

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 19. No. 18.

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Almost without comment, certainly so far as the daily press is concerned, a development is in progress which is quite capable of altering world history. We refer to the integration of a religious body, Islam, across national frontiers, for political objectives.

It may with some justice, be argued that the Jews have always been integrated across national frontiers for a Jewish objective, and this is true. But the methods employed have been those of the Fifth Column—never to fight openly, but to influence others to fight for Jewish ends. That there are stated to be only fifteen million Jews in the world (we refrain from arithmetic connected with the “six million victims of Hitler’s tyranny”) might serve as an explanation, if not as grounds for affection. But there are at least 210 millions of Muslims, many of them traditionally warlike, and the idea that these members of a superstate are not a military power in modern times is just one of those errors of the materialistic West which is at the root of our present weakness.

Once, Christianity had a “drive,” a vivifying force, which made Empires. The religions of the Devil, Socialism and Communism, have inspired, and do inspire, millions who become the tools of the World Empire of Judaism. Are we to witness the issue fought out between the Children of Allah and the Sons of Ildabaoth, while the “Christians” look on apathetically? Quite probably; it is difficult to estimate the deadly poison of the Chosen People myth.

The current number of *Punch* carries a cartoon showing the Master of the House, Marshall, of the . . . States, raising a toast to his obsequious cook, Ernest Bevin, who is carrying in the Boars Head, Molotoff. It appears unfortunate that in some way the toast could not include “the casualties in the Punjab which in the first week (of relinquishment of British rule) exceeded the total American battle casualties of World War 1” (*Saturday Evening Post*, December 6, 1947). To these might be added the extermination of the North American Indians, the financing of treason against Imperial Russia, and the just-beginning murders in Palestine, for all of which, by finance and interested propaganda through its half-baked sob-sisters and others, Mr. Marshall’s large country can legitimately take full credit. We refrain from dilating on the negro problem, as the sob-sisters rarely mention it. The expression of Mr. Punch’s face, in the lower right-hand corner of the cartoon, appears to suggest that somewhat similar reflections are engaging his attention.

The Head of Rugby School, Mr. Percy Hugh Beverley Lyon, M.A., a direct descendant of John Lyon, the Founder, had a few plain words to impart on the occasion of his resignation. Mr. Lyon was a Captain in The Durham Light Infantry during the first world War; and, unlike so many of the products of the Jew-staffed A.B.C.A. in the second phase,

he learnt a good deal from it. The general reply of the current Rugby boy to efforts to impart some consciousness of the springs of action which are resulting in our present immolation can best be given in Mr. Lyon’s own words: “We couldn’t care less.” The dogs and the flicks are the only sensible objects of attention.

It would be easy to over-simplify the situation, but of one contributory we have no doubt. It has been said *ad nauseam* that the Public School is simply a training ground for oligarchs, and there is a great deal of truth in the accusation. But what, for the most part, has been suppressed in this charge, is that the budding oligarchs were not made at school, but were merely “finished” there. A considerable, but steadily decreasing proportion, were hereditary rulers and administrators, and to them the “finishing” process was advantageous both to themselves and the administered. The same process applied to the offspring of the Black Market and the Export Drive is like unto french-polishing a soap-box.

This country is now ruled exclusively by a kakistocracy; and if we must have this type of animal, we prefer it unpolished.

There are certain similarities of education which are common to the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Birmingham, and the Dean of Canterbury. Whether these account for the appointment of the two former by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and the latter by a “Labour”-dominated Mr. Churchill in 1942, we do not know, but we are fairly confident that they account for the line they take in politics. All of them are wreckers; none of them likes tradition, or appears to realise how much easier it is to destroy than to restore. It is significant that the same background is perhaps more common in the Roman Catholic Church, yet never, so far as we are aware, is allowed to dominate the more effective political influence of its clergy.

There is always a danger, when one is constantly dealing with any subject, that certain aspects of it may be so obvious by that close association that it is forgotten that not everyone is equally informed. For this reason, and at the risk of emphasising the obvious, we would draw our readers’ attention to the fact that we are exporting more real wealth for less real return and are daily becoming poorer (our impression is that we are chiefly liquidating the paper “American” Debt) than in the whole of our history, which is full of such transactions; that the result is genuine uncontrolled inflation; and that an economic collapse, accompanied or followed by a complete psychological breakdown of credit, is certain. We regard it as infantile to suppose that we are alone in realising where “the export drive” is leading us, and we connect the resignations of directors and other competent business men, from large industrial businesses, with a similar recognition, probably joined to an inkling that the ruin of the country is consciously intended.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 11, 1947.

Family Quiz, Kent

Mr. Baker White asked the Minister of Education the purpose and conditions of the family quiz, now being conducted in schools in Kent; and if he is satisfied that it does not entail any prying into the private affairs of the families of children taking part in it.

Mr. Tomlinson: I am informed that the Kent local education authority have made no arrangements for the conduct of a family quiz in their schools.

Mr. Baker White: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in schools in East Kent, of which I am prepared to give him the names, this quiz has been carried out? I have a copy of it, and it contains such questions as:

Does your mother earn any money? How much does your father earn? Does your father bring any eggs, cheese, milk, butter, etc., home from his work? How much do your parents pay in rent? Have you enough, or not enough, or plenty of blankets?

Does not the right hon. Gentleman consider that to be a gross intrusion on the family?

Mr. Tomlinson: In one school under the Kent authority, that did take place. It was done by one teacher on her own initiative; she has been doing this for the last 15 years. Instructions have been given that it shall not be done again in the same form.

Mr. Baker White: Is the Minister further aware that since I put down this Question, I have received letters from Essex and Bedfordshire saying the same thing is going on there? . . .

Palestine

Mr. Pickthorn (Cambridge University): . . . It may be remembered, though younger Members of the House can hardly know it, that there was a time when Debates on Palestine in this House were conducted—and this is not an exaggerated thing to say—wholly, almost 100 per cent., by Zionists and friends of Zionists, and it was action by one who was then a Private Member which started something hardly to be called an organisation, but a collection of friends, who made it their business to try to see that other points of view were put, especially Arab arguments, even when they did not agree with them.

I have been intimately, if undistinguishedly and quite ineffectively, concerned with this business of Palestine and Zionism since I gave, or tried to give, advice to the Army Council in 1918, which, of course, the Army Council did not take. . . . This trouble is a trouble which has been made by us; there is no party point involved here, for all I have to say to the contrary one or two of the leaders of my party are concerned at least as much as the leaders of any other party, though I do think it fair to say, and I hope that hon. Members opposite will not think this excessively partisan, that the trouble was made quite gratuitously worse by the extreme uncriticalness with which the Socialist Party, in the years before they were in office, rushed into the most profuse promises of anything and everything which any political Zionist might want.

I say these things . . . for this reason: I believe we are led into an unnecessary and fatal mistake about this matter

by calling it a problem, which gives a sort of subconscious notion that there is a solution somewhere. It is not a problem in the sense that all we have to do is to get hold of a teacher's book, where we will find the solution on one of the pages at the end. It is not a problem in that sense.

My belief is that we cannot begin to diminish the chance of continued suffering out of this matter, for others and for our country and countrymen, until we go back to the point at which we left what seems to me to be a defensible line. That was a long time ago. I think that one has only to state the proposition that the armed force of a great Power is to be used to compel a long-settled society to admit immigration over whose quality and quantity it shall have no control, to see at once that it is really an untenable proposition, and that to try to maintain that proposition through a period when everyone is talking about democracy such as never was before, and a new epoch of superior law, order, justice, self-determination and all that—that that was a hopeless moral and intellectual paradox from the start. . . .

Sir, I have avowed those prejudices because I wish to come, if I may with all due modesty, to reinforce the plea that was put from the Front Opposition Bench, that now we have announced our decision to get out, we should get out quickly. I think that all the arguments used from the other side against that are false arguments and must land us in more and more trouble. While we were in Palestine, I myself and other friends of mine challenged the present Colonial Secretary and others—whichever side was in power we have done it; we have done it more than once—upon this point: that we have allowed the Jewish Agency to be built up into something which was far more than we had any authority to allow it to be built up into. As has been pointed out already today, we also allowed the Haganah to be built up, so that now there is in Palestine something which almost amounts to a state, more or less in control of something which almost amounts to an army. We have done that. . . . Even taking it on the terms of the Mandate, we had no right so to govern that country that there would be formed by the immigrant section an alternative state inside the state and an alternative army inside the state. . . . nothing anybody does or says now can possibly take out of Arab heads, and I think out of the heads of almost all of the East, the view that all the time we are staying there that is a help towards one side rather than the other side.

That may be just or unjust. I am not arguing whether it is just or unjust. But I think that whatever be the view taken about the competence of U.N.O., whatever view be taken about the log rolling and whip cracking, and so on, at U.N.O., of which the hon. Gentleman told us (a) that there was none, and (b) that it was on both sides—whatever view be taken about these things, and about the decision to partition without consulting with those who had been against partitioning, a queer thing to do. . . .

. . . Whatever view be taken about the question whether this particular partition scheme is a good one—and I have not yet met anyone who does not think it a very bad one; whatever view be taken about the special competence of Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Panama and the Philippines, to put this difficult and unprecedented bit of business through; whatever view be taken about those things, I do not think anyone can doubt that the longer we hold soldiers and authority in Palestine, the more it will be felt by the Arabs

that we are thereby assisting this partition scheme. . . . If only for that reason, though I think that there are many others, I think, therefore, that we ought to get out at once. . .

One other thing I want to say and then I will sit down. It is about immigration. There was rather an assumption in an earlier interchange that, of course, all the Zionists—if they are Zionists, and my own belief is that many of them are very conscript Zionists—in Cyprus, at any rate, ought to be decanted back into Palestine. Is that right? . . .

Major Legge-Bourke (Isle of Ely): . . . First, I must tell the House that I reject this plan completely, because I believe that it will lead inevitably to world war. I believe that partition cannot work in Palestine, and I believe that, if we have a problem which is very grave and apparently insoluble, it is no use dividing it into two, so that in each part we reproduce the same problem. I feel that I should tell the House the reasons which lie behind my decision. I believe that the main principle which matters in this world from the democratic point of view, is that we do not achieve prosperity until we have established peace, and that we do not achieve peace until we have established justice. I maintain that there are three incidents in the whole of the Palestine picture and in the history of our rule in Palestine for which there is no justification whatever.

The first was the Balfour Declaration. I maintain that that cannot be found to be just in any way, and it was made clear by Mr. Landman, one of the younger Zionists, who, at Dr. Weizmann's request, was transferred from M.I. 9 in 1918, that the price of American aid at the end of the first war was considered to be an effort to secure Palestine for the Jews, and he emphasised that the new Jewish leaders were anxious lest a Jewish Palestine should affect their civic rights here in this country, and that they were also generally concerned for the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. The second injustice to me is that the Mandate for Palestine conflicted with Clause 4 of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and was therefore unjust to the Arab population. The third injustice is the subsequent action in implementing the Balfour Declaration without the Arabs having either agreed about immigration or as to the Mandatory Power . . .

These conclusions on the subject of these injustices are the three premises which I have in mind when approaching the problems which we are discussing today, and I would now like to try to apply the principle which I mentioned at the beginning, when I said that a solution which had to be just must also promote peace. The U.N.O. proposal splits Palestine into two. I am quite convinced that the inevitable result of that is world war. I think it is only right, however, that, if I criticise and challenge this U.N.O. scheme, I should at least try to provide an alternative, and that is, of course, the hardest task of all today. Before I put forward my views and suggestions, I want to say a few words about Zionism. On page 11 of the Report of the General Assembly, paragraph 9, these words appear:

"In physical resources . . . Palestine is extremely poor, having neither coal, iron, nor any other important mineral deposits. Indeed, the only considerable non-agricultural resources are the potassium and sodium salts which are extracted from the Dead Sea."

Then it goes on:

"Oil, on which some people have set hopes, has not been

discovered in payable quantities, though tests are proceeding in the South."

I maintain that that statement is fundamentally incorrect. The resources of the Dead Sea are enormous, but at the same time they are themselves but a small part of the total resources, most of which are underground. The largest of these underground resources are potash and oil, but there are other resources in Palestine, including gold in solution in the Dead Sea which has been valued at between £10,000,000,000 and £5,000,000,000, and the magnesium chloride, which was estimated by the Crown Agents for the Colonies in 1925 to amount to 22,000 million tons. As long ago as 1864, it was suggested to the Turks that potash could be produced in the Dead Sea, and I mention the date of that because I think it is important that it preceded by 39 years the first Zionist Congress of 1897. Since then, various Zionists have commented on future economic prospects, and, in a report of a meeting addressed by Mr. Ettinger on May 29 to the Zionist Federation of Sydney, Australia, Mr. Ettinger is reported to have said this, referring to the Novomeysky concession which since has become the Palestine Potash Company:

"Had we lost this concession, our whole future in Palestine might have been in danger. All these matters are of an economic nature, but it is in this sphere that our political work is most important."

A year before that, the late Lord Melchett, addressing a conference of Zionists and non-Zionists at the Biltmore Hotel, New York, on October 20, 1928, said, in urging non-Zionist Jews to join the Zionist movement:

"Let me tell you, you cannot afford to wait. While we are discussing, other people are acting. Whereas we have reports as to the possibilities in Palestine, Gentiles are acquiring land and beginning to take possession of all the best things in the country . . . If we do not get together and do something within the next five years, the opportunities may be so slight, and the ideal we have set before us in Palestine may never be realised. I am not troubling about the economic development of Palestine. That is assured. The problem is who will do it."

A debate took place in another place on March 20, 1929, in which Lord Melchett did his best to discourage unwary investors from thinking that there was a golden fortune in the Dead Sea potash. It is, perhaps, naturally difficult for hon. Members of this House who are also Zionists to avoid it, but, throughout the history of this movement, there has been a tendency towards what I might call "political schizophrenia," which is borne out by the two quotations which I have given. The concession was granted on January 1, 1930, to Mr. Novomeysky. Sir John Hope Simpson, in his Report of October 30, Command 3686, page 117, said:

"If the Dead Sea concession proves to be a successful venture, it is impossible to forecast the magnitude to which the chemical industry arising therefrom may expand."

It is obviously true that the idea of a National Home has appealed to the less-informed Jews, but the interests of political Zionism have other aims in view. In his book, "The Jew in Revolt", W. Zuckermann said:

"A Jew can do nothing but follow the road shown by the Soviet Union. There is no other way for him. As a Jew he must join the army, fighting for the social revolution, or perish. . . Spiritually, the social revolutionary movement is saving the Jews for the world."

I do not suggest that all Jews automatically agree with that, but I submit that the inspiration of political Zionism is similar to that which lay behind Bolshevism in 1918. The Netherlands Minister when in Petrograd on September 6, 1918, and as reported in Letter No. 6, Command Paper 8, which was

(continued on page 7.)

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. 19. No. 18. Saturday, January 3, 1948.

The Jews Are the Revolution?

Ilya Ehrenburg the Jewish-Russian journalist who for some time acted as a species of Public Relations officer for the Kremlin, is credited with a recent statement in Washington that "Anti-Semitism" (by which of course he means opposition to Jews) "is the counter-revolution." This is interesting, because it implies that the Jews *are* the Revolution: and it explains the reply officially made during the enquiry on Un-American Activities as to the difference between Communism and Fascism—"It is a question of Anti-Semitism."

We do not believe, nor have we ever believed, that Fascism was anti-Jewish: Jews were behind its inauguration in Italy, and there was no *public* anti-Judaism until Russia became One of our Glorious Allies. But it is necessary that Social Crediters should understand the position, because it is clear that it is developing in Alberta. Mr. Manning, the Premier, appears to view with resignation the relinquishment, except for lip-service, of Social Credit to the Federal field; equivalent to the Greek kalends; Mr. Gillese, the able young editor of the *Canadian Social Crediter*, has "resigned" in favour of a nominee whose first action was to announce that no articles, *e.g.*, by Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., would be permitted; or any anti-anything. So we can conclude that, for the moment, a faction has gained control in the Province which is benevolently inclined to revolution. Which ought to make a coalition with the C.C.F. (Socialists) quite easy. No Fascism (as defined) will be allowed. We have frequently referred to the very subtle propaganda against "negative" action, as though stopping the Germans from bombing London was bad in itself. We are witnessing the same technique in action in Edmonton. There are some very queer things going on in Canada, in these queer times, as the Report of the Royal Commission demonstrates; the most unlikely people appear to become entangled in them, and we have ourselves witnessed, in England, sober business men attacked by what looked like obsession, or what used to be called "possession." A battle is in progress for the soul of the world; and it may easily be that Alberta is a key position.

The B.M.A. versus Bevan

The Council of the B.M.A. has at last blown a thin note of defiance at Mr. Bevan. The trumpet is rather "tinny" and the defiance is preceded by an obligato in honour of the B.M.A.'s part in "helping to formulate the Plan"!

After ten months of secret discussion on terms of service, the B.M.A. has at last discovered that a principle is really at stake.

Whether or not this tardy recognition will save the

doctors and their patients from full imposition of the totalitarian National Health Service remains to be seen. The Minister, whose wife's paper *Tribune* was able accurately to forecast his reply a week before the Medical Press received it, has decreed that payment of General Practitioners shall be by basic salary of £300 a year *plus* capitation fee.

By regulation, he or his successor can alter the ratio of salary to capitation fee without reference to Parliament, and Doctors who have signed on, thereby disposing of their goodwill to him, will be powerless to resist the change in their status that complete payment by salary would bring about.

It is absolutely certain that everything that can be done to cajole or intimidate will be done. Since the Presidents of the Royal Colleges so far forgot their high duties as to approach Mr. Bevan on January 2 last year and thus to promote an intrigue by which the will of the profession was subverted, schism has been encouraged between consultants and specialists and between both and general practitioners. A study of the documents circulated to every doctor reveals that the process is to be a continuing one.

Mr. Bevan must get enough doctors to sign on or he is finished politically and National Socialism will have suffered a major defeat. It is therefore desirable that all who can should fortify the resolution of their own doctors for what the Medical Policy Association calls "The Last Round."

Communists Support Money Power

"Approximately 500 people enthusiastically applauded Mr. Eric Butler's address at the Princess Theatre, Melbourne, when the plan to nationalise the Australian Banking system was exposed as being merely one part of a policy of centralised world control.

"The Communists turned out in force in an attempt to disrupt the meeting, but Mr. Butler wasted no time on them. He instructed the police to have all agitators removed immediately. He pointed out that he was prepared to answer any questions at the conclusion of his address, but he was not going to permit the meeting to be disorganised by a few agitators.

"Although Mr. J. T. Lang, Independent Labour M.H.R., like all Labour Members, supports the nationalisation of banking, in his paper *Century* of August 22 he makes some critical observations which bring into clear relief the grave menace of the Federal Government's proposals:

"Before he (Mr. Chifley) can enforce industrial conscription in peace-time he must have absolute control of banking. By that means he hopes to obtain the economic powers that he has been denied by the people through referendum. . . . There is one big question that must be answered. Who is going to control the Commonwealth Bank? That is the crux of the problem. Experience of war-time control has demonstrated the danger of totalitarianism emerging in this country. Whoever controls the Bank will be the real dictator of this country. . . ."

"Mr. Lang is right. But why take the risk he warns about? Why place enormous power in a few hands? How would Labour supporters like Mr. Menzies to have control of a nationalised banking system? We will be most interested to hear what Labour supporters of bank nationalisation have to say about this question." —*The New Times* (Melbourne).

Notes on the Export Drive

The conditions in which the stampede for exports can be made to function are those of Fear: fear of poverty, and fear of starvation. Such impulse and incentive as the Drive has depends, in the case of the public in general, and the government, at any rate in the main, on a genuine belief that in more and more exports lies Britain's hope of retrieving her economic position. Bankers, economists, newspapers, with scarcely an exception, are lined up behind this drive and no exception is visible anywhere, nor loophole permitted in the curtain of propaganda that closes in the mental scene; while the continuous contraction of food rations gives the necessary touch of stark realism to the threat of actual hunger. It does not require any great imaginative power to see that it is for just such a crisis as this that Fabian-schooled British Socialism and the British Labour Party, advised by the London School of Economics, has been conditioned and groomed. The election of 1945 was the psychological moment chosen for it to undertake the job.

This national front is not, of course, completely consistent or homogeneous in its motives. Besides, the natural power-hunger which serves to keep the successful political party toeing the line, there are influential exceptions, who, to put it at its very lowest, have no strong incentive to examine the present situation critically, or any very urgent impulse to put an end to conditions that produce a Black Market, since they suit their own short-term policy so admirably. And then, behind the national drive there is the international drive, made up to the whole body of international beneficiaries from this sort of traffic.

All the foregoing is primarily on the economic plane, but somewhere at the top there is a political force using the whole situation, which is one of ordinary human action and reaction, for its own political ends: a secret power that gives primary direction and impetus to the whole movement, and, most important of all, controls all information, so that nothing that could deflect the march of events be allowed to get into circulation.

It is perhaps enough to recognise that fact, and then shut one's mouth upon it. But it is necessary to recognize it, in order to understand, in the matter of the Export Drive, its positively anti-British character, accepting the British Way of Life as the symbol of individual freedom, which constitutes an obstacle to the intended political direction of international affairs. For this reason the present inspired economic policy of Britain is specifically designed to injure Britain, and its spear-head, which is the Export Drive, is the point of attack.

HERR JELLINEK'S ARTICLE

Those, then, are the conditions in which the Export Drive Racket is put over, and accepting the fact fully, especially the last factor mentioned, which represents the only angle from which the situation has any coherence or cause whatsoever, we are free to examine the true nature of this injurious mechanism.

As a preliminary we must bear in mind that 19th Century experience, and up to the outbreak of World War 1, shows that those European countries that built themselves up to economic prosperity—and outstandingly among them Germany and Switzerland—*did so on an adverse balance of trade*. In other words, during the whole period they consistently

imported more than they exported. And we can add the U.S.A. and Japan, as well as our own Dominions, to the list. Some of the tremendous implications arising from this fact are set out in *The Social Crediter* for August 30, 1947, referring to an article by Herr Frederick Jellinek published in *The Tablet*. And the matter is again referred to in "From Week to Week" in *The Social Crediter* for September 20, 1947.

The question naturally arises: If a high standard of living and a prosperous internal economy was built up in all these countries on an adverse trade balance, who advanced them their imports? And how were they paid for? Or, conversely, where did they come from? And the answer is, they came from Great Britain, who had what is termed "a favourable balance of trade" during the whole period; and secondly that except so far as Britain imported goods for consumption and not for re-export, she never did get paid.

THE MECHANISM OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The mechanism of these export-import transactions was, and is, as follows: The exporting British firm draws a Bill of Exchange on the Continental buyer, say a Swiss importing house, who in turn "accepted" it. The British manufacturer or export house takes the Bill to an International Discount house, such as Brown Shipley, let us say, and gets the "money", *i.e.*, a bank credit for the sum, less a commission. In this way, the individual firm, or firms, concerned gets payment—paper payment, but entirely satisfactory to him as a producer, which goes in wages, salaries and dividends. On the other side, the purchasing firm meets the Bill on maturity. How, is purely an internal matter; it will be from a bank balance, whether a credit or a debit balance is beside the the argument. The International Discount house, which operates indifferently on either or both sides of the currency curtain, banks the repayment in Switzerland, which transaction squares their books, balancing and cancelling out their advance (credit creation) to the British exporting house, and that closes the matter.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED:

Realistically, what has happened is this: The importing firm, representing Switzerland and Swiss nationals, has acquired a real asset (capital or consumable makes no dialectical difference); for which it can, and does, obtain payment from the public, and so carries on paying salaries, wages and dividends exactly as its opposite number in Britain does. This is achieved admittedly at the expense—if this is an expense—of a minute deflation of the currency. As far as the two importing-exporting firms are concerned the situation has been financially met and liquidated, and reflecting that, Switzerland owes Britain nothing, though *she has* acquired real wealth produced by British energy, which she can freely consume and enjoy.

And what is Britain's position under these conditions of financial adjustment? As we saw, her internal economy carries on, but the country as a whole *has lost in real wealth exactly what Switzerland has gained*. And not only that, but in addition the conventional net gain accruing to the exporting firm, or firms, concerned in the transaction, has been achieved at the expense of the country as a whole, for Britain has suffered a monetary loss in the form of a dilution of the purchasing value of her currency through inflation, which is defined as an increase of bank-created credit—in this case

the discounting of the Bill of Exchange—without any corresponding increase in the volume of goods coming on the market.

To attempt to sum up this mechanism, then,—it is essentially the financing, as a profession, of International Trade, and is almost entirely in the hands of the International Acceptance and Discount Banks. As a profession it has its definite and positive uses. But its abuse, which has enormous economic implications, amounts to the exploitation and control of the natural need for international barter and exchange, both to direct and artificially stimulate or repress it, within limits, according to the wishes of the exploiters. Bills of Exchange can be accepted by the importing country and discounted by the exporting country *solely* at the will of the International Discount Banks.

Of the limitations mentioned above the two main ones are, one, that the actual organic integrity of the national units concerned in the transaction be maintained. And, secondly, the willingness of producing countries to part with their real wealth on some, or any, terms. The first is self-evident, though it does not seem as yet to be realized that all the excessive and unnatural stimulation of exports, such as is the inevitable and urgent objective of professional Internationalism, is at the direct expense of the economic health and stamina of the exporting country, which activity, while it may enrich one section of the community, is at the expense of the nation as a whole. Much limelight plays on big International Loans, floated in the City, for foreign governments, which remain—unless as often happens, they are repudiated—as national indebtedness, and which undoubtedly represents a considerable part of the International Finance racket. But the vast bulk of the business of this (for Britain) exhausting international traffic, has carried on without any general recognition or criticism. The second limitation, the possibility of an unwillingness to sell—is postponed and indefinitely extended by making the distribution of a sufficiency in the Home Markets dependent solely on wages and salaries and dividends paid out in the production of goods for export, *i.e.*, by seeing that there is a chronic shortage of internal purchasing-power.

THE OBVIOUS THING:

The lesson to be learnt, and the moral drawn, from all this is surely that Great Britain, having been led to follow this course for nearly a century and a half,—during which time the whole industrial world has been built up,—culminating in two devastating world wars in quick succession, in which she has taken the predominant part at enormous organic cost to herself, might justifiably allow herself to reverse the process? On the face of it, there could be no revolutionary or dangerous interruption or upset of the ordinary course or flow of World Trade, if, where she is concerned, the direction of that flow were reversed, at least until she has had time to recover herself. Why should she not assume for a time the favourable position of 19th century Switzerland as described above, and get back without any more sense of obligation, or book indebtedness, some part of the immense surplus of goods her beneficiaries received from her during all those years, on exactly the same satisfactory terms, by the exercise of the same internationally self-cancelling mechanism?

The answer to that query is, that there is no reason why she should not; no inherent reason at all, why the system

should not operate in the opposite direction. During most of the 19th century there was an inherent reason for the direction of its flow: Since Great Britain was more or less the only manufacturing nation and, presumably, the world had to be industrially and technologically developed, and no one can say that Britain didn't do her job thoroughly. But now the world situation with a war-shattered Britain, is entirely reversed as regards at least the United States and the Dominions, and such favoured nations as Switzerland and Sweden, *etc.* Well, then, what is to hinder a complete change of policy?

WHY NOTHING IS DONE:

As we saw above, the whole matter lies in the hands of the International Acceptance Houses. They it is who decided, and still decide, whether the importing countries are credit-worthy and advance the money, *i.e.*, discount the Bills of the exporting country. Their power is immense, almost absolute. But in as far as these firms are professional international financiers, up to a point, the *direction of the flow* of international trade is, or should be, a matter of indifference to them. What they want is Trading and the "rake off" they get in performing their legitimate function. And to some extent, no doubt, that condition exists. But—and in this 'but' is to be found the crux of the present state of the world, and the main reason why post-war Britain, which still represents the most stabilizing force in modern society, is not being, and apparently, although there is no inherent obstacle, cannot be, allowed a chance to regain her strength and return to the position where she can exert her steadying influence in the Western World—International Finance, as to its supreme direction, is in the hands of England's enemies, and is being used as a political weapon instead of an economic function. It is, therefore, turned against Great Britain and everything representative of the comparatively tolerant and Christian Anglo-Saxon culture.

This is the reason why, instead of a beneficial reversal of the flow of international trade, to revive the exhausted combatant, the mesmerized political henchmen of the supreme controllers of international trade, pre-eminently, though not exclusively, the Socialist Labour government now in power, are being impelled to goad an under-nourished and war-weary population to undertake this assinine and suicidal operation of blood-letting called the Export Drive. Switzerland and Sweden and the United States and Canada, who all have more than they can consume, are to have more and more of Britain's real wealth, while Britons go ill-fed and ill-clothed, just because the powers that permitted the export mechanism of Discount Banking whose operators they control, to function during the last hundred years or so in favour of Switzerland and all the other nations that, presumably, it was then their objective to have developed with the aid of British skill, and effort, and enterprise, refuse now to allow it to function *in exactly the same manner in favour of Great Britain.*

NORMAN WEBB.

Correction

In Mr. Norman Webb's article "The Prophet of Hughenden," *T.S.C.*, December 20, page 6, column 2, line 37, please read: "And we can, if we choose to look no more deeply . . ." The operative 'no' was omitted.

PARLIAMENT—continued from page 3.

the White Paper entitled "Russia, No. 1, 1919," said:

"I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world, as it is organised and worked by Jews who have no nationality and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."

I submit that the aim of people who finance Zionists is to get control of the economic resources of Palestine which have been deliberately kept out of the public eye. I hope it will be realised that there is a far bigger issue in this than a mere war between Arabs and Jews. It is an economic war, and power politics of the very worst sort.

I would commend to the House the oral evidence given by the Communist Party of Palestine to the representatives of U.N.O. on July 13 this year. I am not going to read it to the House, but hon. Members will find it on page 145 of Annex A, Vol. 3, of Supplement No. 11 of the Official Record of the second session of the General Assembly. I suggest that they should compare it with Dr. Weizmann's remarks on page 78 of that report and with Mr. Preminger's remarks on pages 235 and 237. I believe that once Arabs and Jews are left to the mercies of an unsupported Commission, as is apparently to be the case, "the big show" will start to develop. If this proposal of U.N.O. goes forward, and we acquiesce, we shall have sown the seeds for the next world war, and the harvest may be far earlier than we expect, and may produce a bumper crop.

How, then, is peace to be maintained? I maintain that partition is an impossible way. The only way it might work—and even then I think it is remote—is when it is enforced. Partition multiplies by at least two the present troubles, however forcibly it is imposed. I recommend that His Majesty's Government should, before it is too late, go back to U.N.O., and say that this country cannot possibly agree with its decision.

I suggest that His Majesty's Government should propose a three months' moratorium, announcing that, at the end of that time, they are prepared to meet both sides in Palestine, or all the Jewish and Arab representatives throughout the world. If at the end of that three months' period nothing has transpired, and neither side has come forward and agreed to meet, Great Britain should herself impose the following. A provisional elected government of Arabs and Jews in the relation of two-thirds to one-third, excluding all those on both sides who have bad criminal records behind them; maintaining law and order by giving at long last the British Army a completely free hand. I would then suggest that the Palestine Police Force which, apparently, is already moving in the right direction, should gradually have its British element thinned out, as has been done in the Egyptian Police, and that the Defence Force of Arabs and Jews should be gradually Palestinised, as the Indian Army was Indianised. We should set then a provisional period of nine years in which to complete this process, allowing three three-year elected assemblies in that time. . . .

Mr. *Janner* (Leicester, West): . . . What was the Balfour Declaration? Was not the Balfour Declaration given to Lord Rothschild the president of the Zionist Federation in this country to hand over to them? Nobody misunderstood the matter at all. Everybody knew very well that the Balfour Declaration was an important step further in the development

of the objects of Zionism. Balfour declared himself a Zionist. Lloyd George declared himself a Zionist and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition has always regarded himself as a Zionist.

If there is a suggestion that there is a difference between political Zionism and any other kind of Zionism that is obviously wrong, because Balfour knew, and we knew in this country, and everybody concerned with the Balfour Declaration knew, what Herzl had propounded, and the result was that the declaration was a Zionists declaration and everyone knew just exactly what it meant. Then an hon. Member complained that several years transpired after that before the Mandate was accepted and he used this argument as a cause to complain. What happened was this: The League of Nations most carefully and minutely considered the terms of the Mandate and unanimously—52 nations—after years of study, decided to implement the Balfour Declaration by producing the Mandate, and in addition to that America, who was not a member of the League, also gave her seal to this decision. . . .

. . . I do not want to go further into these points because I believe we have reached a stage when it is essential to deal with matters that are declared to be right by the United Nations organisation. May I say how ridiculous it is for anyone to suggest that he knows the situation better than the United Nations organisation after the exhaustive inquiries that have taken place? What is the United Nations organisation for? This matter was submitted by us to the United Nations organisation. We said that this constituted an independent inquiry. When the result is a report which declares that partition is to be put into effect there is a clamour by some Members. They say, "We will not accept the United Nations organisation report. We want to enter into these arbitration proceedings on the understanding that the result must conform to our point of view." As U.N.O., in their wisdom, have discovered that the right thing to do here is to create a Jewish State, of course that does not fit in with their book.

What has the United Nations organisation said, after examining the situation fully and thoroughly? They have formed two or three conclusions of importance that I want to refer to. First of all, they tore to shreds the 1939 White Paper. Then they said the Jewish people have a right to settle in Palestine and they are fit to run a State there. A number of arguments have taken place in this House and elsewhere on academic grounds as to whether Balfour or Lloyd George meant the formation of a State or a Mandate when they gave the Declaration. Sufficient has been said, I think, to fill many volumes. But the truth of the matter is that U.N.O. says that this is what the Mandate means. . . .

Mr. *Stokes* (Ipswich): The argument to which we have just listened contained so many fallacies that I have not time to deal with them all. I will take up one or two. . . .

I want to take up the point about the Balfour Declaration. I have often wondered how the Balfour Declaration originated. I have managed to get a copy of the original letter which Lord Rothschild wrote to Mr. Balfour. I will read two extracts from it to the House. I will not read the whole letter because that would take too long. The letter is dated July 18, 1917; and it is written from 148, Piccadilly, London, W.1. It is as follows:

"DEAR MR. BALFOUR,

At last I am able to send you the formula you asked for.

If His Majesty's Government will send me a message in line with this formula and they and you approve it, I will hand it to the Zionist Federation at a meeting to be called for that purpose."

The draft declaration was as follows:

"(1) His Majesty's Government accepts the principle that Palestine should be reconstituted as a national home for the Jewish people.

(2) His Majesty's Government will use its best endeavours to secure the achievement of this object, and will discuss the necessary methods and means with the Zionist Organisation."

Anybody who knows exactly what the terms of the Balfour Declaration are knows perfectly well that Mr. Balfour rejected that draft and made it clear in the statement that was subsequently put out as our policy, that he would not accept Palestine as a Jewish state. There was to be constituted in Palestine a National Home for the Jewish people. Let us be quite clear about the Balfour Declaration. Mr. Balfour clearly rejected the specific claim from Lord Rothschild, who had suggested that Palestine should be reconstituted as a national home for the Jewish people. Mr Balfour had replied "No, nothing of the sort; we will arrange a National Home in Palestine for the Jewish people."

If my hon. Friend does not like what Mr. Balfour said perhaps I might take a more modern authority, none other than Mr. Harold Laski. In November, 1945, writing in "Forward" he said, on the subject of Palestine:

"I do not see in the Balfour Declaration, or in the terms of the Mandate itself, any plan that there shall be a Jewish majority or a Jewish state in Palestine."

If Mr. Harold Laski is not a sufficient authority for my hon. Friend, I do not know who else is. [*Laughter.*] . . .

. . . I would like to say one or two things about the present partition proposal. What staggers me is, first, that anybody should think it will work, because it will not; and secondly, that it is just. How can one possibly envisage areas which are almost 50 *per cent.* Arab being handed over to the Jews? So far as I know—my right hon. Friend or anybody else can correct me if I am wrong—the population concerned consists roughly of 450,000 Jews under Arab control. If one leaves out Tel Aviv altogether, in which there are about 170,000 Jews and 5,000 Arabs, under this partition there will be 445,000 Arabs dominated by 380,000 Jews. How can one say that such an arrangement will work satisfactorily or can be considered just? . . .

The hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Ely (Major Legge-Bourke) said that there are some interests in this matter, and I think there is something in that suggestion. The Dead Sea salt is one of those interests. The hon. and gallant Member spoke of there being 33,000 million tons of it. I remember asking questions in the House and eliciting the information that on the 1925 valuation—and there is no difficulty in getting it if one goes about it in the right way—it was worth £240,000 million, and it would be worth double that amount today. That does not take into account gold and other minerals. There is another point which the House ought to know. The Arabs have been told—and I myself was told by one of the most prominent Arabs, King Ibn Saud—that the American Zionists plan for the Arab peninsula is to get a foothold in Palestine and then spread and take all the surrounding areas. [*Laughter.*] . . .

A great deal has been said about what has happened at U.N.O., of how fair the decision was, and that, because the decision had been taken, we ought to put our wills, consciences and intelligence into the locker under the bed and just

do what we are told. I never realised when I became a supporter of U.N.O. that that would be expected of me. I agree that I expected that I should have to abide by the majority decision, and I am prepared to do so, but it does not make me change my view because the majority of an organisation like that take a certain decision. The question is whether the decision is fair. It is well known in Arab circles that the State Department gave the most specific assurances of complete neutrality, and that they would do nothing whatsoever to persuade the nations at the Council of the United Nations to vote one way or another. According to my Arab informant, had the votes been taken on November 26, partition would have been defeated by 30 votes in favour, and 18 votes against, because there would not have been the necessary two-thirds majority; whereas three days later, on November 29, it was carried by 33 votes to 13, giving the necessary two-thirds majority.

I want to quote from the *Philadelphia Record* of December 3, 1947:

"Only a few people knew it, but President Truman cracked down harder on his State Department than ever before to swing United Nations votes for the partition of Palestine. Truman called acting Secretary of State Bob Lovett over to the White House on Wednesday and again Friday, warning him he would demand a full explanation if nations which usually line up with the United States failed to do so on Palestine. Truman had in mind the fact that such countries as Liberia"—

which, incidentally, was anti-partitionist on November 26—"wholly dependent on the United States; Greece, which would fall overnight without American aid;"—she voted for partition—

"Haiti"

which was for partition one night and against it the next—

"which always follows Washington's lead; and Ethiopia, also indebted to the United States, were stepping out of line on Palestine. Half a dozen Latin-American countries were doing likewise, and Truman had inside word that the reason was secret sabotage by certain State Department officials. Mrs. Roosevelt was among those who urged Truman to get busy . . . In the end, a lot of people used their influence to whip voters into line. Harvey Firestone, who monopolises the rubber plantations of Liberia, got busy with the Liberian Government. Adolph Berle, Adviser to the President of Haiti, swung that vote, Frieda Kirchwey, Editor of the Nation, called Foreign Minister Cal Berenson of New Zealand on the Trans-Pacific telephone and won New Zealand's vote. China's Ambassador Wellington Koo warned his Government that he would resign if China failed to take a stand on Palestine. He did not succeed. French Ambassador Bonnet pleaded with his crisis-laden Government for partition, despite Moslem threats in North Africa which face harrassed France. He did succeed. However, the two men who swung the most important influence were Foreign Minister Evatt of Australia, who was defeated for the Presidency of the United Nations, and his friend Oswaldo Aranha, who defeated him—both of whom worked together to put across Palestine partition."

Had the vote been taken on November 26 partition would have been defeated. It was delayed until November 29 while the pressure was put on, and so it was carried through. That is the background of what is supposed to be a fair and proper decision. When it was discussed whether the United Nations could legally decide this problem the vote in favour of showing United Nations legality was only carried by 21 votes to 20. In other words, very nearly 50 *per cent.* of the nations really thought that U.N.O. had no legal right to come to a decision of this kind. . . .

. . . If there is no alternative to partition, then I do wish to add my own voice to those who have already expressed their desire that the Government should clear out quickly. . . .