

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 21. No. 10.

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

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1948.

6d. Weekly.

## From Week to Week

"The committee found themselves unable to accept proposals that the law of defamation should be extended to embrace false statements vilifying groups or classes of persons distinguishable by race, creed, colour, or vocation. . . ."—Lord Porter's Committee on the Law of Defamation, issued October 20.

So fails the insolent effort to protect one race or creed from criticism.

Beyond a well-founded dread of libel actions, the average individual has little knowledge of the principle on which they are supposed to rest—that the injured party has sustained damage "in the way of his calling." The cool effrontery of the suggestion that a group of unspecified size, which on this principle might claim astronomical monetary injury, is covered by this principle requires to be understood to be appreciated.

It is fairly obvious that the venomous hatred of General Franco evinced officially by the "democracies" has little, if anything, to do with his form of government. It is the outcome of the rage of the Freemasons at the first major check received by the Secret Societies since the suppression of the Knights Templars.

It should be recalled that the Spanish Civil War was carefully prepared by the infiltration of the officer *cadres* of the Spanish Royalist army by Masonic Lodges, the spread of commercial and administrative corruption, and the general mismanagement which appeared to justify strikes. To their eternal credit, a fair proportion of the officers renounced the Masonic policy when they recognised whereto it tended; and the Communist front of the Freemasons crumbled from its innate barbarism.

If it should be supposed that we have no concern with these matters, let us think again. In the current issue of *Tomorrow*, Admiral Sir Barry Domvile, with entire objectivity, indicates the activities of, *inter alia*, "a Jewish colonel of Marines." They are stage one of the preparation for civil war, and anyone with experience of Government Departments knows that they have been in progress for many years. The people who quite probably understand least the nature of their own position, and the emergency with which they may at any time be confronted, are the vast majority of those who, for careerist reasons have succumbed to the inducements of "the Jewish colonel of Marines."

We cannot point the moral better than by quoting Admiral Domvile: "I do not think that any employee of the Government, in whatever capacity, should be allowed to belong to a Secret Society of any description."

A correspondent resident in U.S.A. has sent us a folder being widely distributed by a Jewish firm in Indianapolis, promising dispatch within twenty-four hours from Messrs. Joseph Lyons & Co., Ltd., Cadby Hall, London, of assorted

food parcels at various prices containing tea, finest brisket of beef, veal, ham, tongue, and, in the words of the folder, "By special permission of the British Ministry of Food . . . food gift packages containing highly rationed foods." It should be noticed that these "highly rationed foods" are not sent from U.S.A.; they are not in the same category as the parcels sent from, e.g. Australia; they are merely distributed from stocks in the British Isles, at twenty-four hours' notice, by orders placed abroad. The folder concludes, "Place a weekly order so that your English friends may once more enjoy a zest for living."

So now we know why the rationing system is so popular in certain quarters. You aren't rationed because the food isn't here, but because you haven't friends in Indianapolis.

By raising artificially the buying price of silver, the U.S. drained China of the metal which was the basis of her currency, thus forcing her onto a paper currency having no link with commodities. Then, during the Burma War, unknown millions of these bank-notes, printed in U.S. and flown over "the hump" to the exclusion of vital materials, were let loose on China, completely disorganising the economic system and opening the country wide to Communist propaganda. Just how does this link up with the Roosevelt assistance to Russia, everywhere?

In a long letter to *The Catholic Herald* of October 8, Dr. Halliday Sutherland raises perhaps the most sinister feature of the present struggle—the presentation of masses of statistics by various official and quasi-official bodies and "experts," all tendentious, many quite unprovable, and in many cases not serving any purpose but that of the World Planners.

This technique bears a close family resemblance to the use made of the unproved theories of Spencer and Darwin to buttress an equally new theory of "natural law," in conflict with that sanctioned by theology and embodied in Magna Carta.

In a review of a book by Professor Corwin, "LIBERTY AGAINST GOVERNMENT," *Human Events* (Washington, D.C., October 13) remarks in connection with the older and sounder concept: "This principle proceeds . . . from two historical factors; first, of course, the constitutional (U.S.A.) separation of powers; second, the ancient tradition of a natural law transcending all positive [*i.e.* enacted. Ed. *T.S.C.*] law. In mediæval England, the jurisconsults associated the natural law with the idea of "immemorial custom," and this provided the psychological sanction for Magna Carta. The great importance of the natural law in legal history, therefore, is its qualification of the concept of sovereignty."

We see unmistakable signs that this subject will, in the near future, become the major issue. As in the case of other vital matters, it has been carefully kept from the attention of everyone not professionally controllable; but it has come into the light of day. The Powers of Darkness may well take heed.

## PARLIAMENT\*

House of Commons: July 13, 1948.

### British Nationality Bill

[Lords]

Considered in Committee.

[Major MILNER in the Chair]

CLAUSE I.—(British nationality.)

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede):* I beg to move, page 1, line 7, to leave out "British subject," and to insert "citizen."

The purpose of this Amendment and the corresponding Amendments to later Clauses which appear in considerable numbers on the Order Paper is to restore the Bill to the original form in which it was before it was altered in another place. The Bill as it was originally drafted centred round the conception of citizenship, and the nomenclature now used in the Bill, by substituting "British subject" for "citizen" has blurred this conception and rendered its provisions incomprehensible. . . .

*The Chairman:* If the Committee agrees, I think it would be convenient to discuss the next Amendment, in page 2, line 1, to leave out Subsection (4), together with the proposed new Clause (*Continuance of certain citizens of Eire as British subjects.*)

*The Attorney-General:* I beg to move, in page 2, line 1, to leave out Subsection (4).

I am afraid I took up a very long time on the previous occasion on which I addressed the Committee, and I shall endeavour to be as brief as I can on this one, because here we are really traversing exactly the same point—and it is a fairly short point—that we have to consider during Second Reading. We are now considering whether we should delete Subsection (4) of Clause 1 as it stands in the Bill, as it has come down to us from another place, and in effect substitute the new Clause (*Continuance of certain citizens of Eire as British subjects.*)

The Bill as at present drafted is calculated to cause embarrassment to those whose interests it is so mistakenly pretended or desired to protect, and at the same time it is likely to inflict an affront on a nation which, whether she is a member of the Commonwealth or a complete stranger, we have no right to impose upon her. The persons affected by this Amendment are citizens and subjects of Eire. The sovereign legislature of Eire has laid down, as it was entitled to do, the principle, that in general its people—using now a neutral phrase—should not be of divided loyalty, but that they should decide, not seeking to get the best of both worlds, of which country they desired to be citizens.

It is perfectly open, of course, to any existing citizen of Eire to cease to be a citizen of Eire and to become a citizen of any other country; and persons who in future become citizens of Eire will not be debarred, as far as I know, by the Eireann law—although, of course, I cannot speak for the law of that country—and certainly will not be debarred by the United Kingdom law, from becoming nationals of other countries if they choose. But it is the fundamental right of

\* During the Adjournment we are collecting from the proceedings of the last two sessions of Parliament some points of interest omitted at the time only because of pressure on our space.—Editor, *The Social Crediter.*

any sovereign State to say that those who wish to retain the privileges of its own citizenship and nationality must forswear the citizenship and nationality of other countries. We may regret that particular countries should wish to take that course; but we cannot deny as a matter of international law, or as a matter within the practice of our own Commonwealth, that it is for each separate nation State which is a Sovereign State to decide for itself whether it shall provide as part of its law that those who choose to be its citizens are not at the same time to be the citizens of any other country. Now, as a matter of fact, the Government and Parliament of Eire do not seek to do that, although they would have been entitled to if they had so chosen.

There is much in this Bill—as I indicated in the course of our Second Reading Debate—about which the Government of Eire are uneasy; but they are content that those who under our existing law are British subjects should be entitled to claim to retain that British nationality without forfeiting their status and their position as citizens and subjects of Eire, the country in which they choose to live. Speaking as a lawyer, I am bound to say that, whilst we may have a sort of political regret about this, it seems to me that the position which has been taken up by the Government of Eire, ever since it was first enunciated by Mr. De Valera in that statement which I read to the House on Second Reading, is a correct position so far as the law is concerned.

Of course, in this Parliament we can disregard these rules of international law and of comity between the different countries in the Commonwealth. The United Kingdom Parliament can do anything. We can pass a Bill declaring that black is white, and the moment that Bill receives the Royal assent black will be white. It has been said that the only thing the United Kingdom Parliament cannot do is to make a man a woman. But I am not sure about that. The physiological results might be distinctly disappointing, but if such an Act were passed by this Parliament, then in law a man would become a woman. There is nothing that we cannot do.

The question that we have to consider here is: Is it really wise to proceed in this way in relation to a sister country, our relationship with which we are most anxious to improve? As a matter of comity governing the relations between the different Commonwealth countries, and as a matter of international law governing the relations between independent sovereign States, it would be quite wrong for us to insist on giving British nationality to persons who live in Eire, who have Eireann nationality, and who under the law of Eire are not entitled to have the nationality of another country. . . .

What we are entitled to say, and what we say by the proposed new Clause which appears at the end of the Amendment Paper is, without in any way affecting the rules of comity which ought to govern our relationship, and which ought to govern the relationship of all the Commonwealth countries in matters of this kind: "Although you are, and remain, a citizen of Eire, if you come to this country we will give you all the advantages and all the privileges that we would confer on one of our own subjects and citizens." We are entitled to say that to Eire or to the citizens of any other Commonwealth country. Any other Commonwealth country is entitled to do the same.

What we are not entitled to say is: "Despite the laws of your own country and despite the fact that you choose

to remain there and to be a citizen of that country, we are going to make you a national of this country." That we do not propose to do under the Bill. What we seek is to enable those who are British subjects at present to retain that right by claiming it. That, the Eire Government have agreed that we might do. Beyond that we have said, in relation to Eire as to any other sovereign State, it is for them to decide what the nationality of their people may be, and that all that we can do with propriety is to say that we shall always welcome those people to the full privileges that we extend to our own people in this country.

*Mr. W. J. Brown (Rugby):* The discussion on this Amendment is different in character from the discussion on the first three Amendments. The argument then was pre-eminently a legal one as to the precise effect upon the status of individuals of this or that combination of words as against other combinations. The argument here seems to be entirely different in kind and degree. The issue here is whether we are to import, or rather to accept at the instance of another place, the importation into the Bill of a provision which will have the effect of bringing us into conflict with another people. That, and nothing more or less, is the issue that we have to discuss here.

Whatever may be the argument about the Canadians, the Australians, the South Africans and the rest, Ireland is not a British country. She claims to be a mother country in her own right. She has certainly sent out many sons all over the world. To treat Ireland as though she were like the countries which are of British settlement and origin is to approach the matter from a completely wrong angle. The Irish understand that the term "British subject" is one which is cherished by countries of the British race, but it would be a triumph of over-statement to say that it is a title which is loved by the Irish. Indeed, they have always consistently refused to accept the status of British subject. The very same sort of historical reason which makes the term "British subject" valuable and welcome to Canadians, Australians, South Africans and Englishmen, makes that title opprobrious to the Irish. We ought not, therefore, to seek to thrust it on them.

The third point is that the Irish have always objected, not only in words but, since they have had the power, in terms of law, to the term "British subject" being applied to them. The purpose of the Irish Nationality (Citizenship) Act, 1935, was to repudiate the claim that birth in Ireland could confer any nationality other than Irish nationality. It has been argued that since 1935 the issue has rather gone by default, and that the Irish have passively accepted the title "British subject" without making very much fuss about it. That is not true. It will be within the knowledge of the Attorney-General and other Members of the Government that conflicting legislation as between Eire and Britain in relation to citizenship has been the cause of conflict and difficulty between the two countries and, to a less extent, between the two peoples.

I do not want to be misunderstood. We have had difficulty on this matter in the past. For example, during the war I do not think that any Irishman resident in England was unwilling to do his turn at civil defence, fire watching and the rest, but there were many Irishmen who objected like the very devil to being conscripted to do that work as "British subjects." There is all the difference in the world between asking for voluntary service from a man and seeking to impose that service on him as an obligation by thrusting

upon him a nationality which he does not want. In other parts of the Commonwealth the Irish resisted conscription as "British subjects," not because they were unwilling to fight for the land in which they lived and in which they made their living, but because they objected to being conscripted as "British subjects."

. . . The form of the Bill before it went to the other place was agreed with the Irish Government I am told—and the Home Secretary or the Attorney-General may confirm this—that it was not a particularly enthusiastic agreement. It might be described as an acquiescence in the terms of the proposed Bill, rather than an enthusiastic advocacy of it. Even so, it is a considerable thing to have got an acquiescence. Having got it now, it would be utter folly to throw it away as if it were worth nothing. Anybody who has negotiated with any Irishman knows that to achieve any sort of agreement with him is a triumph of the improbable over the impossible! In those circumstances, the Government are perfectly right to try to restore the Bill to the condition it was in before it went to another place, and I will whole-heartedly support them in the Lobby.

*Mr. Gage (Belfast, South):* . . . When one looks at this Amendment and considers Ireland, and I think I can claim that I know Southern Ireland as well as most Members here, if not better than some, and the effect it will have upon Ireland, we find this. We find that roughly the South of Ireland can be divided into three groups. First of all there are those people who loath England and have always loathed England, those people who have never for the last 25 years regarded themselves as British subjects and really do not care whether they are called British subjects by England or not. This Amendment will have no effect upon them at all. They have never been particularly impressed by any English Parliament, and being deeply conservative by nature they are certainly unlikely to be impressed by the measures of a Socialist Government. So far as they are concerned, this Amendment might never have been introduced at all.

Secondly, there are the people—and I suppose I may claim to be one of them—commonly called the "Southern Irish Loyalists," who are deeply affronted by this Amendment. They have for many years felt that it was their duty to build up the greatness of this Commonwealth, and they now feel affronted that they should have to go to an English Home Secretary and apply to him to be called, what they think is their undoubted right, a British subject. That feeling cannot be exaggerated. I know it to be the case from my relations with countless friends throughout the South of Ireland and in this country. In between these two classes there is perhaps the largest class of all, those who are really not particularly interested in this matter and will not be affected by it at all. So far as Southern Ireland is concerned, I do not think that this Amendment will be of any real importance at all. Its only effect will be that it will be regarded as ridiculous by one section and odious by the other. Already I have seen comments in the Irish papers on the subject of what their status here is to be; they are not to be British subjects and yet they are to have all the rights and privileges of British subjects. I take it that if they so desire they will be able to stand for Parliament. I assume that that will be the case, although they will not be British subjects. Someone in a Dublin paper said that they will be a sort of international hermaphrodite. No one on either side has yet described precisely what their status will be. . . .

(Continued on page 7.)

## 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 SELFton Park 435.

Vol. 21. No. 10.

Saturday, November 6, 1948.

### Narrow it Down

On all hands there is talk of breakdown. Sometimes it is 'inevitable' breakdown; sometimes 'breakdown—unless.' It seems to be contended that the doctors are to have it both ways, and the Medical Service to be facing breakdown 'in the winter,' unless something unspecified is done, which would seem impossible, to rescue doctors from too many patients and too little income at the same time. The inexhaustible willingness of the present administration to let, or make, someone else pay to keep its ventures afloat could be stretched to cover the plight of doctors on the verge of bankruptcy, or worse; but that would not increase the number of available doctors. And once having given inducement to all and sundry to consult doctors "free of charge," there does not seem to be much, short of withdrawing the inducement, to limit the number of those who take such advantage of the opportunity as they can see. Mond-Turnerism in action hasn't brought peace to industry, nor has it brought peace to the schools. (The responsibility of the Mond-Turner agreement for recent developments in education is not often stressed; but it is there, and much current discussion of the problems of educational administrators would be better directed if its role were brought under inspection). The 'extra year' of school life, in conjunction with other 'reforms,' has disrupted education at every stage, and newspaper writers are having a fine time explaining what a widening perspective of difficulty attends every human activity that has been touched by the planners' hand, which is to say every activity there is.

We used to look forward (though not happily) to the time when the planners, having reaped the percentage success they had determined upon, would consolidate their position. But like prosperity in the increasingly distant past, this point of hesitation seems to be round the corner; and breakdown for breakdown's sake seems to be more and more certainly the sole present objective of the administration: Nihilism in process of execution.

From this angle, it does seem that the enemy is winning all along the line, without losing a man, and almost without conceding a point. Certainly every potential opposition which might have been predicted to become actual has shown itself to have no substance at all: Lords, Commons, Industry, the Church by Law Established, right down to the driven and ridden individual. The taste has gone out of life for most of those who live it, and even those in unexpected enjoyment of the few corrupted privileges which remain outside of Zion betray signs of a jaded palate. Even Sir (Austerity) Cripps doesn't sound happy when he broadcasts, and Mr. Attlee's medical advisers have painstakingly,

if not pleasantly, distinguished his discomforts from the Gout, a patrician disorder which has still to acquire popularity among our present rulers.

There must also be recorded a rising expectation of an early end to the Government elected (so they say) by a majority of the constituencies in 1945. Probably this signifies little more than wishful thinking on a not very impressive scale. Mass bribery, in one form or another, has by far the greater part of the electorate subject to it. It may not be a willing subjection; but it is an accepted shackle, one of the many. Actually the new hopefulness helps the Government: it acts as a leak to reduce rising resentment. In the total absence of a sound policy from all the parties, it promises nothing but a slope made more slippery.

Whether breakdown can be averted remains to be seen. We have consistently predicted breakdown, and breakdown on the most magnificent scale, if the political and economic directives (the latter as instrumental to the former) of the present century (to go no farther back) were persisted in. The conclusion is inescapable assuming our view of the nature of the universe. Right and wrong are not interchangeable terms. It is as simple as that.

What we have to say beyond that is that, breakdown or not, we have still the same part to play, which is the *uncovering* of obscured or hidden truths concerning our own and everyone else's situation, so that he who wishes to do so may see it. *That* we find easier every day. To Orage is attributed at least this observation: that the opportunities of Social Crediters had a certain periodicity, which Orage put at something like six months. This is something like the billiard-player's 'break.' We are inclined to say that now we 'go to the table' oftener than in Orage's time, and do not stay so long. The game is faster. At the same time, it is more individual, and we have written these lines to persuade our readers to watch ceaselessly for their opening to play, to play up when it comes, and, above all to recognise their chances when they come. There is one major necessity: the narrowing down of the issue to one on which it is possible to break through.

### Children of the Sun?

Under the heading, "Israel's New Jewish Stock," *The Scotsman* for October 20 carried a copyright article by Michael Davidson stating that Israel's soil "is producing a new and surprising Jewish stock—burly, blond, and somewhat oafish. The process is as clearly marked and as novel as the evolution of a new breed of cattle or a new kind of wheat."

If it were not for the upward curve of the nostrils, the writer thinks the fair-haired, blue or brown-eyed "Sabras" of both sexes of the teen-aged generation would seem as "Aryan" as any Scandinavians.

He says the phenomenon is unexplained, "though experts are inclined to believe it due to the impact of minerals in the soil on "unacclimatised European tissues." Nearly everyone of the new race of 'Jewish' youngsters belongs to the youth movement of a political party, and, girls as well as boys, are "generally freethinkers" and regard "most religious prohibitions and practises as outmoded superstition."

### Militant Zionism

The following extracts from the text of the report submitted by Dr. Ralph Bunche to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 27th September, 1948, regarding the assassination of the United Nations mediator, have been published by The Arab Office in its news bulletin, with extracts from other United Nations Documents, also here reproduced:—

I have the honour, in response to the request of the Security Council of 18th September to the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision, to submit a further report on the death of Count Bernadotte and Colonel Serot.

1. The Ruthless assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte, United Nations Mediator in Palestine, and of United Nations observer Colonel André Serot, of the French Air Force, in Jerusalem on Friday, 17th September, 1948, was the result of a deliberate and planned attack aimed at the person of the mediator and at the authority of the United Nations in Palestine. *Assassinations occurred in territory controlled and administered by armed forces and officials of the Provisional Government of Israel.* Foreign Minister of Provisional Government has informed me by letter dated 19th September, 1948, that, "As there seems to be little doubt that the group calling itself Hazit Hamoledet (Fatherland Front), which has acknowledged the authorship of the crime, is an arm of the dissident organisation, Lohame Herut Israel (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel), the Provisional Government has proceeded to take action against this organisation and its members."

2. Official view of the Provisional Government therefore is that the crime was planned and perpetrated by "Fatherland Front" of notorious terrorists long known as the Stern Group (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel).

3. *It has been well known that Terrorist Groups organised to pursue political ends by violent means have existed in territory controlled by Provisional Government of Israel.* Such groups had operated in Palestine during Mandate, and were responsible for many hideous crimes committed in name of political objectives. These organisations continued their activities after termination of mandate, and the Provisional Government of Israel found it necessary to take measures designed to circumscribe their independent military activities. *Until 20th September, however, when the new ordinance aimed at the prevention of terrorism was enacted following the Jerusalem assassinations, they continued to function openly, and without effective restriction or application of available legal sanctions against them in Jewish-controlled area of Jerusalem.*

4. At the very beginning of the first truce, one of these organisations, the Stern Group (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel), had issued general threats against United Nations observers. On that occasion, representative of the Secretary-General of United Nations and of mediator in Tel Aviv immediately sought an interview with the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government and asked for assurance that his Government would deal vigorously with any such threats against United Nations personnel and operations in territory under its control. The Foreign Minister stated that such threats were contrary to the policy of the Provisional Government, which would take view of any threats of this nature or any infringement of the truce. The Stern Group, he explained, then existed within Israel only as a political organisation, having disbanded itself as a military organi-

sation, and its members were being absorbed into the army as individuals.

5. Nevertheless as late as 6th September, 1948, fighters for the Freedom of Israel, in their daily press bulletins issued in Tel Aviv, vigorously attacked both the United Nations mediator and mediation effort, concluding with the words "the task of the moment is to oust Bernadotte and his observers. Blessed be the hand that does it." Particular significance should have been attributed to a statement of this kind precisely because it came from a group which had operated for a number of years as an underground force ruthlessly and notoriously employing assassination, kidnapping and other forms of violence, as a means to its ends.

6. Incidental development which had given concern to the mediator and his staff was the fact that in local Jewish press in recent weeks there had been steadily intensified attack against the mediator, mediation effort, truce supervision and the United Nations itself to the effect that the mediator was arbitrarily opposed to Jewish claims, and that supervision of truce deliberately discriminated against the interest of Israel. *The Provisional Government of Israel in its official pronouncements did nothing to counteract these unfounded attacks on good faith of the United Nations and on the efforts of the mediator as its representative.* On the contrary, public statements were made by responsible officials in the Government which cast reflection particularly upon truce supervision. On several occasions, representations were made on behalf of the mediator to officials of the Provisional Government regarding potentially dangerous situation which might thus be created. This situation appeared all the more ominous by virtue of existence of organised groups of extremists which continued their campaign of agitation against the presence of truce supervision personnel.

7. It is not suggested that there was any cause and effect relationship between this unfortunate development and the specific crime in Jerusalem. *But it was inevitable that the attitude of press and public pronouncements of high Government officials would have an important bearing upon climate of Jewish public opinion as regards the mediation and truce supervision efforts.* By the time of Jerusalem assassinations, widespread atmosphere of public suspicion toward motivations and objectives of mediation and truce supervision work had developed. This public suspicion, growing out of an assumption that a policy of discrimination between the two parties was being deliberately pursued, was entirely unjustified.

8. At the time of the fatal attack in Jerusalem, Count Bernadotte and his party had no armed protection of any kind. Official recognition of his presence in the Jewish area of Jerusalem was extended by Israel authorities in assignment of official liaison officer, who was travelling with mediator's party, in lead car, at time of the assault. This liaison officer however was unarmed.

9. Count Bernadotte's attitude toward armed protection on his numerous visits to Arab and Jewish terrorists was at all times clear and consistent, namely that provision of armed escort for him and party was a matter entirely at discretion of local authorities in whose territory he was travelling. He, like the United Nations observers who served under his direction, was always unarmed. He considered that his protection and safe conduct, and theirs, were responsibility of local authorities who were best situated to know the extent of protection necessary. He never requested an

armed escort, and lacking armed men at his disposal could provide none for himself. But whenever local authorities saw fit to provide an armed escort, it was accepted by him without question. In his visits to Arab countries and in Rhodes, such protection was often afforded him, as it had been on some of his earlier visits to territory under Israeli control.

10. *At the time of the murders, responsibility for the safety of Count Bernadotte and his party rested upon the Provisional Government of Israel and immediately upon the Military Governor of Jewish-occupied area of Jerusalem. Prior notification of the visit was given to Israeli authorities. In fact, the mediator at the moment of attack was returning to Y.M.C.A. building accompanied by an Israeli liaison officer preparatory to an appointment with Dr. Bernard Joseph, Military Governor of Jewish-occupied area of Jerusalem. According to the testimony of some members of Count Bernadotte's party, Dr. Joseph himself had been recognised, by the liaison officer, riding in an armoured car in the vicinity of the outrage a few minutes before it occurred. The failure on this occasion to provide the mediator and his party with armed protection would therefore appear the more pronounced. In the light of all the circumstances, the conclusion seems inescapable that there was negligence on the part of authorities in Jewish-occupied area of Jerusalem with respect to security precautions affecting the safety of the mediator.*

11. By a proclamation issued in Tel Aviv on 2nd August, 1948, the Provisional Government of Israel, defined as an "Occupied Area," the "Major part of the City of Jerusalem, part of its environs and its western approaches," and declared that the "law of the State of Israel applies to this occupied area." Area thus defined includes place at which assassinations occurred.

12. Resolution of Security Council of 19th August (Document S/983) definitely places the responsibility upon each party for the actions of any irregular forces in its midst and obligates each party to use all means at its disposal to prevent violations of the truce by individuals or groups under its authority or in territory under its control. *It is quite clear, therefore, that provisional government of Israel must assume the full responsibility for the action of these assassinations involving a breach of the truce of utmost gravity. Official statements issued by the Provisional Government immediately after outrage, and previously communicated to Security Council (Documents S/1005, S/1007) would seem to indicate that Provisional Government accepts responsibility for these assassinations within an area under its control.*

*Text of the report from the Chairman of the Truce Commission to the President of the Security Council dated 30th September, 1948.*

"Deliberate Jewish campaign led by Military Governor Dr. Bernard Joseph to discredit truce commission and acting mediator Dr. Bunche now apparent, developing along lines of attack launched against late Count Bernadotte prior to his assassination and marked by such deliberate discourtesies as release to press of communications sent to United Nations organisations before their receipt by addressees. Obviously undertaken in effort to destroy public confidence in and arouse public animosity towards the two bodies now striving to enforce truce in Jerusalem and bring about demilitarisation of Jerusalem in accordance with Security Council resolution of July 15th. Coincides with Jewish effort before General Assembly to obtain incorporation of Jerusalem in the State

of Israel and is calculated to prove both Jewish determination to keep Jerusalem and inability of United Nations to internationalise city in accordance with late mediator's recommendations.

"In reply to Dr. Bunche's statement that Israel authorities were lax in providing security for Count Bernadotte, Dr. Joseph in a press release blamed United Nations authorities for negligence in security measures. He claimed United Nations had declined Jewish suggestion that United Nations personnel be accompanied by Israel military personnel. He maintained 'Jewish authorities, had they received slightest intimation that United Nations representatives wished to have special protection accorded to them, would have gladly complied with the request.' Truce commission is writing to Dr. Joseph as follows: As long as Jewish officials pretend to exercise Governmental authority in Jerusalem for safety United Nations personnel: will hold him personally and Israel Army Jerusalem Command responsible for acts by Jewish terrorists; however, restrictions on freedom of movement of United Nations personnel under pretext of 'Safety Reasons' will not be tolerated; if safe, free movement throughout Jewish area cannot be guaranteed, Dr. Joseph should acknowledge inability to maintain law and order.

"In a second press release a proposal by the Truce Commission that a zone comprising the King David Hotel, Y.M.C.A., French and American consulates General be considered a neutral area was declared unacceptable by the Israel Army. Dr. Joseph claimed the Truce Commission had no authority to designate neutral zones and reserved freedom of action. He stated no Jewish troops were now in the area. In accordance with instructions from the late mediator to implement the Security Council resolution of July 15th with respect to the demilitarisation of Jerusalem and in an effort to assure the safety of United Nations personnel, the Truce Commission on August 30th proposed to both military commanders the creation of zone as demilitarised area. *The Arab commander accepted in principle but the Jewish commander ignored the letter until the press release of yesterday. Truce Commission and United Nations observers here consider such a zone not only as logical first step towards demilitarisation but necessary for the safety of United Nations personnel here. The Truce Commission consider it essential to bring to the Security Council's attention the actions of the Military Governor and the local Israel army command in view of the grave consequences which may result from malicious and distorted attacks on United Nations bodies. The attitude adopted appears to be expressly designed to hinder the carrying out of the Security Council resolution of July 15th. The Truce Commission believes that the non-co-operativeness towards United Nations exhibited by local Jewish authorities is diametrically opposed to the statements of responsible spokesmen of the Provisional Government of Israel pledging utmost co-operation with the efforts of the United Nations.*

*Extracts from the speech made before the Assembly of the United Nations on 27th September by Sir Zafrullah Khan, the Pakistan delegate.*

Palestine is an instance in point. *The so-called State of Israel is the culmination of a course of the most insidious aggression carried on and persisted in during the course of a third of a century contrary to all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. It is now*

proposed to stamp this culmination with the approval of the United Nations. It is necessary here and now to utter a solemn warning that *the setting up of the State of Israel in Palestine would mean the introduction of a canker into the body politic of the Middle East, which would eventually either have to be ejected through a surgical operation or else would poison the culture, economic security and policy of not only the Middle East, but of vast areas beyond that region.* Militant Zionism is the spearhead of a new aggression of the West against the East and it is idle to pretend or to hope that it will not sooner or later exact from both the West and the East the inevitable penalties that must follow upon aggression. The lesson is writ large in the pages of history if only we will not in our obstinacy shut them out from our sight. There is yet time to pause and to reflect. To-morrow it may be too late.

One wonders whether it would help the representatives of the Nations assembled here to appreciate more clearly and more justly the problem presented by Palestine if one were to invite them to view it, as it were, in the reverse. What would be the attitude of those of them that represent the Nations of the West both in Europe and in America if it were a case of the East seeking to set up in the heart of the West a sovereign independent state for the benefit of the East, however much the setting up might be reinforced by the kind of consideration by which it is sought to reinforce the setting up of the so-called State of Israel? But whether that may help or not, let me in all humility, but in all earnestness, remind and warn the assembled Nations that *at no time and under no circumstances will the East ever assimilate or reconcile itself to a sovereign State of Israel.* With Jewry as such we have no quarrel—indeed with the sufferings of the Jewish race we have deep sympathy—but does anybody pretend that the proposed State of Israel offer a solution, economic or political, of the problems that face the Jewish people? The insistence upon the setting up of a sovereign State of Israel in Palestine, while it would help to solve none of the problems of the Jewish people, is bound to create and intensify many and complicated problems the solution of which through peaceful means may be found to be impossible. I repeat, there is yet time to pause and to reflect; to-morrow it may be too late.

#### PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede):* . . . We are faced with the anomaly which exists as a result of the Act of Parliament of Eire in 1935 and the position of citizens of Eire when they come to this country. What we have managed to do for the first time in the history of the two countries since the separation between them is to arrive at a working arrangement as to how these respective people shall be regarded in this country. I agree with what the hon. Member for Rugby said. I am not at all sure that on both sides it was not more acquiescence rather than agreement which marked the concluding stages of our discussions.

The hon. Member for South Belfast thought it would be an affront for a person to become a British citizen by permission of the Home Secretary. Let me say that the permission of the Home Secretary is not involved. If a person claims from Southern Ireland to be a British subject, by that claim he becomes a British subject, and there is no power in this Clause that may refuse him. In that, certainly, the citizen of Eire who desires to become a British subject,

and to be known as such, is favoured above all the other people of the earth. Anyone else who desires to make such a claim and to have it granted, has, of course, to go through the complete process of naturalisation. He has to have the prescribed period of residence to be subjected to the investigation of his character and antecedents by the Secretary of State and his advisers, and in other ways to subject himself to a very considerable examination before he acquires that status.

Any person now living in Southern Ireland who desires to become a British subject becomes such merely by making the claim, and no one in this country, if he makes that claim, can refuse him the status for which he asks.

*Mr. Gage:* If the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me—this is an important matter. He has, has he not, to satisfy one of the grounds set out in the new Clause?

*Mr. Ede:* Yes.

*Mr. Gage:* Provided he satisfies those grounds?

*Mr. Ede:* Provided he satisfies those grounds, and makes the claim, then the permission of the Secretary of State is not required.

With regard to the position of the person who has not made such a claim, but comes to this country, he is not an alien. The moment he lands on these shores he has all the rights and privileges that attach to being a British subject in this country. I cannot see that there is any affront to anyone in being in that position. In fact I should have thought that those who are claiming for the Southern Irish loyalist the right that he should retain his position of a British subject without any question would have welcomed that arrangement. It is true that this may present anomalies, but in my experience of attempting to deal with the Irish, whether Southern or Northern, if one can do anything at all it is sure to be either by way of creating an anomaly or of recognising one.

My hon. Friend the Member for Plating (*Mr. Delargy*) asked me about the question of who was a citizen of Eire. The Eire (Confirmation of Agreements) Act, 1938, provides that in United Kingdom law the word "Eire" is to be used to describe what was previously known as the Irish Free State, that is to say, the 26 counties of Southern Ireland. . . .

*Mr. Pickthorn:* I apologise if I have been stupid but I am afraid I have not yet quite understood the right hon. Gentleman on three points. The first is that the Irishman or the Eireann I think is the right word—the Eireann not meaning the Aryan Hitler meant but the Eireann in the other sense—who has not claimed to be registered as a British subject, comes to this country and may be elected to this House. Can he take the oath when he has been elected? Whether or not he takes the oath, can he, for instance, be charged with high treason? It seems to be a very anomalous arrangement if he can be a Member of this House. He might be First Lord of the Treasury, because we all know that the bovine Saxon may pull but does not push so hard, and one of these chaps might get ahead of us all. May he become First Lord of the Treasury, yet would be incapable of being guilty of high treason?

The second point which I did not get quite clear was about the Eireann who does claim to have some connection with this country, and, therefore, to be registered as a British subject. I had thought that I understood the Bill and the Clause, but I am not sure that I understand the explanation, and the question I put is this: The right hon. Gentleman

said there was no question of his consent, but there is, surely, the question of his recognition of a set of facts? Or is that wrong? Does this recognition depend on his judgment whether or not the applicant has that degree of direct relation to this country and its Government which the applicant claims to have and upon which the applicant rests his claim to be registered as a British subject? I think that puts the question clearly, and, with every respect, although I may be mistaken, I do not think the answer to that question was previously clear, and I hope that we may get it clear.

Thirdly, and with much more diffidence, is it quite certain—I am glad that we now have the advantage of the presence of the learned Attorney-General again—is it quite certain that, if this Clause passes as it is and the rest of the Bill passes, is it quite certain that some body, born and brought up in Eire but not having been registered as a British subject, would find it quite impossible to claim in a British court of law that he was a British subject under the common law? It is quite certain that no court could hold that there was an allegiance, that there had been an allegiance, that there had been no explicit ending of that allegiance and that, therefore, the claim as ordinarily founded upon the allegiance was still standing? Is it quite certain that this Clause would get away from the possibility of that decision? . . .

*Mr. Ede:* . . . I will endeavour to deal with the questions put by the senior Burgess for Cambridge University (Mr. Pickthorn). With regard to the first, the man would be capable of taking the oath. Whether he took it or not would be a matter for him. Mr. Bradlaugh refused to take the oath, though he could come to the Table and be sworn—*[Interruption.]* I cannot answer here for what would be the effect on a man under Irish law. After all, none of us wants to create bad relations between the two countries, and I hope I shall not be pressed to give offhand answers to questions which might raise such points. I am only dealing—and I do not profess to do more than deal—with issues that will be raised under United Kingdom law in the event of the Amendment being carried and the Bill becoming law. If, having taken the oath, he was then accused of high treason, I am advised that he could be tried, and, if found guilty, condemned for that offence.

The second question which the hon. Member put was with regard to the extent, if any, to which permission from the Secretary of State is required under the new Clause. I am advised that under the Clause as drafted, I have no claim to be satisfied that the man fulfils the three conditions. If there is a bona-fide claim, I have no option at all, but whether the question of bona-fides could be tested in the courts or not is a matter on which lawyers would have to advise me. The third question which the hon. Gentleman put to me was again entirely legal in its character, and would depend for its answer on a decision of the courts.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 105; Noes, 307

### Australia's Contribution to Relief

The (Australian) *Hansard* quoted for the speech of Mr. Fadden from which extracts were given in *The Social Crediter* for October 9, attributed to the speaker the statement that Australian food to the value of £1,000,000,000 was given recently as "additional post-U.N.R.R.A. relief." The figure should have been £1,000,000.

Reissued in Canada:

## DICTATORSHIP BY TAXATION

By MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS.

(The text of the Belfast Address of November 24, 1936).

PRICE: THREEPENCE.

From:

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Liverpool or Electoral Campaign Headquarters, 207/413, Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C.

A selection of K.R.P. Publications is obtainable from:—

MR. KEITH G. CATMUR, 2, STEPNEY GREEN,  
Phone: STE 3025. LONDON, E.1.

## BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit .....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit .....	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy .....	6/6
Warning Democracy .....	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea .....	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism .....	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction .....	6d.
Social Credit Principles .....	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

### ALSO

The New Despotism by the Right Hon. Lord Hewart...21/-
Secret Societies and Subversive Movements
by Nesta H. Webster.....20/-
The French Revolution by Nesta H. Webster.....10/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....10/-
Elements of Social Credit.....7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage...7/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....5/-
Odlum v. Stratton
(Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....4/-
Communism in Action
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....2/-
Jesus Meets Paul by Dr. Alexander Paterson.....2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp. 1/6
Protocols of Zion.....1/6
The Smear Terror .....
.....1/3
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W.....1/-

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

(Please allow for postage when remitting).

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.