

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 25. No. 14.

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

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1950.

6d. Weekly.

### Political Pharisaism.

By NORMAN F. WEBB.

The Minister of Health and Housing, Mr. Aneurin Bevan, is delivering a series of Lectures to the Fabian Society on "Democratic Values." An analysis of some of his statements in the first lecture of the series may serve to throw some light on the essential elements of their pervasive creed of dialectical materialism which the disciples of the Fabian Society represent in this country. Its outstanding national exponent is, of course, Soviet Russia, but it is an incipient mental condition that can claim to be world-wide, and from which none of us is entirely free. Outside the Iron Curtain its focus, in the political sense, is undoubtedly to be located in the British Socialist Government, many members of which, like the Prime Minister himself, are Fabians.

Psychologically, no doubt, dialectical materialism is as old as human thought; this, however, is no place to go into its origins. For our purpose, which is to analyse the human impulses behind the political activity of Left Wing politics, we will confine ourselves to what is known as Marxism, and the spectacle of a Minister of the British Crown lecturing on Democracy to the Fabian Society is a measure of the distance we have travelled along this road in the hundred odd years since the publication of the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels in 1848. But even that is going too far back for Mr. Bevan; "Democracy as we know it to-day is a product of 20th Century," he told his Fabian audience in this first lecture. That gives one the measure and scope of his outlook, which is typically revolutionary, embracing an immediate past which in as far as he did not figure in it, was all wrong and scheduled to be entirely reversed, a present to do what one likes with, given the power, and a future that scarcely matters because one won't be there. It is obvious that if an individual, employing immense delegated power, acts without considering the past, which includes his own inherited impulses, good and bad, he is not likely to have much understanding of British Constitutionalism or culture. This, alone, is bound to make him a handy tool in any anti-British hands, and he undoubtedly requires to be watched in the public interest.

What is this Fabian Democracy that Mr. Bevan expounds? It is certainly not the Greek conception, for the Athenians had no use for adult suffrage. Whatever it is, he sets great store by it. "No country is safe," he says, "unless it becomes a Socialist Democracy." And as only our practical experience of that is Germany under Hitler's Social Democrats, his statement is not reassuring. It was in Germany that dialectical materialism, as expounded by Marx, first saw the light, and Germany has twice within the half-century demonstrated her inability to achieve social safety. In face of that are we to accept Mr. Bevan's word that a victory for his Social Democrats in 1951 would lead to different results?

It would be useful, therefore, if we could identify at least the outstanding characteristics of this prevalent state of mind, or outlook on affairs, known as dialectical materialism, which is behind the collectivist conception of society. A study of Mr. Bevan's words suggests that one of the main, if not the principal, characteristics is a distortion of motives. It would seem to be the method by which individuals are enabled to pose to the world as reforming philanthropists, when in fact they are in pursuit of their own personal ends. It is giving way to the temptation which allows individuals to indulge their essentially egocentric passion for domination over their fellows in the name of the Public Good. This it is contended, constitutes the immediate motive power behind the whole modern movement towards Collectivism and the almost irresistible urge to further concentration of power. The minimum of experience of human nature is enough to expose it as a sanctimonious lie. Let us see how Mr. Bevan, judged by his own words, supports the definitions.

"We are moving towards a collective society," he announced, and it would not be easy to contradict him. Then, possibly remembering that there might still be remaining traces of middle-class prejudice in the less perfectly Fabianised of his audience, he added ". . . not a monolithic society, in which every barber shop is nationalised. That is not necessary." Necessary, presumably, for the easy passage of Mr. Bevan's plans. "But we must have a society where elected representatives have their hands on the levers of economic power." That is his minimum requirement in the name of this as yet only vaguely defined Social Democracy; a state of things in which, to quote his own words ". . . the massive movements of economic forces are under central management and control. Unless that happens," he adds ominously, "democracy will perish." And in proportion as Mr. Bevan warms to his defence of Democracy, we begin to perceive what the term really means for him; a condition of things, in short, in which he is an "elected representative," and where "elected representatives have their hands on the levers of economic power."

One might be tempted to think that there was no essential difference between that and the position of the director of a capitalistic industrial concern, operating under conditions of private enterprise, and in an environment of economic sanctions. But there is, because in Mr. Bevan's case those very necessary sanctions are absent in any specific sense. No Bankruptcy Court or forced liquidation awaits the unsuccessful operator of Government Enterprise, as has been very crudely demonstrated in the case of Mr. Strachey and the Ground Nuts Scheme. Whatever was done, was done *in the public interest*; the sordid influence of the profit motive was not present, and therefore ordinary economic sanctions need not, and indeed cannot be applied.

Here you have an example of the distortion of motive which it was suggested was one of the chief characteristics of

dialectical materialism in operation. As an assumption either in Mr. Strachey's, or Mr. Bevan's case—or that of any of us—it is too absurd to argue about. What we are concerned with, however, is to find out the art or trick by which it is put over on society. That art, as the name implies, is material dialectics; unanswerably logical argument built up on false premises. In politics it emerges as a plan of action constructed in the belief that ends justify means, and that deception, either *en masse* or individual, on almost any scale, is justified if only the objective is sufficiently grandiose. And what grander than the getting of those "massive movements of economic forces . . . under central control and management!" It is indeed what might be termed a vicious moral spiral, for the more inflated the plan, and consequently the more widespread and disastrous the effects of its failure, the less the inner conviction of error and responsibility; until finally heights are reached where scruples of any kind whatsoever do literally seem out of place, so rarified is the moral atmosphere.

Mr. Bevan illustrated this condition clearly in what he said to his fellow Fabians. Listening to him it must become obvious that one of the chief attractions of the creed of dialectical materialism for such mentalities as his, is its apparent manoeuvrability as a mental vehicle, as compared with common principle; its ability, literally to turn in its own length. This he demonstrates in his lecture, for having got what he wants, *i.e.*, nationalization, or centralized control of production, on the plea that Industry was being run inefficiently and its output deliberately restricted in the interests of high prices by its existing operators, he finds himself under no cramping obligation, in respect of his avowed philosophy, to stick to his argument. When, in fact, the very reverse happens, and enormous operating losses begin to appear while output remains stationary or declines, there is literally nothing inside or outside the precepts of dialectical materialism, excepting the intelligence—of which he has no very high opinion—of those who allow themselves to be influenced by him to prevent him abandoning, and even contradicting it.

It is indeed a fearful and giddy temptation, to be shown the material kingdoms of the earth from such dialectical heights, and Mr. Bevan, with his social bitterness and brilliant debating combativeness, is not one to resist it. "When we argue for public ownership and nationalization," he told his audience, "we do not argue for greater productive efficiency or better balance sheets, but because the transfer to public ownership of economic aggregations is absolutely essential to the shoring up of civilized values in modern society." Could any warning be plainer of what this country has to expect from a regime based on Fabian dialectics? To the discerning, such a dialectical volte-face discloses the bare face of sheer physical force, with all its monopolistic assertion. Most assuredly civilized values are in need of shoring up. What is not so clear, however, is how that object is going to be achieved just by the application of a meaningless financial formula called Public Ownership, when at the same time all common values, and even the common rules of debate, are flouted.

It is the irony—or is it perhaps the tragedy?—of this particular epoch, that ignorant individuals such as Mr. Bevan, embittered by economic conditions that are entirely arbitrary and unnecessary and unrealistic, should be elevated almost automatically by the social and political situation brought about by the very forces that are bent on making these con-

ditions permanent, to where they are put in control of almost unlimited arbitrary power largely divorced from responsibility. One uses the adjective, ignorant, advisedly, because no individual can give himself up heart and soul to such a fake philosophy as dialectical materialism except in ignorance. Once given rein, this mental condition rapidly becomes pathological, and in such extreme cases as Mr. Bevan, probably incurable. But what of those he is so fatally misleading, his fellow-sufferers in quite understandable social bitterness, but lacking the immediate compensation of his corrupting sense of power? How long must it be before the stark facts wake them up sufficiently to see through all this high-falutin' Fabian nonsense!

Undoubtedly, the primary achievement of what is known as Christianity was the advancement of the understanding of the supreme truth that intrinsically bad means cannot be justified by their presumed objective. It is this truism, or scientific axiom, that is directly challenged by dialectical materialism, which, in its extreme form of Communism, or its milder aspects of Socialism or Social Justice, is everywhere in the ascendant to-day. Put without circumlocution, the world issue is, Marx versus Jesus of Nazareth. Pure optimism, substituted for inductive research applied to every aspect of human existence. Under such a mental regime, what one is faced with amounts to raw, uncontrolled human personality, set on preserving its own crumbling economic environment—typified by Orthodox Finance—by sheer, brazen dialectic, in defiance of Natural Law and scientific fact, and of all the common values and standards so painfully built up through nearly two thousand years of Christian teaching.

This is not to say that what nowadays calls itself dialectical materialism, and is openly anti-Christian, only began in the Nineteenth Century with Karl Marx. But it was the achievement of Marx—the son of a well-to-do Jewish Rabbi, enjoying German hospitality—to be the first to systematize anti-Christ and make it the political gospel of the underprivileged. Through him it became the Charter of Envy, whereby the malicious onlooker sets the under-dog to pull the upper-dog down in a demoralizing attempt to satisfy his inner, diabolic craving for a demonstration—a sign from heaven, or hell, he doesn't mind which—of material power. And since his objective is false and inverted; being no less than a confirmation of the Right of Might, in place of the Might of Right, the sign he gets is from hell, and inverted too; and society, instead of being freed and enriched by the applicatoin of Truth, or Science, to the whole art of living, is in grave danger of being permanently enslaved and impoverished by its own economic diabolism.

That Marxism will finally triumph I do not for one moment believe. But this terrific issue has its ups and downs, and we of this generation must see that our age does not touch an all-time low at the hands of "elected representatives" of the calibre of Mr. Bevan, and Mr. Strachey, to mention only two, who—not to put too fine a point upon it—are no more than visible agents, or dupes, of the hidden agents, or dupes, of the Prince of Darkness himself.

Order the book you need from:—

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., LIVERPOOL.

## PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: November 9, 1950.

### Aliens.

#### Aliens (Naturalisation Applications).

*Squadron Leader Burden* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will publish the names of sponsors of persons applying for naturalisation.

*Brigadier Rayner* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what qualifications are regarded as necessary for those British subjects who sponsor an alien's application for a certificate of naturalisation.

*Mr. Braine* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will arrange for the names of persons sponsoring applications made by aliens for British citizenship to be made available for public inspection.

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr Ede)*: A person who applies for naturalisation in the United Kingdom is required to include in his application declarations of support from four British subjects by birth who are intimately acquainted with him and are householders, but applications are never granted solely on the recommendations of sponsors, however distinguished. I do not think that any public interest would be served by the publication of the names of the sponsors.

*Brigadier Rayner*: In view of the large number of unsavoury citizens we seem to be accumulating, will the right hon. Gentleman tighten up the qualifications of sponsors?

*Mr. Ede*: No, Sir. There is no qualification to be a sponsor.

*Mr. Michael Astor*: Would not the Home Secretary be safeguarding himself if he adopted this suggestion, because the sponsors would be doubly careful if they knew that their names were liable to be published?

*Mr. Ede*: I do not think so. The sponsors are among the people interviewed, but it is not upon their views that the final decision is reached.

*Mr. Braine*: In view of the fact that British citizenship is the proudest privilege which can be conferred upon any man, will the right hon. Gentleman consider introducing legislation, reserving the right in each case to publish the names of the sponsors, to act as a deterrent to abuse?

*Mr. Ede*: No, Sir, I think it would be very wrong to pick and choose between one applicant and another.

*Mr. Harrison*: Does my right hon. Friend accept the suggestion that we are collecting a large number of unsavoury citizens? If so, what is he prepared to do about it?

*Mr. Ede*: No, Sir, I do not accept that suggestion, which I did not think was worthy of comment.

*Brigadier Rayner*: Surely "householder" is a qualification? Cannot the qualifications for a sponsor be narrowed?

*Mr. Ede*: I should be very reluctant to go beyond the qualification of householder and suggest that persons with houses either above or below certain rateable value should be disqualified from being sponsors.

*Brigadier Rayner* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will ensure that all applications for naturalisation by aliens are dealt with in his Department by British-born subjects.

*Mr. Ede*: I do not accept the implication that a person who is not British born is necessarily unsuited to deal with applications for naturalisation, but it so happens that all the members of the Home Office at present employed on this work are British born.

*Brigadier Rayner*: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman lay it down as a precaution?

*Mr. Ede*: No, Sir. I hold strongly to the view that in the Civil Service the best person for the job should do the work.

*Major Guy Lloyd* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department what inquiries he makes in the country of origin of an alien who seeks a certificate of British naturalisation.

*Mr. Ede*: Inquiries are not made in the country of origin. A substantial period of residence in this country is required before an application for naturalisation can be entertained. Before considering such an application the fullest possible particulars are obtained about the applicant's history, including his family connections and past and present associations.

*Major Lloyd*: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware, as a result of our unfortunate experiences before the war, of the need to know something of the background of people who come here and obtain naturalisation? Is it not very foolish, in view of the innumerable refugees in this country, that no inquiries should be made in their country of origin.

*Mr. Ede*: I have no power to make inquiries in the country of origin. My power ends at the three-mile limit. I can assure the hon. and gallant Gentleman that every necessary inquiry is made, and that a person normally has to have resided in this country for five out of the last eight years before his application can be entertained. We check up very carefully on his associates.

*Major Lloyd*: Do I understand that screening, which we all understood was a reliable method, really means that we know nothing, care nothing and have no responsibility?

*Mr. Ede*: No, Sir, it means nothing of the sort. It means that the most careful inquiries are made, and that every possible check that can be made in this country is applied.

*Mr. Peter Thorneycroft*: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman—

*Several Hon. Members*: No.

*Mr. Speaker*: Question time is going very slowly.

*Major Lloyd* asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department the total average expense to the State of pursuing inquiries about any alien seeking British naturalisation; and what is the charge to the applicant.

*Mr. Ede*: The cost of making inquiries into applications for naturalisation varies greatly from case to case, but the average cost is estimated to be about £8. The standard fee for a certificate is £10.

*Mr. P. Thorneycroft*: Do those costs include the cost of making inquiries abroad? Did the right hon. Gentleman really intend to say what I understood him to say before that he has no power to make such inquiries?

*Mr. Ede*: These costs do not include any costs for in-

(continued on page 6.)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

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

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFton Park 435.

Vol. 25. No. 14.

Saturday, December 2, 1950.

### From Week to Week

Of two things, one. Either an influential group in the British Government is afraid of the Jews, or it is receiving something from the Jews. We cannot see any other alternative which would account for the almost incredible stupidity which characterises our home and foreign policy, and has done so for the past fifty years at least. As a recent instance, we may notice the imbroglio with Egypt, and the steady deterioration of our relations with Pakistan, both of them directly traceable to our supine policy in Palestine.

Now, the world and politics being what they are, we have no intention of taking a high moral tone in regard to "deals," although we dislike them, and believe that they are undesirable in the long run. But it is clear enough that, in this hidden and determinant deal, the heritage of the British people is being sold down the river, and they are not even getting a moiety of the thirty pieces of silver. If any fresh evidence were needed in regard to the situation, it would be furnished by the alarmed squawks of Jewish organisations at the slightest sign of any policy which might conceivably serve interests before those of Israel, either in or out of Palestine.

The dogs may have been promised the crumbs, but only when it is clear that their Masters have been fully served.

We regret the cause of Sir Stafford Cripp's retirement, although we feel that nothing in his active life became him so well as the leaving of it. We notice, however, that, as in the case of the Russian model to which we aspire, exchange regulations do not appear to hamper members of the inner circles of Government from travel abroad at will.

"Inasmuch as few foreign countries have the dollars to buy the food, the planners are willing to lend the money necessary for its purchase. The effect of this—and the reader is urged to give close attention here—is that the consumer who paid the taxes to buy the food which he was not allowed to eat, and who had to pay higher prices for the food he was allowed to eat, is now expected to lend money so that foreigners can buy the food for which he was taxed to pay—at a big discount. The foreigners, who by this time are raising their own food, regard this as some form of low economic imperialism, and everything is as confused as the most egregious planner could desire."—*Saturday Evening Post* (U.S.).

We should desire to congratulate Mrs. Muir, the Devonshire landowner, on her public denunciation from the gallery at Strasbourg of the so-called Council of Europe, of that *espèce de crapaud*, M. Spaak.

Every student of affairs knows that the popularity of the majority system is solely due to the high percentage of accuracy with which it stultifies the efforts of honest men and plays into the hands of rogues and schemers. But accidents do happen, and the referendum on the return of King Leopold was the exception which proves (*i.e.*, tests) the rule.

This was altogether too much for M. Spaak, that busy agent of the Grand Orient, and the principle was thrown over in favour of rioting and revolution as soon as it became clear that it would procure the return of the King. That such a man should, from a position of eminence again invoke the Divine Right of the redundant surplus ought to discredit the Strasbourg farce while it was still aborning.

"We discovered that 2,500 agents, stooges and minions of a foreign dictator were on the government pay roll, occupying, in many instances, key positions in the state department, the justice department and the interior department.

"I went down to the White House. I said:

"Mr. President, here is a list of these people. We have raided the organization and we have their membership records. There can't be any doubt about it. If you understand the Communists as I understand them, you will know that they are in the government for one purpose alone, to steal important secrets and transmit them to Moscow."

"The President was furious. I was amazed at his anger.

"Well," he said, "I have never seen a man that had such ideas. There is nothing wrong with the Communists. Some of the best friends I have got are Communists."

[Report of the Dies Committee to Congress (U.S.)]

The President to whom reference is made is of course F. D. Roosevelt, who refused to take any action when the Report of the Royal Commission on Espionage (Canada), was brought to his notice.

### Footnote to Parliament.

Referring to the footnote on page 8, it is understandable that Mr. Gaitskell, whose qualifications for operating the nation's finances as Chancellor of the Exchequer include a book against Social Credit, ignored Mr. Norman Smith, and it was left to Mr. Birch, summing up for the Opposition to clap onto the farrago of which we have given merely a sample the label "Douglas Credit." Have we to say again that to manipulate finance by orthodox or unorthodox means in order to impose a policy is social treachery, not social credit?

The reader who holds the balance between the political parties may note that in the matter of the European Payments Union it is the "Conservatives" who wished to give the international European Payments Union the right "if necessary by a vote to enforce the proper use of its funds and its mechanisms by all its members." The Labour Government refused these powers.

### London D.S.C. Group.

Between December 17 and January 9 Dr. Tudor Jones will address three meetings in London, one of which will be a social re-union. Details may be obtained by application to Mrs. B. M. Palmer, 35 Birchwood Avenue, Sidcup, Kent, who requests that enquirers enclose a stamped addressed envelope.

## Lingard and the Expulsion of the Jews from England.

The Whig treatment of this historical incident, of which a contributor complained in a recent article, is now so well established that many readers search in vain in current textbooks for an adequate account of the facts. The following, from Lingard's *History of England*, vol. II, (pages 582-9 of the fifth edition, 1849), is reproduced for record purposes:—

The reader has already observed the impoverished state of the royal revenue under Henry III. As soon as Edward ascended the throne, he appointed in his first parliament commissioners to inquire into the state of the fiefs held of the crown, and by that measure obtained several forfeitures of considerable value. Soon afterwards the law officers of the crown sued out writs of *quo warranto* to the judges of assize directing them to inquire by what title the landholders held their estates, and claimed the liberties and immunities which they enjoyed. This inquest was a source of much vexation and general discontent. During the lapse of years, and amidst the revolutions of property, many families had lost their original deeds, and in that case their lands were adjudged to the king, and withheld from the owners, till the restoration had been purchased by an arbitrary fine. Even when the original deeds were produced, their validity was not admitted, till they had undergone the most rigorous scrutiny, and had been tried by every ordeal which legal ingenuity could devise. At length the king consented to mitigate the rigour of his former instructions; and an undisturbed possession from before the time of Richard I, was allowed to be pleaded as an effectual bar to the claims of the crown.

The Jewry, as it was called, furnished another source of revenue, from which Edward at first like his predecessors derived considerable profits, but which he afterwards destroyed, partly through religious considerations, and partly to appease the clamour of his subjects. Traces of the existence of Jews in England may be discovered under the Anglo-Saxon dynasty; they became more numerous during the reign of the Conqueror, and gradually multiplied under the rule of his successors: not that these princes felt any partiality for a race of men everywhere persecuted, but because, by protecting them, they consulted their own interests. For the Jew, in the language of the law of that period, was the slave, the chattel, of the sovereign; whatever he might actually possess, or subsequently acquire, belonged to the crown; and, if he became an object of value in the royal estimation, it was on account of the profit which he continually brought to the exchequer. Hence he was enrolled as the king's property from his birth, exempted through life from the payment of tolls or dues to inferior authorities, and suffered to dwell nowhere but in the royal cities or boroughs, and only in some of them, and in such particular quarters as were assigned for that purpose. There the Children of Israel formed a separate community; being distinguished from all other classes of men by wearing two tablets, at first of white linen, afterwards of yellow felt, sewn over the breast. They could not intermarry with Christians, nor employ them as servants, nor harbour them as inmates. But they possessed in their own quarters schools for the education of their children, synagogues for the celebration of their worship with due modesty and in a subdued tone, and a cemetery without the walls for the interment of their dead. Their high priest, whose authority all obeyed, resided in the capital, and was elected by themselves, subject to the approbation of the

king. Their only occupation was that of lending money, either on pledges, which were forfeited by the owner, unless redeemed within a year and a day, or upon interest at a certain rate per week, the highest which they could extort from the necessities of the borrower. In this way they made enormous profits; for the rents and fines of the feudal tenures, the aids and tallages imposed by the government, and the want of money for expeditions to the Holy Land, furnished them with opportunities of lending, whilst the notion, that the exaction of interest was forbidden to Christians by the words of Scripture freed them from competition on the part of others. In this their favourite pursuit they met with every encouragement from the crown. The king took them as *his* bondmen under his special protection; established for them offices, where, in coffers under three locks, they deposited their bonds and securities, their money, plate, and pledges, and, withdrawing them from the jurisdiction of the courts Christian and of every ordinary tribunal, placed them under the superintendence of three or four persons called wardens, who had power to hear and determine every cause in which either of the parties was a Jew, the latter pleading in the king's name, and before a jury selected equally from the professors of both religions. For this support, which cost him nothing, the sovereign was amply repaid by fines, forfeitures, and reliefs; by an annual capitation tax of three pennies from every Jew male or female of the age of twelve years; by the practice of imposing tallages on the whole body at will and to any amount; by the right frequently exercised of exacting, or selling, or forgiving, in consideration of a present, the money owing to a Jew, and by the facility of raising at any moment a considerable sum by making over to the lender the emoluments of the Jewry for a certain number of years. Yet attention to his own interest taught the king on these occasions to act with some caution. It was possible to exhaust the source from which so much wealth was derived, and on that account commissioners were occasionally appointed to open the chests of cheirographs, as they were called, and to make inventories of all the bonds and treasures of the Jews, that a council might ascertain what burthen they could bear, and what portion of their profits the king might safely appropriate to himself. It seems never to have occurred to them that, if a Christian could not conscientiously practice usury himself, neither could he encourage it for his own profit in others. To the great mass of the people the Jews during the whole of this period were objects of the bitterest hatred. They looked on them as men whose chief study it was to reduce families to indigence by extortion; as fiends who delighted in the sufferings of Christians; as an accursed race who, by adhering to the religion, professed their assent to the great crime of their forefathers. Reports were continually circulated of blasphemies uttered, and cruelties exercised by them in derision of the Christian worship. Hence the protection of the sovereign was not always a shield to them against insult and oppression; and in times of riot or sedition many of them fell victims to the rage of their enemies. But about the close of the reign of Henry III., a new charge against them was urged on the attention of the monarch, that by lending money on the security of rents they had in many instances crept into the possession of land to the disherison of the tenant's family, and the great prejudice of his lord. As a remedy the king ordained that, since they were incapable of possessing real property with the exception of dwelling-houses and the appurtenances, they should either restore the lands in question to the owner on

his repayment of the loan without interest, or, if he declined the offer, should dispose of them to some other Christian on the same terms. Edward at his coronation was assailed with new complaints from their opponents. He consulted his parliament, and published an ordinance, in which, having first acknowledged the benefit which his predecessors had derived from the Jews, he forbade them ever more to receive interest on the loan of money, exhorted them to seek their living by honest and lawful means, and with that view permitted them to work for Christian masters, to buy and sell all manner of merchandise without payment of toll, and enabled them to take leases of land for any term not exceeding ten years. But few, if any, were disposed to avail themselves of these concessions. They had long been suspected of clipping the coin, a fraud the detection of which was difficult, as long as the silver penny might be lawfully divided into halves and farthings. But now an unusual quantity of light money was found in circulation; the mutilation was of course attributed to the Jews, and the king ordered all who were charged by common fame to be apprehended on the same day. The trials occupied a special commission during several months, and as the actual possession of clipped coin was taken as a proof of guilt, not fewer than two hundred and ninety-three Jews, men and women, were hanged in the capital, and probably an equal number in the country. It should, however, be noticed that the offence was not confined to the Jews; several Christians were also convicted, and with equal justice subjected to the same punishment. At last an end was put to these prosecutions by a proclamation offering full pardon to all, whether Christians or Jews, who not having been indicted for the offence, should come in, confess their guilt, and submit to a competent fine.

The conversion of the Jews to Christianity was an Object which the late king had greatly at heart. To promote it, he distinguished by particular favours the men eminent amongst the proselytes, and founded in the capital an establishment for the reception and support of the more indigent. Edward adopted the views of his father. The task of instructing them was confided to the Friars preachers, that of procuring their attendance at the lectures of the missionaries, to the royal bailiffs. At the same time the king promised as a boon—and the boon shows the degraded state of this oppressed people—that, though all the goods and chattels of every Jew belonged to the crown, he would allow each convert to keep for himself one moiety of such property, and would devote the other to a fund for the support of those in indigent circumstances.\* But Edward promised, the Friars preached, in vain. Nothing could wean the Jews from their attachment to the law of Moses. In 1287 they incurred the king's displeasure, probably by their objection to the payment of a tallage; and on one day the whole race, without exception of age or sex, were thrown into prison, where they remained in confinement till they had appeased the royal indignation with a present of twelve thousand pounds.

But presents could not avert the fate which threatened them. Three years later Edward, yielding to the importunities of his subjects, ordered every Jew under penalty of death to quit the kingdom for ever before a certain day; but at the same time, with some attention to the demands of justice, allowed them to carry away with them their money

\*In addition he promised to add to the fund the proceeds of the capitation tax on the Jews, and of all the deodands throughout the kingdom.

and chattels. To the number of sixteen thousand five hundred and eleven, they repaired to the cinque ports, where the royal officers protected them from insult, provided the poor with a gratuitous passage, and sheltered the rich from imposition. But at sea the mariners, no longer awed by the royal prohibition, in several instances plundered the passengers and threw them overboard — not however with impunity; for Edward caused the murderers to be apprehended, and to suffer the punishment due to their crime. Thus ended the sojourn of the Israelites in England. By the people their expulsion was celebrated as a public benefit; and the clergy granted to the king a tenth, the laity a fifteenth, in proof of their gratitude.

---



---

#### PARLIAMENT

(continued from page 3.)

quiries overseas, for no such inquiries are made.

*Major Lloyd:* On a point of order. As that reply seems to reveal a very unsatisfactory situation, of which the country has heard for the first time, I beg to give notice that I will raise the matter at an early opportunity.

*House of Commons:* November 14, 1950.

#### Congress, Sheffield (Admission of Foreigners).

*Mr. Hopkin Morris (Carmarthen):* . . . This is also a striking Debate because of the division of opinion freely expressed. A person has a right to express his views at all times upon all subjects, and that is one of the most important rights to be safeguarded throughout the world. The right of the person must be an expression of his view, not a person putting forward a false view or a view because he is compelled by an organisation to put it forward.

There can be no doubt that peace can, in certain circumstances, be used as an instrument of war, but when we turn to the history of free speech even in this country we find that, first of all, it was put into the Bill of Rights as a curb upon the authority of the Executive. It was the right of free speech by Members of this House. This is where it began. It was a claim by Members of this House to express their views freely here. That is important to remember. While that right operated inside the House, it was limited to this House only. There was no such thing then, as permission to report the proceedings of the House. There was no such thing as free discussion or the right of free speech in the country. Anyone looking at our libel laws at that time and going through cases in the courts would have at once seen that there was no such thing as the right of free speech.

So we see that free speech was first given to this House to be a curb upon the rights of the Executive. It has gradually spread to the courts and to the country. The doctrine which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Nelson and Colne enunciated this evening was not the doctrine of this country at the time of the Bill of Rights. It was a different doctrine. The Bill of Rights, by giving it a form of law, extended it. Free discussion became law, and then Parliament could not long remain unreported. Once we allowed Parliament to be reported there had, sooner or later, to be a modification of the law of libel. That is the justification of free discussion, and it is the justification for holding even the perverse peace conference at Sheffield.

When we look at the figures given by the Home Secretary, as I understood him, visas were permitted by him to 300 people in the visa countries, but out of those 300 only about

80 of them—or 82 of them—exercised the right to come. Why did not the other members come? They were free to come in; they were not banned. The question arises whether that has something to do with the point raised by the hon. Member for Shettlestone (Mr. McGovern) that they were not genuinely interested in the peace conference. Or were they prohibited by an authority which precluded them from advocating the peace which they genuinely wished to advocate? If they were precluded by another government from attending, it is evident that this peace conference was not an expression of free opinion.

*Mr. Leslie Hale:* No one thinks it was.

*Mr. Hopkin Morris:* That introduces another point about free speech. If speech is coerced it is no longer free speech. If these 270 people were permitted to come in and voluntarily did not come in, or were prevented from coming in they were no longer free men. It can no longer be pretended that they genuinely expressed their own opinions.

*Mr. Hale:* I think I am putting the view of my colleagues and myself in saying that nobody dissents from the Home Secretary's point that this was a Communist meeting or from the point that this Peace Congress was a cloak for something else and was not genuine. No one dissents from the view that Communists have not very much right to free speech, and all of us think there were very substantial grounds for the point of view of my right hon. Friend. What we are wondering about is whether Britain's reputation has been enhanced in a world which is discussing anti-nationalism, and in which we are proud of our great traditions. I am trying to put the matter fairly as a matter of balance. . . .

*Mr. Hopkin Morris:* I am not disagreeing with any of the doctrines laid down by the hon. Member for Nelson and Colne. I agree fully with the doctrines he laid down about the importance of free speech, but it is a duty attaching to free speech that it be a genuine expression of free speech. That is the issue. As I am talking about Communism, I can conceive a perfect right for anybody in this country, just as I have the right to express my conviction as a Liberal, to say—suppose he be a man who owes allegiance to this country—"I am convinced that the proper form of government in this country is a Communist one." I profoundly disagree with that, but if that man owes allegiance to this country and to this country alone, he is, in my view, entitled to express his view quite as much as the member of any other party. But if he says what Communists in this country say, and what the distinguished man from France appears to have said—I do not know the quotation but for the purposes of my argument I am assuming that he did say it—that he owes allegiance to Russia, that is surely something which cannot be tolerated.

*Mr. S. Silverman:* I do not say that this gentleman ever said anything of the kind, but if anybody says, "I owe allegiance to Russia," that is surely a question between him and his own Government and nothing to do with us.

*Mr. Hopkin Morris:* I was not discussing him in that respect. I was replying to the hon. Member for Oldham, West (Mr. Leslie Hale), and drawing a distinction between the two classes of Communist in this country—one advocating Communism but owing allegiance to this country and the other being a Communist owing allegiance to a foreign Power. The latter seems to me to be treasonable sedition. There is a distinction between the two and it is important to bear it in mind.

I saw the report of the speech of the Dean of Canterbury at the Peace Congress. The Dean had a perfect right to make the speech, but he is reported to have said that the rearmament policy of this country proves that this country desires war. That is a gross misrepresentation of any party and of anyone in this country. Apparently he has a perfect right to say it in this country, however wrong and misleading it is. . . .

*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Ede):* . . . There was a great deal of unreality about this discussion, introduced by those who talk as if this was a Congress where the arguments for and against the propositions put forward from the platform were to have been allowed, and as if there would have been some people there representing the point of view of this country and of the Western democracies who would have been allowed to put that point of view against that which was being advocated. If there is one thing that is certain, it is this: that what I did, in the choices I made, was merely to separate the shepherds and the dogs from the sheep. I decided to allow the sheep to come in to the succulent pastures of Western democracy. The shepherds and the dogs, on the figures given by the hon. and learned Member for Carmarthen, declined to allow the sheep in to enjoy, or even get a glimpse, of that particular form of sustenance.

#### National Finance (Personal Incomes).

*Mr. Osborne* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer out of a total working population of 23,328,000, how many receive over £1,000 net per annum; and what is the total they receive per annum.

*Mr. Gaitskell:* The 92nd Report of the Board of Inland Revenue contains the information available about the distribution of personal incomes before and after tax. For 1948-49 there were 434,000 tax payers with incomes exceeding £1,000 net after tax, and this total net income amounted to £713 million. The figures for 1949-50 are not yet available.

#### Banks (Credit Policy).

*Mr. Heath* asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what advice he has given, or what requests he has made, to the banks during the past six months concerning their credit policy.

*Mr. Gaitskell:* No additional requests have been necessary during this period, but the banks have continued to cooperate closely in applying the credit policy of the Government as communicated to them by my predecessor.

*House of Commons: November 16, 1950.*

#### European Payments Union (Financial Provisions) Bill.

Order for Second Reading read.

*Mr. Norman Smith* (Nottingham, South): . . . It is a fact, as this Bill indeed shows, that a revolution is proceeding in financial technique like the revolution, which everybody understands, arising out of our increasing knowledge of physical science. The two go together. It is commonplace that changes in the industrial arts that result from science and invention are reflected in politics. That is no less true in the realm of finance, notwithstanding the innate conservatism of bankers and, indeed, of Chancellors of the Exchequer—on

this side of the House no less than on the other. The Treasury is being driven by the inescapable pressure of events to devise new financial techniques, of which this Bill is only one example. . . . This Measure is a departure from the idea of convertible currency. This departure, so far as it goes—and it is a substantial departure—substitutes a kind of international credit for money based on gold, very much as the banking system in the late 19th century substituted the cheque-book for golden sovereigns in the overwhelming majority of transactions within this country.

I hope that the process of financial innovation will continue. I am not sure whether financial innovation is not one of the major inventions of our age. It so happens that in the 60 years I have been alive there have been five major inventions. I remember them all—the motor car, the cinema, broadcasting, the aeroplane, and the atomic fission, the last having incalculable economic and social consequences. I am not sure whether financial innovation does not constitute a major invention likely to have substantial economic and therefore social effects.

I hope this process will continue until in every country the financial authorities regard full employment as a necessity, until such time as the last aboriginal anywhere has a television set. I hope it will continue, this process of financial innovation, this departure from superstition about gold. I hope it will continue until all over the world the financial authorities everywhere abandon this curious idea that convertible currencies based on precious metals are necessary[\*]

*Mr. Maudling* (Barnet): . . . I want to examine for a moment the implications of a substantial sterling area surplus with the European Payments Union. At the moment we are accumulating a remarkably large surplus, and this is likely to continue for some time at a substantial figure. What is the effect of this surplus? Surely it is, in fact, another form of unrequited exports. For the first 150 million units we have earned we shall get nothing at all, because it has been used to wipe off our deficit. I understand, from the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on 19th July, that the 150 million units would not be something additional to our share of Marshall Aid, but would be used as counterpart aid. Under the European Payments Union arrangement we will get exactly the same Marshall Aid dollars, and nothing additional for wiping out that deficit. We have now got to about 320 units in credit, but we have another 40 million units to go before we start getting gold payments.

I am not sure that we want to absorb part of the gold reserves of other European countries, because they have not a great deal to spare. My point is that a further extension of unrequited exports on a large scale may be a serious thing for the economy of our country. Surely the first principle we must bear in mind is the importance of Empire trade. Important as is European trade, Empire trade is even more important. In so far as we have an increased surplus on the European Trade account, surely we are likely to have a smaller surplus, or a deficit, with the rest of the sterling area.

We can earn our surplus with the European Payments Union, either by the export of our own goods, or by the export of sterling area goods, such as wool. This may produce a credit for us with the European Payments Union but it will be matched by an increase in the balances held in London by Australia and New Zealand. If our credit is made up from

our own exports, then we are exporting merely in exchange for credits with the European Payments Union goods which could be sent to other areas, such as the dollar area, or used to increase our investment in the sterling area, or goods which could be consumed in this country and thereby help to damp down the inflationary pressure. Surely any sending of goods abroad against credit and not against immediate payment is bound to be inflationary in its effect? Secondly, in so far as credit has been earned not by our own exports but by the exports of Dominions passing through our monetary system to Europe, we have been piling up increasing quick sterling liabilities to Dominion countries, and the scale of these liabilities in London at the moment is one of the most serious economic problems which we have to face, and it may become more serious.

I appreciate that there are strong political reasons why we should strive to maintain a high level of exports to Europe. One could not argue very easily in favour of cutting them down, but, on the other side of the picture, surely it is much to our advantage to increase our imports from Europe, particularly at a time when the growing rearmament drive is creating bottlenecks in our own industries and shortages of consumer goods? The heavy engineering industries of Germany and Italy have spare capacity, and so I believe has the Belgian steel industry nowadays. The industries of those countries could provide articles, goods and commodities useful in our rearmament drive and we could take those instead of merely earning for ourselves credits with the E.P.U.

*Mr. Nigel Birch* (Flint, West): . . . Our attitude to the European Payments Union was very well put in the last debate on this subject by the hon. Member for Nottingham, South (*Mr. N. Smith*), when he said that the whole thing could have been much worse. The hon. Member always speaks very good English if nothing else, and I thought that that was admirably put. In his speech today, however, the hon. Member saw a great vision of the whole world going Douglas Credit, with his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer bowing before that idol. I am not at all certain that the hon. Member is right. I am not sure that with the inevitable march of progress in 30 years' time we shall not get back to a foreign exchange situation which our grandfathers considered to be normal. . . .

### T.S.C. Indices.

No index of *The Social Crediter* has been published for some time past. The construction of an index to our pages that is not an affront to the intelligence of our readers calls for powers of an exceptional order, which, in our present circumstances, are, when available, properly devoted to other, and we believe higher purposes. Experiments which we have made in employing professional experts on indexing have been fruitless, either from the high cost of an exhaustive analysis or from total insufficiency of any selection of topics which is not guided by a full understanding of our own and our readers' policy. The results have had to be discarded. With great regret, we must announce that we cannot promise future production of indices. We suggest that readers of *The Social Crediter* will find most useful an extension of the practice of compiling reference lists such as that published by us on March 20, 1948.

Published for the Social Credit Secretariat by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 7, Victoria Street, Liverpool, 2. Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton.

[\*] See note on page 4.