The Jews, for instance, are 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 all nations less intelligent the individual the more likely 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 all nations less intelligent the individual the more likely 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.

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 all nations less intelligent the individual the more likely 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.
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 laws, and what every policeman wants. And when the smaller gangsters have 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. All rights reserved.

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 Saud 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 just, 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 fatal 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 stratagem 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 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 theBloc 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 Temiscamique 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 politicians.

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 Adélaïd 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 Canadiant of national dividends.

---
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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."


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 be paid 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, stature. 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 Kaibushiki (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."

CANT 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 Operators' 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 Messiahism 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 fédérative gouvernée par une oligarchie juive. A mesure que le régime ploutocratique si mal appelé démocratique se développera en Europe, on peut s'attendre à voir se développer une puissante fédalité juive profondément séparée du peuple par la religion, la race, et l'orgueil.... Il suffirait donc aux juifs de se réservier 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 Messiahists 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 Messiahists 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 thereof 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, 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, 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, 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.
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, convinced 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 propagated 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 habits, 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. Raphall, 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 even 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 incapacies 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 Pravy
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 newspa-
ners 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 publica-
tion 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 Govern-
ment 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 Infor-
mation 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 Gov-
ernment will be equally discouraged?

Mr. Bracken: Yes, Sir. I have already had a con-
troversy with a well-known organ called the Daily Worker
for attacks on the Polish Government, and until that paper
learned 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, not-
withstanding 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 Gov-
ernment 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 ex-
plained 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. Benson: It is certainly not my intention, and as Leader of the House 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.
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