

DA
68.32
K6D6.8

Publicity
in Circus.



PRICE-TWOPENCE.

THE MURDER OF LORD KITCHENER

AND

The Truth about the Battle of Jutland and the Jews.

Speech made by LORD ALFRED DOUGLAS at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London.

REPRINTED FROM THE "BORDER STANDARD."

A public meeting inaugurated by the "Lord Kitchener and Jutland Publicity Committee" was held on Friday, 3rd August, at the Memorial Hall, Ludgate Circus. The Committee consisted of the following:—General Prescott-Decie, C.B., D.S.O.; Colonel Haines, D.S.O.; Capt. Harry de Windt., F.R.G.S.; Lady Edith Fox-Pitt; the Hon. Mrs Greville-Nugent; and Mrs Cunningham.

Lord Alfred Douglas, who was invited to address the meeting, which had been called to consider the allegations about the Battle of Jutland and the murder of Lord Kitchener, which were prominent features in the recent action between Lord Alfred Douglas and the "Morning Post," spoke as follows:—

Mr Chairman, My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen,—In addressing you this evening I must start by explaining this is the first time that I have ever spoken at a public meeting. My appearances in public hitherto have taken place in the witness-box. (Laughter.) I have got accustomed to it and its accessories, the lawyers, and I confess that I miss them now, especially the lawyer on the other side, for it is my experience that most of one's best points are made under cross-examination. Whether our friend Mr Winston Churchill would agree I rather doubt. (Laughter.) He, as you will remember, went into the witness-box the other day after previously obtaining an assurance from my Counsel that he would not be cross-examined. I shall refer to this later, and meanwhile I take it that most of you present have read the reports of the case in the papers. On the whole, I am pleased to be able to say that the best and fairest report appeared in the "Morning Post." But even the "Morning Post" left out a great deal; and of my own cross-examination by Mr Hastings not more than half actually appeared in print. Perhaps I ought to begin by explaining to you how this case arose. It arose as follows:—The Editor of a paper called the "Jewish Guardian" wrote a letter to the "Morning Post" in which he accused me of "making it a paying proposition to invent vile insults against the Jews"; the "Morning Post" printed the letter, and it thus made itself a party to the libel on me.

After consultation with my solicitors and counsel, who agreed with me that the words I have quoted were grossly defamatory, I issued writs for libel on the "Morning Post" and the "Jewish Guardian." The first of these actions, that against the "Morning Post," has been tried, and the second, against the "Jewish Guardian," is still to come. If the "Morning Post," when I issued my writ, had replied that the libel I complained of appeared in a letter from a correspondent with whom it was itself engaged in controversy and that it did not represent the "Morning Post's" own views, and if it had added an expression of regret to this assurance, the whole matter would have been at an end as far as the "Morning Post" was concerned. My action against the "Morning Post" would have been dropped and no more would have been heard of it. Instead of following that course, which, in view of the "Morning Post's" own view about the Jews, would have been, one would suppose, the natural course to follow, the "Morning Post," after taking many weeks to consider its attitude, put in a "plea of justification." That is to say, in effect it

2
said to me—"Yes, you are an inventor for profit of vile insults against the Jews, and we are going to prove it," and in support of its plea it put in "particulars of justification," which consisted of 27 different extracts from the columns of the paper, "Plain English," which I edited in 1920 and 1921.

THE "MORNING POST" AND THE JEWS.

DA
68.32
K6D68
The "Morning Post" is a paper for which I have always, in many ways, had a great admiration. It professes, as everyone knows, to be Conservative, ultra-Patriotic, and anti-Jewish (or at least anti-Jewish in the same way that I am anti-Jewish, namely, opposed to Jewish arrogance and evil-doing when they occur, neither I nor the "Morning Post" condemn all Jews indiscriminately). I confess that I have found it impossible to reconcile the attitude taken by the "Morning Post" in the late action with its professions of its own principles. There is no getting away from the fact that by acting as it did, it has come out once for all as a friend and supporter of the Jews and that it has joined hands with the Jews to attack me. In a libel action, when the defendant pleads justification, the positions of plaintiff and defendant are really reversed. The defendant becomes the attacker and the plaintiff brings to defend himself against the charges which the defendant brings against him. Thereafter it is the defendant who is responsible for the conduct of the case. And I wish to emphasise the point that it was not I but the "Morning Post" who was responsible for the fact that the late action was fought out almost entirely over the question of the allegations about the Battle of Jutland which I made in "Plain English," and that really the Jews were scarcely mentioned in the case at all. Of the 27 items quoted from "Plain English" in the "particulars of justification," four referred to the Battle of Jutland and one to Lord Kitchener. Of the remaining 22, only three were so much as mentioned by the defence. All the rest were allowed to go by the board, and I am entitled to claim that the "Morning Post" realised the impossibility of scoring even a small point against me on all these counts in its own carefully compiled indictment. Apart from Jutland and Lord Kitchener, the three paragraphs in the "particulars" which were relied on by Mr Hastings in his cross-examination of me, had reference to my accusations against Sir Alfred Mond, which accusations I was able to justify up to the hilt and to give chapter and verse from out of his own paper—(loud applause)—and the other two related to the iniquitous "Kol Nidre," the Jewish prayer which is recited in all Jewish Synagogues on the "Day of Atonement."

A HORRIBLE JEWISH PRAYER.

This wicked and blasphemous "prayer," which even the paper, the "Jewish Chronicle," admits to be indefensible "in reason or in ethics," consists of a declaration made to God whereby all oaths, vows, promises, and contracts which the Jews are to make in the forthcoming twelve-months of the year, till the next Day of Atonement, are declared to be null and void. "We repent of them all beforehand," says the prayer, and "the vows shall not be vows, the promises shall not be promises," and so forth. It is thus possible and legitimate, according to the Jews' "religion," for them to lie, cheat, and defraud to their hearts' content, and "with a clear conscience." The vows and promises may, of course, include vows of marriage made to a Christian woman. It is a pretty large order, I think. (Loud applause.) Well, I had a Catholic priest, who is the most learned Hebrew scholar in London, the Rev. Father Kent of the community of St Mary of the Angels, who was present in Court, to give evidence about this horrible "Prayer." He was to have gone into the box to swear that the translation of it which appeared in "Plain English" was an absolutely correct and literal translation, and that the words were incapable of conveying any other meaning than that which I had attributed to them. By a most mean and discreditable trick his evidence was kept out by the "Morning Post," the great Conservative, patriotic, and anti-Jewish organ. Their counsel said to mine—"You need not call evidence about the 'Kol Nidre' as I am not going to dispute it." My counsel, who by that time appeared to have lost the wits with which nature has endowed him, assented. He did not call Father Kent. Later on it is the incredible fact that the "Morning Post's" counsel called the Rabbi, whom the "Morning Post" keeps, I suppose, in its back premises—(laughter)—to get into the witness-box, and to make an attempt to explain away the obvious meaning of the "Kol Nidre." After that, will it ever be possible for the "Morning Post" to induce even the most gullible people to believe in the sincerity of the views it professes to have about the Jews? In "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion" (a book referred to by the previous speaker, my friend, Mr Lane), there is a passage which to my mind throws a luridly illuminating light on the "Morning

3
Post." The author of the "Protocols," in describing the method by which his compatriots, the Jews, are to gain the world ascendancy, which is their object, says something to this effect: "We must, of course, control all the press, as in fact we do to a large extent already, but it would be very foolish and only worthy of the silly Goyim (Christians) to suppose that all our press must be pro-Jewish. No, that would never do, we must have at least one important paper which, while pretending to be the enemy of the Jews, will really be controlled by ourselves. Thus, we shall control not only the pro-Jewish press, but also the opposition press." There, I submit, you have the "Morning Post" plainly revealed and exposed and without its mask. (Cheers and loud applause.) The "Morning Post," by conducting the case as it did, performed two important services to the Jews and their agents. In the first place, it obscured the issue and prevented my charges against the Jews from being really gone into; and in the second place, by confining the issue entirely to the question of the Battle of Jutland, it enabled the persons whose conduct I had impugned in connection with that battle to come to the Court and get a cheap and unconvincing whitewashing.

THE CHARGE AGAINST MR WINSTON CHURCHILL.

I made a definite charge against Mr Winston Churchill in "Plain English." I stated that a large sum of money was given to him by the late Sir Ernest Cassel after he (Winston Churchill) had issued what is admittedly a false report of the Battle of Jutland. I put that in print three years ago. (Applause.) No action followed, no prosecution, no civil proceedings for libel, although I repeated my charges over and over again and challenged the parties concerned to proceed against me. Questions were asked in the House of Commons, and the answer given by the Home Secretary was that the issues of my paper, "Plain English," containing the charges against Ministers, had been handed to the Law Officers of the Crown for consideration as to what steps should be taken. Weeks went by, and a further question was asked by a Member of Parliament, Mr McLean (Member for a division of Glasgow), who enquired if the Government intended to prosecute me or to take any steps against me. The answer given was that after full consideration the Law Officers of the Crown had decided that nothing at all should be done. Well, what do you make of that? I suppose you make of it just what I do. One of the few papers which had any comment on the verdict in my recent case against the "Morning Post" was kind enough to describe me as an "honest fool." (Laughter.) The paper in question, the "Daily Graphic," is controlled by Jews, and I accepted their remarks as a compliment of sorts. (Laughter.) I don't mind being called a fool by the Jews; to be called a fool is, I take it, the experience of most men who try to do something a little outside the ordinary run, but I was pleased that even the Jews had to admit that I am honest. I owe that to the verdict. If I had lost my case against the "Morning Post" no doubt the Jewish Press (that is to say, most of the London press) would have been only too delighted to call me a rogue as well as a fool. But in view of the verdict they had to be careful. Well, as an honest man, I have always taken it to be fairly well established that if you bring a serious accusation against a man involving his honour, and if you bring that accusation in the most public manner possible, and if that man ignores your accusation and takes no proceedings against you, you are entitled to believe that your accusation is true. (Applause.)

Mr Churchill said in the witness-box the other day, secure in the knowledge that my poor frightened rabbit of a counsel was not going to ask him a single question, that the reason he took no proceedings against me was that my paper was so contemptible as to be beneath his notice. Well, what a tale! Did you ever hear anything like it? It would be quite impossible for Mr Churchill to feel more contempt for me than I feel for him. But if the positions were reversed, if Mr Churchill were editing a paper and if he printed in his columns about me, one half, one quarter, one fifth, of what I printed about him I would have him round at Bow Street with his nose hanging over the edge of the dock to answer a charge of criminal libel within twenty-four hours I promise you. (Loud applause.) That sort of "guff" about the contemptible nature of my paper is really too foolish to require an answer. Only a man who knew he was not going to be cross-examined would have the impudence to talk in such a way. My paper had a circulation of 3000, and it was read, truly and literally, by "the highest in the land," as well as by the man in the street, and among its regular readers were at least 40 Members of the House of Commons and as many Peers. Mr Churchill—something better than that between now and the he—to order.

"Jewish Guardian," which I intend to take myself.

LIBRARY BUREAU

REMINGTON RAND

DIVISION OF SPERRY RAND CORPORATION

WHY MR CHURCHILL WAS NOT CROSS-EXAMINED.

Now I have to tell you how it was that Churchill and other witnesses for the defence were not cross-examined. The Jew-controlled press has assiduously tried to make it appear that the failure on the part of my counsel, Mr Comyns Carr, to cross-examine these witnesses established the absurdity and falsity of the allegations I made in "Plain English" about the Battle of Jutland. Nothing of the kind. I have not withdrawn a word of my Jutland allegations. I went into the box to support them and was cross-examined about them; when I go into the witness-box (and I always go into the witness-box whenever I have a case) I stay there as long as I possibly can, and I neither ask nor give quarter. I was not in the least shaken in my cross-examination by Mr Hastings; on the contrary, it is the unanimous opinion of all who were present, and it is even acknowledged in the hostile press, that I flattened Mr Hastings out. I left the box with my case won and confidently anticipating a verdict of at least a thousand pounds damages. To my amazement and consternation my counsel, Mr Comyns Carr, who had discussed the case with me on innumerable occasions during the last fifteen months, and who was pledged and bound by every consideration of honour to use my ample material for cross-examining Churchill, at the very last moment, one minute before the case for the defence was opened, declined to use that material. He insinuated then, and he has since confirmed it by letter, that if I persisted in asking him to cross-examine Churchill he would throw up his brief. I think his action was one of the most gross treachery. I think it was a mean, cowardly and dirty trick to play. (Loud applause.) Not only did he refuse to cross-examine Churchill, he did a worse thing than that, a thing for which I am going to have him up before the Bar Council: he got up and addressed the Judge, and said—"It will be an advantage to the Court and my learned friend (Hastings) to know that I am not going to cross-examine Mr Churchill and other witnesses for the defence." I should think it was an advantage to his "learned friend" (who is, by the way, his first cousin), and to Churchill and his troop of satellites who were sweating with fear (to use a vulgar expression), in the back of the Court. Imagine how their hearts must have leaped with joy when they heard they were free to go into the box to answer their counsel's carefully prepared questions, secure in the knowledge that whatever they might say no hostile question would be put to them on my behalf. It was bad enough in all conscience for my counsel to go back on his promises and undertakings, and refuse to cross-examine Churchill and company, but to get up in Court and tell them beforehand that he was not going to cross-examine was an act which is difficult to characterise in moderate language. That is what happens in the Law Courts. Counsel takes your money and then sells you to the other side. Never again will I trust counsel with a case of mine. (Applause.)

When on the top of this I found that the cross-examination of Lord Balfour, which had already taken place on "Commission," and which covered fourteen pages of printed foolscap paper, was not to be read, I rose and made a protest to the Judge and walked out of Court. I regarded the case as finished, and when I ultimately got a verdict and damages of one farthing I was simply amazed. If I got a verdict in spite of my counsel's efforts to assist the other side, what sort of a victory would I have had if he had not played the traitor? (Applause.)

LORD BALFOUR'S EVIDENCE.

I must now come to Lord Balfour's evidence, of which I hold the official printed verbatim report in my hand. In order to understand how Lord Balfour comes in, you must remember that in "Plain English" I charged Mr Churchill with having assisted to bring off a financial coup by issuing a report of the Battle of Jutland which was false and misleading, and which was subsequently corrected. This false report and its correction caused a rise and fall on the American Stock Exchange, which enabled the coup to be made. Well, about three weeks ago my case against the "Morning Post" was in the "warned list" and was due to come on in two or three days. At this stage Lewis & Lewis (the "Morning Post" Jewish solicitors) applied through their counsel to a Judge for permission to take the evidence of Lord Balfour on "Commission," on the ground that he was too ill to attend the Court. We for our part opposed the application. My counsel pointed out that the other side had had over a year in which to prepare their case and that if the evidence of Lord Balfour was material, it was astonishing that they had not got it before, but had waited until the very last moment when the case was set down for trial in the next three days. The Judge, who was rather on our side in this matter, seemed to have no objection to the application, and he finally asked Lewis Zion (a book referred to by—"What is this evidence of Lord Balfour's, and why passage which to my mind counsel was then obliged to reveal that the evidence

they were going to get from Lord Balfour was to the effect that he himself, and not Churchill, drew up the first misleading report of the Battle of Jutland, and that he was going to produce what he described as "the original draft of the report of the Battle of Jutland in his (Balfour's) own handwriting." Hearing this, the Judge made an order for the evidence to be taken on commission, which involved a further postponement of the case. Now here I must call your attention to a remarkable passage in Lord Balfour's cross-examination, which, as you know, was suppressed when the time came for it to be read in Court. I will read it.

Question—With regard to the draft report, when did it come to your knowledge that that was still in existence?

Answer—Yesterday, I think. Yesterday I got a letter from Sir James Masterton Smith, in which he told me that it was in existence.

Elsewhere in his cross-examination Lord Balfour said that the draft report would in the ordinary course have been destroyed but that Sir James Masterton Smith had kept it "I suppose as an interesting relic."

WHO WROTE THE FIRST JUTLAND REPORT?

Now I have racked my brain to try and find an explanation of how it could be satisfactorily explained that Messrs Lewis & Lewis and their counsel were telling the judge a week before Lord Balfour's evidence was taken that he, Lord Balfour, was going to produce a "draft report in his own handwriting," which, according to his own sworn statement, he did not then know was in existence. (Loud applause.) It beats me altogether, and you will perhaps remember that in "witness-box I frankly said that I did not believe a word of Balfour's evidence at this point. Hastings indignantly asked me—"Are you aware that Lord Balfour swore that he wrote the report himself, and that Mr Churchill had nothing to do with it?" And I replied—"Yes, but I don't believe it." "Do you suggest," went on Mr Hastings, "that Lord Balfour forged the report in his own handwriting, which he produced when his evidence was taken?" My answer was—"I don't say that; it is not for me to say that Lord Balfour forged it, but I think it quite possible that Lewis & Lewis forged it." (Laughter.) That statement, then as now, was received with laughter, but I can assure you that I said it in all seriousness. I have had an experience of over ten years of Lewis & Lewis's methods (I gave one example in Court which I will not repeat now), and I believe they are capable of anything. To me it was and is too much to swallow that this draft report, written seven years ago, and which, to quote Lord Balfour's own statement, "ought to have been destroyed," but by an extraordinary coincidence was kept by Masterton Smith as an "interesting relic," should turn up so very conveniently for Lewis & Lewis and the "Morning Post" just three days before my case was due to come on in Court. Frankly, I can't swallow the story at all. (Masterton Smith, by the way, was the gentleman who, after leaving the Admiralty, went as permanent Secretary to the Colonial Office under Churchill, and then in conjunction with his subordinate, a gentleman called Ezekiel, handed over a concession of all the water-power for Palestine to a Bolshevik Jew called Ruthenberg. I wish I had time to read what Sir William Joyson Hicks said about it in the House of Commons.)

ADMIRAL JELICOE'S TELEGRAM.

It is characteristic of the Jews that when you bring an accusation against them they will pitch on some minor or non-essential part of your accusation, and refute it, or try to refute it, with great vehemence. If you say "Mr X., a Jew, is a scoundrel, he was convicted of stealing spoons from a lady living at 137 Belgrave Square," they will reply, "It is an infamous falsehood to say that X. stole spoons from 137 Belgrave Square, never in his life did he take one solitary spoon from that address." Then it turns out that X.'s theft took place at 138 Belgrave Square, and that what he stole was forks and not spoons! (Laughter.) The Jews think that very smart. In the same way you will observe that the main point of the "Plain English" story about the Battle of Jutland does not really depend in the least upon whether Churchill or Balfour wrote the first report. I am firmly convinced that Churchill did write the report, but even if he didn't and if Balfour wrote it, it does not make any difference to the essential part of the charges I made and which have never been so much as denied till a few days ago. Here are further questions and answers from Lord Balfour's cross-examination:—

Question—Do you remember that, rightly or wrongly, Sir John Jellicoe thought that the first reports issued from the Admiralty were unduly pessimistic and unfair to him?

Answer—I was not aware of that. It is to order.
IT IS THE FIRST I HAVE HEARD OF IT.

MANUFACTURED BY
LIBRARY BUREAU
REMINGTON RAND
DIVISION OF SPERRY RAND CORPORATION

My counsel then produced Sir John Jellicoe's telegram from the official Blue Book which contains the following:—"Submit communications to press re enemy's casualties and our own, and general history of action MAY BE AMENDED TO AGREE WITH MY REPORTS OF THE ACTION. LAST NIGHT'S COMMUNIQUE MAGNIFIES OURS AND MINIMISES ENEMY'S CASUALTIES AND GIVES SOMEWHAT FALSE IMPRESSION OF ACTION GENERALLY."

A VITAL PASSAGE.

Now what are we to think of the veracity, or if you like to put it more mildly, of the MEMORY of a First Lord of the Admiralty who says that he has no recollection whatever of having received a telegraphic protest from the Commander-in-Chief of the Navy after the greatest naval battle in all history, complaining that the report of the battle issued to the press is false and misleading and giving an unfair advantage to the enemy? Am I really such a fool and such an absurd person because after reading Lord Balfour's cross-examination, of which I have just given you two small extracts, I refuse to believe that every word coming from Balfour's mouth is to be treated as gospel? (Loud applause.)

I will only give you one more extract from Lord Balfour's suppressed evidence and I submit that it is a passage of the most vital importance and significance. Here it is:—

Question—There is another subject I wish to ask you a question about. Can you tell me why it was, or do you think it proper to tell me why it was, that the Harwich destroyers were not sent out to assist? (Question objected to.)

Answer—If I thought it a proper question to answer I certainly would not answer it without my technical advisers.

Question—Even if you thought it proper you do not think you could answer that question? (Question objected to.)

Answer—No.

So it appears that even now, seven years after the Battle of Jutland, Lord Balfour and the Admiralty have been unable to make up their minds what explanation they are going to give of the recall of the Harwich destroyers which would have wiped out what was left of the German Fleet after the Battle of Jutland. This is what Admiral Sir Percy Scott said about the recall of the Harwich destroyers (I am quoting from the "Times" of November 27th, 1920):—"At the Battle of Jutland when the German Fleet was demoralised, a cloud of these (destroyers) started out from Harwich to administer the 'coup-de-grace' to the German Fleet, but, unfortunately, the Admiralty had a wireless and recalled them; SOMEBODY COMMITTED A TERRIBLE CRIME, and his name was not Jellicoe."

Am I really such a fool and such an absurdly gullible (if honest) person because, in common with Admiral Sir Percy Scott, who spoke the words I have quoted more than a month before I started my campaign about Jutland in "Plain English," I believe that there is still a lot that wants clearing up in this business and because I decline to be put off with official lies and evasions? (Loud and prolonged applause.) History is written in this way. It is a matter of finding motives for admitted facts; that is the historian's job. An extraordinary thing happens and historians say—"Why was this done?" Our Admiralty might have wiped the German Fleet out of existence. They deliberately prevented this from happening? Why? Was it merely incredible folly and idiocy and incompetence, or were there even darker reasons? In either case those responsible ought to be shot. (Loud applause.) My story in "Plain English" provides a motive for what is otherwise inexplicable. Those who think they can dismiss it as an absurd and idle tale are making a big mistake; sooner or later the truth will come out. (Loud applause.)

THE LOSS OF THE "HAMPSHIRE."

That is all I have to say about Jutland for the moment. I now pass on to Lord Kitchener and the loss of the "Hampshire." Here again it is the same story. Certain things happen, what is the explanation? I said plainly in my paper that Lord Kitchener had been murdered by the Jews. I thought so then, and I think now. I never said that I could prove it or prove exactly who were his murderers. I explained in Court in answer to the questions put to me by Mr Hastings, I did not profess to have the complete story, and for that reason I never did more than profess to have what I was convinced Kitchener had been murdered. If I Zion" (a book referred to with its throat cut and a blood-stained knife by passage which to my mind the and to them that a man had

been murdered—if I were to do this, I say, would the police turn round on me and call me names and say—"What is the good of your coming here with vague accusations of murder; tell us the name of the murderer, and produce conclusive proof of what you allege and we will listen to you, but if you can't do that, don't waste our time with a lot of absurd stories." Would that be the way my information would be received? Of course not, and yet that is the sort of answer given to my charges by the "Morning Post" and its protégés.

When I wrote what I did in "Plain English" I did not know as much as I know now. Within the last few days I have had fresh evidence. I have had an interview with a gentleman whose father and mother live on a farm in Orkney within easy sight of the spot where the "Hampshire" went down. Here are the facts which can be proved up to the hilt by a number of witnesses—hundreds of them. The "Hampshire" was lying in Scapa Flow. Lord Kitchener came up from London via Scrabster and got on board her. He was accompanied by a picked company of men who comprised the finest brains that the country could produce. They were experts in finance, experts in transport, experts in commissariat, and so forth. His object was to go to Russia and replace the corrupt Bolshevised Jews who were holding all the key positions by loyal men of British birth. If he had got to Russia and succeeded in his mission the Russian Revolution would have been nipped in the bud. (According to the "Morning Post" statistics ninety-five per cent. of the organisers of the Bolshevik Revolution were Jews, and the "Morning Post" gave all their names.) Obviously if the Revolution was to come off according to Jewish plans, at all costs Kitchener and all with him must be got out of the way. Well, this is what happened.

EXPLOSION WITNESSED BY HUNDREDS.

The "Hampshire" left Scapa Flow with Kitchener and his staff on board her; she was escorted by two destroyers. A violent westerly gale was blowing at the time. Before he "Hampshire" had gone a few miles THE DESTROYERS WERE RECALLED, and the "Hampshire" went out alone into the Atlantic. She skirted along the west coast of Orkney, and at a point between Birsay Bay and Brough Head she blew up. The explosion was witnessed by hundreds from the shore. It took place at 8.30 p.m. broad daylight in the month of June in that latitude. Those who saw the explosion or heard about it from eye-witnesses lined the shore looking out for survivors or wreckage. My informant tells me that the wreck floated for a considerable time after the explosion. I must find out from him exactly how long she floated, but I am afraid I have not got that information now. But I know that one of the witnesses of the explosion telephoned from Birsay to Stromness for the life-boat. THE LIFE-BOAT DID NOT START TILL FIVE HOURS AFTER THE MESSAGE WAS RECEIVED, and when it had started and gone a mile or two out of the ten miles which is about the distance between Stromness and the scene of the disaster, it was CALLED BACK. Some hours later 70 survivors drifted into the shore at a place called Sandwick, just north of Skaile Bay. Of these, all but 11 died during the night. These 11 were taken in and cared for by various farmers and other inhabitants in the neighbourhood. They remained several days, and as soon as they were well enough to walk they were removed to London by the authorities. Those who had taken them in were strictly forbidden to talk about what had happened. The 11 survivors went to London, and from that day to this they have disappeared from human ken. Not a trace, not a sign of them has been heard of since. Whether they were murdered or whether they were merely bribed or terrorised and deported, I do not know. In any case, they have disappeared. That is the most terrible indictment that can be brought against the Admiralty, or whoever was responsible. (Applause.) The "Hampshire" still lies where she sank, less than two miles from the coast, in about 20 fathoms of water. Why have divers never been sent down? (Applause.) Why not settle the question of whether the "Hampshire" was blown up from the outside or, as I believe she was, from the inside?

TIME-BOMBS PUT ON "HAMPSHIRE."

Now these are the admitted facts which can be proved easily by a number of reliable witnesses. Now for the story which supplies an explanation. If I ask where I got the story and who are my informants, I reply as I did

Other sizes made to order.

Printed by JOHN

to share the fate, whatever it may be, of the 11 survivors of the "Hampshire." (Applause.) When the Government appoint a genuine Committee of Inquiry it will be time enough to give all the information I have. At present I merely say that investigation will show that the "Hampshire" before she went to Scapa Flow to take Kitchener to Russia was lying in the docks at Belfast, that a man of the name of Nathan, now dead, a Jew (hisses), was at the time the head of our Secret Service in Ireland, that a shore-gang put time-bombs on the "Hampshire" under his directions. The "Hampshire" went from Belfast to Cromarty. There 14 stokers, who had got wind of something suspicious, deserted. They were taken to the Tower and shot as deserters. The "Hampshire" then went on to Scapa Flow, and the rest of the story is as already related. (Sensation.) No enquiry into this terrible disaster has ever been made. All questions in the House of Commons and elsewhere have been met by evasions. Am I a gullible fool because I think Kitchener was murdered? (Loud applause.)

"KITCHENER GOES TO HELL."

There are two other points. One is this. The "Hampshire" blew up about 8.30. Several hours BEFORE that, an Irish Sinn Fein paper came out with an article describing the "torpedoing" of the "Hampshire," under the head-line—"Kitchener goes to Hell." This is very strong evidence, and you will naturally want to know where it can be verified. I reply that the Duke of Northumberland and his "Committee" have this evidence in their possession. They have had it for at least two years. I know no more why they never used it than I know why they collected £30,000 from the public after the murder of Sir Henry Wilson, and why they have never accounted for this money. I confess that I have no confidence at all in the Duke of Northumberland. He is hand and glove with the "Morning Post," and it looks to me very much as if the game in both cases is to collect evidence, grab all the patriotic subscriptions, draw all the fire, and then to put all this material aside and not use it. I know that the "Morning Post" and the Duke of Northumberland between them moved heaven and earth to bring about the suppression of my paper, "Plain English," and I know that in the end they succeeded. I don't trust one more than I trust the other. (Applause.)

One more point. A German naval officer came over here to attend the hearing of my action against the "Morning Post." He is personally acquainted with Captain Hermann, the officer who commanded all the German submarines in the North Sea during the war. Captain Hermann assured my informant that at the time the "Hampshire" went down there was not a German submarine or a German mine within a hundred miles of her. You can readily understand that if the Germans had sunk the "Hampshire" they would have been only too proud and pleased to claim what would have been for them the legitimate credit of it, but they never did claim it, and they had nothing to do with it. THE "HAMPSHIRE" WAS BLOWN UP FROM INSIDE. The ship still lies where she sank. Why has there never been an investigation? Surely a few divers might be sent down. That is all I have to say except to thank you for a very kind and patient hearing. (Loud cheers and prolonged applause.)

The Chairman (Colonel Haines) then called upon Mr Lane to move the resolution.

CALL FOR GOVERNMENT INQUIRY.

Mr Lane said—There is no need for me to enlarge on what you have heard; it was so illuminating, and I move and suggest that you will do all in your power to bring before the people of this country all that has been told you by Lord Alfred. Lord Alfred came out of his case with a farthing damages, but I claim that he has had the finest moral victory that a man could ever have. It is a question of blood, not money. (Loud applause.) I have pleasure in moving the resolution:—

"That this meeting calls upon the Government to form a Committee to conduct a Public Enquiry into the circumstances which caused the death of Field-Marshal Earl Kitchener, and also to investigate the allegations made in Court about the Battle of Jutland."

The motion was carried unanimously.

A further motion that Lord Alfred Douglas should have a place on any Committee of Investigation appointed by the Government was carried unanimously. Kitchener had been murdered. If "Zion" (a book referred to) with its throat cut and a blood-stained knife in its passage which to my mind the Government and its agents seem that a man has

PAMPHLET BINDERS

This is No. 1525

also carried in stock in the following sizes

HIGH	WIDE	THICKNESS	HIGH	WIDE	THICKNESS
1523 9 inches	7 inches	1/2 inch	1529 12 inches	10 inches	1/2 inch
1524 10 "	7 "	"	1530 12 "	9 1/2 "	"
1525 9 "	6 "	"	1532 13 "	10 "	"
1526 9 1/2 "	7 1/2 "	"	1533 14 "	11 "	"
1527 10 1/2 "	7 1/2 "	"	1534 16 "	12 "	"
1528 11 "	8 "	"			

Other sizes made to order.

LIBRARY HUC-JIR, CIN



1100149672