

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21. No. 23.

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

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

If Mr. Ernest Bevin had received the steady plaudits of the docile press in the manner which Sir Stafford Cripps can rely on them, we should have murmured "Mond-Turner", and recalled that the Cities of the Plain could not produce ten just men. But a series of attacks, the latest of which comes from Mr. Crossman, M.P., whose condemnation is an accolade and whose paper, the *New Statesman*, embalms the twitching corpse of Bloomsbury pedantry, go far to suggest that in the Foreign Secretary, we have got something. If Mr. Bevin could acquire, as by a miracle, a sense of those values which (and we refer to them only because they are vital and unobtainable by the path of Trades Union success) alone render intelligible the destinies of this country, he would make quite a good Leader for the Conservative Party. But, like the American economist, he knows a whole heap of what ain't so—the worst handicap anyone can carry.

We have received from a correspondent a verbatim script of a broadcast delivered by Mr. Manning, the Premier of Alberta. With much of this broadcast, numbered 21 on the script, we are not concerned. But certain statements made towards the conclusion of the broadcast are both incorrect and dangerously misleading on matters of general principle, and concern both ourselves and the interests in every country for which we stand.

Mr. Manning is stated to have said:—

- (1) All propoganda alleging or implying that the Government or the Alberta Social Credit League has in any way repudiated the principles of Social Credit as enunciated by Major C. H. Douglas is wholly false and unjustified.
- (2) There is absolutely no change in our position to-day from that which we have maintained consistently ever since the Social Credit Movement was started in this Province fourteen years ago under the leadership of the late Premier Aberhart.
- (3) There has not been and will not be any repudiation of or deviation from the fundamental

principles of Social Credit and we are determined that our fight to establish those principles shall not be sidetracked by *controversial abstract side issues* [emphasis added] and racial prejudices which have nothing whatever to do with the basic principles of a true Social Credit economy.

It will be noticed that these statements are carefully worded. It is evidently hoped that "repudiated" and "perverted" will be regarded as synonymous.

(1)

In regard to this, it is necessary to point out that it is expressly negated by Mr. Manning's own words as they are quoted in (2). The "principles of Social Credit as enunciated by Major C. H. Douglas" were not those enunciated by the late Premier Aberhart whose earlier legislation was wildly and widely in contradiction to them.

It is important to recall that Major Douglas, *while doing everything possible to assist Mr. Aberhart* to embody correct principles, and to minimise his earlier wild incursions into economic theory, felt obliged, under pressure from Mr. Lymburne, to whom he was reporting as a Member of the (Reid) Administration, to write in repudiation of Mr. Aberhart's technics, concluding "... unless Mr. Aberhart were to persist in actually attempting to attain an increase of purchasing-power by the processes he discusses, I should not myself be inclined to take a political speech containing them with too much seriousness."—*The Alberta Experiment*, pp. 37-38.

Mr. Aberhart for some time (until the arrival of Mr. Byrne) attempted to legislate without any reference whatever to Social Credit principles. But he was consistently supported as *an individual*, by the Secretariat, Mr. Byrne and Mr. Powell, and would have been unable to retain office without that support.

It may be remarked that it was not Mr. Aberhart who initiated the Social Credit Movement in Alberta, unless by a technicality of nomenclature—it was the Federal M.P.'s of the U.F.A. regime, and notably, Mr. Spencer.

(2)

It is obvious from the foregoing comment that either Mr. Manning's ideas of Social Credit are erroneous and unchanged, or they have changed, and are equally erroneous, as implemented in his legislation.

(3)

This is clearly the core of Mr. Manning's policy. Without specifically mentioning the Jewish problem, he characterises it as a side issue, having "nothing whatever to do with the basic principles of a true Social Credit economy." Either Mr. Manning is a good deal simpler than we think he is, or he is a good deal more confident of his ultimate supporters than is perhaps justified.

In case that issue is not clear to him, however, we will

STATES ACTUAL, REAL & POTENTIAL

by

TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

(The substance of an Address to the Speke Discussion Group on 7th December, 1948).

PRICE 6d.

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

once again point out that quite enough persons have a working grasp of "the basic principles of a true Social Credit economy" and several concrete embodiments of the legislation required for it have been presented to him, to none of which has he paid the slightest attention. He is elected and paid to *do*, not to teach, and either he does not want to *do*, or someone is preventing him. To say that interference with the embodiment of the principles which procured his election is a side issue is either disingenuous, or worse.

"We know that in every centre of affairs at home or elsewhere, in business, in administration, or in politics, a student of the London School of Economics is always found."
—Lady Beveridge.

Si momentum requiris, circumspice.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: January 19, 1949.

Middle-East (R.A.F. Reconnaissance Flights)

Mr. Harold Davies asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many aerial reconnaissance flights British aeroplanes have made in the past two months over territory in Palestine occupied by the Jewish forces.

Mr. A. Henderson: I have been asked to reply. No reconnaissance flights by British aircraft have been made in the past two months exclusively over territory in Palestine occupied by the Jewish forces. High level reconnaissance flights, usually at 30,000 feet, have been carried out since the end of the war over all the main Middle East areas as part of our peace-time operational training programme. Since the Security Council truce in June and the placing of a complete embargo on the supply of military materials to Palestine and all the Arab countries, these flights were continued with the knowledge of the United Nations Mediator. Information regarding breaches of the truce by either side was a matter of importance both to the Mediator and to His Majesty's Government. Twenty such flights which passed over Palestine have been carried out in the last two months.

Mr. Davies: Was my right hon. and learned Friend always aware of these reconnaissance flights? Secondly, can reconnaissance flights be made on the instructions of the Foreign Office without the Secretary of State for Air being aware of that fact?

Mr. Henderson: The question of these reconnaissance flights to which I have referred in my reply is entirely a matter for the local Air Commander-in-Chief, and it is well within his discretion.

Mr. S. Silverman: Is my right hon. and learned Friend telling the House that since the date upon which the Security Council asked that no forces should be sent into this area we have been sending aeroplanes on reconnaissance flights two or three times a week for two months?

Mr. Henderson: My hon. Friend can work out the number per week in relation to the total number of flights in this period. If it works out at two or three per week, that is the case.

Mr. Stanley: Does the right hon. and learned Gentleman seriously mean that after the troubles arose in Palestine

this Summer the decision as to reconnaissance over Palestine, and that part occupied by Israel, was a matter solely for the decision of the local commander, and was not one in which the authority of London had to be sought?

Mr. Henderson: I said that this type of reconnaissance flight was carried out before the troubles began in the middle of last year, and they were certainly continued. There was, as I said, no Ministerial authority given because they were carried out within the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief Middle East.

Mr. Stanley: Does the right hon. and learned Gentleman mean to say that after British troops evacuated Palestine no fresh directives were given to the Commanders in the Middle East, and that the discretion was left to them in exactly the same way as it was when Palestine was a British mandated country?

Mr. Henderson: Yes, Sir. That is the position.

Mr. Piratin: In view of the fact that the British Government have not been very friendly with the Israeli Government was the Israeli Government informed that these reconnaissance planes were operating over their territory, even if that were done with the understanding of the United Nations Mediator?

Mr. Henderson: Perhaps the hon. Member will put that question down.

Squadron-Leader Fleming: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman make quite clear to the House whether any of these reconnaissance flights were undertaken on instructions from the United Nations to our own Government?

Mr. Henderson: I am not suggesting that we were carrying out the instructions of the United Nations. I am saying that the benefit of these flights—the results—were conveyed to the United Nations.

Squadron-Leader Fleming: Were we asked to do so by the United Nations?

Mr. Henderson: Not so far as I am aware.

Mr. Emrys Roberts: Were these armed reconnaissance flights or not?

Mr. Henderson: No. The photographic reconnaissance machines are unarmed.

Mr. Stanley: At any rate, have fresh instructions now been sent that these reconnaissances are not to be carried out merely at the discretion of the local Commander, and when were those new instructions conveyed?

Mr. Henderson: I would like notice as regards the date, but I can say definitely that these flights have been stopped.

Mr. Austin: Is it true that the information gained by R.A.F. reconnaissance flights was passed on to the Egyptian Air Force headquarters with a view to its being used in further combat?

Mr. Henderson: I should prefer to have that Question put down.

Sir Peter Macdonald: Is it a fact, as stated by one of the pilots who was shot down, that his guns were loaded at the time he was shot down, because that absolutely contradicts the statement which the Secretary of State has made that reconnaissance planes carried only cameras.

Mr. Henderson: I am afraid there is a misunderstanding.

ing. The reply I have given today deals with the high altitude long distance photographic reconnaissance. The statement to which the hon. Member has referred is one alleged to have been made by one of the pilots who was shot down on January 7 when he was engaged on a tactical reconnaissance—a short distance reconnaissance. I will deal with those incidents in the statement which I shall make at the end of Questions.

Mr. Pritt: Would the Secretary of State answer the Question which he was asked a little earlier, whether, although these flights were within the discretion of the Air Officer Commanding out there, the Foreign Office have anything to do with the carrying out of these flights?

Mr. Henderson: I would prefer that Question to be put down to the Foreign Office.

Mr. A. R. W. Low: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman answer this question? Was he kept informed after the expiration of the Mandate in May of last year that these flights were in fact taking place? Was he kept informed on each occasion that a flight took place, or once per month?

Mr. Henderson: No, Sir, I was not personally kept informed. The results of these reconnaissances which, as I say, were carried on for a considerable time in the Middle East as a matter of routine, as a part of the peace-time operational training programme—

Mr. Stanley: That was when Palestine was a Mandated country.

Mr. Henderson: —the results, as I have said in my reply, were conveyed to the United Nations Mediator, and I have no doubt that the results were received in the Foreign Office.

Mr. Harold Davies: On a point of information. The Minister has already said that he prefers this Question to be put down to the Foreign Office. It was for that specific reason that I put this Question down addressed to the Foreign Office, and the Minister has informed this House that he is now answering for the Foreign Office. May I have an explanation of that?

Mr. Henderson: This Question asked for the number of reconnaissances that took place. It is for me, as Air Minister, to reply, and I have done so.

Mr. Wadsworth: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman say whether the reconnaissance planes were protected at all with fighters?

Mr. Henderson: No, Sir. This type of reconnaissance is conducted on practically every occasion by one machine flying at a very high altitude, say 30,000 feet, and they take what are called vertical photographs, as against oblique photographs taken by the low-flying fighting machines.

Mr. Paget: Is not it a fact that these planes were being used by the Foreign Office without reference to the Air Ministry?

Mr. Stanley: Is not it a fact that some months ago one of our planes on one of these reconnaissances was shot down near Tel Aviv? Did not the right hon. and learned Gentleman then regard the matter as no longer a question of routine and issue fresh instructions as to these reconnaissances?

Mr. Henderson: Yes, in the light of an actual incident

one might have been very well advised to take further action—

Mr. Stanley: But did the right hon. and learned Gentleman take it?

Mr. Henderson: Yes, I have already said that these flights have been stopped.

Mr. Stanley: But when?

Mr. Henderson: Following the report of this incident over Tel Aviv. It is quite clear, if I may say so, that the House is confused over the two types of reconnaissance. The reconnaissances that took place on January 7 are not included in this reply. This reply only deals with what is called photographic reconnaissances.

Mr. Pritt: On a point of Order. Could we have your direction, Sir? The Question was put down to the Foreign Office and not transferred, but answered by the right hon. and learned Gentleman on behalf of the Foreign Office. In those circumstances is it right that he should say in reply to a supplementary question that he would like it put down to the Foreign Office, when he has the representative of the Foreign Office sitting at his left hand?

Mr. Speaker: I have no control over how a Minister answers Questions. That is not my province at all.

Mr. Harold Davies: On a point of Order. I would like to point out that the word "reconnaissance" is a comprehensive term, and when I put the Question down I wanted information of reconnaissances, whether the reconnaissance was high or whether it was low, or whether it was within 12 miles of Tel Aviv. I think the House is entitled to an answer in accordance with the ratio of its intelligence.

Mr. Blackburn: Further to that point of Order. May I point out that the hon. Member opposite and myself, who had constituents killed in one of these operations, had put down Questions previously and refrained from asking any supplementary questions on them, because we understand that there is to be a statement after Questions. It is somewhat embarrassing to have that statement anticipated.

Mr. Henderson: I want to make it quite clear that the Question asked for information about reconnaissances which have been made over territory in Palestine occupied by Jewish forces. The answer to that is that no reconnaissances have been made over Jewish territory, except as I said in my reply.

Mr. Speaker: I think that we had better await the statement before further questions are put now.

At the end of Questions—

Mr. A. Henderson: Towards the end of December, reports were received that Jewish forces had crossed the Egyptian frontier. It was clear that these raised serious questions for us in view of our Treaty obligations and our vital interest in the Middle East. As United Nations observers were prevented by the Jewish authorities from moving to the front, it was essential to obtain independent confirmation of the fact and extent of Jewish incursion into Egypt. As there was no other means of obtaining accurate information, R.A.F. aircraft were, therefore, sent on reconnaissance flights.

On the two first reconnaissances made on December 30, Egyptian aircraft accompanied R.A.F. aircraft but did not
(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFion Park 435.

Vol. 21. No. 23.

Saturday, February 5, 1949.

Destiny or Design?

"Formality," wrote Halifax, "is sufficiently revenged upon the world for being so unreasonably laughed at; it is destroyed, it is true, but it hath the spiteful satisfaction of seeing everything destroyed with it."

"After the firework display, the darkness of a formless mass, *destined* to despotism or anarchy" (our emphasis).

The much quoted work, *Power*, by Bertrand de Jouvenel ends with these words. It seems that at times he is and at other times he is not sure whether "the mortal errors" which beset the centralisation of power are inherent in the nature of the universe.

Would he be more sure, would he believe that the mortal error can be corrected, if he knew what the mortal error was? Social Crediters who understand the technics of Social Credit know that there is available a technique which can both establish and maintain a progressive decentralisation of power to any predetermined point of sufficiency. Social Crediters who understand the political set-up, understand that it is designed to prevent the application of any such technique. To circumvent this design may be immensely difficult; if the design were inherent in the nature of things, if it were

destiny, it would be impossible. The first step is to recognise the obstacle as the outcome of design. Once the technics employed for the implementation of the design are understood, the rejection of the idea that the design is inherent in nature is almost certain. It is important that those who desire the establishment of a just order of society should be assured that they are in tune, not out of tune with reality. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." The words were addressed to Hebrews, and Hebrews have rejected them. Molotov, when he told the Dean of Canterbury that Social Credit was the only thing 'they' feared, confessed to the only thing which, finally, can justify the faith of Social Crediters—the possibility of victory.

So far from being cast down by de Jouvenel's demonstration that self-destruction is indeed the destiny of the State, that "in course of time it does to a natural death the social order which gave it birth," the testimony to the existence of a contrary principle is assurance that it will suffice to find a corrective which exists, and that it is not necessary, and we are not called upon to invent a corrective which does not exist, "You discover Reality; you do not invent it." It is on this plane that Social Crediters are drafting the agenda for the world's thinkers and doers, and they should be busy ceaselessly to emphasise and to underline that agenda. There is plenty of opportunity.

The 'levelling process' which is a part of the destiny of the State has nowhere been better illustrated of late than in the House of Lords, that place where they 'move and, by leave, withdraw.' They have been debating U.N.E.S.C.O., the organisation of 500 'workers,' whose Director receives £6,700 a year free of tax for "promoting inquiries into the distinctive character of the various national cultures, ideals, and legal systems, with the aim of stimulating the sympathy and respect of nations for each other's ideals and aspirations and the appreciation of national problems." That is the sort of abstractionist nonsense which has to be removed from the agenda.

JUDAISM AND THE "STATE" OF ISRAEL

by BORGE JENSEN.

"We kept our promise in the letter and the spirit, and gave the Jews a home in Palestine; without our protection they would long ago have been swept away by the Arabs. But, not content with a home, they demanded a State, and to enforce this they used murder and lying propaganda . . . the Jews have succeeded in making the position of Great Britain impossible, but at a great cost to themselves—for they have lost the friendship of the British people, they have changed the dislike of the Arabs into bitter hatred, and they have incurred the hostility of all the Arab nations which surrounded them."—Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York, York Diocesan leaflet, April 29, 1948.

"The plight of Palestine's 600,000 Arab refugees is disastrous . . . the problem transcends the possibilities of private charity . . . it requires an international contribution on a large scale. People should ask where the 12,000,000 dollars balance of U.N.R.R.A. have gone and why this sum has not immediately affected Arab relief. The answer would be revealing. Pro-

longation of the refugee problem and preventing their return home is a deliberate Jewish effort to decimate the Arabs and destroy Christianity in Palestine . . . I am appalled by the callousness with which the public accepts the intention to expose to death and hardships 600,000 Arabs, including thousands of Christians, in order to make room for 600,000 Jews."—Statement made to the *Catholic Herald*, November 2, 1948, by Archbishop Arthur Hughes, Papal Nuncio in Egypt.

"Israel's return to the soil of its fathers, is, we believe, a Divine Act of Providence. It is a consoling recompense which follows unparalleled suffering and destruction."—The Very Rev. Dr. Israel Brodie, Chief Rabbi of Great Britain, January 9, 1949.

During the quarter of a century when Palestine was 'governed' by the British, and the Leaders of Organised World Jewry obtained monopoly-control of its raw-materials, (The Palestine Corporation, etc.) and its Labour forces, (the "Histadruth" i.e., Jewish Trade-Union-Cartel) official Judaism as personified by the Chief Rabbis of this and that

Empire, or country, regularly and to a man 'deplored' publicly the casualties (and they were many) which this policy entailed, while they, at the same time, in the relative secrecy of Synagogue and Talmud Torah, preached the doctrine of Returning-This-Year-to-Jerusalem on which is built the strategy of World Zionism. The "Seal of Solomon", the two interlaced triangles, is the outward sign showing this intimate relationship.

Readers of *The Social Crediter* will recall that when in the midst of the global war led by the British Government partly, so it was proclaimed, to assist Organised World Jewry to defeat their Number One Official Enemy, Herr Hitler, Lord Moyne was killed in Cairo by two Hebrew-speaking youths dispatched from Palestine for that purpose, the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, Dr. Hertz, 'deeply deplored' the deed whilst accounting for it by relating that the Jewish murderers "were men crazed by the butcheries of their kith and kin in Poland" and were "infected by the evil example of the Mufti's terrorist campaigns." He did not make it clear how this could excuse their murder of a *British* official who could not possibly have had anything to do with either of these matters. The arguments offered to the world at large by Dr. Hertz in extenuation of the successive crimes (which occurred at ever shorter intervals) committed by his co-racialists in Palestine as the Mandate drew towards its close, all suffered from a similar absence of logic. Dr. Hertz, who was born in Bohemia, and had received his rabbinical training in New York, the capital Jewish city of the world, died in 1947, and thus did not live to see the fulfilment of the Hope of Israel.

In the trouble-centre which is now called "Israel" but which was until recently known as Palestine, the occupant of the Chief Rabbinate is Dr. Herzog who was born in the Russo-Polish Pale of Settlement which is fitting enough when one considers that the vast majority of his unruly flock come from the same place. But Dr. Herzog spent his formative years in, or near the centre of what was once the British Empire. His parents arrived in Leeds from the "Pale" in 1897, and their son received his secular and priestly training in the Universities of Leeds and London. He was ordained Rabbi in 1910, and became Doctor of Literature of London University in the year of the outbreak of the first world war. In 1915 he was "called" to administer to the spiritual requirements of the Jewish Community of Belfast. The troublous year of 1919 when his co-racialists railroaded their pre-arranged programmes through the various meetings of the "Peace" delegates at Paris, found Dr. Herzog as Chief Rabbi of the Jewish Community of Dublin, a city which was fast becoming one of the chief anti-British centres of the world. (The part played by Rabbi Herzog's co-racialist, a certain "Robert Briscoe" who also hailed from the Jewish Pale of Settlement, and fulfilled the double-function of financial agent of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., New York, and Treasurer to De Valera's political apparatus in organising the subversive campaigns which first resulted in the Partition of Ireland, and latterly in the secession of "Eire" from the British Crown, is hardly ever hinted at by official chronicles of the bloody events of the Anglo-Irish Civil wars.) Having guided for eleven years the small but closely knit Jewish group of the Irish Free State, Dr. Herzog left the Emerald Isle to take up what must surely be described as a key-position of the Jewish world community. (Mr. "Briscoe", however, remained behind, and represents

to this day the revolutionary aspect of "Irish" "Independence" in the Dail.)

During the last decade Dr. Herzog has been in supreme spiritual charge of Palestine Jewry and his task in piloting the Yishuv through a war in which his flock was fighting both with and against the British can not have been an easy one. Once the war over, however, both the Chief Rabbi and the majority of the Yishuv felt free to adopt an all-out anti-British programme and pursue it relentlessly: at a moment when the British "Labour" Government (which boasts an ample percentage of 'members of the Jewish religion') had strained the patience of its victims to bursting point, or so it seemed at the time, Dr. Herzog delivered the following Easter message from Jerusalem to the Jewries of the world:

As a man of religion, I believe the misfortunes befalling Britain are heavenly punishments for her treatment of Jewish refugees reaching the shores of their homeland.

This speech was made in April, 1947, and can easily be seen to have been part of a campaign of terrorising the Palestine administration, who with the help of Jews in key-position of the Immigration Department, kept up some sort of pretence of preventing the Jews financed by "America" and dispatched by "Russia" from "reaching the shores of their homeland."

After some shadow-boxing for the benefit of, presumably, the largely pro-Zionist corps journalistique (the shuttling backwards and forwards of the "immigrants" between Haifa and Cyprus was part of the game of make-believe), most of the travellers did, in fact, set foot on their "native" shore and were soon, in the official phrase "absorbed" in the general Jewish population.

In May, 1948, the British Mandate came to an end, and a Jewish "Government" was sent up, which, strange as it may seem to some, confirmed all the legislation passed by successive Mandatory administrators with the sole exception of the laws restricting land sales and *immigration*. All the "British" hocus-pocus of "fighting" the Jew-ships arriving in Palestinian waters ceased abruptly, and all the Jewish pretence of "co-operating" with the Arabs was dropped as suddenly by the Jewish authorities, who lost no time in ordering their troops to liquidate the Chief Arab centres of Palestine. Some three hundred thousand native Arabs had been driven from their native land by the Jewish terror-regime of Tel-Aviv when another Chief Rabbi of the British Empire in the person of Dr. Israel Brodie was inducted with much pomp in the North London Synagogue in the presence of members of the Imperial Jewish family of Rothschild and representatives of the British Fighting Services. In his inaugural address Dr. Israel Brodie, who was born in Newcastle-on-Tyne, trained at Jews College, London, and the University of Cambridge, and who has 'practised' in Australia and served as Chaplain to the Jews in His Majesty's Forces in two world wars, referred to Palestine as the little land in which the Will of the Almighty was being worked out. No words of 'regret' fell from his lips 'deploring' the calamities then befalling the native Arabs at the hands of the soldiery of Jehovah, no 'extenuating circumstances' were enumerated to explain the vandalism committed against Christian shrines by the Hebrew-speaking (Hebrew was till 1917 exclusively the Ritual language of the Synagogue) storm-troopers. Perhaps Dr. Brodie felt (as did no doubt his racial brethren attached to the world's press who reported

the ghastly and humiliating tale of the Zionist Rape of Palestine in tones of barely concealed exultation) that as official Britain had now washed its hands of the Palestine business individual Britons were no longer concerned in the matter either, and the 'line of regret' and 'apology' was no longer in order; whatever the reason, the Rabbinical-Public-Relations department of Anglo-Jewry concentrated during the remainder of the year of 1948 on soft-peddalling the gruesome reality of the Soviet-Jewish revolution in Palestine, while reiterating the inevitability of the eventual victory of Israel and the necessity of Great Britain to recognise the Zionist state.

When, however, the people whose chief concern seems never to offend the susceptibilities of the Zionists and who in consequence act as the fond and foolish mother who *so* hopes that if only she once more gives her naughty child the toy which belongs to his play-mate the little darling will never be naughty again, were once more disappointed by finding some of the more venturesome members of their favourite team on the wrong side of the frontiers of Trans-jordan and Egypt. The Rabbinate once again reverted to the former policy of explanation and apology. As always the Rabbinical 'release' was given world-wide publicity. Dr. Israel Brodie, as a good Newcastle-man "deplored the situation which had developed in the Middle East and which was causing unfortunate tension between Great Britain and Israel . . ." Then living up to his publicised reputation as a 'democratic man', as one of the boys of the army, Dr. Brodie continued:—

we ordinary folk cannot pretend to know the true motives and circumstances which determine the foreign policies of government. We can only pray that those to whom the people have given authority to decide in such high matters will be guided by wisdom, justice and charity . . .

Note the abstract form of the word 'government.' Dr. Brodie will not even specify which 'government' it is (or is that his way of intimating that there is only one?) that 'the people' (yes, I think, we know which people Rabbi Israel refers to even though he will not tell us) has "given authority" to do this and that. Dr. Brodie proceeds to pray, hope, admonish and warn and then suddenly he returns to his central theme and all uncertainty and humility and regret is gone:

Israel's return to the soil of its fathers is, we believe, an act of Divine Providence. It is consoling recompense which follows unparalleled suffering and destruction . . .

and which in its turn causes unparalleled suffering and destruction. Dr. Brodie deplors the tense situation in the Middle East, but firmly believes that the tension-making element shall be given ever more scope in the Middle East: he is prepared to do everything for the sake of peace except tell his 'victory'-drunk nation to stop 'drinking.' That of course, is in the best tradition of secular statesmanship, so perhaps Dr. Brodie is closer to 'government' (even closer than his colleagues the Archbishops of the Judao-Christian 'daughter-religions'?) than he would care to admit. I hope it will not be construed as irreverence when I humbly suggest that Dr. Brodie the Chief Rabbi of the — Commonwealth is a little desingenuous when he informs us that he can only pray: by confronting him with this following uninvited proof of the close and intimate connection with the terror-

regime in Tel Aviv, sent to *The Observer*, September 12, 1948, by his colleague Rabbi S. Sperber, Vice-President of the Mizrachi Federation of Great Britain and Ireland:

It has been, and still is the fundamental principle of orthodox Judaism that in all questions of religions and law, the final decision rests with the Rabbinate, which is the only competent authority to interpret and administer Jewish law. The Rabbinate in the Holy Land [Dr. Herzog] and in this country [Dr. Brodie] have given their affirmative opinion and support for the State of Israel . . . Perhaps it is worth while noting that both Mizrachi and Agudas Israel, the only two religious orthodox parties, are represented in the Coalition Government of Israel.

(To be concluded)

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

take part in subsequent reconnaissances. All the flights took place with the knowledge of the Egyptian authorities. The decision to send these reconnaissance flights was taken on His Majesty's Government's responsibility, but, in addition, in conversations which His Majesty's Ambassador in Washington had with the American State Department at the end of the year, the urgent need for precise information on this subject was clear to both sides. The information obtained by these reconnaissances was made available to the U.S. Government, who were aware of the means by which the information was obtained.

The reconnaissance on December 30 established that Jewish forces had reached the area of Abu Aweigla, which is approximately 17 miles inside Egyptian territory. This was confirmed by reconnaissances on the 1st, 2nd and 4th. A further reconnaissance on the 6th revealed fresh incursion in strength into Egyptian territory. Consequently, on the morning of the 7th, a tactical reconnaissance of four Spitfires was ordered. The timing of the reconnaissance was chosen in consultation with the Egyptian Air Force to minimise the risk of encounter with Egyptian aircraft. Four aircraft were briefed, two for reconnaissance, two for cover, and were given the following orders: the Palestine-Egyptian frontier not to be crossed; aircraft not to make hostile approach or fire on any other aircraft unless our aircraft were being attacked; the time over area where land operations were progressing to be limited to the minimum to lessen risk of incident; known anti-aircraft positions were given. Simultaneously, a high photographic reconnaissance by one Mosquito escorted by four Tempests was ordered with the same briefing as for the tactical reconnaissance.

The tactical reconnaissance was executed as ordered. Tactics were to fly at best height to minimise risk from ground fire, but flying lower as necessary for identification. The leader of the formation (Flying Officer Cooper) reports that after turning west from the reconnaissance along the Rafah-El Auja road, he felt his aircraft being hit and saw his number two (Pilot II Close) climb up steeply and bale out from his aircraft, which was on fire. He saw him land safely at a position 10 miles inside Egyptian territory.

After this, the leader himself was attacked by aircraft of the Spitfire type with red spinners similar to those of his own squadron. After a turning engagement, in which the Jewish aircraft had the advantage of height, he was wounded and his aircraft hit. He continued to climb to 9,000 feet, when, his aircraft being uncontrollable, he baled out, landing

in a position over 15 miles west of the frontier. This pilot's statement is confirmed by the finding and identification by an R.A.F. search party of parts of all four British Spitfires within a three-mile radius of a point 13 miles west of the frontier.

As far as can be judged pending full investigation by a Court of Inquiry, it appears that Jewish aircraft dived on the top pair, shooting them down at once. One of the lower pair was shot down by ground fire and the other damaged by ground fire, and subsequently attacked by fighters.

All the evidence is that this formation did not cross the frontier and that the pilots were captured by Jewish troops some ten miles inside Egyptian territory. Moreover, there are landmarks, such as the loop of the El Auja—Rafah road and the road itself, a road block south of Rafah and Rafah itself, all in Egyptian territory. The high photographic reconnaissance was executed without incident.

In the afternoon, a further tactical reconnaissance of four Spitfires was ordered to carry out the same reconnaissance as in the morning, and to look out for crashed aircraft on the outward and homeward routes in search of the Spitfires missing from the morning sortie. In view of the possibility that the fate of the missing aircraft might have been due to hostile action by Jewish aircraft over Egyptian territory, two formations of Tempests were ordered to provide cover for the Spitfires at 6,000 and 10,00 feet respectively.

When turning west over Rafah railway station, the leader saw five aircraft diving steeply on to his section. As a result of this, the leader at once ordered his section to break to starboard and keep turning. In this initial attack, one Tempest was shot down and finally crashed on the Palestine side of the border, and we now know that the pilot was killed. Three other Tempests were hit and slightly damaged. The top cover, seeing aircraft diving on to the lower Tempest formation, chased the attacking aircraft, having left one section to remain as cover. The hostile aircraft flew back over the border where our aircraft could not follow.

As I have said, in all these incidents, R.A.F. aircraft were instructed not to cross the frontier, and not to make a hostile approach or open fire on any other aircraft unless it was quite certain that our aircraft were being attacked. These instructions were given to minimise as far as possible the risk of a clash. In the event, these instructions placed our pilots at a grave disadvantage when aircraft, which had obtained a tactically superior position, made an unprovoked and surprise attack on them.

The risks were fully appreciated by the Air Commander-in-Chief, but in view of the fact that air reconnaissance was the only means available of ascertaining quickly the true facts regarding the incursion into Egyptian territory, I consider he was justified. In these operations, the lives of two Royal Air Force pilots were lost, two pilots are in the hands of the Jewish authorities, but we hope that they will shortly be repatriated.

Our squadrons have carried out a difficult task, calling for accurate flying and good discipline. The results of their reconnaissances, now confirmed from other sources, show that they fully achieved what was asked of them. I am sure the House would wish me to express their sympathy with the next-of-kin of the two officers who lost their lives.

Mr. Clement Davies: Is it quite clear that these planes were sent on their mission without the knowledge of, and

without consultation with, any member of the Security Council? Although, apparently, they were sent with the knowledge of the Egyptian Government, were the reasons of the Egyptian Government given beforehand?

Mr. Henderson: On that point, I cannot go beyond the reference I made in paragraph two of my statement.

Mr. Crossman: In view of the fact that the first reconnaissance on January 7 took place at very low level, and over an area where a land and air battle was taking place, does the right hon. and learned Gentleman believe that the Israeli forces could possibly distinguish between English and Egyptian Spitfires flying over the battlefield, and, if he does not, was it not totally irresponsible to send these aircraft on that mission?

Mr. Henderson: I want to be quite frank with the House and to say that, in my view, it is conceivable that as regards the Jewish ground forces, they might well have mistaken these aircraft for Egyptian aircraft, but I do not take that view with regard to the Spitfires which were shot down by the Jewish Spitfires which swooped down on them, because they should have been able to see the distinguishing marks on the wings.

Mr. Stanley: Is it not a fact that these reconnaissances were undertaken within a few hours of a proposed cease fire, and that the result of these reconnaissances could not, in fact, have been available to anybody before the cease fire had actually taken place? In these circumstances, what was the urgency for sending these people on a dangerous mission to a fighting area?

Mr. Henderson: I think that, again, is a point which must be elucidated by this court of inquiry; I can only give the facts to the House. This reconnaissance was laid on by the Commander-in-Chief. It is quite true that it was three hours before the appointed time for the cease fire, but he considered it necessary to ascertain the actual situation, and that is why he allowed it. Whether he was justified in doing so will be a matter that will be investigated by the court of inquiry.

Mr. Stanley: Are we to understand that these reconnaissances were undertaken on the sole responsibility of the Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief of the Middle East, and not under instructions emanating from this country? If it was done on instructions from this country, then, surely, it is the House of Commons and not the Court of Inquiry who ought to be given the reason?

Mr. Henderson: The authority to carry out these tactical reconnaissances emanated, as I said in my statement, from His Majesty's Government, and, therefore, he was acting under that authority. But the day-to-day decision as to whether a reconnaissance should take place today instead of tomorrow, or tomorrow instead of today, is a matter for the Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. Stanley: When and what were the most recent instructions given by Whitehall to the Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief?

Mr. Henderson: I think the signal was dated January 1.

Sir P. Macdonald: Can the Minister say whether the Egyptian Government invoked the Treaty which they had previously given notice to revoke, and, if they did not ask for our assistance, what right had we to carry out this open

reconnaissance over a battle area at a time when a battle was taking place?

Mr. Henderson: The hon. Gentleman's question is entirely hypothetical.

Sir P. Macdonald: Did they invoke the Treaty?

Mr. Churchill: Have the Egyptian Government invoked the Treaty or have they not?

Mr. Henderson: The answer is "No, Sir."

Mr. Blackburn: May I ask the Secretary of State whether he is aware that the parents of Pilot Officer Tattersfield have received information from an absolutely reliable authority which not only states that this fight took place on the Egyptian side of the frontier, but also, that the attacking aircraft were Spitfires wearing British camouflage, and that it was for that reason that the pilots concerned were not able to take the necessary action by way of evasion or retaliation? Will the Minister look into that, and will he further impress on the Government that there is great concern over the fact that the Israeli Forces had Spitfires? Where did they get them from?

Mr. Henderson: They certainly did not get them from me and I am not in a position to answer the question without proper notice. It should be addressed to another Department.

Mr. M. Lindsay: I want to ask the Secretary of State if he does not realise that this shocking event could not conceivably have occurred if it were not for the very low level of prestige to which His Majesty's Government have brought this country?

Mr. Benn Levy: As my right hon. and learned Friend has made it clear that these reconnaissance flights took place without the invitation of the Egyptians, without the invitation of the Mediator, without the invitation of the United Nations, can he say whether he himself gave the necessary instructions and if not, who did?

Mr. Henderson: I do not think it is for me to pick out a member of the Government when action is taken. As I have said in my statement, the policy was authorised by His Majesty's Government.

Mr. Paget: In view of the fact that the Egyptians were using Spitfires, what did the Secretary of State expect the Jews to do to Spitfires flying in from Egypt? Secondly, were the photographs which were taken by these Spitfires supplied to the Egyptian Command?

Mr. Henderson: My hon. and learned Friend seems to have accepted the view of the Jewish authorities that it was a case of the Royal Air Force planes flying into Palestine. The evidence I have put before the House, and the statement I have made this afternoon, makes it quite clear that the Royal Air Force planes did not cross the Egyptian frontier, but that it was a case of the Jewish planes crossing the Egyptian Frontier.

Mr. S. Silverman: May I ask two questions? The first is: In view of the precautions taken to avoid any incident by warning the Egyptian Government that these planes were to go, can my right hon. and learned Friend say why similar precautions were not taken by warning the Israeli Government that these planes were going, and the purpose of the flight? The second question is: Since under the Anglo-

Egyptian Treaty we are entitled to fly planes outside the Canal Zone only on training flights, unless the Treaty has been invoked, and since this was not a training flight, was not the flight of these planes a breach of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty?

Mr. Henderson: As regards the first part of my hon. Friend's question there was no need to inform the Jewish authorities of the fact that our planes were going to fly in Egyptian territory, because there is no reason at all why they should be told about what is taking place in other countries. All I can say is that these unfortunate events might well have been avoided, because these reconnaissances might well have not been necessary had not it been for the fact that the Jewish authorities prevented observers from the United Nations organisation from visiting the areas in which this fighting was taking place. As regards the second part of the question, it is a legal point whether there has been a breach of the Treaty. I am not prepared to accept my hon. Friend's suggestion that there has been a breach. Apparently the Egyptian Government do not take this view that there has been a breach, first of all because they have been well aware of the fact that these reconnaissances were taking place, and, in fact, as I said in my statement, they participated in the first one on December 30.

Mr. Boothby: May we take it that whoever else gave instructions for these reconnaissance flights over a battle area they were not authorised by the right hon. and learned Gentleman in his capacity as Secretary for Air?

Mr. Henderson: I certainly am not going to shirk my share of any responsibility. I thought I had made it clear to the House that I had, in consultation with other Ministers, or after consultation with other Ministers, sanctioned in principle the carrying out of these tactical reconnaissances.

Mr. Thomas Reid: In view of one of my right hon. and learned Friend's previous statements, that our planes did not cross the Egyptian frontier, would he say if our pilots have made statements asserting that they had flown over the Egyptian frontier into Palestine?

Mr. Henderson: Yes, Sir. There is a conflict of statements between Pilot-Officer Cooper, on the one hand, and Pilot-Officer Close, on the other hand, that can be determined only as and when we have the court of inquiry. . . .

The Haldane Society

An account of recent happenings concerning the Haldane Society, whose pamphlet, *Soviet Justice*, has been mentioned frequently in connection with the English and Scottish Legal Aid measures, was given by the *Daily Mail* on January 27. Sir Stafford Cripps is President and Mr. D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P., Vice-President. There are 540 members recruited from among the Socialist barristers and solicitors, and, of these 50 are said by the *Daily Mail* to be affected by a motion put by Mr. Harold Paton, K.C., that only members of the Socialist Party (*i.e.*, not Communists) should be members of the society. Mr. Pritt is said to be opposing the motion, which is supported by Sir Stafford Cripps, Sir Hartley Shawcross, Sir Frank Soskice and Viscount Jowitt. Mr. Stephen Murray, secretary, is reported as saying that it is against the policy of the society to have it used as a sounding board for Communist opinions.