

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 16. No. 12.

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

SATURDAY, MAY 25, 1946.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"Mr. Herbert Morrison is in Washington for Food Talks."—"B."B.C., May 8.

And very nice too, if the waiter makes suitable suggestions.

• • •

Scotch whisky as sold (sometimes) at 27s. 3d. a bottle in the British Isles is 30 degrees under proof. The same brand of whisky exported and easily obtainable in New York at three dollars a bottle (say thirteen shillings) is 13 degrees under proof—slightly stronger than pre-1914 whisky. This is called living on our exports.

• • •

Who's Who in Ministerial Promotions:—

Mr. H. T. N. Gaitskell (M.P. South Leeds. Leeds has the highest percentage of Jews of any city in the United Kingdom) to be Parliamentary Secretary to Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, Jewish Minister of Fuel and Power.

Mr. Gaitskell was a lecturer at the London School of Economics, and in common with Mr. E. F. M. Durbin, also a lecturer of the London School of Economics, was given a carefully selected publicity some years ago for his attacks on Social Credit.

It is stated in many quarters that Mr. Durbin is also marked out for ministerial office.

• • •

The "B."B.C. now refers to the United Kingdom as "Britain", doubtless to indicate its detachment from local interests.

• • •

It might be supposed that Social Credit had little or nothing to do with the Palestinian question. So far from this being the case, it is probable that Palestinian Zionism, in its present form at least, on the one hand, and both the philosophy and technique of Social Credit on the other, are absolute incompatibles. Many of the reasons for this would require lengthy elaboration; but the two main principles involved are easy to state briefly. By the "nationalisation" of the Bank of "England", contemporaneously with the accession of a Socialist Governmental Administration which is Jewish both in inspiration and support, the control of world financial credit can be, and is being, centralised in a Jewish monopoly with monopolistic powers of bribery. As an instance of this, the Jews in Palestine are "paying" an average of *four hundred dollars* (one hundred pounds) an acre for indifferent land.

The price of much better land in this country is about twenty depreciated paper pounds an acre. These prices

can be paid, of course, because in the last resort it will be the English who will provide the money.

And the second factor of decisive importance is that *for the first time in the Christian Era*, the Jews are faced with the threat of war *as Jews*. If war breaks out in the Near East, as it easily may do, the fighting will doubtless, as usual, involve Jewish employee nations; but the protagonists will be Jews and Muslims.

We propose, therefore, to keep this subject as far as possible in its accurate perspective.

• • •

Nothing is more remarkable than the contrast between the claims made for "Progress" both scientific and political and the steady degradation of human life. The phenomenon is analogous to, and in fact is part of the passive acceptance in the United States, in October, 1929, of an overnight transition from abounding prosperity to economic collapse. The innate absurdity of supposing that a world which was capable of supplying every luxury on October 29, 1929, could be "ruined" on November 1, is of the same nature as the claim that a nation which could fight the most devastating war in all history without suffering from lack of food, should on the cessation of hostilities take every possible measure to interfere with the processes by which it had previously lived. When, in consequence, not of war but of legislation, an alleged famine threatens, every explanation is adduced except the true explanation, that real credit—"the correct estimate or belief in the capacity of society to produce and deliver goods and services, *as, when, and where* required"—is breaking down.

We are in the hands of a gang of crooks utilising a pack of conceited careerists; and everyone knows it and is bored with the game. Ability to produce is greater than ever; but why should we? Don't tell us, because "ye are of your father the devil . . . abode not in the truth, for there is no truth in him . . . he is a liar, and the father of it."

• • •

"So in 1917, the United States was forced to go to war in defense of American rights. . . . They fought bravely and spent lavishly . . . But as soon as the shooting was over, the major Allied Powers—Britain (*sic*), France, Italy and Japan—betrayed the common cause . . . America, disgusted by the quarrels and selfishness of the other nations . . . retired . . . after having been abused, out-smarted and double-crossed by her former associates."

—*The Anatomy of Peace*, Emery Reves, p. 2.

Waal, waal, waal.

• • •

Until you can control your Government, it is your worst enemy.

The "Health" Scheme

The following letter has been addressed to every member of the Standing Committee "C" dealing with the National Health Service Bill:—

21, Hampstead Hill Gardens, N.W.3.
May 13, 1946.

Sir,

THE RIGHT TO CONTRACT OUT.

I wish to draw your attention to the enclosed document which includes a requirement to Members of the House of Commons to protect the right of the electors to contract out, by exemption or refund, from National Insurance, including the Health Scheme.

This was launched by four ordinary people without control of organization or publicity and has already been signed by about three thousand people, a large proportion of whom are obviously poor or of working class.

The first thousand signatures came in in five weeks, the second in three weeks, the third in under a fortnight, and during the last week I have received 300 letters asking for copies of the form. There is no question that there is a growing movement of protest which will be a permanent factor after the Bill is passed.

You will note that the statement expresses a strong sense of indignation that these plans were imposed upon the public mind by the Coalition during the war, and that the case for the objectors is being suppressed by all parties. It ends with an undertaking to continue to expose the facts and work for the repeal of the Act if it infringes the freedom to contract out.

Members of the Standing Committee will have a special responsibility, **TO WHICH THEY WILL BE HELD IN THE FUTURE**, if they allow the Bill to be passed without adequate discussion and recognition of the claims of these objectors.

I am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
(Signed) C. G. DOBBS.

Institutional Contracting Out

The *Catholic Herald* gave prominence in its issue of last Sunday to a reference in a *Times* leading article supporting the suggestion of Cardinal Griffin and the English Hierarchy that Catholic Hospitals should be allowed to contract out of the National Health Service proposed by the present Government. The relevant passage of the leader read as follows:—

"Mr. Greenwood has given a pledge that safeguards will be introduced to protect the distinctive features of Catholic institutions and other hospitals with religious associations which may be taken over. The safeguards should, if possible, be included in the Bill; and the Government should seriously consider whether such hospitals would not better be left out of the service or brought into it as independent institutions under special contracts."

This line of approach, though intelligible, has features which will be evident to Social Crediters who reflect upon the reply of the banker to a questioner: "I know banks create some credit; but they lend as much of their depositors' deposits."

90

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons, May 1, 1946.

Palestine (Anglo-American Committee's Report)

The Prime Minister: I desire to make a statement in regard to the publication of the Palestine Report.

His Majesty's Government desire to express their appreciation for the care and trouble which the Committee have devoted to the preparation of the Report. They hope that it will prove to be a notable contribution to the solution of the problems of Palestine and of the Jews in Europe, both of which they have so much at heart. His Majesty's Government received the Report only last week. His Majesty's Government and the United States Government jointly appointed the Committee, and the Report is addressed to both Governments. His Majesty's Government are now studying it and will consult with the Government of the United States as soon as possible.

The Report must be considered as a whole in all its implications. Its execution would entail very heavy immediate and long term commitments. His Majesty's Government wish to be satisfied that they will not be called upon to implement a policy which would involve them single handed in such commitments, and in the course of joint examination they will wish to ascertain to what extent the Government of the United States would be prepared to share the resulting additional military and financial responsibilities.

The Report recommends that 100,000 certificates for the admission of Jews to Palestine should be authorised immediately, and awarded so far as possible in 1946, and that actual immigration should be pushed forward as rapidly as conditions permit. The practical difficulties involved in the immediate reception and absorption of so large a number would obviously be very great. It is clear, from the facts presented in the Report regarding the illegal armies maintained in Palestine and their recent activities that it would not be possible for the Government of Palestine to admit so large a body of immigrants unless and until these formations have been disbanded and their arms surrendered. As the Report points out, private armies constitute a danger to the peace of the world and ought not to exist. Jews and Arabs in Palestine alike must disarm immediately. The Committee have drawn attention to the failure of the Jewish Agency to cooperate in dealing with this evil, and have expressed the view that the Agency should at once resume active and responsible cooperation with the mandatory power. His Majesty's Government regard it as essential that the Agency should take a positive part in the suppression of these activities. They hope that both Jewish and Arab leaders will give counsels of patience and restraint. His Majesty's Government recognise that decisions must be taken as soon as possible but meanwhile the House will understand that I am unable to make any further statement.

Mr. Churchill: Are we rightly understanding that His Majesty's Government will now immediately enter into discussions with the Government of the United States as to the joint action necessary to do justice to this very important and far reaching Report? Is that so?

The Prime Minister: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Churchill: In those circumstances we should certainly not wish to press for a Debate at the present time. We hope the right hon. Gentleman will let us know when the

moment is opportune. We do regard the matter as urgent, on account of the practical difficulties that may arise. May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is likely, in the near future, to have any statement to make about the negotiations for a new treaty with Egypt?

The Prime Minister: On the first point, we do regard the matter as one of urgency, and we shall get into touch with the Government of the United States as soon as possible. As soon as a decision has been come to it will be communicated to this House. I have no statement to make immediately with regard to Egypt. As soon as there can be any statement I shall see that it is given to the House.

Mr. Janner: In view of the extreme pressure of circumstances in Europe at present, and in view of the fact that an authoritative statement has already been made in America in this regard, will the right hon. Gentleman see to it that at least the portion of the Report which refers to permitting immigration shall be dealt with as rapidly as possible?

The Prime Minister: I have already explained that His Majesty's Government consider the Report should be dealt with as a whole.

Mr. Churchill: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will bear in mind that on the question of the Egyptian treaty negotiations there is a certain amount of anxiety.

The Prime Minister: I quite appreciate that.

Mr. Silverman: Could I ask my right hon. Friend to qualify a little more what he means by the statement that "the Report should be dealt with as a whole?" Inasmuch as the Report recommends a certain immigration in 1946, and recommends further immigration in other years for an undefined and unlimited period, does my right hon. Friend mean that no decision will be taken as to the disposal of displaced persons now in concentration camps in Europe until final decisions have been taken about the ultimate solution of the political problems in Palestine?

The Prime Minister: I think my statement was quite clear. It is obvious that any action taken will have its repercussions. The Report deals with the immediate and long term positions. The thing must be reviewed as a whole.

Mr. Silverman: Everybody recognises that the problem must be treated as a whole. What people are interested in is what is to happen to the people now living in an almost indescribable, hopeless and helpless condition in camps all over Europe, the last remnants of the worst tragedy known to human history. Are they to remain there indefinitely, or is any early hope to be given to them?

The Prime Minister: I must ask the hon. Member to wait until the Government have had an opportunity of studying the question and making an announcement.

Mr. Silverman: That may take a long time.

May 2, 1946.

Russian Language

Mr. James Callaghan asked the Minister of Education in what proportion of secondary, etc., schools, Russian is taught as a principal language; and what steps she is taking to encourage the introduction of the language into school curricula generally.

Mr. Hardman: I am sending my hon. Friend a copy of Circular 81 issued on 15th January last. I regret that it is

not possible to give more detailed information than is contained in the circular.

National Health Service Bill

Sir Wavell Wakefield (St. Marylebone): . . . I feel that under this Bill as it now stands, the public in many respects will not be better served but rather they will be worse served. I think it is absolutely tragic that a Measure which is supposed to have as its basis and foundation the report of Lord Dawson, and in the preparation of which the doctors have given their help in the past two decades, should be opposed as it is now by an almost united medical profession.

Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Bevan indicated dissent—

Sir W. Wakefield: The Minister shakes his head and hon. Members say "No, no," but it is a fact that the medical profession are united against it. They feel deeply that the public will not be better served by this Bill as it now stands. In the very brief time at my disposal I am going to give reasons why I believe this to be the case. The first reason is that the privately owned surgeries of today are to disappear and health centres will take their place. The intimacy of the private surgery will go and people will not be able to go round the corner to see their practitioner. They will have to go to the health centre where there will be group practice and many doctors. That will mean that patients will have longer distances to travel. In these health centres there will be formalities, the keeping of records and the loss of any personal, intimate relationship, and this, I think, will result in a worsening of personal service. The doctors will be there in group practice, and the Government cannot convince me that under a State service, doctors will be willing to go out in the middle of the night. They will come to these health services from nine to five and then go home. There will be a duty doctor with duty typists and secretaries. When people ring up and notice is given of urgent cases, I do not believe that the same personal service will be given under this State service as is available now, when practitioners are responsible directly to their patients and not paid by the State, as envisaged in this scheme. That is my view and that is the view of many people with whom I have discussed this Bill. Furthermore, because there is no goodwill . . .

. . . Doctors and dentists during the period of the war went into the Services and had an opportunity of seeing the State service and the private and personal service. One and all say that there is not the same personal regard for patients in a State service that there is in a personal service. There is no use hon. Members shaking their heads. I have got plenty of evidence on it, . . . As a result of this Bill there will be less quality in the entrants in the medical service. There will be a removal of enterprise, a removal of the taking of risks and responsibility and the carrying out of what a doctor believes to be right in the interests of his patients.

. . . In the human relationship between doctor and patient, risk must be taken. It is individual and it is personal, and rules and regulations cannot be laid down by the Minister to cover all those varied, individual instances of attention which are so necessary in the doctor-patient relationship.

(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: Sefton Park 435.

Vol 16. No. 12.

Saturday, May 25, 1946.

The Policy of "The Times"

Since, under the excuse of paper rationing, or without any excuse whatever, it is deemed desirable that information given to the British public should be confined to matters of no importance, we make no excuse for passing on the report which circulated widely overseas three weeks ago, that *The Times*, widely known as the *Threepenny Daily Worker*, is due for a change of policy. According to this report, the paper's peculiar adoration for Soviet Russia and its gyrations in imitation of its idol, have been less due to its control, which is largely in the hands of the Astor family, or even to its Editor, Mr. Robert McGowan Barrington Ward, than to the obsessions of Professor E. H. Carr, who has been chief leader writer for the last five years or so, with a doctrinaire brand of Power Politics and a contempt for "principles"—all very Muscovite.

The disastrous incursion of Professor Carr into Greek affairs (in which foray he was imitated by the *Ottawa Citizen*), and the caning which the paper received in Parliament in consequence, reinforced the growing body of discontent that a paper which was regarded abroad as still haloed with nineteenth-century greatness should present personal views in the light of national policy.

The belated effect of this has been, it is stated, to suggest to Professor Carr the desirability of his returning to the academic peace of the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth.

We can, without difficulty, recall a number of Professors of various subjects whose similar retirement might be endured with resignation. On the whole, the invasion of politics by professors, as such, whether in this country or elsewhere, has been a major misfortune.

Isolating U.S.A.

The general trend of World Diplomacy is fairly clear. The food situation is, with other issues, being manipulated to exacerbate British-U.S. relations and so throw Europe into the hands of "Russia"; while the Zionist threat is driving the Moslem world in the same direction, so that the Moslems can be sold by Moscow to the Jews at the appropriate moment.

The focus of direction is largely, from a geographical point of view, in Wall Street and Washington; but it has Fifth Columns everywhere, working feverishly, and perhaps in some cases blindly, to bring about the isolation of the real United States. When that moment arrives, by which time it is intended that only two effective powers shall remain, one side will sell out to the other—it is immaterial which.

Obviously, the vital factor in the comprehension of this situation is to realise that the conflict is horizontal, transcending national frontiers, not vertical. It is not nations which make wars; it is international plotters.

Bearing in mind that Karl Marx never in the whole of his writings put forward an original idea, and also that Judaism has a curious but invariable habit of betraying its plans, we can recognise the important bearing of "the class war" on this policy. It will fit almost anything or anybody. Lord Rothschild joins the "Labour Party" to carry on war against anyone or any Party which will not knuckle under to Industrial and Financial Imperialism. Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, a millionaire, is the ostensible organiser of P.E.P. which works for the transfer of property rights. The threat of "vertical", i.e., national, military war, is used to induce submission to horizontal, "class" war; and the military establishments form an ultimate police force to be used against any recalcitrant "class."

The Coast of Barbary

"There is at least one profound and beneficent new fact of which all should take account. The Church of Rome has ranged itself with those who defend the rights and dignity of the individual, and the cause of personal freedom throughout the world." Mr. Churchill's remark when addressing the States General in The Hague, despite the slight flavour of electioneering perception, is interesting as an acknowledgment of the direction in which forces able and willing to assist in stemming the tide of totalitarian encroachment may be sought. *The Tablet* of May 18, which makes of Mr. Churchill's statement the text for a notable article on "The Church and the Freedom of Man," is not, even if Mr. Churchill is, unaware of the fatal fascination of movable majorities:—"The liberation movement itself has produced in Central Europe plenty of men who have risen to power with the name of liberty on their lips, but whose idea is exactly the same modern idea of dictators, from Napoleon onwards, whose simple syllogism is that the will of the people must be supreme and unquestioned, and that they are the sole interpreters of what that will is . . . In our lifetime we have witnessed through much of Europe . . . the swift elevation to the high places of power of men not born or reared to any expectation or sense of responsibility, and the general characteristic, constantly repeated, is that such men are much greedier for power, much more impatient, because they are taking a much shorter view and are much crueller than those they displaced."

A Political Economy of Quality

"No writer on economics has yet told us what are the limits to expenditure in public arts, whether a beautiful city is an investment, or an extravagance. The modern political economy of quantity should be corrected by a political economy of quality. Writers who have set out theories of corporate life talk much of utilities, but they often have a very narrow view of what makes a utility; and the blind may lead the blind down so steep a place that they drive those who have eyes along with them. . . . Every noble city has been the crystallization of the contentment, pride and order of the community."

—*Architecture*, W. R. Lethaby.

The Arab Point of View

The following is the text of an address at Edmonton, Alberta, by Mr. Ali Shaben, Edmonton Secretary of the Canadian Arab Friendship League.

After expressing his gratification to be able to present the Arab point of view on the Palestinian problem, Mr. Shaben said:—

Arabs have no race prejudices or inherent dislikes for the Jews, and Arab history is remarkably free from any deliberate persecution of the Jewish people. When Mediæval Christendom persecuted the Jews, the Arabs gave them refuge and kind hospitality. Before the aggression of political Zionism in Palestine there was no safer place for the Jews than in the Arab countries. If, at the end of the first world war, Zionist leaders had sought a friendly understanding with the Arabs and had offered to co-operate with them in re-building Palestine and other Arab countries, which had been retarded by five centuries of Turkish misrule, the Arabs would have welcomed as friends and fellow citizens all Jews who wished to come.

The two branches of the semitic race would have given the world a fine example of good and co-operation. Instead political Zionist leaders made a political bargain with some British Imperialists, which would make Palestine a Jewish state under the mask of a National Home.

The Arabs do not consider the famous, or infamous, Balfour declaration as binding on them either morally or legally. That declaration was made without their knowledge or consent. It was made before Palestine was occupied by the British. In making it, Mr. Balfour offered something in Palestine which was not his to offer; it promised to establish in Palestine (remember the in) "a national home" for the Jews, whatever that may mean, with a big proviso "That nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious right of existing non-Jewish communities." Yet, during the past twenty-five years the Jews have risen from eight to thirty-three *per cent.* of the population.

The aim of political Zionism is to get as many Jews as possible into Palestine in order to obtain a Jewish majority of the population and convert Palestine into a Jewish state, in which the Arab would be dominated or uprooted and transferred to other lands, as stated in the words of their chief spokesman, Dr. Chaim Weizmann: "The aim of Zionism is to make Palestine as Jewish as England is English." Again, in 1942, Dr. Weizmann wrote "If the Arabs do not wish to remain in a Jewish state every facility will be given them to transfer elsewhere." Thus Zionist enterprise is not the sweet picture we are asked to see but a grim and deadly menace to Arabs in Palestine and surrounding Arab states.

As for the Arabs not being displaced or dispossessed by Jewish immigrants, Sir John Simpson, as chairman of the 1930 Royal Commission sent into Palestine, wrote: "The Arab population has by excess of births over deaths increased with great rapidity, while the LAND available for their sustenance decreased by 250,000 acres. This area has passed into Zionist hands." Through Zionist purchases, the Arabs have lost the land which gave them the assurance of permanent livelihood.

The utilities franchise was given to a Zionist company with certain conditions and provisions whereby all implements

and machinery were imported into the country free of duty until an amortization depreciation interest of 8 *per cent.* was paid to the shareholders.

As for the assertion that Jews only occupy five *per cent.* of the total area of Palestine and that much of that land has been considered for centuries an uncultivable desert and uninhabitable swamp until it was reclaimed by Jewish toil, according to the British administration the Jews own 375,000 acres which is about one sixth of the land suitable for cultivation, and any map of the Zionist land shows that nearly all of it is situated in the most fertile valleys and plains of Palestine. The land reclaimed by Zionists is but a fraction (one tenth) of their holdings, the greater part being well developed farms from which they dislodged Arab tenant farmers. More than three-fourths of Zionist land was sold to them over the heads of Arab tenant farmers by land owners, many of whom live outside of Palestine. The largest of these sales was a total area of 50,000 acres in the fertile plains of Esdrealon. This tract was sold for three and a half million dollars by the Sursoq family, rich Christian Arabs who live outside Palestine. As a result of this sale 1,600 Arab families were evicted from their homes and farms where they had lived for generations. It is estimated that thirty thousand Arabs have been dislodged from their farms and villages by Zionist purchases. As for the claim that every foot of land which the Jews own has been acquired at exorbitant prices, an average of four hundred dollars an acre is sufficient evidence to repudiate their claim that the lands were nothing but swamps and deserts which have been reclaimed by Jewish toil.

The Zionists claim that the increase of the Arab population is evidence of their increased prosperity due to Jewish immigration. They claim that thousands upon thousands of Arabs from neighbouring Arab states have immigrated into Palestine, seeking higher wages and better living conditions. According to the *Statesman's Year Book* these claims are unfounded. According to this reliable reference book, the average number of Arabs immigrating into Palestine has been less than one thousand a year, while the number of Jewish immigrants has been over twenty-thousand per year. This undesirable ratio is due to the fact that a pitiless political alliance of financial interests has deprived Palestine of her natural rights to control the quality and number of her immigrants.

Since the advent of Zionism, the Arab population has increased from seven hundred thousand to one million (that is forty-three *per cent.*) during the same period. The population of Trans-Jordan increased from two million to three million. That is fifty *per cent.*; and that of Syria from two million, eight hundred thousand, to three million, eight hundred thousand, thirty-six *per cent.*, while the population of Iraq increased from two to three million, or fifty *per cent.* These statistics do not support the Zionist claim that Arabs from the neighbouring states have been flocking to Palestine to reap some of the supposed prosperity brought by Zionism. The Arab states of Iraq, Egypt, Arabia and Trans-Jordan, Syria and Lebanon are now free and sovereign. Only Palestine has not been liberated. The Zionists are opposed to Palestine's independence before the Jews achieve a majority of population.

With regard to higher wages in Palestine, that is correct. It is true that Zionist enterprise has led to a rise in the wages

of Arab labour; but, like other Zionist assertions, it is only half the truth, for Zionism has also led to an abnormal rise in the cost of living so that the economic condition of the common Arab labourer has been worse than it was during Turkish rule. Furthermore, the Jewish agency which has taken land away from the Arab farmers, prohibits the Arabs from employment on Zionist lands. While the powerful Zionist labour union turns its full strength against any Jewish employer who is rash enough to employ Arab workers Zionism is not a friend of the Arabs. Its aim is to organize a closed and exclusive community in which Jews only will produce and Jews only will profit. Thus the Jews, who in Europe and in this country champion democracy, tolerance and universalism, become in Palestine, under Zionism, the fervent apostles of social economics and political Chauvinism.

The logic and facts are inexorable. No room can be made in Palestine for a second nation except by exterminating the nation in possession. Palestine is too small to hold a larger increase of immigrants, especially as its present population is increasing with great rapidity. It has the same area as the riding or constituency of Wetaskawin, Alberta, and thirty times its population, and now half a million Jews have found refuge in Palestine. Common decency and Christian honour forbids any further stuffing of Jews into this little country.

The relief of Jewish distress is a duty of the whole civilized world. It is for Britain, America, Canada and other countries that pride themselves on being Christian and humane, to give the hapless Jew asylum in their vast domain. By insisting on Palestine being the only hope of the Jews, the Zionist gives other countries an excuse for evading a manifest duty and keeps their doors shut in the face of humane needs.

The final British policy in Palestine is a notice to Zionists that Britain can no longer use her soldiers as mercenaries of political Zionism. It is also an invitation to the Jews to seek a friendly agreement with the Arabs. One could wish the Jews who have suffered from brute force, would wish to meet the challenge of high idealism and rest their cause in Palestine, not upon military force and financial might, but upon the force of moral principles, justice and goodwill.

There are many Jewish leaders like Mr. Salzburger, Rabbi Lazzastine, Doctor Magnes, Professor Einstein, and a long list of men devoted to the spiritual ideals of Judaism, who vigorously opposed the aggressive policy of Political Zionism and appealed to their fellow Jews to win the confidence and friendship of the Arabs by respecting their natural and inherent rights. Unlike the politically-minded Zionists, these leaders recognize that it is only in a peaceful Palestine based on Jewish-Arab friendship and co-operation that the cultural and spiritual ideals of true Zionism can be fulfilled. They do not want to restore the ancient Jewish state; but only seek in Palestine a centre in which Jewish faith and culture will find inspiration in the land alike of its birth and its ancient glory.

The Zionists have been exerting terrific pressure upon America in order to win American support for Zionist aggression against the Arabs. The Americans have no more right to give Palestine to the Zionists than the Arabs have to give New York to the Jews, or Massachusetts to the Irish.

I would like to quote a great nationalist and peace-loving man, Mohandis K. Gandi: "My sympathies are all with the Jews, I have no doubt that they are going about it the wrong way. The Palestine of the biblical conception is not a geographical tract, it is in their hearts, but if they must look to the Palestine of geography as their national home, it is wrong to enter it under the shadow of the British gun. A religious act cannot be performed with the aid of the bayonet or the bomb—they can settle in Palestine, only by the goodness of the Arabs. They should seek to convert the Arab heart. The same God rules the Arab heart as rules the Jewish heart.

"Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English, or France to the French. It is wrong and inhuman to impose Jews on the Arabs. What is going on in Palestine to-day cannot be justified by any moral code of conduct. The mandates have no sanctions, but that of the last war. Surely it would be a crime against humanity to reduce the proud Arabs so that Palestine can be restored to the Jews partly or wholly, as their national home.

"I am not defending the Arab excesses, I wish they had chosen the way of non-violence in resisting what they rightfully regard as an unwarrantable encroachment upon their country, but according to the accepted canons of right and wrong, nothing can be said against Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds. Let the Jews who claim to be the chosen race, prove their title by choosing the way of non-violence, for vindicating their position on earth. Every country is their home, including Palestine, not by aggression, but by love and services."

Let American and Canadian influence be used to heal the wounds of Palestine, and bring understanding between Arabs and Jews, let all who love Palestine pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3)

Sir Ernest Graham-Little (London University): . . . In a speech in April, 1943, the Lord Chancellor enunciated the very wise axiom that "if you get a scheme which men think is not fair, that scheme is broken at the start." The present position with regard to the Education Act is an example of the truth of that axiom. The teachers were grievously affronted by several of the conditions imposed by that Act. The result is that there are now 24,000 fewer teachers in the schools than there were in November, 1945. A series of teachers' conferences which have been held during the last week have shown that that development has continued and is increasing in force. The net result will be that when, as the Government have decided, the school leaving age is raised on 1st April, 1947, there will be 400,000 additional pupils, but there will be fewer than 200,000 teachers, as the Minister of Education has confessed. What does that mean? There is a general consensus of opinion among educational experts that a minimum of from 300,000 to 350,000 teachers is required to ensure any satisfactory fulfilment of the Education Act. When 1st April, 1947, comes, there will be fewer than 180,000 teachers in the schools. I submit that the Education Act has already broken down. Can the Minister of Health improvise doctors in the same way as the Minister of Education is trying to improvise teachers? I think not.

... I can confirm the statement that was made on Tuesday last by my right hon. Friend the Member for South Kensington (Mr. Law) as to the reaction of the physicians. I was present at the meeting on 15th April, and I can confirm what my right hon. Friend said. That meeting, which was one of the largest I have ever attended in 40 years as a Fellow, resolved, by an enormous majority—again, one of the biggest majorities I have ever known—to refuse the motion approving the transfer of the ownership of hospitals which had been proposed by the President. That was the reaction of the College of Physicians. The College of Surgeons were even more emphatic in their opposition to nationalisation. The College of Obstetricians was, I think, a little misrepresented in the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for South Kensington. I have before me the resolution which was passed by the College of Obstetricians; It was furnished to me by the President of the College, and it reads:

“Hospital ownership: That if the ownership of hospitals passed to the State, the College would urge, (a) that the composition and power of the regional boards must be satisfactory from a medical aspect”—

That it is not so satisfactory has been shown, I think, in the speeches from these Benches—

“(b) that every hospital should have its own committee and management”—

Again, that is denied by the Bill—

“(c) that the endowments of each hospital should be returned to the same hospital for its own use.”

... I wish to draw the attention of the House to one of the gravest reproaches to be made against the Bill, namely, the ludicrously meagre reference to research. Nine lines of the Bill in Clause 16, deal with medical research, but 140 lines, in Clause 35, are devoted to devising a number of savage punishments for the doctor who wishes on his retirement to introduce to his patients a successor to his practice, and who accepts a modest premium for exercising that good will. Let us see what the Bill says on the subject of medical research. I will quote from the statement in the White Paper, and the White Paper everywhere seeks to give the most favourable interpretation of the Clauses of the Bill. The first sentence strikes me as being rich in humour. It reads:

“The Minister is also expressly required by this Bill to conduct research”—

that is, medical research. One might, I submit, as reasonably introduce a Bill expressly empowering the Minister of Health to navigate the “Queen Mary” from Southampton to New York. How diametrically opposed is this conception of medical research dictated from Whitehall to the procedure adopted at voluntary hospitals which have been the sources of medical advance. . . .

U.N.R.R.A. Exports (U.K. Goods)

Mr. Eccles asked the President of the Board of Trade the value of goods exported from the United Kingdom in each of the first three months of 1946, both in respect of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom and in respect of imported merchandise re-exported, which were consigned to Germany and to all destinations on U.N.R.R.A. account; and to what extent these figures are included in the tables given on pages 5-8 of the Accounts relating to Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom for March, 1946.

Mr. Belcher: Exports by U.N.R.R.A. are included in the Accounts relating to Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom, but are not separately recorded. Precise figures cannot therefore be given, but the recorded value of all exports by U.N.R.R.A. of the produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom was roughly £1,500,000 in January, £2,500,000 in February and £2,000,000 in March. Exports by U.N.R.R.A. of imported merchandise during the same period averaged about £500,000 per month. Exports by U.N.R.R.A. to Germany during these months were negligible.

May 6, 1946.

India: Population (Religions)

Sir John Graham Kerr asked the Under-Secretary of State for India the latest estimate of the population of British India, grouped under the following headings: Moslems, Caste Hindus, Untouchables and religions other than those mentioned.

The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. Arthur Henderson): The latest figures available are those of the 1941 Census of India, in which the enumeration was according to community and not religion. With the hon. Member's permission I will circulate the relevant figures from the Census in the OFFICIAL REPORT.

Following are the figures:

Extracts from 1941 Census of India.

The total population of British India was 295,808,722.	
Moslems	79,398,503
Hindus (other than Scheduled Caste Hindus)	150,890,146
Scheduled Caste Hindus	39,920,807
Members of other communities	25,599,266

Legislative Assembly Election (Total Votes)

Sir J. Graham Kerr asked the Under-Secretary of State for India the number of votes cast in the election of the present Indian Legislative Assembly and what proportion this bears to the total population.

Mr. A. Henderson: Of the 102 elective seats for the Indian Legislative Assembly, 46 were filled without opposition. The total number of votes cast in the contested elections was 583,351. According to the 1941 census, the population of British India, included in elective constituencies for the Indian Legislative Assembly was, approximately, 295 million.

Mr. Charles Williams: May I ask what proportion this figure represents of the total voters?

Mr. Henderson: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will be kind enough to work it out for himself. I have not that figure with me and have only given the figure of those who voted.

Mr. Williams: Since when, Mr. Speaker, have hon. Members of this House been ordered by the Government to work things out for themselves?

Lieut.-Commander Joynson-Hicks: Can the hon. and learned Gentleman say what proportion it was to the electorate, as well as to the population?

Mr. Henderson: I am afraid I have not the actual number on the register; I have given the figures of those who actually voted.

Yugoslavia (British Ambassador)

Brigadier Fitzroy Maclean asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to whom His Majesty's Ambassador at Belgrade is now accredited.

Mr. McNeil: His Majesty's Ambassador at Belgrade is accredited to the Praesidium of the Federative Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia.

I.L.O. (Staff Salaries, Taxes)

Major Guy Lloyd asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether all the salaries of the staff of the I.L.O. are free of Income Tax and Surtax.

Mr. McNeil: The salaries of the administrative staff of the I.L.O. (excluding locally recruited employees) have been tax-exempt in all countries since 1920 under the terms of Article 7 of the Covenant of the League of Nations relating to the privileges and immunities of the League of Nations and its organs. The I.L.O.'s privileges and immunities were specifically safeguarded on the recent occasion of the dissolution of the League of Nations, pending the outcome of negotiations between the I.L.O. and the United Nations Organisation on the subject.

Major Lloyd: Would the Under-Secretary state whether there are other examples of British subjects who have this very unique privilege, which many envy?

Mr. McNeil: While I think the envy is misplaced, it is essential, on grounds of equity, that there should be such provision. The officials of the I.L.O. have, since 1939, voluntarily foregone the tax remission which they could legally have claimed.

Major Lloyd: The hon. Gentleman has not answered my question as to whether there were other examples.

Mr. McNeil: Anyone coming within international agreements on the subject will have a similar privilege.

County Executive Committees.

Mr. De la Bère asked the Minister of Agriculture whether, since the W.A.E.Cs. are officially recognised as Government agents, those members of W.A.E.Cs. who are nominated by the N.F.U., C.L.A. and the N.U.A.W. are free to dissent from the Government's instructions, and act in accordance with the wishes of those by whom they have been nominated.

Mr. T. Williams: No, Sir. County war agricultural executive committees are my agents, and as such they are responsible for carrying out the Government's policy in accordance with instructions given to them from time to time. Although some members of the reconstituted committees will be selected from lists of names put forward by the various organisations, those members will not be in a different position from members appointed otherwise than from such lists. They will in no sense be delegates of their organisations.

Mr. De la Bère: Are we to understand from that reply, that members appointed by the N.U.A.W. or N.F.U. have to carry out the instructions of the Government as their agents? I do not understand the position, or where they stand in the matter.

Mr. Williams: The representatives of the various organisations who allow their names to go on a panel for

possible selection, know full well that if appointed, they will become the agent of the Ministry, and the National Farmers' Union have agreed on this.

Mr. De la Bère: The whole thing is nothing more or less than a Government agency: there is no independent spirit at all—it is monstrous.

A few copies of *Sphinx* (Liverpool), March, 1946, are available by donation. Postage 1d.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
Warning Democracy.....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea.....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles.....	(reprinting)

ALSO

Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....	2/-
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
Aberhart: Manning.....	9d.
Southampton Chamber of Commerce: Report of Economic Crisis Committee.....	9d.
The Planners and Bureaucracy by Elizabeth Edwards.....	8d.
Why You Are Short of Coal by Aims of Industry.....	6d.
You and the State Doctor by Charles Mellick.....	6d.
Democratic Victory or the Slave State? by L. D. Byrne.....	4d.
Large versus Small Scale Electrical Production: The Grid by W. A. Barratt.....	4d.
How Alberta is Fighting Finance.....	4d.
20 Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
More Questions About Russia by H. W. Henderson.....	6d.
What are Russia's Ultimate Aims? by H. W. Henderson.....	4d.
The Nature of Social Credit by L. D. Byrne.....	3d.
The Beveridge Plot.....	3d.
Lectures and Studies Section: Syllabus.....	3d.
A Comprehensive Medical Service (Reprinted from <i>The Tablet</i>).....	1d.

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.