

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 20. No. 16.

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

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

"A principal sign of it (the corruption of liberty) is a respect for uniformity. There are, Montesquieu says, certain ideas of uniformity which infallibly appeal to little minds. They find in them a kind of perfection."—*The Liberty of Thought and the Separation of Powers*. Zaharoff Lecture, Oxford 1948. Charles Morgan, M.A., LL.D.

This most important address should be read by everyone who realises the highly critical position of the United Kingdom and the British Empire.

We return, despite discouragement, to the subject of national book-keeping. "Will Congress, as it considers sending \$20,000,000,000 abroad to finance the Marshall Plan, overlook the fact that over-all foreign holdings in America (*sic*) total \$27,000,000,000? . . . That isn't the extent of their North American holdings. Another \$2,000,000,000 is held by Canada and Newfoundland, and approximately \$11,300,000,000 by other countries."—Congressional Record Vol. 80, No. 161, December 10, 1947, Hon. Walter Norblad, Oregon, speaking.

- (a) How much of this very large total is owned or controlled by "British" nationals?
- (b) Of the remainder, how much is owned or controlled by nationals of countries which have been financed by the United Kingdom in the wars of the 20th century, and have not repaid the sums or materials advanced to them?
- (c) Do the *liabilities* of the United Kingdom in respect of, e.g., U.S.A. India, Burma, Ceylon, Canada, Newfoundland, appear in the same account as these *assets*; and if so, where is that account?
- (d) How much of our export drive, the direct and immediate cause of our poverty, is devoted to balancing *liabilities* for which corresponding but concealed *assets* exist in certain so-called British trusts?

Or perhaps you don't think it's worth while having our accounts audited? Let's organise or co-ordinate something.

According to the Washington (U.S.A.) *Times-Herald* of June 2, 1948, "A selected few American (*sic*) newspapers and magazines which shouted the loudest for the \$6,000,000,000 Marshall Plan are to share approximately \$5,000,000 a year, it was learned yesterday . . . Another \$10,000,000 annually is to be divided between book publishers and motion picture producers who similarly were active in the propaganda campaign . . ."

Odd, isn't it, that someone should be willing to distribute \$15,000,000 per annum to popularise a proposal to give money away?

Sir Frank Soskice, the "Labour" Solicitor-General, who has been made a member of the Privy Council, is a Jew born

in Russia 46 years ago. His father, David Soskice was a Russian Jew, secretary to Kerensky, the titular leader of the Russian Revolution, which, it will be recalled, was heavily financed by New York Jews.

Lord Inverchapel, the retiring Ambassador to U.S.A., may be an admirable diplomat, but his popularity seems to be unduly localised. We made reference some time ago to the enthusiasm shown for him by Mr. Edgar Snow, the Communist or near-Communist or fellow-traveller associate-editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*. On the authority of Mr. Marquis Childs, the syndicated columnist who contributes to a wide chain of U.S. and Canadian dailies, he is "A long-time friend of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the extraordinary genius who is now president of Israel" (*Vancouver Sun*, May 29, 1948, p. 4).

We do not know what, if any relationship to the late Marquis of Lothian (Philip Kerr) is borne by Lord Inverchapel (Sir Archibald Clark Kerr). It may be a pure coincidence that two British Ambassadors to Washington of the same family name should share a considerable part of the responsibility for Anglo-U.S. relations during these last fateful eight years. But the coincidence of names is paralleled by a coincidence of spheres of popularity, and we have no hesitation in regarding the late Marquis of Lothian as one of the most disastrous features of British politics from the time of his emergence as Lloyd George's secretary and nearly omnipotent advisor in 1916 to his death in Washington in 1940.

It does not require much perspicacity to see that one of the major, proximate objects of the not very fierce Jewish war on the Arabs in Palestine is to have it settled by a U.S. Jew-controlled United Nations sitting at Lake Success. This would of course establish a precedent for settling all further, and potentially interminable disputes between Jews and everyone else, including the Arabs, by the same mechanism controlled by the same interests.

We have never believed that it was in the least likely that the Jews intended to fight a serious war either with their own men or their own money—it would be repugnant to the technique built up by countless centuries of fight-promotion. ("Wars are the Jews harvests": Wernher Sombart). But the wild rage of their propaganda against the British does suggest alarm at the situation in which they find themselves.

"Often we would send out the same telegram to 20 or more agents in various parts of the world. One 'urgent' query asked for information about some alleged scientific innovation in the United States. . . . Neither of two agents in the U.S. came through, but complete and identical information was received from agents in Canada and England. . . ."

"Thousands of Russian agents are working in Britain, more thousands in the United States, and other thousands

in every part of the world."—Igor Gouzenko, *This was my Choice.*

Medicine in Australia

Under the heading, "PROPOSALS FOR THE PROVISION OF A COMPLETE MEDICAL SERVICE IN THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY" the following has gained the attention of politicians in the Australian Capital Territory:—

Proposals

1.—The medical practitioners residing and practising in the Australian Capital Territory will constitute themselves into a corporate body to be known as the Canberra Medical Service, hereinafter called "the Service."

2.—The Service will be a self-governing body with elected officers and agreed Rules.

3.—Among the office-bearers will be two Trustees who will have power to enter into contracts and engagements on behalf of the Service.

4.—The object of the Service will be the provision of complete medical, surgical, maternity and specialist services to the residents of the Australian Capital Territory in return for a flat rate annual *per capita* payment to the Service.

5.—The payment by or on behalf of each resident of the annual payment will entitle the resident to the services of the medical practitioner of his choice in accordance with the Rules of the Service and on the basis of a contract as set out in the appendix hereto.

6.—Through its Trustees the Service will contract for appropriate specialists to visit Canberra at intervals for the purposes of consultations and treatment, and the payment for these services will be a charge on the funds of the Service.

7.—The Trustees will enter into a contract on behalf of the Service with the Federal Minister of Health, or with a person or persons designated by him, whereby the Minister or his nominee(s) will be responsible for the *per capita* payments to the Service.

8.—The annual *per capita* payment will be £1 10s. as from June, 1948, but will be varied in proportion to any change in the "C" series Price Index whenever the latter shall vary by five *per cent.* from its value as at June 1, 1948.

9.—Breaches of contract by any party or parties to any of the contracts governing the Service will be determined through the ordinary processes of the Courts of Law.

10.—The Service will not be liable for the costs of hospitalisation, transportation of patients, drugs or appliances, or special investigations or treatments such as pathological services and X-ray examinations and therapy.

By

C. H. DOUGLAS:

THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

(Postage 1d.)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LIMITED, LIVERPOOL.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: May 31, 1948.

Extra Rations (Farm Workers)

Mr. Hurd asked the Minister of Food if he will now announce the changes in the method of distributing extra rations to farm workers.

Dr. Summerskill: My right hon. Friend has arranged that where a farmer fails to apply for seasonal allowances, one of the workers or some responsible person acting on their behalf may do so. Farmers are, however, still required to sign the form of application.

Mr. Hurd: Will the farm worker or his wife be allowed now to draw these rations direct?

Dr. Summerskill: No, I am afraid we cannot alter the decision which we made some months ago and which I have conveyed to the hon. Gentleman on many occasions.

Captain Crookshank: Yes, but can the hon. Lady give any reason for not altering the decision?

Dr. Summerskill: Yes, because there are many people who would be shopping with the farm worker's wife who would feel aggrieved if she had extra rations.

Hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Gooch: Will the Minister consider the possibility of making it compulsory upon a farmer to apply for rations for his own men?

Dr. Summerskill: We will certainly consider that.

Mr. Baldwin: Is the Minister aware that this is causing a great deal of hardship to the farmer's wife, and is condemned by the National Union of Agricultural Workers? Does she not think it is about time this method was stopped?

Dr. Summerskill: There would be no hardship to the farm worker's wife if every farmer played the game.

Mr. Baldwin: You try it.

Family Food Survey

Mr. E. P. Smith asked the Minister of Food if he is aware that representatives of his Department have been calling on householders in Ashford, asking them to fill in a form relative to their rations, as well as to exhibit the contents of their larders; that, in cases where the questionees have been unable to comply through their pre-occupation with productive work, they have been asked to fill in a form containing the reasons for their refusal to fill in the first form; and what category of information he hopes to obtain from the latter.

Dr. Summerskill: I assume that these householders were visited by an investigator from the London Press Exchange Limited, which conducts the Family Food Survey on behalf of my Department. If a householder does not wish to participate the investigator simply records brief particulars regarding the family composition and the reason for refusal. These particulars provide a safeguard against biased sampling arising through omission of certain types of households: in no case is the informant herself asked to enter them on a form.

House of Commons: June 1, 1948.

Marginal Farms, Scotland (Grants)

Mr. Spence asked the Secretary of State for Scotland why the grants, offered in January, under the scheme for the assistance of marginal agriculture production for 1948, were reduced on April 15, 1948, by the North-Eastern Agricultural Executive Committee; by what amount they are being reduced

and in what particulars; whether he is aware that farmers have carried out, or are proceeding with, much of this work in anticipation of receiving grants on the basis originally promised; and whether these reductions are local or apply to all classified marginal farms in Scotland.

The Joint Under-Secretary of State for Scotland (Mr. Thomas Fraser): The total amount of grants payable in this area is substantially the same as last year, and approximately the same number of applications has been admitted. The operations and their cost are, however, on a larger scale than could have been anticipated and this has reduced the grants to about 50 per cent. of what would have been payable on the expected scale of operations. The situation is peculiar to the North-Eastern Area.

Mr. Spence: Is the Minister aware that what has happened in Aberdeenshire and the North East is regarded as a complete breach of faith, and will he not reconsider the matter and make arrangements for these grants to be paid in full?

Mr. Fraser: The matter cannot be reconsidered. It may be that farmers anticipated that more assistance would be given to them than has been given, but they had in fact carried out the operations when the applications were still outstanding.

Mr. Snadden: Does not the Minister's answer indicate that the Government are penalising an area in Scotland where the response to the Government's appeal for food production is the greatest, and that, surely, is an absurd policy?

Mr. Fraser: I do not think so. The Committee offered grants at about the same rates as operated in past years, particularly last year; and they expected that the response would not be very different from what it was a year ago. In fact, the response has been very much greater. The Committee have only a certain amount of money voted by this House at their disposal.

Mr. Spence: Is the Minister aware that this offer was made in the form of a definite percentage of the expense, and that the Committee are breaking faith with the farmers by not implementing their promise?

Mr. Fraser: I would not blame the Committee in that way. This House has voted certain moneys towards this end. The Committee had to work within a certain amount of money. They anticipated they would be able to offer certain rates of assistance for specified operations, but at the end of the day the response was so great that they had to reduce the rates for specific operations. The total amount of money being paid this year is at least as great as last year.

Mr. Oliver Stanley: If there was a mistake, was not the mistake made by the Committee, and if so, why should the consequences of that mistake be visited on the unfortunate farmers?

Mr. Fraser: I do not admit that a mistake was made. I said that the Committee could not have anticipated that they would get such a response. The amount of grant cannot be definitely offered until we get the amount of the response.

Mr. Scollan: Would my hon. Friend agree that if a certain amount of money is voted to a Committee and if the Committee appeals to farmers to give certain returns on the assumption that they will receive certain returns, and the response to the appeal has been so great that in effect it has halved the amount given, is there not a moral obligation on the Government to meet that situation? There is no argument against that.

Mr. Spence: In view of the most unsatisfactory answer, I give notice that I shall raise the matter on the Adjournment.

A SPEECH (continued from page 8).

out their precepts.

We consented to that trusteeship. What did the united nations do? Nobody went in. Not a soldier or not a policeman was sent in. The Jewish people had to fight for the preservation of Jerusalem for the three great faiths. No sooner did they meet with a little success when Britain suddenly realised that the condition had deteriorated and arms are now flowing in, such as cannon, aeroplanes and so on. The mandatory nation has exceeded its mandate. While Britain gave us a start, she has missed the boat. She could have had an outpost in Palestine, a situation which we never dreamed would be otherwise. We believed in Britain. When the Kaiser offered us Palestine, we laughed at him; but when Britain offered it, we accepted and respected that offer. The same thing happened in Jaffa. The united nations are fiddling while Palestine is burning and while the holy places are being destroyed.

While we are discussing international affairs, I must express my gratitude to the Canadian government. There can be no reproach that Canada has said that in Palestine the Jews should have their commonwealth. Churchill said it; Morrison said it; Attlee said it; Bevin said it during the election campaign of 1945, and it was repeated at every national congress of the Labour party. It was freely given. We accepted their word. In 1939 when the white paper came out—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but his time is exhausted.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Member has the unanimous consent of the house, he may carry on.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Hart: In 1939 Mr. Chamberlain issued the white paper, the most ill-timed declaration that could have been made. The Jews were trapped in Germany and they knew they would be destroyed. Mr. Chamberlain knew it just as well that they did not have a place to which to run, and the white paper was issued. It said that the Jews could not go to Palestine, the only country in the world which was supposed to have been given to them. They were told they could not go there and they could not buy land.

When war broke out, what happened? Thirty thousand Jews in Palestine enlisted. They fought at El Alamein. General Montgomery will vouch for that statement. They fought in Italy; they fought in the desert; they fought underground and everywhere for the British empire. They had hoped, and the hope was not unfounded, that when the war once finished they should be able to get what was coming to them. We were badly disappointed; we are terribly bewildered. We did not know whom to blame and do not know where we are going. We say to you people now, for two thousand years we have been the butt of ridicule and persecution all over the world. Every moron, every pipsqueak, every sadist who wanted to get a sort of paroxysm by sublimation used the Jew as the butt of his efforts.

We Jews of the western hemisphere are satisfied with Christian neighbours. We may eventually become completely absorbed in the country and may cease to be Jews. We do not know the future. But those who are persecuted in the lands where their ancestors were and their families were destroyed, where the streets are still blood bespattered with Jewish mothers and children are in a different position. For God's sake, for humanity's sake, let them go where they can have some peace.

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. 20, No. 16.

Saturday, June 19, 1948.

Mr. Pickthorne, Sir J. Boyd-Orr, etc.

It is quite in the spirit of the times that Mr. Kenneth Pickthorne, M.P., (Cambridge University), Conservative, should go far to provide justification for the abolition of University representation (a purely party manoeuvre) by an exhibition of rapturous folly on the subject of "poverty amidst plenty" (reported in *The Social Crediter*, June 5), a subject on which he is, by his own demonstration, qualified to give an opinion only by the valour of ignorance. Of course, he could not be expected to have read Mr. Hodgson's *Great God Waste*, but he is quite old enough to remember the millions of bushels of grain burnt for fuel in the Argentine, the thousands of calves shot and left to rot on the plains, the millions of bags of coffee dumped into the sea off Brazil, the restrictions on planting in Canada, the . . . States, and Australia, the subsidies paid for *not* raising pigs and potatoes—the whole weary catalogue of sabotage with which every elementary student of the subject in the early thirties was familiar. There is something about the suggestion of the bountiful character of creation which stirs many people to unreasoning rage, and Mr. Pickthorne is evidently one of them. He may, perhaps, happily be dismissed (with sympathy for Cambridge) by recalling that he was rebuked by Mr. Driberg.

But Sir John Boyd-Orr is another matter. It is not his *metier* to bring the light, polished and not too serious oratory of the Cambridge Union Society to the reluctant attention of Mr. Aneurin Bevan and Mr. Piratin. As the £12,000 *per annum* free-of-tax dispenser of our food, *pari passu* with the Hottentots, he can be expected to have reliable opinions. He has been telling us that we are in danger of starvation; and that we shall be in danger of starvation for many years.

In 1937, on September 23, Sir John broadcast on the Scottish National Wavelength, an address entitled "Scotland in the New Age of Plenty," and this broadcast was printed in *The Fig Tree* for December, 1937. We strongly recommend those to whom that magazine is available to read the whole address, but for those who have not access to a copy we give the following extracts:—

In the past, national problems were problems of scarcity . . . The nature of the problem has been completely changed by the rapid advances which applied science has made in the last two generations. Today the difficulty is not how to produce what we need, but how to distribute and consume the great wealth we can produce.

If we think in terms, not of money, but of the things we use and consume—food, clothing, housing and even luxuries—the modern world is almost inconceivably wealthy . . .

Not only can we produce real wealth in abundance,

but we are doing it with less and less labour. Thus, in the case of wheat, which is an outstanding example of easy production, it is estimated that with modern machinery and modern methods, half a day's work of a man today is equivalent to a month's work of the beginning of last century . . .

And so on.

In the exact words of Mr. Kenneth Pickthorne as reported in *Hansard* and reproduced in *The Social Crediter*, June 5, "That was the nonsense talked in the 1930's about poverty in the midst of plenty, and the world full enough for everyone if we could only push the bankers or somebody off it."

Now, we think we are entitled to know (a) Was Sir John Boyd-Orr, who was, subsequently to the broadcast quoted, selected at the equivalent of about £30,000 *per annum cum* tax to control the very basis of our life, not merely ignorant, but misinformed on the very elements of the subject on which he posed and was so lavishly paid as an expert, or (b) Is Mr. Pickthorne's concept of his function as the representative of an ancient and revered University, ill-mannered and worse-informed intervention on a subject in regard to which he appears to be wholly without suitable qualifications?

We do not doubt that Sir John Boyd-Orr is not only a well-informed man on his special subject, but is well meaning and kindly. But that does not mean that we think he was equipped to find a remedy for the paradox he exposed in his broadcast. Far from it. The latter part of his address, we have little doubt, was mainly instrumental in his rapid advancement. Planning is what is required, me lads. Push the population about. "A national food policy, and a national rehousing policy would give us a country with no slums, etc., etc."

Well, Sir John, we've had it. You as an expert, say we shall be on the verge of starvation for many years—not some of us but all of us. We, as knowing something about structures beg leave to inform you that round every considerable Scottish town (you were broadcasting to Scotland) there will be, as a result of your suggested national housing policy, slums of prefabricated houses in fifteen years time, unless your arch-planner friends in Moscow have bombed them, far worse than anything "private enterprise" was ever able to show. And we have little doubt that, not you, but those who appointed you, knew it perfectly, and thought that your reputation would help to carry them over the initial fences.

Loaves and Fishes

Twentieth century man as described by the Rector of Everdon, near Daventry, the Rev. H. Whiteman, in his parish magazine:—

"He can circle the earth, kill others miles away, weigh and distance the stars, pump oil from the bowels of the earth, coax a hen to lay 365 eggs annually, make dogs smoke pipes and sea lions play ball, and so on.

"But show him five loaves and two small fishes for sale and five hungry adults and two small children without money to buy them and he calls conferences, appoints committees and sub-committees, holds elections and cries out that crisis is upon him.

"He does scores of useless things, then retires, leaving the five adults and two small children starving and five loaves and two small fishes unapproachable."

A Speech

Delivered on May 3, 1948, by Mr. Maurice Hartt, M.P., (Cartier), House of Commons, Ottawa, *Official Report*.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The Cartier Division of Montreal is almost solidly Jewish, and was given representation some years ago on that understanding. Mr. Hartt is a Jew sitting as a Liberal, and succeeds Mr. Fred "Rose", who is serving a term of imprisonment in connection with the Russian Spy investigations.]

We print Mr. Hartt's speech because if read carefully, it conveys a clear and we believe correct, impression of the real nature of the Jewish problem, which, as we conceive it, is comprised in the mental attitude of the Jew to the rest of the world. This attitude is well brought out by Mr. Hartt, sitting as a Canadian M.P., and speaking in a debate on External Affairs, which are envisaged as the relation of Canada to Zionism.

The statements of "fact" contained in Mr. Hartt's speech should be compared with those issued from The Arab Office, 92, Eaton Place, London, S.W.1, where they are considered as affecting the argument.]

Mr. Maurice Hartt (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I consider it a pleasure to be able to participate in this foreign affairs debate, and I sincerely hope that I shall be able to make my modest contribution to this debate on the relationship that Canada must bear and carry with other nations in order that it may exist, in order that it may survive, and in order that it may prosper. And we must not forget the necessity of maintaining peace in a civilized world. I hope Canada will pay a debt beyond a debt, in that it will help to suggest, promote and build international relations to a point where at all times we may be able to avoid war, the greatest scourge that can befall humanity when it reaches that point.

I want to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent) upon the lucid, definite and categorical expose he has given this house on the question of international affairs. I regret, however, that one of the principles the minister has accepted is that for regional defence we must work with and depend upon the United States, while on our large-scale policy we must also stand with Britain in determining our world position. I can understand the utility of this statement; I can understand its purpose; but if a nation cannot determine its own foreign policy, if of necessity it must fall between the conflicting interests of other nations, then it does not have the right of self-determination that it should have. Historically, actually and factually the right hon. gentleman could not help but accept the *status quo* with which we are confronted. By some twist of international mysticism, some ethereal conception of international life, the world has seen fit to divide itself into big fives, big fours, big threes and big twos, while nations which have contributed proportionately as much *per capita*, if not more, are ranked as secondary powers. Then perhaps there are also third-rate powers. In my opinion it was a grave international error to permit five powers, because of their size, to predetermine the life and future of the whole world.

I am a great supporter of the united nations, but I must say the veto was one of those traps none of the nations should have permitted to exist, even if there had been no abuse on the part of Russia. No nation has ownership of another nation. No nation should be able to tell Canada whether or not she

can decide, discuss or express an opinion on a certain matter, whether that is done by Mr. Vishinsky or Mr. Gromyko. No nation should pretend to have the right to say it will veto a certain question. It would be as though a criminal, brought before a court of justice, should tell the court, "I refuse to be tried, and I veto the question." That happened in Iran, in connection with Iranian oil. Russia invades a country, takes possession of territory which is not hers, exploits the people by a fake revolution; and when the question is brought before the united nations it is discussed always under the threat of the veto. Things like this make international fair play impossible.

I must also compliment the government on having established for Canada a multi-partisan committee for international affairs. It is the logical thing to do. This parliament represents all of Canada. We have a common interest; that is, the preservation and wellbeing of Canada. It matters not on which side of the house we sit; our common interest is Canada. In arranging that all parties in this house be represented on that committee, directly or indirectly, the government has taken a unifying step; and I hope that in and for the future this shall remain a tradition with every Canadian parliament, that foreign policy at least shall be more than bi-partisan and shall be multi-partisan if there are more than two groups in the house. In this house we can act with unity of purpose, with strength and courage for the preservation of this country.

I wanted to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell), and I might add that I was quite inspired by his address. In his suggestions as to how to deal with foreign matters I found something rarely heard, that human value and those vital principles common to all humanity, I found him logical, contrary to what someone else may say. I found his remarks pertinent; and when he said that he and his party had always urged that of necessity we must look to the winning of the peace, I was profoundly touched. It is true that the C.C.F. do not have a patent on that feeling, that they were not the only party to make the statement. It is true that it was common talk in the newspapers and on the streets, but the hon. member brought it to the floor of parliament; and I hope it registers with the policy makers as a basis for what shall constitute international obligations and international law.

Unfortunately—and I say this with all deference and respect because I know it is much easier to criticize than to put something into effect—in my humble opinion no nation in the world had an international policy. It was a question of makeshift and mischief; "what can I get for my own country first, without any consideration of international justice?" For this reason we are in such a terrible dilemma today. The world is more confused than before the war with the Nazis. The people do not know whence or whither, whether we are going or coming. They do not know what is the policy of one nation and the policy of another. The question is terribly complex. I agree with the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) that trade is one of the factors for international peace and also for war. It has been said that trade is the search for markets and that war is the obtaining of those markets. But that alone is not the primary factor, and I do not think the hon. member made that claim.

There is a multiple, a complex system of international relationships as regards which, if we lose sight of one, we lose sight of all of them. It is for this reason that it is most

difficult to establish an equitable system of international relations.

I have not seen nations stick together for ideological reasons. I have not seen nations stick together because they had prosperous trade. I have seen them break asunder on little points. For instance, at the time of the first world war Germany and England had a common interest in world trade. "Made in Germany" was beginning to get into the hair of Britain. When 1914 came something had to be done to lessen that trade. So that in this instance common interest is not a preservative of peace. Ideological or religious bases cannot alone keep it, either. The one and common ground must be the vital principle of the right of every nation to exist. That must be the primary humanitarian reason. And, if that is accepted, no nation can go wrong.

We feel now as we have never perhaps felt in the past, and we shall feel it keenly in the future. I do not say this because I want to praise anyone or for reasons of patriotism, but because I am thinking in terms of objective reality, when I say that at the turn of the twentieth century a void or vacuum was created in the world. Britain ceased to be what she was in connection with foreign relations. Never since the days of Henry VIII to the turn of the twentieth century had Britain been so weak in respect of her foreign relations policy. Whether that was by providence, or whether it was because everything that grows does so with the germ of decay, or whether it was by improvidence, or whether it was from lack of knowledge or indifference, the fact is that it was a policy of ponder and blunder.

It was not a policy which could be considered distinctly British. Something happened in the foreign office or the British government which brought Britain to the position where she created a void, a vacuum, which the world has not the ability to fill. Let us look for a moment at the six or eight years before the second world war, and see the blunders made by that nation which was supposed to be most acquainted with international affairs, and which knew the weaknesses and strength of other nations, and it will be seen how Britain brought herself into that position of impotency.

First of all, in 1933 or 1934 they allowed the German government to gain supremacy in the air. Hitler could not have hoped to organize his army, his navy or any military unit in five years. And when Mr. Baldwin declared in the British House of Commons in 1935: "We shall have not only parity with Germany in the air, but supremacy by fifty per cent." Subsequently he rectified this statement by saying, "If I had said in a certain by-election that rearmament is the policy of Great Britain we would have been defeated." Imagine! The British Prime Minister, the symbol of honour and dignity itself, which served as an example of character and strength, placing his country in danger for a political advantage. To make such an admission in the British House of Commons was beyond human understanding.

But by 1935 Hitler had already acquired supremacy in the air. We will remember when Sir John Simon was Minister of Foreign Affairs, and he went along with Mr. Anthony Eden—like two under-developed maidens, meaning well but doing little—to visit with Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini but without any success so far as peace was concerned. They learned then that Hitler had air parity with Britain.

Then we come to the Spanish incident. Never in the history of Britain, as I know it, was the union jack so humil-

iated. And when Mr. Chamberlain got up in the British house and said, "I told the merchant marine not to go to Spain; and if they are bombarded and sunk it serves them right"; and when we have the British Prime Minister telling the House of Commons at Westminster, "We do not allow the British flag to fly in all parts of Spanish waters"—because it suited a certain purpose—we have another unmistakable and dangerous precedent which brought Britain to an inferior position in which she finds herself today.

Then there was the question of the Austrian invasion, which was reported ahead of time to Mr. Chamberlain; and it was told to him and repeatedly told to him. That very night he was having supper with von Ribbentrop, who knew Austria was to be invaded, and carried on an inane conversation with Mr. Chamberlain in order to prevent him from getting to the telephone to learn the real facts. England was faced with a *fait accompli* which left her helpless and with loss of prestige.

Then came the betrayal of Czechoslovakia, the most pitiful and most pathetic blunder in world's history. And at the time Mr. Chamberlain said, "We cannot be of any help to Czechoslovakia, let them take Sudetenland"—and this without consulting Czechoslovakia, but giving them the order to comply—France was allied with Czechoslovakia by a treaty, and obliged to defend that country. But she had to retreat and renounce her pledge, thus giving the bastion of Europe together with the Skoda munition works to Mr. Hitler in preparation for the terrible war to come.

Let me relate another incident, which may not be in chronological order. I refer to Hitler's proposed 25-year non-aggression pact with Great Britain. That was, I believe, in 1935. Within two hours after the proposal was submitted to the British foreign office, the German army was walking into the Rhineland. And these know-it-all statesmen could not see that they were dealing with an international gangster whom they could have stopped, and whom they should have stopped in time.

Personally I think a terrible mistake was made by the foreign office. I do not know whether the whole cabinet was aware, but we hold it responsible, by way of ministerial responsibility. To say at one moment that you cannot guarantee Czechoslovakia because you cannot come to her assistance, and then within a year to guarantee the borders of Poland and Rumania, is a farce beyond description.

So that Britain, slowly and by a series of steps, walked into a position where the dignity and prestige of the British Empire—I will go so far as saying that—were brought to a position where no one took Britain seriously.

Mr. Skey: The Germans did, in the war.

Mr. Hartt: I was going to say how pathetic that remark is.

Mr. Skey: Don't you believe it?

Mr. Hartt: I was going to say how pathetic it is, that it was not the British statesmen who brought Britain to that position who were killed in the war but the common people who suffered. We know it was the ordinary people—you and I—who went to extricate Britain from that terrible, short-sighted policy.

Mr. Skey: Speak for yourself.

Mr. Hartt: That is the position. It is very easy to settle somebody else's business as they have done in London. I am

not trying to speak disparagingly of Great Britain. I still sing "Rule Britannia" with the same fervor as my hon. friends, but I am stating a series of facts which are indisputable, which are definite and categorical. I am not trying to say something that I have invented.

We won the war because of certain fortunate circumstances, but I shall never forget and I do not think any hon. gentleman here will ever forget the tragedy of the days from 1940 to 1941 when Britain stood alone. I know many of you were uneasy; I know many of you were worried, and I say that if it had not been for a mistaken policy on the part of Hitler, God knows what would have happened. If the Japs had not gone crazy and attacked Pearl Harbour I do not know whether you or I would not have been obliged to say, "Heil Hitler." Not I, for I would not be living; I would probably be a cake of soap.

The course of events which brought England to her present unenviable position was of her own doing. The mistakes that occurred in the second world war were also practised in the first world war. While Germany was attacking France, the British Cabinet sat up a whole night deciding whether they should or should not go into the war. They did not realize that there was no alternative; that they had to go into the war as a matter of self-preservation. Sir Edward Grey stood at the window and watched a man turning out the street lamps. He turned and said, "The light in Europe is going out and God knows when it will be lit again." It was a question of being shoved in or carried into the war and afterwards trying to extricate herself by some blunder or through some good fortune. To say that it was a definite policy, to say that Britain knew where she was going is a mistake. To say that Britain happened to be in her present position through no fault of her own is to close our eyes to facts, without being well-wishers of Great Britain.

Blunders were made not only before the war but during the war. Three gentlemen, and a fourth one, Chiang Kai-shek, arrogated to themselves the pre-determination of the entire world and what was to be done with the other nations. They made agreements at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam about which the world knew nothing. When we came to the united nations we were faced with a *fait accompli*; we had to accept it, otherwise we would have destroyed the only thing we wished to build. Instead of alliances, what have we? We have spheres of influence.

We shout communism. We are so busy with communism that we forget what is going on around us. It was Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt who gave Stalin a sphere of influence which he had never dreamed of getting anywhere else. Stalin tried to get it from Hitler and they were negotiating until 1943. All this was given to Stalin before the united nations knew anything about it. This was given by the heads of the nations who participated in the war. They built up this Frankenstein which we are so busy talking about. While Rome is burning we are playing the fiddle.

This totalitarianism which is so nauseating in its nature and in its conception ought to disappear from the face of the earth. There is a complete misconception of its meaning when applied to the U.S.S.R. There is nothing of the kind in their system of society. To call them communists is to give them a title they do not deserve. There is no communism in Russia; there is just international gangsterism. That is the name for it. To call them communists or socialists is

to give a title to their ideology which they do not deserve. The name of slave state or red fascist would be applicable, but the name "communist" is a misnomer and a terrible mistake.

I do not preach war because I do not like it for my own safety or for the safety of my closest neighbours. However I am afraid that we shall not be able to settle this proposition without war. In 1941 when Russia was attacked by Germany I was sitting in the Quebec house. I shall mention names so that I can be checked up. At the time I was talking to the Hon. Francois J. Leduc, a sane, clear-thinking man. He was jumping for joy, and he said to me, "Now we have Hitler." I said, "My dear Francois, you are building a Frankenstein that will take more to beat than Hitler would." He did not agree with me at the time, but when I met him afterwards he told me that he thought I was right.

Russia ganged up on the world after receiving \$10,000 billion in lend-lease, almost half the entire production of the United States. She has used all this to our disadvantage. She took this as a most ungrateful receiver. Our war materials were delivered into Russian territory without our soldiers being permitted to set foot on that territory. She took all she could get with never a thought of repaying it or showing any respect. We had the atom bomb and we told Russia that if she would join in the Asiatic war, if she would take a walk down to Korea, we would give her all we could and what she could take.

They cleaned out Manchuria; they cleaned out Poland—I am jumping from the far east to the west—and they cleaned out Korea. Look at what is happening today in Korea. Our united nations is acting like a paralytic to deal with these problems.

Mr. MacNicol: They cleaned out the Balkans and the Baltic states.

Mr. Hartt: Yes. The same policy of ponder and blunder was applied to the near east. That is history and you have all read about it. The world's conscience was shocked into action; and it was said that these people who had given six million lives, half of our people, to the lethal chambers of Hitler, who had been wilfully destroyed as though it were a matter of sport—good God, I am talking to people who profess to be Christians; I am talking to people who think there is a God, I am talking to people who have spiritual values—would be confirmed in their Jewish homeland.

They gave us one-eighth of what was originally promised by the Balfour declaration. We took it because we were satisfied with little mercies. We must have had confidence in the Christian world to have been able to survive for two thousand years in spite of persecutions, slaughter, murder and everything that could be done, even to dumb animals. We accepted partition gracefully, not ungracefully. We were glad to take it for the sake of peace.

Nothing happened between November 29, 1947, and March, 1948, when all of a sudden we heard of a trusteeship which is still being debated without solution and which will require twice the present army to enforce. Now we have a *fait accompli*. The Jewish state is an accomplished fact. We do not call upon the nations to come and help us. We simply say, "You fulfil your obligations and we will fulfil ours." Their obligation is to keep the surrounding countries from invading Palestine. We will look after Palestine and the

little bit of territory that you have assigned to us. The nations did not believe that we could do it. At Lake Success they came to us, or came to our delegations. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, I say "us" because I am Jewish. I never belonged to the Zionist movement. I never was a Zionist, but I do not differentiate between Zionists and Jews; they are one and the same. Those who want to introduce that note of division are simply not doing justice to this subject. Those who call themselves Zionists are the active leaders of a group that want to see the Jews have a Jewish homeland. It was promised to them; the Jews are in Palestine as a matter of right, not as a matter of grace.

It was under the aegis of the League of Nations, under the mandate of Great Britain, that the Jews were settled in all Palestine including Trans-Jordan. The Jews accepted it, not as gift but in repayment for services. When Hitler destroyed the 6,000,000 Jews, his argument was that it was not the German army that lost the first world war but rather it was hunger that defeated them. The Jews of Poland were the purveyors of food to the German army, and the moment they heard of the Balfour declaration, they stopped supplying Germany with food. Hitler advanced that claim and nobody has refuted it to this day. The Germans, being an accurate people, kept records to prove this contention. We paid for that with 6,000,000 lives.

Jewish armies went into Palestine under Lord Allenby. We fought for Palestine. Britain recognized and admitted that. During the first world war Doctor Weitz invented and gave Britain T.N.T., for which he was offered riches and titles. This he refused in exchange for Palestine. When the Jews went into Palestine they bought every piece of land and paid fifty times its actual value. The Effendi took the money, went to live in Paris and had a good time. When they had spent the money, they came back and with the help of the colonial office began to question the Balfour declaration.

After the last war the Arabs, who had been subjects of the Ottoman empire, did not inhabit that part of the country. Even today Trans-Jordan has only 350,000 people, and it is twice the size of Western Palestine. They were a bunch of squatters. The moment the Jews got hold of it, it prospered. We have a habit of bringing prosperity wherever we go and the countries which we leave keep sinking. Those who dream of our destruction are themselves destroyed. It seems that those who dream of our destruction have not learned that we have outlived the Romans, that Spain was reduced to poverty, that the Italians were reduced to the organ grinders of the world. It is strange that people have not learned that those who plotted the destruction of the Jews were subsequently destroyed themselves. History proves that; and history repeats itself. Perhaps it is because we dream too well. Perhaps it is because we hope too well. We have paid the price, but so have those who wanted to destroy us.

When the Effendi had spent the money in Paris, they came back and suddenly discovered that the Jews had no rights, and the colonial office immediately detached Trans-Jordan. Speeches were being made all over the world and advice given to all plotters that the Balfour declaration did not mean this and did not mean that. However, the people who survived Lord Balfour stated repeatedly—and Mr. Churchill is one of them—that the Jews were in Palestine as of right and that the country belongs to them. The declaration was twice implemented in international law Twenty-six committees appointed by the mandatory nations

came back with reports that Palestine belongs to the Jews as a matter of right. One commission after another was appointed. After the Anglo-American commission two books were published. They exposed the inquiry as the most tragic joke that could have happened to a commission. Bartley Crum came out with a book called "Behind the Silken Curtain," and he states that when those delegates were briefed by the colonial office in England and the foreign office or the department of state in the United States, the thing appeared like a huge joke. It was only a matter of stalling for time. The second book by Crassman is equally devastating.

Britain was backing out of her responsibility. She brought the Palestine question to the united nations at the request of no one. No one asked Britain to do that. She felt that she could not carry on. What is a nation with honour and tradition to do when it cannot carry on a given responsibility? Lay down the mandate and say to the united nations, "We cannot carry on," or "We feel that our mandate has expired." Instead of this, she was constantly and perpetually damaging the whole system that she had installed.

The Jews never thought of establishing a Palestine without a Britain. I confess to you, Mr. Speaker, and you can read Doctor Hertzels speech at the first congress of the Zionist congress in 1897. He said "We look to and shall continually work with Britain and, under the guidance of Britain with other international humanitarians, thus to end the sufferings of our people. These are the people that will eventually give us a homeland."

It is true Britain gave us our start. We cannot deny that but for Britain we would never have had a foothold on the territory. But now that she cannot solve the question, she is acting like a policeman or a detective who cannot solve a murder crime by arresting the corpse. At Lake Success, last November, committee after committee went to the united nations or to the Jewish agency and said, "We know what Jerusalem means to you; it is important to three religions. Give up your claim and you will gain the good will of the world. We did! Palestine to the Jewish people without Jerusalem has no meaning. Every prayer book we have—and we have never renounced Palestine—always refers to Jerusalem and Zion, not Tel Aviv or any port city. We are not seeking any aggrandisement of territory. We want Jerusalem because there we go to pray—go as God wanted us to do there.

What was the result? The Jews did not want to give Jerusalem up. But the matter was put to them on this basis: "It is a centre of three great religions, the Christian, the Mohammedan and the Jewish. Let us put it under an international trusteeship." The Jews consented on religious or spiritual grounds.

It will be noticed from a study of history that the Jews never fought for territory. From Titus to Adrian they always submitted and paid their taxes. But when Adrian wanted to put his image in the temple, they rose in rebellion and fought until they were destroyed. The Jews know the spiritual value of religion. They respect other people's religions. After all we are the progenitors of those religions. They were not just pulled out of thin air. We gave them to you, and there is nothing in Christianity or Mohammedanism that is not Jewish. We only wish that you would carry

(concluded on page 3).