

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 15. No. 21.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper  
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

It is as sensible—neither more nor less—to speak of “the necessity of restoring the control of currency and credit to the Government” as to speak of “the necessity of restoring the control of wheat-growing to the Government.” Mr. Mackenzie-King, in his much-quoted and significant speech at Saskatoon in 1935, knew exactly what he was saying when he used those words, because he had been told. The control of currency and credit has been in the hands of the “Canadian Government” as well as of the “British Government” for nearly ten years. And where we are is where it has got us, and Bretton Woods is where we are going.

What matters both about money and wheat is: who gets it, and on what terms. It should hardly be necessary to refer again to the fallacy that individuals of the general public have any control over the Government, either directly, or through “their” Members of Parliament, and Bretton Woods is explicitly above Governments.

The root of this matter is that a collectivity has no moral standards of its own, and invariably reflects the lowest morals of its constituent units. If any additional proof of this statement beyond the investigations of Gustave le Bon were required, it is supplied at the moment by the “Government” Surplus racket. As we have several times stated, without apparently causing a ripple of public interest, everything made by “Government” instruction, and therefore paid for either by taxation or inflation, belongs to those who bear the taxation or inflation, without further payment. But it is being given away or sabotaged without even the pretence of permission. Not only does the taxpayer not get his property, which certainly amounts to hundreds, and may easily amount to thousands of millions in value, but eight months after the end of the German War, not a visible dribble of the piles of available stores is reaching the consuming public, even by purchase. We don’t wonder that Mr. Ellis Smith resigned. Any man who doesn’t resign from this racket is an accessory before and after the fact of the most gigantic robbery in all history.

And this includes the High Priest of Austerity.

The essential point to notice in all this, is the dissolution of all the framework of civilisation. Under the tawdry and discredited argument of “efficiency,” property is stolen and sequestered, liberty is curtailed and abolished, and alien vulgarity is forced on an ancient and honourable culture. It is so well understood that any association which is to function over a period of time must have a “constitution” that no limited company can trade without a memorandum and articles of association, which define its powers, and are not changeable except by a difficult procedure. But the Company of Gentlemen Adventurers in Great Britain now has no rules, written or traditional.

Any gang which gets a majority, by a fallacious ballot and a manipulated agenda, can upset all the rules, sell or give away all the assets, and liquidate the Company, all in the sacred name of d’markrazi. It is not a question of “Party,” but it is beyond question that the less scrupulous the gang, the less it is handicapped either in the achievement of power, or the use of it.

Not the least of the weapons in the armoury of the Dark Forces is the carefully-managed ridicule which accompanies any general suggestion of their existence. So far as we are aware, there is no very effective answer to this tactic other than the lapse of time, because it is a subtle appeal to what the Americans call “a regular fellow”—a type beautifully portrayed in *Babbitt*. Nevertheless, the trail of the serpent is becoming more visible daily, and one of its curious manifestations is the fervour of the Left for Internationalism for the British Isles and Nationalism for everyone else, and particularly for the British Dominions.

In the Canadian House of Commons a discussion—not the first—on the question of a national flag for Canada has been in progress. Who so ultra-patriotic as Mr. *Rose*, the Jewish Communist who sits for the Cartier Division of Montreal as “Labour-Progressive”? And Mr. Coldwell, the Leader of the Socialists (C.C.F.), born in Devon and an alumnus of the London School of Economics? What is “Britain” to him? “I hope a choice will not be made of a flag which will prove to be not sufficiently distinctive” (*i.e.*, distinctively non-British).

Through all the arguments of both Mr. *Rose* and Mr. Coldwell, together with others more obviously anti-English, ran a dislike of a flag composed of three crosses—those of St. George, St. Andrew and St. Patrick.

## Wool Stocks

Answering a question in the name of Lord Barnby in the House of Lords, Lord Pakenham said the total weight of stocks of wool on July 1, 1945, was about 3,250,000,000 pounds, the cost of which, where lying, was about £170,000,000. Under the recent Agreement, this is owned jointly by the United Kingdom Government and the Dominion Governments. The 1945-46 Dominion clips are being taken up by the United Kingdom Government by the previous methods of appraisal and bulk purchase, at an estimated cost of about £75,000,000, on account of the Joint Organisation which is being set up by the United Kingdom and Dominion Governments. Thereafter, it is proposed that new clips shall be offered for sale through normal channels, the Joint Organisation taking over any such wool not purchased at the auction reserve price.

## Uniform Taxation

The following was broadcast from 7 HO (Hobart, Tasmania) on October 28 last:—

Last week, both parties in the House of Assembly unanimously agreed to a motion seeking the return to the States of their taxing powers. Appearing in the *Mercury* of Friday, October 19 is the following statement:—

"Stating that the maintenance of the Federal system of Government and the existence of the States depended on the termination of the system of uniform taxation and the return to the State of their taxing powers, Mr. Baker moved that the Government should seek from the Commonwealth Government an early intimation of its intention to honour its promise that uniform taxation would not be continued beyond one year from the end of the war.

"If the present system of taxation is allowed to continue by the public of Australia, States will soon be well on the way to liquidation. The Commonwealth, having been beaten in a frontal attack is now pursuing a policy of peaceful penetration, through the courts and in many other ways, chiefly by their financial power which they are using remorselessly," said Mr. Baker.

"The Treasurer, Mr. Dwyer-Gray, speaking in support of the motion said he hoped the House would accord it unanimous support. Mr. Curtin had stated in 1942 that the scheme was intended as a wartime measure only, and would not be imposed by constitutional or any other means as a permanent feature of the financial relations between the States. Mr. Curtin had stated further that the undertaking given by his Government in that regard undoubtedly would be honoured by any succeeding Government."

It is very pleasing to see members of our local parliament acting unanimously to safeguard the interests of their own State.

But the Hobart representative in Canberra, Senator McKenna, doesn't seem to be of the same mind, and as Senator McKenna has been given the task of examining the question of uniform taxation, Tasmania's hopes of obtaining self-government seem pretty remote. According to the *Mercury* report, Senator McKenna stated:—

"The important thing to remember is that the proposal of which the assurance was part was completely rejected by all six States. In those circumstances, the offer, including the assurance, lapsed. The Commonwealth then, not only without the concurrence of the States but in the teeth of State opposition, implemented the present scheme of uniform income taxation in June, 1942. . . . The Commonwealth is not under any obligation to consult the States as to the future of uniform income taxation."

According to Senator McKenna's own statement, the Federal Labour Government, of which he and Mr. Frost and Dr. Gaha are members, forced uniform taxation on this country against the wishes of the States, and of his own State in particular. These men call themselves "representatives." It would be very interesting to know *whom* they represent.

I should like to repeat what Senator McKenna said: "The Commonwealth is not under any obligation to consult the States as to the future of uniform income taxation."

As the word Commonwealth is one of those delightfully vague phrases behind which politicians love to shelter, we

shall use a more precise word; and as the enforcing of "uniform taxation" is merely a very thinly disguised trick to concentrate all taxing power in Canberra, I shall find a better phrase for "uniform taxation."

Senator McKenna's statement would be better understood if it were read thus: "The Labour Party Bosses at Canberra are not under any obligation to consult the States as to whether or not they should be allowed ever again to collect their own taxes." But I am not satisfied to let that statement pass even as I have altered it.

While this country has been at war, and while men have been away from home fighting, with others trying to keep the country going in spite of the appalling incompetence of the politicians and their hosts of bureaucrats, the Labour Government, of which Senator McKenna is a member, have been using every trick known to the underworld, and quite a few probably not known, to alter the Constitution of this country in such a manner as permanently to change it against the wishes of the people.

Australia has a Constitution admitted by experts as one of the finest in the world; the constitution gives ample powers to the people to change that constitution whenever they wish. The Uniform Taxation act undermines the sovereignty of each State, undermines the keystones of the constitution, and destroys the whole purpose and spirit of that constitution.

When we consider these facts, and they are facts, the statement made by Senator McKenna becomes full of startling significance, and, in essence, Senator McKenna has said:—"The Labour Party Bosses are under no obligation to consult the people of this country, or to take the slightest notice of the constitution; if we can't get what we want one way, we shall get it some other way; but we intend to get our way in spite of the constitution and in spite of the wishes of the people." This is what the Labour Party calls Democratic Government.

The Federal Labour party is afraid that even Labour Party followers are beginning to wake up to the hollow mockery of this so-called Democratic Government which is in control of the tax-collecting machine of this country, and so the Labour Party Bosses are once more attempting to swamp the voting strength of experienced men by reducing the voting age to 18.

Is it reasonable to give a vote to a boy or girl of 18—The same vote which is given to a returned soldier and to an experienced man? Can there be any doubt what Labour hopes to do with that vote? They hope to swamp your vote, to wipe it out; they hope to use young and inexperienced boys and girls who don't even know Australia has a constitution; they hope to use these political babes to destroy their own constitution before they have time to wake up to what has happened.

We have a vast amount of evidence to show that the Party Bosses and the Bureaucrats are out to destroy the power of any man or woman to protect themselves either in a court of law or in Parliament or by any other means against the governing clique of Canberra who are drunk with power; and if they get their way then you won't even be permitted the privilege of complaining about it.

## Coal

Industrial experts predict that before many months are past the price of coal in England will be £16 per ton.

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone: Sefton Park 435.

Vol. 15. No. 21.

Saturday, January 26, 1946.

### Two Doctors Disagree

The doctors and patients who are about to be swept into the net of Monopoly in accordance with Assumption B. of the Beveridge plan (repudiated by the only electors who had the chance to do so explicitly when Sir William Beveridge was himself defeated at the General Election) can still ask questions. In theory they can still defeat the plotters against individual liberty and the humane traditions of a great profession. In practice, mass bribery in the form of rest hours for doctors, front seats for specialist doctors and fairy tales for patients (free) make the final stages of the 'Health' ramp's progress of little more than academic interest. The British Medical Association now invites "applications for Election" from prospective members, and may thus be presumed to envisage early metamorphosis into a new kind of 'Learned Society' from which, presumably, all those mundane matters which concern trades unionists will be excluded. It will have served its turn. Is that why a memorandum said to have been distributed to the negotiating committee "of the Medical Profession" [*sic*] with a strong plea for secrecy concerning its terms was first communicated by the Ministry of Health to the Trades Union Congress? The Memorandum embodied 'the Government's' proposals for the future State Medical Service, and the doctors were told that its central principles must stand, but 'there was plenty of room for discussion on methods.'—Almost a quotation from the charge brought against the B.M.A. and the Ministry in concert by the Medical Policy Association!

Another question which sensible people might ask is why our fate should be decided along the lines of an argument between two political doctors, Dr. Charles Hill and Dr. Stark Murray, as broadcast on January 18, which, in any case will offer Mr. Aneurin Bevan the opportunity of saying again that he agrees with both of them? Neither of these gentlemen was chosen by the future sufferers under 'the Government' to speak for them. Nor do those sufferers need anyone to speak for them. Effective action against Monopoly will not come through talk, but by opposing to the dumb insolence of Monopolists a negative equally dumb.

### The Farmer and the Food Office

A Dairy Farmer with a milk round had the Local College as his main customer. He made it a practice to let that College have the majority of his spare milk. He recently received a letter from the Food Office threatening him with proceedings if he handed out more than the bare

ration. He presented himself at the Food Office with this letter and asked what he should do with his surplus milk. He was told that that did not concern them.

He pressed the matter and after some argument saw the Chief of the Local Food Office. He also told him that the Food Office was neither interested nor concerned with what happened to the surplus milk. It was actually suggested to the Farmer that he should not milk his cows as much as he did so as to cut down the milk supply. After considerable argument he was told to go away. The Farmer then said that what he proposed doing was to hand out the bare ration and to bring back his surplus and put it in front of the Food Office. He told the official that it was the Food Ministry that had issued instructions not to issue more than the ration, it therefore was the responsibility of the Food Office to give instructions as to what should happen to the rest. The Farmer told the Local Official that if the employees of the Local Food Office drank the milk probably someone else would prosecute them, but that if the milk was allowed to go bad he, the Farmer, would prosecute the Food Office for allowing food fit for human consumption to be destroyed. He said he himself was in no circumstances going to destroy the milk. There was consternation in the Food Office and he was told that in no circumstances must he do that.

He impressed on the Food Official the fact that proper instructions were his responsibility and that dumping the surplus milk was precisely what he intended doing. He said what was more he would give the Food Office one hour and after the expiration of sixty minutes they would find the milk on the doorstep in full view of the road. He then left the Food Office.

After about half-an-hour the Food Office telephoned him and told him that the matter had been considered and that he could let the College have the surplus milk. The Farmer thanked them for having reconsidered the matter and asked for the new instructions in writing. The reply was that this would be considered. The Farmer replied that they had thirty minutes only in which to consider the matter and also to deliver, by messenger, the written instructions otherwise the milk would be on the doorstep. Before the expiration of the hour Food Officials turned up and explained that it was quite impossible for them to give any written explanation or instructions cancelling the previous letter. They agreed, however, to repeat the withdrawal of that letter and permission to issue the surplus milk in front of witnesses. The Farmer contented himself with this and the College and some of the Farmer's customers now receive the surplus milk instead of its being destroyed.

### Foreign Publications in Great Britain

Questioned in Parliament concerning the newspapers and periodicals published in this country during the war under foreign auspices with British official co-operation, the Minister of Information, Mr. E. J. Williams, said twenty-six periodicals, newspapers, news bulletins and magazines appear under foreign auspices and with British official co-operation. The weekly paper consumption is approximately 12 tons. Contributions from public funds are at present at the rate of rather more than £6,000 a year, and will very shortly be reduced to about £4,000. In addition, there are a number of such periodicals which were officially assisted during the war and still continue to publish without official help.

## The Jewish Problem

The following is the text from the Official Report of Lord Altrincham's speech on the Jewish Problem in the House of Lords on December 10, 1945.

Passages from other speeches during the debate will be published next week.

Lord Altrincham rose to call attention to the questions raised by the present situation of the Jews in Europe and Palestine; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, there are, I believe, proverbs in almost all languages to the effect that silence is better than speech on many difficult questions that trouble the world. The usual reference is to the comparative value of silver and gold; but I have heard in Palestine that the proverb there is "If a word is worth one shekel, then silence is worth two." I am sure your Lordships will feel that those proverbs, whatever form they take, are applicable to the more controversial part of the Jewish question and the Palestine question, on which I have put down my Motion to-day. I would not say a single word which would arouse controversy at the present time, or seem in any way to prejudge the work of the Anglo-American inquiry, on which I shall have some comment to make later, or raise the temperature either in Palestine or elsewhere at the present time. To do so would be most irresponsible. It is not with that object, or indeed, with any fear that what is likely to be said in your Lordships' House will produce results of that kind, that I have put down this Motion.

I have two quite definite objects. One is to give the support of Parliament, as I am sure your Lordships would wish to do, to our Services of all kinds, in Palestine at the present time. They, after all, are bearing the brunt of the controversy by which the whole world is stirred. Secondly, I would commend the course which is being pursued by His Majesty's Government in providing and arranging for the inquiry which is now to take place, and I would make one or two comments upon that course of action, which I entirely commend.

First and foremost, I am sure that in all quarters of the House there will be a desire to assure our Services, civil and military, warmly and generously of the moral support of Parliament in the task which has been laid on them at the present time. The Administrative Service in Palestine has been bearing for twenty-five years the hardest of all tasks in the whole Colonial Empire. I have no doubt whatever about that, having seen a good deal of it there and elsewhere at first hand. The casualties which have been suffered even recently in Palestine afford some index only of the strain under which our officers of all ranks are working in the Holy Land under the conditions that prevail. A list of outrages was given at the end of last year by Colonel Stanley, then Colonial Secretary, covering 1944; and when I say that in 1944, before this question had once again become acute, the number of officers and other ranks in Government service killed was 17 and the number of wounded—most of them seriously—25, your Lordships will understand that the conditions in which our Services carry on in Palestine are very hard. They are very hard not only or principally on the men but also on the women, on the wives, who have all been out there throughout the war.

They are now facing, after six years of war strain, the exceptional difficulties which have been created by the re-

crudescence of the Zionist question in its present form. I should be grateful to the Government for some information as to the conditions in which the Administrative Service is carrying on at the present time. I have seen some of the conditions in the last few months. Leave has been restricted, if not impossible, for six years. Housing conditions are extremely bad; there is a great pressure for houses in Palestine, as great as there is here, and the men in our Services have great difficulty in finding houses in which to live. There has been an almost universal lack of fuel, and that is a serious matter in a country which has a climate like that of Palestine, for few people, I think, realise that the rainfall in Jerusalem is equal to the rainfall in London, with this difference, that it all falls in Jerusalem between October and May. The rations throughout the war have been short and the cost of living has been quite abnormally high—higher than in almost any other part of the Middle East, and that is saying a great deal. All that has been added to the strain and anxiety produced by the succeeding Middle Eastern crises of the war.

I was deeply shocked to find, when I first went to Palestine last year, that the salaries and allowances of the Administrative Service had not been adjusted to these conditions in any way. Lord Gort who was then High Commissioner, was making great efforts to get those adjustments made. I have not heard what action has been taken upon the proposals which I think were put forward at that time, and I shall be very grateful to the Government if they can say whether salaries and allowances for the Administrative Service in Palestine have been adjusted during the present year.

Then take the police. If a policeman is killed on duty in this country, Parliament, the Press and the public show the keenest concern. Surely there should be an equal concern for such casualties in Palestine; but they very often pass unnoticed, as if an Englishman had not given his life in a duty of the gravest and most responsible kind. The police there are a splendid body of men, and when Sir Harold MacMichael was attacked just outside Jerusalem in August last year, he owed his life to the presence of mind of a plain-clothes officer. Since I was often served by that plain-clothes officer afterwards, I know what a remarkable and exceptional man he was. But there are many of his type in Government service in Palestine at the present time. The Tegart forts, which cover so many hillsides throughout the Holy Land, are a witness to the conditions in which the police and their families have lived for years. There are fortresses round every bend, fortresses recently built, which are one of the most prominent features of the scenery in the Holy Land. These fortresses are far more numerous than those left by the Crusaders.

There has been, I know, an effort to improve the terms of service of the police and to offer new inducements to recruits. On that point also I should be glad of what information the Government can give your Lordships to-day. But my praise of the administrative services and of the police services is not confined, I must emphasise, to British personnel alone. Many Arabs and many Jews are rendering efficient and loyal service to the Crown, and in the figures for casualties which I gave just now—the casualties for 1944—I notice that, of the killed, five were Arabs in Government service, and one was a Jewish constable. Of the wounded, one was an Arab, and four were Jews. That shows that Arabs and Jews in the service of the Crown are taking the



same risks, and serving with the same courage, as British personnel.

Mention must also be made, of course, of the service which is being rendered at the present time by the Army and the R.A.F., particularly, in Palestine. Many of our finest troops, with a splendid war record, have been sent out there, and there is no task more distasteful to soldiers than the task which they have been called upon to perform. But they have upheld the law against bodies of people who, at first, look like unarmed civilians and then suddenly turn into an armed, fanatical force of resistance against what our Forces are ordered to do. Of course, this task is especially distasteful to our soldiers when women and children are involved. I most deeply regret, and I am sure all of your Lordships in all quarters of this House will condemn, the unscrupulous abuse which is being directed against our troops and our services generally in Palestine at the present time. Things have been said by the underground Jewish broadcasting system, "The Voice of Israel," which are a disgrace to Israel, and I am sorry to say that some of those things are being echoed in some organs of the Jewish Press over here. It is disgraceful that this should be so, and I think that we here, in your Lordships' House, ought to say to our people that we are convinced that they have upheld, and that they will always uphold, the high standards of the Services and of the country to which they belong.

It was the intention of the most reverend Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury to be here to-day and speak in this debate. He wrote to me asking me to express his regret at his inability to be present on account of having to attend the funeral at Canterbury of Lord Lang. He also asked me to make three or four points on his behalf. But since the most reverend Primate the Archbishop of York is here I will leave those points to him with full confidence that they will be thoroughly covered. I should, however, like myself, to pay my tribute to the work of the Church of England in the Holy Land. It is one of the services which has most truly represented the spirit of our people and our Empire there. It has taken no part whatever in the sectarian rivalries between Christian sects which disfigure the Holy Land. Your Lordships are probably aware how terrible these rivalries are, and you no doubt know that the outer precincts of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre itself have been watched over for two or three centuries by a Moslem family, because the Christians could not agree. In contrast to that, the Church of England, throughout its record in Palestine, has worked wholeheartedly for harmony between races and creeds and cultures there. I think that there has been particularly good service rendered by the Christian schools which have preached unity, when in the greater part of the system of education in Palestine there has been preached the fiercest form of nationalism to be pursued by almost any means.

Religious bitterness has not always marked the relations, at any rate, between Christianity and Islam in Syria. It is an historical fact that in the first seventy years after the conquest of Damascus by Islam in the seventh century of our era, the great Basilica of St. George there was shared equally between Christians and Moslems, for the purposes of worship by the adherents of those creeds. Unfortunately, that spirit of toleration has long been absent from that part of the world. But, my Lords, that breadth of spirit has always characterised and does still characterise the work of

the Church of England there. The only privilege it claims amongst the holy sites, is once a year, on Christmas eve, to arrange for carols to be sung in the cloister outside the Church of the Nativity of Bethlehem. That simple ceremony, I think your Lordships will agree, is symbolical of its devoted service to the cause of peace and good will amongst men in the Holy Land, and throughout the world.

A little while ago I mentioned Lord Gort, who was High Commissioner in Palestine throughout the time that I was Minister Resident in the Middle East. I am sure that your Lordships would wish to express sympathy with him and with his family for the fact that he has been obliged by illness to resign his post. Lord Gort is the epitome of British staunchness and integrity. He is the epitome of the soldierly virtues and of soldierly character in every line. He has, as your Lordships know, rendered splendid war service in many hard and lonely posts. The retreat to Dunkirk has not yet been fully appreciated as a military achievement, and, indeed, the story of it has not even been fully told. His work at Gibraltar when he placed that fortress for the first time in a state of defence, might have been important indeed, if the menace of Hitler—which is now being brought out at Nuremberg—had materialised. He served afterwards as Governor of Malta in the worst stages of the trial through which the "George Island" passed during the war.

In Palestine, his service was perhaps the greatest of all. He was accessible to everybody and he went everywhere—a new tradition I may say for High Commissioners in the past, or perhaps I should say a tradition which he renewed after an interval, and which it was difficult to carry out in the conditions of the time. He was, as your Lordships know, incapable of fear. I was taken by him for more than one walk in the narrow streets of old Jerusalem and I am bound to say that it was a highly interesting and testing experience. I felt as if we were back in the patrols of the first World War when he used to take me on patrols in No Man's Land. He himself never showed a tremor of any kind, and I cannot really under-state his steady influence, his fairness, his indifference to risk and his cheerful and imperturbable serenity towards both races out there. His illness is a tragedy, and I only hope that he may be able to recover so as to take his place in your Lordships' House.

To summarise our debt to British Services in Palestine—and this is the point I wish to make most strongly—let me say this. They are, as we all know, not responsible for policy, yet policy has embroiled them by turn with both races at different times over the past twenty-five years. They have done, and are doing their duty with courage, efficiency and with impartial minds. They most certainly deserve the support and confidence of your Lordships' House and indeed of Parliament as a whole at this most critical and exacting time. There is a sterling *bloc* of a moral, not a material, order formed by the men and women who served the Crown throughout the Empire at the present time. That has been one essential foundation of the loyalty and readiness to serve which has been shown by the peoples of the Colonial Empire during the war and there is certainly no finer example of it, no finer example of its sterling qualities and worth, than is presented by the British Services in Palestine.

I come now to the second object of my Motion, which is to congratulate His Majesty's Government on the inquiry which they have arranged in co-operation with the United States of America and to wish that inquiry well. Clearly

the Palestine question, apart from the Jewish question as a whole, must ultimately go to the United Nations Organisation, but the Jewish issue is much broader than the Palestine question. I am very glad in the first place that the terms of reference of the inquiry have been so made that they will deal with the needs and sufferings and ideals of the Jews in Europe as well as in Palestine. There is universal sympathy with the sufferings of European Jews. Heaven knows there is enough suffering in Europe everywhere, but the Jews have suffered longest of all and it is very natural that the storm of hatred and bestial cruelty which has been directed against them as a race for so long should have stimulated the Zionist ideal. I can well understand the special sympathy and feeling of the relations of European Jews now in Palestine. I can well understand, although I deplore it, the fact that youth in Palestine has been able to see only one side. Young men and women in Palestine, so far as I could find in the Jewish settlements, are convinced of no right but their own as deserving of the support of the civilised world. We must take a broader view of this whole issue than they possibly can. It is not their fault that they think and feel as they do, but if the magnitude of the problem of relief for dispossessed Jewry in Europe is anything like what has been suggested in various accounts, quite clearly there can be no solution to that problem in Palestine alone.

Palestine is a very small country. Its historic limits are from Dan to Beersheba and from the Jordan to the sea. From Dan to Beersheba is one hundred and forty miles and from the Jordan to the sea is an average of twenty-three miles. It is a very small country and clearly if the needs of dispossessed Jewry in Europe are as great as we have been told there can be no solution to that problem in Palestine alone. I would add that, whatever may be thought about the possibilities of further development in Palestine (and in my opinion they are considerable), progress must depend upon co-operation with the neighbouring States. Agricultural progress, industrial progress and progress in every form must depend upon co-operation with the neighbouring States and that is another reason for taking this question out of the narrow confines in which it has been argued and clouded over by propaganda for so many years.

A joint Anglo-American inquiry on the broadest lines seems to me to be indispensable and I am glad that Anglo-American action is being taken as the first step. There is, after all, no ancient or traditional hostility between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East who are both great branches of one Semitic race. That hostility has been created outside the Middle East; it has been imported from Europe and the West. It is due to a new factor which was born in the West and that is the strength of nationalism in its present form. We are the primary cause of that and of course it ran riot at the end of the first World War when President Wilson doctrines kindled quite as heated a fire in the Middle East as in any other part of the world.

I think that President Wilson realised the consequences when he met both Arabs and Jews in the course of the Paris Peace Conferences and your Lordships may remember that in 1919 he recommended an inquiry such as is now to be held. There is therefore good American precedent for the inquiry which is being arranged. President Wilson suggested an inquiry by independent investigators—American, British, French and Italian investigators—and it was agreed to. The

French Government, however, decided afterwards not to appoint any members; the Italians followed suit, and in due course we followed suit as well; with the result that President Wilson was left to send his investigators alone, but they went. Although the King-Crane Report, as it is called, was not made public for some time afterwards and never reached President Wilson while he was in full possession of his powers, yet that Report is a most valuable testimony to the conditions then obtaining in the Middle East and to the opinions held more particularly in Palestine.

There is another reason for Anglo-American co-operation. Together, though in different ways, Britain and the United States have made the Zionist achievement in Palestine up to date possible. It could not have been done without our support and help. The Jews—and I render the most willing tribute to them—have worked miracles in Palestine. Nobody could see what they have done in the course of twenty-five years without admiring the resource, the energy, the industry, the inventiveness and the refusal to shirk difficulties of any kind which have gone into all the work they have done. Unquestionably, they have transformed the face of a considerable part of the Holy Land, but they could not have done that without British support, which has given much life and treasure in helping the Zionist movement and in helping, supporting and defending the Zionist achievement.

The task especially laid upon our Services out there was most difficult, because our undertakings in written documents were equivocal. Your Lordships are on record, in a debate held in your Lordships' House in June, 1922—the debate having been initiated by the noble Lord, Lord Islington—by a majority of 60 to 29 to the effect that the Mandate as afterwards sanctioned and approved by the League of Nations was inconsistent with the undertakings which we had given during and after the war. Your Lordships took that view despite the fact that the noble Earl, Lord Balfour, made his maiden speech and spoke with all his usual eloquence on the minority side. In the following year the noble Lord, Lord Grey, of Falloden, in another debate in your Lordships' House, also expressed the strong desire that the equivocal nature of our undertakings should be more fully explored in order that the honour of this country might be cleared. The Mandate was, nevertheless, approved, and in my opinion we have lived up to that Mandate in every way. I cannot see that there is any ground why the Empire should stand in a white sheet before the world for its record in Palestine. Its achievement there is remarkable, one which I do not believe that any other race with less experience of difficulties of that kind could possibly have attained. It has done well for both the Arabs and the Jews.

While the Jews have multiplied their populations tenfold and while, as I said just now, the development which they have established is in every way wonderful, the Arabs have doubled their population. Their standard of life has risen, and, while it must be admitted that a certain number of Arab peasant proprietors have been dispossessed, we put a stop to that process when we realised what was happening. The Arabs, by and large, have not suffered by our action in Palestine they have gained. Therefore there is no reason why at the present moment we should be attacked for failing to carry out to the best of our ability the Mandate with which we were entrusted and achieving, on the whole, very good results in the most difficult conditions by which we

were faced. But the clash of two conflicting national ideals in Palestine has now reached a stage where His Majesty's Government, as it seems to me, are bound to invoke the principles of the United Nations' Charter by which, after all, they are now bound. The Mandate holds until, I understand, it is replaced by some new agreement under the United Nations' Charter. But, quite apart from the Mandate, we are bound now by the principles of that Charter, and we must do our utmost to observe them in every way.

Let me read to your Lordships the three principles of the United Nations' Charter, which seem to me to justify, in every way, the action which His Majesty's Government have taken. In the preamble we undertook:

"to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours,"

and to attempt to see that that policy is pursued everywhere. That declaration needs all the international influence that can be put behind it in Palestine at the present moment. We further promised:

"to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest. . ."

An appeal is being made to armed force in Palestine now and, if the Charter is to mean anything, we must try to see that armed force is not used in an attempted solution of a question of this kind. Finally, in Article 1 of the Charter, we undertook:

"to develop friendly relations among nations based upon respect for the principles of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples. . ."

The Arabs may justly appeal to that Article, and their case must assuredly be heard.

But the first step is to establish the facts in Europe and in Palestine. The Commissioners who attempt to do so must be manifestly impartial if their report is to carry the weight required. I am sure we can count upon His Majesty's Government to see that such choices are made. It is of vital importance that after that, when the facts are established and when action is possible on the report, there should be international co-operation on which peace is bound to depend. We cannot secure it alone. And it will depend more particularly on the readiness of other powers to bear their share of assistance to dispossessed Jewry in Europe at the present time. We must all pray, then, that this inquiry may establish confidence in its report when that is made, and that there may follow out of it a settlement which will at least bring peace to Palestine. For what will be the value of the United Nations' Charter if its principles cannot be applied to secure between nations, cultures and creeds, the peace that they ought to observe, more especially in a country which is sacred to the three great monotheistic religions, in a country which cradled the faith and the code of ethics on which Western civilisation has been built for nearly two thousand years.

### "An Englishman's Faith"

"When a nation takes to crooked ways, as we have done, everything in it must decay about the same time, because so many people lose confidence when uncertain of their direction. True prophets are, therefore, impelled to incur hatred and unpopularity because they must oppose every

interest and expose evils which occur everywhere at once. No doubt, in the body politic, as in other bodies, traces of health are to be found up to the very moment of death: and there are usually some who can even make dry bones live. The exceptions are, however, negligible, and the only courageous and effective course is to realise that we have lost all our healthy instincts, traditions and institutions, and to clear our minds for a new start.

"The English people have turned away from their hereditary right or straight courses, and until they find their direction again, nothing they do or say or think or believe can save them nor can any of their institutions, religious or secular, be healthy or well-conducted. Power, privileges, wealth and science can only tend towards wrong ends and result in ill-health and misery. If we were degenerate it would be hopeless. But we have seen again that a new inspiration can revive the virtue that has been encrusted with hedonism. When a nation holds its proper course, even the greatest misfortunes hardly retard its progress in the development of its higher impulses and the expansion of its power. It easily evacuates false doctrine and error, so that nothing but good grows in every institution.

"This does not mean that any abstract universal good flourishes unseen. It signifies that there is a particular goodness, a special type and a distinct character that is worshipped in the nation. A nation is not limited to those who live within its boundaries, or to those who spring from certain breeds, but is identified by the character and type evolved from the interpretation of its experience in the light of its own religion. The English, French, Germans and Spaniards do not merely differ in race or nationality because they speak different languages, but they use different languages because their religions (in the true sense of the word which has the double meaning of binding back and binding together), differ as much as the words they use. That is why there is an English proverb that a man who speaks two languages is a scoundrel. That is why the ecclesiastical use of Latin has converted our wise laws into Roman nonsense, about 'rights' and 'justice' and equality in the 'State.' We can see in Europe that internationalism caused by trade and commerce, has in fact destroyed all the national religions. Meanwhile, religions, or, perhaps, to speak more accurately priesthoods, have adapted themselves to the inter-communication of trade, have fastened like limpets on every local tradition, and filled the world with the spirit of equality and what is so inaccurately called 'communism.' The resulting political systems are deliberately based on mechanisation and regimentation, destructive alike of creative genius and noble art."

—William Sanderson, *Statecraft*, 1941.

### The 'State' Above the Law

"The [Crown Proceedings Bill to place the Crown in the same position as the subject to sue or be sued], taken as a whole, would end one of the greatest menaces now affecting the rights of the subject; indeed it is not too much to say that if Collectivism proceeds at its present pace, unless something is done, the legal rights of the subject will diminish to such an extent that in the end the constitutional privileges of the people will become almost valueless—and that, it is feared, without their recognising what has happened."—Sir Henry Slesser, January 20.

## SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

The following Groups and Associations are registered as working in association with the Social Credit Secretariat:—

### GREAT BRITAIN

- ABERDEEN D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., W. J. Sim, 18 Adelphi, Aberdeen.
- BELFAST D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. A. Crothers, 20 Dromara Street, Belfast.
- BLACKPOOL D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., A. Davies, 73 Manor Road, Blackpool.
- BRADFORD D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., R. J. Northin, 11 Centre Street, Bradford.
- CARDIFF D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., Miss H. Pearce, 8 Cwrt-y-vil Road, Penarth, South Wales.
- GLASGOW D.S.C. Group: W. Forrester, 81 Mitchell Street, Glasgow, C. 1.
- LONDON D.S.C. Group: Mrs. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent. Footscray 3059.
- MIDLAND D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., J. Sanders, 20 Sunnybank Road, Boldmere, Sutton Coldfield.
- NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE and GATESHEAD D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., T. H. Rea, 23 Clarewood Place, Fenham, Newcastle, 5.
- PORTSMOUTH and SOUTHSEA D.S.C. Group: Hon. Sec., Mrs. Waite, 50 Ripley Grove, Copnor, Portsmouth.
- SOUTHAMPTON D.S.C. Association: Hon. Sec., C. Daish, 19 Coniston Avenue, Redbridge, Southampton.
- STOCKTON D.S.C. Group: L. Gilling Smith, Eastrea, Durham Road, Stockton.
- Registered Groups are also working at LEPTON (Yorkshire), RUBERY AND REDNALL (Birmingham), WOKING, WOODFORD (Essex), and in BERKSHIRE. The last mentioned is a Services Group. Enquiries concerning all these should be addressed c/o The Social Credit Secretariat, 49 Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15.

### AUSTRALIA

#### New South Wales

- D.S.C.A. AND ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN OF N.S.W.  
Miss K. W. Marlow.
- DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION OF YOUTH  
A. Ferguson.
- COWPER D.S.C. Group  
J. McDonald.
- NEWCASTLE (N.S.W.) D.S.C. Group  
B. V. Murray.
- BELMONT D.S.C. Group  
S. H. Morrow.

#### South Australia

- ADELAIDE D.S.C. Group  
C. H. Allen.
- GLENELG D.S.C. Group  
E. C. Finn.

#### Western Australia

- PERTH D.S.C. Group  
W. F. Andrews.

#### Queensland

- QUEENSLAND D.S.C. Association  
A. W. Noakes.

#### Victoria

- HEADQUARTERS Group  
L. C. Hargreaves.
- MELBOURNE D.S.C. Groups:  
A. J. O'Callaghan.  
B Group  
F. C. Paice.  
C Group  
Miss G. F. Grieg.

#### Tasmania

- HOBART D.S.C. Group  
James Guthrie.

### NEW ZEALAND

- PATEA ELECTORATE V.P. Association G. J. Billinghamurst.  
AUCKLAND D.S.C. Group Mrs. W. James.

### SOUTH AFRICA

- PORT ELIZABETH D.S.C. Group L. W. Smith.

### CANADA

- OTTAWA (Parliamentary) D.S.C. Group  
OTTAWA D.S.C. Bureau of Canada Ralph L. Duclos, Pres.  
VANCOUVER D.S.C. Group J. Vans Macdonald.  
LIVERPOOL (Nova Scotia) D.S.C. Group T. E. D. Watson.  
SOUTH EDMONTON (Alberta) D.S.C. Group R. H. Ashby.

## To all Social Credit Groups and Associations, Home and Overseas

\*Associations desiring to act in accordance with the advice of the Secretariat are asked to fill in the following:—

Name, address, and approximate number of members  
of Association .....

We desire to follow the advice of the Social Credit Secretariat.†

To acquaint ourselves with the general character of this advice and the reasons underlying it, we agree to subscribe to *The Social Crediter* regularly in the proportion of at least one copy for every five members.

We agree not to discuss with others, without authorisation, the details of special advice received from the Secretariat.

Date..... Deputy's Signature.....

To accompany the above form, a brief statement is requested giving the history or account of the initiation of the group, and its present activities and intentions.

HEWLETT EDWARDS,  
Director of Organisation and Overseas Relations.

\*For this purpose an Association to consist of three or more Social Crediters.

†The Secretariat is the channel used by Major Douglas, the Advisory Chairman, for the transmission of advice.

### SOCIAL CREDIT LIBRARY

A Library for the use of annual subscribers to *The Social Crediter* has been formed with assistance from the Social Credit Expansion Fund, and is in regular use. The Library will contain, as far as possible, every responsible book and pamphlet which has been published on Social Credit together with a number of volumes of an historical and political character which bear upon social science.

A deposit of 15/- is required for the cost of postage which should be renewed on notification of its approaching exhaustion.

For further particulars apply Librarian, 21, Milton Road, Highgate, London, N. 6.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.