

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part I

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, in order that the American people may have a clearer understanding of those who over a period of years have been undermining this Republic, in order to return it to the British Empire, I have inserted in the RECORD a number of articles to prove this point. These articles are entitled "Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife." This is part I, and in this I include a hope expressed by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, in his book entitled "Triumphant Democracy." In this he expresses himself in this manner:

Let men say what they will, I say that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, to shine upon, to greet again the reunited states—the British-American Union.

This statement is clear, and the organizations which Mr. Carnegie endowed have spent millions in order to bring this about. This thing has been made possible by scholarships, exchange professors, subsidies of churches, subsidies of educational institutions; all of them working for the purpose of eliminating Americanism as was taught once in our schools and to gradually exchange this for an English version of our history.

These organizations were organized to bring about a British union, a union in which the United States would again become a part of the British Empire. However, this has been upset to some extent by the attempt of the internationalists to establish their own government as an international or world union. And there is, therefore, a conflict between the two, for England wants a British union, with America as a colony, and the international money changers want a Jewish controlled union, in order to establish their own world government.

It is, therefore, best for us to stay out of both of these, in order to save what is left of this Republic as it was given to us in 1787, by a people who knew more about international intrigue and the real problems that confronted the world, than we know today. These early founders not only understood the problems, but in drafting the Constitution they provided an instrument for us to follow, so that we could remain secure from foreign double-dealing and intrigue.

263553—19504

Had we adhered to the Constitution as it was given to us, we would have been secure and safe today.

Therefore, it is our duty, in the interest of our people and in the interest of this Republic of the United States, to ponder seriously and to give fullest consideration to solving the problem which now confronts the world. In doing so, I am rather inclined to believe that the real American people will decide without hesitation, to return to those fundamental principles that were set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Let no one tell you that this instrument is not as valuable today as it was in 1787; for the fact is that it is much more valuable today—so much so that complete disintegration of this Republic cannot be avoided should we fail to return our Government to the principles set forth therein.

I shall now quote an article by Andrew Carnegie, which he wrote at the request of the London Express, and which appeared in that paper October 14, 1904, entitled "Drifting Together."

DRIFTING TOGETHER—WILL THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA UNITE?
(Written by request for the London Express, October 14, 1904, by Andrew Carnegie)

Britain and America being now firmly agreed that those who attempted to tax the American Colonies against their protest were wrong, and that in resisting this the colonists vindicated their rights as British citizens and therefore only did their duty, the question arises: Is a separation forced upon one of the parties, and now deeply regretted by the other, to be permanent?

I cannot think so, and crave permission to present some considerations in support of my belief that the future is certain to bring reunion of the separated parts, which will probably come about in this way: Those born north and south of an imaginary line between Canada and the United States, being all Americans, must soon merge. It were as great folly to remain divided as for England and Scotland to have done so.

It is not to be believed that Americans and Canadians will not be warned by Europe, with its divisions armed, not against foreign foes, but against each other. It is the duty of Canadians and Americans to prevent this, and to secure to their continent internal peace under one government, as it was the duty of Englishmen and Scotsmen to unite under precisely similar conditions. England has 7 times the population of Scotland; the Republic has 14 times that of Canada. Born Canadians and Americans are a common type, indistinguishable one from the other. Nothing is surer in the near future than that they must unite. It were criminal for them to stand apart.

CANADA'S DESTINY

It need not be feared that force will ever be used or required to accomplish this union. It will come—must come—in the natural order of things. Political as well as material bodies obey the law of gravitation. Canada's destiny is to annex the Republic, as Scotland did England, and then, taking the hand of the rebellious big brother and that of the mother, place them in each other's grasp, thus reuniting the then happy family that should never have known separation. To accept this view, the people of the United Kingdom have only to recall the bloody wars upon this island for centuries arising from Scotland and England floating separate flags, and contrast the change today under one flag.

The Canadians and Americans may be trusted to follow the example of the Motherland and have but one flag embracing one

whole race in America. Present petty jealousies melt away as the population north and south become in a greater degree born Americans.

Even if this blessed reunion came as early as the end of the next decade, say 16 years hence, Canada and the Republic—the Scotland and England of America—would embrace 115,000,000 of English-speaking people, probably 7,000,000 of these in Canada. By the end of the present decade, 6 years hence, their population will be close to 97,000,000—6,000,000 of these in Canada. The Republic added to her numbers the past 14 years more than the total population of Australasia, or than that of Canada, the immigration having been enormous. One of these years it almost reached a million.

CECIL RHODES

The peaceful union of Canada and America would lead Britain to a serious view of her position, resulting in the conclusion that Cecil Rhodes reached—it will be remembered that he was at first a strong British Imperialist. Mr. Stead recounts that Mr. Rhodes went to Lord Rothschild and laid that scheme before him, who replied—“This is all very well, if you can get America to join—if not, it amounts to nothing!” This led Mr. Rhodes to a study of the subject, and the result was he saw clearly that Lord Rothschild was right.

British federation would leave Britain as a member of the smaller part of her own race, and out of the main channel of progress; instead of sitting (with race imperialism accomplished) enthroned as the mother among hundreds of millions of her own children, composing all but a fraction of English-speaking men. Hence he abandoned the scheme and thereafter favored race federation, and left to America more scholarships than to all other lands. He saw that it was to the Republic, not to British settlements, his country had to look for the coming reunion of his race, with Britain in her rightful place as parent of all. A few figures will leave no room for dispute about this. In the last decade, 1890–1900, Britain, Canada, Australasia, and New Zealand, combined, added to their population 4,500,000—America 13,500,000. Canada only added 508,000, the Commonwealth of Australasia only 660,000. In the 4 years since 1900 America added more than the total population of either Canada or Australasia. During the present decade, 1900–1910, at the same rate of increase to date, she will add more than the present total white population of Canada, Australasia, New Zealand, and South Africa combined. So fast does the Republic grow, so slowly the Empire.

INCREASE OF POPULATION

The United Kingdom itself increased last decade more than three times as much as Canada and Australasia combined. It is not to her colonies, therefore, that Britain can look for much increase of population or of trade. The growth of Australasia, small as it was in the last decade, so far as reported in this decade is even less. Canada is growing faster only in the far northwest, which is separated by a thousand miles of barren land from the English-speaking Province of Ontario. Last decade Ontario Province (English) actually declined in British population; Quebec Province (French) slightly increased. The census of 1900 shows fewer British-born residents in all Canada than that of 1890. The wheatfields now reached by rail are being settled by Americans who cross the border, selling their American farms and buying new farms in Canada at one-tenth of the price realized for the old. Except for this influx, about 70,000 so far, the rate of increase in Canada will be about as last decade.

When we come to the population of the United Kingdom, we find already in England and Wales 558 to the square mile. What thoughtful man could wish much further increase, even if it were possible? A denser population must cause deterioration. The density of population in England and Wales is not reached by any European country, except the small state of Belgium. France has only 188, Germany 270 (or one-half), Italy 290, Japan has only 296. The authorities agree that England and Wales are fully populated. Ireland proves that it is so by the small increase. Scotland has increased steadily for some decades, but little scope is left for further increase. Substantially, Ireland and Scotland have today all they can maintain in comfort.

Mark the contrast. America has only 21 people per square mile, one-sixteenth that of the United Kingdom, one for every 26 in England and Wales. These figures include Alaska, which resembles most of Canada, and is not likely to support many people. Excluding Alaska, the American population is 28 per square mile, one-twentieth that of England and Wales. It is evident that Green was right when he wrote years ago that the home of the English-speaking race was not to be on the Clyde and the Thames, but upon the Hudson, the Delaware, Ohio, Mississippi, and St. Lawrence. There is not room for it in the dear old home, but there is, fortunately, in the new lands of her children in Canada and America.

When we note the development Britain has attained industrially, we are amazed. It is wonderful almost beyond belief: we doubt and investigate to assure ourselves that we have the facts. This little kingdom has today more shipping, and about as many spindles turning as all the rest of the world. She is the richest of all nations per capita. She makes more iron and mines more coal per capita than any nation. Marvelous! Nothing comparable to her in history! She positively dwarfs all previous records—a dwarf more powerful than most giants. Who is there, then, who can expect her to do more, what she has accomplished being scarcely credible?

PHYSICALLY IMPOSSIBLE

It is physically impossible that much further increase can come to Britain, and in addition to this, conditions otherwise are unfavorable to further development. Other nations by the use of her

263553—19504

inventions, are more and more supplying their own wants, and will continue to do so. They will also compete with her more and more, especially in iron and steel, and in cotton manufactures, owing to her lack of the cotton plantations and of needed iron stone. If Britain succeeds in maintaining present production in these fields great will be the credit due to her captains of industry. As with population, therefore, so with industrials—much increase is impossible.

This is the age of consolidation, industrially and nationally. Consider the recent consolidation of Italy and the more recent consolidation and rapid growth of the German Empire. Who can imagine that the process has stopped? On the contrary, we are on the eve of further consolidations in Europe of great extent. The successes of the American Republic, 45 States consolidated into one Union, with free trade over all, and that of Germany with its Zollverein, are too significant to pass unheeded.

The day of small nations is passing. Their incorporation with larger areas is to be hailed by lovers of progress, provided always that one point be carefully preserved. The national sentiment of the small powers should not only be guarded, but fostered in every way, so that, as in the American Union and in Britain, the Virginian and the Scotsman remain as intensely Virginian or Scotch as ever. Pride in and loyalty to the wider empire do not supplant but supplement love of the part where he was born. He loves the part and is proud of the whole.

What will Britain do? The day is coming when Britain will have to decide on one of three courses. First, shall she sink—comparatively to the giant consolidations—into a third- or fourth-rate power, a Holland or Belgium comparatively? Here note that we do not postulate her actual decline, but the increased growth of other powers. Or, second, shall she consolidate with a European giant? Or, third, shall she grasp the outstretched hand of her children in America and become again as she was before, the mother member of the English-speaking race?

Assuming that other powers are to increase their present population (as Germany and Russia have yet room to do), or by further consolidation, it being evident that there is not room in the 120,000 square miles of the little, crowded United Kingdom for further increase of moment, then the conclusion is inevitable that one of these three courses is the only possible alternative, for Britain has no adjoining territory she can annex.

Some have been disposed to regard British federation as a possible fourth alternative, but the figures given, which convinced Rothschild and Rhodes, we submit, compel its exclusion, especially to such as seek for my motherland, as I do, a destiny worthy of her—a future commensurate with her glorious and unparalleled past. Let us rejoice that this is open. Her Canadian and republican children across the Atlantic will hail the day she takes her rightful place in the high council of her reunited race—that race whose destiny, I believe with faith unshaken, is to dominate the world for the good of the world.

(This article, in pamphlet form, was placed in the New York Public Library on February 27, 1906, by the Honorable Joseph H. Choate.)

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part II

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, we are now dominated and plagued by various pressure groups that care little or nothing about the United States as long as they can involve us in the present European war. Some of these groups are well known, others remain obscure, but nevertheless very powerful and effective in their insidious attempt to convince the people of this Nation that war is impending. These groups are composed of members who are generally classed as the “intelligentsia.” I shall not question their intelligence, but if one is to judge them by what they have said and done, their intelligence is not being directed for the greater interest of the United States. Aiding these groups, I believe often innocently, are those whom we may take the liberty of calling their tools and servants. We have reached a stage where these anglophiles advance the thought that in order to qualify as a good American, one must be pro-English and willing to fight and die for England. These England-first groups and hands-across-the-sea organization are made up of many Canadian and Anglo-American societies which

are located in our larger cities. One of these, and the one to which I shall now refer, is the Pilgrims.

THE PILGRIMS

When the Pilgrims was organized in 1902, to aid in developing Anglophiles in the United States, the Canadians, being British subjects, were not solicited at first as members of this charitable and exclusive propaganda service to sell America to the British Empire. Like converts, many of these members are more loyal to England than the British themselves. In their fanatical zeal to serve Albion, I am informed by a student, that one of them placed the English crown on the flagstaff of the Columbia University. If this is true, the Columbia alumni should "crown" him who gave orders for the mounting of it, and replace the crown with the eagle, so this noble emblem can rest in its rightful place.

The Pilgrim membership may be found in our military organization, in the Government, and particularly among professors, ministers, and authors. In wielding the pen, the aid of these writers is more valuable, for can they not write, as did Carnegie:

Give America to England as a hemostat for the bleeding wound of the British Empire, which the surgeons left oozing after their operation in 1776; the operation which amputated the United States from the British Empire, and set America free.

These Pilgrims, being unfamiliar with the surgery of 1776, evidently do not realize that Canada joined to the United States will prove an equally efficient hemostat to stop this hemorrhage in the British Empire. The American Pilgrims no doubt fear this most sensible measure, because it might antagonize the noble and wealthy in the English Government and the Bank of England so much that they will pack up and leave for home. Such exodus might also prove inconvenient to our idle, wealthy, and charming ladies and their parents, when in their crusade to obtain a new or slightly used husband to hang on their family tree, they find it necessary to embark for Palestine to satisfy their family ambition. It is this and more that the Americans must fight to counteract the propaganda which is now disseminated throughout the country and in our daily press, in order to save America for the Americans.

Many of the members of these groups are ignorant of the real purpose of these organizations and their influence in our political life. Some of the members are so blinded by the glamour and the exclusiveness of these clubs that they do not realize that in supporting their activities they betray America. I now quote from the annual meetings of the Pilgrims, held in New York, 1913 and 1934:

[The Pilgrims, New York. Addresses delivered at dinner in celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Pilgrims of the United States, New York, Tuesday, the 4th of February, 1913, at the Waldorf-Astoria, 1913]

(Hon. Joseph H. Choate, president of the Pilgrims and chairman of the evening, on rising and rapping for order, is roundly cheered and toasted by the members and guests assembled.)

Mr. CHOATE. I am going to ask you, in the first place, to rise, as you did just now for a much less worthy object, when I propose the loyal toasts. I ask you to fill your glasses and rise and drink to the President of the United States and his Majesty, the King of England. (The toast was drunk with great enthusiasm, cheering and singing The Star-Spangled Banner and God Save the King.)

Before the chairman could resume, a delegation of members, consisting of Messrs. F. Cunliffe-Owen, R. A. C. Smith, Herbert Noble, George W. Burleigh, Lawrence L. Gillespie, and George Gray Ward, presented Mr. Choate with a large and beautiful gold and silver salver, richly decorated and suitably inscribed, Mr. Cunliffe-Owen addressing him as follows:

"Mr. Choate, your brother Pilgrims making you the offering herewith of the Pilgrim fare, bread and salt—bread signifying long life and prosperity and salt to ward off from you all evil spirits and every kind of harm—and we ask you, our honored president, in the name of all our brother Pilgrims of the United States, to accept this gold and silver salver as a memento of the occasion."

Mr. CHOATE. I accept the salver with profound gratitude, and I will eat the fare on some more suitable occasion. It will doubtless do for me all that you wish and foretell, but never having until this moment heard of this munificent and wholly undeserved gift, I can only now express to you my warm thanks and high appreciation of your kindness.

I now read to you a message from the President of the United States:

WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D. C., February 4, 1913.

Please extend to the Pilgrims of the United States and their guests at their tenth anniversary my hearty greetings and my

best wishes for a delightful reunion. I am unable to be with you, but I cherish the earnest hope that your gathering may emphasize the cordial relations which we know exist between Briton and Canadian and American.

WM. H. TAFT.

A message from His Majesty the King:

LONDON, February 4, 1913.

I am commanded to convey to the Pilgrims of the United States, celebrating their tenth anniversary, the expression of His Majesty's gratitude for their kind and friendly sentiments contained in your telegram of this evening.

PRIVATE SECRETARY.

A message from Her Majesty, Queen Alexandra, one of the best friends we ever had on the other side of the water:

"I am commanded by Queen Alexandra to ask you to convey to Ex-Ambassador Choate and the members of the Pilgrims of the United States, now celebrating their tenth anniversary under His Excellency's presidency, Her Majesty's sincere thanks for the kind sentiments expressed in the telegram which Her Majesty has just received, sentiments which I am to assure the Pilgrims are much valued by Her Majesty.

"DIGHTON PROBYN."

Now, gentlemen, it remains for me to say a few words, and a few words only. I think, if I continue in this office many years, I may make longer speeches, but I will begin with something very brief and very pertinent. I am a year younger than I was a year ago when you did me the honor to elect me your president, and if I go on, as I hope to do, and as I hope you will do, I shall be a very young man at last.

We are here to celebrate ourselves and our friends on both sides of the water, and among them the best friends that I have ever known—and I knew well their sentiments some years ago, which I believe have continued and which I believe are not well represented in the heart of his present Majesty—I will tell you, in the first place, that King Edward VII, and his Queen Alexandra were two of the most constant and devoted friends that the people of the United States ever had. They lost no occasion to manifest their good will to their kindred in America, and his present Majesty King George V was always most cordial, most friendly, and most determined, so far as I could judge from the sentiments that he expressed—most determined, I say—that the cordial relations between the two countries which have now been transmitted to him by his father should forever continue. We have no difficulty with the royal family. We have no difficulty and never have had that I know of with the people of England. The people of England and the people of the United States are always friendly to each other. Now and then the governments of the two countries come to different conclusions for a brief time on some subject of mutual interest.

It is 10 years since this organization was founded and they have been 10 years of success and constantly advancing prosperity, and, so far as I can understand, of constantly strengthened good will between the people of the two countries. And what I claim for the Pilgrims is that they have done their fair share on both sides of the water to promote this great interest in the world, the preservation of peace between the two countries that combine all the English-speaking people of mankind.

It was not my good fortune to be present when this society was founded in America on the 4th day of February 1903, but I had had the good fortune to be present in London, 6 months before, when the Pilgrims of Great Britain held their first dinner, under the presidency of that grand old soldier and royal hero, Field Marshal Lord Roberts. He believes in making his nation a great fighting nation, but not to fight against the United States. He would consider it the most barbarous, the most unnatural, the most unthinkable contest that ever could be raised. Let me read to you a dispatch from Field Marshal Lord Roberts, which is much better than anything I can say:

"Greatly touched by the Pilgrims' charming and hospitable invitation. There is none I would sooner accept, but unfortunately it is quite impossible for me to be with you on February 4. So sincerely wish it were otherwise. All prosperity to the American Pilgrims."

And from Lord Charles Beresford, who was with us at the foundation of the Pilgrims in England:

"All good luck to Pilgrims. Congratulations on brilliant success of efforts to bring together two great English-speaking nations."

Now, gentleman, that is the object, and the sole object that I know of, that this flourishing society has—the sole reason for its existence; to promote good will, good fellowship, abiding friendship and everlasting peace between the United States and Great Britain. And, for one, I have no fear of failure.

We are now entering upon the celebration of the one hundredth year of peace between the two nations. In 2 years more that celebration will be complete. It is going on all the time, from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month. You will hardly hear so much of anything else for a long time to come. Well, how has it been accomplished? How is it that we have been able to keep the peace, notwithstanding the alarming controversies that have arisen from time to time, controversies which between any other two great nations would probably have provoked and resulted in war? Why, it is because, in the long run, in the main, the people of the two countries are one. They are united in sentiments and in the general object they have in view and in their valuation of things that go to make civilization. We might have fought a dozen wars in the last hundred years, but we have

kept the peace always. And how is it? How has it been done? Why, as I believe, it has been accomplished by the preservation on both sides of absolute good faith in their dealings and in ultimate fidelity to the promises that they have made to each other. I do not mean to say that they have not quarreled. They have quarreled many times, and sometimes not a little sharply.

They have threatened very much on both sides—much more than you will ever hear them do again; but every quarrel has ended in reconciliation, in peace established either by diplomacy or by arbitration—arbitration, the great boast and glory of America.

We have a little difference just now, but I do not look upon it as half as serious as the differences that have arisen in former times, 10, 20, 40, 50, 75, 100 years ago, and there is nothing in it that cannot be readily settled upon the principle of adherence on both sides to the doctrine, to the principle, of good faith and of honest dealing with one another.

I had something to do with the negotiation of the treaty which has formed—I won't say a bone of contention, because I haven't heard anything like the gnawing of bones; not at all—but this little difference that has arisen.

It so happened that that negotiation was carried on in London for several weeks between Lord Pauncefoot and myself and approved, as we went along by John Hay and by Lord Lansdowne. Well, if there ever were two men who deserved the gratitude of their respective nations and each of the other's nation, it was those two men, Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefoot, for their perfectly plain, perfectly honest, perfectly straightforward, method of dealing with one another.

Their principle, their rule of action, was to say what they meant and to mean what they said, and their effort was always to express in perfectly plain English what both had equally in his own mind; and when they said, as they did say in that treaty that the ships of all nations shall have free passage on equal terms through the canal without any discrimination whatever, they thought they were using plain English. And I must say, now that both of these great men and diplomatists have passed away—I must say, as the survivor of them both, that they lived and died without believing or suspecting that their words were capable of any other than the plain meaning that they bore upon their face.

Well, but the wit of man passeth all understanding, and different meanings have been discovered for those very plain and simple words, and thus a difference has arisen as to the interpretation of a treaty. And how are you going to adjust and settle that difference?

Well, I should say, as any gentlemen would settle differences that they could not adjust which had arisen between them—refer it to some other gentleman; and my first proposition would be to refer it to the Pilgrims on both sides of the water. We would not have any difficulty. In the first place, we would take a secret vote, if you please, separately on both sides of the water. We would let our brother Pilgrims of Great Britain answer the question—try their hand at this little puzzle; it is only a puzzle—the question is how to put it together. Let them give their answer first and seal it up, not communicate it to us, and then let these 500 law-abiding, country-loving American Pilgrims answer the question for themselves by another sealed and secret vote.

Now, the people of this country are not going to allow anybody—any Congress, any Government, any President—to break their good faith which they have pledged to the mother country. How are we going to maintain the peace for the next 100 years? These English-speaking people are going to increase on this side of the water in the next hundred years from one hundred millions to four or five hundred millions, and England and her dominions across the seas will increase in like proportion. How are they going to keep the peace. There is only one way. It is by keeping their word, by keeping their good faith, by being always honest in their dealings with one another. So I am not afraid. This little puzzle will be adjusted. I hope that Mr. Bryce will stay here long enough to settle it with Mr. Taft. We know both are great lovers of peace. If not settled by them, why other men—I won't say equally good; I won't say equally good, although I may think so—other men will arise in their places and settle it, and then we shall have 10 years of balm and delightful peace, and then some other question will arise and the puzzle solvers on both sides of the Atlantic will put their heads together and it will be settled, and so again and again and again and again, and our great-grandchildren celebrating in 2013 the second centenary of the Pilgrims, will have cause to bless their fathers that they founded this society and kept the world on the right track.

Now, gentlemen, I have read to you the various messages that we have received from our very eminent friends across the water and at Washington, and we did hope to have with us tonight His Excellency the British Ambassador, but I suspect that he has eaten as many dinners as he could stand—his secretary nods assent—and no man can stand the public dinner every night. I was never able to do it myself. And so we have the pleasure of welcoming here tonight as the representative of Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador, the counselor—I call him counselor—I do not know whether he exactly likes to be called counselor, for they might think he is a counselor-at-law, instead of, as he is in fact the first secretary of the British Embassy, and I call upon him to give us his message from Mr. Bryce. I have the pleasure of presenting to you Mr. Mitchell Innes, Counselor of the British Embassy at Washington.

263553—19504

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to read the speeches given by the American members of the Pilgrims, for they, like all converts, and more un-American and pro-English than the British themselves.

The address of Joseph H. Choate is an example of Anglophile, pertinent at this time in view of the conditions that exist today. I shall now requote some of these statements in order to show how deceptive they can be. Mr. Choate states:

We have no difficulty and never have had that I know of with the people of England.

A statement that is perfectly true, because the people of England have little or nothing to say in the British Government. Our trouble has been with the British Government, which has never at any time been friendly toward the United States—but the gentleman did not make such statement. Furthermore, it is well to note the servile attitude of the speaker to the Crown of England, and his praise of the rulers, which again is perfectly all right, yet he has failed in his speech as others have in theirs, to say one good word for the Government of the United States. He then goes on to say:

The people of England and the people of the United States are always friendly to each other; another statement which no one can criticize, but to which I want to add that the people of all countries—the common people—have always been and are now friendly to each other. If war depended upon them there would be no war. The trouble lies with the rulers of the different governments. It is they who advocate war; war of destruction, not only of property and human life but of Christian civilization itself.

So in view of this, let us remember that no country has been at war so much as England and no country has brought about more misfortune and suffering than the British Government. This should be clear as we review the early history of our own colonies, of India, Ireland, and the 400,000,000 opium addicts in China, all of which may be charged to the greed of the British Government. Mr. Choate, in making his statements, spoke for the people of the United States, when in reality he should have hesitated even to speak for himself. His sole concern appeared to have been our friendliness toward Great Britain, but not their friendliness toward us; and again he placed the United States in the position of a suppliant to the British throne.

Mr. Choate then referred to a dispute which arose in regard to the passage of ships through the Panama Canal, and intimated that it was the understanding of Hon. John Hay and Lord Lansdowne that the British should have equal rights with us in the use of this Canal; a right which the British have never conceded to the United States in the Suez Canal. We have even been driven out of foreign markets by England for many, many years, and in her wars she has brazenly furnished us with a blacklist of firms with which we are not supposed to trade; and we, like fools, comply with her demands.

Continuing his discussion on this topic, Mr. Choate expressed himself as being quite willing to leave the decision of the Panama Canal in the hands of the British and American pilgrims, which anyone can readily understand would be a one-sided decision; i. e., all for England and nothing for the United States.

Mr. Choate then makes his most extraordinary statement, upon which every Member of Congress and the people of this Nation should ponder—particularly in view of the happenings since 1912:

Now the people of this country are not going to allow anybody—any Congress, any government, any President—to break the good faith which they have pledged to the mother country.

In making this statement, Mr. Choate takes the position that Great Britain or England is our mother country; the same position that was taken by Cecil Rhodes over 50 years ago and by Andrew Carnegie in 1893, when he wrote a book entitled, "Triumphant Democracy."

I want you to note particularly that this was in 1913, and that 1913 was the very year we changed our Government

from a republic to a semidemocracy; the year in which we destroyed constitutional government, international security, and paved the road for us to become a colony of the British Empire. It was also the same year in which we, by adopting the Federal Reserve Act, placed our Treasury under the control and domination of the Bank of England and the international banking groups that are now financing the British-Israel movement in the United States. It was also the year preceding the World War; a war in which we became involved, as everyone knows, in 1917, but what everyone does not know is that we were committed to this war in 1910, and were to all intents and purposes in the war in 1914, when J. P. Morgan & Co. began to finance the Triple Entente. This statement is borne out by Mr. J. P. Morgan's own testimony before the Senate committee investigating the munitions industry.

Mr. Choate was, therefore, right, because nothing has stopped, not even Congress, the destruction of this Republic and its gradual incorporation into the British Empire through the efforts of the many subversive and pro-English groups, led and directed, as I have said, by the British-Israel movement.

Let me now quote a message sent by George T. Wilson, chairman of the American Pilgrims, to his brother Pilgrims in London, when they celebrated our entry into the World War. This message states the real hopes and the purpose of the Pilgrims:

SIR HARRY E. BRITTAIN,
Chairman (London):

I should like to read two cables which have arrived within the last few minutes from New York. The first is from our good friends and fellow members, the Pilgrims of America, and it reads as follows:

"At last the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes are nailed to the same staff not to come down until the job is done. Our boys in khaki are anxious to rub shoulders with yours in France and share your struggle and your triumph in freedom's cause. The Pilgrims' dream of 15 years at length has come to pass. (Signed) George T. Wilson, Chairman." [Loud cheers.]

I shall now quote a speech delivered by Nicholas Murray Butler, to a meeting of the Pilgrims in New York, in 1934:

ANNUAL PILGRIM MEETING, 1934

President BUTLER. You have before you the report of your committee on nominations proposing the names of seven gentlemen for election to the executive committee, their terms to expire in the year 1935. Are there other nominations?

Mr. CHARLES H. WARREN. I move that the secretary cast one ballot for the names mentioned in the report of the nominating committee. The motion was seconded.

President BUTLER. It has been regularly moved and seconded that the secretary be instructed to cast one ballot for the names mentioned in the report of the nominating committee. This requires a unanimous vote. So many as are in favor will please say "aye"; contrary-minded, "nay," if any. The vote being unanimous, the secretary is so empowered.

Secretary CHURCH. Mr. President, I report I have so cast a ballot.

President BUTLER. The secretary reports that he has cast a ballot for the gentlemen named in the report of the nominating committee. Therefore, Mr. Burleigh, Mr. Darrell, Mr. Demorest, Mr. Lamont, Mr. Noble, Mr. Satterlee, and Mr. Shields are elected to the executive committee, terms to expire in 1935.

Fellow pilgrims, let me first recall to mind the fact that Sunday was the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of that distinguished and beloved American, linked with Great Britain, who served so long as our president, Joseph H. Choate. In the presence of that anniversary and in your presence, I salute his memory and bear tribute to the service which his years on earth rendered to the great cause which we have so much at heart.

There have been happenings in the year 1931 so grave, so far reaching in their importance, and so massive in their historic interest that it is no slight task to make choice among them of those of which it is permissible to speak in your presence for a few moments this afternoon. Let me first, however, pay tribute to that splendid spirit of the British people which in time of storm and stress, of national embarrassment and portending danger, enabled them, in accordance with the best ideals of the race, to put aside and behind all partisan differences and all prejudices of party affiliation and to unite in that most impressive demonstration which they gave at the last general election. That spirit was voiced by Mr. Snowden on the floor of the House of Commons in the stirring words which he quoted from Swinburne's famous ode:

"Come the world against her,
England yet shall stand!"

[Applause.]
263553—19504

It was not only a magnificent exhibition of political capacity and political power, but it might well be an example to other peoples on this earth, facing problems such as those which are before mankind today, to forget their superficial and often artificial differences and to unite all their power and all their patriotism to solve their great problems solely in the interests of the nation and of the world. Great Britain has shown that it can be done.

I recall that a year ago it occurred to me to say something on this occasion of the movement going on to bring into existence a British commonwealth of nations, a new form of political organization to take the place of the centuries-old organization of the British Empire. I invited your attention to the fact that that movement was going forward, more Anglicana, informally, quietly, illogically, under the pressure of opportunity in events and without any formal or public announcement. During the year, however, without the world paying much attention, and hardly noticed in these United States, that movement, which has been under way for the better part of a generation, came to its climax and has now been formally written into the public law of Great Britain.

I hold in my hand the few printed pages which constitute the State of Westminster, 1931 (see appendix 2), beyond question the most important act in public law since the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. This statute, covering but three or four printed pages, contains three specific provisions which are its essence and which I should like to emphasize.

First, what is to be a dominion?

The expression "dominion" is to mean the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, the Irish Free State, and Newfoundland, six dominions in all.

What is to be the relation of local self-government in each of those dominions to the British Parliament? The Statute of Westminster reads:

"No law and no provision of any law made after the commencement of this act by the parliament of a dominion shall be void or inoperative on the ground that it is repugnant to the law of England, or to the provisions of any existing or future act of Parliament of the United Kingdom or to any order, rule, or regulation made under any such act, and the powers of the parliament of the dominion shall include the power to repeal or amend any such act, order, rule, or regulation insofar as the same is part of the law of the dominion."

In other words, absolute legislative self-control is devolved by the Parliament of Great Britain, where that control has rested for 800 years, upon the parliaments respectively of the six Dominions.

What certainty and security have these dominions that their local self-government shall be permanent and complete?

The Statute of Westminster reads:

"No act of Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the commencement of this act shall extend, or be deemed to extend, to a Dominion as part of the law of that Dominion unless it is expressly declared in that act that that Dominion has requested, and consented to, the enactment thereof."

Those three brief paragraphs, I repeat, are the most important contribution to the public law of the world made since the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. They introduce into the government of mankind a new form of federal relationship, not a federal relationship such as exists between our own States and the Federal Government, but a federal relationship which consists in loyalty and devotion to a person who is the symbol of unity; but the legislation power is as multifarious as the Dominions. The British people consciously, after 25 years of discussion and experimentation, have formulated this great statute, enacted it into law without dissent, and have started this new ship of state out on the sea of human political experience. I submit, my fellow pilgrims, that that is so stupendous a happening and so amazing an achievement that we would do well to pause for a moment to remark upon it. Let me say two things about it in addition, and you will pardon a word of personal reminiscence.

In June and July 1921 the Imperial Conference was sitting in London, and the sort of question which underlay this movement was uppermost in the minds of the conferees. There were other delegates to the conference, but the Prime Ministers of the several Dominions as now defined and the Prime Minister in the Government of Great Britain itself were, of course, the leading personalities. Mr. Lloyd George was Prime Minister. He did me the honor to ask me to come to Chequers for the week end to meet these gentlemen and to hear them discuss the problem of the possibility of a British Commonwealth of Nations.

They spent the whole of Saturday, and Saturday evening, and all of Sunday until luncheon under the trees and in the library at Chequers discussing informally and familiarly and with profound knowledge and that grasp which only comes from experience, the problems that were before them. There was the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Meighen. There was General Smuts from the Union of South Africa. There was the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Hughes. There was the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Mr. Massey, and there were two representatives from the Government of India, the Maharajah of Cutch and Mr. Srinivasa Sastry of Madras.

It was my privilege and good fortune to be questioned by these gentlemen as to the working of our own Federal system. In

particular, they wished illustrations of what happened when there was conflict of authority and of jurisdiction. They pointed out that we had in our great cities officers of the Federal Government. How did they operate without inducing conflict of authority and feeling with the State and municipal officials? How were these almost invisible lines of administrative power kept from overlapping and from friction? What was the function of the courts? What the limit, if any, of their authority? I assure you it was no small pleasure and pride to be able to answer questions to that distinguished and influential group as to how a different form of the federal principle had been operating for more than a century and a half in the United States.

Finally, when the luncheon hour came on Sunday, and these informal discussions were brought to an end, Mr. Lloyd Green turned the conversation into lighter vein and called attention to the fact that it was fortunate indeed that their minds were meeting, that the words British Commonwealth of Nations were beginning to be used by them, and that the day was Sunday. A benediction, as it were, upon their efforts!

"Yes," I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, but if you will pardon an American, there is something more important than that. Tomorrow will be the Fourth of July." [Laughter.]

By pure accident they had brought their discussion of the reorganization of the British Empire and its Dominions to a conclusion at the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence [laughter], surely an interesting coincidence.

One thing more. We do not realize, my fellow Pilgrims, the foresight of our own fathers, how far those nation-builders saw into the future, and what an amazing grasp they had upon the fundamentals of political life and social organization. I sometimes think we are in the habit of taking them too much for granted.

There is on exhibition in this city today one of the two existing signed copies (the other being in the Record Office in London) of a document which in American history stands in importance and significance side by side with the Declaration of Independence itself, and probably not one American in a million has ever heard of its existence. That is the paper which John Adams called the Olive Branch Petition. (See Appendix.) That petition was presented to King George III in July 1775, over the signatures of 46 Members of the Continental Congress, praying for precisely the relationship which the statute of Westminster has written into public law, the public law of England, for the Dominions. And who signed it? The first name is the name which stands at the head of the signers of the Declaration of Independence a year later, John Hancock. Among the 46 names are those of Samuel Adams, John Adams, Roger Sherman, John Jay, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, and Thomas Jefferson. Washington did not sign because he was in command of the troops in Massachusetts, and the Congress was meeting in Philadelphia. Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill had been fought. And this very proposal, which 160 years afterward has been worked out in the life of the British peoples, were presented to them by the signers of the Declaration of Independence a year before they signed that Declaration as the alternative step. It is one of the most extraordinary things in the history of government, and we pay little or no attention to it.

What happened? The Olive Branch Petition was sent to England by the hands of William Penn's grandson. He was to take it to the Government. For weeks he could not be received. Finally he was received, not by his Majesty, but by the Colonial Office, and was then told that inasmuch as the petition had not been received on the throne, no answer would be given. As John Adams had said, "We have the olive branch in one hand and the sword in the other." When the olive branch was rejected, recourse was had to the sword, and these very same men in 12 months signed the Declaration of Independence and history took its course.

It is one of the most astounding things in the history of government that these men off in this distant series of colonies, economically in their infancy, financially helpless and dependent, had the vision of organization which has come now to all the British peoples, and for which surely every Pilgrim wishes the very greatest possible measure of success. [Applause.]

So it is, gentlemen, in the history of our race. Ideas, how slowly they travel, arguments, how slowly they are apprehended; action, how slowly it follows upon conviction! To be sure, as we look back we can see that these 46 members of the Continental Congress were in advance of the opinion of the world. British opinion could not at that time have accepted that course of action. They could not think in terms of a parliament whose legislative authority ended at the island shores. Therefore, revolution, independence, separate nationhood, were of the essence of the great undertaking, and so they happened. But in the intervening years a lesson has been learned by all, by the Motherland and its captains of the mind, by the Dominions and those who speak their voice, and now with great fortune and wisdom they have in the Statute of Westminster written into the public law the principles of the Olive Branch Petition of 1775. [Applause.]

Let me only add that this great principle of federation of one kind or another is the principle which is to mark the life of nations in the days that are to come. Those that are of like race and faith, that have similar economic habits and interests, that have a common language, they will tend more and more to group themselves into units as our United States of America have done. The British Commonwealth of Nations will, perhaps, be the only one of its type because Great Britain is the only far-flung empire

which has gone out for 500 years and put its hand on the distant places of the earth for their enrichment, their betterment, and their increasing civilization. Other proud and powerful and ambitious nations will find ways and means, without losing their independence, their self-control, or limiting their pride, to bring themselves into new economic units for cooperation, enrichment, and the benefit and satisfaction of all their peoples.

This principle of international cooperation, in one form or another, whether it be our form, whether it be the British form, or whether it be the forms which are slowly coming on the continent of Europe, that is the principle which we may look forward to as guiding and shaping the life of the world for the next century or more. But as we Pilgrims look particularly at our own field of historic interest and affection, surely we may in the dark year of 1931 take profound pride and satisfaction in remarking the significance, the far-reaching importance, of this Statute of Westminster and the prophecy of it by our own nation-builders in July 1775.

The audience arose and applauded.

Mr. Speaker, I have included Mr. Butler's address, in order to show how far we have drifted toward this British union. In this speech, you will note he brings out the fact that the olive branch petition has now been adopted by England and extended to her colonies. He further intimates that in view of this adoption, it is now in order for us to join the British Empire. He makes the further statement that this movement has gone Anglican, or more English, which is quite true, for we are just about on the verge of capitulating to the forces which are driving us into the British Empire. To show this, let me quote:

That petition was presented to King George III in July 1775, over the signatures of 46 members of the Continental Congress, praying for precisely the relationship which the Statute of Westminster has written into public law, the public law of England, for the Dominions.

I recall that a year ago it occurred to me to say something on this occasion of the movement going on to bring into existence a British Commonwealth of Nations, a new form of political organization to take the place of the centuries-old organization of the British Empire. I invited your attention to the fact that that movement was going forward, more Anglican, informally, quietly, illogically, under the pressure of opportunity in events and without any formal or public announcement. During the year, however, without the world paying much attention, and hardly noticed in these United States, that movement, which has been under way for the better part of a generation, came to its climax and has now been formally written into the public law of Great Britain.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part III

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

PAMPHLET BY JOHN J. WHITEFORD

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a pamphlet by John J. Whiteford. This pamphlet should be of interest to every Member of Congress because it deals with a subject that will soon confront us, as it did in 1917:

SIR UNCLE SAM, KNIGHT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(By John J. Whiteford)

In these days of national and international confusion and conflict there is one issue on which the American people are substantially in agreement—We do not want war.

This great desire to keep out of war is perfectly logical. We know the cost of war from bitter experience. We are no more responsible for the outbreak of the present hostilities than we were in 1914. We are not an aggressor nation and we have no designs on foreign territory. We have nothing to gain and much to lose if we again take part in foreign wars. We have enough vital problems at home that require all of our attention and efforts. When and if the time should ever arrive, we shall be fully able and willing to defend our shores against foreign invasion.

There are, indeed, a thousand-and-one good reasons why we should stay out of foreign wars.

With all the self-evident advantages of peace for America as against the horrors of war in Europe and Asia, and with an overwhelming majority of our people against war, there still remains the ominous fact that there is a definite danger of this country drifting toward war. Even as in 1914, we are again being deluged and directed by foreign propaganda, only to a much larger extent. Again we have no clear understanding of the real issues involved. In our confusion we are again taking sides, mentally so far, but that is a ripe condition for expert foreign propagandists to lead us toward active participation in the present conflicts.

I would like to say to every American, "There is only one side we can take, and that is the American side." With this in mind, let us try to find out what are the real facts behind these foreign-made conflicts, what are the basic issues at stake, and what are the forces that are so desperately working to again involve the United States in a world war. Only by facing facts and by clearing our minds from the fog of selfish foreign propaganda can we arrive at the right answer to the question, "What is best for America?"

For all our so-called civilization, the impelling force behind the present struggles in Europe and in Asia is still the law of the jungle—the survival of the fittest. Whether we like to admit it or not, that same force guided the early settlers of New England and Virginia when they had to fight for their very existence in a strange and hostile land where they were not invited. In the conquest of this new continent our forefathers proved themselves the strongest—the fittest—and the original owners, the Indians, lost. Only by the process of applying their superior fitness could our ancestors have built themselves a new home, gained their independence, and created a rich and powerful nation. We, as their descendants, stand ready to defend our country with all our might if ever the time should come when we are called upon to show our fitness to "have and to hold" what we have gained.

The struggle of the building of America is only one example of the struggle of mankind since the beginning. The greatest example of all time is the building of the greatest empire in history—the British Empire—covering roughly one-fourth of the world's land surface and inhabited by a quarter of the world's population.

When we speak of the British Empire we must bear in mind a much larger picture than just 13,300,000 square miles of land and 500,000,000 people. It is a huge international institution of world production, consumption, and distribution, with all the related activities of commerce, finance, shipping, industry, and so forth. This vast undertaking is not limited to the geographical borders of the Empire. Its influence extends to every part of the globe, from Hong Kong to Durbin, from Gibraltar to Cairo, from Singapore to Aden, from Melbourne to Montreal, from Bombay to Bermuda, from London everywhere.

The very vastness of the British Empire and its operations constitutes a constant danger to itself and to the peace of the world. Whenever any other nation feels the urge to expand, for whatever reasons and in whatever direction, it automatically comes in conflict with the broad interests of the British Empire.

In the Orient the Sino-Japanese conflict is not only a local matter between China and Japan. It is in reality a threat to British interests in China; to British "concessions" in China; to the huge British investments in China; to British control of Chinese railways and revenues; to British trade and shipping and even to the British port of Hong Kong in China. It is a blow to British prestige and power in the Orient, with repercussions throughout the world. It is actually a challenge to the British Empire. It brought from Britain a cry of outraged justice while at the same time she tried to deposit the Sino-Japanese problem into the lap of the United States.

When Italy marched into Ethiopia, Britain again became highly indignant. This was not because of a profound love for the Ethiopians nor because Ethiopia might bring Italy great wealth. If Ethiopia had really been very valuable, that country could have been, and probably would have been, annexed to the British Empire long ago. The real reason for Britain's agitation was the fact that Italy dared challenge British power in the Mediterranean and endanger British control of the vital Suez Canal regions.

The Treaty of Versailles was in reality an instrument for the permanent elimination of Germany as a world competitor of Great Britain. For years after its signing the Germany people chafed under this yoke, to the point where, defeated and discouraged, Germany became dangerously close to becoming a communist soviet republic. Gradually German leadership took hold and pulled the people out of their spirit of defeatism and, as the pendulum swings, so has Germany again become a menace to Great Britain.

The great bear of Russia is also a definite threat to the British Empire, with its communistic paws uncomfortably close to the Balkan and Suez Canal countries, to India and Burma, and already resting heavily upon a large section of China.

Today, denuded of all propaganda, there is only one fundamental issue behind all the conflict in Europe and Asia—the survival of the British Empire. That was also the real issue of the World War. It is the old challenge of Napoleon.

The most important international question before the people of this country and of the world is whether Great Britain can continue indefinitely to defend herself and her empire against all comers, singly or in combination, and prove her fitness to "have and to hold" her dominant world position. Therein also lies the key to the problem whether America may or may not again be drawn into a world war.

It seems to me that the answer to the above question is definite and indisputable—Britain cannot win a major war in Europe and Asia without the active assistance of the most powerful of all nations, the United States. In their own interest the people of this country will have to make up their minds, soon and soberly and without being influenced by undue sentiment, whether America shall continue to gamble with her youth and her treasure to help defend the British Empire in every new crisis, or whether there are saner and better ways of insuring the peace of the world.

Today the greatest single menace to the peace of the United States is the same as in 1914. It can be summed up in one word—propaganda. Even as today, this country was neutral at the beginning of the World War and managed to stay out of it from 1914 until 1917. But during that time the foreign propaganda machines were working overtime to get us involved in a war that was decidedly not of our making. Finally, on April 6, 1917, America declared war on Germany and so became an active ally of Britain. In addition to the United States, the other allies were Belgium, Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Panama, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Serbia, and Siam. It is true that some of the Allies, like the United States, were active only during part of the war period while others were little more than benevolent bystanders. But against this powerful combination the group of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria held out for more than 4 years, from August 1914 until November 1918, and the German group might have won the war but for the entrance of America into the conflict.

In the present crisis the only active allies of Britain are, so far, the British Empire units and France. If the conflict should spread into another world war Britain cannot again count on her former combination of allies; in fact, it is more than likely that some of these countries will be lined up against her. Therefore, the most powerful ally of all, the United States, must be kept in line by Britain against eventualities. That can only be accomplished through propaganda. And the British are past masters in the art of making gullible Americans swallow the bait of persuasive propaganda.

Few Americans realize the magnitude of British influence in this country. When I write frankly on this subject I fully understand that I lay myself open to the accusation of favoring Britain's enemies. That is not at all the case. I am only following the single track of being pro-American, and I would be grateful to any critics if they would join me on that straight road. I clearly see the menace of all subversive movements, as well as the great necessity of combating all these un-American activities. The point is that, in our justified agitation over communism, nazism, and fascism, we are overlooking another subversive movement that has actually proven to be more destructive to our peace and welfare. In the past it has been largely responsible for drawing this country into the World War at a cost of thousands of our young men and billions of dollars and a long period of depression. It does not work openly and it is not generally recognized by the public. It does not yell from soap boxes in Union Square, call strikes, picket, or hold parades. It operates from the top down and so it reaches into every stratum of American life. It is the far-reaching power of British propaganda to make this country subservient to the interests of Great Britain and the British Empire.

The scene is a banquet held at the Hotel Plaza, New York City, October 25, 1939. This banquet was given by the Pilgrim Society of America in honor of the Marquess of Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States. It is an old custom of the American Pilgrims to extend this honor to every newly appointed British Ambassador, the same as the British Pilgrims invite every new American Ambassador to their midst at a banquet in London.

There are several curious things about these Pilgrim functions. In the first place there is present at these dinners an array of notables such as it would be difficult to bring together under one roof for any other purpose and by any other society. The Lothian dinner was no exception. Presiding over this affair was Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and chairman of the American Pilgrim Society. Among the guests were John D. Rockefeller and J. P. Morgan, Thomas W. Lamont and other members of the House of Morgan, Frank L. Polk, Jeremiah Milbank, James W. Gerard (former American ambassador to Germany), the French Ambassador to the United States, Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum, U. S. A., Maj. Gen. John G. Harbord (chairman of the Radio Corporation of America), the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, and many other leading figures in government, diplomacy, politics, finance, banking, shipping, law, industry, insurance, and education. These men had come especially to honor Lord Lothian and to hear him speak. Before this important audience Lord Lothian's speech could not merely be a light after-dinner talk of clever stories and witticisms. It was an important speech and as such it was carried by the New York Times as front-page news.

As a highly experienced publicist, Lord Lothian opened his remarks with the naive statement that his country has no propaganda in America; that he would merely explain his country's position. The "explanation of his country's position" developed into the same old theme of most British statesmen, writers, lecturers, publicists, and other trumpeters for Anglo-American unity. It can be summed up in one stereotyped formula: "For your own good and for the good of the world, these two great democracies, the British Empire and the United States, must stick together." What this plea to America

really amounts to is this: "We have the largest empire in the world. Never mind how we got it. The trouble is that we may not be able to hang on to it much longer. America is rich and powerful and wants no more additional territory. You should help us out whenever we get into trouble so that we can continue to enjoy what we have."

Lord Lothian practically confirmed that message when he wrote in *Foreign Affairs*, 1936:

"The situation of the last century cannot be re-created by Great Britain alone. She is not strong enough. But the United States, the South American republics, and the nations of the modern British Commonwealth could together re-create it. * * * They also are both democratic and territorially satisfied * * *"

And the morning after the Pilgrim dinner a front-page headline in the *New York Times* read: "Lothian asks unity in democratic aims."

There is something magnetic about the word "democratic." It is very dear to Americans and it means much to them. Once they even went to war * * * "to make the world safe for democracy." They may again be fooled by an appeal to democracy. Knowing this, it has become a valuable vehicle for foreign propagandists, and its real meaning is lost sight of in the confusion. The Communist Party of America, for instance, has officially adopted democracy in its constitution, in its literature, in speeches, and generally as an appealing propaganda attraction in selling their un-American ideology to the American people. * * * All democratic workers must stick together. It is a favorite theme with the radical labor wing.

And now we witness the weird spectacle of titled British visitors, from ambassadors to platform lecturers, using the same tactics in selling their story. * * * We great democracies must stand together.

What kind of democracy are we asked to adopt and to defend? The un-American brand of Marx, of Engels, of Lenin, of Stalin, of the Communist International. * * * Or the democracy of imperialistic Britain, of India, of Ceylon, of Burma, or Hong Kong, of Africa? * * * The democracy of the soap-box orators of Union Square, or the democracy of the Pilgrim banquets at the best hotels of London and New York?

Or shall we stand by our own conception of democracy, safe under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, which still give us far more genuine personal liberty and opportunity than any other people in any other country of the world? If so, let us not forget that today, more than ever, the price of our liberty is eternal vigilance.

We must keep the bright spotlight of public opinion on all under-cover and un-American activities so that we may learn the truth and act accordingly. And we are entitled to know what the Pilgrim Society is, what it stands for, and who these powerful Pilgrims are that can call out the great to hear a British Ambassador expound to Americans the virtues of a united democratic front.

The Pilgrim Society originated in London, July 11, 1902, as an Anglo-American club of important Englishmen and Americans. An American branch was formed January 13, 1903, at the old Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York. Both societies are commonly known as the Pilgrims.

An extract of the Pilgrim constitution reads:

"The object of the society shall be the promotion of the sentiment of brotherhood among the nations, and especially the cultivation of good fellowship between citizens of the United States and its dependencies and subjects of the British Empire.

"The members shall be citizens of the United States or its dependencies or subjects of the British Empire, and others prominent for their sympathy with the objects of the society, who shall be elected by the executive committee, and membership in the London Pilgrims shall ipso facto constitute membership in the New York society, and vice versa, without additional dues. The membership shall be limited to 900. The number may be altered by the executive committee."

Nothing is more needed in the world than a "sentiment of brotherhood among the nations." Nowhere is the promotion of that sentiment more urgently and desperately needed than in Europe and in Asia. This was so even in 1902. But the group of eminent men who formed the Pilgrim Society in London did not step across the English Channel to hold out the hand of brotherhood to the weary nations of nearby Europe. Instead they preferred to reach out across the Atlantic for the special purpose of cultivating "good fellowship" between leading British and American citizens. This beautiful sentiment rose to a climax in 1917, when thousands of American good fellows crossed the Atlantic to fight other people's battles, and when the United States Treasury opened wide its purse to the Allies and lent them whatever they wanted. Then, indeed, Uncle Sam became the good knight of the British Empire. But when the battle was over—over there—and when the same Uncle Sam timidly suggested repayment of some of the billions of dollars of war debts, he was immediately dubbed "Uncle Shylock" by these same Allies. "Good fellowship" is difficult to define, like friendship, but whatever the definition is it should work both ways.

Who are these good fellows that are so deeply interested in British-American friendship and in "united democracy"? They are none other than the 900 of British-American aristocracy. They represent, as a body, the most powerful combination of men of wealth and influence on both sides of the Atlantic. They, the Pilgrims' membership in America and Great Britain, have included and still include men in the highest position in government, in

diplomacy, in finance, in banking, in education, in the church, in literature, in publishing, in commerce, in industry, in shipping, and in practically all other important fields of national and international activities.

The president of the British Pilgrims is His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, great uncle of the present King. As vice presidents are listed: The Most Reverend His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; the Right Honorable Viscount Hailsham, P. C.; the Lord Desbrough, K. G., G. C. V. O.; Sir Harry E. Brittain, K. C., L. L. B., O. O. C. The membership of the British Pilgrims reads like an index to British leadership.

The president of the Americans Pilgrims is Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University. Dr. Butler has worked long and faithfully with the British. A United Press dispatch from London, December 6, 1939, stated: "In the 1940 edition of the *British Who's Who*, appearing today, the longest biography is that of Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, who occupies more than a column and a half of small print—the equivalent of the combined biographies of Mussolini, Hitler, Prime Minister Chamberlain, and President Roosevelt."

Vice presidents of the New York Pilgrims are: Herbert L. Satterlee (brother-in-law of J. P. Morgan), James W. Gerard, G. C. B. (former American Ambassador to Germany), the Right Reverend James DeWolf Perry, Elihu Root (deceased).

The executive committee of the New York Pilgrims consists of: Thomas W. Lamont, Franklin Q. Brown, George W. Burlingame, John H. Finley, Frederic R. Coudert, Edward F. Darrell, James G. Harbord, K. C. M. G., D. S. M., Theodore Hertzler, the Right Reverend William T. Manning, Gates W. McGarragh, Bryce Metcalf, Frank L. Polk, William Shields, Myron C. Taylor, Harry Edwin Ward, Charles S. Whitman, Owen D. Young.

As honorary members of the New York Pilgrims are listed: H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, K. G., H. R. H. the Duke of York, K. G., the British Ambassador to the United States, His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the Secretary of State of the United States, the British Consul General in New York City.

A few prominent Pilgrim members, past and present, are listed below: J. P. Morgan, Russel Leffingwell, Henry P. Davison, John W. Davis, John D. Rockefeller, Percy Rockefeller, Ogden Mills Reid, Henry Morgenthau, Otto Kahn, Robert Fulton Cutting, James B. Clews, John B. Trevor, William Fellowes Morgan, Henry W. Taft, Adolph Ochs, James Speyer, Charles H. Sabin, Sir Ashley Sparks, George F. Trowbridge, Philip Rhineland, Andrew W. Mellon, Albert H. Wiggin, J. W. Hill, John F. O'Ryan, Frank L. Polk, George R. Goethals, Julius Ochs Adler, Alfred L. Aiken, Herbert L. Aldrich, John Whitney, W. B. Whitney, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Vincent Astor, Julius S. Bache, Robert Low Bacon, Ansell H. Ball, David H. Biddle, Robert W. Bigelow, Irving T. Bush, Newcomb Carlton, Joseph H. Choate, William M. Chadbourne, Walter P. Chrysler, Thomas W. Lamont, George F. Baker, John Bassett Moore, Dwight W. Morrow, George W. Wickersham, John George Milburn, Mortimer L. Schiff, Paul M. Warburg, Paul Outerbridge, Ivy Lee, Chauncey Depew, Charles M. Schwab, Frederic R. Coudert, Marshall Field, Paul D. Cravath, Edward S. Harkness, Oliver Harriman, Edward L. Dodge, Frederick H. Ecker, Harry Harkness Flagler, George L. Genung, Walter S. Gifford, Cass Gilbert, Edwin H. Gould, Duncan William Fraser, Robert Erskine Ely, Harry Alanzo Cushing, Frederick W. Budd, Henry Holt, J. G. White, Henry Johnson Fisher, Edward Herrick Childs, and William Phelps Ely.

The present members in the American Pilgrims, and those who have passed away, represent the leadership of America in many important fields. We find among these a candidate for President of the United States, a Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Attorney General, Ambassadors, Solicitor General, Senators, and Congressmen; presidents of the largest banks and financial institutions; presidents and directors of the United States Steel Corporation, and many other large industrial corporations; of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; of the Radio Corporation of America; of insurance and shipping companies. Here are also to be found the members of the leading law firms serving these banks and industries, as well as the interpreters of international law; editors, publishers, and owners of America's leading newspapers; experts in publicity; social and financial leaders and generally the group of men whose influence is capable of exerting great pressure on government and public opinion.

At the outbreak of the present hostilities in Europe, President Roosevelt expressed himself strongly on the necessity for maintaining our neutrality and he promised to do all within his power to keep this country out of war. That is also the great hope and desire of the American people. The Pilgrims and Dr. Butler disagree with this.

At a dinner in New York, at the Biltmore Hotel, February 9, 1928, in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pilgrims, Dr. Butler said in a speech:

"Among other things the Great War has proved conclusively that in a contest of those colossal proportions there were no neutrals * * * if the world should ever again become engulfed in another titanic struggle there would be and there could be no neutrals."

At this particular dinner, during which Dr. Butler expressed these sentiments so contrary to the real hopes and wishes of the American people, three telegrams were received and read to the celebrating American Pilgrims. One came from the King of England, one from the uncle of the King, and one from the Prince of Wales, the future King, now the Duke of Windsor.

The message from King George V was read by Sir Austin Chamberlain:

"The King has pleasure in congratulating the Pilgrims of the United States on the occasion of their twenty-fifth anniversary, and His Majesty takes this opportunity of conveying to them his good wishes for the future."

The future, according to the Pilgrims, does not include neutrality. The message from the King's uncle, the Duke of Connaught, read: " * * * The cause of promoting cordial friendship between our two great countries is one on which the future happiness of the world in a great measure depends. Ever since I have been president of the British Pilgrims I have realized to the full the success of the work carried on by the two societies with this common object in view."

Here again we have the same old story, whether it comes from an uncle of the King, from a British Ambassador, or from a platform lecturer * * * friendship * * * two great countries * * * common object. Here democracy was not mentioned, nor the promotion of brotherhood among the nations.

The message from the Prince of Wales read: "As a Pilgrim of nearly 9 years' standing, I am very glad to send my brother Pilgrims in New York my warmest congratulations on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the club's inception in the United States. There have been many changes in the world during the past quarter of a century but ties which unite the Pilgrims on each side of the Atlantic remain firm as ever * * *"

(Signed) EDWARD.

The British royal family certainly showed an extraordinary interest in a group of American citizens dining in New York. Since that time tremendous changes have occurred to Edward personally, as well as to the world, but he was right in his prediction that the Pilgrim ties "remain firm as ever."

Since we are dining so excitedly, let us go to London and look at a dinner at the Savoy Hotel, April 12, 1917, of the Pilgrims of London "on the occasion of the entry of the United States into the Great War of Freedom." The guest of honor was His Excellency, the American Ambassador, Walter Hines Page.

The speeches at that dinner gave a clear expression of the "ties that bind" the American Pilgrims to London and confirmed Dr. Butler's conviction that "there were no neutrals" in the World War.

Sir Harry E. Brittain, chairman: "I should like to read two cables which have arrived within the last few minutes from New York. The first is from our good friends and fellow members, the Pilgrims of America, and it reads as follows:

"At last the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes are nailed to the same staff not to come down until the job is done. Our boys in khaki are anxious to rub shoulders with yours in France and share your struggle and your triumph in Freedom's cause. The Pilgrims' dream of 15 years at length has come to pass. (Signed) George T. Wilson, chairman." [Loud cheers.]

"The other message is from one who has been frequently and deservedly called the 'Allies' best friend in America,' that very excellent Pilgrim, James M. Beck. His cable reads:

"Joyous felicitations to the British Pilgrims now assembled to celebrate unity in blood brotherhood of English-speaking races. The day which Prussia did not want has come, when the flags of Great Britain, France, and the United States float together in defense of civilization. All hall the greater Entente which opens a new and more resplendent chapter in the history of our common race. To all who welcomed me so kindly last summer a cordial greeting at this great hour. (Signed) James M. Beck." [Loud and prolonged cheers.] (James M. Beck, prominent attorney, born in Philadelphia; United States attorney for eastern district Pennsylvania; Assistant Attorney General of the United States, 1900-1903; Solicitor General of the United States, 1921-25; Member of Congress, 1937.)

Good fellows, these American Pilgrims, or shall we say British colonials?

The Pilgrims' dream of 15 years turned into a nightmare for our boys in khaki, but the unity in blood brotherhood is still the goal of this one-way friendship between British and American aristocracy.

Viscount Bryce, former British Ambassador to the United States, spoke as chairman of the London Pilgrims. May we never have such a speech again. He said, in part:

"When the United States of America, renouncing the isolation which it had cherished since the days of Washington, obeyed the supreme call of duty and set herself in arms beside the free nations of the world in order to save the future of humanity, she took a step of full solemn significance for all the ages to come.

"And now, gentlemen, what is America going to do in this war? She is already doing what those who know her best expected from her. She waited long enough to be quite satisfied that honor and duty called her to arms. After long forbearance, when she was satisfied that the German Government was resolved to persevere with its barbarous and insulting policy, and that the whole feeling of the Nation had been aroused and concentrated as to be virtually unanimous, then America stepped to the front; then she bared her strong arm; then she began to throw all her resources, all her energy, all her inventive versatility, into the development of every possible means for the vigorous prosecution of the war.

"Gentlemen, America is in the war now for all she is worth [hear, hear] and how much that means those best know who

know America best. [Cheers.] She will persevere to the end, for she knows what a successful end means to the future welfare of the world."

No one knew better than Lord Bryce how much America was worth as an ally of Great Britain. With enormous British hypocrisy he made it appear that America bared her strong arm to save the future of humanity and the welfare of the world, when in reality America came to the assistance of only one-quarter of the world, the British Empire.

Lord Robert Cecil was less diplomatic. Considering that the Pilgrim meetings in London have almost the status of official functions, owing to the important attendance, Lord Cecil overstepped the limits of diplomatic decency when he said at this dinner in honor of the American Ambassador:

"May I add one word about the staff of the American Embassy? [Hear, hear.] Many of us have had personal relations of a very friendly kind with several members of that staff, and they have always preserved the most accurate and correct neutrality in talking with us [laughter] but, somehow or another, after a conversation with an yof them, we went away feeling as one does, after having received a hearty grasp of the hand from a friend and an earnest and heartfelt wish of Godspeed to our cause. [Cheers.]

"Well, gentlemen, neutrality is no longer necessary [hear, hear], and we all say thank God for that." [Hear, hear.]

Dr. Butler was right; there was no neutrality, not even in the American Embassy, before this country went into war. It was a joke to Lord Cecil and the Pilgrims.

The guest of honor, Walter Hines Page, spoke before this London group of British-American notables in his capacity as United States Ambassador to Great Britain, representing the American Government and the American people. He said, in part:

"As for the particular aspects of this great subject with which this club has from its beginning had to do—the closer sympathy of the two branches of the great English-speaking peoples—next to the removal of the great menace to free government, which is the prime purpose of the war, this closer sympathy will be to us the most important result of the victory. It will be important not only to us on each side of the Atlantic, but also to all other free nations."

And then Mr. Page made one of the strangest admissions that any diplomat could make under the circumstances. It is taken from the Pilgrim records as are all these quotations.

"Seven years ago an admiral of our Navy, Rear Admiral Sims, who sits now at this table, declared in the Guildhall that if ever the English race were pressed hard for ships, every ship that the United States had would come to the rescue. A great prophet as well as a great seaman, he has not been rebuked for that on this side of the water. [Cheers.]

"For my part I am stirred to the depths of my nature by this American companionship in arms with the British and their Allies, not only for the quicker ending of the war, but, I hope, for a moral union which will bring a new era in international relations.

"My lords and gentlemen, your generous and great compliment to me by making this large gathering in my honor is your way of expressing appreciation of the action of the Government and people that I represent and of the President at whose high command I have the honor to be among you in these historic and immortal days. I thank you with deep emotion."

It would have been more appropriate for the British to thank Mr. Page, with or without emotion, and to show their appreciation of America's participation in the great war of freedom in a more substantial manner than by getting together an imposing array of British notables for a Pilgrim dinner. It is interesting to note that among those who accepted the invitation of the Pilgrims so to honor Mr. Page were none other than Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill who are now leading another war of freedom, while the British Ambassador to Washington is leading another campaign in this country for unity of democracies.

In the nature of their exclusive membership and activities, the Pilgrims may be termed the wholesale agency for promoting the interests of Britain in this country. It is strictly a Tory organization. The retail outlet is the more widely known English-Speaking Union, which has for its avowed purpose:

"To draw together in the bond of comradeship the English-speaking people of the United States and of the British Empire by (a) disseminating knowledge of each to the other and (b) inspiring reverence for their common institutions."

It is interesting to note that the English-Speaking Union originated in London in the fateful year of 1917, when America bared her strong arm in defense of democracy. Like the Pilgrims, the English-Speaking Union has a British organization with headquarters in London and an American branch with central offices in New York. The purposes of the two organizations are virtually the same and there is an interlocking directorate and membership.

The patron of the English-Speaking Union (London) is His Majesty the King. The honorary president of the American English-Speaking Union is the prominent Pilgrim, John W. Davis, successor to the late Walter Hines Page as America's wartime Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Presidential candidate in 1924, and member of J. P. Morgan & Co. As treasurer of the American English-Speaking Union is listed Harry P. Davison, also a Morgan partner, whose father was instrumental in having J. P. Morgan & Co. appointed exclusive purchasing agents for the British Government in America during the World War. Another director of the English-

Speaking Union is Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America, and also a member of the executive committee of the Pilgrims.

As a valuable retail outlet for British propaganda, the English-Speaking Union of the United States covers this country with branches and correspondents in the following cities: Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Chautauqua, N. Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Des Moines, Iowa; Detroit, Mich.; Grinnell, Iowa; Indianapolis, Ind.; Lake Placid, N. Y.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; Milwaukee, Wis.; New York, N. Y.; Minneapolis, Minn.; New Orleans, La.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Princeton, N. J.; Providence, R. I.; Richmond, Va.; St. Louis, Mo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Diego, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Santa Barbara, Calif.; Savannah, Ga.; Seattle, Wash.; Sewanee, Tenn.; Spokane, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.; Washington, D. C.

The English-Speaking Union seeks to "draw together in the bond of comradeship" the people of this country and the British Empire. But let us not forget that in 1917 the Pilgrims spoke of "blood-brotherhood" and "comrades in arms." And now, when Britain is again at war, Sir Evelyn Wrench, C. M. G., LL. D., chairman of the English-Speaking Union of London (also a Pilgrim member), addresses his fellow members of the union in *The English-Speaking World*, October 1939, with the warning call:

"The English-Speaking Union was born 21 years ago during the Great War and it has an even greater function to play in the present crisis. We know we can count on your support."

The founders of the Republic speak to us today through the immortal words of George Washington:

"Against the wiles of foreign influence * * * the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since experience and history prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

And yet, such are the times and such are the forces a century and a half after Valley Forge that many Americans, including many leaders of America, are advocating policies and ideologies foreign and contrary to the very fundamentals on which this Nation was founded. There is needed a new Declaration of Independence and a rededication of the proven principles of our form of government.

In our position as a rich and powerful nation we can no longer avoid the responsibility of leadership in a wilderness of foreign conflict. President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, January 2, 1940, said that "in almost every nation of the world today there is a true belief that the United States has been, and will continue to be, a potent and active factor in seeking the reestablishment of peace."

If we are to accept and to act the role of peacemaker, the first requisite should be to stand before the world with clean hands and a cool head, fair and impartial to all, and free from any taint of favoritism and prejudice. Without this we would hold out false hopes to a war-weary world; we would not be entitled to the respect and cooperation of the embattled nations; the sincerity of our motives would be justifiably questioned, and we would fall, to the detriment of all concerned, including ourselves.

As a "potent and active" factor for world peace we cannot in the meantime accept the one-sided doctrine of "unity between the United States and the British Empire"; we cannot honestly and decently pose as an impartial apostle of world peace and at the same time act as the guardian angel of the British Empire; we cannot look fairly at the world through the meshes of the network of British propaganda; we cannot again allow our statesmen, our ambassadors, our leading bankers, lawyers, industrialists, churchmen, educators, and publishers to sway the sentiment of our Government and our people in favor of one side, a foreign side, inherently and basically non-American.

We have before us a costly lesson from the past to the present as a guide to the future. Let us remember 1914, and not forget in 1940 that a rising tide of war hysteria completely engulfed our Government and our people. The climax came on April 6, 1917, with an American declaration of war, approved by an overwhelming majority of a joint session of Congress. Only 56 out of 518 Senators and Representatives voted against war. Of the Members of the Senate only 6 dared cast their votes against the tides of war. One of these few, Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., addressed the President from the floor of the Senate with words that might well be repeated today:

"There is always lodged, and always will be, thank the God above us, power in the people supreme. Sometimes it sleeps, sometimes it seems the sleep of death; but, sir, the sovereign power of the people never dies. It may be suppressed for a time, it may be misled, be fooled, silenced. I think, Mr. President, that it is being denied expression now. I think there will come a day when it will have expression."

"The poor, sir, who are the ones called upon to rot in the trenches, have no organized power, have no press to voice their will on this question of peace or war; but oh, Mr. President, at some time they will be heard—there will come an awakening; they will have their day and they will be heard. It will be as certain and as inevitable as the return of the tides, and as resistless, too."

Today, with a warm heart full of sympathy for all the suffering in the world, we must firmly maintain our independence of thought and action, free from all foreign influence and entanglements so that we may think and speak and act as unimpaired Americans. Only then can we give the best answer to the question, What is best for America?

263553—19504

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part IV

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a short article entitled, "Undermining America."

UNDERMINING AMERICA

The beginning of the undermining of America was brought by Cecil Rhodes, who, in 1877, left money to establish scholarships at Oxford for the purpose of training diplomats to foster the reunion of Britain and America. In the first draft of his will, which is quoted in the book Cecil Rhodes, by Basil Williams, or the book Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen, he stated:

"Directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world; the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor, and enterprise; and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the Islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire.'" "The foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible, and promote the best interests of humanity."

A new will was made:

"He substituted English-speaking peoples for actual Britons; he came to realize his limitations and reduced his scheme to a mere beginning of it, the scholarships; but yet the thought behind each successive will remained the same—the world for England, England for the world." See page 145, Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen

Other quotations:

Page 377: "But the essence of the will, as the world knows, is the Scholarship Foundation. In the end all that Rhodes can do toward extending British rule throughout the world and restoring Anglo-Saxon unity and founding a guardian power for the whole of humanity is to arrange for a number of young men from the United States, the British colonies, and Germany to go to Oxford. * * * There are, accordingly, rather more Rhodes scholars from America than from all the British Dominions put together."

Page 378: "If the Union of South Africa could be made under the shadow of Table Mountain, why not an Anglo-Saxon Union under the spires of Oxford?"

In 1893 Andrew Carnegie wrote his book, *Triumph of Democracy*, the last chapter of which is "The Reunion of Britain and America." (The 1931 edition of this book is devoid of this last chapter.) The following is a quotation from the original book:

"Regarding those I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of 'imperial federation' dares to intimate that the federation that he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question cannot even be discussed when imperial conferences meet; if it be introduced, it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British productions as a matter of course. The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax revenue, although under free trade such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic, duty free, mean to the linen, woolen, iron, and steel industries of Scotland, to the tin-plate manufacturers of England. It would mean prosperity to every industry in the United Kingdom, and thus in turn would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interests, now so sorely depressed."

Another quotation:

"In the event of reunion, the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great population skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Great Britain."

And still another quotation:

"Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked-for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will, therefore, I say, that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the reunited state, the British-American Union."

1914: Andrew Carnegie took over the controlling group of the Federal Council of Churches by subsidizing what is known as the Church Peace Union with \$2,000,000, and the Church Peace Union or the board of trustees has always exercised a dominating influence

in the Federal Council. This endowment has provided sufficient annual income to run the budget of the Federal Council and its cooperating organizations. Among the associated groups are the World's Alliance of International Friendship Through the Churches, Commission on International Friendship and Good Will, National Council for Prevention of War, and American Civil Liberties Union. (See Pastors, Pacifists, and Politicians, pp. 5 and 6, published by the Constructive Educational Publishing Co., Chicago.)

1917-18: Witnessed the promise of England to give Palestine to the Zionist Jews, if they would throw America into the war on her side. This was reported in the New York Times March 8, 1930, Sunday editorial. It was this that caused Otto Kahn to come to America and become an American citizen. (See New York Sun, June 19, 1936—Pledged Jews National Home—p. 19.)

1917: At the annual meeting of the trustees for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, held at the Headquarters Building, No. 2, Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., on April 20, 1917, the following resolutions were adopted by the board:

"PEACE THROUGH TRIUMPH OF DEMOCRACY

"Resolved, That the trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, assembled for their annual meeting, declare hereby their belief that the most effectual means of promoting durable international peace is to prosecute the war against the Imperial Government of Germany to final victory for democracy, in accordance with the policy declared by the President of the United States.

"SERVICES TENDERED TO THE GOVERNMENT

"Resolved, That the endowment offers to the Government the services of its division of international law, its personnel and equipment, for dealing with the pressure of international business incident to the war." (See pp. 181-183 of the C. E. for I. P. Year Book, 1917.)

In connection with the adoption of this resolution, the following quotation from a letter written to Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, dated April 21, 1917, by the secretary of the board, Dr. James Brown Scott:

"Of course, a general offer to the Government should be interpreted as an offer to the particular department of the Government to which the division of international law may be of more appropriate service, and, since the nature of the work of the division is in line with, and many of its officers and employees are former officers and employees of the Department of State, I feel that the services and equipment of the division should be offered to that Department, which offer I hereby convey as the representative of the endowment in carrying out the above resolution of the board of trustees."

In June 1918: Woodrow Wilson sent two men to England: Mr. Charles Moore, of Detroit, Mich., and Prof. Andrew McLaughlin, of Chicago University, and an agreement was made to leave the carrying trade of the Atlantic to Great Britain, which was embodied in our version of the peace treaty, as written by Col. Edward M. House, at Beverly Farms, Mass.

1918: Witnessed the American Historical Association, Carnegie endowed, meeting in London, and the agreement was made to rewrite American history to please England. (See American Historical Year Book, 1918.)

1919: When Lord Northcliffe had completed his propaganda organization in this country during the recent World War, and was returning home it was announced that he was leaving behind him \$150,000,000 (our own money, of course) and 10,000 trained agents to carry on the work. His own London Times in the issue of July 4, 1919, rendered account of the "efficient propaganda" which he had inaugurated here and was being carried out by those trained in the arts of creating public good will and of swaying public opinion toward a definite purpose. (See Report on Investigation of American History, City of New York, May 25, 1923.)

Among the methods, stated by the London Times, to be then in operation or in prospect in this country were:

"Efficiently organized propaganda to mobilize the press, the church, the stage, and the cinema, to press into active service the whole educational system, the universities, public and high schools and primary schools. Histories and textbooks on literature should be revised. New books should be added, particularly in the primary school. Hundreds of exchange university scholarships should be provided. Local societies should be formed in every center to foster British-American good will, in close cooperation with an administrative committee." (See Report on Investigation of American History, City of New York, May 25, 1923.)

This same Fourth of July issue of the London Times contained a signed article by Owen Wister, American born, in which he said: "A movement to correct the schoolbooks of the United States has been started and it will go on." (See p. 62 of Report on Investigation of American History, city of New York, May 25, 1923.)

1919: Witnessed the rewriting of American history to please England. Protests were made by the Sons of the American Revolution and other patriotic societies. (See Report on Pro-British Histories, held at City Hall, May 25, 1923.)

1919: Mr. Edward Filene, of Boston, an internationalist, set up the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., and by interlocking directorates has control over 124 trust funds, together totaling nearly a billion dollars. Included in this control are the Carnegie, Rockefeller, the Duke and Russell Sage Foundations from which funds go subsidies to subversive communistic, socialistic, and all peace movements, as well as the cooperative movements. Among activities of Twentieth

Century Fund, Inc., are the following: N. R. A., S. E. C., Wagner Labor Act, International Labor Office (affiliated with League of Nations), Foreign Policy Association, credit unions, cooperatives, League of Women Voters. (See Red Network, published by Elizabeth Dilling, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., for communistic activities of these groups. Also see Year Books and American Foundations and Their Fields, published by Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 330 West Forty-second Street, New York.)

1920: From the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Year Book, 1920—Division of International Law—report of the director, James Brown Scott, page 111.

THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

"The director believes that the road to progress runs from the Hague Conferences to a distant and ever receding horizon. He believes that nations are only willing to try on an international scale those things which have been tried within national lines and which have been successful. He believes in an infinite series of little steps, not in any one leap, however attractive the prospect may be."

"During the Conference of Paris, the director daily passed through the Place de la Concorde in going to and from the Hotel de Crillon to the Quai d'Orsay. He has often stood before the obelisk marking the site where the head of Louis XVI fell, and with it the old regime. The men of that day dreamed of a newer and better future. All that has been wrong and the wrong must be righted. They abolished the old calendar based upon the birth of the Man of Nazareth, and brushing it aside, they began their new era with the year 1. But it all ended with the final entry of Louis XVIII, the brother of Louis XVI, into the Tuileries in the year of Our Lord 1815.

"The statesmen of the future, if not of the present day, are bound to recur to the past, and in international organization, the past is, in the opinion of the director, the Hague Peace Conferences."

RECOMMENDATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

(Quotations from p. 110, Year Book 1920)

"It is not necessary for a workable program of international organization that the world should be federated; it is, however, essential that the nations of the civilized world should cooperate."

1921-25: Witnessed the battle for the suppression of the Star-Spangled Banner and the desire to replace it with America the Beautiful. Nine years were consumed in getting the bill out of the pigeonhole of the judiciary, legalizing the national anthem against such attacks. In spite of this, the official national anthem is rarely heard.

Mrs. Augusta Stetson put paid advertisements in newspapers around the country, including the New York Times (August 5, 1925), and admitted under oath when subpoenaed to city hall, March 5, 1924, for an investigation that she had spent \$169,000 in one fund and \$17,000 in another to destroy and delete the Star-Spangled Banner because it was not pleasing to England. Franklin Ford, her secretary, in 1931, admitted at his office that he was financed by the English-Speaking Union and the British Commonwealth Club, Inc. (Refer to hearing before Deputy Commissioner Lowden, March 5, 1924, New York City.)

1925: A March issue of Saturday Evening Post carries an article by Owen D. Young, the originator of the Young plan bonds for the reparation of Germany, in which he stated that American labor would have to be reduced to the status of European labor.

1929: Witnessed the visit of Ramsay MacDonald with Hoover on the Rapidan. (See World-Telegram, October 10, 1929.) "The result of those representations, both Washington and London will hold to be of vital significance to the future of organized society."

See also New York Times, October 10, 1929, Ramsay MacDonald said: "I have achieved more than I hoped."

1929: Witnessed the stock-market crash. See National Message, official organ British-Israel World Federation, New York Public Library, October 12, 1935, page 679:

"It was told to me by a heavyweight American financier before the crash came that the crash was coming, that it would be permitted to run to the danger point, and that when the danger point was passed it would be reversed by measures carefully prepared in advance to meet the situation. I carefully noted what he said and left it for events to prove the value of his statement."

1934: John L. Lewis, organizer of the Committee for Industrial Organization, attended the June conference of the International Labor Organization. (See New York Times, October 11, 1934.)

1935: See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 26, page 15051, Mr. Huey Long: "A newspaperman whom I know to be reliable telephoned me tonight and said: 'I have found out for you that the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, has given out a statement in confidence * * * that this 9-cent plan was devised by Mr. Oscar Johnson, of Mississippi.' I said, 'If it is the Oscar Johnson, of Mississippi, that I know about, he was the manager of a chain of British plantations.' The newspaperman said, 'That is the same man.' I knew this idea could not have been given birth in the brain of an American cotton owner nor an American cotton planter, nor any American who understood the situation. I knew that the idea had foreign parentage; and, lo and behold, the gentleman who was formerly a manager of a number of British plantations, and has lately returned from London, has given birth to this plan, and his brain child has become the adopted child of the A. A. A. of the

good old United States. * * * And he thought the cotton farmer was doing well if he made \$100 a year."

1935: September 25, New York Sun, Food From Overseas: "Twenty-two million pounds of butter came into this country from foreign countries. In the first 8 months of 1934 imported oats, for example, totaled scarcely 200,000 bushels, but this year in the same period imports exceeded 10,000,000 bushels. Imports of corn in the same period of this year exceeded 31,800,000 bushels compared with 371,700 in 1934. American wheat exports dropped from 16,600,000 bushels in the first 8 months of 1934 to 142,000 in 1935." (While crops in this country were being burned and ploughed under.)

1935: Witnessed a secret national peace conference financed by a grant from the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, see New York American, December 19, 1935: "Meeting behind closed doors at the Westchester Country Club at Harrison, N. Y., the conference, composed of 29 organizations, adopted the following six-point program:

1. A Nation-wide radio campaign to commit the United States to a policy of internationalism.
2. Crippling of the Army and Navy billion-dollar appropriation bill by attaching a billion-dollar housing project clause as a rider.
3. Abolition of the Army and Navy sedition bill, which would punish anyone attempting to incite enlisted men to insubordination or mutiny.
4. Abolition of the R. O. T. C. in colleges.
5. A vigorous campaign against those who oppose this country's entrance into the League of Nations and to prevent the United States from obstructing the League in applying sanctions.
6. Adoption of the drastic neutrality bill.

Andrew Carnegie left hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out his plan.

1935-36: American Association for Adult Education, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City, Carnegie endowed, lists the following activities that are financed by the Carnegie Corporation, and the Rockefeller General Education Board: Forum Experimentation (public forums), Federal Emergency Program (cooperates with U. S. Office of Education), C. C. C. camps, community organization, workers' education, international relations, commonwealth college. (See p. 5701, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1936, also see Annual Report of the Directors, above address).

1936: Witnesses Nicholas Murray Butler sailing on the *Queen Mary* June 5, for the most important Carnegie Endowment for Peace Conference in London, England, that has ever been held. It is at this meeting that the question of gold being used on an international basis is to be discussed.

1936—Herald Tribune, June 19, 1936, page 22: "Supply Held Adequate for World Gold Basis." There even may be too much, Brookings Institution says. Brookings Institution (Carnegie-endowed) study of the adequacy of the gold supply, written by Dr. Charles O'Hardy, held that no existing or prospective deficiency in the world gold supply stood in the way of restoration of an international gold standard, whenever such a step was considered advantageous. * * * Two officials of the Federal Reserve System: Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, chief economist, and Adolph C. Miller, former governor and special member, recently made speeches heralding return to the gold standard in modified form. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, has said that the United States will cooperate in such a movement as soon as the rest of the world is ready.

NOTE: What guaranty have the people of the United States that the currency which they would hold would be redeemable in gold?

1936: Witnesses the United States Government largely influenced or controlled by organized financial interests cooperating with or under the control of the 20th Century Fund, Inc., or American Foundations and their Fields. Some of these with their officers and trustees are listed herein:

OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES

Carnegie Corporation, New York, Andrew Carnegie, donor; Elihu Root, Robertson D. Ward, Fred P. Keppel, Robert M. Lester, John M. Russel, Samuel S. Hall, Jr., Barent Lefferts, Ernest A. Farintosh, Thomas S. Arbuthnot, Newton D. Baker, Nicholas Murray Butler, Samuel Harden Church, Lotus D. Coffman, Henry James, Walter A. Jessup, Nicholas Kelley, Russell Leffingwell, John C. Merriam, Margaret Carnegie Miller, Fred Osborn, Arthur W. Page, Carnegie Corporation, Washington, D. C.: John C. Merriam, Elihu Root, Henry S. Pritchett, Fred A. Delano, Thomas Barbour, W. W. Campbell, Homer L. Ferguson, W. Cameron Forbes, Walter S. Gifford, Fred H. Gillett, Herbert Hoover, Frank B. Jewett, Alfred L. Locmis, Andrew W. Mellon, Roswell Miller, Andrew J. Montague, Stewart Paton, John J. Pershing, William Benson Storey, Richard P. Strong, James W. Wadsworth, Fred C. Walcott, George W. Wickerson.

Church Peace Union: Donor: Andrew Carnegie, William P. Merrill, George A. Plimpton, Henry A. Atkinson, Linley V. Gordon, G. S. Barker, Rev. Arthur Judson Brown, Bishop James Cannon, Jr., Rev. Francis J. Haas, Rev. Frank Oliver Hall, Prof. Hamilton Holt, Hon. Morton D. Hull, Prof. William I. Hull, Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, Dr. James E. Joy, Rev. Miles H. Krumbine, Dr. Henry Goddard Leach, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Rev. Charles S. MacFarland, Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Dean Shaller Mathews, Rev. William Pierson Merrill, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Dr. John R. Mott, Rev. Roger T. Nooe, Rev. Howard C. Robbins, Monsignor John A. Ryan, Rt. Rev. Henry K. Sherrill, Dr. Robert E. Speer, Charles P. Taft II, Rev. Charles D. Trexler, Dr. James J. Walsh.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C.: Nicholas Murray Butler, Andrew J. Montague, James Brown Scott, 263553—19504

George A. Finch, Frederic A. Delano (uncle of F. D. R.), Charles S. Hamlin, Wallace McK. Alexander, David P. Barrows, William Marshall Bullitt, Daniel K. Catlin, John W. Davis, Norman H. Davis, Autsen G. Fox, Robert A. Franks, Francis Pendleton Gaines, Charles Hamlin, Howard Heinz, Alanson B. Houghton, Frank O. Lowden, Peter Molyneaux, Roland S. Morris, Henry S. Pritchett, Elihu Root, Edward L. Ryerson, James R. Sheffield, Maurice S. Sherman, James T. Shotwell, Silas H. Strawn, Robert A. Taft, Thomas J. Watson.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York City: Walter A. Jossup, Henry S. Pritchett, Robert A. Franks, Howard J. Savage, William S. Learned, Alfred Z. Reed, Samuel S. Hall, Jr., Raymond L. Mattocks, Walter C. Murray, Thomas William Lamont, Fred. Carlos Ferry, Frank Aydelotte, William Lowe Bryan, Nicholas M. Butler, Lotus Dolta Coffman, James Bryant Conant, George Hutcheson Denny, Albert Bledsoe Dinwiddie, Edward Charles Elliott, Livingston Farrand, Frank Porter Graham, Albert Ross Hill, James Hampton Kirkland, Ernest Hiram Lindley, William Allan Neilson, George Norlin, Josiah Harmar Penniman, Rush Rhees, Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, Frank Arthur Vanderlip, Henry Merritt Wriston.

General Education Board, New York City: Donor: John D. Rockefeller, Raymond B. Fosdick, Trevor Arnett, David H. Stevens, Wm. W. Brierly, Lefferts M. Dashiell, Edward Robinson, George A. Beal, Arthur G. Askey, James R. Angell, Trevor Arnett, Harry W. Chase, Jerome D. Greene, Ernest M. Hopkins, Max Mason, Edwin Mims, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., John D. Rockefeller, 3d, Walter W. Stewart, Harold H. Swift, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Arthur Woods, Owen D. Young.

Twentieth Century Fund, New York City: Donor: Edward A. Filene, Evans Clark, Edward A. Filene, Oswald W. Knauth, Newton D. Baker, A. A. Berle, Jr., Bruce Bliven, Henry Dennison, John H. Fahy, Morris E. Leeds, James G. McDonald, Roscoe Pound.

Religious Education Foundation, New York City: O. H. Cheney, Hugh S. Magill, Russell Colgate, Paul D. Eddy, Newton D. Baker, S. B. Chapin, Robert Garrett, James C. Penney, Charles H. Tuttle, Thomas J. Watson.

Spelman Fund of New York: Donor: Laura S. Rockefeller, Arthur Woods, Guy Moffett, L. M. Dashiell, Edward Robinson, Kenneth Chorley, Cleveland Dodge, Raymond B. Fosdick, Thomas W. Lamont, John D. Rockefeller 3d, Beardsley Ruml.

Textile Foundation, Washington, D. C.: Franklin W. Hobbs, Stuart W. Cramer, Frank D. Cheney, Daniel C. Roper, Henry A. Wallace.

(The above-mentioned organizations and the men connected with them are from American Foundations and Their Fields, published by the Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 330 West 42d Street, New York City.)

The Carnegie Fund joined with the (Rockefeller Fund) General Education Board because they found themselves doing the same work. Above quotation from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Year Book, 1934.

The Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Twentieth Century Funds have through subsidies control over our press, churches, schools, the stage, cinema, colleges, and our Government, and America has not had a President entirely free from this control, particularly since the war.

1776: Hark ye to the warnings of the men of the "horse and buggy days!"

In his Farewell Address, George Washington bequeathed to the American people, as he said the "counsels of an old and affectionate friend." And he did so in the hope that his advice and admonition would, in the years to come, serve the following useful purpose:

1. "Moderate the fury of party spirit."
2. "Warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue." (This includes Britain.)
3. "Guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism."

George Washington also said: "I never have heard, and I hope I never shall hear, any serious mention of a paper emission in this State; yet such a thing may be in agitation. Ignorance and design are productive of much mischief. The former (ignorance) is the tool of the latter (design), and is often set at work suddenly and unexpectedly."

Daniel Webster warned you, in 1832, while in Congress: "Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none have been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money. This is the most effectual of inventions to fertilize the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation—these bear lightly on the happiness of the mass of the community, compared with fraudulent currencies and the robberies committed by depreciated paper. Our own history has recorded for our instruction enough, and more than enough, of the demoralizing tendency, the injustice, and the intolerable oppression, on the virtuous and well disposed, of a degraded paper currency, authorized by law, or in any way countenanced by government." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 24, 1934. Speech by Hon. Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania.)

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C., New York, N. Y., trustees: Arthur A. Ballantine, New York; David P. Barrows, California; James F. Bell, Minnesota; William Marshall Bullitt, Kentucky; Nicholas Murray Butler, New York; Daniel K. Catlin, Missouri; William Wallace Chapin, California; John W. Davis, New York; Norman H. Davis, New York; Frederic A. Delano, District of Columbia; Leon Fraser, New York; Douglas S. Freeman, Virginia; Francis P. Gaines, Virginia; Howard Heinz, Pennsylvania; Alanson B. Houghton, New York; Philip C. Jessup, Connecticut; Frank O. Lowden, Illinois; Peter Molyneaux, Texas;

Roland S. Morris, Pennsylvania; Edward Larned Ryerson, Jr., Illinois; James Brown Scott, District of Columbia; Maurice S. Sherman, Connecticut; James T. Shotwell, New York; Harper Sibley, New York; Slias H. Strawn, Illinois; Eliot Wadsworth, Massachusetts; Thomas John Watson, New York.

Division of Intercourse and Education: Director, Nicholas Murray Butler, office, 405 West One Hundred and Seventeenth Street, New York, N. Y. Telephone, University 4-1850—Cable, Interpax, New York.

Le Centre Européen: Directeur-Adjoint, Malcolm W. Davis, Bureau, 173, Boulevard Ste-Germain, Paris, France. Telephone, Littré 88.50. Adresse Télégraphique, Interpax, Paris.

Advisory Council in Great Britain: Sir Alan Anderson, Ernest Barker, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, William P. Crozier, Mrs. Mary Agnes Hamilton, Sir Frank Heath, Francis W. Hirst, Herbert S. Morrison, Gilbert Murray, J. A. Spender; Honorary Secretary, Mrs. Neville Lawrence.

London Office: Representative in the United Kingdom, Hubert J. Howard; address, 335 Abbey House, Victoria Street, SW. 1. Telephone, Abbey 7228; cable, Carintpax, London.

Mr. Speaker, the information contained in this booklet is important at this time, particularly in view of the fact that the pro-English groups in the United States are now working in close cooperation with world internationalist organizations.

Before 1917, foreign influence came mainly from Anglo-American groups. Since the World War, these groups have been fortified by the international financiers and the internationalists, or the so-called minority group. The pressure is therefore more than double, for combined, these groups control all avenues of communication and are now using them to further their plan of British domination to establish a world federation of states.

Let me call your attention to the fact that on the reverse of the great seal of the United States, which appears on our dollar bills, you will find the exact symbol of the British-Israel world federation movement. This symbol is also carried on literature of other organizations promoting a world government and a world religion. At the bottom of the circle surrounding the pyramid, you will find the wording: "Novus Ordo Seclorum." It was this new order that was advocated by Clinton Roosevelt several hundred years ago; recently in Philip Dru, and now followed by the Executive.

Do you not think, as good American people, that the administration has gone far from constitutional government, when there is inscribed a symbol on the reverse of our great seal, that advocates a new order? Yes, an order which means the destruction of our Republic as formulated in the Constitution of the United States.

It may also interest you to know that this contemplated "Union Now," as advocated by Clarence Streit, will be under the control of Great Britain, and is a movement to return the United States as a colony in the British Empire. Should we become a part of this union, our traditional rights and liberties will be lost, and we will have no greater status than an English possession. This was the dream of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie, when the latter wrote his book, *Triumphant Democracy*, in 1893.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and Internal Strife—Part V

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1940

ARTICLE ISSUED BY THE IMPERIAL FASCIST UNION OF LONDON, ENGLAND

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article issued by the Imperial Fascist Union, of London, England.

I shall not comment on this article except to say that the reference to Masonry, no doubt, refers to the Grand Orient 263553—19504

Masonry and not to the English-American Masons as we know them in the United States.

INTRODUCTION

THE BASIC FACTOR IN POLITICS IS RACE

Those Britons who stand amazed at the defeatist trend of their country's politics; who begin to ask themselves whether our civilization is worth while; and who are puzzled as to how this state of things should ever have come about, will find explained in this pamphlet the cause of it all—the race itself is changing.

The great Persian, Greek, and Roman civilizations died out from this same cause. The dominant Aryan race responsible for their development became too weak by intermarriage with lesser races, until the product could no longer maintain Aryan standards.

Colonel Lindbergh, in 1936, left the United States of America for exactly these reasons; although individual Americans will continue to pull their weight in pioneering for humanity, yet the people of the United States can no longer, in the mass, maintain a decent enough standard of public conduct to protect him from unprovoked annoyance.

This pamphlet demonstrates the Jewish contamination among the titled families of Britain. It has been difficult to "dig out" the information; perhaps the most encouraging aspect in a depressing research has been the obvious desire on the part of most of the affected families to hide their Jewishness; only when it is discovered and dragged forward into the limelight do these families sometimes begin to assert that "they are proud of their Jewish blood!"

A similar phenomenon was observed by the Jewish compilers of the *Who's Who in American Jewry* (1926), who state in their introduction to the volume: "Some persons preferred to be omitted rather than associate their names with those of their racial colleagues. A few even rejected with indignation the proposal of being included in a volume where their Jewish identity would become a matter of public knowledge."

How completely the Jewish masonic teaching of racial equality has conquered Aryan thought in this country is perhaps best indicated by the absence hitherto of any literature dealing with the race change.

Although this booklet deals only with the titled aristocracy, a similar state of affairs could easily be demonstrated among the official, commercial, and professional communities. Possibly the least affected and most Aryan community is the agricultural one. That, incidentally, is one of the reasons why, in a Jew-owned land, it comprises only about 5 percent of the nation's workers.

Our case can be presented best, we think, by a consideration, first, of the examples of Spain and Portugal, where the process of Aryan racial degeneration has taken place not far away from us either in distance or in time, whilst a sufficient period of the latter has elapsed to prove that nations that have gone down from racial causes cannot rise again by their own unaided efforts.

THE NECESSITY FOR AN ARISTOCRACY TO SUPERVISE THE NATION'S POLITICS IS A FUNDAMENTAL TENET OF THE FASCIST CREED

In publishing this pamphlet we have no idea of attacking the aristocratic principle; we simply present evidence that, for racial reasons, our "aristocracy" has ceased to function in its duty as a protector of the people, and that the racial change taking place in it is symptomatic of a racial change affecting other parts of the community, a change which will destroy the British Empire unless it is rendered impotent to injure us.

FOUL BROOD—THE RACIAL TRANSFORMATION OF A NATION—ENFORCED MASONIC UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD

There is a disease of bees called foul brood, which, when it affects a hive, corrupts it irredeemably. An analogous malady is that which has destroyed the greatness of Spain and Portugal, and which has secured for itself a strong footing in Britain, where the symptoms are obvious enough, although puzzling to all who do not appreciate their racial cause.

Spain and Portugal bore the brunt of the early Jewish invasion into western European territory. The poison insinuated itself the more easily because racial differences were obscured by religious ones, so that it was comparatively simple for the Jew to accept Christianity outwardly, whilst remaining at heart a Jew and practicing Jewish rites in the privacy of his home; thus arose the Marrano community, or Crypto-Jews, who at first avoided to some extent the extreme consequences of the hostility of those of the dominant faith.

In the fifteenth century, the Marranos or Secret Jews dominated Spanish life, occupying high positions not only in the administration, the universities, the forces, and the judiciary, but also in the church itself. Their outward conformity to the Catholic church, together with their accumulation of wealth, enabled them to penetrate by marriage to such an extent into the most exalted families in the land that it became difficult to find an aristocratic family in Aragon or in Castile which was not contaminated with the foul stream of Jewish blood.

The worm turned at last, and not only were all professing Jews expelled from Spain, or forcibly converted and later expelled from Portugal, but the inquisition attacked the Marrano community, the position of which was ever afterward insecure and hopeless.

The greatest period of Spanish history followed the expulsion; and Portugal built up her great colonial Empire subsequent to the riddance of the professing Jew. But in both cases, the curse descended upon the colonial possessions of these two nations; in Peru, the Jew held the commerce of the country in his hands,

and it was impossible for a Castilian to succeed in business without a Jewish partner; the Jews purchased the cargoes of great fleets with fictitious credits which they divided amongst themselves, rendering large capital unnecessary. When the struggle between Portugal and Holland for the possession of Brazil took place, the Marranos worked for the Dutch enemy.

At home, the Spanish and Portuguese had, however, made the supreme mistake of imagining that any Marrano could be a substitute for a European. Absolute discrimination between white European Christians and the "new Christians" as the Marranos were called, was only insisted on by the best informed of the aristocracy, who kept a record of the new Christians so that intermarriage with them might cease. The racial quality of the people degenerated rapidly as the Jewish contagion spread by intermarriage.

Then, at last, the assault was deliberately made on the last citadel of racial purity. On St. John's Day, 1744, Frederick, Prince of Wales, grand master of English Masons, admitted the Portuguese Ambassador, Dom Sebastiao de Carvalho e Mello to a London lodge; this gentleman, better known as Pombal, revived Masonry in Portugal on his return to that country.

On May 2, 1768, Pombal ordered the destruction of all registers of Marrano families, and ordered all the heads of the exclusive and race-conscious Portuguese families to arrange that any daughter of marriageable age must be engaged within 4 months to marry a member of one of the hitherto excluded Jew-contaminated families.

This horrible Masonic outrage made an end of the Portuguese as a great nation.

In Spain, discrimination between the Aryan and the non-Aryan gradually declined under similar influences, although the Corps of Cadets insisted upon an unsullied racial origin as a qualification for entry up to 1860, whilst in some parish churches, even in the nineteenth century, notices were still displayed warning the old Christians against intermarrying with the new.

To some extent, of course, in Spain the Moorish occupation had been responsible for a dilution of the Aryan and Mediterranean blood of the people, but this Moorish corruption was never subtle, and its power of penetration was therefore weak. On the other hand, the Portuguese, through their custom of intermarrying with colored people in their colonies and through the return of the resultant half-breeds to the home country, has suffered great contamination from non-Jewish races of color.

Both Spain and Portugal went down because their native peoples have sullied their blood with that of lower races to a toxic degree; "foul brood" has corrupted them beyond hope. Damage of this sort is permanent.

That being so, let our readers consider what is going on in these islands, and ask themselves how Britain can regain her proper place in the world without first recovering her race-consciousness, and how she can do that without accepting the remedy of the Imperial Fascist League?

OUR JEWISH ARISTOCRACY

It has long been one of the Jewish methods in the attainment of world domination to penetrate into privileged circles where political power is greatest; Edward the First, by expelling the Jews in 1290, saved us from too early an application of this process in Britain, but other countries were less fortunate and suffered the extinction of their nobility by Jewish women marrying into the Gentile aristocratic families.

In Britain a few "damped" (baptized Christian) Jews remained in the country when their synagogue-going brothers had been expelled. Some of these attained knighthood, for instance, Sir Edward Brampton, who became Governor of Guernsey. The first serious attempt, however, to penetrate the ranks of the hereditary titleholders of England seems to have been an attack upon royalty itself by that notorious character, Perkin Warbeck, who was a servant of the Jewish knight mentioned above. With characteristic Jewish effrontery, this man claimed the English throne.

Francis Bacon wrote in his *Life and Reign of King Henry VII*: "There was a townsman of Tournay that had born office in that town, whose name was John Osbeck, a convert Jew, married to Catherine de Faro; whose business drew him to live for a time with his wife at London, in King Edward IV's days. During which time he had a son by her; and being known in court, the King either out of a religious nobleness, because he was a convert, or upon some private acquaintance, did him the honor as to be godfather to his child, and named him Peter. But afterwards proving a dainty and effeminate youth, he was commonly called by the diminutive of his name, Peterkin or Perkin. For, as for the name of Warbecke, it was given him when they did but guess at it, before examinations had been taken."

How many of us at school realized that Perkin Warbeck was a figure in the Jewish world plot against Aryan sovereignty?

As everyone knows, Cromwell allowed the Jews to return and they flocked over here toward the latter part of the seventeenth century, the largest wave of rich Jews coming over with William III from Holland.

In 1718 the Attorney General, Sir R. Raymond, hammered another nail into his country's coffin, by deciding that Jews could hold land in England. Walpole had previously allowed the Jew Gideon to hold estates by a special act in his favor; this Jew had lent his "credit" to the government (!) which seems not to have realized that it had a lot of its own, and falsely posing as a Christian, for he never ceased his payments to the synagogue and

died a Jew, he married a Gentile, his son being created a baronet and later Baron Eardley, a title now fortunately extinct. The first synagogue Jew baronets were Sir I. L. Goldsmid (1841), Sir Moses Montefiore, and Sir Anthony de Rothschild; these seem to have qualified for the British aristocracy by using their ill-gotten wealth in buying privileges for the Jews in this and other countries.

It was Sir Issac L. Goldsmid who led the movement for the admission of the Jews to our legislature. Once the barrier was down, the rest was easy. In 1858 legislation enabled the foreign "Baron" Lionel de Rothschild to take his oath in the House of Commons as a Jew. His son was raised to the peerage in 1885. The "damped" Jew Disraeli had of course obtained earlier honors, dying as the Earl of Beaconsfield.

Among the earlier Synagogue baronet creations were those of Sir George Jessel, Sir David Salomans, and Sir John Simon (no relation to the living Sir John Simon, who claims not to be Jewish).

Aryan peers sometimes made matters worse by marrying Jewesses, one of the most disastrous cases being that of the second Viscount Galway, who married as early as 1747 a Jewess called Villa Real, as a result of which countless fine old British families have had this Asiatic strain instilled into them. It was a Rothschild plan to marry superfluous daughters into the families of influential Gentiles; in the case of the Rothschild unions with Baron Battersea and the son of the fourth Earl of Hardwicke, the marriages were sterile, but a daughter of Mayer Amschel Rothschild married the fifth Earl of Rosebery, so that there is Rothschild blood in the present earl, one of whose sisters married the present Marquess of Crewe, himself with Villa Real blood; thus after many days, the blood of the Villa Real Jewess mingles with that of the Rothschild in the issue of this marriage of "British aristocrats."

The custom of mating with Jewesses has now become a common one; the instinct of the Aryan has been broken down by continued propaganda, and H. Belloc in his book on *The Jews* writes of the Jewish penetration of our great aristocratic families: "With the opening of the twentieth century, those of the great territorial English families in which there was no Jewish blood were the exception. In nearly all of them, the strain was more or less marked, in some of them so strong that though the name was still an English name and the traditions those of a purely English lineage of the long past, the physique and character had become wholly Jewish and the members of the family were taken for Jews whenever they traveled in countries where the gentry had not yet suffered or enjoyed this mixture."

A study of the "society" photographs in any copy of *The Bystander* will convince anyone that Mr. Belloc does not exaggerate. To those of us who believe that Aryanization is civilization it is incomprehensible that aristocrats of our race could succumb to the cunning Masonic and educational Jewish propaganda designed to cause them to forget their race. Nevertheless, the opposition to Jewish penetration into the great families has not been expressed in any decided way; Masonry is no doubt responsible for this. Queen Victoria herself had qualms about the granting of titles to Jews, because we know that when it was recommended to her that Sir Lionel Rothschild should be promoted to the peerage, she wrote as follows in a letter dated November 1, 1869, to Mr. Gladstone: "It is not only the feeling, of which she cannot divest herself, against making a person of the Jewish religion a peer, but she cannot think that one who owes his great wealth to contracts with foreign governments for loans, or to successful speculation on the stock exchange can fairly claim a British peerage. However high Sir L. Rothschild may stand personally in public estimation, this seems to her not the less a species of gambling because it is on a gigantic scale and far removed from that legitimate trading which she delights to honor, in which men have raised themselves by patient industry and unswerving probity to positions of wealth and influence."

Her sound instincts, or "prejudices" as they would be called nowadays in our Judaized press, were, however, broken down by Disraeli and we have now reached such a pitch that in 1932 the Jews were seriously planning to get the chief rabbi into the House of Lords, ex-officio. In 1915 a daughter of the fourth Baron Sheffield married the Jew Edwin Montagu, the disturber of Indian "pathetic contentment," and actually "embraced Judaism" also in a religious sense. There was more excuse for Lord George Gordon of the 1780 anti-Popery campaign, who adopted the Jewish religion, but died insane.

In the following review of our titled aristocracy, there are many errors of omission; working chiefly with Burke's Peerage, we find a reticence on the subject of Jewish "relativity" to our nobility; in other words, the volume seems designed to baffle the investigator as much as possible. For that reason, and also because the time at our disposal for this research is strictly limited, the review is far from complete, but it is sufficiently terrible to a racist as it is.

Every effort has been made to avoid errors of commission; we do not desire to hurt the feelings of anyone, but the British people have a right to know the truth; wherever we have insufficient evidence in suspicious cases, the benefit of the doubt has been given; we hope, in many future editions, to be able to make our lists more complete. The excellent library of the Society of Genealogists could not produce a single volume which was of direct help in collecting the material for this pamphlet, which we hope, therefore, will find a place on its shelves; but we think some-

thing will prevent it getting there. It may be of interest to mention that Debrett's Peerage is published by the same Jew firm, Odhams Press, Ltd., which runs the Daily Herald. Sir Sydney Lee (Jew) edited the Dictionary of National Biography, so we get little help from those. And the Jew, M. Epstein, edits the Annual Register.

We have omitted from our list certain cases where Jewesses have married into noble families in which the titles are now extinct or from which marriages there was no issue.

In our investigations we found that the statement made by J. M. Macdiarmid in *The Deer Forests* that the Leveson-Gower family was descended from "a London Jew money lender" is false; the name "Leveson" in this case has no Jewish application. Also, the statement made in the *Jewish Daily Post*, June 17, 1935, that the present Duchess of Norfolk has Jewish blood, is untrue; she is the second wife of the last duke and mother of the present duke; and it was the first wife of the last duke, who left no heir, who had Jewish blood. The *Universe* is in error in stating (Feb. 4, 1937) that the Marquess of Bute is descended from the Jew Treves.

Many Jewish titles, sometimes camouflaged, like those of Barons Wandsworth (real name, Stern) and Pirbright (real name, De Worms), are fortunately extinct. Extinct, also, is the baronetcy of Sir Edgar Speyer, which was revoked by a notice in the *Times* of December 14, 1921, on account of his unlawful communication and trading with the enemy during the war.

The effect of even a slight mixture of Jewish blood in an Aryan family is often very great. It alters the political outlook of the individual because it alters the instincts themselves.

"One Chink or Negro or even Jew ancestor a long way back will undo your Anglo-Saxon composition, of which you may claim an unbroken line of purely Essex stock, more thoroughly than if all your ancestors, from your parents back, had been Dutch, German, Swede, Dane, French, Russian, Portuguese, Italian, or any other easily assimilated Aryan race." W. Gerhardt in *Memoirs of a Polyglot*, 1931.

When a large number of individuals in commanding social or political positions are rendered partly Asiatic in instinct, the nation itself becomes the victim of these destructive instincts.

Referring to Colonel Lane's book, *The Alien Menace*, the *National Review* confirms this in the following words:

"English men and women are constantly asking themselves how it comes about that a twist is so frequently given to British policy that is clearly not in accordance with British interests. There is usually somebody in a position, at the psychological moment, to deflect our government, whatever party be in power, into some line of action that is unintelligible at the time and is fraught with disastrous consequences. * * * It is as though some hostile influence were steadily throwing grit into the machine. In every international financial arrangement we fare badly, and the whole story of reparations and war debts is humiliating in the extreme and calculated to make us the world's laughing stock as well as the world's milk cow. It is in this connection that such a book as Colonel Lane has written * * * throws a timely searchlight. It is in the higher ranks of society that the alien menace is formidable through the influence exercised in government departments, in Downing Street, and high finance by gentry of unmistakable foreign origin."

The repulsive physical appearance of the Hither Asiatic or Armenoid race is often passed on over many generations of a Jew-contaminated Aryan family.

Throughout this pamphlet, the word "Jew" is employed in its racial sense, implying Armenoid, Mongoloid, or Oriental blood. The appointments mentioned in connection with any individual are either past or present ones. The lists given below are of present titleholders only.

HEREDITARY TITLEHOLDERS OF JEWISH BLOOD

(12th) Duke of St. Albans, whose grandfather was the Jew, R. Bernal Osborne, M. P. The Duke married the daughter of the fifth Marquess of Lansdowne, and is the hereditary grand falconer.

(8th) Duke of Richmond is son of a Ricardo of Jewish blood. (1st) Marquess of Crewe, is descended from the second Viscount Galway, who married the Jewess, Villa Real; his second wife was the daughter of the fifth Earl of Rosebery and his wife, who was Hanna Rothschild. The family name is Crewe-Milnes. The marquess is a privy counselor, has occupied Cabinet positions, and was His Majesty's Ambassador at Paris, 1922-28.

(2d) Marquess of Reading. He is the son of the late Rufus Isaacs, who was a privy counselor, and who was Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, a position once held by the present King when Prince of Wales; was also Viceroy of India, and was chiefly responsible for the "white paper" surrender of that vast empire, won to us by British valor and retained by straight dealing; was made Lord Chief Justice of England 3 months after having admitted publicly his "mistake of judgment" in connection with the Marconi scandal. Rufus Isaacs' brother was the power behind the British Broadcasting Co., and appointed its chief, Sir John Reith. The present Marquess married the daughter of the late Lord Melchett, the Jew, Mond.

(6th) Earl of Rosebery, the son of the fifth earl and a Rothschild mother, one of whose daughters married the present Marquess of Crewe. The earl is a great landowner.

(20th) Earl of Suffolk, whose mother was the daughter of the Jew, L. Z. Leiter; he is also distantly descended from John Moses.

(6th) Earl of Craven is great-grandson of the Jew Bradley Martin. (17th) Earl of Devon is son of a Jewish Silva. Countess Loudoun (in her own right) is descended from the Jew Treves.

(6th) Earl of Mexborough is son of a Raphael. The last earl was his half-brother and a Buddhist.

(6th) Earl of Romney is descended from the Jew Treves. (2d) Viscount Bearstead is a Samuel, and owns 150,000 acres; he is chairman of Shell Transport and a director of Lloyds Bank.

Viscount Castlerosse says he has Jewish blood, but we know no details. He is son of the fifth earl of Kenmare.

(9th) Viscount Chetwynd is a descendant of the Jew Gideon.

(3d) Viscount Esher is of Jewish blood; we do not know whether the source was of one or of two generations back, or both, but his sister admitted it in the *Sunday Dispatch* of August 11, 1935, saying she was proud of it. He married a Jewish Hecksher.

(8th) Viscount Galway, descended from the second viscount who married the Jewess Villa Real in 1747; the viscount is stated to be proud of his Jewish blood.

(2d) Viscount Goschen, banker. ("Goschen was a Jew," Lord Riddell in *More Pages From My Diary*, 1908-14, 1934, p. 7.)

(6th) Baron Auckland is descended from the Jew Gideon.

(5th) Baron Brabourne's mother was a Jewish Von Flesch-Brunningen.

(3d) Baron Burnham, whose original name, Levy, was altered to Lawson. Members of this family have married into gentile-titled families as follows: The Hulse baronetcy, the present baronet being free from this Levy blood; the family of the late Sir H. de Bathe, Bart., with issue; and the present baron's niece married the son of the second Earl of Leicester.

(2d) Baron Cranworth is distantly descended from the Jew, Samuel Du Pass, through his mother.

(1st) Baron Duveen, trustee of many art galleries.

(1st) Baron Southwood, lately J. S. Elias, chairman of Odhams Press, Ltd., and controller of a large section of the daily and weekly newspapers, including the *Daily Herald*.

(8th) Baron Foley's mother was a Greenstone.

(3d) Baron Herschell is of Jewish origin, and is a lord in waiting.

(1st) Baron Hirst, chairman of General Electric Co., and of Empire Commission of British Industries and of the Association of Textile Institutes.

(1st) Baron Jessel, who was Controller of Horses Disposal Board after the war; also chairman of Military Services Committee Panel of 1918; and is president of the London Municipal Society. His son has married the daughter of the Marquess of Londonderry.

(1st) Baron Mancroft, formerly Sir A. M. Samuel, Bart., who has held countless important appointments under the government.

(2d) Baron Melchett, who, in *Modern Money*, advised the sale of some of our Pacific and Atlantic possessions to pay off the war debt; opened the business efficiency exhibition, 1933; is a leading advocate of the Jew racket called planning, and is head of the English Zionist Federation. Melchett's sister married the new Lord Reading, and another sister married Sir N. A. Pearson, but was divorced.

(2d) Baron Michelham, real name Stern. One of his daughters married the fourth Baron Sherborne, but without issue.

(1st) Baron O'Neill, distantly Jewish in blood through the families of Lords Galway and Crewe.

Baroness Ravensdale is Lord Curzon's daughter and is granddaughter of the Jew L. Z. Leiter. She is unmarried.

(3d) Baron N. M. V. Rothschild. The intermarriages of the Rothschild family have already been referred to. There has recently been a Rothschild union with the son of Baron Kemsley, of the newspaper-owning family of Berry.

(2d) Baron Strachie, son of a Jewish Braham.

(3d) Baron Swaything is a Samuel, and is head of Samuel Montagu & Co., international loan bankers.

Dowager Countess of Desart is the daughter of a Bischoffsheim, but the present earl is not her son.

Sir G. W. Albu, Bart. (South African gold mines and diamonds).

Sir Alfred Beit, Bart. (the same interests), actually half Jew.

Sir H. J. D. Broughton, Bart., a great grandson of a Rosenzweig

Sir H. J. W. Bruce, Bart., descended from a Ricardo.

Sir S. J. Bull, Bart., is son of a Jewish Brandon.

Sir Julian Cahn, Bart., director of *Everyman Weekly*.

Sir Felix Cassel, Bart., judge advocate general.

Sir H. B. Cohen, Bart.

Sir Guy Colin Campbell, Bart., is son of a Jewish Lehmann.

Sir T. H. W. Chitty, Bart., is the son of a Jewish Newboit.

Sir R. C. G. Cotterell, Bart., grandson of a Ricardo.

Sir P. V. David, Bart., a Sassoon.

Sir O. E. D'Avigdor-Goldsmid, Bart., who has been high sheriff of Kent.

Sir John Ellerman, Bart.

Sir J. P. G. M. Fitzgerald, Bart., is the son of a Bischoffsheim and has married the daughter of the 7th Earl of Dunmore.

Sir G. S. Fry, Bart., is grandson of the Jewish Capper Pass.

Sir William Garthwaite, Bart., is son of a Jewish Andrade, married a Rodrigues, and his son married the daughter of the Jew Lord Duveen.

Sir E. C. Goschen, Bart.

Sir H. Goschen, Bart.

Sir J. L. Hanham, Bart., is son of a Jewish Lopes.

Sir R. L. Hare, Bart., is descended from the Jew Treves.

Sir P. A. Harris, Bart., M. P.

Sir F. D. S. Head, Bart., is descended from Mendes, the Jew physician of Catherine de Braganza.

Sir J. C. W. Herschel, Bart., is of distant Jewish blood, but, according to a book, *The Real Jew*, edited by H. Newman, page 164, "anything which can be called Jewish was absolutely zero," in his distinguished grandfather, the astronomer.

Sir George Jessel, Bart.

Sir H. A. W. Johnson, Bart., is great-grandson of the Jewess Rebecca Franks.

Sir C. G. Lampson, Bart., is the son of a Jewish Van Gelderen.

Sir T. P. Larcom, Bart., is descended from a Jewish D'Agullar.

Sir H. J. Lawson, Bart., is grandson of a Jewish Lousada.

Sir G. E. Leon, Bart.

Sir T. J. P. Lever, Bart., publisher, whose grandfather adopted this old English name to camouflage the fact that his real name is Levy.

Sir E. J. M. Levy, Bart.

Sir G. J. E. Lewis, Bart., of the firm of lawyers Lewis & Lewis, who keep in their cupboards the skeletons belonging to many great British families.

Sir H. Y. B. Lopes, Bart., of Jew descent; has married the sister of the Earl of Mount Edgumbe.

Sir P. Magnus, Bart.

Sir A. J. Meyer, Bart.

Sir C. G. J. Newman, Bart., whose brother married the daughter of the 2nd Baron Loch. (Real name, Neumann.)

Sir M. B. G. Oppenheimer, Bart., whose father married the daughter of Sir R. G. Harvey, Bart.

Sir L. L. Faudel-Phillips, Bart., whose sister married Baron Hothfield's brother.

Sir Lionel F. Phillips, Bart., whose father was arrested in 1896 and condemned to death for high treason, but was released; interests, South African mines, Sudan cotton, etc.

Sir B. L. B. Prescott's (Bart.) mother was daughter of the Jew Lionel Lawson.

Sir L. R. Richardson, Bart., interested in South African wool; his daughter was General Smuts' secretary.

Sir H. L. Rothband, Bart., of J. Mandleberg & Co., waterproofers.

Sir E. L. Samuel, Bart., Australian wool interests.

Sir H. B. Samuelson, Bart., is of Jewish family which has intermarried to a large extent with gentiles.

Sir Philip A. G. D. Sassoon, Bart., a Privy Councillor and first commissioner of works; chairman of National Gallery Board; once secretary to Lloyd George, and acted as such at Peace Conference; royalty accepts hospitality from this Jew, who is a Rothschild on his mother's side. His sister married the Marquis of Cholmondeley.

Sir E. V. Sassoon, Bart., of Bombay, who has been a member of the Legislative Assembly, India.

Sir Felix V. Schuster, Bart., held to be a high banking authority.

Sir R. P. Staples, Bart., is descended from the Jew Mendes.

Sir G. J. V. Thomas, Bart., whose mother was a Jewish Oppenheim.

Sir W. R. Tuck, Bart., whose firm prints Christmas cards.

Sir D. Wernher, Bart., is son of a Jewish Mankiewicz.

Sir H. E. Yarrow, Bart., is son of a Jewish Franklin.

The Earl of Birkenhead is descended from an oriental called Bathsheba, described in a recent biography as a gypsy. Racially, it matters little whether it was gypsy or Jew. He married Baron Camrose's daughter, and his sister married Baron Camrose's son.

HALF-BREEDS IN THE MAKING

As though that were not enough, the following noblemen and baronets now holding their titles have married women of Jewish blood; their heirs, if by descent from these will be Jewish aristocrats:

(9th) Duke of Roxburghe married the granddaughter of a Rothschild.

(5th) Marquess of Cholmondeley's wife is a Sassoon.

(16th) Marquess of Winchester married a Jewess, Mrs. Claude Marks.

(7th) Earl Castle Stewart married a Guggenheim.

(2d) Earl of Incheape married the Jewish Rance of Sarawak's daughter.

(6th) Earl of Rosse married a Jewish Messel.

(1st) Viscount St. Davids married first a Jewish Gerstenberg; and secondly a descendant of the Jew Treves by whom is his heir.

(1st) Viscount Bledisloe married a Lopes for his first wife, and his heir is her son.

(1st) Viscount Dawson of Penn married the daughter of a Jewish Franklin.

(3d) Baron Crawshaw married the granddaughter of a Ricardo.

(2d) Baron Hamilton of Dalzell's married the daughter of a Jewish Lawson.

(8th) Baron Howard de Walden married a Jewish Van Raalti.

(12th) Baron Kinnaird married a Clifton of Treves blood.

(1st) Baron May married a Strauss.

(1st) Baron Mount Temple's first wife was a Jewish Cassel.

(3d) Baron O'Hagan married as first wife the daughter of a Jewish Braham, by whom is his heir.

(1st) Baron Passfield, formerly Sidney Webb, a Fabian Socialist, married the granddaughter of a "tall, dark woman of Jewish type," and his biographer states that Beatrice Webb, now Lady Passfield, inherited many of her characteristics. (See Sidney and Beatrice Webb, by M. A. Hamilton, p. 41.) This appears to be the daughter of John Aked. Baron Passfield himself is described by Mr. Hamilton

as having Jewish features; he was born in Soho and his origins "he has never illuminated." Nevertheless, Mr. Hamilton says that the Baron is pure English; a curious phenomenon.

(1st) Baron Parmoor married Lady Passfield's sister.

(6th) Baron Plunket married a Jewish Lewis.

Sir L. C. W. Alexander, Bart., married the daughter of the Jewish Baron Cable.

Sir J. W. Beynon, Bart., married a Moses.

Sir J. H. Blunt, Bart., married a Goldsmid-Stern-Salomans.

Sir H. L. C. Brassey, Bart., married the daughter of a Jewish Ricardo.

Sir E. C. Coates, Bart., married a Crewe-Milnes of distant Jewish blood.

Sir T. Colyer-Fergusson, Bart., married a Cohen as his second wife.

Sir H. G. de Bathé, Bart., married the daughter of a Warschowsky.

Sir A. E. H. Dean Paul married a Jewish Wieniawski. "Brenda" was a daughter.

Sir T. E. P. Falkner, Bart., married the granddaughter of a Ricardo.

Sir G. C. Hamilton married a Jewish Simon.

Sir L. J. Jones, Bart., married a Schuster as his second wife, but his heir is by his first wife.

Sir E. A. Lechmere, Bart., married the daughter of a Samuels.

Sir R. Leeds, Bart., married a Jewish Singer.

Sir C. E. Lyle, Bart., of the sugar-monopolist firm Tate & Lyle, married a Levy and his son married the daughter of Sir John Jarvis, conservative M. P. for Guildford.

Sir E. O. McTaggart-Stewart, Bart., married a descendant of the Jew Treves.

Sir A. Moir, Bart., married the granddaughter of a Jewish Franklin.

Sir Oswald Mosley, Bart., married a granddaughter of the Jew L. Z. Leiter; he is chief of British Union of Fascists.

Sir P. G. J. Mostyn, Bart., married a Jewish Marks.

Sir J. Gordon Nairne, Bart., married a Costa Ricci.

Sir N. A. Pearson, Bart., married a Mond, but obtained a divorce.

Sir Giles E. Sebright, Bart., married the granddaughter of an Isaacs.

Sir C. E. Warde married a "de Stern."

We are convinced that if we could get proof of certain facts regarding the relationships of other titled families, we could more than double the above list.

Here is a "mixed pickle" of Jewish relationships which we print, not because these cases necessarily influence the titled people mentioned in every instance, as some of them may detest the connection, but to show how intimate the Jewish penetration has become:

(9th) Duke of Devonshire's brother married a descendant of the Jew Bernal Osborne.

(11th) Marquess of Tweeddale married a Ralli, stepdaughter of an Einstein.

(2d) Marquess of Milford Haven is brother-in-law to Cassel offspring.

(7th) Marquess of Londonderry's daughter married a Jessel. His heir is godfather to a Jewish Jessel.

(4th) Marquess of Salisbury's heir, Viscount Cranborne, married a descendant of the Jew Bernal Osborne.

(7th) Earl Beauchamp's daughter is godmother to the son of Hon. E. Jessel.

(5th) Earl Peel's aunt married Charles S. Goldman, M. P., and the Earl's uncle is a director in the Jew international bank of S. Japhet & Co.

(27th) Earl of Crawford's heir married a descendant of the Jew Bernal Osborne. Another son married the daughter of a Jewish Van Raalte.

(17th) Earl of Derby's daughter married the son of a Rothschild.

(7th) Earl Spencer's brother married a Jewish Blumenthal.

(7th) Earl of Orkney is nephew of Baroness de Samuel.

(4th) Earl of Verulam is brother-in-law of a Cassel.

(9th) Earl of Jersey's stepfather is a Jewish Slessor.

(6th) Earl Ranfurly's stepfather is a Jewish Lezard.

(2d) Earl Oxford and Asquith's sister married the cousin of a half-Rothschild. A distant relationship, but significant from a political standpoint.

(2d) Viscount Chelmsford's brother-in-law is a Jew Goldman.

(5th) Viscount Sidmouth's brother-in-law is a Jew Harris.

(2d) Viscount Scarsdale's daughter's godmother is Mrs. Simon Marks.

(1st) Viscount Greenwood is brother-in-law of the half-Jew politician L. C. M. S. Amery of the Privy Council.

(1st) Viscount Davidson's second son's godmother is the Jewish Lady Reading.

(1st) Viscount Runciman's son's first wife was a Jewish Lehman.

(2d) Viscount Halifax's eldest son married the granddaughter of a Rothschild.

(1st) Viscount Hallsham's brother married the granddaughter of a Gompertz.

(8th) Viscount Powerscourt's heir married into the Jew family of Beddington.

(13th) Viscount Falkland's sister-in-law was a Jewish Leon.

(2d) Viscount Chilston is brother-in-law of a Samuelson.

(1st) Baron Rankellour's second son married a Jewish Ricardo.

(3d) Baron Gerard's sister married the Jew Baron de Forest.

(4th) Baron Annaly is brother-in-law to Viscount Galway, of Jew descent.

(2d) Baron Aberdare is brother-in-law of Lord Rosebery, son of a Rothschild.

(4th) Baron Fermoy's daughter has a Sassoon as godparent.

(2d) Baron Hamilton of Dalzell's nephew, his heir presumptive, and himself son of a Ricardo, married the daughter of the second Baron Burnham (Lawson, Levi).

(1st) Baron Kemsley's son married a Rothschild.

(2d) Baron Phillimore's heir married a Pereira.

(2d) Baron Hothfield's heir married a Raphael. His brother married a Jewish Faudel-Phillips.

(7th) Baron Ravensworth's sister married a Speyer. Sir E. J. P. Benn's (Bart.) heir married the daughter of the Jew Sir Maurice Hankey; and his daughter married P. Shinkman.

Sir H. M. Huntington-Whiteley (Bart.) (who married Mr. Stanley Baldwin's daughter) has a sister-in-law Cohn.

Sir J. D. Orr-Lewis (Bart.) is brother-in-law of a Stern.

Sir L. R. Phillips' (Bart.) heir married a Jewish Lehmann.

Sir A. C. Cory-Wright's (Bart.) heir married a Jewish Tree; another son married a Levy.

Sir B. G. D. Sheffield's (Bart.) son married a Jewish Faudel-Phillips.

Sir J. H. B. Noble's (Bart.) son married the granddaughter of a Jewish Goldsmid.

Sir R. Bonsor's (Bart.) sister married a Jewish Hambro.

Sir H. W. Hulse's (Bart.) son has a Jewish Lawson as godfather.

Sir C. G. E. Welby's (Bart.) son married a Jewish Gregory.

In many of the above cases, the heir to the title is involved. Once more, we must emphasize how incomplete the above list still is.

We do not know exactly how to classify—

Baron Strabolgi, formerly Commander Kenworthy, Socialist M. P., but the Daily Telegraph of April 16, 1934, is less cautious and includes him in a list of what it described as the "leaders of British Jewry." Lord Strabolgi looks Jewish, boosts the Jewish nation at every opportunity and reacts like a Jew, and once was a director of the European & Caucasian Export & Import Co., which, as the Patriot states, May 23, 1929, had a capital of £2,200 and "could be nothing but an intermediary between the Soviet that found the banking security and the manufacturers who sold the goods."

Lord Marley is another baron who appears to be a little shy as to his ancestry; Burke simply reveals him to be the grandson of George Joachim Aman, but Lord Marley's actions show that, whatever he may be, he cannot regard it libelous to be described at least as an "artificial Jew"; he spends much of his time boosting Jews and defending Jew interests.

There are scores of other "lords" who are far too shy to reveal even their mothers' names. Surely it is an important thing that the British Democrat should know something of the origins of, say, Barons Arnold, Passfield, and Snell, seeing that they hold prominent positions in the affairs of our country. Then there is Baron Ashfield, whose father changed his name from Knatries to Stanley; this fact is not given in Burke's Peerage, and we should like to know if he was a Jew. Have we not a right to know?

What is the use of a peerage reference book which does not tell where Jewish blood comes in?

A statement originally made by Mr. Shane Leslie, that Lord Curzon of Kedleston had a Jewish grandmother, and repeated by B. Falk in He Laughed in Fleet Street has, we understand from Mr. Leslie himself, been withdrawn by him. We do not know whether or no it should have been withdrawn.

"For over 14 years she had counted Lady Rothschild as her best friend," said Lady Snowden, on March 19 at the jubilee appeal for the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls, at Grosvenor House, Park Lane.

The Earls of Listowel and of Warwick helped to direct the Jewish Daily Post of London, which has since gone into liquidation.

According to the Jewish Chronicle of May 10, Lord Winterton stated in the House of Commons, May 7, that although he was not aware of any Jewish blood among his ancestors, he would be very proud of it if there was. Faugh!

Lady Diana Cooper's child had as its godfather the late Otto Kahn, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

The Balfours, Cecils, Churchills, Lyttons, Russells, and Stanleys seem to have a sort of hereditary lack of Aryan good taste in favoring Jews.

Lady Patricia Moore, daughter of the tenth Earl of Drogheda, served as head of a committee of the British Association of Maccabees in 1933, together with the careerist, Mr. Randolph Churchill. This is an exclusively Jewish national organization and we do not know what these two were doing there.

Adultery with Jews accounts for certain cases where individuals of obvious hither Asiatic race suddenly appear in old Aryan families of nobility. The usual chain of circumstances in these cases was described in The Fascist of May 1934, in an article called A Side Line of Usury. It is the greater scandal that these cases may not here be advertised so that the Eurasian progeny might be chivied out of our British aristocracy, which they must permanently contaminate. These Jew-features cross-breeds often further betray themselves by their instinctive leanings toward Marxism and finance and by a preference and sympathy for Jewish company and Jewish causes. They often live under the perpetual shadow of Jewish blackmail.

263553—19504—3

Generally speaking, when people of Aryan family look like Jews, they are Jewish.

KNIGHTS OF ENGLAND

The list of Jewish knights which follows gives no real idea of the Jewish contamination of the once-prized honor of knighthood. It is far more difficult to get at the ancestry of holders of non-hereditary titles than it is of the others. It is easier for your Jewish knight to camouflage himself, and there is no doubt whatever that there are as many Marrano Jews today in this country working for Jewry under Christianized names and under the Christian religion as ever there were in Spain and Portugal. We include in the list below only names of living knights of undoubted Jewish blood; we know there are scores of others, and we may be able to add to the list in future editions, particularly if our readers will assist us in the business of identification.

The appointments mentioned are either past or present ones. Sir S. S. Abrahams, chief justice, Tanganyika.

Sir M. A. Abrahamson, of an engineering firm in Denmark; was commissioner for repatriation of British and Allied prisoners of war.

Sir George de S. Barrow.

Sir M. Bloch.

Sir M. J. Bonn, banker; chairman of London regional advisory committee for juvenile unemployment.

Sir Montague Burton, cut-price tailor.

Sir B. A. Cohen, barrister.

Sir L. L. Cohen, banker and stockbroker and member of numerous British economic committees.

Sir R. Waley Cohen, of Shell Oil and of Baldwins, Ltd.

Sir S. S. Cohen.

Sir A. Castellani, expert on tropical diseases. His daughter married Sir Miles Lampson.

Sir Albert Clavering (formerly Closenberg), propaganda officer, central conservative office.

Sir H. Courthope-Munroe (real name Isaacs). Has had many important appointments in industrial arbitration and church tithe work.

Sir S. D'A. Crookshank, major general; general secretary, officers' association.

Sir S. Dannreuther, son of a Jewish Ionides; deputy secretary, Air Ministry.

Sir Edmund Davis, director of many mining companies.

Sir Ernest Davis, New Zealand.

Sir Benjamin Drage, installment furniture dealer.

Sir W. Deedes, brigadier general.

Sir John Ducane, was commander in chief, British Army on the Rhine, 1924-27; Governor of Malta, 1927-31.

Sir P. H. Ezechiel 3d, crown agent to the colonies since 1920.

Sir D. E. D. Ezra, late sheriff of Calcutta.

Sir L. Franklin, of A. Keyser & Co., Jew bankers; was in charge of Belgian refugees at Folkestone.

Sir F. E. Fremantle, a descendant of the Jew Gideon.

Sir S. R. Fremantle, whose mother was an Isaacs.

Sir S. H. Fremantle, brother of foregoing.

Sir S. Gluckstein, tobacco magnate.

Sir F. W. Goldstone, general secretary, National Union of Teachers.

Sir W. H. Goschen, chairman of Sun Insurance office.

Sir H. Graumann, interested in South African gold and mayor of Johannesburg.

Sir A. M. Green, High Commissioner for India in London.

Sir C. E. Hambro, director of banks, insurance companies, etc.

Sir M. Hankey, clerk to H. M. Privy Council and secretary of countless international conferences. (See the Fascist for May 1935). Name of his great-grandfather changed to Hankey from Alera.

Sir Victor Harari Pasha, director general of accounts, Egyptian Ministry of Finance.

Sir D. Harris, of De Beers.

Sir P. J. Hartog, Indian educationalist.

Sir P. G. Henriques, once assistant secretary, Ministry of Munitions.

Sir A. Hirtzel, in India office since 1894, becoming Permanent Under Secretary of State for India, 1924-30.

Sir G. B. Hurst, M. P. (formerly Hertz).

Sir Isaac A. Isaacs, Governor General of Australia. Member of the committee which formed the Australian constitution.

Sir J. G. Jarmay, of Brunner Mond & Co.

Sir F. L'E. Joseph, president of the Federation of British Industries.

Sir S. G. Joseph, mayor of Marylebone.

Sir E. Kadoorie, Iraq educationalist.

Sir Cecil H. Kisch, Assistant Under Secretary of State for India and member of international financial conferences as British representative.

Sir Leon Levison, author.

Sir C. B. Levita, lieutenant colonel.

Sir J. A. Levy, jewel dealer.

Sir H. C. Luke (Lusach), has held countless diplomatic key positions.

Sir F. J. Marquis, of Lewis', Ltd.; has occupied many key positions in industrial councils, etc., in this country.

Sir H. Marks, big-business man in South Seas.

Sir Charles Mendl, press attaché, British Embassy, Paris.

Sir S. F. Mendl, member of war office advisory committee on Army contracts.

Sir R. L. Mond, interesting himself in archaeology.

Sir H. A. Miers, geologist.

Sir M. Myers, chief justice of New Zealand.
 Sir M. Nathan, has had five colonial governorships.
 Sir F. G. Newbolt, official referee, supreme court.
 Sir H. J. Newbolt, official naval historian, 1923; controller of wireless and cables in European War.
 Sir E. Oppenheimer, chairman of Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa.
 Sir F. Oppenheimer, British delegate in many international commissions.
 Sir C. E. Pereira, major-general.
 Sir F. Pollitzer.
 Sir Landon Ronald, musical conductor.
 Sir C. Rosenthal, major-general.
 Sir W. Rothenstein, artist.
 Sir Isidore Salmon, of J. Lyons & Co., served on many important public bodies.
 Sir H. Samuelson.
 Sir Claude Schuster, permanent secretary to Lord Chancellor.
 Sir G. E. Schuster, on many bank directorates and financial commissions.
 Sir C. D. Seligman, member of advisory committee of Export Credits Guarantee Department, Board of Trade.
 Sir P. C. Simmons, London County council.
 Sir E. D. Simon, Lord Mayor of Manchester.
 Sir H. H. Slessor, lord justice.
 Sir H. J. Stanley, Governor of Southern Rhodesia; real name, Sonnenthal.
 Sir L. S. Sterling.
 Sir Albert Stern, director-general, mechanical warfare department.
 Sir H. Strakosch, expert on scores of Empire financial commissions; British financial representative, League of Nations.
 Sir Aurel Stein, explorer and traveler to Tibet, etc.
 Sir Thomas White, chairman of Central Valuation Committee for England and Wales.
 Sir H. A. Wernher, chairman of Anglo-Swedish Society.
 Sir A. Zimmern, professor of international relations, Oxford University.
 Sir Otto Niemeyer denies he is Jewish; he does not look it; he is president of the Bank of International Settlements.
 The following Knights now living have married women of Jewish blood:
 Sir Percy Ashley married a Jewish Hayman. Has been lecturer on history, London School of Economics, and secretary, import duties advisory committee.
 Sir J. M. Astbury married a Jewish Susman (first wife). Judge, high court.
 Sir R. M. Banks married an Ehrman, widow of an Epstein. Judge.
 Sir E. C. Benthall married the daughter of the Jewish Baron Cable; he was Lord Reading's agent in India.
 Sir A. A. Biggs married a Pollak.
 Sir C. V. Brooke married a Jewish Brett. Rajah of Sarawak.
 Sir E. J. Cameron married an Isaacs. Has had many Colonial Governorships.
 Sir C. E. Corkran married a Ricardo. General officer commanding, London district, 1928-32.
 Sir R. W. Dalton married a Bamberger. Senior trade commissioner of several Dominions.
 Sir David Davis married a Platner. Lord Mayor, Birmingham.
 Sir S. S. Davis married a Jewish Davis. Many administration and financial appointments, particularly Palestine.
 Sir F. H. Dent married a descendant of the Jew Gideon. Governor, London School of Economics.
 Sir G. M. Franks married a Garcia. General, president Allied Commission of Organization, Turkey.
 Sir R. Goddard married a Schuster. Judge, high court.
 Sir A. Greer married a Van Noorden. Lord justice of appeal.
 Sir C. J. C. Grant married the granddaughter of a Rothschild. General.
 Sir J. Hanbury-Williams married a Reiss. Chief of British Military Mission with H. Q. Russian Army in Field, 1914-17.
 Sir A. E. W. Harman married a Ricardo. General.
 Sir Malcolm Hogg married the granddaughter of a Jew Gompertz.
 Sir A. Hore married the widow of J. I. Belisha. Permanent Secretary, Minister of Pensions.
 Sir H. K. Kitson married a Jewish de Pass. Admiral Superintendent of H. M. Dockyard, Portsmouth.
 Sir Miles Lampson married a Castellani. High Commissioner, Egypt.
 Sir K. Lee married a Strakosch. On many industrial commissions.
 Sir H. J. Mackinder married a Ginsberg, director, London School of Economics, 1903-8; British High Commissioner, South Russia 1919-20; chairman, Imperial Economic Conference 1926-31.
 Sir W. Morrison married a D'Costa. On legislative council, Jamaica.
 Sir F. S. Parry married a descendant of the Jew Gideon. Private secretary, First Lord Treasury 1897-1902; has been deputy chairman, board of customs, for 25 years.
 Sir W. T. Southorn married a Jewish Woolf. Colonial Secretary, Hong Kong.
 Sir F. T. Spickernell married the descendant of a Jew Rosenzweig. Secretary to First Sea Lord for 8 years.
 Sir M. M. Wood married the daughter of Moss Davis. Liberal whip.

263553—19504

Other knights have allowed their children to marry Jews or Jewesses, or have other family ties with Jews, as:
 Sir Hugh S. Barnes' daughter has a Rothschild as son-in-law.
 Sir F. Bowater's son married the daughter of a Jewish Franklin.
 Sir J. F. S. Coleridge's daughter married a Seligman.
 Sir W. Dalrymple's son married a Jewish Albu.
 Sir Austin E. Harris's son married a Bahrens.
 Sir J. A. Hawke's daughter married the Jew Sir P. C. Simmons.
 Sir A. Hopkinson's daughter married Sir G. B. Hurst (Hertz).
 Sir T. G. Horridge married the widow of A. Isenberg.
 Sir Oliver Lodge's daughter married a Jewish Yarrow.
 Sir W. Monckton's wife's stepfather is a Cohen.
 Sir Guy Standing's daughter married a Jewish Leon.
 Some of the knights mentioned are themselves Jewish, but we have no proofs in these cases and therefore make no distinctions.

The following are women of Jewish blood bearing titles as being widows of knights:

Lady M. Barnard (nee Loewen).
 Lady C. M. Chermiside, daughter of 1st Baron Reuter.
 Lady De Pass (nee Mercado).
 Lady A. de Villiers, daughter of Simon Davis.
 Lady M. H. Egerton, daughter of a Jewish Franklin.
 Lady A. Gollancz (nee Goldschmidt).
 Lady A. R. Goodrich (nee Helbert, originally Israel).
 Lady A. G. Gregg (nee Samuel).
 Lady A. Hayter (nee Slessor).
 Lady L. Henry (nee Levy).
 Lady A. E. Henschell (nee Louis).
 Lady H. E. F. Jacoby (nee Liepmann).
 Lady D. F. James (nee Basevi).
 Lady K. de V. Lambton, granddaughter of the Jew, Bernal Osborne.

Lady J. V. Lucas (nee Henriques).
 Lady P. Lyons (nee Cohen).
 Lady A. Mandelberg (nee Barnett).
 Lady V. A. Myers (nee Levy).
 Lady A. E. Nathan (nee Sichel).
 Lady E. Prince (nee Jonas).
 Lady A. Z. Pringle (nee Levy).
 Lady R. Samuel (nee Beddington).
 Lady I. Snowden (nee Isaacs).
 Lady F. Walston (nee Einstein).

So, there is something rotten in the state of Denmark. We ask our readers to join us and to help to rouse what is left of the great British Nation to race-consciousness. No man or woman can escape the responsibility which the knowledge given in this pamphlet forces upon them. The task cannot be left to future generations, because every generation will be more Judaized than the one before it.

The great Jew-wise reformer, William Cobbett thus addressed the nobility of his day (about 1827) in his Letter to the Nobility of England:

"You feel . . . that you are not the men your grandfathers were; but you have come into your present state by slow degrees, and therefore you cannot tell, even to yourselves, not only how the change has come about, but you cannot tell what sort of change it really is. You may know what it is, however . . . when you reflect that your grandfathers would as soon have thought of dining with a chimney sweep than of dining with a Jew or with any huckstering reptile who has amassed money by watching the turn of the market; that those grandfathers would have thought it no dishonor at all to sit at table with farmers, or even with laborers, but that they would have shunned the usurious tribe of loan jobbers, and other notorious changers of money as they would have shunned the whirlwind or the pestilence."

GENTLEMEN, YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED—KEEP TROTH

(Current engagements on going to press: The Marquess of Queensberry's daughter to Count Bendem, son of the new Jew Baron de Forest.)

Revised to November 30, 1937, enlarged with addition of new names and removal of others through death, and in three cases through error.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part VI

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1940

ARTICLE FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO LEADER, FEBRUARY 17 AND 24, 1912

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which is a reprint from the San Francisco Leader of February 17

and 24, 1912, by Lillian Scott Troy. The article is entitled "Benedict Arnold Peace Society—Some Inside and Interesting History of the Infamous Peace Proposal—How the Scheme To Form an Alliance With England Is Being Engineered—Carnegie's Crafty Method."

This is in line with the other matter which I have inserted in the RECORD, of which it is part VI. In these articles I have made it a point to show that this insidious British influence to return the United States as a colony of Great Britain has been active for over a hundred years.

BENEDICT ARNOLD PEACE SOCIETY—SOME INSIDE AND INTERESTING HISTORY OF THE INFAMOUS "PEACE" PROPOSAL; HOW THE SCHEME TO FORM AN ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND IS BEING ENGINEERED; CARNEGIE'S CRAFTY METHOD

By Lillian Scott Troy

[Reprinted from The Leader of February 17 and February 24, 1912, San Francisco, Calif.]

Andrew Carnegie is in high favor in England just now. Britons who formerly sneered at the return of the Scot American to his native Highland heath biyearly, now nod satisfied approval when the iron master's name is mentioned.

When English sneer, they hate; when they hate, they hate forever. Why this sudden change? Carnegie's money? No! His libraries, hero funds, etc.? No! His ambition? Yes!

Within the soul of the little Scotsman dwells a burning weakness, which only an experienced physiognomist could discern in his immobile features.

Ambition! Mad ambition; the ambition of Caesar.

The man who so cleverly amassed one of the largest individual fortunes it has been man's luck to gather together in the age of the world would be less than human had he not some weakness. To be ambitious is good but to be ambitious with a feverish but deliberate intensity which sacrifices principle for trickery and craftiness is bad. The master mind that engineered the ways and means to a colossal fortune has no limitations! Carnegie expands and basks in the limelight; it is the one joy of his declining years.

Since the visit of King Edward to Skibo Castle in Scotland, a new germ of ambition has been sown in the mind and soul of the Scotsman. On that memorable day, when he was honored by the King of England, a flag floated over Skibo Castle, which showed the Stars and Stripes on one side and the British flag on the other. As the King was leaving the castle, after offering Carnegie a dukedom—on terms, the laird of the castle is said to have raised his hand to the flag and exclaimed subjectively, "Your Majesty entered Skibo Castle under the American flag, and the British flag flies over your Majesty as you leave. May there be only one flag over Skibo Castle when your Majesty graciously design to enter again, and may that flag be the British flag. And may it also float over the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific."

Immediately after the peacemaker's visit, the Carnegie peace fund was started in America.

The fair name of peace was substituted for treachery and betrayal. The word "peace" caught the popular mind for the moment. The subtlety which marks the character of Andrew Carnegie forbade mentioning arbitration with England until the peace fund had been well advertised, and duly cemented in the minds of the American people as the best scheme for good the laird of Skibo had initiated.

The "Peace" Fund Committee was painstakingly selected, with a careful regard for future development. And trading under the holy name of "peace" the object and aim of this congenial committee (neat salaries, etc.) was what? To sell the United States to England!

These were the terms demanded for Carnegie's dukedom! His money could buy men buyable, to favor "peace," it could buy or lease secretly newspapers to spread broadcast Carnegian doctrine until their protean proclivities gradually permeated into easily influenced minds; it could hire unnaturalized Englishmen or Canadians who had lived and amassed fortunes in the United States but who found the land of their long residence too inferior for adoption, to spread the doctrine; and lastly, to be ultracharitable, it could even pull the wool over the eyes of the President of the United States!

This sudden haste about arbitration was unwittingly brought about by the impending war between England and Germany. Carnegie was forced on against his will and more farsighted judgment to bring about a working "entente" with the United States before Germany made any hostile move against England. In fact, the United States was to be held over the head of their friend Germany in the shape of a "big stick" by England.

Look well at the men who are talking themselves hoarse trying to tell us why we must have arbitration with England. Is there a man amongst them who is a representative American? Is there one whose patriotism for America we would class with that of Washington, Jefferson, or with that of any of the great men who have passed away, but whose example of shunning "entangling alliances" has helped to make America what it is today, the sun in the constellation of nations?

Of Carnegie I have already spoken—and sparingly. And what of Mr. Eliot of Harvard? We are told that the gentleman is an Englishman and as such probably knows what is good for England more interestedly than he knows what is bad for America.

Mr. Choate, the ex-Ambassador to Great Britain? This gentleman was principally notorious for his ultra-English tendencies and

sympathies when Ambassador to Great Britain; and any fame he may have attained was chiefly as an after-dinner speaker.

Mr. Whitelaw Reid, the present Ambassador to Great Britain? This gentleman is remarkable for the facility with which he manages to marry his relatives of the gentler sex off to decadent members of the English nobility; and also almost famous for the beaming smile he bestowed upon Commander Sims of the U. S. S. *Minnesota* when that previously inspired American officer made his clever faux pas at the Guildhall luncheon in London, given to the officers and sailors of the American Fleet in the Thames some short time since. This speech, which the Englishment gulped down with joy, and which gave serious offense to Germany, contained these most un-American sentiments:

"If Great Britain were to be threatened with an external foe, she could count upon every dollar, every man, and every drop of blood in America."

Like the famous speech of an ex-President of the United States at the Guildhall some time previous, it is generally accepted that Commander Sims simply had his little say, as he was parroted to, and felt amply repaid in the genial nod and beaming smile of approval of the American Ambassador.

This speech was intended to convey false news to Germany; it was intended to scare Germany off.

If the little "feeler" passed unchallenged in America, the intended end would have been accomplished; if exception were taken as to how and for whom we Americans were willing to shed every drop of our blood, there was Sims to be the scapegoat.

I am in Germany as I write this and I want to say right here that Commander Sims' unlucky inspiration has done exactly what these "Benedict Arnolds" expected it to do, and the American people have been greatly injured in the eyes of a friendly nation. Without any other reason than that the Germans have made such wonderful progress in their foreign trade, England has continually insulted and misrepresented German motives and ideals until an industrious people have had the last straw added and they are going to have compensation.

The Boer War opened the eyes of England to her own delinquency and she discovered, after all the rest of the world had done so, that she was the happy possessor of an army that was "brag" and a navy officered by sap-headed gentlemen's sons which was all "boast."

The bragging, boasting, and bluffing went merrily on, but Great Britain immediately began to look around for crutches and a cane. She made an alliance with Japan; Germany minded her own business and sawed wood. She made an "entente" with her old bitter enemy, France; Germany continued to saw wood and work. She made an alliance with Russia and then triumphantly began to insult Germany. She made demands on Germany—commanded her to cease increasing her navy. Germany quietly told Great Britain that her armaments would increase in the ratio of Great Britain's hostile alliances. England tried bluffing and got her bluff nearly called. Germany said she was ready to take her chances with the quartet of England, Japan, France, and Russia, but politely added that she much preferred to work and increase the prosperity and happiness of her people; but * * * * If Great Britain wished to have a little fracas * * * "Barkis was willin'."

Like the slinking coyote which has the will and desire but not the courage to pounce on the lamb, England, with all the reinforcements of three other hungry powers, decided that the time to attack Germany had not yet come. And then the question of how, was the nightmare of Great Britain. A man of initiative, clever in handling difficult situations with dispatch was needed. America was looked to with covetous eyes—but no Englishman dare suggest arbitration. Why? Because the American mind would immediately become suspicious of a "nigger in the woodpile." The suggestion must come from an American! It must appear as if America graciously made the initial move, and England immediately fell into her arms.

Andrew Carnegie, whose sentiments were always British, while willing to father the scheme and pay the bills, was too far sighted to openly suggest the idea himself, knowing the propensity of the American people to ask embarrassing questions, so he whispered first to the King, and the peacemaker found Carnegie's whisper so dashingly funny that he must hold his kingly sides in acute risibility.

The question of arbitration with England must come from no lesser an American than the President of the United States!

Pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire—no wonder the King laughed!

Then the canny Scot, the clever organizer, came to the United States on mischief bent. He tickled President Taft under the ribs and cooed something into his ear—several things. And out of a clear sky "our" President—all by himself (?)—holds out the glad hand to England and says, "Let us arbitrate."

And he says he thought it all out by himself! Ananias!

One high in authority and near to the Throne, in a speech in 1908 said: "In seven years the Union Jack will float over the whole of the United States."

Elihu Root wishes us to celebrate one hundred years of peace with England in 1915—the seventh year. Synchronism!

Why not celebrate with our friends, with whom we have never had war? Why celebrate with the only nation on earth who has always been and still is our own enemy, the only nation who has had the distinction of oppressing us, and whose smoldering hate and contempt for the "Yankee" is only second to the hate and ill will she bears her Irish and Indian subjects?

The present King of England openly boasts that if George III (3rd) had held court in New York, there would have been no American Revolution. The Queen, a woman hard and cold as Queen Elizabeth but without Elizabeth's brains, detests Americans fiercely. No opportunity is lost in showing her royal contempt even to American women who have, by marrying musty and decaying scions of the British nobility, not only reinstated their husbands in three full meals a day, but their whole families as well.

The Duchess of Marlborough was insulted before the world at the Coronation. Why? Because she was a hated "Yankee".

It is quite safe to say that the only Americans who are treated by the English royalties as if they were human beings are the numerous relatives of Ambassador Reid. Not that the Reids are supposed to be in any degree more eligible than any other American family, but because Mr. Reid is and may still be very useful in furthering the arbitration treaty—and a few other things.

The Liberal and the Irish parties have on two occasions taken serious umbrage at Ambassador Reid's attempt to take sides in the British election. At one time it was thought that the Irish party would take the matter to Washington.

On last Thanksgiving Day, Ambassador Reid contemptuously aired his opinion of Americans at the dinner given by the American Society in London. He said that Americans who visited England were generally of two kinds: Those who referred to America as "God's country" and who couldn't find anything as good in England as in America, and women who wished to intrude their republican presence on English royalty.

And thus in a public speech did the man who represents the United States in Great Britain hold his own countrymen and countrywomen up to ridicule. And on Thanksgiving Day, a day on which, if he couldn't bring himself to say something fair and kind, he had done better to have held his peace.

The English newspapers made much of Ambassador Reid's anti-American speech. Many were the gloating references made to the effect that even the American Ambassador could not stand his own people. And why, may the American people consistently ask, does our patriotic reference to the United States as "God's country" exasperate Mr. Whitelaw Reid to such an extent that he must select Thanksgiving Day of all days to criticize at a public dinner our warm-hearted and truthful reference to our own country? As to the American women he holds in such contempt for endeavoring to "intrude" their republican presence on English royalty, why should they not, if they wish to, and royalty wants their money to save the disintegrating nobility? Can Mr. Reid, with all his close experience of royalty, begin to compare any royal house in the world with even the average American family? No! Can he compare any of the royal women with American women in refinement, courtesy, genuine kindness, brains, wit, or honorable pride and virtue? No doubt the United States Ambassador, knowing the distaste the English King and Queen have for Americans, would turn it to account by barring out all but his numerous family and family-in-law from the sensitive royal presence. One has only to glance casually at the picture of the group of guests at Ambassador Reid's country home in England, where King Edward is seen sitting close to D. O. Mills, Mr. Reid's father-in-law, to observe the angry and disgusted expression on His Majesty's face at being roped in so neatly and being obliged to sit and have his royal face and figure taken "with that d——d old nobody, Mills."

But the possibility of an entente with America, and possibly in time—well, the King was only playing the game, even if it did upset him.

Cecil Rhodes' dream of empire found expression in his legacy providing for the education of American youths in England. Rhodes hoped that the process of time would gradually prove an influence in changing the history of the United States as it is written and studied in America to the way England teaches it in her colleges and desires that it should be taught in America in order to "do justice to England."

Rhodes sagaciously remarked that as far as education went, every 10 years saw a new generation. As the influence of American boys educated under English direction increased, so would the tendency to rewrite the history of the United States become easier to suggest and more certain of success. The history of our country as written, studied, and believed in England would put Baron Munchausen to shame.

The first seeds of hate for America are sown in the young student's mind by a cruelly calumnious attack upon George Washington. George Washington is spoken of as a "most inferior rebel general." One wonders what were the delinquencies of the British he whipped. Children are taught that Americans are the refuse of Europe; the descendants of servants, adventurers, and criminals.

The Japanese are right when they say that a secret is best kept by three men when only one man knows it.

Intoxicated with what appeared to them as signs of success in the great "peace" fraud, there are a few whose loquacity, whose brag of American dependence, is more fluent than their silence. Hence this article.

We are told in England that Andrew Carnegie is a loyal subject of the King, and has sworn allegiance to the British crown. Although born a Scotsman, no American cares a rap whether he is a Scotsman or a Frenchman or a Russian, but we most certainly do take exception to his pretending to the American people that he is acting for the best interests of America as an American when he is neither the one thing, nor doing the other.

263553—19504

Why was President Taft in such an indelicate hurry to rush the arbitration treaties through the Senate last July? Because Germany was preparing to attack Great Britain in August, and only the moral influence of a possible entente between Great Britain and the United States, which at a moment's notice could be widened into an offensive and defensive alliance, prevented hostilities.

Mr. Astor, otherwise known as the expatriated American, is keenly in favor of "peace." That's enough to make us suspicious. He loves America so.

John Hays Hammond is in favor of "peace," too. Our President commented most kindly on the warm reception accorded Mr. Hammond at the coronation last June.

And why was John Hays Hammond sent to represent the United States at the coronation of the King and Queen? Why did he receive such a fall-into-my-waiting-arms reception? Because he fought in South Africa with the English against the brave Boers. Also because he is all for England and Carnegie "peace."

While no one in their normal senses would question or attack the patriotism, guilelessness or artless simplicity of heart of Elihu Root, yet—keep your weather eye on him.

Many reputable citizens whose patriotism was unquestioned were misled into taking an active interest in public demonstrations in favor of the special brand of buncombe called Carnegie "peace." The chief aim and object of getting prominent names associated with Mr. Carnegie's scheme was partially successful for a short period but now the eyes of the deceived are widely opened to the full and complete campaign of treachery launched against the United States in Skibo Castle.

If the arbitration treaties must be discussed in the Senate, let the debate be an open session, and let us mark well the men who call upon the dishonored spirit of Benedict Arnold to help them to a ready flow of eloquence that they may hide under their scintillating utterances the sardonic curl of a traitor's lips.

The following is what a few very ambitious but traitorous Americans in high positions could tell us if they would, and to which policies they have either pledged their wealth, their brains, or their influence. Many of these men are under pay from a fund which has given none of its "peace" money to prevent war between Italy and Turkey, or any other nations or peoples at war; a fund which under a false name, is only being used, and only will be used to assist to the utmost the destruction of American independence, and the slow or fast betraying of America's nationhood into the ready hands of the only genuine enemies she has ever had.

As far as can be ascertained, the following are the guidance rules laid down for the accomplishment of this secret society which we can make no mistake in calling the "Benedict Arnold Peace Society."

1. Power of the President of the United States to be increased so as to gradually diminish the powers of Congress.
2. Supreme Court of the United States to be revised so as to embrace only judges agreeable to absorption by Great Britain, and uniformly hostile to the United States Senate.
3. Precedents must be established by said Court against the United States Senate in rulings, decisions, etc., (specially prepared).
4. Strong campaign must be waged in the several States and Territories against Congressmen and Senators showing hostility to Great Britain. If unsuccessful in defeating them, they must be continually watched until discovered in some overt act, mainly personal, and under threat of exposure forced to resign.
5. When the success of the arbitration treaties is assured a few unimportant disputes between the United States and Great Britain may arise, in which the preference must be given to the United States. These apparent victories must be widely advertised in order to create confidence in the propitioussness of arbitration with Great Britain. While the scope of the treaties must be of considerable latitude, care must be taken not to in any way bring such questions as to the fortification or navigation of the Panama Canal, or the Monroe Doctrine, into dispute until the situation is under firm control.
6. As soon as compatible with conditions, the arbitration treaties must be widened into an offensive and defensive alliance.
7. On accomplishment of same, British and American naval officers must be mutually exchanged, but care must be taken that this suggestion is made by an American.
8. Quietly and unobtrusively, American soldiers must be sent to Egypt and India; British soldiers may then be quartered in the United States.
9. English royalty, preferably the Duke and Duchess of Connaught, must be sent to Canada, from whence they must make frequent trips to New York. But great care must be taken not to enter Washington if there is a demonstration against them, or until they have practically "held court" in New York.
10. The wives and daughters of men controlling great wealth and influence in America must be given preference at these "courts." They must be selected carefully from every State and Territory in the United States. Thus a new "society," through royal favor, must quietly and expeditiously be created.
11. Honors must be conferred on the husbands of women thus given preference in the social circles of America, and a rank or position determined by judiciously distributed decorations.
12. Honor must be conferred on all American officers favoring "peace."

13. The women of men showing hostility to "peace" must be socially ostracized.

14. When a strong phalanx of influential people in favor of "peace" has been created, and the exchange of British and American naval officers accomplished, and as many as possible of the United States troops transported to India, the King and Queen of England may then visit Washington.

15. Should any demonstration of hostilities to their Majesties occur, the Hindu troops and the British may, in the absence of the American soldiers, quell any disturbances.

16. Men whose wealth prevents their being influenced by money must have honors and position and possibly a title dangled before their wives' eyes.

17. When newspapers cannot be bought or leased, new publications must be started.

18. Educators must receive special favors in flattering newspaper notices; and wide publicity must not be given to Independence Day celebrations; people persisting in demonstrations must be "cut" and held up to ridicule. Any demonstrations with fireworks must be strongly opposed and discouraged on the ground of protection to life and property.

19. An elaborate celebration must be arranged to take place in the United States in 1915, to commemorate 100 years of peace between Great Britain and America, by which time the object and aim of "peace" will be at the apex of consummation.

20. Education of the masses must be discouraged, in order to create harmony with the desires of the wealthy and the several trusts, who will see in such a suggestion a strong tendency to reduce wages from their now unreasonable heights to the basis of wages paid in Great Britain; also, the suggestion that the ignorant cannot organize so formidably as the educated masses will be widely appreciated as dissension and suspicion of their own leaders can be more easily advanced.

21. A popular feeling against Irish immigration may be aroused in the United States by giving wide publicity to all individual cases of rejection of immigrants for reasons of acute poverty, insanity or criminality, or disease.

22. Arbitration, offensive or defensive alliances, and finally peace must be brought about as quickly as possible. For the latter, armed compulsion may be necessary, and it is recommended that the Indian and British troops be altogether confined to the east of America, leaving the protection of the west to the Japanese troops, 80,000 of which are already scattered throughout the Sandwich Islands, Mexico, British Columbia, and California. Reciprocity with Canada can be passed almost unanimously through the American Congress, and then opposed bitterly in Canada on one ground only—that of annexation by the United States. Simultaneously with the rejection of reciprocity by the Canadian people, a member of the British royal family, preferably the Duke of Connaught, must take up his residence in Canada.

23. With the assistance of some interested and powerful trust, such as the Meat Trust, strained relations may be brought about between Germany and the United States; in such event, and with a defensive and offensive alliance with Great Britain, a casus belli of England would be more easily turned into account by a simultaneous attack on Germany. Great Britain's diplomatic relations with Germany must remain intact until the consummation of the alliances with the United States.

24. It is suggested to embrace France in the arbitration treaties, for the moment, as suspicion must not be created during the initial efforts.

It will be remembered that when the Japanese hero of Port Arthur visited the United States last summer, he graciously informed us that "arbitration between Great Britain and the United States would be such a benefit to the United States." He had just come fresh from England; he hadn't been provisionally promised the Philippines, either in the event of * * *

As the great Japanese admiral placed a wreath at Washington's Tomb, did any of us remember the almost prophetic words of the first American President, "to beware of entangling alliances"?

Let the shades of Benedict Arnold blush for shame, for there are those today who exceed him in treachery and betrayal. Away with the Carnegian peace at the price of liberty!

England's attempted dictation and interference both in our internal and foreign affairs is plainly and boldly illustrated in a book written by Lieutenant Colonel Lowther, military secretary and official mouthpiece of the Duke of Connaught. Lieutenant Lowther says that he suggested a solution of the Japanese tangle to Colonel Roosevelt, namely, that the United States of America should give the Japanese all the facilities they asked for in California, on condition that the Empire of the Rising Sun should take over the Philippines from the United States.

In these few words Lieutenant Lowther has embodied two shots for one bird:

Firstly, the flooding of the United States with cheap coolie labor will reduce wages, thus gradually making it more difficult for the man in ordinary circumstances to spare enough money to support his children during the time they should be in school, and thereby making it necessary for children's education to be reduced to the level of the children of the poor in England, which would tend in a very short time to make for a sharp class distinction or "illiterate rabble." This latter class is regarded as very desirable in England, as the more ignorant the lower classes, the more easily they are controlled.

Secondly, Japan wants the Philippines. Her alliance with England was made for one purpose, and that was, by the careful and cunning treading of certain intricate and complicated paths of diplomacy, to bring about the peaceful or otherwise militant absorption of the Philippines. England's alliance with Japan was made to offer the tempting bait of the Philippines as a reward for services which Japan must be ever prepared and ready to offer, if necessary.

What about the Japanese coaling station recently discovered in Mexico? Preparation?

Lieutenant Colonel Lowther has held the post of naval attaché; his advice has been highly appreciated in the deliberations of his Government; he has lately accompanied the uncle of the King of England to the United States as military secretary and official mouthpiece; therefore let no one discount his set idea of what our policy with the Philippines should be; a man so strictly trained in the policy and diplomacy of his Government speaks with authority from his King and government.

Should a suggestion be made to Congress that "it will be next to impossible to hold the Philippines without increasing our Army, which will entail a great burden of expense on the United States," it will be well to investigate the company the suggester of this statement has been keeping; also, if it is his own opinion, or if it is the opening wedge to the proposal of the English officer, Lieutenant Colonel Lowther, military attaché and official mouthpiece of the Duke of Connaught, to "turn over the Philippines to the Empire of the Rising Sun." * * *

The opening chapter of Lieutenant Colonel Lowther's book, in its general exaggeration of lawlessness in the United States, has helped to cement the idea in the English mind that the United States must come under British rule speedily.

Simultaneously with the publication of this British officer's book depicting Americans as a lot of wholesale murderers, devoid of the slightest honor or courage, and comparing them detrimentally to the gentlemen he had known in Pall Mall, he was scattering broadcast in New York and Washington his hypocritical expression of admiration for "the great Republic and the American people." His comparison of the Canadian soldier to the United States soldier leaves nothing to be admired in the American soldier. In fact, every reference to anything or anybody in America is teeming with contempt and bitterness. Even the clubs in the United States, which received him with open-hearted hospitality, he refers to with sneering contempt, and, to be accurate, one must say that many of his statements regarding the people whose bread he broke are devoid of the merits of truth.

The inefficiency of the Senators and Representatives is systematically advertised to the British public in cleverly written magazine and newspaper articles and books. The English portion of the British public are not overly given to think for themselves; when they read that India "must be governed," Egypt "must be governed," they are one with the Government; and now that they are daily and weekly being fed on the suggestion that the United States has completely gone to the bow-wows, and can only be saved if she throws herself into British arms, they won't let go of the idea, and will help to a man to bring about the consummation of "Carnegie peace."

Even Mr. A. Maurice Low, an Englishman who has lived in the United States for 20 years, tells his countrymen the following in his book on America:

"Secrecy is often essential in negotiations, but secrecy is impossible when a treaty must be communicated to the Senate. The Senate is not popular with the country at large."

He goes on to explain that Members of the Senate are certain to break their oath of secrecy taken regarding "executive sessions." He also says, "It is generally believed that Members of Congress, as a body, are corrupt."

Let some of my statements regarding the hatred the English people cherish for America and the Americans be doubted, I am going to give a few extracts from a book written by an Englishman during the last term of the ex-President in the White House. While the actual literary merits of this book may be nil, its long and complicated sentences obscure and badly constructed, and its syntax amateurish, nevertheless its purpose and its veiled meaning is as clear as crystal. Every page of this book shows malice; every paragraph venom. When I first began to read this book—on the recommendation of another English writer that I would find out some truths about my own country—I naturally supposed the publication to be a sort of "freak" idea; but on closer investigation of all books written by Englishmen about the United States I found that nearly all of these books contained far-fetched lies and calumnies written with pens that were steeped in bitter jealousy, detestation, and hatred. "Americans who favor 'Carnegie peace,' otherwise called 'absorption,' will do well to read 'Y. America's Peril.'" The Y is intended to mean Yankee. This book is intensely popular in England, no less a personage than the late King Edward finding in it the best book on the "Yankee" he has ever read. The author is almost a hero. You had better make up your minds to read some things which you will find real "nawsty."

Following are a few printable extracts from this book:

"There can be no doubt that America is the dumping ground of Europe's refuse; it is the scum of other lands. It has no right to be called a nation. Everything in the United States seemed unwholesome. I think the desire for gold is so deep-rooted in Yankee that if he could 'beat' his own father he would do it. In less

than three generations the United States will be unfit for a civilized lady or gentleman to live in.

"From the boy who shines your boots to the Senator, they are a nation of boodlers. Americans are the cast-offs from every land on the face of the earth.

I saw a good deal of the American woman—in fact, "most all" that she could show me without exposing herself to Yankee's anger.

Verily Yankee's women, and sometimes unwise ones, do not believe in hiding the light of their charms under a bushel or anything else. By the time I had been in the States a month, I began to ask myself, was any woman in the land to be trusted?

I was informed * * * that in a western town, there was not a virtuous woman, and that 75 percent of them had suffered from "modern appendicitis."

(Writer's note—particulars regarding the explanation of this last statement, which appears in the book, cannot be printed.)

Yankee is a deadly assassin, worse than a rattlesnake. Yankee is awfully brave, especially when it is 20 to 1. Yankee does not care to fight with his fists. The American police are no more fitted for police than a barrel; they bear a resemblance to a walrus on end. The standard of fair play, even that of good taste, is not the same as in England. Yankee is vulgar and ignorant. He wears tan shoes with a dress suit. The typical American has no intellectuality. He has a nether lip like a motherless foal reared on a whisky bottle. His hair is cut "slop bowl" fashion. He is sallow, with pointed narrow jaw. Of this type are made magistrate, judges, and so forth. Young men of America are of the ladylike type. Men in America are effeminate looking. They are a mixture of poodle dog and girl.

It is quite a rarity to see an American city-bred child with legs. Their poor little apologetic pipestems are simply pitiful. Already this process of decay has begun. Yankee has no instep. His food is as flat as a pancake and as "narrow as the trend of his mind." * * * His legs are thin, and so infrequently is his body. He is a tramar. I visited the Philadelphia University and had a look through the dental school there. I inquired carefully for the specialists who would not take on anything but canines. I found that it had not come to that yet, but it is trending that way.

The carrion-eating vulture would have suited the Americans quite as well as an emblem of liberty as the eagle.

In four generations when the aggressive newness of the Congressional Library at Washington has been toned down, it may be a fine building. The Capitol is shoddy.

The English writers of books, and those who write for the press, have attacked and calumniated every ideal of our nationhood for generations, but they have left the virtue of our women unassailed until of late years. Where one heard a grudging compliment paid to the virtue of our women, now we hear the most cruel and untruthful aspersions cast upon them individually and collectively. There is no use to remonstrate; they will tell you that several English writers who visited the States have written in their books that the American woman is simply "rotten," and they ought to know. The English are more like sheep than lions; they herd close together in their opinions, which they generally do not form for themselves and when the leader of the flock says "bah," they all "bah, bah." If he says "boo," they all "boo" together. They read *Y, America's Peril*, because the King read it. They like it for the same reason he liked it—because it "slammed it to the Yankee upstarts."

This particular writer says he came away from America with a nasty taste in his mouth. He says the first hotel he stayed at was in San Francisco and the waiters look like "a lot of dirty brigands."

He evidently bears a most venomous spleen for Washington, like the rest of his compatriots. He says he doesn't see how Washington could have been an American if he never told a lie. Writing of the Washington Monument at Washington, he waxes torpidly eloquent. He says that Washington's Monument is a mere elevator "and like everything in America, from justice on, it is hollow and corrupt." He says the Washington Monument is typical of American usages and customs—hollow and corrupt. He adds: "Yankee! Yankee! have you anything in your land that is not hollow?" He calls the American boys "young American dastards. * * * Poor, pitiful little Yankees."

It is puzzling and singular that the only American he admires is Theodore Roosevelt, of whom he speaks pityingly as "Roosevelt, president of champion spitters of the world."

Like many Englishmen, he frets because on our currency we have the words "In God we trust." He says that this should be changed. It is to be wondered if the inspiration to eliminate "In God we trust" from our currency during the term of office of the only American this Englishman admired was done to solve the particular sensitiveness of this anti-American Britisher.

He says, "The dollar is dirty in the West. It is positively filthy in the East, both metaphorically and actually."

The inscription "In God we trust" is a lying religious inscription. He says that he apostrophized a Negro thus: "Aye! Whiter than you, Yankee, except for about a hundredth of an inch. Whiter than you!"

Americans will be surprised to learn the author's story of the Battle of Manila Bay, but they may rest assured that if the history of the United States is rewritten according to Carnegian ideas and to coincide with the British patriotism of Prof. Morse Stephens, of the State university at Berkeley, Calif., this, in a few generations, will be accepted as the correct version;

263553—19504

"England beat the Spaniards at Manila. This isn't generally known, and I got the strictest confidence from a certain admiral in Chicago when Dewey gave the whole secret away."

This writer tells his readers that Dewey went all the way to Manila without ascertaining if he had certain guns and ammunition. In consternation, Dewey sent to Admiral Seymour, of the British squadron in Manila Bay, and obtained the guns and British ammunition with which the Spanish were whipped.

He says that Dewey was confused as to what to do in the battle and signaled Seymour, who from the British flagship directed the American admiral how to proceed, signaling "Fire your port broadsides," and in reference to one Spanish ship Admiral Seymour directed Admiral Dewey not to fire but to "blow her out of the water."

The closing reference to the battle of Manila Bay is as follows: "And now you have for the first time the story of how the English beat the Spaniards at Manila."

This book, which so pleased the late King, and which was read so widely in England, did not miss its mark—the ever growing tendency of the English public to accept as final that the absorption of America by Great Britain would simply be a matter of a few years.

Referring to the United States being skillfully steered into British waters, one is astounded to read that "courageous President Roosevelt realizes the decaying tendencies of the United States of America. A skillful pilot is at the helm, and he is not unaware of the danger * * * but his assistants—what of them?" (The Senate).

Continuing, he says he hopes the President will "wear ship" ere it is too late, and steer the ship into the safe and deep waters beyond (England). His book ends with the expression of a certain conviction that America and Great Britain would "go hand in hand and that time is not far off," and a full-page curse on the United States and its citizens:

"Land of sallow, scurrying men!
Land of bribery and corruption!
Land of the greasy food!
Thrice cursed art thou!"

But these British plans for the peaceful or militant absorption of the United States, with the assistance of Andrew Carnegie's executive ability and money, the treason of members of the Benedict Arnold Peace Society, and the willing cooperation of the rewriters of the history of the United States have gone sadly amuck on account of the threatened war between England and Germany. The matter of the arbitration treaty with England has been unduly and indecently rushed, much to Mr. Carnegie's displeasure; this indelicate haste was caused by the hysterical announcement of Lord Charles Beresford, the hero of many a naval parade, that the British Navy was not what it seemed; that the Navy was "without officers, without men, without the necessary units, and in the event of war with Germany the British Navy would be a present to the enemy."

Plans for the peaceful or otherwise absorption of the United States were overwhelmed with the fear that Germany would give unto herself a present of the British Navy, and possibly even more. While the plans of Carnegian peace were not scheduled to be ripe for a test until 1915, the fear of war with Germany in the immediate present forced the issue with such feverish haste that more than one cat was let out of the bag of diplomacy. England could not tax her people any heavier than she was taxing them, and even if she had the necessary funds at her command to build a navy that would compare with Germany's she did not have time. Germany was ready to spring, and England had little faith in the French and Russian Navies combined against the Germany Navy. She dare not expect the Japanese Navy to fight ship to ship with the Russian Navy for fear they might remember old scores and forget they were fighting for England and turn their guns upon each other.

There was only one subtle influence which could stay Germany's hand, and that was the arbitration treaty between England and the United States and the possible ratification of that treaty by the United States Senate. The treaty was sprung upon the Senate, just as reciprocity with Canada was, and it did not occur to the British Government that there would be any difficulty in quietly slipping the treaty through the Senate, and quickly widening it into a defensive and offensive alliance.

There have been times in the history of the United States when the country has not only been threatened with enemies from without, but also from traitors from within.

There have been times when the United States Senate has taken upon itself the functions of a court of impeachment.

If war is to come between England and Germany, let us keep our hands off. While deploring war and the horrors of war, we must choose between the lesser of the 2 evils—the killing of some thousands in battle or the continual oppressing and torturing of millions. A war between England and Germany would mean the killing of perhaps a few thousand men; but it would also mean liberty for 350,000,000 oppressed of India; liberty for 12,000,000 Persians; liberty for 4,000,000 Irish; liberty for the struggling Egyptians from Alexandria to the Sudan. It might even mean the peace of the world—the break in the trail of blood.

From the Sudan to London, Theodore Roosevelt hurrahed for England; in Egypt he told a patriotic and brave people to be "loyal" to the British Government; he said English rule in India was

great. Ask the Indians. Ask the Egyptians! * * * and you might also ask Mr. Morgan Shuster. Hands off!

Carnegie set up the Church Peace Union in 1914 with a \$2,000,000 fund to further his aims.

World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches has as its stated purpose "To organize the religious forces of the world so that the weight of all churches and Christians can be brought to bear upon the relations of governments and peoples."

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and International Strife—Part VII

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by the Reverend Dr. W. Pascoe Goard which appeared in the National Message, March 28, 1936, the official publication of the British-Israel World Federation. This article is entitled "British-Israel Is True."

We wish to speak a word of caution and exhortation to those of our brethren of the Christian ministry who are boldly challenging the truth of the British-Israel.

First, we may present our credentials to justify what we are about to say hereafter. The following has been written without particular consultation with our associates, but there need be no question that they carry the weight of the judgment of the clergymen and ministers, educationists, and other professional men, and of the laity, who stand with us in the many countries where our movement prevails.

What is the truth of the British-Israel? The truth is that the British-Israel is not a denomination and is not an ecclesiastic sect; but is instead a subsidized political organization. The question may then be asked, How can the British-Israel call the Christian clergy "brethren" when their organization is not ecclesiastic, but political, as I have stated?

It is generally stated, in order to give weight by comparison to the opposition, that there are no scholars in the British-Israel movement. No doubt those who make such statements think that they are strictly adhering to truth, and that this movement is one carried forward by those not qualified to judge.

The statement, however, is not only untrue—which is the negative form of the statement—it is positively untrue. A much shorter form of expression might be used. Facts will be desired to support this statement. Anyone who cares to search the literature of the British-Israel movement will be struck with the fact that among the small number who for many years stood together in defense of this truth a very large proportion of them carried the various degrees which our universities bestow. Such degrees were earned from Oxford, Cambridge, London, Birmingham, Durham, Trinity College, Dublin, Aberdeen, Yale, McGill, Toronto, British Columbia, and many other universities. We warn our opponents, if they have any respect for truth, to avoid circulating such misleading statements as these.

I do not believe anyone will deny that the British-Israel World Federation is well connected and well financed. The question is, Who are the financial promoters of the subversive movement to establish a world government? Can it be possible that the international bankers are the financial backers? Can it be possible that this movement is connected with the Grand Orient Lodge? Is it not true that the British-Israel and its proponents comprise the group now actively promoting war, and is it not true that the backers of this movement are those who control gold and international gold credit? We must recognize that the British-Israel world movement is anti-American and destructive to the principles of this Government.

Turning to standing and experience in the various churches: Within our ranks have been archbishops, bishops, well-placed clergy, ministers of high standing in the various churches, heads of educational departments and institutions, distinguished members of the bar, and so on. Such positions as have been occupied by many of those referred to have been achieved through merit in long and vigorous years of service in the various branches of the Christian church.

It is indeed unfortunate that many Christian churches have allowed the British-Israel in the church organizations.

Ministers should know that political movements within church organizations will destroy the church itself.

Of late a movement to bring forward such leaders as Dr. Goudge, Dr. Dimont, Dr. Campbell, and so on, heads of theological divinity schools, has evidently had as its object the forming of a ring around us of authority. We recognize the attainments and achievements of these highly esteemed men in other fields, but not in the one under consideration. Within our movement we can meet these gentlemen with men of equal attainments, of as wide experience; teachers and authors of equal standing. We cannot allow position or authority to weigh in a question of facts and truths. That argument does not meet the point at issue. But if the argument continues to be advanced, we balance it as we have already said.

We respectfully ask of the rank and file, of those who oppose us—What is it you oppose? We recommend each opponent to face this question, lest in opposing us he may be found to oppose the very standard upon which the whole doctrinal structure of his own communion is based. We will state the things for which we stand.

Dr. Goard employs a subtle argument to disarm anyone who may take issue with his statements. The fact remains, however, that the British-Israel is to establish a world state with a David as King, and the capital of this state, according to their own publications, is to be Jerusalem. I am opposed to the British-Israel, because I am quite well satisfied with our own government and unwilling to crusade for the British Empire or for the real motivators behind this movement in Asia, Africa, Egypt, or anywhere else.

We accept the Bible as it stands. We are quite aware of the various approaches to the Bible and of the various criticism to which it has been subjected. We do not speak in ignorance of these things, but rather with the full knowledge of them as men who have been over the ground again and again for many years past. Our approach to the Bible is an intelligent one. Our acceptance of the Bible is confirmed by facts beyond counting. It is our considered opinion that with the facts in hand which we possess, it is impossible to do otherwise than accept the great, sequent, even consequent, development of facts and truth as it is presented in Holy Writ.

We believe the Bible as it now stands does not need any other interpretation than that which facts, history, and experience accord. The Bible carries information not otherwise possessed by humanity, and which must have had a source higher than humanity because its scope is wider than the sum total of unaided human knowledge. For instance, the Bible contains knowledge of the past before human history began, and knowledge of the future to which humanity has not yet attained but is from day to day attaining. We accept it in its spiritual revelations, in its contacts with natural science and history, and in its prophetic dealing with the future. We take the Bible to be what the Prayer Book assures us it is, namely, "The Word of God Written."

I shall not discuss the historical aspect of the Bible or its revelations, for I grant that education existed then as well as today. The point in issue is that the British-Israel have appointed themselves as the chosen people to sit in judgment on the throne of David in Jerusalem, and I do not deny the British-Israel such rights. Reserving my own rights, I object to giving my aid in this cherished desire, and I refuse to share any responsibility in establishing this world state.

The Bible deals with Israel as a continuous national entity, from Sinai to the end of the world.

The Bible deals with Judah as a separate national entity, from its organization as a kingdom under David to the coming again of our Lord Jesus Christ.

These two paragraphs are illuminating, for they reveal the real purpose of the British-Israel plan; and it is to establish Judah as a kingdom under David, and so stated in the latter paragraph. The British-Israel movement is, therefore, backed by those who are interested in a Judaic state, and they are not the gentiles or those which the British-Israel pretend they represent.

The Bible deals with the continental empires and nations, from the granting of the imperial charter to Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and to his successors right down to that time indicated by Daniel, of which he said, "I beheld till the thrones were cast down * * *." Many scriptures show this to have been the ending of the Babylon succession, which took place in A. D. 1918, 2,520 years after the granting of the great Babylon charter.

We see that these three participants in world history have been the chief actors on the stage. They have so monopolized the activities of world history that what has taken place outside of their scope has scarcely been worth telling.

Bible prophecy and secular history are now merged into one.

This is within the scope of our faith. What objection has any churchman of any denomination to make of the facts here given,

and on what grounds can such objection be raised? Surely every Bible reader must know the truth of that which we have just stated. If not he can easily verify the truth.

We see and know that the general course of the history of each of these peoples is told in the prophetic scriptures. Further, by the interweaving of these lines of prophecy the general course of world history was foretold.

We take these lines of prophecy and we compare them carefully with world history. This is not an easy task. It takes much original research, which we have gone to the labor and expense of making. For instance, for years we have maintained a research department, the members of which have worked and still work in such institutions as the British Museum, and elsewhere, where the treasures of knowledge are deposited. As a result of the general scholarship of our leaders and the special knowledge thus obtained, we can give chapter and verse for much of the information required to establish the fact that history fully fulfills prophecy. A large and growing literature is produced and is still being produced in this field of research.

What a triumph that is for the Bible and for those who preach the Bible facts and truths. Dr. Driver was compelled by his lack of this special knowledge to admit what he believed to be a fact, that many of the promises made by God to the northern Kingdom of Israel and to the southern Kingdom of Judah had never been fulfilled, and that circumstances have so changed that they never can be fulfilled, but must be rather looked upon as ideals which God would fain see fulfilled in the life of His people. This is not a verbatim quotation, but whoever desires to do so will find the original statement in the introduction to Dr. Driver's Commentary on Jeremiah.

The fact that a scholarly wing of the British church, for whom Dr. Driver spoke as the regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford, should have found itself driven by the great atheist, Tom Paine, and his follower, Bradlaugh, to make such an admission, denotes a great tragedy for British Christianity.

The whole thing was a consequence of Dr. Driver's failure to read the continuous history of Israel and to identify it in its modern strength. Possessing this key to the knowledge of history, we are able to say that every covenant which God has entered into, every promise which God has made, and every prophecy which God has authorized concerning the northern Kingdom of Israel and the southern Kingdom of Judah have been and are being fulfilled to the letter up to date, and time only is the element required to complete the fulfillment of them all. Thus we bring triumph to the church; thus we restore shaken faith in the Bible and all its implications. Why Christian ministers should oppose us in making known this triumph is beyond our understanding.

This article which I am quoting is interesting, and I shall now quote a part of the foregoing paragraph:

Possessing this key to the knowledge of history, we are able to say that every covenant which God has entered into, every promise which God has made, and every prophecy which God has authorized concerning the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern Kingdom of Judah have been and are being fulfilled to the letter up to date, and time only is the element required to complete the fulfillment of them all.

In making this statement, Dr. Goard takes much for granted, and I am sure he will find many disappointments on the road he has selected to follow. I realize that he expects the armed forces of the United States to aid him so that his prophecies may be fulfilled, but the taxpayers of the United States, who pay the expenses of the Army, and particularly the men in the Army who must give their lives to please Dr. Goard, might object to aid him in establishing a world state in Egypt.

It will be and is being objected to that we substitute the national and secular phases of the gospel for the spiritual evangel. We do no such thing, and we commend this fact especially to the judgment of our evangelical brethren. Speaking to the latter for a moment, we say that the evangelicals have rightly opposed with vigor and courage the mutilation of the Bible by the higher critical and modernist schools. We join with them heartily in this. But now we say in all kindness, and with the seriousness which belongs to such a statement, that our evangelical opponents go much further than higher critics and modernists in determinately ignoring and often vigorously denying the whole of the kingdom message which deals with the state and its administration. To do this is to deny or ignore quite half of the Bible literature.

Further, we call the attention of our evangelical brethren to the fact that at every point the kingdom message, as it refers to the state, interpenetrates the evangelical message as it refers to the church of Christ.

The evangelical message cannot be given in its fullness nor in its full power if the kingdom message and its references to the state are eliminated. It would be foolish for either side to boast; it would be equally foolish to fail to estimate the work being done. Accordingly, we say that because we understand and use the national element as it penetrates the spiritual evangel, we not only preach the evangel as our evangelical brethren do, but we preach it in its fullness with the fullness of its power in a way that our evangelical brethren who disregard the kingdom message as it refers to the state cannot do.

263553—19504

The question is asked, What are the standards of doctrine recognized in the British-Israel movement? We make answer: We form no denomination; we are not an ecclesiastical sect; our members as a rule are members in good standing in their own communions. We send a constantly increasing army of members into congregations and churches. We take none out. We leave it to the membership and adherents of our movement to exercise perfect freedom as to the formula by which they express their faith. Among us we hold to the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed. One wing of our adherents expresses its faith in the terms of the Articles of the Church of England. Another wing holds as the expression of its faith the standards of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Churches. Still another wing holds the Methodist standards. These three great expressions of faith cover in general the same ground and may be considered as the basis of the faith of British-Israel. Further, as a body we hold and use the Book of Common Prayer, recognizing that that book in its entirety and in detail is compiled upon the assumption that the people who use it and hold it dear are the people of Israel and inheritors of the covenants made with our forefather Abraham.

These three paragraphs are informative, because we find that the British-Israel movement is not a Christian movement. It is not a denomination or church movement and it is not ecclesiastic, as I have already stated in discussing the first paragraph. The interesting part is this statement:

We send a constantly increasing army of members into congregations and churches. We take none out. We leave it to the membership and adherents of our movement to exercise perfect freedom as to the formula by which they express their faith.

This statement leaves no doubt as to this movement, for it is an organization which Judah is employing to destroy and upset Christian faiths in order to establish their own world state. The statement, "We take none out," is true, for these "fifth columnists" are sent into every church, and even into the Government itself, to spread British-Israel and world union now. This in itself proves clearly that all of these movements are un-American, anti-American and most damnably subversive. If we had a patriotic Justice Department and law-enforcement bodies that had the interest of the United States at heart, they would bring every one of these organizations before the bar of justice, because they are enemies of the United States and performing treasonable acts against our Government.

Stated briefly, the Bible, the prayer book, the great confessions of faith are ours. We are probably unique in this, that alone we hold what was generally held by the established church, the Covenanters, the Puritans, and all the great denominations up to a very recent period, namely, the fact that Britain and her associate nations are Israel. Consequently we hold the Bible in its entirety, both in its references to church and state; we hold the prayer book to mean fully what it says; we hold the great confessions of faith, with all the understanding of the fathers who produced them. We hold the state to be designed of God to be as holy as the church, and we believe the time is speedily coming when upon the holy vessels of the temple and the bells of the horses in the streets there will be inscribed equally, "Holiness to the Lord."

This paragraph also identifies the source of this movement in these words:

We are probably unique in this case, that alone we hold what was generally held by the established church, the Covenanters, the Puritans, and all the great denominations up to a very recent period, namely, the fact that Britain and her associate nations are Israel.

This statement reveals how deceptive this movement is, for Great Britain and her associates comprise Mongolians, Negroes, Australians, and many other racial types, who are not of the tribe of Israel. I may also say that no one would make such claim except the British Israel; and the reason for that claim is due entirely to the fact that the background of this movement in Judaic.

Knowing these things, we know that we, as Israel, are subject to the Israel constitution, that in fact our kingdom is made up as of old of Jehovah, the King of Israel, represented on earth by the House of David, of the nation Israel, over which the King bears rule; and of the constitution, which consists of the commandments, statutes, and judgments of the Lord.

This paragraph lets the cat out of the bag, for Jehove, or Jehovah, is the God of the Jews and David is their coming king. Their constitution or laws is the Talmud, and their prophecy is taken from the Old Testament.

IS THIS AN AGE OF REASON?

Let us now be practical. The United States Army and the United States Navy, conscripts or no conscripts, are to crusade in a stupid war in Asia and Africa. Our young men

are to give their lives—not in protection or defense of the United States, but for the sole purpose of establishing a kingdom in Arabia with Jerusalem as the capital, and with David as the king of the world.

I now conclude by quoting the last paragraph:

These are the things we hold; these are the things we teach. On what ground do Christian ministers oppose us? On what ground do they say that we are schismatic or heretics? Surely, if either ourselves or our opponents are schismatic or heretics, it must be our opponents, for we stand squarely for the faith which was first delivered to the saints.

Published by the Covenant Publishing Co., Ltd., 6 Buckingham Gate, London, SW. 1. Printed by the Stanhope Press, Ltd., Rochester, Kent.

I hope that Members of Congress will read this insert, entitled, "British-Israel Is True," and another insert entitled, "The International Situation," because both state the purpose of the British and the American Israel, as well as the Anglo-Saxon Federation.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and Internal Strife—Part VIII

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "The International Situation." This article appeared in the National Message, the official organ of the British-Israel World Federation, under date of November 23, 1925. It is also affiliated with the American-Israel Movement, located in Knoxville, Tenn.

The front page of this pamphlet shows the battle map of Egypt and Arabia, with arrows pointing from Ethiopia toward the Sudan; and with three arrows pointing from Persia, Siberia, and Tobolsk, toward Iraq and Arabia. There are also three arrows pointing from Moscow, central Europe, and southern Europe toward Syria, and one arrow from Libya, pointing toward Egypt. This map is therefore to show the direction of attack on these British Mandates, as prophesied by the British-Israel World Federation.

What is our position in this battle plan of British-Israel? Our position is supposed to be on the side of Great Britain, to war in the Sudan, Egypt, Arabia, Iraq, Palestine, and Syria, against all the world powers. It will require a large army to fight the world, so I am not astonished when the Chief insists that we call out 40,000,000 men to fight for the British-Israel World Federation. All of this is to establish Jerusalem as the capital of the world and the center of this world government in Egypt and Arabia.

Our Army will travel by the way of the Pacific and Indian Ocean to India and the South African British possessions, such as Tanganyika and Rhodesia, from which attack will be launched against the forces that are supposed to attack this little parcel of land lying on each side of the Red Sea. This might seem like a crazy plan, but it is that which the British-Israel and Great Britain have in mind in this war.

I have described the map and shall now insert the article which appears on the other side of the pamphlet.

We come to the consideration of the international situation. The attention of the world has been drawn irresistibly to Italy by the movements of Italy. This is focused at the moment on the invasion of Ethiopia. We have not dealt at large with this matter, and we have avoided having much discussion on it in the National Message. It is important, and the events will be the measure of the importance. But, after all, it is but a detail of the larger plan. Italy is moving; Russia is quiescent, and Germany active only within her own boundaries. We consider that Italy is less of a menace to ultimate world peace than either Russia or Germany. We turn to our Book and there find our instructions. We give, in connection with this article, a map of the heart of the world. We call to mind that the city of Jerusalem is placed exactly in the center of the world's population. We further call to mind that the Great Pyramid is the center of the land surface of the world. Around those two centers, including them, we find the mandated

territories and possessions of Britain. Taking Jerusalem as a center, and looking eastward and north and south, we have Palestine, Trans-Jordania, Iraq, Arabia. Again taking our stand at Jerusalem and looking southward, we have Egypt and the Sudan; with the countries beyond that we do not now deal; they do not come into the picture. The map shows the British mandated territories and possessions as the heart of the world, and this they are. Whoever possesses them a quarter of a century from now will dominate the world. God has said that Israel shall possess them. We believe that the Celto-Saxon world is Israel. Therefore, Israel, the sons of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with Ishmael, will possess the land.

But Italy has announced the intention to regain that which once constituted the eastern part of the Roman Empire. That is plain enough and needs no explanation.

Russia has long announced her intention and has every plan made to take possession of the Euphrates Valley and Palestine, at the least. That also is historic, plain, and needs no interpretation.

Germany, in the last war, made a definite attempt to hold the land which, through Turkey, she had occupied. She lost the war, but not the cause, and has by no means given up hope or intention in regard to such possession.

The Bible takes knowledge of all this, and prewrites the history of the threefold attempt to obtain possession of the land. The thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel are very definite on the matter. We shall later quote the necessary passages to illustrate this. The minor prophets have had very clear vision of this upheaval, as they had very clear vision of that upheaval which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem. We recommend the reader to turn to Joel and read that wonderful prophecy. In my copy of the Oxford Bible it begins at page 1112. It embraces less than four pages, and can be read in half an hour. I would recommend then that the reader should turn to Zechariah, chapter XII, and read it to the end. In my copy it is page 1152, and two-and-a-half pages of the Bible embrace it all. In chapter XIV, verse 2, there is this statement: "For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle." Now, this is a prophecy which would not have fitted any former period of world history. It is a prophecy which will fit no future period of the world history. It is a prophecy which will have fulfillment now.

All nations, then, are to be gathered against that territory now under the British throne, which has Jerusalem for its center. Three groups will move against this territory, with the intention of occupying the whole or a part thereof. First among them will be the chief prince of Meshech (Moscow) and Tubal (Tobolsk). The second group listed are Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya. The third group listed are Gomer (Middle Europe) and all his bands, the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands, and many peoples with him. In the map on the previous page we have traced arrows to show the lines of approach by which the various peoples will invade the British territories, all aiming at Jerusalem as the central point. Here is the map:

Translated into modern phraseology, Central Europe, Russia, and that power which holds Ethiopia and Libya will be marching toward a common center with one definite purpose; namely, the seizing of the land. Those who would read what will be the final issue of the matter may read the passages already named in Joel and Zechariah and, more specifically, the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel.

The following passages furnish those details:

"And say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal:

"And I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed with all sorts of armour, even a great company with bucklers and shields, all of them handling swords:

"Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya with them: all of them with shield and helmet:

"Gomer, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands: and many people with thee."—Ezekiel xxxviii:3-6.

The Lord's army who shall oppose them are:

"Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? Hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? To carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil?—Ezekiel xxxviii:13.

The gathering of the nations is expected and provided against by the Lord; the King of Israel:

"For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.

"Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle."—Zechariah xiv:2-3.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make no comments on this article, except to say that this is a description of the coming war that is planned to take place in Egypt. I shall now include excerpts from other articles, giving the names of the magazines, so that those who read may be better informed of the most devilish plot which has ever been evolved by the brain of man.

I now quote from "The hand of God in the White House," by Edna Bandler:

Franklin D. Roosevelt, ordained and used by God to be His executive—to be the leader and deliverer of His people (like Moses) to

deliver them out of the depression and out of chaos.

Only the hand of God could have delivered this man out of the net of the Chaldeans. But he stood alone like a Christian statesman and pleaded the cause of his people. Just he and God—no "party man" or organization could boast. Just the hand of God put him on the throne.

I have seen the hand of God in the White House. From the day the shield of David and seal of Solomon was discovered on the porte-cochere of the White House kitchen, President Roosevelt has been accused of placing the Jew sign on everything: The six-pointed star rightfully belongs to us, and George Washington ordered it on the White House pillar, and it was not an accident that Betsy Ross, whose father and family were the makers of the first Stars and Stripes; Betsy changed the star to the five-pointed star, but God meant it to be so. We, "the preserved of Israel," were lost and hidden until a time appointed to be revealed.

With the David shield, Solomon's seal, the great pyramid message, "A memorial forever," told in the book of Joshua, fourth chapter, and this pyramid coming out on the new \$1 bill with the six-pointed star, all has great significance.

"All the shields of the earth belongeth unto Me, saith the Lord, and when the standard and the ensign is set up, ye shall know your redemption draweth nigh." The reason this obverse side of the seal is only on the \$1 bill is because "Christ and His people are one." On our early coin with the 13 links of chain, and in the center of the coin "We are one," and on the other side it was written: "Mind your own business." Our shield and all the shields of the nation tell their story. In my new book, *Unveiling of Israel*, many startling things. A great prophecy has just been revealed.

I shall now quote from a book entitled "The House of Israel":

Much is made of the "perpetuity of the Davidic throne." If the Davidic throne was to be established forever, then it must be found somewhere now. The English throne must therefore be the throne of David, and King George the seed of David, for does not the Scripture say that "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel"? (Jer. 33: 17, 20-21.)

I shall now quote an excerpt from *Time*, of September 16, 1936, by Mrs. Edna Bandler, whose husband, I believe, was a prominent Jew:

"The coming of the Lord * * * Great confusion upon earth * * * September 16, 1936," was announced last year in Manhattan by a Mrs. Edna Bandler in volume 1, No. 1, of a magazine called the *Prophet*. Last week Mrs. Bandler turned up in the news again, conducting a "week of prophecy" in Town Hall daily, donning a white veil and prophesying for the 25 to 100 people who dropped in, admission free, to hear her.

Edna Bandler is the white-haired intense-eyed widow of a rich diamond merchant. Until 2 years ago she lived in a mansion, full of gilt and marble, which John D. Rockefeller built years ago in West Fifty-fourth Street for his son, John D., Jr. She now dwells and conducts prophetic services for a small band of followers in a lushly furnished duplex studio in West Fifty-seventh Street, a neighborhood in which flourish many swamis and faith healers.

Mrs. Bandler prophesies in a helter-skelter flow of words which many a listener last week found incoherent. Several of her ideas accord with those of British "Pyramidologists," who believe that in the courses of masonry and many tunnels of the Great Pyramid of Cheops are to be found prophecies of the world's history until the year 2045. Pyramidologists thought September 16, 1936 was to be epochal for the world, but Prophetess Bandler now denies that she predicted anything like the world's end. She insists, however, that, known only to her, 300,000 people were slaughtered on Mt. Carmel on that date. Sample Bandler prophecies:

Fascists are the Philistines. Mussolini is the Biblical "beast of the iron teeth," and he will take over Spain.

The 12 most powerful nations on earth are the 12 tribes of Israel, of which Prophetess Bandler will identify only England (Ephraim), France (Reuben), the United States (Manasseh).

President Roosevelt, to be the last United States President, is God's anointed. Because he is divinely ordained, and also because man's span is 70 years, the President will be allowed to appoint as many Supreme Court Justices as he pleases.

The world's redemption will come through love. "I'm giving the last love-call for the world before the tribulation comes."

When all communications between the United States and Europe are cut off, when radios go dead, when we are forbidden by decree to speak the name of Jesus, when David, Duke of Windsor, takes an airplane to Jerusalem, then we will know the conflict is at hand.

This will give my colleagues an idea of the British-Israel World Federation, an organization which is widely distributed into every nook and corner of the Nation. These subversive teachings which have for their purpose the creation of a world government, with Jerusalem as the capital, should now be clear to all who read this message. This movement has infiltrated our churches, schools, and even the Army itself, as this quotation clearly reveals:

More than a year has passed, but at last we have secured, through the help of Mr. C. H. M. Foster, the honorary secretary of the Keswick convention, testimonials from several men of high rank in the British military and naval service, which we intend placing in

the hands of every officer in the United States Army and Navy. As a foretaste of what our readers are to receive in the next months from the publication of these wonderful stories of God's dealing in the lives of great men of empire, we quote a sentence or two, from the letter from Admiral Sir Harry H. Stileman which accompanied the manuscript. "I send it with the earnest prayer that my experience as a reconciled sinner may help some brother officer in the United States Navy to lay down the arms of his rebellion at the feet of the Lord Jesus, the captain of the Lord's host, and accept from these pierced hands God's gift of eternal life." These admirals and these generals are men who won their promotions and highest honors in the Great War. Their testimonies are going to be of great interest, heart warming, thrilling words to put into the hands of young people.

This movement is very subtle, and on its face appears to be a Christian movement. We must, however, take into consideration that the people who fight and die in this war are not only Christians, but include other creeds and races as well. We will conscript an army today, not to protect America, for we are not threatened. We will instead organize an army to fight in the Holy Land on the side of the English. Can we hope to succeed in this war, facing as we will all nations in the world? The answer is absolutely "No." We should, therefore, make it our business to build the defenses of the United States, wash our hands of this deadly international intrigue that is enshrouding common sense and sound reasoning. And this may be done, as I have said many, many times, by returning to our fundamental teachings and to the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Steps Toward British Union, a World State, and Internal Strife—Part IX

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. THORKELSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1940

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *Record*, I include certain excerpts from the magazine *Prophecy*, monthly—current events in the light of Scripture, June 1936.

I am endeavoring to shed a little light on the British-Israel World Federation and the Anglo-Saxon Federation, for both of these movements are not, as I have said, in the interest of the United States.

Unfortunately, members of these groups—and I believe many of them are innocent members—are going hand in hand, supporting a plan which is undermining our churches, changing our educational system, so as to prepare the public to quietly accept a colonial status in the British Empire.

This movement is carried forward, as I have said, by the various endowment foundations and by the many pro-English organizations, such as the Overseas Club, the Pilgrims, American-Canadian Clubs, and Anglo-American Clubs, and even the Octavia Society of England. All of these have many branches throughout the United States, and are in reality as subversive as the communistic party itself. The only difference is in that the membership of these upper-strata organizations occupy a social status, which leaves them more or less immune from criticism. However, it is important that light be shed upon their activities, so that we may know them for what they are.

The first article concerns Bishop T. Manning, and is evidently a criticism of statements which he has made. Bishop Manning is well known and no doubt the walls of his church carry many secrets that in themselves would be a revelation. I shall now quote this article:

[From *Prophecy Monthly—Current Events in the Light of Scripture of June 1936*]

WORKING TOWARD THE ONE VISIBLE CHURCH

"Mystery Babylon, the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth" (Revelations, 17:5).

The Episcopal bishop, William T. Manning, who a few years ago had something of a testimony for orthodox Christianity, is now

campaigning for a great religious federation to include everything Protestant and Catholic. In an essay being distributed in several nations he decries the "sin" of disunion of Protestantism and Catholicism.

He calls for "true and full conversion to Christ" in Protestantism of all sects and Catholicism, whether Roman, Anglican, or otherwise.

The essays are to be the subject of discussion and questionnaires among these Anglican communicants during the next 4 years to obtain a statement of essential principles, or a platform on which the reunion of Christendom may be approached by Anglicans.

This platform will be presented at an international convention in London in June 1940, to which three representatives from every Anglican diocese in the world will be invited.

"In the great task of reconciling Protestantism and Catholicism," he said, "it seems that God has set the Anglican communion in the middle place for the very purpose of reconciliation."

We can never believe that when our Lord prayed that His people "might be one" that He contemplated that the desired unity should be manifested by one comprehensive religious corporation. Where will we find in the church epistles any intimation that God recognizes in any way the existence on earth of one visible church under the authority of one ecclesiastical organization? God recognizes only the mystic church, comprised of born-again persons, wherever they may be, and God's purpose requires no tinkering at the hands of schemers to repair its unity, for it has never been broken. The unity for which our Lord prayed (John, 17:21-23) is a unity of life in the Father and in Himself.

If the good bishop is working for such a unity, produced only through the regeneration of individuals, we are with him. A church that is the creation of the Holy Spirit must be a church founded on the eternal rock—the deity and atoning work of Jesus Christ. The apostate denominations can never be brought together on such a basis. Any vast human organization such as is proposed can be brought into existence only through compromise. It would be the counterfeit of the body of Christ, the prophesied federation of apostate sects which is to mark the days of the age end. With such a movement, we would have no part whatever.

The words of the risen Christ recorded in Revelation should be sufficient guidance as to His mind in this age. Here He addressed each of the several churches of Asia and His appeal at the close of each is: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." His appeal is to the individual believer in respect to His Word and He holds each individual church responsible directly to Himself.

My opinion is that the people should be left free to worship as they please, within the rights and liberties of the Constitution. For anyone to attempt to establish a monopolistic church, as advocated by Bishop Manning, is as unsound as monopoly in commerce and of the gold which is now in the Treasury of the United States. All of this is a part of the British-Israel plan to undermine the United States. I shall now quote an article from the same magazine entitled "Proofs of British-Israel Trickery," on page 21:

PROOFS OF BRITISH-ISRAEL TRICKERY

If it seems to some of our readers that we have much to say on the subject of Anglo-Israelism, they should understand that our mail is flooded with letters and literature from readers who are taking up with these ideas, and our increasing conviction that this is one of the latter-day deceptions, leads us to repeat our warnings.

We sometimes receive letters from premillennial ministers defending these doctrines, and remonstrating that we have no right to term this a heresy for it is being preached by many who are true to the fundamentals of salvation. This we do not doubt, yet we are certain that these sincere men do not realize to what extent they have been imposed upon by official literature of the movement, or to what port they are being led. It may be true that some advocates of Anglo-Israelism preach "Christ and Him crucified," but it is equally certain that some of the outstanding writers on the subject have no place for this message but preach legalism in its full potency. In all the literature, it is the peculiar "gospel of the kingdom" which is given prominence, and this is a doctrine of the supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon people and their calling to reform the world.

One of the most startling exposures of the official literature that we have seen in small form is a recent booklet by Rev. Roy L. Aldrich, of Detroit, entitled "Anglo-Israelism Refuted." Mr. Aldrich dated the subject with Howard B. Rand, general secretary of the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, in a high school auditorium in Detroit. Mr. Rand utterly failed to answer the propositions stated by Mr. Aldrich.

In the booklet mentioned, Mr. Aldrich gives numerous quotations taken from the best known books of the movement, showing how the writers have deliberately misquoted Scripture or omitted portions of verses which would have ruined the argument. He shows how they have also misrepresented the position of other writers. But if one wishes conclusive evidence of the fallacy of the thing, he should read the quotations as to time reckonings and the setting of dates based upon pyramid measurements and the year-day theory. He quotes again and again from positive predictions of officially recognized leaders, showing how their dates brought forth nothing, and how subsequent issues of the books dropped these references and substituted references to dates still in the future.

263553—19504

Anglo-Israel literature has been saturated with predictions that Armageddon would take place in the years 1928 to 1934. In this period was included the seven times for Judah's trouble, the gathering of all nations against Jerusalem, the repealing of all man-made laws by Britain and America, the adoption of the constitutional law given to Moses and the assumption of Authority by Christ. We were to see in 1934 the last war for 1,000 years. It was flatly stated that if these things did not come to pass as scheduled, it would be the first time that the revelation of the Stone Bible (pyramid) had ever failed. One of their most cocksure writers, W. C. McKendrick, went so far as to say: "You can depend upon it that every divinely inspired prophecy from 1917 to 1936 will come true at the allotted time. Armageddon will be upon us 11 years from the time we took Jerusalem."

Those who are sincere seekers of truth should accept our challenge to read Mr. Aldrich's booklet and check his quotation with the standard books from which they are taken. They will find that they are following blind leaders who have not hesitated to employ trickery in their efforts to maintain a following. We do not question the sincerity of many who have accepted and are teaching these doctrines, but we do pray that they will let the sure Word of Prophecy be their guide. When the books of men become essential to one's maintaining of a system called Christian, we have reason to suspect that we are off the main track.

I have taken the liberty of including this article, in order to show that British-Israel is suspected by many people, who know the real background of this movement. My reason for inserting these articles is to bring to light the fact that there is a movement on foot to try to establish authenticity, or to prove the prophecies of the Old Testament. We have no need for occultism, or for astrology, or for phrenology—feeling the bumps on the head, and such hocus-pocus. What we need is good, sound statesmanship, that is based upon the Constitution of the United States. What do we care about Moses, and what do we care about the prophecies of the Old Testament? What interest can we have in the people who are trying to interpret these prophecies in order to compel us to enact these mysteries in a real world war, which can only end in the sacrifice of millions of lives. Let us get back to sound reason and common sense, and forget all of this soothsaying, legerdemain, and phohphesying. Our Nation cannot be guided by astrological predictions or by any other mystic procedure, for such entertainment is fine in the parlor but has no place on the Ship of State.

I shall now quote another short article from the same magazine:

THIS IS JERUSALEM SPEAKING

"Then will I turn to the people a pure language." (Zeph. 3:9.)

It is interesting enough to find that a language for centuries considered dead, should be suddenly revived and spoken by 90 percent of the Jews in Palestine, but doubly striking to learn that within the last few months, a Palestine Jew, Jacob Maimon, has adapted the international stenographic system to the Hebrew language, achieving the maximum of efficiency required. Maimon and his adept students are a familiar sight at meetings of the Zionist General Council and the Zionist Congress, compiling complete records in Hebrew. Classes were started some time ago in Tel Aviv, and the first shorthand writers are on the staff of Daver, the Hebrew labor daily.

On March 30 Hebrew made its world debut as a radio language, when the Palestine broadcasting service was inaugurated, with addresses by Sir Arthur Wauchope and members of the Jewish and Arab community.

"This is Jerusalem calling" were the words that opened the station in English, Hebrew, and Arabic, and introduced the speech of Postmaster General William Hudson.

In various parts of Jerusalem, crowds thronged the outside of radio stores listening as the radio loud speakers broadcasted the country's first program.

We read in a Jewish paper that a serious disturbance threatened as Arabs warned the Palestine Broadcasting Co. that a national issue would be made of it, if the new broadcasters dared to refer to Palestine as "Eretz Israel." Use of the phrase, which is the Hebrew for "the land of Israel" has already caused the resignation of the Arab section of the broadcasting station.

It is quite evident, after reading this article, that the Arabs did not like the Jews to say, "Eretz Israel." The Arabs no doubt look upon Arabia as their own home, which is proper and right, because they have lived there longer than anyone else.

This article also calls attention to the split in the false and true Semetic ranks, for the Arab, we must confess, is a true Semite.

I wish to quote still another article from the same magazine, which is in regard to a manifesto, which the editor received:

We who have subscribed our names hereto declare that we are opposed to anti-Semitism in whatever form it may take, as in-

consistent with our heritage of liberty and fair play as citizens of America, and as unworthy of those who bear the name of Christian. We further declare that any attempt to use the Scriptures as an excuse for an anti-Semitic attitude is a perversion of God's Word and irreconcilable with the spirit and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. * * * We wish our lives to be worthy of the Gospel of Christ so that the Jew may differentiate between the Gentile who is a Christian and the one who is not. And wherever there are those seeking to make the Jewish people acquainted with the contents of the Christian message, we wish to uphold their hands in prayer and sympathy. * * * To the Jewish people we declare: We have for you a heart full of sympathy. * * * We have no part in the stirring up of base passions against you, and we want you to know that those who are thus guilty do not express the love which the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded us to show you.

Among the many signers are Dr. George W. Arms, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Dr. Arthur I. Brown, Bible lecturer; Dr. Oliver Buswell, Wheaton College; Dr. Herbert W. Bieber, Philadelphia; Dr. O. F. Bartholow, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Dr. H. A. Ironside, Chicago; Dr. Howard A. Kelly, Baltimore; Dr. Fred Melday, Denver; Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, Dallas; Dr. Robert Evans, Pasadena; Dr. Otis Fuller, Grand Rapids; Dr. Albert G. Johnson, Portland; Dr. Cortland Myers, Pasadena; Dr. Wm. Pettingill, Wilmington, Del.; Dr. Herbert Booth Smith, Los Angeles; Dr. John Bunyan Smith, San Diego; Dr. W. H. Rogers, New York; Dr. W. P. White, Los Angeles; Dr. Harold Strathearn, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. Theodore Taylor, New York; Dr. Frank Throop, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. I. L. Yearby, El Paso, Tex., and many others.

People like the signers of this manifesto are responsible for anti-Semitism, for it is they who designate the anti-Semite and who raise the question so that it becomes an issue. These gentlemen who signed the manifesto must be Semites themselves, or else why would they go into battle against an enemy of their own selection and designation? Surely no one bears any enmity toward the Semites as long as they are willing to conform to the same rules and regulations that all Americans have obligated themselves to do. A citizen of the United States, however, has the right to speak in defense of his own Government, without having his life threatened by those who employ the term anti-Semite, and who are Semitic; and I include the gentlemen who signed the manifesto in that category.

Would it not be more honorable if the same gentlemen ~~said, if they are not Semites themselves, that they are supporters of the Semites; that they believe in extra Constitutional rights for them; that they believe they should own and control all the gold; that they believe they should own all the business and means of communication in the United States; that they believe the so-called anti-Semitic, or gentile American should work with a pick and shovel while the people they support, the Semites, should be lords over the land? Should these gentlemen come out like this, we would know where they stand; but they, like the others, hide behind a screen of deception.~~

From now on I shall assume that all who use the designation anti-Semitic are Jews or close associates of the Jew. I believe the gentlemen in question will concede this point to me, and in doing that they have also classified themselves.

The so-called anti-Semites, or gentile Americans can then meet this unfair designation as a clear-cut issue.

I was indeed astonished to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] denounce those of his own race of "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" for having besieged him in his office, to express their views on a critical piece of legislation. They, of course, acted within their constitutional rights, in seeking this audience; and, more than that, they acted within the provisions of a resolution passed by a conference of rabbis, who, in 1936, went on record as claiming military exemption for conscientious objectors of their own race.

I can well understand the Member's embarrassment, particularly in view of the position he has taken in regard to the conscription bill; yet these people are, as I have said, clearly within their constitutional rights, to express their opinion; for it is the people of this Nation who must fight and die in defense of their own rights. I take it that these people do not object to service within the United States, but they do object being conscripted into service and then sent to the Far East to fight for a nation and for a cause in which they have little interest.

As a Representative in Congress, I have given audience to many people who are not residents of my own State, but I look upon this as a public duty to treat all people with con-

sideration and courtesy—no matter who they may be. After all, it is the people who are the power in this Nation, and we Members of Congress are elected to protect their rights; and when we fail in this worthy object they must, in view of our failure, act in their own behalf. It is because of this that these people are here in Washington to protest against the conscription bill.

I wish to further quote from the Prophecy magazine:

Can it be that the modernists sense the need of a revival and of getting back to the great commission?

Let us read on:

That Protestantism is not as potent as it once was is hardly a matter for dispute. Our denominations mean less and less to us. They represent no important convictions on the part of their membership, and would visibly collapse were it not for their vested interests and the spirit of fellowship sustained by a common tradition.

Yes; all this we can follow if the writer is thinking of the results of a denatured Gospel, with its resultant loss of a missionary incentive. Surely there are many churches where the pulpit stands for no positive convictions, and membership in them amounts to little more than belonging to a social club. But perhaps we have not caught this editor's drift. He proceeds:

"It is high time the churches and leaders who sense the weakness of our sectarian missionary structure should come together in a missionary project which is independent of denominational control. An ideal alternative would be for the Federal Council of Churches to take over the missionary enterprise of such denominations as would transfer their present responsibilities to it. It is both logical and urgent."

And why, pray tell, should we hand over the management of missions to this troupe of Modernists?

"The primary reason," says the Christian Century, "is that denominational agencies do not and cannot express the conception of Christianity which is taking form among us today. The goal should be nothing less than the reorientation of the Christian Church in respect to the world mission of Christianity. It is probable that the very word 'missions' would have to be abandoned for a more Christian term."

The cat is out of the bag. It is not a revival of the old-time religion that these gentlemen are desiring. New emphasis upon the marching orders given by our Lord, is not in their thoughts. ~~No, they would even rid the church of the word which implies that men without Christ are lost and needing the good news of salvation. Instead of going forth "to seek and to save that which is lost," they would instill into the church the "new conception of Christianity's social responsibility."~~

No longer are we to regard missionaries as saving brands from the burning. Under the direction of the Federal Council of Churches, we would delegate them to put out the conflagration by introducing modern scientific methods and mass social reforms. As Dr. Sailer Mathews once put it: "The church should be less concerned in rescuing people than in educating them to keep out of danger."

But if we are to set aside completely the fundamental basis of missions as given us by the Lord Jesus Christ; if the church is no longer to hold convictions based upon a divinely inspired Christian revelation—one wonders why we should trouble ourselves to maintain such an organization as the Christian Church, or what need we have of a Federal Council of Churches of Christ? "Woe unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain."

In concluding this speech, may I say that the Federal Council of Churches is a subversive organization, the members of which are clothed in garments of pink, red, and scarlet, all the colors of radicalism and communism. It is now well to take heed, for this movement is carrying this Nation into trials, tribulations, and war. No nation can survive unless it maintains Christian morals and believes in the teachings of the Man who came from Galilee. It is this faith that has carried people on, and it is this faith which has built up the Christian civilization, a civilization which cannot survive when we deny Christian teachings.

I have included these articles in my remarks because they are self-explanatory and more or less in line with the position that I have taken as a Member of Congress. No nation can survive that foregoes the teachings that gave it life and security, and these teachings cannot survive if we destroy the Nation that gives the people an opportunity to express and fortify themselves in the comfort that such teachings give them.

We must, therefore, as I have said before, return this Nation to those sound and fundamental principles upon which it came into life, namely, the Constitution of the United States.