

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21. No. 24.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

## Mr. NORMAN JAQUES

We deeply regret to record the sudden death at Ottawa on January 31 of Mr. Norman Jaques, Social Credit Member of the Canadian House of Commons since 1935.

A personal history and appreciation of Mr. Jaques is on its way from Canada, and will be published here, together with speeches by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the Canadian House of Commons, on its arrival.

## The Real Political Significance of the Legal Aid Bill

By JOHN J. CAMPBELL

It is becoming increasingly evident from closer study of the Legal Aid and Solicitors (Scotland) Bill, 1948, that the legal aid provisions are virtually the liquidation of the profession in Scotland. The momentous question for decision at the moment is "Shall this liquidation be voluntary or compulsory?"

At the outset it cannot be maintained that H.M. Government has received from the country a mandate to take away the independence of the profession nor can it be said that there is any special urgency for dealing with a Bill involving so many intricate problems. The outstanding reality which has emerged during the short period which has elapsed since the Bill was printed and presented to the House of Commons is the feverish anxiety displayed by the Government to rush the Bill through all its stages without giving the profession a reasonable opportunity to understand its implications or to exchange views concerning the grave consequences to the individual members should they become subject to the control of the Executive.

One of the principal arguments adduced by the Government in support of the Bill is that solicitors will now be paid for services which for centuries were performed gratuitously. There is no indication that the profession generally has shown reluctance to continue to discharge what it considered was a duty to a section of the community unable to meet the legal expenses involved in civil and criminal matters. The profession has made no demand for payment, yet money is obviously the bait held out to them. The public has been sedulously coached in all the financial benefits which will accrue from the expenditure of public funds on civil litigation and defence in criminal charges. This line of approach appears to be a necessity for winning popular support to any measure which might otherwise be questioned, particularly as to its real motive. So long as the sly legislators are giving—then the presumption is in their favour. *In quorum manibus iniquitates sunt, dextera eorum repleta est muneribus.*

In the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill in the House of Commons on December 16, 1948, some hard hitting took place regarding the failure of H.M. Government to

consult the members of the profession on the legal aid provisions. In an encounter with Major Guy Lloyd, M.P., who had expressed the widespread dissatisfaction prevailing, the Lord Advocate intervened to say that the prior meetings with representatives of the legal societies, *i.e.* on October 11 and 29, 1948, "had to be treated in a confidential manner . . . but that confidentiality should extend to and not beyond the members of the society or council who would require to be consulted in connection with the proposals."

At a special general meeting of the Faculty of Procurators of Glasgow held on December 21, 1948, the Clerk to the Faculty, in answer to a member, stated that the Lord Advocate's explanation to the House was not accurate. The representatives of the societies had been definitely informed in answer to a specific question on the point, that confidentiality for these meetings was not to extend beyond the councils of the societies. Accordingly, the members were not informed of these fateful meetings.

The Faculty, however, left no one in doubt of its true feelings when it passed the following resolution:

That this meeting of the Faculty of Procurators in Glasgow, while recognising the need to extend the present arrangements for assisting poor litigants, deplores the manner in which the Legal Aid and Solicitors (Scotland) Bill has been introduced to Parliament without consultation with the profession, protests against the measure of State control enforced by the Bill and in particular the formation of State supervised panels, is opposed to the principle of acceptance of State funds which in its opinion is contrary to the public interest, and resolves that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Lord Advocate and the other legal Societies in Scotland.

It is astonishing that, since October 1948, until the matter was raised on December 2, 1948, the profession as a whole was totally unaware that its elected representatives were in close consultation with the Law Officers of the Crown regarding the most vital problems affecting the existence and independence of Scotland's ancient legal system. That these representatives ever came to assume or believe that they had any kind of mandate, or even ostensible authority to enter into any kind of consultations which were ultimately to be construed by H.M. Government spokesmen as being tantamount to binding agreements on the profession, is one of the terrifying features of the age in which we live. Surely they must, at least, have had doubts? No one, however, has so far confessed the whole truth, and the history of these negotiations has yet to be told. In fairness to the profession, and in view of the conflicting statements made in the debate, a full report should be prepared and published by the societies before the Third Reading, which will probably take place early in March. A White Paper on the subject is an urgent necessity.

In view of the gravity of the situation there is no good

purpose to be served in attempting to evade the issues involved. If anyone has doubts about the true object of the Bill, those doubts will surely be dispelled by the retort of the Lord Advocate (p. 1471):

I ask hon. members opposite who have taken the view that we are making the legal profession State servants—as if that were a crime; but I do not want to argue that point in this debate—to take note of the fact that, subject to certain restrictions so far as the financial expenditure is concerned—because, after all, we are responsible to Parliament for the expenditure of that money—a very substantial sum of money is being handed to the legal profession to allow them to operate this scheme on their own.

The candid, forceful, and, at times, abusive speeches of other Labour spokesmen in the debate are equally revealing. While it is not my intention to deal with the actual provisions of the Bill, yet it is right to point out that solicitors who wish to act for clients under the Bill will require to be on the panel for the rest of their days. I am more concerned that the profession should be alive to the strategic importance of this Bill to Socialist theorists and planners who hold the Marxist view of law, which is lucidly explained in a pamphlet entitled *Soviet Justice* by Mr. Ralph Millner, Barrister-at-Law, and published by the "Haldane Society" in September 1943. This authoritative survey of the legal system in the U.S.S.R. contains an interesting preface by Mr. D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P., who stresses the superficial similarity of the legal system—both of law and procedure—of the Soviet Union to those of other countries and comments on the difficulty of realising the fundamental differences between the whole social structure of the Socialist and Capitalist worlds. Study of Mr. Millner's work enables the reader to understand the Socialist criticism of the present legal system and to appreciate the extent of the drastic changes which are essential to achieve the Socialist ideal of law. Among the reforms necessary are the establishment of legal chambers under the supervision of a full-time director; the compulsory abolition of private practice; the supervision and direction of the handling of cases—particularly those involving State interests; the suitable distribution of members in all centres of population within the area where a People's Court exists and, if necessary, transfers to other districts. Judges, likewise, are kept under careful observation and are subject to recall.

The similarities between the Soviet legal system and the present Legal Aid Bill provisions are striking. Its passage as an Act of Parliament would be a flagrant violation of the Act of Union of 1707 which guaranteed the legal system in Scotland "in all time coming." It would liquidate the profession as an independent body.

Some may regard these ideas with incredulity, but the profession, would in its own interest, be well advised to devote a little more time and study to the speeches of those politicians who are shaping the destiny and future of our country.

It must be clear that the urgency with which the Government have attempted to rush through the Bill has given rise to the profoundest disquiet and anxiety. To my mind, the haste has been indicative of a deep sense of guilt. There is no recent parallel in Parliament for the urgency with which a measure has been rushed through its concluding stages. There are undoubtedly sinister implications in this Bill, and it will not serve the best interests of our profession and our country to take the view that, because the Govern-

ment has a large majority, therefore we should endeavour to make peace with those who have determined to put an end to our freedom as an independent profession. The hour calls for courage. It is suggested that if the terms of the Bill are not accepted they will be made "more stringent before the Bill is through." If this threat is real, and those who have been told are personally afraid of the consequences of opposition, then those members of the profession who have not as yet learned all the secrets of the consultation should declare boldly that they will resist all such threats and that they will not surrender their rights and their country's glorious legal heritage to any form of despotism. Tyrants have fallen ere now, and the history of Scotland cannot possibly lead any body of legislators—no matter how numerous or conceited—to assume that the Scotsman of to-day is lacking the courage of his forebears.

The issue may undoubtedly be regarded as a deliberate and carefully planned attempt to seize control of the bodies and souls of the advocates and solicitors of Scotland. The medical profession has been brought to heel and is temporarily crushed. Its liquidation provides a salutary warning.

The Scots are a hardy race who have managed to survive many desperate onslaughts on their liberties. It would be a sad reflection on this generation of lawyers were the pages of history to record that the profession had been found wanting and had surrendered its historic independence to the intellectual planners of a party whose alien conception of law is based on the brutal necessity of ensuring that their fellow-citizens are effectively stripped and robbed of those very rights which are fundamental to the existence of a civilised State. Asiatic halts may be suitable for the new way of life in the concentration camps and police-terrorised cities of Soviet Russia: they will never be worn in Scotland.

## PARLIAMENT

*House of Commons: January 26, 1949.*

### Middle East

*The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Ernest Bevin):* . . . I should like now to turn to the Jewish problem itself. . . .

. . . The Government did not create the Palestine problem. I do not want to arouse controversy, but ever since I have had anything to do with it I have been conscious of one fundamental fact, that the Balfour Declaration promised the same thing to two peoples. If partition is difficult now it is because the statesmen in those days did not face the problem fearlessly, resolutely and finally. If they desired a National State for the Jews and not, as they said, a National Home I cannot understand why they did not carve out a piece of territory and then say, "This is Jewish and that is Arab." They were dealing at that time with a fluid situation and it was no service to posterity to take refuge in contradictory statements to Arabs and Jews, leaving this problem to go on for 32 years under successive Governments and never bringing it to a final issue. . . . At the end of the war the pressure on Jewish immigration was greater than it had ever been, and the Government of Palestine were forced to take costly and unwelcome measures to control it. Jewish immigration was allowed to continue after the limits laid down by the 1939 White Paper, which was 70,000, were passed. I repeat that the professed aim of the Balfour

Declaration was the establishment of a National Home, and when my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies and I came to deal with this problem we were faced not with a demand for a National Home but for a Jewish State. . . . This development made a more intense conflict with the Arabs inevitable. It also meant we would have to do a thing not contemplated by the Balfour Declaration nor by the League of Nations. It has been suggested that His Majesty's Government have been opposed to the establishment by the Jews of their own State of Israel in fulfilment on centuries of national and religious aspirations. Our original objective, which has been the objective of other Governments since 1917, was to persuade Jews and Arabs to live together in one State as the Mandate charged us to do. We failed in this. The State of Israel is now a fact, and we have not tried to undo it. . . .

Let me, . . . just say one or two words about Israel's neighbours, the Arabs. I think they have a case which has got to be considered. I do not think they can just be dismissed because of what has taken place. They have to be taken into account. The Arabs, like the Jews, are a proud people with a long history and great traditions. They have long been friends of this country. Many of them fought with us in the 1914-18 war. Even when the United States and Russia were neutral and we were facing the Nazis and the Fascists alone, at least King Abdullah and the Senusi fought with us loyally.

*Mr. Churchill:* So did the Jews.

*Mr. Bevin:* I have just dealt with the Jews. Let me say a word for the Arabs on their own. After all, this is my speech.

It was in Arab countries that the Eighth Army was based and equipped, and without the help the Arabs freely gave us, I doubt whether the North African campaign could have been fought and won in spite of all that might be said about them. We depended on them for communications, and for many resources. If we had lost the Suez Canal we might have lost the war. I do not think that it is in the tradition of the British Army to forget their friends, and I am certainly not the Foreign Secretary who is going to make a start in that direction.

The Arabs feel as profoundly as the Jews that in the problem of Palestine right is on their side. They consider that for the Arab population, which has been occupying Palestine for more than 20 centuries, to be turned out of their lands and homes to make way for another race is a profound injustice. We understand how this strikes the Arabs—all the Arab people, not only their Governments—and we should consider how the British people would have reacted if a similar demand had been made on us. Suppose we had been asked to give up a slice of Scotland, Wales or Cornwall to another race, and that the present inhabitants had been compelled to make way. I think there might have been trouble in this House, and possibly outside. We cannot handle these problems unless we put ourselves in the other fellow's place and just see how he looks at the world.

The Arabs believe that for what they regard as a new and an alien State to be carved out of Arab land by a foreign force, against the wishes and over the protests of the inhabitants, is a profound injustice. The Arabs believe that it is contrary to the right of self-determination and to the principles of the United Nations. I am giving the House and the country their arguments, because there is so much propaganda on the other side and I think it is sometimes

forgotten that the Arabs are in the world. They point to the fact that since Britain gave up the Mandate—and I repeat the figure I gave just now—500,000 Arabs have been driven from their homes. In Jaffa, which was an Arab town of 70,000, allotted to the Arabs by the Assembly Resolution of 1947, there are now, so I am informed, only 5,000 Arabs. . . . The fact is that 500,000 Arabs are gone; they are refugees; and I do not think they walked out voluntarily. I really do not think that it is any good either side being touchy. I am trying to make a balanced speech, and when I get through it will be found that I have done so. However, I cannot accept the position that when anybody mentions the Arabs he is—[*Interruption.*]—well, I will leave it at that; I will not use the phrase I was about to use.

Do let us be fair and just. If we proceed on those lines, then I think that in the end we shall get a solution. But I must state the facts, and the fact is that there are over 500,000 Arab refugees, and the marvel to me is that the conscience of the world has been so little stirred over that tragedy. I hope that there will be a greater response to the appeal for funds that is being made for these people. Up to now the money that has been poured out to help them has come mainly from His Majesty's Government alone. I do not think there should be any belittlement of that. . . . His Majesty's Government was at this stage faced with a problem which had never faced Governments before the war. The United States had long been interested in Palestine, but it was not until 1945 that American interests in Palestine and pledges made in America became one of the determining factors. I have to be very careful what I say here, or I shall be accused of disturbing relations with America; but in defence of His Majesty's Government I ask the House to realise that at this point the whole question of who should be elected to certain offices in the United States turned on this problem, and the United Kingdom had very little latitude after that time. We had to consider the matter on an entirely different footing.

After consideration of the problem we proposed the establishment of an Anglo-American Commission. If I remember rightly, when this was announced to the House it was welcomed as a first step towards getting Britain and America into collaboration on the Palestine issue. That Commission reported, but they did not recommend a Jewish State: they recommended a unitary State of Arabs and Jews. Their recommendations were largely on the same footing as His Majesty's Government's approach to the problem. We were ready to accept the recommendations as a whole but the United States would only accept one point, the immediate immigration of 100,000 Jews. . . .

[*Continuing, Mr. Bevin reviewed the course of negotiations until fighting broke out in 1947. He went on:* ]

. . . In the first period of three months our effort was mainly to induce the Arabs to stop fighting. In the second period, from July, 1948, until now, the effort has been to stop the Jews from fighting. On October 14 the Jews attacked Egyptian forces in the Negeb in violation of the truce. At the end of October they attacked Lebanese forces in Galilee and occupied 15 villages on the Lebanese side of the frontier. They refused to comply with the Security Council resolution of November 4 and with the orders of the Acting Mediator.

Meanwhile, Count Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator, had stated that he considered the Assembly plans  
(*Continued on page 6.*)

## 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 SEFion Park 435.

Vol. 21. No. 24.

Saturday, February 12, 1949.

### From Week to Week

"There began in 1923 a friendship and collaboration between the school [London School of Economics] and the Rockefeller Foundation which grew and flourished."—Lady Beveridge.

Let us help each other, as the elephant said to the partridges.

The Union des Electeurs (Social Credit, Quebec) have forwarded a strongly worded resolution to M. St. Laurent, the Canadian Prime Minister, asking him to protest against the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty.

"New Delhi, January 18.

"On the eve of the nineteen-nation Asian Conference on Indonesia, New Delhi's man in the street, judging from an informal survey, has never heard of the place."—*The New York Herald Tribune*.

But the Cassell-Mountbatten-Schiff-Kuhn-Loeb-Schuster-Kisch-Isaacs fraternity are going to make him into a good little Indonesian in the next few years—or else.

"The explanation seems to be that people have become so bemused with words as to be no longer able to discern when a fundamental principle is jeopardised . . .

"Certainly the confused jargon which to-day passes for political thinking represents a collective departure from sanity."—*Human Events*, Washington, D.C.

And how.

We extend a cordial welcome to the latest comer in Social Credit journalism, *China Calling*, which is printed in Chinese and English, and circulates in the large Chinese cities. Its significant sub-caption reads "Who marches with us, marches with New China."

Probably few, if any, of the readers of this review are in any doubt as to the meaning of President Truman's policy speech on the development of backward nations, which was promptly endorsed by Mr. Bevin. In fact, we have very little doubt that they understand it better than either Mr. Truman who made it, or Mr. Bevin who endorsed it.

But, because it embodied the doom of civilisation in words of one syllable, and because there does not appear to be, since the amazingly successful disintegration of the British Raj, any human power with even the will to avert it, we propose to examine that policy in terms of the *kinder-garten* of Social Credit economics. Technically, and briefly,

it consists in the still further expansion of non-consumable goods production.

It will be recalled that the first sharp split with the economics of the Socialist London School of Economics related to the treatment of production as homogeneous and as, equally, "wealth." It is of course true that the phrases "capital goods" and "consumption goods" were in use, but so far from being emphasised, they were carefully played down, for reasons to which we shall come shortly. To clarify the meaningless term "capital goods," the term "semi-manufactures" as presenting a clear idea of the *nature* of a large and increasing portion of modern production, and in particular factory or "industrial" production, was substituted in early Social Credit literature. The Americans have coined the phrase "durable goods" which again misinterprets the situation.

Now, *as such*, while semi-manufactures absorb limitless labour and material, *the wages paid for their production are valueless; they are pure inflation*, because the individual cannot use semi-manufactures. This is another way of saying that all semi-manufactures increase the cost of living. The reason for fantastic taxation is not the war; it is because fantastic sums are being paid for *ipso facto* valueless production and have to be cancelled. And either the Chancellor of the Exchequer knows this, or he ought to be certified. And he also knows that the process is robbery.

The Socialist soak-the-rich filth has been so successful that predatory taxation is positively popular. What would not be so popular, if "the worker" understood it, is that he is, collectively, working for nothing; and that Mr. Truman is proposing, and Mr. Bevin is endorsing, that he shall work harder for less; that probably seven-eighths of his labour is paid for by one eighth of his production, and that instead of the "private capitalist" getting about 3 per cent. of the wealth, the international capitalist is getting ninety per cent. in the sense of real control and is going to give it to the Hottentots so that the Englishman shall not get it. The present "austerity" is a standard fixed by the international financier, *and it would not be affected by doubling production* of non-consumable semi-manufactures, which doubling, would however force the imposition of still higher taxation. It is impossible to trace the financial chicanery which the present Administration is exercising; but we have small doubt that the only major use which is made of the credits we accumulate by the "export drive" is to pay for a minimum standard of imports and to reduce, for the moment, the astronomical "American" Debts, including those of the First World War.

Considered as an economic system, nothing has ever in history been so ingeniously devised for the purpose of defeating human aspiration. Considered as a preparation for war, it is so admirable that we are driven to conclude that war is the chief end of man, and battle, murder and sudden death his destiny.

It did not require the division on the Adjournment provoked by Mr. Churchill in reference to the Administration's policy on Palestine to make it clear that Mr. Churchill, whether consciously or not, is doing everything in his power to ensure the defeat of the *soi disant* Conservative Party at the next election. We do not believe that he can be ignorant of the solid body of dislike, to put it no higher, which the Jews have engendered in the native-born; and we can only assume either that he has some information on the available Jewish vote which, in our opinion erroneously, leads



him to assume that it will be decisive, or he does not want responsibility for the next five years. He appears to be cast for the role of Mr. Thomas Dewey; but if our Mr. Attlee is the local Mr. Truman, our political system has plumbed even greater depths than we should have thought possible.

## JUDAISM AND THE "STATE" OF ISRAEL

by BERGE JENSEN.

(Concluded)

The two largest parties are the 'Mapai' and the 'Mapam', the 'Labour' party and the 'Opposition.' Mr. Ben Gurion's Mapai Party is the parliamentary facade of the Histadruth, or Trade Union Cartel, and is expected to get a comparative majority. Through the Poale Zion, or Jewish Socialist International, it is fraternally connected with the 'British' 'Labour' party:

"we have—or rather the Labour Movement of Britain has—a special affiliation with the Palestine Jews. Members of their Labour movement were associated with ours. They were members of the Socialist International . . ."

writes *The Tribune* of December 17, 1948. On another page of the same periodical Mr. Ian Micardo, the Jewish "Labour" M.P. who is on its Editorial staff and is one of the leading lights of the Keep Left Group of the "Labour" Party writes:

Everybody who has been to the Annual Labour Conferences of the Labour Party, whether as a delegate or a visitor, will know Maurice Rosetté, who came and spoke regularly as the delegate of the Jewish Socialist Labour Party (Poale Zion) . . . He was the hero of the unforgettable moment at Scarborough this year [summer 1948]: he stood on the rostrum pleading for recognition of an independent Israel, when he was barracked by a bunch of delegates at the back of the hall. "I've been waiting to make this speech," he cracked back at them, "for two thousand years; you can wait five minutes for me to finish it." And they did.

Now he has been rewarded for a lifetime of devoted service to Zionism by being appointed Secretary of the State Council in the Israeli Government—one of a significant number of appointments of British born Jews to high office in Israel. Last week, some of his many friends in the House of Commons gave a farewell party to him . . . Rosetté will have one of the most thrilling jobs I can think of—the job of building up a new parliament, with all its constitution, standing orders, procedure and working methods, from a blank sheet of paper.

The proposal that Great Britain should recognise Israel was put forward by the secular and priestly heads of the Jewish Community the moment "Israel" was proclaimed a "State" in Tel-Aviv and 'acknowledged' in Washington. The suggestion was then so unacceptable to the British public that Mr. Rosetté's motion of support for Israel at the Labour Conference shortly afterwards was ignored, and the Palestine Question, ever a standing item of Labour Conferences, was not even mentioned in the agenda. In the intervening

months the Rabbinical proposal, working its way from the Left to the Right, has been discussed more sympathetically by the majority of the editors of this country. Recognition, will be a complete, but we hope, momentary, surrender to the doctrine that Might is Right. It will be power-politics at its worst, and the result can be predicted with certainty: the abject appeasement of the Jewish Blackmail International will be followed, as was the instantaneous "American" and "Russian" recognitions in May, 1948, by months of further, even bolder Israeli-Communist aggression in the Middle East.

While this was being written the adherents of the various "parliamentary" parties in "Israel" were making their last preparations for holding (or should it be celebrating?) the first elections by which 'the people' are going to instruct 'their government' of their sovereign will.

Simultaneously most British organs of publicity were informing their clients of the imminence and inevitability of the British Government's 'recognition' of 'Israel.' Besides the two orthodox parties mentioned by Rabbi Sperber and blessed by Rabbis Herzog and Brodie, we hear of a dozen other splinter-parties. There is the Freedom (Cheruth) party headed by Menachem Beigin, former C.-in-C. of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, and the Fighters-for-Liberty-party formerly known as the Stern Gang, both of which, naturally enough, intend to continue the fight till the last vestige of British (and Arab?) influence has been eradicated from Palestine. Then there is the Revisionist Party which goes a step further still, and apparently, want to liquidate British (and Arab?) influence on the other side of the Jordan as well. (In London, the propaganda of this school of thought has been carried out by the "Jewish Dominion of Palestine League," whose aim is "to promote the transformation of Palestine into a self-governing Jewish State on both sides of the Jordan, with status of a Dominion within the British Commonwealth," and whose Chairman is Lord Strabolgi, the 'Labour' peer).

All of which makes it easy to understand why the Keep Left Group have latterly worked with feverish haste to make 'British' recognition of Israel coincide with what they hope will be the Parliamentary victory of their Trade Union fellow-lodgers in Palestine. But why their efforts should have the warm support of the leaders of the Conservative Party (Churchill, Eden, Amery, etc.) and the Liberal Party (Samuel, Perth, Clement Davies, etc.), to say nothing of the vast majority of British 'editors,' appears something of a puzzle until it is realised that the only difference between the Mapai, or 'Labour' Party, and the Mapam, or 'Opposition' Party, is that the former "looks west" (Wall Street?) and the latter "looks east" (Moscow-Wall Street?). Our authority for this fine distinction is the anonymous correspondent to the *Daily Telegraph* and *The Scotsman* who sums up an article on the "Israeli" elections (*The Scotsman*, January 17, 1949) by saying that "the programmes of the various parties would scarcely be intelligible to the British people" a statement at which the British People need not feel offended for it is doubtful if the sort of party-political programmes that the Laskis and Rosettés of this world are in the habit of drawing up and which are anchored to the kind of paper-Constitutions which 'Liberal' Jews have drawn up for gentile territories ever since the Revolutionary Year of 1848, is intelligible to any people anywhere, any more than is the so-called legislation 'produced' by the same party-politicians. As for the Israelis themselves, they will hardly have the

leisure to bring their superlative intellects to bear on the profundities of party-political programmes for, as the correspondent says, the issue of peace and war dominates everything: "the two main principles are: war or peace."

In view of the bellicose record of the "State" of "Israel" during the first year of its existence when it was "governed" by the Mapai-Histadruth-clique who are the only party ready to negotiate (at least for election purposes) an immediate peace, one trembles to think what will happen if some of the pro-war, or war-at-any-cost splinter parties should get seats in the new "Israeli" "Parliament."

Of one thing we can be certain: the conflict inherent in the existence side by side on this once so lovely earth, of two opposing philosophies (whose exponents are, on the one hand the Hertz-Herzog-Brodie-Rothschild-Laski-Rosetté-Micardos *etc.*, and, on the other, the leaders of the militant Christian resistance movements) is nearing its climax.

Now that legal and military (and not so much financial) sanctions are more and more directly determining the shape of human life in association we can hardly pay too much attention to the official views of the leading exponents of Judaism, which has been described as Law Religionised, and is nothing if not a militant set of doctrines. The hereditary policy-makers of Jewry relying increasingly for the implementation of their long-range aims on the more tangible mechanisms of Bureaucracy and Police Forces (under this head we may include all the Fighting Services) are likely more and more to employ priests and soldiers in preference to bankers and politicians, as their public relations officers. In the future rabbinical 'releases,' in the reactions and the comments of the Rabbis to the successive and (unless I am much mistaken) sanguinary acts of the swiftly moving drama of Jewish World Conquest, there will be perceptible the 'line' which will subsequently be taken by the world's news-agencies, whose chief function is not the purveying, but the with-holding of vital news. In war, a good 'intelligence' service is of first importance. Our chance of survival, and final victory may depend to a large extent upon the timely and correct 'reading' of the Judaic 'line' so that we may counter it with an equally timely and correct exposure of the facts which the 'line,' as often as not, is designed to obscure.

#### PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

of November, 1947, to be unworkable and he made alternative proposals. The United States Government considered Count Bernadotte's proposals, and on September 21 Mr. Marshall announced publicly in Paris that they had the approval of the United States Government in their entirety. I should like to emphasise that fact. I was shown the document in which the announcement was to be made that afternoon at three o'clock. I undertook to put it before the Cabinet and, if necessary, to put it before this House, which I did. I think I am entitled to take notice of a man of Mr. Marshall's status and position. When he tells me that that is the policy of the United States I am entitled to take that statement as a fact without questioning it at all.

Therefore, I reported that that was the position, and His Majesty's Government adopted it. I felt for the first time that we had a really agreed policy. Many hon. Members opposite have spent weary hours with maps considering the issues involved in partition. I thought that Count Bernadotte had put forward a more homogeneous plan. There were no enclaves and no corridors, and it gave the

Arabs access to the sea. It also afforded communication between Egypt and Transjordan. I thought it was a clearer and cleaner arrangement than the plan of 1947. In this new plan the Arabs lost Jaffa and Western Galilee, which went to the Jews. In return for the Negeb the Jews had a more fertile area given to them. As this movement of Arabs had taken place we felt that this was a tidier proposal.

Having accepted that assurance and got His Majesty's Government to agree to it I reported it to the House. However, at the General Assembly later we were told that the United States could not support the original decision. It is no good crying over spilt milk; the situation has been altered from September. Again we went into discussion and again a new decision was arrived at and embodied in the Resolution which went before the Assembly and which I understood was then agreed. That failed to get the necessary two-thirds majority and was superseded by a new proposal which holds the field today. It is that a Conciliation Commission should go to Palestine to take over the work of the Mediator and his powers and should promote negotiations and endeavour to get a settlement of the problem. The Conciliation Commission, as elected, consists of representatives of the United States, France and Turkey. That is the position as we left it at the Assembly.

Only 11 days after the appointment of the commission another attack was launched in the Negeb. It is rather significant that the United Nations' Mediator, Dr. Bunche, who has done a very great work in this matter, could find no provocation at all for this attack. . . .

[*He went on to deal with the question of the Spitfires shot down over Egypt by Israeli fighters, and of the recognition of Israel by this country. Finally he said: ]*

. . . As far as His Majesty's Government are concerned, I wish to restate three main points. I am not now announcing *de facto* recognition until I have replies from those Commonwealth countries and the other countries I have named, but I am assuming that those replies will be in during the next few days when a final decision can be made. I would repeat that the security and stability of the Middle East are of vital importance to His Majesty's Government, and we intend to be faithful to our interests and obligations. Secondly, there must be peace and no more fighting. Thirdly, the settlement with Palestine should be on lines most likely to afford a hope of stability throughout the Middle East as a whole. On these aims I ask the support of the House. I wish to pledge the utmost endeavours of His Majesty's Government in the promotion of security and economic and social progress in an area which is vital to us and vital to world peace.

*Mr. Churchill (Woodford):* . . . No one has done more to build up a Jewish National Home in Palestine than the Conservative Party, and many of us have always had in mind that this might some day develop into a Jewish State. [*Interruption.*] I am speaking for myself, anyhow. . . . I do not feel any great confidence that he has not got a prejudice against the Jews in Palestine. . . . We [the Government] have so managed our affairs as to find ourselves arrayed in this matter on the opposite side to the United States, to Soviet Russia, to the Palestine settlers and to Zionist supporters all over the world, and without—and I want my hon. Friends on this side to realise this—doing the slightest service to the Arab countries to whom we have very serious obligations. This is not at all a favourable conjunction for British interests, and it should have been the

careful aim of the Foreign Office to avoid its being brought into being. It makes our position a very weak one and it predisposes U.N.O. against us on numbers alone. Our influence is therefore at a minimum as a result of our improvident diplomacy.

This is a poor and undeserved result of all that we have created and built up in Palestine by the goodwill and solid work of 25 years. We have lost the friendship of the Palestine Jews for the time being. I was glad to read a statement from Dr. Weizmann the other day pleading for friendship between the new Israeli State and the Western world. I believe that will be its destiny. He was an old friend of mine for many years. His son was killed in the war fighting with us. I trust his influence may grow and that we shall do what we can, subject to our other obligations—because we cannot forget those other obligations—to add to his influence. I hope that later on a truer comprehension of the Zionist debt to this country will revive. Here I am in agreement with the right hon. Gentleman—I trust it will revive; but for the present we seem to have deprived ourselves of all the fruits of the past. Moreover, as I mentioned just now, the Foreign Secretary's policy has been the worst possible for the Arabs. . . .

. . . I do not pretend to propose to enter tonight upon the drawing of frontier lines or the details of any partition for which we should use our remaining influence, such as it is. I will, however, say that we ought not to grudge a fair share of the deserts of the Negeb to the Jews. It is nearly 30 years since I came officially and responsibly into this story. I have always felt that the Negeb should afford a means of expansion to the Jewish settlers in Palestine and offer future prospects to Zionist movements. But it is impossible to fly over these regions low down, as I did before the Secnd Great War, or travel through them to Petra and other places without seeing how fierce and barren these regions of the Negeb are. And yet they once held great cities and nourished important populations. The Jews, by the gift they have and by the means which they do not lack, have a way of making the desert bloom. Those who have seen it can testify. The Arabs, with all their dignity and grace, are primarily the children of the desert, where they dwell, in this part of the world at least, and for the most part, the desert lands do not become reclaimed while the Arab control is complete over them. . . .

*Mr. Crossman* (Coventry, East): . . . Here in Israel is a social democratic State if ever there was one. They are akin to us in all their outlook. Their only difference is that they are to have a socialised agriculture and a free enterprise in industry for reasons which are special to their country. Yet we are told that we cannot trust them that they are all crypto-Russians. If anything could have driven them into accepting Russian support it would have been the policy of this country during the last three years. The tragedy is what we have missed. In 1946 I talked with Weizmann, Ben-Gurion and Shertok. They said, "We cannot hope yet for Dominion status. That will possibly come in a year or two. But if you grant partition there can be a British base at Lydda, a British port at Haifa and British Forces in the Negeb, of course." Now that has all gone. We could have had it in 1946. They wanted it then. But we compelled them to fight for their independence. We threw away a Dominion. I know that this will not please the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Platts-Mills). They were loyal to us. They wanted to be on our side, they wanted to be British. We said, "You cannot

be British because we cannot give you that much for fear of offending the Arab League." . . .

*Mr. Norman Smith* (Nottingham, South): . . . I first turn to the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for East Coventry (Mr. Crossman). While I was listening to my hon. Friend's speech, which was full of accusations of prejudice against my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary, I wondered where on earth was the constituency that sent my hon. Friend to the House of Commons, because the essence of what I propose to say is, firstly; that the views expressed by my hon. Friend, which, after all, were only his own prejudices with regard to this matter, do not represent the opinion of the ordinary Englishman in the street and particularly the working-class Englishman and woman; and, secondly, that Zionism is in itself inherently a wrong thing. Behind all the speeches that have been made tonight against my right hon. Friend and in favour of the Israeli State lies the cold, calm assumption that Zionism in itself is good and, therefore, ought to be supported.

*Mr. Crossman*: Is my hon. Friend now arguing that he is supporting the Foreign Secretary because the Foreign Secretary, like him, holds that Zionism is an evil thing?

*Mr. Smith*: No, I am glad that the hon. Member asked that. I am supporting the Foreign Secretary's policy, because it has throughout been marked by resistance to aggression, and it is the point of view of the ordinary Englishman that aggression should be resisted. The English have political maturity and commonsense, a combination that exists nowhere else in the world to the same extent. This combination of political maturity and commonsense has led Englishmen in crisis after crisis to resist aggression and, therefore, to align themselves behind a foreign policy aimed at restraining aggression, as in this case.

*Mr. Benn Levy* (Eton and Slough) rose—

*Mr. Smith*: We have heard a lot of views expressed in the House tonight, and they have all been based on the gratuitous assumption that Zionism is a good thing and therefore ought to be supported. I believe that Zionism is a bad thing. What is Zionism but the expressed belief of certain fanatical Jews that they are the chosen people, who ought to have a national state in Palestine, a country which they left 20 centuries ago? This belief of the more fanatical Jews is a belief backed by big money in various parts of the world, particularly in the United States. I could not help feeling amusement at the emotional argument with which the hon. Member for East Coventry sought to arouse the sympathy of the House for this small nation, which has been backed by the two greatest powers in the world today, Russia and America, whose support of Israel is the only thing they have in common with one another.

The actual evidence that Zionism is essentially aggressive goes back a long way. The Zionist movement only began in my life time. The first Zionist Congress was held in 1897, and that Congress started the technique of deceit which has been characteristic of Zionism ever since. It started—

*Mr. Janner* rose—

*Mr. Smith*: The hon. Member for West Leicester (Mr. Janner) has been interrupting all the afternoon. It is about time he restrained his enthusiasm.

*Mr. Janner*: Will the hon. Gentleman say what he understands by "Zionism"?

*Mr. Smith*: I actually have the quotation in my pocket.

Israel Cohen's "The Zionist Movement" quotes Herzl's private diary written immediately after the first Zionist Congress, held in 1897 at Basle, had defined the aim as

"A home in Palestine secured by public law."

But the private diary said:

"If I were to sum up the Basle Congress in one word—which I shall not do openly—it would be this: at Basle I founded the Jewish State."

The founder of Zionism says privately, quoted by one of his most enthusiastic admirers and biographers, "We want a Jewish State." All the way through the piece ever since, at Labour Party Conferences no less than anywhere else, the Zionists have practised this singular piece of deceit—they have interpreted the "Home" and the "State" as meaning one and the same thing.

Zionism is not only characterised by deceit in its methods; it is also characterised by its violence. There is a type of man who, when he feels weak cringes, but who, when he feels strong, bullies, and there is the Zionist from whom, when he is weak we hear about the ills the Jews have suffered. They say they want a National Home. I am in my 42nd year of membership of this party. Before I joined it, I was a fervent admirer of a great, far-seeing statesman, Joseph Chamberlain, who in the early days of the Zionist movement took them at their word and offered them territory in East Africa, what is now Uganda, land since much sought after by affluent people in this country who can pick and choose where they would like to go. But the ensuing Zionist Congress turned down the offer of land in Uganda because it was not Palestine. It did not suit the religious fanaticism which was, in fact, the mainspring of their movement. They could have had a beautiful settlement in what is now Uganda had they liked, but their fanaticism restrained them.

In those days, they were weak; in those days they cringed. But when, after the last war, they began to feel strong, they pursued their ends with a ferocity paralleled by the ferocity with which my right hon. Friend has been assailed in this House today. They pursued it with a ferocity that involved the introduction of new kinds of violent crime, for example, the use of the postal explosive with murderous intent, than which I can imagine nothing more cowardly. Theirs was the idea of putting booby traps on the bodies of men they had hanged in cold blood for doing their duty, than which I can imagine nothing more beastly. My hon. Friend for East Coventry said that the Jews remember, but so do the English working-class remember.

I wish that the hon. Member for West Leicester would do what I do, maintain social contacts with his constituency. I spend many Saturday evenings in working men's clubs and other social organisations with my constituents. It would surprise the hon. Member for West Leicester and the hon. Member for East Coventry if they knew what ordinary people were saying about Israel, not because people think Zionism is wrong—they probably know nothing about it—but because they know of the violent methods which the Zionists have used to attain their ends, and they naturally hate people who use those methods.

*Mr. Janner rose—*

*Mr. Smith:* I will not give way. The hon. Member has been interrupting all the evening.

I want to refer to another favourite technique of deceit practised by the Zionists. It is much resorted to in this Parliamentary Labour Party. If a member of this party dis-

approves of Zionism and approves, as I do, of the Foreign Secretary, they are told that they are anti-Semitic. Some hon. Members confuse anti-Semitism with anti-Zionism. I am not an anti-Semite. I have many good friends among Jews in this House and out of it, and I resent the imputation of anti-Semitism. The English working class are a kindly, tolerant, friendly people. There is still no anti-Semitism rampant in England today. There is a feeling against the State of Israel, but no anti-Semitism, thanks to the decency and the political maturity of the English people. However, there are many Labour supporters among the working class who do wonder just for what purpose some hon. Members of the Parliamentary Labour Party are in this House.

Now I want to come to the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Cheltenham (Mr. Lipson). He referred to the Balfour declaration. I do not think that many hon. Members of this House really understand the circumstances in which that rather discreditable incident cropped up. The evidence is on record. It was given by the late Mr. Lloyd George to the Palestine Royal Commission in 1937 and is quoted in the report. It is worth while to quote it because Mr. Lloyd George referred particularly to the timing of the Balfour declaration. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Sir C. Headlam) said just now that when in Flanders he did not know what it meant. Nor did I in Flanders know what it meant at the time, but I know now because Mr. Lloyd George told the Commission in 1937. The Balfour declaration came at a very critical moment during the First World War. Russia had fallen out of the fight, the Rumanian Army had been dispersed and Italy had suffered the crowning humiliation of Caporetto. It was at that time, said Mr. Lloyd George:

"No American divisions were yet available in the trenches. In this critical situation it was believed that Jewish sympathy, or the reverse, would make a substantial difference one way or the other to the Allied cause. In particular, Jewish sympathy would confirm the support of American Jewry."

The Balfour declaration was issued at that time in order to get the more active co-operation of America in the war. There was no American election at the end of 1917; it was not a case of enlisting the support of the New York voters. What did the words "American Jewry" at that time actually imply? What could those words have implied except the influence of those Americans who were able to exercise influence by virtue of their wealth? It was the wealthy Zionists in the United States whose aid was invoked in the First World War, and that was the purpose of the Balfour declaration.

[In view of the great interest of Mr. Norman Smith's speech—badly reported in the Press—we should have wished to print it without interruption. Since that is impossible without altering the order of the Report, or omitting other matter in this issue, we postpone completion of the Report until next week.—Editor T.S.C.]

## THE "PALESTINE" PLOT

By B. JENSEN.

The clue to the world conspiracy against Great Britain is to be found in the Palestine affair. Here is a full documentation, 150 pages, covering the momentous events of 1948. 3/-, post inclusive, from W. L. Richardson, Lawers, by Aberfeldy, Scotland.