

# The British Guardian.

Telephone: Museum 2566.

Editorial and Advertisement Office: 40, Great Ormond Street, W.C.1., London, England.

SIXPENCE MONTHLY or 6/6 per annum (post free).

The Editor will be pleased to consider manuscripts if accompanied by stamped and addressed envelopes. He accepts no responsibility, however, for manuscripts submitted to him. All communications and MSS. should be addressed to the Editor, "THE BRITISH GUARDIAN," 40, Great Ormond Street, W.C.1., London, England.

## NOTES OF THE MONTH.

### GENERAL PRESCOTT DECIE'S MISTAKE.

The Loyalty League at the present time is conducting a very active campaign in the West of England. Brigadier-General Prescott-Decie, speaking at a meeting at Bath, made statements which have greatly disturbed our Jewish contemporaries. As is customary when anybody openly states the truth about the Jews, General Prescott-Decie in so doing is stated by them to be demented, and to have "Jews on the brain." These remarks are so much a matter of course to those who know of the Jewish peril and fight it that they have become a joke to them, but they are far from being a joke when their possible effect on the unenlightened is taken into consideration. General Prescott-Decie is no more demented than was Field-Marshal Sir Henry Wilson, who told our country the same truths, and for doing which he was assassinated. But although we agree with most of what the General had to say, and although we are always morally encouraged by his well-known uncompromising attitude to the Jews, we are distressed to find from a remark which he appears to have made in his speech that even he has fallen into the error of misguiding people on the question of the origin and character of the destructive force at work pulling down the British Empire. He is reported to have said that "there was a plot on foot to ruin the British Empire and the three dominating factors were the Jews, the Germans and the Irish Sinn Feiners." Now the Germans and the Irish Sinn Feiners are no more dominating factors in the plot than are the Conservative and Liberal Parties, which are both being used by the Jews for the destruction of the British Empire, admittedly not so dramatically, but certainly far more effectively than either of the two agencies mentioned by the General.

### LOYALTY LEAGUE WORKERS.

We cannot mention the Loyalty League without expressing our great admiration for the work being done by Miss Akers-Douglas and Mr. Mudge. Miss Akers-Douglas has organised a number of speakers to tour the country in caravans from village to village, speaking at each. Miss Akers-Douglas herself is doing a great deal of the speaking in this campaign, and Mr. Mudge is also speaking extensively, and we are constantly receiving evidence of the good effects of their work. Mr. Mudge is so deeply engrossed in this work whilst on his vacation that our readers have to suffer, for we are unable to obtain from him further instalments of his splendid articles on "Pride of Race."

### ANOTHER CASE OF MENTAL ABERRATION.

There is an amusing instance in the *Jewish Guardian* of August 15th of the use made by the Jews of the suggestion that any disagreement with their views can only be the result of mental aberration, although in this case they are not referring to one who has been making truthful statements about them. It appears that the son of the late Dr. Theodore Herzl, who was the founder of the Zionist movement, has been baptised a Christian and joined the Roman Catholic Church. The ceremony was performed by a converted Jewish priest. The comment of the *Jewish Guardian* reads:—

"The general impression among those who know him is that Hans Herzl has not been of normal mind for a long time. He was an official for almost a year in the Union Bank and then without any notice suddenly disappeared. One of his sisters, too, is abnormal."

The continuation of the paragraph is equally amusing, for it discloses the annoyance of the *Jewish Guardian* that the customary deprivation of the convert's worldly goods cannot be effected owing to the Austrian law. It continues:—

"Although he is 34 years of age, Hans Herzl is still in ward, but in the question of changing his religion, the Austrian law gives him the right to decide for himself."

There is one more amusing point towards the end of the paragraph, where it says:—

"He (Hans Herzl) has been for many years under the close influence of Pater Schlesinger, a converted Jew who has affected him with his views on Jewish nationalism. Although a Catholic (Roman) Priest, Pater Schlesinger regards himself still as a member of the Jewish nation, and he has definite views with regard to the part of Christian Jews in Palestine. There is some talk about Pater Schlesinger intending to go to Palestine with Hans Herzl as a demonstration to the world of a Nationalist-Jewish-Christian movement."

### "EUROPEANS."

The South African branch of the Jewish Kahaldom has just escaped a horrible danger. Jews have narrowly escaped being scheduled in the South African law as being—themselves! Since the League of Nations has classed all Jews as emanating from a National Home in Asia, logic would insist that Jews are Asiatics like Hindoos. And as South Africa has made laws restricting the numbers and movements of "Asiatics" in the colony, the Jews had a great fright lest the South African Government should include them in the schedule. But the Jew plays no game except that of "Heads I win, tails you lose." Therefore, whilst he has got Palestine scheduled as his "Home," he has got himself "recognised" in the colony as a "European"! And in these days it does not matter in the least what a man is or what he has done; all that matters is what he can get himself "recognised as." As long as Braunstein—Trotsky, Apfelbaum-Zinovieff, Sobelsohn-Radek and the Jew Rakovsky can get themselves "recognised as Russians"; and Lionel Phillips, Beit, Eckstein, Sammy Marks, Joffe and the rest can get themselves recognised as "Europeans," Jewry wins hands down. And so long as Jewry controls Westminster and Cape Town will Jews be able to get themselves "recognised" as anything they like, and compel honest Englishmen to do everything which they don't like.

## ALIEN IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL EMIGRATION.

We recently came across an interesting statement of Lord Rosebery's made in 1894, and quoted in a book, *The Alien Immigrant*, by Major W. Evans Gordon, M.P., published in 1903. The statement reads:—

"I take it if there is one certainty in the world it is this, that with the growth of immigration and with the continual closing of the confines of States to the destitute immigrants of other countries, there is no country in the world which will not be compelled to consider and reconsider its position with regard to pauper immigration, unless it wishes permanently to degrade the status and the conditions of its own working classes."

We have surely come to the time when we should compel the reconsideration of this problem. Our Governments have refused to take any steps to stop the continued influx of the most undesirable type of pauper Jew alien into the country, and there is reason to believe that they are still coming in in large numbers. Statistics dealing with Jews are notoriously unreliable, and we must not be misled by them. On the other hand, the emigration figures for 1923 were nearly double those of the two preceding years. They reached the great total of 130,000 men alone. If emigration continues at the present rate, Britain will be losing annually and permanently over a hundred thousand of its most vigorous sons. It should not be forgotten that the politician who is most active in the cause of "adjusting the population within the Empire"—as it is called—is Mr. Leopold Amery. This adjustment would be a most excellent thing were the immigration of aliens to this country absolutely prohibited, but we do not find Mr. Amery advocating this. The result is that he is actively assisting in a mere exchange of the population of this country, alien Jew for pure Briton. The story of the overpopulation of the country, so far as he is concerned, would seem to be nothing but an excuse for effecting this exchange. It is within the power of Englishmen to stop it if they want to do so.

## MAJOR ROBERT IMBRIE.

A new speculation has been introduced into the case of the murder of Major Robert Imbrie, the American Consul at Teheran, by an article which has recently appeared in an Italian journal, *Il Mattino*, on the subject. According to the information which they have received from a source which they claim to be truthfully inspired, the murder was committed at the instigation of a so-called "British" (in reality Jewish) oil group who have found Major Imbrie a stumbling-block to them in their intrigue to obtain oil concessions in Persia. It is stated in that article that a certain section of the British Secret Service, the personnel of which has been changed since the war by the "accidental" death of three of its leading members under peculiar circumstances, was used by the Jewish Oil Group to arrange the murder of Major Imbrie. What *Il Mattino* discloses may have been an added inducement to the Kahal to get rid of Major Imbrie, but for our part we are much more inclined to believe that the main reason why they arranged his assassination was because of his unique knowledge of the Jewish revolution in Russia, and the subsequent period of the Jewish Kahalocratic Government.

## OUR EFFORT TO BEAT MOND.

We reproduce elsewhere in this number a leaflet which we had distributed in the Carmarthen constituency in the recent by-election in which Sir Alfred Mond was successful. Unfortunately our resources and the assistance which we received for this special effort only made it possible for us to distribute a very limited number. We feel confident that had we had the necessary funds to have thoroughly distributed the leaflet throughout the constituency, even the inducements which it is possible persuaded the people of Carmarthen into humbugging themselves into thinking that Sir Alfred Mond could represent them would not have been effective in preventing a very different result.

There is a touching circumstance regarding this by-election which has apparently escaped general notice. There was no very obvious reason why the late Liberal Member, who is of genuine Welsh blood, Sir Ellis Griffiths, should have relinquished his seat in the House, except that he was returned with a handsome majority at the General Election, which afforded a healthy prospect for the Liberal cause in the future. That quondam Member for Wales (if not exactly a naturalised Welshman), Sir Alfred Mond, was without a seat in Parliament, and apparently wanted one more acutely than Sir Ellis Griffiths. Sir Alfred Mond, it so happens, is Chairman of the Mond Nickel Company, whilst Sir Ellis Griffiths is only an ordinary director of the same Board. So that whatever the Liberal Member for Carmarthen may represent in the House, the Mond Nickel Company will still be represented there just the same. As is well known, Sir Alfred Mond has always urged his "co-Welshmen" to stand up for their national right against the tyrannical English. The Chairman of the Mond Nickel Company will now be a much greater power in Parliament for the double service of the Mond Nickel Company and Wales. "Wales for the Welsh" is the slogan. But also Sir Alfred Mond is not only a Welsh Nationalist, he is also a Jew Nationalist and a leader of the Zionists. "Palestine for the Jews" is thus another of his slogans, so there will be a double nationalist advantage served by the people of Carmarthen having sent Sir Alfred into Parliament once more. Also the leadership of the Liberal Party is still an unsettled problem—and, who knows?

## SIR ALFRED MOND'S KOSHER (?) PIGS.

The newly-elected member for Carmarthenshire reminds us of the actor who, when playing the part of Othello, was not content to blacken his face and hands, but insisted on blackening himself all over in order to enter more thoroughly into the part. Sir Alfred is well known as a Welsh mine-owner and a supporter of Welsh light railways, but that is not sufficient Welshness. Carmarthenshire is largely agricultural country, so Sir Alfred must needs convert himself into the simulacrum of a complete Welshman by becoming a Welsh farmer also, and a Carmarthenshire farmer at that. The *Evening Standard's* "Londoner" who is devoted to Hebrew interests, and whose knowledge of them is both extensive and peculiar, tells us that Farmer Alfred has 400 acres under cultivation in the Welsh county, and that one of the chief agricultural aims of his farm is to improve the breed of—pigs! Mr. Israel Zangwill, in his prophetic poem "Israel" must have had Farmer Alfred in his mind's

eye when he described his people as "licensed keepers of swine." At any rate, the cult would seem to show that Sir Alfred Mond is at least possessed of what the Jewish journals delight to call "broadmindedness." In all probability his efforts will be aimed at producing a peculiar breed of pigs that can be guaranteed "kosher," and eaten by the chosen ones with unruffled conscience.

### LORD ERNLE'S JEWISH MIND.

The Times of August 6th publishes a letter over the signature of Lord Ernle on the subject of the Agricultural Wages Board, containing the most astonishingly blatant avowal of regard for a view which is thoroughly Judaistic and utterly alien to our English Christian thought. What is more, Lord Ernle declares, as though it were a matter for pride, that this was the view which determined him, as the Minister responsible, to obtain powers to appoint the Agricultural Wages Board. The paragraph in the letter reads:—

"The creation of a Wages Board (during the war in 1917) and its centralised form were necessitated by war conditions. It was part of the Government policy to secure as large a supply of supplementary agricultural labour as the exigencies of military service allowed. Four hundred thousand men and women, largely subsidised by the State, some skilled, some unskilled, were, as a fact, thrown upon the land, depriving agricultural workers of their legitimate opportunity of profiting by the increased demand for their labour and the reduction in its supply. For their protection a wages tribunal was a necessity. . ."

At the moment we are not concerned with the question of the Agricultural Wages Board, but solely with the reason given by Lord Ernle why he, as Minister responsible, and the Government of which he was a member, obtained the powers to appoint the Wages Boards. He says that it was because the agricultural workers were being deprived of "their legitimate opportunity of profiting by the increased demand for their labour and the reduction in its supply."

This is really a most remarkable disclosure. We suppose that it also reveals the reason why Admiral Consett was unable to persuade the Minister of Blockade—Lord Robert Cecil—to take any action to stop the Jews in this country from trading with the enemy through the Scandinavian countries—it would have been depriving them of their legitimate opportunity of profiting by the circumstances. It is an open avowal of approval—if not of actual participation in it—of the wholesale profiteering which so disgraced us in the war.

We cannot find that Lord Ernle has any trace of Jewish blood to account for this degraded view. He appears to be a Welshman. His father was a clergyman and Rector of Whippingham. At Oxford he took honours in History and Classics. We get no indication of any possible explanation until we find that he is, by profession, a barrister. We are reminded of Shakespeare's famous dictum which we are keeping in mind for our future guidance if ever we are fortunate enough to get the chance: "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers."

### HOW THE JEWS CAN HELP US.

There is interesting confirmation in a paragraph in the Evening Standard of the truth of our assertion in our article "The Proteus of Peoples" that it is essential to go to the root of the matter and attack the danger for what it is—Judaism. We have derived great spiritual benefit ourselves from the fight against

the Jew power, for we have always found that by taking a diametrically opposite view to that taken by the Jews (where it has been possible to truthfully ascertain the view which the Jews really did take) we should be certain to be right. And here is such a case. The paragraph reads:—

"While giving Mrs. Webster credit for every good and patriotic intention this is the type of book which does harm. It distracts attention from the important issue of Communism *versus* the Community, and diverts it to nebulous Jews of super-malignancy. What is more, she does not prove that these unknown powers of evil are Jews. They might turn out to be Glasgow Irish. More probably they do not exist at all."

### A RETORT TO DEAN INGE.

A correspondent who read of Dean Inge's refusal of the use of St. Paul's Cathedral for a service to be held for the St. George's Society on St. George's Day wrote to the worthy Dean asking him if the report was true and requesting the Dean to inform him, if the report was true, why he made this refusal. Receiving no reply to his first communication, our correspondent wrote again enclosing a stamped addressed envelope for the reply. No reply being forthcoming to this second letter our correspondent wrote the following verses which he sent to the Dean to remind him that there were still some Englishmen who had not lost their love of England.

Who fears to speak of England's fame?  
Who fears to honour England's name?  
The renegade who feels no shame  
In speaking ill of England!

Though every renegade refuse  
To sing the patriotic muse  
But hails with joyful sound the news  
That augurs ill for England!

Though motley hordes from distant parts  
May practise diabolic arts  
Let them not think that English hearts  
Will lose their faith in England.

We children of the Motherland  
Linked heart with heart and hand in hand  
For England's honour firm will stand  
And cry "Hurrah for England!"

"O England, model to thy greater self  
Thou little body with a mighty heart."

Shakespeare.

"Happy is England, I could be content  
To tread no other verdure than thine own  
To feel no other breezes than are blown  
Through thy tall woods, with high romances blent."

Keates.

"England, with all thy faults, I love thee still!"

Cowper

## THE PROTEUS OF PEOPLES.

Every day that passes sees some further disclosure of the disruptive forces at work in the British Empire, with the result that every day brings more and more people into the group of those who realise that some sinister, occult, destructive force is at work. Every day determines more and more of these people to exercise themselves in opposing this force. Consequently, the necessity for clearly discerning the nature of this force hourly becomes more important.

A review of the political activity in the country reveals the existence of a great many conceptions of the nature of this force in the minds of those who are seeking to oppose it. To some it is "Socialism," and they are "Anti-socialist"; to others it is "Communism" and they are "Anti-Communist"; still others see it as nothing but the work of "Secret-societies." There are many other conceptions of its nature. All this is very natural, for people react to that particular phase of it with which they come into contact, and of which, to some extent, they have realised the danger.

But surely the time has come when these different conceptions should be correlated, and the particular characteristics and field of each should be recognised. Long ago we undertook for our own satisfaction to do this very thing, and discovered that in all of these apparently different systems of ideas there existed a singular similarity. They were all the result of a particular outlook on life; an outlook which was certainly not the result of Christian thought. It was an outlook which gave the supremacy to the material, and the only teaching which we could find of this nature was the teaching of the Talmud. This was an interesting revelation, the value of which was utterly unrecognised until applied. Only when we had obtained the knowledge of what to look for did we find that at the back of each one of these systems of ideas there was invariably the mind of the Jew suggesting them, and almost equally invariably Jewish minds directing them in their course. We were aware, of course, of the world fact that there is a power which is the perversion of the divine power, but that there should be a particular body of people who predominated in the activities of this perverted power was startlingly new to us. We found, however, that there was nothing new in the fact of their activity, and that it was not by mere chance that they so largely predominated in the operations of this perverted power. We discovered that they were a very highly organised people

deliberately working as a body in opposing the divine law.

This discovery was like a magic guidance to the fitting together of the pieces in the jig-saw puzzle of the world drama. Once in possession of this key, all the otherwise inexplicable mysteries—the application of utterly ridiculous and absurd theories to the practical matters of life—are explained. The Jews are revealed as the seducers of the nations to a belief in "ideas" which are the perversion of the divine law, and which must inevitably destroy them if persisted in. A study of the methods adopted by the Jews to thus seduce Christian peoples to work for anti-Christ reveals a decree of subtlety incredible to the uninstructed Christian mind. A Jew himself has given us the correct phrase with which to describe their duplicity, or rather "multiplicity." Mr. Israel Zangwill, in his poem "Israel," describes his nation as the "Proteus of Peoples," and as "wearing all colours and none." Proteus, in the old mythology, is described by Homer as having had Menelaus in his power only so long as Menelaus was unable to grasp him in his true shape. So long as Proteus was able to change his form into any shape he desired, Menelaus had no power over him. And this is exactly the situation in which the Christian nations find themselves with regard to Jewry.

### JEWRY IS THE PROTEUS OF PEOPLES.

We assert, therefore, that all these apparently differing systems of ideas have but one origin and one purpose. They originated in the mind of Jewry and are designed to destroy those who are so misguided as to give any credence to them. This being so, it follows that there is but one name to give to the destructive agency which the English people have to oppose, and that name is Jewry. Jewry and Judaism are one and the same thing. To think of it as being "Socialism," or "Communism," or "Bolshevism," or "Subversivism," or any other "ism" than "Judaism," is simply to render ourselves impotent from the beginning. For let us be thoroughly successful in removing any of these "isms" from the minds of men, we must make no mistake about it, so long as Jewry is left to disguise its activities under any suitable "ism," so long will Jewry produce just as many more "isms" as can be removed, and probably of a far more dangerous character.

# THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

BY A CORRESPONDENT.

The article which appeared in the June number of *The British Guardian* on the British Fascisti dealt with factors which concern every patriotic or political body. The method therein described of the penetration and control of a body working in the national interest by those who are in reality seeking to destroy the nation has probably been effected to a greater extent in the Conservative Party than in any other body. This Party was the natural champion of all the sound, sane, constructive elements in the country. It is inconceivable that, had there not been some subtle influence at work, the type of Englishman it embodies should have so worthily demonstrated his ability in almost every part of the world and yet have made such a terribly poor showing in the management of his own domestic affairs. The common taunt that the personnel of the Conservative Party has never been renowned for its intelligence is not the honest expression of an observed truth. It is easily recognisable by those having any knowledge of Jewry as the work of that particular people. In fact it is an instance of a method which has become so well known to the anti-Judaist that it has been classified by him under the title of "The Whisper Drive." Having had some years experience of the Conservative Party and its managers it is not difficult for me to appreciate the nature of the subtle influence which sterilised it. The influence is the same as that referred to in the British Fascisti article, an influence which long ago succeeded in its work and is now firmly established in control. Many of the Agents in the Constituencies are Jews, and the deliberate mismanagement and dissipation of the valuable voluntary assistance offered in those Constituencies during the last Election was on a very large scale. Unfortunately the candidates in those Constituencies, where they are true, honest Englishmen, are so utterly ignorant of the Jew and his methods that the idea of such a thing happening never occurs to them. Moreover, these Jewish Agents are usually so plausible and cover their true purpose under such a volume of sound "talk" that the candidate is almost invariably gulled into the belief that he has been extremely fortunate in having the assistance of such an excellent Agent. These Jewish Agents have been appointed at the instance of the Central Office, which is almost entirely staffed by Jews. An amusing story is told in this connection—a story which I believe to be true—of a visit paid by Brigadier-General Prescott-Decie to the Central Office. On entering the Enquiry Office it is said that he was approached by a palpable Jew and asked to explain his business. The General, looking at the man in a way which made him feel decidedly uncomfortable, said, "I never tell my business to a Jew. Here is my card. If you will go and find an Englishman for me to talk to I will explain my business to him." I do not know whether the General was successful in finding an Englishman to talk to. I rather doubt it. I imagine Englishmen are as difficult to find in the Central Office as the proverbial needle in the bottle of hay. However that may be, certain it is that at the last election it was Sir Herbert Jessel—now Lord Jessel of Westminster (!)—who sat on the Party chest and decided who should receive financial support and who should not. Certain it is also that the new Party Manager, Blair, is the product of one of the largest Jewish

Trusts in the country. And again, certain it is that it was the influence of Mr. Leopold Amery which persuaded Mr. Baldwin some months ago to rashly appeal to the country. I see that the disclosures in the last number of *The British Guardian* of the influences brought to bear on the country for the defeat of the Conservative Party have not passed unnoticed, anyway by the leader-writer in *The Patriot* of August 21st, for he says:—

"The policy with which Mr. Baldwin rashly went to the country and the results of the Election require explanation which has not been forthcoming. Dark forces were brought to bear to wreck the Conservative majority, and funds from foreign sources were made available."

This is perfectly true, of course, but I am sorry to find *The Patriot* making the statement without asserting at the same time that Mr. Baldwin did nothing to render himself unworthy or unsuitable to continue as Leader of the Party. There is the most lively necessity at the present time for those who have any hope in the Conservative Party to support Mr. Baldwin in his position. The Jews always have more than one reason for doing anything. Mr. Baldwin is an honest, patriotic Englishman; a character unique in modern political life. He has made speeches of so noble a character, and has advocated political action with regard to trusts and monopolists, both of which have been most displeasing to the Jews. Having manipulated him, quite unconsciously, into the foolish action of resigning and the Election, they are now using his mistake with its resultant defeat in the most strenuous efforts to bring about his deposition as Leader of the Party. That section of the penny press which is supposed to be Conservative in "policy," yet helped so materially to bring about the Conservative defeat, is now working overtime in an endeavour to bring about Mr. Baldwin's downfall. The trouble they have with him is that although (through ignorance, I am sure) he is not hostile to Jews, yet he is hostile to their methods—whether used by Jew or Gentile—and is also not directly manageable. This latter is for three reasons. They cannot control him by blackmail; they cannot coerce him financially; and they have found it impossible to hook on to him a Jewish Private Secretary. Mr. Baldwin's continued Leadership of the Conservative Party is the one hope that Party has got of ever being of any true service to the country. He may not have the "first class brains" of some—they have been tried and we know but too well whither they lead us—but what he has got is honesty. And this is the very thing the country is in a terrible danger through the lack of in those who have formed its successive Governments. For my part, I am sorry to say that I do not believe there to be any hope for the country in the Conservative Party, even with Mr. Baldwin as its Leader, and even with him enlightened to the true cause of all the trouble. The Jewish grip on the Party is a stranglehold, and were Mr. Baldwin to take any line which would be likely to result in anything truly beneficial to the country, they would throttle it to death. I am convinced that our only hope is for those English Conservatives who have the courage and the ability to seize the power and administer the government to do so.

## RUDYARD KIPLING'S SPEECH OF MAY 1914.

[The recent case in which the Editor of the Communist paper, *The Workers' Weekly*, was discharged against a summons for inciting His Majesty's soldiers and sailors to mutiny should surely have revealed to the people of this country the dangerous situation they have placed themselves in by handing over the administration to a Government some of the members of which have themselves, at different times, committed similar offences. We are reminded of that inspired speech of Rudyard Kipling's at Tunbridge Wells in May, 1914, when we were on the verge of civil war over Ireland, a situation which we seem to be rapidly approaching once more. This speech was of so remarkable a character that it will undoubtedly remain for all time a classical indictment of political corruption. It is as apposite to-day as it was in May, 1914, and would be so well worth re-reading to most Englishmen that we take the liberty of reproducing it here in order to relieve them of the difficulty they might experience in looking for it elsewhere. It is in just the same way in which he described the downward path of the Government of that day that the Government of the present time is sinking, and will continue to sink, deeper and deeper, into criminal depths. And it is for just the same reason which Mr. Rudyard Kipling gave for the descent of their predecessors, namely, *they started crooked*. Our national problem is, that of all Parliamentary political possibilities there is not one which would not take office with the same dreadful certainty of following the same downward path for the same reason. And it is for this very reason that in ever increasing numbers intelligent, patriotic Englishmen are looking for an alternative method of producing a pure National Government. We hope and believe that the re-reading of Mr. Rudyard Kipling's speech at the present time will reveal to a great many more the necessity and urgency of their allying themselves with this group.]

### THE SPEECH.

When I was a young man in India I used to report criminal cases for the newspaper that employed me. It was interesting work because it introduced me to forgers and embezzlers and murderers, and enterprising gentlemen of that kind. Sometimes, after I had reported their trial, I used to visit my friends in gaol when they were doing their sentences. I remember one man there who got off with a life sentence for murder. He was a clever, smooth-spoken chap, and he told me what he called the story of his life. It wasn't a very truthful account, but he finished by one true sentence. He said: "Take it from me, that when a man starts crooked, one thing leads to another till he finds himself in such an awkward position that he has to put somebody out of the way to get straight again." Well, that exactly describes the present position of the Cabinet. They started crooked; one thing led to another till they found themselves in such an awkward position that they had to put some one out of the way to get straight again.

Nearly all practical and constructive crime—that isn't done for the sake of a woman—is done for money. I won't make wild statements about other people's characters—we can leave that to the Chancellor of the Exchequer—but I should like to draw your attention to these plain, acknowledged facts. We know that,

with a few exceptions, the members of the Cabinet are not men of large private means or independent incomes. We know that two, at least, of them found it necessary to supplement their official incomes of £7,000 and £5,000 by taking part in a Stock Exchange flotation which was floated (about the time the "Titanic" sank) in a way that was too much even for the Stock Exchange. We were not permitted to know how many of their colleagues took part in that ramp; but we do know that their colleagues upheld their action both in the House of Commons and out of it. It is not too much to assume then that the bulk of the Cabinet, and certainly the most notorious persons in it, are dependent largely on their official salaries plus what they make in tips. People who are dependent on their salaries take good care to make the billet that gives them their salaries as permanent as possible. One thing naturally leads to another. A good deal of crooked work on the part of the Cabinet ended in the passage of the Parliament Act, by which the Cabinet assured itself a straight run of at least five years' salary. The Parliament Act provided that under no circumstances should the House of Lords be allowed to refer any legislation to the electorate, and that the length of a Parliament should be five years. Of course, the Cabinet promised on their word of honour that a Second Chamber should be created as soon as possible. But that was another bit of crooked work. The Parliament Act meant that if their majority could be kept together, the Cabinet stood to make over £400,000 in salaries alone during their term of office. But still there was a danger that the unsalaried individual Member of Parliament might object to passing legislation that struck him as too corrupt or too dangerous. It was necessary to give the private member a direct financial interest in voting for Cabinet measures. That interest was at once supplied. The House of Commons voted itself £400 per head per annum out of the nation's money. It was crooked work, but, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, the House of Commons was the supreme and ultimate master of the situation. Therefore it embezzled public funds under trust, well knowing that it could not be called into account. The meanest sneak-thief takes his chance against the laws of civilized society. The House of Commons took none. As long as the Cabinet stayed in office, every coalition Member of Parliament knew that he would get his cheque for £100 every quarter. If the Cabinet were defeated he knew that the money would stop. Men will do a great deal for the sake of £400 a year certain for five years.

You see how one thing leads to another. The Parliament Act and the fact that no Second Chamber had been created prevented the possibility of any interference by the electors outside; payment of members prevented any revolt on the part of members inside the House. The Cabinet were in the position of a firm of fraudulent solicitors who had got an unlimited power of attorney from a client by false pretences and could dispose of their client's estate as they pleased. The only drawback to the situation was that their majority was not big enough to make them independent of the Irish Nationalist vote. If that vote were not bought the Cabinet would lose their salaries as well as the chance of supplementing those salaries, which we know was a valuable chance, and the private member would lose a very comfortable income.

So the Irish Nationalist vote was bought by means of the Home Rule Bill. One thing led to another till the Cabinet found themselves in an awkward position. The Home Rule Bill, as they thought, was the easiest way out of it. Up till that time the Cabinet's legislation had been nothing more than corrupt or reckless or dangerous. The passing of the Parliament Act had, of course, destroyed the Constitution of this country, and the law of the land had been made to fit the needs of the Cabinet. Our country had been openly degraded in the eyes of all nations who value the purity of their justice or the personal honour of their administrators. But so far that had been all. Till the Home Rule Bill was produced the Cabinet had done nothing which fatally and irretrievably compromised the unity of Great Britain or the safety of the Empire, or made existence unendurable to any large section of the King's subjects.

The Home Rule Bill broke the pledged faith of generations; it officially recognized sedition, privy conspiracy and rebellion; it subsidized the secret forces of boycott, intimidation, outrage and murder; and it created an independent stronghold in which all these forces could work together, as they have always and openly boasted that they would, for the destruction of Great Britain.

Understand gentlemen, that I do not for one instant blame the Nationalists. They are what they are—what their particular type of their race has always been since the beginning of recorded history. They have done nothing, and, so far as in them lies, they have suffered nothing to be done for the peace or the material advancement of their land. They have imposed their own ancient form of tribal administration on large tracts of Ireland—the despotism of secret societies, a government of denunciation by day and terrorism by night. You can see the fruits of their work within a few hours of where we stand if you choose to visit the cities or the country-sides that they control by their peculiar methods—by the only methods they have ever understood—by the methods of fear, oppression, and hate. To do them justice, they have never faltered in their passionate and persistent hatred of England. They have preached it and practised it by every means in their power. They have prayed for the success of England's enemies in every quarter of the world; they have assisted those enemies with men and arms; they have jeered at England's defeats; they have befouled the honour of England's army, and they have mocked England's dead.

It was to men with this record of crime and hatred that the Cabinet prepared to hand over a portion of our United Kingdom for no other reason than that they might continue in the enjoyment of their office. They were warned from the first of the certain consequences of their action; they were entreated—abjectly entreated, as I think—to refer the matter to the electors, they were even offered the lives and fortunes of the Loyalists in the South and West of Ireland if they would leave the North and East out of their Bill of Sale.

You know their answer. You know Ulster's answer. You know with what devotion and self-sacrifice Ulster has set her house in order to avert this crime. Ulster is the first community in our realm to realize that this Home Rule Bill means life or death, and better death than the life it will impose upon her sons. But, gentlemen, the Home Rule Bill is equally one of life and death to every freeman in the kingdom.

Ireland is sold to-day. To-morrow it may be the turn of the Southern counties to be weighed off as make-weight in some secret bargain. Why not? *Three years ago you would have said that the Marconi scandal and the appointment of the present Lord Chief Justice were impossible.* Three months ago you would have said that the plot against Ulster was impossible. Nothing is impossible to a land without a Constitution—nothing except peace. We may believe that President Huerta would not sell a province of Mexico to the United States. We have no right to believe that of our own country. For what are the reasons that have called us here to-day?

A province and a people of Great Britain are to be sold to their and our enemies. We are forbidden to have any voice in this sale of our own flesh and blood; we have no tribunal under heaven to appeal to except the corrupt parties to that sale and their paid followers. And what has happened within the last two months? One thing led to another till the Cabinet found themselves in such a position that they had to put some one out of the way to get straight again. So they proposed to put Ulster out of the way. With this object they secretly prepared the largest combined expedition of both arms that has been launched since the Crimea—a force of horse, foot, field guns, howitzers, battleships, cruisers and destroyers. If these Ulster cattle could not be sold on the hoof they should be delivered as carcasses. Then they made a slip. It takes nerve to organize such a cattle killing on a large scale. They gave the officers told off for the business their choice—whether they would first provoke collision with, and then loose death and destruction on, the one loyal, the one prosperous, the one law-abiding portion of Ireland at the order of a secret Cabinet committee, or whether they would face the ruin of their careers as officers in his Majesty's army.

The choice was not so easy as it sounds. For, remember, that though the Constitution had ceased to exist; though the men who were planning these infamies had put all methods of civilized government behind them; yet the old trappings of constitutionalism, the old forms of conventions of civilized government still existed. They were a valuable asset to the Cabinet. They were the cloak under which the conspirators could operate, under which they could threaten. These men who met to arrange the massacre of decent citizens; these men who would bombard an open town of loyal subjects sooner than risk the loss of thirteen guineas a day while they ask the electors for leave to kill; these outlaws were still his Majesty's Ministers, powerful heads of great Departments of State. They could make or break the careers of honourable men. They elected to forfeit their pay and position rather than do this work to save the pay and position of his Majesty's Ministers. By their choice—to their eternal honour and glory be it recorded—the Army saved the Empire.

What has happened since? The Cabinet and the House of Commons have drawn eight weeks' more salary. If the Cabinet do not go forward with the Home Rule Bill they will cease to draw any salary. Therefore, they must go forward with the Home Rule Bill. We know, all mankind knows, they did not shrink from attempted murder to overcome beforehand the opposition which they were warned the Home Rule Act would meet. Through no fault of the Cabinet that attempt failed. But don't be under any delusion. Do not be deceived by any talk of arrangements or accom-

modations in the House of Commons. If the Cabinet thinks that murder will serve the Cabinet's turn again, they will attempt it again. And they will go further. In the light of their record two months ago, we are justified in believing that, if by any lie, by any falsification of facts, speeches, documents or telegrams, by any bribe of money, title or promotion, by subornation of evidence or pre-arranged provocation, the blame of causing bloodshed can be laid upon Ulster, the Cabinet will, openly or secretly, lend itself to that work.

Ulster, and as much of Ireland as dares to express itself, wishes to remain within the Union and under the Flag of the Union. The Cabinet, for reasons which I have given, intend to drive them out. The electors of Great Britain have never sanctioned this. Ulster has made every sacrifice, save one, to make effective her intention to remain in the Union. She stands ready to make the last sacrifice. How do we stand in this matter? Our forefathers, who were no strangers to tyranny, would have set their house in order long ere this, but we, who encounter it for the first time in generations, are slow to realize that civil war is possible. For civil war is possible. Civil war is inevitable unless our rulers can be brought to realize that, even now, they must submit these grave matters to the judgment of a free people. If they do not, all the history of our land shows that there is but one end—destruction from within or without.

## THE HOUSE OF JEWS.

By PARLIAMENTARIAN.

A correspondent has recently cast doubts on the existence of a racially alien Jewish Parliament in this country. We therefore think it well to quote from the report of the last session of this Parliament in the Jewish Chronicle of August 1st. And, to begin with, a list of the names of those present and the constituencies they represent will be found to be highly illuminating—the anglicised names not the least. Here is the opening of the report:—

A meeting of the Deputies was held on Sunday at the Old County Hall, Spring Gardens. Mr. H. S. Q. Henriques, K.C. (West London), the President was in the chair. There were also present:

Lord Rothschild (Manchester, Great).  
Sir S. Instone (Cardiff New).  
Rabbi Dr. S. Daiches (Leeds Beth Hamedrash).  
Dr. G. Chaikin (Sandy's Row).  
Dr. M. Epstein (United Synagogue).  
Dr. D. Jochelman (Woolwich and Plumstead).  
Dr. J. Klein (Hambro).  
Dr. M. Maizels (Llanelly).  
Lieut.-Col. C. Waley Cohen (Central).  
Capt. I. Fredman (Exeter).  
Mrs. A. Model (Union of Jewish Women).  
Mrs. M. A. Spielman (Union of Jewish Women).  
Messrs. D. Barnett (Tottenham).  
A. I. Belisha (West London).  
L. Benjamin (South Shields).  
S. Binderman (Order Achei Brith and Shield of Abraham).  
P. Burns (Wolverhampton).  
M. Cash (Association of Jewish Friendly Societies).  
J. Castello (Spanish and Portuguese).  
H. B. Cohen (Borough).  
H. D. Cohen (Brisbane).

L. I. Cohen (United Synagogue).  
R. Cohen (Bournemouth).  
S. Cohen (Sunderland Beth Hamedrash).  
M. H. Davis (Cannon Street Road).  
G. Delgado (Spanish and Portuguese).  
L. Deyong (Philpot Street).  
J. H. Elkes (Belfast).  
I. Feldman (Spitalfields, Great).  
B. A. Fersht (Darlington).  
M. I. Florentin (Manchester, Spanish and Portuguese).  
D. Franks (Walthamstow and Leyton).  
A. Gaber (Old Castle Street).  
E. Goldman (Grand Order of Israel).  
I. Goldman (St. John's Wood).  
S. W. Goldman (Great Garden Street).  
O. E. d'Avigdor Goldsmid (Anglo-Jewish Association).  
P. Guedalla (Sunderland).  
S. E. de Haas (Christchurch, N.Z.).  
L. J. Hydleman (Ealing and Acton).  
A. Instone (Pontypridd).  
E. Isaacs, M.B.E. (Glasgow, South Portland Street).  
I. J. Isaacs (Manchester, Rydal Mount).  
W. F. Isaacs (Independent Order of B'nai B'rith).  
E. L. Jackson (Cork).  
A. J. Jacobs (Bristol).  
B. Jacobs, LL.B. (Newport, Mon.).  
L. Kingsley (Walford Road).  
I. Kutner (Grand Order of Israel).  
M. J. Landa (Leeds, Old).  
I. Landau (United Synagogue).  
E. H. Langdon, J.P. (Manchester Congregation of British Jews).  
N. J. Laski (Manchester, South Broughton).  
N. Lazarus (New Road).  
L. H. Leiserowitz (Adath Yisrael).  
A. Levy (West Hartlepool).  
J. Levy (Order Achei Brith and Shield of Abraham).  
M. Levy (Association of Jewish Friendly Societies).  
A. Lewis (Brighton).  
H. R. Lewis (Anglo-Jewish Association).  
J. M. Lissack (United Synagogue).  
M. G. Liverman (Dublin United).  
J. B. Magnus (United Synagogue).  
L. Magnus (West London).  
H. M. Marx (Western).  
H. Michaels (Bethnal Green Great).  
S. Mitchel (Bethnal Green Great).  
M. E. Mosely (Sydney N.S.W.).  
S. Moses, M.A. (Hampstead).  
A. Moss (Manchester, New Rumanian).  
H. Newman (Artillery Lane).  
G. H. Nisse (Coventry).  
D. Phillips (St. John's Wood).  
A. Possener (Falkirk).  
P. M. Phillips (Grand Order of Israel).  
I. Prag, J.P. (Brondesbury).  
L. Quint (Dalston Beth Hamedrash).  
S. Reichmann (Finsbury Park).  
F. Rose, O.B.E., J.P. (Liverpool, Old).  
A. Rosen (Federation of Synagogues).  
N. Rosenberg (Bethnal Green Great).  
A. Rubens, LL.B. (Dalston).  
A. M. Sandler, J.P. (Manchester, Bishop Street).  
P. Sayers, J.P. (Dublin).  
E. H. Schiff, M.B.E. (Southend and Westcliff).  
H. S. Schildkraut (Order Achei Brith and Shield of Abraham).  
P. H. Schwarzschild (Notting Hill).  
V. Schutz (Poplar).  
L. Segelov (Great Garden Street).  
J. Sions (Llandudno).  
B. S. Straus, J.P. (East London).  
J. H. Taylor, B.A. (Association of Jewish Friendly Societies).  
S. Taylor (Blackpool).  
J. Ullmann (Western).  
H. H. Walford (Bayswater).  
A. M. Wartski (Durban).  
J. Wimborne (West Ham).  
A. M. Woolf, O.B.E. (United Synagogue).

It will be seen from the above that the "Irish Free State Jews" are represented in this Parliament as well as "Ulster Jews." There is no partition of Ireland for Jews. New Zealand Jews, Australian Jews, Secret Society Jews, all have seats in this House of Jews which controls the Empire in the interests of Jewry from the old London County Council Hall in Spring Gardens. Another point to be noticed is the

number of names which have been "naturalised" as English—Instone, Sayers, Walford, Wimborne, Taylor, etc. The owners' ancestors were evidently not born thus.

The first business of the session came under the heading of

### "THE HOME OFFICE AND ALIENS."

The delegates received and discussed the report of "The Law and Parliamentary and Aliens Committee" of the House of Jews. The title of this Committee means that it is told off to watch the making and administration of the laws made by the British Parliament for the protection of Britons, and also for the protection of such Jews as have not yet got themselves "naturalised," from the operation of Acts made for the protection of Britons. It is "Jews above the English Law" all the time, or else they call it "persecution."

There is at present dumped in Hampshire a colony of Jews from Russia rejected as undesirable by America. These are being fed and fostered until such time as "homes" can be found for them anywhere but in Russia. They are being taught English, and any new ones born at the camp will be full-blown British citizens.

That "alien" can be spelt with three letters, J. E. W., is perfectly plain from the action of the House of Jews. The House cares nothing for Britons, or any other nationals—only for Jews. The woes of any other species of "alien" leave Jews very cold. In point of fact Jews are all ethnically or racially aliens in this country, whether "politically English" or not.

A deputation of this precious "Law and Parliamentary and Aliens Committee" waited on the Home Secretary, who received them with great deference instead of showing them the door, and these are the points: The deputation asked practically, (1) that the power of making orders for the deportation of Jewish criminals and undesirables should be withdrawn; (2) that the order for alien Jews to register at a certain age should be abrogated; and (3) that naturalisation should be speeded up.

The Home Secretary was very sympathetic to the "Aliens Committee," and promised to make things as easy and pleasant for them, and therefore as dangerous for Britons, as he possibly could.

In response the Home Secretary received a letter of thanks from the Chairman of the Jews' Parliament which began in these terms:—

"Sir: I am directed by my Board (of Deputies) to thank you for . . . the sympathetic consideration which you have been good enough to give to the views and suggestions which they have had the honour to lay before you."

Of course, by "honour" they mean "impudence." But it is easily understood when we remember that the Jews claimed the "Labour" ticket as peculiarly—that is to say, officially—their own before the last Election. The other parties were also theirs, but unofficially. Like a racehorse owner who has more than one horse running in a race and "declares" which he intends to win on, the Jews "declared" to win on "Labour." Hence these mutual compliments. The Home Secretary owes his place in no small measure to the tribesmen of the deputation.

The debate on this report was highly interesting, and dealt largely with the "Shelter" at Eastleigh where the Jews from Russia rejected by America are

(Continued on page 123).

## THE BRITONS PUBLISHING SOCIETY,

40, GREAT ORMOND STREET,  
London, W.C.1.,

Has for Sale the following Books . . .

### The Jews' Who's Who.

Price . . . . . 10 0

### England Under The Heel of The Jew.

By J. H. CLARKE, M.D.

Price . . . . . 2 6

### Democracy or Shylockracy.

By H. S. SPENCER.

Price . . . . . 2 0

### The International Jew.

(In 4 Vols.)

Being Reprints from *The Dearborn Independent*.

Price . . . . . 2 0

### The Bolsheviks of Ancient History

By "Apionus"

Price . . . . . 6

### The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.

A new Translation by the late Victor Marsden.

Price . . . . . 1 0

### Letters from Palestine.

By B. Pullen-Burry, F.R.G.S., F.R.I.A.

AUTHOR OF

*Jamaica as it is*, "Ethiopia in Exile," *From Halifax to Vancouver*

Price . . . . . 2 0

### The Jews in Russia.

With the names of the 447 Jews of the "Russian" Soviet.

By Victor Marsden.

Price . . . . . 6

### The Gravediggers of Russia.

Price . . . . . 6

### PAMPHLETS:

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| White Labour versus Red.                                | 4d  |
| The Future Domination                                   | 3d. |
| The Four Protocols of Zion (not the Protocols of Nilus) | 6d. |
| Jews Ritual Slaughter                                   | 3d. |
| Jews and the White Slave Traffic                        | 2d. |
| Kol Nidre—Jews Immoral Prayer                           | 2d. |

## THE INFAMOUS RUSSIAN TREATY.

England is piling up for herself much expiatory tribulation in the future, but the weight of it has been added to many thousandfold by the recent recognition of the Jew tyranny governing Russia, and the pact made with it by the British Government. It is an inevitable law of life that whatsoever a man sows that shall he also reap. And the same law applies equally to nations. Only by terrible suffering will the British people expiate the iniquity which has been perpetrated in their name. There would seem to be some justification for the charge of hypocrisy so frequently brought against us, for the country cannot but know full well the Jewish anti-Christian character of the present Government (as we suppose it must be called) of Russia.

Our people must know of the deliberate attack on the Christian religion made by these Jewish "bloody baboons"—as they have been called—not only in Russia but in all the Christian countries of the world; of the murder of the head of the Orthodox Christian Church in Russia with his whole family, and of many thousands of the priests of that church, in most instances with diabolical cruelty. Our people must also know of the blasphemous travesties of the most sacred episodes in the life of Christ and in the life of the Virgin Mary, deliberately portrayed by the Jewish Bolshevik Government—travesties in some respects so obscene as to be indescribable. Also it cannot be forgotten how these bloody-handed Jews attempted to prevent the martyrism of those Christian saints who suffered death at their hands by chopping their corpses into small pieces and giving the flesh to the starving people to eat, or feeding beasts with it, the idea being that it would be impossible to consider anybody as a saint or a martyr whose body had been eaten by his fellow beings. Yet these are the people whom the British Government in the name of the British people have "recognised" and entered into normal relations with.

The extent to which this Jewish attack on the Christian religion has been successful in this country

will be apparent when it is realised that not one single protest on the part of any English cleric, or of any representative of any sect of dissenters, has been reported as having been raised against it. A few laymen have been left to make whatever protest has been made, though they are voices, as it were, "crying in the wilderness." Mr. Evelyn Hubbard wrote a letter to *The Times* which, as Lord Sydenham truly said in a letter which he followed up by writing to the same journal, "lifted criticism of this infamous treaty from the material to a high moral plane," and Lord Sydenham's letter is so full of spiritual fire that it will surely produce results, however difficult it may be for us to see them. Well may he ask: "What holds back the churches and the religious bodies that they do not realise that Christianity is in grave danger, and unite in vigorous defence of their faith? Do not the murder of more than 8,000 ecclesiastics, including monks and nuns of the Orthodox Church, and the demoralisation of a whole generation of Russian children appeal to their consciences?"

The great majority of the Anglican Clergy have been Judaised. They are Christian no longer. Christ was a "revolutionary" to them. But their day shall come. They shall feel the weight of God's wrath. Lord Sydenham concludes his letter by asking: "Why should it be difficult to make clear the moral degradation—the sin against the light—to which it commits the British nation at home and abroad?" To which we reply, That it is not difficult to make this clear to those who have retained their faith and still hear the voice of God. They may be few in number, but no matter how insignificant the weapon used by the divine power, so long as that weapon is wholly consecrated and pure as crystal, the divine power can perform its work against all the powers of darkness. Mr. Hubbard said, "the quasi-treaty . . . is not likely to survive the devastating criticism that its provisions have already evoked, and the *coup de grace* will, presumably, be administered as soon as Parliament meets."

Unfortunately, we have no such hopes. The Labour Party was put into power precisely to fulfil this very purpose, and the parties are controlled much too strongly for any hitch to be possible. Moreover, we do not believe there to be a single politician who fulfils the requirements we mentioned above of being wholly consecrated to the will of God, and without that they are impotent. No, we pray, with Mr. Hubbard, "that the crime of aiding and abetting this infamous tyranny may never be laid to our charge," but we are conscious that it will be, although we have the faith to believe that it will not be very long before it is removed. A movement is afoot of Englishmen who are determined to free this country from the Jewish Kahlocratic domination to which it is now subject. They may be few in number for such a great purpose, but they listen to the voice of God, and they hear that they are fighting the battle of Christ against the powers of darkness. They believe that in this battle it is not mere numbers that count on their side, but the purity of their purpose. We believe that they will win, and when they have won England, then Russia can look for her salvation; for they will inaugurate a new crusade against the Jew power tyrannising the Russian people to free them in the name of Christ.

### THE HOUSE OF JEWS.

(Continued from page 122).

housed. The one thing the deputies would not hear of was having them sent back to Trotskyland!

"Schechita," or Ritual Slaughter, and Jewish education were other topics dealt with. It is not generally understood by Gentiles that there is a "business" side to ritual slaughter. "Kosher" and "trefa"—clean and unclean—are not the first or the last consideration. The appointment of Rabbi, or Rabbi-appointed slaughterers, gives the Kahal a control of prices and also a proportion of the money paid. It has been said that no one who is not a Jew could make a commercial success of a religion. So the "Schechita Board" controlling this Kosher "business" has contrived to amass a sum of £100,000, from which it makes "liberal" donations to some Jew charities, and may also be used for other purposes.

SEE NOTE ON PAGE 115.—"OUR EFFORT TO BEAT MOND."

# ELECTORS !

**You have the choice of 3 Candidates.**

SIR ALFRED STEPHENS.                      A Welshman.

REV. E. T. OWEN.                              A Welshman.

SIR ALFRED MOND.                      Whom the Jews say  
cannot be a Welshman.

---

If you believe what the Jews say of themselves you will vote for either  
**STEPHENS or OWEN.**

Before casting your vote for Mond read what the Jews say of themselves :

"The patriotism of the Jew is simply a cloak he assumes to please the Englishman. Jews who pretend that they can at once be patriotic Englishmen and good Jews are Simply Living Lies."—B. Felz. A letter entitled "Can Jews be Patriots." *Jewish Chronicle* December 8th, 1911, p. 38.

"Let us take the mask off. Let us play the Lion of Judah for a change. Away, away with false patriotisms. A Jew can only recognise one fatherland—Palestine." M. J. Wodislawski. *Jewish World*, Jan. 1st, 1909.

"... We are, whether born here or naturalised here, not really British at all. We are 'National' Jews—Jews by 'Race' and faith—and not Englishmen."—"Zionist" in the *Sunday Chronicle*, Manchester, p. 4, Sept. 26th, 1915.

Issued by "THE BRITONS," which is a Patriotic Society.

Before casting your Vote for Mond read what the Jews say of themselves.

A Jewish writer in the *Jewish Chronicle* for September 22nd, 1922, has at last admitted what the Lloyd George Government knew in 1917 and the 'Morning Post' published in 1918 *i.e.*, that the Bolshevist officials of Russia are Jews. The Russian Revolution with all its ghastly horrors was a Jewish movement, initiated by Jews with the assent and connivance of the Headquarters Staff of the German Army.

"There is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolshevists, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism."—*Jewish Chronicle*, April 4th, 1919.

"Jewish Nationalism is a Jewish question which must be governed by Jewish principles and not be made subservient to the convenience or exigencies (that is, the necessities or dangers) for the time being of any Government, however important. As a people, we Jews have not been at war between ourselves, the Jews in England against the Jews in Germany, or the Jews in France against the Jews in Austria: and to sectionalise Jewry in obedience to international differences seems to us to give way the whole principle of Jewish nationalism."—*Jewish World*, Jan. 15th, 1919, p. 6. (The inserted brackets are ours.)

This latter statement is surely explicit enough and perfectly frank. It should be a warning to every civilised country which harbours Jews or allows them to obtain positions of influence in its Councils of State. It means that whatever the crisis or danger of any nation, if its removal conflicts with the interests of Jewry, then the Jews within the nation affected may be disloyal to that country, and may either stand idly by while it is destroyed or take a secret part in its destruction. In other words, when it suits the policy or convenience of Jewry, our country may be betrayed by it, just as in the past, other countries, both ancient and modern, have been betrayed.

Do we need a clearer warning of the part which Jewry may play?

Faced as we are, with this possible Jewish menace, proclaimed not by us, but, as the extracts above show, by Jews themselves the safety of our country demands that our House of Commons and House of Lords shall be composed wholly of men of British blood.

At all Parliamentary and Municipal Elections arrange that only men of native blood and race are nominated as candidates.

**We must work not only for ourselves but for  
our country and our children.**

**JOIN THE BRITONS.**

Write to the Secretary for application form.

40, Great Ormond Street, London, W:C 1.

## MRS. WEBSTER'S BOOK.

We were not favoured with a complimentary copy of Mrs. Webster's book, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, with the consequence that we have had to wait for some considerable time before the kindness of a friend gave us the opportunity of reading it. We can well understand that a book selling at twenty shillings a copy cannot be sent out gratis without the most careful thought as to the prospective value of the gift, and we can also understand how this commercial consideration, which necessarily entered into the matter when the value of the work was fixed at the figure mentioned, deprived us of receiving a consideration which we might otherwise have enjoyed—anyhow, we like to think that it was that. In any case we should have been perfectly candid in our criticism of the work.

We have not had the time to prepare a full criticism for this number, nor would the space at our disposal have sufficed. This we hope to give in future numbers. For although there is much for us to congratulate Mrs. Webster upon, there is, in our opinion, a deficiency running through the whole book which, if it does not entirely neutralise, from a propaganda point of view, the enormous amount of good work done, certainly robs it of a great deal of its efficacy. Mrs. Webster may say that the book is not written as propaganda, that it is an historical study pure and simple. But to that we could not agree. Conclusions are drawn and asserted much too forcibly from inadequate premises which certainly constitute propaganda. In any case, all modern historical works are propaganda. It is for that very reason we find ourselves compelled—for we would have much preferred to have been able to have offered nothing but the most laudatory compliments—to mention this deficiency, because of the necessity for prompting the subconscious minds of her readers to question suggestions which will undoubtedly have sunk into them. However, as we have said, this we must leave for future issues, for we have to deal with distinctions which are so fine that they are very difficult to formulate and explain. What we want to mention here is the very high excellence of the last chapter, *The Real Jewish Peril*, and the *Conclusion*. This would make a most effective pamphlet.

The answer given to the question, frequently propounded, as Mrs. Webster rightly states, "How can one believe that Jews advocate Socialism, since they stand to lose everything by it?" is indeed splendid. We ourselves have had it in mind to attempt an answer to this very question for a long time, but we have not been given the guidance which Mrs. Webster has obviously received on this matter. After showing how "the Jewish capitalist meets with indulgence at the hands of our socialist Intellectuals who, whilst inveighing against British owners of property never include Jewish millionaires in their diatribes," and also how the Jews claimed the Labour Party in the last Election as peculiarly their own, yet pride themselves on the riches of some of their fellow tribesmen, so that "it would seem that in the eyes of Jewry all capitalists are not to be regarded as monsters who should be mercilessly expropriated," Mrs. Webster goes on to say:—

"But in considering the war on Capitalism it is essential to bear in mind that capitalists are of two kinds: national industrial capitalists—largely Gentiles and usually men of brains and energy who have built up flourishing businesses—and international loan-mongering capitalists, principally, though not exclusively, Jews, who live by

speculation. Whilst to the former, social unrest may prove fatal, to the latter any disturbances may provide opportunities for profit. As M. Georges Batault has well expressed it:

'From the strictly financial point of view, the most disastrous events of history, wars or revolutions, never represent catastrophes; the manipulators of money and the wary business men can make profit out of everything, provided they know beforehand and are well-informed. . . . It is certain that the Jews dispersed over all the surface of the earth . . . are particularly favourably situated in this respect.'

It is significant to notice that the capitalists most attacked by the Socialists and Pacifists are not those who make profit out of wars and revolutions, but those who contribute to the prosperity of the country and provide work for millions of people. Here, then, the Jews and the Socialists seem to find a point of agreement. It is evident, at any rate, that many rich Jews consider that they have nothing to fear from the threatened Capital Levy and other measures of expropriation. Are we not irresistibly reminded of the passage in the Protocols—where incidentally the Capital Levy is specifically mentioned—'Ours they will not touch, because the moment of attack will be known to us and we shall take measures to protect our own'?

But let us consider further how the Socialist plan for 'the nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange' might be reconciled even with the interests of Jewish industrial Capitalists. The more we examine this magic formula which is to transform the world into a Paradise for the workers, the more we shall see that it approximates to the system of Super-Capitalism, of which, as Werner Sombart has shown, the Jews were the principal inaugurators. Socialists are fond of explaining that 'Capitalism' began with the introduction of steam; in reality, of course, Capitalism, in the sense of wealth accumulated in private hands, has always existed since the first savage made his store of winter food. What Socialists really mean by Capitalism is the modern system of Industrialism, which tends to concentrate all the means of production and distribution in the hands of individuals or groups, who, if they happen to be unscrupulous, are able by systematic sweating of the worker and bleeding of the consumer to conduct operations on so large a scale as to crush all competition by the home worker or the small tradesman.

Obviously, however, with the growing demand of the workers for better conditions of life and the increasing support lent to them by enlightened public opinion, this possibility cannot continue indefinitely, and unless a violent convulsion takes place the time will come when great industrial magnates will have to content themselves with moderate profits on their outlay. Thus although at first sight it may appear that the Super-Capitalists must desire to maintain the existing order of things, if he is far-seeing he must realise that profiteering under present conditions must soon cease.

It is therefore conceivable that even the Jewish Industrial Capitalist may see in the nationalisation of industry a preferable alternative to the limitation of profits under private enterprise. The same financial acumen and skill in management which has enabled him to control rings and trusts in the past would ensure him a place at the head of nationalised industries, which in effect would be nothing but gigantic trusts nominally under State control, but really, like all State enterprises, in the hands of a few men. Under Socialism the position of these trusts would be rendered impregnable. For whilst under the present system any individual or group may set out to break a trust, no such competition would be possible in a State where private enterprise had been made illegal. The men in control of nationalised industries would therefore be able to exercise absolute authority both over the worker and the consumer. Further, if the worker can be persuaded to accept the ultimate scheme of Communism, which is compulsory labour in return for no monetary remuneration, but merely a daily ration of food and the other necessities of life whenever State officials decide that he requires them, the directors of Labour, like the overseers in a slave plantation, will be able, as in Russia, to impose any conditions they please.

The Jews may well hope to occupy these posts, not only because of their aptitude for organisation on so large a scale, but because their international relations would

facilitate the sale or barter of goods between countries. The cohesion which exists amongst them would speedily lead to the monopolisation of all the higher posts by members of their race.

It is idle to dismiss such a possibility as a chimera. This is what happened in Russia and is happening in Germany to-day. Here, then, we may find perhaps the inner meaning of a remark attributed to a prominent member of the Labour Party, that under Socialism a certain well-known Jewish capitalist might well be worth £10,000 a year. Lenin expressed much the same idea when he said that the Russian Soviet Republic might require a thousand first-class specialists 'to direct the work of the people,' and that 'these greatest "stars" must be paid 25,000 roubles each,' or even four times that sum, supposing it were necessary to employ foreign specialists for the purpose.

But the Jewish capitalists doubtless see further than in England, as in Russia, this condition of things would be merely a temporary phase, and that the institution of Socialism by dispossessing the present Gentile owners of wealth and property would pave the way for a Jewish and German (sic) plutocracy. In Russia wealth has not been altogether destroyed; it has simply changed hands, and a class of new rich has sprung up which meets with no hostility from the professed advocates of equality. Those Jews who see in the Christian Intelligentsia the main obstacle to their dream of world-power, therefore naturally find in the promoters of class-warfare their most valuable allies. For the Christian Intelligentsia is the sole bar to the enslavement of the proletariat; most of the movements to redress the wrongs of the workers, from Lord Shaftesbury's onwards, have arisen not amongst the workers themselves, but amongst the upper or middle classes; once these were swept away an iron bureaucracy would have the workers at their mercy. I do not say this is the plan, but I do say that such a hypothesis provides a reason for the otherwise unaccountable indulgence displayed by Socialists everywhere towards wealthy Jews and at the same time for the huge funds the Socialists appear to have at their disposal.

If big financiers are not at their back, I repeat: where does all the money come from? It seems unlikely that it can be derived from the British owners of wealth and property whom the Socialists are openly out to dispossess; the only body of financiers which can therefore be suspected of contributing towards this end is the body known as 'International Finance,' which is mainly, though not exclusively (sic), Jewish."

This is, of course, a marvellously clear and reasoned answer to the question raised. It is a question which has been a stumbling-block to a great many people worried by that Jewish whisper-drive, "But there are some good Jews." This answer of Mrs. Webster's should entirely relieve them of their misgivings.

Unfortunately, there are in this chapter one or two points to which we must take exception. A mistake has been made, which was the mistake also made by Hilaire Belloc in his book "The Jews." This mistake is one which it is very easy to make in a book on this particular subject, for the only logical conclusions which can be drawn are of so drastic a nature that the writer knows full well the uninstructed mind will discount them, and baulks at recording them. Consequently, the mistake is in drawing conclusions which, having regard to the terrible indictment built up against the Jews as a premiss, are absolutely futile. Hilaire Belloc in his work, after describing very clearly the true character of the Jews, propounds as the only possible solution of the problem—a change of heart on the part of the Jew! Anything more nonsensical could hardly be imagined, and it was obviously written with his tongue in his cheek. The writer of the book before us falls into the same error. She says, for instance,

"In reality, nothing is more cruel than to encourage in the minds of a nervous race the idea of persecution; true kindness to the Jews would consist in urging them to throw off memories of past martyrdom and to enter healthfully into the enjoyment of their present blessings, which are the direct outcome of Christian civilisation."

We do not know whether Mrs. Webster fully realises what she has said in this passage, but we say

at once that it is more than nonsense; it is also untruth. The present blessings of the Jews in this country are not the result of Christian civilisation, they are the result of the abnegation of Christian civilisation. In a Christian civilisation Jews would have been kept in their right place. If true kindness to the Jews would consist in urging them to enter healthfully into their present blessings, which are, incidentally, the domination of the English Christian people, then the Jews may know at once that they need not expect "true kindness" at our hands. Our determination is to see that they are relieved of their "present blessings" as soon as may be.

Again later on she says:—

"The truth is, of course, that kindness to any portion of the human race brings its own reward in the form of moral improvement in the individual or nation which performs it, but no more benefit attaches to philanthropy when exercised towards the Jew than towards the Chinaman."

"I would urge, then, that the Jewish Problem should be approached neither in the spirit of superstitious pro-Semitism, nor in the bitter spirit of anti-Semitism, but with the sanity worthy of an enlightened age."

The point is, of course, as to what would constitute "kindness to the Jew." If it would be "kindness" to a homicidal maniac to permit him the freedom to exercise his mad tendency, then it would be "kindness" to allow a similar freedom to the Jew, for the benefit which is derived from this form of kindness in the latter case is similar to the benefit which those supposititious persons who were foolish enough to show "kindness" in the former case would presumably derive. Such a suggestion is obviously absurd.

A further point to which we take exception is the statement that the very existence of a Jewish organisation "working for the destruction of Christianity is still a matter of speculation and not a known fact." It is rightly said "we cannot cite the names of the leaders, or the centres of direction, we cannot produce documentary evidence as to their methods of organisation or their final aims"; but these are not the only species of evidence available, and of other kinds there is, surely, weight of evidence enough to definitely prove the existence of this "Jewish organisation."

In another part of her work Mrs. Webster has denounced the claim constantly put forward by the different subversive movements that Christ was a revolutionary and that the early Christians were communists. Consequently we are astounded to read in the opening part of the chapter with which we are dealing the following clause:—

"... the Christian dispensation, whereby all men are declared equal in the sight of God. . . ."

Now this is the very heresy which she has been previously denouncing. It is the most damnable heresy with which the Christian Church is now faced. The Christian dispensation has never declared that all men are "equal" in the sight of God. It has been declared to avail "equally" for all mankind, notwithstanding differences—a wholly different declaration. This is one of the most important points of Christian doctrine which it is necessary for us, in this present age, to have clearly in our minds. Those clerics who teach that the Christian dispensation declared all men equal in the sight of God, which so many of them are doing, are not teaching Christianity but anti-Christianity—the very perversion of Christianity. We are really distressed that Mrs. Webster should have fallen into this terrible error.

A final point in the Conclusion of her work with which we cannot agree is contained in the following passage:—

"It is idle to say that so insane a project (that is

the project of "everything must be destroyed, since everything must be remade," propounded by the revolutionaries) can present no danger to the world; the fact remains that an increasing number of people regard it with perfect equanimity. The phrase: "All civilisations have passed away; ours will doubtless pass away likewise," is continually to be heard on the lips of apparently sane men and women who, whether they advocate such an eventuality or not, seem prepared to accept it in a spirit of complete fatalism and to put up no resistance. The point they ignore is that when civilisation existed only in isolated spots on the earth's surface it might pass away in one spot only to spring to life in another, but now that civilisation is world-wide the dream of a return to nature and the joys of savagery conjured up by Rousseau and Weishaupt can never be realised. Yet if civilisation in a material sense cannot be destroyed, it is none the less possible to take the soul out of it, to reduce it to a dead and heartless machine without human feelings or divine aspirations. The Bolsheviks continue to exist amidst telephones, electric light, and other amenities of modern life, but they have almost killed the soul of Russia. In this sense, then, civilisation may pass away, not as the civilisations of the ancient world passed away, leaving only desert sands and crumbling ruins behind them, but vanishing imperceptibly from beneath the outward structure of our existing institutions. Here is the final goal of world revolution."

This hypothesis of the destruction of the soul, but leaving the soulless in continued enjoyment of the amenities of modern life, such as the telephone, the electric light, and so on, is a most dangerous fallacy. Unfortunately, there are many people who would not be in any way disturbed by the idea of losing their souls provided that they were left in full enjoyment of their bodies. And, consequently, this false teaching is much more likely to encourage them in their apathy in regard to this matter of the Bolshevisation of the world than in arousing them to resist it. God knows it is difficult enough to move them by telling them the truth. The fact is, of course, that with the Bolshevisation of the world, and the destruction of the soul, the "amenities," as Mrs. Webster calls them, of modern life, will disappear. The material things of the world are nothing but the manifestation of the spiritual, and with the elimination of the spiritual from any material object, the disintegration of the object follows. The only reason why the British Empire has been such a great power in the world is because of the high spiritual standard which existed in the English people. With the depreciation of that standard have come the disintegrating tendencies within the Empire. The salvation of India, the salvation of Egypt, the salvation of Ireland does not depend upon the renewal of a strong, firm government backed by military forces in those lands nearly so much as on the spiritual revitalising of England.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH GUARDIAN.

Dear Sir,—

I was indeed glad to receive the July-August number of THE BRITISH GUARDIAN: more especially I concur with you in thinking that the struggle is a spiritual struggle. I have never seen the case better presented than by you.

Yours faithfully,

ARNOLD WHITE.

Windmill Cottage,  
Farnham Common,  
Bucks.

August 14th, 1924.

## AN EXPLANATION OF THE LOAN TO GERMANY.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH GUARDIAN.

Sir,—

LOANS.—A Problem.

'A' and 'B' are grocers and compete for the trade of a small town. They fall out and go to Law. The case lasts a long time and the costs are heavy. In the end 'B' loses and is responsible for all costs of the fight.

In the meantime he has secured his business assets in such a way that 'A' cannot seize anything. A conference follows and experts appointed by each party arrange that 'A' shall now lend money to 'B' to enable him to enter into even stronger competition.

What pressure could possibly be brought to bear on 'A' to induce him to agree to such suicidal business?

Answer.—A mortgage is held by a third party over all the assets of both 'A' and 'B' and he forces them to agree to his plan.

Substitute England for 'A' and Germany for 'B' and say who is the third party.

Yours faithfully,

2nd September, 1924.

TINA ETIMES.

M. URBAIN GOHIER.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH GUARDIAN.

(Translated.)

Dear Sir,

I am much touched by the farewell which you give to *La Vieille France* in the last number of THE BRITISH GUARDIAN. If there could be any consolation for me, it would be in seeing THE BRITISH GUARDIAN so interesting and so well started.

The total conquest of France is well shown by the position of its chief, Herriot, who you see everywhere flanked by a Meyer and an Israel—at least these two do not camouflage themselves; for Israel (formerly a deputy kicked out by the electors), the Kahal has ordered the creation of a new office "Secretaryship general of the Presidency of the Council," with the signing powers of the President of the Council during his absence; that is to say Israel is officially the coadjutor, controller, inspirer and mentor of our "apparent" Premier. It is even more open than it was with Clémenceau's Mandel-Rothschild. I am glad that you should have realised the collusion of the *Action Française* people with Jewry. The incident of the Protocols had unmasked them; M. Beamish had conclusive personal experience of it.

The recent works of Mrs. Webster have well proved that the Orléanists have been associated with the Jews and the Prussians against France for more than a century and a half.

The present situation is but the logical outcome of former events.

I thank you very cordially for your sympathies. "While there's life there's hope." That which I no longer possess the means to do in the open daylight, I continue in the shadow and by indirect means. Look on me always as a brother in arms and as a friend.

11 Bd. du Palais, Paris.

URBAIN GOHIER.

17/8/24.

Printed by THE BRITONS PRINTING CO., LTD., and  
Issued by THE BRITONS PUBLISHING SOCIETY, at 40,  
Great Ormond Street, W.C. 1., London, England.

# THE BRITISH GUARDIAN

No. 9 Vol. V.

SEPTEMBER, 1924.

PRICE SIXPENCE MONTHLY.

**The Proteus of Peoples.**

**The Infamous Russian Treaty.**

**Rudyard Kipling's Speech of 1914.**

**The Conservative Party.**

**Mrs. Webster's Book.**

**The House of Jews.**

**Our Effort to Beat Mond.**

General Prescott-Decie's Mistake. Loyalty League Workers. Lord Ernle's Jewish Mind.

Alien Immigration and National Emigration. Sir Alfred Mond's Kosher (?) Pigs.

How the Jews Can Help Us. A Retort to Dean Inge.

**CORRESPONDENCE.**