THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 10. No. 18. Registered at G P.O. as a Newspaper Postage (home and abroad) 1d. SATURDAY, JULY 10, 1943. 6d. Weekly.

Programme For the Third World War (XIV)

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Let us try to draw the threads of the long story (a story which, to be understood, must be considered over periods involving thousands of years) into a tapestry.

A Chosen People *is a collectivity bound together by a myth, and the less intelligent the individual the more likely he is to be the slave of a myth.* The Jews, for instance, are not in the main intelligent. No body of individuals which was intelligent would have repeated its mistakes as the Jews have repeated, and are repeating theirs. An in-bred race is peculiarly susceptible to hypnotism, *i.e.,* domination by a myth.

The relation of an individual to a myth is important, and is well illustrated by Hans Andersen's charming little fable of the King who had no clothes on. The conventions and laws which grow up round, and buttress, a myth may persist, in the manner in which the sanctions of the money myth persist, but they are in mortal danger when a child sees through them, and says so. "Nothing is so dangerous as initiative."

If we substitute the word "ruling" for "chosen," and realise that various peoples, including our own, have presented a facade of being the "ruling" race for just so long as they have been the passive tools of the money power, it is not difficult to see that, once the myth gets out of hand, wars and yet more wars are inevitable. After draining and pillaging one country after another, the international money power, the wandering Jew, has in the past left bemused or subsidised historians to explain that, like the rise and fall of the Roman Empire (almost completely a monetary phenomenon due to "silver inflation"), all nations have their day, and that prosperity is bad for them. Several children have seen through this story, with the result that old contestants for the limelight are unwilling to retire into the wings and a virtuous poverty. We have only to compare the remark of General Ludendorff, which I have quoted elsewhere, that "The majority of the English do not realise that, having done their duty by the inner Jewish circle, they have now got to disappear as a world Power" (—*The Coming War,* 1931) with that of Mr. Winston Churchill, which has been so coldly received in America, "I did not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire," to see that the meek acceptance of the decrees of fate is somewhat marred by the realisation that fate is a lady of easy virtue, always to be found and acquired where the pickings are good.

There is a technique well known to politicians, lawyers and jugglers which consists in emphasising the unimportant while you slip in the essential. It is much in evidence just now. If you can get up a furious debate as to whether income tax shall be 10/- or 15/- after the war, you stand a fair chance of drowning the small, but rapidly increasing, number of people who say that taxation is robbery. If you can become really excited about whether the unit of world currency shall be called a bancor or a unitas (United States) or a shekel, you will be less likely to enquire whether the creation of the means of payment out of nothing has been so striking a success when administered more or less locally that the immense urgency of removing this myth incarnate to a point in space where its administrators will be even more shrouded in mystery, and immune from the consequences of financing Hitler's successor, is sufficiently demonstrated, except to the Chosen. And you may, once again, be driven to wonder why it is that, if an individual finds that a device does not work satisfactorily, he modifies it before extending its use, but if a Government finds a device is demonstrably defective, it connives at its enthronement as a world principle.

Precisely at this point the contribution of the province of Alberta to world history and genuine progress can be seen. Mr. Aberhart's Government has demonstrated, by forcing the nominees of the Money Power to disallow his legislation, that "economic determinism" is a mechanism of political intention. The Money Power does not, and never did wish to improve the money system—its consequences in war, sabotage and social friction are exactly what is desired. This, I think, exactly defines the task which society must face and solve, or perish. *First,* to attack and defeat the Money *Power; then* consider the reorganisation of the money *system.*

All these things, and many more, have convinced me that one of the fundamentals of genuine Christianity is that the only true focus of power is the individual, which is simply a matter-of-fact method of affirming the Immanence of God over the Monotheistic Jehovah. The conscious man is not born to be ruled, neither is he born to rule over other people. Jesus said so, and the Jews crucified Him. They could do no other.

I believe we shall be taking the most generally accurate view of history for at least the past two thousand years if we view it as a conscious attempt on the one side, and an unconscious reaction on the other side, to and from the separation of the individual and his natural attributes, and to vest them in organisations controlled by power maniacs. If you prefer to say that it is a struggle to separate man from God, to replace the immanence of God (*i.e.,* power over *events*) by the Omnipotent Jehovah (*i.e.,* subservience to events), I shall not quarrel with your choice of words,

although it is the practical use you can make of them which matters.

I have spent some of my life on, or beyond, the fringes of "civilisation," where men carried guns, and used them without hesitation. The social atmosphere of those districts was much better than that of policed areas. It is not in the wilds that the scum of the earth rises; it is in the towns.

The denial of the right of the individual to carry arms is a fundamental infringement of liberty. Just as the bootlegger was the most enthusiastic supporter of prohibition, the gangster, both national and international, is a convinced adherent of disarmament by law. He knows what to do about the law, and what every policeman wants. And when, the smaller gangsters having disarmed the individual, the larger gangsters disarm the smaller gangsters, then, of course, the gangsters who are left will be transformed into ministering angels, and their international police will spend all their time helping international nursemaids to cross the international traffic. Anyone can see that.

To be continued.

Wahabi King on Palestine

The Times's correspondent in Cairo has seen fit to report at some length an important pronouncement by the Wahabi King of Saudi Arabia on the question of Palestine. The statement was made originally last March, when it took the form of an interview granted to the special correspondent of an American magazine. *The Times's* correspondent comments: "For his own reasons, on June 11, the Wahabi King republished the declaration textually in his own newspaper, *Om El Kura,* which appears at irregular intervals.

"As the statement contains the first categorical pronouncement the King has made on the Jewish question, and in view, first, of the immense authority attaching to this great Moslem leader's opinions, and, secondly, of the fact that there are already signs that the problem will be among the foremost post-war preoccupations in the Middle East, it is of the highest interest to the Moslem world, in which it is now obtaining prominence."

In the course of the statement the Wahabi King said: —

"First, I do not know that the Jews have any justification for their claims in Palestine on the grounds that for centuries before the Mohammedan mission Palestine was Jewish land. The Romans had conquered the Jews, killing and scattering them so that no trace of their rule remained. The Arabs conquered Palestine over 1,300 years ago, freeing it from the Romans, and since that time it has remained Moslem. The Jews therefore have no right to the country, because all countries of the world have been conquered by people who have made undisputed homes in such lands. If we were to follow the Jewish theory, many of the settled peoples of the world would have to leave their countries.

"Secondly, I am not afraid either of the Jews or of their having a State or authority in Arab countries or anywhere else, because of what the good God told us by the tongue of his prophet in his holy Book; but I see that the Jews' insistence on Palestine cannot be justified (*a*) because it is unjust to the Arabs and Moslems, and (*b*) because it only creates friction between the Moslems and their friends, the allies. If the Jews need a place in which to live, there are countries in Europe, America, and elsewhere that are larger, more fertile, and more convenient to their interests. This is justice, and there is no use in facing the allies and the Moslems with a problem from which neither will profit. As for the old Jewish inhabitants of Palestine (presumably pre-Zionists), it is my opinion that the Arabs will agree with their friends, the allies, on preserving their interests, provided that the Jews do not behave in a manner calculated to provoke trouble and disturbance, and will give an assurance, guaranteed by the allies, that they will not strive by their great financial power to buy up the Arabs' properties, which are their very life; this would mean loss and harm to the natives of Palestine, causing poverty and dissolution which would only create another problem."

Soviet Foreign Policy

From *Soviet Foreign Policies,* by Eugene Lyons* in *The American Mercury* of March, 1943: —

". . . Scott's main thesis is that within the global war there is a second and no less fateful war—the duel between Hitler and Stalin for hegemony over Europe. The implications of that duel cannot be blinked. Dallin formulates the two-fold conflict a bit differently, in terms of the fundamental Soviet concept of world relations. According to this concept, 'two separate conflicts are now being waged within the framework of a single world war.' One is 'the aggressive antagonism of Germany and Japan against the rich "owners of the world",' and the other is the 'combined antagonism of the entire world against the Socialist State.'

"It would assuredly be reckless self-delusion to ignore the Soviet theory of a dual war. The most generous appraisal of the Stalin-Hitler deal of August, 1939, is that Russia feared a double-cross and beat the Western Powers to it. If it is true that Stalin still fears a double-cross, then the danger that he may again 'steal a march' on his present allies cannot be wished away. That is the clear warning of both the Scott and the Dallin books, fairly explicit in Dallin's case, implicit in Scott. . . .

"In the hour of defeat and impending collapse in 1918, the Germans—including Junkers, industrialists, and even monarchists—evaded the ultimate disaster by embracing democracy. In retrospect, it is possible to recognise the move as a strategem for heading off invasion and dismemberment. Is it not possible that in the hour of a new defeat and a new impending collapse, all groups except the Nazis—and even a lot of *them*—may see in Communism a similar stratagem for this day? A 'surrender to the East' may seem to offer them more chance of national survival than surrender to the East *and* the West.

"Stalin, a master of psychological warfare, has not hesitated to hold out that hope. Alone among the United Nations' leaders, he has emphasised that his hatred is directed solely against the Nazi régime. In his most recent speech, last November 7, he again underlined his view that 'it is impossible to destroy Germany' and 'not our aim to destroy all military force in Germany'—indeed, that these things are 'also inadvisable from the view-point of the future.'"

* Reviewing *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy* (Dr. David J. Dallin), *Duel for Europe,* by John Scott, and other books on this subject.

The Union of Electors: Action in Quebec

The following notes are taken (in free translation) from an article in the French Canadian journal VERS DEMAIN *of April* 15, 1943:—

The Union of Electors is a mechanism by which the people express their will to their representatives. As such a mechanism did not formerly exist, it had to be formed. It was necessary to bring about unity where political parties caused division; to instruct where politicians were content to find ignorance; to learn to act, where the action of others had been relied on; to make men stand on their own feet who had been forced always to crawl.

The Union of Electors is a new organism, but one which is developing quickly, so quickly that it is already frightening those who were counting on the old methods.

Each new action taken by the Union of Electors arouses the enthusiasm of its members for further action. The Union practises pressure politics—the pressure of the strength of a whole people who know what they want, on those who are paid to bring about the common will of that people. It acts in every public field, municipal, provincial, federal, —everywhere where we have been taught that a democratic régime existed.

• • •

Our readers already know what pressure the Union is putting on the speakers of the *Bloc Populaire Canadien*, since they began their campaign of meetings, to make them declare clearly their attitude towards Social Credit. The pressure is getting always stronger. After Granby, where 713 signatures were obtained without going outside the town, and where Dr. Hamel added nothing new to his previous statements, it is to be brought to bear on the speakers at one of the meetings* held by the *Bloc Populaire* in the capital itself of New France, Quebec.

The form to be presented at Quebec explains:—

"The members of the Union of Electors are strongly decided:—

"(1) To demand of each candidate, in every election, to define clearly his attitude with regard to a national dividend for each citizen;

"(2) to refuse their vote to every candidate who does not pronounce himself squarely for the grant of a national dividend to each citizen."

They also demand of *each speaker* that he should define his personal attitude on the occasion of the public meeting.

The members of the Union of Electors of Abitibi and the north of Témiscaminque are no less categorical: they declare firmly "that it is useless for a candidate, to whatever political group he may belong, to ask for our votes, in any election, unless he declares himself wholly ready to demand insistently the national dividend of Social Credit."

The replies or the silence of each speaker will be noted by *Vers Demain*. Let them declare themselves. Social Crediters want to end the reign of clam-like politicans.

• • •

At Roc d'Or, a small village near Malartic, six policemen keep continuous guard to prevent families from coming to settle there, and to push the present residents into emigrating to Malartic.

The residents of Roc d'Or and Malartic protest against this intimidation. Those of Roc d'Or are poor, but at least are masters of their small pieces of land, owing nothing to anyone. Their removal would mean the loss of their property, excessive expense and, for most of them, the contraction of debts.

The Union of Electors of Malartic and Roc d'Or have sent to the Honourable Adélard Godbout, premier of the province, a protest and demand for the withdrawal of the six policemen. A copy was sent to the provincial deputy of Abitibi.

• • •

In about forty parishes of settlers in Abitibi the Union of Electors is organising a demand to the provincial government for seed. The demand is made with a precision unprecedented in the history of colonisation. The quantity of each kind of seed required by each settler is registered, the total for the parish reckoned up and transmitted by a responsible elector who will undertake the distribution, according to individual demands, of all the seed received.

Vers Demain will follow with attention the progress of this demand, and will publish the results obtained, or the absence of a reply should that be necessary.

Our people are going to learn the facts. We are in a democracy and we intend to be served.

• • •

In each of these cases the initiative has been taken by the members of the Union of Electors themselves—not for personal demands, as has been seen, but for collective demands affecting the whole group concerned.

Thus the protest of Roc d'Or arose at Roc d'Or itself. We have a letter from M. Henri Arpin of Roc d'Or, explaining its origin. In the same way the organisation of a demand for seed for settlers was suggested by a settler of Granada, M. Wilfred Trudel, the Social Credit lieutenant of the district.

Everywhere people are thinking that now that the government have taxed and surtaxed Canadians while giving presents to foreigners it will soon be time to think of gifts to Canadians of national dividends.

*The results of these meetings are not yet available in this country.

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*: (*Editorial and Business*) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, *Telephone*: *Wavertree* 435.

Vol. 10. *No.* 18. *Saturday, July* 10, 1943.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"With regard to the matter that was raised" (by Mr. Mackenzie King, Canadian Prime Minister.—*Ed.*) "if I am at all able to judge of the significance of things, I would say that the speech which was delivered the other day by Mr. Sandwell" (in Toronto, on the necessity for a World Government.—*Ed.*) "advocated the accomplishment of an object which is diametrically opposed to the object for which the United Nations are fighting. If he gains his objective, all is lost; this war will have been fought in vain. If there is anything that will deaden the enthusiasm of the people in regard to the conduct of this war, it is the discussion of such matters as this, of supra-national governments, which need not be discussed while this war is being carried on."

— MR. BLACKMORE, M.P., Leader of the New Democracy (Social Credit) Party, Ottawa.

• • •

The shadow of the coming Presidential Election is rousing the American vote fixers, if not the American voter. Soon we shall be told that the heart of the great American Public is torn with the problem of whether God's Country needs a white cat with black markings, or a black cat with white patches. In the first case, the G.A.P. will clearly have voted for an American World Government, and in the latter, for a World Government of Americans.

• • •

A savage attack is being made by the international banking interests on Mr. L. D. Byrne, the Technical Adviser to the Social Credit Board of the Alberta Government. While this is of course the greatest compliment that could be paid to him, the methods employed afford evidence of the Apache mentality behind it.

In this connection, while we do not suggest that the Southam Press is in any way the originator of the policy it reports we do not think that, with the outstanding exception of the *Ottawa Citizen* and its sturdy Northumbrian editor, C. A. Bowman, the chain of newspapers it controls deserves much thanks from the Canadian public.

In the blast of canting nonsense about the "freedom of the Press" which greeted Mr. Aberhart's Bill to ensure that misrepresentation should be corrected, no voice was more strident than that of the *Edmonton Journal*, whose editor was rewarded by the Jew Pulitzer Medal. If the *Edmonton Journal* were to publish a series of articles to the effect that the Japanese are being oppressed by the Canadians, precious little, quite rightly, would be heard of the "Freedom of the Press." But Alberta has suffered, and is suffering far more from the oppression of the "Canadian" debt-mongers than it is ever likely to suffer from the Japanese, and if the Editors of the Southam chain of newspapers don't know it, they are not fit to be Editors.

• • •

A war always seems to bring the "temperance(!)" crank (or is it whisky speculator?) to power with a prohibition, or near-prohibition, statute. Certain results always follow automatically—(1) The distillers make enormous profits with no risk and little labour. (2) Bootleg liquor of the vilest kind comes on the market in quantity. (3) Drunkenness increases and becomes far more serious owing to the poisonous liquids sold and consumed.

A case came to our attention a few days ago in which a young woman drank two small glasses of a "Ready-mixed Cocktail." The effects were horrifying—stupefaction, loss of muscular control, glazed eyes, and an hour later violent abdominal cramp and sickness.

• • •

Commander Locker-Lampson, who considers that you can't have too many Jews, has tabled a motion in the House of Commons that the word Commonwealth should be used for the Empire, and the title Protector added to the titles of H.M. The King.

They hardly bother to conceal the plot, nowadays, do they?

• • •

It is obvious that the attack by the Republican (anti-Roosevelt) Party on the use of the Social Credit device, the Compensated Price, is because they are aware of the favourable reaction which will be produced on the general public by it, and the consequent strengthening of President Roosevelt's political position, which they are primarily concerned to weaken.

• • •

The *Liverpool Post* published on June 29 a Reuter message from Washington (not printed in *The Times*) stating that the United States Department of Justice had announced the indictment by a Federal grand jury of three chemical companies for creating a world-wide cartel in conspiracy with German, British, Italian, Japanese and other foreign interests. The Department alleged that substantially all the important foreign chemical companies of the world were involved, among them the I.G.F. (Germany), I.C.I (England), the Montecatini Company (Italy) and the Kokusan Kogyo Kaibushihi (Japan).

Interviewed, Lord McGowan said: "I give you an absolutely flat denial that we are engaged in any international conspiracy. We are not in combination with any international bodies. The report is quite wrong. I deny it absolutely."

CAN'T BE CANNED

Criticising the proposed pre-fabricated home in post-war house planning, Mr. Richard Coppock, general secretary, said at the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives' conference, at Blackpool, that we had not got to the stage when we could be canned like peas. "We do not want tinned houses. We want designed houses produced by craftsmen. We will adapt ourselves to new methods and new technique, and we will use the machine tool, but we will not be lashed to it."

NATURALISATION (I)

By "PRO PATRIA"

In the vicissitudes of twenty centuries or so, several strains of Norsemen have fought and invaded this island, and in settling down the English, Scots, Welsh and Irish have evolved and maintained an attitude to government rare, if not unique, in the history of civilisation: an attitude which insists on the devolution of power and freedom to the individual, with the minimum of imposed government. This principle is the antithesis of the centralised systems of Roman and Jewish Law, which concentrate power in the hands of a few, and are the models venerated and copied by most Continental states.

The perseverance with which the aristocratic, *i.e.*, the *best* (in the Greek sense of the word) instincts of our countrymen have been undermined, and the camouflaged tyranny of the present pluto-democratic system of government built up, shows how the powers working against our institutions have realised the strength of the "instinct roots" in the cultural life of this country. These instincts are still strong, though misled at times into un-English expression by duped, half-baked minds succumbing to the "insatiate cormorant" of vanity.

The "free" attitude of the English mind towards matters of government is opposed to centralisation and control of the individual such as is practised under Latin and Jewish commands. When Major Petherick, M.P. said recently of the British Constitution, "No rigid series of rules such as were laid down by the Medes and Persians and other more modern nations have ever been laid down for us by a body of persons at any given period who thought that their wisdom was eternal and that the circumstances on which they based their code were perennial and would hold good for all time.... we have a composite and ancient edifice which is amorphous though definite, delicate yet powerful, virile yet steadfast—the world's greatest example of a gigantic paradox which works," he was saying what may yet be true, but what at the moment by no means holds.

Contained in characteristics proper to the English people is the dormant seed of that which, once fully and consciously realised and operated, must render Messianism ineffective.

Its effectiveness (and until the age of universal miseducation this was a source of strength) is inherent in action rather than in word.

It unfailingly opposes and must continue by its nature to oppose, the policy of Messianism and the control of the earth by the Chosen Few; be they Germans or those of whom they are the tools and clumsy imitators, the Jews. Of the Jews and their ambitions as Messianists a French historian once wrote:—

"*Aucun autre élément ne possède une telle proportion d'hommes habiles à semer la corruption autour d'eux.... C'est pourquoi il est possible que dans un avenir prochain l'Occident devienne, à l'exception de l'Angleterre une république féderative gouvernée par une oligarchie juive. A mésure que le régime plutocratique si mal appélé démocratique se développera en Europe, on peut s'attendre à voir se développer une puissante féodalite juive profondément separée du peuple par la religion, la race, et l'orgeuil... Il suffirait donc aux juifs de se réserver les charges de judicature et les hauts emplois militaires pour maintenir leurs sujets dans la soumission.*" (*—Vicomte de Lapouge.*)

As "freedom" in our country is an unconscious attribute of English character, it is to be expected that the tactics of the Messianists would be designed to pervert the good stock of the race, together with the institutions and actions in which its qualities are embodied.

On to "this happy breed of men" the false Messianists have attempted to graft alien stock as a medium for imposing a policy foreign to the natives of these islands who are antagonistic to the rule of the few.

In this connection we propose to review shortly the changes in the laws of naturalisation in this country in the last few centuries.

• • •

King William the Third came from Holland with a train of foreigners. He himself could not speak English. It is not surprising, therefore, to find in the Act of Settlement of 1700 (which is described as an "Act for the further limitation of the Crown and better securing of the Rights and Liberties of the Subject") that provision was made for keeping the government of the country in the hands of Englishmen. Section 3 of this Act says:—

"That after the said Limitation shall take effect as aforesaid no Person born out of the Kingdoms of England, Scotland, or Ireland or the Dominions thereunto belonging (although he be naturalised or made a Denizen, except such as are born of English parents,) shall be capable to be of the Privy Council, or a Member of either House of Parliament, or to enjoy any Office or Place of trust, either Civil or Military, or to have any Grant of Lands, Tenement, or Hereditaments from the Crown, to himself or to other or others in trust for him."

Before 1844 the process of naturalisation involved an Act of Parliament and entailed the cost of £100, and the taking in the Protestant form of a Christian oath, and before 1829 the Lord's Supper together with repudiation of the doctrine of transubstantiation; and, of course, the Bill for the person's naturalisation was subject to scrutiny in the House of Commons. These conditions limited the naturalisations from about eight to twelve a year.

By an Act passed in 1844 this method was superseded, and the right of granting naturalisation vested in the Home Secretary absolutely, and he could grant certificates at his discretion, observance of the above ceremonies being cancelled. While this change laid responsibility on the Government official in respect of his discrimination, the Act of 1844 retained the incapacities cited above against the holding by naturalised subjects of certain offices in that it re-instated in its Sections 6 and 8, Section 3 of the Act of 1700, thus:—

"And be it enacted That upon obtaining the Certificate, and taking the Oath hereinafter prescribed, every Alien now residing in, or who shall hereafter come to reside in, any part of Great Britain or Ireland with Intent to settle therein, shall enjoy all the Rights and Capacities which a natural born subject of the United Kingdom can enjoy or transmit, except that such Alien shall not be capable of becoming of Her Majesty's Privy Council, nor a Member of either House of Parliament, nor of enjoying such other Rights and Capaci-

ties, if any, as shall especially be excepted in and by the Certificate to be granted in manner hereinafter mentioned."

Naturalisation has always been a Jewish interest and is a tactical part of their policy. The Jew has pertinaciously insisted on following his own Talmudic racial policy, a policy alien to those among whom he lived, whose traditions he exploited but was unwilling to conform to.

In 1290 the Jews were expelled from England, and there followed a period in English history of unexcelled prosperity and vigorous expansion. They filtered back, *via* 'conversion' or other means, in the course of the next few centuries, and Oliver Cromwell, whose army they financed, connived unofficially at their return. Their position was the same in the reign of Charles II, who entered into relations with Jewry when in exile in Amsterdam, and England suffered another influx with the advent from abroad of William and Mary.

Until 1844 all Jews, therefore, could be classed as foreigners. Their policy was anti-nationalist but supra-national for themselves. At the beginning of the nineteenth century open agitation for the emancipation of the Jews, backed by the so-called 'Liberals', was being propagandised by the Press in Europe. In the English Parliament it took the form of ten Bills for the enfranchisement of the Jews, up to 1858. These ten Bills were rejected when the people were informed of their content.

"The Jew," said Sir Robert Peel, in one of the earlier Parliamentary debates on the Bill that was thrown out, "is regarded in the light of an alien, he is excluded, does not amalgamate with us in any of his usages or habit, he is regarded as a foreigner.... the exclusion of Jews does not arise from their incapacities, but from their own particular institutions and usages."

In 1847 Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild was returned to Parliament for the City of London, but was unable to take his seat because M.P.s were at that time sworn in with a Christian Oath. The alliance between Finance, the City and Jewry in this matter is noted by the following passage from a Jewish journal nearly 100 years later: —

"We Jews have reason to know.... that the City was the best friend of our people in this country, when they were fighting for equal citizen rights in the middle of last century.... again and again it [the City] defied those who in Parliament wished to prevent the Jew from being a member with all a member's privileges, unless he would recite a form of words which to him were meaningless mockery or an outrage upon his conscience. It was the support the City gave to the cause of the so-called 'emancipation' by returning Baron Rothschild time after time that did more than anything else to break down the old evil religious discrimination before the law so far as Jews were concerned."

In 1858, however, the procedure was amended and the Christian oath omitted and Baron Rothschild enabled to take his seat in what was at that date a Christian English Parliament. A study of the debates in Parliament of that time shows that the method by which this result was obtained was neither common nor straightforward. Had the people and the majority of members of the Commons and the Lords, had the issue put to them openly, they would not have admitted the Jews to Parliament. The final stage of the debate took place at the end of a session and the Bill was passed by *Resolution.* Mr. Drummond pointed out the danger of Resolutions, and said, "It was high time that there was a dissolution in order that the constituencies might speak their mind on this subject [the admission of Jews.] All the mischief done at the beginning of the French Revolution was done by Resolutions."

Lord John Russell, who sponsored his fellow-member for the City of London, was "supposed to act on pressure from without," said Mr. Bentinck, voicing a rumour current that a certain great capitalist and Lord John Russell stood in the position of patron and nominee. It was said that if the country were polled throughout, the opponents of Jewish admission would be ten to one.

The following points from the debate are also interesting: —

Mr. Newdigate, in March 1858: "This Bill is really introduced for the purpose of obtaining a seat for Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild. We.... have a wealthy Jew, who by means of a large foreign influence has obtained a great command over the City of London. I do not believe that the Jew is likely to be a better member of this House because he is a strict adherent of the Talmud.... of which I can shew that the tendencies are of an immoral anti-social and anti-national character. The most intelligent portion of our countrymen are opposed to this measure."

Mr. Raphael, a convert from Judaism: "I see in this proposition to seat Judaism in Parliament a means to accomplish the end of the bitterest enemies of England."

Mr. Walpole: "The Jew is excluded because of his innate inability to amalgamate with the habits and institutions of a Christian country. You exclude naturalised aliens from Parliament. I would have this House adhere to its own nationality and the Jews to theirs."

In the House of Lords, Lord Harrington "proposed an amendment 'That no member of the House of Commons, having made a loan to a foreign State after he has been elected, shall be allowed to sit in Parliament until he has been re-elected, as the interests of such a loan contractor may be opposed to his duties as a legislator.' "

Lord Harrington also said: "I oppose the admission of Jews because they are the great money-lenders and loan contractors of the world. They do not care whether they support a good or a bad cause. The consequence is that the nations of the world are groaning under heavy systems of taxation and national debt. They have ever been the greatest enemies of freedom. I would rather see a good Mahomedan or Hindoo sitting in the House of Commons than a Jew loan contractor. Have they not a great portion of the Press, the most powerful political engine that ever existed, supporting them?" He added that during the Crimean War large sums of money were sent by Jews from this country to Holland, as contributions to a Russian loan.

Lord Galloway: "The time might not be far distant when a profligate Prime Minister of this country might receive a large bribe for recommending the creation of a Jewish Peer."

By an Act passed in 1870 naturalised British subjects were given all the rights, *etc.*, of natural born British subjects, but there was some doubt as to whether when repealing the Act of 1844, section 3 of the Act of Settlement of 1700 did not remain in full force: except as affected by

the provisions of the new Act of 1870. This leaves operative to-day the incapacities of naturalised aliens and their sons if born abroad to sit in Parliament, to have a grant of land *etc.*, from the Crown, or to be a member of the Privy Council. Some eminent legal authorities were of this opinion.

In a further Act passed in 1914, an insidious little sub-clause Section 3 (2) was inserted to make it clear that the special section excluding naturalised aliens from these offices was also repealed; but as one authority* puts it: "the unfortunate wording of the section leaves the matter in the same doubtful state as before."

Points from Parliament

House of Commons: June 23, 1943.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION FOREIGN NEWSPAPERS, GREAT BRITAIN (INQUIRY)

Mr. Mander asked the Minister of Information whether he is now able to make a statement with reference to his inquiry into the activities of newspapers published by Allied subjects in this country hostile to the Soviet Government; and whether the attacks made have now ceased?

The Minister of Information (Mr. Brendan Bracken): Yes, Sir. The inquiry into the activities of foreign newspapers has been completed, and His Majesty's Government have taken measures to ensure that a failure on the part of a foreign publication to observe proper restraint will not be tolerated. In answers to questions in this House, I have warned editors of foreign journals of the responsibility they owe in return for the hospitality they enjoy. I hope they will take careful note of what I have said, because if any of them defy this warning and attempt to stir up discord among the United Nations, official facilities for the publication of their journals will be withdrawn and their licences to publish will be revoked.

Mr. Mander: Will my right hon. Friend consider also the advisability of taking drastic action against those responsible for the secretly published and unofficial journals which are sometimes as embarrassing to the Polish Government as they are hostile to the Soviet Union?

Mr. Bracken: I entirely agree with the hon. Member, but I would point out to him that these are not journals but pamphlets. These Poles rush around to printers in various parts of the country, and no licence is required to publish pamphlets. I do not intend to ask the House for power to stop the publication of pamphlets, even though it might put an end to the scandal, because if the Ministry of Information is given too much power, it is bound to abuse it.

Wing-Commander James: Are we to take it that the converse also applies, and that attacks on the Polish Government will be equally discouraged?

Mr. Bracken: Yes, Sir. I have already had a controversy with a well-known organ called the *Daily Worker* for attacks on the Polish Government, and until that paper learns manners I intend to see that it shall not be sent abroad.

Captain Peter Macdonald: What is the Paper Controller doing in allowing so many journals and pamphlets to be published which Members of Parliament as well as other citizens every day have showered upon them?

Mr. Bracken: I have quite enough trouble without answering for the Paper Controller.

Mr. Gallacher: Is it not the case that since the Minister issued his warning to the Polish papers they have now extended their activities to publishing an English section, directed towards the English-speaking public, and carrying in this English section slanders against the Soviet Union?

Mr. Bracken: No, I am sure that is not the case.

Mr. Gallacher: Has the right hon. Gentleman seen the papers?

House of Commons: June 29, 1943.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Third Reading of the Finance Bill may be taken immediately after the consideration of the Bill, as amended, notwithstanding the practice of the House as to the interval between the various stages of such a Bill."—[*Mr. Eden.*]

Colonel Sir Charles MacAndrew (Ayr and Bute, Northern): I feel that on a matter of this kind the Government ought to give the House some reason for what they are proposing. I do not know whether my right hon. Friend has looked at the Amendments, or whether he has looked at the Schedule which stands in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and there is an Amendment to that new Schedule. Over the week-end I consulted an eminent lawyer, who is a friend of mine, and the Schedule is, to him, quite incomprehensible. That being so, surely our usual custom of having separate days for the Report stage and the Third Reading of the Finance Bill ought to be followed unless there is some very good reason to the contrary.

Mr. Eden: No, Sir, I do not think so. When I explained last Thursday that it was proposed to follow this practice no suggestion was made that any exception should be taken to-day. It is exactly the same practice as we have followed for the last two years, and I can see at present no reason for varying it. . . . .

Sir C. MacAndrew: When was this Schedule in our hands?

Mr. Eden: Some days ago. I could not say exactly when.

Mr. A. Bevan (Ebbw Vale): Surely the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman is not sufficient. For the convenience of the Government two years ago the House consented to depart from what is a very useful tradition and practice. Because we have departed from that useful practice on three occasions the right hon. Gentleman thinks that we ought to have a reason for re-establishing the position and for not going on with this bad practice. We ought now to have a positive reason why it is necessary to take the Third Reading of the Finance Bill on the same day as the Report stage.

Sir William Davison (Kensington, South): Does not this show how very undesirable it is for the House to give

---

* W. N. HIBBERT: *International Private Law*, chapter 3.

way to representations from the Government upon occasions of alleged urgency, respecting practices which have been the rule here for many years? We are told, when the same matter comes up another year, that the Minister is only following the precedent of the previous year. It is very undesirable that any such precedent should be set up, and no reason given. A further point is that the Leader of the House forgot that when he mentioned this matter before this very complicated Motion in the name of the Chancellor was not before us, or even if it was, its contents had not been mastered by the House. The very fact that this complicated Motion has been put down is a very good reason in itself why more time should be given to Members to study it and for not taking the Third Reading immediately after the Report stage, when obviously Members would not have had time to give the consideration which is so very desirable.

Mr. Mander: It is very important to do all we can to maintain the ancient practices of the House of Commons, and whatever may be done on this occasion I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will bear in mind the importance of doing that, except when it is necessary for high reasons of policy connected with the war to rush through something as a matter of urgency. I trust also that he will bear in mind the feeling of the House on this occasion.

Mr. Bevan: May we have the reason, please?

Mr. Benson (Chesterfield): I certainly hope that this Motion goes to a Division. I have no objection to the Chancellor of the Exchequer putting his Motion down, but what strikes me as very serious is the defence put forward by the Leader of the House. The mere fact that this has been done twice before appears to him to be an adequate reason why it should be done a third time. The House is always prepared to give way on a matter of urgent Government Business, particularly in war conditions, and in order to facilitate such business to modify its traditions, but such modification is an *ad hoc* present to the Government and not the conferment of an established precedent. The Government are now apparently trying to turn this process or habit of taking the Report and the Third Reading stages consecutively into not only a precedent but an established order, and there is strong objection to it. It happens that there is very strong objection to it on this particular day, because of the complicated Motion put down in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is not merely complicated but is very controversial, and to-day is one of the last occasions on which the process of consecutive Report and Third Reading stages should be proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but that it should be defended by the Leader of the House on the ground that we have already established a precedent seems to be an adequate reason why we should reject it.

Mr. Eden: I hope the House is not going to think that I wish to deprive it of long-established rights. That is certainly not my intention, and as Leader of the House it would be a very foolish practice for me to make any attempt of that kind. It is quite true that when, as a result of the Committee stage, only one Amendment was accepted, it became clear that if that Amendment had not been accepted, there would not even be a Report stage at all. That was the position as it then was, and I thought it not unreasonable to ask the House to follow the same practice as we had followed in the last two years. I certainly do not wish to insist upon this course against the wish of the House.

. . . . The Motion I have moved is permissive, and if it is passed the Business may be taken in one day. If the House is willing to let the Motion be passed, and will have confidence in me as Leader of the House, and if I find, as the business proceeds, that it is desired to have another day, I am prepared to arrange it with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. [*Interruption.*] I do not want to force it against the wish of the House, if the House is anxious on the subject of precedent, as I can quite understand it may be. We do not wish to get into the position that because the House has given us a special power we take it year by year. I think we shall be wiser not to press this Motion, and therefore I shall ask leave to withdraw it. . .

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Published by the proprietors K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 49, Prince Alfred Road, Liverpool, 15. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.