

# . THE GERMANY AND ENGLAND

BY NESTA WEBSTER (1939)

*This pamphlet was written in 1939 just before Britain declared war on Germany. Like the majority of Britons, the author opposed the war and supported Chamberlain's Peace pact with Hitler. She believed that England was being manipulated into entering a disastrous war by financiers who supported Bolshevism and opposed Hitler's anti-Jewish policies. She makes a compelling case the allied powers were deceived into fighting a cataclysmic war that killed millions of "goyim", and ultimately benefitted only Jews, Bankers, and Bolsheviks.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE VOLTE FACE (ABOUT-FACE).....	1
II. GOVERNESSING EUROPE.....	5
III. THE QUESTION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA.....	9
IV: BOLSHEVISM AND FASCISM.....	15
V: HITLER.....	19
VI: HITLER AMD THE JEWS.....	23
VII: A WAR OF HATE.....	30
VIII: HORRORS OF THE HOME FRONT.....	32
APPENDICES.....	37

## FOREWORD

For the benefit of the younger generation or of foreigners who, never having read "Trilby," may fail to understand the meaning of the frontispiece to the book, it should be explained that the famous novel of this name, written and illustrated by the late George du Maurier, which appeared in 1894, described the history of an artist's model named Trilby in the Quartier Latin of Paris, who, without any natural voice, was hypnotized to sing by a clever Jewish musician named Svengali, and fell completely under his power.

The point in reproducing it here is to show that the British people are being hypnotized to repeat the phrases put into their mouths at the wave of a conductor's baton.

### I. THE VOLTE FACE (ABOUT-FACE)

To the dispassionate observer who happens to possess a memory, nothing is more extraordinary than the paroxysm of fury and suspicion with regard to

Germany's intentions which broke out last spring in our country where—until five years ago—pro-Germanism was *de rigueur* in "intellectual" and so-called "advanced" circles.

This kind of pro-Germanism was of long standing. It was seen after the Franco-Prussian War when *The Times* of 18 November, 1870, gave prominence to Carlyle's letter deploring the "cheap pity and newspaper lamentation over fallen and afflicted France" and ending with the fervent hope that "noble, patient, deep, pious and solid Germany should be at length wielded into a nation and become Queen of the Continent."

Before the Great War [WWI] when the hostile intentions of Germany toward the British Empire were clearly evident; when German officers were drinking to "der Tag," [the Day] whilst German writers openly committed their plans for world power to paper and incident after incident showed that war was inevitable, all those who warned our country were derided or insulted. It was even suggested that Lord Roberts should be deprived of his pension for conducting his campaign for National Service.

The Day—when it at last arrived—was hailed with rapture by the German people. The women threw their hats into the air with joy and the *Daily Mail* of 3 August 1914, published a photograph of a whole London street filled with young Germans cheering for war.

Meanwhile the same sort of crowds of Socialists and Pacifists who have recently been parading London shouting for war with Germany were then agitating for non-resistance to German aggression.

Even when the grey legions of Germany were marching through Belgium and Flanders on their way to these shores, the Socialists held meetings of protest against national defence, and the reluctance to fight engendered by their propaganda proved a serious check to recruiting. All this when we were at war with an autocracy headed by an Emperor with a ruling caste of Junkers to whom Socialism in any form was abhorrent!

This anti-patriotic campaign was maintained throughout the War and the fifteen years that followed it. Socialists, Communists and Pacifists continued to clamour for greater gentleness to be shown to Germany, declaring that we had "been mad to fight" her and that the Treaty of Versailles should be torn up.

In Liberal, and even in Conservative circles, the same sentiments were frequently expressed—"the Germans are our natural allies; in the next war we hope we shall be marching with them against France."

It must be admitted that the incivility sometimes shown to British travelers to France had something to do with these sentiments. Indeed, towards 1930, especially after Mr. Philip Snowden accused France of "bilking her obligations," feelings between the two countries had become so bitter that those of us who loved France lived in dread of an open rupture with her.

It was but natural that France, having suffered twice within fifty years from invasion by German armies, should fear and distrust Germany's further intentions more profoundly than England whose soil had never been trodden by a foreign foe since 1066 and that she [France] found some difficulty in believing that Germany had undergone that "change of heart" of which our Socialists and Pacifists spoke with so much assurance.

For, as all well-informed people in this country were aware, the spirit of militarism had not been crushed in Germany. Military associations were openly drilling, secret societies aiming at a war of revenge were formed, stores of ammunition were being secretly piled up.

At the same time close co-operation took place between the "Eastern" school of German militarists and Soviet Russia, Bolshevik propaganda emanated from Berlin as well as from Moscow, the Communist Party of Germany was the largest in the world outside Russia and in all countries Communism aimed particularly at the destruction of France and of the British Empire.

All this was shown in my *Surrender of an Empire* (in 1931) against which a boycott was organised in the Press. In those days it was "French militarism" which had become the bogey of our Pacifists just as in France the perfidy of England became the theme of certain French writers.

I remember during that period attending a meeting in London of a certain association which purported to arrange debates and discussions on world politics from a non-party point of view, which, as usual, meant that only "Left" views were given a fair hearing.

On this occasion a German had been invited to speak, and he held forth at great length on the grievances of Germany, observing that, although he himself was not a Nazi, Nazi-ism was but the natural outcome of German resentment at the policy of disarmament imposed on Germany by the Allies.

This was received with sympathy by the audience, a member of which rose at the end of the address and said:

"I am the Bishop of \_\_\_\_\_ and I am sure that everyone here must feel ashamed of the way in which we are disarming Germany whilst we ourselves are continuing to arm."

As no one dissented it was evident that this sentiment was shared by all those present. Not one person in that crowded hall rose to observe that we had just scrapped a number of cruisers and were disarming—as is now generally admitted—to the point of danger.

Now, today a leading official of that same association is trumpeting an appeal for an increased national defence against the German menace!

If Germany at the present time considers she has grievances, and that the Treaty of Versailles should be scrapped in favour of a policy more in accord with calm judgment and altered circumstances, how can she be blamed by those who formerly encouraged her to think she had greater grievances than those she now puts forward?

Either they were wrong then or they are wrong now; in either case we should not be guided by their opinion.

Now we—who were never pro-Germans in the sense of seeking peace at any price and of endangering the security of our own country, but who held, on the contrary, that in view of the disturbed state of Europe we must remain fully armed—nevertheless recognised that many errors had been made in the Peace Treaties. It is clear that the policy of forcing Germany with the sword at her throat to admit war guilt, and the absurdity of incorporating the Covenant of the League of Nations in the Treaty of Versailles, could never lead to lasting peace.

Again and again revisions of the Treaties were demanded by the Germans and their friends in this country but when Hitler, finding that nothing was to be gained by arbitration, decided to take the law into his own hands, the Socialists and Pacifists who from 1914 to 1933 had pleaded the cause of Germany, raised a howl of execration and declared that the Treaties must now be enforced even at the cost of war.

What happened to bring about their change of front? The accession of Hitler to power. Now Hitler had in the past shown himself, at moments, as a fire-brand. But how often have we been told in the case of our own Socialists that office "sobers"?

It certainly seemed to do so in the case of Hitler, who, once in control of his country, abandoned his aggressive attitude toward the Allies. But at the same time he put down Bolshevism and took the control of Germany out of the hands of the Jews.

By these measures it was not only Germany that profited but the two greatest dangers to our country were removed. For the support given to Germany by "International Finance," which would have enabled her to defray the cost of another war at any moment, was withdrawn and the link between Germany and Soviet Russia was broken.

The floods of Bolshevik propaganda flowing from Berlin into all parts of the British Empire were checked at their source. The resentment of the German people towards the Allies as the cause of all their sufferings gave way to passionate enthusiasm for a leader who set out to restore their country by constructive methods.

The old Pan-German dream of world power was replaced by a Nationalist scheme for the union of all German peoples under one head, leaving the peoples of other countries to work out their own destinies.

Then was the moment for the ending of war hates and of peace between the nation which, throughout thirteen years of endless congresses and assemblies, had been the professed aim of European statesmen, of the talkers at Geneva and countless Pacifist associations.

Then was the moment for the whole civilized world, which for fifteen years had been tossed on the waves of unrest set in motion by Moscow, to see in Hitler, as it should have seen in Mussolini, a saviour from the greatest enemy of the human race—the hideous system of tyranny which threatened to spread itself into every country, well stigmatized by Mr. Winston Churchill at its onset as "the bloody baboonery" of Bolshevism.

Instead of this Hitler was reviled, as Mussolini had been reviled after he had saved Italy from the grip of the Red octopus. Such is the power of the Press, and of mass hypnotism exercised over the minds of the British public that they were now made to regard Hitler as their mortal enemy.

Yet in the place of an autocratic Emperor at the head of a military caste and of a warlike German nation, we were faced by a ruler who, although a dictator, represents the will of 90 per cent of the population, a plain man of the people, an ardent social reformer, too Socialistic for us but clearly sincere, a leader who whilst restoring the confidence and self-respect of the German people has quelled in them the spirit of hatred towards our country.

Instead of young Germans cheering for war in the streets of London we have had the youth of Germany cheering Mr. Chamberlain as the messenger of peace through the streets of Munich.

And this was the moment when we were told that a world war was inevitable in order to crush the "German menace."

## II. GOVERNESSING EUROPE

Great indignation has been aroused in certain circles lacking in a sense of humour by Herr Hitler's recent remark that England would be well advised to stop "governessing" Europe.

The expression in reality was singularly apt and indicated no hostility to the British people, but conveyed advice that many of us would be glad to see laid to heart by our politicians. For it is as much to England's interest as to Europe's that she would refrain from putting her finger into every Continental pie and thereby

burning it severely. The Daily Express, though in no way sympathetic to Nazi-ism or Fascism, has from the beginning persistently repeated the slogan of "Keep out!"—unless our own vital interests were threatened.

As I observed in the opening words of the *Surrender of an Empire*, Britain until 1914 had remained in lofty isolation from the dusty arena of Continental strife. So might she have of that infernal machine—the League of Nations, devised, as we now know, at the head Lodge of the Grand Orient of France on the 28th and 29th of June, 1917.

That it was an infernal machine constructed to blow up the foundations of Europe—for America, whose President was its principal advocate, carefully kept out of it herself—was evident to all but the most incorrigible optimists. For since disputes were henceforth to be settled by a tribunal composed of all the Powers, any conflict between two nations would automatically draw in all the rest so that every war, instead of remaining localized, was bound to develop into a world war.

Thus, far from proving a scheme for ensuring perpetual peace, its real effect would be to keep Europe in a state of perpetual warfare.

Moreover, since the sympathies of the League lay clearly on the side of the Left, its influence was to promote internal strife and encourage the class war, and those countries which resolutely put down Bolshevism were liable to find the forces of the League arrayed against them.

Now the League having after some twelve years proved its futility—and in the opinion of many people its harmfulness—and having been deserted in consequence by some of the leading Powers, might have been left to collapse quietly, like a deflating balloon on the shores of Lac Lemman and Europe might have been allowed to return to its former method of settling quarrels between nations by conflict between those concerned, without interference from the rest of the world.

But to this neither England nor France—or, rather, the Leaguists of those countries, for in both there were many disbelievers in the League from the time of its inception—would consent.

Since the League was defunct the Governments of England and France in close co-operation with Soviet Russia, formed themselves into a coalition described as the Democracies. That is a most ridiculous term since the "Democracies" include Monarchist England, passionately loyal to its King, attached to its ancient traditions and predominantly Conservative, and at the same time Soviet Russia, the most brutal tyranny the world has ever seen.

However, the countries variously described as the "totalitarian States"—a word not to be found in the dictionary but presumably implying absolute autocracies—or the Dictatorships, are Italy and Germany led by men of the people primarily

concerned with improving the lot of the working-classes and supported by the overwhelming majority of the population.

The Democracies then proceeded to take up the role of the League and arrogate to themselves the right to interfere in the affairs of all other nations, thus constituting themselves a tribunal for—as Hitler expressed it—"governessing" the world.

Now the first qualifications of a governess are calmness, orderly habits, firmness and an even temper; a woman who perpetually quarreled with her own family, boxed her sisters' ears, hurled the furniture about and defied the parental authority could hardly be expected to maintain discipline or command respect in the schoolroom.

The French *Chambre des Deputes*, divided into warring factions, some of them bitterly opposed to their own Government and actually coming to fisticuffs during debates. The rulers of Russia are busily shooting their former colleagues, later on their generals, admirals and airmen. The British Government is battling with rebels against the Constitution in the House of Commons and sending troops out to Palestine in order to crush the revolt of the Arabs at the loss of the freedom promised them.

All these Democracies seem—both to Germany and Italy—hardly qualified to "governess" the rest of Europe, and certainly not those States in which a united people live contentedly under one man who, if a Dictator, nevertheless dictates according to the will of the people.

Hitler in asking us to "look at home" is really not unreasonable; indeed he showed considerable restraint in not drawing more invidious comparisons between the unrest prevailing in Democracies and the happiness which travelers in Germany observe everywhere amongst the population of that country.

We are frequently told that there are many secret malcontents in Hitler's Germany and that in private conversations with travelers they admit their dissatisfaction with the Fuhrer. That may be so, since no form of Government can content everybody and there were many rebels against the German monarchy, still more against the Republic that followed on the war. And foreign travelers on the look-out for grievances are still sure to find them.

As Monsieur Madelin observes in his book on the French Revolution, men are always discontented under whatever government they live, however excellent it may be, and if people are asked to complain they will do so loudly.

Doubtless the equalitarian schemes of Herr Hitler, with which we as anti-Socialists must strongly disagree, have met with resentment from the possessing classes but have satisfied the great majority of the population.

At any rate it is the Germans' own affair, not ours, and we have no more right to attack the Fuhrer for his system of government than he would have to attack us for our administration of the dole, demanding that it should be replaced by his plan of Labour camps as leading to happier results—which no doubt is true.

As to the concentration camps of Germany, about which we hear so much, what are we to believe? Returning travelers bring back totally conflicting accounts; the rest of us only know what our papers tell us, and but a short time ago they were telling us that the inmates of our own prisons were treated with inconceivable brutality. We did not believe that; why, then, should we believe all that they tell us about Germany?

Neither in the internal nor in the external policy of foreign Governments have the Democracies the right to interfere except where their own interests or security are concerned.

If in the case of Czechoslovakia England and France as victors in the Great War held they were entitled to maintain the conditions laid down in the Treaty of Versailles, however unworkable they had become, what earthly right had they to intervene between Italy, their former ally, and Abyssinia, or between the opposing parties in Spain, which had remained neutral?

In each case their policy was based on opposition to Fascism, and its only effect was to deprive Abyssinia of any independence it might have enjoyed and to prolong the civil war in Spain. It will be said that Germany and Italy also intervened in Spain, but the fact habitually ignored by our Press and Left politicians is that intervention by the French, Russians, and a few British Communists began in August, 1936, and by the Germans and Italians not until four months later.

Moscow had determined to set up a Soviet Republic in Spain, and the "totalitarian" states [Italy and Germany] resolved to prevent the execution of a plot which might have set all Western Europe aflame. That was their crime.

Again, what is the reason for the hatred stirred up against Japan? If that country had begun by attacking us in Hong Kong or Shanghai we should have had every right to oppose her. But she had begun as early as 1919 by resolutely opposing Bolshevism while China allowed itself to be penetrated by the influence of Moscow; in 1920 Lenin declared that it was in China the British Empire would be overthrown.

So, in spite of the hostile attitude shown to us by the Chinese from the time of the Boxer riots onwards, the kidnapping of the Englishwomen and by the murder of missionaries, the agitation carried out after 1924 by the Kuomintang working in close co-operation with Soviet Russia, under whose inspiration anti-British riots broke out at Shanghai and Shameen in 1926, the British concession in Hankow

was attacked in 1927 to the cry of "Down with British Imperialism!" and finally handed over to Chinese control.

In spite of all this British sympathies are with "martyred China," whilst Japan, the land of "bushido," our ally in the Great War, Japan—who showed us no hostility until we acted for the League of Nations in intervening between her and China—is reviled as the enemy of Great Britain.

It is now the fashion to speak of the cruelty of the Japanese character and we are asked to believe that the nation which supplied the Cheka with Chinese torturers is kindly in comparison.

I have been in both countries long ago, and during the week I spent in China I saw cruelty such as I shall never forget all my life. During two months in Japan I saw nothing but kindness, love of nature and of children. And whilst in Canton we passed through terrifying mobs howling execrations at us as "foreign devils", in Japan we met nothing but smiling villagers who crowded round us in welcome and showed never a trace of xenophobia.

We are told that British businessmen much prefer the Chinese to the Japanese; so they did then, simply because the Chinaman was more to be depended on than the temperamental Japanese. Nevertheless in 1931 it was from British business men in China that my *Surrender of an Empire* containing a chapter on the Chinese question received the greatest encouragement; a series of extracts from it were contributed by them to the *Hong Kong Daily Press* and republished in pamphlet form at their expense. [see Appendix 1]

Can it be mere coincidence that all those countries we are now taught to hate [Japan, Italy and Germany] are those which have shown the strongest opposition to Bolshevism?

### III. THE QUESTION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

Ever since Hitler came to power in 1933 the secret directors of world affairs have never relaxed their efforts to bring about a war between England and "the Dictators," that is to say, between England and Italy or German. The dictatorship of Stalin is never mentioned in this connection, except as an aid to the cause of Democracy.

No adequate pretext was found, however, until the recent crisis over Czechoslovakia. Hitler's march into Austria early this year had merely provided an "incident" which could only be used as evidence of his hostile intentions.

Now, as I pointed out in *The Surrender of an Empire*, our own folly in breaking up the Austro-Hungarian Empire was bound to lead to the Anschluss and this was recognized by far-sighted Englishmen before the Treaty of St. Germaine was made.

In a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* of March 26, 1938, Lady Wester Wemyss recalled the fact that,

"when the destruction of the Hapsburg Monarchy was beginning to be mooted in Allied circles. Lord Wester Memyss, then First Sea Lord, drew up a memorandum (quoted in his Life and Letters) in which he pointed out the cogent reasons why the disappearance of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy would necessarily entail eventual German hegemony over Central Europe. This memorandum he sought to circulate amongst His Majesty's Ministers, where, however, it met with no attention."

The annexation of Austria by Germany last spring was thus the direct result of our own policy.

If in this matter—in that of Hungary and of other territorial changes in the map of Europe—we made mistakes, we have got to bear the consequences and redress the grievances we have created or allow those who suffer from them to take the law into their own hands.

Weakened Austria demanded the *Ausschluss*, and even the Socialists of France in 1928 gave it their approval, but when at last Hitler tired of words, marched across the frontier and averted civil war, the storm aroused could hardly have been greater if he had bombed Bucharest.

Germany cannot, of course, demand the status quo of before the War. She cannot expect the Allies to renounce all the fruits of victory, nor has she done so. No attempt has been made to regain Alsace and Lorraine, and Hitler has declared that he is content to leave those provinces to France, he has in fact never shown any inclination to annex an inch of territory that was not predominantly German.

What he has demanded is that those territorial changes which have proved to be a source of continual unrest and of misery for the Germans affected by them should be revised, and if the matter could not be settled by arbitration he was prepared to take independent action. This was the case with regard to Czechoslovakia which was made the pretext for the Democracies threatening to bring about a world war.

That it was but a pretext is clearly evident, for only madmen could seriously contemplate sacrificing millions of lives and bringing unspeakable horrors on the world merely in order to keep three and a half million Germans under subjection to the Government of Czechoslovakia; one cannot imagine so large a proportion of the human race to have become suddenly afflicted with homicidal mania.

There must then have been a motive for their apparent madness, and that motive was in fact plainly avowed in the current phrase: "We must stop Hitler."

The pretext then, this time, was Czechoslovakia. Now probably not one in a hundred ordinary people who make of that country a second Belgium and talk of the "gallant little nation" bearing the martyrdom with exemplary patience, have any idea what, or possibly where, Czechoslovakia is; like the blessed word "Mesopotamia," it

has become to them a sacred cause for which no sacrifices of blood and suffering would be too great.

Existing before the War as Bohemia, Moravia and part of Silesia, the country now known as Czechoslovakia had for nearly a hundred years been the scene of constant strife between the Czechs and Germans inhabiting it. The conflict thus did not originate with the peace Treaties, but merely entered on a new phase when an artificial state was created by the Treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye in 1919, comprising a population of over thirteen millions belonging to six or seven nationalities, of which some seven million were Czechs, who then formed the Government, in which the remaining minorities were very inadequately represented.

The three and a half million Sudeten Germans were thus placed under the rule of their former opponents, and their representatives in the first Czechoslovak Parliament immediately entered a strong protest on June 1 and 9, 1920, declaring that they, the Germans, "had no part in any agreement or establishment of that State," and that: "The whole Czechoslovak legislation represents a glaring infringement of the Minorities Protection Treaty."

As years went by the bitterness between the two races increased, and although the Sudeten Germans sent innumerable appeals to the League of Nations against a growing oppression from which they suffered, they met with no response.

For this oppression the Czech Government was to blame, whilst Lord Winterton in his speech in the House of Commons on May 11, 1934, stated that,

"the whole of the land in Czechoslovakia belongs to Jewish moneylenders, and not to the peasants who are occupying it".

When this state of things had lasted for nearly twenty years and Hitler finally announced that, since the grievances of the Sudetens had not been redressed by arbitration, Germany would rescue them by forcibly taking over the Sudeten districts, the Democracies announced their intention of assembling their combined armies, navies and air forces "in defence of Czechoslovakia."

This is what they call Hitler threatening to bring about a world war, and describe him as a breaker of treaties. What treaty had he broken?

If anyone had broken a treaty it was France or rather the French Government. From the time that the "Geneva Protocol" (or the Arbitration and Sanctions Protocol) was put forward in 1924 under the aegis of Benes and Politis, the representatives of Czechoslovakia and Greece at the League of Nations, British Conservative Governments had firmly refused to follow the lead of France and other countries in guaranteeing the security of the frontiers in the East of Europe, including that of Czechoslovakia, and it was in September, 1927, two years after the Locarno Pact, guaranteeing the frontier between France and Germany had been signed, that the "Geneva Protocol" was revived and met with the strongest

opposition from Sir Austen Chamberlain who, in the finest speech of his life declared:

"You invite us to take for every country and for every frontier the guarantee which we have taken for one by treaty. If you ask us that, you ask us the impossible. . . You do not know what you ask us. You are asking nothing less than the disruption of the British Empire. I yield to no one in my devotion to this Great League of Nations, but not even for this League of Nations will I destroy that smaller but older league of which my own country was the birthplace and of which it remains the center."

France, however proceeded on her own account, in December 1934, to sign a Three Power entente with Czechoslovakia and Soviet Russia and in May, 1935, a separate military pact with Russia, a complete violation of the principles of the League, according to which military alliances were to be replaced by peaceful arbitration.

We were thus in no way bound to "stand by France" in the recent crisis by "going to the rescue of Czechoslovakia" since we had repeatedly refused to join her in the undertakings she had entered into with this protege of the Soviets for which only the French of the Left felt any particular sympathy. Indeed, according to the Locarno Pact we were more bound to stand by Germany, since by that treaty we had undertaken to defend her if attacked.

The Franco-Soviet Pact, deplored by all right thinking Frenchmen, was really the beginning of all the trouble in Europe from 1934 onwards, for Germany, finding herself flanked on both sides by hostile Powers, one wholly and the other in part inflamed with hatred of Hitler as the opponent of Bolshevism, now started to re-arm openly.

It was not that the re-armament of Germany began at this juncture for, as was pointed out in the chapter of this book, secret arming had gone on in Germany ever since the War but had to a great extent been winked at by Great Britain.

Now that Hitler was in power, however, matters took on a different aspect and his open announcement of Germany's intention to re-arm against an equally open and hostile alliance was regarded as a casus belli and Czechoslovakia provided the pretext for starting a world war on Nazi-ism and Fascism.

That we were saved from this appalling catastrophe was mainly owing to the vision and magnificent courage of our great statesman.

Hitler never wanted war with England and that he was willing to co-operate with her in a scheme for averting a general conflagration was shown by his appreciation of Mr. Chamberlain who on his part very wisely avoided the "governess" attitude, still less the "mailed fist" advocated by that former supporter of the League of Nations Union for promoting peace—Mr. Duff Cooper. Instead he talked to the

Fuhrer as man to man, giving him credit for good will and for a sincere desire to find a peaceful solution to the Sudeten question.

For this solution the Czechs themselves have every reason to be grateful, for had the threat of "rescuing" them by force materialised no plan seems to have been evolved for carrying it out. Owing to the geographical position of Czechoslovakia the Germans, driven into war, could have overrun the whole country before their opponents could have appeared on the scene and the chief sufferers would have been the Czechs themselves.

How little the situation was apprehended by the general public in this country is illustrated by an amusing story told me by a doctor. He had gone to visit one of his patients and found him lying on a sofa with a large cigar in his mouth repeating that he "felt so humiliated." On the doctor enquiring the reason he replied that England had failed to rescue the Czechs. The doctor then asked how he proposed we should rescue them. The man had not the vaguest idea!

Now let us imagine what we should have done if the British subjects had been placed in the position of the Sudeten Germans. Supposing that instead of winning the War we had lost it, and that while it lasted the Sinn Feiners instead of merely stabbing us in the back—as Lloyd George expressed it—had openly joined up with Germany, and as a reward after the victory Ireland had been reft from the British Empire and given independence by the Central Powers, subjecting Ulster against its will to the Dublin Government.

Does anyone suppose that England, though forced with the sword at her throat to sign such a treaty, would have sat down under it for ever, after it had proved disastrous? Would she have calmly endured seeing loyal Ulstermen oppressed and made to feel themselves a subject and inferior race?

Possibly under certain governments she might; but if at the end of twenty years a strong British patriot had been raised to power and determined to rescue the victims of Sinn Fein tyranny by insisting force if reason could not prevail, would Germany have been justified in stigmatising him as a madman, out to trample over the whole of Northern Europe?

Let us further consider what we did do when we believed our nationals were oppressed in the Transvaal. After recognising the independence of the Boer Republic in 1884, the alleged oppression of the Uitlanders led to the second South African War of 1899, in the course of which we annexed the whole Transvaal.

The case for the Sudeten Germans is surely stronger, since they were not immigrants into a foreign country, but the old inhabitants of a land which had been theirs from time immemorial, and which against their will had been placed under a Government hostile to them.

Fortunately for the peace of the world no League of Nations existed at the time of the last Boer War, so the conflict remained localised in South Africa, and the Kaiser's telegram President Kruger was regarded in this country as a most unwarrantable act of interference.

What could have been said if he had called on all the Powers of Europe to resist us?

But, though the war was generally disapproved abroad, no one thought of flying into a panic and asking what England might be expected to do next, the Germans fearing for Tanganyika, the Belgians for the Congo, the Portuguese for Mozambique; they left it to the Boers and British to fight it out, with, in the end, a peaceful understanding.

Let us hope that the recent crisis may lead to equally happy results, and that the Czechs may find themselves delivered from an alien domination. For in reality Czechoslovakia enlisted the sympathies of the secret promoters of world revolution merely as a dependency of Soviet Russia, with whom she had made a Pact of Mutual Assistance on May 16, 1935, and had entered into very cordial relations.

Guileless English Christians who speak tearfully of the small and martyred nation with its heroic leaders. Presidents Masaryk and Benes, are no doubt aware that Czechoslovakia was not merely a breeding ground of Bolshevism but of militant atheism.

The International of Proletarian Freethinkers was founded in that country in 1925, and at Easter, 1936, a world Congress of so-called "Freethinkers" was held in Prague at which the Vice-President of the Soviet "League of Militant Godless" and other Russians were present, also delegates from twelve other countries, including several Frenchmen noted for their literary achievements in blasphemy.

These were received by the Vice-Mayor of Prague, Dr. Kellner, who expressed his joy that the Congress should be held in that city. The President of the Congress, a Belgian named Terwagne, thanked the Vice-Mayor, observing that the delegates "appreciated the free-thought of the Czechoslovakian Republic ... a deputation of delegates to the Congress was also received by President Benes. [*The Universe* for 22 May, 1936.]

Such were the leaders of a country on whose behalf the world in September last was to be plunged into the most frightful war in history. Who knows whether the Czechs themselves may not come to rejoice at being purged of these elements? Already we have read that the youth of Czechoslovakia carried out demonstrations at which the cry of "Out with the Jews! Czechoslovakia for the Czechoslovaks!" was raised.

It will be curious to notice the attitude of our War Party in this country if Czechoslovakia goes Nazi and anti-Semite and we are called upon to implement

what is regarded in some quarters as the rather imprudent undertaking to defend her frontiers, especially if these are invaded by the good friends of that Party—Comrades Stalin, Litvinoff and Co.

Perhaps then they will discover that the Czechs are an unworthy race, to which we owe no obligations. And then too demonstrators, carrying in procession what Mr. Churchill in an earlier phrase of his chameleonic career called "the filthy red flag of International Communism," may change their slogan to "Down with Czechoslovakia!"

#### IV: BOLSHEVISM AND FASCISM

The defence of Czechoslovakia having been only a pretext for the World War into which we have narrowly escaped being plunged, and the destruction of the Dictatorships—other of course than Stalin's—its real object, let us consider the nature of those systems which, at the cost of countless human lives and untold suffering, it was held necessary to destroy.

On this subject most people in our country depended for their information on the Press and especially on the newspapers, which in the main opened their columns freely to anti-Fascist views and firmly closed them on contrary opinions and even on authoritative statements of fact.

England has thus become a gigantic parrot house in which words pass from mouth to mouth without any comprehension of the real issues at stake. The analogy perfectly applies to the methods employed. For in the teaching of a parrot the procedure is, I believe, to place a thick cloth cover over its cage and then to go on clearly enunciating the same phrases over and over again until it has learnt to repeat them of its own accord.

This is precisely what has been done to the British public; it has been kept in the dark as to the truth of world events and misleading statements have been made to it by the press and by that whisper that the secret directors of world events well know how to set in motion so that from the most raucous macaws down to gently twittering budgerigars the same catch-phrases are obediently repeated.

The two most current and the most absurd of these are (a) that "Bolshevism is the outcome of Fascism" and (b) that "Bolshevism and Fascism are really the same thing" and therefore equally to be fought. (It will be noted, however, that the people who say this seldom display any inclination to fight Bolshevism.)

Now with regard to the first phrase, that Bolshevism is the outcome of Fascism, history shows exactly the contrary; no "Red" rising has ever followed on a system for forcibly preserving law and order unless an attack had first been made on that system by subversive forces.

From the French Revolution onwards a "White Terror" has always been the sequel to a Red.

Fascism—under which term for the sake of brevity we must here include Nazi-ism—was both in Italy and Germany the reaction to the destructive activities of the Communists.

And if in all such reactions there has been an element of violence, it is because terrorism can only be put down by counter-terrorism and a nation which has been kept in a state of fear and subjection under a tyranny once known as Jacobin and now as Bolshevik, inevitably turns with fury upon its oppressors as soon as its liberty has been restored.

As a French historian has well expressed it:

"Nothing is so terrible as those who have been afraid and are afraid no longer!"

As to the second phrase, what could be more ludicrous than to bracket Bolshevism and Fascism together? The only point they have in common is that both are autocracies. But the police force is an autocracy, demanding unquestioning obedience from its subordinate ranks; is that then a reason for bracketing it with a band of Chicago gangsters who have to obey the murderous dictates of their leaders?

The difference between the two is no greater than the difference between Bolshevism and Fascism. For Bolshevism is destructive of all that constitutes civilisation whilst Fascism sets out to correct those parts of civilisation which, in common with all sincere social reformers, it regards as defective.

A further and most important difference between the two is that whilst Bolshevism seeks to spread its doctrines all over the world and organises Communist Parties in every country, working under the obedience of Moscow for the overthrow of constitutional government and supplying them freely with funds. Fascism has never sought to proselytise and has never been accused, even by its bitterest enemies, of forming affiliations abroad or of financing any foreign group.

Indeed Mussolini, somewhat egotistically, declared at the onset that Fascism was for Italy alone and that Italians only were capable of comprehending its ideals. The various groups of "British Fascists" became the butt of his pleasantries.

Hitler expressed himself in much the same way with regard to Nazi-ism and in his insistence on "race" and the superiority of the German race over any other discouraged imitators. And that is only logical, since the essence of Fascism and Nazi-ism is Nationalism, whilst that of Bolshevism is Internationalism.

This being so why should Fascism be continually denounced as a menace to this country whilst Bolshevism is declared to be innocuous? People who exclaim

with an air of heroic determination: "We will not have Fascism here!" are really making themselves supremely ridiculous—they have never been asked to have it. But if the Italians and Germans choose to have it what business is it of ours to interfere? It is this "governessing" of other nations with regard to their internal arrangements as much as their foreign policy that led Hitler to protest.

What then is this monstrous thing against which we are warned, so repeatedly? In Italy the word Fascism is now seldom used since it signifies only the first point in Mussolini's programme—the suppression of Bolshevism in Italy, and that was accomplished long ago. Fascism was thus only a means to an end, and that end was the establishment of "the Corporate State."

This took place quite constitutionally; the King remained on his throne, in fact it was he who, after the march on Rome, sent for Mussolini and gave him full discretionary powers. After four years of reconstruction the Corporate State was created in 1926 by an act of legislation.

Its principles are a system built up on Trade Unions of organised labour on the one part, and Capitalism on the other, and its object is to promote peaceful relations between the two. Together they form a corporation or guild and enter into agreements which cannot be infringed without rendering the defaulting party liable to prosecution, so that Capital cannot tyrannise over Labour and Labour cannot hold a pistol at the head of Capital.

Space forbids a fuller exposition of the system, but that it is one which has contented the workers of Italy is clearly apparent; at the same time it has forcibly suppressed the stirring up of class hatred. For the same reason the Press is now not free.

When we observe the mischief-making role of many of our newspapers, we cannot help wishing that Fleet Street could be put under a like control.

In Germany the same ideals inspired Hitler. He himself, like Mussolini, had sprung from the ranks of the workers and felt keenly the misery of their lot at the hands of heartless employers; he felt too, as every thinking man must feel, the injustice between extreme poverty and vast riches acquired by the exploiters of labour. At the same time he realised the wickedness and futility of the class war. For this reason he hated Marxism, which he saw as "a world pestilence" to be destroyed before any constructive new order could be introduced.

That both in Germany and Italy immense reforms have been effected nobody can deny. Agriculture has been encouraged so as to provide the population with home-grown food—in Germany at any rate superior to that which is to be found in Great Britain\*—and thus to render the country self-supporting.

\*G. Ward Price, "I Know These Dictators," p. 115, and confirmed to me on the day of writing this by an English friend just returned from Bavaria who speaks with particular enthusiasm of the marvellous vegetables grown there. Mr. Ward Price's book should be read by everyone who wishes to know the truth about Germany and Italy under Hitler and Mussolini.

The housing problem has been dealt with and slums abolished; the workers' conditions of life have been raised, their physique improved; holidays and amusements are provided for them; and their self-respect is stimulated so that each worker feels himself of value to the State.

How far this frame of mind will last we cannot guess; the weakness of all Socialist schemes lies in the fact that they depend on the degree of enthusiasm their originators are able to keep up; all we can say now is that in both these countries the people as a whole seem happy.

Undoubtedly in both, the new order has pressed hardly on the upper classes, but why Socialists should rave against it seems at first inexplicable. The fact that the upper classes are allowed to live in peace, provided they do some useful work for the State, no doubt arouses the fury of the Bolshevik who holds that the hated bourgeois should be "liquidated," after perhaps having his eyes gouged out.

The fact that the drawing-room Socialists, who disclaim all ideas of violence and have long preached the doctrines which Hitler and Mussolini have put into practice, not only disapprove but foam at the mouth when the names of the "Dictators" are mentioned, suggests one or both of two conclusions—either that they do not really wish for Socialism but adopt it as a pose, or that Socialism is a camouflage for something else.

If it were not so they would praise the Dictators' social reforms, even if they condemned their methods of government. But no, the Dictators and their systems are condemned by them as wholly evil.

It may be that both these conclusions are correct. The vast number of "Socialists" to be found in drawing-rooms, universities, newspaper offices, etc., or whose ideas are set forth in books well boomed by publishers and Press, are undoubtedly actuated by the primitive instinct of self-preservation. They know that the sort of stuff they talk and write will pay, and that to profess "Left" views is the only way to a successful career. Of the real doctrines of Socialism many of them know nothing.

But there are those who know. And these are the secret directors of world revolution, who use Socialism and Communism alike in order to achieve their real aim—world domination.

For this reason they stir up strife between classes and nations. For this reason they hate "the Dictators" who have rendered them powerless in the lands that the Dictators control.

In order to judge of the influence the Dictators exercise one has only to compare the effect on the character of the populations rules respectively by Hitler and Mussolini and on the other hand by Stalin: in the first: hope and purpose; in the second: dull despair; in the first: the friendly salute of the raised arm; in the second: the clenched fist of hatred and blood lust.

The great evil of Marxism lies in its appeal to the basest instincts of human nature—to self interest, to greed and envy.

The only honest Socialist I have ever talked with—who had known Marx personally and for this reason detested him—used to say:

"We have not got to tell people what they would gain by Socialism but to ask them what they are prepared to lose. True Socialism means sacrifice, self-denial in the common sense".

This is the Socialism that both Hitler and Mussolini have set out to inculcate and because the noblest instinct in human nature is its passion for self-sacrifice, they have met with a tremendous response: in Italy the women brought their wedding rings to help the cause, in Germany families sit down contentedly to their single dish meal once a month in aid of the Winter Relief Fund.

It is natural that the drawing-room Socialists in our country would not enjoy this sort of thing at all. It is one thing to write and talk of the beauties of Socialism, it is quite another to have to buy a cheaper make of car because some people are starving.

Still less can the Italian or German systems please those who are using Socialism merely as a cover to their own scheme of world domination.

## V: HITLER

In the last article some explanation was given for the Socialists' hostility towards the systems instituted in Italy and Germany, in spite of the fact that in many respects these systems resemble those which they themselves have advocated. But this was not to go to the root of the matter. The real cause de guerre is the policy of the Dictators with regard to the Bolsheviks and the Jews.

Mussolini was long in coming to the conclusion that the Jewish question must be faced, for in Italy the Jews were few and exercised little influence; thus for many years he carefully avoided any appearance of anti-Semitism. It was only when he found that the Jews presented an obstacle to his plans for the reorganisation of labour and for limiting the profits of the middle-man that he realised the necessity

for curbing their activities in public life. For this reason and for his forcible suppression of Bolshevism, hatred was stirred up against him to the same extent as against Hitler.

Hitler, however, from the beginning of his public career, proclaimed himself an "anti-Semite." But this was no new thing in Germany. From the time of Martin Luther, who, after demanding equal rights for the Jews, found himself obliged to denounce them as arch-liars and the most dangerous enemies of Christianity, and even from before this day, the Jews have almost always been disliked, distrusted, and at times persecuted in large parts of Germany.

As their influence in commerce and other spheres of public life increased during the end of the nineteenth century, feeling against them rose higher and higher; they were resented, boycotted, and precluded from becoming officers in the German Army.

Yet throughout all this period up to the outbreak of the Great War, and again during the years that followed, Germany was regarded with particular sympathy not only by our Socialists, Pacifists and intelligentsia, but also by the Jews themselves. Before the War they had again and again expressed all their passionate loyalty to Germany as the one country on which all their hopes were set.

For although despised and hated, they were able to make money in a country where, as Hitler says, "gold was a god," to a larger extent than in any other except perhaps the United States.

They were also allowed to occupy positions in the learned and professional classes out of all proportion to those held by Germans. Though largely barred by society, they were encouraged by the Hohenzollerns, who had always believed in making use of them, from Frederick the Great with his miinzenjude to Wilhelm II with his Rathenau at the end of a private telephone wire.

It was thus that during the War so many of the Jews in this country hoped for the final victory of Germany and provided some of her most useful spies and informers.

It was a Jew, Ernst Lissauer, who coined the phrase "Got strafe England" and composed the "Hymn of Hate" \*against the land which had protected his race, of which the beginning has been translated thus:

French and Russian they matter not,  
A blow for a blow and a shot for a shot.  
We love them not, we hate them not;  
We hold the Weichsel and Vosges gate.  
We have but one and only hate;

We love as one, we hate as one.  
We have one foe and one alone,  
England!

Refrain:

Hate by water and hate by land.  
Hate of the head and hate of the hand.  
Hate of the hammer and hate of the crown.  
Hate of seventy millions, choking down.  
We love as one, we hate as one  
We have one foe, and one alone—England!

\*

Published in *The Evening News* for 10 December, 1937, and headed "German Poet dies in exile."

Lissauer on being exiled from Germany by the Nazi Government declared that he was sorry he had written those words and really meant them for Russia; if so it was the most remarkable slip of the pen since he had specifically mentioned Russia as not the foe. No doubt, however, he was sorry; we are all sorry, very sorry, when we find we have backed the wrong horse.

But in the main, it was Russia that the Jews—including those in England—regarded as their principal enemy, and it was out of hatred for Russia that they sided with Germany against the Allies.

After Russia had been brought low and a hideous revenge taken on her by the predominantly Jewish Bolsheviks, and the Kaiser had been got rid of, the Jews started Bolshevizing Germany, and having got her almost completely under their control they remained pro-German until the rise of Hitler.

It was then that the whole Jewish power was turned against Germany.

The Jews had not minded a certain amount of persecution, which after all mainly affected the humbler classes of their race, as long as they were given power in the State. But this is precisely what Hitler took from them, hence largely the cry of persecution.

Hitler himself had been slow to adopt an attitude of anti-Semitism.

As he relates in *Mein Kampf*, he was at first revolted by the hostility shown towards the Jews which he encountered in Austria and attributed to their religion:

"As I thought they were persecuted on that account, my aversion to remarks in their disfavour almost grew into abhorrence. . . I considered that tone, especially that adopted by the anti-Semitic Press of Vienna, unworthy of cultural traditions of a great nation."

But by degrees he came to the conclusion that "the Jewish religion" was really a misnomer:

"Through his own original being the Jew cannot possess any form of idealism, and therewith belief in the Hereafter is completely foreign to him. One cannot however imagine a religion according to the Aryan conceptions in which the conviction of life after death in some form is lacking."

This statement entirely accords with those made to me by two Jews, quite independently of each other, who assured me with deep regret that the Jews of Western Europe rarely believe in God or the immortality of the soul; their outlook is entirely material.

For this reason it is not surprising that Karl Marx having declared that "religion is the opium of the people," Jews should, as Hitler further observed, have become the chief propagandists of Marxism—"that world pestilence".

He saw them, too, as the oppressors of the working-classes and at the same time the agitators who stir them to revolt, he realised "their glibness" and "their artfulness in lying" on which Martin Luther in his treatise "Von den Juden and ihren Lugen" (Concerning the Jews and their Lies) had expressed himself with far greater violence some four hundred years earlier.

Above all. Hitler saw the fear they are able to inspire in order to drive all rivals or opponents off the field: "anyone with intelligence enough to resist the Jewish lure is broken by intimidation, however determined and intelligent he may be."

"*Mein Kampf* is really an amazing book when one considers that it was written by a young soldier with little education, most of whose life had been spent in the direst poverty or in the trenches. Hitler writes in no spirit of Jew-baiting but as a bacteriologist calmly examining through his microscope the action of certain noxious bacilli on the human body.

He observes the influence exercised by the Jews in the world of art; he sees them as "the inspired creators of those hideous inventions for the cinema and the theatre," of "those unclean products of artistic life as given to the people."

"It was pestilence, spiritual pestilence, worse than the Black Death, with which the nation was being inoculated"—especially the youth of Germany.

"Anyone," he says, "who has not lost the capacity for entering into the souls of the young will realize that it must lead to their grave injury."

And elsewhere he adds: "The State must declare childhood to be the most precious possession of the nation."

In his strictures on pre-Nazi Germany Hitler is undeniably justified; it was a matter of common knowledge just before and after the War that Berlin became a center of iniquity, its night life worse in some respects than that of Paris; vice of an unspeakable kind was flaunted with impunity, nude midnight orgies took place in the West End of the city—a cult that may in fact be said to have originated in Germany; the Jugendbewegung, chaotic and uncontrolled, encouraged license

among the young; filthy and blasphemous books poured forth from the German Press.

Whether Hitler is right in attributing all this to the Jews we cannot tell; there are depraved elements of every nation which need no inciting to vice. The fact remains, however, that since Hitler started to purge town life in Germany, pornographic books and pictures have disappeared from the shops, the Youth movements have become clean and healthy, the cult of nudity has been suppressed. And all this has coincided with the expulsion or voluntary departure of a number of Jews from Germany—not of Jews in the mass, since thousands still live there in peace, but without the power to influence the public mind which they formerly enjoyed.

Once-Christian England, in welcoming Jewish refugees indiscriminately to her shores, shows surprisingly little concern for the effect some of them may have on the minds and morals of her people, especially on the youth of the country.

We cannot help, moreover, noting, since this influx began, the change that has come over our Press; a once decent popular paper has boomed the nudity movement; another, which a few years ago could have been safely placed in the hands of a child, publishes matter exalting immorality and sneering at virtue; cartoons by artists not of British race, vulgar and not in the least funny, designed to create bad blood between classes and nations, are published with impunity.

Meanwhile the view of those to whom all these things are hateful, of those who crave to see their country restored to its former greatness as a beacon shedding the light of truth and justice on the world, are denied a hearing.

If this is the "liberty of the Press" enjoyed under "democracy," I should prefer the censorship of the Dictators.

## VI: HITLER AND THE JEWS

Since, as was shown in the preceding article, the main cause de guerre against Hitler is his treatment of the Jews, it is most urgent for people in this country to know the truth about it. But that is just the difficulty. The British public derives its information from the newspapers or the radio, both of which are largely controlled by Jews and in their turn receive their information from Jewish sources.

Thus all that reaches it comes to it through a Jewish filter. It is only when we read in the papers something about which we ourselves know the truth that we see how grossly the public is misinformed.

Ever since certain Jewish papers abroad announced whilst I was living peacefully with my family in London, that I was really in Austria—a country I have never been to in my life—forming one of a secret Council of Five for carrying out

pogroms and political assassinations all over the world, I have realised that there is no limit to the Jewish faculty for invention, and therefore that what appears in the papers with regard to Nazi Germany may be equally devoid of truth.

As long ago as 6 December, 1923, the Jewish World of London announced that "Adolf Hitler has been incarcerated in a lunatic asylum, having been found hopelessly insane."

Propaganda of the same grotesque kind is carried on by word of mouth and the guileless British public swallows the wildest stories about the man who is represented to it as a sort of ogre eating babies in a cave.

I have seriously been asked whether it is true that Herr Hitler takes pleasure in watching Jews being tortured and even a learned man, accustomed all his life to weighing evidence, told me in a frenzy of indignation that the tortures inflicted by the Nazis equaled those of the Russian Cheka. I asked him for his authority for this statement and he referred me to a book of which he did not know the author's name or anything about him.

Where however does this savant spend his summer holidays? Very happily—in Germany! At the same time, although a great Dante scholar and in private life the gentlest of men, his hatred of Mussolini is such that he declares himself unable any longer to appreciate the Russian language. To such a pitch of fanaticism may the best brains be brought under Jewish influences!

The first thing therefore to discover with regard to any story of anti-Semite violence is whether it is true or pure invention. Having proved the former the next thing is to find out (a) whether it was ordered by the Government or the act of irresponsible individuals, and (b) whether it was a reprisal for injuries received.

This is where the regimes of Germany and Italy on the one hand and Russia on the other differ so entirely.

In Soviet Russia cruelties far too horrible to be described merely as persecution were and are committed by the State Department once known as the Cheka, having its own locale in the Lubianka with Chinese and Jewish torturers all complete.

Can the Gestapo, or secret police of Germany, in any way compare with this? There is certainly nothing in the nature of the Cheka but there are concentration camps where prisoners are said to be "beaten up"—so for the matter of that are rioters beaten up by the American police. But no evidence of instruments of torture on the Russian or Chinese model has ever been produced.

Is it not moreover the fact that some of the acts of violence committed against the Jews has been spasmodic outbreaks of popular feeling, not ordered by the Government and even in certain cases condemned by it?

Moreover how far were such outbreaks by individual Nazis reprisals for those outrages committed on their comrades?

Here again we see the difference from the cruelties of the Bolsheviks. For the tortures inflicted by the Cheka and the commissars all over Russia have not been acts of counter-violence but barbarities inflicted on innocent men, women and children who had done no harm to anyone.

In Germany on the contrary the most horrible cruelties were committed by the Communists, who in that country as in Russia were predominantly Jews, before Hitler came to power; hundreds of Nazis were assassinated, others blinded or maimed for life, and once the Jewish power was broken they hurled themselves on their former oppressors. This was more particularly so in Austria where Nazi violence was greater than in Germany.

The frightful programme of the German Communist party was no figment of the imagination, as the raid on the Karl Liebknecht Haus clearly proved. There were all the secret preparations for world revolution, underground passages running all over Berlin, plans for blowing it up, and also whole departments devoted to planning the destruction of the British Empire.

Making, however, all allowance for provocation and irresponsible acts that the Nazi government may not have been able to prevent, we cannot help deploring certain of the methods employed against the Jews in Germany and Austria.

Persecution is never justified, and Jew-baiting whether by speech or print is not only cruel but stupid, for it defeats its own ends by enlisting sympathy in other countries with the Jewish cause; Herr Streicher with his Sturmer has doubtless had the effect of bringing many people abroad over to it.

A German tells me that only this kind of propaganda appeals to the uneducated classes in Germany and acts as a continual reminder to them of the Jewish danger. This may be true and the reason why Low's equally oppressive caricatures of Hitler and Mussolini continue to appear in the British press. There may be no other way of keeping up hatred of the "Dictators" in the minds of the less educated British public.

Those of us who recognise most clearly that the Jewish question must be faced cannot but (?) with that Herr Hitler, on taking over the immense power conferred on him, did immediately forbid any displays of violence and, further, ordain that no Jew should suffer merely on account of his race but only for conduct proved by fair trial to be reprehensible.

Arbitrary imprisonment or punishment is a system which has been abhorrent to every Briton from the time of the Habeas Corpus Act onwards. Again when limiting the number of Jews occupying posts in the professional classes, we regret that this very necessary measure of justice to the Germans should not have been carried out in a manner which could have raised no reasonable protests in foreign countries.

The Nazis in this respect displace the same lack of psychology as the Jews in their attitude to anti-Semitism. For directly the latter detect in anyone the least inclination to oppose Jewish supremacy in any sphere, and fail either by bribery, flattery, or intimidation to win him over, they proceed to attack him. If sufficiently important, in the Press, to injure him in his career even to the point of depriving him of his livelihood, and thus force him into an attitude of anti-Semitism against his will. Both Jews and Germans fail to realize that persecution only strengthens the case of their opponents.

Another accusation frequently brought against the Nazi movement is that it is anti-Christian; if it were so it would be no new thing. For in spite of the piety that prevailed in a large part of old Germany atheism flourished there more freely than in any other country in the world (see *World Revolution*, p. 309). In 1931 the Russian *League of the Godless* found there its strongest support; a "general offensive against the Christian Church" was planned in Berlin, which was to become the headquarters of the Bolshevist anti-religious campaign. The advent of Hitler to power necessitated the movement being transferred to Czechoslovakia.

Nazi Germany is thus less anti-Christian than the Germany of some years ago, and it takes no part in the militant atheism and revolting blasphemies of the previous Godless movement. Only amongst a portion of the present Nazis the theory of "Nordic" superiority descending from Nietzsche, making of Germans the supermen of the world, has led to a racist "religion," regarding Germany as their only god and the formation of a powerful German bloc in the East of Europe as their final aim.

But this is where these extremists of Nazi-ism come up against another racism, for the Jews are still more convinced than their race is superior to all others; indeed in the Cabala the goyim (Gentiles) are denied human attributes— "the Jews alone are to be styled men"—and they look forward to the day when they shall rule the whole world and all other nations shall be wiped out. I admit I find the idea of a German bloc in the East of Europe less unpleasant.

Those Nazis, however, who oppose Christianity on the grounds that it is the outcome of Judaism have surrendered their strongest weapon, since it was this exclusive Jewish racism that Christ denounced, preaching instead love for all mankind.

Hitler himself gave the lie to the former theory in *Mein Kampf*, where he pointed out that Christianity is the very antithesis of Judaism and recalled how Christ drove out with a whip the money-changers from the temple of the Lord.

No one condemned the Jews more severely than did Christ, and one wonders, if He came to earth to-day, how many professing Christians would be willing to receive Him; too often their sympathies are with the money-changers rather than with Him who drove them out. If this was the attitude of some of the German clergy one can understand Hitler's determination to prevent them propagandizing from the pulpit.

I write however as no blind admirer of Hitler or of Nazi-ism, for, like most Britons, I prefer a regime of greater liberty, such as we enjoyed in the days when England was a free country, to one under which, however necessarily, it is curtailed.

We must not forget that Hitler rendered an immense service, not only to Germany but to all Europe by stemming the tide of Bolshevism when it was flowing westward; later the Berlin—Rome—Tokyo axis was formed for joint action against the Komintern—on the lines advocated by the Netherlands Minister in the famous deleted passage of the British White Paper in 1919—and Great Britain's misguided opposition to it made co-operation between our governments in this matter impossible. [See *The Patriot*, December 8, 1938.]

But Hitler might have realized more clearly that the policy of the British Government, under pressure from the Socialists and Jews, was not that of British patriots who are in exactly the same impotent position as his own Party before 1932, and therefore that in speaking of "England," this wide difference of opinion should be taken into consideration.

Moreover by driving out the Communists and Jews into other countries in such a way as to enlist sympathy for them, instead of keeping them humanely under control in his own, he disregards the fact that he is helping to spread Bolshevism abroad and actually to strengthen the Jewish Power.

The Nazi theory of Nordic superiority is also rather weakened by the fact that some of Hitler's worst enemies have been Germans whom he believed he could trust.

The terrible Rohm purge,—though in no way comparable to the massacre of British officers in their bedrooms in Dublin on 21 November, 1920, of which some of the instigators were received with honour by Mr. Lloyd George at 10, Downing Street, eleven months later—or again with the recent purges of Stalin, was the result of this misplaced confidence.

Again I cannot understand how a man of Hitler's brilliant intelligence can ever have trusted Ludecke, whom after one interview in 1924 I judged immediately as a man not to be taken seriously, and never again admitted within my door. He

departed hurling insults at this country, and the gullible British public has now filled his pockets with money for the book *I Knew Hitler*, which is in reality a treacherous attack on the leader who at last saw him in his true colours.

Yes, Hitler has not been altogether happy in his choice of friends—and there are perhaps others. . . but what government is free from treacherous elements? Did Mr. Chamberlain ever dream that whilst the whole world rang with applause at his great and heroic work for peace, he would find men of his own country and his own party base enough to attack him? Was there not reason to trust his opinion and that of Monsieur Daladier, formed by personal contact with the Fuhrer, that there was good ground for the hope of peace between the Democracies and the Dictatorships in future?

Great capital has recently been made out of Hitler's hostile references to France in *Mein Kampf*, which having been written five years after the war, seemed to breathe a spirit of irreconcilable hatred.

But the point never explained to the British public is that at the time Hitler expressed himself in this manner the French had just occupied the Ruhr, a procedure which those of us who stood by France agreed with her in regarding as the only means for obtaining the reparations due to her by Germany, but which evoked a storm of protest from the Labour Party, the T.U.C., a number of Liberals and Conservatives and also from Mr. Lloyd George, who wrote on the subject with violent indignation in the Hearst Press.

If this was how they felt about France at that moment. Hitler, as a German, can hardly be blamed for describing her in one of those famous passages in *Mein Kampf* as "the inexorable enemy of the German people," and if he has declined to omit them from later editions of his book it was because they expressed what he felt at the time they were written.

No author can be expected to rewrite his earlier works because circumstances have led him to adopt a different point of view. Ramsay MacDonald has never asked to withdraw his books in favour of Socialism when he assumed the leadership of a predominantly Conservative Government. But from the moment of Hitler's accession to power he showed by deeds his change of attitude, and from May 1933, to September, 1938, he repeatedly made attempts to bring about an understanding with France.[see Appendix II]

Unfortunately all these overtures were met with incredulity, just as in England the hand of friendship held out again and again by Hitler was rejected, although during the pre-Hitler era any gesture by the German delegates to the League of Nations was received with rapture. It is not as if any risk would have been a conciliatory spirit, to stop the attacks that were constantly made on him in our Press and to co-operate with him in securing the peace of Europe.

Even if this last offer had proved delusive what purpose could be served by treating it as if it were so and destroying all hope of understanding?

Hitler has never in the past shown himself the enemy of England. Already in *Mein Kampf* he declared it to be the country with which he most ardently desired German friendship.

Dr. Ernst Hanfstaengl, one of his earliest supporters and later his Foreign Press Chief, told me recently that in those days of 1923, Hitler, in recalling his experiences as a soldier during the terrible years of the War, said that nothing in his eyes seemed more insane and deplorable than the wholesale slaughter between the Germans and English. It was very painful to him to have to fire on Englishmen and at moments the sight of the dead bodies of the splendid Highlanders made him feel quite sick.

These are the sentiments which the war-mongers in our midst are trying to destroy by continued attacks on Hitler for which he naturally feels he is justified in retaliating. If they succeed in exasperating him beyond endurance, to the point of making him cry out: "Then let there be war!" they will have gained their end and we shall have them to thank for the world chaos that will follow.

Those of us who most admire Herr Hitler for his courage and patriotism earnestly wish that he would disregard all such provocations as unworthy of his notice and refrain from retorts which only give satisfaction to his opponents. For nothing could be further from the sentiments he has expressed in the past than to afford the Jews the triumph of seeing the two great Nordic nations, between which he has hoped for friendship, again.

*NOTE.—Since this article was written news has come from Germany which adds further emphasis to what is said in it with regard to the persecution of the Jews; but as is also pointed out we must accept with extreme caution all that appears in our Press on the question.*

If, however, these reports are true, those of us who stand for the principles set forth by *The Patriot* from the beginning deplore as much as any other body of opinion the cruelty and injustice of avenging on the whole Jewish population of Germany a crime committed by one of their race. At the same time no evidence has been brought forward to prove the contention that the Jewish boy who so brutally murdered young Herr von Bath was not instigated, whilst the outrages committed by hooligans all over Germany were instigated.

In the case of a political assassination the murderer is always represented as a solitary fanatic and pays the penalty. Those who planned the crime go free—they are too powerful to be brought to justice. The Grand Orient of France which has already instigated so many Masonic murders and the Central European Bureau of the Komintern which since the occupation of the Sudeten land has moved from Prague to Paris keep their own secrets.

## VII: A WAR OF HATE

Ever since the whole civilised world hailed with joy the Munich Agreement and the Pact of Peace signed between Mr. Chamberlain and Herr Hitler, the newspapers have been busily assuring us that "a reaction has taken place" in public opinion, and that the peace at which we rejoiced was not a peace at all, but only a breathing space before Armageddon.

The truth is that if any such reaction took place it was mainly brought about by the newspapers themselves, particularly the popular and picture papers which have been doing their best to fan up a fresh panic and sabotage the agreements between the representatives of the Four Powers by perpetual sneers and insults leveled at the chosen leader of the German people.

How far did this contribute to their fury during the recent riots? If, after they had welcomed Mr. Chamberlain with ovations and Herr Hitler had given him reason to believe that he was sincerely desirous of peace, the Jewish question was still to be made a bone of contention and the reasons for inflaming British public opinion against the Fuhrer, it is hardly surprising that they should feel increased resentment toward the race which, as they well knew, was behind the Press campaign of vilification.

Hence this resentment which reached its climax after the brutal murder of young vom Rath was largely worked up by the Jews and their friends in this country. So one injustice has been answered by another injustice, one hate by another hate, and a vicious circle has been created of which one cannot see the end.

The reports of our Press on recent events in Germany have proved useful by showing us the extent to which they have previously misinformed us. For five years we have been told that, life having become unbearable for the Jews in Germany they have been driven in thousands to take refuge abroad, and that it was our duty to let them swarm into our small and overcrowded island, and even oust our own people from their jobs in order to find employment for them.

But now we find that over half a million Jews were still living on in Germany, some in the greatest prosperity, owning a number of the finest and largest shops in the Kurfurstendamm (the Piccadilly of Berlin, as one paper explains) and many synagogues. Their martyrdom until this last crisis seems therefore to have been of a not unbearable kind.

It is further interesting to note that in all the diatribes now appearing both in the British and American Press, great care is taken to exonerate completely the German people and to concentrate the attacks on Hitler alone, although no evidence has been produced to show that he provoked the outbreak. The object of this is evidently to avoid offending the people of Germany in case one day Nazi-ism

is overthrown, the Jews re-admitted and Germany is then restored to favour by the Democracies.

The campaign of hate against Hitler is calculated to do almost equal damage to Mr. Chamberlain. The brainless chatterers in London clubs and drawing rooms, calling themselves Conservatives, who in the same breath praise Mr. Chamberlain and abuse Herr Hitler do not perceive that they are playing the game of Mr. Chamberlain's enemies who, in the Press under their control, proclaim triumphantly that "his peace plan is now dead." They have certainly done their best to kill it.

If anything more were needed to show the fearful danger the Jewish question presents it is the suggestion that the treatment of the Jews in Germany should be made the reason for destroying the peace and for launching a world war involving the sacrifice of millions of lives and untold suffering to the human race.

Did we in the past ever dream of making war on any country—Russia, Rumania, Poland or Germany of the nineteenth century—when actual pogroms from time to time took place there? Much destruction, suffering and, above all, pecuniary loss have been endured by the German Jews in the present crisis but nothing in the nature of a pogrom, since no Jews are proved to have been killed during the riots.

Moreover, what better evidence could be produced to show the control the Jews have acquired over the councils of the nations if only their sufferings are to evoke sympathy from the so-called Christian world? Are they alone to wear the martyr's crown?

The Jews themselves are not deceived by the protestations. They know it is the wealth and power they possess which leads Press, politicians and private individuals to seek their favour. They know that when no corresponding advantage is to be reaped by shedding tears over the victims of persecution, the eyes of these sympathisers remain dry and their hearts unmoved.

Did the Democracies ever contemplate declaring war on the Bolsheviks when thousands of Christians were being tortured and 2,800,00 massacred, or on the Spanish Government which also employed inhumane tortures and murdered 450,000 people—a figure which does not include those killed in battle?

Did the "humanitarians," the intellectuals or the clergy other than the Roman Catholic—ever organise protests against these atrocities? Have they ever expressed even disapproval of our own treatment of the Arabs in Palestine referred to recently by Hitler in words which I know through communications received direct from British residents in Palestine to contain only too much truth.

Was ever hypocrisy more nauseating than the sanctimonious letters now filling our Press expressing horror of Germany's treatment of the Jews from people who

never felt a pang of pity for suffering Christians or Moslems? On the contrary the most powerful influences in our country have been directed in favour of the persecutors rather than the persecuted, and the hand of Soviet Russia dripping with the blood of a million martyrs is to be grasped in friendship by Christian England in the world conflict on which our warmongers' minds are set.

Thus all those countries or factions abroad which have shown the greatest resistance to Bolshveism are not only to receive no sympathy, but are to be respresented to us as our enemies. If they were really so, if Germany were to launch a war of aggression against us or against France, or if any other Power were to attack us, British patriots would be found as united as in 1914, ready to fight whatever the cost might be.

And in the present state of the world, when new combinations arise daily, it is absolutely necessary for Britain to bring her armaments up to full strength. But this is not the kind of war into which our present jingoists wish us to be drawn, it is no desire to defend their country against a foreign foe which has driven hundreds of Communists into our army, it is on the contrary at the bidding of their alien directors that they are arming for the fight for world revolution.

The intended war will thus be a war of Bolshevism against Fascism, with Great Britain, to her eternal dishonour and eventual ruin, on the side of Bolshevism.

Of course this will not be the reason given to the nation or even perhaps realised by the rulers at the onset, some pretext will be put forward by the secret directors of world affairs, as it was in the spring of this year with Italy, in the recent crisis with Germany; next time it may be Japan or Franco's Spain.

It does not matter with which of the Fascist States the quarrel is begun, the rest will come in with it and the war will indeed become world wide.

## VIII: HORRORS OF THE HOME FRONT

Such then is the position in Europe to-day. No people of any country wish for war except Bolsheviks and Jews.

The Germans do not want to fight the French nor the French the Germans, the true people of England do not want to fight either. Never, probably, throughout the last fifty years has there been so little animosity between the peoples of Europe. Yet never has war been prepared on so gigantic a scale. In every country the extraordinary spectacle is seen of the human race digging itself in as in a vast rabbit warren, for refuge against each others' bombs in the war we are being led to believe is inevitable.

How different is the atmosphere in our country to that which prevailed in 1914! Then, amidst all the grief and tragedy, there gleamed the glorious spirit of

patriotism, of ardent desire on the part of all who stood for England to do their bit in the great conflict.

And in the hearts of the men who went out to fight there was no puerile hatred of the enemy, but burning love of country; even when the Germans were marching towards our shores the difficulty was to prevent fraternizing between the trenches, and "Fritz" was declared to be "not such a bad fellow after all." Everyone laughed at the Punch cartoon of the German family having their "morning hate" against England.

Yet now when—as every traveler from Germany has related—the Germans have shown nothing but friendship for our country, it is the British family reading its morning paper at the breakfast table that foams at the mouth with hate against the "Dictators," and gentle old ladies clench impotent fists over the preposterous pages of "I Knew Hitler." Have we lost our national sense of humour?

Moreover, in the preparations for war how different is the spirit shown by the authorities to that of 1914. Then everything was done to allay panic, scaremongers were sternly rebuked, and the public was spared as much suffering as possible. But before and during the recent crisis and still at the present moment, the nation has been deliberately worked up into a state of "jitters," its flesh has been made to creep with the ghastly possibilities that lay before it.

Again, in the matter of air-raid shelters, of the evacuation of London and the billeting arrangements, orders were issued with the harshness of a Prussian drill sergeant—more than this, with a sort of gloating malevolence as if satisfaction was felt in official quarters at the power to inflict as much inconvenience and misery as possible on the British people.

Trenches which have the appearance of veritable death traps were dug in London's loveliest gardens without even the courtesy of notifying the owners, whilst in the matter of billeting, enough indignation has been aroused for it to be unnecessary to enlarge on here. [see appendix III]

And in reply to the very natural protests of the public at the invasion of their homes, a Conservative Home Secretary announced in the House of Commons that he had answered "as brutally as he could." [*Daily Telegraph* and *Morning Post*, for 4 November, 1938.]

What is the explanation of this malignant spirit in our once free and kindly land? Where is the England we loved, the paternal government to which we had become accustomed? Is this the democracy we are told to fight for? Is this a foretaste of what we shall have to offer if war bursts on the world and a free hand is given to those who will be able to tyrannise over us?

Let us look facts in the face and realise what is at the back of this change in the spirit of our country:

England of 1938 is not the England of 1914 because she is no longer controlled by Britons. Ever since the war the Jewish power has been growing.

It was this that brought about the League for creating discord between the Nations, that set up the Soviet regime for carrying out the same process between the classes.

It was this which up in 1933 tried to turn us against France and since then against Germany and that is now destroying the peace of the world.

It is this again which, working on the spirit of our nation, has made the change in it that we see to-day. In 1914 love and courage; in 1938 hate and fear.

Hatred is a soil on which nothing fruitful can grow, hatred is sterile; it may help to win wars but only wars waged from love of country can bring permanent blessing to a nation. Britons in the past have not been easily worked up to hate, but this insane hatred of two men, Mussolini and Hitler, is being instilled in them by the Jews and those who benefit by them, and acting like a poison in the life blood of our people.

Germany is under a visible anti-Jewish dictatorship. We are under an invisible Jewish dictatorship, but a dictatorship that can be felt in every sphere of life, for no-one can escape from it.

Already the Jews can make or break the career of any man as they please. Once war broke out we cannot doubt that they would be found in every key position and would hold us at their mercy. Then the real purpose of the world war will become apparent. As long as the Jews do not hold Germany they can never realise their final aim—world domination. Therefore Hitler must be overthrown and the Jewish power restored.

It is idle to say that this vast ambition has been falsely attributed to the Jewish race. The dream of a Messianic era when they shall rule the world runs all through their "sacred" writings. Thus in its article on the Messiah, the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* says:

"In the rabbinical apocalyptic literature the conception of an earthly Messiah is the prevailing one, and from the end of the first century of the common (i.e. Christian) era it is also the one officially adopted by Judaism. . .

His mission is, in all essential respects, the same as the apocalypses of the older period; he is to free Israel from the power of the heathen world, kill its ruler and destroy its hosts, and set up his own kingdom of peace."

The peace of death for all the Gentile world!

That this is still the plan of modern Judaism was confirmed to me in a conversation I once had with a young Jew who asked me for an interview. He said:

"I come to you to thank you for what you have written. Do not suppose I come as an anti-Semite since I am a Jew in the marrow of my bones. But in studying the question of Pan-Judaism I came across your books, and they explained to me much that I had never understood before.

"You are perfectly right in saying the Jews desire world domination, all my life I have heard them speak of it. And I am afraid, yes, I am afraid they will attain it. But that can be only for a moment.

"The nations of the world will not be able to bear so intolerable a tyranny and they will rise, they will rise and there will be the greatest pogrom the world has ever seen. That is why I come to thank you, for in warning the world of this plan you may help to avert its execution and so save my people from the terrible fate that awaits them."

Those friends of the Jews who encourage them in their thirst for power are thus their cruelest enemies.

How often has this prophecy recurred to me during the recent crisis! The Jewish power grows steadily in the West—in England, France and the United States, but in the East, the tide of anti-Semitism is rising everywhere. It covers nearly all Eastern Europe with the exception of Soviet Russia where it is kept down by force. Owing to events in Palestine the Moslem world is seething with it, and its repercussion reaches to far Japan.

Even amidst the pro-Semite bloc of the West it has numerous and vocal supporters. In England it is strongest among the working classes who have nothing to gain by seeking favour with the Jews.

The present movement, moreover, is not unprecedented in this country for anti-Jewish riots took place at the coronation of Richard Coeur de Lion, and Edward I found it necessary to expel all the Jews from England.

The Home Secretary has announced that he will prevent its recurrence by "stamping on anti-Semitism"; to do this will merely make it burst into flames. The function of Government is to prevent disorders; it cannot control opinions.

What, by the way, has become of the safety valve theory so freely applied when it was a case of Communists in the Park insulting the Royal Family and preaching revolution? Apparently it does not operate when free speech on the Jewish question is concerned.

We do not want to have pogroms or persecutions here, but if the British people are to see thousands of Jews pouring into their country to be given work or supported by charity whilst their own unemployed walk the streets; if Jewish children are taken in and given every advantage in feeding and education whilst the columns of our papers are filled with appeals for our own waifs and strays, for children's holiday funds and homes for cripples, the British people will be more than human if they do not express their resentment in a forcible manner.

The importation of the children from Red Spain was a sufficiently enlightening experiment, but they at least were segregated. We understand from the Press, however, that in preference to installing these Jewish children in camps or institutions reserved for them, they are as far as possible to be introduced into British schools and families and encouraged to associate with British children.

Has it not been considered what harm, physical and moral, may be done to our own children through contact with these unknown aliens from the lowest quarters of foreign cities? Are they to be thrust indiscriminately into Christian households where they may infect the bodies or corrupt the minds of the coming generation?

Is the boasted Christianity of England then all a sham if those who have been brought up outside it, or even to hate and despise it, are judged to be the right companions for Christian children? The sentimentalist will answer that Christian influences may win them over. Alas! evil is more contagious than good. Should our children be made the objects of so dangerous an experiment?

Moreover nothing would be more objectionable to professing Jews themselves than that what they describe as "perversion" should be practised on Jewish children. The Jewish world, August 25th, 1927 stated that:

"To induce Jews to abandon the faith with which they are born is a form of hostility to our people, which if not anti-Semitic in intention (or perhaps in fact) is as hateful to us as the machinations of anti-Semitism in its most virulent form."

The so-called "Jewish problem" could surely be solved in a safer and simpler way. The vast unpeopled spaces of Soviet Russia, under the government of pro-Semitic rulers, could accommodate the whole Jewish race. Biro—Bijan has already been offered them—whilst the fabulous wealth of rich Jews all over the world could be used to settle them there.

The surest way to promote anti-Semitism in Great Britain is to bring them over here; and the only way to check it is to prevent the inevitable clash which their presence in large numbers would bring about. Unless our politicians will face the Jewish question fairly and squarely, here and in Palestine, in a spirit of justice to the indigenous population of both countries and of firmness in dealing with the Jews, the people may take the law into their own hands with consequences that no one can foresee.

Meanwhile the shadow of war hangs over England, a shadow that could be dispelled if the rulers of all countries would realise that it can end only in the ruin of civilisation. Failing this the one hope lies in attempting to open the eyes of the people, especially those of Great Britain, to the truth, so that they will refuse to be dragged into war at the bidding of an alien power. The British are slow to wrath but once they realise the nature of the tyranny to be imposed on them they will rise as one man to resist it.

## APPENDICES

### I. ANTI-JAPANESE RIOTS IN HONG KONG

Extract from letter of a Business Man in Swatow. (8th October, 1931)

. . . You will have heard of the anti-Japanese demonstrations recently in Hong Kong. I enclose cutting of a letter which the supineness of the H.K. Government inspired a member of this Community to address to the H. Kong Daily Press. It created some stir in the complacent Colonial dovecot.

The murder by 1,000 Chinese in the most brutal circumstances (brave fellows, armed with hatchets!) of a poor inoffensive Japanese and his family—6 in all—led to the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders being summoned to the aid of the police, which was immediately effective and resulted in at least 100 Celestials "knowing another Dawn than ours," though the official figure was a dozen!

I simply cannot help sympathising with the Japanese in this dispute with China over Manchuria and I hope they won't climb down at the behest of the well-meaning village idiots (in this respect only, of course!) who live so comfortably in Geneva!

Extract from *Hong Kong Daily Press*. ". . . Imagine then the dismay and indignation of British subjects here when they read in their Hong Kong papers news of the anti-Japanese rioting in Hong Kong with its awful toll of butchered Japanese women and children. We could scarcely believe our eyes.

### II. HITLER ON PEACE WITH FRANCE

In his speech of January 30, 1934, Hitler said: "France fears for her security. No-one in Germany wishes to threaten her and we are ready to do anything in order to prove this to her."

Again on March 7, 1936: "Throughout three years, I have tried slowly but continuously to create the foundations of a Franco-German entente."

On March 16, 1936: "I have tried to show that the maintenance of the doctrine of the hereditary enemy is and must be unreasonable for the two peoples."

And in the week of the recent crisis, on September 26, 1938: "I have affirmed that the question of Alsace Lorraine no longer existed for us. We all of us do not wish for war with France. We have no claims to formulate with regard to France. Absolutely none!

All territorial differences which existed between France and Germany are eliminated. "I see no difference whatever between us. We are two great nations which both wish to work and live. And they will live better if they work together."

### III. BRITISH OFFICER ON REFUGEES

Extract from a letter of a British Officer. (October 27, 1938.)

. . . We did not realize the war scare much down here. The only shock we had was the threat to billet 6,000 slum children and women upon us, apparently for the "duration," which might have been some ten years. I never heard a more fantastic or ill-digested scheme.

"I had a lot to do in the last war with billeting large bodies of troops, and also disposing of refugees—and one thing I learned was that to dump swarms of undisciplined strangers on ordinary inhabitants and just tell the latter to carry on is the last thing to be done. It will produce rows, rapes, robberies, murders, food and water shortage and epidemics in no time at all."

#### IV. JEWISH CHILDREN IN ENGLAND

It is perhaps hardly realized in this country that Christianity is not merely unacceptable by orthodox Jews but actually abhorrent to them. The plan of placing Jewish children in Christian schools or homes would therefore be as objectionable to them as to us. A Rabbi in a long article contributed to the Jewish Chronicle of April 6, 1923, on the danger of allowing Jewish boys to enter British public schools observed:

"It is a sorrowful fact that, in this free England, Jewish parents, of their own accord, are allowing their children, Sunday after Sunday, to join in Christian prayers and imbibe Christian doctrine."

However, he added later: "I readily admit that a certain number of these children pass through the fire unscathed."

A Jewess writing to the same issue of this paper added her testimony by describing how a small Jewish boy after attending a Hebrew Kindergarten, was sent to a public school where he "went to prayers with the other boys, but when he realised what was taking place he was so horrified that he repeated to himself the Shema."