time the Roosevelt administration began in 1933 many powerful business interests as well as a large section of the press had reached the view that it was time to regularize relations between the two countries . . . American export firms had discovered that business with the Soviet Union was the one foreign business that had involved no repudiated contracts during the depression.

"In October, 1933, President Roosevelt asked President Kalinin to send a representative 'to explore with me personally all questions outstanding between our two countries.' Maxim Litvinoff*, Soviet Commissar arrived in Washington on November 7th, and ten days later diplomatic relations were established by an exchange of notes in which each party agreed to respect the territorial integrity of the other, not to interfere in the internal affairs of the other and tolerate no organisation engaged in such interference."

RELATIONS WITH EUROPE

After the war Soviet Russia's professed policy in Europe was one of 'co-operation', 'economic progress' and peace. In 1924 the major European powers established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union; and in 1934 U.S.S.R. joined the League of Nations, in the counsels of which she took an active part.

It must be noted that side by side with the official

policy of 'co-operation' there was interference in the internal affairs of foreign countries by the Third and Communist International known as the 'Comintern'. The avowed purpose of the Comintern was to 'overthrow their regimes and institutions by violence . . . the Comintern extended its activities to the colonies of foreign Powers and to semi-colonial countries or spheres of interest, such as China.'

INTERNAL HISTORY OF POST-WAR RUSSIA

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, in an article by Michael Farbman, states:—

"The stark historical truth is that nobody either organized or provoked the Revolution."

"If the New Economic Policy was to succeed it must clearly have banking facilities and a more convenient medium of exchange than commodity cards. The shift of policy was quickly made. The state bank was established in the autumn of 1921 and gives the authority to issue bank notes as well as to serve as a credit institution . . .

"The monetary unit chosen for the new bank-notes was the chervonetz with a gold value of 10 pre-war roubles . . . *The rouble was thus given its pre-war gold equivalent.*

"For a time the chervonetz (state bank notes) circulated side by side with the earlier sovznaky ("Soviet" notes), whose value was adjusted to the chervonetz from day to day.

"The State bank notes were strictly controlled, but the sovznaky was printed in great quantities in the succeeding months. The public, especially the peasants, grew to distrust them, and the remaining steps in currency reform were pushed through as quickly as possible.

"In May, 1924 the emission of sovznaky was stopped . . . henceforth the currency system of the Soviet Government was on the same general basis as that of Western countries.

"The reform of the currency required in turn the establishment of the State budget on a solid foundation since the government could no longer print notes to meet the deficits.

"In May, 1923, a more extensive reform was made. Cumbersome miscellaneous taxes were swept aside, a single agricultural tax was provided and money payments were gradually substituted for commodity payments.

"Meanwhile the urban taxation had been developed by indirect taxes and by income and property taxes . . .

"The most radical change involved in the New Economic Policy was the restoration of the whole internal economy of the country, industry, commerce, transport, housing and employment to a straight money basis. Instead of the vague system of accounting prevalent under militant Communism, every state enterprise was compelled to issue a regular balance-sheet and to show profit and losses in the old fashioned way. Instead of commodity cards, employees received a regular wage paid in cash.

"Communist critics of the New Economic Policy were perhaps justified in declaring it a reversion to capitalist methods . . . an attempt was made to resolve ideological doubts by the adopting of the self-contradictory phrase Socialist Capitalism, to define the precise significance of the policy. The commoner and less

(continued on page 11)

* Litvinoff further secured one of his greatest successes at the Economic World Conference of 1933 (at which James Warburg represented the American interests) by negotiating an American loan for Russia bringing about the resumption of commercial relations with England.

SIMON'S BUDGET

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the over-paid and still to be paid leaders of the Labour and Liberal parties are apparently as pliable victims of the financial thimble-riggers as their predecessors in 1914 and 1918. The latest proposals to provide for war expenditure preclude any possibility that the past twenty years have taught them anything. With the exception of slight protests against a tax on sugar, and other details, the Chancellor's financial statement of the 27th September, compiled by Treasury officials, has been accepted by docile politicians and swallowed without protest by the public sheep.

"Finance is the fourth arm of defence" stated Sir John, "if finance failed then the prop which sustains the whole of our war effort collapses."

By "finance", does our lawyer Chancellor mean the system or organisation controlled by the Bank of England with the Treasury as its willing instrument, or does he mean the collection of money? If he means the former, then its failure would arise from its own inherent incapacity to relate the mechanism of money control to the material needs of the nation. If, on the

contrary, he mean the ability to collect money payments from the public, then any failure in this respect must also be the responsibility of those who persist in creating debts against the public and insist on their repayment through taxation.

"The increased taxation will not exhaust the duty of the citizen. It will also be his duty to contribute to the greatest extent possible to these loans."

Now either the citizen is going to be depleted of funds or he is not. That he will be so deprived of money through direct and indirect taxation is inevitable, and to expect him to denude himself of his trousers for loans while the Chancellor is taking his coat could only arise in the mind of an optimist.

The Treasury official, Mr. R. G. Hawtrey has stated:

"Temporary borrowing has this advantage, or this danger, that the money to be borrowed need not exist. What he [the banker] lends is credit—his own obligation. This obligation he can himself create."

In Major Douglas's first broadcast in 1919 from Manchester (before the

B.B.C. was established) he said *inter alia*:

"Has it ever struck you that there is something extraordinary in the position of an organisation which we call the Government and which we say represents our interests and amongst other things our collective wealth that it should always be in debt? To whom is it in debt? If all money is national money and originates with the Government how can the Government conceivably contract a debt? The answer is . . . 'the British Government, and all Governments, have handed over to financial institutions this power to issue claims on goods produced by the general community' . . . Taxes paid for interest and repayment debt are a transfer of claims for goods for the benefit of institutions which created those claims by a stroke of the pen." E. J. P.

SOCIAL CREDITERS
IN KENSINGTON

We regret that the address of Mr. John Mitchell, who is forming a social credit group in north Kensington, was erroneously given in his letter last week as Ladbroke Grove. It should have been 14, Ladbroke Square.

ENGLAND

Sir Philip Sydney was admired and loved possibly more than any other great gentleman of his day. This song is from his 'Arcadia', published after his death at Zutphen which has passed into the legendry of the English.*

O sweet woods, the Delight of Solitaryness?
O how much I do like your solitaryness?
Where Man's mind hath a freed Consideracyon,
Of goodness, to receive lovely direction,
When senses do behold the order of heavenly host,
And wise thoughts do behold what the Creator is,
Contemplation here holdeth his only seat
Bounded with no limits, born with a wing of hope,
Climbs even unto the Stars Nature is under it,
Naught disturbs thy quiet, all to thy service yield,
Each sight draws on a thought, thought Mother of Science.
Sweet birds kindly do grant harmony unto thee
Fair Trees shade ye enough fortification
Not danger to thyself, if not in thy self.

O sweet woods, the delight of solitaryness?
O how much I do like your solitaryness?
Here no treason is hid, veiled in Innocency,
No Envy's snaky eye finds any harbour here,
Nor Flatterers venomous Insinuation
Nor Cunning Humorist's peddled opinions
Nor courteous Ruyning of proffered usury
Nor Time prattled away, Cradle of Ignorance,
Nor Trifling Teeth of vanity dazzleth us

Nor golden Manacles stand for Paradyse,
Here wronges name is unheard, Slander a monster is,
Keep thy spirit from abuse—here no abuse doth haunt
What man grafts in a tree dissimulation?

O sweet woods, the delight of solitaryness?
O how well do I like your solitaryness?
Yet Dear soul, if a Soul closed in a Mansion
As sweet as violets, as fair as a Lily is,
Straight as a Cedar, a voice stayneth the Canary Bird's,
Whose shade safety doth hold, Danger avoideth her,
Such wisdom, that in her lives speculation,
Such goodness, that in her Simplicity Triumphs,
When envy's snaky eye winceth or else dieth,
Slander wanteth a Pretext, Flattery gone beyond,
O if such a one hath bent to a lovely life,
Her step glad we receive, glad we receive her eyes
And think not she doth hurt our solitaryness,
For, such Company deckes solitaryness.

—Sir Philip Sydney.

* We have modernised the spelling, depriving the poem of much of its picturesque appearance but making it easier to read.

Mrs. PALMER'S PAGE

BILLETING AGAIN

"Thousands of parents fear that the Government's decision to impose a charge for evacuated children will mean that children will have to be brought back to the danger zones . . .

"They simply cannot see how the charges can be met, out of their slender income . . . Particular resentment is felt at the refusal of the authorities to regard travelling costs on visits to the children as necessary expenses.

"Workless are to be exempt from the charge, but many families who have recently suffered unemployment ask why the Government expected them to keep a child on 3/- when evacuation cost is so much higher."

Reynold's News.

For years social crediters have been trying to make it clear that there are two distinct policies struggling together in this country, each trying to get the upper hand of the other. The policy of the ordinary Englishman is to have a happy, comfortable home life, with some prospect that his children can look forward to a life at least as good or better, than his own. The policy of the financiers, a far smaller but apparently more powerful group, is to make the money system work in such a way that they themselves retain all the advantages therefrom in their own hands.

The Government is engaged in the discreditable task of compromising between these two policies. They are trying to run the country in such a way that both parties shall seem satisfied, or at least that one of them shall be silenced. Social crediters know that this is impossible.

It would be pathetic, if it did not make us feel downright ashamed to note how first one side, then the other is given a sop. There is danger! The Government comes forward to save the children. "No one need be afraid to leave with the evacuation parties because of a lack of money." (Broadcast instructions on September 1st). Everything must be done to save life and make things comfortable. But the scheme has not been in operation for a month before the supporters of the orthodox money-system are given an innings. "We have given you safety—but you can't keep it unless you can pay for it. And we have the right to fix the price."

And so it goes on, one policy fighting against the other. The war is horrible—tragic—but realities stand out starkly, more starkly than in peace-time. And the people's voice will not be silenced, though as yet it has not grown very strong.

Before the war is over one policy or the other has got to prevail, and the social creditor's part is to see that it is the people's.

How utterly false and fantastic this money business is! I'd like to conjure up a picture before your eyes if I could—an old miser, dressed in rags; while the house is burning over his head he is grubbing in the cellar to collect his store of gold and "securities" to remove them to a place of safety.

The whole evacuation problem is simply bristling with difficulties, most of which would not have arisen in a state whose policy was controlled by the people. In "Home to Roost" I tried to put the case of the householders who were coping with disorderly mothers and children. This week I want to put another aspect of the question. :

A social creditor who is also a school master writes:—

"Do you see the Collectivist hand at work—presumably Communists in my own profession? Two camps are ready, and if the photographs are reliable one is a pretty grim, barracks of a place. Now in response to a careful campaign about *unsatisfactory* billets (for which there is absolutely no justification) parents will demand camps. Then, with men teachers withdrawn into the army, the children

will be herded into camps, and the camps will be run by the Ministry of Health (the Board of Education seems to recede more and more into the back-ground) and these bureaucrats, quite likely army dugouts, will have a lovely time regimenting the children with endless marches, drills, fatigues, patriotic lessons, numbers instead of names—and the men teachers will not be there—only women left to make what fight they can for the children's individuality and right to mental freedom and development. Private billeting is the lesser of the two evils."

This is an aspect of the question that I must admit makes my blood run cold. The position seems to me to be this. Compulsory billeting has been very much resented in the country, and the government is well aware of this. They know they can go no farther in their attack on the Englishman's home, so something else must be done. But on no account must the supporters of the money policy be offended. If camps are built it must be on the strict understanding that monetary "economy" is to be observed, that is to say the camps must cost less in "costless credit" than the private billeting scheme did. Now this gives the Labour party their opportunity. They too believe implicitly in the sacrosanct nature of the money system, and would not upset it for the world, but they also believe in the Servile State, and regimentation.

Here is a priceless opportunity to achieve both ends.

"Socialist organisation means that personal interests and ambitions must be subordinated to the public good." (*Arthur Greenwood in "Reynold's News," October 8th.*)

The view that the Labour party are hoping to make a lot of capital out of the demand for camps is supported by this letter in the "*Sidcup Times*," October 6th:

"As we foretold, the present system of evacuation can only be regarded as a temporary expedient and not one to be continued.

"The solution surely is the taking of large country houses and mansions, and the building of school hutment camps . . . Undoubtedly the cost per child taking all features into account, schooling, board, sports, welfare, etc.,

RENDEZ-VOUS

at

4. Mecklenburgh St., W.C.1.

Mrs. Palmer and Mrs. Hyatt will be at this address on Saturday, October 28th, from 2 p.m., till 5 p.m.

TEA 3d.

(7 minutes Russell Square Station).

At this meeting it is hoped to make some arrangement for keeping a London group together.

will be less if a large scale unit is adopted, say a whole school department being transferred en bloc of 100 upwards . . .

"Labour in the House of Commons before the war started, insisted that hutted camps and large houses was the real solution. Can you doubt we were right?"

The whole question is an excellent illustration of the attempt to manipulate public opinion so that the people do not get what they want, and the planners do.

"You don't like compulsory billeting—you prefer to have your home to yourself? that is absolutely final? Very well, then, you want camps. Now these are the sort of camps you must have—they cost less."

It is up to the parents now. If they don't come forward to protect their own children, no one else will. When, as a result of reorganisation, after the adoption of the Hadow report, large

numbers of children were expected to travel long distances to school, the parents had no difficulty in expressing their wishes, and in compelling the attention of the authorities. They must do the same again.

It is not a question of the lesser of two evils, but of choosing a positive good.

There is absolutely no reason why the alternative to private billeting should be the concentration camp run on "community" lines and dominated by the ideology of the Labour party and the Seydow State.

There have been for some years in England holiday camps with separate family quarters, comprising sitting room and sleeping accommodation. This is the sort of thing that the people would in all probability prefer. It would mean that the mother could have her own children with her, and home life would not be lost.

It is all very well to compare the camps envisaged by the Labour party to

boarding schools. *There are no holidays to look forward to.* It means that for the duration of the war the children would be almost entirely cut off from both parents, and from real home life.

For when we get down to bed-rock what is the real desire that lies behind the hatred of compulsory billeting and concentration camps?

It is the fundamental belief, still so strong among the English, in the sanctity of home life, the belief that in our own houses at least, we have a right to do exactly what we like with no interference.

It is this spirit we must trust now. If the people have enough steam to cripple compulsory billeting, they will also be strong enough to see that they get the right sort of camps. What we as social crediters must be adamant about is this: One section of the population must not be made to suffer for the benefit of the other. *We must choose our own positive good—the positive results that we intend to get.*

B. M. PALMER.

THE REAL PROBLEM

"The real problem is to make this a war against the supreme Enemy rather than a fratricidal war."

Identification of the enemy comes first, and this journal provides authentic information as to that. This enlightenment may be passed on in a variety of ways, as in a recent letter to a Member of Parliament who also happens to be a junior member of the Government. This letter protested against the move to sabotage any discussion of peace proposals which has led to such absurd terms as the "Threat of Peace", "Hitler's Peace Offensive", etc. It also pointed out the curious insistence that the people of this country would prefer Churchill to Chamberlain as Prime Minister; and expressed the firm conviction based on personal opinion and conversation with other members of the constituency, that the public is strongly of the view that the long sighted steadiness of Mr. Chamberlain is needed to deal with the present situation rather than the qualities displayed by Mr. Churchill.

A copy of the letter was sent to the Ministry of Information and here is the reply.

Dear Sir,

The Minister asks me to thank you for your letter of the 10th October, and enclosure which is receiving

attention.

*Yours faithfully,
Private Secretary.*

And from the Member of Parliament,

Dear Mr. . . .

I thank you for your letter and fully agree with the contents of it.

I am obliged to you for writing to me.

*Yours sincerely,
(personal signature).*

In effect this letter pointed out danger signals which in this case are agreed by the M.P.—that the Press exhibits antagonism to the public interest, and that Mr. Chamberlain represents the People and not the source of this antagonism.

Letter to the Editor

MODERN LITERATURE

Sir,

I would like to draw attention in your gallant paper to one of the most insidious evils of our present-day life: The infiltration of young minds with a brutal and materialistic literature.

I have just finished reading a novel, widely advertised and recommended, which in its pessimistic outlook, and derision of all disinterested purpose in life, leaves the reader with the sense of "having no hope and without God in the world." The novels of a past generation inspired us with confidence in the ulti-

mate destiny of man, with finer ideals of love and with an heroic acceptance of tragedy.

We were once a proud and individual race, why do we submit to this infection of evil? Make no mistake, there is an organised effort to reduce us into accepting materialism as our gospel.

A mechanised society seeks to extinguish individual and disinterested motives, and that is the society the modern novel depicts as representative: A society which seeks to enslave the imagination, to disparage the power of individual effort, and to bring down to a common level the rarer values of personality.

A standardised character, that is one of the phantasms engendered by this outlook.

If we are to oppose, with any success, the materialism which is wrecking our civilisation, we must exclude from our homes the stream of crime, sensual sentimentalism, and sophistication, whose destructive influences are cheating youth of any worthwhile purpose in living, of happiness, too and hope.

The mind, no less than the body, lives and is healthy or unhealthy, by what it feeds on.

Yours, etc.,

E. MARY MOORE.

74, Montpelier Road, Hove; October 4th, 1939.

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.

VOL. 3. NO. 6.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21st, 1939.

12, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL, 2.

GERMAN-RUSSIAN 'STRIP-POKER'

The Times of October 10th gave an account of an article which appeared in the Swedish paper *Svenska Dagbladet* on October 9th:

The Berlin correspondent of that paper asserts that the Great Powers are now "playing diplomatic poker for the highest stakes." Germany is determined to force Great Britain to make peace by methodically letting Russia march westwards step by step until Great Britain realizes that Communism would be the only victor in a continued war.

It is vital for Germany (he writes) to have Russia as an ally, and she cannot oppose any Russian demands anywhere—in Scandinavia, the Balkans, or elsewhere. No German undertakings or pledges are now valid. If Russia demanded the naval ports of Gothenburg and Karlskrona, Germany would not try to prevent her getting them.

Germany is ready to make new concessions if the present Soviet demands do not have the desired effect, says the correspondent. Demands which would formerly have been regarded as absurd are now blessed by Germany in the hope of breaking Great Britain's nerve.

At first Berlin thought that the Russian penetration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania would make Britain dismayed. This plan miscarried, and Germany is now giving Russia a free hand in Finland. If Great Britain does not make peace and Russia desires further expansion, Germany will not oppose a continued Russian advance in North Europe. If such an advance induced Great Britain to make peace, Germany would consider herself the victor.

The evacuation of Germans from Estonia and Latvia (he continues) shows that Germany expects a swift Russian entry into the Baltic States. It is an open question whether this fantastic game of poker will succeed. It is im-

probable if Finland resists, or Russia voluntarily stops at a point where she thinks Great Britain would call a halt.

The correspondent suggests that Berlin is afraid that Turkey is once more approaching the democracies and that Italy is faltering. It is rumoured in Berlin that the French are offering Italy concessions in Djibuti, Suez, and Tunisia, and that Mussolini is inclined to listen to such offers, in the fear that Turkey might otherwise become a new Great Power in the Mediterranean. The correspondent concludes:—"If Berlin miscalculates, she is willing in the last resort to throw herself into the arms of Communism. If Germany should fall, she will try to drag Europe into the catastrophe."

The result of such action would be eventually to bring Great Britain and France face to face with Communist Russia. This is the real issue, and the sooner we realise and consider the best way of meeting it the better. Why not enlist the Germans by re-organising the financial system and bringing them in?

THE WORLD WE LIVE IN

After having been given sanctuary in England for two years because his own gangster-ridden country wasn't safe for him, Col. Lindberg hopes Canada won't drag the Western Hemisphere into war simply because it prefers a British King to American Independence (sic).

Fortunately, there are Americans, and banker's sons-in-law.

Mr. Harold Callender, European Correspondent of the *New York Times*, who presided, said he thought the War was the most deliberately planned and the least necessary that had even taken place. It was planned in Berlin, with the assistance and en-

couragement of Moscow.

The (London) Times, Oct. 12, 1939.

Well, he ought to know. The *New York Times* is owned or controlled by Adolf Ochs, a leading New York Jew.

"In 1918 under the presidency of Apfelbaum (Zinovieff), out of 388 members only sixteen were Russians, and all the rest Jews, with the exception of one, who is a Negro from North America. 265 of these Jews, sitting in the Smolny Institute (the old seat of Government) come from the Lower East Side of New York."

U.S. Senate Document 62,
66th Congress.

Sentiment Confused

New York, Oct. 13.—While intervention by President Roosevelt at present is considered to be unlikely, many Wall street circles are still not too sure that an armistice might not be arranged, and sentiment to-day was most confused.

The (London) Times, October 14.

Dear, Dear. Just think if the "success" of the Jew Deal in these United States was imperilled by peace in Europe!

REASON FOR RATIONING

Tit-bit of conversation for the Englishman has always been the Weather (it has only lately been succeeded by Herr Hitler and the War), which is some indication of the importance of the temperature to John Bull. Coal, gas and electricity are now all rationed and we are faced with the prospect of a chilly winter. Even winter overcoats are increasing in price.

We feel that it would be relatively much simpler to keep cheerful and to preserve the delicate flower of morale in the warm glow with our toes on the rungs of the grate than in the hostile atmosphere of huddled rugs and great coats. The coal in the mines is unlikely to be exhausted during the next two or three years (a hundred or so is a different matter) and there are 100,000 miners still unemployed. No:—

"One of the main reasons for the rationing of coal, gas and electricity is the risk of a dislocation of coal transport distribution facilities", said Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd, Minister of Mines, in the House of Commons on October 10th.

Coal transport distribution facilities!

THE INEVITABLE CONFLICT (II)

By L. D. BYRNE

(The first part of this article appeared in the last issue of "The Social Crediter.")

For Results.

Government to yield the people the results they want from the management of their affairs and society based upon the principle of "love thy neighbour as thyself" can have nothing in common with the class struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The carnage which the pursuit of the latter ideas have produced should surely be sufficient to demonstrate this.

View the matter as we will, we are driven back to the two opposite concepts that form the basis of these conflicting social philosophies which are struggling for survival in the world to-day. On the one hand we have democracy, based on the concept that society, the nation or the State exists to serve the individuals which comprise it and who collectively constitute the sovereign or supreme authority. On the other hand we have the social system, (call it socialism, finance, capitalism or anything else), under which the supreme authority is vested in an individual or group of individuals who are able to impose their will upon the majority on the basis that the State (i.e., the dictatorship) is supreme and its individual citizens must be subservient to the State.

When we realize that the first law of human relationships is the free association of individuals to obtain the objectives they want in common, it should be obvious that only to the extent that individuals achieve the purpose of their association will civilization progress. Any attempt to organize society on the lines of a reformatory and subject its individual members to mass regimentation will inevitably destroy ordered society. This is absolutely fundamental.

The Unholy Alliance.

The close connection between the activities of socialism symbolized by the red flag and the Internationale, and International Finance symbolized by the red shield of the House of Rothschild and the serpent of cunning is significant.

There is well established evidence that Jacob Schiff of the dominating New York Banking House of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., directed the Russian Revolution with the help of other members of the Rothschild banking group in Germany. The original Soviet hierarchy were predominantly agents of this Jewish financial group, and effective control of Russia has remained with International Finance ever since. Any attempt from within to overthrow this rule has been brutally suppressed. The tremendous armed forces of the U.S.S.R. are to-day the armed forces of International Finance.

Similarly the ascent to power of Hitler in Germany received financial assistance from the same quarter. And it is well known that the post-war years have been marked by the ready financial aid which can be obtained for the spread of socialist doctrines—whether of the violent revolutionary brand or the more sinister and plausible brand which has permeated even into the economic teaching in universities everywhere.

It is not a particular kind of socialism or similar social philosophy which attracts the support of the Money Power,

but rather the spread of the social ideology based upon the subordination of individuals to institutions and systems for the purpose of dominating them. Generally speaking, those receiving this support are not conscious tools of the Money Power. They merely find that a certain line of talk, propaganda or action on their part attracts the greatest support and thus they are encouraged to pursue it. It is significant that in the political sphere in every country the socialists are the champions of financial orthodoxy. Their propaganda is conspicuous for the absence of any effective criticism of the financial system as such. Their proposals for the ineffectual reforms which they advocate, involving as they do a process of levelling down and centralization of control of all social organization, play right into the hands of International Finance.

World Domination.

The objective of International Finance is world domination. Its spokesmen hardly make any secret about this now, so confident are they that nothing can defeat them. To achieve this, these men must destroy all national sovereignties and assume absolute control. The goal of the Money Power is a universal dictatorship which cannot be challenged.

Standing between these power maniacs and their fantastic goal are the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic peoples, whose philosophy, ideology and traditions are in violent opposition to the dream of the universal servile state of International Finance. The bulwark of these peoples is in the British Empire and its free institutions.

What we are facing to-day is a carefully planned attack on the British Empire and all it stands for in social ideology.

It is now recognised that the only persons who won the last war were the International banking houses. Everybody else lost. International finance alone emerged from the struggle immeasurably more powerful than it was. This power was acquired through the staggering debt structure which it was able to build up under the stress of war.

After the war, in 1918, International Finance immediately set to work to consolidate its position, attack the British Empire and establish its supremacy in the United States. The two main methods employed in this offensive against humanity were the restriction of financial credit and the progressive centralization of control.

Attack on Sovereignty.

The following quotation from a published address by Arnold Toynbee to a group of Internationalists in Copenhagen, (the Fourth Annual Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations) on June 8—10, 1931, gives a fair picture of the kind of poisonous activity which was openly pursued in influential quarters after the last war:

"In the spirit of determination which happily animates us, we shall have no inclination to under-estimate the strength of the political force which we are striving to overcome. What is this force? If we are frank with ourselves, we shall admit that we are engaged on a

deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States which at present partition the habitable surface of the earth and divide the political allegiance of mankind. The surest sign, to my mind, that this fetish of local national sovereignty is our intended victim is the emphasis with which all our statesmen and our publicists protest with one accord, and over and over again, at every step forward which we take, that, whatever changes we may make in the international situation, the sacred principle of local sovereignty will be maintained inviolable. This, I repeat, is a sure sign that at each of those steps forward, the principle of local sovereignty is really being encroached upon and its sphere of action reduced and its power for evil restricted. It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise—lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence. Perhaps, too, when we make these protestations, we are partly concerned to deceive ourselves. For let us be honest. Even the most internationally-minded among us are votaries of this false god of local sovereignty to some extent. It is such an old-established object of worship that it retains some hold even over the most enlightened people.

“And what is the magic which gives local sovereignty its power? It is powerful, I think, because it has inherited the prestige and the prerogatives of the mediæval Western Church, which were transferred, at the close of the Middle Ages, from the whole to the parts, from the great society of Western Christendom to each of that society's “successor states”, represented now by the fifty or sixty sovereign independent States of the “post-war” world. The local national state, invested with the attributes of sovereignty—invested, that is, with the prestige and the prerogatives of the mediæval Church—is an abomination of desolation standing in the place where it ought not. It has stood in that place now—demanding and receiving human sacrifices from its poor deluded votaries—for four or five centuries. Our political task in our generation is to cast the abomination out, to cleanse the temple and to restore the worship of the divinity to whom the temple rightfully belongs. In plain terms, we have to re-transfer the prestige and the prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty fragments of contemporary society to the whole of contemporary society—from the local national states by which sovereignty has been usurped, with disastrous consequences, for half a millennium, to some institution embodying our society as a whole.

“In the world as it is to-day, this institution can hardly be a universal Church. It is more likely to be something like a League of Nations. I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or a publicist can be—perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracised and discredited. The

dragon of local sovereignty can still use its teeth and claws when it is brought to bay. Nevertheless, I believe that the monster is doomed to perish by our sword. The fifty or sixty local states of the world will no doubt survive as administrative conveniences. But sooner or later sovereignty will depart from them. Sovereignty will cease, in fact if not in name, to be a local affair.”

It will be obvious from the foregoing that a concerted and successful attack has been going on against national sovereignties; that is, upon the constitutional and established right of national groupings—including the British Commonwealth of Nations—to exercise their sovereign power to determine their own affairs. As the statement tells us, the intention is to divest all nations of their sovereignty and to concentrate this in a world authority. This is another way of saying that the conscious objective of the persons engaged in these activities has been to destroy the sovereignty of nations in favour of a centralized, universal tyranny for the establishment of a world authority dominating all peoples. Inevitably this would involve the destruction of every vestige of democracy.

Professor Toynbee is described in the British “Who's Who” as Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs since 1925, and Research Professor of International History in the University of London; besides having been connected with Political Intelligence Department, Foreign Office, April, 1918; Member of Middle Eastern Section, British Delegation, Peace Conference, Paris.

Stage is Set.

As the operation of their disastrous financial system led to widespread economic distress and growing social discontent, International Finance has been manoeuvring the situation for a final bid for world domination. Great Britain and France were jockeyed into a position in which it became increasingly certain that they would be embroiled in war with Germany and Italy. The necessary financial assistance to ensure that all nations were well armed was forthcoming, thereby ensuring that the combatants would inflict the maximum damage on each other. In passing, it should be noted that throughout the preceding post-war year of economic distress no such financial assistance was made available to relieve the economic plight of the people in those countries.

To any one who has followed the situation closely, it would appear that the broad plan of campaign of the Money Power is to engage Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy in a war which will wreck those countries. This would leave the intact forces of Russia—i.e., of International Finance—masters of Europe. At the appropriate moment, through their control of the entire economic structure of the United States and because of economic conditions developing there, the Money Power will be able to collapse the economy of that country and precipitate revolution. By the same tactics as they have already adopted in Russia and elsewhere, it would seem that International Finance hopes to create a situation in which they will be able to seize power and establish a dictatorship in the U.S.A. This might be done through the establishment of a Soviet Union of American Republics or some similar social system. Thus the Money Power is moving to gain within a comparatively short time its objective of world domination and to achieve the destruction of the British Commonwealth of Nations. On paper it would seem that they cannot fail to win, but they will lose. Three factors will combine to defeat them. The

deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States which at present partition the habitable surface of the earth and divide the political allegiance of mankind. The surest sign, to my mind, that this fetish of local national sovereignty is our intended victim is the emphasis with which all our statesmen and our publicists protest with one accord, and over and over again, at every step forward which we take, that, whatever changes we may make in the international situation, the sacred principle of local sovereignty will be maintained inviolable. This, I repeat, is a sure sign that at each of those steps forward, the principle of local sovereignty is really being encroached upon and its sphere of action reduced and its power for evil restricted. It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise—lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence. Perhaps, too, when we make these protestations, we are partly concerned to deceive ourselves. For let us be honest. Even the most internationally-minded among us are votaries of this false god of local sovereignty to some extent. It is such an old-established object of worship that it retains some hold even over the most enlightened people.

"And what is the magic which gives local sovereignty its power? It is powerful, I think, because it has inherited the prestige and the prerogatives of the mediæval Western Church, which were transferred, at the close of the Middle Ages, from the whole to the parts, from the great society of Western Christendom to each of that society's "successor states", represented now by the fifty or sixty sovereign independent States of the "post-war" world. The local national state, invested with the attributes of sovereignty—invested, that is, with the prestige and the prerogatives of the mediæval Church—is an abomination of desolation standing in the place where it ought not. It has stood in that place now—demanding and receiving human sacrifices from its poor deluded votaries—for four or five centuries. Our political task in our generation is to cast the abomination out, to cleanse the temple and to restore the worship of the divinity to whom the temple rightfully belongs. In plain terms, we have to re-transfer the prestige and the prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty fragments of contemporary society to the whole of contemporary society—from the local national states by which sovereignty has been usurped, with disastrous consequences, for half a millennium, to some institution embodying our society as a whole.

"In the world as it is to-day, this institution can hardly be a universal Church. It is more likely to be something like a League of Nations. I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or a publicist can be—perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracised and discredited. The

dragon of local sovereignty can still use its teeth and claws when it is brought to bay. Nevertheless, I believe that the monster is doomed to perish by our sword. The fifty or sixty local states of the world will no doubt survive as administrative conveniences. But sooner or later sovereignty will depart from them. Sovereignty will cease, in fact if not in name, to be a local affair."

It will be obvious from the foregoing that a concerted and successful attack has been going on against national sovereignties; that is, upon the constitutional and established right of national groupings—including the British Commonwealth of Nations—to exercise their sovereign power to determine their own affairs. As the statement tells us, the intention is to divest all nations of their sovereignty and to concentrate this in a world authority. This is another way of saying that the conscious objective of the persons engaged in these activities has been to destroy the sovereignty of nations in favour of a centralized, universal tyranny for the establishment of a world authority dominating all peoples. Inevitably this would involve the destruction of every vestige of democracy.

Professor Toynbee is described in the British "Who's Who" as Director of Studies in the Royal Institute of International Affairs since 1925, and Research Professor of International History in the University of London; besides having been connected with Political Intelligence Department, Foreign Office, April, 1918; Member of Middle Eastern Section, British Delegation, Peace Conference, Paris.

Stage is Set.

As the operation of their disastrous financial system led to widespread economic distress and growing social discontent, International Finance has been manoeuvring the situation for a final bid for world domination. Great Britain and France were jockeyed into a position in which it became increasingly certain that they would be embroiled in war with Germany and Italy. The necessary financial assistance to ensure that all nations were well armed was forthcoming, thereby ensuring that the combatants would inflict the maximum damage on each other. In passing, it should be noted that throughout the preceding post-war year of economic distress no such financial assistance was made available to relieve the economic plight of the people in those countries.

To any one who has followed the situation closely, it would appear that the broad plan of campaign of the Money Power is to engage Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy in a war which will wreck those countries. This would leave the intact forces of Russia—i.e., of International Finance—masters of Europe. At the appropriate moment, through their control of the entire economic structure of the United States and because of economic conditions developing there, the Money Power will be able to collapse the economy of that country and precipitate revolution. By the same tactics as they have already adopted in Russia and elsewhere, it would seem that International Finance hopes to create a situation in which they will be able to seize power and establish a dictatorship in the U.S.A. This might be done through the establishment of a Soviet Union of American Republics or some similar social system. Thus the Money Power is moving to gain within a comparatively short time its objective of world domination and to achieve the destruction of the British Commonwealth of Nations. On paper it would seem that they cannot fail to win, but they will lose. Three factors will combine to defeat them. The

widespread recognition of the Money Power as the enemy of humanity, the character of the Anglo-Saxon peoples, and the pragmatic impossibility of organizing mankind under any system of mass regimentation.

Fight for Survival.

However, to anyone who realizes the forces ranged on the side of International Finance (including what we can properly term the powers of evil) and the terrific situation which exists, it will be evident that the struggle ahead of us will be no child's play. We shall literally be fighting for survival, and only the most tremendous effort combined with a high degree of courage and resolute determination will give mankind victory.

We must face the fact that the war into which we have been precipitated is no ordinary military conflict. It has all the potential elements of leading to world disorder on a scale which may smash civilization for centuries. It can be otherwise, but that will depend upon each one of us.

The basic issue in this struggle is that of sovereignty. Failure to recognise that fact is to court disaster.

So far as this continent is concerned, and probably so far as the world is concerned, the final outcome will not depend so much upon what we do outside Canada as within the nation. If within a reasonably short time the people can assert their sovereignty to enforce the surrender of power by finance and the operation of the financial system to serve the tremendous national effort which will be required of us, I shall be completely confident as to the outcome. We can then, as a nation, effectively mobilize our tremendous resources to ensure that Canada throws its full weight into this conflict in a manner which can and if properly organized will save the world from the threat of chaos. In the absence of such action, we shall later find ourselves fighting with our backs to the wall for the preservation of everything we hold dear.

Is it not well worth the effort to take deliberate and effective action now to ensure victory? That question can be answered only by action on the part of the people, led by those in a position to influence such action. This is a matter of personal responsibility and nobody can escape this responsibility.

THE POLICY OF THE JEWISH RACE

There is no problem the solution of which is more vital to civilisation than the "Jewish Problem." The Jewish race is unique: its members seem to have behaved with consistency throughout thousands of years.

The nature of the results produced by this behaviour forms the policy of the race, which is the expression in practice of its philosophy; and the effect of that policy on other peoples is what has built up the "Jewish Question."

This is one of a series of articles giving an account of the relations of Jewry with some other cultures. It is taken largely from Jewish sources, and therefore presents the policy of the Jewish race according to its own records. It is NOT an assessment of the success or otherwise of the policy disclosed.

9. JERUSALEM AND THE CITY OF LONDON

(iii) RESETTLEMENT.

Jewish Encyclopaedia:

"Toward the middle of the seventeenth century a considerable number of Marrano merchants settled in London and founded there a secret foundation at the head of which was Antonio Fernandez Carjaval. They conducted a large business with the Levant, East and West Indies, Canary Islands and Brazil, and above all with the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal."²

"Their position enabled them to give Cromwell and his secretary Thurloe important information as to the plans both of Charles Stuart in Holland and of the Spaniards in the New World."⁴

"Outwardly they seemed as Spaniards and Catholics, but they held prayer-meeting at Cree Church Lane . . . meanwhile public opinion in England had become prepared by the Puritanical movement for a sympathetic treatment of any proposal by the Judaizing sects among the extremists of the Parliamentary Party for the re-admission of the Jews into England."²

Then, in 1650 Manasseh ben Israel published his 'Hope of Israel': the Messiah could not appear until the Jews settled in all the lands of the Earth, and if England admitted them the Messianic Age might be expected:

"Meanwhile the commercial policy which led to the Navigation Act in October, 1651 made Cromwell desirous of attracting the rich Jews from Amsterdam to London so that they might transfer their important interests from

the Spanish Main from Holland to England . . . the mission of St. John to Amsterdam which had previously proposed as an alternative to the Navigation Act a coalition between the English and Dutch commercial interests had negotiated with Manasseh ben Israel. A passport was granted to Manasseh ben Israel . . ."²

M. ben Israel then left for London where he:

"printed his 'humble address' to Cromwell . . . as a consequence a National conference was summoned at Whitehall. Both the divines and the merchants were opposed to the re-admission and Cromwell stopped the discussion in order to prevent an adverse decision."²

Early the following year:

"The question came to a practical issue through the declaration of war against Spain, which resulted in the arrest of Antonio Rodrigues Robles and forced the Marranos of London to avow their Judaism as a means of avoiding arrest as Spaniards and the confiscation of their goods. As a final result Cromwell appears to have given informal permission to the Jews on condition that they did not obtrude their worship on public notice. Under cover of this permission Carjaval and S. de Carceres purchased a piece of land for a Jewish cemetery . . . , and Solomon Dormido, a nephew of M. ben Israel was admitted to the Royal exchange as duly licensed broker to the City of London without taking the usual oath involving faith in Christianity."

"This somewhat surreptitious method of solving the Jewish Question in England had the advantage of not raising anti-semitic feeling too strongly, and it likewise enabled Charles II on his return to avoid taking any action

of the petition of the merchants of London asking him revoke Cromwell's concession.*²²

"He had been assisted by several Jews of Royalist sympathies, as Mendes da Costa and Augustine Colonel-Chacon during his exile."

"In 1664 a further attempt was made by the Earl of Berkshire and Mr. Ricaut to bring about the expulsion of the Jews, but the King in Council assured the latter of the continuance of former favour."

"Similar appeals to prejudices were made in 1673 when Jews . . . were indicted on a charge of rioting and in 1685 when 37 were arrested on the Royal Exchange, but the proceedings in both cases were put a stop to by the direction of the Privy Council. The state of the Jews was still very indeterminate. 1684 in a case connected with the East India Company, it was contended that they were alien infidels, and a perpetual menace to the British Crown, and even the attorney-general declared that they resided in England only under implied licence."²²

WILLIAM III.

"William III refused a petition from Jamaica to expel the Jews . . . His tenure of the throne†, however, brought about a closer connection between the London and Amsterdam communities, and thus aided in the transfer of the centre of European trade from the Dutch to the English capital."

In 1694, five years after William III came to the throne, the Bank of England was founded, and early in the 18th century the Jewish community of London comprised representatives of the chief Jewish financiers of northern Europe.

"The utility of the larger Jewish merchants was recognized. Marlborough in particular made great use of the services of Sir Solomon de Medine, and indeed was publicly charged with taking an annual subvention from him. These merchants are estimated to have brought into the country a capital of £1,500,000 which had increased by the middle of the century to £5,000,000.

"As early as 1723 a special act of Parliament was passed which permitted them to hold land on condition of their taking oath when registering their title; they were allowed to omit the words 'upon the faith of a Christian.'

"In 1740, an act was passed permitting Jews who had resided in the British colonies for a period exceeding seven years to become naturalized. Shortly afterwards a similar bill was passed in the Irish Parliament . . . but it failed to pass the Irish Peers and was ultimately dropped."

"During the Jacobian insurrection of 1745 the Jews had shown particular loyalty to the Government. Their chief financier Samson Gideon had strengthened the Stock Market and several of the younger members [of the Jewish community] had volunteered in the corps raised to defend London."

"Possibly as a reward, Pelham in 1753 brought in a

* Cromwell had not given any.

† The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* remarks in the article on Holland that the reign of William III marked a "period of exceptional prosperity for the Jews . . . the prince employed Jews in his negotiations with foreign Kings, especially members of the Belmonte family, Moses Machado (who rendered important services to the army in Flanders) and Isaac Lopez Suasso (who lent 2,000,000 gulden to William for his descent upon England.)"

bill allowing Jews to become naturalized."

"The Tory Party made a great outcry against 'this abandonment of Christianity'. The Whigs, however, persisted in carrying at least one part of their general policy of religious toleration, and the bill was passed and received the Royal Assent."

"Nevertheless a great clamour was raised against it and the Lord Mayor and the Corporation of London petitioned Parliament for its repeal."

"In 1754 the Jew bill was repealed."

"Samson Gideon, the head of the community determined to bring up his children as Christians, and his example was followed by many of the chief families during the remainder of the century."²²

GEORGE III.

"At this time a number of the more prominent members of the Sephardic community, as the Bernal, Lopez, Ricardos, Disraelis, Aguilers and Samudas gradually severed their connection with the Synagogues and allowed the children to grow up without any religion or in the Established Church. Meanwhile the ranks of all the English Jewry were being recruited from the downtrodden German and Polish communities of the Continent."

In time the lead among the English Jews passed from the Spanish (Sephardic) to the German section of the community (e.g., the Rothschilds).

"When in 1829 the Roman Catholics of England were freed from all their civil disabilities the hopes of the Jews rose high and the first steps towards a similar alleviation in their case was taken in 1830 when Mr. Huskisson presented a petition signed by 2,000 merchants and others of Liverpool . . . at first the bill failed even to get through the House of Commons . . . it was rejected by 104 to 54, though the Duke of Sussex, a constant friend to the Jews, presented a petition in its favour signed by 1,000 distinguished citizens of Westminster.

"The whole force of the Tory party was against the Bill, which had besides, the personal antagonism of the bluff sailor King William IV.

" . . . by the passing of the Sheriff Declaration Bill August 21, 1935, Jews were allowed to hold the ancient and important office of sheriff."²²

During the years 1840-44,

"The political activities of the English Jews were concentrated on the attempt to obtain admission to municipal offices . . . it was not until July 31, 1845 that the bill was carried. In the following year (August 18, 1826) the Religious Opinions Bill removed a certain number of Minor Disabilities which affected the Jews of England . . . and the only portal which still remained closed to the Jews was that of Parliament."²²

3. THE STRUGGLE FOR EMANCIPATION

When the 'liberal' ideas thus promulgated had taken a firm hold on the minds of the English ruling classes the Jewish leaders decided that the struggle for 'emancipation' (i.e., open rule by Jews) could begin:

"The success with which the Jews of England had induced Parliament to admit them to the shrievalty [office of sheriff] and to municipal offices had been due

to the fact that Jews had been actual candidates and had been elected to those offices before any parliamentary relief was asked. It was now decided to adopt the same policy in regard to a seat in Parliament itself. Baron Lionel de Rothschild was elected member for the city of London by a large majority in 1847 and the bill that was introduced on December 16th of that year was intended to carry out the wishes of a definite English constituency . . . it was rejected in the Lords . . . the same thing happened in 1850 when Baron Lionel de Rothschild was again elected but in the following year the struggle took a more dramatic form.

"David Solomons, who had successfully fought the battle for the shrievalty and the aldermanic chair, had been elected member for Greenwich and insisted on taking his seat, refusing to withdraw on being ordered to do so by the speaker, and adding to his seeming parliamentary offense by voting in the division on the motion for adjournment which was made to still the uproar caused by his bold course of action. The prime minister moved that Solomons be ordered to withdraw, and on that motion Solomons spoke in a dignified and forcible manner, and won the sympathy of the house, which nevertheless passed the premier's motion. The matter was then referred to the Law Courts, which decided that Solomons had no right to vote without having taken the oath of abjuration in the form appointed by the government and mulcted him in a fine of £500 for each vote he had recorded in the Commons.

"The government then brought in another bill in 1853, which was also rejected by the Lords. In 1855 the hero of the parliamentary struggle, David Solomons, was elected Lord Mayor of London. In the following years bills were introduced by the Government to modify the parliamentary oath, but they failed to obtain the assent of the Lords. In 1858 when the oath bill reached the Lords they eliminated the clause relating to the Jews but when the bill was referred again to the Commons, the Lower House refused to accept it as amended, and appointed a committee to formulate its reasons, upon which committee, as if to show the absurdity of the situation, the member for the city of London, Baron Lionel

de Rothschild was appointed to serve—which he could legally do, even though he had not taken his seat. A conference was appointed between the two houses, and ultimately a compromise was reached by which either house might admit Jews by resolution, allowing them to omit the words 'on the faith of a Christian.'

"As a consequence Baron Lionel de Rothschild took the oath with covered head substituting "So help me Jehovah" for the ordinary form of the oath and thereupon took his seat as the first Jewish member of Parliament.

"Two years later a more general form of oath for all members of Parliament was introduced which freed the Jews from all cause of exclusion."²

In this fashion the 'Mother of Parliament' was first openly remoulded to suit Jewish habits and inclinations, a process that has gone on ever since:

"In 1870 the University Test Act removed the difficulties in the way of a Jew becoming a scholar or a fellow in an English university. In 1885 Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild was raised to the Upper House as Lord Rothschild, to be followed within a few years by Baron Henry de Worms as Lord Pirbright and Mr. Sidney Stern as Lord Wansworth, while in 1890 all restrictions for every position in the British Empire save that of monarch were removed, the offices of Lord High Chancellor and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland being thrown open to every British subject without distinction or creed."

"Altogether the struggle had lasted for 60 years, though practically all that was contended for had been gained in half that period. Yet it must be remembered that complete Equality was not granted to Roman Catholics and Jews until 1890. The very length of the struggle shows how thoroughly the opposition had been overcome. The many political friendships made during the process had facilitated social intercourse, which is nowhere so unrestricted as in England."² B. J.

References:

² *Jewish Encyclopaedia.*

⁴ *Lucien Wolf: "Cromwell's Intelligencers."*

"UNCLE SAM AND THE BEAR"—continued from page 2.

ambiguous expression "State Capitalism" was perhaps more accurate.

"Under the New Economic Policy a great many nationalized enterprises were 'released' not to former proprietors or private owners . . . the financing of such corporations were carried out by the Industrial and Commercial banks and by other new banking establishments.

"As the New Economic Policy developed industry was divided into 'trusts', as they were called. With the trusts which were organs of production, were associated syndicates, organs of sale and purchase handling both foreign and internal trade. United action and governmental control was secured by the expansion of the supreme Economic Council to include representatives of the trust sections, so as to form a kind of industrial General Staff.

"The constitution of the new state, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, was accepted by the Central Executive Committee, 1923.

"Each republic had its own Council of Commissars, but the Union reserved for itself the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, War, and Marine, Trade Transport and Posts and Telegraphs.

"Paradoxically, the most important unifying force of the new state [Communism] which contained so many races, creeds and languages was not mentioned in the Constitution. The Communist party with its rigid discipline and centralized authority was destined to control each of the constituent states and to cement them more firmly together . . ."

It should be noted that U.S.A. was the first Power to engage in trade with Russia and the last to acknowledge her politically.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND MEETINGS

Will advertisers please note that the latest time for accepting copy for this column is 12 noon Monday for Saturday's issue.

BELFAST D.S.C. Group. Headquarters: 72, Ann Street, Belfast. Monthly Group Meetings on First Tuesday in each month.

BIRMINGHAM and District. Social Crediters will find friends over tea and light refreshments at Prince's Cafe, Temple Street, on Friday evenings, from 6 p.m., in the King's Room.

BLACKBURN Social Credit Study Group. Enquiries to Hon. Sec., 47, Whalley New Road, Blackburn.

BRADFORD United Democrats. All enquiries welcome; also helpers wanted. Apply R. J. Northin, 11, Centre Street, Bradford.

CARDIFF Social Credit Association: "The Pursuit of Glory", a short lecture beginning at 7-30 p.m., prompt at 10, Park Place on Wednesday, October 25th.

The Social Crediter

If you are not a subscriber to THE SOCIAL CREDITER, send this order without delay.

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

Please send THE SOCIAL CREDITER to me

Name

Address

For Twelve Months—I enclose 30/-

„ Six „ „ 15/-

„ Three „ „ 7/6

(Cheques and Postal Orders should be crossed and made payable to K.R.P. Publications Ltd.)

Name.....

Address.....

TO THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE, THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT, 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

I wish to support Social Credit Policy as defined in the terms of association of and pursued by The Social Credit Secretariat under the Chairmanship of—Major C. H. Douglas.

I will, until further notice, contribute

£ : : , { per month, per quarter, per year,

towards the funds of the Social Credit Secretariat.

Signature.....

I herewith enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the above mentioned funds.

Signature.....

DERBY and District—THE SOCIAL CREDITER will be obtainable outside the Central Bus Station on Saturday mornings from 7-15 a.m. to 8-45 a.m., until further notice. It is also obtainable from Morley's, Newsagents and Tobacconists, Market Hall.

LIVERPOOL Social Credit Association: Weekly meetings of social crediters and enquirers will continue, but at varying addresses. Get in touch with the Hon. Secretary, at "Greengates", Hillside Drive, Woolton, Liverpool.

NEWCASTLE D.S.C. Group. Literature, The Social Crediter, or any other information required will be supplied by the Hon. Secretary, Social Credit Group, 10, Warrington Road, Newcastle, 3.

PORTSMOUTH D.S.C. Group. Weekly meetings every Thursday at 8 p.m., 16, Ursula Grove, Elm Grove, Southsea.

SOUTHAMPTON Group: Secretary C. Daish, 19, Merridale Road, Bitterne, Southampton.

TYNESIDE Social Credit Society invite co-operation to establish a local centre for Social Credit action in all its aspects. Apply W. L. Page, 74-6, High West Street, Gateshead.

EXPANSION FUND

To the Treasurer, Social Credit Expansion Fund, c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 12, Lord Street, Liverpool, 2.

I enclose the sum of £ : : , as a donation towards the Social Credit Expansion Fund, to be expended by the Administrators at the Sole Discretion of Major C. H. Douglas.

Name

Address

WOLVERHAMPTON: Will all social crediters, old and new, keep in contact by writing E. EVANS, 7, Oxbarn Avenue, Bradmore, Wolverhampton.

Miscellaneous Notices.

Rate 1s. a line. Support our Advertisers.

TO LET—For winter months, proportion of rent to Expansion Fund. A sunny and comfortable furnished cottage in North Devon, glorious view. Two sitting, three bed., (sleep 5), kitchen, oil cooker, lamps and radiator, drinking water laid on; e.c. under cover. Garage.

Part time labour available. Apply H. M. C., Beaford House, N. Devon.

TO LET—Furnished accommodation for S.C. couple available in country house twenty miles Newcastle, acre site, good travelling facilities. Also new double-wall four-berth caravan available for family or friends. Write K.R.P. Publications Ltd., for address.

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:—

- Economic Democracy 3/6
Social Credit 3/6
Credit Power and Democracy ... 3/6
The Monopoly of Credit 3/6
Warning Democracy 3/6
The Tragedy of Human Effort ... 6d.
The Use of Money 6d.
Approach to Reality 3d.
Money and the Price System ... 3d.
Nature of Democracy 2d.
Social Credit Principles 1d.
Tyranny 1d.

By L. D. Byrne:—

- Alternative to Disaster 4d.
The Nature of Social Credit ... 4d.
Debt and Taxation 2d.

ALSO

- The Douglas Manual 5/-
The Economic Crisis:
Southampton Chamber of
Commerce Report 6d.
The Bankers of London
by Percy Arnold 4/6
Economics for Everybody
by Elles Dee 3d.

LATEST PUBLICATIONS

- The Purpose of Politics by H.E. 3d.
The Power of Money com-
piled by J. B. Galway 3d.
Copies of the U.R.A.A. circular
"Warning Europe" as well as the
K.R.P. Publications circular "The
Mark of the Beast" are available at
2d. each.

All from

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., 12, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.