Draft

The Story of Anglo-Saxon Anti-Semitism: An Open Conspiracy

THE STORY OF ANGLO-SAXON ANTI-SEMITISM

The story of anti-Semitism in Britain begins with the Norman Conquest.

"There is no evidence of Jews residing in England before the <u>Norman Conquest</u>. The few references in the <u>Anglo-Saxon Church laws</u> relate to Jewish practices about <u>Easter</u>. <u>William of Malmesbury</u> states that <u>William the Conqueror</u> brought Jews from <u>Rouen</u> to England. William the Conqueror's object may be inferred: his policy was to get feudal dues paid to the royal treasury in coin rather than in kind, and for this purpose it was necessary to have a body of men scattered through the country who would supply quantities of coin." ¹

So, a corollary would be the association with Norman conquest, and all the resentments due to that conquest. During that period, Christendom could not engage in usury, i.e., moneylending.

"As the Jews were ostracized from most professions by local rulers, the Western churches and the <u>guilds</u> ^[24], they were pushed into marginal occupations considered socially inferior, such as <u>tax</u> and <u>rent</u> collecting and moneylending. Natural tensions between creditors and debtors were added to social, political, religious, and economic strains. ²

...financial oppression of Jews tended to occur in areas where they were most disliked, and if Jews reacted by concentrating on moneylending to non-Jews, the unpopularity and so, of course, the pressure—would increase. Thus the Jews became an element in a vicious circle. The Christians, on the basis of the Biblical rulings, condemned interesttaking absolutely, and from <u>1179</u> those who practiced it were <u>excommunicated</u>. Catholic autocrats frequently imposed the harshest financial burdens on the Jews. The Jews

1

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Jews_in_England#Norman_England,_ 1066%E2%80%931290

² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Usury#Historical_meaning

reacted by engaging in the one business where Christian laws actually discriminated in their favor, and became identified with the hated trade of moneylending." ³

NORMAN CONQUEST AND FEUDAL EXPLOITATION

The story originates in feudal exploitation, in which religious differences over financial conduct were capitalised on by the English monarchy, the Norman invaders. So the Norman conquest was the vector for initial entry of the Jewish Diaspora into Britain. The context is financial from the outset.

VIKING SYSTEMS OF FINANCE

Viking, or Norman (Norsemen), systems of finance, and their instrumentalising of religious difference, was the context of Norman utility in which Jewish identifications arose. In Britain, those systems began with William the Conqueror, a systematicity that has continued right up to contemporary times.

History Of The English Fiscal System

The **history of the English fiscal system** affords the best known example of continuous financial development in terms of both institutions and methods. Although periods of great upheaval occurred from the time of the <u>Norman Conquest</u> to the beginning of the 20th century, the line of connection is almost entirely unbroken. Perhaps the most revolutionary changes occurred in the 17th century as a result of the <u>Civil War</u> and, later, the <u>Glorious Revolution of 1688</u>; though even then there was no real breach of continuity.

The primitive financial institutions of <u>early England</u> centred round the <u>king's household</u>. In other words, the royal preceded the national economy in importance. Revenue dues collected by the king's agents, rents, or rather returns of produce from land, and special levies for emergencies formed the main elements of the royal income which gradually acquired greater regularity and consistency. Following the Glorious Revolution, control of finance passed more and more to Parliament, which together with the decline of the

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Usury#Historical_meaning

importance of land rents as a source of income from about the <u>Wars of the Roses</u> led to different forms of taxation. ⁴

Systematising finance

The picture presented by the <u>Dialogue of the Exchequer</u> (c. 1176) is that of a comprehensive system which secured the receipt of royal income by providing a thorough audit of accounts, employing processes adapted to the circumstances of the time. It is, in fact, through the description of financial institutions that it is possible to ascertain the forms of revenue held by the crown. Thus, the ingenuity expended on the Exchequer's administrative machinery had as its aim the increase of the king's resources, a subject in which all politically involved churchmen and lawyers were deeply involved.

The history of the English fiscal system affords the best known example of continuous financial development in terms of both institutions and methods. Although periods of great upheaval occurred from the time of the Norman Conquest to the beginning of the 20th century, the line of connection is almost entirely unbroken. Perhaps the most revolutionary changes occurred in the 17th century as a result of the Civil War and, later, the Glorious Revolution of 1688; though even then there was no real breach of continuity. ⁵

HYSTERICAL LIES - INVENTIONS OF WEAPONISED PIETY

In addition to finance, there were factors of religious intensification, increasing Christian piety, which brought the differences between the Judaic and Christian into an increased relevance. To be of the Hebrew faith, became increasingly precarious in the early centuries of the millennium, a context of insecurity in which Jewish identifications

4

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_English_fiscal_system#Systematising_f inance

 $https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_English_fiscal_system#Systematising_finance$

took on a distinct status in accord with the functional relationship of their feudal role between Norman sovereignty and Anglo-Saxon peasantry.

STATUS OF JEWS

Prior to their expulsion in 1290, the status of Jews in England was completely dependent on the will of the Crown. .^[6] As "royal serfs," they were allowed freedom of the king's highways, exemption from tolls, the ability to hold land directly from the king, and physical protection in the vast network of royal castles built to assert Norman authority.^[7]

The Jews of London were the responsibility of the Constable of the Tower and for this reason they were able to seek refuge in the Tower of London when at risk of mob violence. This was resorted to on a number of occasions, with large numbers staying there, sometimes for months at a time. There are records of a body of Jewish men-atarms forming part of the garrison of the Tower in 1267, during a civil war.[8] A clause to that effect was inserted under <u>Henry I</u> in some manuscripts of the so-called *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* ("Laws of Edward the Confessor"). Henry granted a charter to Rabbi Joseph, the chief Rabbi of London, and his followers. Under this charter, Jews were permitted to move about the country without paying tolls, to buy and sell, to sell their pledges after holding them a year and a day, to be tried by their peers, and to be sworn on the Torah rather than on a Christian Bible. Special weight was attributed to a Jew's oath, which was valid against that of twelve Christians. The sixth clause of the charter was especially important: it granted to Jews the right to move wherever they wanted, as if they were the king's own property ("sicut res propriæ nostræ").^[5] As the king's property, English Jews could be mortgaged whenever the monarch needed to raise revenue and could be taxed without the permission of Parliament, eventually becoming the main taxpaying population.^[9]

English Jews experienced a "golden age" of sorts under <u>Henry II</u> in the late 12th century due to huge economic expansion and increased demand for credit. Major Jewish fortunes were made in London, Oxford, Lincoln, Bristol, and Norwich.^[10] The Crown, in turn, capitalized on the prosperity of its Jews. In addition to many arbitrary taxes, <u>Richard I</u> established the Ordinance of the Jewry in 1194 in an attempt to organize the

5

Jewish community. It ensured that mandatory records would be kept by royal officials for all Jewish transactions. Every debt was recorded on a chirography to allow the king immediate and complete access to Jewish property.^[11] Richard also established a special exchequer to collect any unpaid debts due after the death of a Jewish creditor. The establishment of the Exchequer of the Jews eventually made all transactions of the English Jewry liable to taxation by the king in addition to the 10% of all sums recovered by Jews with the help of English courts.^[11] So, while the First and Second Crusades increased anti-Jewish sentiments, Jews in England went relatively unscathed beyond occasional fines and special levies. Though they did not experience the same kind of social mobility and cultural advancements that Jews under Muslim rule did, the Jews of England's population and prosperity increased under the protection of the king.^[11] Though rulers of both church and state exploited and monopolized on the advancements in commerce and industry of English Jews, popular anti-Jewish sentiments grew as a result of their prosperity and relationship with the king and the courts.^[12] External pressures such as the circulating myth of the <u>blood libel</u>, the religious tensions in light of the Crusades, and the interference of Pope Innocent III in the late 12th century created an increasingly violent environment for English Jews. Mob violence increased against the Jews in London, Norwich, and Lynn. Entire Jewries were murdered in York.^[13] Because of their financial utility, however, English Jews were still offered royal protection, and Richard I continued to renew orders to protect the Jews, formalizing the Exchequer and designating "archae," or centralized record chests monitored by panels of local Christian and Jewish key holders to better protect records of all Jewish transactions.^[12]

The incompetence of <u>King John</u> in the early 13th century depleted even the wealthiest Jews, and though they had more than a decade to recover, <u>Henry III</u>'s equally mismanaged finances pressed roughly 70,000 pounds out of a population of only 5,000.^[14] To do so, they had to sell off many of their mortgage bonds to wealthy nobles. The Jews then became a focal point of those debtors' hatred and mass violence spiked again in the mid-13th century. Their legal status, however, did not change until Henry's son, <u>Edward I</u>, took control of the Jewries. He issued restrictive statues, forbidding them from taking any more property into bond, the means by which they could lend money

and how they lived. With almost all means of income denied them and property being confiscated, the Jewish population diminished. New waves of crusading zeal in the 1280s in conjunction with debt resentment pressured Edward into the expulsion of the depleted Jewish community in 1290.^{[15] 6}

ENGLAND AS PRINCIPAL PROMOTER AND INVENTOR OF LITERARY ANTI-SEMITISM

Anthony Julius finds that the English were endlessly imaginative in inventing anti-Semitic allegations against the Jews. He says that England became the "principal promoter, and indeed in some sense the inventor of literary anti-Semitism."^[16] In his book, Julius argues that blood libel is the key, because it incorporates the themes that Jews are malevolent, constantly conspiring against Christians, powerful, and merciless.⁷

BACKGROUND FOR FUTURE PRODUCTIONS OF ANTI-SEMITISM

This, then, was the background for future productions of anti-Semitism. The Anglo-Saxon resentment against Norman rule was channelled into a finance and religion fuelled hysteria against the Hebrews, the instrumentalised face of that Norman rule. Thus began the vicious discourse of hatred and lies constituting anti-Semitism; a discourse, that, due to its conveyance of fevered, Anglo-Saxon, resentment, became a de facto and habitual social structure, accompanying the Normans and Anglo-Saxons all around the globe, to eventually settle in the USA, where it took root in various communities, and continues to this day.

EXPULSION OF JEWS FROM BRITAIN

In order to gain favour with Anglo-Saxon populism, there was an official expulsion of Jews from Britain, by Norman sovereignty, for over 400 years.

RETURN OF JEWS TO BRITAIN

 $https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Jews_in_England \#Attitudes_of_the_kings$

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_Jews_in_England#Status_of_Jews
⁷

The readmission of Jews to Britain, by Oliver Cromwell, would most likely be due to the English Merchant interests financing Cromwell, to their desire for increased access to the international market, and to Jewish finance.

Can Cromwell be seen as a rebellion against Norman nobility, by mixed Anglo-Saxon and Norman, non-noble, bourgeois merchants, against the nobility, or at least against the Royalists, using their financial power to forcibly extract concessions from a persisting figure of royal, Norman hegemony?

In order to extend and grow this financial power, was access to increased capital and international markets required? Hence, Cromwell's reversal of Jewish expulsion that had taken place 400 years earlier?

THE PRODUCTION OF ANTI-SEMITISM AND COLONIALISM

The production of anti-Semitism, of colonialism, and of 'modernity', all these historical lines, have a tentative origination in the Norman conquest of Britain.

The Norman conquest, together with other Norse infiltrations, were responsible for the creation of British monetary and financial systems. The arising and development of those systems was the preliminary for all future British developments, culminating in the global imperialism, on which 'the sun never set'.

By this time, if Britain could be seen as a 600-year-old system of financial records, of meticulous national bookkeeping, in conjunction with the legacy of Roman administration, as received through the vector of various Germanic appropriations, permeating their way through to Britain; how could such a structure of organisations, implemented and tested through the centuries, not be an effective structure of continuing appropriated, imperial investments?

Thus, it would seem, if the global stage was set for the deployment of this imperially incubated structure, structural colonisation was inevitable, given sufficiently diligent applications towards its implementation. The key factor of observation is the overt militarisation of trade mentioned by Ramsay, the facile substitute for usual forms of diligence.

RAMSAY'S WARMONGERING PROFITEERS OF TACTICAL PIETY

"It is interesting to note that Allan Ramsay likewise deplored "a friendly alliance between the camp and the counting-house" for exactly the same reasons (Letters on the Present Disturbances, p.34). Ramsay maintained that of the evil consequences of such alliance "the two last wars carried on by England against France and Spain, furnish a most melancholy illustration. To obtain the sole and exclusive commerce of the western world, in which the French and Spaniards were their rivals, was the modest wish of our merchants, in conjunction with our Americans. The fair, and truly commercial, method of effecting this would have been, by superior skill, industry and frugality, to have undersold their rivals at market: but that method appearing slow and troublesome to a luxurious people, whose extraordinary expences* required extraordinary profits, a more expeditous one was devised; which was that of driving their rivals entirely out of the seas, and preventing them from bringing their goods at all to market. For this purpose, not having any fleets or armies of their own, the powers of the State were found necessary, and they applied them accordingly" (ibid., pp.32 f.).

Knorr, K. E. 'Cho2-Part2 British Colonial Theories 1570-1850'. In British Colonial Theories, 1570-1850. The University of Toronto Press, 1944."

Ramsay's warmongering merchants, profiteers, and pirates, left Britain with a huge tax bill for wars they instigated and profited from, often running off to America with their dubious gains.

The roots of wealth acquisition always constitute forms of anxiety for the imperial acquirer. They are radical forms of anxiety, at the intersections of foreign opportunity brought in line with domestic, structural obligation. But those intersections can themselves become quasi-autonomous zones of free opportunity, beyond the dictates of both foreign opportunity and domestic obligation, though they may be supported by both. They are zones in which distributional innovation can occur, to the benefit of all concerned. But in conjunction with on-site militarisation, they are all too susceptible to the enforcements of coercive exploitation, those enforcements masking themselves often as defences of trade interest and investment.

It is here that private interests escape both foreign and domestic obligation, in a hyperpiracy whose institutional infiltrations take the form of a 'military industrial complex'.

US REPETITION OF A MILLENNIUM OLD FIGURE?

Does the feudal pattern of resentful, 'peasant reaction', against 'noble exploitation', repeat itself within the USA, within bourgeois modernity, and within the contemporary; as the conflict between American middle and working classes against the so-called 'Ivy League, liberal elites' of the US East Coast?

Do those so-called, 'liberal elites', function as de facto Norman nobility, within this millennium old, habitual Anglo-Saxon narrative? Do their associations with Europe, and with any so-called 'Jewish financial interests'; the natural result of international trade, but so beloved by USA conspiracy theorists; receive undue emphasis because they repeat the same originary structure as the initial, or primal, Norman Conquest trauma? Norman nobility vs. Anglo-Saxon peasantry, in the 'New World' of the Americas?

INCESSANT MISREPRESENTATION

Does every conspiracy and accusation hurled by anti-Semitism at the Hebrew people, actually constitute the history of Norman and Anglo-Saxon behaviour, actions from Britain or by the Anglo-Saxon diaspora, under the sign of scapegoating projection, hurled at others as incessant misrepresentation?

The current preoccupations with tribalism and territory; nativism and xenophobia; none of these factors seemed to deter the expansions of European colonialism. 'Diversity', was forcibly inflicted by Europeans on the entire globe. That was a choice no one else asked them to take, one by which they were extraordinarily enriched; so enriched, that they continue on with its adapted structures, as remote-controlled exploitation.

UNFORTUNATE TRUTHS

Britain of the early 1950s, and even 1960s, had many thriving Jewish businesses, which contributed significant prosperity to the country, Jewish labour, commercial knowledge,

and capital, helping to rebuild Britain after the war. Gradually, as time went on, all of the Jewish businesses were taken over by British natives.

Britain invited Commonwealth citizens from all over the world, to come to the UK. Their labour, likewise, helped rebuild Britain, creating prosperity. But obviously, the current Home Office doesn't see it that way with regard to the recently publicised, Afro-Caribbean documentation scandal.

Ironically, the very techniques used by British natives to disenfranchise post-war, Jewish business interests, are precisely some of the accusations that Anglo-Saxon, anti-Semitism, projects onto Jews. The hypocrisy is astounding!

Unfortunately, the same ideology continues in the USA, in virulent form. The convolutions of self-contradictory 'justification' resorted to by this ideology would be hilarious if they weren't sincere beliefs. Indeed, for those so stubbornly and stupidly sincere, hypocrisy is the only way of life they know.