

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 17. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1947.

6d. Weekly.

"Political Zionism"

(A speech by Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., at Los Angeles on December 9.)

Canada has recently been favoured with a visit by Mr. Albert E. Kahn, an American citizen. Mr. Kahn is the distinguished author of *The Great Conspirator* and was formerly, I understand, editor of the Anti-defamation League's *Hour*. He is a frequent contributor to the *New Masses*.

Mr. Kahn has been delivering a series of addresses in Canadian cities under the sponsorship of the Canadian Soviet Friendship Council. In Vancouver, B.C., he addressed 700 members of the United Jewish People's Order. In Calgary, Alberta, Mr. Kahn spoke to a meeting held in the United Church; the Socialist mayor of the City being on the platform. I base the following remarks on the account of the meeting in the Vancouver and Calgary papers, an account headed "Britain, U.S. Promoting Fascism and Anti-Semitism."

Under the title, "The Plot Against the Peace," Mr. Kahn painted a grim picture of conditions in Europe, stating that the main war criminals have not yet been hanged; these are the industrialists who even to-day, he said, maintain their connections with British and American industries. (Presumably they ought to be hanged for this crime). In Poland, according to Mr. Kahn, General Ander's soldiers, secretly flown in from Italy, are responsible for more than 2,000 Jewish massacres in the past year, some of them bore British intelligence papers.

In Greece, old men and women are starved in concentration camps in order to force their democratic partisan (communist) menfolk from the hills.

"In Palestine," says Mr. Kahn, "the Jews do not believe that the British Empire should be preserved; they believe the British should be driven into the sea and the issue left to the Jews and the Arabs. The British want to keep the Holy Land as a possible base for attacking Russia."

I shall deal briefly with Palestine before I close, but meantime let me ask you if you believe this Zionist anti-British propaganda which is so widespread in America today? If any of you do fall for Mr. Kahn's Zionist propaganda against my country, listen to what he has to tell Canadians about you and your country.

According to Press reports, Mr. Kahn, the Zionist, said "Fascism is immensely strong in the U.S. today and there is intense anti-semitism. Jews cannot ignore the fact that this may not end in baiting and beatings, but in death chambers. Anything that happens in the United States is reflected in Canada, and Jews must fight Fascism by supporting Russia through the labour union movement and militant progressive action in all political issues." Do you believe that? *There* is the proof of the link between political Zionism

and Communism. What was it that Gouzenko said?—"The Soviet government falsified the Canadian picture to their own country and to those of other countries. The Soviet government is secretly preparing for a third world war and was creating fifth columns in democratic countries." That is the truth, and since you American and we British peoples remain the only bulwarks against Soviet world power it stands to reason that Communists above all things desire to drive a wedge between us by their lying propaganda. I am a nationalist. I have always opposed internationalism because it means a surrender of sovereignty. I am even more strongly opposed to it now, because I know its real purpose. But I also know that a quarrel between your people and our people—the English speaking peoples—in the face of the Communist threat, would mean suicide for both—we must hang together, for we shall surely hang separately. Therefore, I say that all propaganda against the Anglo-Saxon peoples has its ultimate source in Communistic political Zionism and that its purpose is to divide our countries, so that we can be defeated the more easily and, therefore, the more certainly.

The hatreds inspired by political Zionists in both our countries is a terrible thing. Even after the King David Hotel outrage Zionists and their Communist fellow travellers continue to denounce British policy in Palestine as anti-Semitic, and elsewhere as Imperialistic. Palestine threatens the peace of the world. If Great Britain resists Zionist demands to seize control by force of arms, the Zionists, the Communists and fellow travellers will stir up trouble everywhere. On the other hand, unless Great Britain refuses further demands for unlimited Jewish entry into Palestine, the whole Moslem world, numbering several hundred million people, may be driven within the orbit of the Soviet Union. That has been the aim of Socialist supported Communist-Zionist policy in Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, Spain, Argentina, India, China; while everywhere the lying, blackmailing, "smear bund" goes to work, labelling as anti-semitic and fascist all opposition to this Communist-Zionist policy. And it all adds up: Teheran, Potsdam, Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks in place of the Atlantic Charter; Zionism, Palestine, Moscow, the Laskis, Hillmans and Morgenthau and the surrender of sovereignty; the "spy ring," the "smear bund," the anti-defamation league, the Carlsons, the Kahns, Winchells and Birkheads in the U.S.A., and their opposite members of the "Red" network in Canada. All these agents of Wall Street and of Moscow, of Shylock and Marx, are working to prevent any true understanding or real friendship between the Anglo-Saxon peoples.

We read and hear a great deal about Palestine these days but, as you must have noticed, we hear only the Zionists, never the Arab side of the question. As I said in Parliament, a year ago; I have no brief for either side; my sole concern is to establish the truth, for just as truth and

freedom are indivisible, so mutual faith in the given word is the basis of friendship, individual and international. Once that faith is destroyed or even impaired, trust and friendship turn to suspicion and hatred. But instead of historic fact, the political Zionists base their case on racial, cultural and commercial superiority. These claims on behalf of a favoured nation and a chosen people are upheld especially by leftists and internationalists, by the very people who, otherwise, denounce racism and nationalism. They, also, are the people who claim to be the world's peacemakers but who, in the face of continued and fatal rioting in Palestine, are going out of their way to embarrass Great Britain in her efforts to maintain peace by encouraging tolerance by both Arab and Jew.

The present Palestine question dates from 1917, the year of the Balfour Declaration. In 1915 during the first world war the German-led Turkish army threatened the Suez Canal, Great Britain's life-line to the East. The British Government sent their agent, Sir Henry McMahon, to negotiate with the Arab leaders with a view to enlisting Arab support against the Turks. An agreement was signed by which Arab independence within certain boundaries would be granted in return for their armed assistance. The whole situation is complicated by secret treaties and pledges which, unknown to the Arabs, were concluded between the great powers.

Next came the Balfour Declaration of November, 1917 which reads as follows:—

"His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

The promise of a Jewish home in Palestine was made by the British Government to Dr. Weizman, the Zionist leader, and chemist, as a reward for his war-time discovery of producing acetone, the base of high explosive.

The confusion and misunderstanding of the Palestine question mainly are due to the different interpretations put upon the phrase "National Home in Palestine."

For political Zionists and for a great many of their Socialist fellow travellers and agents a national home for Jews has come to mean a Zionist national State, with, or without the consent of the Arabs.

In fact, when giving evidence before our Canadian Parliamentary Committee of External Affairs last summer the Zionists made no secret of their determination to create a Jewish State, and they will stop at nothing to gain their ends. But, in a letter to King Ibn Saud, dated April 5, 1945, President Roosevelt said, "Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action in my capacity as chief of the executive branch of this Government which might prove hostile to the Arab people."

President Truman in his speech on Navy Day, 1945 said: "We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government, by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true

in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western hemisphere." Then why make an exception of Palestine? The Jews have no moral or historical claims to Palestine which they left two thousand years ago, and which had been the home of the Arabs for a thousand years before Columbus discovered America.

Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons, a year ago and as a member of its committee of External Affairs, I said that the peace of the world was maintained by faith in the pledges of governments, and that Palestine is a graveyard of that peace. Can anyone say that in backing political Zionist claims, he is promoting world peace? I have addressed several meetings on behalf of the Canadian Arab Friendship League, and if one thing is certain, it is that all Arabs, Christian and Moslem, are united in their determination to fight to the death to prevent the formation of a Jewish State in Palestine. How many people know that when an Arab sells land to a Jew it is always made a part of the contract that never again can an Arab own, or even work on, the land?

There are many obvious reasons for Jewish demands on Palestine besides their unwarranted claim to it as their ancestral home. Palestine commands the Suez Canal, the oil pipe lines from Iraq and Iran pass through it on their way to the Mediterranean, there is the immense wealth of the Dead Sea, but there is a more fundamental reason for the outrages committed by so-called terrorists.

A white paper issued by the British Government states that the Zionist terrorist outrages are not the acts of a few fanatics, but the deliberate policy of the responsible Jewish Agency: A leading British paper, with a circulation of millions, recently stated "This paper can do no more than state once again the truth: Zionism is a political movement, and the leaders have as little compassion for the Jewish wrecks of Europe as for the Englishmen they murder. Their policy has had one, and only one, aim since Balfour was duped in 1917: the creation of a Palestinian Jewish State. No other country than Palestine was acceptable, for their state had to straddle the narrow bridge between east and west and be in a position to change at will the balance of power—in fact, to dominate the world." That is the truth, and that is the reason for all the propaganda by Zionists, and for the visit and speeches of Mr. Kahn, who tells his fellow Jews they can only survive by supporting Russia against the British and the American peoples. Speaking in the British House of Commons, the Right Hon. Herbert Morrison, a member of Britain's Labour Government, said—"The shock of the King David Hotel explosion has surely aroused us to a fuller understanding, if that were needed, of the horrible and monstrous nature of those "evil things" against which we are fighting. The curse of Hitler is not yet fully removed. Some of the victims of ravaged Europe have carried with them the germs of those very plagues from which they sought to escape—intolerance, intimidation, terrorism and worship of force. In dealing with Zionism we must deal with the clash of political forces, deeply rooted in history, stirring strong and terrible emotions. Zionism is regarded by its supporters as a profound and splendid impulse in the souls of the Jewish people. Let them beware, however, lest this modern perversion of their faith brings ruin upon them, and it." Is that anti-Semitism? Or is it a solemn warning to those who act on the belief they are God's chosen people? Let us make sure that this political Zionism does not bring

ruin upon us. But *all* Jews are not political Zionists. Let me quote an eminent Canadian Jew, Dr. Rabinowich, in an address to the Canadian Club of Montreal. Said Dr. Rabinowich, "I am a Jew through and through. It is essential that this be understood. What has prompted me to appear before you is the desperate needs of my people in Europe and the utter confusion of thought and values which is not only prolonging their sufferings, but has fired a train of events potentially disastrous to Jewry, to the peace of the world as a whole.

"To the non-Jewish world, the silence of all but political Zionists about the situation in Palestine must be difficult to understand. This silence may be ascribed to three reasons—confusion, intimidation and disgust. The confusion is not difficult to understand. Intimidation? I refused to believe it for some time—persecution of Jews by Jews seemed to be beyond reason. I, now, know it to be a fact. In Palestine the intimidation is complete. Outside Palestine the intimidation is not so complete, but it is by no means negligible.

"According to political Zionists one is either one of them or a traitor to his People. On Saturday," Dr. Rabinowich continues, "on the most sacred day in Jewish life I was denounced from a pulpit for appearing before you today without the faintest knowledge of the subject-matter of my address. Since then I have received five death threats, which latter I shall completely ignore.

"All Jews are Zionists, but there are two types of Zionism—Religious and Political. The Religious Zionists are absolutely opposed to a Jewish State, and the basis of their opposition is their Religion. The Political Zionist extremists' only objective is the Jewish State. To that end they have distorted facts and suppressed truth and as they have in the past, they are now using the suffering remnant of their People as a tool for their own Political ends."

That was the statement of an eminent Jew speaking for those of his People who are opposed to Political Zionism but who, for that very reason, are the victims of intimidation and persecution by their fellow Jews.

What, then, is anti-Semitism? An obvious answer would be to define Semitism. Shortly, Semitism is the claim by, and for, the Jews for special consideration, privileges and preferred treatment based on the belief, or claim, that the Jews are a "Chosen People."

One special privilege claimed is exemption from criticism, and any criticism of the Jews is, in fact, resented and denounced as anti-Semitism. This claim for the Jews has become a blackmailing racket which stifles free speech, controls the press and muzzles members of parliament and of Congress.

Now, the belief in a "chosen people" is not confined to the Jews. Various races have "fallen" for the idea—the Germans and the Japs being the latest. Only the Jews have succeeded in implanting this belief in the religion of their intended victims whom Zionists plan to control by means of an international, world government which is being imposed on the peoples of the world by every means, not the least of which is the propaganda of anti-Semitism directed against any, and all who actively defend their national sovereignty, the Christian religion, and a Christian culture and way of life. That is, all but the subjects of Saint Stalin, for does he not "liquidate" all guilty of anti-Semitism? Strangely enough the Jews show an obstinate desire to leave the protection of

their patron Saint for the terrors of anti-Semitism outside Russia.

Palestine is another proof of "Semitism" and its power to exploit international rivalries for its own benefit by stirring up international jealousies and ill feelings. Let me quote from a pamphlet handed to me as I was speaking on Palestine last August in the House of Commons.

According to this pamphlet—"Palestine lies crushed under a regime of brutal terror for the past many months. Under the pretext of suppressing terrorism, the British Labour Government under the leadership of Attlee and Bevin, have begun a campaign to wipe out the Yishuf, in order to strengthen British Imperialist domination over the peoples of Palestine and the Near East. It is tragic to note, that since the crushing of Hitlerism, Great Britain, pretended friend of world Jewry, has been the first power to strike a blow with the full force of her armed might against the Jewish people.

"The sudden raids of June 29 can only compare with the brutal and anti-Jewish terror of the Nazis in the various ghettos in Europe at the time of Hitler's domination."

Thousands of copies of that pamphlet have been distributed, and if anybody here is inclined to believe it, let me hasten to add that the pamphlet was issued by the Cartier Council of the Labour Progressive Party in Montreal. You will understand the point I am making when I tell you that the Labour Progressive Party is a Communist party, and that Cartier, in Montreal, was represented in the Canadian Parliament by Fred Rose, *alias* Rosenberg, the chief agent in Canada of the Soviet Spy Ring, recently sentenced to seven years in prison, as a traitor and a spy who was scheming and plotting to steal the atom bomb, and other vital secrets, to hand over to Moscow. Remember Cartier and Fred Rose when you read or listen to Zionist propaganda.

To sum up: Political Zionism has one real aim and purpose—a world State and world control. And its methods? A lying propaganda, in order to breed hatred between the American and British peoples, and a world wide conspiracy against Britain. The Zionists' strongest weapon is the cry of anti-Semitism which they shriek at any critic of their policies. This cry is always echoed by their Communist comrades who find it useful as a means of frightening and blackmailing their Jewish victims to force them to pay for Communist protection. Anti-Semitism in America is a Communist racket. The truth, is as Dr. Rabinowich has testified, Zionist terrorism over non-Zionist Jews is complete, just as the prisoners in the terror camps of Buchenwald had been under the absolute control of Communists since 1941. There is not, nor can there be, Jewish persecution by the American, British, or any other people, so long as we retain our Christian ideals and beliefs. But, political Zionism and Communism are denials of Christianity; both are anti-Christian.

(continued on page 8)

Mr. Colin Young, 91 Ashkirk Drive, Glasgow, S.W. 2, will be glad to hear from anyone interested in the formation of a Glasgow (Southern) Douglas Social Credit Group.

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. 17. No. 24.

Saturday, February 15, 1947.

From Week to Week

The so-called "temperance" agitation, perhaps one of the most intemperate, illiberal and, in essence, anti-Christian movements which have afflicted Great Britain, was widely known, particularly in the North, two or three generations ago, as Templarism (sometimes, Good Templarism). "Templarism" has been a word of ill-omen to this country for eight hundred years, and it would be informative to know how it came to be chosen for activities which, both here and in North America, have been interlocked with hypocritical policies and politics all aiming at the extension of domination over the individual, as well, incidentally, as affording an excuse for fantastic taxation. We notice with some amusement that the same type of agitation, although with less hypocrisy about it, is being used to prepare the ground for a heavy betting tax.

We say amusement, because, for some rather mysterious reason, the chosen race has not noticeably been associated with the wine and spirit trade, whereas betting and gambling, is its home ground.

It is fairly obvious that many good-hearted and well-intentioned people have lost all sense of political direction, so that, in consequence, their opinions on current legislation bear no relation to their good intentions. The situation is quite similar to that which confronts the British financial "system"—it has ceased to be based on gold, and yet has no discernible substitute. In other words, it has substituted no system for an unkept system. Many people have abandoned their belief in the Christian ethic, which would have furnished them with a foot-rule with which to measure politics, and have accepted a rubber string as a substitute. That they show signs of confusion is hardly to be wondered at.

As never before, the maxim that a lie is both murder and suicide in the spiritual world, applies to this condition, and the safest and only ultimate guide both to finance and politics is a sense of reality. The idea that you can improve matters by juggling with accounts in a "national" sense, whereas you put in gaol a trader who juggles with accounts in a trading sense; that you can increase wages without regard to their effect on costs, and export three-quarters of your production without increasing your true prices by 300%, and that politics consists in robbing Peter to pay Paul, the only criterion being whether you can get away with it, is simply a challenge to the axiom just quoted. You can do it of course, just as you can lie, and lie, and lie. But the idea that you can get away with it indefinitely seems to us to be merely infantile. You might just as well say that you can go on

knocking a surreptitious stroke off your score at golf, and still find yourself in request on the links. Even if the Christian ethic were baseless, it would still be necessary to assume it as a working hypothesis; and to suppose that a world can be made to operate on the complete absence of principle, which appears to characterise current legislation (because "nationalisation" is not a principle, it is organisation divorced from reality), is to assume that politics are more powerful than culture—a fallacy of which we shall see the disproof before many months have passed.

While there is no principle corresponding to reality in Socialism, it would be absurd to contend that there is no *plan*. Mr. Emanuel (God with us) Shinwell is obeying instructions from hidden Masters, and those instructions are clear enough. Every move is towards monopoly. "The State" is the Trojan Horse; but the Greeks can splinter it when they have captured the citadel.

Now, it is clear enough that if you are going to maintain a facade of reason for monopoly you must induce people to accept the idea that no organisation can be too big, and our Immanent God of Less Fuel and Occasional Power is almost naive about it. In the face of the fact that electricity breakdowns have increased in magnitude almost in proportion to the size of electricity undertakings; that British Grouped Railways have sunk, under Grouping, from being the best railways in the world, to being amongst the poorest; his main argument for the "nationalisation" of electricity generation and distribution is that there are too many concerned. It is partly, no doubt, this extraordinary obsession with figures and bigness—there is a close connection—but it is also an exhibition of the tendency of people who know nothing practical about a subject, to treat it as an abstraction. There is something yet deeper—the dwarfing of the individual in the work of his own hands. It is the Policy of a Philosophy. What could give Satan more exquisite pleasure than to watch Man destroy himself?

Someone has to have the bad bananas, the non-striking matches and the always striking "workers," so why not you, Clarence? Besides, it makes the Americans laugh.

And as for the near-beer, the electric darkness, the durable or non-burning coal, the fifth rate radio programmes and the speeches by Mr. Silkin, well, peace is peace, isn't it?

Perhaps the most important factor which it is necessary to grasp in the affairs of this country under our present dispensation is that everything that happens is either for the worst, or alternatively, cannot do us any good. Are the wheat crops of Canada, the United States, and the Argentine larger than ever before? The threat of cuts in our bread ration looms larger too. Does dear Mr. Strachey, after repeated and protracted delays to allow barley to rot, and to show who's master, suddenly permit the distillation of whisky? It's not for you, Clarence, and anyway things will be far worse for some years. Is Russia the most wonderful country with the most marvellous system ever known? (Whirree, rah, rah) Yes, but unfortunately she is likely to starve to death, because the most fertile wheat zone in the world, the famous Black Earth district, isn't growing any crops.

You will notice that the more we Plan, the more perverse everything becomes, and so, of course, makes more Planning

and more Planners necessary and more and more marvellous results practically certain in twenty, or fifty years' time. And after all, our Cabinet Ministers have doubled their own salaries, and will double them again, if it will help; and the major occupation of the far-flung British Empire is now politics, sabotage and Fifth Column activity. It all makes you think; or doesn't it?

"We are particularly proud of what we have done by way of international co-operation to meet the food crisis granting wheat loans, giving large grants to U.N.R.R.A. . . .

"Britain (*sic*) was giving away the equivalent of two months' exports to U.N.R.R.A., and one and a half months' exports to Germany."—Mr. Henry Hardman (?Hartmann) "British" delegate to International Emergency Food Council.

Somehow or other, the date on which "we" were consulted about these generous gifts has slipped our memory, so "we" have deferred wearing our look of pride, which is in any case rather an old model, until we understand why all the other delegates are grinning.

An Introduction to Social Credit

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Part 1.—PHYSICS.

We regret that owing to pressure on our space resumption of publication of Dr. Monahan's Essay is again postponed.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 27, 1947.

AGRICULTURE BILL

Order for Second Reading read.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Thomas Williams):
 . . . I do not claim the sole authorship of this Bill. It is a product of the combined wisdom of all the different sections of the industry, and of the advertised views of the three major political parties in this House. . . . Instead of stopgap, patchwork, legislation, this Bill is a piece of constructive machinery which has been designed to put the industry on a sound footing for the first time. There have, during the past year or two, been quite a large number of reports on agricultural policy by independent bodies. Wartime seems to be a regular forcing ground for agricultural policies, which everyone—except the Labour Government—seems to forget in peacetime. The most remarkable feature of all these blue-prints is the large degree of unanimity which is shown on the basic principles. They all stress the need for stable conditions to allow the farmer to get on with his job of producing food; they also stress the need, as complementary to stable conditions, that the industry should achieve the greatest possible measure of efficiency. They all point the remarkable success of the wartime experiment of administration through the county war agricultural executive committees. I need only take one example to indicate the basic principles that stand out from these reports. I refer to the Royal Agricultural Society of England, which issued a unanimous statement with the approval of farmers, workers, landowners, and, indeed, the professional organisations. I quote a small portion of their statement:

"In return for a guaranteed price level, all owners and occupiers of rural land must accept an obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of good husbandry and good estate management, and submit to the necessary measure of direction and guidance, subject to provisions for appeal to an impartial tribunal."

Here was a clear lead, therefore, on the general principles which should form the basis of a healthy and prosperous agriculture—the sort of principles which a few people, including, I hope, myself, have been advocating for the past 15 or 16 years. In translating those principles into detailed legislation, the Government have been wise enough to keep in close consultation with the main representative bodies of the industry. I refer to the National Farmers' Union, the Central Landowners' Association, the workers' unions, and the professional organisations. We sought, and we used their collective wisdom, and, if Press statements are any guide, they indicated that those bodies welcomed the Measure as being a workmanlike, and indeed, a sensible scheme. Not only do the practical men of agriculture welcome this Bill. If election manifestos mean anything—and we are setting a new fashion in this direction—hon. Members opposite, in all parties and both sections of the Liberal Party, must welcome this Bill. May I remind hon. Gentlemen of the document entitled "Mr. Churchill's declaration of policy to electors"? I quote from page 9, which states, among other things:

"We must maintain the fertility of the soil. We must be skilful in the use and the management of the land for the production of the foodstuffs which it is best fitted to provide, and which are most required to satisfy the nutritional needs of the people."

It goes on:

"Our policy will be one of stable markets and prices. In return for this all occupiers and owners of agricultural land must maintain a reasonable standard of good husbandry and estate management."

. . . The manifesto of the Liberal Party was, if anything, I believe, more forthright than the one from which I have just quoted, and I need not, therefore, read it. All I need say to hon. Members opposite, in particular, is that if they will read Clause 1 of this Bill they will see just how accommodating we have been and how faithfully we are fulfilling their promises for them. . . . I cannot see that there will be any disagreement with the principles incorporated in this Bill. We may argue about details if we will. . . . When the Bill, . . . becomes law the agricultural Ministers will be required to hold annual price reviews in consultation with representatives of the farmers. But the Bill also provides that should there be a sudden change in the economic position of the industry, involving substantial changes in costs of production, then arrangements can be made for special reviews. In the light of those reviews, prices for all the principal products will be fixed far enough ahead to enable farmers to plan their production in security. Crop prices will be fixed 18 months ahead, actual prices for fat stock, milk and eggs one year ahead, with minimum prices laid down for two to four years ahead—something which the agricultural industry never even dreamed of before.

The remaining Clauses in this part of the Bill provide for the necessary machinery to make effective guaranteed prices and assured markets. As I said a moment or two ago, no single method is laid down in the Bill. The actual provision for any commodity may be a guaranteed fixed price, a deficiency payment related to the standard price, such as we had in regard to wheat in prewar days, an acreage payment, such as we have for both wheat and potatoes today,

or it may be a subsidy, or a price calculated according to a formula relating prices to feeding stuffs . . . It is, however, possible in the Bill to use some prewar machinery should that be the best method, such as, for instance, the Wheat Commission, or the Milk Marketing Board, or anything parallel to these.

Clause 4 is widely drawn for that purpose. It gives ample power to apply any or all of these variants for a period. Obviously, it is going to take time to work out permanent plans. Therefore, Orders, subject to affirmative Resolution, are confined to three years with power to extend year by year . . . I think that even before the war our farming compared favourably with agricultural systems overseas. Indeed, the yields in this country were among the highest in the world, and the production per man hour, comparing like with like, was not unfavourable in relation to that of most other countries. During the war we made further strides in this direction. We became one of the most highly mechanised agricultural countries in the world and our knowledge of farming and technical problems greatly increased.

With all this there still remains quite a margin for improvement. Efficiency is a relative term, and I do not suppose we shall ever be entirely satisfied that we have reached a final point, but with the combined efforts of the Agricultural Research Council, the Agricultural Improvement Council and the county executive committees I think we shall have a technical service for our agriculturists which will be as good as, if not better than, any in the world. In fact, we are going a step further with a similar service on problems of estate management in the very near future. In addition to the technical services, Clause 101, hon. Members will observe, allows county agricultural executive committees to continue their services to farmers started during the war. That is, to provide agricultural machinery and direct services and labour gangs so long as they may be necessary. Also, in appropriate cases, they will be able to provide goods on credit as they have done during the war. We shall also, under Clauses 93 and 94, continue grants for drainage, farm water supplies and liming.

I mention all these things to indicate that the State is providing every conceivable help towards the efficiency of agriculture, but with all our help and encouragement, and despite the pruning of the worst farmers during the war, there will still be a number—the fewer the better—who will fail to make the grade. In such cases, I think, it is fair that the State should have the power to enforce a reasonable standard of husbandry and estate management, and that those who fail in their duty to the land and the nation must make way for those who are likely to succeed. Part II of the Bill is designed exclusively for this purpose. We lay down in Clauses 10 and 11 rules of good estate management and good husbandry. Upon failure to reach those standards we shall take power to place a farmer or estate owner under supervision and to issue the appropriate directions. In the case of owners, directions would be related to farm buildings, fixed equipment, repairs or maintenance; in the case of an entailed estate we should claim the right to insist upon the appointment of a competent manager. In the case of an owner occupier, the directions will cover any aspect of farming, cultivation, management, livestock or, indeed, the use of fertilisers. In certain cases, however, direction could be given without placing a person

under supervision. It will obviously be undesirable to place a person under formal supervision if there was only one single thing to correct. Apart from this, we shall only issue directions to farmers under supervision. We shall enable them to grow the produce for which their farm or farms are best suited, having regard to the situation of those farms. We shall rely upon advice and the price mechanism to steer production in the direction desired by national policy, subject to one exception—national emergency, when, under Clause 92 we can, by order, take power to issue directions to all farmers in the land, but I might mention that this was readily accepted by the representative farmers' organisation.

I want hon. Members to appreciate just what is the position before a person is placed under supervision. It must have been noticed that his farm is under-cultivated, and that warnings are of no avail, and the County Executive Committee must be satisfied that unless the person concerned is placed under supervision he will neglect his land and, to that extent, falsify the principles embodied in this Bill. Having placed a person under supervision, then it is quite clear that the next step is to give him all the help we can during the next 12 months so as to avoid the necessity for dispossession . . . Before any person is placed under supervision or given a direction he will have an opportunity of being heard by the County Executive Committee, and, what is more, take a legal friend with him if desired. Should the case be one affecting owner and tenant such as the ploughing up of permanent pasture, both tenant farmer and owner will be able to go to the Committee.

Except in cases which concern new fixed equipment costing more than a specific sum there will be no appeal against supervision or direction . . . Where there is no satisfactory improvement, or a person fails to comply with directions over a period of 12 months, power is taken to dispossess the tenant farmer or to compel the owner occupier to let his land, or, in the case of the estate owner, to direct that his estate shall be purchased compulsorily. It all depends upon the farmer or the estate owner how many such cases there will be. During the war we took possession of under two per cent. of our agricultural land. Therefore, even though it is going to be our aim to raise substantially the efficiency of both farming and management, there really should be few dispossession cases if farmer and owner will accept their respective obligations. In any case, they will be tried by their own peers for, after all, executive committees consist of farmers, land owners, workers and others experienced in agriculture, and in all cases before dispossession or purchase takes place they will have access to an agricultural land tribunal whose decision in all cases will be final . . . there are areas of land in this country where it would be unreasonable to expect private owners to provide the vast amount of capital necessary to enable these areas to be farmed efficiently. I refer to the Fens or to the Romney Marsh which need very large draining schemes, miles of roads, and houses, to be made fully productive. In such cases, it is only reasonable to expect that the State should tackle such a gigantic job . . . In these cases we feel justified in asking the House for power to acquire such areas compulsorily.

There are other powers of compulsory purchase in the interests of efficiency in Clauses 80 to 84. For instance,

where, as a result of the making of a new road or railway, farms are completely severed, we take power to buy the severed portions where necessary and to re-form them into more economic units either on the left or the right side of the road or railway as the case may be . . . power is taken to make Orders, to apply either to the whole or part of England and Wales, to buy compulsorily the components of any farm which has been split up, in order to restore it to its original state.

Another case for compulsory purchase is that in which during the war, land was requisitioned and it is necessary to retain it in State ownership to preserve the benefit of the works carried out by the nation during the war. Let me give two examples. There are areas in the country where a lot of small units were joined together and then farmed as one enterprise. The State erected buildings in the centre of the new unit and that unit has been farmed as one during the course of the war and still exists in that state. It is clearly in the interests of agriculture to continue to farm those areas as one unit, instead of breaking them up and handing them back in small pieces to their original owners. Therefore, power is taken to purchase the pieces which were requisitioned, and also to retain land which was purchased under the 1941 Act, despite an obligation to offer it back to the original owner . . .

In every case where we propose compulsory purchase, there are sound, solid, national reasons for it. In every case it is for the purpose of maintenance of agricultural efficiency. Having purchased odd spots here and there, for the purpose of managing this agricultural land required by the State or transferred from other Government Departments, we propose to set up an Agricultural Land Commission consisting of five persons, with a Sub-Commission for Wales consisting of three persons, one of whom must be a member of the English Land Commission. These bodies will be non-representative expert bodies, and we hope to obtain persons with wide agricultural, business and administrative experience. They will neither acquire land nor yet be able to dispose of land, but they will undertake all management functions and be responsible for the development or reclamation of such areas as the Fens and Romney Marsh or similar areas. They would also play a very special role in connection with the experimental schemes for readjustment of farm boundaries referred to in Clause 84 . . . I regard the regrouping of farm boundaries as a problem that can no longer be shelved or ignored. There are large areas where portions of farms are scattered, some being many miles from the homestead, and they cannot truly be regarded as efficient units. We therefore propose to aim at three experimental schemes, on a voluntary basis if possible, and only if voluntary adjustment fails, will compulsory powers be exercised.

Let me turn to Part III of the Bill which deals with the relationship between landlord and tenant . . . Clause 30, which gives greater security of tenure to the farmer, is the most important Clause. In future, where a tenant receives a notice to quit, he will have a right of appeal to the Minister except, of course, where he has failed to fulfil the terms of his tenancy agreement, and if the Minister considers that a change of tenant would be likely to result in the more efficient use of the land, then the Minister has the power to give consent . . . Clauses 21 to 28 provide a comprehensive code of compensation for improvements carried out by

a tenant and for tenant right matters and for dilapidations. They also abolish customary rights which vary, without rhyme or reason, throughout all parts of the country and, in future, claims will depend either upon the Statute itself or upon a written contract of tenancy. . . We are laying down by Regulation a model repair and maintenance Clause which will be read into all tenancy agreements except where the liabilities of the parties are specifically defined by written agreement. . . We are also taking power to vary the terms of tenancy agreements with regard to permanent pastures. With our increased knowledge of the benefits of ley farming, it is obviously important to release the tenant farmer from an out of date tenancy agreement, so that he may adopt a system of alternate husbandry. . . For the administration of these various provisions, we propose to continue the wartime system of county agricultural executive committees and I am sure that few will quarrel with that decision. These committees provide a unique partnership between the industry and the State. They were remarkably successful during the war, and it is right and proper that responsible people from all sections of the industry should play a part in the administration of their own affairs. In fact, without their co-operation I am afraid the whole edifice would fall like a house of cards, and I shudder at the alternative, for there might conceivably be as an alternative a repetition of the misfortunes that overtook the industry in the inter-war years.

These committees will consist of 12 persons. Five will be direct appointments by the Minister, and the remainder will be drawn from panels nominated by the National Farmers' Union, the Central Landowners' Association, and the workers' unions. . . In the new conditions the old county council agricultural committees will be dissolved and with them—unfortunately, perhaps some people think—the Councils of Agriculture for England and Wales too. In addition to the county agricultural executive committees, we propose to set up Agricultural Land Tribunals to whom appeals will be referred. They will consist of an independent legal chairman appointed by the Lord Chancellor, with a farmer and landowner, and in addition, we take power to appoint two assessors where necessary, because we think in certain cases it will be helpful for Tribunals to have the assistance of independent professional men. I need only add that their decision will be final and binding upon the Minister. . . This is a very long Bill. . . There seems to me to be little or no politics inside it. It is generally agreed to be a desirable Bill, and I hope to see the House absolutely unanimous. . .

House of Commons: January 28, 1947.

[There was no vote on the Second Reading of the Agriculture Bill. Not one M.P. seriously attacked the principle of the Bill. Lieut.-Commander Joynson-Hicks came closest to doing so, in the following remarks:]

Lieut.-Commander Joynson-Hicks, (Chichester): . . . Substantially, Part I of the Bill is merely the legislative perpetuation of the system which has been built up by trial and error during the war, whereby we have striven to attain what has been a recognised need—that farmers should have fixed prices and assured markets. Having said that, we have said about all that can be said in favour of this Bill. It has been referred to as a pillar, a framework, a structure, and a foundation for the agricultural industry, but every Member has avoided calling it anything synonymous with a complete

entity. It is obvious that all Part I of the Bill does is to lay a moral obligation on the Government to implement the pious hope which they have expressed that the future of British agriculture shall be prosperous. I shall not vote against the Second Reading of the Bill because, for a long time, I have striven and preached the need for fixed prices and assured markets for agriculture. . . References have been made to the acquisitional powers under Clause 80. It has long been the custom in almost every civilised country for governments to carry out research work, to bear all the expense of research necessary for the welfare of the community, and to lay the result at the feet of the community, so that they may profit by it. This Government adopt exactly the opposite procedure. They wait until some private individual, or combination of private individuals have made a success of their business, carried out all the pioneer work and built up some profit-making concern and then they take it over. Is it surprising that we fear the powers conferred on the Government by Clause 80? The Minister said that the object of these powers of compulsory acquisition was to ensure the efficiency of the industry. One thing essential to the efficiency of the industry is confidence, and the one thing which the Minister undermines more than anything else by this Bill is the confidence of the agricultural community. Far from being a charter, this Bill is a strait-jacket for the industry. If farmers think it is worth their while to go into the Minister's strait-jacket, let them do so with their eyes open. The Minister has ample powers to nationalise the industry under this Bill. He can acquire anything which he wishes and run the industry either in whole or in part. Let the farmers realise that state of affairs, and go into it with their eyes open.

Pensioners (Employment)

Mr. Butcher asked the Minister of National Insurance whether, with a view to encouraging elderly people to continue to assist the national effort for increased production, he proposes to take any steps enabling him to pay pensions irrespective of the total earnings of pensioners.

Mr. J. Griffiths: Action on the lines suggested would require the amendment of the National Insurance Act, 1946, which has only recently been approved by this House.

Mr. Butcher: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that the economic position of the country has not improved, that we have had further information on the valuable contribution elderly people can make to industry, and will he keep the matter under review?

Mr. J. Griffiths: We are very anxious indeed to do anything we can under this scheme to encourage people to postpone their retirement and, as the House will know, I doubled the increment proposed by the Beveridge Report and the Coalition White Paper.

Mr. Willis asked the Minister of National Insurance if he is aware that widows over 60 years of age who received the recent increase of 16s. per week in their pension and now wish to supplement their pension by working a few hours per week at their former employment, are being informed that they might be considered as not having retired and lose their increase; and whether he will take steps to ensure that no deduction in the pension is made unless the widow earns more than 20s. per week.

Mr. J. Griffiths: Where it has been decided by the

appropriate statutory authority that a pensioner has retired from regular employment, that decision cannot be revised unless new facts relating to the position at the material date are brought to notice. A pension which has been increased will not be affected by earnings unless they exceed 20s. a week. It appears that some misunderstanding arose in the handling of the case which the hon. Member brought to my notice. I have taken steps to put the matter in order.

Mr. Willis: Will my right hon. Friend say what is meant by retirement, because it seems to me to be important?

Mr. Griffiths: I am in a difficulty about that, because the precise definition of the term has also to be decided by the tribunal and the Commissioner and not by the Minister.

"POLITICAL ZIONISM"

(continued from page 3)

There is overwhelming evidence to prove the connection between Semitism, Political Zionism, Marxian Socialism and Communism. All are based on the belief that a chosen few should control the many. That is a complete denial of Christianity which teaches that he who would be great among you must be your servant, that the few must serve the many.

The one great issue today is whether we shall live according to the Christian Gospels, or whether we shall exist under the doctrines of Karl Marx. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Eudaimonism

"John [*] was struck by a remark he had found in Bishop Henry Spondé's *Annales*, published in Paris in 1641, which suggested that Dante was an adherent of the Knights of the Temple. This idea exactly fitted John's hypothesis of some hidden meaning in Dante's great poem, and he began to work on the assumption that Spondé's supposition was true. He embarked on careful studies of the history of the Templars, which ends tragically with the condemnation and abolition of the Order in 1312. If Dante were in fact a sympathizer or member of the Order there ought to be found in Dante's writing, and above all in his *Divina Commedia*, some reference to, or some reflection of the proceedings against the Templars. This theory not only stood the test, but worked out in a most surprising way. When John began to work on this supposition he found not merely some references, as he had expected, but that he held the clue which eventually deciphered all Dante's symbolism. He discovered the startling fact that the whole of the *Divina Commedia* rests upon a peculiar purely Templarian eudaimonistic doctrine, and that Dante himself was an adept of the Order. . . It is now for the expert students of Dante and the competent 'Dantologists' to deal with Fr. John's sensational discovery. If John is right—and if you read his book you will be persuaded that he is—we have to see Dante and his Divine Comedy in a completely new light, in the aspect of the Templars and their highly intellectual 'Gnosis.' They cherished peculiar doctrines about the Church and the Empire, and they kept their teaching strictly secret, partly because they regarded themselves as the heirs and successors of the ancient Eleusinian mystery-cults, and partly because they were carefully shadowed by the Inquisition. . ."—Walter C. Breitenfeld: "Dante and the Templars" in *The Tablet*.

[*] Robert John, "a priest in Vienna," has written a book on Dante published a few months ago by "one of the chief publishing firms" of the city.

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