

Christopher Jon Bjerknes

THE MANUFACTURE AND SALE
OF
SAINT EINSTEIN

Copyright © 2006. All Rights Reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

<u>1 EINSTEIN DISCOVERS HIS RACIST CALLING</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>1.1 Introduction</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>1.2 The Manufacture and Sale of St. Einstein</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>1.2.1 Promoting the “Cult” of Einstein</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>1.2.2 The “Jewish Press” Sanctifies a Fellow Jew</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>1.3 In a Racist Era</u>	<u>.....</u>
 <u>2 THE DESTRUCTIVE IMPACT OF RACIST JEWISH TRIBALISM</u>	 <u>.....</u>
<u>2.1 Introduction</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>2.2 Do Not Blaspheme the “Jewish Saint”</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>2.3 Harvard University Asks a Forbidden Question</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>2.4 Americans React to the Invasion of Eastern European Jews</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>2.4.1 Jewish Disloyalty</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>2.4.2 In Answer to the “Jewish Question”</u>	<u>.....</u>
 <u>3 ROTHSCHILD, <i>REX IVDÆORVM</i></u>	 <u>.....</u>
<u>3.1 Introduction</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.2 Jewish Messianic Supremacism</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.3 The “Eastern Question” and the World Wars</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.3.1 Dönme Crypto-Jews, The Turkish Empire and Palestine</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.3.2 The World Wars—A Jewish Antidote to Jewish Assimilation</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.4 Rothschild Warmongering</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.4.1 Inter-Jewish Racism</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.4.1.1 Rothschild Power and Influence Leads to Unbearable Jewish</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>Arrogance</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.4.1.2 Jewish Intolerance and Mass Murder of Gentiles</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.4.2 The Messiah Myth</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.5 Jewish Dogmatism and Control of the Press Stifles Debate</u>	<u>.....</u>
<u>3.5.1 Advertising Einstein in the English Speaking World</u>	<u>.....</u>

3.5.2 Reaction to the Unprecedented Einstein Promotion	
3.5.3 The Berlin Philharmonic—The Response in Germany	
3.5.4 Jewish Hypocrisy and Double Standards	
3.6 The Messiah Rothschilds’ War on the Gentiles—and the Jews	

4 EINSTEIN THE RACIST COWARD

4.1 Introduction	
4.2 The Power of Jewish Tribalism Inhibits the Progress of Science and Deliberately Promotes “Racial” Discord	
4.3 A Jew is Not Allowed to Speak Out Against a Jew	
4.4 The Bad Nauheim Debate	
4.4.1 Einstein Desires a “Race” War Which Will Exterminate the European Esau	
4.4.2 Genocidal Judaism—Pruning the Branches of the Human Family Tree	
4.4.3 Crypto-Jews	
4.4.4 The Gentiles Must be Exterminated Lest God Cut Off the Jews	
4.4.5 Jewish Dualism and Human Sacrifice—Evil is Good	
4.4.6 Gentiles are Destined to Slave for the Jews, Then the Slaves Will be Exterminated	
4.4.7 Lenard Sickens of Einstein’s Libels	
4.4.8 Let the Debate Begin	
4.4.8.1 Einstein Disappoints—“Albertus Maximus” is a Laughingstock	
4.4.8.2 Contemporary Accounts of the Bad Nauheim Debate	
4.5 Einstein the Genocidal Racist	
4.6 Racist Jewish Hypocrisy, Intimidation and Censorship	
4.7 Einstein’s Trip to America	
4.7.1 Einstein Faces Criticism in America	
4.7.1.1 Einstein Hides from Reuter Dahl’s Challenge to Debate	
4.7.1.2 Cowardly Einstein Caught in a Lie	

3 ROTHSCHILD, REX IVDÆORVM

The banking family known as the “House of Rothschild” desired to become the “King of the Jews”. According to Jewish myth, the King of the Jews will bring all Gentile nations, cultures and religions to ruins through world wars. The King of the Jews, whom the Jews call “Messiah”, will then rule the world from Jerusalem. According to Jewish myth, the remnant of the Gentile peoples (“Esau”) left after the wars to come, will be enslaved, welcoming their enslavement as a joyful opportunity to obey their divine Jewish masters (“Jacob” and “Joseph”). Then the Gentile peoples will be exterminated. The process is well underway and is accelerating. The Rothschilds eventually succeeded in their Messianic goal to found a racist “Jewish State”. The Balfour Declaration was written directly to Lord Rothschild, who no doubt took the title literally.

“15 For the day of the LORD is near upon all the heathen: as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head. 16 For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be as though they had not been. 17 ¶ But upon mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions. 18 And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for the LORD hath spoken it.”—*OBADIAH* 15-18

“8 And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep: who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver. 9 Thine hand shall be lifted up upon thine adversaries, and all thine enemies shall be cut off.”—*MICAH* 5:8-9

“In European capitals there are Hebrew bankers who dictate certain international relations because they hold the purse-strings of governments; and every European country owes much to the men of great genius that the race has contributed to the arts and to statecraft.”—*The World’s Work*¹²²

3.1 Introduction

Throughout history, the world has faced the radical tendency of many Jews to destructive polarized extremes, which undermined the sovereignty and the cultures of other peoples and led those peoples into wars and revolutions, which fulfilled Jewish Messianic prophecies of Jewish supremacy in the world. Casson wrote, in admiration,

“Whenever the country has been split in two by a political question, there have been Jews on both sides. Judah P. Benjamin, cabinet officer in the Confederate government, supported the gray as stubbornly as Joseph Seligman did the blue. And in the largest sense we may say that international capital marches under the banner of Rothschild, and international labor under the flag of Karl Marx—Jews both, and irreconcilable.”¹²³

The Rothschilds and Karl Marx worked together to undermine Gentile nations and gather wealth and power unto the Jews, as was prophesied in *Deuteronomy*, *Isaiah*, *Obadiah*, and other Jewish religious literature. The Rothschilds were a highly religious Jewish family and Marx came from a rabbinical family, originally named “Marx Levi”. Like Moses Mendelssohn,¹²⁴ Karl Marx was a devout Talmudist, which made him devoutly anti-Christian and devoutly anti-Gentile.¹²⁵ In hopes that the Gentiles could be persuaded that it was in their best interests to surrender to Jewish world rule, the Rothschilds deliberately caused perpetual wars,¹²⁶ which made the Gentile peoples clamor for peace. The Rothschilds then sponsored the myth that the only means to end the wars they themselves had caused, was to eliminate the Gentile nations.

Marxist Jews preached that the only means to attain peace was to abolish the nations and establish a world government run by them; for, after all, with no nations left but Israel, how could there be any war? This was the method that Jewish leadership used to undermine the sovereignty of the nations in fulfillment of Jewish Messianic prophecy.¹²⁷ They did not always openly depend upon Communism, *per se*, but also upon such bodies as the League of Nations, the United Nations, the European Union, etc.; which, like Communism itself, were conspicuously over represented by Jewish leadership.

Many Jews have interpreted the Old Testament to predict that when the Messiah arrives, the Jews will hoard all the gold, silver and jewels of the world and keep this treasure in Jerusalem. Judaism teaches that the Garden of Eden contained all the jewels of the world, and many Jews believe that these will all fall into Jewish hands in Jerusalem in the “end times”. *Ezekiel* 28:13 states,

“Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone *was* thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold: the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created.”

In 1932, Michael Higger divulged the intentions of Cabalistic Jews in his book *The Jewish Utopia*,

“All the treasures and natural resources of the world will eventually come in possession of the righteous. This would be in keeping with the prophecy of Isaiah: ‘And her gain and her hire shall be holiness to the Lord; it shall not be treasured nor laid up; for her gain shall be for them that dwell before the Lord, to eat their fill and for stately clothing.[*Isaiah* 23:18]’²⁰ Similarly, the treasures of gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, and valuable vessels that have been lost in the seas and oceans in the course of centuries will be raised up and turned over to the righteous.²¹ Joseph hid three treasures in Egypt: One was discovered by Korah, one by Antoninus, and one is reserved for the righteous in the ideal world.²² [***] Gold will be of secondary importance in the new social and economic order. Eventually, all the friction, jealousy, quarrels, and misunderstandings that exist under the present system, will not be known in the ideal Messianic era.³¹⁹ The city of Jerusalem will possess most of the gold and precious stones of the world. That ideal city will be practically full of those metals and stones, so that the people of the world will realize the vanity and absurdity of wasting their lives in accumulating those imaginary valuables.^{320”}¹²⁸

The Jewish Encyclopedia reveals the designs of Jews on all the wealth of the world, and the Jewish desire to ruin all nations save Israel,

“With regard to the text ‘This is the law when a man dieth in a tent’ (Num. xix. 14), they held that only Israelites are *men*, quoting the prophet, ‘Ye my flock, the flock of my pasture, are men’ (Ezek. xxxiv. 31); Gentiles they classed not as men but as barbarians (B. M. 108b [*see also: Baba Mezia* 114b]). [***] The barbarian Gentiles who could not be prevailed upon to observe law and order were not to be benefited by the Jewish civil laws, framed to regulate a stable and orderly society, and based on reciprocity. The passage in Moses’ farewell address: ‘The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran’ (Deut. xxxiii. 2), indicates that the Almighty offered the Torah to the Gentile nations also, but, since they refused to accept it, He withdrew His ‘shining’ legal protection from them, and transferred their property rights to Israel, who observed His Law. A passage of Habakkuk is quoted as confirming this claim: ‘God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. . . . He stood, and measured the earth; he beheld, and drove asunder [ויתר = ‘let loose,’ ‘outlawed’] the nations’ (Hab. iii. 3-6); the Talmud adds that He had observed how the Gentile nations steadfastly refused to obey the seven moral Nachian precepts, and hence had decided to outlaw them (B. K. 38a [*see also: Baba Kamma* 113a-b]).”¹²⁹

Indeed, the Talmud “grants” the Jews all of the wealth and property of the Gentiles,

at *Baba Kamma* 38a,

“WHERE AN OX BELONGING TO AN ISRAELITE HAS GORED AN OX BELONGING TO A CANAANITE THERE IS NO LIABILITY etc. But I might here assert that you are on the horns of a dilemma. If the implication of ‘*his neighbour*’ has to be insisted upon, then in the case of an ox of a Canaanite goring an ox of an Israelite, should there also not be exemption? If [on the other hand] the implication of ‘*his neighbour*’ has not to be insisted upon, why then even in the case of an ox of an Israelite goring an ox of a Canaanite, should there not be liability? — R Abbahu thereupon said: The Writ says, *He stood and measured the earth; he beheld and drove asunder the nations*,² [which may be taken to imply that] God beheld the seven commandments³ which were accepted by all the descendants of Noah, but since they did not observe them, He rose up and declared them to be outside the protection of the civil law of Israel [with reference to damage done to cattle by cattle].⁴ R. Johanan even said that the same could be inferred from this [verse], *He shined forth from Mount Paran*,⁵ [implying that] from Paran⁶ He exposed their money to Israel. The same has been taught as follows: If the ox of an Israelite gores an ox of a Canaanite there is no liability,⁷ but if an ox of a Canaanite gores an ox of an Israelite whether the ox [that did the damage] was *Tam* or whether it had already been *Mu‘ad*, the payment is to be in full, as it is said: *He stood and measured the earth, he beheld and drove asunder the nations*,² and again, *He shined forth from Mount Paran*.⁵ Why this further citation? — [Otherwise] you might perhaps think that the verse ‘*He stood and measured the earth*’ refers exclusively to statements [on other subjects] made by R. Mattena and by R. Joseph; come therefore and hear: ‘*He shined forth from Mount Paran*,’ implying that from Paran¹ he exposed their money to Israel.”¹³⁰

According to the Masoretic Text, which is the version of the Old Testament that most accurately reflects of the views of Jews, *Deuteronomy* 6:10-11 and 11:24-25 (see also: *Joshua* 1:2-5) state,

“6:10 And it shall be, when the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land which He swore unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give thee—great and goodly cities, which thou didst not build, 6:11 and houses full of all good things, which thou didst not fill, and cisterns hewn out, which thou the didst not hew, vineyards and olive-trees, which thou didst not plant, and thou shalt eat and be satisfied— [***] 11:24 Every place whereon the sole of your foot shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness, and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the hinder sea shall be your border. 11:25 There shall no man be able to stand against you: the LORD your God shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as He hath spoken unto you. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]”

Isaiah 2:1-4; 40:15-17, 22-24; 54:1-4; 60:5, 8-12, 16-17; and 61:5-6 state,

“2:1 The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. 2:2 And it shall come to pass in the end of days, that the mountain of the LORD’S house shall be established as the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. 2:3 And many peoples shall go and say: ‘Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths.’ For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. 2:4 And He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide for many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. [***] 40:15 Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold the isles are as a mote in weight. 40:16 And Lebanon is not sufficient fuel, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for burnt-offerings. 40:17 All the nations are as nothing before Him; they are accounted by Him as things of nought, and vanity. [***] 40:22 It is He that sitteth above the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in; 40:23 That bringeth princes to nothing; He maketh the judges of the earth as a thing of nought. 40:24 Scarce are they planted, scarce are they sown, scarce hath their stock taken root in the earth; when He bloweth upon them, they wither, and the whirlwind taketh them away as stubble. [***] 54:1 Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear, break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the LORD. 54:2 Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations, spare not; lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. 54:3 For thou shalt spread abroad on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall possess the nations, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. 54:4 Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed. Neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame; for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and the reproach of thy widowhood shalt thou remember no more. [***] 60:5 Then thou shalt see and be radiant, and thy heart shall throb and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be turned unto thee, the wealth of the nations shall come unto thee. [***] 60:8 Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their cotes? 60:9 Surely the isles shall wait for Me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, for the name of the LORD thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel, because He hath glorified thee. 60:10 And aliens shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee; for in My wrath I smote thee, but in My favour have I had compassion on thee. 60:11 Thy gates also shall be open continually, day and night, they shall not be shut; that men may bring unto thee the wealth of the nations, and their kings in procession. 60:12

For that nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. [***] 60:16 Thou shalt also suck the milk of the nations, and shalt suck the breast of kings; and thou shalt know that I the LORD am thy Saviour, and I, the Mighty One of Jacob, thy Redeemer. 60:17 For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron; I will also make thy officers peace, and righteousness thy magistrates. [***] 61:5 And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and aliens shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers. 61:6 But ye shall be named the priests of the LORD, men shall call you the ministers of our God; ye shall eat the wealth of the nations, and in their splendour shall ye revel. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]”

Obadiah states,

“1 The vision of Obadiah. Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom: We have heard a message from the LORD, and an ambassador is sent among the nations: ‘Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle.’ 2 Behold, I make thee small among the nations; thou art greatly despised. 3 The pride of thy heart hath beguiled thee, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, thy habitation on high; that sayest in thy heart: ‘Who shall bring me down to the ground?’ 4 Though thou make thy nest as high as the eagle, and though thou set it among the stars, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the LORD. 5 If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night—how art thou cut off!—would they not steal till they had enough? If grape-gatherers came to thee, would they not leave some gleaning grapes? 6 How is Esau searched out! How are his hidden places sought out! 7 All the men of thy confederacy have conducted thee to the border; the men that were at peace with thee have beguiled thee, and prevailed against thee; they that eat thy bread lay a snare under thee, in whom there is no discernment. 8 Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, destroy the wise men out of Edom, and discernment out of the mount of Esau? 9 And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one may be cut off from the mount of Esau by slaughter. 10 For the violence done to thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever. 11 In the day that thou didst stand aloof, in the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them. 12 But thou shouldest not have gazed on the day of thy brother in the day of his disaster, neither shouldest thou have rejoiced over the children of Judah in the day of their destruction; neither shouldest thou have spoken proudly in the day of distress. 13 Thou shouldest not have entered into the gate of My people in the day of their calamity; yea, thou shouldest not have gazed on their affliction in the day of their calamity, nor have laid hands on their substance in the day of their calamity. 14 Neither shouldest thou have stood in the crossway, to cut off those of his that escape; neither shouldest thou have delivered up those of his that did remain in the day of distress. 15 For

the day of the LORD is near upon all the nations; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy dealing shall return upon thine own head. 16 For as ye have drunk upon My holy mountain, so shall all the nations drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and swallow down, and shall be as though they had not been. 17 But in mount Zion there shall be those that escape, and it shall be holy; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions. 18 And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for the LORD hath spoken. 19 And they of the South shall possess the mount of Esau, and they of the Lowland the Philistines; and they shall possess the field of Ephraim, and the field of Samaria; and Benjamin shall possess Gilead. 20 And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel, that are among the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath, and the captivity of Jerusalem, that is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the South. 21 And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the LORD'S. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]"

Micah 5:7-8 (*Micah* 5:8-9 in the KJV) states:

"7 And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the nations, in the midst of many peoples, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, who, if he go through, treadeth down and teareth in pieces, and there is none to deliver. 8 Let Thy hand be lifted up above Thine adversaries, and let all Thine enemies be cut off. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]"

Zechariah 8:20-23; and 14:9 state,

"8:20 Thus saith the LORD of hosts: It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come peoples, and the inhabitants of many cities; 8:21 and the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying: Let us go speedily to entreat the favour of the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts; I will go also. 8:22 Yea, many peoples and mighty nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to entreat the favour of the LORD. 8:23 Thus saith the LORD of hosts: In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying: 'We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.' [***] 14:9 And the LORD shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall the LORD be One, and His name one. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]"

3.2 Jewish Messianic Supremacism

In order to understand why so many viewed racist Jews like Albert Einstein, Karl

Marx, and the Rothschilds, as a threat to humanity; it is helpful to understand that Judaism prophesies the violent destruction of Gentile humanity. The same racist Jewish forces who were promoting the racist Jew Albert Einstein to the public, were destroying the nations and religions of Europe in their pursuit of the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy.

Many have written exposés on the Jewish-Messianic nature of Communism, among them Denis Fahey, who stated, *inter alia*,

“As there is only one world and one Divine Plan for that world, the Messiah to whom the Jews look forward must be purely natural. The unity and peace of the coming Messianic era, must, accordingly, be brought about by the subjection of all nations to the Jewish nation. Thus they dream of establishing, on the purely natural level, the union which God is striving to bring about on the supernatural level of the Mystical Body, respectful of national characteristics and of the diversity of national vocations in Christ. The Jews are, therefore, opposed to the whole order of the world, built on the Divinity of Jesus, and their influence in every sphere, in Freemasonry and in Communist movements, in Finance, in the Press and in the Film-world, will favour the naturalistic aims of Masonry and of revolutionary societies while at the same time impelling them in the direction of a world-state in which the Jewish race will be supreme. Accordingly, when we read, in the sermon broadcast by Chief Rabbi Julian Weill (Radio-Paris, March 27th, 1931): ‘The Jewish Passover. . . is turned to the future and affirms with a definite and joyous conviction the liberation to come and the Messianic Passover of the peoples of the world,’ we know what that means for those who believe in our Lord’s Divinity. We know, too, That this Jewish view of the world may be expressed in another fashion, for it presents another aspect to the Gentile peoples who are being ‘liberated.’ The *Pilori*, a newspaper published at Geneva, puts that other point of view as follows:—

‘Of course, all cannot grasp that it is international high finance, dominated by the Jews and supported by Freemasonry, that started the world-war, brought about the revolutions in Russia and Spain, and now throws the economic life of peoples into confusion. Lengthy reflection is required in order to see that a hundred Jewish bankers. . . are engaged in liquidating the remaining stocks of the ancient Christian civilization of Europe.’[Footnote: Issue of September 25th, 1931.]

[***]

[Footnote: ‘When people talk about the Jewish religion, they think only of the Bible, of the religion of Moses. This is an illusion. . . . According to the *Univers Israélite* ‘For two thousand years. . . the Talmud has been the religious code of Israel’. . . A work of hatred and impiety, the Talmud definitely confirmed the apostasy of modern Jewry. . . It is a systematic deformation of the Bible. . . . The pride of race with the idea of universal domination is therein exalted to the height of folly. . . . For the Talmudist, the Jewish race alone constitutes humanity. The non-Jews are not men. They are

of a purely animal nature.’ (*L’Histoire et les Histoires dans la Bible*, by Mgr. Landrieux, Bishop of Dijon, pp. 101, 102, 99.) For texts of Talmud, cf. *Les Sources de l’Impérialisme Juif*, pp. 21-40, by Mgr. Jouin.] [***] [Footnote: Mrs. Webster even says that ‘it is in the Cabala, still more than in the Talmud, that the Judaic dream of world-domination recurs with the greatest persistence.’ (*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p. 370.)] [***] The official head of the Anti-God Association of the U.S.S.R. is the Jew, Yaroslowsky, whose real name is Goublemann. [Footnote: *R. I. S. S.*, January 1st, 1933, p. 18. Cf. Appendix I, ‘Jewish Power.’] [***] [Footnote: ‘The deification of humanity by the Freemasons of the Grand Orient finds its counterpart in the deification of Israel by the modern Jew.’ (Mrs. Webster in *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p. 374.)] [***] A few words must suffice here, but they will be enough to show that many of the Gentile instruments, who figure as leaders, are really the dupes of Jewish capitalism. [***] The proletariat class, which produces the material goods on which human society lives, is a Messianic class destined by its rule to bring about a new era for the world. This Messianic vocation of the proletariat, according to Marx, found an answering echo in the Messianic expectations of the Russian people. [Footnote: Cf. *The Russian Revolution*, by N. Berdyaev, pp. 74, 75.] But both the proletariat in general and the Russian people in particular are only means for the realization of the Messianic dreams of Marx’s own people. Masters of production through finance, they will shape the destinies of the world-God or collectivity-God. [***] It would be too long to recount the whole story of the growth of the Communist movement in Europe. The plan of the revolution is always substantially the same. The reins of government of some great nation must be captured and then that nation must be made a sort of battering-ram, in order to impose the revolutionary ideal on the neighbouring peoples. The France of 1789 and its people were used as revolutionary ammunition, to be hurled at Europe. If Marx had succeeded through his agents in the Paris Commune of 1871, France would have had the fate which was reserved to the Russia of 1917. In Russia the vast sums invested in Communism by Jewish capitalists bore fruit and the sovereign thought of the Hegelian philosopher of Berlin has passed from the passive state to the free state, with the results we know. The ideas of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, the native land, the family, and the personality of the child, are all being swept away in the name of ‘progress,’ while the financiers laugh at their poor dupes. The Russian revolutionary Bakunin, who knew Marx well and who used to describe him and his following as the ‘German-Jew Company,’ complained in his day of the contempt of Marx and Engels for the poor. Marx spoke of the poor and destitute workers as the ‘ragged proletariat’ (*Lumpenproletariat*). [***] If we now turn to Mrs. Webster’s *The Surrender of an Empire* (pp. 74-79), we get some additional information about the rise of Bolshevism. It seems that the real name of the individual mentioned above in Section III, under the designation of Parvus, is Israel Lazarevitch Helphand and that he is a Jew of the province of Minsk, in White

Russia. In the second half of the eighties he took part in revolutionary work in Odessa. In 1886 he went abroad and finally, after many wanderings, went to Copenhagen, where he amassed a large fortune as the chief agent for the supply of German coal to Denmark, working through the Danish Social Democratic Party. Dr. Ziv, in his *Life of Trotsky*, relates that when he was in America in 1916 he said to Trotsky: 'How is Parvus?' to which Trotsky replied laconically: 'Completing his twelfth million.' It is this Jewish multi-millionaire who, after Karl Marx, was the great inspirer of Lenin. It was through the intervention of Parvus that Lenin was sent back to Russia by the Germans. Lenin was dispatched from Switzerland to Russia in a locked train and was provided with no less than £2,500,000 by the German Imperial Bank. It was not, therefore, as a needy revolutionary, setting forth on a precarious mission, his soul lit with pure zeal for the cause of the workers, that Lenin journeyed into Russia, but as a well-trying agent, versed in all the tricks of intrigue and the art of propaganda and backed by the powerful organization of international finance. The people accompanying him were predominantly aliens: out of a list of 165 names published, 23 are Russian, 3 Georgian, 4 American, 1 German and 128 Jewish. '[Footnote: An illuminating sketch of Lenin's career is to be found in an article by Salluste in *La Revue de Paris* (December 15, 1927). Lenin, according to this able writer, was, at the same time, a paid agent of the Russian secret police and of the Jewish financiers engaged in furthering the Marxist conspiracy. He profited by his position as police agent to prepare the triumph of the schemes of the financiers.] The English accuse the Germans of having sent Lenin to Russia. We have seen the influences at the back of that action. On the other hand, the Germans accuse the English of having sent Trotsky back, for Trotsky was set free from arrest by order of the British Government (he had been arrested at Halifax), when he was needed by Jacob Schiff and the others, as we saw above. The truth is that Jewish financial influences were working behind the Governments of both peoples for their own ends. 'Russia' is not a triumph for the workers; but seems to be a gigantic investment of Jewish capitalists for their own ends. Amid the welter of details about 'Russia,' the great fact must not be lost sight of, that the men who seized power and retain it, as the taskmasters of the rationed and ticketed people of Russia, were put there by a certain number of Jewish capitalists. The Russian middle-class and the nobles, the natural leaders of the people, were exterminated, while the manual workers, who were too uneducated to see through the plans of the investors, were extolled to the skies. [***] Of course, Muscovite propaganda, when attacking God and the hierarchical order of human society, will not inform the people who are urged on to the class-war and revolution that a new and savage feudalism or rather slavery will be the result. The members of the Bolshevik party are the new supreme class, and against the party and its members no rights exist, for there is no such thing as a right in the correct sense. [***] One question, however, always returns: 'What about the Jewish international financiers

who financed Lenin and Trotsky in 1917?’² That their control over the figure-heads of the Communist party, like Stalin, exists is certain. In her book, *Trois ans chez Tsars rouges* (p. 96), Madame Éise Despreaux speaks of the appearance of anti-Semitism in the Communist party and continues:

‘It is its preponderance amongst the Communists which has brought about the success of Stalin, in 1926 and 1927. Nevertheless, if the Georgian dictator maintains his position, it is at the price of a manifest capitulation in face of the higher power of international finance. The part played by this power in the destinies of the U.S.S.R. is undeniable. Of course, the exact nature of the part is difficult to prove, on account of its secret character. The influence of this power has, however, been exercised recently in favour of the Jews, without whom the Russians would find it difficult to manage commercially and economically.’¹

[***]

It is to the influence of international finance that the relative stability of the Russian revolution is due. Just as greater skill in carrying out successful revolutions has been acquired by experience since 1789, so also progress has been made in the art of maintaining the figure-heads in power, in spite of the discontent of the majority of the people and the unceasing struggle against the laws of nature.² [***] Again, Marxian Communism is a neo-Messianic movement, based on Jewish rejection of the Messiah Who has come, and the workers are merely the tools by which Israel hopes to exercise world domination. [***] The complete triumph of the so-called Christian Workers’ Republic can have no other result than the extermination of all those who believe in the Divinity of Christ the King. ‘No man can serve two masters’ (Matthew vi. 24). Of course anyone, Bishop, priest or layman, who stands up for the integral rights of Christ the King will be got rid of, ostensibly as an enemy of the republic and a counter-revolutionary. And be it noted that ideas work themselves out in act, or rather men are spurred on to draw the final conclusions from the ideas they hold. Marxian republicans cannot stop halfway and compromise with Catholicism. They must seek to exterminate its adherents and educate a new generation which will worship only matter, machinery and—Satan. [***] A few extracts from Waldemar Gurian’s able work from which we have already quoted will confirm these statements:—‘[***] This produces an oppression of unparalleled magnitude. All intellectual life that does not serve Bolshevik aims must be annihilated; intellectual freedom and independence must yield to the dogmas of the Bolshevik creed; religion must disappear, and scientific research be exclusively directed to results which are in harmony with the doctrines of dialectical materialism and above all serve the Bolshevik rule. [***]’”¹³¹

3.3 The “Eastern Question” and the World Wars

In an article entitled “Modern Jewish Worship”, the *New York Evangelist*, Volume 12, Number 40, (2 October 1841), p. 1, wrote,

“Through all their wanderings, they have followed the direction of Moses, to be *lenders* and not *borrowers*. The sovereigns of Europe and Asia, and the republics of America, are their debtors to an immense amount. The Rothschilds are Jews; and they have wealth enough to purchase all Palestine if they choose; a large part of Jerusalem is in fact mortgaged to them. The oppressions of the Turkish government, and the incursions of hostile tribes, have hitherto rendered Syria an unsafe residence; but the Sultan has erected it into an independent power, and issued orders throughout his empire, that the Jews shall be as perfectly protected in their religious and civil rights, as any other class of his subjects; moreover, the present controversy between European nations and the East seems likely to result in placing Syria under the protection of Christian nations. It is reported that Prince Metternich, Premier of Austria, has determined, if possible, to constitute a Christian kingdom out of Palestine, of which Jerusalem is to be the seat of government.”

The Rothschilds, and their agent, Karl Marx, saw to it that Gentile nations and peoples did not advance peacefully and prosperously to the highest achievements they could otherwise have attained without the influence of these corrosive forces. The results of Rothschild and Marx agendas have been the same—tax the Gentiles into comparative poverty, financially, intellectually and even genetically; primarily through wars and revolutions, and through control of the monarchies, press, politics, education and the professions. For centuries, Jewish bankers agitated the nations and artificially created the “Eastern Question” in an effort—which was ultimately successful—to provoke world wars, which would net them Palestine and obstruct the progress of Gentile nations. This was already apparent to many in 1820—after Napoleon Bonaparte had devastated Europe in order to emancipate the Jews and “restore” them to Palestine.

The Athenaeum; or, Spirit of the English Magazines, Volume 2, Number 10, (15 August 1820), pages 398ff. stated,

“RUSSIA AND TURKEY

THERE is a madness of thrones, and it is the madness of perpetual desire—the madness of avarice and accumulation. No extent of dominion can satisfy it; the utter worthlessness of the object cannot restrain it; desert is added to desert, marsh to marsh, a sickly and beggared population is gathered to the crowd that are already perishing in the midst of their uncultured fields;—yet the passion is still keen, and thousands of lives are sacrificed, years of desperate hazard are encountered, and wealth, that might have transformed the wilderness into a garden, is flung away, for the possession of some leagues of territory, fit only to make the grave of its invaders. Austria, at this hour the mistress of a prodigious empire, one half of which is forest, heath, or mountain, unpeopled, or only peopled by barbarians—Austria, the mistress of Croatia, the Bannat, and Transylvania,

is longing for Albania, a country of barren mountain and swampy valley, with a population of robbers. Russia, with a territory almost the third of the old world, stretching from the Black Sea to the Pole, and from Finland to the wall of China, is longing for the fatal marshes of Wallachia and Moldavia; for the deserts of Romelia, and the sovereignty of the fiercest race of barbarians on earth, alien by their creed, alien by their habits, and cursing the ground that has been defiled by the tread of a Russian. With two capitals already hostile to each other, she is struggling for a third, incurably and furiously hostile to both. With an extent of dominion that no single sceptre can adequately rule, and which a few years will see either torn asunder by the violence of rebellion, or falling in pieces by the natural changes of overgrown territory, she is at this hour marshalling her utmost strength, and laying up debility for many a year, in the frantic eagerness to add the Turkish empire to the Muscovite, the Siberian, and the Tartar.

And in this tremendous chase of power, what is to be trampled under the foot of the furious and guilty pursuer! The heart sickens at the reckless waste of life and the means of life, the myriads that must perish in the field, the more miserable myriads that must perish of disease, famine, and the elements let loose upon their naked heads; the still deeper wretchedness of those lonely and deserted multitudes, whose havoc makes no display in bulletins and gazettes, but whose history is registered where the eternal eye of justice and vengeance alone reads—the innumerable host of the widow and the orphan. Yet this weight of calamity is let fall upon mankind at the word of a single individual:—often the most worthless of human beings, an empty, gaudy, ignorant slave of alternate indolence and sensuality; trained by the habitual life of foreign courts to the perpetual indulgence of personal excess, and differing from the contemptible race generated by the habits of foreign life, only by his being the more open dupe of sycophancy, the more prominent object of public alarm, and the more unbridled example of every profligacy that can debase the individual, or demoralize the nation.

Europe is again threatened with universal hostilities by the passion of the Czar to be master of Constantinople.—The nominal cause of the war with Turkey is the removal of the hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia by the Porte. A treaty in 1801 had established that those governors of the provinces should be removed only at the end of every seven years; a period fixed by the customary cunning of the Russian cabinet, as one in which the hospodars, thus rendered secure from the bow-string, might connect themselves more effectually with Russia. The hospodars were Greeks, and their national prejudices allied them to their new protectors; they were like all the Greeks of Fanar—ambitious, corrupt, and crafty; and the gold of Russia was the virtual sceptre of the hospodariates.”

It necessary to interject some explanatory comments, before proceeding with the rest of the above article “Russia and Turkey”. Jewish bankers orchestrated an alliance of Greek and Russian Orthodox Christians to diminish or utterly destroy

Turkish influence, especially in Greek and Slavic regions, which confrontation benefitted the Jews by opening up Palestine—which was a part of the Turkish Empire—to Jewish colonization, and setting up the groundwork for the world wars, which would lead to peace conferences that would establish a Jewish state and a world government run by Jews.

An article entitled, “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 337-339, wrote,

“Since the last conquest of Constantinople, Turkish policy has inclined to tolerate the Jews; and the consequence has been a great increase of their numbers in that city. They are often bankers for the grandees, and custom, acquiring the force of law, has established them as collectors of the customs and purveyors for the seraglio. Their taxes are not greater than those paid by other races in a similar condition. ‘The Jews,’ says Judge Noah, ‘are at this day the most influential persons connected with the commerce and monetary affairs of Turkey, and enjoy important privileges; but hitherto they have had no protecting influence.’¹³² [***] In Syria, the Jews are in a state of real servitude, and no change of masters has bettered their condition. Mohammedans and Christians alike hate and maltreat them; and this hatred is heartily returned, as the latter find, whenever any circumstance gives their enemies a temporary advantage. When the Turkish succeeded the Egyptian troops in Damascus, a few years ago, they were stirred up by the Jews to persecute the Christians of every sect. When the Greeks rose against the Turks in 1822, the Jews eagerly joined against the Christians, especially in Constantinople; while the Greeks, in revenge, murdered all the Jews on whom they could lay their hands.”

3.3.1 Dönme Crypto-Jews, The Turkish Empire and Palestine

The Jewish bankers oversaw and governed the “Greek” and “Armenian” control of Turkish finances, and eventually bankrupted the Turkish Empire and destroyed the Egyptian economy. The Jewish bankers feared that the Egyptians would oppose the formation of a Jewish kingdom in Palestine, even if the Sultan of Turkey and the lands of Palestine could be bought by Rothschild. In an article entitled “Modern Jewish Worship”, the *New York Evangelist*, Volume 12, Number 40, (2 October 1841), p. 1, wrote,

“Through all their wanderings, they have followed the direction of Moses, to be *lenders* and not *borrowers*. The sovereigns of Europe and Asia, and the republics of America, are their debtors to an immense amount. The Rothschilds are Jews; and they have wealth enough to purchase all Palestine if they choose; a large part of Jerusalem is in fact mortgaged to them. The oppressions of the Turkish government, and the incursions of hostile tribes, have hitherto rendered Syria an unsafe residence; but the Sultan has erected it into an independent power, and issued orders throughout his empire, that

the Jews shall be as perfectly protected in their religious and civil rights, as any other class of his subjects; moreover, the present controversy between European nations and the East seems likely to result in placing Syria under the protection of Christian nations. It is reported that Prince Metternich, Premier of Austria, has determined, if possible, to constitute a Christian kingdom out of Palestine, of which Jerusalem is to be the seat of government.”

Agitated by Jews and crypto-Jews, who hated Christians, the Sultan retaliated against innocent Armenians who were blamed for allegedly stealing the wealth of the Kingdom—wealth which had been stolen by Jewish financiers. These attacks on innocent Armenians benefitted the Jewish financiers by weakening an ancient Christian enemy in the region, one associated with the mythical exile of the lost ten northern tribes of Israelites and one associated with the Christians in Jerusalem and elsewhere in Palestine, which Christians then outnumbered the Jews in Palestine. It also deflected attention away from the crimes of the Jewish financiers. Furthermore, these attacks left the Sultan dependent on Jewish influence in the mass media to safeguard the image of the Empire from exposure of the atrocities the Turks committed against Armenians due to the instigation of Jews and crypto-Jews. The Jews led the Christians and Moslems to devour one another.

When crypto-Jewish “Young Turks”¹³³ finally succeeded in overthrowing the bankrupt Sultan, the crypto-Jews mass murdered the Armenians in a genocide of some 1.5 million lives lost—far worse atrocities than had ever been committed under the Sultan, which genocide benefitted the Jews in that it diminished Christian influence in the region of Palestine. The Zionist Jews also hoped that the atrocities could be used as wartime propaganda to inspire hatred of the Turks and of the Germans in America and elsewhere; and would draw the British and French into the region—a goal Cabalistic Jews had lusted after for centuries.

An article entitled, “The Turkish Situation by One Born in Turkey”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 2, (February, 1902), pp. 182-191, at 186-188 states:

“Turkish treasury accounts have always been kept by Greeks and Armenians. If a Turk owns land, some Christian keeps its rent-roll. If he has a business, Christian clerks manage it, If he owns mines or works the richer placer of official extortion, some Christian engineer or scribe manages and manipulates his accounts. Such prosperity as there was through the twenty years of Abdul Hamid’s reign, which seemed prosperous, went to Christians.”

The Zionists deliberately bankrupted Turkey, which owned Palestine, so that they could blackmail the Sultan into surrendering the territory to the Jews. Soon after the Young Turk revolutionaries gained power under their *Dönmeh* crypto-Jewish leadership,¹³⁴ the Zionist bankers largely had their way. The Zionists scripted Young Turks to betray the interests of the Turkish Empire and the Moslem faith, and favor

the interests of Zionist Jews. *The London Times* reported on 12 March 1909 on page 4,

“A TURKISH DEPUTY ON ZIONISM.—The *Jewish Chronicle* of to-day states:—Dr. Riza Tewfik, a member of the Chamber of Deputies and one of the foremost leaders of the Young Turk party, delivered a lecture on the Jewish question recently in Constantinople, under the auspices of the Society of Young Jews. At the close of the lecture, Dr. Riza Tewfik invited questions, and in reply to the inquiry, whether a good Ottoman could be a Zionist, he replied, ‘Certainly, I myself am a Zionist. Zionism is fundamentally nothing more than the expression of the solidarity which characterizes the Jewish people. What is the aim of Zionism? A humanitarian one: to find a more friendly fatherland for unfortunate co-religionists, where they can live as free men in the enjoyment of their rights. The methods of Zionism are exclusively peaceful. Palestine is your land more than it is ours; we only became rulers of the country many centuries later than you. A service would be rendered to our common fatherland by undertaking the colonization of that uncultivated land, Palestine. Your nation has incomparable qualifications for trade; your fellow-Jews are sober and industrious. They would restore this desolate land. They would devote all their energies to the service of our dear fatherland, and I assure you that my co-operation will never fail you in order to attain this aim.’”

The London Times reported on the Turks’ suspicion of crypto-Jewish and Zionist Jewish financial influence on the Empire, on 3 March 1911, on page 5,

“THE TURKISH CHAMBER AND ZIONISM.

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

CONSTANTINOPLE, MARCH 1.

In to-day’s debate on the Budget in the Chamber Ismail Hakki, Deputy for Gumuldjina, made a long criticism of Djavid Bey’s financial policy, at the close of which, after expressly declaring his confidence in the loyalty of the great majority of the Ottoman Jews, he hinted that the Minister had shown undue preference to Jewish capitalists and their agents, some of whom he accused of favouring Zionism. He also drew the attention of the House to the growth of Zionist propaganda in Turkey and to the efforts of the foreign Jewish agents on behalf of that cause.

The leader of the ‘People’s Party’ then treated the House to something of an anticlimax, naming Sir Ernest Cassel and other unlikely persons as presumable Zionists. The Grand Vizier explained that Sir Ernest Cassel was a member of the Anglican Church, and was an intimate friend of the late King, and therefore a ‘true and loyal friend of the Ottoman Empire.’

Talaat Bey, answering the statement of Ismail Hakki, said that proposals

had been made to him and to Djavid Bey by the Jewish General Colonization Society, which they had been unable to accept. He admitted Zionist activity, but said that the law preventing Jewish immigration into Palestine remained in force.

Ismail Hakki Bey Babnzadeh has been appointed Minister of Public Instruction.

The monopolies which the Government intend to create, as announced by Djavid Bey in his recent Budget speech, do not include petroleum. I understand that the Government proposes, subject to the consent of the interested Powers, to establish an Excise duty on petroleum instead of creating a monopoly."

Zionist activity in Turkey became so noxious that it threatened to lead to anti-Semitism in the Turkish Empire, which Turkey had not known. Note that before the Zionists stabbed Germany in the back in favor of England, the German Government and the Zionists had worked together and the German Government was very good to Jews, and to Zionists in particular. *The London Times* stated on 14 April 1911 on page 3,

“THE YOUNG TURKS AND ZIONISM. HOSTILITY TO THE MOVEMENT. (FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

CONSTANTINOPLE, APRIL 9.

A curious incident, the news of which has just reached the capital from Salonika, reveals in unmistakable fashion the rapid growth of Turkish hostility to the Zionist movement. A well-known Zionist propagandist, Santo-Semo Effendi, having obtained the permission of the Committee of Union and Progress to use its Club at Salonika for the purpose of a lecture on immigration into Mesopotamia, a large number of Jewish and Turkish members of the Committee promised to be present on this occasion.

They kept their promise, but when the lecturer, after discussing various schemes for the colonization of Mesopotamia, delivered a violent attack on Great Britain, accusing her of opposing German commercial schemes in Mesopotamia simply with a view to the eventual economic and political conquest of Irak, many of the Turks present hooted the lecturer and the meeting was for a time so disturbed that several of the leading Jews present withdrew. Quiet was soon restored, but on the following day the Turkish *Rumeli*, which is now the organ of the Salonika Committee and is believed especially to reflect the views of its military members, published a violent attack on Zionism, which it described as being simply and solely a cloak for German designs and notably for schemes for the economic conquest and exploitation of Mesopotamia. These views certainly appear now to prevail

among many Turks both withing and without the Committee organization, who profess to find evidence of German support of Zionism in the strongly Germanophile and Anglophobe tendencies of the principal Zionist organs published in Turkey, and the fact that some of the chief Zionist propagandists here are German subjects. However this may be, it is to be hoped that the anti-Zionist feeling, which has become very marked of late, may not degenerate into Anti-Semitism from which Turkey has till now been free.”

At various times, duplicitous Zionist Jews used the French, Russians, Germans, and English against the Turks, leading each nation to believe it was in its own best interests to war with the Turks and install a Jewish nation in the region. The Jewish Zionists were loyal to no nation but themselves. France, Russia, Germany and England each suffered for the loyalty they showed to Zionist Jews—as did the Turkish Empire, which had also been very good to Jews. The Zionists even used themselves as bait to create a war between the Germans and the British over Mesopotamia—and Palestine, and to drive a wedge between the Germans and the Turks on the eve of the First World War.

These facts were becoming increasingly obvious to the Turks, such that the Zionists felt obliged to protest loudly against such accusations. The Zionists even went so far as to blame the Turks for the Zionists’ continued intrigues in Turkey, on the sophistical and false premise that they were obliged to continue to intrigue in Turkey so as to dispel the alleged myth that they were intriguing in Turkey. The fact that the Zionists played both sides of the struggles the Zionists themselves had fomented is further revealed in their denials of the facts—the Zionists were primarily Russian Jews operating around the world—disloyal Russian Jews who wanted to bring England, Germany, Russia and Turkey into war. *The London Times* reported on 9 May 1911 on page 7,

“ZIONISM AND TURKEY.

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

COLOGNE, MAY 4.

The International Council of the Zionist Organization, which has just concluded a two days’ Conference at the Central Office, conducted most of its proceedings in private, as they were devoted to a discussion of the Zionist situation in the Ottoman Empire. It was announced that the following resolution had been adopted:—

The International Council, having carefully considered the Zionist situation in Turkey and the reports which it has received from there, declares that the charges recently brought against Zionism are based upon a deficient knowledge of the real character of the movement, and upon an incorrect conception of its aims and endeavors. It is firmly convinced that Zionist aspirations are in complete accord with the interests of the Ottoman Empire, and considers it its duty to continue its efforts in Turkey so that the real import and aims of the Zionist movement may be rightly understood.

In connexion with the Conference, meetings of the Jewish National Fund,

the Anglo-Palestine Company, and the Anglo-Levantine Banking Company—which are all Zionist institutions—also took place.”

In yet another of the countless instances where Zionists have played both sides of an issue with mutually exclusive and contradictory arguments, a Zionist leader named Wolffsohn attacked the *London Times*’ reporting on the basis that the Jews had no desire to take over Palestine. The Zionists later would reverse this stance and go so far as to claim that the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was their deed to the land—this in spite of the fact that England had no right to issue the Declaration and it did not give Palestine to the Jews for the formation of State, but merely looked favorably on the idea of Jews living under a Palestinian Government. It had perhaps escaped Wolffsohn’s memory that Theodor Herzl’s book was titled, “The Jewish State”, which would lead a reasonable person to believe that the political Zionists sought to form a State, no matter what lies the political Zionists told the world public as a means to regulate public opinion, and no matter what public political expressions they were forced to accept. History has put the lie to Wolffsohn’s sophistry. The brazen dishonesty of the Zionists is apparent, given the events of the First World War, which contradict Wolffsohn’s deceitful reassurances.

On 10 May 1911, on page 8, *The London Times* published the following Letter to the Editor,

“THE YOUNG TURKS AND ZIONISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I shall feel much obliged if you will allow me to make a few observations upon the article of your Constantinople Correspondent on the ‘Young Turks and Zionism,’ which appeared in your issue of April 14, and regret that my recent absence from Cologne has prevented me from writing to you before. I particularly regret this inevitable delay, as several statements in the article are quite incorrect, and as they have not yet been challenged or rectified in your columns, I fear they may have found acceptance in certain quarters. Knowing, however, that you are far from desiring that any injustice should be done through any article in your paper to the cause that I represent, I feel sure that you will grant hospitality to few notes of correction and explanation.

While fully admitting the evident desire of your Correspondent to present an objective and impartial account of Zionism in the Ottoman Empire, I regret that his limited knowledge of our movement and the sources from which he appears to have derived it made it impossible for him to realize that desire. The cardinal defect of his article consists in the assumption that Zionism is a scheme for the foundation of a Jewish State in Palestine. This assumption is wrong. His comments upon our movement and his account of the views upon it in Turkish circles are mainly dependent upon this

assumption. As his premiss is incorrect, his conclusions are of interest only in so far as they represent the state of mind shared by others in Turkey who have likewise been misled as to our aims and intentions.

The object of Zionism is clearly defined in its programme adopted at our first Congress at Basel in 1897, and hence known as the Basel Programme. This programme is 'To create a publicly recognized and legally secured home for the Jewish people in Palestine.' The aim thus formulated is essentially different from the aspiration to found a State, and those who attribute to us such an aspiration misrepresent us in a very serious degree, as they are likely, however unwittingly, to cause difficulties being put in our way. It is because this erroneous notion has secured a strong hold upon the minds of many people that disparaging remarks were made upon Zionism in the Turkish Chamber several weeks ago. The misinterpretation of our position is all the more strange and inexcusable as I expressly declared at the ninth Zionist Congress at Hamburg in December, 1909, that our work is guided and governed by the deepest respect for the Constitution and by the fullest recognition of the sovereignty of the Porte. We are simply desirous of making Palestine once again the national home of the Jewish people; and, to achieve that end, we are working for the economic and intellectual regeneration of the Holy Land in full conformity with the law.

Our object is so peaceful and our aims are calculated so highly to benefit the interests of the Ottoman Empire that we are painfully surprised that our movement should arouse any distrust in authoritative circles in Turkey. This circumstance can be ascribed only to the prevalence of various fantastic legends that have been put into circulation by our opponents, who, I regret to say, include many Jews. The latest of these legends is that Zionist activity is being conducted in the specific interests of Germany. This story is utterly without foundation in substance or fact, as we have no relations of any kind that can be construed as specially favouring the economic interests of Germany. The *data* advanced in support of the story are also incorrect. The *Jeune Turc* cited by your Correspondent is a purely Turkish paper, which, it is quite true, has more than once advocated a Jewish immigration into the Ottoman Empire in the interests of the Empire itself, but there is not the least ground for deducing from this that we are even in the least responsible for the policy of the paper. It is therefore immaterial to us whether the proprietor, Herr Hochberg, is a German Jew, or, as I have just been informed on excellent authority, a Russian Jew. Dr. V. Jacobson, who is one of the leading Zionists in Constantinople and manager of an English company—the Anglo-Levantine Banking Company—is also a Russian subject.

Finally, I wish to point out that the Zionist Organization has absolutely no connexion with the General Jewish Colonizing Organization of Berlin. Hence the activity of this organization, or rather of its representative, Dr. Nossig, does not form a 'new phase'—or, indeed, any 'phase'—of Zionism, and the conclusions derived from this activity cannot be used as an argument against our movement.

I feel sure that when those who are interested in Zionism will have purged their minds of the various fantastic fables that have been put into circulation to damage it, they will realize its peaceful intentions and beneficent aims. Our organization has already given a powerful impetus to commercial and industrial life in Palestine during the few years it has been active in the country, mainly through our companies which carry on their operations there. These companies—the Anglo-Palestine Company (Limited), the Jewish National Fund (Limited), and the Palestine Land Development Company (Limited)—have all been registered in London as English companies. The part they are playing in the economic amelioration of Palestine is but an earnest of the great work that Zionism is destined to do, and which, with the good will of the Ottoman Government, it will accomplish.

Yours obediently,

D. WOLFFSOHN,

President of the Zionist Organization.

Cologne, May 1.”

+

3.3.2 The World Wars—A Jewish Antidote to Jewish Assimilation

The racist Zionists failed in their attempts to buy Palestine and populate it with Jewish colonists, because the vast majority of Jews did not want to go to Palestine. The Zionists caused the First World War in order to break up the Turkish Empire and weaken the Moslem nations, which they feared would unite to fight against the formation of a “Jewish State”.

The Zionists knew that the First World War would end with a peace conference, where the breakup of the Empires and the formation of small, ethnically segregated nations would be discussed. That deliberately manufactured opportunity would give the Zionists a chance to petition for the creation of the “Jewish State”. However, since the majority of Jews were happily assimilating into Gentile societies and had no desire to move to Palestine, the Zionists’ plans, which were otherwise largely successful, ultimately failed.

The Zionists then felt they had the right to manufacture the Second World War and the Holocaust in order to change the Jews’ collective mind by means of force. They did not care at all what most Jews wanted for themselves and the racist Zionists were willing to mass murder millions of Jews in the hopes that the “remnant” would be persuaded to emigrate to the “Holy Land” at war’s end. Racist political Zionist Israel Zangwill predicted in 1923 that Zionism would lead to an unprecedented world-wide conflagration.¹³⁵ He knew whereof he spoke. The Zionists Lloyd George and “Mentor” also realized at the end of the First World War that there would be second.¹³⁶

In 1906, Leo Tolstoy recognized that the Zionists were leading the world, and especially the Jews, towards disaster. On 9 December 1906, on page SM2, *The New York Times* published a translation of Tolstoy’s ominous warnings, which were translated by Herman Bernstein—note the name,

“ZIONISM

An Argument against the Ambition for Separate National Existence. A Plea for Devotion to the Idea of Common Humanity.

By COUNT LEO TOLSTOY

(Translated from the Russian by Herman Bernstein.)

THIS movement has always interested me, not because it offers to the Jews a way out of their painful condition—it offers if them no way out of it—it has interested me because of the example of the enormous influence to which people, who have suffered a great deal and have experienced all the vanity of a certain project, will occasionally submit. Before our eyes an old, wise, and well-experienced people, which had gone through one of the most terrible maladies of mankind, is now falling back into the same malady. There is an awakening of the thirst for imperialism and an evil desire to govern and to play an important part. Again they want to provide themselves with all this show of outward nationalism, with armies—with banners awl inscriptions.

The leaders, without realizing it themselves, have fallen into the terrible sin of separating themselves from others, and they are eminently battering this sin into the consciousness of the people to whom they represent the matter not at all as it really is.

They are forever repeating that Zionism is a progressive movement of the national spirit which is eager to throw off at last the chains of captivity and to give the nation an opportunity to live a free and independent life on the sacred mounts where their great past is buried. I have been told of a Jewish preacher who in one of the synagogues of Tula struck himself on the chest and, sobbing, called the people to Palestine, saying: ‘There we will see the rock on which Jacob had rested, and we will walk along the same path that Abraham bad trodden. This awakens our feelings!’

But the horror of it all is that this movement is neither progressive nor national, nor does it awaken any feelings.

Jacob’s rock and Abraham’s path are such distant things that they cannot stir a people and make them take up the wanderer’s staff. A nation is Dot an archaeologist, and to break new ground it will not go in a horde of ten millions from the places where they have lived for many centuries, and where they feel more at home than amid the rocks of Jacob and the paths of Abraham. This can be seen on those that go to America, and tortured with homesickness, exhausted, they return and kiss the ground of their native land, the black soil of the same Russia they still love, notwithstanding that the terrible oppressors are shamelessly trying to make of the life of the Jews here a hell of suffering.

If their memory of the sacred places of Palestine were really so strong and their eagerness to live there had been inherent in the Jewish people, they had numerous occasions during these 1,800 years to return there and to live once more in those ancient places.

But the people consciously never wanted it, even as they do not want it now. And that is why I do not regard Zionism as a national movement. The real Jewish spirit is against a separate territory of their own. It does not want the old toy of empire, and it has renounced it once for all. I cannot think without emotion of the beautiful saying about a certain Jewish sage of the times of the destruction of the Temple. He had rendered a great service to Vespasian, and Vespasian told him to ask for anything he pleased, and he would grant his request. It would seem that that was an excellent opportunity to ask him to raise the siege and restore the freedom to his land. But the sage said:

‘Allow me to go with my pupils to the town of Yamnia and to establish there a school for the study of the Torah.’

This answer seemed strange to the Roman, who had become brutalized in wars and slaughters.

But it was a conscious, powerful, and beautiful answer of the entire nation.

The sage understood correctly the secret of the people’s spirit and asked for something which seemed insignificant. This voluntary fate of the sage—this substitution of the spiritual for the corrupt—is the grandest moment in the history of Judaism, something which has not as yet been sufficiently appreciated, and of which even the Jews have not entirely availed themselves.

And this nation feels it and resists it with all its powers, unwilling to rush into the old adventure which is foreign to its soul.

It is not the land, but the Book, that has become its fatherland. And this is one of the grandest spectacles in history, the noblest calling man can only hope for. Absorbed by this Book, the Jewish people did not notice how centuries had passed over their heads, how nations had appeared and then been wiped off the face of the earth, how new lands had been discovered and steam power invented, while the black, heavy smoke of the factory chimneys had overcast the clear sky, hiding it from the people who walked in darkness under a dense network of wires along which a mute but cruel power carried tidings, one more cruel than the other, one more bloody than the other—such tidings as the world had never heard before.

This roaring noise of civilization which is rushing like a waterfall toward the precipice, which kindles in men only wretched desires for worthless comforts, had not reached the ears of the great Wanderer who was absorbed reading the great Book. And the foam of the gushing waterfall is striving to besprinkle the holy pages and to cover them with rusty stains of mockery and unbelief.

And the leaders of Zionism are helping on the work of this foam,

majestically ignoring the religious question and putting forth only immigration and politics, politics and immigration.

‘Let us first come together from all sides of the globe,’ they say, ‘and then we shall also work out a religion.’

This is just as unnatural and unwise as it is not national, especially with regard to the Jews. One recalls the splendid chapter of Deuteronomy, where, after the thundering words of cursings and blessings, the young spirit of the new-born nation utters words of profound significance: ‘And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, And shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey His voice—thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; That then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. And will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed. * *’

This is the hope of the people. First turn to God, and then God Himself will do His own work and will give the land to the people and will grant them more favors than He had granted their fathers.

The leaders of Zionism reason differently. They seem to have changed roles with God. They want to gather the Jews from among all nations into the land of their fathers, and there God would take care that the people should turn their hearth to Him.

And God says to them:

‘Try to do My work.’

And He turns away from them.

And thus childish colonial banks are started, toy congresses are held, with small and large committees, which, authorized by nobody, are carrying on unnecessary negotiations concerning childish charters and the Sultan’s favors. The people see all the vanity of these projects and also turn away from this movement. It isn’t God’s work—there is too much of the human, the invented, too much of the medical prescription in this work.

That is why, I hear, there are some rabbis who curse this work, condemning Zionism as a doctrine that is foreign to the people and that threatens them with great misfortune. And, indeed, although this view is held by the orthodox rabbis, who usually occupy a dark position on religious questions, yet in this case the orthodox Jews stand upon firm ground, and their opposition is entirely legitimate.

There is no progressive spirit in this movement, which is cut out according to European fashion—it has not even the character of progress of which they speak so eloquently at their congresses. And this is the most amazing feature of it all. If the leaders of Zionism, generally sensitive and sensible men, but far from their people, were unable to create a healthy national movement, they are not to be blamed. They are eager to do something, but they cannot. But if all these people, with their quick

understanding of everything that is progressive and striking, did not understand what really moves the higher life of Europe and what constitutes the power of the summits of the European minds, they cannot be excused under any circumstances. Believing that the strength of Europe lies in its imperialism—that is, in its gun power, with all the horrors of militarism—they have decided to array their old man also in the armor of a warrior and give him a rifle in his hands. They felt like creating a new Juden-Staat. The best minds in Europe, and also in America, all those that think truthfully and sincerely, are agitated to the very depths of their souls at the madness and horror of this abyss whither savage mankind, so called civilized, is drifting head foremost.

All that is right, sensible, and not enslaved by fear or money is striving with all its powers to undeceive the people and to remind them that the strength of mankind does not at all lie in the cannon power of imperialism, and that the future of mankind is not in the passion to separate themselves and to live in small States. Those that are truly progressive see the happiness of mankind in just the reverse, in broad union and in the complete absence of cannon and mortars and those groups which are now held together only by the power of mortars, thus ruining the life of the people. All the rational work of the rational portion of mankind is against such imperialism. And they, the leaders of Zionism, want to give life to this antiquity and call such a wild aspiration—progress.

This is a great sin. It borders on blasphemy against the most sacred things that we have in life now.

We need no new Governments; we need loving people who see in their love the mission of life and love of God.

What is it that tempted them, what is it that they like so much in this nationalist, which is in reality a military, movement among the European little nations which the leaders of Zionism are apparently trying to imitate with all their might? Is it the toy freedom of Servia, where the word of the Austrian Ambassador is of greater importance than the orders of the King, and where all their freedom comes to nothing but endless slaughter and intrigues among the parties, and finally to the ruination of the peasants and the exhaustion of the land, which is overburdened with taxes in order to maintain the great number of officials and soldiers, who could be mowed down by two or three volleys from a small battery? Do they like this? Or do they like the seeming freedom of Bulgaria, which is also torn asunder by riots on account of their temporary little Czars, and which will soon be swallowed up by some other power? Or do they like Roumania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Crete, Greece—which of these does Zionism like? I say nothing of Italy, France, England, Germany, and some of the countries still nearer to us, where the cry also goes up to Heaven from the tortured people who are becoming savage and impoverished, thanks to militarism and organization.

The healthy seed of immigration which is striving to break up the congestion of the Jews and to bring them back to long-forgotten

agriculture—this undoubtedly a pure and beautiful movement, which the Zionists now claim as their own—does not at all belong to the Zionists. The tendency toward colonization existed before; Zionism has boldly usurped it and given it an unnatural and unnecessary political coloring, and has thus completely checked the return of the Jews to agriculture. The vision of a Jewish State was started, and this has only complicated the simple and clear desire of the people to leave the cities and take up the only proper, healthy, living, and honest work of God—the tilling of the soil.”

Racist Zionist Theodor Herzl spoke at the first Zionist Congress of 1897 and disclosed the machinations of the Zionists and their centuries’ old desire to destroy the Turkish Empire and bankrupt the Sultan. Herzl had a covert plan to have Turks mass murder Armenians, which would cause an outrage around the world, so as to leave the Turkish Empire at the mercy of the Jewish controlled press, which Herzl pledged would cover up the atrocities if the Sultan would agree to give the Zionists Palestine.¹³⁷ *The New York Times* reported on 31 August 1897 on page 7,

“ZIONIST CONGRESS IN BASEL.

The Delegates Adopt Dr. Herzl’s Programme for Re-establishing the Jews in Palestine.

BASEL, Switzerland, Aug., 30.—At to-day’s session of the Zionist Congress the delegates present unanimously adopted, with great enthusiasm, the programme for re-establishing the Hebrews in Palestine, with publicly recognized rights.

A dispatch was sent to the Sultan of Turkey, thanking his Majesty for the privileges enjoyed by the Hebrews in his empire.

The Zionist Congress opened at Basel yesterday with 200 delegates in attendance from various parts of Europe. Dr. Theodor Herzl, the so-called ‘New Moses’ and originator of the scheme to purchase Palestine and resettle the Hebrews there, was elected President and Dr. Max Nordau was elected Vice President of the Congress.

Dr. Herzl has only recently come into prominence. He seeks to float a limited-liability company in London for the purpose of acquiring Palestine from the Sultan of Turkey and thoroughly organizing it for resettlement by the Hebrews. He has, it is said, already won converts to the Zionist movement in all parts of the world.

When asked to outline his plans, Dr. Herzl said:

‘We shall first send out an exploring expedition, equipped with all the modern resources of science, which will thoroughly overhaul the land from one end to the other before it is colonized, and establish telephonic and telegraphic communication with the base as it advances. The old methods of colonization will not do here.

‘See here,’ continued Dr. Herzl, showing a good-sized book, ‘this is one of the four books which contain the records of the movement—the logbooks

of the Mayflower,' he added, with a smile. That one watchword, the 'Jewish State,' has been sufficient to rouse the Jews to a state of enthusiasm in the remotest corners of the earth, though there are those forming the so-called philanthropic party who predict that the watchword will provoke reprisals from Turkey. Inquiries in Constantinople and Palestine show that nothing is further from the truth.

'My plan is simple enough. We must obtain the sovereignty over Palestine—our never-to-be-forgotten, historical home. At the head of the movement will be two great and powerful agents—the Society of Jews and the Jewish Company. The first named will be a political organization, and spread the Jewish propaganda. The latter will be a limited-liability company, under English laws, having its headquarters in London and a capital of, say, a milliard of marks. Its task will be to discharge all the financial obligations of the retiring Jews and regulate the economic conditions in the new country. At first we shall send only unskilled labor—that is, the very poorest, who will make the land arable. They will lay out streets, build bridges and railroads, regulate rivers, and lay down telegraphs according to plans prepared at headquarters. Their work will bring trade, their trade the market, and the markets will cause new settlers to flock to the country. Every one will go there voluntarily, at his or her own risk, but ever under the watchful eye and protection of the organization.

'I think we shall find Palestine at our disposal sooner than we expected. Last year I went to Constantinople and had two long conferences with the Grand Vizier, to whom I pointed out that the key to the preservation of Turkey lay in the solution of the Jewish question.

'The Jews, in exchange for Palestine, would regulate the Sultan's finances and prevent disintegration, while for Europe we should form a new outpost against Asiatic barbarism and a guard of honor to hold intact the sacred shrines of the Christians.

'We can afford to play a waiting game, and either take over Palestine from the European Congress called together to divide the spoils of disintegrated Turkey, or look out for another land, such as Argentina, and say: 'Your Zion Is there.'

'It is to confer over this point that the congress was arranged for at Basel.

'I am sure that the Jews are even better colonists than Englishmen. There are already colonies of Jews in Palestine, and I have on my table excellent Bordeaux, Sauterne, and cognac grown in that country. It is well known that in Galicia and the Balkans the Jews perform the roughest kind of manual labor. There the wealth they bring is not their money, but themselves.'"

Racist Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, and his Jewish financier predecessors, collaborators and successors, promoted anti-Semitism as a means to force reluctant Jews to Palestine against their will—as will be shown later on in this text. An article entitled, "The Jewish State Idea", in *The New York Times*, 15 August 1897, on page 9, evinces the Zionists' designs for a world war centered on the "Eastern Question"

which world war the Zionists had been fomenting for centuries; and the article further evinces the fact that the Zionists knew that anti-Semitism was a means to drive Jews to Palestine—as will be confirmed later in this text by citation to Herzl and other Zionists,

“The question of colonization was agitated so early as 1840 by the late Sir Moses Montefiore, but it was not until 1878 that the first colony was planted at Pethach-Thikvah. This was an utter failure, due to the poor selection of colonists, who soon returned to Jerusalem. But in 1880, under the stress of Roumanian oppression, immigrants founded the villages and settlements of Sichron-Ja’akob and Rosh-Pinah. The Russian persecutions brought about the founding of Rishou-l’Zion and the re-establishment of Pethach-Thikvah in 1882. [***] With the bursting of the storm of Russian hate came perilous times for the Palestinian colonists. Their friends in Russia, who had promised their aid, had all they could do to care for themselves, and Palestine was overrun with poverty-stricken Russian exiles. [***] As to the question of the advisability of establishing a Jewish State there, it is natural that opinions vary most widely. Holman Hunt, R. A., the famous English artist, who has lived in Syria, wrote not long since: ‘Palestine will soon become a direful field of contention to the infernally armed forces of the European powers, so that it is calculated to provoke a curse to the world of the most appalling character. Russia and Greece will contend for the interests of the Greek Church, France and Italy for the Latin, Prussia and Germany for the German political interests. In addition to the above named contenders for Palestine, there would be England. The only remedy is a Jewish State. Both in Europe and America there are many Jews who oppose the founding of this State on the ground that it could be only a small, weak State, existing by sufferance. It is also urged that Israel’s mission is no longer political, but purely and simply religious, and that the establishment of the State would do incalculable harm, and could do no good.”

Prominent and influential racist Zionist Israel Zangwill wrote in 1914, shortly before the First World War began, in his booklet *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9-10, 21,

“Rabbinic opportunism, while on the one hand keeping alive the hope that these realities, however gross, would come back in God’s good time, went so far in the other direction as to lay it down that the law of the land was the law of the Jews. Everything in short—in this transitional period between the ancient glory and the Messianic era to come—was sacrificed to the ideal of mere survival. The mediaeval teacher Maimonides laid it down that to preserve life even Judaism might be abandoned in all but its holiest minimum. Thus—under the standing menace of massacre and spoliation—arose Crypto-Jews or Marranos, who, frequently at the risk of the stake or sword, carried on their Judaism in secret. Catholics in Spain and

Portugal, Protestants in England, they were in Egypt or Turkey Mohammedans. Indeed the *Dönme* still flourish in Salonika and provide the Young Turks with statesmen, the Balearic Islands still shelter the *Chuetas*, and only half a century ago persecution produced the *Yedil-al-Islam* in Central Asia. Russia must be full of Greek Christians who have remained Jewish at heart. Last year a number of Russian Jews, shut out from a university career, and seeking the lesser apostacy, became Mohammendans, only to find that for them the Trinity was the sole avenue to educational and social salvation. Where existence could be achieved legally, yet not without social inferiority, a minor form of Crypto-Judaism was begotten, which prevails to-day in most lands of Jewish emancipation, among its symptoms being change of names, accentuated local patriotism, accentuated abstention from Jewish affairs, and even anti-Semitism mimetically absorbed from the environment. Indeed, Marranoism, both in its major and minor forms, may be regarded as an exemplification of the Darwinian theory of protective coloring. The pervasive assimilating force acts even upon the most faithful, undermining more subtly than persecution the life-conceptions so tenaciously perpetuated. [***] A host of political rivalries, perilous to the world's peace, center around Palestine, while in the still more dangerous quarter of Mesopotamia, a co-operation of England and Germany in making a home under the Turkish flag for the Jew in his original birthplace would reduce Anglo-German friction, foster world-peace and establish in the heart of the Old World a bridge of civilization between the East and the West and a symbol of hope for the future of mankind."

Israel Zangwill had a close relationship with the Rothschild's, who had offered to sponsor his education.¹³⁸ In the 1800's, Jewish bankers prompted what would become "German" leadership to oppose this racist Pan-Slavic push to conquer Eastern Europe, with a Pan-Germanic movement based on racist principles. Jewish bankers led all of these elements, including the Turkish, British and French, into perpetual war for expanded territory, so as to destroy Europe and replace it with a world government run by them, and in order to open up the way for the Jews to enter Palestine *en masse*. Jewish bankers led the Czar to destroy Russia with wars, and eventually bankrupted her by closing off Russia's access to funds, while heavily funding Japan's economy in their war with Russia, as well as funding revolutionary elements against the Czar. Hitler was an agent of the Jewish bankers, and he likewise saw to it that Europe, Germany included, was consumed by perpetual and expanding war, which killed off millions of the best Germans and Slavs. After Hitler's reign, the Jewish bankers succeeded in taking Palestine from the indigenous population and in expanding the Soviet Empire across Eastern Europe—and very nearly all of Europe and America.

The article "Russia and Turkey", *The Atheneum; or, Spirit of the English Magazines*, Volume 2, Number 10, (15 August 1820), page 398ff. quoted above, continued as follows:

“The determination of Russia to seize upon the European dominions of the Sultan, was at length practically exhibited by the march of her troops, under Wittgenstein, to the Danube. The Turks, after some affairs of posts, retreated before the powerful army which now rushed down from Podolia and Moscow on their scattered parties; and the three sieges of Shumla, Silistria, and Varna, were immediately and rashly undertaken.

The result of the campaign undoubtedly disappointed, to a great extent, the expectations formed of the Russian arms. The Turks were often the assailants even upon level ground, and were not unfrequently left masters of the field. Some of their incursions into Wallachia put the Russian corps into such imminent hazard, that they were saved only by an instant retreat—large convoys were intercepted by the Turkish cavalry, and the campaign was speedily discovered to be only the beginning of a dubious and protracted struggle. The assaults on the Turkish posts were generally repulsed with heavy loss; and, of the three great sieges, but one offered the slightest hope of success. Shumla, the grand object of the campaign, was early found to be totally impracticable. Silistria was nearly despaired of, and finally was abandoned by a disorderly and ruinous flight. Varna alone gave way, after a long succession of attacks; and, from the singular circumstances of its surrender, is still said to have been bought from the Governor, Yusuf Pacha, a Greek renegade.

The campaign was urged into the depths of winter, and the weather was remarkably inclement; the Turks were elated by success, and their attacks kept the enemy perpetually on the alert; the walls of the great towns would not give way; the villages were burnt, and could give shelter no longer; and, as the general result, the Russian army were ordered to retreat from the Danube. The retreat was a second march from Moscow. Everything was lost, buried, or taken. The horses of the cavalry and artillery were totally destroyed, the greater part of the artillery was hidden in the ground, or captured, and the flying army, naked, dismantled, and undisciplined, was rejoiced to find itself once more in the provinces from which it had poured forth a few months before, to plant its standards on the seraglio.

Russia, beaten as she has been, has yet showed that she is too strong for the Turk; she has mastered Varna, a situation of high importance to her further movements, and she has been able to baffle every exertion to wrest it out of her hands. She has seized some minor fortresses, and in every instance she has been equally able to repel the efforts of the enemy. She has also conquered a city between the Balkan and Constantinople, which, if she shall pass the mountains, will be a place of arms for her troops, and a formidable obstacle on the flank of the Turkish army. The system of the Russian discipline, finance, and influence over the population of the North, is so immeasurably superior to the broken and disorderly polity of the Turk, that if the war be a work of time, victory must fall to the Czar. On the other hand we must remember the daring and sagacious spirit of the Sultan, the fierce bravery of his people, the power of the most warlike superstition on

earth, the national abhorrence of the Muscovite, and even the new intrepidity of recent success. A still more powerful element of defence remains, the jealousy or prudence of the great European kingdoms. The possession of Constantinople, by the masters of Moscow and St. Petersburg, would shake the whole Europe an system, by giving, for the time, at least, an exorbitant influence to Russia. England would see in it the threatened conquest of India: France, the complete supremacy of the Levant, and the exposure of her own shores to a Russian fleet on the first hostilities. Spain, though fallen in the scale, must still resist a measure which would lay open her immense sea-line from Barcelona to Cadiz. Austria, alone, might look upon it with some complacency, if she were bribed by the possession of Albania, or the prospect of planting her banners in the Morea. But the aggrandizement of Austria would be resisted by Prussia, and then the whole continent must hear the Russian trumpets as a summons to prepare for universal war.

The possession of Constantinople would be, not merely the mastery of the emporium of Asiatic trade, nor of a great fortress from which Asia and the East of Europe might be awed; but it would be an immediate and tremendous instrument of European disturbance by its perpetual transmission of the whole naval strength of Russia into the centre of Europe. The Russian fleet is unimportant, while it is liable to be locked up for half the year in the ice of the North; or while, to reach the Mediterranean, it must make the circuit of Europe. But if the passage of the Dardanelles were once her own, there is no limit for the force which she might form in the Black Sea, and pour down direct into Levant. There can be no doubt, that with this occasion for the employment of a naval force, Russia would throw a vast portion of her strength into a naval shape; and that while the Circassian forests furnished a tree, or the plains, from the Ukraine to Archangel, supplied hemp and tar, fleet upon fleet would be created in the dock-yards of the Crimea, and be poured down in overwhelming numbers into the Mediterranean.

Thus it is impossible that the Czar shall attack Constantinople without involving the world in war, and in that war England must be a principal. The premier's opinion has been distinctly stated on this subject, and so far as we can rely on the fluctuating wisdom of cabinets, it coincides with that of France and Prussia. To arrange more systematically the resistance to the ruin of Turkey, the Duke of Wellington is said to be on the eve of an extensive European tour, in which he will ascertain the dependence to be placed upon the courts, and discover how far the Czar may have learned moderation from his last campaign. But the world is in a feverish state: ambition is reviving; conspiracy is gathering on the Continent, and the first hour that sees the Russian superiority in the field decisive, will see the great sovereignties remonstrating, arming, and finally rushing, as to a new crusade, but with the sword unsheathed, nor for the fall, but for the defence of the turban!

That this will be the ultimate consequence we have no doubt. But the time may not be immediate. We are inclined to think that the French war has not yet been sufficiently forgotten by the states of central Europe to suffer

them to run the hazards of collision without the most anxious efforts for its avoidance. There is a general deficiency of money. All the great powers are actually, at this hour, living on *loans*. There is no power in Europe whose revenue is enough for its expenditure. Even in England we are borrowing. Our three millions of exchequer bills, issued in the fifteenth year of peace, shows us how little the finance system has sustained our expectations. A war, even for a year, would double our expenditure. On the continent, Rothschild is the true monarch. Every state is in his books, and what must be the confusion, the beggary, and the ultimate bankruptcy of hostilities. The fall of every throne must follow the bankruptcy of every exchequer, and the whole social system be broken up amid revolutionary havoc and individual misery. We believe that the four great powers are so fully convinced of the evil of this tremendous hazard, that they are struggling in every shape of diplomacy to avert the continuance of a war between Turkey and Russia. If they succeed, peace will, in all probability, continue for a few years more; if they fail, Europe must instantly arm, and a scene of warfare be roused, to which there has been no equal since the fall of the Roman Empire.”

3.4 Rothschild Warmongering

As anti-Communist Myron Fagan argued, the Rothschilds had hoped that the Napoleonic Wars would have made the world so weary of war that the nations would have eagerly surrendered their sovereignty to the Rothschilds’ Jewish world-government at the Congress of Vienna of 1814-1815. Jewish bankers were behind these wars, in which they financed all sides to destroy each and shatter the empires which stood in the way of the Rothschilds’ establishing a Jewish kingdom in Palestine from which to rule the world—in agreement with Jewish Messianic myth.

Much of the monarchy of Europe had been infiltrated by Jews and crypto-Jews either through intermarriage and disingenuous Christian conversion, or through finance. Many of these rulers intentionally bankrupted the nations over which they ruled. These nations were then subverted by revolutions and dictatorships under the leadership of Jews, or the agents of Jews. The largest revolutionary movement came in 1848, and it was organized, led and financed by Jews—as Disraeli had noted, in 1844, four years before it happened.

One hundred years after the article “Russia and Turkey” appeared, and shortly after the Zionists had had their First World War, it was again apparent to many that a group of radical Jews sought to rule the world and focused their attention on the “Eastern Question” and the development of a Second World War, which would pit Japan and Germany against America and Great Britain. On 19 June 1920, John Clayton wrote in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* on the front page,

“TROTZKY LEADS RADICAL CREW

TO WORLD RULE

Bolshevism Only a Tool for His Scheme

BY JOHN CLAYTON.

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

PARIS, June 18.—For the last two years army intelligence officers, members of the various secret service organizations of the entente, have been bringing in reports of a world revolutionary movement other than Bolshevism. At first these reports confused the two, but latterly the lines they have taken have begun to be more and more clear.

Bolshevism aims for the overthrow of existing society and the establishment of an international brotherhood of men who work with their hands as rulers of the world. The second movement aims for the establishment of a new racial domination of the world. So far as the British, French and our own department's inquiry have been able to trace, the moving spirits in the second scheme are Jewish radicals.

Use Local Hatreds.

Within the ranks of communism is a group of this party, but it does not stop there. To its leaders, communism is only an incident. They are ready to use the Islamic revolt, hatred by the central empires for England, Japan's designs on India, and commercial rivalry between America and Japan.

As any movement of world revolution must be, this is primarily anti-Anglo-Saxon. It sees its greatest task in the destruction of the British empire and the growing commercial power of America. The brains of this organization are in Berlin.

Trotsky at Head.

The directing spirit which issues the orders to all minor chiefs and finds money for the work of preparing the revolt is in the German capital. Its executive head is none other than Trotsky, for it is on the far frontiers of India, Afghanistan, and Persia that the first test of strength will come. The organization expert of the present Russian state is recognized, even among the members of his own political party, as a man of boundless ambition, and his dream of an empire of the east is like that of Napoleon.

The organization of the world Jewish-radical movement has been perfected in almost every land. In the states of England, France, Germany, Poland, Russia, and the east it has its groups. It is behind the Islamic revolt with all the propaganda skill and financial aid at its command because it hopes to control the shaping of the new eastern empire to its own ends. Sympathy with the eastern nationals probably is one of the chief causes for the victory of the pro-nationals in the bolshevik party, which threw communism solidly behind the nationalist aspirations of England's colonies.

Out to Grab Trade Routes.

The aims of the Jewish-radical party have nothing of altruism behind them beyond liberation of their own race. Except for this their aims are purely commercial. They want actual control of the rich trade routes and production centers of the east, those foundations of the British empire which always have been the cornerstone of its national supremacy.

They are striking for the same ends as Germany when she entered the war of 1914 to establish Mittel Europa and so give the Germans control of the Bagdad railway. They believe Europe is tired of conflict and that England is too weak to put down a concerted rebellion in part of her eastern possessions. Therein lies the hope of success. They are staking brains and money against an empire.

‘Westward the course of empire makes its way,’ but even it swings backward to the old battleground where for countless ages peoples have fought. Nations have risen and crumbled around control of eastern commerce.”¹³⁹

3.4.1 Inter-Jewish Racism

Albert Einstein was the most prominent and vocal advocate of Eastern Jewish emigration to Germany, England and America; which was unusual given that Einstein was a German Jew, and most German Jews opposed the immigration of Eastern Jews into Germany, England and America. The conclusion many drew was that Einstein was a willing stooge exploited by Eastern European Jewish Zionists, who used him to promote their interests. In exchange, they gave Einstein fame and protection from criticism. Note that the Zionist Nazis first attacked assimilatory German Jewry, and then went after the Orthodox Jewry of Eastern Europe who opposed Zionism on religious grounds, while privileging the Zionist Jewry of Eastern Europe. Zionist Jews used their agents the Nazis to punish assimilatory and anti-Zionist Jewry and to degrade and deplete the population of adversarial Jews. Zionist Jews, Albert Einstein chief among them, had long been attacking assimilatory German Jews. “Mentor” wrote in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 11 April 1919 on page 9 in an article entitled “From My Note Book”,

“On the other hand, there are anti-Zionists who wish to see tradition perish from Judaism so that it may be left a religion only, and who recognise in Zionism the strongest possible counter-force. These have their spiritual home in Germany, the cradle of de-traditioned Judaism.”

In 1922, Burton J. Hendrick wrote, among other things,

“The wave of anti-Semitism, which has been sweeping over the world since the ending of the World War, has apparently reached the United States. An antagonism which Americans had believed was peculiarly European, is gaining a disquieting foothold in this country. The one prejudice which would seem to have no decent cause for existence in the free air of America

*is one that is based upon race and religion. Yet the most conservative American universities are openly setting up bars against the unlimited admittance of Jewish students; the most desirable clubs are becoming more rigid in their inhospitable attitude towards Jewish members; a weekly newspaper, financed by one of the richest men in America, has filled its pages for three years with a virulent campaign against this element in our population; secret organizations have been established for the purpose of 'fighting' the so-called 'Jewish predominance' in American life; Congress has passed and the President has signed an immigration law chiefly intended—it is just as well to be frank about the matter—to restrict the entrance of Jews from eastern Europe. It is an impressive fact that these manifestations of a less cordial attitude toward the Jews find their counterpart in another country which, in modern times, has been friendly to them—that is, England itself. That anti-Semitism should prevail in Russia, Germany, France, indeed in the whole continent of Europe, is not surprising; but its development in the Anglo-Saxon countries is something entirely new. Yet such conservative organs as the London Morning Post and London Spectator are picturing the activities of English Jews as one of the most disrupting and dangerous influences in British life. [***] This Jewish community—and similar Sephardic colonies were established in most important American cities, such as Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charleston—had since led a career of exclusiveness and hauteur that is typically Spanish. As in Spain centuries ago these Israelites constantly associated with the best in the intellectual and social life of the old grandees, so to-day the New York Mendozas, Cardozos, Acostas, Pintos, and Cordobas—for they all still retain their old Spanish names—find their most congenial associates among cultivated Gentiles. They have always looked down upon their Russian co-religionists, and even upon the Germans, as inferior breeds. No anti-Semite among the native American stock has ever regarded the poor Polish immigrant with greater aversion. There was a time when a Spanish Jew or Jewess who married a German or Russian co-religionist would be promptly disowned; the hostility to such alliances was much stronger than it has ever been between Protestant and Catholic. The Sephardim have always had their own graveyards in which German and Russian Jews have not found rest. Part of this feeling has been due to ancestral pride; part had a more rational basis, for it is incontestable that, from most points of view, the Spanish Jews are superior to other representatives of Israel. There are only a few of them; they are nearly all rich or at least prosperous; they are merchants, bankers, and land owners; they are not pawnbrokers or peddlers or rag-pickers; and they have a distinct talent for public life. It is no accident that the most distinguished Jewish statesman of Great Britain, Disraeli, was a descendant of Spanish Jews and that the greatest public man of American Jewry, Judah P. Benjamin, Secretary of State of the Southern Confederacy and probably the most adroit brain in the Secession movement, belonged to the same branch of the race.*

It is also significant that the Jew who has reached the most powerful position of any member of his race in recent American life, Mr. Bernard Baruch, also traces his origin to the Jews of Spain.

So long as the Jewish population was limited chiefly to Spanish Jews America had nothing that remotely resembled a Jewish 'problem.' Before the American Revolution practically the whole Jewish population of this country consisted of these Sephardim. They played an honorable part in the Revolution and lived on terms of friendship and respect with the other racial elements. There were only about 2,000 of them in the whole United States at that time. Just how many there are now is not known; that their number is steadily decreasing is apparent and here again the explanation has a great importance; the Spanish Jews are becoming fewer through inter-marriage not with other branches of the race, but with Gentiles. In England it is said that the Spanish Jews have practically disappeared, and, here again, through inter-marriage with Christians. I have instanced above three Sephardic Jews who have reached high public station in Great Britain and the United States: Disraeli, Benjamin, and Baruch. All three of these men married Christians. The tendency that was so common five and six hundred years ago in Spain, when cardinals and kings acknowledged a mixture of Jewish blood, is similarly apparent in the England and America of the present time.

Neither did the second phase of Jewish immigration create anything that could be called a 'problem.' This was the much larger influx of German Jews, which began soon after the Battle of Waterloo, reached a considerable proportion in the 'forties and 'fifties and fell off appreciably in the late 'seventies. These dates indicate that German Jewish immigration had about the same rise and fall as German immigration in general, and it is a fact that it was not a distinct movement but was merely part of the general flow of German immigrants to this country. German Jews came here for the same reason that other Germans came; in part the motive was economic, the desire to get a better chance at life, and in part the motive was political. German Jews participated extensively in the German liberal movement of '48; when it failed they emigrated in large numbers, precisely as did their Christian associates; the two most distinguished of these political refugees were Carl Schurz, a Gentile, and Abraham Jacobi, a Jew. But racially and culturally the German Jew seemed an entirely different person from his Spanish predecessor. He belonged to the second and northern division of Israel, the type which the Jewish writers designate as the Askenazim. Physically he was probably inferior to the Sephardim. His features were inclined to be coarser, his lips thicker, his hair more woolly in its texture, his head round rather than long; his physical type was not invariably brunette, for blond hair and blue eyes were not uncommon. These points, however, can be pushed too far; the women were not infrequently exceedingly beautiful, and the most famous of American Jewesses belonged to the Germanic branch. This was Rebecca Gratz, a Jewess distinguished for her beauty and piety, and for her friendships with eminent Americans. There is a tradition that Henry Clay was

an unsuccessful suitor, and one of her most distinguished friends was Washington Irving. This later association had important literary consequences; Irving was likewise a close friend of Sir Walter Scott, whom he used frequently to visit at Abbotsford; it is said that his description of Miss Gratz, of her loveliness of person, the fineness of her character, her devotion to her religion and her race—a devotion that had prevented her from marrying, most of the men with whom she associated having been Christians—so fired the romantic imagination of Scott that he put her in the novel that he was then writing. In this way it happened that Scott's most famous woman character, his Rebecca of 'Ivanhoe,' was drawn from Rebecca Gratz of Philadelphia.

In the main, however, the German Jew was inferior, in manners, intelligence, and social adaptability, to the Spanish type. In numbers he was much greater; from 1815 to about 1880, when German Jewish immigration, on a large scale, came to an end—in this following the course of German immigration in general, of which, as already said, it was merely one phase—probably not far from 200,000 German Jews arrived, though scientific statistics are not available. With them arrived those characteristically Jewish figures—the rag picker, the itinerant peddler, the pawnbroker, the petty tradesman. These German Jews were not workers; for the most part they were middlemen. Many of the best known Jewish families of the United States founded their fortunes in these humble occupations. The Seligmans, who established one of the most important Jewish-American banking houses, were originally peddlers and clothing merchants; so was Solomon Loeb, who founded the great banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Company; and Benjamin Altman, who died the owner of the most distinguished department store in New York and the possessor of one of the greatest collections of paintings ever assembled by an American—a collection which, with fine public spirit, he willed to the Metropolitan Museum of Art—is said to have started his business career with a pack on his back. Mr. Oscar S. Straus, ex-Ambassador to Turkey, has recently given, in his very interesting memoirs, a charming picture of a German Jewish family attempting to establish itself economically in its new environment. Mr. Straus' father was an itinerant peddler in the South; he drove a wagon from plantation to plantation, disposing of a miscellaneous cargo of 'Yankee notions.' Such a peddler was a welcome figure in Southern life preceding the Civil War; his coming was an annual event that was eagerly anticipated; he usually became the guest of one of the planters in the community in which he set up his temporary emporium, taking his meals at the family table; his host would never accept pay for this entertainment, but the Jewish merchant, as an acknowledgment of the hospitality, invariably made a parting gift to the wife or daughter—not uncommonly an unusually fine piece of dress goods. It may well be imagined that the arrival of an exotic figure of this kind, with his conversation of great cities and his reminiscences of European life, gave a welcome and bazaar-like color to the somewhat monotonous life of a

Southern plantation; and this scene also is typical of the entirely kindly relations that prevailed sixty years ago between the native population and the Jewish immigrant.

The great point to be kept in mind is that these German Jews did not congregate in vast colonies in the great seaboard cities. [***] Perhaps the public feeling now and then was a little contemptuous; the Jewish sharpness in trading created a veritable literature of Jewish anecdotes; but the American attitude was always good natured; the idea that this race was a 'menace' to American institutions never occurred to the most harebrained of contemporary thinkers. In certain respects the German Jew displayed a greater tendency to "assimilation" than did his Spanish predecessor. The change in the ritual of the synagogue, for which the German Jew was responsible, is most significant from this point of view. Fundamentally this represented an attempt to Occidentalize somewhat the Jewish services—to make them more like the proceedings in Christian churches. Meetings were held Sunday instead of Saturday; English sermons were introduced; organs and choirs became regular features of the programme; the men removed their hats and the women appeared in bonnets instead of shawls. The German Jews greatly shocked their more conservative Spanish co-religionists by the extent to which they ignored the dietary laws; ham and bacon not infrequently appeared upon their breakfast tables; and oysters, lobsters and other forbidden creatures tempted the Jewish appetite as irresistibly as the Gentile. Jewish children formed a small minority in every public school and high school; a still smaller contingent appeared in all the colleges—thirty and forty years ago Yale, Harvard, and Princeton usually had four or five in every graduating class; now and then a German Jew was elected to one of the most exclusive city clubs—though here, it must be admitted, progress was more difficult. It would be absurd to deny that a certain prejudice existed against the Jews, even in the days when the Spanish and German elements constituted almost exclusively American Israel, but it was not intense or bitter, and never reached the proportions of a public issue. Occasionally the desire of Jews to be exempted from the provisions of Sunday laws—on the ground, that, as orthodox Hebrews, they kept their establishments closed on Saturdays—caused a ripple of dissatisfaction; the refusal of summer hotels to admit them led to several law suits of sensational character; but, in the main, the Gentile population showed little alarm about their progress, and anti-Semitism was a word whose significance few Americans remotely understood.

The facts to be kept in mind are that the Jewish population before 1880 consisted almost exclusively of Spanish and German Jews, or their descendants; that they were comparatively few in number; that they were bankers or tradesmen, large and small; that they did not form a compact mass of wretchedness in large cities; that, in education, manners, and social opportunities their past did not compare unfavorably with that of the other immigrating races, It is the year 1881 that marks the beginning of the

American Jewish ‘problem’ as that word is commonly understood. Then began the influx, on an enormous scale, of an entirely different type of Judaism from the staid Spanish and the energetic German of the previous generations. It is customary to speak of Israel as a scattered people, as a race that is constantly seeking a home among other nations, as one that really possesses no settled abode of its own. In a sense that is true; but in its larger aspects it is not true at all. For the Jews, as a mass, have inhabited the same territory for at least a thousand years. At the present time there are perhaps 9,000,000 Jews in Europe. Comparatively small numbers are found in all countries—perhaps 100,000 in France, 240,000 in the United Kingdom—despite the ribald accusation that Scotland is no place for the Jews, the record discloses about 27,000 north of the Tweed—15,000 in Belgium, 8,000 in Greece and so on. These are merely the fringes of European Israel; of the 9,000,000 Jews living in Europe, not far from 7,000,000 are congregated as a mass in one rather restricted area.* This territory comprises western Russia, eastern Prussia and northern Austria. One hundred and fifty years ago not a square mile of this region belonged to the three countries named; all of it was part of the ancient Kingdom of Poland. Until the partitions of Poland, in the Eighteenth Century, neither Russia, Prussia, nor Austria had any large number of Jews; their present Jewish populations, that is, are an inheritance from that unholy piece of statecraft. There is thus a certain inaccuracy in referring to Russian and Austrian and Polish Jews; in reality they are all Polish Jews. For some reason which is not perfectly understood the great majority of all the Jews in the world found their way into Poland in the Middle Ages and in that country their descendants have remained until the present time. Here, then, is the present Jewish home—or at least here it was in 1881, but there is one country now which also has a very large Jewish population. That is the United States. In forty years, that is, American Jews have grown in numbers from 200,000 to 3,000,000. And the significant fact is that this growth represents a type of Jew that was hardly known to this country in 1881. Almost all of our American Jews have come from those provinces of Poland which were until recently parts of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The transplantation of millions of Jews from their mediaeval home in Central Europe—a transplantation which was perhaps not at first deliberate and conscious, but which is becoming increasingly so—forms not only the most startling migration in the history of Israel, but gives the United States its great ‘Jewish problem.’ Unless the influx is artificially dammed there is not the slightest question that, in less than a generation, this great mass of central European Jews will have been moved to this country America will fulfil the rôle which Poland filled in the Middle Ages as the great home of the Jewish race.

It would have been strange if this eastern European Jew did not present such dissimilarities to the type of Jew which had already been domesticated here as to seem almost to belong to an entirely different race. His history had been a deplorable one. Possibly his remote ancestors may have resembled the

Spanish Jew or the Jew from Bavaria and the Rhineland, but centuries of separation, in the era when means of communication were all but unknown, had produced a type that had little in common except a common religion. The Polish Jew had lived for centuries among Slavs and physically he had taken on so many Slavic characteristics that there is little doubt that in his veins there flows a considerable amount of Slavic blood—just as in the Spanish Jews there flows a considerable mixture of Spanish blood. The brunette type—the Jew of coal-black eyes and raven hair—is perhaps the most commonly met among the Polish Jews, but there was a considerable proportion of blonds—Jews and Jewesses with the fair hair and the blue and gray eyes that unquestionably indicate a considerable racial mixture with the Slav. Even that feature which is so dear to the cartoonist, the hooked nose, is infrequently found among the so-called Russian Jews; their nose is more commonly retroussé or pug. The hair is not always kinky or curly, but more commonly straight—again a Slavic characteristic. While physically the Eastern Jew frequently resembled the peoples among which he had lived for centuries, and so presented traits which greatly contrasted with his co-religionists already established in this country, mentally and spiritually he is something entirely different.

The thing that marked him most conspicuously was his religious orthodoxy. The long unkempt beards, the trailing hair, the little curls about the ears—these carefully preserved stigmata of traditional Israel were merely the outward signs of lives that were lived strictly according to the teachings of rabbinical law. It is perhaps not strange that the Jewish communities already established in this country regarded these strange apparitions as peoples alien to themselves, and, that, although they sympathized with their sufferings and gladly assisted in establishing them in their new environment, they refused to regard them as social equals, abhorred the idea of intermarriage, called them ‘Polaks’ and ‘hinter Berliners,’—and practised against them, indeed, many of the discriminations which all Jews have for generations suffered at the hands of their Gentile compatriots. [***] These expulsions and these massacres had another purpose—and one which was chiefly interesting to the United States. When the Jews protested against these proceedings to Count Ignatieff, the author of the May laws, he made this laconic answer: ‘The Western borders are open to you Jews.’ Up to this time Russia had had vigorous laws prohibiting emigration; but now she began to relax these laws. One privilege was extended to the Jews that was withheld from all other denizens of the Czar’s dominion: they were not only permitted but invited to leave the country. Such was the original impetus of the movement that, in forty years, increased the Jewish population of the United States from 200,000 to 3,000,000.”¹⁴⁰

Sephardic and German Jews had long opposed the emigration of Russian Jews into the United States. They considered them to be racially and socially inferior and an embarrassment to the modern faith of “Reformed Judaism”. As is always the case,

the worst enemy of the Jews was Jewish racism and Jewish religious intolerance. Burton J. Hendrick wrote in his article, “The Jews in America: III. The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”,

“From the standpoint both of the citizen and business man, no more abrupt change could be imagined than that which the Eastern Jew made when he transplanted himself from the old cities of Poland to the Atlantic seaboard of the United States. This Jew had never been a citizen, and had never developed the slightest sense of citizenship, as that word is understood. For thousands of years he had merely been the member of a tribe, governed by tribal laws and tribal chiefs. With the Jews from western Europe who had preceded him to America, in much smaller numbers, the Polish or Eastern Jew had little in common except a common religion. I have made this point before, but it cannot be made too frequently or too emphatically, for it is the fundamental fact in the existing Jewish problem. [***] As candidates for assimilation these Jews, as they land at Ellis Island, are about as promising as a similarly inflowing stream of Hindus or Syrian Druses. This may seem an extreme statement, but a glance at the Jews of eastern Europe, especially Poland, makes it clear that it is not. For these Eastern Jews have never been Europeanized. For ages they have lived, in Poland, in Russia, in Galicia, in Hungary, in Rumania, not as a nation or part of a nation, but essentially as a tribe. With them the Jewish religion has been the all-important consideration, far more important than nationality; the right to practise their faith, to observe their Sabbath and religious holidays, to limit their diet to the most rigid teachings of the Talmud, has been valued much higher than the mere right to enjoy political equality. A Jew of the old breed in America takes pride in calling himself an American and resents any imputation that he is not; a Jew in Germany, as the Great War showed, is almost fanatical in his assertion of his Germanism; but a Jew in Poland just as vehemently resents being called a Pole. ‘I am not a Pole; I am a Jew,’ he retorts. After a sojourn of 800 or 1,000 years in Poland he does not speak the Polish language; his dialect is a form of middle low German which was spoken in certain parts of Germany in the Middle Ages and which is still spoken in a few remote areas. The orthodox Jew in Poland not only lives, by preference, in crowded ghettos in the cities, but he dresses in a way—a long gabardine of black cloth reaching to his ankles and a skull cap trimmed with fur—which emphasizes his Jewish particularism. His long beard and the ringlets about his ears are also part of his religion. He treats his womankind in a way that suggests his Asiatic origin. ‘Thank God I am not a dog, a woman, or a Christian,’ is the prayer of thanksgiving with which he begins his day. [. . .]”

This prayer, which Jewish men recite each morning, appears in the Talmud, *Menachos* 43b, and in the *Tosefta Berachot* 6:18, and is still widely used:

“**6:18** A. R. Judah says, ‘A man must recite three benedictions every day:

- (1) 'Praised [be Thou, O Lord. . .] who did not make me a gentile';
- (2) 'Praised [be Thou, O Lord. . .] who did not make me a boor';
- (2) 'Praised [be Thou, O Lord. . .] who did not make me a woman.';
- B. 'A gentile—as Scripture states, *All the nations are nothing before him, they are accounted by him as less than nothing and emptiness* (Isa. 40:17).
- C. 'A boor—for 'A boor does not fear sin' [M. Abot 2:5].
- D. 'A woman—for women are not obligated [to perform all] the commandments.'"¹⁴¹

Menachos 43b states:

"A MAN IS OBLIGED TO RECITE THREE specific BLESSINGS EVERY DAY, [***] —and THEY ARE THE FOLLOWING: [***] —(1) *Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe, WHO HAS MADE ME A JEW*; [***] —(2) . . . *WHO HAS NOT MADE ME A WOMAN*;^[42] AND [***] —(3) . . . *WHO HAS NOT MADE ME A BOOR*. [Footnote: Nowadays, this blessing is recited in the form of: [***] *Who has not made me a gentile*]"¹⁴²

Time Magazine wrote in the issue of 3 March 1923,

"'Thank God I am not a dog, a woman, or a Christian,' is the prayer with which the orthodox Jew in Poland begins his day."

Evelyn Kaye wrote in her book, *The Hole in the Sheet: A Modern Woman Looks at Orthodox and Hasidic Judaism*, L. Stuart Inc., Secaucus, New Jersey, (1987), p. 89:

"During the prayers which a Jewish man recites every morning are a series of blessings, which include: 'Thank you, Lord, for not making me a non-Jew, for not making me a slave, for not making me a woman.'"¹⁴³

The prayer takes on somewhat different forms in different traditions, though it always expresses a Jew's gratitude to God for not being born a Goy. Burton J. Hendrick continued in his article, "The Jews in America: III. The 'Menace' of the Polish Jew",

"[. . .]Just as Japanese women blacken their teeth and Chinese women bind their feet, so the orthodox Polish Jewesses, after marriage, shave their heads. These are merely the outward indications of an Orientalism that controls all phases of Jewish life. For centuries the orthodox Jews existed in Poland under an order that was tribal and patriarchal—never national. They were not subject to the laws and the civil and criminal administration of the country but they were ruled, in all departments of life, by their own rabbis, who

administered the law as it is laid down in the Old Testament and the Talmud. They even counted time, not according to the Christian, but according to the Jewish Calendar. The British Commission sent to investigate the condition of the Jews in Poland were astonished to find, in interrogating witnesses, that few knew the day of the week, the month, or the year; the reason is that they all reckoned time according to the orthodox Jewish calendar. That this exclusiveness is not necessarily enforced upon an unwilling people is evident from the fact that the Jews of Poland demanded of the Versailles Peace Conference—and successfully—the right to be regarded as a ‘minority’ people in a resurrected Poland. This means that the Jews intend to maintain themselves in Poland as a separate people, with the right to a certain number of seats in every municipal council and the national parliament, with important powers of legislation and taxation, with their own law courts, the privilege of using their own language, and other important advantages which they are to enjoy not as Poles but as Jews. Thus the organization of the Eastern Jews in Europe, in its political and social aspects, is primitive, tribal, Oriental; and their economic status represented just about the same stage of progress. Though the population did contain a considerable number of handicraftsmen, especially in the tailoring trades, for the most part the Polish Jews were middlemen—hucksters, hawkers, peddlers, small tradesmen, petty bankers, and the like. The Polish masses were agriculturists, and the Jews, who were for the most part city dwellers, acted as middlemen in the distribution of their products. They would travel into the surrounding country, chaffer with the peasants for their vegetables, and sell them in the city. Poland of course was not an industrial state; factories were few; there was thus no opportunity, had the Jew really had the inclination, for training in industrial life. They were the small shopkeepers in the town; they hawked their wares up and down the streets; such occupations, however, could not furnish support for the entire Jewish population, the result being that the great masses lived under conditions of appalling poverty and social degradation. That they were uncleanly in their habits was perhaps the inevitable consequence of the over-crowded conditions under which they existed, for their poverty was so great that a great population struggled from hand to mouth, never knowing whence their daily bread was to come. Such was the exotic mass that the steamships began dumping on the Atlantic seaboard forty years ago, and which has been attempting since to adjust itself to the economic conditions of the United States. [***] The three-per-cent. restriction on immigration therefore represents statesmanlike wisdom of the highest kind, and all attempts to break this down should be vigorously resisted.”¹⁴⁴

The Judaification of American institutions would only have been a bad thing if it resulted in a degeneration of those institutions and served to reduce what would have otherwise been the participation and productive talents of Gentiles in the progress of humanity; or if it led to subversive political movements and worked

against the interests of Americans at large. So the question arises, “What were the effects?”

One of the effects, which no doubt had many benefits, was to tend to secularize these institutions, many, if not most, of which had a Christian foundation. This resulted from Jewish tribalism, Jewish secularism, and the schism which existed between Christian and Jew which vanished on the neutral ground of secularism. This is not to say that there was no such push towards secularism among the Gentile community of professionals and scientists, as well. On the downside, the massive influx of *Ostjuden* lent a kosher talmudic flavor to both the content of the curriculum and the atmosphere of the universities—and more broadly to professional and scientific debate—which was unpalatable to many Gentiles and Jews alike, and which discouraged Gentile participation. Debates increasingly became festivals of *ad hominem* attack, where racist Jews would subvert open scientific debate and substitute in its place personal insult, smear campaign, the self-glorifying hero worship of Jews made famous by the Jewish press, and the dogma (often plagiarized and corrupted Metaphysical nonsense) their feted Jewish leaders promoted. One sees a similar shift toward adolescent behavior in the modern media, which has increasingly come under the influence of Zionists, and which tends to discourage reasonable Gentiles and Jews from becoming involved in the political process. The deleterious political effects of Eastern Jewish emigration, were, among other things, the unnecessarily involvement of Americans in numerous wars, and will be addressed at length later in the text.

3.4.1.1 Rothschild Power and Influence Leads to Unbearable Jewish Arrogance

The tribalistic intolerance of some racist Jews in the press and at the universities did enormous harm to the reputation of Jews in general after emancipation, as did the tribalistic attacks many Jews in the press made on Catholics during the *Kulturkampf*, which ultimately resulted in the anti-Jewish spirit in France of the Dreyfus Affair. The rise in Jewish influence through the Rothschild family at the expense of the Roman Catholic Church was so apparent in the 1870's, that some felt a need to defend themselves against a general vilification of Jews based on the Rothschilds' corruption of international politics. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 28 June 1874 on page 2,

“Disraeli and the Jews.

London Correspondence of the Cincinnati Commercial.

Every now and then there are little intimations of the bitterness with which the Jews regard the desertion of their ancient religion and fraternity by Disraeli. All the glory which his genius and eminence reflect upon them ethnologically is lost again by his condemnation of them religiously, by his example,—that is, allowing himself to be spoken of at May anniversaries as a ‘converted Jew.’ Disraeli is so plainly a Jew in physiognomy that his look has unconsciously reminded the public again and again of the debt they owe to the intellectual distinction of the race. A very clever Jewish writer of

London,—Mr. Levy,—recently wrote a very remarkable article showing to what a large extent European nations are at present under the influence of Jews (as Castelar, Gambetta, the Rothschilds, etc.), and contrasted the fact with the decay of Roman Catholic power over the politics of Europe—the implication being that the historic position of the two, Jews and Romanists, might one of these days be reversed. The clever writer of the article might have given it more point by reference to certain facts in the career of the late Sir David Salomons, who, above all others of his race who have lived in England, deserves to be remembered as the true representative of his people. Through his influence Parliament altered the declaration, ‘On the faith of a true Christian,’ which he refused to make, thereby annulling his election to the office of Alderman twice. He then obtained very civic distinction, and in 1855-’56 became Lord Mayor of London. His first work after being raised to this distinction was to secure two things which relieved the Roman Catholics of special grievances. He put down the before boisterous and general observance of Guy Fawkes Day, which was always the occasion of insults to the Catholics, and he caused so much of the inscription on the monument near Billingsgate, which attributed the great fire of London to the Catholics, to be erased. Pope wrote of that column, which—

Towering to the skies,

Like a tall bully lifts its head and lies.

But that it no longer slanders the Catholics is due to the determination of a Jew. Baron Lionel de Rothschild was the first Jew elected to the House of Commons, but he had omitted the declaration, ‘On the true faith of a Christian,’ and withdrew. In 1851, Sir David Salomons was elected to Parliament by the borough of Greenwich. He also refused the declaration, and was requested to withdraw. He did so, but not until he had made a wise and temperate speech to the House which made it feel ashamed of the disabilities imposed on Jews. The late Lord Westbury took the matter up, and after a time the ‘Jewish Disabilities bill’ was passed. From that time Sir David, who, meanwhile, was created a Baronet of the United Kingdom, sat in Parliament, where he was considered the highest authority on finance, a subject on which he wrote several valuable books. He was one of the founders of the London and Westminster Bank, and was its Chairman until the day of his death. It is a notable circumstance that the Catholic organs of London should have attacked the Jews generally because of the loan the Rothschilds are said to have made to the Italian Government, saying that they were as ready to crucify Christ, when the first acts of the first Jews who got into power in London were the abolition of the two things which most annoyed them. When he was before the people for election as Sheriff, they were curious to know whether some of his views might not impair his official work. Some one asked him what he would do in case a reprieve for a criminal came on Friday night—riding being then prohibited to Jews—and he promptly responded, ‘I would order my carriage and go at once.’ Some propositions have been made lately that the large and increasing body of

Theists should graft themselves on to the ancient Jewish stem; but there is in England no society of Jews who have dispensed with the old formulas and usages—paschal, sabbatarian, etc.,—which would, of course, render such amalgamation impossible. However, amenities have been passing between the Theists and the Jews, and not a few of the latter are now found attending the religious services of Mr. Voysey and other rationalists.”

It should be noted that the seemingly altruistic actions of David Salomon towards Catholics had an ulterior motive. Jews were traditionally staunchly anti-Catholic, but they saw an opportunity to benefit themselves by emancipating Catholics and opening up religious tolerance for Catholics in England. This freedom for Catholics in England would set the precedent for religious tolerance for Jews in England—which is ironic given that it was Cabalist Jews who created Protestantism and Puritanism as a means to destroy Catholicism and convert it into Judaism. *The North American Review* wrote in 1845,

“Strange to say, in England the Jews still suffer under grievous civil disabilities. In 1290, Edward the First banished all in his kingdom, and seized on their property. The exclusion was so rigid and complete, that no traces of them in that country occur again till the period of the Commonwealth. Cromwell made an unsuccessful movement in their behalf; and in his time they began to return in small numbers. In the reigns of Charles the Second and James the Second, some privileges were granted them; which, however, were withdrawn after the Revolution of 1688. In 1753, a bill was passed in parliament, not without virulent opposition, permitting Jews, who had been residents of Great Britain or Ireland three years, to be naturalized; but so odious did the law prove to the nation at large, that the ministry who had encouraged the enactment shrunk from its support, and it was repealed at the very next session. From the pulpit generally, by the mercantile corporations, and by a bigoted populace, it was vehemently opposed. Dean Tucker, who, almost alone among the clergy, wrote decidedly in favor of the naturalization of the Jews, was very roughly treated, and, by the people of Bristol, burnt in effigy in full canonicals, with his obnoxious writings. In May, 1830, on the back of the Roman Catholic emancipation act, another effort was made in parliament to emancipate the Jews; but it was opposed by the ministry, and failed. In short, the decree of Edward the First has never been formally abrogated; and though several acts of parliament have recognized, and thus legalized, their presence in the kingdom, England, with all her boasting of Roman Catholic and negro emancipation, still treats native-born Jews as foreigners, admitting them to few privileges but those of alien residents and traders. To a single inch of the soil they cannot obtain a title.”¹⁴⁵

Einstein claimed that anti-Semites were correct to believe that Jews exercised undue influence in Germany. Einstein wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau*, on 21 June 1921, on pages 351-352,

“This phenomenon [*i. e.* Anti-Semitism] in Germany is due to several causes. Partly it originates in the fact that the Jews there exercise an influence over the intellectual life of the German people altogether out of proportion to their number. While, in my opinion, the economic position of the German Jews is very much overrated, the influence of Jews on the Press, in literature, and in science in Germany is very marked, as must be apparent to even the most superficial observer. This accounts for the fact that there are many anti-Semites there who are not really anti-Semitic in the sense of being Jew-haters, and who are honest in their arguments. They regard Jews as of a nationality different from the German, and therefore are alarmed at the increasing Jewish influence on their national entity. [***] But in Germany the judgement of my theory depended on the party politics of the Press[.]”¹⁴⁶

Einstein also stated,

“The way I see it, the fact of the Jews’ racial peculiarity will necessarily influence their social relations with non-Jews. The conclusions which—in my opinion—the Jews should draw is to become more aware of their peculiarity in their social way of life and to recognize their own cultural contributions. First of all, they would have to show a certain noble reservedness and not be so eager to mix socially—of which others want little or nothing. On the other hand, anti-Semitism in Germany also has consequences that, from a Jewish point of view, should be welcomed. I believe German Jewry owes its continued existence to anti-Semitism.”¹⁴⁷

Nazi Zionist Joseph Goebbels, sounding very much like political Zionist Albert Einstein, was quoted in *The New York Times*, on 29 September 1933, on page 10,

“It must be remembered the Jews of Germany were exercising at that time a decisive influence on the whole intellectual life; that they were absolute and unlimited masters of the press, literature, the theatre and the motion pictures, and in large cities such as Berlin, 75 percent of the members of the medical and legal professions were Jews; that they made public opinion, exercised a decisive influence on the Stock Exchange and were the rulers of Parliament and its parties.”

Max Born knew that a Albert Einstein and his sycophantic Jewish promoter Alexander Moszkowski would be used as examples to justify a Dühring-style general vilification of Jews—which could also hurt the sales of Born’s book and spoil his efforts to profit from the Einstein name in the desperate times which followed the First World War. Eugen Karl Dühring, who wrote important historical treatises on Physics which are on a par with those of Ernst Mach, including an analysis of space-time theories and the underlying principles of what was to become the general theory of relativity, promoted racial anti-Semitism to modern Germany and inspired Theodor Herzl’s racist political Zionist movement.¹⁴⁸ Dühring was a Socialist who

combated Lasalle, Marx and Engels over the future of Socialism in Germany. The Socialists Dühring, Lasalle and Marx each used the tactic of Jew-baiting for political gain. Engels, in at least one instance, spoke out against it.¹⁴⁹

Shrill cries of “anti-Semite!” and “dirty Jew!” increasingly filled the air in both political and scientific debates, and were most often the product of those Jewish minds who wanted to deflect interest from the facts, and who wanted to keep Jews segregated from non-Jews. Anti-Semitism was a favorite tool of racist Jews to manipulate both Jews and Gentiles, and it was racist Jews who deliberately caused most of the anti-Semitic persecutions of Jews throughout history, either by posing as anti-Semites, or hiring or otherwise recruiting Gentiles to pose as anti-Semites. As fantastic as it sounds, this is easily proven, and will be proven later in the text.

The context of the polemic battles between these Socialists is given in the endnote,¹⁵⁰ which reprints an important and quite readable history of the Socialist movement in Germany in the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries found in Robert Herndon Fife, Jr.’s book, *The German Empire Between Two Wars*, which was published in 1916. Fife also analyzed contemporary German newspapers, and provides the modern reader with an understanding of the background which gives context as to why Einstein was often viewed as a Socialist and Communist agitator. Fife also documents the unabashed political partisanship of the contemporary newspapers in Germany. According to Fife, Socialists tended to be rigidly dogmatic and vicious to those with whom they disagreed. They tended to be very intolerant of dissent and/or mere disagreement.

Einstein had many Socialist friends in the press and publishing business. Most of them were ethnically-biased Jews, who were prone to make personal attacks against Einstein’s critics through their journals and newspapers. These pro-Einstein Socialists often called Einstein’s critics “anti-Semitic” without grounds. Socialists in the Dühring camp were in turn vicious to Einstein and to Jews in general.

Communists were also rigidly dogmatic¹⁵¹ and murderous to their critics. Communists are notorious for manufacturing patently false historical revisionism and for suppressing the truth, which false revisionism favors their equally notorious penchant for creating cults of personality around megalomaniacal and genocidal dictators like Lenin (born Ulyanov), Trotsky (born Bronstein) and Stalin (born Djugashvili). Socialists and Communists created personality cults around Marx and Lasalle and used anti-Semitism for political gain, as did the German Jews Karl (born Mordecai) Marx (whose family name was originally Marx Levi) and Ferdinand Lasalle (born Lasal), who promoted anti-Jewish hatred as a means to promote crypto-Jewish Socialists and Jewish Communists into power.¹⁵² The Communist German-Jewish agitator Ferdinand Lassalle wrote to Marx on 24 June 1852,

“...Party struggles lend a party strength and vitality; the greatest proof of a party’s weakness is its diffuseness and the blurring of clear demarcations; a party becomes stronger by purging itself. . .”¹⁵³

3.4.1.2 Jewish Intolerance and Mass Murder of Gentiles

Russian-Jewish anarchist Emma Goldman, who was accused of inciting the assassination of U. S. President William McKinley in 1901, stated in 1920 that “we” always knew that Marxism would inevitably lead to tyranny. John Clayton reported in *The Chicago Tribune* on 18 June 1920 on the front page,

**“RUSSIAN SOVIET
‘ROTTEN,’ EMMA
GOLDMAN SAYS**

**U. S. Flag on Bureau;
Longs for Home.**

BY JOHN CLAYTON

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

PARIS, June 17:—On the bureau of Emma Goldman’s room in Hotel Astoria at Petrograd draped over a corner of the picture of her niece is the American flag. Emma Goldman, deported from America as an anarchist, makes no apologies for this flag.

The communist leaders living at the hotel josh her a little about it, but Emma says:

‘That’s the flag of my niece’s country. I’m going back there some day, for I love America as I love no other land.’

Emma: ‘Bolshevism is Rotten.’

Emma Goldman is sick of bolshevik Russia. When I called on her in Petrograd she asked: ‘What do you think of it? You have been here six weeks. How do you feel about it?’

‘It is rotten,’ I replied. ‘It’s so rotten I’m sick with it.’

‘You’re right, it is rotten,’ she said. ‘But it is what we should have expected. We always knew the Marxian theory was impossible, a breeder of tyranny. We blinded ourselves to its faults in America because we believed it might accomplish something.

‘I’ve been here four months now, and I’ve seen what it has accomplished. There is no health in it. The state of socialism or state of capitalism—call it what you will—has done for Russia what it will do for every country. It has taken away even the little freedom the man has under individual capitalism and has made him entirely subject to the whims of a bureaucracy which excuses its tyranny on the ground it all is done for the welfare of the workers.’

More Freedom in United States.

‘Where did you find the greater degree of freedom, Miss Goldman?’ I asked. ‘In the United States or in communist Russia?’

‘Any form of government is bad enough,’ she replied, ‘but between this and individual capitalism, the choice lies with the latter. At least the individual has a chance to express his individuality.’

Of all the deportees who entered Russia with Miss Goldman, only one or two have accepted the doctrines of communism. Miss Goldman, Berkman, and Novikov, the leaders of the group, refused to work with the government in any way except purely humanitarian labor.

Expects to Go to Jail.

‘We are studying conditions in Russia,’ said Miss Goldman at another time. ‘We want to make a trip through the country districts and talk with the peasants. Then we will be ready to speak. We probably will go to jail when we start criticising, but that doesn’t matter. We’ve been in jail before. We cannot be true to our principles and not speak.’

Miss Goldman and Novikov refused places in the reviewing stand at the May day procession, nor will they accept places at any government meeting.

Emma: ‘Hit Hard.’

I spent much of my week in Petrograd with them. When I was ready to leave she said to me: ‘Be careful what you write, if you want to return to Russia. If you don’t, then hit hard. You may be called an agent of the capitalistic class by the people in America who don’t understand.

‘If you are, tell them we have been here four months and now we know. We have investigated the factories, homes, and institutions as no newspaper man can be permitted to investigate them, and we’ve found them bad. I know from my conversation with you you have gotten at the heart of the matter. It’s up to you to tell the American people, and tell them straight.’

And that is what I intend to do. Emma Goldman has found, as I did, that the best cure for bolshevism is a trip to bolshevik Russia. She told me to hit out straight from the shoulder. Well, as an American, I’ll let that little flag on Emma’s bureau hit for me.”

Jewish leaders sponsored Marxism, Bolshevism and the Russian Revolution. After news arrived in the West of the Bolshevik mass murders of millions of Christians, Jewish leaders made a great show of denouncing Bolshevism in the West, especially after the First World War ended. They feared retaliation against all Jews for the crimes committed by Jewish Bolsheviks in the East.

Russian and Polish Jews committed genocide against the Russian People as an act of revenge and mass murdered millions of innocent Christians. This was part of a series of vengeful acts which Jewish bankers had been carrying out against the Russians at least since the 1870's, which vengeful acts resulted in Pogroms in the 1880's—a series of vengeful acts which Jews continue to this day. It was the Jews who began the cycle of violence and death, by their refusal to assimilate into Russian society, while taking from that society a disproportionate share of its wealth—which they continue to do to this day. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* wrote on 21 July 1878, on page 13,

“BEACONSFIELD’S LUCK.

Bismarck’s Hand Disclosed in the

Workings of the Congress
at Berlin.

How the Jew Bankers Revenged
Themselves for Insults to Their
Race.

Correspondence New York Graphic.

LONDON, July 6.—All hail, Beaconsfield!

He is the hero of the hour. He is looked upon by all loyal Englishmen as the pivot on which has turned all the deliberations of the Berlin Congress. But is this the correct view?

Not at all. England's triumphs at Berlin are simply incidents in the 'streak of luck' which has marked the career of this great political adventurer.

I am enabled to furnish the *Graphic* with the first true account of the recent moves on the chess-board of European politics.

The result of the Congress may be briefly stated as the complete humiliation of Russia. True, she receives Batoum, with conditions that render the concession practically valueless. True, she regains her little strip of Bessarabia that had been given to Roumania, and she is permitted to retain Kars. But it is her rivals who have secured the material advantages at the Congress, and, worse than all, it is England, her special rival, who has been made the chief recipient of the fruits of Russia's expenditure of blood and treasure.

It is now certain—it will be published in the journals and confirmed in Parliament ere this letter is 1,000 miles on its way to you—that England is to have Cyprus as her own, and is to acquire a protectorate of the whole of Asiatic Turkey, with practically illimitable possibilities of the extension of trade in the Levant and down the Valley of the Euphrates. Egypt is virtually hers; the Suez Canal is absolutely in her control.

Russia has acquired neither facilities for the extension of her trade nor territory; and she has lost all the prestige acquired by the war.

What does this mean?

The answer to this question involves three names—Rothschild, Bismarck, Andrassy.

First, as to Rothschild. The sympathy of the Hebrews all over the world has been with Turkey and against Russia. Russia, in the nineteenth century, has oppressed and persecuted the Jews with the most bitter and malignant cruelty. The hatred of the Greek Church for the Jews to-day is as intense as was that of some of the bigoted Catholics in the Middle Ages for that long suffering and persecuted race. The success of the Russian arms against Turkey filled the Jews with indignation and alarm. The Turks in their rule in Europe and in Asia have been tolerant alike to Christian and to Jew; it may be said they have been forced to award this tolerance; but it was not in violation of their faith nor of the will of their great Prophet, for to this day

there exists the authenticated manuscript of the famous decree of Mohammed, in which he commands the faithful to abstain from persecuting and to treat charity and kindness the Jews and Christians dwelling under their rule. But, against the personal wishes of the Czar, the blind and bitter hatred of the Russians for the Jews continually manifests itself, and their persecution of the chosen people has never ceased.

Russia was forced to make great pecuniary sacrifices to keep her armies in the field; she taxed her monetary resources to the utmost; and when the San Stefano treaty had been negotiated and the question of war or peace hung trembling in the balance, she found to her dismay that if she ventured upon a war with England she must reckon with a potent foe, of whose existence she had hitherto been disdainful, if not ignorant.

This foe was the most powerful element in Continental Europe.

All bankers are not Jews. But the Hebrew element among the money-lenders and money-masters of Europe is so widespread and so powerful that it was easy for it to effect combinations by which Russia was shut out from the privilege of borrowing money to continue to renew her march of conquest.

She tried to borrow in England—no money! She sought to effect a loan in Paris—no money! She intrigued through her most skillful agents in all the minor Bourses of Europe—not a rouble could she obtain. And now, as you will probably learn in a few days, she is in such desperate financial straits that, as a last resort, she is about to call upon her patriotic subjects—if she has any—to put their hands in their pockets and lend her their own money,—if they have any, which is doubtful.

Yes! In the very hour of Russia's military triumph, when, flushed with her dearly-bought victories, and with the Sultan willing to prostrate himself as a vassal at her feet, the despised and persecuted Israelite was able to say to the Czar: 'Thus far and no farther!'

It was not England who forced Russia to appear before the Berlin Congress, and submit to a revision of her extorted treaty with Turkey.

Russia was forced into this humiliation by the Jew bankers of the world.

Once in the Congress, Gortschakoff and Schouvaloff found to their dismay and horror that they were contending single-handed against all Europe.

Bismarck proved to be the arch enemy of Russia in the Congress, the master-spirit who formed the combination to humiliate her by the Treaty of Berlin after her victories more than she had been humiliated by the Treaty of Paris after her defeats.

Now for a State secret, hinted at in various ways, but which has never come to light in any official form, and the details of which cannot be fully known until after Kaiser William and Prince Bismarck are dead.

Bismarck, with true statesmanlike prescience, detests Russia. Russia is a military power of incalculable possibilities, capable, perhaps, in time, of overrunning and conquering all Europe. A war that would increase the

military prestige or augment the territorial domain of Russia, Bismarck regarded with alarm and indignation.

Why, then, did he not put an end to the Russian and Turkish war?

The answer is—Kaiser William.

The German Emperor is swayed by his personal affections and his dynastic prejudices. The old gentleman never had much political sense. He supposed his personal honor was pledged to Russia. The Czar had not interfered with Prussia in her wars with Austria and France. He, then, should not interfere in Russia's contest with Turkey. Bismarck had been quite willing to have an amicable understanding with Russia as regarded Austria and France; but he had no intention of permitting Russia to gain a military and territorial predominance that might overshadow Germany.

Thus it was Bismarck who formed the combination that robbed Russia of the fruits of her great victories.

How did he effect this? Here comes in the third name—Andrassy.

The Prime Minister of Hungary, be it remembered, is a Hungarian statesman. Blood with him, also, is thicker than water. He remembers that, when Hungary had German-Austria at her feet in 1848, Russia sent 60,000 troops to the aid of Austria, turned the tide of victory, and crushed out forever the hopes of Hungary for independent neutrality. The hated Slav was thus used to overcome the legitimate and patriotic aspirations of Hungary.

I state upon the best authority that, in the conferences held in the beginning of the late war by Bismarck and Andrassy, the scheme was concocted which culminated in the yet unsigned Treaty of Berlin. It was in these conferences determined that Russia should be despoiled of the fruits of her victories. One of the results is seen in the virtual annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, and the great strengthening of that Power thereby.

Here, then, is the key to the mysteries of the Congress of Berlin. Rothschild, the representative of the Jews, closing the Bourses Europe against Russia; Bismarck, intent on the purpose of curbing and manacling the giant of the North in the interests of Western civilization; Andrassy paving off Russia for the injuries inflicted on Hungary in 1848, and turning her victories into Dead Sea fruit,—pleasant to the sight, but turning to ashes upon the lips.

But how about Disraeli—Beaconsfield? Is he not the real hero of this great drama? Not at all.

True, again, blood with him is thicker than water; and undoubtedly he placed himself in relation with the Jewish money-kings to effect the humiliation of Russia. True, he withdrew the timid and hesitating Lord Derby at the right moment, and put the courageous Marquis of Salisbury in his place. But the cession of Cyprus to England, and investing her with protectorate of Asiatic Turkey, was really the work of Bismarck.

Cyprus should have been given to France. The trade of the Levant properly belongs to her and to Italy more than to England. But Bismarck, in

view of the prejudices of his own people,—not that he shares these prejudices, for he is a true statesman, but merely out of deference to these narrow hatreds and dislikes,—was compelled to permit England to take what really belongs to France, and by doing this he has crowned with a new chaplet the brow of that strange personage, the novelist and the political adventurer who is now Premier of England, who will certainly become a Duke, and who is possibly destined—as gossip will have it—to still further honor, to wear the Royal robes of Prince Consort and to occupy the long vacant bed of ‘Albert the Good.’”

Despite their public protests of the atrocities Eastern Jews committed against Russian Christians, Western Jewish leaders believed that they had a duty to perpetuate Bolshevism in Russia and with it the mass murder of Russian Christians, lest the freed Russian Gentiles take revenge on the Jews—Jews who had mass murdered their people.¹⁵⁴ That element of Jewish leadership which received the most attention in the press was consistent only in its public dishonesty. More sensible Jewish leaders were often largely ignored by the press, or, when they could no longer be ignored, ridiculed.

In addition to the pure blood lust Jewish bankers had expressed for centuries—the blood lust of Judaism itself—those Jewish leaders who brought about the Russian Revolution must also have concluded that it would be to their advantage to weaken Russian society and culture, so as to minimize any retaliatory actions taken against Jews at some future date. They had their agents pillage the land and execute its best citizens, which, in addition to minimizing any risk of any backlash against Jews, fulfilled the Jewish prophecies that Jews should destroy other nations and take their wealth, then rule the world, a world which would suffer only suppliant and stupid Gentiles to survive.

When this cultureless Soviet society led to better relations between Jews and Gentiles and to the assimilation of Jews into Gentile Soviet society, Zionist leaders feared that the Jews were losing their unique identity. These Jewish leaders once again promoted anti-Semitism to prevent the assimilation of Jews into Soviet society. They also advocated the segregation of Jews. Jewish leadership intentionally caused great harm and prolonged suffering to both Russian Gentiles and Russian Jews, as will be shown later in this text—their deliberate mass murder and general inhumanity is truly shocking.

It bears repeating that on 19 June 1920, John Clayton published an article in *The Chicago Tribune* on the front page, which alleged that an international Jewish organization sought Jewish supremacy over the world, largely through the destruction of the British Empire,

“TROTZKY LEADS RADICAL CREW TO WORLD RULE

Bolshevism Only a Tool for His Scheme

BY JOHN CLAYTON.

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

PARIS, June 18.—For the last two years army intelligence officers, members of the various secret service organizations of the entente, have been bringing in reports of a world revolutionary movement other than Bolshevism. At first these reports confused the two, but latterly the lines they have taken have begun to be more and more clear.

Bolshevism aims for the overthrow of existing society and the establishment of an international brotherhood of men who work with their hands as rulers of the world. The second movement aims for the establishment of a new racial domination of the world. So far as the British, French and our own department's inquiry have been able to trace, the moving spirits in the second scheme are Jewish radicals.

Use Local Hatreds.

Within the ranks of communism is a group of this party, but it does not stop there. To its leaders, communism is only an incident. They are ready to use the Islamic revolt, hatred by the central empires for England, Japan's designs on India, and commercial rivalry between America and Japan.

As any movement of world revolution must be, this is primarily anti-Anglo-Saxon. It sees its greatest task in the destruction of the British empire and the growing commercial power of America. The brains of this organization are in Berlin.

Trotsky at Head.

The directing spirit which issues the orders to all minor chiefs and finds money for the work of preparing the revolt is in the German capital. Its executive head is none other than Trotsky, for it is on the far frontiers of India, Afghanistan, and Persia that the first test of strength will come. The organization expert of the present Russian state is recognized, even among the members of his own political party, as a man of boundless ambition, and his dream of an empire of the east is like that of Napoleon.

The organization of the world Jewish-radical movement has been perfected in almost every land. In the states of England, France, Germany, Poland, Russia, and the east it has its groups. It is behind the Islamic revolt with all the propaganda skill and financial aid at its command because it hopes to control the shaping of the new eastern empire to its own ends. Sympathy with the eastern nationals probably is one of the chief causes for the victory of the pro-nationals in the bolshevik party, which threw communism solidly behind the nationalist aspirations of England's colonies.

Out to Grab Trade Routes.

The aims of the Jewish-radical party have nothing of altruism behind

them beyond liberation of their own race. Except for this their aims are purely commercial. They want actual control of the rich trade routes and production centers of the east, those foundations of the British empire which always have been the cornerstone of its national supremacy.

They are striking for the same ends as Germany when she entered the war of 1914 to establish Mittel Europa and so give the Germans control of the Bagdad railway. They believe Europe is tired of conflict and that England is too weak to put down a concerted rebellion in part of her eastern possessions. Therein lies the hope of success. They are staking brains and money against an empire.

‘Westward the course of empire makes its way,’ but even it swings backward to the old battleground where for countless ages peoples have fought. Nations have risen and crumbled around control of eastern commerce.”¹⁵⁵

The man behind Joseph Stalin’s genocide of the Slavs and anti-Semitism was an alleged “self-hating Jew”,¹⁵⁶ Lazar Moiseyevich Kaganovich. Kaganovich caused the deaths of tens of millions of innocents, including many Jews. American Communists, many, if not most of whom were ethnic Jews, largely turned a blind eye to these atrocities in their attempts to sponsor the cult of personality of Joseph Stalin and bring Communism to America and the rest of the world. After the creation of the State of Israel, the Communists used anti-Semitism as a means to try to force Jews towards Israel. The Jewish Communists also tried to take over Moslem nations in the hopes that they could ruin the Moslem religion, culture, and Moslem governments—and to create the illusion that Israel was strategically important to the United States—and to artificially make the Moslem nations enemies of the United States. Communists lured Moslems toward self-destruction by pretending to be the enemies of Zionism, though they ultimately hoped to instill Communist régimes led by Jews in the nations surrounding Israel, and thereby secure the hegemony of the Jews in the Mideast. Some believe the Saudi Royal family descends from Jews, and if the current President of Iran is not an agent of Israel, he could not be doing a better job of serving the Zionists’ perceived self-interests.

Adolf Hitler used the same principles as Lasalle to make himself a dictator, to mass murder his perceived political rivals in the SA and to justify the *Gleichschaltung* and the *Ermächtigungsgesetz* laws in Nazi Germany, which forbade dissent of any kind. Lenin iterated his infamous doctrine of “Democratic Centralism” in 1901-1902 in his famous article “What is to be Done?”,¹⁵⁷ which doctrine prohibited dissent, or even discussion, on issues of Party dogma. Communist Party dogma covered all aspects of life, including science. Lenin employed this principle of “Democratic Centralism” to make himself a dictator, as did Joseph Stalin. Lenin censored the press and prohibited the publication even of revolutionary literature by such notables as Maxim Gorky, which dared to advocate democracy and freedom of thought. In 1948, Communists used terror tactics to close down the play “Thieves’ Paradise” by outspoken Jewish anti-Communist Myron Fagan.¹⁵⁸ The Communists largely destroyed Fagan’s career and his life.

The Jewish Bolshevik Leon Trotsky (born Lev Davidovitch Bronstein) tried to justify dictatorship, terrorism (“Red Terror”) and murder in his book: *The Defence of Terrorism (Terrorism and Communism) a Reply to Karl Kautsky*, Labour Pub. Co. and G. Allen & Unwin, London, (1921); republished as: *Dictatorship vs. Democracy (Terrorism and Communism) a Reply to Karl Kautsky*, Workers party of America, New York City, (1922). The Jewish publicity which promoted Einstein as a sort of law-giver Moses, with whom no one could disagree because his laws supposedly came from God, was immediately criticized as the intrusion of totalitarian Bolshevism into science, by Charles Lane Poor in November of 1919.¹⁵⁹

In 1843, Karl Marx reviewed Bruno Bauer’s anti-Semitic works “On the Jewish Question”.¹⁶⁰ Marx’s anti-Semitic responses were published in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* in 1844 at a critical time in the struggle of Jews to obtain political freedom and equality. Karl Marx, like Bauer, denounced Jews as anti-social segregationists, who worshiped and accumulated gold, and despised art and science. Marx concluded,

“The *social* emancipation of the Jews is the *emancipation of society from world Jewry* [or: *Judaism*.].”

“Die gesellschaftliche Emancipation des Juden ist die Emancipation der Gesellschaft vom Judenthum.”¹⁶¹

Many leading Jews desperately sought to keep Jews segregated from Gentiles and used anti-Semitism as a means to accomplish this end. Their racism stems from their religion.

Marx and his Jewish friend the racist Zionist Moses Hess were two early Socialists, who defamed Jews in order to promote themselves and their political agenda. Hess later became the founding father of a racist theory of National Socialist Zionism, which eventually morphed into the Nazi Party.¹⁶² Marx and Hess were followed by an unbroken line of Socialist anti-Semites, that eventually perpetrated the Holocaust in a Socialist totalitarian regime led by a dictator—the NSDAP (National Socialist German Worker’s Party) led by Adolf Hitler. Hitler, himself, was a former Bolshevik reputedly of Jewish descent.¹⁶³

Judaism is absolutely intolerant of dissent or disagreement, promotes dictatorship though its Messianic myths, and promotes a rigid belief system centered on the illusion of absolute law. Communism (and its absurd bastard child, the National Socialist German Worker’s Party) was merely a temporary means of achieving the goals of Judaic Messianic myth. Those goals include the destruction of Gentile peoples, their “racial” distinctions, their independence and liberty, their religions and nations, even their very lives. This is succinctly proven in Robert H. Williams’ booklet, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?). Williams proves that the “New World Order” is in fact the “Jewish World Order” of Judaic prophecy. The ancient and medieval Jewish myths which call for the destruction of Gentiles will be quoted, and their implications explored, further on in this text.

Maurice Samuel wrote in his collection of contemporary Jewish clichés, which he styled *You Gentiles*,

“If anything, you must learn (and are learning) to dislike and fear the modern ‘assimilated’ Jew more than you did the old Jew, for he is more dangerous to you. At least the old Jew kept apart from you, easily recognizable as an individual, as the bearer of the dreaded Jewish world-idea: you were afraid of him and loathed him. But to a large extent he was insulated. But the Jew assimilates, acquires your languages, cultivates a certain intimacy, penetrates into your life, begins to handle your instruments, you are aware that his nature, once confined safely to his own life, now threatens yours. You are aware of a new and more than concerting character at work in the world you have built and are building up, a character which crosses your intentions and thwarts your personality. The Jew, whose lack of contact with your world had made him ineffective, becomes effective. The vial is uncorked, the genius is out. His enmity to your way of life was tacit before. To-day it is manifest and active. He cannot help himself: he cannot be different from himself: no more can you. It is futile to tell him: ‘Hands off!’ He is not his own master, but the servant of his life-will. [***] It is to this Jew that liberals among you will point to refute my thesis. And it is precisely this Jew who best illustrates its truth. The unbelieving and radical Jew is as different from the radical gentile as the orthodox Jew from the reactionary gentile. The cosmopolitanism of the radical Jew springs from his feeling (shared by the orthodox Jew) that there is no difference between gentile and gentile. You are all pretty much alike: then why this fussing and fretting and fighting? The Jew is *not* a cosmopolitan in your sense. He is not one who feels keenly the difference between national and nation, and overrides it. For him, as for the orthodox Jew, a single temper runs through all of you, whatever your national divisions. The radical Jew (like the orthodox Jew) is a cosmopolitan in a sense which must be irritating to you: for he does not even understand why you make such a fuss about that most obvious of facts—that you are all alike. The Jew is altogether too much of a cosmopolitan—even for your internationalists. [***] Philosophies do not remold natures. What your radicals want is another form of the Game, with other rules. Their discontent joins hands with Jewish discontent. But it is not the same kind of discontent. A little distance down the road the ways part for ever. The Jewish radical will turn from your social movement: he will discover his mistake. He will discover that nothing can bridge the gulf between you and us. He will discover that the spiritual satisfaction which he thought he would find in social revolution is not to be purchased from you. I believe the movement has already started, the gradual secession of the Jewish radicals, their realization that your radicalism is of the same essential stuff as your conservatism. The disillusionment has set in. A century of partial tolerance gave us Jews access to your world. In that period the great attempt was made, by advance guards of reconciliation, to bring our two worlds together. It was a century of failure.

Our Jewish radicals are beginning to understand it dimly. We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers for ever. *Nothing* that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will for ever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which it is not in your nature to build. Beyond all temporary alliances with this or that faction lies the ultimate split in nature and destiny, the enmity between the Game and God. But those of us who fail to understand that truth will always be found in alliance with your rebellious factions, until disillusionment comes. The wretched fate which scattered us through your midst has thrust this unwelcome role upon us. [***] You are bound to find ‘spiritual value’ in science because you do not want ultimate spiritual value—only the spiritual value of immediate lyric enjoyment. You who worship gods instead of God must naturally worship science. Science is merely idol-worship: for eikons instruments, for incantations formulæ: the palpable, the material, the enjoyable. Science is not a serious pursuit: your grave professors of chemistry, astronomy, physics, your Nobel prize winners are but bald or bearded schoolboys playing mental football for their own delight and the delight of spectators. Science, then, is an art, though its technique is of so peculiar a nature as to divide it from all the other arts: but we most easily recognize it as an art because the true scientist takes an artistic delight in science. And because your science is not serious, we Jews have never achieved in it any peculiar preëminence. We have our few exceptions: we can master as well as you the system and the scheme, but we lack the spiritual urge, the driving joy, the illusion that this is the all in all. We know nothing of science for science’s sake—as we know nothing of art for art’s sake. We only know of art for God’s sake. If there is art or beauty in our supreme production, the Bible, it is not because we sought either. The type of the artist is alien to us, and just as alien is the delight of the artist. The artist is one who seeks beauty, goes out of his way to find her. But the Hebrew prophet, who wrought so beautifully, did not go out of his way to find God. God pursued him and caught him; hunted him out and tortured him so that he cried out. Until this day we have no artists in your sense: such art as we have created has been the byproduct of a fierce moral purpose. Art and science—this is your gentile world, a lovely and ingenious world. Kaleidoscopic, graceful, bewilderingly seductive, a world, at its best, of lovely apparitions, banners, struggles, triumphs, gallantries, noble gestures and conventions. But not our world, not for us Jews. For such Field-of-the-Cloth-of-Gold delights we lack imagination and inventiveness. We are not touched with this vigor of productive playfulness. Under duress we take part in the ringing mêlée, and give an indifferently good account of ourselves. But we have not the heart for this world of yours.”¹⁶⁴

Note that Samuel repeats the ancient accusation that Jews lack imagination for the arts and sciences, and that art and science are irreligious. The enduring existence of this theory is one reason why Jews so vigorously hyped Albert Einstein as if he were a great scientist. They hoped to add a “Jewish Newton” to the list of greats who

have revolutionized science, because no Jew had yet made a breakthrough discovery on the level of a Copernicus, Galileo or a Newton; and Jews were roundly criticized, by Jew and Gentile alike, as if parasites instead of contributors. It terribly irked the Jews that they had not produced a Galileo, a Mozart, nor a Rembrandt. What they could not accomplish in fact, some Jews accomplished through plagiarism and hype. Other Jews justified their insecurities with the sour grapes of their religious beliefs. They asserted that the Jews were the chosen people of God—chosen to obey supreme law, not to artistically create new laws and images.

Note further Samuel's subtle argument that Jewish segregation is better for Gentiles than Jewish assimilation, because assimilated Jews become radicals and revolutionaries who will ultimately fulfill the "Jewish mission" to destroy Gentile nations, cultures, religions and peoples; and will Judaize the world. This was part of an ongoing Zionist campaign against Gentile nations and assimilatory Jews, which employed the carrot and the stick method of persuading Gentiles to segregate Jews and prevent Jewish assimilation. Racist Jews loathed assimilation and told Gentiles that they had to choose between a segregated "Jewish State", or a subjugated world under Jewish tyranny. This will be discussed in detail further on in this text in section "7.6 The Carrot and the Stick". These Jewish propagandists failed to mention that the formation of a Jewish State heralded the extermination of the Gentiles in Jewish Messianic prophecy.

3.4.2 The Messiah Myth

Jewish leaders have, for thousands of years, corrupted international politics and culture in order to fulfill their Messianic prophecies of Jewish world domination. The Rothschilds and other Jewish financiers have used their great wealth to destroy nations and religions through wars, Communism, and control of the mass media and government. Jewish financiers brought about the calamitous events of the Twentieth Century, the mass murder of tens, if not hundreds, of millions of human beings, in order to: force assimilating Jews back to the racist segregationist prophecies of Judaism; to force the establishment of a Jewish State which will eventually extend from the Nile to the Euphrates; to force the destruction of all other nations and their peoples, who will be killed off or enslaved and ruled by Jews; to force the destruction of all other religions; to force the destruction of the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa Mosque to be replaced with a Jewish Temple; and such petty and spiteful acts which fulfill prophecy as the destruction of the orchards and farms of the Palestinians, etc. Both the "Proclamation of Independence"¹⁶⁵ of the racist "Jewish State" and the "Law of Return 5710-1950"¹⁶⁶ are segregationist instruments which assert the same racist doctrines of "*Blut und Boden*" as Nazism.

On 28 December 1960, racist Zionist David Ben-Gurion, who was the first Prime Minister of the undemocratic and racist "Jewish" State of Israel, revealed that the allegedly *political* motivations of the Zionists, were in fact *religious*; and that, though the declaration of independence of Israel claimed that the state was founded as a result of the Holocaust, the formation of the state was in fact the fulfilment of an ancient religious Messianic plan of the Jews to rule the world, which the "Jewish

People” had themselves fulfilled because God had failed to give them the promised Messiah. Note that racist Zionist Jews deliberately caused both World Wars and the Holocaust in order to fulfill the “apocalyptic goals” of their genocidal religious mythologies, as will be proven throughout much of this text. Note also that Ben-Gurion’s Hitler-like cry for Jews to tribalistically unite in blind loyalty to one another and to segregate, or face extinction through assimilation. This warning should be heeded by American and Russian Jews, for they will face the same fate at the hands of racist Zionist Jews in the coming Third World War, as the assimilatory Jews of Europe faced in the Second World War. Racist Zionist Jews directed the exact same threats at the Jews of Europe from the 1880’s through the 1930’s, and then they put Adolf Hitler into power in order to herd up the Jews of Europe and march them out—or into their graves. Note still further the fanatical arrogance of racist, religious Jews, who believe that they have the sole God-given right to govern the fate of humanity and determine the religion and “redemption” of others. According to racist Jews and their Messianic mythologies, all laws worldwide must emanate from Jerusalem, and no individual has the right of free choice and no nation the right of self-determination (*Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 2:1-4; 9:6-7; 11:4, 9-10; 42:1; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17. *Micah* 4:2-3. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9). Judaism differs from Christianity, in that Jews believe that their Heaven is on Earth and that their rewards are found on Earth. If evil actions bring them earthly success, then they believe that God will judge those actions as good. Racist Zionist Jews believe it is righteous to fulfill God’s plan by human political action. They are not concerned by judgements in an afterlife, nor do they aspire to attain rewards in Heaven. They want everything here and now, and view immortality not as an individual achievement, but as the survival of the “Jewish People”. Ben-Gurion stated,

“But through all these changes there was a continuity, a basic nucleus that did not change, and this nucleus is the Messianic vision of redemption, the vision of redemption for the Jewish nation and for all mankind.

This vision is also intimately intertwined with our ancient homeland and our cultural heritage, and it has close and organic bonds with the apocalyptic goals: the goal of international peace and human fraternity cherished by the prophets of Israel and the best men of all nations.

The Jewish faith and the Messianic hope enabled the Jews to overcome the sufferings, restrictions and humiliations that they underwent in most countries and in most generations. Their ability withstand external pressure, undismayed by tortures and persecution, were examples of great moral heroism, but this was only a passive heroism. This was an inner heroism, accompanied by a submission to fate and a feeling of helplessness and impotence in practice. The salvation which they expected and desired was to be brought about by supernatural forces from above.

The emancipation, the Haskalah and the revolutionary developments in the nineteenth century; the movements for national liberation and unity that arose among the enslaved and divided peoples of Europe (Italy, Germany, Poland, the Balkan States), the awakening of the working class to struggle for

a new social regime; the mass migration from Europe to countries across the seas; the new Hebrew literature which inspired the Hebrew reader with the spirit of the Bible in its early glory—all these gave a new direction to the aspiration for redemption, a natural, active, deliberate and planned direction.

Active Faith in Ability

There awoke the active faith in the ability and power of the Jew to change his fate with his own hands, and to advance his redemption through natural means. This faith became the common property of the best sons of the people, both among the religious (like Rabbi Alkalai, Rabbi Kalisher, etc.) and among the non-religious. And from the deepest wellsprings of the people there arose the latent but powerful will, the pioneering will, which is not discouraged by difficulties, obstacles and dangers from fulfilling its historical mission. [***] I regard the unity of the Jewish people as a primary condition for its survival—and the survival of Israel as well—and as I have said elsewhere, I am a Jew first, and an Israeli afterwards. [***] In our Proclamation of Independence, we declared that ‘the State of Israel will be open for Jewish immigration and the ingathering of the exiles,’ and in 1950 we enacted in the Knesset the Law of the Return, which is one of our basic laws, characteristic of the mission and the unique character of the Jewish State that we have established.

This law lays down the national principle through which and for which the state was established, namely that it is a natural and historic right of every Jew, wherever he may dwell, to return and settle in Israel.

It is not the state that grants the Jews of the Diaspora the right of return; it is inherent in every Jew. This right preceded the revival of the State of Israel; it was this right that built the state. [***] This was the Messianic vision, the vision of national redemption and revival, which in the last seventy years was given the name of Zionism but was real and live before the term was coined, and it lived in the hearts of thousands and tens of thousands of Jews who settled in Israel after it was coined, but never described themselves as ‘Zionists,’ and the term has remained strange to them to this day. [***] On the other hand, the Messianic vision of redemption for the Jewish people and all mankind is not something that has been created by European Jewry in recent times; it is the soul of prophetic Jewry, in all its forms and metamorphoses until this day, and it is the secret of the open and hidden devotion of world Jewry to the State of Israel.

While before the rise of the state, the Messianic vision was reinforced by the pressure of Jewish distress in the Diaspora, in our days it is strengthened by the attractive force of the state itself, as it is today and as it ought to be, namely by the reality of the state and by its historic mission in the realization of the Messianic vision.

This vision is not the outcome of any local or temporary conditions; it was created by the prophetic concept of the universe, the destiny of man on earth and the millennial era. It does not recognize idols of gold and silver; it does not accept the robbery of the poor, the oppression of peoples, the lifting

up of swords by nation against nation or the study of war; it foretells the coming of the Redeemer whose loins are girt with righteousness; it looks forward to the day when the nations will cease to do evil.

2 Forms of Redemption

This Messianic vision depends on the redemption of Israel, which will assume two forms: The ingathering of the exiles and the creation of a model nation, as Isaiah, the son Amotz, prophesied:

‘Fear not, for I have redeemed thee. From the East I will bring thy seed and from the West I will gather thee. I will say to the North: Give, and to the South: Hold not back, bring my sons from far and my daughters from the end of the earth’ (43:5-6). And he also said: ‘And I will hold thee by the hand, and I will form thee, and I will make thee a covenant of the people, a light to the nations’ (42:6).

These are no empty figures of speech—in our own day we are seeing the first signs of their realization. [***] This really the most important aspect of the picture, for our very survival—which involves the survival of Jewry in the world—depends on it. [***] [T]he Judaism of the Jews of the United States and similar countries is losing all meaning, and only a blind man can fail to see the danger of extinction, which is spreading without being noticed. [***] A large part of the laws cannot be observed in the Diaspora, and since the day when the Jewish state was established and the gates of Israel were flung open to every Jew who wanted to come, every religious Jew has daily violated the precepts of Judaism and the Torah of Israel by remaining in the Diaspora. Whoever dwells outside the land of Israel is considered to have no God, the sages said.

Every Jew who is concerned for the future of the Jewish people, and who holds the name of Jew dear above every other, must realize that without Jewish education for the younger generation, to imbue him with a more profound Jewish consciousness and deepen his roots in Israel’s history and the unity of the people, Jewry in the Diaspora is on the road to assimilation and extinction.

Those who are devoted to Judaism must see the dagger facing Diaspora Jewry courageously and with open eyes. In several totalitarian and Moslem countries, Judaism is in danger of death by strangulation; in the free and prosperous countries it faces the kiss of death, a slow and imperceptible decline into the abyss of assimilation.”¹⁶⁷

Ben-Gurion, *de facto* “King of the Jews”, or Messiah, wrote in his *Memoirs*,

“Jews are activists, that is they have a Messianic spirit. They are not missionaries since they don’t seek to convert others to their ways. But they are merciless with themselves. The Bible has imparted to them that divine discontent leading at its best to initiatives such as the pioneering life, at its worst to persecution by their fellow men. It has never allowed them as a people to enjoy for long comfortable mediocrity. Certainly in Israel today we

are Messianic. The Jews feel themselves to have a mission here; they have a sense of mission. Restoration of sovereignty is tied to a concept of redemption. This had determined Jewish survival and it is the core of Jewish religious, moral and national consciousness. It explains the immigration to Israel of hundreds of thousands of Jews who never heard of Zionist doctrine but who, nevertheless, were moved to leave the lands wherein they dwelt to contribute with their own effort to the revival of the Hebrew nation in its historic home. [***] The Jewish people are not easily overwhelmed. They have their Messianic tradition which binds them together and gives their existence purpose. More than one sea of eastern or western culture has attempted to swallow them up but never has succeeded. They have influenced the world far more than the world has influenced them. Israel is far better equipped to resist cultural extinction than were the Jewish exiles during two thousand years. Our evident role here is to give new life to all that is meant by the 'Covenant' of the Jewish people whereby they remain one. That is hardly a role leading to 'drowning' in alien cultures. On the contrary, it represents a revival of our own cultural activity."¹⁶⁸

It is interesting to note that Adolf Hitler fit in very well with Jewish apocalyptic mythology, especially the prophecies recorded in the *Sefer Zerubbabel* (*Book of Zerubbabel*), *The Wars of King Messiah* and the writings of Rabbi Simon Ben Yohai. These predicted that an evil pseudo-Messiah named Armilus would emerge as a child born of a statue in Rome, and of Satan. Though this prophecy was probably meant to ridicule Jesus, a contemporary of Hitler who sought to convince himself and others that prophecies were being fulfilled could have argued in retrospect that the birth of Armilus represented the rise of Adolf Hitler as the product of Mussolini's fascism. This monster of Jewish lore would gain power through his charisma and attempt to conquer the world and lead people to believe that he is the Biblical Messiah destined to lead a thousand-year Empire, the Messianic Era—one might say in this context: *Ein tausendjähriges Reich*. Adolf Hitler's crypto-Jewish propagandists did in fact promote Hitler to the German People as if he were the Messiah, who would lead Germany through a period of tribulations into the 1,000 year Messianic Era (*Revelation* 20:1-7), the thousand-year German Empire.

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article "Zerubbabel, Book of",

"The victory of the Messiah and his mother over Armilus represents that of Judaism over the Roman Empire and the Christian Church."¹⁶⁹

This victory heralds the "restoration" of the Jews to Palestine and the enslavement, then extermination of the Gentiles after "the times of the Gentiles" has expired (*Luke* 21:24. *See also: Matthew* 24. *Romans* 9; 11).

According to the Jewish prophecies, the Jews would oppose the pseudo-Messiah, and he would be defeated by Messiah Son of Joseph, and then the Jews would be restored to Palestine—as happened in the case of Hitler and Joseph Stalin, though by human design, Jewish design. The name "Stalin" is a pseudonym. Joseph "Stalin"

was born Joseph Djugashvili. “Stalin” means “steel” in Russian. He was said to rule with an iron fist, one might even say, with an iron scepter (*Numbers* 24:17-20. *Psalm* 2:9). While the names are coincidental legacies, they may have been seen and exploited as fortuitous by Cabalistic Jews, who tend to be highly superstitious, and who practice such occult beliefs as numerology.

In any event, it is a fact that Joseph Stalin’s government, like that of Adolf Hitler, was rotten with genocidal Jews and crypto-Jews, who committed genocide against the Slavs, Georgians, Germans, and other peoples under their control. They insisted upon the segregation of the Jews at all costs, including the mass murder of Jews, terrorism against Jews committed by Jews, who disguised themselves as non-Jews, and who blamed non-Jews for the atrocities they themselves committed so as to artificially cause enmity between Jews and the rest of the world. They sought the diminution of the genetic stock of other peoples, and the improvement of the genetic stock of the Jews through vicious natural and artificial selection, and perhaps sought the injection of fresh blood into the “tribe” from kidnaped children after the war.

They sought a world government led by Jews, that would blend other “races” into one amorphous whole, without a unique heritage, and without a religion, in keeping with Jewish Messianic myth. While racist Jews commonly blame Jewish segregation on non-Jews, it has commonly been the case that the Jews themselves have sought to segregate from the non-Jews. It was the Jews who created the segregated Ghettos of Poland before the Nazis rose to power, as Adolf Eichmann and others have noted.¹⁷⁰ Intrinsic Jewish racism even caused the Jews to segregate among Jews, with the Sephardim refusing to integrate with the Askenazim, and with each forming racist subgroups. In 1845, *The North American Review* wrote, and note that the Jews were very much involved in slavery, the secession of the Confederacy which began in South Carolina, and the KKK,

“The first great fact which strikes the observer of this people, in their present state, is their dispersion throughout the world, while they are still a separate race, excepting where, at the confines of their channel, they mingle enough with the surrounding waters to manifest that tendency to amalgamation, which characterizes all human kind, and in them is overborne only by some mysterious power opposing the diffusive force of the natural current. The narrative of their dispersion is necessarily involved at many points in great obscurity, which Jewish superstition and fondness for traditionary lore have served in no small degree to thicken. The agricultural life of the early Hebrews, as well as all the Mosaic institutions, opposed their mingling freely with other nations [***] The first who settled in the United States are said to have been Spaniards and Portuguese, who fled from the inquisition to the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam. To South Carolina the Jews came long before the Revolution, being German, English, and Portuguese emigrants; and they are now more numerous there than in any other Southern State. To Georgia a few came over in 1733, soon after General Oglethorpe. In Virginia we find them before the year 1780. The Jews of this country are as mixed a people as those among whom they dwell, and much less disposed than the

latter to forget petty differences, real or imaginary, in family or caste, among themselves; and therefore not so rapidly assuming a homogeneous aspect.”¹⁷¹

The Hitler and Stalin régimes, as do the American régime, and the emerging Chinese régime, fit the mythological prophecies of *Daniel 7*, which religious Jews employ as a political guide, and which state, *inter alia*,

“3 And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. 4 The first *was* like a lion, and had eagle’s wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man’s heart was given to it. 5 And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and *it had* three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh. 6 After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion *was* given to it. 7 After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it *was* diverse from all the beasts that *were* before it; and it had ten horns.”

The myth of Zerrubbabel is noteworthy today for another reason. It calls on the Jews to use a Christian empire to clear the way for the Jewish Messiah. The Zionists, who have long believed that politics can play the rôle of Messiah, and the evil pseudo-Messiah the Christians call the “anti-Christ”. The Zionists are currently using the United States of America to smash Islam and spread a corrupted form of Christianity, which will condition the peoples of the world to accept Jewish Messianic myth and monotheism. The Zionists are using America as the “anti-Christ” to make way for the Jewish Messiah, who will then crush America. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes of the myth of Zerrubabel in its article “Messiah”,

“Only after such unity is achieved by a Christian ‘messiah’ can the Jewish Messiah appear and overcome the enemy.”¹⁷²

In describing another pervasive Jewish Messianic myth, the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article “Messianic Movements”,

“[T]he Messiah is to take the crown from the head of the alien sovereign by his virtue of appearance alone and redeem and avenge the Jews by miraculous means.”¹⁷³

Racists Jews are settled upon the idea that they can fool the foolish by using modern science to accomplish things their future subjects will be conditioned to believe are “miraculous”. For example, the use of biological agents to kill off populations. Recall that the Zionists declared HIV/AIDS to be a scourge of God

upon the homosexuals. This misuse of Science was already discussed, in a way, in the writings of Maimonides and other Jewish scholars, and was an ancient and Medieval theme taken from the story of “Atlantis” found in Plato’s writings. One also wonders what smoke and mirror illusions the racist Jews will use to promote their Messiah, as if he descended from the heavens and carries with him supernatural powers.

The racist Jews would have an easy time deceiving Gentiles who are deliberately raised in ignorance. The Bolsheviks tried very hard to keep the Peoples of the Soviet Union from discovering the true nature of life in the West and Jewish organizations are now imposing Soviet style restrictions on the Peoples of the West. The American news media keeps the American People in ignorance of world events and disproportionately focuses attention on Israel and does so with an heavily pro-Israeli bias. Many of those same Americans who criticized the Soviets for submitting to such autocratic and oppressive tactics sheepishly laud those who are oppressing them today in America.

The genocidal Zionists justify their inhuman actions as manifestations of the Messianic myth of *hevlei Mashiah*, or “the birth pangs of the Messiah”.¹⁷⁴ They believe it is alright to mass murder fellow Jews and the rest of humanity, because it will supposedly hasten the Messianic Era, in which the Jewish “remnant”, or “the Elect” will enslave the rest of humanity and then exterminate it. In Biblical prophecy, the “remnant” are a minority in the Jewish community, who embrace genocidal Judaism while other Jews have abandoned it; and to Dispensationalist Christians, the “remnant” will be those Jews who convert to Christianity and rule the world from Zion, see: *Isaiah* 1:9; 6:9-13; 10:20-22; 11:11-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 59:20-21. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14; 37. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 5:8. *Matthew* 24. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5, 17, 26-27.

Racist Jews have succeeded in creating the “Jewish State” through these means—through the Holocaust. To this day, the Zionists justify their genocide of the Palestinians as *hevlei Mashiah*, and ask their fellow Jews—especially those who dominate the mass media—to conceal the Jewish genocide of the Palestinians, and to call those who object to it, “anti-Semites”. Preterist Christians, in contrast to Dispensationalist Christians, believe that the prophecies of the Old Testament have already been fulfilled and do not wish to make themselves the slaves of Jewish tyrants. Since the Jews’ Messianic myth will never be fulfilled, they will forever trouble the world and justify their villainy as *hevlei Mashiah*.

David Ben-Gurion admitted in 1956 that the Jews had stolen the Palestinians’ land,

“I don’t understand your optimism,” Ben Gurion declared. ‘Why should the Arabs make peace? If I was an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural: we have taken their country. Sure, God promised it to us, but what does that matter to them? Our God is not theirs. We come from Israel, it’s true, but two thousand years ago, and what is that to them? There has been antisemitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They only see one thing: we have come here and stolen their country. Why

should they accept that? They may perhaps forget in one or two generations' time, but for the moment there is no chance. So it's simple: we have to stay strong and maintain a powerful army. Our whole policy is there. Otherwise the Arabs will wipe us out.'"¹⁷⁵

When Black leader Stokely Carmichael stated essentially the same thing at a lecture in George Washington University in 1970, pro-Israel supporters jeered at him.¹⁷⁶ When Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stated essentially the same thing on 14 December 2005, Zionists called him "anti-Semitic" and made his statements a *casus belli* for annihilating Iran. President Ahmadinejad stated,

"Today, they have created a myth in the name of Holocaust and consider it to be above God, religion and the prophets, [***] If you committed this big crime, then why should the oppressed Palestinian nation pay the price? This is our proposal: If you committed the crime, then give a part of your own land in Europe, the United States, Canada or Alaska to them so that the Jews can establish their country."¹⁷⁷

The Zionists have been in a quandary for over half a century on how to justify the theft of Palestine from its native population. The Zionists put the Nazis into power in order to chase the reluctant Jews of Europe into Palestine. When their efforts failed in the late 1930's, they caused the Second World War and blamed it on the Jews, so as to provoke the Germans into humiliating and murdering Jews, which indescribably painful experience the Zionists hoped would then inspire the Jews to flee to Palestine—though it did not. The Zionists then caused problems for the Jews of Hungary, Romania, Russia, Iraq, Egypt, etc. to force them to Palestine against their own wishes, with marginal success. They doubtless plan to create more problems for the Jews of America and Russia so as to increase the population of Israel.

In *The Washington Post* on 11 July 2003 on page A1, Rebecca Dana and Peter Carlson quoted excerpts from the diary of Harry "S" Truman, President of the United States of America:

"'He'd no business, whatever to call me,' Truman wrote. 'The Jews have no sense of proportion nor do they have any judgement [sic] on world affairs. Henry brought a thousand Jews to New York on a supposedly temporary basis and they stayed.'

Truman then went into a rant about Jews: 'The Jews, I find, are very, very selfish. They care not how many Estonians, Latvians, Finns, Poles, Yugoslavs or Greeks get murdered or mistreated as D[isplaced] P[ersons] as long as the Jews get special treatment. Yet when they have power, physical, financial or political neither Hitler nor Stalin has anything on them for cruelty or mistreatment to the under dog. Put an underdog on top and it makes no difference whether his name is Russian, Jewish, Negro, Management, Labor, Mormon, Baptist he goes haywire. I've found very,

very few who remember their past condition when prosperity comes.”

After the Second World War ended, Zionist racists like Albert Einstein callously demanded Palestine on a *quid pro quo* basis for the human sacrifice of millions of Jews, which the Zionists had wrought.¹⁷⁸ But where was the logic in this? If the Europeans had murdered six million Jews, as the Zionists claimed, why should the Palestinians pay with their lives and property for the crimes of the European Nazis? In typical fashion, the Zionists exhibited their infamous dishonesty and argued both sides of the same issue as opposing and mutually exclusive arguments suited their needs. David Ben-Gurion wrote in his *Memoirs* of 1970,

“I have called the Arab attitude towards Israel irrational. Nevertheless, the Arab world has levelled several concrete accusations against us and it might be well to answer these here.

They have said, for instance, that the Moslem portion of the globe is paying for Nazism in Europe, that without the holocaust we would never have come here as a mass and never have founded a State. And, complain the Arab propagandists, it isn't fair that this part of the world should pay for the persecutions carried out in Europe.

I have already gone exhaustively into the reasons for our being here, reasons that I as a pioneer of 1906 can affirm have nothing to do with the Nazis! I think that Hitler did much to retard, not advance, our nationhood. In the middle thirties, it looked as though we were soon to achieve a Jewish State. But with war in Europe looming ever closer, thanks to the Nazis, Britain cracked down on Jewish nationalist aspirations with the famous White Paper of 1939. Ripe as we were for nationhood at that time, we had the greatest difficulty in helping even a fraction of European Jewry escape the gas chambers. Certainly Israel's population contains no massive element of direct victims of Nazism or their descendants. We just were unable to save the majority of these people. And those who did escape from Germany and the other countries didn't always come here as we weren't equipped to get them in their hundreds of thousands past the British embargo on immigration or offer them a true nation once they got here.

I would agree, however, that the advent of Nazism and its consequences in Europe did have one direct effect on Israel. It indicated to us all, to every Jew, the potential danger of being without a homeland. Nazism proved that Jews could live for five hundred years in peace with their neighbours, that they could all but assimilate in national society save for a few traditions and separate religious practices. They could believe themselves integral citizens of states professing freedom of belief and granting full rights to all inhabitants. Such was the situation prevailing in Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Norway. Yet one raving maniac could blame the world's troubles on a group constituting less than six per cent of Europe's population and the holocaust was at hand!

So, many a Jew realized that to be fully Jewish and fully a human being,

and fully safe as both, one had to have a country of one's own where it was possible to live and work for something belonging to a personal cultural heritage. In this sense, Nazism did bring many Jews to Israel, from everywhere on earth. Not as victims of persecution but as believers in the positive good of a Jewish national home.

I have said that personally I was never a victim of anti-Jewish persecution. I have, however, seen and marked the 'outsider' status of the Jews in even the most enlightened countries, as opposed to their full participation in our society here."¹⁷⁹

Ben-Gurion lied when he implied that he had tried to help the Jews of Europe escape death in the Holocaust. The Zionists delighted in the suffering of the Jews of Europe and were the instigators of it. David Ben-Gurion stated,

"The First World War brought us the Balfour Declaration. The Second ought to bring us the Jewish State."¹⁸⁰

Michael Bar-Zohar wrote in his book *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*,

"The danger soon became a reality. Many were unable to distinguish between the British Government and the British people, and when war broke out, the extremists adopted radical methods. Supporters of Abraham Stern, who dreamed of a Kingdom of Israel extending from the Nile to the Euphrates, fired the first shots against the British. They even committed the unpardonable crime of recommending an alliance with Nazi Germany, against Britain. When the British shot Stern, his gang avenged him by bomb attacks. These men were few in number and represented a very small part of the *Yishuv*, but their terrorist activities began a new, violent phase in the struggle against the British, a phase which was to lead to open warfare between various factions and groups in Palestine, when Jew fought against Jew and disaster almost came to the Zionist cause."¹⁸¹

David Ben-Gurion stated,

"If I knew that it would be possible to save all the children in Germany by bringing them over to England, and only half of them by transporting them to *Eretz Yisrael*, then I would opt for the second alternative. For we must weigh not only the life of these children, but also the history of the People of Israel."¹⁸²

In 1944, while the Nazis were massacring innocent and helpless Slavs, Jews, Gypsies, etc., Zionist David Ben-Gurion stated,

"One Degania [resident of the first communal settlement of Zionists in Palestine] is worth more than all the 'Yevsektzias' [Jewish Bolsheviks who

sought to secularize Jews] and assimilationists in the world.”¹⁸³

and boasted,

“This people was the first to prophesy about ‘the end of days,’ the first to see the vision of a new human society. [***] Our small and land-poor Jewish people, therefore, lived in constant tension between the power and influence of the neighboring great empires and its own seemingly insignificant culture—a culture poor in material wealth and tangible monuments, but rich and great in its human and moral concepts and in its vision of a universal ‘end of days.’”¹⁸⁴

Christopher Sykes wrote,

“[. . .]Zionist leaders were determined at the very outset of the Nazi disaster to reap political advantage from the tragedy.”¹⁸⁵

David Ben-Gurion stated in 1932,

“What Zionist propaganda for years and years could not do, disaster has done overnight. Palestine is today the fiery question for the Jews of East and West, and the New World as well.”¹⁸⁶

Ben-Gurion also stated,

“The disaster facing European Jewry is not directly my business.”¹⁸⁷

and,

“It is the job of Zionism not to save the remnant of Israel in Europe but rather to save the land of Israel for the Jewish people and the yishuv.”¹⁸⁸

In the 1937, David Ben-Gurion stated that the Zionist Jews want to take not just Palestine, but all of southern Syria and southern Lebanon, as well as Jordan and the Sinai, from their rightful inhabitants—they want the land of the Covenant from the Nile to the Euphrates.¹⁸⁹ Ben-Gurion stated in 1936,

“The acceptance of partition does not commit us to renounce Transjordan; one does not demand from anybody to give up his vision. We shall accept a state in the boundaries fixed today, but the boundaries of Zionist aspirations are the concern of the Jewish people and no external factor will be able to limit them.”¹⁹⁰

Ben-Gurion stated to the General Staff,

“I proposed that, as soon as we received the equipment on the ship, we should prepare to go over to the offensive with the aim of smashing Lebanon, Transjordan and Syria. [***] The weak point in the Arab coalition is Lebanon [for] the Moslem regime is artificial and easy to undermine. A Christian state should be established, with its southern border on the Litani River. We will make an alliance with it. When we smash the [Arab] Legion’s strength and bomb Amman, we will eliminate Transjordan, too, and then Syria will fall. If Egypt still dares to fight on, we shall bomb Port Said, Alexandria, and Cairo. [***] And in this fashion, we will end the war and settle our forefathers’ accounts with Egypt, Assyria, and Aram.”¹⁹¹

In her book *Israel’s Sacred Terrorism*, Livia Rokach reproduced an excerpt from a 26 May 1955 entry in Moshe Sheratt’s personal diary, which recounts his impressions of Moshe Dayan’s plans to provoke the Arabs to respond by first attacking them, then stealing their land when they sought to defend themselves,

“The conclusions from Dayan’s words are clear: This State has no international obligations, no economic problems, the question of peace is nonexistent. . . . It must calculate its steps narrow-mindedly and live on its sword. It must see the sword as the main, if not the only, instrument with which to keep its morale high and to retain its moral tension. Toward this end it may, no—it must—invent dangers, and to do this it must adopt the method of provocation-and-revenge. . . . And above all—let us hope for a new war with the Arab countries, so that we may finally get rid of our troubles and acquire our space. (Such a slip of the tongue: Ben Gurion himself said that it would be worth while to pay an Arab a million pounds to start a war.) (26 May 1955, 1021)”¹⁹²

Menachem Begin stated in 1948,

“The partition of the Homeland is illegal. It will never be recognized. The signature of institutions and individuals of the partition agreement is invalid. It will not bind the Jewish people. Jerusalem was and will forever be our capital. Eretz Israel [the Land of Israel] will be restored to the people of Israel. All of it. And forever.”¹⁹³

As Ben-Gurion and many other leading Jewish figures have declared, Jews set about to fulfill the Messianic prophecies themselves, without God’s intervention and without any concern for the rights, or the lives, of others. The Zionists were not reacting to the Holocaust when they took away the Palestinians’ homes by force. Rather, they created the Holocaust as a means to achieve Jewish prophecy and force the Jews out of Europe, then the Zionists continued their Nazi practices in Palestine. The Zionists were not justified in taking the Palestinians’ land because of the Holocaust. Rather, they were themselves responsible for the rise of the Nazis, and in no event did anything the Nazis did give the Jews the right to maim, murder,

terrorize or displace the Palestinians. It is important to note that Nazism was but one phase of the Zionists' plan to terrorize humanity and that the Zionists' terror tactics were widely used during the formation of the "Jewish State" and have continued throughout Israel's existence. The Zionists will eventually cause a Third World War to bring on the apocalypse that they believe will hasten the Messianic Era and the miraculous creation of a new Earth with only "righteous" Jews to populate it (*Isaiah* 11:4; 42:1; 65; 66. *Jeremiah* 33:15-16). Racist cabalistic Jews believe that they are duty bound to destroy the living environment of the earth and ruin the genetics of the human species so as to provoke God to obliterate this earth and "create new heavens and a new earth"—the so-called "New World Order" or "Jewish Utopia". These racist cabalistic Jews are taught that they will have new and improved bodies in this new world and need not worry about the genetic damage they are intentionally causing to human beings across the earth. They believe that only Jews will be left alive and that they will not only be restored, but improved upon. The books of *Isaiah* chapters 65 and 66 and *Ezekiel* chapters 36 through 38 are the primary sources of these concepts, which were more fully developed in subsequent Jewish literature including the apocalyptic apocryphal Jewish books of *Enoch* and others. Note that the "elect", the "chosen" are exclusively the Jews.

The *Zohar*, I, 28a-b, states,

"At that time every Israelite will find his twin-soul, as it is written, 'I shall give to you a new heart, and a new spirit I shall place within you' (Ezek. XXXVI, 26), and again, 'And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy' (Joel III, 1); these are [28b] the new souls with which the Israelites are to be endowed, according to the dictum, 'the son of David will not come until all the souls to be enclosed in bodies have been exhausted', and then the new ones shall come."¹⁹⁴

Isaiah 65 states,

"1 I am sought of *them that* asked not *for me*; I am found of *them that* sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation *that* was not called by my name. 2 I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh *in* a way *that was* not good, after their own thoughts; 3 A people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face; that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon altars of brick; 4 Which remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable *things is in* their vessels; 5 Which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These *are* a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day. 6 Behold, *it is* written before me: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, 7 Your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the LORD, which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills: therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom. 8 Thus saith the LORD, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and *one* saith, Destroy it not;

for a blessing *is* in it: so will I do for my servants' sakes, that *I* may not destroy them all. 9 And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there. 10 And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks, and the valley of Achor a place for the herds to lie down in, for my people that have sought me. 11¶ But ye *are* they that forsake the LORD, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for *that* troop, and that furnish the drink offering unto *that* number. 12 Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose *that* wherein I delighted not. 13 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: 14 Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. 15 And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord GOD shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: 16 That he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth; because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes. 17¶ For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. 18 But be ye glad and rejoice for ever *in that* which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. 19 And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. 20 There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner *being* an hundred years old shall be accursed. 21 And they shall build houses, and inhabit *them*; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. 22 They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree *are* the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. 23 They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they *are* the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them. 24 And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. 25 The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust *shall be* the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the LORD."

Isaiah 66:22-24 states,

"22 For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I *will* make, *shall* remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain. 23 And it shall come to pass, *that* from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the

LORD. 24 And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”

Ezekiel 36:24-38 states,

“24 For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. 25 ¶Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. 26 A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. 27 And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them*. 28 And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God. 29 I will also save you from all your uncleannesses: and I will call for the corn, and will increase it, and lay no famine upon you. 30 And I will multiply the fruit of the tree, and the increase of the field, that ye shall receive no more reproach of famine among the heathen. 31 Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that *were* not good, and shall lothe yourselves in your own sight for your iniquities and for your abominations. 32 Not for your sakes do I *this*, saith the Lord GOD, be it known unto you: be ashamed and confounded for your own ways, O house of Israel. 33 Thus saith the Lord GOD; In the day that I shall have cleansed you from all your iniquities I will also cause *you* to dwell in the cities, and the wastes shall be builded. 34 And the desolate land shall be tilled, whereas it lay desolate in the sight of all that passed by. 35 And they shall say, This land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden; and the waste and desolate and ruined cities *are become* fenced, *and* are inhabited. 36 Then the heathen that are left round about you shall know that I the LORD build the *ruined* places, *and* plant that that was desolate: I the LORD have spoken *it*, and I will do *it*. 37 Thus saith the Lord GOD; I will yet *for* this be inquired of by the house of Israel, to do *it* for them; I will increase them *with* men like a flock. 38 As the holy flock, as the flock of Jerusalem in her solemn feasts; so shall the waste cities be filled *with* flocks of men: and they shall know that I *am* the LORD.”

Ezekiel 37 states:

“1 The hand of the LORD was upon me, and carried me out in the spirit of the LORD, and set me down in the midst of the valley which *was* full of bones, 2 And caused me to pass by them round about: and, behold, *there were* very many in the open valley; and, lo, *they were* very dry. 3 And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord GOD, thou knowest. 4 Again he said unto me, Prophecy upon these bones, and say unto them, O ye dry bones, hear the word of the LORD. 5 Thus saith the

Lord GOD unto these bones; Behold, I *will* cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live: 6 And I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I *am* the LORD. 7 So I prophesied as I was commanded: and as I prophesied, there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. 8 And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above: but *there was* no breath in them. 9 Then said he unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, prophecy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. 10 So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army. 11 Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones *are* the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts. 12 Therefore prophecy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, O my people, I *will* open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. 13 And ye shall know that I *am* the LORD, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, 14 And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the LORD have spoken *it*, and performed *it*, saith the LORD. 15¶ The word of the LORD came again unto me, saying, 16 Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and *for* all the house of Israel his companions: 17 And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand. 18 And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not shew us what thou meanest by these? 19 Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I *will* take the stick of Joseph, which *is* in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, *even* with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. 20 And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes. 21 And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I *will* take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: 22 And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: 23 Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwellingplaces, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God. 24 And David my servant *shall be* king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. 25 And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my

servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, *even* they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David *shall be* their prince for ever. 26 Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. 27 My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people. 28 And the heathen shall know that I the LORD do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore."

Ezekiel 38 states:

"1 And the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, 2 Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him, 3 And say, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold I *am* against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal: 4 And I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, horses and horsemen, all of them clothed with all sorts of *armour*, *even* a great company *with* bucklers and shields, all of them handling swords: 5 Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya with them; all of them *with* shield and helmet: 6 Gomer, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands: *and* many people with thee. 7 Be thou prepared, and prepare for thyself, thou, and all thy company that are assembled unto thee, and be thou a guard unto them. 8 After many days thou shalt be visited: in the latter years thou shalt come into the land *that is* brought back from the sword, *and is* gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste: but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they shall dwell safely all of them. 9 Thou shalt ascend and come like a storm, thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land, thou, and all thy bands, and many people with thee. 10¶ Thus saith the Lord GOD; It shall also come to pass, *that* at the same time shall things come into thy mind, and thou shalt think an evil thought: 11 And thou shalt say, I will go up to the land of unwallled villages; I will go *to* them that are at rest, that dwell safely, all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates, 12 To take a spoil, and to take a prey; to turn thine hand upon the desolate places *that are now* inhabited, and upon the people *that are* gathered out of the nations, which have gotten cattle and goods, that dwell in the midst of the land. 13 Sheba, and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil? 14 Therefore, son of man, prophesy and say unto Gog, Thus saith the Lord GOD; In that day when my people of Israel dwelleth safely, shalt thou not know *it*? 15 And thou shalt come from thy place out of the north parts, thou, and many people with thee, all of them riding upon horses, a great company, and a mighty army: 16 And thou shalt

come up against my people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land; it shall be in the latter days, and I will bring thee against my land, that the heathen may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes. 17¶ Thus saith the Lord GOD; *Art* thou he of whom I have spoken in old time by my servants the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days *many* years that *I* would bring thee against them? 18 And it shall come to pass at the same time when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, saith the Lord GOD, *that* my fury shall come up in my face. 19 For in my jealousy *and* in the fire of my wrath have I spoken, Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel; 20 So that the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth, shall shake at my presence, and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground. 21 And I will call *for* a sword against him throughout all my mountains, saith the Lord GOD: every man's sword shall be against his brother. 22 And I will plead against him with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that *are* with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone. 23 Thus will I magnify myself, and sanctify myself; and I will be known in the eyes of many nations, and they shall know that *I am* the LORD.”

Christians who believe that these prophecies are miraculously being fulfilled in modern times are admonished to realize that what has happened in recent centuries is not the product of divine intervention, but rather the result of the deliberate actions of racist Cabalistic Jews meant to destroy Christians. It is not the work of God, but rather the deliberate destruction is wrought by ill-intentioned racist Jewish leadership who intend to exterminate the Christians. Jesus warned against obeying racist Jewish leadership and in Christianity the covenant with God has passed from the Jews to all Peoples (*Matthew* 12:30; 21:43-45. *Romans* 4; 9; 11:7-8. *Galatians* 3:16, 28-29; 4. and *Hebrews* 8:6-10).

In a “Letter to the Editor”, signed by Isidore Abramowitz, Hannah Arendt, Abraham Brick, Rabbi Jessurun Cardozo, Albert Einstein, Herman Eisen, M. D., Hayim Fineman, M. Gallen, M. D., H. H. Harris, Zelig S. Harris, Sidney Hook, Fred Karush, Bruria Kaufman, Irma L. Lindheim, Nachman Majsel, Seymour Melman, Myer D. Mendelson, M. D., Harry M. Orlinsky, Samuel Pitlick, Fritz Rohrlich, Louis P. Rocker, Ruth Sager, Itzhak Sankowsky, I. J. Schoenberg, Samuel Shuman, M. Znger, Irma Wolpe, Stefan Wolpe; dated “New York. Dec. 2, 1948.”; published as: “New Palestine Party; Visit of Menachen Begin and Aims of Political Movement Discussed”, *The New York Times*, (4 December 1948), p. 12; it states, *inter alia*,

“Among the most disturbing political phenomena of our time is the emergence in the newly created state of Israel of the ‘Freedom Party’ (Tnuat HaHerut), a political party closely akin in its organization, methods, political philosophy and social appeal to the Nazi and Fascist parties. It was formed

out of the membership and following of the former Irgun Zvai Leumi, a terrorist, right-wing, chauvinist organization in Palestine. The current visit of Menachen Begin, leader of this party, to the United States is obviously calculated to give the impression of American support for his party in the coming Israeli elections, and to cement political ties with conservative Zionist elements in the United States. Several Americans of national repute have lent their names to welcome his visit. It is inconceivable that those who oppose fascism throughout the world, if correctly informed as to Mr. Begin's political record and perspectives, could add their names and support to the movement he represents. [***] The public avowals of Begin's party are no guide whatever to its actual character. Today they speak of freedom, democracy and anti-imperialism, whereas until recently they openly preached the doctrine of the Fascist state. It is in its actions that the terrorist party betrays its real character; from its past actions we can judge what it may be expected to do in the future. [***] The Deir Yassin incident exemplifies the character and actions of the Freedom Party. Within the Jewish community they have preached an admixture of ultranationalism, religious mysticism, and racial superiority. Like other Fascist parties they have been used to break strikes, and have themselves pressed for the destruction of free trade unions. In their stead they have proposed corporate unions on the Italian Fascist model. [***] This is the unmistakable stamp of a Fascist party for whom terrorism (against Jews, Arabs, and British alike), and misrepresentation are means, and a 'Leader State' is the goal. In the light of the foregoing considerations, it is imperative that the truth about Mr. Begin and his movement be made known in this country. It is all the more tragic that the top leadership of American Zionism has refused to campaign against Begin's efforts, or even to expose to its own constituents the dangers to Israel from support to Begin."

While the mass media in America has traditionally covered up the fascistic nature of the Israeli Government and its leaders, certainly not all Israelis have approved of the territorial and political ambitions of leading Zionists murderers like David Ben-Gurion and Menachem Begin. Anthony Lewis quoted Avraham Burg in an article titled, "Hope Against Hope" in *The New York Times*, Section 4, on 17 April 1983 on page 19,

"'When we established Israel,' [Avraham Burg] said, 'it was based on the feeling that we needed a new basis for Jewish continuity, Jewish existence. Now, for many, the state has become the end of existence instead of the means. It has become the Messiah.

'That is dangerous because in Judaism there is no Messiah now. You walk toward it. It is your ideal. If you achieve it, it's a false Messiah. And our history knows many false Messiahs who endangered Jewish existence. I'm afraid that if the Jewish state becomes such a false Messiah, such a substitute for our ideals, the day will come when we will recognize that and there will

be a mortal crisis. I am against it totally.

Judaism is not territories. It is more than a piece of the land.”

Pious and compassionate Jews must realize that the racist and genocidal Jewish Messianic myths guiding the actions of the leading Zionists like Ben-Gurion and Begin remain troubling today, because they predict an apocalyptic war between the “Messiah Son of Joseph” (in a secular view, the State of Israel) and the King of Persia (President of Iran), which, after a nine month period of tribulations for Israel and the death of the Messiah Son of Joseph, will result in the ascendance of the “Messiah Son of David” (in a secular view, the State of Greater Israel extending from the Nile to the Euphrates), and the subjugation, then extermination, of the Gentile peoples of the Earth.

The Lubavitcher Jews have announced that they are prepared to anoint the Messiah and that it will happen soon. They are broadly disseminating propaganda to condition the world to accept this event.

Karl Marx took advantage of Gentile prejudice against pious Jews to bring about the ruin of Gentile nations, in fulfilment of Jewish Messianic prophecy. Pious Jews hated science, art and Gentiles—refused even to eat at the same table with Gentiles—as Shakespeare’s Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice* noted.¹⁹⁵ Pious Jews felt a loyalty only to God, to the Law and to each other. To a pious Jew, Greek science was a product of human reason and an affront to the Law, which had supposedly been given to the Jews, and only to the Jews, by God. Art depicted graven images and idols, and the Gentiles were individualistic in the pejorative sense and the Jews considered them to be soulless and cruel animals. For a pious Jew, immortality was meant for the Jews as a “race”, and they did not accept the Christian belief in the immortality of the individual soul. In order to achieve their “racial” immortality, the Jews had to remain segregated, and this meant that they ultimately had to kill off the Gentiles. The God of the Old Testament is a creator God, and the creations of mankind, such as science and art, were considered to be an affront to this God’s authority. After the emancipation movement, begun by the French Revolution and advanced by Napoleon, came into full swing, several Jewish movements tried to reconcile the Enlightenment, and the insights of science, with the antagonism of Judaism to human creations and the obvious falsehoods expressed in the religion. These organizations created Marxism as a stumbling stone for the Gentiles to trip over. Marx took this opportunity to defame his fellow Jews in order to promote himself and use the Gentiles’ own prejudices to destroy them.

Many newly emancipated secular Jews embraced art and science and excelled at them. They found themselves hated by many pious Jews, and some returned that hatred and ridicule. This was a painful dilemma for secular Jews, because all of their traditions taught them to find security in community, and their quest for individuality often resulted in alienation from both the Jewish and Gentile communities. This struggle between secular and pious Jews continued through the Twentieth Century and is depicted in Chaim Grade’s story “My War with Hersh Rasseynner”, *Commentary*, Volume 16, Number 5, (November, 1953), pp. 428-441; and yet more poignantly in the 1991 film based on this story, *The Quarrel* directed by Eli Cohen.

3.5 Jewish Dogmatism and Control of the Press Stifles Debate

If Robert Herndon Fife, Jr.'s book, *The German Empire Between Two Wars: A Study of the Political and Social Development of the Nation Between 1871 and 1914*, Macmillan, New York, (1916), at pages 177-199 and 359-388, bore a political bias, it appears to have been a pro-Socialist bias tending toward Marxist Socialism, though certainly not anti-Semitism. His book is dated in its relevance to Einstein by two factors: the founding of the Weimar Republic, and the interjection of politics into scientific matters practiced by Einstein and his advocates, as well as his opponents. In matters related to Einstein, the normally responsible scientific reporting of the German press surrendered ground to their typically irresponsible political reporting.

Just as a terrible propaganda machine had evolved in Germany, which apparatus of propaganda truly became a monster during the war, Lord Northcliffe and many others had established numerous propaganda outlets in Great Britain and America to promote Allied interests, often with outrageous lies.¹⁹⁶ After the war, these highly advanced propaganda factories consolidated to promote Einstein to the world. They successfully brought him undeserved fame and defamed and largely silenced his critics. Their vitriolic and racist attacks on Einstein's critics, coupled together with organized campaigns to destroy the careers of any scientists who would speak out against the theory of relativity, had the desired chilling effect on the effort to expose Einstein to the public as an irrational plagiarist.

Sir Gilbert Parker, who was in charge of British propaganda in America, revealed the organized power of the highly developed art of propaganda at the time, in *Harper's Magazine* in March of 1918. Parker discussed many of the corrupt tactics that were put to use soon afterwards to promote Einstein and to attack his critics and suppress dissent against Einstein, against Einstein's self-promotion and against Einstein's irrationality,

“Perhaps here I may be permitted to say a few words concerning my own work since the beginning of the war. It is in a way a story by itself, but I feel justified in writing one or two paragraphs about it. Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George (the present Prime Minister), Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Runciman, (the Lord Chancellor), Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and fully a hundred others.

Among other things, we supplied three hundred and sixty newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gives a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlet etc.; and by letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighboring States. We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association, by personal correspondence, with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers.

It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, but I was fortunate in having a wide acquaintance in the United States and in knowing that a great many people had read my books and were not prejudiced against me. I believed that the American people could not be driven, preached to, or chivied into the war, and that when they did enter it would be the result of their own judgment and not the result of exhortation, eloquence, or fanatical pressure of Britishers. I believed that the United States would enter the war in her own time, and I say this, with a convinced mind, that, on the whole, it was best that the American commonwealth did not enter the war until that month in 1917 when Germany played her last card of defiance and indirect attack. Perhaps the safest situation that could be imagined actually did arise. The Democratic party in America, which probably would not have supported a Republican President had he declared war, were practically forced by the logic of circumstances to support President Wilson when he declared war, because he had blocked up every avenue of attack.”¹⁹⁷

After the war ended, both the media of the Allies and that of the Central Powers were applied to making Einstein a celebrity and the fine art of controlling public opinion, which had become so refined during the war, was applied to the task of making Einstein famous. The methods learned and employed in wartime were also used to suppress and quash open debate on important scientific and ethical questions related to Einstein’s plagiarism, the fatal flaws in the theory of relativity and the misrepresentation of the physical evidence used to justify the theory.

Many were struck by the speed with which Einstein became famous. No scientist

had ever become so famous so quickly. Many were skeptical and suspicious that something unseemly was taking place.

In his book, Alexander Moszkowski recounts Albert Einstein's assuredness as to the results of the eclipse observations that made Einstein famous—*before the photographs of the eclipse had been taken*, an assurance that worried Max Planck and struck Heinrich Zangger as odd.¹⁹⁸ Einstein was absolutely confident that the results of the eclipse observations would confirm "his" prediction. Einstein's apparent knowledge of the results before they were obtained leads one to believe that the published conclusions of the eclipse observations, no matter what the evidence actually showed or was capable of showing, was a foregone conclusion arrived at in collusion, not through experimentation and observation. Moszkowski wrote,

"In no sense did Einstein himself entertain a possibility of doubt.

On repeated occasions before May 1919 I had opportunities of questioning him on this point. There was no shadow of a scruple, no ominous fears clouded his anticipations. Yet great things were at stake.

Observation was to show 'the correctness of Einstein's world system' by a fact clearly intelligible to the whole world, one depending on a very sensitive test of less than two seconds of arc.

'But, Professor,' said I, on various occasions, 'what if it turns out to be more or less? These things are dependent on apparatus that may be faulty, or on unforeseen imperfections of observation.' A smile was Einstein's only answer, and this smile expressed his unshakeable faith in the instruments and the observers to whom this duty was to be entrusted.

Moreover, it is to be remarked that no great lengths of time were available for comfortable experimentation in taking this photographic record. For the greatest possible duration of a total eclipse of the sun viewed at a definite place amounts to less than eight minutes, so that there was no room for mishaps in this short space of time, nor must any intervening cloud appear. The kindly co-operation of the heavens was indispensable—and was not refused. The sun, in this case the darkened sun, brought this fact to light.

Two English expeditions had been equipped for the special occasion of the eclipse—one to proceed to Sobral and the other to the Island of Principe, off Portuguese Africa; they were sent officially with equipment provided in the main by the time-honoured Royal Society. Considering the times, it was regarded as the first symptom of the revival of international science, a praiseworthy undertaking. A huge apparatus was set into motion for a purely scientific object with not the slightest relation to any purpose useful in practical life. It was a highly technical investigation whose real significance could be grasped by only very few minds. Yet interest was excited in circles reaching far beyond that of the professional scientist. As the solar eclipse approached, the consciousness of amateurs became stirred with indefinite ideas of cosmic phenomena. And just as the navigator gazes at the Polar Star, so men directed their attention to the constellation of Einstein, which was not yet depicted in stellar maps, but, from which something uncomprehended,

but undoubtedly very important, was to blaze forth.

In June it was announced that the star photographs had been successful in most cases, yet for weeks, nay for months, we had to exercise patience. For the photographs, although they required little time to be taken, took much longer to develop and, above all, to be measured; in view of the order of smallness of the distances to be compared, this was a difficult and troublesome task, for the points of light on the plate did not answer immediately with Yes or No, but only after mechanical devices of extreme delicacy had been carefully applied.

At the end of September they proclaimed their message. It was in the affirmative, and this Yes out of far-distant transcendental regions called forth a resounding echo in the world of everyday life. Genuinely and truly the $1\frac{7}{10}$ seconds of arc had come out, correct to the decimal point. These points representing ciphers, as it were, had chanted of the harmony of the spheres in their Pythagorean tongue. The transmission of this message seemed to be accompanied by the echoing words of Goethe's 'Ariel':

'With a crash the Light draws near!
Pealing rays and trumpet-blazes,—
Eye is blinded, ear amazes.'

Never before had anything like this happened. A wave of amazement swept over the continents. Thousands of people who had never in their lives troubled about vibrations of light and gravitation were seized by this wave and carried on high, immersed in the wish for knowledge although incapable of grasping it. This much all understood, that from the quiet study of a scholar an illuminating gospel for exploring the universe had been irradiated.

During that time no name was quoted so often as that of this man. Everything sank away in face of this universal theme which had taken possession of humanity. The converse of educated people circled about this pole, could not escape from it, continually reverted to the same theme when pressed aside by necessity or accident. Newspapers entered on a chase for contributors who could furnish them with short or long, technical or non-technical, notices about Einstein's theory. In all nooks and corners social evenings of instruction sprang up, and wandering universities appeared with errant professors that led people out the three-dimensional misery of daily life into the more hospitable Elysian fields of four-dimensionality. Women lost sight of domestic worries and discussed co-ordinate systems, the principle of simultaneity, and negatively-charged electrons. All contemporary questions had gained a fixed centre from which threads could be spun to each. Relativity had become the sovereign password. In spite of some grotesque results that followed on this state of affairs it could not fail to be recognized that we were watching symptoms of mental hunger not less imperative in its demands than bodily hunger, and it was no longer to be appeased by the former books by writers on popular science and by

misguided idealists.

And whilst leaders of the people, statesmen, and ministers made vain efforts to steer in the fog, to arrive at results serviceable to the nation, the multitude found what was expedient for it, what was uplifting, what sounded like the distant hammering of reconstruction. Here was a man who had stretched his hands towards the stars; to forget earthly pains one had but to immerse oneself in his doctrine. It was the first time for ages that a chord vibrated through the world invoking all eyes towards something which, like music or religion, lay outside political or material interests.

The mere thought that a living Copernicus was moving in our midst elevated our feelings. Whoever paid him homage had a sensation of soaring above Space and Time, and this homage was a happy augury in an epoch so bare of brightness as the present.

As already remarked, there was no lack of rare fruits among the newspaper articles, and a chronicler would doubtless have been able to make an attractive album of them. I brought Einstein several foreign papers with large illustrations which must certainly have cost the authors and publishers much effort and money. Among others there were full-page beautifully coloured pictures intended to give the reader an idea of the paths pursued by the rays from the stars during the total eclipse of the sun. These afforded Einstein much amusement, namely, *e contrario*, for from the physical point of view these pages contained utter nonsense. They showed the exact opposite of the actual course of the rays inasmuch as the author of the diagrams had turned the convex side of the deflected ray towards the sun. He had not even a vague idea of the character of the deflection, for his rays proceeded in a straight line through the universe until they reached the sun, where they underwent a sudden change of direction reminiscent of a stork's legs. The din of journalistic homage was not unmixed with scattered voices of dissent, even of hostility. Einstein combated these not only without anger but with a certain satisfaction. For indeed the series of unbroken ovations became discomfiting, and his feelings took up arms against what seemed to be developing into a star-artist cult. It was like a breath of fresh air when some column of a chance newspaper was devoted to a polemic against his theory, no matter how unfounded or unreasoned it may have been, merely because a dissonant tone broke the unceasing chorus of praise. On one occasion he even said of a shrill disputant, 'The man is quite right!' And these words were uttered in the most natural manner possible. One must know him personally if one is to understand these excesses of toleration. So did Socrates defend his opponents."¹⁹⁹

Albert Einstein marveled at the spurious evidence which had made him a cult figure. Moszkowski informs us that,

"A copy of this photograph had been sent to Einstein from England, and he told me of it with evident pleasure. He continually reverted to the delightful

little picture of the heavens, quite fascinated by the thing itself, without the slightest manifestation of a personal interest in his own success. Indeed, I may go further and am certainly not mistaken in saying his new mechanics did not even enter his head, nor the verification of it by the plate; on the contrary, he displayed that disposition of the mind which in the case of genius as well as in that of children shows itself as *naïveté*. The prettiness of the photograph charmed him, and the thought that the heavens had been drawn up as for parade to be a model for it.”²⁰⁰

We know that Eddington was biased, and that photographs taken in 1918 failed to show any displacement—though it is difficult to believe that any photographs taken in that era were accurate enough to measure such things. The Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Bournemouth, 1919, in its “Transactions of Section A”, Friday, September 12, pages 156-157, reported:

“1. *Photographs taken at Principe during the Total Eclipse of the Sun, May 29th.* By Professor A. S. EDDINGTON, F.R.S., and E. T. COTTINGHAM, followed by a Discussion on Relativity, opened by Professor EDDINGTON, F.R.S.

Professor Eddington gave an account of the observations which had been made at Principe during the solar eclipse. The main object in view was to observe the displacement (if any) of stars, the light from which passed through the gravitational field of the sun. To establish the existence of such an effect and the determination of its magnitude gives, as is well known, a crucial test of the theory of gravitation enunciated by Einstein. Professor Eddington explained that the observations had been partially vitiated by the presence of clouds, but the plates already measured indicated the existence of a deflection intermediate between the two theoretically possible values $0.87''$ and $1.75''$. He hoped that when the measurements were completed the latter figure would prove to be verified. Incidentally Professor Eddington pointed out that the presence of clouds had resulted in a solar prominence being photographed and its history followed in some detail; some very striking photographs were shown.

Following on this account Professor Eddington opened the discussion on relativity, and referred again to the bending of the wave front of light to be expected from Einstein’s new law when the light passes near a heavy body. It should be possible to test experimentally this law, which demands that the speed of light varies as $1 - 2\Omega/c^2$ where Ω is the gravitational potential. He showed that whether Einstein’s solution of the problem be correct or not, it has at any rate given a new orientation to our ideas of space and time. Sir Oliver Lodge regarded the relativity theory of 1905 as a supplement to Newtonian dynamics by the adoption of the factor $\left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)$ and its powers necessitated by experimental results; but he did not consider this

dependence of mass and length on velocity as entailing any revolutionary changes of our ideas of space and time, or as rendering necessary the further complexities of 1915. He compared the difficulties involved with the case of measuring temperature, defined in terms of a perfect gas, and made with gases which only approximate to this ideal state. Dr. Silberstein pointed out that Einstein's theory of gravitation predicts three verifiable phenomena, *i.e.*, a shift of spectral lines, the bending of light round the sun and the secular motion of the perihelion of a planet. In the neighbourhood of a radially symmetric mass, such as our sun, the line element ds is given by:—

$$ds^2 = (1 - 2M/c^2r) c^2 dt^2 - (1 - 2M/c^2r) (dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2).$$

The coefficient $c^2 dt^2$ gives by itself a lengthening of the period of oscillation for a terrestrial observer in the ratio $(1 + M/c^2r) : 1$, demanding a shift of spectral lines of about $\cdot 01 \text{ \AA.U.}$ Secondly, the path of rays of light is obtained by putting $ds = 0$, and the first and second coefficients give jointly a bending which, for rays almost grazing the sun, is $1\cdot 75''$. Thirdly, Keplerian motion is predicted with a progressively moving perihelion which in the case of Mercury turns out to be $43''$ per century. He drew attention to the fact that St. John's results in 1917 showed no shift of the spectral lines, a fact which in itself would overthrow the theory in question. Father Cortie pointed out that Campbell's photographs, taken in 1918 and measured by Curtis, gave no trace of any displacement of the images of 43 stars distributed irregularly round the sun."

Regarding this meeting and the evidence against general relativity which was known to Freundlich and Einstein, *see also*: *Nature*, Volume 103, (1919), p. 394; and *The Observatory*, Volume 42, (1919), pp. 298-299, 361-366; and the letter from E. Freundlich to A. Einstein of 15 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 105, Princeton University Press, (2004); as well as Einstein's response to Freundlich on 19 September 1919, *ibid.* Document 106.

On 9 October 1919, Albert Einstein reported in *Die Naturwissenschaften* (J. Springer), Volume 7, Number 42, (17 October 1919), p. 776,

“Zuschriften an die Herausgeber.

Prüfung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie.

Nach einem von Prof. *Lorentz* an den Unterzeichneten gerichteten Telegramm hat die zur Beobachtung der Sonnenfinsternis am 29. Mai ausgesandte englische Expedition unter *Eddington* die von der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie geforderte Ablenkung des Lichtes am Rande der Sonnenscheibe beobachtet. Der bisher provisorisch ermittelte Wert liegt zwischen $0,9$ und $1,8$ Bogensekunden. Die Theorie fordert $1,7$.

Berlin, den 9. Oktober 1919.

A. Einstein.”

Lorentz followed his telegram with a letter of 7 October 1919. Einstein delighted in Lorentz' news and forwarded the information to numerous friends and family.²⁰¹

Vossische Zeitung began actively promoting Albert Einstein at least as early as 26 April 1914.²⁰² On 23 July 1918, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

“Das Weltbild des Physikers.

Professor Einstein über die Motive des Forschens.

Anläßlich des 60. Geburtstages von Max Planck, dem Schöpfer der Quantentheorie, veranstaltete die Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft eine besondere Sitzung, in der Plancks Verdienste um die Wissenschaft in Ansprachen hervorragender Physiker gewürdigt wurden. Diese Ansprachen liegen jetzt gedruckt vor. (C. F. Müllersche Hofbuchhandlung, Karlsruhe). Der Frankfurter Physiker M. von Laue schildert Plancks thermodynamische Arbeiten, der Münchener Physiker A. Sommerfeld zeigte, wie Planck zur Entdeckung der Quanten kam, Einstein, der Physiker der Berliner Akademie, untersuchte die Motive des Forschens und kommt dabei auf das Weltbild des theoretischen Physikers zu sprechen. Dieses stellt die höchsten Anforderungen an die Straffheit und Exaktheit der Darstellung der Zusammenhänge, wie sie nur die Benutzung der mathematischen Sprache verleiht. Aber dafür muß sich der Physiker stofflich um so mehr bescheiden, indem er sich damit begnügen muß, die allereinfachsten Vorgänge abzubilden, die unserem Erleben zugänglich gemacht werden können, während alle komplexen Vorgänge nicht mit jener subtilen Genauigkeit und Konsequenz, wie sie der theoretische Physiker fordert, durch den menschlichen Geist nachkonstruiert werden können. Höchste Reinheit, Klarheit und Sicherheit auf Kosten der Vollständigkeit. „Was kann es aber für einen Reiz haben, einen so kleinen Ausschnitt der Natur genau zu erfassen, alles Feinere und Komplexere aber scheu und mutlos beiseite zu lassen? Verdient das Ergebnis einer so resignierten Bemühung den stolzen Namen „Weltbild“? Ich glaube, der stolze Name ist wohlverdient, denn die allgemeinsten Gesetze, auf welche das Gedankengebäude der theoretischen Physik gegründet ist, erheben den Anspruch, für jegliches Naturgeschehen gültig zu sein. Aus ihnen sollte sich auf dem Wege reiner gedanklicher Deduktion die Abbildung, d. h. Theorie eines jeden Naturprozesses einschließlich der Lebensvorgänge finden lassen, wenn jener Prozeß der Deduktion nicht weit über die Leistungsfähigkeit menschlichen Denkens hinausginge. Höchste Aufgabe des Physikers ist also das Aufsuchen jener allgemeinsten elementaren Gesetze, aus denen durch reine Deduktion das Weltbild zu gewinnen ist. Zu diesen elementaren Gesetzen führt kein logischer Weg, sondern nur die auf Einfühlung in die Erfahrung sich stützende Intuition . . . Die Entwicklung hat gezeigt, daß von denkbaren theoretischen Konstruktionen eine einzige jeweils sich als unbedingt allen anderen überlegen erweist. Keiner, der sich in den Gegenstand wirklich vertieft hat, wird leugnen, daß die Welt der

Wahrnehmungen das theoretische System praktisch eindeutig bestimmt, trotzdem kein logischer Weg von den Wahrnehmungen zu den Grundsätzen der Theorie führt. Mit Staunen sieht der Forscher das scheinbare Chaos in eine sublimen Ordnung gefügt, die nicht auf das Walten des eigenen Geistes, sondern auf die Beschaffenheit der Erfahrungswelt zurückzuführen ist; dies ist es, was Leibniz so glücklich als „prästabilierte Harmonie“ bezeichnete.”²⁰³

On 15 April 1919, *Vossische Zeitung*, evening edition, reported,

“Grundgedanken der Relativitätstheorie.

Professor Einstein am Vortragstisch.

Nicht nur in der Politik, auch in der Wissenschaft wird der Fortschritt aus der Not geboren, so begann Professor Einstein, das an Jahren jüngste Mitglied unserer Akademie, der Mitschöpfer der modernen Relativitätstheorie, seine Betrachtungen über diese Theorie. Da der Redner bei der überaus zahlreichen Zuhörerschaft, die sich in der Aula der Viktoria-Luisen-Schule auf Einladung des sozialistischen Studentenvereins zusammengefunden hatte, weder auf besonders mathematische, noch physikalische Vorkenntnisse rechnen konnte, so verzichtete er fast völlig auf das anscheinend unentbehrliche mathematische Rüstzeug. Auch die grundlegenden physikalischen Experimente konnten nur kurz in ihren entscheidenden Endergebnissen herangezogen werden.

In seinen Betrachtungen geht Einstein von der Relativität der Bewegung aus, wie sie Galilei und Newton gelehrt haben. Er zeigt, daß wir eine absolut gleichförmige Translationsbewegung in keiner Weise definieren können. Zwei sich gleichförmig gegeneinander bewegendes Bezugssysteme (Koordinaten-Systeme) sind mechanisch vollkommen äquivalent. Es sind Aussagen von vollkommen gleichem Inhalt, wenn wie einmal das eine System als ruhend und das andere als bewegt ansprechen oder umgekehrt. Es kommt gar nicht darauf an, welches Bezugssystem das ruhende, welches das bewegte ist. Dieses Relativitätsprinzip der Mechanik läßt sich aber nicht ohne weiteres auf die Vorgänge beim Licht, oder allgemeiner, auf die elektrodynamischen Erscheinungen anwenden. Dem widerspricht anscheinend der Fizeausche Versuch. In einer mit gleichförmiger Geschwindigkeit strömenden Flüssigkeit möge sich Licht in Richtung der Strömung fortpflanzen. Nach dem Relativitätsprinzip Galileis müßte ein im Strom treibender Beobachter die gleiche Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit wahrnehmen, wie wenn die Flüssigkeit ruhte. Der außenstehende Beobachter müßte also die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit des Lichts um die volle Geschwindigkeit der Flüssigkeit vermehrt finden. Das ist aber nicht der Fall. Auch im luftleeren Raum pflanzt sich der Lichtstrahl mit derselben Geschwindigkeit fort. Michelson hat versucht festzustellen, ob die Bewegung der Erde einen Einfluß auf die Lichtgeschwindigkeit hat, aber sowohl seine

Experimente, wie die seiner Nachfolger verliefen so, als ob das Relativitätsprinzip der Mechanik auch in der Optik gilt, während das nach dem Fizeauschen Versuch nicht der Fall war. Wie läßt sich dieser Widerspruch lösen? Er liegt, wie Einstein weiter ausführt, [??? *three words illegible*] Voraussetzungen unserer Ueberlegung. Wenn der nicht mitbewegte Beobachter einen Einfluß der Bewegung für den mitbewegten Beobachter festzustellen meint, den dieser selbst nicht wahrnimmt, so liegt das daran, daß beide Beobachter mit verschiedenem Maße messen, daß es verschiedene Dinge sind, die sie als identisch bezeichnen, gleiche Zeitintervalle und gleiche Längen ansprechen. Was gleichzeitig in bezug auf das eine Bezugssystem ist, ist nicht gleichzeitig auf ein anderes Bezugssystem, ebenso ist der Begriff der Länge ebenfalls relativ. Bewegte starke Körper und bewegte Uhren verhalten sich anders als ruhende. Der bewegte Körper verkürzt sich. Eine Uhr, die vom nichtbewegten System aus beurteilt wird, läuft langsamer. Der bewegte Beobachter beurteilt mit seinen Instrumenten die bewegte Welt anders, als der unbewegte Beobachter.

In der knappen Zeit von 1½ Stunden ist es unmöglich, die ganze Gedankenarbeit auch nur in kurzen Umrissen zu schildern, die zur heutigen Relativitätstheorie geführt hat. Aber man erhält doch einen Einblick, wie die Physiker die gedanklichen und physikalischen Schwierigkeiten zu beseitigen versuchen. Wir sehen, wie das moderne Relativitätsprinzip dazu zwingt, die Beziehungen zwischen wägbarer Masse und Energie neu zu gestalten, wie nach dem Relativitätsprinzip jede Energiezunahme auch eine Massenzunahme zur Folge hat. Tatsächlich haben die neueren Untersuchungen über die Elektronen diese Forderung bestätigt. Auch die Perihelbewegung des Merkur bestätigt die Relativitätstheorie, auch die Aberration des Lichts der Fixsterne dient zu ihrer Stütze. Ende dieses Monats soll ein neuer experimenteller Beweis für sie geführt werden. In Brasilien will man die Sonnenfinsternis daraufhin beobachten, ob eine Ablenkung der Sonnenstrahlen entsprechend dem modernen Relativitätsprinzip stattfinden.

K. J.”

On 13 May 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

“**Sonnenfinsternis und Relativitätstheorie.** Die am 29. Mai stattfindende Sonnenfinsternis, deren Totalitätszone sich in einem nach Süden offenen Bogen von Arequipa an der Westküste von Südamerika bis etwa nach Mikindani, an der Ostküste von Afrika erstreckt, gewinnt dadurch eine ganz besondere Bedeutung, daß sie durch ihre lange Totalitätsdauer für die Prüfung der E i n s t e i n s c h e n Theorie besonders geeignet ist. Zu ihrer Beobachtung haben, wie die „Naturwissenschaften“ nach englischen Quellen berichten, die Engländer zwei Unternehmungen ausgerüstet. Die eine unter Crommelin geht nach Sobral in Brasilien (etwa 130 Kilometer landeinwärts von der Küste), die zweite unter Eddington auf die portugiesische Isla do Principe (etwa 180 Kilometer von der afrikanischen

Küste). Abgesehen von der langen Totalitätsdauer ist diese Sonnenfinsternis durch das reiche Feld an Sternen rings um die Sonne bemerkenswert, und es ist die Aufmerksamkeit auf die dadurch gegebene, überaus günstige Gelegenheit gelenkt worden, die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie zu prüfen. Nach diesen muß ein Strahl, der von einem Stern aus tangential zur Sonne verläuft, $1,74''$ abgelenkt werden und die Ablenkung für andere Sterne umgekehrt proportional ihrem Abstände vom Mittelpunkt der Sonne sein. Fällt die Entscheidung für Einstein, so würde das zusammen mit seinem Erfolge in der Erklärung der Bewegung des Merkurperihels, genügen, um seine Lehre als das wirkliche System des Universums anzunehmen. Auch ihre endgültige Widerlegung aber würde von Nutzen sein, da sie die Verschwendung weiterer Kraft auf ihre Ausarbeitung verhindern würde, obwohl diese Theorie, wie die „Nature“ bemerkt, als scharfsinniges System idealer Geometrie noch immer unsere Bewunderung verdienen würde.”

On 21 July 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

“Die Sonnenfinsternis am 29. Mai. Wie die englische Zeitschrift „Nature“ vom 5. Juni meldet, hat die englische Expedition, die in Sobral in Brasilien arbeitete, günstiges Wetter gehabt. Die gestellten Aufgaben ließen sich befriedigend durchführen. Alle zu erwartenden Sterne sind auf den photographischen Platten herausgekommen. Auch die nach Eddington an der Küste Westafrikas gesandte Expedition ist mit ihren Erfolgen zufrieden. Beide Expeditionen sollten, wie schon gemeldet, die dicht bei der Sonne stehenden Sterne photographisch aufnehmen, um die Einsteinsche Theorie zu prüfen. Die Aufnahmen während der Sonnenfinsternis dienen zum Vergleich mit Aufnahmen derselben Himmelsgegend bei Nacht, um eine etwaige Verschiebung zu entdecken, die man auf die Anwesenheit der Sonne in diesem Feld als Ursache zurückführen kann.”

On 15 October 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

“Sonnenfinsternis und Relativitätstheorie. Nach einer Mitteilung des neuesten Heftes der „Naturwissenschaften“ hat die zur Beobachtung der Sonnenfinsternis am 29. Mai ausgesandte englische Expedition die von der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie geforderte Ablenkung des Lichtes am Rande der Sonnenscheibe beobachtet. Der bisher provisorisch ermittelte Wert (die Durchrechnung der Beobachtungsergebnisse ist noch nicht beendet) liegt zwischen $0,9$ und $1,8$ Bogensekunden, die Theorie fordert $1,7$.

Eine der wichtigsten Folgerungen der Einsteinschen Theorie ist die Abhängigkeit der Lichtgeschwindigkeit von dem sogenannten Gravitationspotential, und die sich dadurch ergebende Krümmung eines Lichtstrahles bei seinem Durchgang durch ein Gravitationsfeld. Die Theorie ergibt für einen dicht an der Sonne vorbeigehenden Lichtstrahl, der z. B. von einem Fixstern herkommt, eine Krümmung seiner Bahn. Infolge der

Krümmung muß man den Stern gegen seinen wahren Ort am Himmel um einen Betrag verschoben sehen, der am Sonnenrande 1,7 Sekunden beträgt und proportional dem Abstände vom Sonnenmittelpunkte abnimmt. Da aber die photographische Aufnahme des an der Sonne vorbeigehenden von einem Fixstern herkommenden Lichtes nur dann möglich ist, wenn das alles überstrahlende Licht der Sonne am Eintritt in unsere Atmosphäre gehindert wird, so kommen nur die seltenen totalen Finsternisse für diese Beobachtung und die Lösung der Aufgabe in Betracht. Die Sonnenfinsternis am 29. Mai dieses Jahres, während der die Engländer auf zwei Beobachtungsstationen im Hinblick auf dieses Problem photographische Aufnahmen gemacht haben, hat das erforderliche Material zur Entscheidung geliefert.”

On 18 November 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

“Einstein und Newton.

Die Ergebnisse der Sonnenfinsternis vom Mai 1919.

Wie erinnerlich hatte England eine Expedition ausgesandt mit der Aufgabe, die Erscheinungen der Sonnenfinsternis vom 29. Mai d. J. photographisch festzuhalten. Als geeigneter Ort hierfür war Sobral in Nord-Brasilien bezeichnet worden. Es wurde damals telegraphisch gemeldet, daß die Abordnung ihre Aufgabe voll erfüllen konnte. Inzwischen sind die Mitglieder der Expedition nach England zurückgekehrt und haben der britischen Astronomischen Gesellschaft Bericht erstattet.

Professor C. Davidson von der Greenwich-Sternwarte sprach sich des näheren einem „Times“-Redakteur gegenüber über diese Ergebnisse aus. Davidson bestätigte, daß die im Augenblick der totalen Verfinsterung der Sonnenscheibe an Kappa 1 und Kappa 2, nahe dem Sternbild der Hyaden, angestellten Beobachtungen die vollständige Richtigkeit der Ablenkung der Lichtstrahlen durch die Schwerkraft der Sonne ergeben haben. Auf den vom Professor R. E. Wall von der Universität Cambridge erhobenen Einwand, daß diese Ablenkung durch eine noch unbekannte Sonnen-Atmosphäre von ungeahnter Ausdehnung und noch unbekannter Kraft verursacht sein könnte, erwidert Professor Davidson: „Das ist nicht möglich, denn um eine derartige Ablenkung hervorzurufen, müßte eine Atmosphäre vorhanden sein, die jeder bisherigen Theorie und Beobachtung widerspricht. Ueberdies sind Kometen beobachtet worden, die in einem, den Sonnenraum fast streifenden Abstände von der Sonne ihre Bahn ohne jede Störung verfolgt haben.“ Davidson trennt sich demnach nicht von der Anschauung, daß die Entdeckung einer Lichtquelle, die sowohl Gewicht als Körper besitzt, einen Fortschritt für die Auffassung bedeutet, daß außerhalb des drei-dimensionalen Raumes, wie wir ihn heute kennen, noch besondere Bedingungen vorhanden sind. Professor Einsteins Theorie, so bemerkte Davidson, verlangt u. a. eine Verschiebung der Spektrallinien nach dem Rot hin. Diese Forderung hat auch Dr. St. John auf Mount Wilson in Amerika nachgeprüft, doch bisher ohne jeden Erfolg.

Nichtsdestoweniger sind gewisse Abweichungen in dem Verhalten der Spektrallinien vorhanden, für die, nach Meinung einer großen Zahl von Gelehrten, eine befriedigende Erklärung gefunden werden könnte. Was aber jene in Brasilien gemachte hauptsächlichste Entdeckung anbelangt, so pflichtet Professor Davidson voll der Meinung bei, daß das Newtonsche Prinzip umgeworfen worden sei und daß Professor Einstein wenigstens bezüglich zweier seiner drei Voraussagen recht hat. Seine Vermutung bezüglich des Spektrums, versicherte der Greenwicher Professor, bleibt noch den Beweis schuldig. Betreffs der Lichtablenkung aber haben die in Brasilien vorgenommenen Beobachtungen ergeben, daß an Stelle einer Ablenkung von 0,87 Bogensekunden am Sonnenrande, wie man sie nach dem Newtonschen Gesetze allenfalls hätte erwarten können, diese Ablenkung 1,75 betrug, wie sie nach Einsteins Theorie auch sein sollte.”

Vossische Zeitung continued to promote the eclipse observations and Einstein on 8 December 1919, 27 January 1920, 7 February 1920, and 24 February 1920. On 30 November 1919, Erwin Freundlich, a Jewish man who considered himself to have been Einstein’s friend, though Einstein had ridiculed him behind his back,²⁰⁴ and a man who had a personal interest in the promotion of the eclipse observations, published an article in the morning edition of *Vossische Zeitung*, which promoted Einstein. Freundlich had been the brains behind Einstein’s plagiarism of the general theory of relativity from Marcel Grossmann and David Hilbert, though Einstein took all of the credit.

Freundlich was trying to advance his career and increase his salary and his success depended on the acceptance of the general theory of relativity by German astronomers. Times were hard in Europe after the First World War. Einstein’s friends desperately needed money and believed they could not succeed without promoting Einstein. Einstein’s friends often complained to him that they needed money and asked for his help in furthering their careers. Freundlich sought to profit from a book he had published on relativity theory, and from its translation into English—as did Einstein’s acquaintance Moritz Schlick—and they had Einstein intervene with the publishers to increase their profits.²⁰⁵ Freundlich was corrupt through and through, as were Einstein and Schlick.

Freundlich’s article is notable for many things. “Einstein’s” theory was not initially popular—in fact it was very unpopular in the scientific world. Freundlich was keenly aware that his own institution would not back him due to the lack of support for relativity theory. The majority of physicists and astronomers opposed the general theory of relativity. He also knew that there was strong evidence against the general theory of relativity.²⁰⁶ Einstein wrote to Freundlich on 19 September 1919,

“You are entirely right that getting you a position in Potsdam should not be attempted *for the present*. The Gen. Th. of Rel. must win acceptance among astronomers beforehand.”²⁰⁷

Einstein and his friends knew that they needed a public following and the

acceptance of astronomers in order to be successful in setting aside the “old” ideas—in order to forward their careers. Knowing that they had plagiarized it, they nevertheless speciously promoted the theory of relativity as a completely new approach, one which was unique to Einstein and one which he allegedly thought up in his head without any empirical inspiration. They did this in part to deceive the public and make a hero out of Einstein. They also were forced to do this, because Einstein had plagiarized the works and failed to reference his sources.

Note that Freundlich lauds Einstein; but the names of Poincaré, Mach, Bateman, Hilbert, Gerber, Maxwell, FitzGerald, Larmor, Cohn, Lorentz, Minkowski, etc. are conspicuously missing from his piece; such that one must conclude that it was not the ideas which were considered significant, because they were not considered significant under the pens of Einstein’s predecessors, but it was instead the promotion of Albert Einstein as a hero that was foremost on Freundlich’s mind. Freundlich was also able to blackmail Einstein as a means to promote himself, Freundlich, because Freundlich could have exposed Einstein as a plagiarist and a fraud at any time.

Furthermore, it would have been impossible to have advertised Einstein the way Einstein’s friends sought to advertize him, and to still have named a just handful of Einstein’s predecessors—the historical facts and the circus promoter’s fancy simply did not agree. For example, the perihelion motion of the planet Mercury was taken as proof that Einstein was correct and the implication was that Einstein had predicted a previously unknown effect with a non-Newtonian theory of gravity premised on the belief that gravity propagates at light speed. In fact, the perihelion motion of Mercury was observed long before Einstein was born. The equations Einstein used to describe it in 1915 were first published by Paul Gerber in 1898. Gerber believed that gravity propagates at light speed and attempted to prove it with Mercury as an empirical example. Einstein and Freundlich were aware of these facts and deliberately lied to the public.

Einstein, himself, admitted that the hype promoting him was unfounded,

“‘There has been a false opinion widely spread among the general public,’ [Einstein] said, ‘that the theory of relativity is to be taken as differing radically from the previous developments in physics from the time of Galileo and Newton—that it is violently opposed to their deductions. The contrary is true. Without the discoveries of every one of the great men of physics, those who laid down preceding laws, relativity would have been impossible to conceive and there would have been no basis for it. Psychologically, it is impossible to come to such a theory at once without the work which must be done before. The four men who laid the foundations of physics on which I have been able to construct my theory are Galileo, Newton, Maxwell, and Lorenz.’”²⁰⁸

When Einstein critic Ernst Gehrcke made similar statements, Einstein called him “anti-Semitic”.

Speaking anecdotally, it amazes your author how relativists praise specific ideas,

when they attribute them to Einstein, but when it is proven to them that another person wrote the same thing before Einstein, these same relativists call these same ideas “insignificant” and “obvious”. They then change the subject to another idea they wrongfully attribute to Einstein, and the pattern repeats itself, until they feel forced to change the subject from mathematical formalism to Metaphysics, or vice versa, then to the combination of mathematical formalism with Metaphysics in the theory of relativity which they mistakenly attribute to Einstein, and when even this is proven unoriginal, they either circle back to the start as if their views had not been refuted, or they launch a personal attack, or they change the subject to racial, nationalistic or humanitarian politics and issues. There appears to be a deep need for the hero not to be toppled—especially among racist and ethnically biased Jews, and it is the childish and fawning love of this hero, “Einstein”, not his mythologies, which is at the core of the Einstein legend. The theories may be debunked, diminished or demeaned, but the love of the man cannot be shaken among his devout and blind followers—no matter what the facts tell us about him.

So powerful was the initial propaganda of self-interested liars like Alexander Moszkowski, Erwin Freundlich, Max Born, and the others, so vulnerable and gullible are his admirers, that nothing can shake off their religious fervor for the man. They are eager to excuse his sadistic mistreatment of his family and friends, his career of plagiarism, his irrationality, his racism, his misogyny, and his nationalistic segregationist bigotry. Nothing can make them fall out of love with their shaggy-haired comic book hero. What is worse for them is the fact that Einstein has been so shamelessly overrated for so long, that for them to admit to the truth is to admit to their past gullibility, or deliberate dishonesty and, often, racist bias.

Similar hero worship had attended the cults which arose around Aristotle, Spinoza, Copernicus, Des Cartes, Newton, and, in the time of Einstein, Leonardo da Vinci. Einstein and his promoters knew their history and knew how to manufacture a “star-artist cult” around Einstein, which they could then use to promote a theory with no practical implications (believed by them at the time), which would make Einstein a powerful political force in the international arena, who could then do great good—in their eyes, by creating a race war between Jews and Gentiles.

R. S. Shankland stated,

“About publicity Einstein told me that he had been *given* a publicity value which he did not *earn*. Since he had it he would use it if it would do good; otherwise not.”²⁰⁹

Albert Einstein stated on 27 April 1948,

“In the course of my long life I have received from my fellow-men far more recognition than I deserve, and I confess that my sense of shame has always outweighed my pleasure therein.”²¹⁰

Albert Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

“Peter, I fully realize that many people listen to me not because they agree with me or because they like me particularly, but because I am Einstein. If a man has this rare capacity to have such esteem with his fellow men, then it is his obligation and duty to use this power to do good for his fellow men.”²¹¹

Einstein “had been *given* a publicity value which he did not *earn*” so that he could promote political Zionism among Jews. Political Zionism is a racist movement among Jews meant to segregate Jews in Palestine in order to end the assimilation of Jews into other cultures and “races”. In 1919, most Jews opposed this racist movement and the Zionists needed a famous spokesman to help overcome this resistance to Zionism among Jews.

Albert Einstein confided to his old friend and confidant Michele Besso, on 12 December 1919, that he planned to attend a Zionist conference dedicated to founding a Hebrew university in Palestine. Einstein wrote,

“The reason I am going to attend is not that I think I am especially well qualified, but because my name, in high favor since the English solar eclipse expeditions, can be of benefit to the cause by encouraging the lukewarm kinsmen.”²¹²

In his book *The Jewish State*, Theodor Herzl laid emphasis on the need of celebrity and publicity to promote Zionism. The same is true of his diary. In 1897, Theodor Herzl told the First Zionist Congress,

“We Zionists wish to urge self-help on the people; thereby no exaggerated and unsound hopes will be awakened. On this ground, also, publicity in dealing with this point is of the highest value. [***] The confidence of the State, which is necessary for a settlement of large masses of Jews, can only be gained by publicity and by loyal action.”²¹³

Paul Ehrenfest wrote to Albert Einstein on 9 December 1919,

“I hear, for ex., that your accomplishments are being used to make propaganda, with the ‘Jewish Newton, who is simultaneously an ardent Zionist’ (I personally haven’t *read* this yet, but only *heard* it mentioned). [***] But I cannot go along with the propagandistic fuss with its *inevitable* untruths, precisely *because* Judaism is at stake and *because* I feel myself so thoroughly a Jew.”²¹⁴

Most people probably think that we today are the most politically sophisticated generation of all times, having the benefit of the recorded history of all other times to guide us. I do not think we today are, in general, nearly as politically sophisticated as the Europeans of the early Twentieth Century. The reasons for this are many, and I suspect include the overspecialization of today’s students, which does not give

them a broad enough knowledge of many fields of study to gain the insights needed to absorb the fuller meanings of what they are told, and they too often lack the willingness and ability to judge all aspects of the information presented to them as if facts. Many too often succumb to the opinions of others based on their credentials alone and are reluctant to rely upon logic and research, and instead submit to authority. Physicist Ernst Gehrcke noted that this was already becoming a problem in the 1920's, and Sociologist Max Weber's concerns over the bureaucratic control of human behavior have since been justified. Another problem is the fact that the internationalization and attendant standardization of thought has diminished competition in the arena of ideas and replaced it with cult figures who dominate the debate, not through talent, but through relentless commercial promotion.

At any rate, Einstein's friends were very sophisticated politically. Einstein was himself manipulative. Einstein had a good teacher in his mother on how to manipulate people and circumstances. His friends in the scientific community, and in the press, came to his aid in a most corrupt fashion whenever he needed their help. It appears odd that these scientists were determined to promote Einstein as if a revolutionary figure in the popular press, when they knew that he was not, until one realizes that they were his friends and had selfish interests in promoting and perpetuating the cult of Einstein for personal profit.

Article after article appeared in the popular press aggrandizing and sanctifying the man, but nothing was written about how "his" theory allegedly changed everyday life so as to make it deserving of the abundant *news* coverage that it received—all of which is why Reuter Dahl dubbed Einstein the "Barnum of the scientific world". While others made important discoveries that benefitted humanity in unprecedented ways, it was Einstein who was aggressively promoted in the press. The wealthy internationalist Richard Fleischer wrote to Einstein on 21 December 1919 offering grant money for research into any practical applications the theory of relativity might have, with the goal of promoting international cooperation in the sciences. The best Einstein could offer was a self-serving experiment on spectral lines by Grebe and Bachem meant to eliminate the doubts cast on the general theory of relativity by the experiments of St. John and others.²¹⁵ This had no practical implications to the man on the street.

The astronomer W. J. S. Lockyer was quoted in *The New York Times* on page 17, 10 November 1919,

"The discoveries, while very important, did not, however, affect anything on this earth. They do not personally concern ordinary human beings; only astronomers are affected."

The New York Times later reported on 25 November 1919, page 17,

"The effects on practical astronomy of the verification of Einstein's theory were not very great. It was chiefly in the field of philosophical thought that the change would be felt."

Einstein was quoted in *The Chicago Tribune* on 4 April 1921 on page 6,

“Whatever the value of relativity, it will not necessarily change the conceptions of the man in the street, said Prof. Einstein. ‘The practical man does not need to worry about it,’ he said.”

Erwin Freundlich, in his article which follows, does not acknowledge the fact that the empirical basis of the theory was known before the theory was developed and applied to it, and that the alleged experimental confirmations and predictions were known beforehand, or were corrupted and misrepresented to fit the theory. Freundlich, as a scientist, must have known that his declarations were, at best, incorrect and premature.

The fundamental belief of science is that of generalization. A non-Newtonian theory of gravitation which describes the known motion of the perihelion of Mercury automatically leads to a non-Newtonian prediction of the deflection of a ray of light grazing the sun, and a shift in the spectral lines, and vice versa. The inductive analysis of one of these known problems leads to generalizations which deduce the solution to the other, such that there was no great insight in clarifying the known problems with known solutions, which is to say that geometrical laws circularly defined to describe one motion ought to describe all of Nature, if Nature is truly uniform, *cæteris paribus*.

A key facet (and specious *fecit*) of the modern propaganda promoting Einstein is the myth that he had thought up the physical problems in his head and derived their solutions by himself with original thought experiments. The solutions and approaches, contrary to Moszkowski and Freundlich’s self-serving propaganda, were developed before Einstein by Voigt, FitzGerald, Lorentz, Larmor, Poincaré, Poisson, Gerber, Cohn, Minkowski, Bateman, Varičak, Grossmann, Hilbert, Schwarzschild, and many others; and the physical problems were known through the research of Soldner, Leverrier, Michelson and *Freundlich*, among many others, before Einstein.

Freundlich, of course, knew most of this, though he failed to disclose these facts to the public. Freundlich himself worked on the eclipse idea and Eddington expressed regret that Freundlich was not the first to experimentally test the theory, though he was “first in the field”—a comment which caught Einstein’s attention.²¹⁶ As is proven by a letter from Max Born to David Hilbert dated 23 November 1915,²¹⁷ Erwin Freundlich knew that David Hilbert had first derived and discovered the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity, which Freundlich and Einstein plagiarized from Hilbert on 25 November 1915—Freundlich likely being the true primary author of the subsequent paper on the field equations of gravitation attributed to Einstein.²¹⁸

Freundlich, Born and Moszkowski were but a few of Einstein’s many dishonest friends. Max Planck and Max von Laue were well aware that Poincaré had anticipated Einstein, which we know because they cited Poincaré’s work in their early works on Poincaré’s principle of relativity. In 1905 and 1906, Paul Ehrenfest considered Lorentz’ 1904 paper²¹⁹ on special relativity and Poincaré’s 1905 *Rendiconti* paper²²⁰ on space-time to be the most significant work (both historically

and scientifically) on the subject of the principle of relativity. Ehrenfest and his wife Tatiana attended David Hilbert's 1905 Göttingen seminars on electron theory, which described Lorentz' and Poincaré's work on special relativity. In 1911 in a long and well-referenced paper²²¹ written in consultation with Lorentz on the principle of relativity, space-time and the perihelion motion of Mercury; Willem de Sitter extensively cited Poincaré, but did not mention Einstein, and de Sitter knew that Lorentz and Poincaré had created the theory of relativity before Einstein. Minkowski, at times, took credit for many of Poincaré's insights, and falsely credited Einstein with Poincaré's ideas on time in Minkowski's most famous lecture "Space and Time" of 28 September 1908 delivered in Cologne. David Hilbert must have been aware of these facts—we know that Minkowski was, because he acknowledged Poincaré's work in earlier statements. Arnold Sommerfeld, whom Einstein characterized as deceitful,²²² was aware of this, and, according to Lewis Pyenson,

"Sommerfeld was unable to resist rewriting Minkowski's judgment of Einstein's formulation of the principle of relativity. [***] Sommerfeld also suppressed Minkowski's conclusion, where Einstein was portrayed as the clarifier, but by no means as the principal expositor, of the principle of relativity."²²³

Lorentz and Sommerfeld failed to include any of Poincaré's work in their famous collection of papers *Das Relativitätsprinzip* of 1913, though they included Einstein's papers and Minkowski's lecture "Space and Time". No scientist would today dare to try to lay claim to all that preceded her the way that Einstein and his friends did, even if she assembled specific known empirical facts and predictions with known theory the way that Einstein and his friends did—often with mistakes and contradictions.

Note Feundlich's overblown title and bear in mind that it was written soon after Germany's defeat in the First World War. Feundlich wrote in the 30 November 1919 morning edition of *Vossische Zeitung*:

“Albert Einstein. **Zum Siege seiner Relativitätstheorie.**

Von
Erwin Feundlich, Neubabelsberg.

In Deutschland hat ein wissenschaftliches Ereignis von außerordentlicher Bedeutung noch nicht den Widerhall gefunden, den es seiner Bedeutung nach verdient. Anlässlich der Sonnenfinsternis am 29. Mai dieses Jahres haben englische Astronomen eine wichtige Voraussage der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie, nämlich die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahles im Gravitationsfelde der Sonne, bestätigt gefunden und damit eine Erkenntnis sichergestellt, die von ausschlaggebender Bedeutung für unsere Auffassung

von Raum, Zeit und Materie in der Physik ist. Es ist keine Uebertreibung, wenn wir dieses Ereignis als einen Wendepunkt in der Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften feiern, nur zu vergleichen mit Epochen, welche mit den Namen Ptolemäus, Kopernikus, Kepler und Newton verknüpft werden.

Wenn es auch nicht möglich ist, an dieser Stelle die Grundzüge der Einsteinschen Theorie darzulegen, so will ich doch versuchen, die große Linie in der Entwicklung der Physik bis zur Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie aufzuzeichnen, um die volle Würdigung seiner genialen Leistungen zu ermöglichen.

Das Weltbild, welches sich das Altertum gebildet hatte, ist durch den Umstand gekennzeichnet, daß in den Mittelpunkt der Welt der Mensch, d. h. die Erde, gesetzt wurde, um welche alle Himmelskörper in Kreisen sich bewegen sollten, Gäbe es keine Planeten, so wäre die Durchführung dieser Auffassung nicht auf solche Schwierigkeiten gestoßen. Da tat K o p e r n i k u s um 1543 den ersten großen Schritt. Er entthronte die Erde und erhob die Sonne zum Mittelpunkt der Welt. Diese Tat stellt wohl den entscheidendsten Fortschritt in der Gestaltung unseres Weltbildes dar; doch hafteten ihr zu Anfang noch mannigfache Schwächen an, bis K e p l e r seine bekannten Gesetze aufstellte.

Was die Entwicklung bis dahin charakterisiert, ist der Umstand, daß man sich noch nicht bemühte, durch Aufstellung allgemeiner Prinzipien zu einer einheitlichen Auffassung der mannigfachen auch auf der Erde beobachteten Bewegungserscheinungen fortzuschreiten. Den Beginn mit einer so vertieften Naturbeschreibung machte G a l i l e i, als er den Begriff der Trägheit schuf und den Grundsatz aufstellte: Jeder bewegte Körper behält infolge seiner Trägheit eine einmal gewonnene Geschwindigkeit bei, es sei denn, daß eine bremsende Kraft sie allmählich verringert. Als Galilei seine Bewegungsgesetze aufstellte, stand ihm vielleicht eine einheitliche Erfassung aller Bewegungsvorgänge, auch der der Himmelskörper, als fernes Ziel vor Augen. Zu diesem führte uns aber erst Newton hin. Er verschmolz die Fallerscheinungen auf der Erde mit den Bewegungsvorgängen der Planeten und Monde, indem er neben dem Begriff der Trägheit den der Schwere eines Körpers schuf und sein mathematisch außerordentlich einfaches G r a v i t a t i o n s g e s e t z aufstellte. Auf seinen Aufsätzen baut sich die „k l a s s i s c h e“ M e c h a n i k auf, die in einer Kette unerhörter Erfolge alle Bewegungsvorgänge im Sonnensystem mit einer solchen Genauigkeit zu verfolgen erlaubte, daß viele glaubten, hier sei man zu einer ganz endgültigen Theorie der Bewegungserscheinungen gelangt, die in ihren Fundamenten niemals erschüttert werden können. Und doch nagte schon damals der Wurm an den Wurzeln des hochgeschossenen und weit verästelten Baumes; und niemand verspürte vielleicht tiefer die angeborenen Schwächen der Theorie als ihr Schöpfer, Newton, selbst.

Die Newtonsche Mechanik arbeitet nämlich mit verschiedenen Grundbegriffen, über deren physikalische Bedeutung und Beziehung zueinander man nie so recht ins Reine kam. Z. B., obwohl wir ausschließlich

die Bewegungen von Körpern relativ zueinander wahrnehmen, tritt doch in der Newtonschen Mechanik der l e e r e Raum als ein physikalisches Ding auf, welches für das Auftreten der Zentrifugalkräfte, die wir auf rotierenden Körpern feststellen, verantwortlich gemacht wird. Schon Newton empfand das physikalisch Unbefriedigende einer solchen Auffassung. Oder, um noch ein Beispiel anzuführen: in die Newtonsche Mechanik werden zwei von einander unabhängige Grundattribute eines jeden Körpers, nämlich seine Schwere und seine Trägheit, eingeführt. Als man an die Messung der Beträge dieser beiden Größen heranging, entdeckte man das anscheinend mit aller [??? *Three to five words illegible on my photocopy.*], daß die träge und schwere Masse aller Körper stets absolut gleich sind. Sollte diese Uebereinstimmung ein reiner Zufall sein? Oder ist nicht vielmehr zu vermuten, daß eine Theorie wie die Newtonsche, in welcher dieses Grundgesetz für alle Materie keine tiefere Begründung findet, in ihren Grundlagen verfehlt ist?

Schließlich stieß man sogar auf eine zahlenmäßige Abweichung zwischen Theorie und Beobachtung, nämlich beim Planeten M e r k u r, die sich im Rahmen der Newtonschen Theorie nicht beheben ließ. Ihre sonstigen Erfolge waren jedoch so groß, daß man lange Zeit nicht glauben konnte und wollte, daß sie in ihren Grundlugen einen Todeskeim trage. Den Anstoß zu ihrem Zusammenbruch erfuhr sie auch nicht von innen heraus, sondern von seiten der Elektrodynamik. Als nämlich diese dazu überging, die elektrischen Vorgänge bei bewegten Körpern zu studieren, geriet man in eine äußerst mißliche Lage. Es zeigte sich nämlich, daß uns die bestehende Physik nicht die erforderlichen Hilfsmittel zur befriedigenden Beschreibung solcher Erscheinungen an die Hand gab. Nachdem man sich einige Zeit vergeblich abgemüht hatte, den fühlbaren Mangel befriedigend zu beheben, trat A l b e r t E i n s t e i n im Jahre 1905, damals noch ein junger, 26jähriger, unbekannter Physiker, hervor und zeigte, daß in den ganz prinzipiellen, tiefliegenden Schwächen der Newtonschen Theorie der Grund der Schwierigkeiten zu suchen sei. Und nun begann er in einer Folge groß angelegter Arbeiten, die in den letzten Jahren einen gewissen Abschluß gefunden haben, ein ganz neues Gebäude der theoretischen Physik von so unerhörter Kühnheit aufzuführen, daß er sicherlich nicht so schnell Mitarbeiter und Anhänger gefunden hätte, wenn nicht folgende drei Momente jeden objektiv Forschenden gewonnen hätten. Erstens, die grundsätzlichen begrifflichen Schwierigkeiten der Newtonschen Theorie, von denen wir schon einige andeuteten, waren unbestritten vorhanden. Dadurch, daß Einstein seine Theorie frei von diesen Schwächen begründete, kam er einem lang empfundenen Bedürfnis entgegen. Zweitens, schon die ersten Ansätze im Anschluß an die Probleme der Elektrodynamik lieferten eine so befriedigende Darstellung aller Beobachtungen, daß man an der Fruchtbarkeit seiner neuen Gesichtspunkte nicht zweifeln konnte. Drittens, in mutiger Verfolgung der letzten Folgerungen seiner allgemein durchgeführten Ideen hat Einstein n e u e E r s c h e i n u n g e n

vorausgesetzt, die sich bisher alle fast restlos haben bestätigen lassen. Wer es weiß, wie furchtlos, ohne sich gewissermaßen durch Geschwindigkeit seiner Ansätze einen Rückweg zu sichern, Einstein seine Theorie begründet und aufgebaut hat, der vermag die Bedeutung dieser praktischen Erfolge zu würdigen.

Zum Ausgangspunkt seiner Reform wählte Einstein das Relativitätsprinzip der Newtonschen Mechanik. Dieses Prinzip fordert, daß in den Bewegungsvorgängen z. B. auf der Erde, deren, in jedem Augenblick mit genügender Annäherung, geradlinig gleichförmiger Bewegungszustand mit bemerkbar wird. Diese durch die Erfahrung gesicherte Tatsache äußert sich mathematisch in den Formeln der Mechanik darin, daß die Bewegungsgleichungen ihre Gestalt bewahren, ganz gleich, auf welches System die Raum-Zeit-Messungen, die den Vorgang festzulegen und zu verfolgen erlauben, bezogen werden, solange man sich auf geradlinig gleichförmig gegeneinander bewegte Systeme beschränkt. Transformationsformeln, welche den Uebergang von den Raum-Zeit-Messung eines solchen Systems zu denen in einem anderen bewerkstelligen sollten, hatte man abgeleitet und lebte in der falschen Vorstellung besungen, diese Formeln seien die einzigen, die diesem Zweck dienen könnten. Da zeigte Einstein als erster, daß, wenn man den Uebergang von einem System zu einem anderen [*about seven words are illegible on my photocopy: perhaps* Bewegungssystem und insbesondere eine neu gewonnene Erfahrung,] nämlich die besondere Bedeutung der Lichtgeschwindigkeit in der Natur in Rücksicht zieht, man gezwungen ist, andere Transformationsformeln als die bisher üblichen zu verwenden, und ein neues Relativitätsprinzip formulieren muß. Diese neue Erkenntnis war von geradezu revolutionärem Charakter. Denn einmal folgte aus den neuen Formeln, daß wir unsere Anschauungen über das Wesen der Raum-Zeit-Messungen von Grund auf ändern müssen, da nach ihnen die Länge eines Gegenstandes, der Zeitpunkt eines Ereignis ihren absoluten, d. h. unabhängig vom Bewegungszustand des Beobachters geltenden Wert verlieren. Sodann aber zeigte sich, daß die Gleichungen der Newtonschen Theorie dem neuen Relativitätsprinzip entsprechend umgestaltet werden mußten. Dafür behob aber Einsteins Neugestaltung des Relativitätsprinzips für geradlinig gleichförmig bewegte Systeme mit einem Schlage alle Schwierigkeiten, auf die die Elektrodynamik gestoßen war. Dies war die erste Etappe auf seinem Wege zur Neubegründung der Physik.

Bis hierher folgten ihm bald viele, sobald man die Richtigkeit und Ueberlegenheit seines Standpunktes erkannt hatte. Und während schon fleißige Hände und Köpfe an die Aufgabe gingen, die Gleichungen der Newtonschen Mechanik dem neuen sogenannten „speziellen“ Relativitätsprinzip anzupassen, da war Einstein, in voller Klarheit über die begrenzte Leistungsfähigkeit der bis dahin gewonnenen Erkenntnisse, in seinen Gedanken seinen Mitarbeitern einen großen Schritt voraus. Er war sich darüber im klaren, daß der Boden für die Neubegründung der Mechanik

noch nicht erreicht war. Mit der Erkenntnis der Relativität der beschleunigten Bewegung ein tieferes Erfassen der Gravitationsgeschwindigkeit war wohl eine Schwäche der bestehenden Theorie aufgedeckt, aber vielleicht keineswegs ihre fundamentalste. Ein Anpassen der Mechanik an die spezielle Relativitätstheorie wäre ein Stehenbleiben auf halbem Wege gewesen.

Einstein übersah sofort, daß eine Reform der Newtonschen Mechanik nur in einer radikalen Umgestaltung derselben in eine solche bestehen konnte, welche ausschließlich Aussagen über Relativbewegungen enthielt und den Begriff des absoluten Raumes ausschaltete. Er erkannte auch sofort, daß eine Berücksichtigung der beschleunigten Bewegungen ein tieferes Erfassen der Gravitationserscheinungen erforderte. Und hier tritt besonders eindringlich eine Besonderheit der Einsteinschen Forschungsart zutage, die, trotz des ausgesprochen philosophischen Grundzuges seines Wesens, ihn als reinen Naturforscher kennzeichnen. Zwei alte Erfahrungstatsachen, die wir alle in der Schule gelernt haben, an denen wir aber alle mehr oder minder gedankenlos vorübergegangen sind, nämlich die Gleichheit der trägen und schweren Masse aller Körper und die völlige Unabhängigkeit der Fallbeschleunigung von der physikalischen und chemischen Beschaffenheit des fallenden Körpers, diese gewannen durch Einstein erst Leben und tieferen Sinn. Er erkannte, daß diese zwei Tatsachen uns im wesentlichen alle erforderliche Erkenntnisse liefern, um eine Mechanik der Relativbewegungen der Massen und eine Theorie der Gravitationserscheinungen aufzubauen. Allerdings hatte die letzte Säule unserer Anschauungen über das Wesen von Raum-Zeit in der Physik zu fallen.

Durch die „spezielle“ Relativitätstheorie war der absolute Charakter der Raum-Zeit-Messungen zwar beseitigt worden. Doch behielt immerhin jedes System das Recht, eine Messungen nach den Formeln der euklidischen Geometrie auszuwerten. Bei der Ausgestaltung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie kam aber die schon im Jahre 1854 von dem genialen Mathematiker Bernhard Riemann ausgesprochene Erkenntnis zutage, daß die Erforschung der geometrischen Verhältnisse in der materiellen Welt ein Grundproblem der Physik sei und nicht eine rein mathematische Angelegenheit. Ganz unabhängig gelangte Einstein zu derselben Einsicht, fand aber zugleich als erster eine Lösung für diese tiefliegende Problemstellung. Er zeigte, daß die Erforschung der geometrischen Zusammenhangsverhältnisse der physikalischen Welt gleichbedeutend ist mit der Erforschung ihrer Gravitationsverhältnisse.

Auf Fundamente von solcher Tiefe und Breite baute Einstein seine neue Mechanik auf; immer, trotz aller Abstraktheit der Gedankengänge und trotz der schwierigen neuen mathematischen Hilfsmittel, die er heranzog, immer bestrebt, durch beobachtbare Folgerungen seiner Ansätze ihre Ueberlegenheit über die früherer Theorie zu erweisen. Er schuf neue Bewegungsgesetze für die Planeten und zeigte, daß sie nicht nur dasselbe leisten wie diejenigen der Newtonschen Mechanik, sondern darüber hinausgehend, sofort die beim

Merkur beobachtete und oben erwähnte Bewegungsanomalie restlos deutete. Seine Theorie ergab, daß die Eigenschaft der Schwere und Trägheit, bisher von uns als spezifisches Merkmal der Materie aufgefaßt, auch jeglicher Energie, also Licht, Wärmestrahlung usw. zukommt. Daraus zog er sofort die für die neue Auffassung entscheidende Folgerung, daß ein in unmittelbarer Nähe an der Sonne vorübergehender Lichtstrahl eines Sternes abgelenkt werden müsse. Zwei englische Expeditionen, die am 29. Mai dieses Jahres speziell zur Prüfung dieser Folgerung der Einsteinschen Theorie ausgerüstet worden waren, haben seine Voraussage vollauf bestätigt gefunden. Auch eine dritte Folgerung seiner allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, ein Einfluß der Schwere auf die Lage der *Spektrallinien* ist, wenn auch nicht sicher erwiesen, doch schon heute in hohem Grade wahrscheinlich gemacht.

So hat die beispiellose Gestaltungskraft eines Mannes in 15 Jahren die Physik auf eine ganz neue Grundlage gestellt, so daß wir am Beginn einer ganz neuen Epoche der Naturbeschreibung stehen, geknüpft an den Namen *Einstein*, so wie frühere an die Namen Ptolemäus, Kopernikus und Newton geknüpft werden. Er hat die Physik vor ganz neue Probleme gestellt, die Mathematik vor die Aufgabe, die neuen mathematischen Hilfsmittel auszubauen, die benötigt werden, da seine Theorie die bisher üblichen Formeln der euklidischen Geometrie verläßt; die Philosophie vor die Notwendigkeit, unsere Anschauungen über Raum — Zeit — Materie einer gründlichen Revision zu unterziehen, und die Astronomie vor die Ehrenpflicht, die Prüfung der letzten Konsequenzen der neuen Theorie an der Erfahrung durchzuführen.”

The *Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung*, Volume 28, Number 50, (14 December 1919), printed a large portrait of Einstein on the cover with the following caption,

“Eine neue Größe der Weltgeschichte: Albert Einstein,
dessen Forschungen eine völlige Umwälzung unserer
Naturbetrachtung bedeutet und den Erkenntnissen eines Kopernikus,
Kepler und Newton gleichwertig sind.”

Einstein’s acquaintance Max Born wrote in the *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt* (which Zionist Theodor Herzl called a “Jewish paper”²²⁴), first morning edition, on 23 November 1919 (*see also: Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*, first morning edition of 30 September 1919, for an article on the eclipse expeditions):

“Raum, Zeit und Schwerkraft.

Von Professor Dr. M. Born.

Am 29. Mai dieses Jahres fand eine Sonnenfinsternis statt, die einen schmalen Streifen der südlichen Erdhälfte einige Minuten verdunkelte, in Europa aber unsichtbar blieb. Mit diesem unscheinbaren Ereignis ist einer der größten Siege verknüpft, die der Menschegeist der Natur abgetrotzt hat,

kein Triumph dröhnender Technik, sondern des reinen Erkennens: die Bestätigung der Einsteinschen Theorie der Gravitation und der allgemeinen Relativität.

Zur Beobachtung der Finsternis war eine englische Expedition unter dem Astronomen E d d i n g t o n ausgesandt worden; ihre Aufgabe war nicht die Aufzeichnung und Messung jener glänzenden Erscheinungen, die jede totale Verfinsterung so eindrucksvoll machen, wie Protuberanzen, Corona, Fackeln, sondern die Messung der Stellung einiger Fixsterne, die während der Finsternis in unmittelbarer Nähe des Sonnenrandes standen und nur während der Verdeckung der alles überstrahlenden Sonne durch den Mond dem Auge und der photographischen Platte zugänglich waren.

Der Zweck dieser höchst mühseligen, schwierigen Messung war die Prüfung, ob diese Sterne die von der Einsteinschen Theorie geforderte scheinbare Verschiebung zeigten. Der beschränkte Raum gestattet nicht, die Entwicklung dieser Theorie hier darzustellen. Nur soviel sei gesagt, daß es zuerst Erfahrungen bei optischen und elektrischen Präzisionsmessungen waren, die sich mit Hilfe der überkommenen Vorstellungen von Raum, Zeit, Bewegung nicht deuten ließen, und die Einstein veranlaßten, eine Revision dieser Grundbegriffe vorzunehmen.

Der Hauptinhalt seiner Lehre ist folgender: Man denke sich einen Beobachter, der sich mit seiner Umgebung geradlinig und gleichförmig durch den Raum bewegt; dies ist tatsächlich unsere Situation auf der im Weltenraum dahineilenden Erde, wenn man von der schwachen Krümmung der Erdbahn absieht. Richtet der Beobachtet seinen Blick auf andere Körper, die an seiner Bewegung nicht teilnehmen (etwa auf entfernte Gestirne), so wird er an der allmählichen Verschiebung dieser Körper merken, daß sein Standpunkt sich gegen sie bewegt. Die Frage ist nun aber, ob er seine Ortsveränderung auch feststellen kann, wenn er nicht fremde Körper beobachtet, sondern sich auf Messungen in seinem Laboratorium mit seinen mechanischen, elektrischen, optischen Apparaten beschränkt. Die klassische Mechanik gibt darauf die Antwort, daß ihm seine Bewegung verborgen bleiben muß; denn die mechanischen Gesetze in gleichförmig und geradlinig bewegten Systemen von Körpern stimmen vollständig mit denen überein, die im Falle der Ruhe dieser Körper gelten, daher funktionieren alle mechanischen Apparate, wie Pendel, Wage usw. genau so, als wenn sie sich auf ruhender Grundlage befänden. Versagt also die mechanische Apparatur, so wird der Beobachter die elektrische, magnetische und optische zum Nachweise seiner Bewegung heranholen. Hier könnte man zunächst ein positives Ergebnis erwarten, denn als Träger der elektromagnetischen und optischen Erscheinungen gilt der Weltäther, und wenn das ganze Laboratorium des Beobachters auf der Erde mit der gewaltigen Geschwindigkeit dieses Planeten von etwa 30 Kilometern in der Sekunde durch den Aether rast, so müßte ein heftiger Aetherwind durch das Laboratorium wehen, entsprechend dem Gegenwinde, den der Automobilfahrer bei schneller Fahrt spürt. Der Aetherwind würde mancherlei

Wirkungen ausüben, z. B. Lichtwellen verwehen, ihre Richtung und Geschwindigkeit ändern; man hat nun mit den schärfsten Meßmethoden versucht, diese Wirkungen nachzuweisen, aber immer vergebens: Der Aetherwind existiert nicht, die Lichtwellen laufen auf der *b e w e g t e n* Erde gerade so, als wenn sie ruhte, und von allen elektrischen und magnetischen Vorgängen gilt dasselbe. Das heißt aber nichts anderes als daß auch mit elektromagnetischen und optischen Messungen die Feststellung einer absoluten gleichförmigen und geradlinigen Bewegung durch den Raum nicht möglich ist. Feststellbar sind nur relative Bewegungen eines Körpers gegen den anderen.

Diese Tatsache ist aber, wie das Bild des Aetherwindes zeigt, mit der gewöhnlichen Auffassung von Raum, Zeit, Bewegung vollständig unbegreiflich. *E i n s t e i n* faßte nun den kühnen Gedanken, zugleich mit der Vorstellung des absoluten *R a u m e s* auch die der absoluten *Z e i t*, als einer physikalisch meßbaren Größe, auszugeben. Auf diese Weise gelang es tatsächlich, alle elektromagnetischen und optischen Erfahrungen ebenso gut wie die mechanischen mit der Relativität in Einklang zu bringen.

Diese erste Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie vom Jahre 1906 heute die „spezielle“ genannt, war noch ziemlich harmlos zwar brachte sie außer der Auflösung der überlieferten Begriff von Raum und Zeit noch zahlreiche umstürzende Gedanken wie den, daß die Masse keine konstante Eigenschaft der Materie sondern von ihrer Geschwindigkeit und ihrem Energieinhalt abhängig sei, aber es bedurfte nur weniger Jahre, um so ziemlich alle Physiker zu Relativisten zu machen. Denn diese spezielle Relativitätstheorie hatte eine große Anzahl von Konsequenzen, die sich durch Versuche prüfen ließen, und nachdem ein Experiment nach dem anderen zu ihren Gunsten entschied mußten selbst hartnäckige Verfechter des Absoluten die Waffen strecken.

Die Beschränkung auf gradlinige und gleichförmige Relativbewegung ist für den auf Allgemeinheit der Erkenntnis gerichteten Geist zweifellos ein Stein des Anstoßes. Aber primitive Erfahrungen scheinen dafür einzustehen, daß diese Beschränkung wesentlich ist. Hierher gehören die bekannten Erscheinungen, auf Grund deren man die Rotation der Erde durch irdische, nicht astronomische Messungen nachweist; z. B. die Drehung der Schwingungsebene des Foucauldschen Pendels oder die Zentrifugalkraft, durch die eine scheinbare Aenderung der Schwerkraft mit der geographischen Breite und der Abplattung der Erde an den Polen erzeugt wird. Nach der klassischen Mechanik sind das alles Erscheinungen, die auf die Widerstände der Massen gegen Geschwindigkeitsänderungen (Beschleunigungen), der sogenannten Massenträgheit, beruhen. Durch die Rotation der Erde werden solche Trägheitswiderstände hervorgerufen; obwohl die Mechanik behauptet, die gleichförmige und geradlinige Bewegungen gegen den absoluten Raum nicht feststellbar sind, hält sie daran fest, daß ungleichförmige oder nicht gradlinige Bewegungen, z. B. Rotationen, gegen den leeren Raum bestimmte physikalische Wirkungen

hervorbringen. Auch wenn die Erde allein im Weltraume schwebte, müßten die Menschen ihre Drehung etwa mit dem Foucauldschen Pendel oder durch Beobachtung der Abplattung der Erdkugel feststellen können, also eine Drehung gegen den leeren Raum, gegen das *N i c h t s*. Vor Einstein haben nur wenige Denker an diesem Unding des im leeren Raume bewegten Körpers Anstoß genommen, so vor allem Ernst *M a c h*, der Physiker und Philosoph, der ausdrücklich eine Revision der mechanischen Grundgesetze zur Beseitigung jeder absoluten Bewegung forderte. Aber erst Einstein besaß die Kraft der Abstraktion, die zu einer solchen Leistung notwendig war. Der Schlüssel für die Lösung war die Entdeckung des Zusammenhangs zwischen dem Raum-Zeit-Problem und dem Problem der Gravitation oder allgemeinen Schwerkraft. Eine sehr sicher begründete, aber wenig beachtete Erfahrung besagt, daß alle Körper (im luftleeren Raume) gleich schnell fallen. Man denke sich einen Beobachter in einem allseits geschlossenen Kasten mit allerlei Gegenständen untergebracht, und dieser Kasten falle herab, dann wird der Beobachter, da alle Dinge im Kasten gleich schnell fallen, feststellen können, daß die Dinge ihre Schwere verlieren. Hier erkennt man die Brücke zwischen der Bewegungslehre und der Gravitation. Der Widerstand, den die Masse der Körper einer Beschleunigung entgegensetzt, und die Anziehung einer schweren Masse durch die andere werden zwei Erscheinungsformen desselben Grundgesetzes. Nun ist die Massenanziehung offenbar eine relative Wirkung zweier Körper; somit muß auch der Beschleunigungswiderstand relativiert werden, auch er ist nur vorhanden, wenn andere Körper zugegen sind, nicht aber im leeren Raume. Die zum Nachweis der Rotation der Erde gebrauchten Erscheinungen der Massenträgheit, z. B. die Abplattung der Erde, sind nach Einstein Wirkungen fremder Massen, nämlich des Systems aller Himmelskörper, vor allem des Heeres der Fixsterne, und sie würden verschwinden, wenn die Erde allein im Weltenraume schwebte. Das Argument der im leeren Raume allein rotierenden Erde ist für Einsteins Wirklichkeitssinn nichtig; für ihn ist nur reell, was feststellbar ist, also relative Oerter, relative Zeiten, relative Bewegungen. Aber der Weg, der ihn von dieser subjektiven Ueberzeugung bis zur objektiven Behauptung der *a l l g e m e i n e n* Relativität *a l l e r* Bewegungsvorgänge, *a l l e r* physischen Vorgänge führte, war ein Anstieg auf steilsten Hängen, über Hindernisse, die jeden andern abgeschreckt hätten.

Nur einer vor ihm hatte ähnliche Pfade eingeschlagen, der Mathematiker Bernhard *R i e m a n n*, doch war seine Zeit (Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts) noch nicht reif, die Summe der Erfahrungen zu beschränkt. Die Durchführung der allgemeinen Relativität erfordert nämlich nicht mehr und nicht weniger als den Verzicht auf die allgemeine Gültigkeit der *E u k l i d i s c h e n* *G e o m e t r i e*, die seit 2000 Jahren als der Grundstein allen Wissens gilt, und ihre Ersetzung durch die von Riemann zuerst entworfene *a l l g e m e i n e* *R a u m l e h r e*. In dieser gibt es weder gerade Linien noch ebene Flächen, die nach Euklid wie ein starres Gerüst den Raum durchziehen. Am besten kann man sich eine Vorstellung von dieser

Riemannschen Geometrie machen, wenn man an die Geometrie auf einer krummen, komplizierten Oberfläche, etwa einer Alpenlandschaft, denkt; auch da kann man keine geraden Linien von beträchtlicher Länge auf dem Erdboden ziehen, und ein Feldmesser, der nur mit der Meßkette, ohne optische Visierinstrumente ausgerüstet wäre, hätte eine heillose Mühe: und doch würde er die Aufgabe bewältigen. Er würde, von irgend einem Netz von Fixpunkten ausgehend die kürzesten Wege zwischen irgend zwei Punkten mit der Meßkette festzustellen suchen, dann die Krümmungseigenschaften der Berge, Täler und Sättel ausmessen und so allmählich eine Aufzeichnung des Geländes herstellen, die von dem zugrunde gelegten Netze von Fixpunkten unabhängig ist und nur die tatsächlichen Beziehungen der Oertlichkeiten enthält. In ganz ähnlicher Lage ist der Mensch im Raume, wenn man diesen nicht von vornherein als Euklidisch voraussetzt, sondern ihn ohne Voreingenommenheit mit der Meßkette ausmißt.

Das ist der Standpunkt Riemanns, den Einstein, durch Einbeziehung der Zeit auf das physikalische Geschehen übertragen hat; zur Meßkette muß dann noch eine Uhr treten. Gestützt auf ein beliebiges Gerüst physischer Fixpunkte sucht man durch Messung die den Dingen eigentümlichen Raumgesetze zu ergründen, die in unserm Bilde den Krümmungsverhältnissen der Erdoberfläche analog sind. Die Einsteinsche Theorie führt dann zu der Vorstellung, daß der Raum nur da „ungekrümmt“, „Euklidisch“ ist, wo keine merkbaren Massen sind; in der Nähe der Massen aber zeigt er Abweichungen von den Euklidischen Gesetzen „Krümmungen“, und auf diesen beruhen die Krümmungen der Bahnen bewegter Körper, die in der klassischen Mechanik als Wirkungen der Schwerkraft angesehen werden.

Man sieht, wie diese auf dem Boden der Erfahrung gewachsene Theorie hinübergreift über die Grenzen der Naturwissenschaft und die Philosophie zur Stellungnahme herausfordert.

Für die tatsächliche Gültigkeit der Einsteinschen Theorie konnten bislang nur wenige Tatsachen der Astronomie angeführt werden. Die klassische Himmelsmechanik Newtons ist nämlich vom Standpunkte der neuen Theorie nur näherungsweise richtig und muß in der Nachbarschaft großer, gravitierender Massen, wie der Sonne, in bestimmter Weise korrigiert werden; in der Tat konnte Einstein auf diesem Wege eine bisher unerklärte Abweichung des sonnennächsten Planeten Merkur von seiner Newtonschen Bahn quantitativ genau erklären. Außerdem fordert die Einsteinsche Theorie gewisse Verschiebungen der Spektrallinien des Lichtes der Sonne und der Fixsterne; auch diese Erscheinung ist heute sicher nachgewiesen. Endlich sollen Lichtstrahlen, die nahe an der Sonne vorbeistreichen, von dieser abgelenkt werden; dies zu prüfen, war die Aufgabe der englischen Finsternis-Expedition. Nach einer Mitteilung in der Zeitschrift „die Naturwissenschaften“ [*Footnote*: 7. Jahrg., Heft 42 vom 17. Oktbr. 1919. S. 775.] hat nun Einstein ein Telegramm des holländischen Physikers Lorentz bekommen, wonach die von Einstein vorhergesagte Ablenkung der Lichtstrahlen im vollen Betrage (1,7 Bogensekunden) wirklich vorhanden

ist.

Ist es nun aber nötig, das ganze Gebäude der tausendjährigen Geometrie einzureißen, um diese winzige, unauffällige Erscheinung zu erklären?

Sicherlich wird der, der nichts anderes als diese eine Uebereinstimmung kennt, ein solches Beginnen töricht nennen; gibt es doch genug physikalische Kräfte, die man ersinnen könnte, um die Lichtstrahlablenkung durch die Sonne zu erklären. Aber wer das ganze System der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie gründlich durchdacht hat, der ist hinreichend vorbereitet, um an sie zu glauben, sobald ein schlagendes Experiment den Einklang des Gedachten mit dem Wirklichen beweist. Darum kann man dem Vorsichtigen, Ungläubigen nur sagen: geh hin und studiere, die Mühe lohnt; du wirst eine geistige Befreiung erleben, vergleichbar der, die Kopernikus der Menschheit bereitet hat.

Es steht wohl außer Zweifel, daß die physikalischen Wissenschaften sich in Zukunft streng relativistisch einstellen werden. Für die Philosophie aber bedeutet die Einsteinsche Lehre den Sturz der räumlichen und zeitlichen Kategorien von der Höhe des *a priori* in die Niederungen der „platten Empirie“. Die Behauptung Kants, daß die Urteile über Raum und Zeit synthetische Urteile *a priori* seien, stützt sich auf die zu seiner Zeit geltende Ansicht, daß man an der Wahrheit der geometrischen Erkenntnisse in der überkommenen Form Euklids nicht zweifeln dürfe, daß es vielmehr die Aufgabe der Philosophie sei, die „Möglichkeit“ einer solchen Erkenntnis nachzuweisen, die Gründe für sie aufzusuchen. Da nun die Möglichkeit solcher objektiven und vollkommen genauen Urteile weder auf reiner Logik (analytisch Urteile *a priori*) noch auf Erfahrung (synthetische Urteile *a posteriori*) beruhen konnten, so entstand die Vorstellung einer besonderen Erkenntnisquelle, die „synthetische Urteile *a priori*“ ermöglichen soll. Raum und Zeit sind nach Kant „Formen der Anschauung“ und ihre Gesetze *a priori* gültig. Inzwischen hat die Entwicklung der Geometrie die Sonderstellung der Euklidischen Geometrie durch die Entdeckung von logisch widerspruchsfreien „nicht-Euklidischen“ Geometrien durchbrochen, sodann hat die Physik die allgemeinste Form dieser übergeordneten Geometrien, die Riemannsche, ihrer Darstellung der Wirklichkeit zu Grunde gelegt. Natürlich bleibt davon die logische Sicherheit des Euklidischen Systems von Sätzen unangetastet; aber daß die Axiome Euklids, aus denen diese Sätze folgen, die adäquate Darstellung der räumlichen Beziehungen der Dinge sind, das leugnet die heutige Physik. Damit ist die Grundlage der kantischen Lehre von der Unantastbarkeit der geometrischen Wahrheiten durchbrochen. Die Empirie hat sie verworfen und sich allgemeinere Grundlagen geschaffen. Ob die „Formen der Anschauung“ Kants als Ausdruck gewisser psychologischer Eigenschaften des menschlichen Geistes eine Daseinsberechtigung haben, das zu prüfen ist nicht Sache des Physikers. Allerdings steht die Exaktheit der geometrischen Sätze zu der Verschwommenheit aller psychologischen in krassem Widerspruche.

Wer diese Entwicklung miterlebt hat, der wird sich des Zweifels am

apriorischen Charakter auch anderer Kategorien des Denkens nicht erwehren können. Einstein selbst steht in seinen philosophischen Ueberzeugungen den größten unter den exakten Naturforschern nahe, einem Gauß, einem Riemann, einem Helmholtz, die sich alle trotz Kant zum Empirismus bekannten und unmittelbar an Hume anknüpften.

Die relativistischen Ideen sind zuerst in deutscher Sprache gedacht und aufgezeichnet worden; das *Experimentum Crucis* haben englische Forscher durchgeführt. Ein so kostspieliges Unternehmen wie die Finsternis-Expedition zu rein Theoretischen Zwecken beweist eine starke Teilnahme der Oeffentlichkeit an wissenschaftlichen Problemen. Großen Anteil daran hat die berühmte, im besten Sinne populäre Zeitschrift „The Nature“, die unter Mitwirkung der ersten Gelehrten erscheint und ungeheuer verbreitet ist. Auch wir besitzen ähnliche, nach denselben Grundsätzen geleitet Wochenschriften, vor allem die schon genannten „Naturwissenschaften“; doch spielen sie noch nicht die gleiche Rolle im Geistesleben der Nation wie in England. Erst wenn die Kenntnis der wissenschaftlichen Probleme das Interesse an ihnen geweckt hat, kann die Opferwilligkeit entstehen, die für ideelle Ziele Mühe und Geld nicht scheut.”

It is interesting to observe how Einstein’s followers like Max Born, Robert Daniel Carmichael²²⁵ and Moritz Schlick²²⁶ tried to justify Einstein’s many fallacies of *Petitio Principii*. These fatal fallacies were obvious to Einstein’s critics Robert Drill (whom Born had attacked),²²⁷ and more significantly Franz Kleinschrod²²⁸ and Hugo Dingler.²²⁹

Albert Einstein, Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud were each plagiarists promoted by the “Jewish Press” and each lacked the ability to form rational theories which proceeded from fundamental principles to logical conclusions. They and their defenders argued in circles—redundancies, and stagnated science with their irrational dogmas. When relativity critics pointed out the fatal flaws in the theory of relativity, they were told that the theory was irrefutable and that it was the finest example of logical perfection in the history of science. Redundancies are not theories and it is irrational to state conclusions as premises, which is what Einstein did in order to mask his plagiarism.

Nobel Prize laureate Friedrich August Hayek encountered the same type of irrational devotees defending the irrational dogmas of Marx and Freud, as those who defended the similarly irrational dogmas of Einstein. Hayek stated,

“The two chief subjects of discussion among students of the University of Vienna in the years immediately after the war were Marxism and psychoanalysis, as they were to become much later in the West. I made a conscientious effort to study both the doctrines but found them the more unsatisfactory the more I studied them. It seemed to me then and has so appeared ever since that their doctrines were thoroughly unscientific because they so defined their terms that their statements were necessarily true and unrefutable, and therefore said nothing about the world. It was in the struggle

with these views that I developed views on the philosophy of science rather similar to, but of course much less clearly formulated than, those which Karl Popper formed from much the same experiences; and it was only natural that I read his views when he published *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* in 1935, some years before I made his acquaintance. [***] Karl Popper is four or five years my junior, so we did not belong to the same academic generation. But our environment in which we formed our ideas was very much the same. It was very largely dominated by discussion, on the one hand, with Marxists and, on the other hand, with Freudians. Both these groups had one very irritating attribute: They insisted that their theories were, in principle, irrefutable. I remember particularly one occasion when I suddenly began to see how ridiculous it all was when I was arguing with Freudians, and they explained, ‘Oh, well, this is due to the death instinct.’ And I said, ‘But this can’t be due to the death instinct.’ ‘Oh, then this is due to the life instinct.’ Naturally, if you have these two alternatives available to explain something, there’s no way of checking whether the theory is true or not. And that led me, already, to the understanding of what became Popper’s main systematic point: that the test of empirical science was that it could be refuted, and that any system which claimed that it was irrefutable was by definition not scientific. I was not a trained philosopher; I didn’t elaborate this. It was sufficient for me to have recognized this, but when I found this thing explicitly argued and justified in Popper, I just accepted the Popperian philosophy for spelling out what I had always felt.”²³⁰

Max Born’s condescending tone when addressing Einstein’s critics is perhaps reflective of his insecurity surrounding his overblown claims. His strikingly incomplete and nationalistically biased history is one example of his duplicitous character. Note that Poincaré’s name is conspicuously absent from Born’s article.

Max Born was educated at the Göttingen Academy and this was typical of their attitude toward their mathematical and national rival Henri Poincaré, as Jules Leveugle has shown.²³¹ Hilbert and Minkowski, both of Göttingen, lectured Born in 1905 on the works of Hertz, Voigt, FitzGerald, Larmor, Lorentz, and Poincaré,²³² the real founders of the theory of relativity; and Born would later acknowledge their contributions—after Einstein had died. While Einstein lived, and after Whittaker had completed the second volume of his *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, which disputed Einstein’s priority for the theory of relativity based upon the facts and primary sources, Born felt obliged to write to Einstein to emphatically deny that he had helped his very good friend Sir Edmund Whittaker to write it. Born then later endorsed Whittaker’s and G. H. Keswani’s view that Lorentz and Poincaré published the special theory of relativity before Einstein, in a letter Born wrote to Prof. Keswani. Born’s early papers on what he, like many others, sometimes called the “Lorentz-Einstein principle of relativity”,²³³ did not emphasize the work of Einstein, but instead emphasized the work of Lorentz and Minkowski, to the exclusion of Poincaré.²³⁴ Minkowski, like Born, was Jewish and many thought that Lorentz was also Jewish. It should be noted that Felix Klein was an important figure

at Göttingen and that Arnold Sommerfeld kept close ties to the Göttingen community.

Note also that David Hilbert's name is not to be found in Born's article. Born, who at one time was Hilbert's lecture assistant, knew that Einstein had plagiarized the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity from Hilbert. Max Born wrote to David Hilbert on 23 November 1915,²³⁵ two days before Einstein submitted a paper which plagiarized Hilbert's equations. Max Born knew that Hilbert had the equations before Einstein, and that Einstein and Freundlich copied them from Hilbert.

Einstein's sycophantic friends, Moszkowski, Freundlich, Born, Planck, Laue,²³⁶ etc. had a vested interest in the Einstein image and they desired to make fortunes from it. Moszkowski, Laue and Born were especially greedy. This explains Nobel Prize laureate Max von Laue's disingenuous attempts (which are reprinted later in this text) to change the subject from Einstein's sophistry, self-promotion, plagiarism, and the evidence against the general theory of relativity; to racially charged personal attacks on Einstein's critics Paul Weyland, Ernst Gehrcke and Philipp Lenard, which vicious attacks shocked Nobel Prize laureate Lenard, who had been completely objective in his criticisms of relativity theory and had treated Einstein with great respect.²³⁷

Lenard was assistant to Heinrich Hertz, who was half-Jewish, and Lenard posthumously edited Hertz' works. Lenard was perhaps himself of Jewish descent,²³⁸ though he later publicly espoused Nazism after Einstein and Einstein's friends had smeared him with lies in the international press and had refused to retract their admitted lies. The financial and egotistical interests of Einstein's friends also explains Planck's corrupt methods at the Bad Nauheim debate, and the deceptive articles by the experts Freundlich and Born which gave credence to the promotional campaign for Einstein in the press, promotions tainted with the foul smell of highly unethical ethnic and political bias.

Born attempted to obstruct Moszkowski's efforts to profiteer off of the Einstein brand Moszkowski had created, by blocking publication of Moszkowski's book *Einstein, the Searcher; His Work Explained from Dialogues with Einstein*. Born feared that the publication of this shameless book would confirm Weyland, Gehrcke and Lenard's accusations that Einstein was a sophistic, plagiarizing, publicity-seeking egomaniac and that many wished to profit from his name. Born, Einstein and others believed that the unprecedented Einstein hype by Einstein's Jewish friend Moszkowski revealed that Jews and Jewish-owned media interests were manufacturing an Einstein legend for the purposes of profit and self-promotion. Hedwig and Max Born wanted to calm this rising storm and protect their financial interests.

The "Magazine Section" of *The Minneapolis Journal* reported on 24 October 1920,

"Dr. Einstein at the present is meeting a wave of opposition in Germany. Professors and scientific men recently have banded together in a campaign against him. They accuse him of fostering a great propaganda with the aid of

Jewish funds to put himself on the pedestal of fame. They go so far as to call his work plagiarism and his theories sophistry.

The *Tidende* of Bergen, Norway, prints in detail the record of a meeting in Germany in which the name Einstein was hooted by the assembly. A writer sent to interview the famous doctor disagreed with the tales of modesty attributed to him and characterized Einstein as a man having a very exalted opinion of himself.”

The Literary Digest wrote in April of 1921,

“There are two men in Germany to-day who are traditionally inaccessible to newspaper men, Mr. Tobinkin notes. One is the financier, Hugo Stinnes. The other is Einstein. We are told:

Einstein has been greatly abused by a section of the German press, and he therefore shuns publicity.”²³⁹

Einstein confirmed that Moszkowski wanted to profit from the Einstein brand Moszkowski had created, and that Einstein approved of the profiteering, while attempting to quash legitimate criticism of the theory of relativity by the world-famous physicists Philipp Lenard and Willy Wien. Einstein wrote to Max Born in 1920,

“However, I still prefer [Moszkowski] to Lenard and Wien. The latter two squabble because of a passion for squabbling, while the former does it only to earn money (which is, after all, better and more reasonable).”²⁴⁰

Einstein interceded on behalf of Erwin Freundlich and Moritz Schlick in an effort to help them profiteer from the Einstein brand on 27 January 1920.²⁴¹

Max Born was peddling a book of his own, *Einstein's Theory of Relativity*.²⁴² Born, who was eager to prevent the public disclosure of the truths carelessly revealed in Einstein's conversations, wrote many desperate letters to Einstein trying to prevent the publication of Moszkowski's book and stated, *inter alia*,

“It seems that you are less excited about it than your friends. My wife has already written to you saying what I think about this affair. (She is already regretting that she, too, has tried to turn your name into gold by sending me to America; women, poor creatures, carry the whole burden of existence, and grasp at any relief.) You will have to shake off [Moszkowski], otherwise Weyland will win all along the line, and Lenard and Gehrcke will triumph. [***] Forgive the officiousness of my letter, but it concerns everything dear to me (and Planck and Laue, etc.) You do not understand this, in these matters you are a little child. We all love you, and you must obey judicious people (not your wife). Should you prefer to have nothing further to do with the whole business, give me *written* authority. If necessary, I will go to

Berlin, or even to the North Pole.”²⁴³

Bear in mind that Einstein was, at that time, just a friend of these men and not the awe inspiring superhero of science they made him out to be through their deceptive self-aggrandizing promotion. They knew that they were lying to the public, and they constructed the modern myth from their lies and misrepresentations. Born later changed his opinion of Moszkowski’s book when he read it many decades later, seemingly having come to believe in his own mythologies. However, Max Born conceded in 1962 in the preface of the revised edition of his book *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity* (first edition 1920), that the chief cause of interest in the eclipse expeditions, which made Einstein famous in 1919, was deliberate sensationalism—and he was himself a very active participant in that campaign to promote Einstein,

“This text was originally an elaboration of a series of lectures given at Frankfurt am Main to a large audience when a wave of popular interest in the theory of relativity and in Einstein’s personality had spread around the world, following the first confirmation by a British solar-eclipse expedition of Einstein’s prediction that a beam of light should be bent by the gravitational action of the sun. Though sensationalism was probably the main cause of this interest, there was also a considerable and genuine desire to understand.”²⁴⁴

Born states that the first edition of his book of 1920 resulted from a series of lectures given to large audiences. Born’s lectures, which were promoted in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*,²⁴⁵ might have been polemic, as well as promotional. Born states in his book,

“There are opponents of the principle of relativity, simple minds who, when they have become acquainted with this difficulty in determining the length of a rod, indignantly exclaim, ‘Of course, everything can be derived if we use false clocks; here we see to what absurdities blind faith in the magic power of mathematical formulae leads us,’ and then condemn the theory of relativity at one stroke.”²⁴⁶

Born did indeed profiteer from the Einstein name,

“At that time a wave of interest in Einstein and his theory of relativity was sweeping the world. He had predicted the deflection, by the sun, of light coming from a star. Several expeditions, amongst them a British one under Eddington, had been sent out to tropical regions where a total eclipse of the sun was visible and the deflection could be observed. Now after laborious measurements and tedious calculations the conclusion was arrived at that Einstein was right, and this was published under sensational headlines in all the newspapers. It caused a tremendous stir in the civilized world, as I have already described in another chapter. There was an Einstein craze, everybody

wanted to learn what it was all about, and he became the victim of a publicity racket. I used this for my own purposes. I announced a series of three lectures in the biggest lecture-hall of the University of Einstein's theory of relativity and charged an entrance fee for my Department. It was a colossal success, the hall was crowded and a considerable sum collected. My friends in the Frankfurt business world told me that I would have done even better if I had sent out private invitations to a lecture in the most expensive hotel, in evening dress and with cocktails, and had asked for an assistance fund. But that was not in my line.

The money thus earned helped us for some months, but as inflation got worse, it evaporated quickly and new means had to be found. One day I met a friend of the Ehrenberg family who told me that he had been engaged for years to an American girl from whom he had been separated by the war, and now he was going to New York to be married. I said jokingly: 'If you find a German-American who is still interested in the old country, tell him I need dollars for important experiments in my Department.' I had quite forgotten this remark when a few weeks later a postcard arrived, signed by this man: 'I am happily married and have found your man. Write to Henry Goldman, 998 Fifth Avenue, New York.' At first I took it for another joke, but on reflection I decided that an attempt should be made. With Hedi's help a nice letter was composed and despatched, and soon a most charming reply arrived and a cheque for some hundreds of dollars which helped us out of all our difficulties."²⁴⁷

Felix Ehrenhaft also sought to profiteer from the Einstein name and wrote to Einstein on 6 December 1919 requesting that he lecture for the Chemical-Physical Society of Vienna, stating, "[. . .]I would expect extraordinary profit[. . .]"²⁴⁸

3.5.1 Advertising Einstein in the English Speaking World

Ernst Gehrcke's *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, (1924), is a valuable reference for newspaper and journal articles promoting Einstein as well as criticisms of Einstein up until 1924. I am only able to reproduce some of the articles cited in Gehrcke's important work and add a few others I have found.

The London Times wrote on 7 November 1919,

“REVOLUTION IN SCIENCE.

NEW THEORY OF THE

UNIVERSE.

NEWTONIAN IDEAS OVERTHROWN.

Yesterday afternoon in the rooms of the Royal Society, at a joint session of the Royal and Astronomical Societies, the results obtained by British observers of the total solar eclipse of May 29 were discussed.

The greatest possible interest had been aroused in scientific circles by the hope that rival theories of a fundamental physical problem would be put to the test, and there was a very large attendance of astronomers and physicists. It was generally accepted that the observations were decisive in the verifying of the prediction of the famous physicist, Einstein, stated by the President of the Royal Society as being the most remarkable scientific event since the discovery of the predicted existence of the planet Neptune. But there was difference of opinion as to whether science had to face merely a new and unexplained fact, or to reckon with a theory that would completely revolutionize the accepted fundamentals of physics.

SIR FRANK DYSON, the Astronomer Royal, described the work of the expeditions sent respectively to Sobral in North Brazil and the island of Principe, off the West Coast of Africa. At each of these places, if the weather were propitious on the day of the eclipse, it would be possible to take during totality a set of photographs of the obscured sun and of a number of bright stars which happened to be in its immediate vicinity. The desired object was to ascertain whether the light from these stars, as it passed the sun, came as directly towards us as if the sun were not there, or if there was a deflection due to its presence, and if the latter proved to be the case, what the amount of the deflection was. If deflection did occur, the stars would appear on the photographic plates at a measurable distance from their theoretical positions. He explained in detail the apparatus that had been employed, the corrections that had to be made for various disturbing factors, and the methods by which comparison between the theoretical and the observed positions had been made. He convinced the meeting that the results were definite and conclusive. Deflection did take place, and the measurements showed that the theoretical degree predicted by Einstein, as opposed to half that degree, the amount that would follow from the principles of Newton. It is interesting to recall that Sir Oliver Lodge, speaking at the Royal Institution last February, had also ventured on a prediction. He doubted if deflection would be observed, but was confident that if it did take place, it would follow the law of Newton and not that of Einstein.

DR. CROMMELIN and PROFESSOR EDDINGTON, two of the actual observers, followed the Astronomer Royal, and gave interesting accounts of their work, in every way confirming the general conclusions that had been enunciated.

‘MOMENTOUS PRONOUNCEMENT.’

So far the matter was clear, but when the discussion began, it was plain that the scientific interest centred more in the theoretical bearings of the results than in the results themselves. Even the President of the Royal Society, in stating that they had just listened to ‘one of the most momentous, if not the most momentous, pronouncements of human thought,’ had to confess that no one had yet succeeded in stating in clear language what the theory of Einstein really was. It was accepted, however, that Einstein, on the basis of his theory, had made three predictions. The first, as to the motion of the planet Mercury, had been verified. The second, as to the existence and the degree of deflection of light as it passed the sphere of influence of the sun, had now been verified. As to the third, which depended on spectroscopic observations, there was still uncertainty. But he was confident that the Einstein theory must now be reckoned with, and that our conceptions of the fabric of the universe must be fundamentally altered.

At this stage Sir Oliver Lodge, whose contribution to the discussion had been eagerly expected, left the meeting.

Subsequent speakers joined in congratulating the observers, and agreed in accepting their results. More than one, however, including Professor Newall, of Cambridge, hesitated as to the full extent of the inferences that had been drawn and suggested that the phenomena might be due to an unknown solar atmosphere further in its extent than had been supposed and with unknown properties. No speaker succeeded in giving a clear non-mathematical statement of the theoretical question.

SPACE ‘WARPED.’

Put in the most general way it may be described as follows: the Newtonian principles assume that space is invariable, that, for instance, the three angles of a triangle always equal, and must equal, two right angles. But these principles really rest on the observation that the angles of a triangle do equal two right angles, and that a circle is really circular. But there are certain physical facts that seem to throw doubt on the universality of these observations, and suggest that space may acquire a twist or warp in certain circumstances, as, for instance, under the influence of gravitation, a dislocation in itself slight and applying to the instruments of measurement as well as to the things measured. The Einstein doctrine is that the qualities of space, hitherto believed absolute, are relative to their circumstances. He drew the inference from his theory that in certain cases actual measurement of light would show the effects of the warping in a degree that could be predicted and calculated. His predictions in two of three cases have now been verified, but the question remains open as to whether the verifications prove the theory from which the predictions were deduced.”

The London Times wrote on 8 November 1919,

“THE REVOLUTION IN SCIENCE.

EINSTEIN v. NEWTON.

VIEWS OF EMINENT PHYSICISTS.

Wide interest in popular as well as in scientific circles has been created by the discussion which took place at the rooms of the Royal Society on Thursday afternoon on the results of the British expedition to Brazil to observe the eclipse of the sun on May 29. (These were referred to in an interview with Sir Frank Dyson, the Astronomer Royal, which appeared in *The Times* of September 9.) The subject was a lively topic of conversation in the House of Commons yesterday, and Sir Joseph Larmor, F. R. S., M. P. for Cambridge University, on arriving at a lecture before the Royal Astronomical Society last evening, said he had been besieged by inquiries as to whether Newton had been cast down and Cambridge ‘done in.’

Mr. C. Davidson, of Greenwich Observatory, one of the astronomers who took the photographs of the sun’s eclipse at Sobral, in Northern Brazil, last May, in conversation with a representative of *The Times* last night, said he agreed that the observations taken of Kappa¹ and Kappa², near the constellation of Hyades, at the moment of totality, were conclusive of the deflection of their rays by the gravitation of the sun. In reply to the suggestion made by Professor Newall, of Cambridge, that the deflection might be due to an unknown solar atmosphere further in its extent than had been supposed and with unknown properties, Mr. Davidson said:—‘That does not seem possible, because to produce such a deflection there would have to be an atmosphere of a kind unknown to theory and observation. Moreover, comets have been known to pass within grazing distance of the sun without any apparent retardation in their motion.’

Mr. Davidson was also prepared not to dissent from the view that the discovery of light possessing weight as well as mass might mark progress towards a conception of conditions outside three-dimensional space as we at present know it. ‘Professor Einstein’s theory’, he remarked, ‘demanded a good deal more of the dimensions existing in space than can be at present mathematically proved. It requires the curvature of space, variable time, and the displacement of the spectral lines towards the red. The latter has been very carefully tested by Dr. St. John at Mount Wilson in the United States, but so far without success. Nevertheless, there are some anomalies in the

behaviour of the spectral lines which a good many scientific people believe may have compensations to explain them.'

On the main discovery, however, Mr. Davidson fully endorsed the opinion that the Newtonian principle had been upset, and that Professor Einstein had been right in at least two of his three predictions. 'His surmise with regard to the spectrum,' Mr. Davidson said, 'remains to be demonstrated. As to the phenomena of light, the Brazil observations have established that instead of a deflection of $\cdot 87$ of a second of arc at the sun's limit which would have been expected by the application of Newton's law, it was $1\cdot 75$, which accords with Professor Einstein's theory. Our observations also proved that the outstanding discrepancy in the perihelion of Mercury can now also be accounted for.'

THE ETHER OF SPACE.

SIR OLIVER LODGE'S CAUTION. TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—To avoid misunderstanding, permit me to explain that my having to leave the meeting, reported in your issue of to-day (Friday), was due to a long-standing engagement and a 6 o'clock train.

The eclipse result is a great triumph for Einstein; the quantitative agreement is too close to allow much room for doubt, and from every point of view the whole thing is of intense interest.

I have more to say about it, and your excellent report gives a good idea of the general position; but I must deprecate the notion that last February I ventured on anything so serious as a prediction concerning the probable result.

I was rash enough to express a hope for a result equal to half Einstein's value. But the double-valued result can be assimilated and specified in various ways, one of which is the ponderability of light coupled with a definite effect of motion on the Newtonian constant of gravitation, an effect which the behaviour of Mercury and other planets has already rendered probable; while another is the vaguer suggestion that one of the two etherial constants, responsible for the velocity of light, is affected by a gravitational field, so as to cause a kind of refraction.

In any case, I would issue a caution against a strengthening of great and complicated generalizations concerning space and time on the strength of the splendid result: I trust that it may be accounted for, with reasonable simplicity, in terms of the ether of space.

Meanwhile I heartily congratulate Professor Einstein, and also the skilled and painstaking observers who have so admirably verified his striking and

original prediction.

Yours faithfully,
OLIVER LODGE.
Llwynarthan, Castleton, Cardiff, Nov. 7.

DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN.

Dr. Albert Einstein, whose astronomical discoveries were described at the meeting of the Royal Society on Thursday as the most remarkable since the discovery of Neptune, and as propounding a new philosophy of the universe, is a Swiss Jew, 45 years of age. He was for some time Professor in Mathematical Physics at the Polytechnic at Zurich, and then Professor at Prague. Afterwards he was nominated a member of the Kaiser Wilhelm Academy for Research in Berlin, with a salary of 18,000 marks (£900) per annum, and no duties, so that he should be able to devote himself entirely to research work.

During the war, as a man of liberal tendencies, he was one of the signatories of the protest against the German manifesto of the men of science who declared themselves in favour of Germany's part in the war, and at the time of the Armistice he signed an appeal in favour of the German revolution. He is an ardent Zionist and keenly interested in the proposed Hebrew University at Jerusalem, and has offered to cooperate in the work there."

Note that *The London Times*, which had been one of the Director of British War Propaganda Lord Northcliffe's wartime propaganda organs, wanted to stress that Einstein opposed "Germany's part in the war". It also emphasized the claim that Newtonian theory had been overthrown. This drew harsh criticism from the nationalistic British, who took great pride in Isaac Newton. *The New York Times* emphasized the idea that Einstein's theory was incomprehensible to all but twelve persons in the world.²⁴⁹ This myth aided Einstein, in that it allowed him to avoid criticism by claiming that anyone who criticized the theory of relativity did not understand it. The myth also enthralled a gullible public, which found the notion of incomprehensibility intriguing, and felt no need to try to judge the merits of the theory for themselves. In the introduction to the abridged version of the collection of some of Einstein's statements entitled *The World As I See It*, it says, among other things,

"Einstein, therefore, is great in the public eye partly because he has made revolutionary discoveries which cannot be translated into the common tongue. We stand in proper awe of a man whose thoughts move on heights far beyond our range, whose achievements can be measured only by the few who are able to follow his reasoning and challenge his conclusions."²⁵⁰

The New York Times wrote on 9 November 1919 on page 6,

“ECLIPSE SHOWED GRAVITY VARIATION

Diversion of Light Rays
Accepted as Affecting
Newton’s Principles.

HAILED AS EPOCHMAKING

British Scientist Calls the Discovery
One of the Greatest of
Human Achievements.

Copyright 1919, by The New York Times Company.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, Nov. 8.—What Sir Joseph Thomson, President of the Royal Society, declared was ‘one of the greatest—perhaps the greatest—of achievements in the history of human thought’ was discussed at a joint meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society in London yesterday, when the results of the British observations of the total solar eclipse of May 29 were made known.

There was a large attendance of astronomers and physicists, and it was generally accepted that the observations were decisive in verifying the prediction of Dr. Einstein, Professor of Physics in the University of Prague, that rays of light from stars, passing close to the sun on their way to the earth, would suffer twice the deflection for which the principles enunciated by Sir Isaac Newton accounted. But there was a difference of opinion as to whether science had to face merely a new and unexplained fact or to reckon with a theory that would completely revolutionize the accepted fundamentals of physics.

The discussion was opened by the Astronomer Royal, Sir Frank Dyson, who described the work of the expeditions sent respectively to Sobral, in Northern Brazil, and the Island of Principe, off the west coast of Africa. At each of these places, if the weather were propitious on the day of the eclipse,

it would be possible to take during the totality a set of photographs of the obscured sun and a number of bright stars which happened to be in its immediate vicinity.

The desired object was to ascertain whether the light from these stars as it passed by the sun came as directly toward the earth as if the sun were not there, or if there was a deflection due to its presence. And if the deflection did occur the stars would appear on the photographic plates at measurable distances from their theoretical positions. Sir Frank explained in detail the apparatus that had been employed, the corrections that had to be made for various disturbing factors, and the methods by which comparison between the theoretical and observed positions had been made. He convinced the meeting that the results were definite and conclusive, that deflection did take place, and that the measurements showed that the extent of deflection was in close accord with the theoretical degree predicted by Dr. Einstein, as opposed to half of that degree, the amount that would follow if the principles of Newton were correct.

Dr. Crommelin, one of the observers at Sobral, who spoke next, said that eight exposures of twenty-eight seconds each were made during the totality of the eclipse. Seven of these plates showed seven stars in each. One showed no stars, owing to the presence of a thin cloud, but gave well-defined images of the inner corona of the sun and of great prominence. Seven exposures of the same star field were made for comparison between July 14 and July 18 in the morning sky, the sun being then 45 degrees or more away from it. The results reduced to the sun's limb were 2.08 seconds and 1.94 seconds respectively. The combined result was 1.98 seconds, with a probable error of about 6 per cent. This was a strong confirmation of Einstein's theory, which gave a shift at the limb of 1.7 seconds. The evidence in favor of the gravitational bending of light was overwhelming, and there was a decidedly stronger case for the Einstein shift than for the Newtonian one.

Though the results were fairly conclusive, Dr. Crommelin said the question of the revision of Newton's law of gravitation was one of such fundamental importance that consideration was already being given to the next total eclipse in September, 1922, visible in the Maldives Islands and Australia.

Two of the consequences of Einstein's theory, he continued, namely, the motion of Mercury's perihelion and the bending of light by gravitation, might now be looked on as established, 'at least with great probability.' There was, however, a third predicted consequence, which was a shift of the lines in the spectrum toward the red in a strong gravitational field. The effect in the solar spectrum would amount to one-twentieth of the Angstrom unit, the same as that due to a motion of one-half kilometer per second away from the sun. Dr. St. John had looked for this effect without success. If this failure were taken as final it would mean that parts of Einstein's theory would need revision, but the parts already verified would remain.

The effects on practical astronomy, Dr. Crommelin said, of the

verification of Einstein's theory were not very great. It was chiefly in the field of philosophical thought that the change would be felt. Space would no longer be looked on as extending indefinitely in all directions. Euclidian straight lines could not exist in Einstein's space. They would all be curved, and if they traveled far enough they would regain their starting point.

Sir Joseph Thomson, summing up the discussion, said:

'These are not isolated results that have been obtained. It is not the discovery of an outlying island, but of a whole continent of new scientific ideas of the greatest importance to some of the most fundamental questions connected with physics. It is the greatest discovery in connection with gravitation since Newton enunciated that principle.'

On page 17, 10 November 1919, *The New York Times* reported:

“LIGHTS ALL ASKEW IN THE HEAVENS

Men of Science More or Less
Agog Over Results of Eclipse
Observations.

EINSTEIN THEORY TRIUMPHS

Stars Not Where They Seemed
or Were Calculated to be,
but Nobody Need Worry.

A BOOK FOR 12 WISE MEN

No More in All the World Could
Comprehend It, Said Einstein When
His Daring Publishers Accepted It.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, Nov. 9.—Efforts made to put in words intelligible to the nonscientific public the Einstein theory of light proved by the eclipse expedition so far have not been very successful. The new theory was discussed at a recent meeting of the Royal Society and Royal Astronomical Society, Sir Joseph Thomson, President of the Royal Society, declares it is not possible to put Einstein's theory into really intelligible words, yet at the same time Thomson adds:

'The results of the eclipse expedition demonstrating that the rays of light from the stars are bent or deflected from their normal course by other aerial bodies acting upon them and consequently the inference that light has weight form a most important contribution to the laws of gravity given us since Newton laid down his principles.'

Thomson states that the difference between theories of Newton and those of Einstein are infinitesimal in a popular sense, and as they are purely mathematical and can only be expressed in strictly scientific terms it is useless to endeavor to detail them for the man in the street.

'What is easily understandable,' he continued, 'is that Einstein predicted the deflection of the starlight when it passed the sun, and the recent eclipse has proved a demonstration of the correctness of the prediction.'

'His second theory as to the anomalous motion of the planet Mercury has also been verified, but his third prediction, which dealt with certain sun lines, is still indefinite.'

Asked if recent discoveries meant a reversal of the laws of gravity as defined by Newton, Sir Joseph said they held good for ordinary purposes, but in highly mathematical problems the new conceptions of Einstein, whereby space became warped or curled under certain circumstances, would have to be taken into account.

Vastly different conceptions which are involved in this discovery and the necessity for taking Einstein's theory more into account were voiced by a member of the expedition, who pointed out that it meant, among other things, that two lines normally known as parallel do meet eventually, that a circle is not really circular, that three angles of a triangle do not necessarily make the sum total of two right angles.

'Enough has been said to show the importance of Einstein's theory, even if it cannot be expressed clearly in words,' laughed this astronomer.

Dr. W. J. S. Lockyer, another astronomer, said:

'The discoveries, while very important, did not, however, affect anything on this earth. They did not personally concern ordinary human beings; only astronomers are affected. It has hitherto been understood that light traveled in a straight line. Now we find it travels in a curve. It therefore follows that any object, such as a star, is not necessarily in the direction in which it appears to be astronomically.'

'This is very important, of course. For one thing, a star may be a considerable distance further away than we have hitherto counted it. This will not affect navigation, but it means corrections will have to be made.'

One of the speakers at the Royal Society's meeting suggested that Euclid was knocked out. Schoolboys should not rejoice prematurely, for it is pointed out that Euclid laid down the axiom that parallel straight lines, if produced ever so far, would not meet. He said nothing about light lines.

Some cynics suggest that the Einstein theory is only a scientific version of the well-known phenomenon that a coin in a basin of water is not on the spot where it seems to be and ask what is new in the refraction of light.

Albert Einstein is a Swiss citizen, about 50 years of age. After occupying a position as Professor of Mathematical Physics at the Zurich Polytechnic School and afterward at Prague University, he was elected a member of Emperor William's Scientific Academy in Berlin at the outbreak of the war. Dr. Einstein protested against the German professor's manifesto approving of Germany's participation in the war, and at its conclusion he welcomed the revolution. He has been living in Berlin for about six years.

When he offered his last important work to the publishers he warned them there were not more than twelve persons in the whole world who would understand it, but the publishers took the risk."

On 11 November 1919, on page 17, *The New York Times* reported:

“ACCEPTS EINSTEIN GRAVITATION THEORY

Prof. Currier of Brown University
Calls Eclipse Demonstration
Great Achievement.

SOME SCIENTISTS CAUTIOUS

They Want Full Reports from the
Observers Before Forming Their
Final Conclusions.

Special to The New York Times.

PROVIDENCE, Nov. 10.—The two expeditions which went out from the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, England, in connection with the total solar

eclipse of May 29, accomplished one of the greatest scientific achievements of modern times, Clinton H. Currier, Professor of Astronomy at Brown University, declared tonight in commenting on the results recently announced at the joint meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society in London.

As the result of the observations made by these scientists in Sobral, Brazil, and on the island of Principe, in the Gulf of Guinea, Professor Currier said, the Einstein relativity theory had apparently been confirmed.

Professor Currier pointed out that, according to Newton's theory, gravitation would not affect the direction of a ray of light. With the development of the electro-magnetic theory of light, however, it was asserted that gravitation would bend a ray of light as if it were a material projective moving at the same rate.

'It was not until 1915,' he said, 'that the four-dimensional theory of the universe, with time as a fourth dimension, was definitely conceived. This was contained in Einstein's famous relativity theory.'

'According to Einstein, a ray of light is deflected by gravitation, the amount of deflection being twice that predicted by the electro-magnetic theory. The only way yet devised to test these theories is by means of stars near the sun at the time of a total eclipse of the sun. At such a time, a ray of light from a distant star passing close to the sun would be bent, according to these theories, causing the star to appear displaced from the position it normally occupied.'

This apparent displacement, according to recent dispatches from London, was observed by the scientists last May.

Special to The New York Times.

POUGHKEEPSIE, Nov. 10.—Miss Caroline Ellen Furness, Ph. D., Professor of Astronomy and Director of the Observatory at Vassar, says:

'Einstein's theory is one of the most difficult parts of mathematical physics. As yet I have not followed strictly its application to astronomy. Its results are remarkable and are such that they must be accepted. Since it was made from a study of photographs taken May 29, 1919, it ought to be easily verified by study of photographs of previous eclipses. At the time of every eclipse photographs are taken to see if there are any planets between Mercury and the sun. It ought to be possible to use these for this purpose.'

'This phenomenon means that light does not travel in straight lines; that a ray from a star passing near another body of matter is slightly deflected from its original course.'

'Ordinarily the positions of the stars are not affected by their nearness to the sun. They cannot be seen when near the sun except at an eclipse. The course of a star may be deflected many times, according to the new theory, and the true positions of stars will be confused for a while,' Professor Edna Carter of the Department of Physics says:

‘This is the first positive proof for Einstein’s theory of gravitation. It is of great importance. Einstein claimed that light was constant only when in uniform gravitation, and that when it came in the field of the sun it was deflected somewhat. His theory affects the theory of gravitation with relation to generalized relativity. The proof for Einstein’s new theory seems indisputable.’

Special to The New York Times.

HANOVER, N. H., Nov. 10.—John M. Poor, Professor of Astronomy at Dartmouth College, said concerning the Einstein theory:

‘If, as reported in the daily papers, Einstein’s theory has received confirmation as a result of observations of photographs made at the time of the recent eclipse, it represents another approximation to the ultimate truth which the scientist is continually seeking. The Newtonian mechanics will need modification. That will be a matter which for the present, at least, will concern the student in mathematics and pure science. But what the ultimate effect will be on practical life cannot now be foretold.’

Astronomers and physicists and other scientific men in New York are much interested in the news from London that British observations of the total solar eclipse of May 29 bore out the theories of Dr. Einstein, Professor of Physics in the University of Prague, which, in effect, would bring about a revision of Newton’s law of gravitation. They are reluctant to express an opinion on the deductions from the observations until they have full information. However, they regard the discovery as important; but one prominent physicist said that he would not regard it as being of such importance as to revolutionize the accepted fundamentals of physics.

Another said that he did not doubt the correctness of the observations, but that he would not be willing to accept the conclusions until it had been more definitely shown that the bending of light from stars passing close to the sun on its way to the earth was not due to the refraction of light gases surrounding the sun. He said that the theory was probably all right, but pointed out that it was one very hard of proof.”

Numerous other articles appeared in the period from 1919 through 1921 and those interested in these articles are encouraged to reference the *New York Times* and *London Times* indices, as well as Gehrcke’s *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*.

3.5.2 Reaction to the Unprecedented Einstein Promotion

Sir Oliver Lodge was one of Einstein’s many critics. *The New York Times* published some of Sir Oliver Lodge’s comments on 25 November 1919,

“A NEW PHYSICS, BASED ON EINSTEIN

Sir Oliver Lodge Says It Will
Prevail, and Mathematicians
Will Have a Terrible Time.

SPACE OF FOUR DIMENSIONS

In Which Gravity Ceases to be
a Force and Becomes
a Quality.

ATTEMPT TO MEASURE IT

**Its Radius Put at 16,000,000 Light-
Years, or 80 Times the Distance to
Farthest Star Cluster Known.**

Copyright. 1919, by the New York Times Company.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, Nov. 24.—To a small and distinguished gathering at Lord Glenconner's residence tonight, Sir Oliver Lodge explained the theory of Einstein, whose predictions were recently partially confirmed by the solar expedition and given to the world by the Astronomer Royal.

So complicated has this revolutionary theory proved that even some of the most learned have been confounded. Sir Oliver gave the foundation of the theory in this way:

‘So long as matter is stationary with matter, its motion with respect to the ether produces no sort of optical effect, though this effect has been sought by observers in the last half century. Hence Einstein said ‘let us assume that it is impossible to observe motion through the ether, but that the compensation will always be complete and let us work out a physics on that hypothesis. We

do not know,' he said, 'whether the earth is moving a thousand miles a second or only an inch an hour. All our attempts to measure such ideas of motion are frustrated by some compensations influences which are embedded in the ether.'

'So in 1905 Einstein virtually said: 'We must assume that we shall never be able to get anything about the motion of matter through the ether, and we can only make deductions from the relativity of other motions of matter.' '

Hence the new physics, declared Sir Oliver, required four co-ordinates, not merely length, breadth, and thickness, but time. Gravity, too, ceases to become a force but becomes a quality in a fourth dimensioned space.

'The death knell of ether has been sounded,' he said, 'and there come strangely varying properties out of emptiness. Einstein's theory is not dynamical. Euclid becomes incorrect when applied to existing realities. Either there is boundary to space or there is not, but personally I cannot conceive either, though we must assume that one of these theories is right. To my mind, the great achievement of Einstein is his discovery of gravity in its relation to other forces.'

Sir Oliver concluded with the prediction that the new physics would dominate all other physics, and that the next generation of mathematical professors would have a terrible time of it, at which there was laughter.

'For university courses and for all purposes of scholastic instruction,' he said, 'we shall have the Galilean and Newtonian dynamics, but they would reign as a 'limited monarchy,' and, sooner or later, the Einstein physics would influence the intelligent man.'

Replying to Dr. Schuster, who voiced the thanks of the company, Sir Oliver said that the younger scientists of today were pursuing Einstein's path with brilliant success.

'Some day,' he remarked, 'I think that perhaps gravitation will give up its secret, but I must leave all the 'transcendental' methods to the young men.'

More Details Made Known.

The observations confirmatory of 'the Einstein theory' were made during the total eclipse of the sun on May 29 last, by two British expeditions, one sent to Principe on the west coast of Africa, the other to Sobral, in North Brazil. The results of these observations were communicated to a joint meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society in London on Nov. 6. Perhaps the clearest and fullest account was supplied by Dr. A. C. Crommelin of the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, who was one of the observers with the Sobral expedition.

Dr. Crommelin said that the purpose of the expeditions was to test whether the light of the stars that are nearly in a line with the sun is bent by its attraction, and if so, whether the amount of bending is that indicated by

the Newtonian law of gravitation (viz., seven-eighths of a second at the sun's limb), or the amount indicated by the new Einstein theory, which postulates a bending just twice as great. The fact that the new theory explained the anomalous motion of the major axis of Mercury's orbit impressed astronomers with a sense of its truth, and they took advantage of the recent eclipse to test it further. Two cameras were employed by the party at Sobral.

The first had a lens of 4 inches aperture and 20 feet focus; this camera and its coelostat were lent by the Royal Irish Academy. It was with this instrument that the best results were obtained. Eight exposures of 28 seconds each were made during the totality of the eclipse; seven of these plates showed seven stars each; one (the sixth exposure) showed no stars, owing to the presence of thin cloud, but gave well-defined images of the inner corona of the sun and of a great prominence. Seven exposures of the same star field were made for comparison between July 14 and 18, in the morning sky, the sun being then 45 degrees or more away from it.

The results, reduced to the sun's limb, were 2.08 and 1.94 seconds respectively. The combined result was 1.98 seconds, with a probable error of about 6 per cent. This was a strong confirmation of Einstein's theory, which gave a shift at the limb of 1.75 *seconds*. The results from the individual stars were consistent, and incidentally they confirmed the theoretical law that the shift ought to vary inversely as the distance from the sun's centre. If the shift were due to refraction produced by a gaseous envelope round the sun, it would vary according to a less simple law. The second camera used at Sobral was the object-glass of the Greenwich astrographic equatorial, of aperture 13 inches (which was reduced to 8 inches, as it was found to improve the definition), and focal length $11\frac{1}{4}$ feet, mounted in a steel tube, and supplied with light from a 13-inch coelostat. The focus was obtained by photographs of Arcturus. Unfortunately the images secured were not good, evidently owing to the coelostat mirror not being flat, for the quality of the object-glass was known to be very good.

Observations at Principe were much interfered with by clouds; however, five stars were recorded on some plates. No comparison plates of the field could be taken here; the observers did not arrive early enough to obtain them before the eclipse, and it was impossible to wait long enough to obtain them after it. The plan adopted was to photograph a check field near Arcturus. Both this field and the eclipse field had been photographed with the same object-glass at Oxford (without using the coelostat) and the Oxford plates enabled the eclipse field to be connected with the check one.

The shift at the sun's limb came out 1.60 seconds, with a probable error of about 0.30 second. It could be seen that the mean of this result and that of the four inch at Sobral exactly agreed with the value predicted by Einstein. The evidence in favor of gravitational bending of light was overwhelming, and there was a decidedly stronger case for the Einstein shift than for the Newtonian one. Though the results were fairly conclusive, the question of the revision Newton's law of gravitation was one of such fundamental

importance that consideration was already being given to the next total eclipse, in September, 1922, visible in the Maldive Islands and Australia.

Two of the consequences of Einstein's theory, viz. the motion of Mercury's perihelion and the bending of light by gravitation, might now be looked on as established (at least with great probability). There was, however, a third predicted consequence, which was the shift of the lines in the spectrum toward the red in a strong gravitational field. The effect in the solar spectrum would amount of 1-20 of an Angstrom unit, the same as that due to a motion of $\frac{1}{2}$ kilometre per second away from us. Dr. St. John had looked for this effect without success. If this failure were taken as final it would mean that parts of Einstein's theory would need revision, but the parts already verified would remain.

The effects on practical astronomy of the verification of Einstein's theory were not very great. It was chiefly in the field of philosophical thought that the change would be felt. Space would no longer be looked on as extending indefinitely in all directions; if they went far enough they would re-enter the same ground. Euclidian straight lines could not exist in Einstein's space. They were all curved, and if they traveled far enough they would regain the starting point. Mr. de Sitter had attempted to find the radius of space. He gave reasons for putting it at about 1,000,000,000 times the distance from the earth to the sun, or about 16,000,000 light-years. This was eighty times the distance assigned by Dr. Shapley to the most distant stellar cluster known. The fourth dimension had been the subject of vague speculation for a long time, but they seemed at last to have been brought face to face with it."

The New York Times published numerous articles which mentioned Sir Oliver Lodge. Lodge was a vocal critic of Einstein's work.²⁵¹ *The New York Times* published the following on 26 November 1919, on page 12,

"Bad Times for the Learned.

It must indeed have been 'a small and distinguished gathering' that Sir OLIVER LODGE addressed in London, this week, if they were helped toward an understanding of the Einstein theory when he presented, as its foundation, the statement that 'so long as matter is stationary with matter, its motion with respect to the ether produces no sort of optical effect.'

So darkling and so seemingly irrelevant to anything in particular is that statement that one refrains with difficulty from suspecting a cable operator of having edited the dispatch. By no means all of it, however, was incomprehensible, even to the wayfaring man, and some of it even he could enjoy. Nothing could have been simpler, or pleasanter, for instance, that Sir OLIVER'S admission of his personal inability to conceive of space either as having a boundary or as not having one, though obviously it either is or is not unlimited. Some of us cannot see how anybody can conceive space otherwise than as going on and on, forever and forever. At least to do so is vastly easier than to elude the natural question, What except more space can there be

beyond the place where space ends, if it does end? If Sir OLIVER can, he is lucky, or queer, or something.

Thoroughly human was his prophecy that as a result of the Einstein discoveries ‘terrible times’ are coming for the mathematicians—at any rate the tone of satisfaction in which he said it was thoroughly human. Mathematicians have caused so many other people to have terrible times so often and so long that it’s only fair for them to have their own troubles at last. Not one woman in a hundred will give them any sympathy, whatever their suffering may be, and innumerable boys and girls will simply gloat if the mathematicians are forced to admit the wrongness of their haughty pronouncements. Their infallibility had been admitted long enough, and those of us who always thought there were errors in the multiplication table, especially where it deals with sevens, eights, and nines, at last are to be brilliantly vindicated.”

On 15 December 1919, *The New York Times* wrote on page 14:

“Obviously a Rash Prophecy.

As it was before the Royal Society that Sir OLIVER LODGE last week discussed atomic energies and the possibilities they offer, it is to be presumed that he spoke with some care. Yet, when he prophesied that within a century the power now derived from burning 1,000 tons of coal would be obtained by setting free the force latent in two ounces of some unnamed substance, one cannot help remembering that Sir OLIVER has two personalities—that he is an eminent scientist and a credulous listener to ‘mediums.’

That the atoms, instead of being mere ultimate divisions of dead matter, are alive with force nobody now doubts, but it seems hardly scientific to emphasize as Sir OLIVER did the astonishing velocity at which move the missiles which some atoms shoot out without at the same time calling attention to the size of the missiles. He knows, of course, the formulae relating to speed, mass, and momentum, and that to get any appreciable amount of ‘work’ done by the radium particles he described it would seem that they would have to move far more rapidly than they do. And a way to harness them is hardly imaginable, as yet.

Curved Space Before Einstein.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

In so far as concerns Einstein’s ‘new theory’ that space is curved, which carries with it implications necessarily overturning current scientific dicta that parallel lines can never meet, that astronomical parallaxes cannot be relied upon for giving approximate distances of faraway stars, it may be interesting to note that Einstein is a late investigator in this field of speculative research.

For instance, Professor A. E. Dolbear in his 'Matter, Ether and Motion' (edition of 1892, page 57) says:

'We are assured that, for all we know, and therefore for all we can reason from, space itself may be curved so that if one were to start in what we call a straight line, in any direction, and travel in it on and on he would find himself after a long time coming to his starting point from the opposite direction; that what one would see if his sight were prolonged in any direction would be the back of his own head much magnified. * * * If the space we live in and the geometric relations are only practically true upon a small scale; if we may have a kind of space of four or more dimensions, whether we can now conceive of it or not, then should one understand that spaces and distances and velocities, and all computations formed upon them, though practically true, for all our experience, must not be pushed up into statements that shall embrace all things in the heavens as well as on the earth.'

It will appear from the above that one of our own foremost American physicists, one who is credited as having antedated Marconi in all the theoretical possibilities of wireless telegraphy, had covered, nearly three decades ago, all the essentials of what is now being attributed as a 'new theory' of the universe to Dr. Einstein.

GEO: H. HADLEY.
Fairfield, Conn. Dec. 12, 1919."

Sir Oliver Lodge believed in the utility of atomic energy. Contrary to popular modern myth, Albert Einstein opposed the idea of atomic energy. It turns out that Lodge was right and Einstein was wrong; but, amazingly, it is Einstein, and not his predecessors, who is today considered the father of atomic energy, which is an idea Einstein had found silly. The modern association of Einstein and the formula $E = mc^2$ with atomic energy and the atomic bomb probably originally stems not from Einstein, but from Pflüger and Moszkowski, as will be shown further on in this text.

Charles Lane Poor was another outspoken critic of Einstein and of the disingenuous promotion of the man. *The New York Times* wrote on 16 November 1919:

"JAZZ IN SCIENTIFIC WORLD

Prof. Charles Lane Poor of Columbia
Explains Prof. Einstein's Astronomical

Theories.

WHEN is space curved?
When do parallel lines meet?
When are the three angles of a triangle not equal to two right angles?
Why, when Bolshevism enters the world of science, of course!

It is thus that Charles Lane Poor, Professor of Celestial Mechanics at Columbia University, explains the extraordinary cable announcements from London about Professor Albert Einstein's theories, which some suppose to have been verified by observations of the recent total eclipse of the sun. These observations were assumed to show that the rays of stars were deflected as they passed the sun, which led to the Q. E. D. that they were subject to the attraction of the sun, that is to gravitation: and from this premise it was easy to jump to the conclusion that Sir Isaac Newton's theory had been knocked to smithereens.

Well, Sir Isaac, after he saw the apple fall in his gardens at Woolsthorpe, and evolved therefrom his theory of gravitation, couldn't prove it for a long time. He made his calculations from a wrong estimate of the radius of the earth; and it was not until years later, when another scientist had corrected the figure for the radius, that he was able to give the gravitational principle to a shocked and incredulous world. Once the incredulity had evaporated in the light of proof, and the theory had become an established fact, it still was not immune from mistaken attack, as Professor Poor points out.

'For some years past,' Professor Poor said the other day, after reading the cable dispatches about the Einstein theory, 'the entire world has been in a state of unrest, mental as well as physical. It may well be that the physical aspects of the unrest, the war, the strikes, the Bolshevik uprisings, are in reality the visible objects of some underlying, deep mental disturbance, worldwide in character. This mental unrest is evidenced by the widespread intent in social problems, by the desire, on the part of many, to throw aside the well-tested authors of Governments in favor of radical and untried experiments.

'This same spirit of unrest has invaded science, and today there is just as great a conflict in the realm of scientific thoughts as there is in the realm of political and social life. There are many who would have us throw aside the well-tested theories upon which have been built the entire structure of modern scientific and mechanical development in favor of psychological speculations and fantastic dreams about the universe.

'Whenever a new observation is made which apparently does not directly fit into the old-time theories these modern disciples of scientific unrest rush into some weird explanation involving psychological speculations as to the constitution of matter or our fundamental concepts of mathematics.

'The eclipse observations reported to have been made on May 29 last are a case in point. If these observations are as reported (and such seems

unquestionably to be the case), then these explanations, under present accepted theories, may be difficult, but such observations certainly do not warrant the acceptance of the speculations of Einstein.

‘It may be that history is merely repeating itself. When Newton’s theory of universal gravitation was given to the world in 1685 it was received with incredulity, especially among scientists on the Continent of Europe. Observations were adduced which these scientists asserted proved the fallacy of the Newtonian ideas. One by one these observations were shown to be in harmony with the law, to be direct consequences of it.

‘Nearly one hundred years later (1770) Euler, one of the greatest mathematicians of the age, who had devoted a lifetime to developing and perfecting the Newtonian theory, in discussing the observed motion of the moon, wrote:

‘‘There is not one of its equations about which any uncertainty prevails, and it now appears to be established by indisputable evidence that the secular inequality in the moon’s motion *cannot* be produced by the forces of gravitation.’

‘The essay in which this statement was made appeared during a time of profound mental and political unrest, such as now pervades the world. It won the prize of the Paris Academy of Sciences. To explain this peculiar motion of the moon, the greatest scientists of that age adopted theories involving a resisting medium in space, or introduced a time element into gravitation. Yet only a few years later Laplace found a full and complete explanation in certain intricate relationships between the motion of the moon and the varying shape of the earth’s orbit, which had been overlooked by Euler and his followers, and found that this motion was a direct result of the forces of gravitation.

‘Now, the so-called Einstein theories, or rather speculations, are such as completely overthrow not only the law of gravitation, but the fundamental conceptions on which all geometry and physics rest. And to sustain such a complete overturning of the entire basis on which scientific thought has been built, two—just two—observed facts are quoted; the motion of the perihelion of Mercury and certain displacements of stars when photographed near the sun.

‘There is no need to go outside the law of gravitation to explain the motion of Mercury’s perihelion. The explanation may well be in some term of the most complicated formulas which the mathematicians have overlooked or in some distribution of matter near the sun which the astronomer has hitherto failed to properly note. As a matter of fact, in order to make their equations usable, the mathematical observer assumes that the sun is a perfect sphere and that the space between the sun and the planets is empty. Yet both these assumptions are known to be false; the well-known sun spots and the many photographs of its corona prove the sun to be not perfectly spherical and to be surrounded by an irregular and changeable mass of matter. The real trouble is that the mathematicians have not yet been able to introduce the

effects of these into their equations and to deduce their possible effects upon the motion of Mercury.

‘The displacement of the stars noted in the recent eclipse photographs may be a phenomenon analogous to the refraction of light. All rays of light, when they pass from one medium to another, from air to glass, for example, are bent or refracted. Upon this principle are based the ordinary eyeglass, or the telescope. When the rays from the stars enter the earth’s atmosphere they are bent and travel in curved paths. Now, the sun is surrounded by an envelope of gases of irregular shape and of varying densities, an envelope which certainly extends to the orbit of the earth, and probably, millions of miles beyond. Would it not be in accord with all known laws of optics if the rays of light from distant stars were bent and refracted when passing through such an envelope?’

‘The fact that such a bending effect has now been measured is of great scientific importance, and the results may change some of the hitherto accepted ideas as to the density and distribution of matter near the sun, but I fail to see how such an observation can prove the existence of a fourth dimension, or can overthrow the fundamental concepts of geometry.

‘I have read various articles on the fourth dimension, the relativity theory of Einstein and other psychological speculation on the constitution of the universe; and after reading them I feel as Senator Brandegee felt after a celebrated dinner in Washington. ‘I feel,’ he said, ‘as if I had been wandering with Alice in Wonderland and had tea with the Mad Hatter.’”

3.5.3 The Berlin Philharmonic—The Response in Germany

It was often difficult for scientists in Germany to publish their works in opposition to relativity theory or their condemnation of Einstein’s plagiarism. Paul Weyland and Hermann Fricke organized a group of scientists to stand up against the suppression of dissent. They called themselves the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft*. Their plan was to publish the facts surrounding the promotion of Einstein and the theory of relativity and to hold public meetings exposing Einstein as a fraud and the theory of relativity as a “mass suggestion” imposed on the world public by the press. Einstein knew well the power “of coercive manipulation of public opinion”²⁵². Einstein wrote to Lorentz on 21 September 1919 in the context of his, Einstein the Zionist’s, hatred of the German People’s loyalty to their nation,

“Those on the outside have no conception of how difficult it is to escape mass suggestion.”²⁵³

The first meeting of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft* was held in the Berlin Philharmonic on 24 August 1920. Einstein attended the meeting with his stepdaughter Ilse,²⁵⁴ who was a reluctant member of Albert Einstein’s “small harem”.²⁵⁵ Young Ilse Einstein wrote to Georg

Nicolai about Albert Einstein's sexual advances toward her,

"I have never wished nor felt the least desire to be close to [Albert Einstein] physically. This is otherwise in his case—recently at least.—He himself even admitted to me once how difficult it is for him to keep himself in check."²⁵⁶

At the meeting, Paul Weyland and Ernst Gehrcke publicly exposed Einstein as a sophist and a plagiarist and discredited the evidence taken to support the theory of relativity. After the meeting, Einstein was convinced that all of German science knew he was a fraud. Panicked, Einstein wanted to run away from Germany without another word. A few days later, Einstein learned that his friends and friendly newspapers had instigated a smear campaign against Einstein's critics. Learning that there were others dishonest enough to defend him, and knowing that he would not have to defend himself, but instead would be defended by more competent persons than himself, Einstein decided to join in the fray with an article he published in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. He threw an undignified fit, which juvenile rant found a ready outlet in a pro-Einstein "Jewish newspaper".

Hendrik Antoon Lorentz and Paul Ehrenfest had been trying to persuade Albert Einstein to move to Leyden. Einstein refused because he knew that Lorentz would quickly discover that Einstein had no talent for original thought. Ehrenfest realized this and wrote to Einstein on 2 September 1919 to reassure him that they were not interested in Einstein's work, but merely wanted to use his name,

"No one here expects any accomplishments, all simply want you nearby."²⁵⁷

Soon after the press began to promote Einstein as if he were a new Newton, Albert Einstein wrote to Lorentz (whose work Einstein had plagiarized in 1905) about Lorentz' offer to join him in Leyden, or at least to spend a couple of weeks a year in Leyden. The press claimed that Einstein was the greatest and most original thinker the world had ever seen. Einstein wrote to Lorentz on 19 January 1920,

"Nevertheless, unlike you, nature has not bestowed me with the ability to deliver lectures and dispense original ideas virtually effortlessly as meets your refined and versatile mind. [***] This awareness of my limitations pervades me all the more keenly in recent times since I see that my faculties are being quite particularly overrated after a few consequences of the general theory stood the test."²⁵⁸

Pacifist Lorentz was very interested in the success of the eclipse observations as an opportunity for *rapprochement*, as were Einstein's supporters Arthur S. Eddington,²⁵⁹ and Robert W. Lawson and Hans Thirring, who were apparently friends.²⁶⁰ Thirring, like Einstein, never doubted the results of the eclipse expeditions. Bertrand Russell, Georg Friedrich Nicolai and Romain Rolland were also Socialist Pacifists, who supported Einstein. Russell profited from a popular book he published on the theory of relativity, which helped to promote the theory,

Einstein, and Russell.²⁶¹ As so often asserted by the researchers themselves, the eclipse observations were a publicity stunt to advertise a *rapprochement* between British and German science.

When this stunt was exposed, Einstein, in cooperation with a few pro-Einstein newspapers, tried to change the subject to anti-Semitism from Einstein's plagiarism, Einstein's misrepresentations of the scientific evidence, and the exposure of the contradictions in Einstein's theories. Certain papers made it quite clear to all, that anyone who criticized Einstein would be viciously smeared as if anti-Semitic, no matter what the nature of their complaint might be, and whether or not they had made any anti-Semitic statements—even Nobel Prize winning physicists were smeared around the world. There was no to be no fair hearing for Einstein's many critics. Their views would not be made known to the public through the major press outlets of the world. This, of course, had a chilling effect on the debate, and when the press had effectively silenced all but a few of Einstein's many critics, the press disseminated the lie that no scientists of renown had ever disagreed with Einstein.

Einstein was right to run from his critics. He had been exposed as a plagiarist and a fraud. However, the proven threat of public smears undoubtedly quieted many who opposed Einstein and the theory of relativity, which group constituted the majority of scientists at the time. The pro-Einstein papers were especially vicious to Paul Weyland, probably because he had dared to accuse them of what they were doing—of shamelessly hyping Einstein, of misrepresenting the facts, and of making false accusations of anti-Semitism in a cowardly attempt to change the subject.

After an exchange of newspaper articles between Max von Laue and his opponents, and after the pro-Einstein press misrepresented the events at and surrounding the meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic, Paul Weyland printed his Philharmonic speech and reprinted several newspaper articles in the second volume of works published by the press of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaften*. The anti-Einstein press (Einstein used the term “pan-German press”²⁶²) and Weyland were generally fair to the extent that they allowed both sides of the argument to be heard. Such was not, and is not, the case with the pro-Einstein press.

Paul Weyland's brochure:

Schriften aus dem Verlage der Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher
Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft e. V.
Heft 2.

Betrachtungen
über
Einsteins Relativitätstheorie
und die Art ihrer Einführung

von

Paul Weyland

Vortrag gehalten am 24. August 1920 im großen Saal der Philharmonie
zu Berlin

Berlin 1920

Verlegt bei der
Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner
Wissenschaft e. V. Berlin N 113.

Als sich die Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft gründete, um als eins ihrer Hauptziele die Auswüchse der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie einerseits und die Art ihrer Propaganda andererseits zu bekämpfen, waren sich die Gründer von vornherein darin klar, daß es hier nicht glatt gehen würde. Der Umstand, daß

Herr Einstein zufälligerweise jüdischen Glaubens sei und seine Gegner, die sich z. T. in der genannten Arbeitsgemeinschaft zusammenfanden, auch Christen aufweisen, ließ die Vermutung begründet erscheinen, daß, wenn sachliche, von den Rednern der Arbeitsgemeinschaft angeführte Gegengründe nicht sachlich erwidert werden können, diese zu schimpfen anfangen und dann mit dem Rettungsanker, dem Vorwurf des Antisemitismus kommen.

Diese Vermutung, die allerdings erst für die eigentlichen, späteren Vorträge erwartet wurden, hat sich überraschender Weise schon beim ersten Abend bestätigt — ein Umstand, der deutlich beweist, wie schwach man sich auf der Gegenseite fühlt.

Es ist nicht meine Absicht gewesen, meine, ausdrücklich als die Vorträge einleitenden Bemerkungen und Begrüßungsworte an das Auditorium, im Druck erscheinen zu lassen. Ich glaubte meiner polemischen Taktik dadurch Genüge getan zu haben, daß ich einige Artikel in die Tagespresse lenkte. Im übrigen war es — und ist es noch heute — mein Standpunkt, daß nur die Widerlegung des Themas selbst nötig und erwünscht sei. Ich bin eines besseren belhrt worden. Ein Teil jener Presse, die ich als „gewisse“ Presse bezeichne, beginnt, sich deutlich abzuheben und durch entstellte Berichte den Wert einer Aktion in den Augen der Öffentlichkeit herabzusetzen, für die sie bestimmt sind. Ich durchbreche deshalb in diesem Falle mein Prinzip nur unbedingt wissenschaftlich zu sein, indem ich mich mit der Technik der Einsteinschen Regie befasse. Immerhin trösten mich die in dieser Schrift angeführten Tatsachen: Der genaue Nachweis der Methode, wie die Einsteinleute arbeiten, ist vielleicht kein wissenschaftlicher Gewinn, aber doch wohl [*4*] Mittel zum Zweck, uns solchem Gewinn näherzubringen. Denn bisher ist es m. E. noch nicht belegt worden, wie systematisch und skrupellos man dort zu Werke geht.

Der Leser möge nun ja nicht glauben, daß ich die „kritischen“ Glanzleistungen des „Berliner Tageblatt“, der „Vossischen Zeitung“, des „Vorwärts“ oder des „8-Uhr-Abendblattes“ für ernst nehme, daß ich ihnen die Ehre eines Abdruckes zolle. Mein Zweck ist ein anderer. Da, wie gesagt, vermutet wurde, daß die Gegenpartei alles aufbieten wird, um der Aktion zu schaden, so haben wir zunächst auf sachliche Einwände gewartet. Diese sind ausgeblieben. Man schimpft. Man kommt mit dem schwarzen Mann, dem Antisemitismus. Was hat der schon bei schiefen Situationen helfen können! Ich will dem interessierten Publikum nun Gelegenheit geben, selbst zu urteilen, wer „Zur Sache“ zu rufen ist. Jene Skandalmacher, die um jeden Preis stören wollten, oder ich in meinem Vortrag, der alles, was er behauptete, ausgiebig bewies. Daß ich speziell nicht sprach, habe ich gleich in den ersten einleitenden Worten betont und auf die spezielle Behandlung an einem späteren Termin hingewiesen.

Ich übergebe deshalb meinen Vortrag der Öffentlichkeit in der Hoffnung, daß er dem edlen Zweck, dem die Vortragsreihe dienen soll, ein weiterer Baustein sei. Mit dem Erkennen der Einsteinschen Methode ist schon ein

gewichtiger Schritt zum Erkennen der wahren Sachlage gedient. Daß aber die Gegenpartei derartig schnell die Flinte ins Korn wirft und in unsachgemäßes Schimpfen verfällt, hat sich selbst der kühnste Optimist auf unserer Seite nicht träumen lassen. Mein Vortrag ist genau wörtlich nach dem Konzept abgedruckt. Wo es mir wichtig erschien, habe ich Ergänzungen gemacht, diese aber als Fußnoten angebracht.

Vorher jedoch die Abdrucke der klassischen Beispiele objektiver Berichterstattung: Zunächst das Tageblatt vom 25. August 1920, Morgenausgabe. (Nr. 398, Ausgabe A Nr. 210):

Die Relativitäts-Theorie.

Von Dr. V. Engelhardt (Berlin-Friedenau)

Gestern begann die „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“, über deren Zusammensetzung uns Näheres nicht bekannt ist, in der Philharmonie eine Reihe von Vorträgen, die sich gegen Einsteins „Relativitäts-Theorie“ richten sollen. Obwohl diese Art öffentlicher Polemik gegen einen [*5*] Forscher von der Bedeutung Einsteins uns wenig angemessen erscheint, werden wir über den Eindruck des ersten Abends sachlich berichten. Damit aber die Leser zunächst auch wissen, worum es sich eigentlich handelt, sei in den folgenden Zeilen der Versuch gemacht, über den Sinn der Relativitäts-Theorie einiges in populärer Form zu sagen. Daß ein Problem von dieser Tiefe in dem begrenzten Raum einer Tageszeitung auch nicht annähernd erschöpft werden kann, wird jedem Nachdenklichen klar sein.

Die Redaktion.

Es folgt nun ein Einstein-Artikel.

Erst bekommt also das Publikum schnell eine Einstein-Spritze. Die „sachliche“ Entgegnung sieht folgendermaßen aus: (Berliner Tageblatt, Nr. 399. Ausgabe B Nr. 189, Mittwoch, 25. August 1920, abends).

Die Offensive gegen Einstein.

E. V. Nachdem die Gegner Einsteins und seiner Relativitätstheorie sich in einer „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ organisiert hatten, erfolgte gestern abend in der Philharmonie der erste Vorstoß. Die beruhigende Erklärung des einen Forschers und Gelehrten, daß entsprechende Maßnahmen getroffen seien, um Skandalmacher an die Luft zu setzen, mußte den rein wissenschaftlich interessierten Besucher, der gekommen war, einer gelehrten Auseinandersetzung, einer streng sachlichen Beweisführung zu lauschen, etwas eigenartig berühren. Immerhin scheint die Erkenntnis, daß Stuhlbeine als Gegenargumente nur bedingten Wert haben, auch in dieser Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher vorhanden zu sein. Obwohl Professor Einstein, in einer Loge sitzend, eine bequeme Zielscheibe bot, wurde er doch nur mit solchen kleinen Invektiven wie „Reklamesucht“, „wissenschaftlicher Dadaismus“, „Plagiat“ usw. bombardiert.

Auf die bibelfesten Naturforscher, die einst so wild gegen Darwin vom Leder zogen, sind die gesinnungstüchtigen Naturforscher gefolgt, die jetzt dem wahrscheinlich höchst prinzipienlosen Relativitätsprinzip zuliebe wollen. Gesinnung ist etwas sehr Schönes, aber es wirkt immer ein wenig komisch, sie in der Mathematik verwendet zu sehen; sie hat die Eigentümlichkeit, den aufgestellten

Lehrsatz nur mangelhaft zu beweisen. Das ehrlichste im wissenschaftlichen Kampf bleibt doch immer das *argumentum in rem*. Die *argumenta in personam* sind außerdem ein zweischneidiges Schwert, und als einzige Gesinnung des Angreifers entpuppte sich schon öfter der Neid. Und wenn Namen von so glänzender Unbekanntheit sich erheben, so haben sie doch unbedingt nötig, sich mit Beweisen zu legitimieren.

Daß Herr Paul Weyland mit seiner Volksversamlungsrede die sogenannte „Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie“ zu Fall gebracht hätte, kann auch der stärkste Mann der Wissenschaft, ja selbst Herr Weyland nicht behaupten. Er wandte sich auch lediglich gegen die Person Einsteins und „seine Reklamepresse“, [*6*] und verfehlte dabei nicht, für die eigene Presse gebührend Reklame zu machen. Sein Ton war nicht überzeugend, bisweilen aber peinlich. Wenn man dem Gegner unlautere Propaganda seiner Idee vorwirft, sollte man diese Idee nicht mit unlauterer Propaganda bekämpfen. Und wenn man dem anderen die Suggestion der Massen nicht verzeihen kann, so sollte man selber nicht auf die Gasse laufen.

Vornehmer und wissenschaftlicher war der Vortrag von Professor Gehrcke, und sein Spott auf die „junggeschüttelten Organismen“ und andere „Experimente“ der Relativität der Bewegung und der Relativierung von Zeit und Raum wäre vielleicht sehr treffend gewesen, wenn er in den Bildern nicht so stark aufgetragen hätte. Was er über die Beweise der Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien und über die Perihelbewegung des Merkur vorbrachte, wird hoffentlich Professor Einstein zu wissenschaftlichen Entgegnungen reizen.

Von gleichem sachlichen Geist zeugt der Bericht der „Vossischen Zeitung“, die schon leise zum Rettungsanker des Antisemitismus schielt:

Der Kampf gegen Einstein.

Der Feldzug gegen die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie oder wohl mehr gegen Einstein selbst wurde gestern Abend in der Philharmonie ziemlich temperamentvoll eröffnet. Eine zahlreiche Zuhörerschaft hatte sich eingefunden, darunter namhafte Mitglieder der Gelehrtenwelt, auch Prof. Einstein sah man in einer Loge, an seiner Seite die Tochter und nicht weit von ihm Prof. Nernst. Der angegriffene Forscher folgte mit gelassener Ruhe, mitunter sogar leise lächelnd, den Ausführungen der Redner oben auf der Bühne.

Mit schwerem Geschütz rückte Herr Paul Weyland, der die Kampagne eröffnete, an. Er wandte sich gegen die „sogenannte Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie“, die „Einsteinschen Fiktionen“, ohne auch nur mit einem Worte zu erklären, worin diese eigentlich beständen. Daneben machte er wacker Reklame für Schriften, die im Vorraum käuflich seien; um deren Absatz zu befördern, wurde sogar bald eine einviertelstündige Pause eingelegt. Daneben wurden Physiker, die für Einstein eintraten, gehörig verdächtigt, dieser selber beschuldigt, daß er und seine Freunde die Tagespresse und sogar die Fachpresse zu Reklamezwecken für die Relativitätstheorie eingespannt hätten. Da man immer noch nicht erfuhr, worum es sich eigentlich handelte, erscholl wiederholt der Ruf: „zur Sache!“ Herr Paul Weyland erwiderte auf diese freundliche Aufforderung: „Es sind entsprechende Maßnahmen getroffen, um Skandalmacher an die Luft zu setzen.“ Nach etlichen Ausfällen gegen die ProfessorenklIQUE, wobei der Redner bei Schopenhauer fleißige Anleihe machte, wurde über die geistige Verflachung unseres Volkes geklagt, selbst

der Dadaismus wurde herangezogen und Herrn Einstein und seinen Anhängern wissenschaftlicher Dadaismus vorgeworfen. [*7*] Daneben klang ganz schwach eine antisemitische Note an und zum Schlusse Herrn Einstein ohne weiteres vorgeworfen, daß seine Formeln über die Perihelbewegung des Merkur einfach von Gerber abgeschrieben worden sei.

Eine ganz andere Tonart schlug der nächste Redner, Prof. Gehrecke, ein. Er bemühte sich, völlig sachlich seinen gegnerischen Standpunkt gegen die Relativitätstheorie klarzulegen. Diese sei eine geistige Strömung; ob gesund oder verhängnisvoll ist eine andere Frage. Er geht kurz auf die Relativität der Bewegung ein, bemüht sich sodann, zu zeigen, wie Einstein seine Relativitätstheorie mehrfach geändert habe; was er als Schwankungen bei Einstein bezeichnete, würden vielleicht andere als eine Entwicklung auffassen. Dann geht Gehrecke auf die Relativierung von Zeit und Raum ein. Nicht ohne Humor sucht er die Einsteinschen „Organismen“, die sich der relativierten Zeit anpassen müssen, zu verspotten. Die Relativierung der Zeit führe, so meinte der Kritiker, zur Relativierung des Seins und damit zum physikalischen Solipsismus. Wie stehe es nun mit den Folgerungen, die Einstein aus seiner Theorie gezogen hatte? Es seien freilich nur winzige Effekte zu erwarten, aber die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien hat sich nicht feststellen lassen. Die Perihelbewegung des Merkur sei auch auf andere Weise zu erklären, ebensowenig seien die Ergebnisse der letzten Sonnenfinsternis-Beobachtung ein zwingender Beweis für den Einstein-Effekt. Zum Schluß meint Gehrecke, daß auch die Gedanken der Relativitätstheorie, nämlich die Idee der Union von Zeit und Raum von einem ungarischen Philosophen schon im Jahre 1901 ausgesprochen sei. Die heutigen Vorträge können noch keine abschließende Antwort über die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie geben. Im übrigen möge sich jeder selbst ein Urteil bilden, die Grundlagen dazu werden die späteren Abende, die dieser Theorie gewidmet sind, liefern.

K. J.

Der freundliche Leser wolle sich an Hand meines Vortrages genau überzeugen, wo ich bei Schopenhauer Anleihe machte und ob zum Thema geredet wurde oder nicht.

Seiner Tendenz entsprechend besitzt der Vorwärts das größte Maß an Unverfrorenheit, der die Veranstaltung sogar für Vorgänge verantwortlich macht, die sich auf der Straße abspielen. Jedes Kind weiß, daß man in dieser herrlichen Republik nicht in seinem Haufe kommandieren kann, daß also auch bei Veranstaltungen, Theatern usw. Zeitungs- und sonstige Verkäufer in den Pausen bis in die Säle dringen. Daß Zigarettenverkäufer, „Freiheits“-Zeitungshändler ebenfalls da Publikum belästigen, hat der wackere Vorwärtsmann natürlich nicht gesehen. Es entfließt folgender Erguß dem Gehege seines Schreibtisches:

Der Kampf um Einstein. Gestern Abend entbrannte in der Philharmonie der Kampf um Einstein. Die Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur [*8*] Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft hatte geladen. Der Anfang war häßlich und hatte mit Wissenschaft nichts zu tun, weder mit „reiner“ noch mit „unreiner“. Am Tore wurden Hakenkreuze verkauft — solche, die man die Rockklappe stecken konnte. Der erste Vortrag des Herrn Weyland paßte zu diesem Empfang. Er versprach eine wissenschaftliche Bekämpfung der Relativitätstheorie und mußte fortwährend zur

Sache gerufen werden. Die höchst „sachliche“ Entgegnung des Vortragenden war die Versicherung, daß man auf solche Zwischenrufe gefaßt sei und Vorsorge getroffen hätte, unliebsame Störenfriede an die Luft zu setzen. Jedenfalls auch eine Methode, um wissenschaftliche Fragen glatt zu lösen!

Doch genug von diesem Schmutz, der schließlich in persönlichen Angriffen das höchste leistete. Der nachfolgende Redner, Prof. Gehrcke, ein in der physikalischen Welt anerkannter Forscher, hatte nach dieser ihm scheinbar unerwarteten Einleitung sichtlich mit Befangenheit zu kämpfen. Bald aber festigte sich seine Stimme und er brachte in wohlthuend ruhiger Weise seine Bedenken gegen die Relativitätstheorie vor. Die Widersprüche dieser Theorie sind nach Gehrcke nur zu lösen, wenn wir uns auf den Standpunkt eines „physikalischen Solipsismus“ stellen und behaupten, daß jeder Mensch in seiner eigenen Welt lebt, die mit der des anderen gar nichts zu tun hat. Die Schwierigkeiten, welche die Relativitätstheorie unserem Denken bereitet, liegen wohl darin, daß wir immer und immer wieder unser gefühlsmäßiges „Zeiterlebnis“ mit dem exakt definiertem „Zeitmaß“ Einsteins verwechseln. Die Einwendungen Gehrckes gegen die Relativitätstheorie gingen ebenfalls von dieser „erlebten“ Zeit aus, die mit dem physikalisch definierten Zeitmaß nichts zu tun hat — und können darum nicht stichhaltig genannt werden. Über den Ausfall der experimentellen Prüfung der Theorie wurde etwas einseitig berichtet. Die Akten sind hier noch nicht geschlossen. Den Stimmen gegen Einstein stehen ebenso gewichtige für Einstein gegenüber. Erst die Zeit wird lehren, ob Einsteins Theorie die experimentelle Fenerprobe wirklich besteht.

Am entzückendsten und sachlichsten äußert sich das „8-Uhr-Abendblatt“, das Blatt der Dezimeter großen Überschriften, anerkannter Sachlichkeit, pp.:

Ein Einstein-„Kenner“. Der Kampf gegen die Relativitätstheorie.

Ein Herr Weyland, dessen Verdienste um die Wissenschaft weitesten Kreisen bisher verborgen geblieben sind, versprach gestern in der Philharmonie einen Vortrag über „Einsteins Relativitätstheorie eine Massensuggestion“. Als der Vorleser aber immer wieder von einer „gewissen Presse“, die für Einstein Reklame machte, sprach, aus dieser „gewissen Presse“ ihm passende Artikelstellen zitierte und dann aber selbst für einige „geschäftliche Mitteilungen“ Gehör [*9*] verlangte, wurde der Vorleser aus der Mitte des Saales lebhaft „Zur Sache!“ gerufen. Aber Herr Weyland hatte darauf nur zu erwidern, daß dafür gesorgt sei, Skandalmacher an die frische Luft zu befördern. Diejenigen, die wirklich Eintrittsgeld gezahlt hatten und nicht als persönliche Leibgarde des Herrn Vorlesers erschienen waren, hatten — so dünkt uns — doch einen Anspruch darauf, zu verlangen, daß gehalten werde, was in den Ankündigungen versprochen worden war. Tatsächlich sah man im Auditorium neben einigen wenigen ausgesprochenen Gelehrtenköpfen — Einstein selbst saß in der Nähe von Nernst in einer Loge — eine Anzahl junger handfester Burschen, deren ganzes Gehaben deutlich zeigte, in welchem Zusammenhang sie mit der Einsteinschen Lehre stünden. Schon beim Betreten des Saales wurden ja die berühmigten antisemitischen Hetzbrochüren und blätter laut angepriesen. — Der Vorleser gedachte nicht mit einer Silbe der

Genialität Einsteins, die von seinen wissenschaftlich geschulten Gegnern ohne weiteres anerkannt wird. Dafür erwähnte er aber die „sogenannte Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie“, die einen Umsturz in den Massen hervorgerufen habe, und prompt sagte eine hinter mir sitzende biedere Frau zu ihrem Mann: „Nu siehste, ick habe dir doch jesagt, daß er een Bolschewist ist.“ Der Mann nickte resigniert. Als der Vorleser dann, ohne es zu beweisen, von der „gewisse Presse“ sprach, die vollkommen im Dienste Einsteins stünde, und man im Saal „Verleumdung Beweise!“ rief, war es das biedere Ehepaar, das Herrn Weyland am begeisterten Beifall klatschte! Wollte man Herrn Weylands Ausführungen für ernst nehmen, dann müßte man folgerichtig die Universitätsfakultäten und Akademien, die Einstein mit Ehrenprofessuren und anderen akademischen Würden auszeichneten, für Reklameorganisationen von Stümpfern und Idioten halten. Als der Vorleser schließlich eine Brücke zwischen Einsteins Lehren und dem Dadaismus zu schaffen sich anschickte, brachte ihm dies aus meiner Umgebung Kosenamen ein, die ich aus Höflichkeit hier lieber nicht wiedergeben möchte. Sie sind auch recht unparlamentarisch. Nach dieser vielversprechenden und verheißungsvollen Ouvertüre glaubte ich der Fortsetzung dieser eigenartigen Veranstaltung nicht weiter beiwohnen zu müssen. Diese taten desgleichen: ergriffen mit der einen Hand ihren Hut, mit der andern die — Flucht.

K. M.

Hoffentlich nimmt der glänzende Vertreter einwandfreier Berichterstattung am 2. September Veranlassung, alsdann mit der anderen Hand sitzen zu bleiben, and jenem 2. September, wo speziell begonnen wird, Einsteins Theorie zu zergliedern.

Inzwischen erscheint — zur Verwendung für diese Broschüre nicht mehr geeignet — im Berliner Tageblatt (Nr. 402 Ausgabe A Nr. 212) vom Freitag, den 27. August, Morgen-Ausgabe, Einsteins Antwort. Hier sei nur soviel bemerkt, daß Herr Einstein sachlich ebenfalls nichts [*10*] hervorbringt und ganz offen hinter dem Antisemitismus Schutz sucht. Es ist also soweit gekommen, eine sachliche Erklärung von ihm nicht zu erlangen. Er fertigt seine Gegner als kleine Geister ab, hat aber doch soviel Respekt vor ihnen, daß er schleunigst ins Ausland geht, statt sie mit seinen „erdrückenden“ Beweisen zu schlagen. Nicht einmal den ersten der speziellen Vorträge hat Herr Einstein abgewartet! Die ersten allgemeinen Ausführungen genügen vollständig, ihn zum Rückzug zu veranlassen!

Ich lasse meinen Vortrag folgen:

Meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren!

Ich habe die Ehre und das Vergnügen, Sie heute mit einigen einleitenden Worten zu einer Reihe von Darlegungen zu begrüßen, die sich mit der sogenannten Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie befassen. Es handelt sich darum, kritisch zu untersuchen, ob die Einsteinschen Fiktionen eine konkrete Stütze durch die Wissenschaft, insbesondere die Naturwissenschaft erfahren kann, oder philosophische Punkte zu ihrer Bestätigung anzuführen hat.

Meine Damen und Herren! Es übersteigt den Rahmen der uns heute zugemessenen Zeit, daß ich Ihnen in diesem erten Vortrag eine gründliche

Kritik der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie vom speziellen Standpunkt aus gebe. Diese Darstellung wird später mathematisch erfolgen. Ich habe mich heute lediglich damit zu befassen, zu untersuchen, wie es kam, daß die Allgemeine Relativitätstheorie seit geraumer Zeit die Massen in Aufruhr versetzen konnte. Ehe ich mich jedoch dieser einleitenden Aufgabe entledge, möchte ich einige geschäftliche Bemerkungen vorneweg schicken. Es wird mir soeben mitgeteilt, daß die Druckerei den heutigen Vortrag des Herrn Professor Dr. Gehrcke fertiggestellt hat und eine gewisse Anzahl Exemplare noch heute hierher senden wird. Ich werde diese Bücher im Foyer aufstellen lassen, wo selbst diese nach dem Vortrage käuflich zu haben sind. Ebendort wird eine Schrift des Heidelberger Physikers P. Lenard ausgelegt, die ich allen denen, die sich über den Wert der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie in wirklich sachlicher Weise informieren wollen, recht empfehlen möchte. Das Buch erfreut sich nach meinem Dafürhalten neben strenger Wissenschaftlichkeit ungemeiner Eindringlichkeit und Gemeinverständlichkeit.

Meine Damen und Herren! Wohl selten ist in der Naturwissenschaft [*11*] mit einem derartigen Aufwand von Reklame ein wissenschaftliches System aufgestellt worden, wie bei dem Allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzip, daß sich bei näherem Zusehen als höchst beweisbedürftig entpuppte. Dieses System, das unter Heranziehung aller möglichen Philosopheme, mit Mathematik verbrämt, teils in reiner Abstraktion, teils in konkreten Abstrusitäten als Relativismus oder allgemeine Relativitätstheorie bezeichnet wird, wollen wir uns im Verlaufe der vorliegenden Vortragsreihe unter der Führung von Spezialforschern etwas näher ansehen.

Es handelt sich um ein System, welches beansprucht, die alleinige Wahrheit zu bringen über alle Vorgänge des Naturgeschehens. Es soll uns die tiefste Wahrheit über das, was in der Erfahrungswelt geschieht, enthüllt werden. Wie begründet nun aber der Erfinder der Relativitätstheorie diese, seine Absicht. Er sagt: „Es ist mein Hauptziel, meine Theorie so zu entwickeln, daß jeder psychologische Natürlichkeit des eingeschlagenen Weges empfindet.“ Statt uns mit Tatsachen zu kommen, statt Beweise zu bringen, wird uns „die psychologische Natürlichkeit der Theorie“, „empfindend“ nahegelegt, an anderen Stellen „die Schönheit der Theorie“, in noch anderem Falle „die Kühnheit der Theorie“ angepriesen. Meine Damen und Herren! Kühnheit des Gedankens ist sehr wohl eine Notwendigkeit des erfolgreichen Forschers, nur hat diese Kühnheit sich selbst Grenzen zu ziehen, die im menschlichen Taktgefühl und in wissenschaftlicher Einsicht begründet sind. Treffender kann sich niemand über diesen Punkt äußern als P. Lenard [*Footnote*: P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von S. Hirzel, Leipzig 1920. Preis M. 6.—] in seiner kleinen Schrift. Ich möchte Ihnen diese Stelle hier nicht vorenthalten. Lenard sagt zu diesen Punkt auf Seite 1 folgendes:

„Den Tatsachen kühn voraneilen wollen — Hypothesen machen — gehört dabei dennoch immer zu den schönsten, auch nützlichsten Vorrechten

des Naturforschers. Aber er darf auch hierbei nicht rücksichtslos verfahren, sondern muß jeden Augenblick bereit sein, vor Tatsachen sich zu beugen, und er muß nie vergessen, daß er wirklich nur Zufall ist; wenn eine seiner Hypothesen dauernd die Probe an der Wirklichkeit besteht und also einen Fund bedeutet, und daß er also, will er gewissenhaft sein, nur zögernd das, was ursprünglich Hypothese, Dichtung des Geistes war, als Wahrheit auszugehen oder anzuerkennen wird bereit [*12*] sein dürfen. Je „kühner“ ein Naturforscher sich gezeigt hat, desto mehr Stellen finden sich im allgemeinen in seinen Veröffentlichungen, die nicht dauernd standhalten; man kann dies mit Beispielen aus alter und neuer Zeit (besonders leicht aus letzterer) belegen. Deshalb verdient die Kühnheit des Naturforschers auch lange nicht die Hochschätzung wie die des Kriegers; denn letzterer setzt mit seiner Kühnheit sein Leben ein, während ersterer meist bequeme Nachsicht und Vergessenheit für seine Fehlschläge findet. Manchmal scheint die Naturforschern zugeschriebene „Kühnheit“ wirklich nur darin zu bestehen, daß ziemlich skrupellos zu Ungunsten der Gediegenheit der Wissenschaftsliteratur von vornherein auf eigene Schadlosgkeit gerechnet wird. Deutsche Eigenschaft ist **diese** Kühnheit nicht.“

Meine Damen und Herren! Es ist eine ganz auffallende Erscheinung, daß die Einstein-Presse und -Literatur sich mit ganz geringen Ausnahmen in einer derartigen überschwänglichen Lobhudelei gefällt, wie ich sie oben angeführt habe, daß aber diesen Phrasen nicht das geringste Positive entgegensteht. Ich könnte noch stundenlang in der Aufzählung solcher Äußerungen fortfahren — alle aus Einsteins oder seiner Anhänger wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen, aus Arbeiten — die in den Annalen der Physik, in den Sitzungsberichten der Preußischen Akademie und in vielen anderen ernsten wissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften gedruckt worden sind.

Diese Redensarten, die nun schon in der Fachpresse auftraten, werden durch die Veröffentlichungen, welche sich an ein breiteres Publikum wenden, noch erheblich übertroffen. Es soll Einsteins Theorie einen „Wendepunkt des menschlichen Denkens und der menschlichen Kultur“ bedeuten. „Die großen Genies der Vergangenheit Kopernikus, Kepler, Newton verblassen gegenüber der alles überstrahlenden Theorie von Einstein!“ „Abgrundtiefe eisige Höhen“, „höchste Gipfel“, „gewaltigste Gedankenarchitektur“ — das sind die Beiworte, die dieser Fiktion gezollt werden. „Die wissenschaftliche Welt beugt sich vor der siegenden Kraft, vor dem glänzenden Triumph des menschlichen Geistes der an theoretischer Bedeutung noch die berühmte Errechnung des Planeten Neptun durch Leverrier und Adams in den Schatten stellt. Von überraschender Folgerichtigkeit, physikalisch und philosophisch gleich befriedigend ist der Bau des Alls, den die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie vor uns enthüllt. Überwunden sind alle Schwierigkeiten, die auf Newtonschen Boden erwachsen, alle Vorzüge jedoch, durch die das moderne Weltbild sich [*13*] über die engen antiken Anschauungen erhob, strahlen im reineren Glanze als

zuvor. Die Welt ist durch keine Grenzen eingeengt und doch in sich harmonisch geschlossen, sie ist vor der Gefahr der Verödung gerettet! Von neuem erkennen wir die erlösende Kraft der Relativitätstheorie die dem menschlichen Geist eine Freiheit und ein Kraftbewußtsein schenkt, wie kaum eine andere wissenschaftliche Tat sie je zu geben vermochte!“

Meine Damen und Herren! Was ich Ihnen hier eben erzählte, sind nicht etwa von mir ausgedachte Parodien, sondern wörtliche Zitate aus der Einstein-Presse, die ich Ihnen hundertfältig ergänzen könnte und die in unzähligen Auflagen in einer wahren Massenflut auf die bedauernswerte Öffentlichkeit losgelassen wurde.

Wenn man sich diese Ausprüche vergegenwärtigt, so drängt sich dem kritisch veranlagten Geist unwillkürlich die Frage auf: „Sollte hier nicht etwas vorliegen, was mit ernster wissenschaftlicher Arbeit und Sachlichkeit nichts zu tun hat? Wie will ein heute lebender Mensch imstande sein, eine menschliche Entdeckung oder Erfindung in eine Linie mit den Taten eines Kopernikus, Kepler oder Newton zu setzen, von denen uns heute Jahrhunderte trennen? Wie will der heutige Mensch irgend einer wissenschaftlichen Neuheit heute schon ansehen können, daß sie sich dereinst in Jahrhunderten aus dem Getriebe der Zeit so herausheben wird, wie dies bei den großen Namen der Vergangenheit der Fall ist? Spricht bei solch exaltierten Ausdrücken wie wir sie soeben gehört haben, überhaupt noch der nüchterne wissenschaftliche Verstand, oder sind wir hier in einem Gefühlsrausch hineingeraten, der vor anderen Räuschen nur das voraus hat, daß es sich auf die Wissenschaft bezieht? Solche überschwänglichen Ausdrücke sind jedenfalls in der wissenschaftlichen Welt etwas ungewöhnliches und lassen deutlich eine gesuchte Beeinflussung mit Reklamemitteln vermuten, wo durch strenge Sachlichkeit nichts erreicht werden kann.

Aber nun wird behauptet, der Erfinder der Relativitätstheorie habe mit allen diesen Dingen nichts zu tun. Ihn kümmerte nur der weitere Ausbau seiner Theorie und die reine Wissenschaft in stiller Gelehrtenzurückgezogenheit. Ein Büchlein [*Footnote*: Max Hasse, Das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip, Magdeburg, Selbstverlag des Verfassers.] dem ich einen Teil der Lobeshymnen entnommen habe, schreibt nun in seinem Vorwort: „Der Verfasser nahm sich die Freiheit, die Druckbogen Prof. Dr. A. Einstein [*14*] einzusenden, der ihn mit folgender Antwort erfreute: „Ihre populäre Darstellung scheint mir in der Tat dem Geiste des Nicht-Physikers in glücklicher Weise entgegenzukommen. Ich sende Ihnen die Korrekturbogen mit einigen Randbemerkungen zurück, damit Sie einige kleine Böcke daraus entfernen können.“

In einem Zeitungsartikel verwandte ich diese Niedlichkeit und werde von einem hervorragenden Berliner Physiker darauf mit folgenden Worten angegriffen:

In Nr. 171 dieses Blattes ereifert sich Herr Weyland gegen Einsteins allgemeine

Relativitätstheorie; gegen die Art ihrer Verbreitung in der größeren Öffentlichkeit sowie gegen ihren Inhalt. Es liegt mir durchaus ferne, alles das decken zu wollen, was kleinere Geister bei der Verbreitung der neuen Lehre durch Ungenauigkeiten, Übertreibungen und Geschmacklosigkeiten gelegentlich gesündigt haben, und die im besonderen herangezogenen Äußerungen von Archenhold und Max Hasse kann ich nicht beurteilen, weil ich sie nicht kenne. Zu einem solchen Angriff auf Einsteins Persönlichkeit, wie ihn Herr Weyland macht, bieten diese Dinge aber doch nicht den mindesten Anlaß.

Demgegenüber möchte ich feststellen, daß Herrn Einstein die Mitwirkung der jetzt abgeschüttelten kleineren Geister doch wohl höchst angenehm war, denn sonst hätte er sich nicht zu der soeben verlesenen Antwort veranlaßt gefühlt. Aber einen Menschen, der in seiner Naivität und Unkenntnis des Themas soweit geht, daß er noch ausdrücklich in seinem Vorwort hervorhebt, nicht mehr einen Satz der euklidischen Geometrie beweisen zu können, vor seinen Wagen zu spannen, ist nach meinem Dafürhalten Reklamemache um jeden Preis — oder Unwissenschaftlichkeit. Wenn Herr Einstein gewollt hätte, diesem Geschreibsel ein Ende zu machen, hätte er jahrelang Zeit gehabt. Durch eine einzige Äußerung, durch der mit seinem Kreise vorzüglich in Verbindung stehenden Presse hätte er es erreichen können, daß der ganze Schwall von Verherrlichung und Bewunderung ein Ende findet, das hat Einstein nicht gewollt, sonst hätte er sich dementsprechend geäußert und was noch wichtiger ist, dementsprechend gehandelt. Das ist die systematische Massensuggestion zum Preis und Ruhm eines Einzelnen, der die breite Öffentlichkeit bitter notwendig hat, nachdem ihm sachlich Opposition über Opposition erwächst. Aber auch in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen wird das Äußerste versucht, um Beweise für die Relativitätstheorie an den Haaren herbei zu ziehen. [*15*] Da es um die Frage der Rotverschiebung still geworden ist, [*Footnote*: Wer sich über den neuesten Stand der Rotverschiebung informieren will, dem sei die Schrift von L. C. Glaser, Über Versuche zum Beweise der Relativitätstheorie (Heft 3 der vorliegenden Sammlung) empfohlen.] schaut man nach anderen Objekten aus und findet leider recht dürftige Ausbeute. Da setzt dann nun an gewissen Stellen, wo man die Beziehung und die Macht hat, die Taktik des Totschweigens ein. Einsteins ständige Referenten geben von Forschungsberichten auf anderem Standpunkt stehender Gelehrten in ihren Referaten entweder gar keine oder durch einschränkende Bemerkungen entstelle Berichte, z. B. werden solche Forschungsergebnisse gegenüber den Einsteinschen „Axiomen“ stets als unbewiesene offene Fragen behandelt. [*Footnote*: Unter einem Referat versteht man gemeinhin die Wiedergabe der Meinung eines Autors, ohne daran einschränkende Kritiken zu knüpfen. Die „Physikalischen Berichte“, deren Redaktion durchaus unter Einsteinschen steht, wendet diese nicht übliche Praxis der indirekten Stimmungsmache an, wo es absolut nicht zu vermeiden ist, über gegenteilige Ansichten zu referieren.] So wird eine Arbeit von Sir Oliver J. Lodge mit folgenden Worten abgefertigt: „ Es wird in dieser ganz kurzen Notiz

versucht, das Wesen der Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahles, nach der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie eine Folge der Schwere der Energie, auf Grund früherer Anschauungen plausibel zu machen.

Weiter heißt es (Physik. Ber. 1920, Heft 15, S. 947) J. v. Kries: Über die zwingende und eindeutige Bestimmbarkeit des physikalischen Weltbildes. Die „Naturwissenschaften“, 8, 237-44, 1920: Kries wirft die Frage auf, ob das Weltbild der modernen Physik zwingend und eindeutig genannt werden kann, und vertritt die Anschauung, daß diese Forderung für das Weltbild der Relativitätstheorie nicht durchgeführt ist, diese also nur als eine mögliche Erscheinungsform unter vielen anderen erscheint. Für den Physiker, dem die Relativitätstheorie heute als der befreiende Weg aus den Dunkelkammern der bisher klassischen Wissenschaften erscheint, muß diese Auffassung befremdend anmuten usw.

Einen anderen, noch instruktiven Fall finden Sie in der letzten Nummer der Naturwissenschaften. [*Footnote*: Die Naturwissenschaften 1920, Heft 34, Seite 667-673. Der Bericht der englischen Sonnenfinsternisexpedition über die Ablenkung des Lichtes im Gravitationsfeld der Sonne. Von Erwin Freundlich.] In dieser Zeitschrift, die nicht nur [*16*] von Fachleuten gelesen wird, sitzen die Einstein-Leute besonders fest. Von dort aus wird quasi als deren Hauptquartier Stimmung für ihn gemacht.

Es werden in einem langen Artikel die Untersuchungen der englischen Sonnenfinsternisexpedition, die nach Brasilien gesandt wurde, Herz und Nieren geprüft, ob sich etwas für das Relativitätsprinzip günstiges herauspressen ließe. Dabei kann der Referent — natürlich ein Freund Einsteins — nun nicht umhin, sich den Schein der Objektivität zu geben. Er zitiert ausdrücklich die Bedenken der Expeditionsleiter **gegen** eine Annahme einer Bestätigung im Sinne des allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzipes, wo es heißt:

Die Aufnahmen mit dem 8zölligen astrographischen Objektiv, die ebenfalls in Brasilien gewonnen wurden, liefern zwar auch einen Hinweis für die vermutete Lichtablenkung, aber die Sternbilder auf den Patten sind nach den Angaben der englischen Beobachter so unscharf und diffus, daß die aus ihnen abgeleiteten Resultate nur ein geringes Gewicht haben. Anscheinend hatte sich der Coelostatenspiegel infolge der Sonnenstrahlen stark verworfen und die Abbildungen verdorben. Es ergibt sich für den Wert von a am Sonnenrand der Wert $0'',93$. **Nimmt man aber an**, daß der Skalenwert auf den Finsternisplatten in Wahrheit nicht weiter verändert war, als er es nach dem Einfluß der Refraktion und Aberration sein mußte — **eine sehr wahrscheinlich richtige Annahme**, denn die Unschärfe der Bilder rührte wohl kaum von einer reellen Änderung der Fokussierung des Objektivs her —, so resultiert für a der Wert $1'',52$ am Sonnenrand.

Und was macht der Einstein-Mann aus dieser deutlichen Einschränkung?
Er leitet daraus folgendes ab:

„Zusammenfassend kann man sagen:

„Die Sonnenfinsternisplatten in Sobral wie in Principe offenbaren unzweideutig eine systematische Verlagerung der Sternbilder, wie sie zutage treten müßte, wenn das Licht im Gravitationsfelde der Sonne abgelenkt würde. Diese Ablenkung verläuft dem Betrage nach durchaus [*17*] so, wie sie von der Relativitätstheorie vorausgesagt worden war.“ [Footnote: Die Frage der Refraktion, die, wenn ein Effekt in Frage kommt, sowie der sogen. Eberhard-Effekt, der jedem Astrophysiker bekannt ist, wird hier nicht berührt. Falls Opponenten hier die Beobachtungen auf Principe für sich in Anspruch nehmen, verweise ich auf Heft 3 dieser Sammlung: Dr.-Ing. L. C. Glaser: Über Versuche zum Beweise der Relativitätstheorie, wo dieser Einwand vornherein widerlegt wird.]

Gegenüber solchen Unglaublichkeiten versagt einem Menschen normaler Denkungsweise das Ausdrucksvermögen. Ein Kaufmann hat dafür den treffenden Ausdruck: Bilanzverschleierung.

An diesen kleinen Beispielen, die sich, wie die oben angeführte Lobhudelei in beliebigem Maße fortsetzen lassen, können Sie ersehen, daß auch hier die Macht des Einsteinschen Armes wirkt und die Beeinflussung in diesem Falle der wissenschaftlichen Welt genau so versucht und durchgeführt wird, wie der breiten Öffentlichkeit gegenüber. Wo es absolut nicht geht, die berühmte Konjugation, über die sich bereits Schopenhauer in seiner Abhandlung über die Universitätsphilosophie in so satyrischer Weise ausgelassen hat, anzuwenden, nämlich nach der Formel: ich schweige tot, du schweigst tot, er schweigt tot — wir schweigen tot, ihr schweigst tot, sie schweigen tot außer Kraft zu setzen, da beginnt die indirekte Methode, nämlich Forschern, die sich durch räumliche Entfernung oder sonst wie nicht gleich zur Sache äußern können, den Wert ihrer Abhandlungen durch einschränkendes oder kritisches Referat herabzusetzen.

Warum hat nun Einstein Veranlassung, mit seinen Hypothesen die breiten Massen und die Wissenschaft zu beeinflussen zu versuchen? Wohl nur deshalb, weil ihm in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen dauernd Gegner erwachsen — Tatsachen, die man gern verschweigt und, wenn sie gedruckt werden sollen, gern unterbindet durch die Beziehungen, die man hat. Noch ein in den letzten Tagen erscheinendes Buch eines gewissen Harry Schmidt (Verlag Hartung, Hamburg) erkühnt sich, alle Gegengründe gegen Einsteins Theorie, ohne die Spur eines Gegenbeweises anzutreten, abzuweisen, unglaubliche Unrichtigkeiten und Unsachlichkeiten in das Publikum zu werfen und, was das Unverschämteste an dieser Arbeit ist, *Beweise als gesichert anzugeben, wo das [*18*] Gegenteil einwandfrei feststeht.* [Footnote: Das Schmidt'sche Buch werde ich an anderer Stelle behandeln.] Aber nicht nur in der Literatur, sondern auch in öffentlichen Vorträgen wird die Massensuggestion im Einsteinschen Sinne emsig

betrieben, ohne daß die interessierte Öffentlichkeit den wahren Stand der exakten Naturforschung zu hören bekommt. So hielt kürzlich ein Berliner Populärastronom im Blüthner-Saal einen Propagandavortrag, [*Footnote:* Während der Pause nahm Herr Archenhold Veranlassung, mich im Künstlerzimmer aufzusuchen und sich erregt über meinen Angriff auszusprechen. Herr Archenhold erklärte, daß er den Vortrag aus eigener Initiative hielte, Einstein ebenso gut und schlecht kenne, wie mich. Ferner machte Herr Archenhold Bemerkungen darüber, daß er an der Treptower Sternwarte mit seinem Herzen hängt und genau so arm einst aus ihr herausgehe, wie er hineingekommen ist. Diese zum Thema nicht gehörige Bemerkung möchte ich dahin berichtigen, daß es mir erstens nie eingefallen ist, gegen die verdienstvolle und ehrwürdige Persönlichkeit des Herrn Archenhold auch nur in irgend einer Form vorzugehen, Was Herr Archenhold auf seinem Gebiet — nämlich für die Popularisierung der Astronomie — geschaffen hat, bin ich der letzte, nicht anzuerkennen. Ich verahre mich aber s a c h l i c h mit Entschiedenheit dagegen, daß er seine große Popularität dazu benutzt, die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie zu interpretieren, die er, wie sein Vortrag bewies, in ihren Prinzipien und Konsequenzen nicht erkannt hat. Und w e n n er sie erkannt hätte, wäre es verdamnte Pflicht und Schuldigkeit des ernststen Forschers gewesen, sich über die Qualität des referierten Gebietes zu überzeugen, ehe er es kritiklos dem bedauernswerten Publikum vorsetzte. Herr Archenhold trug aber nur Einstein-Literatur vor. Der Arbeiten von Hale, Silberstein, St. John, Evershed, Davidson, Eddington u. a. Forscher, die gewichtiges Material gegen Einstein anführen, gedachte er keines Wortes. Selbst wenn hier, was ich im Interesse des Herrn Archenhold annehme, Gutgläubigkeit vorliegt, so ist doch diese Gutgläubigkeit im vorliegenden Falle u n b e d i n g t verwerflich. Meine kritische Bemerkung war in diesem Falle also sachlich durchaus gerechtfertigt. Gerade Herr Archenhold hat sich durch die Eigenart seiner Position doppelt vorzusehen, unfertige Wahrheiten zu behandeln, denn er spricht vor einer Gemeinde die ihm unbedingt glaubt.] den er nebenbei bemerkt vom Einsteinschen Standpunkte aus betrachtet, schlecht genug interpretierte. Auch hierbei wurde das Publikum in mehr als fragwürdiger und unsachlicher Weise über den Wert der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie unterrichtet und bewiesene Gegengründe nach bewährter Methode einfach totgeschwiegen.

[*19*]

Meine Damen und Herren! Es liegt mir heute ob, zu ergründen und nachzuweisen, wie es kam, daß diese sogenannte Hypothese, die sich bei näherer Prüfung als glatte Fiktion herausstellte, die Welt dauernd in Atem halten konnte. Wissenschaftlich genommen, ist dieses leicht erklärlich. Durch die Verbrämung verschiedener wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen mit einander ist es dem Spezialforscher nicht möglich gewesen, sich in ein ihm fremdes Gebiet, schnell genug hinein zu finden. Gründliche Forscherarbeit und Prüfung erfordert eben Zeit.

Aber noch ein anderer Grund spricht hier ein wichtiges Wort mit. Wohl nicht zum geringsten Teile hat diese Erscheinung ihre Ursache in der mehr oder minder geistigen Verflachung, in die uns die gegenwärtige Zeit versenkt hat. Wir haben erst kürzlich erleben können, mit welchem Aufwand von Reklame heutzutage Wissenschaft gemacht wird. Es ist leider soweit gekommen, daß die Wissenschaft nicht mehr Selbstzweck ist, sondern Mittel zum Zweck, gewissen Personen mit dem Glorienschein wissenschaftlicher Päpstlicher zu umgeben. Sie alle, meine Damen und Herren haben es mit eigenen Augen gesehen und mit eigenen Ohren gehört, in welchem Tiefstand sich die geistigen ethischen, und moralischen Qualitäten derer bewegten, die uns die gegenwärtigen Zustände brachten. Das schlimmste Übel war eine gewisse Presse, die die neben einer bereits bestehenden wie Pilze aus der Erde schoß, die alle moralischen und sittlichen Werte im deutschen Volke erstickte, um aus dem geschaffenen Trümmerhaufen für sich brauchbares herauszuscharren. Um diese Presse gruppieren sich Abenteurer jeder Art, nicht nur in der Politik, sondern auch in Kunst und Wissenschaft. Genau wie die Herren Dadaisten mangels jeden Erfahrungsgedankens in ihrer Kunst- und Weltanschauung, Aufbau, Entwicklung und Reife vermissen lassen und dieses unreife Zeug durch einen Teil der alten, hauptsächlich aber die neue Literatur propagieren lassen, weil sie geistig nicht imstande waren, sich selbst durchzusetzen, genau so vollzieht sich in der Einstein'schen Relativitätstheorie als ein völliges Analogon das Hineinwerfen der Relativitätstheorie in die Massen. Auch hier liegt bewußte Ablehnung erfahrungsmäßiger Kenntnisse und Erkenntnisse vor. Wir stehen bei der Betrachtung der Einsteinschen Ideen genau vor demselben Gedankenchaos der Dadaisten, die wohl etwas wollen und wünschen, es aber nicht begreiflich machen und beweisen können.

[*20*]

Meine Damen und Herren! Niemand wird sich wundern, wenn gegen diesen wissenschaftlichen Dadaismus eine Bewegung entstanden ist, mit dem Ziele, die Öffentlichkeit aufzuklären, was denn eigentlich an der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie ist, und was man vor allen Dingen unter Fortschritten der Wissenschaft zu verstehen hat. Es sollen in einer Reihe von Vorträgen andere Gesichtspunkte und Anregungen zur Geltung kommen, als sie bisher in allzu einseitiger und aufdringlicher Weise der Öffentlichkeit geboten worden sind. Zu Einzelheiten wissenschaftlicher Art mich zu äußern bin ich heute noch nicht an der Reihe. Den Herren, die schon lange in der Bewegung stehen und die Einsteinschen Phantasmen unentwegt bekämpften, gebührt der Vortritt. Ehe ich jedoch schließe, noch eine kurze Bemerkung. Ich bin in der Tagespresse, wie ich schon vorhin erwähnte, von einem hervorragenden deutschen Physiker angegriffen worden. [*Footnote:* Ich habe im Anhang dieses Heftes die Polemik abgedruckt, um sie besser bekannt zu geben.] Mir wurde u. a. entgegengehalten, daß ich annehme, die Ergebnisse

mancher Forscher hinsichtlich der Prüfung der Relativitätstheorie könnten durch Voreingenommenheit beeinflusst sein. Dem gegenüber stelle ich fest, daß alle für Einstein sprechenden Gründe in Deutschland besonders aufgebauscht und die gegenteiligen Beweisgründe in angeführter Manier totgeschwiegen wurden. Ferner wird mir meine Behauptung vorgeworfen, Herr Einstein habe eine Formel von Gerber abgeschrieben. Hierzu stelle ich fest, daß das peinlich jahrelange Schweigen von Herrn Einstein über diesen nicht nur von mir, sondern auch von einer ganzen Reihe von Fachgenossen und unvoreingenommenen Beurteilern erhobenen Vorwurf als sehr eigentümlich empfunden wird. Ich stelle fest, daß es doch allgemein üblich ist, sich zu Vorwürfen solcher Art und Schwere selbst und zwar sofort zu äußern.

[*21*]

Abdruck aus: „Tägliche Rundschau“, Freitag, 6. August, Abendausgabe.

Einsteins Relativitätstheorie—eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion.

Von P a u l W e y l a n d.

Wir leben in einem Zeitalter des Amerikanismus. Die Geschäftswut Englands ist in Dollarika zur Potenz erhoben, führte dort auf allen Gebieten des wirtschaftlichen und geistigen Lebens zu Rekordleistungen, die rein technischer, zivilisatorischer Art waren, hinter denen kulturelle Bestrebungen zurückstehen mußten. Die Rekordjägerei endigte im Bluff, und wir stehen vor der traurigen Tatsache, daß auch diese Bluffmacherei vor der reinen Wissenschaft nicht Halt machte, so daß die Sache neben der Person verschwand.

Ich erinnere an den bekanntesten Fall dieser Art, an den Entdeckerstreit Cook-Pearry, der in der Öffentlichkeit am besten bekannt wurde. In Deutschland erlebte man, nach dem der Amerikanismus hier Eingang fand, gegenüber diesen Reisenbluffs bislang nur Sensatiönchen, die aber so lebhaft von dem Geist Zeugnis ablegten, der gewisse wissenschaftliche Kreise auch unseres Vaterlandes ergriffen hat. Ich erinnere an Friedmanns Tuberkulin, an die Herstellung von Mehl aus Stroh usw., um an diesen Beispielen zu zeigen, daß man es in gewissen Kreisen nicht mehr für nötig hält, die Bestätigung eines Laboratoriumversuches in der Praxis abzuwarten, sondern mit Hilfe einer gefügigen Presse sich mit seiner halbfertigen Sache dem Publikum vorstellt, den wertigen Namen nebst Photographie in alle Windrichtungen hinausbläst, um einige Zeit später, wenn — wie fast stets — die Hinfälligkeit der Entdeckung durch ernste Forscher bewiesen wird, beharrlich zu schweigen. Davon aber erfährt das Publikum natürlich nichts, und die Masse schwört blindlings auf die „großen“ Namen.

Mittlerweile hat sich Deutschland — endlich — neben solchen Sensatiönchen auch eine richtige Sensation geleistet. Herr Albertus Magnus ist neu erstanden, guckte in die ernsten Arbeiten stiller Denker wie Riemann, Minkowsky, Lorentz, Mach, Gerber, Palagyi u. a. m., räusperte sich und sprach ein großes Wort gelassen aus. [*Footnote:* Um endlose Wiederholungen zu vermeiden, wird das Relativitätsprinzip beim Leser als bekannt vorausgesetzt.] Die Wissenschaft staunte.

Die Öffentlichkeit war starr. Alles [*22*] brach zusammen. Herr Einstein spielte mit der Welt Fangball. Er brauchte nur zu denken, und flugs relativierte sich alles Geschehen und Werden.

Einsteins Methode war nun so bewußt abstrakt, daß es dem Fachmann ernstliche Schwierigkeiten bereitete, sich hindurchzuarbeiten. Zunächst verquickte er mehrere wissenschaftliche Disziplinen miteinander, ja er errichtete für seine Zwecke ein ganz neues mathematisches Gebäude, so daß der nachprüfende Naturforscher vor lauter Nebensachen zunächst gar nicht an den Kern der Sache heran kam, weil diese Nebensächlichkeiten, die erst geprüft werden mußten, ja den Aufbau seines Theorems bedeuteten. Dieses Drum und Dran ist von Forschern wie P. Lenard, Gehrcke, Kraus u. a. geprüft worden, es stellte sich heraus, daß nicht einmal das Skelett einer kritischen Betrachtung standhielt. Was soll da aber erst aus dem Hauptteil werden?

So bemängelt z. B. P. Lenard mit unbedingtem Recht, daß bei Einstein der einfachsten Logik Hohn gesprochen wird. Ich zitiere Lenard wörtlich: [*Footnote*: P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag S. Hirzel, Leipzig 1920.]

„Man lasse den bekannten Eisenbahn eine deutlich ungleichförmige Bewegung machen. Während hier durch Trägheitswirkung im Zuge alles in Trümmer geht, während draußen alles unbeschädigt bleibt, so wird, meine ich, kein gesunder Verstand einen anderen Schluß ziehen wollen als den, daß es eben der Zug war, der mit Ruck seine Bewegung geändert hat und nicht die Umgebung. Das verallgemeinerte Relativitätsprinzip verlangt es, seinem einfachen Sinne nach, auch in diesem Falle, zuzugeben, daß es möglicherweise doch die Umgebung sei, welche die Geschwindigkeitsänderung erfahren habe und daß dann das ganze Unglück im Zuge nur Folge dieses Rucks der Außenwelt sei, vermittelt durch eine „Gravitationswirkung“ der Außenwelt auf das Innere des Zuges. Für die naheliegende Frage, warum denn der Kirchturm neben dem Zuge nicht umgefallen sei, wenn er mit der Umgebung den Ruck gemacht habe — warum solche Folgen des Rucks so einseitig nur im Zuge sich zeigen, während dennoch kein einseitiger Schluß auf den Sitz der Bewegungsänderung möglich sein sollte — hat das Prinzip anscheinend keine den einfachen Verstand befriedigende Antwort.“

Hier hat Lenard mit wenigen klar verständlichen, an den Verstand gerichteten Worten den mathematischen Unfug getroffen, der sich aus dem Theorem entwickelte. Was nützt alle hochgelahrte Mathematik, aller verwickelter Formelkram, wenn er — verkehrt aufgebaut wird? Zu obigem Einwand, den Lenard bereits 1918 in dem Jahrbuch für Radioaktivität und Elektronik erhob, hat sich Einstein bis heute nicht geäußert. Mit diesem Einwand oder seiner Widerlegung fällt und steht aber das ganze Prinzip.

Doch sehen wir weiter zu. Einsteins Theorie verlangt, daß infolge der Gravitationswirkung der Sonne ihr Gravitationsfeld passierende Lichtstrahlen [*23*] eine Verzögerung, eine zeitliche Abbremsung erfahren müssen. Die Theorie berechnet eine Verschiebung nach dem roten Teil des Spektrums um 0.01 Angström-Einheiten, d. h. den zehntausendmillionsten Teil eines Millimeters, eine fast unvorstellbare Kleinheit, die aber mit unseren feinen Gitterspektrographen sehr gut zu messen ist. St. Juhn hat („Astrophysik. Journ.“ 46, S. 249, „Nature“ 100, S. 433) an 43 Linien in der Sonnenmitte I 0.00 A.—E., also ein negatives Resultat erzielt, für die Sonnenkorona + 0.0018 A.—E. Ferner hat Schwarzschild (Berl. Ber.

1914 S. 1201) ein ebenfalls negatives Ergebnis festgestellt. Auch andere Forscher von Ruf haben diese Einsteinsche Hauptbedingung nicht bestätigt gefunden. Grebe und Bachem, ausgesprochene „Relativisten“, glauben nun, die gefundenen Werte $+ 0.0018$ für Einstein deuten zu können und ziehen mit einer Kompensationserklärung vom Leder. Einem jungen Forscher, Glaser, ist es aber gelungen, den Nachweis zu führen, daß das Grebe und Bachemsche Ergebnis lediglich auf Beobachtung mit einem fehlerhaften Rowlandschen Gitter zurückzuführen ist. Das Material hierüber wird dem Naturforschertag in Nauheim im September vorgelegt werden. Mit der Verschiebung der Spektrallinien nach Rot ist es also auch nichts. Bleibt somit nur noch die berühmte Ablenkung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur um 41 Sekunden übrig.

Es ist auch hier wieder das Verdienst von Prof. Gehrcke (Berlin), der festgestellt hat, daß Einstein für seine Zwecke eine äußerst schwer zugängliche Arbeit von Gerber benutzte, die bereits vor achtzehn Jahren erschien. Hier gestattete er sich die Abschrift einer Formel, verwendete diese für sich und ließ den wahren Entdecker unerwähnt. Prof. Gehrcke sorgte flugs für zugänglichen Neudruck der seltenen Gerberschen Arbeit, und jedermann kann heute feststellen, wer der Autor dieser Erklärung der Perihel-Abweichung des Merkur ist und ob es nötig ist, dafür ein Relativitätsprinzip zu erfinden.

Unzählige andere Beispiele können noch angeführt werden. Diese wenigen mögen hier genügen. Ein großer Teil deutscher Forscher, der sich zuerst zu Einstein bekannte, sieht den Irrtum ein. Mancher hat schon widerrufen in der richtigen Erkenntnis, daß es ruhmvoller ist, einen Irrtum ehrlich zu bekennen, als in ihm hartnäckig zu verharren. Diese Forscher stellen sich ein ehrenvolles Zeugnis aus, daß sie der Sache, der Wahrheit die Ehre geben und die Person zurückstellen. Noch einige taktische Bemerkungen seien angeführt.

Da, wie gesagt, Einstein eine gewisse Presse, eine gewisse Gemeinde hat, so wird von dieser immer wieder die Öffentlichkeit im Einsteinschen Sinne beeinflusst. So hielt z. B. vor vierzehn Tagen Herr Archenhold im Blüthner-Saal einen Vortrag über dieses Thema. Kundige haben den Kopf geschüttelt, daß Herr Archenhold gar nichts von den Gegengründen erwähnte, sondern sie stillschweigend überging, dagegen die unbedingt strittige Ablenkung des Lichtes um $1.7''$ im Gravitationsfeld der Sonne postulierte. Herrn Archenhold sei erwidert, daß solche Stellungnahme vor einem Publikum, das in der großen Mehrzahl seine Ausführungen nicht beurteilen [*24*] konnte, entschieden zu verurteilen ist daß Parteinahme wohl politisch gerechtfertigt, wissenschaftlich aber verwerflich ist. Es dürfte Herrn Archenhold als Fachmann und „Sonnenforscher“ wohl nicht unbekannt sein, daß die Sonne eine Atmosphäre besitzt und daß diese für die Ablenkung des Lichtstrahles mit mindestens demselben Recht in Frage kommt wie die sehr hypothetische Wirkung des Gravitationsfeldes, wie das schon Lindemann 1918 festgestellt hat. Daß Einstein den Aether durch ein Dekret abschaffte, ihn aber durch einen anderen Begriff mit gleichen Funktionen wieder einführte, sei hier nur, um mit Einstein selbst zu reden, der „Drolligkeit“ halber erwähnt.

Schließlich sie noch der unzulässigen Art der Propaganda kurz gedacht, die Einstein zum ersten Male in die deutsche Universität einführte. Welcher Mittel sich Einstein zur Verbreitung seiner Ideen bedient, ist an dem Wust von Referaten zu erkennen, von denen die meisten ihn nicht einmal verstehen. Der entzückendste

Witz dieser Art ist eine Schrift von Max Hasse, A. Einsteins Relativitätslehre (Magdeburg 1920, Selbstverlag des Verfassers), wo es im Vorwort heißt: „Der Verfasser gesteht freimütig ein, nicht mehr einen Lehrsatz euklidischer Geometrie beweisen zu können — die Zeit hat früher Gelerntes verwischt.“ Und solch ein Mensch wagt es, über die tollste mathematische Abstraktion, die es je gegeben, zu berichten! Und was sagt Einstein dazu? Es heißt nämlich im Vorwort weiter: „Der Verfasser nahm sich die Freiheit, die Druckbogen Prof. Dr. A. Einstein einzusenden, der ihn mit folgender Antwort erfreute: „Ihre populäre Darstellung scheint mir in der Tat dem Geiste des Nicht-Physikers in glücklicher Weise entgegenzukommen. Ich sende Ihnen die Korrekturbogen mit einigen Randbemerkungen zurück, damit Sie einige kleine Böcke daraus entfernen können.“

Das ungefähr kennzeichnet Einsteins Methodik. Wenn aber die deutsche Wissenschaft demnächst geschlossen gegen Einstein auftreten wird und mit ihm zu Gericht geht, dann hat er sich diese Wirkung seiner, sagen wir ungewöhnlichen Kampfweise selbst zuzuschreiben.

[*25*]

Abdruck aus: „Tägliche Rundschau“, Mittwoch, 11. August, Abendausgabe.

Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie.

Entgegnung an Herrn Paul Weyland. Von M. v. L a u e.

In Nr. 171 dieses Blattes ereifert sich Herr Weyland gegen Einsteins allgemeine Relativitätstheorie; gegen die Art ihrer Verbreitung in der größeren Öffentlichkeit sowie gegen ihren Inhalt. Es liegt mir durchaus ferne, alles das decken zu wollen, was kleinere Geister bei der Verbreitung der neuen Lehre durch Ungenauigkeiten, Übertreibungen und Geschmacklosigkeiten gelegentlich gesündigt haben, und die im besonderen herangezogenen Äußerungen von Archenhold und Max Hasse kann ich nicht beurteilen, weil ich sie nicht kenne. Zu einem solchen Angriff auf Einsteins Persönlichkeit, wie ihn Herr Weyland macht, bieten diese Dinge aber doch nicht den mindesten Anlaß.

Welche Einwände richtet aber Weyland gegen den Inhalt? Daß hier reines Denken eine neue Naturauffassung begründet, scheint ihm, wenn ich recht verstehe, gegen die Begründung der Physik in der Erfahrung zu verstoßen. Ist ihm aber nicht bekannt daß Einstein von einer Tatsache ausgeht, die, längst bekannt, noch in den letzten Jahren durch besonders gute Messungen auf das genaueste festgestellt ist? Daß nämlich alle Körper unter der Wirkung der Schwere gleich rasch fallen? Oder fehlt ihm das Verständnis für die Größe einer Leistung, welche uns bei einer so alten Tatsache endlich etwas zu denken lehrt? Bisher galt es doch stets als der größte dem menschlichen Geiste in einer Naturwissenschaft mögliche Triumph, wenn in Umkehrung des gewöhnlichen Ganges die Theorie der Beobachtung erfolgreich voranschritt.

Nun kann man ja freilich noch bestreiten, daß die Folgerungen aus der Theorie, wie die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien und die Lichtablenkung an der Sonne durch die Erfahrung endgültig bestätigt sind. Darüber ist in der Tat das letzte Wort nicht gesprochen. Wenn aber Herr Weyland entgegen den sonstigen Gepflogenheiten in wissenschaftlichen Erörterungen andeutet, es könne Voreingenommenheit die Ergebnisse mancher Forscher beeinflußt haben, so möchten wir ihm mitteilen, daß die Engländer, denen wir die

Lichtablenkungsmessungen [*26*] verdanken, vorher durchaus nicht Anhänger des Relativitätsgedankens in Einsteinscher Prägung waren. [Footnote: Hätte Herr v. Laue die englische Literatur etwas aufmerksamer verfolgt, so hätte er diese Behauptung sicher nicht aufgestellt. Die Tagespresse, wohl meist der Niederschlag der inspirierten öffentlichen Meinung schreibt z. B. darüber: Westminster-Gazette: 14. August 1920: „Obwohl die Exped. nach Sobral und Principe in Bezug auf die Bestätigung der Theorie erfolgreich waren, wurde der damals erlangte, etwas dürftige Beweis (*somewhat meagre evidence*) in einem gewissen Grade durch das Versagen des astrographischen Fernrohres in Sobral beeinträchtigt. Aus diesem Grunde sollen eben bei der Sonnenfinsternis am 20. IX. 22 neue Prüfungen vorgenommen werden.“

Hieraus geht z. B. auch hervor, daß die unter atmosphärischen Beeinträchtigungen behinderte Beobachtung auf Principe nicht für einwandfrei betrachtet wird. Im Übrigen verweise ich auf die schon erwähnte Arbeit von Glaser in Heft 3 dieser Sammlung.]

Unbestreitbar gibt die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie jene minimalen, aber sicher festgestellten Abweichungen der Merkurbahn von der nach der älteren Theorie der Schwere errechneten Form zahlenmäßig richtig wieder. Man mag dies Zusammentreffen als einen Zufall ohne besondere Beweiskraft abtun. Aber man darf Einsteins Ableitung, welche eine entfernte Folgerung einer großen, aus ganz anderen Gesichtspunkten entsprungenen Theorie darstellt, denn doch nicht in einem Atem nennen mit der Arbeit von Gerber, welche nach einer Fülle von Unklarheiten, Mißverständnissen und Ungenauigkeiten die Perihelbewegung aus einem eigens zu diesem Zweck ersonnenen, sonst zu nichts brauchbaren, aus der Geschichte der Wissenschaft nur zu gut verständlichen mathematischen Ansatz errechnet. Hat sich doch auch der Münchener Astronom H. v. Seeliger, ein entschiedener Gegner der Relativitätstheorie, scharf gegen dies Machwerk gewandt. Wie Herr Weyland hier gegen Einstein den Vorwurf erheben konnte, die Gerbersche Formel „abgeschrieben“ zu haben, darüber mag er sich einmal selbst Rechenschaft zu geben versuchen.

Etwas näher wollen wir eingehen auf P. Lenards, von Herrn Weyland angeführten Einwand. Einstein hat in der Tat nie auf ihn geantwortet. Man tritt eben einem verdienten Fachgenossen nicht immer entgegen, wenn ihm einmal eine weniger richtige Äußerung entschlüpft; zumal in einem Falle, in welchem der Sachverhalt so leicht zu durchschauen ist, wie hier. Wie steht es denn? Um den Grundgedanken seiner Lehre klarzumachen, knüpft Einstein an das alltägliche Erlebnis einer Eisenbahnfahrt an. Führt mein Zug auf idealen, stoßfreien Schienen mit unveränderter Geschwindigkeit immer in derselben Richtung a , so sind es zwei physikalisch gleichwertige Annahmen, ob ich mein Abteil als bewegt und die Umgebung als ruhend bezeichne oder umgekehrt verfare. Das war die Meinung schon seit jeher. Nun aber sagt Einstein, man könne, [*27*] auch wenn der Zug bremst und alle Körper im Abteil das Streben zeigen, sich gegen dessen vordere Wand zu bewegen, die Auffassung in allen ihren physikalischen Folgerungen vertreten, das Abteil bleibe in Ruhe, während die Umgebung, die mir bisher mit konstanter Geschwindigkeit entgegenkam, jetzt in ihrer Bewegung aufgehalten wird. Nur muß dann in dem Bezugssystem, in welchem mein Abteil dauernd ruht, ein Schwerfeld in der Richtung a neu entstanden sein, welches die Umgebung aufhält. Im Innern des ruhenden Abteils bemerke ich das Feld an der erwähnten Bewegungstendenz der Körper. In der Umgebung ruft es außer der gemeinsamen

Geschwindigkeitsverminderung aller Gegenstände keine Wirkungen hervor, eben weil alle Körper gleich schnell fallen. Geschieht doch auch in einem Aufzug, der sich von der Aufhängung gelöst hat, kein Unheil, solange er frei fällt; erst beim Aufschlagen auf den Erdboden wird das anders. Herr Lenard übersieht, daß infolge des gleich raschen Falls aller Körper das neue Schwerefeld im Außenraum keine Lageänderungen der Gegenstände gegeneinander hervorruft, wohl aber im Innenraum die Dinge gegen die ruhenden Wände des Abteils in Bewegung setzt.

Soviel gegen P. Lenard. Herrn Weyland aber möchte ich zum Schluß einen Rat geben, dessen Befolgung in seinem eigensten Interesse liegen dürfte: sollte er sich nämlich noch einmal gegen Einstein wenden, sich über diesen Mann mit etwas mehr Achtung zu äußern. Die Relativitätstheorie mag man für richtig oder falsch halten, es äußert sich auf jeden Fall in ihr eine Genialität, die auf anderen Gebieten der Physik schon zu den schönsten Ergebnissen geführt und ihm verdienstermaßen Weltruhm verschafft hat. Die stolze Wissenschaft ist stolz darauf, ihn zu den Ihrigen zählen zu dürfen!

Wir haben Herrn Weyland, wie üblich, von dieser Entgegnung Kenntnis gegeben und erhalten darauf von ihm folgende Zuschrift:

Raummangel verbietet mir, an dieser Stelle eine Erwiderung zu geben, wie sie eine Persönlichkeit wie Herr v. Laue erfordert. Ich werde mich am 24. August im großen Saal der Philharmonie mit Herrn E. Gehrcke zunächst allgemein zur Sache äußern, späterhin im besonderen. Ich bitte Herrn v. Laue, zu diesem Abend anwesend zu sein. Des weiteren werden Herr Kraus (Prag) und Herr Glaser (Berlin) am 2. September im gleichen Saale zum Thema sprechen.

Hier nur soviel: Ich wende mich nicht gegen eine Theorie, sondern gegen mathematische Fiktionen und maßlose Übertreibungen. Daß die Frage der Rotverschiebung für Herrn v. Laue nunmehr ebenfalls keine absolute Tatsache ist, freut mich. Früher, als keine Kritiker, die es kontrollieren konnten, (ich erinnere an Herrn Freundlichs Märzvortrag), da waren, las man's anders. Ferner ist Herr v. Laue anscheinend über den neuesten Stand der englischen und amerikanischen Forschung nicht ganz im Bilde. Anders kann ich seine Bemerkung nicht verstehen. Näheres im Vortrag. Hinsichtlich der Gerberschen [*28*] Formel verweise ich auf die Arbeiten von E. Gehrcke (Verhandlg. d. Deutschen Physikal. Gesellschaft 1918 S. 165, Ann. d. Physik, 4. Folge, Band 51, 1916, S. 119.) Die Sache ist ja für Herrn Einstein sehr peinlich, aber nicht zu ändern. Es wundert mich nur, daß man die ganze Gerbersche Arbeit verdonnert — Schwächen seien zugegeben, aber: wo sind keine? — und gerade das Ergebnis so schön findet, daß man es, sagen wir, verwendet. Hier hilft kein Drehen und Deuteln. Oder soll ich noch deutlicher werden? Ich erinnere an Palagyi, Mach! Weiß Herr v. Laue nicht, wie sich Herr Einstein hinsichtlich der Verwendung, Machscher Gedanken herausgeredet hat?

Zu dem Einwand gegen Herrn L. Lenard äußere ich mich nicht. Dieser hervorragende Heidelberger Gelehrte wird seinerzeit selbst das Wort gegen Einstein ergreifen. [Footnote: Herr Lenard teilt mir seine Antwort brieflich mit, die ich hier wiedergeben möchte: „Herrn v. Laues Äußerungen zu meiner Schrift haben mich stark befremdet, insofern sie mir die Sachlage nicht zu treffen scheinen. 1. Trifft es nicht zu, daß Herr Einstein auf meine Einwände nie geantwortet habe. Vielmehr wird seine Antwort in der soeben erschienenen 2. Auflage meiner Schrift „Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation“ nicht nur genau zitiert, sondern auch

besprochen, aber nicht als befriedigend befunden (siehe meine Fußnote auf S. 31) und es wird sogar angegeben, wo Herr Einstein oder einer der Verteidiger der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie einsetzen müßten, um den Beweis — oder genügenden Hinweis — für die Berechtigung der Verallgemeinerung zu liefern, wobei ich garnicht zweifle, daß es nicht nur mir allein gegenüber lohnend wäre, dies wirklich zu tun, — falls es möglich ist. Es scheint mir hiernach, daß Herr v. Laue die neue Auflage meiner Schrift noch garnicht, die alte aber auch nur unvollkommen kennt, beziehlich überlegt hat. Denn 2. trifft es außerdem auch nicht zu, daß ich das Nichtauftreten von Trägheitswirkungen infolge gleichschnellen Fallens aller Körper bei Wirkung von Gravitation übersehen hätte. Sondern ich finde nur große Schwierigkeiten gegen die Annahme der Einsteinschen Gravitationsfelder und erörtere diese Schwierigkeiten — die sofort auftreten, sobald man einfache Beispielfälle zu Ende zu überlegen versucht — ausführlich mit dem Resultate, daß eine Einschränkung des verallgemeinerten Relativitätsprinzips notwendig sei, um es von seinen gegen den Verstand gerichteten Härten zu befreien. — Eine selbst bei Zutreffen der von Herrn Einstein gemachten, experimentell kontrollierbaren Voraussagen irgendwie gesicherte Allgemeingiltigkeit des Relativitätsprinzips kann bisher nicht behauptet werden, womit aber auch jede Betonung einer philosophischen auf die Grundauffassung des Naturgeschehens gerichteten Bedeutung zunächst wegfallen sollte. Gerade weil solche Betonung zu oft zu auffallend vor die Allgemeinheit gebraucht worden ist, schien es und scheint es nun eben nötig, neben den Vorzügen auch die der gegenwärtigen Erfahrung entsprechenden Grenzen des Relativitätsprinzips, oder die Übertreibungen, die man sich mit demselben gestattet hat, hervorzuheben. Wer hierüber im Einzelnen orientiert sein will, wie es meiner Auffassung nach dem wirklichen Stand der Kenntnis entspricht, muß für jetzt auf die erwähnte 2. Auflage meiner Schrift verwiesen werden.] Herr v. Laues Einwand werde ich ihm übermitteln.

[*29*]

Für den mir erteilten Rat danke ich bestens. Ich bin mit anderen Herren so frei, über die Relativitätstheorie meine besondere Meinung zu haben. Die Beweise werden in einer Vortragsreihe, an der erste Physiker und Astronomen teilnehmen, dargelegt werden.

P. Weyland

Tägliche Rundschau Nr. 180.

Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie.

Entgegnung an Herrn Professor Dr. M. v. Laue.

Von Dr.-Ing. L. C. Glaser (Berlin).

In Nummer 175 dieses Blattes sagt M. v. Laue, daß man Einsteins Erklärung für die Abweichung der Perihelbewegung der Planetenbahnen, insonderheit des Merkurs, nicht in einem Atem mit der Arbeit von Gerber nennen darf, welcher nach seiner Meinung nach einer Fülle von Unklarheiten, Mißverständnissen und Ungenauigkeiten die Perihelbewegung aus einem eigens zu diesem Zweck ersonnenen, sonst zu nichts brauchbaren, aus der Geschichte der Wissenschaft nur zu gut verständlichen, mathematischen Ansatz errechnet. Man ist, wie von P. Lenard bereits schon bemerkt ist, mit der Arbeit des verstorbenen Oberlehrers Paul Gerber besonders scharf ins Gericht gegangen. Im Hinblick

darauf, daß M. v. Laue sich schützend vor Einstein stellt, ist es Pflicht der Menschlichkeit, das Ergebnis dieser Arbeit des verstorbenen Oberlehrers Paul Gerber gegen die Bezeichnung „Machwerk“ in Schutz zu nehmen. Die Ereiferung M. v. Laues über die Arbeit von Gerber ist unverständlich, zumal diese Arbeit im Auslande auf Grund des Wiederabdruckes in den „Annalen für Physik“ von Herrn L. Silberstein, der ja bekanntlich gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie Einsteins eine durchaus ablehnende Stellung einnimmt, gelegentlich einer Arbeit „über die Perihelbewegung des [*30*] Merkurs, abgeleitet nach der klassischen Theorie der Relativität“ in den „Monthly Notices“ der *Roy. Astr. Soc.* 1917, 503-610, als Gerbers Formel aufgeführt und anerkannt wird. Daß nun den Anhängern der Relativitätstheorie das Bestehen der Gerberschen Formel, über deren Ansatz man im einzelnen denken kann, wie man will, recht unbequem ist, ist ja sehr leicht verständlich, zumal die Forderungen und sogenannten Bestätigungen der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie im ganzen äußerst beweisbedürftig sind. Da die Arbeit Gerbers der Geschichte angehört, das Einsteinsche Ergebnis vorwegnimmt, aber gern totgeschwiegen wird, ist es besonders erfreulich, festzustellen, daß diese bereits Aufnahme in der zweiten Auflage des Lehrbuches der Physik von Riecke, herausgeben von Lecher, gefunden hat.

Tägliche Rundschau Nr. 175, Abendausgabe.

Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie.

Von M. v. L a u e.

Auf meinem Aufsatz in Nr. 176 dieses Blattes hin haben mich verschiedene Fachgenossen auf Einsteins „Dialog über die Einwände gegen die Relativitätstheorie“. [*Footnote*: Diese Arbeit war mir bekannt. Als Einwand habe ich sie nicht gelten lassen. Herr Lenard ist lt. seinem Briefe genau derselben Ansicht.] (Naturwissenschaften, 6. Jahrgang, Seite 6-697, 1918) aufmerksam gemacht, in welchem Einstein selbst zu dem Lenardschen Einwand Stellung nimmt. Was dort steht, deckt sich zwar nicht mit dem, was ich neulich an dieser Stelle — übrigens als die Ansicht sehr vieler — darüber sagte, doch besteht auch kein Widerspruch; ich gebe diesen Hinweis hiermit weiter.

Ein wenig ausführlicher aber möchte ich in Hinblick auf Herrn Glasers Entgegnung in Nr. 178 auf die Gerbersche Erklärung der Perihelbewegung beim Merkur eingehen. Zwar kann man eine sozusagen philosophische Kritik dieser Arbeit und ihrer Schlußformel nur einem fachmännischen Publikum verständlich machen, so daß ich hier darauf verzichten muß. Aber ich möchte doch einmal fragen, was diese Arbeit denn eigentlich leistet.

Eine Tatsache physikalisch erklären, heißt doch, sie in Beziehung zu anderen physikalischen Tatsachen setzen. Darin bin ich hoffentlich mit den Gegnern der Relativitätstheorie einig. Mit welcher anderen Tatsache setzt nun Gerber die Perihelbewegung in Beziehung? Die Überschrift seiner Veröffentlichung könnte die Antwort nahelegen: Mit der (zwar nie unmittelbar beobachteten, [*31*] aber doch sehr wahrscheinlichen) Ausbreitung der Schwere mit endlicher, und zwar mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit. [*Footnote*: Diese sehr interessante Einschränkung eines der wichtigsten Einstein'schen Postulate werde ich an anderer spezieller Stelle entsprechend würdigen. Daß v. L a u e das Einsteinsche

Postulat von der Lichtgeschwindigkeit als äußerste Grenze aller Geschwindigkeiten so einschränkend behandelt, ist aus der Feder diese bedeutendsten Relativisten von außerordentlicher Wichtigkeit.] Aber diese Antwort wäre nicht richtig. Unmittelbar nach dem Wiederabdruck in den Annalen der Physik habe ich an derselben Stelle (Band 53, Seite 214) darauf hingewiesen, daß Gerbers Formeln die Schwere als eine unvermittelte Fernwirkung hinstellen. Einen Widerspruch gegen diesen Nachweis habe ich bisher weder öffentlich noch privatim vernommen. Und welche andere Tatsache ließe sich hier erwähnen? Ich wüßte keine.

Nun lege wir einmal denselben Maßstab an Einsteins Erklärung. Sie bringt die Perihelbewegung in Zusammenhang mit der Äquivalenz der trägen und der schweren Masse, die der Versuch mit einer seltenen Schärfe bewiesen hat; natürlich auch mit der Lichtablenkung und der Verschiebung der Spektrallinien an der Sonne — doch diese Tatsachen sind ja noch bestritten. Sicher aber ist, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie die beschränkte (ich vermeide gern das Fremdwort „spezielle“) als fast stets brauchbare Näherung einschließt. Sie setzt damit die Perihelbewegung in Beziehung zu allen den berühmten Versuchen, welche durch Beobachtung auf der Erde deren Bewegung um die Sonne vergeblich nachzuweisen suchten; ferner zu den vielen sicher festgestellten Tatsachen der Elektrodynamik und Optik der bewegten Körper. Weiter: Die beschränkte Relativitätstheorie steht — ich glaube unbestritten — im Einklang zur gesamten mechanischen Erfahrung, einschließlich der verhältnismäßig neuen Beobachtungen über die Dynamik schnell bewegter Elektronen. Kurz: Einsteins Erklärung reiht die Perihelbewegung in den großen Zusammenhang von Tatsachen ein, den wir als das physikalische Weltbild bezeichnen.

Der Weg, auf dem das erreicht wird, mag manchem nicht gefallen. Dafür habe ich durchaus Verständnis. Aber man soll die relativistische Theorie der Perihelbewegung wirklich nicht auf eine Stufe stellen mit der Gerberschen Erklärung, die, abgesehen davon, was sonst über sie zu sagen wäre, überhaupt keine Erklärung ist.”

Ernst Gehrcke addressed Albert Einstein to his face in the Berlin Philharmonic on 24 August 1920. Ernst Gehrcke was the second and last speaker at the event. Gehrcke stated, as recorded in a the published transcript of his talk: *Die Relativitätstheorie. Eine Wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion, gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, Volume 1 of the Press of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft e. V., Köhler, Berlin, (1920); which was reprinted in Gehrcke’s booklet *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 54-68:

“Was ist eigentlich die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie? Diese Frage wird heute nicht nur in gelehrten Kreisen erörtert, sondern sie beschäftigt sehr viele, denen akademische und gelehrte Dinge sonst fern liegen. Das Thema der Relativitätstheorie, der Streit über ihre Bedeutung und Richtigkeit ist heute bis in die Tagespresse aller möglichen Richtungen gedrungen. Aber um was es sich eigentlich dreht, das dürfte trotz aller Zeitungsartikel und populären Broschüren, die wie Pilze aus der Erde schießen, nur sehr wenigen klar sein. Dem soll im Folgenden abgeholfen werden.

Es wird dabei zu beachten sein, daß die Relativitätstheorie nicht wie ein *deus ex machina* plötzlich eines Tages da war, sondern dass sie, wie alle geistigen Strömungen, eine längere *Entwicklung* gehabt hat und schrittweise und allmählich gewachsen ist. Daß die Relativitätstheorie eine geistige Strömung darstellt, kann niemand bezweifeln, nur darüber wird man verschiedener Meinung sein können, ob diese Strömung eine gesunde, verheißungsvolle ist, ob sie, kurz gesagt, einen *Fortschritt* darstellt, oder ob das Gegenteil der Fall ist, ob sie ungesund, unfruchtbar und falsch, also kurz gesagt ein Irrlicht der geistigen Entwicklung war. Die Meinungen hierüber sind sehr geteilte. Der Gemeinde der Relativitätsgläubigen steht eine Schar von Zweiflern und Kritikern gegenüber, hüben und drüben haben anerkannte Autoritäten Partei ergriffen, und wie die Dinge liegen, werden nicht allein wissenschaftliche, sondern auch politische und andere Gesichtspunkte in die Debatte hineingetragen. In dieses Chaos der durcheinander wogenden Behauptungen und Interessen soll hier also hineingeleuchtet werden. Nur unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Entwicklung wird es aber möglich sein, das Durcheinander zu verstehen und sich über das Gewirr der Meinungen ein Urteil zu bilden. Wir fragen im Folgenden nicht, was ist die Relativitätstheorie? sondern: wie hat sie sich entwickelt? und beginnen mit demjenigen Punkte, welcher der Relativitätstheorie den Namen gegeben hat, mit dem

Relativitätsprinzip.

Gemäß dem Obigen werden wir nicht fragen, was ist das Relativitätsprinzip? sondern: wie hat sich das Relativitätsprinzip entwickelt? Erst die Darlegung dieser Entwicklung wird uns zu einem Standpunkt gegenüber dem Relativitätsprinzip führen, der von dem augenblicklichen Tagesurteil frei ist.

Das Relativitätsprinzip ist in der Tat kein erst in unsern Tagen aufgestellter Grundsatz, sondern es hat eine lange Geschichte, die bis in das griechische Altertum und möglicherweise noch weiter zurückreicht. Die vollständige Darstellung seines Werdeganges wäre eine umfangreiche, historisch-kritische Studie, die hier nicht auf kurzem Raum gegeben werden kann und hier auch nicht behandelt zu werden braucht. Es wird genügen, wenn wir deutlich machen, daß das Relativitätsprinzip an sehr einfache, alltägliche Erfahrungen, die schon mancher gemacht hat, anknüpft.

Stellen wir uns etwa vor, daß wir in einem Eisenbahnzuge sitzen, der auf dem Bahnhof hält. Auf der andern Seite des Bahnsteigs soll ebenfalls ein Zug stehen. Wir warten ungeduldig auf Abfahrt, endlich geht es los, der Zug setzt sich in Bewegung, und wir sehen durch das Fenster, wie wir am jenseitigen Zuge uns vorbeibewegen. Aber mit einem Mal entdecken wir, daß wir uns geirrt haben: w i r halten immer noch auf dem Bahnhof, aber der a n d e r e Zug fährt! Dieses unliebsame Erlebnis in seiner Alltäglichkeit und Einfachheit ist geeignet, uns dem Relativitätsprinzip näher zu führen: Wir konnten nicht feststellen, ob w i r fahren oder der a n d e r e Zug, ob w i r in Ruhe blieben oder der andere Zug, das einzige, das wir beobachten konnten,

war, daß die beiden Züge *relativ* zueinander in Bewegung waren. Man nennt dies die *Relativität der Bewegungen*. Alle Bewegung ist *relativ*, d. h. bezogen auf irgend etwas, außerhalb des Bewegten Befindliches. Alle Naturkörper in unserer Umgebung, auf der Erde, alle Gestirne am Himmel bewegen sich *relativ* zueinander. Man drückt sich auch so aus, daß man sagt, der Bewegungsbegriff sei ein Relationsbegriff, d. h. ein Begriff, der ohne Bezugnahme auf etwas, *gegenüber welchem* das Bewegte sich bewegt, nicht gedacht werden kann. Aber die Relativität der Bewegungen ist noch nicht das *Prinzip* der Relativität. Hierüber ein anderes, alltägliches Beispiel.

Es soll ein Stück Holz mit einer Säge durchgesägt werden. Das kann auf zweierlei Weisen geschehen: erstens so, daß das Stück Holz *festgehalten* wird, z. B. indem man es auf einen Sägebock legt und die Säge hin und her *bewegt*, zweitens so, daß die Säge festgehalten, z. B. zwischen die Knie geklemmt wird, und nun das Stück Holz quer zur Säge hin und her bewegt wird. In beiden Fällen wird das gleiche Ergebnis erzielt: das Holz wird durchgesägt. Ob ich also die Säge bewege und das Holz festhalte, oder umgekehrt die Säge festhalte und das Holz bewege, kommt auf dasselbe hinaus. Die beiden Bewegungsvorgänge: Holz fest, Säge bewegt und: Säge fest, Holz bewegt, sind aber in *relativer* Hinsicht gleich; es bewegt sich in *beiden* Fällen das eine *in bezug auf* das andere in gleicher Weise. Dieser Spezialfall läßt sich sogleich verallgemeinern, wenn man behauptet, daß bei irgend zwei Bewegungsvorgängen, die *relativ zueinander* gleich sind, immer das gleiche Ergebnis herauskommt. Damit wird ein Satz aufgestellt, der durch Beobachtung nahegelegt ist und den man in seiner Allgemeinheit versuchsweise auf *alle* Bewegungsvorgänge in der Natur erstreckt. Die Behauptung, *wenn sie richtig ist*, wird damit zu einem allgemeinen Naturprinzip, und man nennt ein solches Naturprinzip das Relativitätsprinzip.

So weit ist die Sache also gar nicht schwierig, und jedermann, der über Beobachtungen an relativ zueinander bewegten Körpern verfügt oder der Holz gesägt hat, kann begreifen, was man unter dem Relativitätsprinzip versteht. Man wird auch begreifen, daß die Gedankengänge, die zum Relativitätsprinzip geführt haben, nicht erst im 20. Jahrhundert von der Menschheit eingeschlagen wurden, sondern erheblich älteren Datums sind. Sonderlich originell ist also das Prinzip *nicht*, das der Relativitätstheorie den Namen gegeben hat. Es taucht nun aber sogleich die Frage auf: ist denn das Prinzip überhaupt richtig?

Diese Frage zu beantworten ist viel verwickelter, als begreiflich zu machen, was man unter dem Relativitätsprinzip versteht. In der sogenannten klassischen Mechanik, die von Galilei und Newton begründet ist, wird das Relativitätsprinzip als in aller Strenge gültig angesehen für gewisse Bewegungen von Naturkörpern, nämlich solche, die derartig verlaufen, daß die *relativen Bewegungen gradlinig* sind und mit *gleichbleibender Geschwindigkeit* erfolgen, sofern dabei

keine andern als rein m e c h a n i s c h e Erscheinungen hervortreten.

Ob das Relativitätsprinzip auch über diesen engen Bereich hinaus n o c h i m R a h m e n der alten klassischen M e c h a n i k tatsächlich gültig ist, darüber sind sich nicht einmal heute die Gelehrten einig. Namhafte Forscher nehmen an, daß alle Bewegungen in der klassischen Mechanik, in denen die Geschwindigkeiten n i c h t gleichbleiben, in denen also sogenannte Beschleunigungen auftreten, das Relativitätsprinzip durchbrechen, andere nehmen an, daß das Relativitätsprinzip auch für u n g l e i c h f ö r m i g e Bewegungsvorgänge gültig bleibt, sofern dabei Drehbewegungen (Rotationen) ausgeschlossen werden. Für Drehbewegungen jedenfalls gilt das Relativitätsprinzip der klassischen Mechanik n i c h t. Wer sich näher für diesen Gegenstand interessiert, mag dies in der Fachliteratur nachlesen. [*Footnote:* Vergl. E. Gehrcke. Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft **15** S. 260. 1913.]

Wir werden nun weiter gehen und fragen, ob denn das Relativitätsprinzip auch für solche Naturerscheinungen gilt, welche nicht nur hinsichtlich ihrer Bewegung (z. B. wie zwei relativ zueinander bewegte Eisenbahnzüge) oder mechanisch, wie das Zersägen von Holz, betrachtet werden, sondern ob es auch für elektrische, magnetische, optische und andere Erscheinungen gültig bleibt. Auch hierüber besteht keine Einigkeit unter den Forschern. Besonders trennen sich hier die Parteien nach dem Gesichtspunkt, ob die elektrischen, magnetischen, optischen u. a. Erscheinungen in einem unsichtbaren, untastbaren, unwägbaren, aber doch tatsächlich vorhandenen Medium, genannt Weltäther, vor sich gehen oder nicht. Diejenigen Forscher, welche an den Äther glauben — und zu diesen gehören die bedeutendsten Gelehrten der Vergangenheit und der Gegenwart — müssen das Relativitätsprinzip, wie es oben für wägbare Naturkörper eingeführt wurde, allgemein ablehnen, auch für völlig gradlinige Bewegungen mit völlig gleichförmiger Geschwindigkeit (sogenannte gleichförmige Translationen). Diejenigen aber, welche nicht an den Äther glauben, haben die Freiheit, die Gültigkeit des Relativitätsprinzips in den verschiedensten Erweiterungen probeweise anzunehmen. Welchen Gültigkeitsbereich nehmen nun die Anhänger der sogenannten Relativitätstheorien für das Relativitätsprinzip an?

Auch diese Frage ist nicht einfach zu beantworten, weil die Meinungen sehr geteilte sind. Der Erfinder der Relativitätstheorie, Einstein, hat hierüber im Laufe der Zeit sehr verschiedene Ansichten gehabt und seinen Standpunkt mehrfach gewechselt. Er hat zunächst behauptet [*Footnote:* A. Einstein, Annalen der Physik **17**, S. 891, 1905. Vgl. ferner die Zusammenstellung von Gehrcke: Die Naturwissenschaften **1**, S. 62, 170, 338, 1913; ebenda 1919, S. 147.], daß das Prinzip auch für optische, elektrische usw. Erscheinungen an wägbaren Körpern g ü l t i g sei wobei stillschweigend vorausgesetzt war, daß die oben von der klassischen Mechanik für m e c h a n i s c h e Erscheinungen zugelassene Bedingung der geradlinigen, gleichbleibenden Geschwindigkeit (gleichförmiger Translation) zutrifft; dann hat er sich zwei Jahre später merkwürdigerweise dahin geäußert, daß das Relativitätsprinzip

nur auf beschleunigungs freie (relative) Bewegungen angewandt worden sei, und überlegt, ob das Prinzip auch für beschleunigte Bewegungen gelte. Er kommt zu dem Schluß, daß dies so ist und glaubt, das Prinzip auf den speziellen Fall gleichförmiger Beschleunigung erweitern zu dürfen. Später hat Einstein in einer mehrere Monate nach meinen Einwänden erschienenen Schrift das Relativitätsprinzip wieder beschränkt auf gleichförmige Translationen. Ferner hat Einstein das Relativitätsprinzip ganz allgemein erweitern zu können geglaubt, und es auf sämtliche, auch ungleichförmige Translationen, und sogar auf Rotationen ausdehnen wollen. Er nannte die auf diese Ansicht gegründete Theorie „allgemeine Relativitätstheorie“. Schließlich hat Einstein noch einen etwas anderen Standpunkt eingenommen, er hat nämlich das Relativitätsprinzip ersetzt durch ein modifiziertes Prinzip, das sogenannte „Äquivalenzprinzip“ [*Footnote*: A. Einstein, Annalen der Physik, Bd. **35**, S. 898, 1911.], und wir stehen vor dem bemerkenswerten Ergebnis, daß dasjenige Prinzip, welches der Relativitätstheorie den Namen gegeben hat, in der neueren Theorie Einsteins einem anderen Prinzip Platz gemacht hat. Einstein hat sich übrigens in der Verteidigung des Relativitätsprinzips nicht glücklich geäußert; dies trifft besonders für seine Polemik mit Lenard [*Footnote*: P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von Hirzel, Leipzig 1920. P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von Hirzel, Leipzig 1920. Hier findet man viele zugehörige Literaturhinweise.] zu, den er sachlich gar nicht widerlegen kann und an dessen Gegengründen er einfach vorbeiredet.

Es hätten die Schwankungen in der Auffassung Einsteins über eine so grundlegende Frage wie das Relativitätsprinzip eigentlich schon genügen können, um die Fachwelt stutzig zu machen und mit Skepsis gegen die Relativitätstheorie zu erfüllen. Wenn diese Skepsis nicht in dem Maße zutage trat, wie es unter gewöhnlichen Umständen zu erwarten gewesen wäre, so werden hierfür Gründe da sein. Darüber soll später im Zusammenhang mit anderen Dingen einiges gesagt werden. Hier sei noch folgendes zum Relativitätsprinzip bemerkt:

Das Relativitätsprinzip, das in der Relativitätstheorie eine Rolle spielt, betrifft die Relativität von Bewegungsvorgängen. Sachlich gar nichts zu tun hat mit dieser Relativität der Bewegungen alles das, was in der Presse und auch zuweilen in Fachblättern sonst noch mit dem Wort Relativität gemeint wird. Daß „alles relativ“ ist, worunter man sich, je nach dem individuellen Bildungsgrad, das Verschiedenste denken kann, mag auch bei den Anhängern der Relativitätstheorie eine wichtige Rolle, möglicherweise zuweilen nur im Unterbewußtsein, spielen, aber mit der theoretischen Relativitätstheorie als solcher haben derartige Allgemeinheiten sachlich nichts zu schaffen. Als Schlagwort, das auf die Massen wirkt, bei dem jeder glaubt, etwas ihm einigermaßen Bekanntes zu hören und bei dem auch kaum zwei an dasselbe denken, ist aber das „Relative“ zur Einführung und zur Empfehlung der Relativitätstheorie vorzüglich geeignet. Das

„Äquivalenzprinzip“ wird niemals so populär werden können wie das „Relativitätsprinzip“. Es liegt eine gewisse Tragik darin, daß die Relativitätstheorie in ihrer allmählichen Entwicklung ihr Hauptschlagwort in den Hintergrund geschoben hat; statt dessen wird, je länger je mehr, der Hauptnachdruck auf ein anderes Gebiet der Relativitätstheorie gelegt: auf die sogenannte

Relativierung von Raum und Zeit.

Die „Relativierung von Raum und Zeit“ bildet heute die stolzeste Errungenschaft der Relativitätstheorie, deren Erwähnung die Brust des Relativisten schwellen läßt und durch die die philosophisch-erkenntnistheoretische Umwälzung unserer ganzen Weltanschauung gegeben sein soll. Die Relativierung von Raum und Zeit soll eine geistige Erneuerung und einen Wendepunkt in der menschlichen Denkweise bedeuten, demgegenüber die Taten von Kopernikus, Kepler und Newton verblassen.

Die Relativierung von Raum und Zeit wird in den bekannten Darstellungen der Relativitätstheorie als eine grundgelehrte Sache mathematisch eingekleidet vorgetragen, sodaß vielfach der Nichtmathematiker den Eindruck erhalten hat, er werde nie imstande sein, die Tiefe dieser weltstürzenden Gedanken je zu ermessen und zu begreifen. Und dabei ist kaum ein Gegenstand der ganzen Relativitätstheorie mit so wenig Aufwand an gelehrten Ausdrücken und Formeln klar zu machen, als gerade dieser. Das ist eigentlich von vornherein klar. Denn über Dinge, die so g r u n d l e g e n d sind wie Raum und Zeit, auf denen sich so vieles, Mathematisches und Nichtmathematisches, aufbaut, muß sich der Verstand mit einem Minimum an künstlichem, mathematischen Handwerkszeug klar werden können — wenn er dazu überhaupt imstande ist. Die mathematischen Formeln geben uns ja auch nur Aufschluß darüber, w i e g r o ß im einzelnen die errechneten Effekte sind, sie sagen jedoch nichts aus über den ihnen zugrunde liegenden Standpunkt. Aber die Anhänger der Relativitätstheorie sind anderer Meinung. Ihnen ist der m a t h e m a t i s c h e Aufbau offenbar unlösbar verknüpft mit den a l l g e m e i n e n, erkenntnistheoretischen Grundauffassungen, vor denen sie staunen. An keiner Stelle liegt aber die Wurzel der Relativitätstheorie klarer, als bei der ihr eigentümlichen Auffassung von Raum und Zeit, und an keinem Punkte wird die Lage für die Zukunft der Relativitätstheorie bedenklicher als beim Raum und bei der Zeit.

Einstein hat, wenn auch nicht seine Grundauffassung, so doch seine F o l g e r u n g e n hinsichtlich des raumzeitlichen Geschehens durch allgemein verständliche Bilder zu erläutern gesucht. Hier nur eine Probe.

Einstein erörterte gelegentlich eines Vortrages in Zürich [*Footnote*: A. Einstein, Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft Zürich **56**, S. 11 und folgende.] die Vorgänge, die sich nach seiner Theorie in einer hin und her bewegten Uhr angeblich abspielen sollen. Eine solche hin und herbewegte Uhr soll nach Einstein gegenüber einer ruhenden Uhr n a c h gehen. Er äußert sich dann, um recht deutlich and populär zu sein, folgendermaßen: „Wenn wir z. B. einen lebenden Organismus in eine

Schachtel hineinbrächten und ihn dieselbe Hin- und Herbewegung ausführen ließen wie vorher die Uhr, so könnte man es erreichen, daß dieser Organismus nach einem beliebig langen Fluge beliebig wenig geändert wieder an seinen ursprünglichen Ort zurückkehrt, während ganz entsprechend beschaffene Organismen, welche an dem ursprünglichen Orte ruhend geblieben sind, bereits längst neuen Generationen Platz gemacht haben. Für den bewegten Organismus war die lange Zeit der Reise nur ein Augenblick, falls die Bewegung annähernd mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit erfolgte! Das ist eine unabweisable Konsequenz der von uns zugrunde gelegten Prinzipien, die die Erfahrung uns aufdrängt.“

Also kurz gesagt: Die Zeitfolge aller Ereignisse auf einem Naturkörper soll nach Einsteins Theorie abhängig sein vom Bewegungszustand des Körpers, derart, daß die Bewegung des Naturkörpers alle auf ihm sich abspielenden Vorgänge *verlangsamt*: es soll hiernach z. B. ein lebender Organismus durch Schütteln, wegen der dadurch bedingten Verzögerung aller an ihm und in ihm sich abspielenden Prozesse, *jung erhalten* werden können. Diese Geschichte hat Einstein und ebenso seine Anhänger als „unabweisable Konsequenz“ der Relativitätstheorie einem staunenden Publikum erzählt! Sie ist von den Relativisten mannigfach variiert und weiter ausgebaut worden: Von zwei Zwillingen wird der eine gleich nach seiner Geburt auf eine lange Reise geschickt, von welcher er als Schuljunge zurückkehrt; er findet dann seinen Bruder als Greis mit weißen Haaren vor! Solche and ähnliche Betrachtungen sind, um es noch einmal hervorzuheben, nicht etwa Märchen oder Witze, sondern „unabweisable Konsequenzen“ der Relativitätstheorie! Die genannten Konsequenzen muß man mitmachen, wenn man an die Relativitätstheorie glaubt.

Statt auf mathematische Formeln einzugehen, können wir an den genannten Bildern das Wesen der erkenntnistheoretischen Grundlagen der Theorie erfassen. Wir wollen uns fragen: 1. Welche Grundansicht über die Zeit liegt diesen Betrachtungen zugrunde? 2. Was folgt weiter daraus?

Fassen wir jetzt also irgendeine den Folgerungen ins Auge, die den relativistischen Zeitablauf kennzeichnen, z. B. das obige, Einsteinsche Beispiel der gegeneinander bewegten Organismen. Wir wollen tatsächlich annehmen, es wäre experimentell gefunden, daß der *bewegte* Organismus *jünger* geblieben ist als der ruhende; über die Unwahrscheinlichkeit und die technischen Schwierigkeiten einer solchen Feststellung wollen wir uns hinwegsetzen. Dann wäre alles, so sonderlich es wäre, immerhin verständlich, wenn Bewegung als solche die Eigenschaft haben würde, eine Verlangsamung aller auf dem bewegten Körper vor sich gehenden chemischen und physikalischen Prozesse hervorzubringen. Gerade die Bewegung als solche, auch genannt „absolute Bewegung“, wird aber von Einstein geleugnet, und er muß daher die gegebene Erklärung für das merkwürdige Jungbleiben des bewegten Organismus von sich weisen. Statt dessen nimmt er eine „Relativierung der Zeit“ an; das bedeutet, daß der bewegte Organismus *nur vom Standpunkt des ruhenden*

Organismus aus der jüngere ist, daß aber andererseits auch vom Standpunkt des andern Organismus aus der erste Organismus der bewegte und daher der jüngere ist. Nach der Relativitätslehre soll jeder Standpunkt dem andern gleichberechtigt, keiner von dem andern bevorzugt sein. Ein solcher Ausweg führt nun aber zu höchst bedenklichen Folgerungen. Dies ist unschwer einzusehen, wenn wir die beiden Organismen miteinander reden lassen, nachdem die Reise beendet ist und sie beide wieder relativ zueinander ruhen. Der e i n e Organismus wird z. B. behaupten: i c h habe weiße Haare, and Du bist jung geblieben; der a n d e r e Organismus wird ebenfalls behaupten: i c h habe weiße Haare and Du bist jung geblieben, denn i c h bin ja von m e i n e m Standpunkt aus der ruhende, und D u der bewegte! Also die beiden Organismen wenden sich g e g e n s e i t i g für jung und jeder sich selbst für gealtert erklären!

Die beiden kommen also zueinander in Widerspruch. Man könnte auf den Einfall kommen, daß der Widerspruch beseitigt wäre, wenn in der Unterhaltung der eine immer das Gegenteil von dem h ö r e n würde, was der andere s a g t, aber auch das rettet nicht aus der Schwierigkeit. Denn wenn die Reise des bewegten Organismus lange genug gedauert hat, ist der ruhende Organismus tot (vgl. oben Einsteins Worte). Dann ist es aber eine „unabweisbare Konsequenz“, wenn der jung gebliebene Organismus zum Toten spricht: N i c h t D u bist tot, sondern i c h ! Denn vom Standpunkt des jungen Organismus aus war j a e r s e l b s t d e r r u h e n d e, der andere der bewegte [Footnote: Der empirische Einwand, daß ein Toter nicht sprechen kann, steht dem Relativisten nicht zu, der selbst als Begründung für seine Behauptungen über Zeit und Raum nichts anderes anzuführen weiß, als daß sich „a priori“ nichts gegen sie einwenden ließe.]! Es ist zu bedauern, daß die Relativitätstheoretiker das Einsteinsche Organismenbeispiel nicht gründlich weiter gedacht haben. Vielleicht wären ihnen dann noch einige Zweifel aufgestiegen, ob die Vertauschbarkeit den Standpunkte, die sie hinsichtlich des zeitlichen Geschehens unter der Bezeichnung „Relativierung der Zeit“ eingeführt haben, sich durchführen läßt.

Es ist nur eine einzige Möglichkeit ersichtlich, aus den Widersprüchen, zu denen die „Relativierung der Zeit“ führt, herauszukommen, wenn man nämlich dazu übergeht, jedem Standpunkt, Organismus, Beobachter, Subjekt oder „Monade“ eine e i g e n e W e l t zuzuordnen, die mit den Welten anderer, bewegter Monaden nichts zu tun hat. Der „Relativierung der Zeit“ fügt man so eine „Relativierung des Seins“ hinzu, d. h. mit anderen Worten: die E i n d e u t i g k e i t des Naturgeschehens für alle bewegten Monaden wird aufgehoben. Man kann auch so sagen: es wird der Standpunkt eines physikalischen Solipsismus eingenommen. Es weist kein Anzeichen darauf hin, daß die in den erkenntnistheoretischen Fragen sehr unklaren Relativitätstheoretiker einen solchen Ausweg beabsichtigt oder überhaupt nur erwogen haben. Auch Minkowski, der von seiner eigenen „Verwegenheit mathematischer Kultur“ spricht, scheint diese Verwegenheit der Relativierung des Seins, zu der er bei konsequentem Festhalten an dem

einmal beschrittenen Wege gedrängt wird, nicht im Auge gehabt zu haben. Wie denn überhaupt die Denkrichtung den Relativitätstheoretiker auf den mathematischen Ausbau und die formalistische Struktur der Theorie gerichtet ist, und nicht in die erkenntnistheoretische Vertiefung und Klarstellung.

Immerhin deuten manche Äußerungen Einsteins, gerade in seinen sogenannten „allgemeinverständlichen“ Darlegungen, darauf hin, daß ihm die inneren Schwierigkeiten seiner Lehre nicht ganz fremd waren. Wenn er z. B. gelegentlich behauptet hat, daß der Begriff der Gleichzeitigkeit zweier Ereignisse keinen Sinn habe, so läßt diese zunächst mystische Ausdrucksweise vermuten, daß Einstein gefühlt hat, etwas Besonderes erfinden zu müssen, um innere Widersprüche zu vermeiden. Bei Klarlegung des erkenntnistheoretischen Standpunkts der Relativitätstheorie als eines Solipsismus erscheint allerdings das Sinnlose der Gleichzeitigkeit als eine zulässige Selbstverständlichkeit. Es ist aber keine Kunst, einen Widerspruch dadurch zu vermeiden, daß man implicite den Grundsatz einführt: es bezieht sich die eine Aussage, die einer zweiten Aussage widerspricht, auf eine ganz andere Welt als die zweite. Die Sonderbarkeiten der Relativitätstheorie, ihre angebliche Reform der Erkenntnistheorie mündet immer wieder in den oben gekennzeichneten Standpunkt aus, den man physikalischen Solipsismus nennen kann. Dieser Standpunkt ist der eines Menschen, welcher in die äußerste Enge getrieben ist, der seine Sache bis aufs letzte verfährt, und schließlich, um sich zu retten, die Erklärung abgibt: ich habe nicht, denn Du hast auch recht, weil wir beide verschiedenen Welten angehören und deshalb unsere Aussagen gar nicht miteinander vergleichen können! Wenn man den „Zeitbegriff relativiert“, so zerstört man die Idee der einen, allgemeinen, objektiven Natur; wenn die eine Monade ihre Eigenzeit, von den Relativisten t genannt, die andere ihre Eigenzeit, t' genannt, hat, so muß auch jede Monade ganz für sich ihre eigene Welt oder Natur haben, und so wenig man den Zeiten t und t' „gleichzeitige“ Augenblicke erlaubt, ebensowenig sind auch in den Welten der beiden Monaden ein und dieselben Dinge vorhanden, höchstens können beide Welten miteinander gewisse Ähnlichkeiten aufweisen. Die Relativitätstheorie führt also nur zu einem alten, abgelebten, skeptischen Standpunkt. Das ist die „neue Revolution des modernen Denkens“, die die Relativitätstheorie enzeugt hat!

Wir werden es uns versagen können, nach dem Obigen noch die Relativierung des Raumes in der Relativitätstheorie näher zu erörtern. Wenn Minkowski von sich sagt, er habe Einsteins „Hinweschreiten über die Zeit“ durch ein „Hinweschreiten über den Raum“ vervollständigt, so hat er damit eine Folgerung gezogen, die ihm nur deshalb bewundernswürdig erschienen ist, weil er selbst sich prinzipiell so unklar war.

Relativitätstheorie und Gravitation.

Die erste Relativitätstheorie Einsteins, welche er später „die spezielle“ genannt hat, wurde von ihm ersetzt durch eine zweite „allgemeine“ Relativitätstheorie, die die ursprünglichen Mängel der ersten Theorie nicht

haben sollte. Nun ist aber das Verhältnis der beiden Theorien zueinander nur in formaler Hinsicht das des Speziellen zum Allgemeinen, während in grundsätzlichen Fragen ein erheblicher, bis zum Widerspruch gesteigerter Unterschied besteht. Die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie ist dadurch gekennzeichnet, daß in ihr die allgemeine Schwere (Gravitation) eine besondere Rolle spielt, ferner ist besonders bezeichnend für sie ein allgemeines Relativitätsprinzip, d. h. die Behauptung der Relativität aller Bewegungen, auch die der Rotationen.

Abgesehen von den mit den „Relativierung von Zeit und Raum“ verbundenen, oben erwähnten Schwierigkeiten sind es auch Bedenken mehr empirischer Natur, die die allgemeine Form der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie als undurchführbar erscheinen lassen. Ein Beispiel wird dies deutlich machen können. Angenommen, wir setzen uns auf den in manchen Vergnügungsstätten sehr beliebten Apparat, genannt Drehscheibe, oder wir setzen uns auf eins der altmodischen Karussells, so soll es nach der Relativitätstheorie ebenso gut möglich sein zu behaupten, daß das Karussell fährt, als daß das Karussell still steht und die ganze Außenwelt sich um das Karussell dreht. Also der Auffassung des gewöhnlichen Menschen: das Karussell fährt: soll die Behauptung des Relativisten gleichwertig sein: die ganze Welt fährt um das stillstehende Karussell im Kreise herum! Hierbei kommt der Relativist nicht nur zu der von seinem eigenen, theoretischen Standpunkt aus störenden Folgerung, daß er den in großen Abständen vom Karussell stehenden Naturkörpern, wie z. B. allen Fixsternen, ungeheure Geschwindigkeiten beilegen muß, welche die auch der Theorie höchst zulässige Geschwindigkeit, die Lichtgeschwindigkeit, erheblich übersteigen, er muß auch noch besondere, seltsame Naturerscheinungen hinzudichten, um den Ablauf der Erscheinungen, wie er sich abspielt, beschreiben zu können. Er muß nämlich annehmen, daß die bei der Rotation der Welt auftretenden Zentrifugalkräfte durch eine Schwerkraft kompensiert werden, welche proportional dem Abstand von der Drehungsachse des Karussells zunimmt und welche im Raume des Karussells selbst ihr Vorzeichen umkehrt. Für ein solches Schwerkraftfeld ist aber keine Veranlassung erkennbar, abgesehen davon, daß sich auch mathematisch überhaupt keine Massenanordnung ersinnen läßt, die ein Schwerefeld erzeugen können, welches den mathematischen Bedingungen des Problems zu genügen vermöchte. In der Tat ist das Vorgehen des Relativisten, der die ganze Welt in Rotation, um ein Karussell versetzt und der zu diesem Zweck ein physikalisch unmögliches Gravitationsfeld voraussetzt, rein fiktiv, physikalisch unzulässig. Der Standpunkt des Relativisten gleicht dem eines Menschen, welchem ein Geldstück gestohlen worden ist und der behauptet: ich kann entweder annehmen, daß der Dieb das Geldstück gestohlen hat, oder ich kann annehmen, daß der Dieb die ganze Welt gestohlen hat, nur nicht das Geldstück. Die zweite „Denkmöglichkeit“ scheidet aus Gründen der Erfahrung, „a posteriori“, aus, und es ist deshalb nicht möglich, hier eine „Relativität“ der Standpunkte einzunehmen. Genau so ist es auch mit dem

Standpunkt des Relativitätstheoretikers gegenüber der Rotation eines Karussells, er widerspricht aller Erfahrung. Wer sich über diese Seite der Gegnerschaft gegen die Relativitätstheorie näher unterrichten will, dem seien die Schriften von Lenard angelegentlichst empfohlen, besonders die Broschüre: Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von S. Hirzel, Leipzig 1920, von der ausgehend man auch den Weg zu der übrigen Literatur über den Gegenstand findet.

Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie leidet auch an dem Mangel, keinen *i n n e r e* Grund für die Annahme eines *S c h w e r e* feldes für die zur Durchführung der Theorie benötigten Beschleunigungsfelder erkennen zu lassen. Man kann nicht einsehen, warum gerade die *G r a v i t a t i o n* berufen ist, als Ursache für Beschleunigungen angesehen zu werden, wo doch auch *a n d e r e* Ursachen für Beschleunigungen denkbar sind, wie Kräfte im Äther, Kapillaritätskräfte usw. Durch die Einführung der Gravitation, also einer empirischen, physikalischen Erscheinung in die Grundgleichungen der Relativitätstheorie, wird jedenfalls der Boden der reinen, mathematischen Konstruktion verlassen und ein physikalisches, empirisches Element hineingezogen. Der Relativist kann sich daher nicht mehr in der Rolle des abstrakten Mathematikers allein verhalten, sondern er muß es sich gefallen lassen, daß der Physiker die Theorie als eine empirisch richtig sein sollende objektiv prüft. Fällt diese Prüfung zu ungunsten des Relativisten aus, so muß dieser seine Theorie aufgeben und kann eventuell eine neue ersinnen. Es geht aber nicht an, daß der Relativist *d e s h a l b* an seiner Theorie festhält, weil er sie mathematisch schön findet. Abgesehen von allen logischen und erkenntnistheoretischen Erwägungen bleibt die Erfahrung der Hauptprüfstein jeder physikalischen Theorie, und so auch der Relativitätstheorie.

Die experimentelle Prüfung der Theorie.

Wer sich im praktischen Leben oder als Naturforscher betätigt, wird dem theoretischen Unterfangen, *e i n e* für alle Beobachter gleiche, objektive Natur in ihrer *e i n e n* Zeit und ihrem *e i n e n* Raume aufzugeben, wenig Vertrauen entgegenbringen.

Er wird daher auch nicht sonderlich erstaunt sein, wenn sich herausstellt, daß einzelne praktische Folgerungen einer solchen Theorie mit der Erfahrung in Widerspruch geraten. So wenig einerseits die Bestätigung einer *F o l g e r u n g* die Richtigkeit der *T h e o r i e b e w e i s e n* würde, — kann man doch häufig von ganz verschiedenen Grundlagen aus zu derselben, sich als richtig erweisenden Folgerung kommen, ohne damit etwas über die Richtigkeit der Grundlagen sagen zu können, — so sicher beweist andererseits eine als falsch sich herausstellende Folgerung, daß auch die Grundlage, aus der sie abgeleitet war, falsch sein muß. Die Relativitätstheorie hat die Prüfung an der Erfahrung schlecht bestanden. Dies soll im Folgenden kurz dargestellt werden.

Zunächst sei bemerkt, daß alle Folgerungen den Relativitätstheorie immer auf so winzige Effekte führen, daß es nicht einfach ist, die

experimentelle Prüfung vorzunehmen. Das war bisher in gewissem Sinne ein Glück für die Theorie, die ja dadurch in die Lage versetzt ist, auf die Schwierigkeit des Experiments, die Ungenauigkeit den Beobachtungen hinzuweisen, wenn sich ein vorausgesagter Effekt nicht findet. Es gibt aber heute Beobachtungen, die so genau sind, daß man diesen Schluß nicht mehr ziehen kann.

In ersten Linie ist hier die sogenannte Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien zu erwähnen. Eine Spektrallinie wird durch gewisse Schwingungen in einem Gase erzeugt, das leuchtet. Auch auf unserer Sonne, welche nach den Ergebnissen der Astronomie und Astrophysik ein sehr hoch erhitzter Gasball ist, werden Spektrallinien beobachtet. Nur soll nach der Relativitätstheorie die Zeitdauer irgend eines Vorgangs vom Schwerkraft-(Gravitations-)felde abhängig sein, also sollten auch die Schwingungsvorgänge aller Spektrallinien auf der Sonne vom Gravitationsfeld der Sonne abhängen. Dieses letztere ist aber erheblich stärker als das Gravitationsfeld der Erde, so daß die Spektrallinien eines Gases auf der Sonne gegenüber den Spektrallinien derselben Gasart auf der Erde einen Unterschied zeigen sollten — behauptet die Relativitätstheorie. Für die Größe dieses Unterschiedes und sein Vorzeichen sind Formeln aufgestellt worden. Sie besagen, daß die Spektrallinien der Sonne eine geringe Verschiebung nach der roten Seite des Spektrums erleiden müssen, im Betrage von 0,01 sogenannten Angströmeinheiten. Die Kleinheit dieses Betrages ist für jeden ersichtlich, wenn man ihn in Millimeter ausdrückt: er beträgt ein Milliardstel eines Millimeters. Dieser kleine Effekt, dessen Bestehen die Relativitätstheorie prophezeit hat und fordert, kann aber heutzutage mit den hochentwickelten Meßeinrichtungen gesucht werden und würde den modernen Instrumenten nicht entgehen, wenn er da wäre. Der Effekt ist sorgfältig gesucht worden, hat sich aber nicht finden lassen:

Zuerst ist die relativistische Rotverschiebung an Stickstofflinien der Sonne auf dem astrophysikalischen Institut in Potsdam gesucht worden; Schwarzschild [*Footnote*: Sitzungsbericht der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaft 1914, S. 1201-1213.], der verstorbene Direktor des Instituts, hat das Ergebnis im Jahre 1914 veröffentlicht; er findet keine Rotverschiebung. Dann hat der bekannte amerikanische Astrophysiker St. John nach der Rotverschiebung gesucht und sie ebenfalls nicht gefunden. St. John sagt in seinem Bericht vom Jahre 1917 über das Ergebnis seiner Versuche [*Footnote*: St. John, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Mount Wilson Solar Observatory Communications to the National Academy of Sciences No. 46. Vol. 3, 450-452, July 1917.]: „Das allgemeine Ergebnis der Untersuchung ist, daß innerhalb der Beobachtungsfehler die Messungen kein Anzeichen eines Effektes von der Größenordnung ergeben, die aus dem Relativitätsprinzip abgeleitet wird.“ Die Beobachtungsfehler St. Johns waren nur ein Bruchteil von dem geforderten, nicht vorhandenen Einstein-Effekt. Hale, der bekannte Sonnenforscher und Direktor der Mount-Wilson-Sternwarte, hat sich für die Richtigkeit St. Johns Beobachtungen

ausgesprochen [*Footnote*: Z. B. im Annual Report of the Direktor of the Mount Wilson Solar-Observatory, Yearbook, Nr. 16, S. 200, 1917.]. Diese Untersuchungen auf Mount Wilson, mit den besten Instrumenten unter den günstigsten Arbeits- und Beobachtungsbedingungen, wie sie zurzeit kein anderes astrophysikalisches Institut auf der Erde aufweisen kann, hätten den Einstein-Effekt unzweifelhaft feststellen müssen, wenn er existierte. Demgegenüber will es wenig heißen, wenn neuerdings ein Mitarbeiter von Einstein, Herr Freundlich, mit der Behauptung aufgetreten ist, daß die Amerikaner eine Fehlerquelle in ihren Messungen gehabt haben; die Zusammenstellung und kritische Würdigung dieses gesamten Materials wird in einer demnächst von fachmännischer Seite in Aussicht gestellten Druckschrift von. L. C. Glaser gegeben werden, auf die hier verwiesen sei.

Die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien auf der Sonne stellt bisher den Haupteffekt der Relativitätstheorie dar, er ist entschieden die wichtigste, weil am genauesten zu prüfende Folgerung, deren Nichtvorhandensein als eine experimentelle Widerlegung der Relativitätstheorie anzusehen ist — wenn es einer solchen überhaupt noch bedurft hätte. Andere Folgerungen der Relativitätstheorie sind für die Theorie weniger charakteristisch, weil sich sofort verschiedene andere Erklärungsmöglichkeiten darbieten. Da ist z. B. die sogenannte Perihelstörung des Planeten Merkur zu nennen. Nach den Beobachtungen der Astronomen dreht sich die Bahnellipse des Merkur um einen sehr kleinen Betrag von 43 Bogensekunden in 100 Jahren. Auch dies ist eine ungeheuer kleine Größe, aber sie ist dank der Feinheit der astronomischen Beobachtungsmethoden feststellbar. Es sind schon seit vielen Jahren Erklärungen für diese Bahnstörung des Merkur gegeben worden, insbesondere muß hier die Formel des Oberlehrers Gerber vom Jahre 1898 genannt werden [*Footnote*: Die schwer zugängliche Veröffentlichung Gerbers ist in den Annalen der Physik Bd. 52, Seite 415, 1917 im Neuabdruck erschienen.], die dieser aufgestellt hat, als es noch gar keine Relativitätstheorie gab und die völlig mit der aus der Relativitätstheorie von Einstein abgeleiteten Formel übereinstimmt. Hier könnte die Relativitätstheorie nur dann als eine gewisse, und zwar die zuletzt gegebene, Erklärungsmöglichkeit für eine an sich bekannte Sache angesehen werden, wenn sie im übrigen einwandfrei wäre.

Endlich ist noch ein, neuerdings in der Tagespresse mit besonderer Breite behandelter Effekt zu nennen: die Ablenkung der Sternorte in der Nähe der Sonne. Auch hier ist die Sache durchaus nicht so neu, als es auf den ersten Blick den Anschein hat, denn man kennt in der Astronomie schon lange gewisse systematische Abweichungen der Sternorte in Abhängigkeit von der Stellung des Sterns zur Sonne. Diese Erscheinung, die als jährliche Refraktion bezeichnet wird, ist bisher noch nicht erklärt, obschon ein erhebliches Tatsachenmaterial über den Gegenstand vorliegt, das bis in die Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts zurückreicht; man kann sich hierüber z. B. aus einer Abhandlung von L. Courvoisier, Beobachtungsergebnisse der Kgl. Sternwarte zu Berlin Nr. 15 vom Jahre 1913 unterrichten. Einstein hat nun

ebenfalls eine Abhängigkeit der Sternorte in Abhängigkeit von der Sonne aus seiner Relativitätstheorie gefolgert und es sind Messungen darüber von englischen Expeditionen gelegentlich der Sonnenfinsternis des Jahres 1919 angestellt worden. Die Beurteilung dieser Beobachtungen ist schwierig, da die Originalberichte noch nicht alle gedruckt vorliegen und die Angaben über die in der englischen Akademie in London vorgelegten Mitteilungen der verschiedenen Forscher nicht einheitlich sind. Jedenfalls steht fest, daß die deutsche Fachwelt und Presse bisher in einseitiger, für Einsteins Theorie zu günstiger Weise unterrichtet worden ist. Dies geht z. B. aus Äußerungen des Londoner Astronomen Silberstein hervor, der darauf aufmerksam macht [*Footnote*: Abgedruckt in: Die Naturwissenschaften **8**, 390, 1920.], daß das in der physikalischen Gesellschaft in Berlin erstattete Referat in wesentlichen Punkten Irrtümer enthielt, deren Berichtigung das Ergebnis den Messungen zu Ungunsten von Einsteins Theorie verschiebt. Über den Effekt der Sternorte in der Nähe der Sonne läßt sich also zurzeit nichts Sicheres aussagen. Aber er ist für die Theorie gar nicht so wichtig, da er, selbst wenn die von Einstein angegebene Verschiebung der Sternorte um $1\frac{3}{4}$ Bogensekunden am Sonnenrande tatsächlich sicher beobachtet wäre, noch eine ganze Reihe anderer Erklärungsversuche, die physikalisch viel verständlicher sind als die Deutung durch die Relativitätstheorie, gegeben werden können. Es ist übrigens hier die Kleinheit des Betrages von nur $1\frac{3}{4}$ Bogensekunden ein erhebliches Hindernis für das Experiment; um von diesem Betrage eine Vorstellung zu geben, sei erwähnt, daß der kleine Winkel $1\frac{3}{4}$ Bogensekunden diejenige Größe hat, unter der dem Auge eine Kirsche in 2 Kilometer Entfernung erscheint.

Welches Urteil wird man sich über die Relativitätstheorie zu bilden haben?

Das ist die Frage, die nunmehr zu beantworten ist.

Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie nimmt ihren Ursprung aus einer Theorie des holländischen Physikers Lorentz. Die Übereinstimmung mit der Lorentzschen Theorie geht so weit, daß die *m a t h e m a t i s c h e* Form der Einsteinschen Theorie vom Jahre 1905 wesentlich dieselbe ist, wie die von Lorentz, die Gleichungen dieser Einsteinschen Theorie sind die Gleichungen von Lorentz. Neuartig erschien die *D e u t u n g* der Theorie, die *I n t e r p r e t a t i o n* der Grundbegriffe Zeit und Raum. Einstein hat mit dieser Interpretation etwas getan, von dem seine Bewunderer gesagt haben, es stelle alles bisher Dagewesene in den Schatten. Die Interpretation Einsteins war aber gleichfalls weit weniger neu, als es den Anschein hatte. Schon im Jahre 1901 hat der ungarische Philosoph Melchior Palágyi in Engelmanns Verlag in Leipzig eine Schrift in deutscher Sprache [*Footnote*: Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit. Von Dr. Melchior Palágyi. Verlag Engelmann, Leipzig 1901.] erscheinen lassen, die wesentliche Gedanken Einsteins und Minkowskis, des begeisterten, mathematischen Anhängers Einsteins, vorwegnahm: so besonders die Idee der „Union zwischen Zeit und Raum“, die Auffassung der „Welt“ in 4 Koordinaten, von denen die eine,

die Zeit, mit der imaginären Einheit $\sqrt{-1}$ multipliziert auftritt usw. Den Physikern waren diese Vorgänge — zum Teil heute noch — unbekannt, sie nahmen die Relativitätslehre Einsteins teils kopfschüttelnd, teils abwartend auf. Als aber anerkannte Autoritäten sich begeistert für die Relativitätstheorie einsetzten, trat auch im Publikum Begeisterung auf, und nun nahm die Entwicklung ihren unaufhaltsamen Gang. Bei der Verknüpfung mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Gedanken in der Relativitätstheorie war es den Fachleuten in unserer Zeit des hochgesteigerten, wissenschaftlichen Spezialistentums sehr schwer gemacht, zu einem selbständigen Urteil über die Theorie zu gelangen, zumal Einstein sein Werk mit Geschicklichkeit zu verteidigen wußte und den Physikern ihre Bedenken mit mathematischen und philosophischen, den Mathematikern ihre Bedenken mit physikalischen und philosophischen, den Philosophen ihre Bedenken mit mathematischen und physikalischen Gegengründen zerstreute: jeder Fachmann beugte sich vor der Autorität des Kollegen im andern Fach, jeder glaubte das, was er nach andern Fachautoritäten als für bewiesen halten zu sollen vermeinte. **Niemand wollte sich dem Vorwurf aussetzen, er verstehe nichts von der Sache!** Und so wurde eine Lage geschaffen, ähnlich der von Andersen geschilderten in seinem Märchen „Des Kaisers neue Kleider“: hier sieht ein Kaiser mit seinen Ministern und Untertanen dem Weben eines Gewandes zu, das die Eigenart hat, von denjenigen Menschen nicht gesehen zu werden, die dazu nicht klug genug sind, und schließlich stehen alle staunend vor den leeren Webstühlen, weil niemand sich getraut zu bekennen, daß er nichts sieht. So hat auch die Relativitätstheorie die Geister gefesselt, sie ist zur Massensuggestion geworden. Aber eine Massensuggestion ist an sich nichts Verwerfliches, die Ausschaltung des klaren Verstandes braucht durchaus kein Beweis dafür zu sein, daß das Streben der Masse ein törichtes ist. Alles hing bei der Relativitätstheorie davon ab, ob sie in ein erkenntnistheoretisch annehmbares Fahrwasser geleitet werden konnte.

Einstein hat die Schwächen seiner Theorie öfters zu verbessern und den Einwänden auszuweichen gesucht, er hat z. B. das Relativitätsprinzip hin und hergeworfen (s. oben S. 57 ff.), er hat schließlich geglaubt, den sicheren Hafen erreicht zu haben und im Jahre 1915 erklärt [*Footnote*: Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie 1915, S. 847.], daß endlich die Relativitätstheorie als logisches Gebäude abgeschlossen sei. Ein Punkt bei all diesen Wandlungen ist noch besonders wichtig, hervorgehoben zu werden: so wenig neuartig die mathematische Form der ersten Relativitätstheorie Einsteins ist, die mit der älteren Lorentzschen Theorie übereinstimmt, so wenig ist auch die im weiteren Verlauf der Entwicklung durch Einstein vollzogene Veränderung des mathematischen Gewandes der Theorie besonders neuartig gewesen: daß die Relativitätstheorie in die Formeln der nichteuklidischen Geometrie hineinführt, zeigte zuerst der Mathematiker Varicak; daß die mathematische Komplikation der nichteuklidischen Kontinua von den Mathematikern formal bereits seit

langem gelöst war, erkennt sogar Einstein an. Inwieweit Einstein die neueste von Weyl u. a. eingeschlagene, relativitätstheoretische Richtung überhaupt noch mitmacht, ist nicht recht klar. Jedenfalls verbreiten Anhänger von Einstein Nachrichten, die für die Weylschen Arbeiten ungünstig lauten.

Wenn es also feststeht, daß Einstein in seiner Relativitätstheorie keine mathematisch ungewöhnlichen Formen entdeckt hat, wenn die philosophisch-erkenntnistheoretische Grundlage des ganzen Gebäudes unbefriedigend ist, wenn endlich die Experimente der Physiker und Astronomen die Theorie nicht beweisen können, so wird man fragen, was denn überhaupt noch übrig bleibt, um in der Relativitätstheorie ein Werk zu erblicken, das über die Taten von Kopernikus, Kepler und Newton hinausgeht. Diese Frage werden die heutigen Anhänger und Gegner der Theorie, je nach ihrem persönlichen Gefühl, verschieden beantworten. Eine Antwort, die alle befriedigt, wird sich erst erzielen lassen, wenn die Suggestion der Reklame und der Druckerschwärze, mit welcher die „revolutionäre Relativitätstheorie“ arbeitet, von allen als solche erkannt ist. Zu dieser Aufklärung beitragen zu helfen mögen die obigen Zeilen dienen.”

Gehrcke effectively accused Einstein of plagiarizing the mathematical formalisms of Lorentz, the space-time concepts of Palágyi,²⁶³ and the non-Euclidean Geometry of Varičak.²⁶⁴ Albert Einstein's first wife Mileva Marić would have been able to have read *all* of Varičak's works. She also would have been able to have understood all of Smoluchowski's lectures. She could also read English, making her the likely source of many of the works Albert Einstein plagiarized from English-speaking authors.²⁶⁵ Gehrcke also accused Albert Einstein of masking his plagiarism and the weaknesses of the theory of relativity with irrational Metaphysics. Gehrcke stood up and declared that, “the Emperor has no clothes!”—an admission Einstein had already privately made to Heinrich Zangger on Christmas Eve of 1919.²⁶⁶ Gehrcke said that people were often afraid to admit that they did not understand the theory of relativity, and were in stupefied awe of that which they did not understand, not in informed appreciation of the theory. Einstein had made the exact same statements in his private correspondence, but shamelessly called Gehrcke anti-Semitic when he reiterated Einstein's own beliefs.

Einstein's only response came days later in a frantic, inappropriately emotional and irrational “hand-waving” *ad hominem* attack against Lenard, Weyland and Gehrcke. Einstein simply appealed to authority—his hangers-on, and those from whom he had plagiarized the theory of relativity. Einstein's response appeared in the *Berliner Tageblatt* on pages 1 and 2 on 27 August 1920.

Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard had had no involvement in the Berlin Philharmonic lectures. Even Einstein's friends condemned Einstein's flippant, inaccurate and racially-charged response. Sommerfeld wrote to Lenard and pleaded with Lenard to forgive Einstein, who had misrepresented Lenard's involvement in the event. Lenard must have been outraged that Sommerfeld should be the one to write to him, not Einstein, and Lenard must have been outraged that Einstein apologized not only through a proxy, but privately.

Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard demanded a personal public apology from Albert Einstein to be attended with as much publicity as Einstein's (and Max von Laue's) cowardly and unscrupulous personal attacks against Lenard. Einstein's apology was not forthcoming.²⁶⁷ After the Bad Nauheim debate, where Lenard destroyed Einstein in a debate, Max Planck and Franz Himstedt stated to the press that Einstein had regretted including Lenard in his personal attack, because Lenard had not granted Weyland leave to place his name on the list of speakers at the Berlin Philharmonic lectures. The *Berliner Tageblatt* morning edition 25 September 1920 ran this story. This was obviously not an adequate apology for Einstein's vicious and deceitful smears.²⁶⁸

Einstein could not defend himself or his position other than to change the subject to a personal attack against his opponents. He pouted and whined like a spoiled brat in order to avoid the bulk of accusations made against him and the theory of relativity. Instead of arguing the issues, Einstein wanted to wait for others to speak on his behalf in defense of the theory. He was not competent to defend the theory himself. Einstein, who was himself a racist who believed that anti-Semitism was justified and proper and helpful to Jews, hypocritically tried to change the subject to race in order to attack his opponents as if racists. Albert Einstein wrote in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen Ausgabe, 27 August 1920, pp. 1-2:

“Meine Antwort

Ueber die anti-relativitätstheoretische G. m. b. H.

Von

Albert Einstein.

Unter dem anspruchsvollen Namen „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ hat sich eine bunte Gesellschaft zusammengetan, deren vorläufiger Daseinszweck es ist, die Relativitätstheorie und mich als deren Urheber in den Augen der Nichtphysiker herabzusetzen. Neulich haben die Herren Weyland und Gehrke in der Philharmonie einen ersten Vortrag in diesem Sinne gehalten, bei dem ich selber zugegen war. Ich bin mir sehr wohl des Umstandes bewußt, daß die beiden Sprecher einer Antwort aus meiner Feder unwürdig sind; denn ich habe guten Grund zu glauben, daß andere Motive als das Streben nach Wahrheit diesem Unternehmen zugrunde liegen. (Wäre ich Deutschnationaler mit oder ohne Hakenkreuz statt Jude von freiheitlicher, internationaler Gesinnung, so . . .) Ich antworte nur deshalb, weil dies von wohlwollender Seite wiederholt gewünscht worden ist, damit meine Auffassung bekannt werde.

Zuerst bemerke ich, daß es heute meines Wissens kaum einen Forscher gibt, der in der theoretischen Physik etwas Erhebliches geleistet hat und nicht zugäbe, daß die ganze Relativitätstheorie in sich logisch aufgebaut und mit den bisher sicher ermittelten Erfahrungstatsachen im Einklang ist. Die bedeutendsten theoretischen Physiker — ich nenne H. A. Lorentz, M. Planck, Sommerfeld, Laue, Born, Larmor, Eddington, Debye, Langevin, Levi-Civita

— stehen auf dem Boden der Theorie und haben meist wertvolle Beiträge zu derselben geleistet. Als ausgesprochenen Gegner der Relativitätstheorie wüßte ich unter den Physikern von internationaler Bedeutung nur Lenard zu nennen. Ich bewundere Lenard als Meister der Experimentalphysik; in der theoretischen Physik aber hat er noch nichts geleistet, und seine Einwände gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie sind von solcher Oberflächlichkeit, daß ich es bis jetzt nicht für nötig erachtet habe, ausführlich auf dieselben zu antworten. Ich gedenke es nachzuholen.

Es wird mir vorgeworfen, daß ich für die Relativitätstheorie eine geschmacklose Reklame betreibe. Ich kann wohl sagen, daß ich zeitlebens ein Freund des wohlerwogenen, nüchternen Wortes und der knappen Darstellung gewesen bin. Vor hochtönenden Phrasen und Worten bekomme ich eine Gänsehaut, mögen sie von sonst etwas oder von Relativitätstheorie handeln. Ich habe mich oft lustig gemacht über Ergüsse, die nun zuguterletzt mir aufs Konto gesetzt werden. Uebrigens lasse ich den Herren von der G. m. b. H. gerne das Vergnügen.

Nun zu den Vorträgen. Herr W e y l a n d, der gar kein Fachmann zu sein scheint (Arzt? Ingenieur? Politiker? Ich konnt's nicht erfahren), hat gar nichts Sachliches vorgebracht. Er erging sich in plumpen Grobheiten und niedrigen Anschuldigungen. Der zweite Redner, Herr Gehrke, hat teils direkte Unrichtigkeiten vorgebracht, teils hat er durch einseitige Auswahl des Materials und Entstellung beim unwissenden Laien einen falschen Eindruck hervorzurufen versucht. Folgende Beispiele mögen das zeigen:

Herr G e h r k e behauptet, daß die Relativitätstheorie zum — Solipsismus führe, eine Behauptung, die jeder Kenner als Witz begrüßen wird. Er stützt sich dabei auf das bekannte Beispiel von den beiden Uhren (oder Zwillingen), deren e i n e in bezug auf das Inertialsystem eine Rundreise durchmacht, die andere nicht. Er behauptet — trotzdem ihm dies von den besten Kennern der Theorie schon oft mündlich und schriftlich widerlegt worden ist —, die Theorie führe in diesem Falle zu dem wirklich unsinnigen Resultat, daß von zwei nebeneinander ruhenden Uhren jede der anderen gegenüber nachgehe. Ich kann dies nur als einen Versuch absichtlicher Irreführung des Laienpublikums auffassen.

Herr Gehrke spielt ferner auf Herrn Lenards Einwände an, die viele auf Beispiele der Mechanik aus dem alltäglichen Leben beziehen. Diese sind schon hinfällig auf Grund meines allgemeinen Beweises, daß die Aussagen der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie in erster Näherung mit denen der klassischen Mechanik übereinstimmen.

Was Herr Gehrke über die experimentelle Bestätigung der Theorie gesagt hat, ist mir aber der schlagendste Beweis dafür, daß es ihm nicht um die Enthüllung des wahren Sachverhalts zu tun war.

Herr Gehrke will glauben machen, daß die Perihelbewegung des Merkur auch ohne Relativitätstheorie zu erklären sei. Es gibt da zwei Möglichkeiten. Entweder man erfindet besondere interplanetare Massen, die so groß und so verteilt sind, daß sie eine Perihelbewegung von dem wahrgenommenen

Beträge ergeben; dies ist natürlich ein höchst unbefriedigender Ausweg gegenüber dem von der Relativitätstheorie gegebenen, welche die Perihelbewegung des Merkur ohne irgendwelche besondere Annahme liefert. Oder aber man beruft sich auf eine Arbeit von Gerber, der die richtige Formel für die Perihelbewegung des Merkur bereits vor mir angegeben hat. Aber die Fachleute sind nicht nur darüber einig, daß Gerbers Ableitung durch und durch unrichtig ist, sondern die Formel ist als Konsequenz der von Gerber an die Spitze gestellten Annahmen überhaupt nicht zu gewinnen. Herrn Gerbers Arbeit ist daher völlig wertlos, ein mißglückter und irreparabler theoretischer Versuch. Ich konstatiere, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie die erste wirkliche Erklärung für die Perihelbewegung des Merkur geliefert hat. Ich habe die Gerbersche Arbeit ursprünglich schon deshalb nicht erwähnt, weil ich sie nicht kannte, als ich meine Arbeit über die Perihelbewegung des Merkur schrieb; ich hätte aber auch keinen Anlaß gehabt, sie zu erwähnen, wenn ich von ihr Kenntnis gehabt hätte. Der diesbezügliche persönliche Angriff, welchen die Herren Gehrke und Lenard auf Grund dieses Umstandes gegen mich gerichtet haben, ist von den wirklichen Fachleuten allgemein als unfair betrachtet worden; ich hielt es bisher für unter meiner Würde, darüber ein Wort zu verlieren.

Herr Gehrke hat die Zuverlässigkeit der meisterhaft durchgeführten englischen Messungen über die Ablenkung der Lichtstrahlen an der Sonne in seinem Vortrage dadurch in einem schiefen Lichte erscheinen lassen, daß er von den drei unabhängigen Aufnahmegruppen nur eine erwähnte, welche infolge Verzerrung des Heliostatenspiegels fehlerhafte Resultate ergeben mußte. Er hat verschwiegen, daß die englischen Astronomen selbst in ihrem offiziellen Berichte ihre Ergebnisse als eine glänzende Bestätigung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie gedeutet haben.

Herr Gehrke hat bezüglich der Frage der Rotverschiebung die Spektrallinien verschwiegen, daß die bisherigen Bestimmungen noch einander widersprechen, und daß eine endgültige Entscheidung dieser Angelegenheit noch aussteht. Er hat nur die Zeugen gegen das Bestehen der von der Relativitätstheorie vorhergesagten Linienverschiebung angeführt, hat aber verschwiegen, daß durch die neuesten Untersuchungen von Grebe und Buchem und von Perot jene früheren Ergebnisse ihre Beweiskraft eingebüßt haben.

Endlich bemerke ich, daß auf meine Anregung hin in Neuheim auf der Naturforscherversammlung eine Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie veranstaltet wird. Da kann jeder, der sich vor ein wissenschaftliches Forum wagen darf, seine Einwände vorbringen.

Es wird im Auslande, besonders auf meine holländischen und englischen Fachgenossen H. A. Lorentz und Eddington, die sich beide eingehend mit Relativitätstheorie beschäftigt und darüber wiederholt gelesen haben, einen sonderbaren Eindruck machen, wenn sie sehen, daß die Theorie sowie deren Urheber in Deutschland selbst derart verunglimpft wird."

Einstein knew that he had been very publicly exposed as a fraud. He decided to flee Germany. It was obvious to him that all of German science would stand against him for what he had done. Pro-Einstein newspapers came to his rescue and published alarmist nonsense and personal attacks by Einstein's friends. It came as a surprise to Einstein that Laue, Nernst and Rubens would campaign by personal attack in the newspapers to rescue Einstein's reputation.²⁶⁹

It was only reluctantly that Einstein then chose to put up any kind of a fight with his undignified rant in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. If his friends had not rescued him, Einstein would have left Germany in total defeat without having spoken a word in his defense. The *Berliner Tageblatt* reported on 27 August 1920, parroting (as opposed to mocking) the nationalistic tone von Laue and Einstein had condemned as "anti-Semitic", and cried out that the sky was falling, and spoke of Einstein as if of a god,

"Albert Einstein will Berlin verlassen! Die persönlichen Angriffe, die gegen Dr. Albert Einstein in der an dieser Stelle bereits gekennzeichneten Versammlung der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ vorgebracht wurden, haben einen Erfolg gehabt, der für Berlin tief Beschämend ist: Albert Einstein, angewidert von den altdeutschen Anrempelungen und den pseudowissenschaftlichen Methoden seiner Gegner will der Reichshauptstadt den Rücken kehren. So also steht es im Jahre 1920 um die geistige Kultur Berlins! Ein deutscher Gelehrter von Weltruf, den die Holländer als Ehrenprofessor nach Leiden berufen, dem die amerikanische Columbia-Universität die Große goldene Medaille verleiht, den schwedische und norwegische Gesellschaften zu ihrem Ehrenmitglied ernennen, dessen Werk über die Relativitätstheorie als eines der ersten deutschen Bücher nach dem Kriege in englischer Sprache erscheint: ein solcher Mann wird aus der Stadt, die sich für das Zentrum deutscher Geistesbildung hält, herausgeekelt. Eine Schande!

Wir können es noch nicht glauben, daß in dieser Angelegenheit, die nicht nur für die Welt der Wissenschaft von Bedeutung ist, das letzte Wort gesprochen sein soll. Die Berliner Universität hat die Pflicht, alles zu tun, um diesen hervorragenden Lehrer und Gelehrten sich und Berlin zu erhalten. Und Albert Einstein, der über niedrigen Anwürfen steht, wird hoffentlich nach ruhigerer Ueberlegung seinen Feinden nicht den Gefallen erweisen, vor ihrem sinnlosen Geschrei den Platz zu räumen. Wer die Ehre deutscher Wissenschaft auch in Zukunft hochhalten will, muß jetzt zu diesem Manne stehen."

The report in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, adopting and improving upon Lenard's tactics, sought to make it appear unpatriotic for Germans to enter into a scientific dispute with Einstein—the archangel of Berlin. Einstein had called the *Berliner Tageblatt* a hypocritical newspaper in the context of Socialism.²⁷⁰ The *Berliner Tageblatt* turned Einstein's cowardly flight from the exposure of his plagiarism, the self-contradictions in relativity theory, and the uncertain evidence used to promote

the man and his theory, into the crucifixion of the Messiah by a cabal of ungodly anti-German nationalistic Germans. More effective—more boldly dishonest—propaganda than that used to promote and sell Einstein to the public is hard to find.

Einstein had made his *ad hominem* attacks against the Berlin Philharmonic gathering with the cooperation of some members of the international press not only in an effort to smear his outspoken critics, but also to threaten anyone who dared side with them. The press orchestrated an overwhelming international defamation against Einstein's critics.

Einstein believed the majority of physicists sided with Lenard and Gehrcke and sought to suppress any public sympathy for their position. After the terrible hype of the 1919 eclipse observations, the press used Einstein and Einstein used the press. Einstein wrote to Sommerfeld in this context,

“It is a bad thing that every utterance of mine is made use of by journalists as a matter of business.”²⁷¹

Ad hominem attack and smear campaigns were Einstein's and his followers' preferred method of response to challenges to Einstein's priority and to relativity theory, as even Einstein's advocates were forced to concede in 1931,

“Even individual fanatic scientific advocates of the Einsteinian theory seem to have finally abandoned their tactic of cutting off any discussion about it with the threat that every criticism, even the most moderate and scrupulous ones, must be discredited as an obvious effluence of stupidity and malice. But even if these monstrous products of the ‘Einstein frenzy’ [*Einstein-Taumel*] now belong to history and are thus eliminated from consideration, thoroughly respectable reasons for a certain discomfort with relativity theory still do remain[.]”²⁷²

This was a response to the charge of such *ad hominem* attacks made in *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* (100 Authors Against Einstein),

“It is the aim of this publication to confront the terror of the Einsteinians with an overview of the quality and quantity of the opponents and opposing arguments.”²⁷³

Ernst Gehrcke decided to fight propaganda with thoroughly documented fact, but initially came up on the losing side. Einstein's persona, as depicted in the corrupt press, was perhaps too endearing to be successfully countered by the facts. The press also largely made it impossible for Einstein's critics to argue their side to the public. Einstein often opted to hide from criticism, as even his advocates were forced to admit,

“Although Einstein himself, by nature a pure scientist, is uninterested in such

academic disputes!”²⁷⁴

After decades of misrepresentations which promote Einstein as if he were an angelic figure, it is necessary to show that he was not only capable of plagiarism, but that we know for a fact that he committed far worse moral offenses—Einstein’s plagiarism is among the least of his many sins. It is also helpful to know Einstein’s habits. Einstein clearly plagiarized the special theory of relativity, as well as many important aspects of the general theory of relativity, from Jules Henri Poincaré and Hendrik Antoon Lorentz. In fact, Einstein evinced a career-long pattern of plagiarism and was often accused of appropriating the work of others. He tried to avoid these accusations and never refuted them.²⁷⁵ For example, Einstein wrote to Willy Wien in 1916 when Ernst Gehrcke²⁷⁶ effectively accused Einstein of plagiarizing Paul Gerber’s formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury,

“[. . .]I am not going to respond to Gehrcke’s tasteless and superficial attacks, because any informed reader can do this himself.”²⁷⁷

It was clear that Einstein had an ethical obligation to acknowledge Gerber’s priority. Einstein’s close friends Friedrich Adler and Michele Besso wrote to him and pointed out that Einstein had repeated Gerber’s formula.²⁷⁸ It was terribly unfair, unethical and unprofessional of Einstein to respond to Gehrcke in the manner in which he did. Einstein had an ethical obligation to acknowledge Gerber’s priority and explain why he had repeated his formula without an attribution. Einstein instead ridiculed Gerber and Gehrcke and asserted that he had no obligation to cite Gerber’s work.

In another instance where Einstein took the coward’s way out, a meeting was arranged to discuss Hans Vaihinger’s²⁷⁹ theory of fictions in 1920. Einstein pledged that he would attend this meeting. Knowing that Einstein would be devoured in a debate over his mathematical fictions, which confused induction with deduction, Wertheimer and Ehrenfest helped Einstein to fabricate an excuse to miss the meeting he had agreed to attend. Einstein was proven a liar.²⁸⁰ He also hid from many other criticisms, and Einstein refused to answer T. J. J. See’s many charges of plagiarism,²⁸¹ and refused to debate Arvid Reuterdaahl or to answer his many charges of plagiarism.²⁸² When Robert Drill²⁸³ criticized the theory of relativity, Einstein tried to persuade Max Born and Moritz Schlick to not respond to the critique, but if they did so, to hide from his arguments and merely ridicule Drill with insults.²⁸⁴ Einstein hid from the French Academy of Sciences.²⁸⁵ Einstein hid from Cardinal O’Connell.²⁸⁶ Einstein hid from Cartmel.²⁸⁷ Einstein hid from Dayton C. Miller’s falsification of the special theory of relativity.²⁸⁸ Miller challenged Einstein in the press over the course of many years. *The New York Times Index* lists several articles in which Miller’s and William B. Cartmel’s falsifications of the special theory of relativity are discussed.²⁸⁹ Einstein and Lorentz were very worried by Miller’s results and could not find fault with them.²⁹⁰ Einstein told R. S. Shankland not to perform an experiment which might falsify the special theory of relativity,

“[Einstein] again said that more experiments were not necessary, and results

such as Synge might find would be ‘irrelevant.’ [Einstein] told me not to do any experiments of this kind.”²⁹¹

Einstein knew he was caught at the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic, and wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein desired to hide from the Bad Nauheim debate, in which he had threatened to devour his opponents,²⁹² then Einstein—after being talked into appearing and after much hype promoting the event which attracted thousand of visitors—then Einstein, when losing the debate, ran away during the lunch break and again wanted to run away from Germany.²⁹³

Einstein prospered from hype. Einstein never exhibited his legendary genius in public. Instead, Einstein either appeared like a childish madman in public, or rattled off a script he had been told to recite. The press rescued him again and again, while he and they hid from, and suppressed, legitimate criticism. Einstein was unable to defend “his” theories.

3.5.4 Jewish Hypocrisy and Double Standards

Einstein’s plagiarism became an international scandal in the early 1920's and many newspapers owned and/or edited by Jews avoided the legitimate criticisms leveled at Einstein and instead resorted to *ad hominem* attacks against his critics calling anyone who dared speak a word against Einstein *ipso facto* an anti-Semite. The intolerance of criticism in the “Jewish liberal press” had long struck many in Germany as hypocritical. During the *Kulturkampf* (the struggle between Catholics and Protestants in the German Empire in the Nineteenth Century) elements of the “Jewish liberal press” in Vienna and in Berlin relentlessly attacked Catholicism, Catholics and the Gospels, but were intolerant of any criticism directed at them, or Judaism. Ernst Lieber, while defending Jews against discriminatory legislation, stated to the Reichstag in 1895,

“Those of us in particular who bore the brunt of the *Kulturkampf* will never forget how viciously and brutally Jewish pens attacked, dragged into the mud, reviled, ridiculed and insulted all that is sacred to us and that we were called on to defend so strenuously and painstakingly.”²⁹⁴

Adolf Stoecker brought attention to this fact in an attempt to justify his call for discriminatory legislation against Jews in 1879. Stoecker stated,

“It is strange indeed that the Jewish liberal press does not have the courage to answer the charges of its attackers. Usually it invents a scandal, even if there is none. It sharpens its poisonous pen by writing about the sermons in our churches and the discussions in our church meetings; but it hushes up the Jewish question and does everything to prevent its readers from hearing even a whisper from these unpleasant voices. It pretends to despise its enemies and to consider them unworthy of an answer. It would be better to learn from the

enemy, to recognize one's own defects, and work together toward the social reconciliation which we need so badly. It is in this light that I intend to deal with the Jewish question, in the spirit of Christian love, but also with complete social truthfulness. [***] People who are in the habit of pouring out the most biting criticism of State and Church, men and events, become highly incensed when anyone takes the liberty of directing even so much as a searching glance at Jewry. They themselves hatefully and sneeringly assail any non-Jewish endeavor. But as soon as a mild word of truth is uttered about them and their doings, they put on an act of injured innocence, of outraged tolerance, of being the martyrs of world history. Nevertheless I shall dare to speak up openly and candidly about modern Jewry tonight. And I am quite prepared for the distorted reports that will come back."²⁹⁵

Wilhelm Marr also alleged in 1879,

"The *Kulturkampf* breaks out. Since 1848, if we Germans so much as criticized any little thing Jewish, it was enough to have us entirely outlawed from the press. Jewry, on the other hand, not only mixes in our religious controversies and in the *Kulturkampf* against Ultramontanism but has the most to say about it in our press. In their humor magazines, which are anxiously on the lookout for anything that can be satirized as 'Jew baiting,' they pour boiling oil on Ultramontanism. Why, of course. Ultramontanism was Jewry's competitor for world hegemony! While a sense of delicacy is wholly absent among the Jews, it is demanded of us that we handle them like fine glassware or extremely sensitive plants.

Indeed, there were great newspapers in which we Germans could not even get a hearing. Why not? Because in order to criticize Romish fanaticism, it would have been necessary to show that it was the outcome of Old Testament, Jehovah fanaticism. Even the Ultramontanes suppressed hostile representations from their newspapers as soon as Israel was even lightly grazed!!

Just once try to comment upon Jewish rituals and observances. You will see that no pope is more infallible and unassailable than these doctrines. You would be accused of religious hatred. But when Jews hold forth and have the final say on our church-state matters, that is something quite different! While we embroil ourselves in church-state conflicts, Jewry shouts 'Vae Victis! Woe unto the vanquished!'

I and several of my friends tried, at the outbreak of the *Kulturkampf*, to participate and contribute from a higher cultural and historical point of view. But in vain. We were only permitted to speak without theoretical premises or when, out of the blue, we wished to disparage the clericals. None of our letters to the editor were ever printed in the Jewish press. Thus has Jewry monopolized the free expression of opinion in the daily press."²⁹⁶

Hermann Bielohlawek expressed his outrage at the defamations issuing from the

“Viennese Jewish press beasts” against Mayor Karl Lueger, and the “muzzling and terrorism” of the Social Democrats who prevented fair and open debate, before the Vienna City Council in 1902.²⁹⁷ Long before Stoecker and Marr, Bruno Bauer argued that “the Jews” hypocritically insulated themselves from criticism, while attacking Christians.²⁹⁸

Those elements in the Jewish press of Vienna and Berlin who participated in the *Kulturkampf*, and relentlessly and viciously attacked the Catholics, ultimately incurred the wrath of both Catholic and Protestant, both Frenchman and German, and provoked much of the anti-Semitism that manifested itself the Dreyfus Affair, where Jews were seen as agents of German Protestants attacking the French Catholics, or that German Protestants were the dupes of those Jews out to destroy Catholicism. French Catholics had been under attack since the early days of the French Revolution—French Catholics gave the Pope the majority of his funding and the Revolution sought to destroy French Catholicism and with it all Catholicism. In the 1893, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu wrote,

“CHRISTIANS who belong to the educated classes do not share the antiquated popular prejudices against the Jew. Even in Eastern Europe, in Hungary, Roumania, and Russia, the thin stratum of the cultured, ‘the intelligent,’ as the Russians call them, are well aware that the Jew does not steal children to give them up to the knife of the *schochet* and that the Synagogue needs no Christian blood to celebrate the Hebrew Passover. The Catholics, Protestants, and members of the Greek church have another grievance against the Jews, a less crude and childish one. They accuse them of being the born enemy of what they style ‘Christian civilisation.’ The very vagueness of this charge makes it one of the most serious brought against Israel.

If it be not true that, in his secret rites, the talmudic Jew takes delight in spilling Christian blood, the Jews, it is asserted, especially the progressive Jews, do what is still worse: they are bent upon destroying Christian faith, morals, and civilisation. Not satisfied with the toleration accorded to them, they endeavour, openly or secretly, to ‘de-christianise’ Europe and modern society. Thus considered, Judaism is a disintegrating force, both from the moral and the religious, as well as from the economic and the national, point of view; it is a solvent of our old Christian institutions.

In Evangelical Germany, in Orthodox Russia, in Catholic France and Austria, the Jew is denounced as the most zealous destroyer of what one is pleased to call the Christian state and Christian civilisation. In assailing the Jews and Judaism, Christians of every sect assert, with Pastor Stoecker, that their attack on the Jew is only an act of self-defence. There are men who strive to find hidden springs in every historical event, who believe in prolonged designs, mysteriously followed up through centuries; such persons go so far as to look upon the ‘princes of Judah’ as the eternal instigators of the secular war waged against Christ, the Church, and the Christian spirit. [Footnote: Thus, for instance, *Les Juifs nos Maîtres*, by Chabaudy, Paris,

1882.] To them the ancient, chosen people, having rebelled against the Messiah, has become the enemy of the city of God, the foundations of which it is noiselessly sapping, and on the ruins of which it hopes to establish the site of Israel's dominion. The Jews are the originators and the apostles of the great 'Anticrusade' waged in our times against Christian traditions and institutions. In this sense, Antisemitism is, after a fashion, the counterpart of Anticlericalism; it is a second *Kulturkampf*, a *Kulturkampf* that has recoiled against the secret or avowed enemies of Christian civilisation.

Here we have, indeed, one of the real causes of the Antisemitic movement. It may be recognised by the country and the period in which it first appeared. The fact that it originated in the Germany of Bismarck, in the very heart of the struggle between the new Empire and the Catholic hierarchy, is not due to mere chance. Whilst the liberal German press, partly led by the Jews, was assailing the Church, the besieged party, trying to find the weak spots in the lines of attack, made a sally in the direction of the Synagogue, where the troops commanded by the Jew Lasker were encamped. That was good strategy. Such a digression had been suggested by the composition of the opposing armies. In fact, it is in a fair way of coming to be considered as one of the classical manœuvres of modern clerical campaigns. The Jew, who was apparently to have been the gainer, thus runs the risk of being the victim in the warfare against Christianity. This incident proves that he does not invariably play a safe game when he incites, or takes part in, religious struggles. Imprudent being! He will get nothing but blows for his pains. The shafts hurled by him, or by his people, against the Clericals, are in danger of rebounding against Israel. It is an unfortunate situation for the Jew when the question is put whose eyes can be offended by the harmless shadow of the Cross, whose hands are interested in effacing from our old countries the noble and precious emblems of the religion of our fathers?

'Why,' said a Silesian German to me, 'should you try to prevent us from returning to the Talmud the blows aimed at the Gospel? When an appeal is made to the state against our clergy and our Christian associations, have we not a right to appeal in our turn to the state and the people against the rabbis and the Jewish associations? Let the toleration which the Jews claim for themselves, who are in the minority, be shown to us, who are in the majority. Otherwise they will again have to listen to the cries of 'Hep! hep!' [Footnote: *Hep! Hep!* the traditional cry against the Jews in Germany. Many explications, almost all imaginary, have been given of it. Some have found in it the initials of the three words: *Hierusalem est perdita*.²⁹⁹ It is, perhaps, according to the hypothesis of Isidore Loeb, nothing more than a corruption of the word *Hebe! heb!* 'Stop! hold him!' still used, in this sense, in Alsace and the Rhenish lands.] from millions of Christians who persist in believing that the best gifts they can make to their children are the New Testament and the Crucifix.' And such language is used not only by believers; I have heard it from the lips of sceptical or indifferent people, who, in the presence of a

Jew, all of a sudden remembered that they were Christians.

Anticlericalism has thus been, by the revulsion it has occasioned, one of the main abettors of Antisemitism. In more than one country its effects have been felt by the Jews even more keenly than by the Catholics. To those who denounced the Church as a foreign body, obedient to a foreign master, the Catholics were naturally led to reply with a denunciation of the Jews as intruders of an alien race, without country, or love of country. To those who in Germany, for instance, accused the spiritual subjects of the pope of being thorough-going Ultramontanes, rebellious to the Teutonic spirit, the Catholics were, of course, ready to retaliate with an attack on the Semites, as persons obstinately set against the German spirit and *deutsche Kultur*. 'Make front against Rome,' was said one day, in 1879, in the thick of the *Kulturkampf*, by one of the Berlin journals, managed or edited by Jews. This war-cry was answered by another from the *Germania*, the organ of the *Ultramontane Centre*: 'Make front against New Jerusalem.' Thus, from time immemorial, has intolerance bred intolerance: *abyssus, abyssum*.

'The eyes of the German nation are opened at last,' continued the *Germania*; 'it sees that the struggle for civilisation is the struggle against the ascendancy of the Jewish spirit and of Jewish wealth. In every political movement, it is the Jew who plays the most radical and revolutionary part, waging war to the death against all that has remained legitimate, historical and Christian in national life.' [Footnote: *Germania*, September 10, 1879. In Germany and in Austria this has become the habitual theme of a number of newspapers. Cf., in our country, *La France Juive*, of M. Drumont.]

And this awful charge against Israel was not advanced only by the Catholics, who had to face Prince Bismarck and his short-sighted allies, the national Liberals; Protestant Germany echoed the words of Catholic Germany. The Russian priests, uneasy at seeing that the missiles aimed at the Roman hierarchy, flew higher than the mitres of their bishops and reached the Gospel and the Cross, were themselves perhaps the most ardent preachers of the new crusade. [Footnote: I could cite, as an example, the speech of Pastor Stoecker in the *Landtag*, March 22, 1880. Cf. the writings of Professor von Treitschke.] The *Kreuz-Zeitung* exceeded the *Germania* in zeal; and, outside of Germany, in states where such a movement seemed out of place, Russian writers took it up, in their turn. The *Rous*, edited by the Moscovite Aksakof, formed the Slav component of the cosmopolitan quartette which was composed of the Evangelical *Kreuz-Zeitung*, the Ultramontane *Germania*, and the Roman *Civiltà Cattolica*. Thus, for the Prussian Protestant, for the Austrian and French Catholic, for the Russian Orthodox, the war against Israel was merely a *Kulturkampf*. It meant nothing less than the preservation to modern nations of the benefits of Christian civilisation, by putting an end to what is called the judaising of European society. To one and all, Slav, Latin, German, and Magyar, the Jew, that odious parasite, was the deadly microbe, the infectious bacteria, that poisoned the blood of modern states and societies."³⁰⁰

The active involvement of persons guided by Cabalistic Jews,³⁰¹ persons such as Weishaupt, Nicholai, Bahrdt, Voltaire, Diderot, etc., in the destruction of the Catholic religion in the period preceding the French Revolution is covered by John Robison in his book *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe: Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, Printed for William Creech, and T. Cadell, Junior, and W. Davies, Edinburgh, London, (1797); see especially the fourth edition of 1798, to which Robison added a postscript. Robison stated in the introduction to his book,

“I have been able to trace these attempts, made, through a course of fifty years, under the specious pretext of enlightening the world by the torch of philosophy, and of dispelling the clouds of civil and religious superstition which keep the nations of Europe in darkness and slavery. I have observed these doctrines gradually diffusing and mixing with all the different systems of Free Masonry; till, at last, AN ASSOCIATION HAS BEEN FORMED for the express purpose of ROOTING OUT ALL THE RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENTS, AND OVERTURNING ALL THE EXISTING GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE. I have seen this Association exerting itself zealously and systematically, till it has become almost irresistible: And I have seen that the most active leaders in the French Revolution were members of this Association, and conducted their first movements according to its principles, and by means of its instructions and assistance, *formerly requested and obtained*: And, lastly, I have seen that this Association still exists, still works in secret, and that not only several appearances among ourselves show that its emissaries are endeavoring to propagate their detestable doctrines among us, but that the Association has Lodges in Britain corresponding with the mother Lodge at Munich ever since 1784.

If all this were a matter of mere curiosity, and susceptible of no good use, it would have been better to have kept it to myself, than to disturb my neighbours with the knowledge of a state of things which they cannot amend. But if it shall appear that the minds of my countrymen are misled in the very same manner as were those of our continental neighbours—if I can show that the reasonings which make a very strong impression on some persons in this country are the same which actually produced the dangerous association in Germany; and that they had this unhappy influence solely because they were thought to be sincere, and the expressions of the sentiments of the speakers—if I can show that this was all a cheat, and that the Leaders of this Association disbelieved *every word* that they uttered, and every doctrine that they taught; and that their real intention was to abolish *all* religion, overturn every government, and make the world a general plunder and a wreck—if I can show, that the principles which the Founder and Leaders of this Association held forth as the perfection of human virtue, and the most powerful and efficacious for forming the minds of men, and making them good and happy, had no influence on the Founder and Leaders themselves,

and that they were, almost without exception, the most insignificant, worthless, and profligate of men; I cannot but think, that such information will make my countrymen hesitate a little, and receive with caution, and even distrust, addresses and instructions which flatter our self-conceit, and which, by buoying us up with the gay prospect of what is perhaps attainable by a change, may make us discontented with our present condition, and forget that there never was a government on earth where the people of a great and luxurious nation enjoyed so much freedom and security in the possession of every thing that is dear and valuable.

When we see that these boasted principles had not that effect on the leaders which they assert to be their native, certain, and inevitable consequences, we will distrust the fine descriptions of the happiness that should result from such a change. And when we see that the methods which were practised by this Association for the express purpose of breaking all the bands of society, were employed solely in order that the leaders might rule the world with uncontrollable power, while all the rest, even of the associated, will be degraded in their own estimation, corrupted in their principles, and employed as mere tools of the ambition of their *unknown superiors*; surely a free-born Briton will not hesitate to reject at once; and without any farther examination, a plan so big with mischief, so disgraceful to its underling adherents, and so uncertain in its issue.

These hopes have induced me to lay before the public a short abstract of the information which I think I have received. It will be short, but I hope sufficient for establishing the fact, *that this detestable Association exists, and its emissaries are busy among ourselves.*"³⁰²

Like Robison and many others including Pope Leo XIII,³⁰³ George Goyau argued that Freemasonry sought to establish a world government—a Jewish Messianic goal.³⁰⁴ Denis Fahey argued that the Jews, armed with their Cabalistic and Talmudic doctrines and symbolism, were the guiding force behind Freemasonry.³⁰⁵ Freemasonry became truly tigerish under the direction of Adam Weishaupt.

It is interesting to note that the charges made against Jews of corrosive materialism and of leading revolutionary movements to overthrow European civilization and with it Christendom were also made by the racist Zionist Jews: Moses Hess, Benjamin Disraeli, Bernard Lazare and Theodor Herzl. The Frankist Jews and their progeny wanted to “Judaize Europe” and destroy Christendom. There are many instances in the Bible where Jews are told to destroy other religions and that Judaism will become the only religion on Earth (*Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 2:1-4; 9:6-7; 11:4, 9-10; 42:1; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17. *Micah* 4:2-3. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9). In addition, Jews must have feared that should they anoint a Messiah, Christians would attack them for worshiping the anti-Christ. The same obstacle also confronted Jews who would “restore” the Jews to Palestine. Should a Jewish State be formed in Palestine, that Jewish State would be obliged to obey Mosaic Law and chase out the Christians and Moslems.

Knowledgeable Christians, Moslems and Orthodox Jews, were likely to oppose

the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine on the grounds that it would lead to: the reconstruction of the Temple in Jerusalem—the destruction of the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa Mosque; the reestablishment of the Priests of Aaron and the Levitical ministration, together with the re-institution of the animal sacrifices of lambs, bulls and goats as David had done and as Jews are required to do for atonement (*Leviticus* 17:11. *I Samuel* 7:9. *II Samuel* 6; 24:22-25. *Ezra* 3. *Jeremiah* 33:18. *Daniel* 12:11); the need to honor the year of release, the *Shemmitah* and perhaps even the Jubilee, as well as proscriptions against usury to fellow Jews (*Exodus* 23:10-11. *Leviticus* 25. *Deuteronomy* 15; 23:20; 31:10-13. *II Chronicles* 36:20-21. *Jeremiah* 33:15); and the anointment of the Jewish Messiah, who will signify the “anti-Christ” to Christians. These were probably the reasons why Herzl laid emphasis on his assertion that political Zionism was an atheistical movement, so as not to worry Christians and Moslems that he was the anti-Christ and would destroy Moslem Mosques.

A. Kisch wrote a letter to Editor of *The Jewish Chronicle* which was published on 1 December 1911 on pages 20-21, in which Kisch tried to reassure Christians who were leery of Zionist motives that the Zionists did not want a state and that their Zionism did not herald the appearance of the Jewish Messiah, a. k. a. the anti-Christ,

“Like the Professor, Mr. Chamberlain contends that religious Jews feel the attraction towards Zion so overpowering a force that should it at any time involve a course of action opposed to the interests of the British Empire, those interests were, he considered, in danger of being disregarded to the peril of the State. Having regard to the recognised ability of the Hebrew race he thinks this supposed possibility a serious matter, but he did not show why the possession of political rights by naturalized foreigners coming from other nations was not open to the like objection. It, therefore, seems clear that his attitude is based on prejudice, not on reason. It is but fair to recognise that he confessed to some ignorance of the Jewish position, and it is only such ignorance that can excuse his attitude. Thinking that he might be under some misapprehension about the meaning and aims of the movement known as Zionism, I rose with the intention of reassuring him that it makes no pretension to herald the approach of the Messiah, or the formation of an independent Jewish State.”

Many Zionists pushed this false message in 1911, at a time when they were trying to convince the Turks that they had no reason to fear the Zionists, who had been out to destroy the Turkish Empire for centuries (recall D. Wolffsohn’s letter to the Editor of the *The London Times* published on 10 May 1911, on page 8, entitled, “The Young Turks and Zionism”). The Zionists have since founded their “Jewish State” and the Lubavitchers are trying to condition the world to accept the appearance of the Jewish Messiah, whom they are about to anoint. It is good lesson not to trust the assurances of Zionists.

Other Zionists were less guarded in their public statements. In the 8 December 1911 edition of *The Jewish Chronicle*, a letter to the Editor by B. Felz appeared on

page 38,

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE ‘JEWISH CHRONICLE.’

SIR,—It is not in the least surprising that Mr. Chesterton’s lecture to the West End Jewish Literary Society should have proved so unpalatable to the members of that body in general and to your correspondent, Mr. Kisch, in particular.

There are quite a number of ladies and gentlemen with a weathercock cast of mind—the sort of person who though he has never read a single one of M. Bergson’s books, can never say anything just now without mentioning his name—who, at prize distributions of Sabbath classes, boys’ and girls’ clubs, and other functions of the kind, makes it a constant burden of all his speeches, that Jews besides being good Jews should always be good Englishmen. This is the message that the West is repeatedly flashing to the East. When, therefore, a gentleman of Mr. Chesterton’s logical cast of mind comes along and very flatly tells them that good Jews cannot be patriotic Englishmen, it is not unnatural that the ladies and gentlemen in question should kick. The patriotism of the Jew is simply a cloak he assumes to please the Englishman and so when Mr. Chesterton is shrewd enough to detect the Jew beneath the Englishman’s clothing, the masqueraders become exceedingly angry. They had hoped to placate the Englishman by saying that they loved him and agreed with him. Judge then of their dismay when he turns round and says: I can only accept your love when you hate me and differ from me. The Jew is suspect and he knows it; and in the hope that the suspicion will be drowned in the noise, he becomes most vulgarly loud in his profession of patriotism. This atmosphere of suspicion in which the Jew lives from the moment of his birth, makes him so horribly fidgety, that when he meets a Gentile, the fact that he is a Jew is either the very first or the very last thing he wants to tell him. The Jew never takes the fact that he is one as a matter of course, which shows that he is never sure of himself, since it is only the things we are sure of and easy about that we take as matters of course.

Mr. Kisch seems to think that because some thirty years ago, two eminent men had a quarrel about the question whether good Jews could be patriotic Englishmen that, therefore, the matter has been disposed of at once and for all. To the Jews of this generation, the question is more acute and insistent than ever. We Jews of the younger generation are simply being coerced and intimidated, not through the compulsion of physical force but through the more subtle and insidious compulsion of a tyrannous public opinion, into a profession of patriotism, which, in the nature of things, must always be viewed with distrust and suspicion. I think it can be laid down as a general law, that the more Jews become Englishmen the less they become Jews. That does not imply any moral censure; it is simply a statement of fact, and Jews who pretend that they can at once be patriotic Englishmen and good Jews are simply living lies.

Yours obediently,

B. FELZ.”

While Christians were more easily duped, contemporary Orthodox Jews, who were close to the Zionists, remained very worried about the Zionists’ intentions. Rabbi Isaac M. Wise was quoted in *The New York Times* on 5 September 1897 on page 14,

“A Jewish State in Palestine and Impossibility.

Rabbi Isaac M. Wise in *American Israelite*.

Sept. 2.

Dr. Herzl does not profess to be a religious Jew. With most of his followers he maintains only to be a Jew by nationality or race. He has not the least intention to benefit Judaism. He is a politician, loyal and patriotic, no doubt, as so many politicians profess to be, and works to set up a Judenstadt [*sic*], not a religious congregation at all. Religion is at present out of the question altogether. Some zealous Zionists want the return to Palestine as a revival of Judaism, and hold also to Dr. Herzl’s project. Romantic zealots cannot possibly do without a number of contradictions in their creed, religious or political. The establishing of a Jewish State in Palestine is an impossibility in itself, and with the state laws of Moses unimaginable. The years of release and Shemittah (Sabbatical years) can not well be re-introduced, but the genuine Zionists must do it, as they have proved a few years ago. The sacrificial cult with the Aaronitic priesthood and the Levitical ministration, so much the zealous Zionist must admit, cannot be restored, nor can it in Palestine be abolished according to the dogmas of the strict Zionists and the whole orthodoxy. You would not stone to death the Sabbath breaker, the adulterer, the blasphemer, the false prophet. But in the Judenstadt [*sic*] in Palestine the laws of Moses would be in force and you cannot get over it as orthodox Jews. The contradictions between Dr. Herzl and the orthodox Zionists are as numerous as they are in every rationalistic Lover of Zion. None can leap over two thousand years of history and commence anew where all things were left then.”

For Christians, Christ was the ultimate sacrifice (*Isaiah* 53:5-7). Christ foretold the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D., which ended Jewish animal sacrifices—at least until very recently. The fear that Christians would stand in the way of the formation of a Jewish State and the anointment of a Jewish Messiah gave the Jews an enormous incentive to destroy Christianity and Christians. Zionist Jews also felt obligated to destroy Islam, for they could not rebuild the Temple without destroying the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque, which would inflame the Moslem world against them. This is one reason the Israelis seek to destroy the Moslem nations of the world today, and in so doing render their armies impotent and unable to oppose, with military force, the destruction of Moslem holy sites and building of the Jewish Temple. It should be noted that most religious Jews today follow the ancient tradition of Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai (*Berakoth* 55a. *Midrash Avot de*

Rabbi Natan), who felt that kindness and obedience to God, not animal sacrifices, atoned for sins (I *Samuel* 15:22. *Isaiah* 1:11-15. *Hosea* 6:6. *Amos* 5:22-24. *Micah* 6:6-8).

Moses Mendelssohn was on a “Jewish Mission” to supplant the religions of the world with a modern (and in some senses a more ancient) reformed Judaism, which would make political revolution the Jewish Messiah.³⁰⁶ However, this mission was the same old Jewish mission of subjugating the world to the Jewish faith, a Jewish world-government, and world-wide obedience to Jewish dogma. Like Karl Marx,³⁰⁷ Mendelssohn was a strict Talmudist. Like the Frankist revolutionaries, Mendelssohn attacked Rabbinical Judaism in order to promote himself and gain inroads into Gentile society. Mendelssohn set the stage for Communism, political Zionism and the Jewish revolutions which spread like wildfire around the globe. Like the Frankists, Mendelssohnians sought to keep their true objectives hidden behind a veil of “modernism”. Like the Frankists, the Marxists are known for loose morals and sexual incontinence, and engaged in orgies and other deviant behavior associated with the Frankists.³⁰⁸ Einstein also engaged in this deviant Frankist lifestyle. Frankist Jews believed that they could hasten the coming of the Messianic Era by making the majority of Jews infidels or Christians, thereby angering God, who would slaughter masses of Jews and give the “remnant” of “righteous Jews” both Israel and command over the Gentiles.³⁰⁹ In 1845, shortly before the revolutions of in Europe of 1848, which largely accomplished the emancipation of the Jews across Western Europe, *The North American Review* wrote,

“We might confidently look for reformers under such a system as Rabbinism; and, even without the name of reformation, for wide departures from the Talmud, either towards the ‘old paths,’ or to infidelity. The man who in modern times exerted the most commanding influence on Judaism was Moses Mendelssohn. He was born at Dessau, in 1729, was carefully educated in the Bible and Talmud, but was thrown upon Hebrew charity in Berlin, at the age of thirteen. Following the bent of his own genius, and stimulated by various associations, he left the dreary paths of tradition, to pursue the intricate but flowery ways of Gentile philosophy. He even improved the German language, in which he wrote with great taste. The influence of his works and his example was soon manifest. An enthusiasm for German literature and science was awakened among the Jewish people, when they beheld their kinsman ranking with the first scholars of the age. ‘Parents wished to see their children like Mendelssohn. Rashi and Kimchi, the Shulchan, Aruch, and Josaphoth, were laid on the shelf. Schiller and Wieland, Wolff and Kant, were the favorite books of the holy nation.’ Mendelssohn was very strict in Talmudical observances, and did not in his works directly oppose them; yet he certainly intended to undermine Rabbinism, and covertly labored to obliterate superstitions and prejudices, and to render his religion consistent with free intercourse between Jew and Gentile, and with the palpable benefits of modern progress in letters and refinement in manners. After all, he was probably at best but a deist; and he

certainly lacked that directness, candor, and earnestness of purpose, which true-hearted reformers have usually manifested. Christians must deny to Judaism that vitality which is essential to its maintenance upon the true basis even of a pure pre-Messianic creed. As a system, though not indeed strictly in each individual, it must ever oscillate between Rabbinism, or the like, and rationalism,—finding no stable, middle, spiritual ground.

Mendelssohn died in 1786; but others arose to carry out his innovations. A Jewish literary and philosophical society was formed at Königsberg, in 1783, which supported the first Jewish periodical ever published,—a journal devoted to the cause of reform. The ‘new light’ rapidly spread; and now Mendelssohnism, in different varieties, inclined more or less to the Talmud, or to infidelity, is the religion of a great majority of the Jews in all Europe west of Poland, into which country itself, especially Austrian Poland, the revolution has in some degree extended. The ‘Jews of the New Temple,’ or ‘Rational ‘ or ‘Reformed Jews,’ as they are called, where their numbers have not secured peaceable ascendancy, have generally seceded from the Talmudists; who, on their own part, where the so-called reformation has made good progress, adhere to the Talmud scarcely even in name.

The creed of the new sect has never appeared in an authoritative shape, but may be gathered from their writings and practices. The believers in it agree, that the Jews are no longer a chosen people, in the sense hitherto commonly received. They reject the Talmud, professing to receive the Hebrew Scriptures as the true basis of religious belief, and as a divine revelation; though after explaining away their inspiration, and the miracles recorded in them, on rationalistic principles. Regarding the Mosaic institutions as never abrogated, they consider, however, that most of their requirements are applicable only to a state of national establishment in Palestine; and therefore hold, that, until the unknown period of the Messiah’s advent, and Israel’s restoration, such laws only are to be observed as are necessary to preserve the essence of religion, or useful to form pious ecclesiastical communities, and which do not interfere with Gentile governments, with any of the existing relations of life, or with intellectual culture. The synagogue service has been remodelled; and the modern languages have been generally substituted for the Hebrew. A weekly lecture has taken the place of the semi-annual sermons of the Rabbinites. Contrary to the precept of the Talmud, instrumental music is introduced into public worship. ‘The question of organ or no organ,’ says a late journal devoted to the Jews, ‘divides Judaism on both sides of the Atlantic.’

Before long, the latitudinarian views of the leaders in this movement clearly discovered themselves; and there was a temporary reaction in favor of Rabbinism, to which the more devout among their converts receded. Yet the new system has signally prevailed and flourished. It is in France, perhaps, that the Jews have thrown off most completely the trammels of Judaism,—indeed, of all religion. They now style themselves *French Israelites*, or *Israelitish Frenchmen*, according to the doctrine of Napoleon’s

Sanhedrim; and seem anxious to amalgamate themselves more and more with the nation at large. Most of their leaders are infidels, undisguisedly aiming to obliterate all the common notions about a Messiah, as utterly superstitious; referring the prophecies of his advent—which they still nominally treat as prophecies—to the political emancipation of the Jews in the various lands of their sojourn. ‘The Regeneration,’ a journal published at Paris by some of their most learned and influential men, has represented the French Revolution as the coming of the Messiah, bringing, first, judgment, then, liberty and peace. The grand rabbi of Metz, a few years ago, in addressing the Jews of his district, spoke thus:—

‘God has permitted different religions, according to the different necessities of men, in the same way as he has created different plants, different animals, and men of different characters, genius, constitutions, physiognomies, and colors. Consequently, all religions are salutary for those who are born in these religions; consequently, we must respect all religions. All men, without distinction of religion, will be partakers of eternal beatitude, provided they have practised virtue in this life.’

On the 12th of June last, a voluntary Jewish synod met at Brunswick, composed of twenty-five eminent rabbins, from various parts of the continent. It was the first of a proposed succession of annual synods, to deliberate on Jewish affairs. They sat eight days, passed various resolutions proposing important changes, and declared their concurrence in all the decisions of Napoleon’s Sanhedrim. The Jews of England, though visibly influenced by residence in so enlightened a kingdom, were all nominally Rabbinites, until, within the last four or five years, a reforming party seceded in London whence their principles and denomination—‘British Jews’—have since gradually spread. Even among those who remained, great difference of opinion prevails as to Talmudical observances. Both there and in this country, the Portuguese Jews seem most active in the work of revolution. The tide of Jewish emigration to the United States is rapidly swelling; and as it comes from many lands, it exhibits a variety of hue. But the voluntary emigrant is ever and characteristically a lover of change; and here the Talmud has little sway, and that rapidly declining. Mr. Leeser represents the Bible alone as the basis of the Jewish faith and in the whole article already referred to, does not so much as mention the Talmud. He edits, at Philadelphia, ‘The Occident and American Jewish Advocate,’ the first Jewish periodical established in this country. Soon after its establishment, ‘The Israelite,’ a weekly German paper, devoted to the same cause, and also published in Philadelphia, was announced; whether this still survives, we know not. Mr. Leeser expects a literal Messiah, —not God, or a son of God, but a mere man, eminently endowed, like Moses, to accomplish all that is foretold of him. He protests against some of the decisions of the late Brunswick synod, particularly the one reaffirming the *dictum* of the French Sanhedrim, that Jews might intermarry with Gentiles. He has long had in his congregation a Sabbath school, or a school for religious instruction, held, not

on the seventh day, but on the Christian Sabbath, which Christian observance makes necessarily a day of convenient leisure for the purpose.

Among the stricter Jews, all over the world, the expectation of Messiah's advent is becoming more and more anxious. They not unfrequently talk, though without serious purpose, of embracing Christianity, should he not appear within a certain time. Migration to the Holy Land is visibly increasing. Multitudes from all parts of the world would hasten thither, could they become possessors of the dear soil, and enjoy reasonable protection. Mr. Noah proposes, that Christian societies and governments interested in the welfare of the Jews should exert their influence to procure these advantages for them in their native land of promise. The suggestion deserves notice.

Of modern efforts for the conversion of Israel to Christianity we can speak but briefly. The chief extraordinary obstacles which have hitherto opposed such efforts have been, a bigotry which treated the bare thought of investigating Christianity as a heinous sin, and which was ever prepared to stifle free inquiry by persecution; the character of Talmudical education, which disqualified the pupil for independent judgment; and accumulated prejudices against a religion too often exemplified only by profligate persecutors. But all these obstacles are gradually sinking away; nor does growing infidelity appear so formidable as the superstition and fanaticism which have given place to it. Moreover, the spirit of inquiry, and the dissensions kindled by the progress of the revolution which Mendelssohn commenced, are favorable to Christian effort. We shall speak only of what Protestants have done."³¹⁰

Protestantism, Puritanism and the *Kulturkampf* were instigated by Cabalistic Jews seeking to create a schism in the Church of Rome in order to end its hegemony and desires on Jerusalem, as well as to lead Christianity back to its Jewish roots and then destroy it. Jews were largely left alone when the Christians began to fight each other at the instigation of Jews. When searching for the true forces behind the Reformation and the French Revolution, one should ask, *qui bono?* or who benefits? The *North American Review* wrote in 1845,

"The darkest pages of history are those which exhibit Christianity, so called, as a persecuting religion. Before the epoch of the Reformation, bigotry, clothed with ecclesiastical power, was generally leagued with political tyranny and popular malice to oppress and destroy the Jews. To attempt to convert them to the Christian faith without violence was considered by most Roman Catholics as a wholly chimerical scheme, and the undoubted fact of their rejection by God, even more than the dreaded anathemas of the Church, seemed to place them beyond the pale of human sympathies. Better prospects than at any period of their dispersion brightened before them with the dawn of the Reformation. The principles of that mighty change extended to all the interests of humanity, temporal as well as eternal; and planted the seeds both of religious and political regeneration. The hearts of the Reformers were

moved with compassion towards the ancient people of God; and they advocated milder plans than those which had usually been adopted, to bring them over to the Christian faith. They discountenanced and condemned the system of wholesale plunder, from which, under the garb of zeal for the Catholic church, princes and prelates had for ages drawn a bloody revenue. But a period of lethargy among Christians in regard both to the civil and religious state of this people—a period of returning gloom—soon succeeded; and the French Revolution, itself one of the mighty effects of a reformation which necessarily emancipated human error and passion, at the same time with truth and reason, brought the first blessings of permanent civil freedom to any of the Jews of Europe.”³¹¹

Paul Scott Mowrer wrote in 1921,

“But the religious wars had now fairly begun, and in the heat of the struggle between Catholic and Protestant, the Jews, greatly to their good, were well-nigh forgotten. For them, the worst was over.”³¹²

In 1914, Edward Alsworth Ross, a Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, wrote in his book, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, The Century Co., New York, (1914), pages 160 and 163,

“The good will of a Southern gentleman takes set forms such as courtesy and attentions, while the kindly Jew is ready with any form of help that may be needed. So the South looked askance at the Jews as ‘no gentlemen.’ Nor have the Irish with their strong personal loyalty or hostility liked the Jews. On the other hand the Yankees have for the Jews a cousinly feeling. Puritanism was a kind of Hebraism and throve most in the parts of England where, centuries before, the Jews had been thickest. With his rationalism, his shrewdness, his inquisitiveness and acquisitiveness, the Yankee can meet the Jew on his own ground.”

The *Kulturkampf* followed the anti-Catholic English and French Revolutions, which had emancipated the Jews of many nations. The Old Testament led Jews to believe that Jews would rule the world through their Messiah, who would dwell with the Lord in Jerusalem, which city would serve as the sacred and the profane capital of the world. *Deuteronomy* 18:14-18:

“14 For these nations, which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and unto diviners: but *as for* thee, the LORD thy God hath not suffered thee so *to do*. 15 The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; 16 According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD

my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. 17 And the LORD said unto me, They have well *spoken that* which they have spoken. 18 I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. 19 And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require *it* of him. 20 But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. 21 And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? 22 When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that *is* the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, *but* the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.”

Psalm 72:1-20,

“Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteous’ness unto the king’s son. 2 He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. 3 The mountains shall bring peace to the people, and the little hills, by righteousness. 4 He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor. 5 They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. 6 He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth. 7 In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. 8 He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. 9 They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. 10 The kings of Tarshish and *of* the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. 11 Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him. 12 For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth; the poor also, and *him* that hath no helper. 13 He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. 14 He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence: and precious shall their blood be in his sight. 15 And he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba: prayer also shall be made for him continually; *and* daily shall he be praised. 16 There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon: and *they* of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth. 17 His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and *men* shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed. 18 Blessed *be* the LORD God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous *things*. 19 And blessed *be* his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled *with* his glory; Amen, and Amen. 20 The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended.”

Isaiah 9:6-7,

“6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. 7 Of the increase of *his* government and peace *there shall be* no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.”

Jeremiah 3:17,

“At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart.”

Zechariah 8:20-23; 14:9

“20 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; *It shall yet come to pass*, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: 21 And the inhabitants of one *city* shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts: I will go also. 22 Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD. 23 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days *it shall come to pass*, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard *that God is* with you. [***] 14:9 And the LORD shall be King over all the earth: in that day there shall be one LORD, and his name one.”

In 1862, racist Zionist Moses Hess expressed the motives of the Jews who participated in the *Kulturkampf* as a means to destroy Catholicism in order to end German anti-Semitism and as revenge for Catholic persecutions (as opposed to their other motivations of ending Catholic hegemony and Catholic designs on Jerusalem, which they believed were Jewish provinces),

“FROM the time that Innocent III evolved the diabolical plan to destroy the moral stamina of the Jews, the bearers of Spanish culture to the world of Christendom, by forcing them to wear a badge of shame on their garments, until the audacious kidnapping of a Jewish child from the house of his parents, which occurred under the government of Cardinal Antonelli, Papal Rome symbolizes to the Jews an inexhaustible well of poison. It is only with the drying-up of this source that Christian German Anti-Semitism will die from lack of nourishment.

With the disappearance of the hostility of Christianity to culture, there ceases also its animosity to Judaism; with the liberation of the Eternal City on the banks of the Tiber, begins the liberation of the Eternal City on the

slopes of Moriah; the renaissance of Italy heralds the rise of Judah. The orphaned children of Jerusalem will also participate in the great regeneration of nations, in their awakening from the lethargy of the Middle Ages, with its terrible nightmares.

Springtime in the life of nations began with the French Revolution. The year 1789 marks the Spring equinox in the life of historical peoples. Resurrection of nations becomes a natural phenomenon at a time when Greece and Rome are being regenerated. Poland breathes the air of liberty anew and Hungary is preparing itself for the final struggle of liberation. Simultaneously, there is a movement of unrest among the other subjected nations, which will ultimately culminate in the rise of all the peoples oppressed both by Asiatic barbarism and European civilization against their masters, and, in the name of a higher right, they will challenge the right of the master nations to rule.

Among the nations believed to be dead and which, when they become conscious of their historic mission, will struggle for their national rights, is also Israel—the nation which for two thousand years has defied the storms of time, and in spite of having been tossed by the currents of history to every part of the globe, has always cast yearning glances toward Jerusalem and is still directing its gaze thither. Fortified by its racial instinct and by its cultural and historical mission to unite all humanity in the name of the Eternal Creator, this people has conserved its nationality, in the form of its religion and united both inseparably with the memories of its ancestral land. No modern people, struggling for its own fatherland, can deny the right of the Jewish people to its former land, without at the same time undermining the justice of its own strivings. [***] No nation can be indifferent to the fact that in the coming European struggle for liberty it may have another people as its friend or foe. [***] The general history of social and political life, as well as the national movement of modern nations, will be drawn upon, so as to throw light upon the undischarged function of Judaism. These sources will be utilized, furthermore, to demonstrate that the present political situation demands the establishment of Jewish colonies at the Suez Canal and on the banks of the Jordan. And, finally, these illustrations will be employed to point out the hitherto neglected fact, that behind the problems of nationality and freedom there is a still deeper problem which cannot be solved by mere phrases, namely, the race question, which is as old as history itself and which must be solved before attempting the solution of the political and social problems.”³¹³

These revolutions; and the wars fought over the “Eastern Question”—the battles between the Holy Roman, Russian, Turkish, Hungarian, French, German and British Empires; favored Zionism, as did the national unifications of Italy and Germany; though the Papacy remained sovereign in Rome, to the dismay of the Zionists. Jewish enmity towards Christianity continues to this day, most especially in Israel, as Israel Shahak has proven.³¹⁴

The Rothschilds used their incalculable wealth in an attempt to act as Messiah and destroy the economies of Egypt, Russia, and Turkey, so as to leave these nations no choice but to sell Palestine to the Rothschild family. They created wars throughout the world to generate profits for themselves, and to liberate Jews; as well as to open the gates to Palestine. However, they could not persuade large numbers of Jews to emigrate to Palestine, until Jewish financiers put Adolf Hitler into power in order to scare the Jews into emigration.

3.6 The Messiah Rothschilds' War on the Gentiles—and the Jews

It is an ancient trick of the loan shark, and the extortionist criminal, to run a victim into debt, then force the victim to obtain a loan secured by property the loan shark wishes to own, and then to ensure that the victim has no means to repay the loan, such that the loan shark becomes the inevitable owner of said property. Shakespeare told such a tale of a Jewish Shylock in his *Merchant of Venice*. An article appeared in *The Religious Intelligencer*, Volume 9, Number 26, (27 November 1824), page 411, which stated,

“PROPOSED RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

The Gazette of Spire, assures its readers, that the house of Rothschilds [an immensely rich Jewish banking house in London] has recently received proposals from the Turkish government, for a loan to a considerable amount, and an offer of the entire of Palestine as a security for the payment. In consequence, adds the paper, a confidential agent has been despatched by that house to Constantinople, to examine into the validity of the pledge offered by the Turkish Cabinet.

The N. Y. Advocate says, that the Jews will be restored to their former country, and possess it in full sovereignty cannot be doubted.

Our country must be an asylum to the ancient people of God. Here they must reside; here, in calm retirement, study laws, governments, sciences, become familiarly known to their brethren of other religious denominations; cultivate the useful arts; acquire a knowledge of legislation, and become liberal and free. So, that appreciating the blessings of just and salutary laws, they be prepared to possess permanently their ancient land, and govern righteously.”

Baron Rothschild wanted to beat Jesus Christ to the second coming, by becoming the first Jewish Messiah to wreck the Gentile nations and restore the Jews to Palestine. He tried to justify the theft of Palestine from its indigenous population with the same argument Zionists employed after the Holocaust—that the Jews need a nation in order to be safe from Gentiles—again, note the incentive that Jewish financiers had to create the Holocaust in order to “justify” the theft of the

Palestinians' land. However, the vast majority of Jews did not want a Jewish nation. Most Jews did not believe Palestine would be a sanctuary, and certainly did not want to live in Palestine. It was the Zionists who perpetrated the Holocaust in order to force the reluctant Jews into moving to an undemocratic, segregated and racist "Jewish" State. Bear in mind that the word "Holocaust" means burnt sacrifice, and the slain and humiliated Jews of Europe were such a sacrifice to the ambitions of the Zionists.

It is important to note that the sophistical premise for the creation of the "Jewish State" of Israel was asserted more than one hundred years before the Holocaust began, and the Holocaust was created in order to justify the formation of an apartheid and racist "Jewish" State. Jews who want to be safe from further persecution should investigate and prosecute the Zionists and disassemble the State of Israel. The ultimate source of their suffering was, is, and will continue to be the racist Zionists.

The Episcopal Watchman, Volume 3, Number 38, (5 December 1829), p. 304; published the following article:

"ROTHSCHILD AND JERUSALEM.—Without vouching for its authenticity, we copy below, from the London Court Journal, an account of a project which it is said that the great banker Rothschild entertains of purchasing the sovereignty of Jerusalem, and the territory of ancient Palestine. If any credit is to be attached to this statement, the sublime Porte will not find the difficulty which the London journalists anticipate, in complying with the pecuniary demands of Russia. Whether, however, this letter from Smyrna is entitled to any belief or not, it is quite certain that there have been some curious notions propagated of late among the Israelites in Great Britain, and we have seen it mentioned that a number of enthusiastic men—Irrving, Cunningham, Drummond, &c. have openly maintained that the Jews will ere long be restored to Palestine, where it is prophesied that Christ will re-appear, in person, and establish a political kingdom. Mr. Wolff, the Christian missionary, is said to have embraced this doctrine, and the following paragraph which has found its way into the newspapers, is alleged to be an extract of a letter from him, dated in Jerusalem in April last.—*N. Y. Eve. Post.*

'I proclaimed for two months to the Jews the great truth—first, that Jesus of Nazareth came the first time to the earth despised and rejected of men to die for poor sinners; and secondly, that he will come again with glory and majesty, and glorious in his apparel, and travelling in the greatness of his strength, he will come the SON OF MAN, in the year 1847, in the clouds of Heaven, and gather all the tribes of Israel, and govern in person as man and God, in the literal city of Jerusalem, with his saints, and be adored in the Temple, which will be rebuilt, and thus he shall govern 1000 years; and I, Joseph Wolf, shall see with my own eyes, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in their bodies, in their glorified bodies! and I shall see thee, Elijah, and thee, Isaiah, and thee, Jeremiah, and thee, David, whose songs have guided me to *Jesus of Nazareth*. I shall see you all here at Jerusalem, where I am now writing

these lines! There were the topics upon which I spoke, not only with Jews, but likewise with some Mussulmans.’

The following is the extract of a letter, published in the Court Journal on the subject of the purchase of Jerusalem by Baron Rothschild:—

King Rothschild.—The following curious extract is from a private letter from Smyrna. We give it without note or comment.

The confidence of the children of Israel in the words of the Prophet has not been in vain: the temple of Solomon will be restored in all its splendor. Baron Rothschild, who was accused in having gone to Rome to abjure the faith of his fathers, has merely passed through that city on his way to Constantinople, where he is about to negotiate a loan with the Porte. It is stated, on good authority, that Baron Rothschild has engaged to furnish to the Sultan the enormous sum of 350,000,000 piastres, at three installments, without interest, on condition of the Sultan’s engaging, for himself and his successors, to yield to Baron Rothschild for ever, the sovereignty of Jerusalem, and the territory of ancient Palestine, which was occupied by the twelve tribes. The Baron’s intention is, to grant to the rich Israelites who are scattered about in different parts of the world, portions of that fine country, where he proposes to establish seigniories, and to give them, as far as possible, their ancient and sacred laws.

Thus the descendants of the Hebrews will at length have a country, and every friend of humanity must rejoice at the happy event. The poor Jews will cease to be the victims of oppression and injustice. Glory to the great Baron Rothschild, who makes so noble a use of his ingots.

A little army being judged necessary for the restored kingdom, measures have been taken for recruiting out of the wrecks of the Jewish battalion raised in Holland by Louis Bonaparte. All the Israelites who were employed in the various departments of the Dutch Administration, are to obtain superior posts under the Government of Jerusalem, and the expenses of their journey are to be paid them in advance.”

The New-Yorker, Volume 9, Number 13, Whole Number 221, (13 June 1840), pp. 196-197; wrote of Rothschild’s desire to be King of the Jews, and by the implications of Jewish prophecy, King of the World—and by the implications of Christian prophecy, the anti-Christ:

“RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.—On more than one occasion we have called attention to the signs, of one kind or another, by which the exiles of Israel are beginning to express their impatience for the accomplishment of the prophecies that point to their restoration; and the changes, physical and moral, which are gradually breaking down the barriers to the final fulfilment of the promise. These are curious and worth attention; and more significant in their aggregation, and with reference to the character of the people in question, than those of our readers who have looked at them hastily and separately, may have been prepared to suspect. The Malta letters brings

accounts from Syria, in which some curious particulars are given of Sir Moses Montefiore's proceedings, during his late visit to the Holy Land. We remember rumors, which had currency some years ago, of the Jewish capitalist's (Rothschild's) design to employ his wealth in the purchase of Jerusalem, as the seat of a kingdom, and bring back the tribes under his own guidance and sovereignty. If the scheme, amid its sublimity, savored sufficiently of the romantic to make the rumor suspicious, the positive acts of Sir Moses, at least, exhibit an anxiety to gather together the wanderers in the neighborhood of their ancient home and future hopes; that they may await events on the ground where they can best be made available to the fulfilment of the promise. During his pilgrimage he sought his way to the hearts of his countrymen, by giving a *talaris* (we believe about fifteen piastres) to every Israelite; and having instituted strict inquiries respecting the various biblical antiquities on his way, and ascertained the amount of duty which the sacred places and villages paid to the Egyptian Government to be about 64,000 purses (a purse being equal to fifteen talaris,) he proposed to the Viceroy of Egypt, that he (Sir Moses) should pay this revenue out of his own pocket, as the price of that prince's permission to him to colonize all those places with the Children of Israel. The offer has been, it is said, accepted, subject to the condition that the colony shall be considered national, and not under European protection. Athenæum."

The *Scientific American* wrote in 1846 of the man who would be King of the Jews, Rothschild, and revealed that orthodox religious fanaticism and a racist desire to keep the Jews segregated from the *Goyim* were the main motives of Messiah Rothschild,

"THE ISRAELITES IN GERMANY are in great commotion. At Berlin and Frankfort two-thirds of them have separated from the synagogues, to form new societies, and it is thought that their example will be generally followed. The new school are supported by the government; they celebrate the Sabbath of the Christians, and worship with chaunts, the music of the organ, and sermons. Sir Moses Montefiore, backed by the Rothschilds, is about establishing a Jewish colony in Palestine, and has obtained an ukase from the Emperor Nicholas, authorising the emigration thither of ten thousand Russian Jews."³¹⁵

On 2 October 1866, on page 2, *The Chicago Tribune* reported that Rothschild wanted to rule the Jews and fulfill Messianic prophecy,

"REGENERATION OF THE HOLY LAND.

An important society has been formed in Europe called the 'International Society of the Orient,' to prevent the grave complications arising out of the Eastern question, and to regenerate the East by infusing therein the spirit of Western civilization. To accomplish this great result the Society, which

enrolls among its members such men as Napoleon, the Rothschilds and Montefiore, propose to favor the development of agriculture, industry, commerce and public works in the East, especially in Palestine; to obtain from the Turkish Government certain privileges and monopolies, chief of which is the gradual concession and advancement of the lands of Palestine; to distribute at cash prices such of those lands as the company receives, and to effect the colonization of the more fertile villages of the Holy Land.

The Society, after having established its commercial bureau at Constantinople and other cities of the Turkish Empire, will construct a port at Joppa, and a good road or railroad from that city to Jerusalem. Upon the north of this road the Society expect land to be conceded by Turkey, which they will sell to Israelitish families. These in their turn will create new colonies, aided by their Oriental co-religionists, and it is expected special committees will send thither Jews of Morocco, Poland, Moldavia, Wallachia, from the East, and from Africa. The Society claim that this plan will reconstruct the Holy places of Jerusalem in a Christian manner; put an end to the constant conflict between the great powers in reference to them; transform the ancient Jerusalem into a new and great city; create European colonies which will become in time the centres whence occidental civilization will spread in Turkey and penetrate to the remote Orient.

The Society is being rapidly formed, with the strongest influences, financial and political, at its back. The Rothschilds, Sir Moses Montefiore, and other great capitalists among the Jews, are actively in sympathy with the undertaking. The plan has also the favor of more than one crowned head in Europe, among them Napoleon, of whose especial theory of nationalities it is a development. Several prominent noblemen of England, and the leading names of the Faubourg St. Germain, are also among its friends.”

Mayer Anselm (Bauer), the founder of the Rothschild destiny, was a highly religious Jew and his father urged him to become a rabbi.³¹⁶ Mayer aimed higher and sought to become the Messiah, himself, a goal which he passed on to his descendants. On 8 April 1878, *The Chicago Tribune* reported, among other things, in an article “The House of Rothschild” on page 2,

“There is a popular idea that the Rothschilds dream of yet restoring the Temple and the City of Jerusalem. If so, events may even now be working to meet their views. They are all earnest in the faith of their fathers, and proved their Jewish convictions by breaking off all relations with the Roman Government after the abduction of the little Moriara.”

The Rothschild’s used prominent figures in the “Gentile” community, either “Shabbas Goys” or crypto-Jews, to spread the myth that the Jews were morally and intellectually superior to Gentiles, but were kind enough to condescend to lead the Gentiles. Meanwhile, the Rothschilds accumulated the wealth of the Gentile nations while deliberately destroying their culture, their countries and their genetics. Many

have alleged that there is a clear pattern in history, where one can observe that for two thousand years, Jews had preached liberalism to Gentiles as a means to remove barriers against Jewish access to immigration, then government, commerce, higher education and the media. Once in control of those organs of society, Jews have historically instituted the most tyrannical and illiberal of régimes. In a society in which the majority act morally, socially responsibly, and largely independently; a corrupt minority which acts immorally or amorally, considering only their perceived self-interests, and which works collusively—tribalistically to accumulate the wealth of nation and corrupt its media, government and universities, such a deceitful minority can easily overwhelm a society. When the success of Jewish tribalism led to Jewish assimilation, the Rothschilds promoted anti-Semitism as a means to segregate Jews from Gentiles and force the Jews to emigrate to another region, taking with them the wealth of the nation they had overwhelmed, and in some instances brought to ruins.

In 1883, Ernest Renan gave a philo-Semitic lecture. He was introduced by “Baron” Alphonse de Rothschild. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 25 June 1883 on page 7,

“THE FUTURE OF JUDAISM.

M. Renan Delivers a Panegyric of the Jews and Predicts a Realization of the Religion of Isaiah.

At a recent meeting of the society of Jewish Studies in Paris M. Ernest Renan, presented by the Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, delivered a remarkable lecture on the subject of the original identity and gradual separation of Judaism and Christianity. M. Renan predicted a great future for the Society of Jewish Studies, one clause of whose studies permits Gentiles to form part of the society. Doubtless Jewish studies belonged of right to the Jews; but they belonged also to humanity. Researches relative to the Israelite past interest all the world. All beliefs find in Jewish books the secret of their formation. The Bible has become the intellectual and moral nutriment of civilized humanity. The Jews have this incomparable privilege, that their book has become a book of the whole world—a privilege of universality which they share with the Greeks, a race which has imposed its literature on all centuries and all countries. M. Renan thanked the members of the Society of Jewish Studies for having admitted the Gentiles, like good Samaritans, to work along with them in a work that interests us all equally. Proceeding then to speak of the subject of his life’s study, the origins of Christianity, M. Renan said that those origins ought to be placed at least 750 years before Christ, at the epoch of the great prophets, who created an entirely new idea of religion, and under whose influence was definitively accomplished the passage from primitive religion full of unwholesome superstitions to pure religion. After the captivity, in the sixth century B. C., the dream of the prophet of Israel is a worship that might suit all humanity, a worship consisting in the pure ideal of morality and virtue—in short, the reign of

justice. This idea constitutes the great originality of the prophets; and the true founders of Christianity, according to M. Renan, were these great prophets, who announced pure religion, freed from all coarse material practices and observances, and residing in the disposition of the mind and heart—a religion, consequently, which can and ought to be common to all, an ideal religion, consisting in the proclamation of the kingdom of God upon the earth and in the hope of an era of justice for poor humanity.

M. Renan next proceeded to show that the first Christian generation is essentially Jewish. The epistles of St. James and St. Jude, representing the spirit of the first church, are altogether Jewish; St. Paul never thought of separating himself from the Jewish Church. The Apocalypse of St. John, composed about A. D. 68 or 69, is a Jewish book and the author is a passionate Jewish patriot. After the capture of Jerusalem comes the composition of the synoptical Gospels. Here there is a division, and yet Luke, the least Jewish of the evangelists, insists upon the fact that Jesus observed all the ceremonies of the law. Toward 75 or 80 A. D. many books were written inspired by Jewish patriotism, such the book of Judith, the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch, and even the book of Tobias. There is nothing more Jewish than the book of Judith, for instance, and yet these books are lost among the Jews and preserved only among the Christians, so true is it that the bond between the church and synagogue was not yet broken when they appeared. In the epistles and Gospels attributed to St. John and written about A. D. 125, the case is altogether different. In them Judaism is treated as an enemy, and they contain symptoms of the approach of the systems that will lead the Christians to deny their Jewish origin, such gnosticism, for instance, which represents Christianity as being a reaction against Judaism and utterly opposed to it, while Marcion goes still further, and declares Judaism to be a bad religion which Jesus came to abolish.

M. Renan remarked the singularity of such an error having been able to manifest itself only a century after the death of Christ, but insisted on the fact that in the Christian church gnosticism was like a lateral stream to a river. In the second century the orthodox church always considered itself bound in the most intimate manner to the synagogue. In the third century the schism becomes more pronounced under the influence of the school of Alexandria. Clement and Origen speak with much injustice of Judaism, and the separation becomes complete when, under Constantine, Christianity becomes a state religion and official, while Judaism remains free. And yet Chrysostom was obliged to rebuke his congregation for going to the synagogue. Nevertheless, the separation really grows more and more profound; we enter the middle ages; the barbarians arrive, and then begins that deplorable ingratitude of humanity, become Christian toward Judaism. The crusades give the signal for the massacres of the Jews, while scholastic philosophy largely contributed to embitter the hostility against them.

Reviewing rapidly the condition of the Jews in France in the Middle Ages and subsequently, M. Renan arrived at 'a more consoling epoch, that

eighteenth century which proclaimed at length the rights of reason, the rights of man, the true theory of human society—that is to say, the State without official dogma, the State neutral in the midst of metaphysical and theological opinions. It is from that day that equality of rights began for the Jews. It was the revolution that proclaimed the equality of the Jews with the other citizens of the State. The revolution found here the true solution with a sentiment of absolute justice, and everybody will come around to this opinion.’ In point of fact, continued M. Renan, the Jews had themselves prepared this solution; they had prepared it by their past, by their prophets, the great religious creators of Israel. The founders of the movement were Isaiah and his successors, then the Essenians, these poetical ascetics who announced an ideal of peace, of right, and of fraternity. Christianity, too, has powerfully contributed to the progress of civilization, but Christianity was only the continuation of the Jewish prophets, and the glory of Christianity and the glory of Judaism are one. And now that these great things are accomplished, let us say with assurance, continued the speaker, that Judaism, which has done so much service in the past will serve in future. It will serve the true cause—the cause of liberalism of the modern spirit.”

The cause of Jewish “Liberalism” created the tyranny of the French, Russian, Chinese, Cambodian, Israeli, etc., Terrors. The cause of Jewish Liberalism slaughtered countless Europeans and Americans in the Nineteenth Century, and many millions more human beings in the Twentieth Century. It brought the world to world wars and to genocide. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Jews began to convert the Northern Europeans and the British to Judaism, which is to say, when the Jews began the Protestant cults, the racist Jewish concept of the “Elect” found in *Isaiah* 65 and in the *Book of Enoch* and in the Jewish myth of the “chosen”—in contradiction to the “Universal” or Catholic Church—as well as the Jewish practices of wealth accumulation and sober studies, led the Puritans and Protestants to surpass their philosophical masters. This benefitted the Jews by spreading monotheism around the world and opening up markets and trade routes, but some Jews ultimately sought to eliminate the threat of Gentile world domination by reintroducing Jewish “Liberalism” in the form of Communism, which taught the Gentiles to self-destruct by degrading the practice of wealth accumulation and by degrading the Nationalistic pride inherent in the mythology of the “Elect” (*Isaiah* 65); both of which had worked so well for the Jews for thousands of years. They hoped that this Jewish Liberalism, imposed on the Gentiles, though not on the Jews, would have the same destructive effects on Gentile empires in the modern world, that it had on the Roman Empire in the ancient world.

One need only take a cursory look at the immensely destructive antisocial behavior of the Rothschilds to see that they were not a friendly guiding spirit to the Gentile nations. They caused the stock markets to crash in the “Black Fridays” of Wall Street in New York, as well as other financial calamities, in 1869, 1873, 1879, 1893, 1907, and 1929; in Prussia in the 1870's; in the “Black Friday” of Vienna in 1873; and in London after the battle of Waterloo—an event that began the large scale

emigration of German Jews to America, which increased after the Jewish-led revolutions of 1848. While tragic for the nations and for the world at large, these crashes netted the Rothschilds and their agents immense profits—profits made by destruction, not production—profits made without labor. The Rothschilds also deliberately caused wars and revolutions towards the same ends.

The Jewish bankers caused wars to make the peoples of the world clamor for world government, which they alleged could secure peace. Wars also made the Jewish bankers enormous profits and weakened the nations. The Jewish bankers deliberately caused chaos after the revolutions they instigated, in order to make peoples clamor for dictatorships, which the Jewish bankers argued would restore order—dictatorships the Jewish bankers covertly controlled—dictatorships which brought on wars and enabled the Jewish bankers to rob the wealth of the nation and ruin the people. The Jewish bankers deliberately caused depressions in America to make the people clamor for banking reforms which would enable the Jewish bankers to install a privately held central bank in control of the money supply. Depressions also made for wonderful buying opportunities for Jewish bankers.

On 2 June 1873, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on the front page in an article entitled “Vienna’s Black Friday”,

“Reading off the names of brokers and firms that failed to meet their engagements was like the call of the death-roll in the Reign of Terror. Many of the lighter stocks were swept out of the market. Austrian loans, railroad shares of the best companies, dropped 5, 10, 20, even 50 per cent. On Friday afternoon it seemed impossible to raise a loan on any security. The bears had things their own way. The branch house of Rothschild was accused of ‘bearing’ without mercy, and two of the firm narrowly escaped being lynched.”

Wherever a corrupt cabal controlled the disproportionate wealth the Rothschilds controlled, there was no chance for any individual, or even any government, or even any coalition of governments, to compete with them on a level playing field. The Rothschilds enjoyed a rigged system in which they could steal the wealth of nations at will, and could demand that nations engage in wars, win wars, and even lose wars, or face utter annihilation and death by starvation. Their fortunes eclipsed the wealth of any nation on Earth. Their fortunes eclipsed the wealth of many nations combined.

The Chicago Tribune made a point of pointing out that the Rothschilds had been war profiteers from the beginning of their financial empire, which was built in part on elicited profits gained by spreading the false rumor that the British had lost at Waterloo in order to buy shares at reduced prices, only to sell the next day at inflated prices, which netted the Rothschilds \$5,000,000 in one day, while throwing the British Nation into turmoil. The *Tribune* proved that the Rothschilds profited from the havoc they caused in the United States during the Civil War through the American representative of the Rothschild family,³¹⁷ Auguste Belmont—a crypto-Jew whose real name was August Schoenberg—the name “Schoenberg” becomes “Belmont” when translated into French, which sounds more *gentil* and Gentile.³¹⁸

While Schoenberg financed the South, the Seligmans (a. k. a. the “American Rothschilds”)³¹⁹ financed the North, and the country fought its bloodiest and most profitable war to date—against itself. The Rothschilds desired to divide America up between France and Great Britain.³²⁰ The North would join with Canada and return to the British Empire. The South would go to Mexico, which would in turn serve as a colony of France. The Rothschilds would then have a profitable division between Latin and French Catholics in the South, and Anglo-Saxon Protestants in the North. The Rothschilds could then use the model they had so successfully employed in Europe to create perpetual wars³²¹ between the North and South which would earn the Rothschilds immense profits, place both Empires further in the Rothschilds’ debt, and destroy the competitive threat that American finance posed. Bismarck, who had close contacts with Jewish finance, stated,

“The division of the United States into federations of equal force was decided long before the Civil War by the high financial powers of Europe. These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they remained in one block and was one nation, would attain economic and financial independence, which would upset their financial domination over Europe and the world. Of course, in the ‘inner circle’ of Finance, the voice of the Rothschilds prevailed. They saw an opportunity for prodigious booty if they could substitute two feeble democracies burdened with debt to the financiers, . . . in place of a vigorous Republic sufficient unto herself. Therefore, they sent their emissaries into the field to exploit the question of slavery and to drive a wedge between the two parts of the Union. . . . The rupture between the North and the South became inevitable; the masters of European finance employed all their forces to bring it about and to turn it to their advantage.”³²²

The Attorney General, then Secretary of War, then Secretary of State of the Confederacy—“the brains of the Confederacy”³²³—was a Jew named Judah Philip Benjamin, who was a close and enduring friend of Jefferson Davis.³²⁴ President Lincoln was assassinated by a Jewish actor named John Wilkes Booth—some say because Lincoln dared to oppose the desires of the Rothschilds to control American banking.³²⁵ Before Belmont (Schoenberg) helped the Rothschilds to foment the Civil War, the Bohemian Jew Isaac Phillips represented the Rothschilds’ interests in America.³²⁶ Later, John Pierpont Morgan, John Davison Rockefeller and “Colonel” Edward Mandell House served as the Rothschilds’ agents in America.³²⁷ Though their plan to divide America between North and South largely failed, after the Civil War the Rothschilds and their agents drew a steady profit from the American financial system. In an article entitled “Review of the Stock and Money Market for 1879”, *The Bankers’ Magazine and Statistical Register*, Volume 14, Number 8, (February, 1880), p. 635; reported,

“The great event of the year was, of course, the resumption of coin payments on the first day of January. It occurred without a jar or ripple and would have been unobserved if the public had not been constantly reminded of it by the

newspapers. The parity of paper and coin having been restored several weeks previously, no demand was made for coin. All anxiety on the subject was over in a day, and it was instinctively felt that an era of prosperity was ushered in. The sales of four per cents., under the offer for popular subscriptions, became so large that from January 1 to January 18, both inclusive, calls were issued for the redemption of \$90,000,000 of outstanding bonds at a higher rate of interest. On the 21st of January, the Treasury made an arrangement with a syndicate consisting of the following banking firms in London, viz.: Messrs. Rothschild, J. S. Morgan & Co., Morton, Rose & Co., and J. and W. Seligman & Co., for the exclusive sale in Europe of the United States four per cents. They took \$10,000,000 on that day, with the option, provided they took \$5,000,000 more monthly until July 1, of then having the entire balance (if any) of the loan, which, however, was to remain open until July 1 to popular subscription. The arrangement with this syndicate was regarded as settling the question of the ability of the Government to obtain all the money it might desire at four-per-cent. interest. The success of resumption, the large and continuous popular subscriptions to the four-per-cent. loan, and the syndicate arrangement of January 21, naturally caused a very buoyant feeling and a general upward tendency in the prices of bonds and shares dealt in at the Stock Exchange.”

On 29 March 1861, at the beginning of the Civil War, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on page 2, that Baron Rothschild had arrived in New Orleans,

“Arrival of Baron Rothschild at New Orleans.

The New Orleans *Picayune* of the 22d says:

Among the arrivals in this city yesterday by the steamship Cahawba, from Havana, was Baron Rothschild, of the distinguished family of that name in Paris, who is a guest of the St. Charles. Baron R. has been spending some weeks in Havana, where he was the object of many attentions on the part of the Captain General and other distinguished gentlemen of that city.”

The Rothschilds had been working toward a “race war” between Latin Catholics and Anglo-Saxon Protestants centered in Mexico and spreading to the United States, Canada, France, Great Britain, Austria and North Germany, at least since the time of the Civil War. The Rothschilds sought to weaken the United States by dividing it up. They funded both sides of the Civil War. McClellan needlessly prolonged the war, by refusing to attack and pursue the Confederates. The Rothschilds did not desire to end slavery, rather they desired to enslave Mexico and America, and to return the Americas to a colonial status and to embroil the Americas in perpetual war for the sake of Rothschild profits. On 10 June 1862, on page 3, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

“FRANCE AND MEXICO.

**THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE
EXPEDITION.
THE ACTUAL ATTITUDE OF THE
FRENCH GOVERNMENT.**

New Mutterings of Intervention.

[New York Times Correspondent.]

PARIS, May 23, 1862.

The Mexican affair has assumed all at once at Paris a most serious aspect. Never before has the Emperor been attacked by the liberal press with such violence, or rather, with such an outspoken energy, as within the last few days, on this unfortunate Mexican expedition. It is the all-absorbing topic of the moment, and I cannot do better than to give you an *aperçu* of the situation, as we understand it here.

It so happens that, so far as regards the Press, the three papers which have thus far defended the cause of the rebellion in the United States, are exactly those which sustain the Almonte-Maximilian programme for Mexico; while the rest of the journals, with the exception of the Catholics, defend the cause of the Union in the United States, and combat the monarchical programme in Mexico. This striking concurrence in the division of views on the two subjects, indicates, beyond any question, that for the French there is an important connection between the two. It is this connection which gives the question its gravity.

For a long time the Emperor has dreamed of two things:

First—The acquisition of Sonora, with its gold and silver mines.

Second—The reconstruction of the Latin race, and the pitting of this race and Catholicism against the Anglo Saxon race and Protestantism.

The two governments of France and England, and no doubt of Spain also, did not believe till lately that there was any possibility of the suppression of the rebellion in the United States and the reconstruction of the Union. When, therefore, the treaty of London, of last year, in regard to the expedition to Mexico, was drawn up, it was drawn up with an almost complete indifference as to what the United States might think or do about it, and there is now every reason to believe that each of the contracting parties had ulterior views, which were not only concealed from the world, but from each other. The treaty was therefore drawn up in a loose and vague manner, so as to admit of deviations at will, so that each might seize upon whatever advantages offered themselves. And here I ought to recall, for its historical value, an observation made by Mr. Dayton nine months ago, and put upon record at the time in this correspondence, to the effect that, although the French government was full of kind and frank expressions towards the United States in connection with this Mexican expedition, yet that there seemed to be a vagueness and a confusion in their own understanding of the objects and the details of the expedition which foreboded no good to the future relations between France and the United States.

At the time of the arrival of the Soledad Convention at Paris there had been nothing done toward changing the belief of the French Government that a final dissolution of the Union was inevitable, and Napoleon is known at that time to have given Gen. Lorencez hasty and imperative orders to hurry on to the City of Mexico, without regard to consequences. Why? Because, the Government papers here now say, it was recognized as impossible to gain the objects of the expedition without displacing Juarez from power and establishing in his stead a stable government, capable of offering, besides indemnity for the present, security for the future. And here is where the English and Spaniards deserted Napoleon, and where the great majority of Napoleon's own subjects also deserted him. They divided on the question of an interference in the internal affairs of Mexico, after having obtained satisfaction for the first objects of the expedition. It came out all at once that Napoleon had been serious in his secret transactions with Almonte at Paris, and that the plan of erecting a throne for an Austrian Prince was not an illusion. Knowing the mind of the Mexican people, the Allies and the Liberals of Paris naturally and legitimately jumped to the conclusion that the Emperor was bent on a conquest of the country, for that was the only condition on which he could maintain a foreign Prince in power, and that sooner or later it would terminate with an acquisition of territory and a war with the United States.

The news of the breaking up of the alliance at Orizaba arrived in Europe with that of the capture of New Orleans, and it is hard to tell which event caused most consternation at the Palace. For the first time the fact that the Southern Confederacy might possibly prove a failure, penetrated the short vision of the French Government; and now we believe that under the influence of these two events, the French Government has modified its intentions, and that it has sent to Mexico orders not to push matters to the extreme point at first designed.

The opposition press here has said to the Emperor: Your Mexican expedition, under the present aspect of the case, (that is to say, as an agent of the monarchical party,) is either an aberration or a scheme for the ransom of Venetia. If it be the first, comment is unnecessary—there is but one course to follow: withdraw as quickly as possible after securing what Mexico owes us; if it be the ransom of Venetia that is intended, permit us to suggest that a war with Austria in the quadrilateral will cost us infinitely less in time; men, money, and especially in honor, than a war with the United States.

The opposition press also points out with telling effect on the public mind the analogy which exists between the entrance of the allies into France in 1815, bringing with them the exiles who were selling their country in order to gain power for a minority. For whatever may be the faults of Juarez, he is fighting for his native country against the foreigner, which constitutes his patriotism—quite another thing to that of Almonte, Miramon and company.

As we understand the question then, to-day, Napoleon, at the moment he heard of the treaty of Soledad, gave to Gen. Lorencez instructions which

conveyed with them the perspective of a monarchy, a more or less permanent occupation, an acquisition of territory, and a strengthening of the Latin race in America. But the late Union victories have changed the programme, and by this time we have every reason to believe Gen. Lorencez has received a modification to his previous orders. But how far this modification extends no one knows or pretends even to conjecture. That the Emperor will renounce the monarchical programme is, however, generally believed, but whether, when his troops arrive at the capital, they will treat with Juarez or insist on putting Almonte into the Presidential chair before treating, is all in doubt. If Almonte is put into the chair provisionally, every one can see that then the reign of anarchy will only have commenced, and that the French will be obliged to remain to carry out their unfortunate programme by force. And yet, up to the present moment, the Ministerial papers here declare that it will be degrading to the dignity of France to treat with such a man as Juarez, and that such a thing cannot be thought of for a moment. But who can see the end if they go beyond Juarez? One step beyond him and everything is darkness and confusion. Every one in France seems to understand that, if the power of the Federal Government is again consolidated by the suppression of the rebellion, Mexico will at once occupy the attention of the United States, and that France cannot afford, for the benefit of an Austrian Duke and a score of Mexican exiles, to bring upon herself a war with the United States.

The Republicans in France, in view of this war with the United States, declare that it will bring with it the downfall of the Bonaparte dynasty, and they are quite elated at the prospect.

Among the persons who have been indicated as having used their influence with the Emperor since the commencement of the rebellion, in urging on the Sonora programme, are Messrs. Michel-Chevalier, Fould, Rouher, and De Rothschild. These gentlemen do not see why France should not make an acquisition of valuable gold mines—which, by the way, she much needs—as well as the United States.

As regards the more utopian scheme of reconstructing and strengthening the Latin and Catholic elements in America, some of the most influential imperialist writers of France have long been urging it. To these must be added a demented party not far removed from the Emperor's person, who dream of nothing less than setting up in America what has been repudiated in Europe—a nobility system, based upon the divine right, and which shall give an asylum and an occupation to the castoff kings and princes of Europe. They would have the Grand Duke Maxamilian or Ferdinand II., of Naples, placed on the throne of Mexico, surrounded by the European rejected princes, and this try to gain a new foothold for a system which is here growing weaker every day.

But the Emperor has generally shown great judgment in seizing the right side of questions as they pass before him, and great wisdom in retreating from mistaken positions, into which, like the ablest of men, he has sometimes fallen; and we have great confidence that he will yet, with the new light

which has broken in upon him from the United States, retire from Mexico before he has become so far entangled in the meshes that await him.

A new secession pamphlet is also just out, to which M. Marc de Haut, advocate at the Imperial Court, has put his name. It is entitled: *The American Crisis: its causes, probable results, and connection with France and Europe*. The pamphlet is but a repetition of several of those which have preceded it, and appears to prove that the secessionists think it necessary to keep certain arguments continually, in one form or another, before the public. The following are the stereotyped heads of arguments found in this book: Republics, when they grow too large, must divide. The Americans of the North are ancient English Puritans, sombre, intolerant, taciturn and commercial. The Southerners are descendants of the Cavaliers, grand, historical *seigneurs*, who love a large and free existence, who don't build workshops or counters, but furnish orators, statesmen and presidents. The sole cause of the dissolution of the Union is the tariff—slavery was only the pretext. The Yankees abandoned slavery in the Northern States, not from principle, but because free labor was more profitable in their climate. The proof of this is found in their well known antipathy to the person of the negro. The present struggle is one of free trade against protection. A reunion can never take place. And then the writer terminates with that funny appeal for the sympathy of the French—that the South is French. 'Does not,' he exclaims, 'the General-in-Chief of the Southern forces bear a French name—Beauregard? And what souvenirs do the following names of *Southern* towns recall to the French hear—Louisburg, Montmorency, St. Louis, Vincennes, Duquesne, New Orleans?'

Thus you will see that the French secessionists demand sympathy for the South because it is French, while, the other day, the London *Times* demanded the sympathy of the English for the South because it is English! We hope they will settle the question between them.

MALAKOFF."

This 1862 article is given credence by the fact that the French, under Rothschild's puppet Napoleon III, drove out Juárez in 1864 and made the Austrian Hapsburg Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian Joseph the Emperor of Mexico. Maximilian sought to improve Mexico for Mexicans and to improve Confederate-Mexican relations. This did not promote the race war that the Rothschilds wanted to foment between Mexico and America. The Rothschilds bankrupted Maximilian, and Mexico, and then reinstalled Juárez, who murdered Maximilian. It should be noted that in 1861 Juárez had provided the Rothschilds with the pretext for the initial French and British invasion of Mexico by failing to pay interest on Mexico's debts.

President Lincoln opposed the Rothschilds' designs on the American banking system. A Jewish actor named John Wilkes Booth assassinated Lincoln, and some claim the assassination was instigated by international bankers.³²⁸ After sponsoring a seemingly endless series of dictators and revolutions in Mexico, the Rothschilds, through their agent "Colonel" Edward Mandell House, again sought a major war

between Mexico and the United States in the Twentieth Century, which plan was spelled out in House's apocalyptic book *Philip Dru: Administrator*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, (1912).

On 30 October 1939, Congressman Thorkelson warned the American Congress that some Jews were out to destroy America with another world war and by seeding Mexico with Communist revolutionaries—an old Rothschild plan, which is still in the works and is a real and present danger to America's security,

“If House Joint Resolution 306, the present Neutrality Act, is passed as it is, it is my firm belief that such action on our part will bring about civil war in the United States, which may well terminate in the ultimate destruction of those in the invisible Government who sponsored this legislation and who are the silent promoters of the present war in Europe.

As the first step in consideration of this so-called Neutrality Act of 1939, please ask yourself, Who is it that wants war? It certainly is not the people that want war, and it is their wish that we must consider, as we are their Representatives in Congress.

Have any of your constituents asked you to vote for war, so that their children may be sent forth to drown in the Atlantic or die in the trenches of Europe? Are there any Members of Congress who want war? I do not believe so. Have you ever stopped to think, or have you tried to identify those whose greatest ambition is to aline this country in war on the side of England? I have not found anyone that wants war except those who harbor hatreds toward Hitler, and strange as it may seem, they are the same people who approved of Stalin.

Is it logical or reasonable that all Christian civilized nations, such as the United States, England, Canada, Australia, France, Germany, Austria, and other European nationalities, must engage in internecine conflict or war of extermination, so that this group of haters may get even with one man? Shall we sacrifice millions of our young men from 18 to 30 years of age to appease personal hatreds of a small group of international exploiters? I think not. I do not believe that there is any one person worth such sacrifice, whether he be king, prince, or dictator.

Let me now carry this argument a little further, for I want to call your attention to the fact that this same group that now hates Hitler was pro-German during the World War, and it is the same group that ruled and directed Germany's military machine before and during the World War. It is the same group that brought about inflation and exploited the German people, and it is the same group that furnished the money that brought about revolution in Russia and eliminated the Russian Army when its aid was needed to win the World War. This same group of internationalists paid and promoted the bloody invasion of Hungary, in which the invaders destroyed life and property with utter disregard for civilized warfare or even decency. It is this same group that has spread and nourished communism throughout the whole world and that sponsored the 'red' revolution in Spain. It is the

same communistic group which is now concentrated south of us in Mexico, waiting to strike when the time is ripe.

Please ask yourselves if you are justified in giving the President the power set forth in this Neutrality Act, and are you justified in repealing the arms-embargo clause, when you know it is for no other reason except to aline the United States with Grëat Britain in another war as senseless as the World War. In considering this remember that there are no hatreds among the common people of the nations of the world, and for that reason no desire to destroy either life or property. Is it not tinie that we, the common people, learn a lesson—yes; a lesson in self-preservation instead of fighting for the ‘invisible government’? Let us marshal this personnel into an army of their own and ship them some place to fight it out among themselves. It will be a blessing to civilization.

This contemplated war will not save the world for democracy because we have that now in the fullest measure; it is fully entrenched within the Government itself and in many organizations. We need no further evidence of that than the recent exposé of the League for Peace and Democracy, with its many members employed in strategic positions within the Federal Government, to further the cause of democracy and communism. No; this war will not be fought for so-called democracy or communism, for it is here, and is an evil that we will eventually be called upon to destroy or else be destroyed by it.

If the present agitation in Europe should terminate in an active war, its purpose will be to place all Christian civilized nations under the domination of an international government that expects to rule the world by the power of money and the control of fools who sit in the chairs of governments. I do not believe this will happen here, for the people are too well informed about this evil blight that is keeping the world at odds, and which is spreading dissension and hatreds by confusion and international intrigue. Let us shake off this evil, put our shoulders to the wheel, and push the carriage of state back on the road to sound constitutional government. Do not forget, if attack comes, it will be delivered by the Communists within the United States and next by the Communists who are waiting beyond our borders. Let us, therefore, give undivided attention to the Communists within our midst, for they have no place within a republican government. We should not tolerate foreign or hyphenated groups that, for reasons best known to themselves, cannot or will not assimilate to become Americans. For our own preservation we must get rid of those who cannot subscribe to the fundamental principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.”³²⁹

Today, we again see the powerful forces of finance attempting to foment a war between Mexico and America. Some Mexicans are being duped into claiming the Southeastern United States as their national territory and agents of the warmongers are making outrageous statements so as to provoke Americans into an artificial animosity towards their Southern neighbors. It has always been in Americas best

interest to have a thriving and friendly southern neighbor, just as it has always profited America to have a stable and successful neighbor to the North, but Jewish interests have always oppressed the Mexican People and desire to stir up war and “racial” divisions on the North American Continent. Hardworking and good natured Mexicans are being blamed for all of America’s ills, as if they had such power to bite the hand that meagerly feeds them.

The American media are teaching Americans to hate, instead of help, the long suffering Mexican People. It would be far better for America to have Mexico as an industrious and well-educated ally, than as a Communist satellite of a Red China controlled by Jewish financiers. The issue of illegal Mexican immigration to the United States is also being promoted as a rallying cry for an American revolution, which would only result in further oppression of the American People and the destruction of the America economy. It is a trap created by Jewish bankers to ruin the North American Continent. Many of the same persons calling for war with Mexico and revolution in the United States of America are also calling for a return to the gold standard, which would earn the Jewish bankers incredible profits on their gold reserves, and ultimately yield them all the gold in the Americas and eventually the world. These people are wittingly or wittingly baiting the trap with the promise of an American Utopia if only the Mexicans could be chased out, the American Government destroyed and a gold standard instituted. There are no Utopias, and the solution to Americas problems, which are still slight compared to those of the rest of humanity, are education, industry and responsible nationalism.

The roots of Jewish finance in America reach back into the prehistory of the United States. The Polish-Jewish Masonic-Frankist Haym Solomon (*also*: Salomon) was one of the financiers of the American Revolution. Other Jewish Freemasons of the Revolutionary Period include one of the founders of the Scottish Rite in American Freemasonry in the 1760's, Moses Michael Hays (*also*: Hayes), as well as Stephen Morin, Isaac da Costa, Rabbi Moses Sexias, Joseph Myers, Abraham Forst and Solomon Bush.³³⁰ Many of these Jews, who brought with them the Frankist and Illuminati movements, were Bohemians. They were quite successful in America, and their descendants sponsored a wave of Jewish immigration to the United States in the European revolutionary period of 1848.³³¹ The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article “Freemasons”,

“In the U.S. Jewish names appear among the founders of Freemasonry in colonial America, and in fact it is probable that Jews were the first to introduce the movement into the country. Tradition connects Mordecai Campanall, of Newport, Rhode Island, with the supposed establishment of a lodge there in 1658. In Georgia four Jews appear to have been among the founders of the first lodge, organized in Savannah in 1734. Moses Michael *Hays, identified with the introduction of the Scottish Rite into the United States, was appointed deputy inspector general of Masonry for North America in about 1768. In 1769 Hays organized the King David’s Lodge in New York, moving it to Newport in 1780. He was Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts from 1788 to 1792. Moses *Seixas was

prominent among those who established the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, and was Grand Master from 1802 to 1809. A contemporary of Hays, Solomon *Bush, was deputy inspector general of Masonry for Pennsylvania, and in 1781 Jews were influential in the Sublime Lodge of Perfection in Philadelphia which played an important part in the early history of Freemasonry in America. Other early leaders of the movement included: Isaac da *Costa (d. 1783), whose name is found among the members of King Solomon's Lodge, Charleston, in 1753; Abraham Forst, of Philadelphia, deputy inspector general for Virginia in 1781; and Joseph Myers, who held the same office, first for Maryland, and later for South Carolina. In 1793 the cornerstone ceremony for the new synagogue in Charleston, South Carolina, was conducted according to the rites of Freemasonry."³³²

The Rothschilds made so much money from spreading war around the world, that by 1875 their wealth had eclipsed that of most nations, as *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 27 December 1875 on page 8,

“The Rothschilds.

New York Sun.

The combined capital of the Rothschilds is stated by Emile Burnouf, the well-known publicist, to have attained in the present year to the almost incalculable sum of seventeen billions of francs, or \$3,400,000,000. The significance of these stupendous figures may be rudely conceived by comparison, but there is nothing in the history of private wealth with which they can be compared. The capital of the Barings, the estates of Lord Dudley, the Marquis of Bute, and the head of the family of Grosvenor, belong relatively to a humble category, to which the City of New York has contributed the fortunes of Astor, Vanderbilt, and Stewart. The financial resources attributed to the Rothschilds can best be measured by contrasting them with the funded debts of the richest countries on the globe. The capital of this house, as estimated by M. Burnouf, is about equal to the whole funded debt of Great Britain, or that of France, and considerably exceeds the National debt of the United States. A single century, or the possible span of one man's life, has sufficed for the accumulation of this fortune, and the rise of its authors from a shabby rookery in Frankfort to the financial domination of Europe. At the period of Rothschild's first decisive triumph on the London Exchange—the day after Waterloo, just sixty years ago—John Jacob Astor was already a rich man. The great fortune which the latter bequeathed is not believed to exceed \$50,000,000, while the inheritance of his Hebrew contemporary has been swollen to more than sixty times that sum. Although its territories are not to be found on any map, and the names of its representatives are set off with no princely dignities, nevertheless the House of Rothschild must be reckoned among the foremost war-sustaining and world-compelling powers of the earth.”

The following article appeared in the “Foreign Affairs” section of the *National Repository, Devoted to General and Religious Literature, Criticism, and Art*, Volume 7, (February, 1880), pp. 168ff.,

“WHAT BARON ROTHSCHILD DOES FOR HIS FAVORITE HORSE.—It is not the fate of many to be a Rothschild. But there is many a poor man who will envy not only the rich bankers by that name, but even the horse the Baron Rothschild, of Vienna, has come to regard as his favorite. For the accommodation of this dumb, though attractive, animal he has had a special loose box built at the cost of twelve thousand dollars. This elegant room forms a part of a new stable which cost only eighty thousand dollars. It has marble floors, encaustic tiles painted by distinguished artists, rings, chains, and drain-traps of silver, and walls frescoed with splendid hunting scenes from the pencils of eminent animal painters. Fortunately, however, the baron’s annual income is \$1,600,000.”

The Rothschilds were loan sharks to the nations. They would run a nation into debt by provoking wars, or destroying economies, or talking leaders into self-ruin, then they would foreclose on the nations by demanding more wars—race wars, religious wars, economic wars, trade wars, vendetta wars, utterly senseless wars, etc. Many have alleged that the wars of Napoleon and most since, including both world wars, were brought about by the bankers to reap profits, and more significantly to fulfill Jewish prophecies and create a Jewish State in Palestine. Even France’s involvement in Algiers may have begun at the instigation of Jewish interests, on the pretext of an insult on the French Consul by the Dey in 1830. *The North American Review* wrote in 1845,

“The Moors seem to consider the Jews born to serve them and bear their wanton insults. The Moorish boys torment the Jewish children for pastime; and the men, with impunity, maltreat the male adults, and take the grossest liberties with the females. In 1804, many of them were subjected to horrible tortures in Algiers, merely because they had unsuspectingly lent money to certain political conspirators; and they were not released till they had paid an exorbitant ransom. In 1827, the Dey extorted from a rich Jew, by throwing him on some pretence into prison, 500,000 Spanish dollars. But the French occupation of Algiers has greatly improved the condition of this people in that country; and, in consequence, their numbers have increased by immigration.”³³³

Those Christian leaders who were traitors to their Gentile followers, encouraged their Christian believers to accept destruction and death as the fulfillment of prophecy, Jewish prophecy deliberately fulfilled by heartless and cruel Jewish leaders. These traitors instructed their gullible followers to see their own demise, for the sake of Jewish profits, as a beautiful and supernatural event. This has been going on in England at least since the time Cabalists brought Jews and Judaism to England

with the aid of “Christian” leaders including Oliver Cromwell and “Christian” propagandists including Isaac Newton and Samuel Clarke, who were Cabalist religious Jews who denied the Trinity, and who called on Christians to welcome the end of the world in apocalyptic horrors as if it would be a joyous event, an event which would enslave them to the Jews, destroy their nations, and give all of their wealth and power to a Jewish King under the false promise that a new world would emerge, a false promise on which they would never have to make good. This madness of self-destruction imposed on Christians by Jewish Zionists and their agents has culminated in the apocalyptic desires of Dispensationalist Christians, who slavishly promote the evils of Israel and eagerly await a nuclear holocaust which will destroy human life on Earth.³³⁴

Jews sought to be readmitted to England in order to profit from English wealth and trade, but also, as Menassah Ben Israel declared, to fulfill the prophecy that Jews would occupy the ends of the Earth (*Genesis* 12:3; 28:14. *Deuteronomy* 28:64-66. *Isaiah* 27:6; 49:6. *Jeremiah* 24:9). Jews felt they had to be readmitted to England before the Messiah could come, and that their readmission to England would herald the coming of the Messiah. Zionist Joachim Prinz wrote in his book *The Secret Jews*,

“After a year in London, ben Israel was granted an annual stipend of one hundred pounds. Although his mission had succeeded and his petition had provided Cromwell with the excuse he wanted to admit the Jews to England, ben Israel was disappointed. He had wanted a solemn declaration by the Lord Protector, or at least a meeting of Parliament, which would have recognized the religious, Messiah-oriented reasons why this should be done. He wanted a proclamation heralding the coming of the Messiah now that the prophecy of Daniel had been fulfilled.”³³⁵

A virtual confession of the Rothschild’s corruption, corruption that would spill oceans of blood in the Twentieth Century, appeared in *The Chicago Daily Tribune* on 27 June 1880 on page 9, where a plan is laid out for the First and Second World Wars:

“MODERN PALESTINE.

ANCIENT JUDEA TO BE CONVERTED INTO A JEWISH COLONY.

The Cologne *Gazette* of a recent date says that among the Orthodox Israelites and Christians unfriendly to the Israelites this has always been a favorite cry: ‘Palestine for the Jews!’ and has gained strength in proportion as the power of the present political ruler over the ‘beloved land’ wanes away. The English preacher, Nugee, who has interested himself in this matter, expounded on the 14th of the month, in a public lecture, a plan which of late has assumed a practical shape. The Englishman, Oliphant, has laid the plan before the Sultan. It is that the land of Gilead and Moab, embracing the whole territory of the Israelitish tribes of Gad, Reuben, and Mannasseh, shall be converted into a Jewish colony, the Sultan being paid in cash for the

territory, a proposition which the Sultan has already favorably entertained. Still more, Goschen, the recently-appointed Ambassador Extraordinary of England, at Constantinople, has expressed himself as well disposed toward the furtherance of the plan. The territory in question embraces about 1,500,000 English acres, and is at present inhabited only by nomadic tribes. The colony is to remain subject to the Turkish power, while yet its immediate Governor is to be an Israelite. In this manner Judaism is to regain a firmer foothold in its own land, and the colony itself ultimately become a rallying point for the scattered people of Israel, around which it is hoped an ever-broadening girdle of new settlements will form itself. The purchase money for the territory of the new colony is to be contributed by the freewill offerings of patriotic Israelites. Two railroads or highways are to be built, the one ascending from Jaffa to Jerusalem, the other extending from Haifa to the further side of the Jordan. Sir Moses Montefiore has already interested himself in these significant enterprises, furnishing material aid for the same. For the construction of the road to Jaffa the Turkish Government has already made a concession, with the proviso that work shall be commenced upon it by next January at the farthest. Still further, the construction of a ship canal from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Akabe and the Red Sea is contemplated. Palestine is again to be reopened, under the influence of the ideas of the nineteenth century, if only the Jews themselves are ready with their contributions and their settlements for their own land.'

Another paper, also, the London *Times*, has the following: 'A negotiation is said to be on foot between the members of the house of Rothschild and the venerable Sir Moses Montefiore on the one hand, and the Ottoman Government on the other, for the cession, under certain conditions, of the Holy Land. The Ottoman Government is already at its last gasp, for want of ready money. The Jewish race wish a '*habitat*' of their own. As the Greeks, though a scattered people, living for the most part in Turkey, have a Greek Kingdom, so the Jews wish to have a Hebrew Kingdom. This, it will be remembered, is the leading idea of George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*.' Few persons, and probably the gifted authoress herself not more than others, imagined that the dream of the Mordecai of those pages was in the least degree likely so soon to be realized. Information as to the nature of the new Jewish State, whether it is to be theocratic or royal, is uncertain, but the arrangements in reference to it are in progress. Prophecies have a way of fulfilling themselves, more especially when those who believe in them are possessed of the sinews of Government. The day when 'the Dispersed of Israel' are to be gathered into one is confidently looked forward to, not only by Hebrews, but by multitudes of Christians. The author of '*Alroy*' would be gathered to his fathers in greater peace, were he permitted under his Administration to see this day and be glad. Superstitious persons, who think that the end of the world is to be preceded by the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, will be inclined to lend serious belief to Mother Shipton's prophecy that this earth is to see its last days in 1881.'

These extracts are significant, and specimens of long articles that have appeared of late in the European press, secular as well as religious. Whatever some people may think of prophecy, it is clear that a grand movement is on foot for the regeneration of Palestine. The 'Holy Land' looms up with every agitation of the Eastern question, and is, in fact, its central point. As to population, Jerusalem has now 20,000 Jews, a larger number than the Turks and Christians combined, not to name the Russian colony outside. Forty years ago, the population was only 300, and only within ten years was it allowed outside the Ghetto. The Jewish population of Palestine is greater to-day than ever since the Roman expulsion. Andree and Pescher's 'Statistical Atlas' puts the sum total of Jews in the world at 7,000,000, the number in Solomon's time. In Europe the Latin group of Jews is 89,000; the Teutonic 842,000; the Slavonic, 4,047,000; in all 4,978,000. In Asia there are 800,000. In Africa, 600,000. The figures 150,000 for the United States are far too low.

The interest in Palestine is shown by the International Exploration Society. Its 'Great Map of Palestine,' drawn on a scale of one inch to a mile, will surpass all others, and, under the direction of the British Ordnance Survey Department, will show 'every detail of ruin and village, ancient and modern, aqueducts, plantations, roads, dells, synagogues, tombs, temples, castles, forts, Crusading and Saracenic, wadies, fountains, seas, mountains, rivers, plains, springs, and wells.' The preparation is extensive, and the progress has already begun. Jewish synagogues and hospitals are multiplied. The German Jews have already sixteen charity institutions and twenty-eight congregations. The tide of immigration is setting in strongly, and the appointment of Midhat Pasha as Syrian Governor gives promise of brighter days for Palestine. A Venetian Jew has given 60,000 francs for the establishment of an agricultural school in the Plain of Sharon, and Baron Albert de Rothschild has just guaranteed to the ex-Mayor of Jerusalem a large pecuniary contribution for the construction of the Jaffa-Jerusalem Railroad. The *South German Wochenblatt* reminds its readers that the great banking-house of the Rothschilds, at the time of the last loan of 20,000,000 francs to Turkey, accepted as security a mortgage on Palestine, and adds that 'as it is impossible for a bankrupt State, like Turkey, to pay back the money, the Israelites may now count upon their return to the Land of Promise as a certainty.'

A proposition is now under discussion, since a concession has been made to the French for the Euphrates Valley Road, to make a junction between the latter from the old provinces of Assyria to Jerusalem the plan of Gen. Sir Frederick Goldsmid, a Jew whose munificence to the Turkish Jews is so well known, and whose distinguished relative, Francis Goldsmid, a few years ago acted as reference in the question of the Persia and Afghanistan boundary. The interpreters of prophecy in reference to Israel's future have quoted Isaiah, chapter xix., 23, as a prediction whose fulfillment this enterprise seems to favor in some way. The text is this: 'In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt,

and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians.' It is thought to foreshadow a tripartite alliance between Israel, Egypt, and Assyria, in the future of the Hebrew races, when converted. Then the next verses are quoted: 'In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land, whom the Lord will bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my inheritance.' It is agreed that no alliance has ever yet taken place.

The usual objection that Palestine is incapable of supporting a dense population is set aside by the testimony of the late United States Consul-General, who writes from Jaffa: 'An abundant supply of water could be brought to the city from the pools of Solomon, were it not that all efforts are thwarted by the Moslem rulers. The land of Palestine is extremely productive, and were colonies planted here, as they are in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, there is no reason to doubt their success.' Arnold, the celebrated historian, who traveled over it, says, 'The old abundance is still sleeping in the soil of Palestine, and it needs not any miracle, but industry, to bring back the wealth and beauty of the early ages of the Hebrew Monarchy.'

What adds interest to the Jewish question is the discoveries made by scholars of the whereabouts of the lost 'Ten Tribes,' or the tribes of the Northern Kingdom, carried away by Shalmaneser, a century before the Babylonian exile of Judah, the Southern Kingdom. It seems to be established that the Jews in Afghanistan and in the Caucasus, and those in China, with the 200,000 Falashas in Abyssinia, are all descendants from the Ten Tribes. The wonderful increase, too, of Mohammedanism, outstripping Christianity the last ten years as a proselyting religion, and the growing belief of orthodox Moslems that the decay of the Ottoman power is a sign of the end of the world and the judgment day, attract attention. The special interest Englishmen take in the whole question is very marked. Politically, what England wants is a strong power in Syria to protect the Alexandrian Road and Suez Canal from Russian assault. Jewish nationality would solve that problem, provided England had the protectorate. This involves the dispossession of the Turks and overthrow of their Government, and a conflict of nations for the possession of Palestine and dominion of the East and the world. That means a general Asiatic, European, and African struggle, with Jerusalem the objective. This, too, is interesting. With Egypt and Greece already existing, if diplomacy erects Syria and Thrace into two separate Kingdoms, then modern history reproduces the four Kingdoms into which Alexander's Empire was broken up, and points to Syria as the spot where the last enemy of the Jews appear in the last struggle. Out of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes came, and it is thought that out of Syria, again, according to the prophecy of Daniel, in his eleventh chapter, the last Anti-christ will arise. The discussions in the press and magazines are many and full of interest. One of England's Bishops has just said: 'If ever the question is raised, and it may

be raised very soon, Shall the Jews be inducted into their patrimonial land as tenants at will? no matter by whom the proposition is made, or for what purpose,—even hostile to England,—it will be England’s duty not to oppose but to assist, or at least permit Israel to be restored, unconverted.’ This is the general tone of Christendom. The ‘Reformed Jews’—i. e., the Rationalists—are laughing, or mocking.”

The Rothschilds owned the Pope and Rome. The question naturally arises whether the Pope was simply reckless with the finances of the Church, or if he was an agent of Rothschilds, who intentionally ran up the debts of the Church. The Jews had always believed that the Kings, Queens, Princes and Princesses of the Gentiles, in other words, all Gentile leaders are destined to be the Jews’ obedient slaves. *Psalm* 18:40-50 states,

“40 Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies; that I might destroy them that hate me. 41 They cried, but *there was* none to save *them: even* unto the LORD, but he answered them not. 42 Then did I beat them small as the dust before the wind: I did cast them out as the dirt in the streets. 43 Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people; *and* thou hast made me the head of the heathen: a people *whom* I have not known shall serve me. 44 As soon as they hear *of me*, they shall obey me: the strangers shall submit themselves unto me. 45 The strangers shall fade away, and be afraid out of their close places. 46 The LORD liveth; and blessed *be* my rock; and let the God of my salvation be exalted. 47 *It is* God that avengeth me, and subdueth the people under me. 48 He delivereth me from mine enemies: yea, thou liftest me up above those that rise up against me: thou hast delivered me from the violent man. 49 Therefore will I give thanks unto thee, O LORD, among the heathen, and sing *praises* unto thy name. 50 Great deliverance giveth he to his king; and sheweth mercy to his anointed, to David, and to his seed for evermore.”

Psalm 72:8-11,

“8 He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. 9 They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. 10 The kings of Tarshish and *of* the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. 11 Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him.”

Isaiah 49:23 states,

“And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee *with their face toward* the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that *I am* the LORD: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me.”

Micah 17:16-17,

“The nations shall see and be confounded at all their might: they shall lay *their* hand upon *their* mouth, their ears shall be deaf. 17 They shall lick the dust like a serpent, they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth: they shall be afraid of the LORD our God, and shall fear because of thee.”

One can imagine how quickly the Rothschilds could seize power over Europe and the world if they placed monarchs, heads of state, and church leaders in power, who were their agents, and who intentionally ran up their nations’ debts and deliberately brought their nations into wars, and into ruin. There are various means to gain control over a leader: threats, blackmail, bribery, flattery, fame, megalomania, messiah complex, etc. A leader may also be placed in power who already has allegiance to a specific cause due to his or her ethnicity, family history, etc. Once a sovereign of one sort or another is controlled and creates debts which are not paid by the wealthy, but by the comparatively poor, those poor must slave forever to pay off those debts. Not only do the immensely wealthy earn the interest on the debt, that interest accrues to monies which were never truly taxed—this while the immensely wealthy disproportionately reap the benefits of citizenry. It was important to the Rothschilds to not only accrue wealth, but also to prevent Gentiles from accruing wealth and thereby gaining control over their own destinies.

The Chicago Tribune reported on 27 February 1867 on page 2,

“The Rothschilds of Rome.

[Rome Correspondence of the London News.]

Who, whether he has set foot in the Eternal City or no, has not heard of the Torlonias—the Rothschilds of Rome? In the course of last summer, when the monetary crisis here was at its height, Don Alessandro Torlonia—the acting head of the house—won extraordinary popularity by writing a letter to the Pope, in which he offered to buy up the unconvertible Government paper, and substituting a metal currency in its place, providing that the existing managers of the Roman Bank, with Cardinal Antonelli’s brother at their head, were sent about their business, and the direction confided to himself. At that time it was quite impossible to get notes converted into coin at any price for the simple reason that there was no coin in the bank. Even now, when things have improved somewhat, it is with the utmost difficulty that you can get change for a scudi note, even at shops in the Corso, and there is not a hotel keeper or a tradesman in Rome who would even look at a five scudi note if you were sufficiently ignorant of the state of things here to present it in payment in the expectation of getting any change out. Of the small pieces of silver, which you obtain with no little difficulty, many are so worn and thin that they seem in a sort of transition state between silver and paper, and have long since lost all trace of any image or superscription whatever.

So rolling in wealth is Don Alessandro Torlonia that his riches are

admitted to be literally untold, and only this much is known certain, that everything in Rome worth having, except the Pope and St. Peter's, already belongs to him. No wonder then that at the Vatican Don Alessandro should be looked upon as a hardly less dangerous character than Victor Emanuel himself, and that the insulting offer which he made last summer to buy up the Holy Father, and add him so his possessions, should have been decidedly rejected, though it had not entailed the removal of an Antonelli from a lucrative place. On his first appearance in public after making the above mentioned patriotic offer, Don Alessandro received such an ovation as has not been witnessed in Rome since those of which Pius IX. was himself the object, when he gave the first impulse to the Italian Revolution in 1846. This Don Alessandro is the same Torlonia who risked his whole fortune on the gigantic enterprise of draining the Fucine Lake, the issue of which struggle with nature was so long doubtful that it became a common saying in Rome, 'Either Torlonia will drain the Fucine Lake, or the Fucine will drain Torlonia.' In the end, however, Torlonia got the better of the lake, and redeemed about one hundred thousand acres of land for cultivation. Over what was a few years ago a barren waste of waters, flourishing crops may now be seen waving every harvest time, and with last year's produce Don Alessandro had a scheme of feeding the now almost starving Roman people by selling them bread of his own baking at a reduced rate. Such, at least, was the account of the story given me by a patriotic and exceedingly liberal Roman, who made a severe case against the Government out of the stoppage of Torlonia's extensive bread baking-by-machinery works, which threw some two hundred workmen out of employment just a fortnight ago. I am bound, however, to add that, on proceeding to the spot and making inquiries, I learned quite a different version of the affair, entirely exculpating the Government from any direct interference in the matter. Only this much is certain, that the works are stopped, and that the Roman people stand little chance, at present, of getting their bread at reduced rates."

On 2 June 1867, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on page 3,

"THE ROTHSCHILDS AND THE POPE.

For fifteen centuries the Jews have been cursed by the Pope, and persecuted by the Roman Church. There is no more revolting chapter of horrors in history than that of the treatment of the Jews at the hands of the Pontiffs. In all lands where the Roman religion is dominant the children of Israel have been treated with barbaric rigor—allowed few privileges, denied all rights, looked upon as a people accursed of God, and set apart by divine ordination to be trampled upon by the church. In Rome, at the present day, the Jews are confined to the Ghetto; they are not allowed to set up a shop in any other part of the city; they cannot leave the city without a permit; they can engage only in certain trades; they are compelled to pay enormous taxes into the Papal treasury; they are subject to a stringent code of laws established

by the Pope for their special government; they are imprisoned and fined for the most trivial of offences. They cannot own any real estate in the city; cannot build or tear down or remodel any dwelling or change their place of business, without Papal permission. They are in abject slavery, with no right whatever, and entitled to no privileges, and receive none, except upon the gracious condescension of the Pope. In former times they were unmercifully whipped and compelled to listen once a week to the *Christian* doctrine of the priests. But time is bringing changes. The Pope is in want of money; and the house of the red shield has money to lend on good security. The house is always ready to accommodate Governments. Italy wants money, so she sells her fine system of railroads to the Rothschilds. The Pope wants money, and he sends his Nuncio to the wealthy house of the despised race, offers them security on the property of the church, the Compagna, and receives ten million dollars to maintain his army and Imperial State. That was in 1865. A year passes, and the Pontifical expenditures are five million more than the income, and the deficit is made up by the Rothschilds, who take a second security at a higher rate of interest. Another year has passed and there is a third great annual vacuum in the Papal treasury of six million, which quite likely will be filled by the same house. The firm can do it with as much ease as your readers can pay their yearly subscription to the weekly *Journal*. When will the Pope redeem his loan at the rate he is going? Never. Manifestly the day is not far distant when these representatives of the persecuted race will have all the available property of the Church in their possession. Surely time works wonders.”

On 24 December 1893, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported, on page 6,

“INCOME AND EXPENSES OF THE POPE.

Economy Necessary Because of the Continual Decrease in the Revenues.

Since the heavy losses made by the Pope a year or more ago the finances of the Vatican have been superintended with great care. ‘It is known,’ says a Paris paper, ‘that a committee of prelates and several Cardinals exists at Rome whose duty it is to regulate the use of the sums of money which flow into the treasury of the Vatican. These sums come principally from two sources: The revenues of the property possessed by the Pope and the gifts of the faithful, known as Peter’s Pence. The property of the Vatican is of various kinds, but the greater part of it consists of money or bonds, placed in England and France, under control of the Paris house of Rothschild. Peter’s Pence is an annual revenue which far from being fixed. In good years the total of the sum received from all countries of the world reaches 8,000,000 francs. Sometimes it is as low as 6,000,000 and even 5,000,000. This has been the case for the last five years. This diminution is due, in great part, to the discord between the Royalists and the French Catholics produced by the republican policy of the Pope. France alone furnished two-thirds and often

three-quarters of Peter's Pence. And in France it is the royalists who prove themselves most generous. But since the adhesion of Leo XIII. to the republic many of them, more Royalist than Catholic, have closed their purses to the Pope. However, despite all this, French Bishops still forward the largest sums to his Holiness. Thus, the Bishop of Nante sent a few days ago 100,000 francs from his flock as their gift to the Vatican treasury.

'Italy,' adds the *Journal*, 'contributes only a small part of the revenue—a few hundred thousand francs a year. The Romans show themselves in this regard less generous than other Italians. On the other hand, the Anglo-Saxon countries—England, Ireland, Australia, and the United States—begin to send important sums. If Catholicism continues to grow in these countries, it is easy to see that in time the Vatican will draw considerable sums from them.

'Again, there are the royal courts, such as that of Austria, which send annually rich presents to the Pope. This is even true of princes of ancient Italian families. Francis II., ex-King of Naples, and Maria Theresa, formerly Grand-Duchess of Tuscany, never fail to send their offerings, which consist of several thousands of francs. The Comte de Chambord was accustomed to give annually 50,000 francs; the Count of Paris sends the same sum.

'The expenses of the Vatican,' continues the writer, 'amount annually to more than 7,000,000 francs. They are regulated as follows: for the personal wants of the Pope, 500,000 francs; for the Cardinals, 700,000; for poor dioceses, 400,000; administration of the Vatican, 1,800,000; Secretary of State, 1,000,000; employés and ablegates, 1,500,000; support of schools and poor, 1,200,000.

'The Cardinals at Rome live at the expense of the Pope. The income of each from this source is at least 22,000 francs. The Secretary of State is charged with upholding relations with foreign governments by the mediation of nuncios. The four most important—Paris, Vienna, Madrid, and Lisbon—each receive an allowance of 60,000 francs a year.

'The last jubilee of Pope Leo XIII. brought to the Vatican 3,000,000 francs. At the first, celebrated five years ago, 12,000,000 francs were received. In the course of years the Pope has introduced a number of economies in the different branches of the Vatican service, and for that reason he has been called miserly. This accusation is not merited; the economies became necessary in a State whose expenses are considerable and whose revenues continue to diminish. Leo XIII. has many reasons to follow the example of his illustrious predecessor, Sixtus, as it is difficult in the present time to count on the generosity of the faithful.'"

There was even talk of making the Pope, who was owned by the Rothschilds, the King of Palestine, thereby making Rothschild King of Palestine by proxy; and, in the minds of Protestants, making the Pope the anti-Christ. This would have enabled the Rothschilds to take Palestine from the Turkish Empire, install the Pope as King, and then unseat him as the "anti-Christ" and replace him with the allegedly "neutral" Jewish Kingdom of the Rothschild dynasty. *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 4 June

1887 on page 5,

“The Pope for King of Palestine.

VIENNA, June 3.—The *Algemeine Zeitung* mentions that a project is hinted at to make the Pope the King of Palestine under a guarantee of protection on the throne by all the Catholic Powers.”

The Catholics gave their money to the Popes, who gave it the Catholics’ enemies, the Rothschilds to finance the destruction of Catholicism via Christians who had been essentially converted to Judaism *viz.* Protestantism, and the anti-Catholic Jewish press. Numerous European nations ran themselves into debt fighting wars and the only beneficiaries were the bankers and arms manufacturers—the Rothschilds gave the monarchies some wealth to flatter them and control them, then the Rothschilds betrayed them and destroyed them. Continually, the ultimate progress of European nations, and their colonies, and their former colonies, was impeded in ways that profited rich Jews, rich Jews who quietly pretended to the throne of Israel in the diaspora, while doing little for their “subjects”, the millions of impoverished Jews struggling in *Schtetels*.

It should, however, be noted that Jews often concealed their wealth and had a love for jewels and gold, because, among other reasons, they were easy to transport at a moment’s notice. Many of the Jews who appeared impoverished were in fact wealthy, and the numerous accounts of Jews miraculously becoming wealthy in America are doubtful. In 1845, *The North American Review* wrote,

“Indeed, throughout the East, the Jews are obliged to affect poverty, in order to conceal their wealth; what is exposed to view is never safe from Mohammedan rapacity. Though the great majority of those in Palestine are poor and dependent, some may be found there in comfortable circumstances, or even rich; but their wealth appears to those only who gain their intimacy. Dr. Richardson, an English traveller, says, ‘In going to visit a respectable Jew in the Holy City, it is a common thing to pass to his house over a ruined foreground, and up an awkward outside stair, constructed of rough, unpolished stones, that totter under the foot; but it improves as you ascend, and at the top has a respectable appearance, as it ends in an agreeable platform in front of the house. On entering the house itself, it is found to be clean and well furnished the sofas are covered with Persian carpets, and the people seem happy to see you.’ The synagogues in Jerusalem are, from prudential motives, both small and mean. A Jew dares not set foot within the Holy Sepulchre. When, in 1832, the Egyptian troops occupied Palestine, the Jews did not find their condition in the least improved. The common soldier made the best Jew sweep the streets, or perform any menial office.”³³⁶

In an article entitled “The Jews”, *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine*, Volume 53, Number 1, (January, 1859), pp. 41-51, at 44-45, 48, wrote,

“Yet the Jews of the Ottoman Empire, notwithstanding their degradation, exhibit a certain intellectual tendency. They live in an ideal world, frivolous and superstitious though it be. The Jew who fills the lowest offices, who deals out *raki* all day long to drunken Greeks, who trades in old nails, and to whose sordid soul the very piastres he bandies have imparted their copper haze, finds his chief delight in mental pursuits. Seated by a taper in his dingy cabin, he spends the long hours of the night in poring over the Zohar, the Chaldaic book of the magic Cabala, or, with enthusiastic delight, plunges into the mystical commentaries on the Talmud, seeking to unravel their quaint traditions and sophistries, and attempting, like the astrologers and alchymists, to divine the secrets and command the powers of Nature. ‘The humble dealer, who hawks some article of clothing or some old piece of furniture about the streets; the obsequious mass of animated filth and rags which approaches to obtrude offers of service on the passing traveller, is perhaps deeply versed in Talmudic lore, or aspiring, in nightly vigils, to read into futurity, to command the elements, and acquire invisibility.’ Thus wisdom is preferred to wealth, and a Rothschild would reject a family alliance with a Christian prince to form one with the humblest of his tribe who is learned in Hebrew lore.

The Jew of the old world, has his revenge:

‘THE pound of flesh which I demand of him
Is dearly bought, is mine, and I will have it.’

Furnishing the hated Gentiles with the means of waging exterminating wars, he beholds, exultingly, in the fields of slaughtered victims a bloody satisfaction of his ‘lodged hate’ and ‘certain loathing,’ more gratifying even than the golden Four-per-cents on his Princely loans. Of like significance is the fact that in many parts of the world the despised Jews claim as their own the possessions of the Gentiles, among whom they dwell. Thus the squalid *Yeslir*, living in the Jews’ quarter of Balata or Haskeni, and even more despised than the unbelieving dogs of Christians, traffics secretly in the estates, the palaces and the villages of the great Beys and Pachas, who would regard his touch as pollution. What, apparently, can be more absurd? Yet these assumed possessions, far more valuable, in fact, than the best ‘estates in Spain,’ are bought and sold for money, and inherited from generation to generation.

The Jewish population of Egypt numbers not more than ten thousand souls, of whom nearly seven thousand live in Grand Cairo. Though now undisturbed in the practice of their faith, the oppressive exactions of the Government, and the fear of renewing the persecutions of former times, have taught them to dissimulate. Dressing in filthy rags, and living in houses of the meanest external appearance, they strive to seem even more wretched than they are in reality, so as not to invite taxation.”

Jews boasted of their power in terms that Jewish racists would call “anti-Semitic” when stated by Gentiles. Jewish influence circumvented any democratic hopes that Europeans had in the Nineteenth Century and hindered the Continent with endless wars that ultimately only served the perceived self-interests of Jews. Rich Jews beat the drums for war in their newspapers, profited from wars in the markets, and brought about wars through their corrupt influence over politicians, church leaders and monarchs. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 13 May 1877 on page 3,

“Jews in European Politics.

London Public Leader (Jewish Organ).

The London *Examiner* last week announced that a Berlin firm of publishers intended issuing next winter a work entitled ‘The Political Influence of the Jewish Race in Europe.’ Our contemporary observes that, ‘leaving out of consideration the power of Lord Beaconsfield (Disraeli) in English, and of M. Gambetta in French, politics, and the growing Hebraic dominance in Russia, particularly in cities like Odessa, Germany itself would hardly have been the Germany of to-day but for the exertions with pen and tongue of such Liberal politicians as Jacoby, Sonneman, and, above all, Edward Lasker, the ‘natural leader,’ of the National Liberals.’ This is a poor summary of the political influence of the Jews in Europe, especially the production of M. Gambetta as an example of their influence in French politics. There are many more Jewish politicians in France of much greater importance, prominent amongst them are MM. Cremieux and Jules Simon. Austria has been entirely forgotten by our contemporary, notwithstanding that the revolution which necessitated the flight of Metternich was organized and led by Jews, and that amongst the most popular members of the Austrian Parliament are such Jewish statesmen as Hirsch and Kuranda. Then again the Italian Assembly contains several Jewish members, whose opinions are of great weight, and the city of Rome itself—the stronghold of that power which, throughout long ages, attempted the extermination of the Jews—numbers amongst its legislative representatives a Jew born and partly reared in the Roman Ghetto. Whilst we are on this subject, we cannot help remembering the enormous political power wielded by the Jews through the medium of the continental press. In Germany and Austria the majority of papers belong to Jews, and the most brilliant journalists are Children of Israel: and then—finis coronat opus—where in the Examiner’s short summary is a mention of the influence of the Rothschilds? The political power of this family can hardly be estimated. It reminds us of an anecdote told of the wife of old Meyer Anselm Rothschild, which is sufficient to illustrate it. To her dying day she lived in the Ghetto of her forefathers in Frankfort, and attained such an age that she saw her sons rise to the position of the greatest financiers in the world. She never renounced her old gossips, and one day, in 1830, one of her friends came to her and told her that her son was ordered to join the military and might be killed in the impending war. ‘Be comforted,’ answered Madame Rothschild, in the homely patois of her

district, 'I will tell my sons not to give the Princess money, and then they will not be able to go to war.'"

War and the revenge of the Jews against the Christians were common themes when discussing the Rothschilds in the Nineteenth Century. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 28 December 1873 on page 16,

"Character of the Rothschilds.

The four original houses remain, though they have agencies and interests in all the leading cities of Europe, Asia, and Africa, as well as North and South America. They have belted the globe with their operations, and are in the fullest sense universal and cosmopolitan bankers. For generations they have been Barons, and the title is hereditary in their family. Since the death of old Mayer Anselm, they have added the distinguishing *de* and *von* to their names, and are as far removed from democratic affiliations and sympathies as if it were a thousand instead of a hundred years since their ancestors counted kreutzers and old [??] in the Judengasse of Frankfort. They have always been devoted to their theological [??], and strict in observing all the forms of the synagogue. They are not without superstition in their creed, believing that much of their good fortune has come from their unswerving fidelity to Judaism. Their charities to their coreligionists have been many and liberal. They have endowed schools, built hospitals, and funded almshouses. Their attachment to their ancient form of worship is noble and commendable. They cannot help remembering how bitterly their people were persecuted for ages, and how very recent it is that they have been allowed to enjoy either political or civil rights. Long after Mayer Anselm had grown rich, he and his fellow-Hebrews were locked into the Jews' quarter of Frankfort after nightfall, and forbidden to depart thence until the iron gates were thrown open in the morning. If the great bankers have forgiven the inhuman wrongs done through centuries to their race, they are singularly magnanimous. They have reason to feel as *Shylock* felt to *Antonio* toward the fawning Christians who go to them for money. Their negative revenge cannot be without sweetness when they think that the once despised and hunted Jew has had the proudest nobles begging for his gold, and even Kings soliciting his aid. It has been their boast that monarchs could not go to war without the consent of the Rothschilds. Like most boasts, this was not strictly true; but they who furnish the sinews of battle are the most desirable of allies, not less than the most formidable of foes. The Rothschilds, save at rare intervals, continue to intermarry, and are likely to while the powerful family holds together. If the common theory respecting the union of blood-relatives were true, the banking brotherhood would be reduced by this time to hopeless imbecility; and they are in the opposite extreme.—*Harper's Weekly*."

Others believed that inbreeding had indeed degraded the Rothschild family. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 15 February 1874 on page 7,

“There is no question that, with the death of Baron James, the genius of the house of Rothschild has departed. Constant intermarriage with cousins and the absence of that intellectual vigor which the infusion of fresh, new blood imparts, has its effect on men as on animals, and the younger branches of the family are far inferior to the elder.”

Wars helped the Rothschilds destroy competing banks, including national banks, and consolidate their power, while weakening the European nations—which had been a prophetic wish of Judaism for thousands of years. It is important to note that the effect, and perhaps the desire, is to prevent an entire society, even humanity at large, from becoming powerful and wealthy; which would enable Gentiles to resist Messianic Jewish world domination. *The Chicago Press and Tribune* reported on 6 June 1859,

**“The War Revulsion in European Finance—First
Effects of the Storm.**

[From the New York Herald.]

The monetary disasters which are likely to follow from the effects of the present war in Europe, and the necessary destruction it will entail upon the financial and banking system of several of the most powerful of the European governments, are so entirely different in their character and in the laws that govern them from the revulsions known to the present generation, that few persons now engaged in the active transactions of life comprehend or consider them.

The experience of the present age is limited to a small number of commercial revulsions which have grown out of the exaggeration of the healthy elements of trade. Few recollect the ruin that swept through the commercial world on the commencement of Pitt’s war, and the consequent suspension of specie payments by the Bank of England, or the vast fortunes made by a horde of army contractors during its twenty-one years’ continuance, while commerce flagged, looms were stopped, ships rotted at the wharves, merchants went into bankruptcy or prison, and the army was the only refuge of the people from starvation. The beginning of a great war, and the short continuance of any strictly local conflict, acts as a stimulus upon trade and industry, because its effects are as yet felt only in their demand for the elements of destruction. But when its true work comes to bear—when the circulating medium is turned from its wonted channels, and the force of destruction without production and exchange begins to be felt—the longing for peace sets in, and continues to increase in intensity till its arrival is celebrated with bonfires and enthusiastic shouts that far exceed any manifestations of joy at the declaration of war. This simple truth marks the real effect of war upon the common weal. Let us now group together a few of the facts that have marked the progress of the present contest.

In the foreground stands the fact that the several governments of Europe, since the 1st of the January, have either come into the market, or are

preparing to come in, for loans to the amount of three hundred and fifty millions of dollars. England raised thirty-five for her Indian wants, and immediately sent one-half of it in silver to Calcutta. Austria asked for a hundred millions; but all the power and credit of the Rothschilds could not raise it for her, and she seized the metallic reserve of the Bank of Vienna, suspended specie payments, borrowed two-thirds of the sum in paper, and assessed a forced loan of fifteen millions more on Lombardo-Venetia. Russia sought for sixty millions; but she, too, failed to obtain it, and has adopted a system of financial expedients at home. Sardinia asked for six millions, failed to get it, and suspended specie payments also, borrowing the amount in paper from the Bank of Turin. France has called upon her people to contribute one hundred millions of dollars, and they offer five hundred millions. Turkey borrowed a short time since twenty-five millions. Prussia, Holland, Belgium and the German Confederation are now preparing to come into the money market for large amounts.

The first effects of these extraordinary borrowings is to cause the people to look at the financial condition of several governments. They find that for years past all have exhibited deficits in their budgets. Since 1851 France has borrowed and spent six hundred millions of dollars more than her revenue. Austria has done the same to the extent of four hundred millions. England had to borrow nearly one hundred millions to prosecute the Crimean war; and if she goes into the present one, there is no possibility of estimating how much she must borrow. Russia, Sardinia, Spain, Germany, Prussia—all have exhibited deficits for some time past; and the revolution that now threatens to sweep over commerce gives no hope of a different state of things.

As a result of these movements we find specie disappearing from the vaults of trade, and seeking the hoards of fear or the war chests of the army. In fifteen days New York has sent off ten millions of dollars. The last returns of the Banks of England and France show that in one month they had lost ten millions of bullion. In the two months preceding the declaration of war in 1854, the bullion in the Bank of England alone ran down eight millions, and in the two succeeding months ten millions more. To endeavor to stop this drain, the rate of interest has already been raised in London one per cent., on the 6th of May, and will no doubt be further advanced. This stops commerce from using money. But war does not care for per centages; its first step is to suspend specie payments, which, when taken by a government, is nothing more nor less than a direct robbery of its own subjects.

Already the consequences of these extraordinary movements are beginning to be felt. Although the promised rate of interest has not been refused, an immense depreciation has been caused in the value of government securities and public stocks. It is calculated that the depreciation in British consols is already equal to three hundred and fifty millions of dollars, and that of the stocks of public companies three hundred and fifty millions more. On the Continent the effect has been much greater, and we may safely estimate the fall in the value of funded property in Europe at four

thousand millions of dollars. From these causes will follow the ruin of the bankers; and they have already begun to fail. In April Lutteroth failed for a large amount in Trieste. On the 2d of May, Wolf & Co., Berlin bankers, failed; on the 5th, Lloyd, Belby & Co. failed in London; on the 6th, Arnstein & Eckles, Vienna bankers, failed for ten millions of dollars; and up to the 12th of May, nearly one hundred failures were announced on the Stock Exchange and trade in London. At Constantinople a sudden advance in the value of sterling exchange from 143 to 156 piastres had caused the bankers to gather in council in the beginning of May; and in Holland, where large amounts of Austrian and other Continental securities are held, the depreciation of securities had been so severely felt that numerous distressing suicides had taken place.

The cause of these dire results may be reduced to a simple expression. The governing class in Europe—a class that has no connection with commerce and little sympathy with industry—is seizing upon the wealth of the world, perverting it from the arteries and veins of trade, and pouring it into their own pockets and the pockets of a hoard of army contractors, and squandering it in destructive dynastic wars. Let not our merchants flatter themselves that these things are going to be good for them. They will be good for a new class of speculators; men who will run great risks for the chance of great profits—men who connect themselves with the quartermasters and supply contractors of Europe, and who will resort to all kinds of expedients to win a purse or break a neck in the race for fortune. But a general war in Europe will break down all its existing financial and commercial circles, and the effects cannot but be severely felt in one way or another here.”

As the Civil War grew nearer, Americans grew suspicious of the Rothschilds’ destruction of European economies. Americans noted the new phenomenon whereby governments passed debt on to future generations, who were undemocratically forced to give up their treasure to the repressive Rothschilds. These intrigues, which had the effect of fulfilling Jewish prophecy, were among the reasons why Jews were looked upon with suspicion, especially in Europe. Another major reason was the fact that Jews were prominent in the revolutionary movements. It is important here to note that the debts the Rothschilds manufactured promoted the conditions which enabled the Marxists to overthrow governments and ruin societies, and these Jewish forces covertly worked in collusion. *The Chicago Press and Tribune* reported on 22 December 1859 on page 3,

“Baron Rothschild’s Visit to America.

We see announced as among the arrivals by the Persia, one of the celebrated house of Rothschild. Thus far the business of that house with this country and its securities has been comparatively small. They have estimated our government loans too insecure, and our railroad stocks too small, or too speculative and fluctuating. They have negotiated the loans of crowned heads

to the amount of millions, resting on no more solid basis than the honor of some bankrupt government. For England, with its debt of eight hundred millions of pounds sterling, they have been the chief government agents at most important and critical times. For France they have at times done much in this way, under half a dozen dynasties, just to keep stocks up and what they had from being swept away. In Austria they have been everything more potent than sovereigns—yet themselves compelled to sustain tottering governments by taking loans to keep things going. Meantime they have despised the growing wealth of this country, which has not exhibited itself in crown jewels or costly palaces, or immense retinues of servants, or of soldiers, but in careful re-investments, railroads, telegraphs and broad acres, subdued by the hand of industry, to supply the world with cotton and with grain.

No Rothschild that we know of has visited this country before, and their doing so now may have a significance in history difficult to calculate. Of course, they do not tell their purposes and their plans. They do not even herald their approach, or intimate it by any ostentatious display. But it is not impossible that such an arrival may indicate at a future period the gradual transfer of large portions of their countless wealth to this country. If such should be the case, it would be perfectly certain that the wealth of thousands of others would follow in the same direction, and our stocks of every kind would rise, and enterprise be pushed in ten thousand channels; so that the next fifty years would produce an expansion and growth from the capital of the old world, united with the industry of the new, compared with which, all the past progress of the last fifty years would be as nothing.

This country *must* afford the best field for the employment of capital. The Rothschilds began with nothing. They made their money mainly by the rise of government securities, consequent on the re-establishment of order and of confidence, after the wild and sweeping ruin of the first French Revolution. The peace of 1815 made them indisputably the first house in the world for capital vested in government securities. But, since the Revolutions of 1848, the loss of confidence in the government securities of Europe has been gradually becoming more and more marked among the most sagacious. Austrian finances have been proverbially rotten for years, and each year has not only added to the deficit, but displayed some new government fraud, until, within the last year, things have come to light showing the over-issue of stock, in such ways and to such an extent that would destroy the character and the credit of any mercantile house, or of anything, in fact, that had any character or credit to lose, except a European government.

The debt of France has been enormously increased, and that of England also. Not a country in Europe is diminishing its debts in peace, and all its wars and preparation have to be carried on by taxing posterity. How long can all this last? If peace were the order of the day, things might go on without getting worse. But peace is not the order of the day, and war is getting to be more and more a question of finance and credit on an unheard of scale of

cost. Some nation like Austria will one of these days come to a halt—will run down—and then the rest will follow, like a row of dominoes; and then the capitalists will have stocks and government bonds, but the coupons will be unpaid, and the whole worth only so much waste paper.

The last century taught the civilized world a new act, that of borrowing without the least prospect of ever repaying, by simply paying the interest and throwing the rest upon posterity. So long as posterity obtains something better than the interest in return—peace, order, credit and wealth—they may go on and meet the drafts of their predecessors upon them; but, directly the cost becomes greater than the advantage, and war and insecurity return, a new generation will arise and sweep away the whole debt as unjust. In this country we have *lands*, and railroads, and solid products at the bottoms of our stocks, and into these things the capital of the old world is finding its way and will find it.”

The Rothschilds defended Jewish interests. There are indications that they believed that this brought them good luck. It also generated distrust and conflict. Cabalist Jews believed that committing both good acts and evil acts could hasten the coming of the Messiah, and Rothschild wanted to be the Messiah. On 5 September 1874, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* published an obituary for Anselm De Rothschild, which evinces the undemocratic and repressive power of the Rothschild family, as well as their use of their power to promote Jewish interests,

“Baron Anselm De Rothschild.

The death of the lamented Baron Anselm De Rothschild, says *Jewish Chronicle*, has produced a deep impression throughout Vienna. The Baron died at Dobling, near that town. He had attained the age of 71. He was born on the 29th of January, 1803, at Frankfort-on-the-Main. He was a son of Baron Solomon De Rothschild, who was a grandson of the founder of this distinguished commercial dynasty, Anselm Meyer. He spent his youth at Frankfort, and passed some time during his young manhood at Berlin, where he attended the university of that city. His career as a university student imbued him with a lively interest in science. He attached to scientific pursuits and held communion with scientific men throughout his whole life, and he invariably endeavored to keep up with the stream of scientific progress. It is said that he had a special acquaintance with history, but he principally acquired renown as an enthusiastic friend of the fine arts and a profound connoisseur in painting and archæology. In 1855 he took up his residence in Vienna, and rarely quitted it excepting during the hot weather, when he usually went to his estate at Schillersdorf, in Silesia. He married his cousin Charlotte, daughter of his uncle, Baron Nathan Mayer De Rothschild, the well-known head of the London branch (father of Baron Lionel and Sir Anthony Rothschild). He lost his wife in 1859. He had seven children, viz.: three sons, Nathaniel, Ferdinand, and Alfred; and four daughters, Julia, the wife of Adolphe Charles De Rothschild; Matilda, who married William

Charles De Rothschild; Louisa, who married Baron Franchetti, and Alice, who is still unmarried. His sons have no children; Baron Ferdinand is a widower. In 1861 Baron Anselm De Rothschild was appointed a member of the Upper House, or House of Lords, of the Austrian Imperial Parliament, in which he always voted with the Liberal party. Not having been endowed with oratorical talents he did not attempt to shine as a speaker, but he enjoyed the highest esteem of his illustrious senatorial colleagues by the firmness of his character and the unshakable consistency of his principles. Indeed, it is difficult in Austria for a political personage to acquire a reputation for consistency, but this reputation he deservedly obtained. Baron Anselm De Rothschild invariably evinced a strongly pious adherence to the orthodox principles of the religion of his fathers. In 1866 he gave a notable proof of the intensity with which he felt any blow directed against the honor of his coreligionists. In that year the war broke out between Austria and Prussia. At that time Count Beleredi was at the head of the Austrian Government; he was a man of Ultramontane Catholic principles, and he had very little sympathy with the Jews. Under an assertion of patriotism he put forth the notion of requiring the Jewish congregations to organize several battalions of volunteers at their own expense. Now, as the Jews necessarily undertook the obligations of military service in common with other citizens, Count Beleredi's plan was neither more nor less than an extraordinary tax levied on the Jews, a disguised renewal of the special Jews' tax, that had been abolished since the emancipation of the Jews. Naturally the Jews protested on all sides against this injustice, and on this occasion Baron Anselm de Rothschild wrote to the Imperial Minister that he would close his offices, break off all financial negotiations with the Government, and leave Austria if the Minister persisted in carrying out a project which would be so injurious to the Jews. His letter had the desired effect, and the Minister abandoned the tax. He spent his last days at a villa at Dobling, a village near Vienna. He had suffered much, and was obliged to submit to a painful operation. For some days before his death this catastrophe was regarded as inevitable. According to the last wish of the deceased, his body was taken, with the greatest simplicity, to Frankfort. With the exception of the two preachers of the Synagogue, the functionaries of the burial society, and his most intimate friends, very few persons were at the ceremony. Immediately on hearing of the death of the Baron, the Emperor sent his adjutant to offer his condolence to the family, as did also the German Emperor, the Czar of Russia, and the King of Italy by their respective Ambassadors. Prince Bismark and Count Andrassy, Primo Minister of the Austro-Hungarian realm, sent telegrams of sympathy."

Though the Rothschilds felt justified in using their power to promote Jewish interests, they did not hesitate to use unscrupulous means to fleece entire Gentile societies of their wealth. The callous elitism and arrogant inhumanity of the Rothschilds was revealed in an article that appeared in *The Chicago Tribune* on 24

December 1867 on page 2,

**“The Career of the Great Rothschild, of
London, as Narrated by Himself.**

Extract of a Letter from Sir Thomas Powell

Buxton to Miss Buxton.

DEVONSHIRE STREET, Feb. 11, 1834.

We yesterday dined at Ham House, to meet the Rothschilds, and very amusing it was. He (Rothschild) told us his life and adventures. He was the third son of the banker at Frankfort. ‘There was not,’ he said, room enough for us all in the city. I dealt in English goods. One great trader came there who had the market to himself; he was quite the great man, and did us a favor if he sold us goods. Somehow I offended him, and he refused to show us his patterns. This was on Tuesday. I said to my father, ‘I will go to England.’ I could speak nothing but German. On Tuesday I started. The nearer I got to England the cheaper goods were.

As soon as I got to Manchester I laid out all my money, things were so cheap and made good profit. I soon found that there were three profits—on the raw material, the dyeing and the manufacturing. I said to the manufacturer, ‘I will supply you with material and dye, and you supply me with manufactured goods.’ So I got three profits instead of one, and could sell goods cheaper than anybody. In a short time I made my £20,000 into £60,000. My success all turned on one maxim. I can do what another man can, and so I am a match for the man with the patterns, and all the rest of them! Another advantage I had; I was a off-hand man; I made a bargain at once. When I was settled in London, the East India Company had \$800,000 of gold to sell. I went to the sale and bought it all. I knew the Duke of Wellington must have it for the pay of his army in the Peninsula; I had bought a great many of his bills at a discount. The government sent for me, and said they must have it. When they got it they did not know how to get it to Portugal. I undertook all that, and I sent it through France, and that was the best business I ever did. Another maxim on which he seemed to place great reliance was never to have anything to do with an unlucky place or an unlucky man. ‘I have seen,’ said he ‘many clever men, very clever men, who had not shoes to their feet! I never act with them. Their advice sounds very well, but fate is against them; they cannot get on themselves; and if they can not do good to themselves, how can they do good to me?’ By aid of these maxims he has acquired three millions of money.

‘I hope,’ said -----, ‘that your children are not too fond of money and business, to the exclusion of more important things. I am sure you would not wish that.’ Rothschild: ‘I am sure I should wish that. I wish them to give mind and soul, and heart and body, and every thing to business. This is the way to be happy. It requires a great deal of caution to make a large fortune, and when you have got it, it requires ten times as much wit to keep it. If I

were to listen to all the projects proposed to me I should ruin myself very soon. ‘Stick to one business, young man,’ said he to Edward: ‘stick to your brewery, and you may be the great brewer of London. Be a brewer, and a banker, and a merchant, and a manufacturer, and you will soon be in the *Gazette*. One of my neighbors is a very ill-tempered man; he tries to vex me, and has built a great large place for swine close to my walk. So when I go out I hear first grunt, grunt, squeak, squeak: but this does me no harm. I am always in good humor. Sometimes to amuse myself, I give a beggar a guinea. He thinks it is a mistake and for fear I should find it out, off he runs as hard as he can. I advise you to give a beggar a guinea sometimes; it is very amusing.’

The daughters are very pleasing. The second son is a mighty hunter, and the father lets him buy any horses he likes. He lately applied to the Emperor of Morocco for a first-rate Arab horse. The Emperor sent him a magnificent one, but he died as he landed in England. The poor youth said, very feelingly, ‘that was the greatest misfortune he had ever suffered.’ And I felt strong sympathy with him. I forgot to say that as soon as Mr. Rothschild came here, Bonaparte came here. ‘The Prince of Hesse Cassel,’ said Rothschild, ‘gave my father his money; there was no time to be lost; he sent it to me. I had £600,000 arrive unexpectedly by the post, and I put it to such good use that the Prince made me a present of all wines and linen.’”

The Chicago Daily Tribune reported on 8 June 1873 on page 10 in an article entitled “Great Fortunes”,

“The rise of the great House of Rothschild belongs to the eighteenth century. Meyer Anselm, a Jew, was born in 1743, and was established as a money-lender, etc., in Frankfort, in 1772. From his poor shop bearing the sign of the Red Shield, he acquired the name Rothschild. He found a good friend in William, Landgrave of Hesse; and when the Landgrave, in 1806, had to flee from Napoleon, he intrusted the banker with about £250,000 to take care of. The careful Jew traded with this; so that, in 1812, when he died, he left about a million sterling to his six sons, Anselm, Solomon, Nathan, Meyer, Charles, and James. Knowing the truth of the old motto, ‘Union is strength,’ he charged his sons that they should conduct their financial operations together. The third son, Nathan, was the cleverest of the family, and had settled in England, coming to Manchester in 1797, and London in 1803. Twelve years after, we see him at Waterloo, watching the battle, and posting to England as soon as he knew the issue, and spreading everywhere the defeat of the English. The clever but unscrupulous speculator thus depressed the funds, and his agents were enabled to buy at a cheap rate; and it is said that he made a *million* by this transaction. He died in 1836; but the real amount of his wealth never transpired. It has been said; ‘Nothing seemed too gigantic for his grasp, nothing too minute for his notice. His mind was as capable of contracting a loan for millions as of calculating the lowest possible amount

on which a clerk could exist.’ (*Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange*.)”

The Rothschilds had insider information and used it to drain the nations of their wealth. Some speculate that they had improved upon George-Louis Le Sage’s telegraph and could transmit messages over great distances effectively instantaneously, or that they had a system of speedy horses like the pony express, or that they had the swiftest vessels with which to cross the English Channel. Much of the knowledge that must have appeared to have been the result of speedy communications, may instead have been planned in advance. The Rothschilds had agents in banking and government and knew far in advance of others what was about to occur in government, business and war. Many nations depended upon the Rothschilds’ wealth for loans. The Rothschilds had no need of personal genius, because they had several advantages which made it impossible for anyone to compete with them. It also appears that they had corrupted many heads of state, and the leaders of many churches, and persuaded them to betray the Peoples whom they represented in order to enrich the Rothschilds and put the wealth of the world into Jewish coffers. Many of these leaders were likely crypto-Jews on a mission to subvert Gentile societies and bring them into debt, largely through wars and manipulation of the currencies and gold markets. Much of the royalty of Europe was of Jewish descent, or thought that they were of Jewish descent. That which Rothschild sycophants attributed to good fortune and acumen was instead the product of foreknowledge and corruption. Whoever controls the press, the banks, the preachers and the State has foreknowledge of just about everything and can profit from it. For example, anyone with a news story must first bring it to the press, which makes them the most powerful spy apparatus in the world. They not only know things in advance, they regulate the flow and timing of information. Another example is the banks. Any major project requires financing and a business plan before it can begin. This gives the bankers inside information. In addition, the Rothschilds could incite wars, recessions, depressions and concentrate wealth and economic growth in any nation or empire of their choosing. With a corrupt head of state, or church leader, who worked for them, the Rothschilds could quickly run a nation into debt and syphon off its gold reserves and tax its People in perpetuity. *The American Farmer, Containing Original Essays and Selections on Rural Economy and Internal Improvements, with Illustrative Engravings and Prices Current of Country Produce* (Baltimore), Volume 5, Number 29, (10 October 1823), p. 229, wrote,

“MEMOIRS OF MR. ROTHSCHILD.

Mr. N. M. Rothschild is descended from a German lineage. Mr. R. sought to establish his fortune in England. Various were his vicissitudes in early life; by his industry and prudential conduct, he acquired considerable property in the linen trade at Manchester, vast quantities of which article, were exported during the last war to the Continent, where Mr. Rothschild availed himself of the peculiar advantage of his brother’s agency in that quarter of Europe.

Previously to the close of the late war, Mr. Rothschild transferred the scene of commercial operations from Manchester to London. He then became a considerable speculator in the Foreign and British Securities on the Stock Exchange; and after the melancholy death of Mr. Goldsmidt, assumed a very prominent station in the money market. But the principal accident which contributed to the rapid elevation of our Modern Cræsus, was the escape of Buonaparte from Elba, in 1814.—In consequence of Mr. R.'s superior means of information on the Continent, this important occurrence was known to him nearly forty-eight hours before it was in the possession of any other person in this country. He did not fail to avail himself of every advantage which this priority of intelligence presented. His agents went into the market and sold prodigious quantities of stock. The consternation was dreadful! Every one suspected danger, none knew where to look for it. The panic was epidemic! On the disclosure of the fact, the general cry was *saute qui fient*; and the object of our present article bore off the immense sum, gained by his success on this great and extraordinary occasion.

Mr. Rothschild, thus fortified in wealth, and enjoying at this time the almost exclusive means of acquiring the first intelligence from the Continent, soon established for himself a reputation and importance, the maturity of which can scarcely be said to have been accomplished at the present moment. He availed himself of a conjunction with his brothers, (who are also great capitalists on the Continent,) of the opportunity of administering to the wants of the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, the Kings of Naples and Spain; the Republic of Columbia and other States, who negotiated loans on terms highly profitable to him; and which have, with the advantages of the courses of exchange, and other incidental benefits, realized immense sums in addition to his fortunate speculations in British Stock. But the great *coup de main* of Mr. R. consisted in his out-generalling the Gallic Financiers in the recent French Loan. In that transaction he is supposed to have cleared upwards of £100,000, by the commission alone, independent of the advantages of the courses of Exchange!

By the fortuitous occurrence of favourable circumstances, Mr. R. has been enabled to amass greater wealth, than any man that ever existed in England. It would be impossible for others to estimate his property, when Mr. R. has declared that he could not do it himself. It has been asserted, however, that he can command upwards of Fifteen Millions sterling at any time, if required! When it is considered that 'money, the sinew of war,' is in its amount illimitable, and in its control so much at the mere volition of Mr. R. it ceases to surprise the reader, that such a man should be necessary to the Potentates of Europe, and that his friendship and assistance should be no less anxiously sought, than promptly and powerfully afforded.

Mr. Rothschild is a Baron of the German empire, to the Emperor of which, he has rendered some essential services. He is about 43 years of age, and possesses a family of nine children. His mode of life is remarkable for its retired description. Unlike his great predecessor, (Goldsmidt,) he does not

boast of his choice and exquisite wines, or herald his hospitality towards the Princes of the blood. His appearance is unostentatious; his deportment familiar; and his manners unaffected and affable. His conversational style on 'Change is rapid, acute, and discriminating. He carries about him no aristocratical feeling; neither does he affect a singularity, the common concomitant of extraordinary genius, and the impotence of mental pecuniary plenitude. His face is distinguished by a lack of that piercing intelligence, which lights up and animates the expressions of those proverbial for their acuteness; but there is a quickness in the eye, which denotes a lively and unremitting watchfulness of the mind, on every subject of general interest.

When engaged in conversation, Mr. R. usually dangles a bunch of keys in his right hand, and indulges a habit of abruptly turning from the object to whom he is speaking, and suddenly renewing the colloquy. He possesses a memory so remarkably retentive, and the powers of mental addition so copiously strong, that he effects all his immense calculations without the agency of pen or paper: and often at those times, when the din of business 'gives note of preparation' for a 'rise or fall.' His genius is of that order, which often enables him to perceive the benefit or disadvantage of a proposition, before the parties have fully viewed the surface. His movements are characterized by profound judgment: his attack is no less able, than his retreat judicious.

Mr. Rothschild's private character is, we believe, as amiable as his public life is important. He diffuses his benevolence with judgment and liberality. When solicited to countenance an Institution with his name, he answers, 'You know I never take a public part; if you want (as I suppose you do,) money; name the sum, and you shall have it; but don't make me look ostentatious or mean, by naming too large or too small a sum.' His eleemosynary contributions are chiefly distributed amongst objects of the Jewish persuasion; who have in many instances arrived at a state of opulence through his instrumentality. Such a liberality of disposition, and philanthropy of character, has divested envy of her deadly influence; and created for Mr. Rothschild, an imperishable reputation, which will descend with advantage to his family in after ages."

The *Saturday Evening Post*, Volume 3, Number 42, (16 October 1824), p. 2, reported under the heading, "European Affairs. Late from England":

"Mr. N. M. Rothschild has contracted for a loan to the Napolitan Government to the amount of £2,500,000."

The stories which assert that the Rothschilds built their fortune on funds entrusted to them by the Prince of Hesse and from the profits they netted from the false rumor they spread that the English had lost at Waterloo do not appear to account for their vast wealth. They may have come into the great wealth Jewish bankers had accumulated from the times of the de Medicis and even earlier. They put

this wealth to the purpose of fulfilling Jewish Messianic prophecies of the destruction of the Gentile world through perpetual war³³⁷ and sought to make one of their own the King of the Jews, and King of the World through the world government they sought to impose on Gentile humanity. The machinations which brought them into this position remain a mystery. It is not known who chose them or why. One could speculate that the Jews have for a very long perpetuated the myth that certain families carry with them the Royal blood of King David. Wealthy families would have an easy time creating this myth for themselves. Since there never was a King David, it is difficult to challenge them, though realistically speaking Ashkenazi Jews would a far more difficult time linking their lineage to Judah, let alone to a King David who never existed, than would Sephardic Jews, who carry with them a stronger genetic tie to the Judeans.

Judaism has always operated under a double standard and considered Gentiles to be mere animals undeserving of moral treatment. Just as the Jewish story of the flight from Egypt taught Jews it was alright to appropriate the gold of other peoples by unscrupulous means, many Jewish financiers delighted in cheating Gentiles, though in the process they also cheated other Jews. Rothschild published his “Memorial of the Jews in England to the Czar of Russia” in 1882. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* quoted Rothschild on 19 February 1882 on page 5 in an article entitled “The Judenhetze”,

“Here in England, where perfect civil and religious equality has been granted us, we English Jews can bear testimony to the happy results effected by such complete emancipation. Here all those restrictions—civil, commercial, and educational—which formerly oppressed us have happily been removed, and, as a result, Jew and Christian here live and work side by side on terms of mutual respect and good fellowship, engaged in friendly rivalry, which stimulates public industry and adds to the common weel.”

The Chicago Press and Tribune reported on 13 September 1859 on page 2,

“ROTHSCHILD’S INGENUITY.—An eminent Parisian [???], of the Jewish faith, knew the secret of the recent armistice several days before it was actually concluded, and he was desirous of communicating intelligence of the coming event to the house at Berlin. But how was it to be done? The electric wire is by no means a safe confidant for a secret. The banker hit upon a device. He wrote a telegram and concluded it in the following terms: ‘Herr Scholem will shortly arrive.’ Scholem is a Hebrew word signifying peace. In the Berlin house, where the Hebrew language was understood, the true meaning of the announcement of Herr Scholem’s expected arrival was readily interpreted.”

It was obvious to many that a democratic society could not exist while wealth remained concentrated in corrupt hands. It became increasingly obvious in the mid-Eighteenth Century that national sovereignty meant little more than the ability to go

to war in order to profit the “Moneyocracy”, which was more interested in fulfilling the prophecies of Judaism than benefitting the societies over which it ruled. *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 4 April 1866 on page 2,

“A SPEECH BY JULES FAVRE.

The Emperor Napoleon having risen to power by perjury and by the connivance of the moneyocracy and of the principal debauchees of Paris, his reign has become the signal of a reign of lust, luxury and money to such an extent as to make all cultivated men and virtuous women blush for shame, and to cause the people to tremble with indignation as they read the recent speech of Jules Favre in denunciation of these crying evils. In fact Rothschild, Pereire and Fould are, under the second empire, what the ancient nobles were under the rule of the elder Bourbons, and since the moneyocracy of 1866 is not even endowed with the accomplishments which constituted the redeeming but unavailing graces of the aristocracy of 1766, it is not only as hateful as the last were, but still more despicable. The battle cry of the old nobility was monopoly in land, that of the new moneyocracy is monopoly in cash, in railways, in bank, in insurance, and joint stock companies. In fact they assume to be the lords of modern society as the ancient nobles were those of the feudal era, but since their power is not as venerable as that of entailed estates, it is more easily withstood, while its lack of all noble tendencies withholds from it the prestige which clustered round the gallant bearing and emblazoned glories of the old nobility.

Money, and nothing but money, is the great end of all the exertions of this Bonaparte moneyocracy, and not, as it ought to be, whenever honorably obtained as a means for the more liberal fulfilment of all the manifold domestic, social, patriotic, humanitarian and religious duties of life. Wherever the mere possession of money opens, as it does under Napoleon’s rule, the door to society, to influence, to every brute, and to every licentious man and bedizened woman, that society is doomed to destruction as surely as was that of the harlot and spendthrift era of Louis XIV and XV. No wonder that the late Baron Dupin animadverted upon this demoralization before he descended to the grave. No wonder that books are published showing that the state of society in Pagan Rome was not a whit worse in its worst period, than at the present time, in Paris. No wonder that Jules Favre, the great jurist, orator and parliamentarian makes the tribune ring with his eloquent vindication of the virtue, the culture, the art, the intellect of France against the fearful supremacy of brutes, bloated with ill-gotten wealth, and of a society reeking with lust and abomination. The following is the concluding extract of the remarkable speech delivered by this gentleman, who is the leader of the opposition in the legislative body, on the 15th inst.:

‘In regard to the exterior policy, if the country had been master of its destinies, we should never have witnessed these distant expeditions which have so greatly compromised our interests. We should not have sent to die on the other side of the Atlantic so many young men whose arms would have enriched our soil. We should

not have seen millions wasted in Mexico in behalf of an enterprise the least fault of which is that it is impossible. These millions would have been usefully employed in benefitting France and her colonies.

‘As to the interior *regime* we are sometimes told that the passions are completely appeased. Sometimes that they are still fermenting, that parties are always armed, and that our liberties should still be refused us. Public morals are spoken of. If you would have good morals you must make good citizens; to make citizens you must have institutions which can form them. France is saturated with military glory. *She has need of moral dignity and grandeur*. If you will interrogate the literature of the present day, which is the expression of public morals, you will be driven to some unfortunate conclusions.

‘You have decreed the liberty of theatres, and with the censorship you do what you please upon the public scene, and what do you show us there? Great God! you force a man with any sense of decency to keep away from this privileged temple in launching at him this sort of insult. ‘I desired to speak of virtue and devotion. These are no longer actualities, and I am driven from the temple consecrated to them.’

‘What do you make of the French scene? You have made it a scene of libertinage and shamelessness; you expose upon it disgusting nudities. You have in your hands a law made to prevent children from working in manufactories, and you begrime the child upon the scene of a privileged theatre, in making him represent the type and model of degradation and cynicism, to the scandal of all respectable people. And then you open *bais masques*, and you say, ‘Come and amuse yourselves, and drink from the cup which I put to your lips.’ As for me, I say to you, *France wants something else. She wishes to have the power of exercising her liberties. We are nothing if we cannot raise our eyes toward Heaven, and we cannot do that if we are not free.*’

No description, however graphic, could do justice to the effect produced by this oration. It fairly electrified the Chambers, and on the next day it was perused with enthusiasm by millions of noble women and worthy men, whose sentiments it embodies more emphatically than any speech ever delivered since the days of the Girondins and of Mirabeau.”

Under the heading “Foreign Gossip”, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 14 March 1869 on page 3,

“The leaders of the French Opposition, Jules Favre, Thiers, Picard, Eugene Pelletan, Glais Bizoin, Marie and Bethmond, are all wealthy men. Only Garnier Pages is poor.”

During the Civil War, the Rothschilds gained power on the American Continent by corrupting politics with their wealth and by running up the nations’ debts. After the war, the Rothschilds floated huge loans to the United States, which netted the Rothschilds immense profits and enormous influence over America. Other European bankers, like Erlanger, fleeced investors and profited immensely during the war.

The Chicago Daily Tribune reported an accusation on 3 February 1873 on page 2, that the Rothschilds had gained control over a political party in order to sabotage it and secure victory for their candidate,

“In a paper on Federalism, read before the Liberal Club last night by Mr. Delmar, the following remarkable passage made some sensation: ‘The people have tacitly committed their entire interests and fortunes to the keeping of two political parties, whose leaders and managers, instead of Congress, as was intended, sway their destinies. It is charged that, knowing this, the Rothschilds, through their American agent, obtained control of one of these parties in the general election of 1868, and threw it into confusion by abandoning its Presidential candidate on the eve of election, so as to afford victory to its opponent, whose financial views more nearly accorded with the interests of that great house.’”

Henry Morgenthau reported that in 1919 the Zionist Jews in Poland used unscrupulous tactics to subvert Polish democracy and attain Jewish control over the Polish Government,

“They admitted that their fifty-six could sway legislation only in case of close divisions among the other parties. It became clear that their hope must be to encourage such divisions.”³³⁸

Most Polish Jews hated the Zionists and considered them to be demonic³³⁹ and correctly predicted that the Zionist Jews would cause terrible havoc around the world. Morgenthau reported that,

“Space will not permit the reproduction here of all that these leaders said, but one or two sentences should be repeated, and in considering them it should be kept in mind that the Orthodox Jews number about eighty per cent. of the Jewish population of Poland.

‘Our principal conflict,’ said Rabbi Alter, ‘is with Jews; our chief opponents at every step are the Zionists. The Orthodox are satisfied to live side by side with people of different religions. . . . The Zionists side-track religion.’

‘We are exiled,’ said Rabbi Lewin; ‘we cannot be freed from our banishment, nor do we wish to be. We cannot redeem ourselves. . . . We will abide by our religion (in Poland) until God Almighty frees us.’

And again: ‘We would rather be beaten and suffer for our religion than discard the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Judaism, such as not cutting the beard, etc. . . . The Orthodox love Palestine far more than others, but they want it as a Holy Land for a holy race.’”³⁴⁰

In 1921, the Rothschilds were still the principal force behind Zionism and acted against the will of the vast majority of the Jews, whom the Rothschilds wanted to force to Palestine, so that the Rothschild dynasty could be Messiah, meet God, and rule the world from Jerusalem. Note that the Balfour Declaration was written directly to Lord Rothschild. Note further that Polish Orthodox Jews were the primary target, and the hardest hit victims, of the Holocaust the Zionists perpetrated against them

by means of the Nazi Party, which the Zionists put into power in Germany in order to persecute their brethren. Morgenthau stated,

“We have learned the folly of persisting in a distinctive style of clothing, beard, and locks (imposed upon the Jews extraneously as a badge of slavery and oppression), and of ascribing a spiritual significance to such a costume in this age when saints like Montefiore and Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the great patron of Palestine, find sanctity not incompatible with the ordinary dress of those about them.”³⁴¹

Frankist Jews had been worming their way into positions of authority in Poland since the 1700's, and by the 1900's crypto-Jewish Frankists dominated the aristocracy, government and Catholic Church of Poland. Zionist Jews were the cause of the majority of the problems the Polish Jews faced, which were many, though it is true that the pogroms had been greatly exaggerated by the Jewish press around the world. Zionist Jews openly sought to form a foreign and adversarial government within Poland, making Jews the sworn enemy of the Polish People. Morgenthau wrote,

“The Zionists were our first callers and were also our most constant ones. We were soon in close contact with all their leaders; we attended their meetings, and they rarely left us. Some were pro-Russian, all were practically non-Polish, and the Zionism of most of them was simply advocacy of Jewish Nationalism within the Polish state. Thus, when the committee of the Djem, or Polish Constitutional Assembly, called on us, led by Grynbaum, Farbstein, and Thon—all men who had discarded the dress and beard of the Orthodox Jew—and when I discovered that they were really authorized to represent that section of the Jews that had complained to the world of the alleged pogroms, I notified them that we were willing to give them several hours a day until they had completed the presentation of their case to their entire satisfaction. That programme was adhered to, and it constantly cropped out that their aim was the securing of Jewish Nationalism within Poland. [***] There was no question whatever but that the Jews had suffered; there had been shocking outrages, of a sporadic character at least, resulting in many deaths and still more woundings and robberies, and there was a general disposition, not to say plot, of long standing, the purpose of which was to make the Jews uncomfortable in many ways: there was a deliberate conspiracy to boycott them economically and socially. Yet there was also no question but that the reports of some of the Jewish leaders had exaggerated these evils.

We found that, among the Jews, there was a thoughtful, ambitious minority who, sincere in their original motives, intensified the trouble by believing that its solution lay only in official recognition of the Jew as a separate nationality. They had seized on Zionism as a means to establish the Jewish nation. To them, Zionism was national, not religious; when

questioned, they admitted that it was a name with which to capture the imagination of their brothers whose tradition bade them pray thrice daily for their return to the Holy Land.

Pilsudski, in a moment of diplomatic aberration, had said that the Jews made a serious error in forcing Article 93; quoting that utterance, these Jewish Nationalists now asserted that neither the Polish Government, nor the Roumanian for that matter, ever would carry out the spirit of the Treaty concessions, and so they aimed at nothing short of an autonomous government and a place in the family of nations. Meanwhile they wanted to join the Polish nation in a federation having a joint parliament where both Yiddish and Polish should be spoken: their favorite way of expressing it was to say that they wanted something like Switzerland, where French, German, and Italian cantons work together in harmony.

Unfortunately, they disregarded the facts. In Switzerland, generally speaking, the citizens of French language live in one section, those of German language in another, and so on, whereas these aspiring Nationals, of course, wanted the Jews to continue scattered throughout Poland. They wanted this, and yet wanted them to have a percentage of representation in Parliament equal to their percentage in the entire Polish nation! Finally, they took no account of the desires of the Orthodox Jews, who form about 80 per cent. of their number, who were content to remain in Poland and suffer for their religion if necessary, and whom the Polish politicians were already coddling and beginning to organize politically as a vote against the Nationalist-Zionists.

The leaders of these Nationalist-Zionists were capable and adroit, but they were like walking-delegates in the Labor Unions, who had to continue to agitate in order to maintain their leadership, and their advocacy of a state within-the-state was naturally resented by all. It was quite evident that one of the deep and obscure causes of the Jewish troubles in Poland was this Nationalist-Zionist leadership that exploited the Old Testament prophecies to capture converts to the Nationalist scheme.

Here, then, was Zionism in action. We had seen it at first hand in Poland. I returned home fearful that, owing to the extensive propaganda of the Zionists, the American people might obtain the erroneous impression that a vast majority of the Jews—and not, as it really was, only a portion of the 150,000 Zionists in the United States—had ceased considering Judaism as a religion and were in danger of conversion to Nationalism.”³⁴²

On 10 October 1864 on page 2, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

“ENCOURAGEMENT—NOT FOR THE ‘ROTHSCHILDS’

The fact that the Chairman of the National Democratic Committee is the agent of the Rothschilds gives the Copperheads an immense advantage in receiving an unlimited amount of funds from the money kings of the old

rotten despotisms of Europe in order to secure the election of McClellan and the destruction of the Government. That Copperhead Democracy and European despotism are working for the same end, there cannot be a particle of doubt. The hand of Belmont is most directly seen in the second plank of the Copperhead platform, and in fact it is demonstrable from the language of it, that it was all made in the interest of Jeff. Davis and his alies, the aristocrats and despots of Europe. Shrewd, far-seeing men on the other side of the Atlantic understand this matter perfectly. One of our citizens who has been making an extensive tour in Europe, writes to the Treasurer of the Union State Central Committee as follows:

‘Enclosed is an order on -----, for three hundred dollars, to aid the Union party in publishing and disseminating that proper information in order to secure the re-election of Abraham Lincoln to the office of President of the United States, and to aid in the election of the nominees of that party in the State of Illinois. * * * I have written to ----- to pay this order for me, and to respond to any calls of years to the extent of two hundred dollars more if you think it will be wanted. I feel that the future interests of our beloved country depend much on the re-election of Mr. Lincoln and the success of the Union party, and though absent, I wish to do what I can to secure that result. I hope to be home in time to vote for the Union candidates, both State and National, in November.’

Our shrewd patriotic citizen takes a wise and enlarged view of his duties, and of his interests as well; for if the Copperhead party succeed in the election, his ample fortune would not be worth the cost of a month’s sojourn in Europe or elsewhere. The destruction of the Government—the sure result of a Copperhead triumph—would destroy all values, and all personal and public safety for the next generation.”

On 16 October 1864 on page 2, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

“BELMONT’S CONFEDERATE BONDS.

The Chicago rebel organ is annoyed by the publication of the fact that a controlling share in the stock of the Copperheads machine has been bought up by Auguste Belmont, the American member of the Rothschilds family and firm, well known everywhere to be controlling owners not only in the British debt and the London *Times*, which together control the British aristocracy and oppress the Irish people, but also of the Maximillian debt, (which fact accounts for the striking out of the Monroe doctrine from the Chicago Platform,) and finally of the rebel debt, (which accounts for Belmont spending two millions dollars to nominate a war man on a peace platform.) These facts are a little inconvenient to the Copperheads. They were never intended by them for publication. They are decidedly embarrassing. It is perhaps somewhat flattering to our national pride to know that the Rothschilds, who hold up every despotism in Europe, have concluded that it would be cheaper to buy up one of our political parties, and in that way

secure the dissolution of the Union, than to have their agents in England and France interfere and fight us. But Irishmen and Germans have a something, which for brevity we will call a 'crop,' and this fact sticks in their crop, that the oppressors of Ireland and Germany, the money kings of Europe, not daring to carry out their first pet project of breaking down this Government by the armed intervention, of England and France, for the rebels, which would shake the bourse, lower the rates of consols and take away the ducats of the Rothschilds, have adopted the cheaper and easier mode of accomplishing the same object, by buying up the Copperhead leaders and running the Democratic machine. The Rothschilds want ducats, but to make their ducats they want votes. Votes for the Peace party will send stocks up and so the Rothschilds make their ducats. Votes for McClellan send the Union stock, which the money kings have no share, down, and so the Rothschilds make their ducats. Votes for the dissolution of the Union relatively strengthen England and France and send consols up—and so the Rothschilds make their ducats. The Union dissolved and Maximillian will not be overthrown, nor will England have to pay for her rebel privateering, nor will Ireland, backed by our Government, rebel and be free, nor will British America unite with us, by all which the Rothschilds and Belmont, chairman of the Democratic party, make ducats. The Rothschilds will fish with a silver hook for votes which net them so good a profit, but even the silver hook must be baited, and the *Chicago Times* is authorized to adjust the bait. It is 'authorized to say that Belmont owns no Confederate stock, and that he knows that the Rothschilds do not.' Now, we are authorized to say that all Europe have known for months and years that they do. We know that a banker may, by the scratch of his pen, own nothing but Confederate stock one minute and nothing but five-twenties the next. We happen to have heard of some Copperhead bankers who own little besides five-twenties on the day the Assessors calls. But the financial community know in what stocks financiers are interested, in spite of anything true or false which rebel papers may be 'authorized to state.' Let Belmont state over his own signature, if he can that he and Rothschilds have not, directly or indirectly, in their own name, or in that of others, operated in Confederate stocks during this rebellion. Until he can face the music in that style it matters little what tune any of the Copperhead penny whistles may be authorized to blow, as they are very seldom authorized to state anything that is true."

What the Rothschilds lacked in their efforts to build a Jewish nation in Palestine was any real support from the Jewish community. They could bankrupt Egypt and Turkey. They could bring Russia to ruins. They could buy Jewish neer-do-wells. They could even buy the Pope, but the only way to force Jews in large numbers to Palestine was to put Hitler and Stalin into power and persecute Jews on a massive and unprecedented scale. On 28 January 1877 on page 12, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported,

“THE NEW EXODUS.
THE IDEA RIDICULED IN NEW YORK.

New York World.

There is a report ‘that the Jews are again crowding back to Palestine.’ A writer in the Cincinnati *Commercial* says there are ‘many closed Jewish houses in London. The whole region from Dan to Beersheba is crowded with immigrant Jews from all parts of the world.’ Conversations with the leading Jewish ministers and professional men of this city show that there is no truth whatever in these reports, except in this, that the Jewish population of Palestine has in recent years, been composed altogether of ‘immigrants from all parts of the world,’ who have settled in Palestine so as to benefit by the numerous charities which enable them to live there in idleness and pauperism. The wholesale and indiscriminate alms-giving for the relief of ‘the poor of Jerusalem’ has added to the population, which, as a class, is thoroughly lazy and good-for-nothing. As to the idea of a general return of the Jews to Palestine, it is scouted as absurd and improbable in the highest degree. With the exception of a very few orthodox people, the Jews, as a religious sect, have long since given up all expectation of ever returning to the Holy Land, and the thought of returning now and founding a Jewish state has, it is said, never existed, save in the imagination of some very visionary people.

Mr. Lewis May, the senior member of the banking firm of May & King, and President of the Temple Emmanuel, the largest and richest Jewish congregation in the country, said yesterday to the writer: ‘The Jews are more apt to invest in Fifth avenue lots than in Jerusalem real estate. I should advise you to sell short any Jordan River front lots you may happen to have. I think the general feeling of the Jews is that New York is good enough for them, and that Bloomingdale is good enough for the authors of these perennial rumors of a return of the Jewish people to Palestine.’

Another well-known Jewish banker ridiculed the report in a very humorous vein. He said: ‘I have not yet prepared to start for Jerusalem, nor shall I until the weather is milder.’

A prominent member of the Stock Exchange said: ‘Just fancy what a stir it would make if this absurd report were true. We should have Seligman, Hallgarten, and Netter all shutting up their banking offices; Rothschild would no doubt limit his financial operations to the Holy Land; Ald. Lewis and Phillips would leave two vacancies in the City Government, to which Coroner Ellinger would add another; then what would become of Anti-Tammany without Emanuel B. Hart and Judge Koch, Gershom Cohen, and Adolph Sanger; what bench in Jerusalem would Judge Joachimsen fill? Assemblyman Stein, William H. Stiner, and Judge Dittenhoefer would vanish, too. Solomon would move his furniture place and his Fifth Avenue mansion to the banks of the Jordan; and a host of lesser lights would vanish. What a time there would be ‘on ’Change,’ too, to miss our Seligmans, De Cordovas, Josephs, Sternbergers, and Bernheimers; what would the theatres

do on Saturday nights; who would patronize the balls? With the stores of the Vogels, Stadlers, Rosenfelds, Solomons, Lagowitzes, Adlers, Lauters, and others, shut up, Broadway would be indeed deserted. The handsome Harmonie Club on Forty-second street would, of course, be removed to the Holy Land, and the Standard Club would follow suit. There would be a big falling-off in the membership of the Manhattan, Union League, Lotos, and Palette. Ferdinand Myer would close his 'Newport' flat, Lewis May his 'Albany' flat, and Dore Lyon would sell his real estate. The Temple Emmanuel, on Fifth avenue, all the handsome temples in other parts of the city, the elegant mansions of the Hendrickses, Myers, Kings, Nathans, and Pikes, all to vanish to the stony streets of Jerusalem. Oh, no; never.'"

121. H. N. Casson, "The Jew in America", *Munsey's Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 386.

122. "The Jews in the United States", *The World's Work*, Volume 11, Number 3, (January, 1906), pp. 7030-7031.

123. H. N. Casson, "The Jew in America", *Munsey's Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 386.

124. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 361-365.

125. P. S. Mowrer, "The Assimilation of Israel", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 107.

126. G. E. Griffin, "The Rothschild Formula", *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.

127. "Salluste", "Henri Heine et Karl Marx. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 11, (1 June 1928), pp. 567-589; **and** "Henri Heine et Karl Marx II. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 12, (15 June 1928), pp. 900-923; **and** "Henri Heine et Karl Marx III. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 13, (1 July 1928), pp. 153-175; **and** "Henri Heine et Karl Marx IV. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 14, (15 July 1928), pp. 426-445. **See also, Rabbi Liber's Response:** "Judaïsme et Socialisme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 15, (1 August 1928), pp. 607-628; **To which "Salluste" Replied:** "Autour d'une Polémique: Marxism et Judaïsme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 16, (15 August 1928), pp. 795-834. **See also:** "Salluste", *Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme: Henri Heine et Karl Marx*, Jules Tallandier, Paris, (1930). **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935). **See also:** R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in "The Jewish Utopia"*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?).

128. M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932), pp. 12-13, 57.

129. "Gentile", *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 619-620.

130. Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein, Editor, *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nezikin: Baba Kamma*, Volume 23, The Soncino Press, London, (1935), pp. 213-216, at 213-214.

131. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 74-77, 82, 84, 86-87, 92-93, 98-102.

132. The article cites: "Lecture on the Restoration of the Jews. By M. M. NOAH. Delivered October 28th, 1844, in the Tabernacle, New York City."

133. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.

134. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.

135. "Mr. Zangwill on Zionism", *The London Times*, (16 October 1923), p. 11. I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278.

136. "Peace, War—and Bolshevism", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (4 April 1919), p. 7. "1918 Peace Views of Lloyd George", *The New York Times*, (26 March 1922), Editorial Section, p. 33.

137. "The Turkish Situation by One Born in Turkey", *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 2, (February, 1902), pp. 182-191, at 186-188. "Zionism",

Encyclopædia Britannica, Eleventh Edition, (1911).

138. “How Zangwill Fought His Way”, *Current Literature*, Volume 27, Number 2, (February, 1900), p. 107.

139. See also: “World Mischief”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (21 June 1920), p. 8.

140. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161.

141. J. Neusner and R. S. Sarason, Editors, “Berakhot 6:18”, *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew*, Volume 1, Ktav Publishing House Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, (1986), pp. 40-41, at 40.

142. Rabbi E. Herzka and Rabbi M. Weiner, Elucidators, “Tractate Menachos 43b”, *Talmud Bavli: The Schottenstein Edition*, Volume 59, Mesorah Publications, Ltd., Brooklyn, New York, (2002), 43b⁵.

143. E. Kaye, *The Hole in the Sheet: A Modern Woman Looks at Orthodox and Hasidic Judaism*, L. Stuart Inc., Secaucus, New Jersey, (1987), p. 89.

144. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: III The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377, at 366-368, 377.

145. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 346.

146. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

147. A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.

148. M. Samuel, “Diaries of Theodor Herzl”, in: M. W. Weisgal, *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial*, The New Palestine, New York, (1929), pp. 125-180, at 129. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 4, 111.

149. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 311-312.

150. R. H. Fife, Jr., *The German Empire Between Two Wars: A Study of the Political and Social Development of the Nation Between 1871 and 1914*, Macmillan, New York, (1916), pp. 177-199 and 359-388:

“CHAPTER IX

THE PROLETARIAN IN POLITICS

If we were obliged to cover with one word the development of Germany in the four decades between the two great wars, that word would certainly be “socialism.” It is not merely that in philosophy, literature and art the welfare of the masses is the leading motif running through the eighties and nineties until it became lost after 1900 in the swelling music of national ambition. In the field of political economy also socialistic ideas marked the age. They began by conquering the professorial chairs in the universities in the seventies, where such “socialists of the chair” as Adolf Wagner of the university of Berlin set their stamp on the generation of political economists which followed the war with France, and they found expression in the compulsory insurance measures and similar legislation of the following decade. Such ideas were indeed nothing new in Germany since the sixteenth century, when cities such as Augsburg and Strasburg were models of a hard and fast organization, in which capital played a small part and the workers formed the commonwealth on the principle of a closed shop, where communal undertakings largely supplanted private enterprise and every detail of life, including the details of food and dress, was fixed by law. The paternalism of the petty despotisms which preceded German unity had disciplined the Germans to live

under efficient supervision, and the ideals of the Manchester school of British economists did not take lasting hold on German economic life.

Socialism then grew in Germany on well-prepared soil. State ownership of railroad and telegraph had come naturally soon after the coming of these utilities, and municipal control of many forms of enterprise descended as a tradition from the later middle ages. That the individual should look to the government to provide for his welfare and that state and communal funds should supplant private capital in many undertakings had long been the case when Bismarck undertook his compulsory insurance policy in the eighties. This program was, as we have seen, an effort to strike the ground from beneath the Social Democrats by removing some of the causes of proletarian dissatisfaction. Here and there Bismarck's successors went further on the road, with such measures as the purchase of the *Hercynia* potash mine (cf. page 166). That they did not go still further in this and other fields of state socialism was due in large measure to the existence of the Social Democratic party. This Ishmael in Germany's political life by its very advocacy of measures made them impossible for the government.

What is it that has made the Socialist unfitted to be an ally and unwelcome as a coworker with nearly all other parties? What is there in the advocacy by the Social Democrats of any reform that has caused not only the East Elbian *Junker* and the Westphalian manufacturer, but even the National Liberal physician and shopkeeper to look askance at it? The answer is to be found both in the doctrinaire character of the party and in the violence of Socialist editors and orators. Karl Lamprecht has shown that all German political parties are antiquated in that all cling to formulas and doctrines that have outlived their applicability to present-day affairs. In this sense the Social Democratic party is the most antiquated and the least opportunist. In this has lain its strength as a class party and its weakness in electoral and parliamentary strategy. Beginning with the removal of the coercive laws in 1890, it cast at all national elections the largest vote of any party, and after 1903 held under its discipline nearly one-third of all the electors to the national parliament, more than all the other Liberal fractions combined. Nevertheless it exercised less influence on legislation than any other of the major groups in the empire. To understand the reason for this one must glance at the development of socialism as a political force.

When in 1867 Friedrich Liebknecht and August Bebel were elected to the first *Reichstag* of the new-born North German Confederation, they found ready at hand both the gospel of socialism in the works of Karl Marx and the needed fighting force in the German Workingmen's Party (*Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiter-Verein*), which had been founded four years earlier by Ferdinand Lassalle. Two years later at the famous Eisenach Convention Liebknecht and Bebel called the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party into existence, on a platform built of Marx' theory of the destructive rule of capital and his call to the workingmen of all lands to unite, and finally in 1875 the followers of Lassalle forsook their nationalistic ideals and were won over to the internationalism of the Marxists. Immediately the triumphal march of the Social Democrats began, a march which has continued with few halts since. Aided by the hardships brought on by the financial crises of the seventies, the Marxian theories of the misery caused by the capitalistic state and the exploitation of the working class through the capitalistic organization of society found eager acceptance in all quarters of industrial Germany. Already in 1876 there were twenty-four papers and journals published in the interest of the party with nearly one hundred thousand subscribers: by the next year the number of party periodicals had increased to forty-one, and that year the party cast nearly half a million votes and elected twelve members to the national legislature. From that time the Social Democracy kept pace closely with the forward movement of industrial Germany. Wherever factories sprang up and workmen came to live together, the theories of

Marx took root. The workingmen were organized into Socialist unions, which became at once fighting units in the industries and the elections; with the capacity for organization so characteristic of an industrial age and of German society in particular, the Social Democracy was solidified by the establishment of central bureaus under the control of secretaries. These latter quickly developed into a class of experienced leaders, at once clever agitators in the industries and skillful strategists in political campaigns.

Bismarck watched the rise of the party and its often unscrupulous means of agitation with growing distrust. He put no confidence in the alleged peaceful program of socialism: for him the party bore nothing but red revolution on its banners. In 1878 two attempts were made on the life of Emperor William which were unjustly ascribed to the effect of socialist agitation; and the Chancellor took advantage of the popular outcry to dissolve the Liberal *Reichstag* and appeal to the electors on an anti-socialist program. The result was the enactment of rigid laws forbidding Socialist propaganda. The following ten years, 1880 to 1890, were for the party a period of almost subterranean existence. Clubs were suppressed, newspapers and journals confiscated, many of the leaders, Liebknecht and Bebel among them, went to prison. In spite of prosecution and imprisonment, however, the propaganda went straight ahead. Political clubs were reorganized as singing societies and bowling clubs and the party organization was perpetuated by these and by the trade unions, which continued to spread like a vast network throughout industrial Germany. During the ten years of the anti-socialist laws the total vote of the party increased, a larger number of deputies was chosen to the *Reichstag*, and more important still, the inner organization and solidity of the party gained tremendously under persecution. This was shown immediately on the expiration of the anti-socialist laws in 1890. In that year the party cast nearly one and one-half million votes in the national elections, and became thereby the strongest party in the empire. In 1898 the Social Democratic vote had risen to two millions, in 1907 to three and one quarter millions, in 1912 to more than four and one-quarter millions, more than one-third of all votes cast in the imperial elections of that year.

The great Chancellor was, however, too far-seeing a statesman to think that the mere forbidding of socialist propaganda would stop the growth of socialism, which to his mind was only revolution in disguise. He set out, as we have seen, to cut the ground from beneath the feet of the proletarian agitators by a system of legislation which should ban from the empire the direst poverty by insuring to the working class compensation in case of injury and care in sickness and old age. These needs, which were outlined in an imperial message of 1881, formed the basis of debate and experiment through the following eight years and were finally met in the various compulsory insurance measures which, so to speak, set their stamp upon Germany's internal politics in the eighties. In the Workingmen's Compensation or Accident Insurance Act of 1884, the burden of insurance was laid entirely upon the employer; the cost of the Sick Insurance Act of 1883 fell upon both employer and employee; for carrying out the provisions of the Old Age Pension Act of 1889, the empire joined with both capital and labor in providing for the veterans of labor. By this legislation, which though several times amended in minor parts, has remained essentially the same, Germany took a long step in the direction of state socialism and assumed the first place among nations in the protection of its army of labor. Both Radical and Socialist have found much to criticise in the laws, and the amendments which reformers suggested should long ago have received attention at the hands of the government; nevertheless, with all of their imperfections, the compulsory insurance acts have been a guiding star for the social legislation of other lands and one of the brightest decorations on the bosom of modern Germania. They are no less a superb monument to the liberal view and modern spirit of Bismarck in social legislation.

But they did not win over the Socialists. The representatives of the fourth estate

accepted the socialistic laws of the eighties not as a gift from the hands of benevolent capital, but as a right conceded through the fear of the rising strength of the proletariat. There is evidence that the old Chancellor had wearied of the struggle to win the working classes to a national and patriotic spirit and that at the expiration of the anti-socialist laws in 1890 he was preparing a stroke against the constitution, which by the abolition of manhood suffrage should undo the work of 1866 and exclude the non-propertied classes from a share in government (cf. page 127). However, young Emperor William thought otherwise, and with the fall of Bismarck, legislation against the Social Democracy was dropped and the Emperor sought to accomplish by conciliation what suppressive laws had failed to do. He summoned an international congress in Berlin to consider measures for the further welfare of the working classes, and outlined for adoption various propositions, such as a complete Sunday holiday, which had been advocated in the Socialist platform. But the effort to win the workingmen to fealty to monarch and Fatherland by kindness broke against the hard class consciousness of the fourth estate. No royal enticements could prevail against the teachings of Marx, ably and speciously interpreted by Socialist speakers, no words of the sovereign could make progress against the class feeling which had been bred in the industrial proletariat for two decades in trade union, tavern debating club and Socialist journal. From that day on the crown and indeed all of the upper classes and a large part of the middle classes in Germany parted company with the proletariat. Henceforth every representative of the existing organization of society from the sovereign to the Rhenish crockery dealer denounced the Social Democrats as enemies of the Fatherland. But whether ridiculed as a "transitory phase" or threatened with a holy war of extermination by "all lovers of God and Fatherland," the Socialist forces marched on in ever increasing numbers, a solid phalanx of industrial workers, soaked with the doctrines of Marx and Engel and ably led by labor secretary and editor.

In his opposition to the monarchy and the entire capitalistic state, the Social Democrat included of course the army, under feudal and capitalistic leadership. Nowhere, however, has the German military spirit found better expression than in the organization and discipline of the Social Democratic party. Who could watch the orderly, shoulder to shoulder march of tens of thousands of workingmen through the streets of Berlin on the occasion of the burial of a leader or on the anniversary of the "victims of March," the revolutionists who fell in the street fighting of March 1848, without seeing in imagination these same men clad in the blue and red or khaki of active soldiers? And who could see the eyes-to-the-front, fingers-on-the-trouser-seam carriage with which the individual workman follows his leader in strike or electoral campaign without recalling the Prussian military discipline? In August 1911 at Treptow, a suburb of Berlin, a mighty Socialist demonstration was made against the threatened war with France and England over the Morocco affair. A vast crowd of men and women, estimated at eighty thousand, gathered on a Sunday afternoon about a tribune to hear their leaders denounce war as a diabolical game at which the capitalist must win and the proletarian lose. Only a few of the mighty audience could hear a word of the orators, but all stood at respectful attention in the intense heat until the speeches were over and then at a given signal waved their arms in a mighty storm wave, voting affirmatively on a resolution which protested in the name of labor against the threatened war. And throughout the day not one case of disorder, scarcely even a chance hard word at an over-officious policeman, among the tens of thousands of workingmen and working women who spent the hot Sunday journeying back and forth from their homes in almost all parts of Greater Berlin!

The same iron discipline that has taught moulder and stoker and street paver that he owes it to his class to suppress even a natural outburst of resentment, because it may give the representatives of feudalism and capitalism an advantage, holds sway over leader and editor.

The annual party convention, the *Parteitag*, is the court of last resort, before which even those highest in the councils of the party must appear and justify their actions. Prominent Socialists, including some of the leading parliamentarians of the party and the editors of such journals as *Vorwärts* and the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, have been called upon to defend the orthodoxy of their faith, and prominent leaders have been unceremoniously thrust out of the party. It became an accepted canon that when a man found that his position, reached after scientific inquiry, was no longer that of the party, and when he could not persuade the party to accept his position, he was by that very fact no longer a Social Democrat. This tyranny of the majority was due not merely to a democratic intolerance of strong individualities, it proceeded also from the extreme doctrinarianism of the party.

This doctrinarianism is the very bone of the Social Democracy. No orthodox theologian of years ago ever clung to the verbal inspiration of Holy Writ with greater zeal than Socialist orator and editor and private soldier have held to every jot and tittle of the Erfurt Platform. This declaration of faith was adopted in 1891, soon after the expiration of the anti-socialist laws, and has had no official revision since. It could not be expected, however, that the Marxian theories, as enunciated in that instrument, would stand unimpaired by the experience of the passing years, and even the most devout Socialist must acknowledge that some planks in the Erfurt Platform have been shown to be fallacies by the industrial history of the past few decades in Germany. Of none is this more strikingly true than of the so-called "iron law of wages," according to which the condition of the workingman under the capitalistic system must constantly grow worse. This dogma has been absolutely contradicted by the facts. The general condition of industrial labor in Germany has constantly grown better, and as the years have passed not a few of the proletariat have become themselves members of the capitalistic class.

These conditions were recognized quite early by Social Democrats of more liberal training. The first bold reformer to attempt to bring socialism down from the domain of dreams to economic reality was Edward Bernstein in a memorable brochure published in 1899 (*Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie*). [Footnote: *The Basis of Socialism and the Task of the Social Democracy*.] The author, who had suffered in his own person for his adherence to the Marxian faith in the days of the anti-Socialist laws, proposed a revision of the old Marxian theories in the light of present day economic and social life, "the development of the theory and practice of the Social Democracy in an evolutionistic sense." The first point of his attack was the time-honored premise of the "iron law of wages." The condition of the working classes, he contended, is not growing worse but better. Furthermore, not all means of production are to be socialized, as is demanded in the Erfurt Platform, but only land and the larger means of production, and as a very important reservation, one must avoid anything which would injure the nation in its competition for trade with foreign countries. This attack on the major premise of the Erfurt Platform and this modification of its first article instantly called into the ring a host of defenders of socialistic orthodoxy. August Bebel, the parliamentary generalissimo, Karl Kautsky, the learned dogmatist, and others rushed to arms in defense of the Marxian theories and the battle was on between "Radicals" and "Revisionists," the former ably led by Kautsky in the *Neue Zeit*, the latter by Bernstein in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*. The struggle reached its culmination in the Dresden convention of 1903, a convention which will long be remembered in German political annals as the highwater mark of violence and "rough-house" tactics. The result was a defeat for the "Revisionists," less on scientific than on tactical grounds, the "Radicals" claiming that any concession to the "middle-class parties," whether in theory or practice, would result in weakening the feeling of class consciousness upon which the Social Democracy is built.

In the meantime, however, practice ran away with theory. The exigencies of electoral and parliamentary struggles drew the party more and more into coöperation with the Liberal Left, and tended more and more to transform the revolutionary Socialists, despite themselves, into political democrats. Liebknecht, the founder, with truly doctrinaire consistency, had held that the party existed as a protest against the capitalistic organization of society and should therefore take no part in parliamentary affairs, except in protest. In the days of the anti-socialist laws, the Social Democratic members of the *Reichstag* refused to accept membership on committees. The first break in this policy of simple negation came from South Germany, where as a result of more democratic constitutions, the working classes had been accustomed to a share in governmental responsibilities. A Bavarian deputy, Vollmar, as early as 1891, came out strongly against the attitude of sulking, and demanded that the party, deferring its ultimate aim, the socialization of industry, should coöperate with the middle-class parties in winning immediate advantages for the working class. In spite of the bitter opposition of the Prussian irreconcilables, a revision of the party's program in this respect actually took place. With the growth of Socialist representation in the *Reichstag*, their work on the committees became more and more important, and at the beginning of the session of 1912 a Socialist presided for a time over the national parliament. While the fraction continued to vote steadily against all military and naval supplies and against the prosecution of colonial development, signs multiplied that the opposition to these national undertakings had lost its ferocity, and Socialist votes in committee repeatedly brought about modifications in military and naval bills.

When finally under the shadow of a great national danger in May 1913 the Social Democrats accepted the national Defense Bill, which in its system of direct property taxation coincided with their theories, it was plain that a considerable breach had at last been made in the doctrinarian internationalism of the party and that it had at last begun to catch the national spirit. That this was true found complete confirmation at the outbreak of the war, when disappointment came to those who had counted upon socialism as a weakness in Germany's hour of trial. The Social Democratic workman threw down his tools and rushed to obey the order of mobilization with the same patriotic enthusiasm as inspired shopkeeper and reserve officer. The party leaders, speaking through their papers, reaffirmed the faith of the Socialists in the ideals of peace and international brotherhood among workers, but put the defense of German culture from Russian barbarism as a first life-consideration; and the Socialist members of the *Reichstag* followed the direction of the party councils in voting with practical unanimity for the government war measures. The same hail which had resounded so often with attacks on the spirit of militarism, and Prussian militarism in particular, now heard from the Social Democratic leaders words of patriotic devotion scarcely less ardent than those which came from Conservative and Liberal benches. That there were still elements of dissent and that the hatred of feudalism and capitalism still burned brightly could not be doubted, but for the present these were lost to view in the national enthusiasm which made many Socialist leaders answer the first call for volunteers.

In South Germany, indeed, even before the "revision" crusade the Socialists had become to all intents and purposes a national party. In Würtemberg, Baden and Bavaria they repeatedly voted for the budget, including the supplies for the royal family, a proceeding which stirred the radical Socialists to the bitterest attacks. In Baden in 1906 the leader of the party in the Chamber paid a visit of respect to the Grand Duke on the birth of a prince; in the Grand Duchy of Hesse in 1907 the fraction voted an address to the sovereign. In the diminutive principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt the Socialists had in 1912 a majority of the Chamber and elected one of their number president. In the same year in nineteen states of the empire one hundred and eighty-eight Socialist deputies sat in the legislative chambers.

The increasing participation in government which such a large number of representatives must bring with it on more than one occasion excited the Prussian radicals to the boiling point and more than one national party convention resounded with wild scenes of disorder over the struggle as to how far a Social Democrat might participate in government. Under the sting of the radical lash the South German delegates revolted at the Nuremberg Convention of 1908 and announced their intention of proceeding independently of the party in state affairs, submitting themselves to the national convention only in matters of national issue.

That the process of *Mauserung* of the Social Democrats, that is, a gradual conversion to the practical cowering with other liberal groups, did not go further and faster was chiefly due to conditions in Prussia. It is not an accident that most of the radicals among the Social Democratic leaders have been Prussians and that the worship of an idea among the serried thousands of followers has gone further and the collisions between the proletarian and propertied classes have been more numerous in Prussia than elsewhere in the empire. It is true that the Prussian, whether capitalist or proletarian, has a real gift for discipline, whether it be the discipline of the drill sergeant, of the manufacturers' association, or the Social Democratic party leader. But the existence of a sharp and obdurate class feeling in Prussia is to be explained most of all by the constitution of the kingdom. Under the provisions of this constitution, as we have seen, a property qualification for the vote exists, and the working classes are almost entirely excluded from participation in government, whether it be the government of parish, province or kingdom. Of the three classes (cf. page 143) which by indirect means choose the representatives in local and municipal council, in provincial assembly and national *Landtag*, the first class has included in the elections since 1903 from three to five per cent of the total vote, the second class from ten to fourteen per cent, the third class from eightyone to eighty-seven per cent. Since the Socialists from the nature of things fall almost entirely in the third class, it will be seen what a small chance they have of securing adequate representation in any elective body. The industrial workers are placed at a further disadvantage in elections to the *Landtag* by a system of electoral districts which has remained, with minor alterations, that of sixty years ago. Thus while in the agrarian districts of East Prussia in 1908, 63,000 persons elected a deputy, in Berlin the average was one deputy to 170,000. It is not surprising that the Conservative agrarians, who are most bitterly opposed to the interests of the industrial workers, have a far greater number of seats than their vote entitles them to. In 1903 the Conservatives, polling 19.4 per cent of the vote, elected 33 per cent of the deputies in the *Landtag*.

It is not to be wondered at that when in 1908 for the first time Social Democrats, seven in number, found their way into the lower house of the Prussian parliament, they were received with scant courtesy. The Conservative *Kreuzzeitung* protested against their being assigned to any committees, and in fact something very like a boycott was exercised against them. The election of 1913 brought only a slight increase in numbers; but the Socialist deputies made up in noise what they lacked in voting strength, and in spite of the iron rod of Conservative presiding officers, they made themselves as obnoxious as ever did the Irish Nationalists at Westminster in the palmy days of Parnell and Healy. Thus in the spring of 1912 a scandalous scene was precipitated on the floor of the *Landtag*, during which the presiding officer was obliged to send for the police. The minions of the law forcibly removed a refractory Herr Borchardt and played hide-and-seek a while with him in the corridors, a comical scene which found its epilogue in the law courts, where the liberties of the house were finally vindicated by Herr Borchardt paying a small fine. During the same session a Socialist was called to order for saying that "war is a mockery against God" on the ground that this was "an insult to the memory of Emperor William the Great, who waged three

wars, and to the chivalrous and patriotic spirit of the German people." The Socialist members are obliged to hear from the ministerial benches that the government regards all Socialists as enemies of God and Fatherland, and that any official, civil or military, breaks his oath to the sovereign when he affiliates himself in any way with the anti-monarchical party.

It was the same bitter impatience against the Prussian constitution that accounted for many of the violent outbreaks of representatives of the fourth estate in the *Reichstag*. Here, backed by crowded benches of applauding colleagues, the fiery champions of the proletariat have reaped a harvest of calls to order in every session for their attacks on the sovereign, the ministry, the army, the Prussian constitution and the entire Prussian system. Some of the party manifestations have been even less excusable, and their childishness can only be explained by political immaturity or demagogery run mad, as the habit which the Socialist members have had of leaving the hall of parliament when the obligato *Hoch!* is given in honor of the Kaiser at the close of the session. When with the Liberal-Radical-Socialist victory of 1912 the Clerical party was obliged to resign to Radical hands the presidency of the *Reichstag*, attacks on the Emperor himself became less restrained than ever. Each public speech of the monarch found its echo in some choice epigram from the Socialist benches. Thus in the debate on the Kaiser's threat against the constitution of Alsace-Lorraine the printer Scheidemann, erstwhile president of the assembly, aroused an uproar by characterizing the Emperor as a "crowned dilettante," and the intellectual free lance Ledebour earned a call to order by declaring that if the king of England had spoken as Kaiser Wilhelm did, he would be straightway shut up in Balmoral, like the crazy king of Bavaria or Abdul Hamid of Turkey. It was not merely by their attacks on the monarch and by their unceasing diatribes against army and bureaucracy that Social Democratic editors and orators won applause in tavern and workshop or wherever their eager constituents gathered to read the party press. Were a stupid recruit in Jüterbog or Gumbinnen overdrilled by a zealous sergeant until he fell from exhaustion, then one might be certain that the case would be illuminated down to its furthest cranny in the next issue of *Vorwärts* or by a vitriol-tongued Liebknecht or Ledebour in the *Reichstag*. Did a Conservative government official in some remote Silesian district snort at Social Democratic voters at a bye-election, the party press and the *Reichstag* hall would ring with denunciation. Every case of judicial error had a merciless searchlight turned upon it, every instance of official discrimination against those suspected of being Socialists became the theme for attacks in which coarseness and brutality of language often crossed the limits prescribed by the German libel law. Whatever political errors may be charged to the Socialists, the weakness of turning the other cheek to the smiter is something of which the party's representatives cannot be accused. While one must credit Social Democratic representatives in press and parliament with sincerity of motive in the defense of the politically and socially weak and defenseless, it cannot be overlooked that it is mainly due to them that a spirit of undisciplined coarseness and vituperation has found its way into German public life.

There is no denying that they have bad provocation enough. The government from the sovereign down has always made no secret of its determination to fight the Socialists as a foreign enemy in the Fatherland. As believers in "internationalism" and enemies of the existing state, they have been as a matter of course ineligible to any office in the government, whether in the army, navy or in the civil service, although they represent more than one-third of the voting strength of the nation. At the elections all government officials have been expected to exert every legitimate influence against the Social Democratic candidate. Recruits who attended Socialist gatherings or frequented taverns known to be Socialist rendezvous were liable to severe punishment. Especially in Prussia, although the basic ideas of socialism had for years been freely taught in the universities, any teacher in an elementary

school who was suspected of Socialist sympathies exposed himself to loss of promotion or might even be removed from the service. The same fate awaited any postal or customs employee who identified himself in any way with the Socialist cause; and it has often been charged by the Socialists and never disproved that the workmen on public works have been practically forced to enroll their children in clubs where a sort of "hurra-patriotism" was taught and where the youngsters were trained to regard the Social Democrats as the most dangerous enemies of God and native land. Naturally a state of affairs like this leads to deceit, to cringing, tale-bearing and denunciation. Unfortunately also, while the German courts are usually models of fairness and inaccessible to political, social or financial influences, the Social Democrat has not always had an impartial hearing. The Jena students demonstrated against the Socialist convention held in that little Athens on the Saale in 1911, and the Weimar *Volkszeitung* was fined for calling one of the student leaders a *Mistfink*, a somewhat intensified equivalent of "mucker." A laborer in the Kiel district in 1912 gave his daughter the euphonious name of Lassalline. When the registrar refused to record a name so full of danger to the Fatherland, the magistrate's court finally ordered him to do so, but attached to this confirmation of the parent's right to denominate his offspring a long oration against socialism.

The Socialist workman replied to this boycott by exercising in his way a terrorism which the government, aided by all the conservative forces in the state, has striven in vain to suppress. He has vented on the non-socialist worker his dissatisfaction with the government, and, as might be expected, often with brutality and violence. That during a political strike, such as the coal strike in the Ruhr district in 1912 (cf. page 167), the Catholic labor unions should suffer bloody attacks from the striking miners is not surprising: even the non-political Hirsch-Duncker unionists have more than one tale to tell of similar mistreatment during labor troubles. But it is not merely the strike breakers in strike times who have suffered. Every non-Socialist brick mason or carpenter must look for a continuous hazing. If he were so unfortunate as to be obliged to work with a Socialist unionist, he might consider himself lucky if he got off with the occasional loss of tools or dinner bucket or an accidental fall into a horse-pond and did not have his hand permanently maimed by the slip of a chisel or his head cracked by the premature topple of a hod of bricks. Against such petty cases of tyranny of course both government and employer have been helpless. In past years the government has eagerly sought from the *Reichstag* sharper weapons for the suppression of strike violence and the protection of strike breakers; but in spite of the personal influence of the Emperor in their favor, no one of these special measures for the protection of the workers has been able to find a majority in parliament. The fear that they might be used as a weapon for further strengthening the great industrialists has always frightened off enough Clericals to cause their defeat.

It must not be supposed that the feeling against the Socialists has been confined to feudal squires and factory owners. It pervades the entire middle class in Germany, for except the extreme Radicals, all Germans, whether they thrive by land, trade or manufacture, have been taught to regard the Social Democrat as an enemy of the Fatherland. The Rhenish shopkeeper, the Black Forest clockmaker, the Pomeranian peasant farmer, — all have shuddered alike at the growing power and influence of the Social Democracy and regarded almost any means as holy that would tend to defeat its ultimate success. It was only when the excessive demands of agrarian and clerical interests aroused the alarm of those who live by commerce and industry that these classes considered the possibility of a league, and the coworking of Radicals and Social Democrats at the polls in 1912 broke ground in that direction. The Socialist leaders, however, have been well aware that any modification of their extreme radical attitude toward the middle classes would not only endanger their hold

on the working class, with its sharp class feeling, but that a large number of the discontented from all classes would fall away from them. For the growth of socialism's vote in Germany has been due by no means merely to the rising demands of the industrial workers. It has been distinctly the party of discontent and protest. Every discontented and disappointed man is liable at any time to express his dissatisfaction with society in general by voting the Social Democratic ticket. Has the young medical student failed of an appointment, has the citizen soldier been given a verbal castigation by the officer during his drill with the reserve, has a postal clerk been docked in his pay, has the grocer's wife had a snub from the factory owner's, — each sufferer can give vent to his private grievance against society by voting for the Social Democrat and thus making trouble for the powers that be. None of these persons has the slightest sympathy with the ultimate socialist program, and none of them would think of overthrowing the present state of society, except in a moment of ill humor. This habit of "voting to the Left" has attracted large classes of democratically inclined persons of the lower middle class following such a period of reaction as that which ended with the election of the *Reichstag* of 1912.

It is indeed unfortunate that this is so, and the lovers of Germany have often asked themselves what the end would be, if so strangely constituted a party continued to grow in voting strength. Largely through its own choice the Social Democracy, although representing one-third of the voters in the empire, has been deprived of any considerable share in government and remained in an attitude of sullen hostility to the state. So well have the class organizers of past decades done their work that they have developed among the industrial workers who make up the Social Democratic party a class feeling that is nothing more nor less than an independent class culture. It is not merely a political gulf which the Socialist leaders have fixed between the workman and every other class in Germany. Through constant teaching in young men's clubs, trade unions and political societies the industrial worker has become to a certain extent a different creature from his middle class neighbor, a member of a nation within the German nation. A striking characteristic of the German the world over is the love of Fatherland. The Socialist workman has claimed to be an international and to feel as one, and in program at least he has professed to be more strongly drawn to his fellow proletarian in France and England than to the shopkeepers and peasant proprietors of his native district. The North German is by tradition strongly monarchical; the Socialist frankly detests monarchy and monarch. While the German, north and south, may not approve of all the methods of the Evangelical and Roman Catholic churches, he is held by mighty roots to a deep religiosity; the Socialist claims to regard religion as a private matter, nevertheless he cannot forget that the church has been the handmaid of reaction and oppression, and the attitude of intellectual leader and proletarian follower is frankly and openly anti-religious. Many of the most brilliant Social Democratic leaders with tongue and pen are Jews, it need hardly be said, unorthodox Jews, who have cut loose entirely from the religion of Moses and the prophets. Anyone who is at all familiar with the anti-Semitic feeling among the upper and middle classes in Germany can understand how much the prejudice against the Socialists is deepened by this Jewish alliance. Furthermore, in spite of the casehardening of the modern struggle for existence, the average German has remained a romanticist, full of hero-worship and with a deep enthusiasm for the poetry of the nation's past; the Social Democrat has been taught to view the past under the hard light of Marx' theory as a battle-ground of economic forces, where without mercy the strong has preyed upon the weak.

When the war came the attitude of the Social Democracy toward it showed at once that much of the so-called "internationalism" of the German industrial worker is purely academic. All the doctrinarianism of the tavern benches and the nobler enthusiasm of such

demonstrations as that of Treptow could not affect the age-old roots which bind him to the Fatherland. It is improbable that the Socialists, were they to command a majority in Germany's parliament and so succeed in changing Germany's constitution as to have a free hand in legislation, would do anything to weaken the nation's defenses, either by a change in the military system or a destruction of protective duties. It seemed, indeed, as if even old-line leaders, like the late August Bebel, had caught something of the enthusiasm for Germany's world-empire. After the so-called "Hottentot election" of 1907, when Socialists and Clericals alike suffered severely at the hands of the voters for their opposition to colonial expansion, there began to show itself in the Social Democratic press a tendency toward increasing patriotic expression with regard to the national honor and defenses. Here again South Germany led the way, for here the "revisionists" were stronger. Among the first prominent men to fall in the invasion of France in August 1914 was Dr. Frank of Mannheim, a widely known Social Democratic leader; and indeed the blood of Socialist patriots has reddened every battlefield where German armies have fought. Under these the attitude of the party towards the nation's inner life cannot fail to undergo a change. In later years indeed the Social Democrats had already accomplished much that was positive. By their constant and searching criticisms they held a searchlight constantly fixed on the weak spots and the sore spots in the courts and the army. In the field of social legislation, such as the extension of compulsory insurance, the fixing of a shorter working day, and the protection of women and children in the industries, they kept high ideals before the country. In their work for universal peace, in their opposition to immoderate military expenditures and to duels and other manifestations of the feudal spirit in the army, they offered a valuable counterbalance to the militarism-run-mad spirit. In their pleas for a judiciary free from influence of every kind, schools free from religious bigotry, for a system of taxation which should fall directly upon the propertied classes, for a strong central control of great industries and for woman's suffrage, they accomplished much toward the inner upbuilding of the state. These affirmative policies have been pushed by a class of leaders who are very different from those who led the serried thousands of the fourth estate in the nineties or even at the beginning of the present century. The really advanced men in the Social Democratic party are no longer the narrow Marxian enthusiasts or class fanatics who grew up under the anti-socialist laws or when the party was still in the fledgling period of political strategy. They are often men of the highest university training, occasionally with inherited wealth and culture, who know the history of the party and are filled with the optimism of success. They have shown an increasing power to lead the party farther away from a sterile doctrinarianism toward a really practical democracy.

[***]

CHAPTER XVII

THE PRESS AND PUBLIC OPINION

SINCE the day when the bankrupt Mayence genius invented movable types, Germany has with few interruptions held the first place among printing and publishing nations. Her annual output in books surpasses the combined production of France, England and the United States; and even if we subtract pamphlets, which in German statistics are rated as books, and which bring into the world many things that appear in other countries in magazines, the Fatherland exceeds in its contribution to this "paper age" any two other nations. The explanation is to be found not merely in the high culture of the nation, but also in the methodical spirit, which drives the German to analyze, correlate and formulate, seeking not merely apostles for his patiently won ideas but often clearness for the writer through the very formulation of his ideas. In no land is access to the press so cheap and easy, in no land are the rewards for the author proportionately so large. Unfortunately also in no

land are there so many worthless books brought into the world, from the machine-made doctor dissertation with its pathetic testimony to years of youthful vigor wasted in counting the hairs in Homer's beard down to the penny manuals on "How to learn French in Three Weeks." The Germans pay the penalty of a nation which produces each year a mass of creative scholarly research with the by-products of boneless pedantry and speculative dilettanteism.

Besides the book press, the periodical press rolls up each month and each day its vast flood. Every science, art and industry, every branch of commerce, every political faction has its press; every handicraft, yes, almost every forceful personality in the country has its periodical exponent. The press directory of 1913 mentions 11 periodicals devoted to the continuation school system alone. The *Schornsteinfeger*, published monthly in Berlin, ministers to the literary needs of chimney sweeps; the *Allgemeine deutsche Käseblatt* to those of the cheese workers: a specialization in the printed representatives of Germany's multifarious industries confronts us as hairsplit and bewildering as in the industrial branches themselves. Only indeed in a land where the division of industry and the organization of commerce are carried as far as in Germany could this vast array of trade periodicals live and flourish.

On the other hand the number of popular periodicals dealing with history, political science and geography is small: the *Deutsche Rundschau*, founded by the late Julius Rodenberg, the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* and the *Deutsche Revue* are the only ones which deserve to be put beside half a dozen or more great British reviews. In the field of artistic and literary criticism there is none which in the variety and brilliance of its contents appeals to so large a public as the *Revue des deux Mondes*. Nor do the more popular *Westermanns* or *Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte*, *Nord und Süd* or the time-honored *Gartenlaube* attain to the vivid contemporary interest of a few of the best American illustrated magazines. The out-of-door element, so attractive a part of British and American magazines, has only recently made its appearance in German periodicals and is to be found mainly in publications devoted to Alpine, automobile and aviation clubs or other special sports. If, however, the German press has something less to offer to the leisure hours of the man of general culture than that of the western nations, to the specialist and scholar, whether he be a specialist in Sanscrit, stamp collecting or soap boiling, it brings each year a wealth of material which serves later on as a reservoir for the writers of other nations.

The spirit of the German press is then that of German scholarship. It shows the same enthusiasm for truth, the same conscientiousness in the search for it and the same honesty in proclaiming it as have set their stamp on German scholarship everywhere. The reverse of this in pedantry of manner and boring tediousness of portrayal is not lacking. The daily press, to which this chapter is chiefly devoted, shows these characteristics in an even greater degree. The most popular child of the printing press, the newspaper, had also its birth in Germany, and so far as numbers are concerned, Germany is still above all its home. Exact statistics are lacking, but in 1908 the number of daily papers was estimated by competent authorities at four thousand, of which Dr. Robert Brunhuber, [Footnote: *Das deutsche Zeitungswesen*.] an expert in this field, counts about four hundred organs of considerable importance. Of these perhaps 35 are papers of great influence of which over one-half appear in Berlin and less than half a dozen outside of Prussia. In the aggregate the German daily press rises then to tremendous figures. The post-office department acts as the agent of the press, receiving subscriptions at all offices and distributing the papers, and reckoning by post-office statistics, German observers set the distribution of papers in the year 1906 at between twelve and twenty million copies per day. This mighty flood, which pours itself daily over all parts of Germany, rippling to the most distant dune villages of the Baltic coast

and the eeriest nests of the Bavarian highlands, flows most densely in the Rhine valley. Here the Cologne, Düsseldorf and Dortmund papers find their way into every hamlet and in the industrial centres into every house. In the Rhine Palatinate the average is one daily newspaper to every fifteen thousand inhabitants in the entire district.

Through this great flood, from the Berlin and Frankfort journals down to the provincial "*General Anzeiger*" ("Official Gazette") is a long journey past all sorts of newspaper undertakings. Most of the larger papers maintain correspondence bureaus in the greater German cities, and the largest also in foreign capitals, but as in the case of other lands, by far the greater part of the news comes to them through press associations. The great German press association is Wolff's Telegraphic Bureau, which differs from international bureaus like Reuter's and the Agence Havas in that it is mainly national in its scope, and differs from the American press agencies in being directly under government control. Wolff's Bureau counts among its subscribers practically all the important papers in Germany, its despatches are forwarded over the imperial telegraph system toll free and have a certain precedence over private messages, and it is used, as we shall see, to disseminate governmentally edited news. Besides Wolff's, there are in Berlin and other larger capitals other news agencies which send out information, — telegraphed, printed, mimeographed, — flooding the newspaper world with official, semi-official, political or colorless news items, which play a great part in the make-up of the provincial press. The pirating of news from the larger journals is carried on by the provincial papers in Germany in a way that is absolutely conscienceless, possibly because, as will be shown below, the reading public seems less eager for news than for editorial comments thereon.

This borrowing of news items is not, however, confined to the provincial press. As we have seen, the larger papers maintain correspondents in foreign capitals; but only in a few cases is this correspondence forwarded by telegraph, since the papers, apparently following the desires of the reading public, prefer to spend their money on literary essays and scientific treatises rather than on telegraph and cable tolls. For their daily news from abroad they depend on Wolff's Bureau, which has a limited staff abroad, but derives most of its information through the great international agencies like Reuter's. The cheapest and readiest source of information is the French and British dailies, whose news columns even the largest Berlin papers do not hesitate to use, reproducing with a generous hand news items from the *Times*, the *Daily Chronicle* and the *Standard* forty-eight hours after publication in London.

The effect on Germany's relations with the outside world of this dependence on British-influenced news agencies has already been noted (cf. page 73 ff.). Even more important for the development of public sentiment at home is the lack of an adequate, independent system of telegraphic correspondence from foreign countries. The greater metropolitan papers which do maintain foreign correspondents have not succeeded in placing in the foreign capitals men who are able to give a true picture of foreign feeling or through personal influence and adroitness to fill the semi-diplomatic mission of their office, with the result that the readers of even such high-class journals as the *Kölnische* or *Frankfurter Zeitung* or the *Berliner Tageblatt* are often uninformed as to the real condition of public affairs and public feeling in France, England and America. The result has been that each succeeding international crisis has found the German reading public living in a fool's paradise of misinformation with regard to the mighty forces of public sentiment which sway cabinet decisions in London, Paris, Washington and to some extent Rome. Some of the greater German dailies, like the *Kölnische*, have spent vast sums in sending experts to spy out the highlands of Thibet or the savage stretches of the upper Congo and spread before their readers a wealth of information regarding the economic possibilities of southern Brazil or the valleys of Mesopotamia or the fauna and flora of the strangest islands of the southern

seas. Of everything that has a scientific interest they render account with characteristic German enthusiasm for truth: in political matters their information is usually neither complete nor accurate and their correspondence from neighboring French and Italian cities or even from Alsace or the Prussian East is often but valorous vamping of the tap-room sort.

The weakness of the German papers as international newsgatherers is partly to be explained through the personnel of the German newspaper office. This seldom has at its command men of the standing of those who represent the great London papers in foreign capitals, a lack that is directly traceable to the inferior standing of the journalist in Germany as compared with Western lands. In the Fatherland, as elsewhere, the newspaper man does not as a rule freely elect the profession which he practises, but gravitates into it as a result of circumstances. Here, however, the result is worse than elsewhere, not only for the training of the journalist, but for the social status of the profession. In this land of specialization every aspirant for a professional career selects or is supposed to select, or have his parents select for him, his life career before he goes to the university, and he is expected to follow it up with all his force and enthusiasm from that time forth forevermore. Few, very few, select journalism, for while the financial rewards of the successful journalist are not inconsiderable, the social prestige belonging to the profession is still almost as lacking and the professional pride among journalists as undeveloped as half a century ago, when Gustav Freytag wrote his charming comedy *Die Journalisten* to prove that German editors could be men of honor.

The editorial chairs of Germany contain some brilliant men, who, feeling an inner call to journalism, have deserted the teacher's chair or even the lawyer's desk or surgeon's case. Besides these and others, whose lives have been given to a special training for the periodical press, there are a very great number who have found their way into the newspaper office simply because they have failed as lawyers or as teachers or in some other calling where success means *official* position. Hard-and-fast conditions of society in Germany admit a fall in the social scale, but seldom a rise. There is no such thing as working for a while in a minor or menial position and then entering one of the learned professions: the educational system forbids it. The dark side of German efficiency is that those who have through temperament or other causes made a failure in the profession for which they have prepared, have thereafter small chance of success in any calling of equal social rank or even in the close in-fighting of business competition. To a good many such journalism offers the only field where they can still hope for a remunerative activity without entire loss of social position.

In addition to the lack of preparation for their profession under which so many German newspaper men suffer, they are not permitted, as in France, to sign their articles. Not a few leading articles and summaries are signed by the chief editor; but as a rule the German newspaper man is hidden behind the same impenetrable veil of anonymity that shrouds his colleagues in England and America. His work, be it ever so faithfully done, brings him no personal advertisement. On the other hand, the lack of liberal institutions condemns the editor to something like political impotence; and except among the Social Democrats, where newspaper editors are frequently elected to legislative office, he rarely gets anything in the way of political reward. The positions in the consular and even the diplomatic service that now and then recompense the American editor for faithful service to the party cause and the titles and distinctions which successful British journalists receive have no counterpart in Germany. With the exception of the two groups with the best developed political sense, the Conservatives and the Social Democrats, the journalist plays but a small part in the active life of the party and is practically never rewarded by the gift of political office. The effect of this upon the ambition of newspaper men can well be imagined. Thus cut off from adequate preparation, shut in behind a paralyzing anonymity, ineligible for political rewards,

the German journalist cannot, save in the case of a few great papers, lay claim to an enviable social or political position. As a rule he does his duty faithfully within the limits allowed him by the laws and by the business considerations of his office.

These considerations play a no more important part in Germany than in more democratic lands, where the cashier's office is too often permitted to dominate the editorial rooms. Absolute independence of the advertising columns and similar considerations is an ideal rather than a fact in every part of the newspaper world, though here the German publisher may be said to be less exposed to temptation because of the rigid laws which govern business competition and because by education the German is opposed to unfair play in business life. The treatment of the editor as a hireling who must echo the policy of the publisher and guard the latter's political and financial interests is a sacrifice which the editorial profession makes everywhere to the capitalistic organization of society, and it is no more common in Germany than abroad, although it must be said that anything that in any way diminishes the importance and standing of the press as a tribune of the people must increase the temptation of publisher and editor to sell their influence to the highest bidder.

The dignity of the press is then directly dependent upon the liberty allowed it, and this liberty in turn upon the habit of free institutions. It follows that those statesmen who have shown themselves most hostile to these institutions have in the history of present-day Germany done the most to prostitute the press. Bismarck, according to his press secretary, Moritz Busch, frequently expressed himself with cynical contempt on the subject of the honesty of the German press and its value as a representative of the people. "German papers," he declared in 1876, "are bound to be amusing reading, for they are meant to be glanced over while drinking a mug of beer and to furnish topics of lively conversation, usually about something which has taken place a long way off in foreign parts." The Iron Chancellor, however, himself made constant use of the newspapers to influence public opinion both at home and abroad, maintaining at the foreign office, in addition to the official literary bureau, a private bureau under the adroit management first of Busch and later of Professor Aegidi. Through these men he played upon public opinion by means of articles inspired by himself and often prepared under his dictation, which were published not only in the semi-official *Norddeutsche Zeitung*, the *Kölnische Zeitung* or the *Kreuzzeitung*, but in papers issued in remote cities of the provinces, whose connection with the government would not be guessed. Sometimes under the direction of their wily chief his lieutenants would put the Chancellor's ideas in the form of a letter from a German long resident in Paris or a Prussian close to Vatican circles in Rome, playing upon the various keys and stops of prejudice and sentiment as the national or international situation demanded. By his Press Ordinances of 1863 Bismarck had shown himself quite willing to throttle a free press, later on he assured himself of adequate newspaper support by means of a cleverness and an insincerity a little more than diplomatic. That these means were at times highly immoral, no one who reads Busch's biography of the Chancellor can deny. From the income of the sequestered property of the King of Hanover and the Landgrave of Hesse, who had been deposed on the annexation of these countries by Prussia in 1866, the Chancellor drew the so-called "reptile funds," by which the imperial government maintained an influence over the press which extended into the remotest corners of Germany and made itself felt in London, Paris and Rome.

All of this was justified by Bismarck and his apologists as a measure of war. It is certain that the Iron Chancellor had to face all of his life the bitterest opposition on the part of a few independent newspapers, the most relentless from the *Kreuzzeitung*, which under its brilliant editor Hammerstein forced the fighting in the most violent manner whenever Bismarck showed the slightest inclination toward liberal ideas. Confronted by bitter enemies

not only in the Liberal and Clerical ranks but among his own class, the conservative aristocracy, as well, Bismarck did not hesitate to assure himself of press support by means which were sometimes, as has been pointed out, of doubtful morality. He believed that his enemies were poisoning the wells of public opinion; he himself disdained no weapons of deceit and bribery in his newspaper campaigns, furnishing false information to draw the fire of his opponents, or introducing misleading articles into the trusted organs of the opposition. The success of this policy for the Chancellor's aims cannot be denied; its final result was to weaken for decades the political influence of the German press at home and abroad.

Bismarck's successors in the home and foreign offices inherited something of his cynical contempt for the press without the great Chancellor's skill in using it for his purposes. Indeed the attitude of the government officials in Germany toward the representatives of the fourth estate has been one of arrogance, not unmixed with fear. Often the feeling seems to be that the press represents an improper curiosity on the part of the masses about government doings, a curiosity which must be checked if possible, and if that is not possible, satisfied with such meagre news as the government may find fit for popular consumption. The result is, that the same feeling is cultivated in the German newspapers that one finds often among German citizens toward public affairs: they have been told so often that the governing classes can manage things without their help that they have grown to believe it, and the press thus frequently accepts without hesitation government leadership and voluntarily resigns its rights as a tribune of the people. Two instances will illustrate this, both taken from the exciting days at the end of July, 1914, just before Germany declared war against Russia. On July 30 the air was full of rumors and the Berlin *Lokalanzeiger* published an extra announcing that war had been declared against Russia. This was followed immediately by a governmental denial and a disavowal and the withdrawal of its issue by the offending paper. The premature news reached Munich, where it was published in various extra issues and caused the greatest excitement. At the height of this the newspapers, which were unable to communicate with Berlin on account of the overloading of the wires, applied to the Bavarian government to know the truth of the situation. For hours they were kept waiting, and finally with the greatest reluctance the Bavarian officials gave the information that they had not been advised of a declaration of war, which as a matter of fact did not take place till two days later. As showing how dependence on the government has become a matter of habit in crises, on the same day on which the press representatives were treated so superciliously by the Bavarian government when making inquiries regarding a matter of the highest public concern, the Munich *Zeitung*, a Radical paper, called urgently upon the imperial officials, in view of the disturbed state of the public mind, to "take charge of public opinion!"

As a rule the papers have no right to find fault with the government for not attempting to mould public opinion. Since Bismarck's day, however, with the growth of healthfulness in German political life, ministerial efforts to control the public view have become less insidious, although they are not yet always sincere and devoid of trickery. At the present time governmental influence finds its way to the public mind through papers which are directly "official" and papers whose utterances are known as "semi-official" and also by means of articles in journals where government influences are least suspected. The directly and openly "official" papers, such as the *Reichsanzeiger* and the organs of the army and navy and the various *Anzeiger* to be found in the Prussian provincial capitals and the capitals of the other German states, are merely organs of governmental announcement, and have no more influence on public opinion than departmental announcements in Washington. Aside from these organs of the imperial and state governments, the various departments of the federal government contain officials whose duty it is to furnish information to the press,

the most important bureau of that kind being found in the Foreign Office. The organization of these bureaus is as efficient as the German bureaucracy always is, and their work includes not only the furnishing of information to the press, but the preparation of editorial leaders and all sorts of articles intended to work upon public sentiment, which find publication in some of the "semi-official" papers.

As has been noted, the most important agency for disseminating news throughout Germany is Wolff's Telegraphic Bureau, an institution which may be called a governmentally owned press association. It antedates the foundation of the new German empire, having been organized in 1865 as a joint stock company, with the Prussian government in control of a majority of the stock. Like Reuter's Bureau, the Agence Havas and other national news agencies, the Wolff Bureau claims an international character. It maintains correspondents in foreign capitals and has in peace times affiliations with other great news agencies. It practically controls the news field in Germany, although its known governmental character causes German readers to discount its despatches to some extent, less because there is any possibility of Wolff's Bureau falsifying the actual facts furnished from the world outside of Germany than from the feeling that other facts may be suppressed. To the American in Germany the tone of the Wolff messages, when they concern royalty, smacks not a little of unctuous servility. Good or bad, it forms the first means by which the German reader learns his foreign news: that it has not developed further in past years as a real newsgatherer is due less to governmental control than to the traditional lack of interest among Germans in international affairs.

Next to Wolff's Bureau come the information bureaus of the government offices, referred to above, and that brings up the question of "semi-official" papers. Just which papers deserve this title is hard to say, the German press itself being often in the dark as to how far government influence extends over certain papers. Universally recognized as the government mouthpiece is the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of Berlin, which has been in the service of the Prussian and the imperial government since the sixties. Bismarck used it from the early days of his chancellorship, and since that time it has published the government's views, particularly on foreign affairs, prepared in the government offices and under the direction of the imperial chancellor and occasionally of the emperor himself. The statements of the rather old-fashioned *Norddeutsche* are recognized as having the highest authority. At the other end of the scale stands the rural daily which champions the government program and especially at election time rages against the Social Democrats with eager zeal in return for the local government advertising given by the all-powerful local administrator, the *Landrat*. Between the two there extends a whole line of papers, whose articles are regularly or occasionally inspired by the federal or state officials. Certain journals, like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Tägliche Rundschau* of Berlin and the *Hannoverische Courier*, have been regularly used to express government opinion on domestic or foreign affairs, the actual subject-matter or the general ideas being furnished from the Home or Foreign Office. Frequently the reading public is hard put to it to know whether articles in these papers represent the ideas of the government or not, for even the staid *Norddeutsche* occasionally kicks over the traces and treats the topics of the day in a manner which is quite opposed to all theories of feudal-conservative administration. In proportion, however, as the news matter concerns the person or entourage of the Emperor or one of the rulers of the major states or a foreign crisis the articles in the papers in question are apt to reflect the feeling in government circles, for the value of the proper public treatment of such subjects is well understood by the governing class. The public and semi-public utterances of the Emperor are regularly reported by an official stenographer and carefully edited by the Foreign Office before publication.

"One cannot carry on international politics without a press." This statement of the late Marschall von Bieberstein, formerly German foreign minister, is undoubtedly confirmed by the practice of every civilized land. But there is considerable difference between the information furnished the national press in London, Paris and Washington and the press articles which find their way into the German "semi-official" papers, a difference peculiar to the German government. In the more democratic countries the press is taken sufficiently into the government's confidence as to facts to enable it to fulfil its mission as the mouthpiece of the nation. In Germany the imperial and Prussian government by the use of its system of anonymous inspiration has been accustomed to play upon the various organs in which the government's views are wont to appear so as to control public opinion, fanning or restraining the fires of national enthusiasm as the foreign situation demands. This was illustrated in the careful management of the press in the Morocco crisis of 1911, when the anti-French and anti-British feeling was alternately stimulated and checked; incontestibly also in the days preceding the outbreak of war in 1914, when a series of "hands off!" articles following Austria's ultimatum to Serbia was well adapted to steel and inspire the national spirit for the approaching crisis.

Occasionally, however, public opinion in Germany gets very much out of hand. This was the case during the Boer War, when the waves of enthusiasm for the South African republics rolled high in spite of all efforts of the governmentally inspired press to pour oil upon them, and in 1906 when through the Kaiser's interview with the *Daily Telegraph* correspondent the last phases of the pro-British attitude of the imperial government at the time of the struggle with the Boers were laid bare. On such occasions as this, when German ideals are strongly touched, the press arrays itself with force and remarkable unanimity on the popular side and leads an outbreak of Teutonic fury that echoes in every home and hall of the Fatherland. Such unanimity is, however, rare. Some of the strongest papers are handicapped in their influence on public opinion by the suspicion of government inspiration. All tend to suffer, so far as they are not the mouthpieces of the Foreign Office, from a lack of a feeling of responsibility, passing in their leading articles from an unmotivated exultation over Germany's present and future situation to an equally unfounded despair.

Much more than in foreign matters has the system of governmental influence been harmful to the German press in matters of domestic policy. While the ministry no longer poisons the wells of public opinion as in Bismarck's day, it does greatly impair the influence of a great section of the press. During crises like that before the *Reichstag* election of 1907 or the discussions preceding the passage of the Defense Bill in 1913, the imperial ministry constantly played upon the keys and stops of the press. Here, however, there has grown up in the great National Liberal and Radical papers, not to speak of the vast network of Socialist organs, led by the Berlin *Vorwärts*, an array of popular tribunes, who guard jealously the interests of the economic groups which they represent and are themselves free from all suspicion of unfair government influence.

Almost all of the great papers of Germany are in fact strict party organs, only a few like the *Lokalanzeiger* of Berlin professing to be impartial in matters political. Political interests have, as we have seen, combined with economic interests in Germany, so that journals represent not merely a party, but an economic group as well. Thus the *Kreuzzeitung*, the old organ of the Conservative party, is likewise the most influential representative of agrarian interests, while Radical organs like the *Frankfurter Zeitung* have their constituency among the financial and commercial classes of the cities and the great National Liberal papers, like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Tägliche Rundschau* of Berlin and the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, represent the industrial interests and those of the upper middle class. It is but natural that those political parties which are most closely identified with economic groups

should be represented by the most aggressive press. Thus the two groups which occupy opposite ends of the political scale, the Conservatives and the Socialists, whose organizations rest on a strong community of economic interest, have an aggressive and well-disciplined press; and as a result it is chiefly among the Conservative and Socialist editors that one finds men of strong personal influence on the counsels of the party. Next to them comes the press of the Centre party, led by the powerful *Germania* in Berlin, a journal which was founded in 1870 with the first leap into power of the ultramontane party and which has valiantly led the firing line in defense of Roman Catholic interests ever since. Between these extremes stands a long line of papers with liberal and radical leanings. It is remarkable indeed that by far the greater number of journals of national and international standing in Germany are National Liberal in faith or tendency, just as this party, with all of its trimming and irresolution in program, contains a vastly greater proportion of the brains of the empire than its electoral figures would lead one to suppose. Papers like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, the *Schwäbische Merkur* of Stuttgart, the *Hannoverische Courier* or the *Tägliche Rundschau* of Berlin, with their Radical contemporaries, the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin and the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, represent the very best that German journalism has to offer, both as newsgatherers and in the national-patriotic tone of their policies. In Germany as elsewhere the more narrow the political attitude of a paper, the less its importance as a gatherer of news.

Every political, social and economic direction then has its own press, which watches jealously over the interests of its group and presents them with more or less passion and narrowness. From the wild chauvinism of the Berlin *Deutsche Tageszeitung* or *Post* to the bitter class appeals of the Socialistic *Vorwärts*, each strikes its own peculiar note and plays the pipe for its party's dancing. It seldom happens indeed that a newspaper ties itself completely to the fortunes of a political leader, as in France, nevertheless the party press reflects in striking fashion the individualism and separatism of German politics as well as the pettiness and narrowness which is a part of factional strife. The fulminations of the agrarian aristocrat against the inheritance tax, those of the manufacturer against the income tax or the radical against the tariff on food-stuffs and the appeals of the Social Democrat to class feeling echo and reecho harshly and shrilly according as the acoustic space furnished by the individual sheet is large or small.

The German, whether country squire, townsman or peasant-farmer, demands that the paper which he reads beside the family lamp or the restaurant table shall support first of all Germany's claims abroad and secondly, the program of his particular party, with loyalty, which is the trait which he most reveres. In no country is a newspaper more clearly tagged with its party name, and in no country does the reader insist more strongly that it shall remain true to its colors. Through thick and thin, right or wrong, in disaster or success, the paper must be the defender, apologist and conservator of the party's traditions. Every act of the party's leaders must be championed, every move of the party's opponents must be attacked or given an unflattering interpretation. Characteristic of this is the attitude of the papers in reporting political debates. "I always took care that the Whig dogs should not get the best of it," said Dr. Johnson in speaking of his parliamentary reporting, and something like this has become the motto of the German press. Even journals of the highest standing almost always have their party's representative emerge from a political discussion covered with honor "for his clear and practical demonstration of the facts," while his opponent invariably "seeks to confuse the matter and takes refuge in excuses and hedging."

The result of this attitude on public opinion is still further to narrow and to embitter political life. The unfortunate side of this life, already pointed out, is that it splits the nation into factions and creates among these factions the feeling that the government is a hostile

force with which in various crises the best terms possible are to be made. The result is that the German citizen gets very little help from the press in laying aside the swaddling clothes of political separatism. He swears by his *Frankfurter* or *Magdeburger* or *Kölnische* and avoids other papers like the pest. This attitude toward the newspapers is characteristic of the narrow partisan in every country. An especially unfortunate result in Germany, however, is the weakening of liberalism through the dissipation of its energies in factional controversies. Radical and National Liberal papers have found it as impossible to make common cause against feudal pressure and agrarian demands in the press as in parliament, and the Social Democratic papers attack the middle-class Berlin *Tageblatt* as fiercely as they do the feudal *Kreuzzeitung*.

Unfortunately then political factionalism and blind subserviency to the party program harm the independence of the press and damage its influence as an organizer of public opinion. On the other hand it seems that the sources of public opinion are kept purer from strictly financial and business contamination in Germany than elsewhere. Such bribery as there is, is usually backed in some way by government influence, which dominates many a petty provincial or rural sheet. In the various "districts" and "circles" into which Prussia is divided some one of the local newspapers enjoys the official advertising and is regarded as the governmental mouthpiece. This provincial sheet, which assumes the proud title of "Official Gazette" (*Amtsund Kreisblatt*), is a private undertaking, of course, but is strongly under the influence of the local crown official, the *Landrat*, who has the privilege of withdrawing at any time the official titles and official advertising. Naturally the paper is expected to support the government, and particularly the policies of the Conservative party, with all vigor, and the *Landrat* sees to it that it goes for the Social Democrats without gloves and he permits nothing to pass uncensored that might be construed as a reflection on the ruler or the monarchy. During electoral campaigns the editor of such a paper must do his utmost to prevent any increase in the Radical or the Socialist vote in his district, if he would avoid a vigorous bullying from the all-powerful *Landrat*, who is nearly always a member of the feudal class.

Aside from such instances of official terrorism, it is not usual to find German journals listening to financial seduction. Certain papers, it is true, represent particular business interests, as the *Rheinwestfälische Zeitung* of Düsseldorf those of the Westphalian mine operators and iron and steel manufacturers. The big business interests, indeed, have their own press, which is in great measure independent of party, although supporting of course Conservative or National Liberal policies. Thus the Krupps and iron and steel interests are said to own the Berlin *Neueste Nachrichten*, which represents most adequately those industries and the financiers behind them, while individuals identified with the Agrarian League own the Berlin *Tageszeitung*. It is, however, extremely rare when a newspaper modifies its understood political policy as a result of financial considerations. Especially in the case of the Social Democratic press is the influence of the advertising columns on the papers' policy negligible.

Of all the influences then which work upon the press, the government through its various open and subterranean agencies is far and away the strongest. Even in peace times the Berlin ministry may hold a heavy hand on public information through its control of the only great news agency, Wolff's Bureau, to which every German paper is in a sense tributary, from the metropolitan journal with its four editions daily to the "patent outside" of the East Prussian or Bavarian village. The result is a marked lack of enterprise in seeking news on the part of the individual journals, greatly in contrast with the papers of western Europe and America. To begin with, in the very arrangement of the greater number of German papers the news plays a much less important part than the editorial and essay, for

the telegraphic news is usually relegated to the inside pages, the first page being given over to discursive articles, which in the greater journals may concern the most recent news, but in the smaller papers usually limp twenty-four hours behind it. More often the first columns in the morning or evening editions are devoted to an essay on some political or sociological subject or to a résumé, such as would be found in the Sunday issue of an American paper. Even some of the best German newspapers put the latest news in the last columns of the inside of the last page, the place which seems to foreign readers the least conspicuous in the whole paper. News is indeed furnished with startling frequency by the greater German papers, such journals as the *Kölnische Zeitung* putting out four editions daily, with a specialization that is characteristic of other sides of German industry, one edition containing general news, another especially market reports, etc. The wealth of material which such a daily offers, including social and political philosophy, fiction, poetry, travel, biography and literary criticism, much of it of considerable scientific and literary value, is confusing to the American, who seeks first of all the news in his daily paper.

There are other confusing sides in the German attitude towards the day's news when approached with British or American prejudices. One of the most striking is the habit of even the best papers of interlarding news despatches with editorial comment. Provincial sheet and metropolitan daily alike are apt to introduce telegraphic news which is favorable to the cause which they represent with salvos of editorial applause, while unfavorable items are emasculated by constant interlinear comments signed "D.R." (*Der Redakteur*, the editor), such as, "We doubt that!" "Well, we shall wait and see!" or even "This is an open falsehood!" or "Such a campaign of lies!" and similar remarks. Or passages of crucial importance in the text may be interrupted by a bracketed row of question marks or points of exclamation. This confusing mixture of editorial opinion with the day's news is not countenanced by some prominent publishers, like Louis Ullstein, the owner of the Berlin *Morgenpost* and other publications, who have tried to make head against it. Like most newspaper sins, this is also to be laid at the door of the reader, for it must be said that the German reader likes to have his news served up in a way which shall spice the attractiveness of welcome announcements and soften the bitterness of unwelcome things. The German, it must never be forgotten, embraces a cause with his whole soul, whether it be the cause of the whole Fatherland, or that of his economic class or political party, or even his side in the teapot tempest of local politics. He is a devoted champion and good fighter, but also a hard loser, and his tendency to romanticism often permits him to revel in a paradise of dreams even when the enemy is at the gate. This characteristic of the great body of Germans is not of course a weakness of the politically trained classes nor of those aggressive men who guided Germany's industry to the front. But it must not be forgotten that the great majority of German citizens are just emerging from a state of political immaturity. They devote themselves with patient conscientiousness and enthusiasm to the daily duties of home and family, handiwork or profession, and leave political leadership to those who make a profession of ruling, quite willing to accept their orders so long as their patriotism seems trustworthy.

If the liking for news flavored with the sauce of editorial comment indicates a weakness in German public opinion, the distaste for a directly sensational treatment of news is a strength. Germany has, to be sure, its political press of a sensational sort. The wild chauvinism of some of the Berlin and provincial journals is not to be outdone in Paris or Petrograd; but in all that does not concern politics, the most sensational of German journals is as mild when compared with certain French or American dailies as the poems of Felicia Hemans with the early effusions of Swinburne. In the whole field of personalities and in the matter of crime especially, the German papers show a decency and reserve all the more

refreshing in view of the flood of impure books which has risen to such a height in Germany. There are, to be sure, yellow journals in Berlin and Munich, and especially certain comic weeklies, the clever *Simplicissimiss* at their head, show a coarseness of tone which has on more than one occasion shut them out from the mails in those countries where puritanism is still a strong tradition; but the German demands that the news columns of his daily paper shall be clean, and the law backs him up in it. For here as elsewhere in German life, the correction of abuses is not left simply to the force of public opinion. Court proceedings must be reported in such a way that they cannot possibly educate to crime; certain classes of cases are entirely shut out of the papers, and it may be said in general that the atmosphere of the German court room does not lend itself to yellow journalism. Offenders against the press laws are invariably punished, often with a severity which seems really out of proportion to the offense.

Especially does the German journalist have to walk carefully to avoid conflict with the rigid libel laws. Even the most innocent remark about the behavior of some public servant or a news item which permits of a construction placing some private individual in an unflattering light may call forth a demand for a public retraction or provoke an expensive libel suit. The German law, indeed, goes very far in protecting the individual in all the rights of personality, especially in the right of avoiding publicity. The retractions published from time to time in German papers are one of the most enlightening chapters in a study of the German press, illustrating as they do how fully the rights of the individual are guarded. The feeling seems to prevail that the doings of no person or group of persons shall be dragged before the public without the consent of those concerned. It goes without saying that the interviewer plays no considerable rôle in the German newspaper world, and that the position of the reporter is much less important than in those countries where an unrestricted license of the press prevails. Indeed the German law goes so far that in many ways the importance of the press as a sanitary agent is taken away. A newspaper is sometimes forced by threats or legal sentence to retract a statement when the retraction is practically a falsehood, for the mere fact that a news item is true does not by any means serve as a defense against a libel suit, if the item may be construed as a reflection on the behavior of any person or group of persons. Thus a case is recorded where an editor was convicted for publishing a statement reflecting on a hospital, although it was shown in the court proceedings that the statement had been made in a public medical gathering. In this case the law guaranteed to the physician the right of criticism, but denied to the editor the right of publicity.

The libel laws are the constant burden of editorial complaint in Germany. Especially the Social Democratic press has had to suffer under their administration at the hands of their political opponents. The German bench is far above any suspicion of bias except that which comes with the belief held in official circles that the Socialists are public enemies, combined with a reverence for those in authority which degenerates at times into servility. This, the Socialist press has contended, was hardly the right source from which it might expect a square deal. In the nineties and the earliest years of the present century heavy sentences, often from three to five years in prison, were pronounced against Social Democratic editors for *lèse majesté*. The modification of the law in 1908 (cf. page 108) did much to soften the tone of the Socialist and Radical press towards royalty in Prussia; but prosecutions for libel still occur when the press of these parties breaks the bounds prescribed by conservative feeling in its criticism of some municipal official or even of a minister of state. Such cases are usually fought bitterly up through the various courts and usually result in a conviction. With the increase of the number and influence of the Socialist press — the party had by 1910 established daily newspapers in more than 68 cities — the watchfulness of prosecuting officers under the inspiration of the higher provincial officials is kept constantly alert. All

of this has not tended to soften the tone of the Socialist editor, who never turns the other cheek to the smiter. This unfortunate state of affairs has done much to lower the tone of political discussion in Germany to a bitterness and brutality, which, especially in electoral campaigns, swells into a crescendo of billingsgate and presents a most unattractive side of the German press. No stronger evidence could be presented that the cure for the shrill outbreaks of political immaturity is to be found in liberty and not in constant paternal correction.

In spite of these false notes, the lack of sensationalism in the treatment of news is one of the most refreshing characteristics of the German press. The fact that in Prussia and in some other German states every issue must show the names of the persons responsible for the news and editorial portions and for the advertising columns is a guarantee; and the innate German love of truth and hatred of sham hangs heavy on the success of those metropolitan sheets which show a dangerous tendency to rival the yellow papers of France and America. That these tendencies are manifest in some of the Berlin papers is not to be denied, and it is to be expected that they will continue to grow in proportion as the Americanization of the imperial capital emancipates the individual spirit from the traditions of the past. But the whole spirit of German public opinion is opposed to this hectic demoralization of the press. A few years ago, when an enterprising Berlin firm established an illustrated weekly on the model of those British and American papers which have a maximum of the personal in pictures and articles and a minimum of news and literature, the undertaking was received with a shaking of heads everywhere. "This personal advertisement is against the genius of our people," remarked a prominent Leipsic business man concerning it. "It is an importation from America and is fostering a spirit which Germany has never known." It must be said in defense of America, however, that the German press admits without hesitation advertisements and a sort of humor which in America would be impossible in any paper using the mails.

The reformation of the libel laws cannot long be delayed in Germany, and the result will almost certainly be an improvement in the tone of political and public discussion. It is, however, very improbable that the tone of the German daily papers will be much brightened thereby. The staring headlines which form such a feature of the foreign press the German newspaper reader knows only in a mild form: he demands that he be given that which is true or at least that which is in accord with his ideas of the truth, and wants no trifling with his news in order to make it sensational. The interesting "write-up" of the American or English reporter cannot therefore find a place in a paper which takes itself and its functions so seriously. The editor may himself destroy the effect of the news by critical interpolations, but these spring in most cases from soul convictions which are those of the reader himself. The latter disdains any attempt to make either news or editorial matter interesting, and this paired with the German lack of feeling for literary form makes the German press dull reading for those who seek in it anything like the sparkle and crisply classical presentation of the Paris journals. The dull and formal narration of the news, fortified usually by editorial comment, political résumés, rhodomontades of doubtful inspiration, accurate but colorless police and market reports, with here and there an outburst of Teutonic rage against foreign competitors or political opponents, — these make up the current parts of the newspapers, and certainly do not appeal to those who read the journals for the froth of life or expect from them models of literary excellence.

Since Schopenhauer's day, indeed, "newspaper German" has been a term of contempt. "Pig German, — I beg pardon, — newspaper German!" exclaimed the celebrated pessimist more than half a century ago in a memorable essay on "The Butchery of the German Language." "The linguistic debauch," he exclaimed in his customary gentle style,

“to which no other nation can show a parallel, seems to proceed in the main from the political newspapers, the lowest form of literature, and go from them into the literary journals and finally into books.” It is certain that newspaper German has done nothing to remove this reproach since Schopenhauer’s day; indeed, the style of German prose, which seems to grow more cumbersome and unwieldy every year, can charge much of its degeneracy to the daily and weekly press. An illustrated journal of the highest standing introduces to its readers a series of pictures “from the by-the-Russians-temporarily-occupied-and-by-the German-army-under-the brilliant leadership-of-General-von-Hindenburg-gloriously-reconquered province of East Prussia,” and similar sins against all of the muses may be found in the best journals. Of recent years a reaction has been observable, led by papers like the *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin, “Auntie Voss,” as it is humorously called by its contemporaries, which looks back on a century and three-quarters of literary history since no less a stylist than young Gotthold Ephraim Lessing contributed to its early numbers, or the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, which commands some very able pens.

Such criticisms of the German newspaper as literature, however, apply only to its news and editorial columns. Besides these transient expressions of the popular spirit which are written day by day and exist only for a day, the German journals, provincial and metropolitan alike, offer each day a mass of material, which is not merely literature in the strict sense of the word, but which for richness and variety of literary and scientific material has no equal anywhere in the world’s press. It is the custom for most papers to maintain a *feuilleton*, separated from news and editorial matter by a type-bar, which reserves the lower half of the page for matters of more lasting content, non-contemporaneous or quasi-contemporaneous in their interest. This essay was a French invention developed in Germany early in the nineteenth century by the Jewish prose virtuoso Heinrich Heine, and it has cultivated a lightness and gracefulness of style which is strikingly in contrast to the soggy editorial or news paragraph. In light essays on science, literature or art, the whole field of modern culture is laid under tribute with a style which recalls the conversational tone of the drawing room or club. The *feuilleton* writers of Germany lack the grace which marks the best salon literateurs of the French press; but they count among them some of the most brilliant stylists of the nation and maintain a high standard in the wealth and variety of their scientific material.

To these articles of critical and conversational tone are to be added literary works, such as novels by the best authors of Germany, published serially in the daily papers. Gerhart Hauptmann’s *Atlantis* first appeared in the daily edition of the Berlin *Tageblatt*, and other names scarcely less well known on the German Parnassus are to be found in the daily press of the larger cities. Articles of more solid import appear in special supplements, forming a weekly or semi-weekly part of the larger papers. Some of these command the ablest pens in Germany in the field of literature, art and science, and become an indispensable reference material for investigators and critics. Indeed, the literary criticism of such papers as the Berlin *Tag* and the *Vossische Zeitung* or the Cologne *Volkszeitung* is among the best that appears anywhere in Germany. The well-nigh inexhaustible wealth of material offered in this way may be shown by a résumé of the various supplements issued within one week to accompany the morning and afternoon news and editorial matter and market reports of a large Berlin newspaper: a technical supplement of eight pages; a supplement containing essays on legal subjects, four pages; a literary review, two pages; an illustrated supplement, six pages; a comical supplement, six pages; a household supplement, six pages; and a page each for women’s affairs, for art and drama criticism and for tourists. In addition the regular issues contained a letter from China on politico-economic subjects, a sketch of the Hungarian drama, and essays on the teaching of pedagogics in the universities and on the sleeping

sickness in the African colonies, and one page daily devoted to a review of sports, mostly horse racing and aeronautics.

It is evident that while the German newspaper does not as a newsgatherer satisfy western demands, it brings to its readers each day a wealth of material which in other lands would find its way into the "heavier" magazines or into scientific periodicals. It is evident also that while the German who reads his chosen newspaper may be insufficiently informed or biased regarding that which is called in press parlance "live news," he is schooled in scientific methods of observation and inquiry and in accuracy of reporting regarding those things which can be divorced from the ephemeral passions of the day. He finds in his daily or weekly journal not so much a raconteur of the day's doings as a pedagogue and staid mentor, who delights to lead him into the devious paths of science or the romantic world of ideas and ideals. The pedagogical instinct and the enthusiasm for knowledge for its own sake, the love of truth and the careful accuracy in method, narrowness of political view and passionate insistence on the personal standpoint: these ingredients of German character are nowhere more clearly exemplified than in the nation's press."

151. F. S. Meyer, *The Moulding of Communists: The Training of the Communist Cadre*, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, (1961). **See also:** W. Chambers, *Witness*, Random House, New York, (1952). **See also:** D. A. Hyde, *Dedication and Leadership Techniques*, Mission Secretariat, Washington, (1963); **and** *Dedication and Leadership: Learning from the Communists*, University of Notre Dame Press, (1966).

152. E. Bernstein, "Jews and German Social Democracy", *Die Zukunft* (New York), Volume 26, (March, 1921), pp. 145ff.; English translation in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 322-330. **See also:** H. Hirsch, "The Ugly Marx: Analysis of an 'Outspoken Anti-Semite'", *Philosophical Forum*, Volume 8, (1978), pp.150-162. **See also:** P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), pp. 296-305. **See also:** R. Grooms, "The Racism of Marx and Engels", *The Barnes Review*, Volume 2, Number 10, (October, 1996), pp. 3-8.

153. Quoted in V. I. Lenin, "What is to be Done?", *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works*, Volume 5, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1961), pp. 347-530, at 347; **and** *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, International Publishers, New York, (1969), p. 5.

154. "Hope Strong Man Will Rule Russia", *The New York Times*, (9 November 1917), pp. 1-2. **See also:** "Jews Against Bolsheviki", *The New York Times* reported on (19 November 1917), p. 2. **See also:** C. Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volume 1, Series B, August 1898-July 1931, Transaction Books, Rutgers University, (1983), pp. 241-242. **See also:** "Bolshevism and the Jews", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (28 March 1919), p. 11. **See also:** X, "Flight from Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (14 October 1919), p. 14; **and** "The Horrors of Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (14 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** I. Cohen, "Jews and Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (21 November 1919), p. 8; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (25 November 1919), p. 8; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism: The Mosaic Law in Politics: Racial Temperament", *The London Times*, (27 November 1919), p. 15; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism: A Further Rejoinder", *The London Times*, (1 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** Philojudaeus, "Jews and Bolshevism: The Group Round Lenin", *The London Times*, (22 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Janus, "Jews and Bolshevism: Revolutionary Elements", *The London Times*, (26 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Judaeus, *The London Times*, (26 November 1919), p. 8; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism: A Reply to 'Verax.'", *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), p. 8. Verax, "Jews and Bolshevism: The Mosaic Law in Politics: Racial Temperament", *The London Times*, (27

November 1919), p. 15; **and** "Bolshevism and the Jews: A Larger Issue: The Danger in Russia", *The London Times*, (2 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** J. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi, "Jews and Bolshevism: The Chief Rabbi's Reply", *The London Times*, (29 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Pro-Denikin, "A Witness from Russia", *The London Times*, (29 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** An English-Born Jew, *The London Times*, (1 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** Ivan Ivanovich, "The Jews and Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (6 December 1919), p. 10. **"Epatism" defined in *The London Times*:** "Epatism", *The London Times*, (10 December 1919), p. 15. **See also:** I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead?", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

155. **See also:** "World Mischief", *The Chicago Tribune*, (21 June 1920), p. 8.

156. S. Kahan, "Preface", *The Wolf of the Kremlin*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, (1987).

157. V. I. Lenin, "What is to be Done?", *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works*, Volume 5, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1961), pp. 347-530,; **and** *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, International Publishers, New York, (1969).

158. "Communists Closed Play", *The New York Times*, (6 February 1948), p.29.

159. "Jazz in Scientific World", *The New York Times*, (16 November 1919), p. X8.

160. B. Bauer, *Die Judenfrage*, Friedrich Otto, Braunschweig, 1843; English translation, H. Lederer, *The Jewish Problem*, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, (1958); **and** "Die Fähigkeit der heutigen Juden und Christen, frei zu werden", *Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz*, Herausgegeben von Georg Herwegh, Zürich und Winterthur, (1843), pp. 56-71 **See also:** B. Bauer, "Die Judenfrage", *Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst*, Numbers 274-282, (17-26 November 1842), pp. 1093-1126; **and** "Neueste Schriften über die Judenfrage", *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Volume 1, (December, 1843), pp. 1-17; **and** "Neueste Schriften über die Judenfrage", *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Volume 4, (March, 1844), pp. 10-19.

161. K. Marx, "Zur Judenfrage. 1) Bruno Bauer: Die Judenfrage. Braunschweig 1843. — 2) Bruno Bauer: Die Fähigkeit der heutigen Juden und Christen frei zu werden. Ein und zwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz. Herausgegeben von Georg Herwegh. Zürich und Winterthur. 1843. S. 56-71", *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, Herausgegeben von Arnold Ruge und Karl Marx, 1ste und 2te Lieferung, Paris, (1844), pp. 182-214, at 214.

162. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

163. H. Koehler, *Inside the Gestapo: Hitler's Shadow Over the World*, Pallas Pub. Co. Ltd., London, (1940). **See also:** H. Frank, *Im Angesicht des Galgens; Deutung Hitlers und seiner Zeit auf Grund eigener Erlebnisse und Erkenntnisse. Geschrieben im Nürnberger Justizgefängnis*, F. A. Beck, München-Gräfelfing, (1953), pp. 330-331. **See also:** D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). **See also:** H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997).

164. M. Samuel, *You Gentiles*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, (1924), pp. 144-145, 150-151, 154-155, 174-176.

165. Provisional Government of Israel, "The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel", *Official Gazette*, Number 1, Tel Aviv, (14 May 1948), p. 1.

166. *Sefer Ha-Chukkim*, Number 51, (5 July 1950), p. 159.

167. "Text of Ben-Gurion's Address Before the World Zionist Congress in Jerusalem", *The New York Times*, (8 January 1961), pp. 52-53.

- 168.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, The World Publishing Company, New York, Cleveland, (1970), pp. 122, 162.
- 169.** “Zerubbabel, Book of”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 16 UR-Z, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), col. 1002.
- 170.** P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 104. **See also:** B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: III The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377, at 368; **and** “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 593. **See also:** J. Drohojowski, *Brief Outline of the Jewish Problem in Poland*, Polish National Alliance of Brooklyn, U.S.A. (Zjednoczenie Polsko Narodowe), Brooklyn, New York, (1937), p. 22. **See also:** A. Eichmann, “Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story”, *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 106; *see also:* “Eichmann’s Own Story: Part II”, *Life Magazine*, (5 December 1960), pp. 146-161.
- 171.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 331-332.
- 172.** “Messiah”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 1407-1417, at 1413.
- 173.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1419.
- 174.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1418.
- 175.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: N. Goldmann, *The Jewish Paradox*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, (1978), p. 99.
- 176.** “Carmichael, in Washington, Terms Arab Struggle Just”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1970), p. 22.
- 177.** S. Delacourt, “Iranian President Denies Holocaust, Sparks Outrage”, *The Toronto Star*, (15 December 2005), p. A1.
- 178.** A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.
- 179.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, The World Publishing Company, New York, Cleveland, (1970), pp. 163-164.
- 180.** M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 69.
- 181.** M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 68.
- 182.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: Y. Gelber, “Zionist Policy and the Fate of European Jewry (1939-1942)”, *Yad Vashem Studies*, Volume 13, Martyrs’ and Heroes Remembrance Authority, Jerusalem, (1979), pp. 169-210, at 199.
- 183.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 616.
- 184.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 607-608.
- 185.** K. Polkehn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 58; citing C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, London, (1965); *Kreuzwege nach Israel; die Vorgeschichte des jüdischen Staates*, C. H. Beck, München, (1967), p. 151.

- 186.** C. Weizmann, "The Key to Immigration", *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), p. 41.
- 187.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 98.
- 188.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 129.
- 189.** D. Ben-Gurion, "On Ways of Our Policy", *Report of the Congress of the World Council of Poaley Zion*, (Zurich, July 27-August 1937), Tel-Aviv, (1938), pp. 206-207. Cf. I. Shahak, "The 'Historical Right' and the Other Holocaust", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 10, Number 3, (Spring, 1981), pp. 27-34, at 30. N. Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, Second Revised Edition, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1999), p. 161.
- 190.** N. Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, Second Updated Edition, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1999), p. 161.
- 191.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*, Delacorte Press, New York, (1978), p. 166.
- 192.** L. Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*, Third Edition, AAUG Press, Belmont Massachusetts, p. 41.
- 193.** N. Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, Second Updated Edition, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1999), p. 161.
- 194.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 108.
- 195.** W. Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act 1, Scene 3, "Yes, to smell pork; to eat of the habitation which your prophet, the Nazarite, conjured the devil into! I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you."
- 196.** H. E. Barnes, *The Genesis of the World War: An Introduction to the Problem of War Guilt*, A.A. Knopf, New York, London, (1927), pp. 590-653; **and** *In Quest of Truth and Justice: De-bunking the War Guilt Myth*, National Historical Society, Chicago, (1928), pp. 30-34, 98-105. **See also:** A. Ponsonby, *Falsehood in War-Time, Containing an Assortment of Lies Circulated Throughout the Nations During the Great War*, G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. London, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1928). A. J. Dawe, Letter to the Editor, "The Crime Of Louvain. Vivid Account By An Eye-Witness. **See also:** A Ruthless Holocaust. The Real Horrors Of War", *The London Times*, (3 September 1914), p. 4. **See also:** J. Bryce, *Report of the Committee on alleged German outrages appointed by His Britannic Majesty's Government and presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce. Evidence and Documents laid before the Committee on alleged German outrages: (appendix to the Report).*, Printed Under the Authority of His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, (1915); **French** *Rapport de la Commission d'Enquête sur les Atrocités Allemandes*, Darling & Son, London, (1915); **Italian** *Relazione della Commissione d'Inchiesta sulle Atrocità Tedesche*, Vincenzo Bartelli, Perugia, (1915), **Portuguese** *Relatorio da Comissão sobre as Barbaridades Atribuidas aos Alemães, nomeada pelo Governo de Sua Magestade Britannica presidida pelo Visconde Bryce*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Paris, Edimburgo, (1915); **Spanish** *Informe Acerca de los Atentados Atribuidos á los Alemanes, Emitido por la Comisión Nombrada por el Gobierno de su Majestad Británica y Presidida por el muy Honorable Vizconde Bryce*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Paris, Edimburgo, (1915).
- 197.** G. Parker, "The United States and the War", *Harper's Magazine*, Volume 136, Number 814, (March, 1918), pp. 521-531, at 521-522.

198. Letter from M. Planck to A. Einstein of 4 October 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 121, Princeton University Press, (2004). Letter from H. Zangger to A. Einstein of 22 October 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 148, Princeton University Press, (2004).

199. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 12-15.

200. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), p. 19.

201. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 110, 112, 113, 117, 121, 124, 127, 149, 151, 164, 165, etc., Princeton University Press, (2004). R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), pp. 230-231.

202. A. Einstein, "Vom Relativitäts-Prinzip", *Vossische Zeitung*, Morning Edition, (26 April 1914), pp. 1-2; reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 1, Princeton University Press, (1996), pp. 3-5.

203. The published lecture was: A. Einstein, "Motive des Forschens", *Zu Max Plancks sechzigstem Geburtstag. Ansprachen, gehalten am 26. April 1918 in der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft von E. Warburg, M. v. Laue, A. Sommerfeld und A. Einstein*, C. F. Hofbuchhandlung, Karlsruhe, (1918), pp. 29-32; reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 54-59.

204. *See*: Letter from A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld of 2 February 1916, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 186, Princeton University Press, (1998).

205. E. Freundlich, *Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie*, J. Springer, Berlin, (1916); English translation: *The Foundations of Einstein's Theory of Gravitation*, Cambridge University Press, (1920). *See also*: M. Schlick, *Raum und Zeit in der gegenwärtigen Physik. Zur Einführung in das Verständnis der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie*, Springer, Berlin, (1917); English translation: *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics: An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity and Gravitation*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1920). *See also*: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 105, 119, 222, 228, 234, 240, 249, 275, 285, 392, 393, Princeton University Press, (2004).

206. Letter from E. Freundlich to A. Einstein of 15 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 105, Princeton University Press, (2004).

207. Letter from A. Einstein to E. Freundlich of 19 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 106, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 89-90, at 89. Freundlich's fortunes changed after Einstein began to spread word of Lorentz's news that the English confirmed that a deflection of light at the limb of the sun had been measured. *See*: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 119, 168 and 194, Princeton University Press, (2004).

208. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein, Too, Is Puzzled; It's at Public Interest", *The Chicago Tribune*, (4 April 1921), p. 6.

209. R. S. Shankland, "Conversations with Albert Einstein", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56. Also see Einstein's letters to Zangger of late December, 1919, and of January, 1920, in which he discusses the cult surrounding him.

210. A. Einstein, "On Receiving the One World Award", *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950); here quoted from: *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 146-147.

211. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 32, *see also*: pp. 110, 116-117.

212. Letter from A. Einstein to M. Besso of 12 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 207, Princeton

University Press, (2004), pp. 178-179, at 178.

213. “The Zionist Congress: Full Report of the Proceedings”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 10-15, at 11.

214. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.

215. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 227, 238, and 283, Princeton University Press, (2004).

216. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 186, 187 and 216, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Documents 492 and 506, Princeton University Press, (1993). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 19 August 1914, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 56-57, especially p. 57, note 4. **See also:** E. Freundlich, “Über einen Versuch, die von A. Einstein vermutete Ablenkung des Lichtes in Gravitationsfeldern zu prüfen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 193, (1913), cols. 369-372; **and** “Zur Frage der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 835-838; **and** “Über die Verschiebung der Sonnenlinien nach dem roten Ende auf Grund der Hypothesen von Einstein und Nordström”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 369-371; **and** “Über die Verschiebung der Sonnenlinien nach dem roten Ende des Spektrums auf Grund der Äquivalenzhypothese von Einstein”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 198, (1914), cols. 265-270; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 199, (1915), cols. 363-365; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, (1915), pp. 115-117; **and** *Beobachtungs-Ergebnisse der Königlichen Sternwarte zu Berlin*, Number 15, (1915), p. 77; **and** “Über die Erklärung der Anomalien im Planeten-System durch die Gravitationswirkung interplanetarer Massen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 201, (1915), cols. 49-56; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1915), cols. 17-24; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), cols. 17-24; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), col. 147; **and** “Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 4, (1916), pp. 363-372, 386-392; **and** *Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie*, Multiple Revised and Enlarged Editions; **and** “Über die singulären Stellen der Lösungen des n -Körper-Problems”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1918), pp. 168-188; **and** “Zur Prüfung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), pp. 629-636, 696; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen. II. Mitteilung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 20, (1919), pp. 561-570.

217. Letter from M. Born to D. Hilbert of 23 November 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 40 A: Nr. 11; the relevant part of which is reproduced in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“: *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 73-74.

218. A. Einstein, “Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 844-847.

219. H. A. Lorentz, “Electromagnetische Verschijsenelen in een Stelsel dat Zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van Het Licht, Beweegt”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone*

Vergaderingen, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009; translated into English, “Electromagnetic Phenomena in a System Moving with any Velocity Smaller than that of Light”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam (Noninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)*, 6, (May 27, 1904), pp. 809-831; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 172-197; a redacted and shortened version appears in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 11-34; a German translation from the English, “Elektromagnetische Erscheinung in einem System, das sich mit beliebiger, die des Lichtes nicht erreichender Geschwindigkeit bewegt,” appears in *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 6-26.

220. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78.

221. W. de Sitter, “On the Bearing of the Principle of Relativity on Gravitational Astronomy”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 71, (March, 1911), pp. 388-415.

222. Letter from A. Einstein to H. and M. Born of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004).

223. L. Pyenson, *The Young Einstein: The Advent of Relativity*, Adam Hilger, Boston, (1985), p. 82.

224. Political Zionist Theodor Herzl wrote on 12 June 1895, “Jewish papers! I will induce the publishers of the biggest Jewish papers (*Neue Freie Presse*, *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, etc.) to publish editions over there, as the *New York Herald* does in Paris.”—T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 84.

225. R. D. Carmichael, *The Theory of Relativity*, Mathematical Monographs No. 12, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, Chapman & Hall, Limited, London, (1920).

226. M. Schlick, *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1920).

227. R. Drill, “Die Kultur der Haeckel-Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (18 August 1919); **and** “Nachwort”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (2 September 1919); **and** “Ordnung und Chaos. Ein Beitrag zum Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft. I-II”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (30 November 1919 / 2 December 1919).

228. F. Kleinschrod, “Das Lebensproblem und das Positivitätsprinzip in Zeit und Raum und das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip in Raum und Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitgemäße Broschuren*, Volume 40, Number 1-3, Breer & Thiemann, Hamm, Westphalen, (October-December, 1920), pp. 17, 47.

229. H. Dingler, *Die Grundlagen der Physik; synthetische Prinzipien der mathematischen Naturphilosophie*, Second Edition, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1923); **and** *Physik und Hypothese Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre nebst einer kritischen Analyse der Fundamente der Relativitätstheorie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921); **and**

“Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 668-669.

230. F. A. Hayek, edited by S. Kresge and L. Wenar, *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue*, University of Chicago Press, (1994), pp. 48-49, 50-51.

231. J. Leveugle, *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004).

232. M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), pp. 98, 130; **and** *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 1; **and** “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 101. **See also:** J. Leveugle, “Hilbert et Poincaré”, *Poincaré et la Relativité : Question sur la Science*, Chapter 10, (2002), ISBN: 2-9518876-1-2, pp.147-230; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** L. Pyenson, *The Young Einstein and the Advent of Relativity*, Bristol, Adam Hilger, (1985), pp. 103-104. **See also:** C. Reid, *Hilbert*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, (1970), pp. 100, 105.

233. *See, for example:* M. Born, “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers im System des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1910), pp. 161-179, at 161.

234. *See, for example:* M. Born, “Eine Ableitung der Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern vom Standpunkte der Elektronentheorie. Aus dem Nachlaß von Hermann Minkowski”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 68, (1910), pp. 526-551; **and** “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers im System des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1910), pp. 161-179.

235. Letter from M. Born to D. Hilbert of 23 November 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 40 A: Nr. 11; the relevant part of which is reproduced in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“: *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 73-74.

236. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 5.

237. *See:* Letter from P. Lenard to J. Stark 8 September 1920 in A. Kleinert and C. Schönbeck, “Lenard und Einstein. Ihr Briefwechsel und ihr Verhältnis vor der Nauheimer Diskussion von 1920”, *Gesnerus*, Volume 35, Number 3/4, (1978), pp. 318-333, at 328-329.

238. D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), pp. 4, 73.

239. “Personal-Glimpses: Einstein Finds the World Narrow”, *The Literary Digest*, (16 April 1921), pp. 33-34.

240. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 41.

241. Letter from A. Einstein to Cambridge University Press of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 285, Princeton University Press, (2004).

242. M. Born, *Die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins und ihre physikalischen Grundlagen: gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, J. Springer, Berlin, (1920).

243. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 39-40.

244. M. Born, “Preface”, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Dover, New York, (1962/1965).

245. “Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie” *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Number 46, (18 January 1920), p. 2; Number 61, (23 January 1920), p. 2; Number 82, (31 January 1920), p. 2.

246. M. Born, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Dover, New York, (1962/1965), p. 246.

247. M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), pp. 195-196.

248. Letter from F. Ehrenhaft to A. Einstein of 6 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 196, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 166-167, at 166. Einstein rejected the offer *ibid.* Document 211; and expressed reservations about Ehrenhaft’s personality, *ibid.* Documents 269 and 270.

249. J. Crelinsten, “Einstein, Relativity, and the Press”, *The Physics Teacher*, (February, 1980), pp. 115-122; **and** “Physicists Receive Relativity: Revolution and Reaction”, *The Physics Teacher*, (March, 1980), pp. 187-193. On the reaction of the British to the idea that Newton had been defeated, see A. F. Lindemann’s letter to A. Einstein of 23 November 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 174, Princeton University Press, (2004).

250. “Introduction to the Abridged Edition”, in A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, translated by A. Harris, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. vii.

251. O. Lodge, “The New Theory of Gravity”, *Nineteenth Century*, (December, 1919); and “The Ether Versus Relativity”, *Fortnightly Review*, (January, 1920). Cf. “A New Physics Based on Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (25 November 1919), p. 17. *The London Times*, (8 November 1919), p. 12, col. d; (25 November 1919), p.16, col. d; (29 November 1919), p. 9, col. d; (13 December 1919), p. 13, col. a. Lodge also published an article in *Nature*, Volume 106, (17 February 1921). Confer: J. Crelinsten, “Physicists Receive Relativity: Revolution and Reaction”, *The Physics Teacher*, (March, 1980), pp. 187-193.

252. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 21 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 108, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 92-93, at 93.

253. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 21 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 108, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 92-93, at 93.

254. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 106.

255. A. Einstein quoted in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 8.

256. Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 565. See also: D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. See also: A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998).

257. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 2 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 98, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 81-82, at 82.

258. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 19 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 265, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 220.

259. Letter from A. S. Eddington to A. Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 271, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 224-225, at 224.

- 260.** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 146 and 177, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 261.** B. Russell, *The A B C of Relativity*, Harper & Brothers, New York, London, (1925).
- 262.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Delbrück of 26 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 235.
- 263.** Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit*, Engelmanns, Leipzig, (1901); reprinted in *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925).
- 264.** V. Varičak, “Primjedbe o jednoj interpretaciji geometrije Lobačevskoga”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 154, (1903), pp. 81-131; **and** “O transformacijama u ravnini Lobačevskoga” *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 165, (1906), pp. 50-80; **and** “Opcéna jednadzba pravca u hiperbolnoj ravnini”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 167, (1906), pp. 167-188; **and** “Bemerkung zu einem Punkte in der Festrede L. Schlesingers über Johann Bolyai”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 16, (1907), pp. 320-321; **and** “Prvi osnivači neeuclidiske geometrije”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 169, (1908), pp. 110-194; **and** “Beiträge zur nichteuclidischen Geometrie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 17, (1908), pp. 70-83; **and** “Anwendung der Lobatschefskijschen Geometrie in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 93-96; **and** “Die Relativtheorie und die Lobatschefskijsche Geometrie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 287-294; **and** “Die Reflexion des Lichtes an bewegten Spiegeln”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 586-587; **and** “Zum Ehrenfestschen Paradoxon”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 169-170; **and** “Интерпретација теорије релативности у геометрији Лобачевскова”, *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 83, (1911), pp. 211-255; **and** *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 88, (1911); **and** “Über die nichteuclidische Interpretation der Relativitätstheorie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 21, (1912), pp. 103-127; **and** *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, (1914), p. 46; (1915), pp. 86, 101; (1916), p. 79; (1918), p. 1; (1919), p. 100.
- 265.** Cf. J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 110.
- 266.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 24 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 233, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 197-198.
- 267.** A. Kleinert and C. Schönbeck, “Lenard und Einstein. Ihr Briefwechsel und ihr Verhältnis vor der Nuheimer Diskussion von 1920”, *Gesnerus*, Volume 35, Number 3/4, (1978), pp. 318-333.
- 268.** D. K. Buchwald, et al. Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 110.
- 269.** A. Hermann, *Briefwechsel. Sechzig Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 65.
- 270.** Letter from A. Einstein to A. Stodola of 31 March 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 16, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 271.** A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

272. A. v. Brunn, quoted in: K. Hentschel, Ed., A. Hentschel, Ed. Ass. and Trans., *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), p. 11.

273. From the preface of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* translated by: H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: 'A Hundred Authors against Einstein'", J. Earman, M. Janssen, J. D. Norton, Eds., *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 251.

274. A. v. Brunn, quoted in: K. Hentschel, Ed., A. Hentschel, Ed. Ass. and Trans., *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), p. 14.

275. C. J. Bjerknes, *Albert Einstein: The Incorrigible Plagiarist*, XTX Inc., Downer Grove, Illinois, (2002). **See also:** P. Langevin, "Le Physicien", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 20, Number 5, (September, 1913), pp. 675-718. **See also:** H. A. Lorentz, "Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique", *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; and Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. **See also:** W. Pauli, "Relativitätstheorie", *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958). **See also:** H. Thirring, "Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie", *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12 ("Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik"), Springer, Berlin, (1927), pp. 245-348, especially 264, 270, 275, 283. **See also:** S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1929). **See also:** J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1931). **See also:** J. Le Roux, "Le Problème de la Relativité d'Après les Idées de Poincaré", *Bulletin de la Société Scientifique de Bretagne*, Volume 14, (1937), pp. 3-10. **See also:** Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), especially pp. 27-77; and "Albert Einstein", *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 37-67. **See also:** G. H. Keswani, "Origin and Concept of Relativity, Parts I, II & III", *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306; Volume 16, Number 61, (May, 1965), pp. 19-32; Volume 16, Number 64, (February, 1966), pp. 273-294; and Volume 17, Number 2, (August, 1966), pp. 149-152; Volume 17, Number 3, (November, 1966), pp. 234-236. **See also:** G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, "Intimations of Relativity before Einstein", *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354. **See also:** G. B. Brown, "What is Wrong with Relativity?", *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), pp. 71-77. **See also:** C. Cuvaj, "Henri Poincaré's Mathematical Contributions to Relativity and the Poincaré Stresses", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 36, (1968), pp. 1109-1111. **See also:** C. Giannoni, "Einstein and the Lorentz-Poincaré Theory of Relativity", *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, Volume 1970, (1970), pp. 575-589. JSTOR link:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0270-8647%281970%291970%3C575%3AEATLTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>>

See also: J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, Reidel, Dordrecht, Netherlands, (1974). **See also:** W. Kantor, *Relativistic Propagation of Light*, Coronado

Press, Lawrence, Kansas, (1976). **See also:** R. McCormmach, "Editor's Forward", *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 7, (1976), pp. xi-xxxv. **See also:** H. Ives, D. Turner, J. J. Callahan, R. Hazelett, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers*, Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** J. Leveugle, "Henri Poincaré et la Relativité", *La Jaune et la Rouge*, Volume 494, (April, 1994), pp. 29-51; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L'Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995); **and** *The Theory of Gravity*, Nauka, Moscow, (2001); **and** Анри Пуанкаре и ТЕОРИЯ ОТНОСИТЕЛЬНОСТИ, Наука, Москва, (2004). An English translation of this book will soon appear as: *Henri Poincaré and the Theory of Relativity*. **See also:** E. Gianetto, "The Rise of Special Relativity: Henri Poincaré's Works before Einstein", *ATTI DEL XVIII CONGRESSO DI STORIA DELLA FISICA E DELL' ASTRONOMICA*, pp. 172-207; URL:

<<http://www.brera.unimi.it/Atti-Como-98/Giannetto.pdf>>

See also: S. G. Bernatosian, *Vorovstvo i obman v nauke*, Erudit, St. Petersburg, (1998), ISBN: 5749800059. **See also:** U. Bartocci, *Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: La vera storia della formula piu famosa del mondo*, Societa Editrice Andromeda, Bologna, (1999). **See also:** Jean-Paul Auffray, *Einstein et Poincaré: sur les Traces de la Relativité*, Le Pommier, Paris, (1999). Y. Brovko, "Einshteinianstvo—agenturnaya set mirovovo kapitala", *Molodaia Gvardiia*, Number 8, (1995), pp. 66-74, at 70. Юрий Бровко, "Эйнштейнианство — агентурная сеть Мирового капитала", *Молодая гвардия*, № 8, (1995), сс. 66-74; **and** Y. Brovko, "Razgrom einshteinianstvo", *Priroda i Chelovek. Svet*, Number 7, (2002), pp. 8-10. Юрий Бровко, "Разгром эйнштейнианства", *Природа и Человек. Свет*, № 7, (2002), сс. 8-10. URL:

<<http://medograd.narod.ru/einstein.html>>

276. E. Gehrcke, "Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; reprinted *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp.40-44.

277. Letter from A. Einstein to W. Wien of 17 October 1916, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 267, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 255.

278. M. Besso letter to Einstein of 5 December 1916, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 283, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 271. F. Adler letter to Einstein of 23 March 1917, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 308.

279. H. Vaihinger, *Die Philosophie des Als Ob, System der theoretischen, praktischen und religiösen Fiktionen der Menschheit auf Grund eines idealistischen Positivismus. Mit einem Anhang über Kant und Nietzsche*, Reuther & Reichard, Berlin, (1911); English translation by C. K. Ogden, *The Philosophy of 'As If'*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., New York, (1925); reprinted Routledge & K. Paul, London, (1965). **See also:** C. K. Ogden, *Bentham's Theory of Fictions*, K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., (1932).

280. H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 111.

- 281.** “Einstein Ignores Capt. See”, *The New York Times*, (18 October 1924), p. 17.
- 282.** “Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21. **See also:** “Einstein Charged with Plagiarism”, *New York American*, (11 April 1921). **See also:** “Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory”, *New York American*, (12 April 1921).
- 283.** R. Drill, “Die Kultur der Haeckel-Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (18 August 1919); **and** “Nachwort”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (2 September 1919); **and** “Ordnung und Chaos. Ein Beitrag zum Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft. I-II”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (30 November 1919 / 2 December 1919).
- 284.** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 198, 199 and 222, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 285.** *The New York Times*, (4 April 1922), p. 21.
- 286.** “Cardinal Doubts Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (8 April 1929), p. 4. **See also:** “Einstein Ignores Cardinal”, *The New York Times*, (9 April 1929), p. 10. **See also:** “Cardinal Opposes Einstein”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (8 April 1929), p. 33. **See also:** “Cardinal Hits at Einstein Theory”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (8 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Gives Further Views on Einstein”, *Boston Evening American*, (12 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Warns Against Destructive Theories”, *The Pilot* [Roman Catholic Newspaper, Boston], (13 April 1929), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Vatican Paper Praises Critic of Dr. Einstein”, *The Minneapolis Morning Journal*, (24 May 1929).
- 287.** *The New York Times*, (24 February 1936), p. 7. **See also:** “Calls Ether Reality; Differs with Einstein; Proof is Submitted”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (23 February 1936).
- 288.** M. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, (1958), p. 13. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 113-114. **See also:** W. Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), p. 139.
- 289.** **See also:** “Einstein Theory will be Refuted by an American”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (24 October 1929), p. 18. **See also:** “Calls Ether Reality; Differs with Einstein; Proof is Submitted”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (23 February 1936).
- 290.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57; **and** “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901.
- 291.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 54.
- 292.** A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.
- 293.** A. Einstein, *Neues Wiener Journal*, (29 September 1920). C. Kirsten and H. J. Treder, *Albert Einstein in Berlin 1913-1933*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, Volume 2, (1979), pp. 139, 205.
- 294.** Quoted in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 296.
- 295.** Quoted in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-279; **see also:** pp. 304, 314-315.
- 296.** W. Marr, *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum*, Rudolph Costenoble, Bern, (1879); English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 76-93, at 85-86.

297. H. Bielohlawek, "Yes, We Want to Annihilate the Jews!" in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 115-120.

298. P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), p. 267.

299. Cf. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 347.

300. A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 43-48.

301. B. Lazare, *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes*, (1894); *L'Antisémitisme, son Histoire et ses Causes*, L. Chailley, Paris, (1894); cf. "Salluste", "Autour d'une Polémique: Marxism et Judaïsme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 16, (15 August 1928), pp. 795-834, at 825. **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 76-77.

302. J. Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe, Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies, Collected from Good Authorities*, Fourth Edition, Printed and Sold by George Forman, New York, (1798), pp. 6-8.

303. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 69, 79-81, 103, 111-112.

304. G. Goyau, *L'Idée de Patrie et l'Humanitarisme: Essai d'Histoire Française, 1866-1901*, Perrin et Cie., Paris, (1902). **See also:** Abbé Barruel *Mémoires pour Servir à l'Histoire du Jacobinisme*, De l'Imprimerie Française, Chez P. Le Boussonier, Londres, (1797-1798); English translation by R. Clifford: *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobism*, Printed for the translator by T. Burton and co., London, (1798). **See also:** P. Benoit, *La Franc-Maçonnerie*, Société Générale de Librairie Catholique, Palmé, Paris, (1886). **See also:** E. Cahill, *Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement*, M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin, (1929). **305.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 76-77.

306. A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, "The Jew is the product of His Tradition and His Law", *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, Chapter 6, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 123-147.

307. P. S. Mowrer, "The Assimilation of Israel", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 107.

308. See, as but one example: "Soviet 'Orgies'", *The London Times*, (31 August 1922), p. 7.

309. *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.

310. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 361-365.

311. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 342-343.

312. P. S. Mowrer, "The Assimilation of Israel", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 104.

313. M. Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 35-37, 40.

314. I. Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*, Pluto Press, London, Boulder, Colorado, (1994).

315. *Scientific American*, Volume 1, Number 42, (9 July 1846), p. 3.

316. "Rothschild", *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, Volume 21, Ninth Edition, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1886), p. 3.

317. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.

318. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 267, 277-278.

319. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 272, 278.

320. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 222-224. R. McNair Wilson, *Monarchy or Money Power*, Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd., London, (1933), pp. 81-83.

321. G. E. Griffin, "The Rothschild Formula", *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.

322. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 374. Griffin cites C. Siem, *La Vieille France*, Number 216, (17-24 March 1921), pp. 13-16.

323. "Benjamin, Judah Philip", *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1940), pp. 181-184, at 182.

324. "Benjamin, Judah Philip", *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1940), pp. 181-184. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161, at 153.

325. Refer to the articles in *The Vancouver Sun* on 2 May 1934 and 4? and 5? May 1934 relating to Gerald Grattan McGeer's speech before the Canadian House of Commons, and the *Vancouver Daily Province* of 2 May 1934. **See also:** G. G. McGeer, *The Conquest of Poverty; or, Money, humanity and Christianity*, Garden City Press, Gardenvale, Quebec, (1935).

326. "Phillips, Isaac", *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 8, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1942), p. 492.

327. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 209, 213, 457-459.

328. Refer to the articles in *The Vancouver Sun* on 2 May 1934 and 4? and 5? May 1934 relating to Gerald Grattan McGeer's speech before the Canadian House of Commons, and the *Vancouver Daily Province* of 2 May 1934. **See also:** G. G. McGeer, *The Conquest of Poverty; or, Money, humanity and Christianity*, Garden City Press, Gardenvale, Quebec, (1935).

329. *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the 76th Congress: Second Session*, Volume 85, Part 1, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1939), p. 1068.

330. H. N. Casson, "The Jew in America", *Munsey's Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 393. **See also:** S. Oppenheim, *The Jews and Masonry in the*

United States before 1810, Samuel Oppenheim, New York, (1910); reprinted from: *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Number 19, (1910). **See also:** “Bush, Solomon”, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1940), p. 608. **See also:** *Jewish Calendar for Soldiers and Sailors: 1943-1944: 5704*, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York, (1943), pp. 15-17. **See also:** “Freemasonry”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 5 Dreyfus-Brisac—Goat, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 503-505. **See also:** “Freemasons”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 FR-HA, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 122-125.

331. G. Kisch, *In Search of Freedom: A History of American Jews from Czechoslovakia: 1592-1948*, Edward Goldston, London, (1948). **See also:** M. Rechcigl, Jr., *Early Jewish Immigrants in America from the Czech Historic Lands and Slovakia:*

<http://www.jewishgen.org/BohMor/early_immig.html>

332. “Freemasons”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 FR-HA, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 122-125, at 124.

333. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 338-339.

334. G. Halsell, *Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War*, Lawrence Hill & Co., Westport, Connecticut, (1986); **and** *Prophecy and Politics: The Secret Alliance Between Israel and the U. S. Christian Right*, Lawrence Hill & Co., Westport, Connecticut, (1986); **and** *Forcing God’s Hand: Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture—and Destruction of Planet Earth*, Crossroads International Pub., Washington, D.C., (1999), Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2003); **Turkish:** M. Acar, H. Özmen, et al. translators, *Tanrı’yi kiyamete zorlamak: Armagedon, Hristiyan kiyametçiliği ve İsrail = Forcing God’s Hand : Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture: And Destruction of Planet Earth*, Kim, Ankara, (2002).

335. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), p. 110.

336. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 339-340.

337. G. E. Griffin, “The Rothschild Formula”, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.

338. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 624.

339. M. Selzer, Editor, “Statement by the Holy Gerer Rebbe, the Sfas Emes, on Zionism (1901)”, *Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy*, Macmillan, New York, (1970), pp. 19-22, at 19-20.

340. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 628.

341. H. Morgenthau, “Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at viii.

342. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 623, 630.

343. “3379 (XXX). Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination”, General Assembly—Thirtieth Session, Resolutions adopted on the reports of the Third Committee, 2400th Plenary Meeting, (10 November 1975), pp. 83-84. URL:

<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/30/ares30.htm>

Confer: Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium, International

Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 249-250. Cf. F. A. Sayegh, *Zionism: A Form of Racism And Racial Discrimination* "Four Statements Made at the U.N. General Assembly, Office of the Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, (1976), pp. 40-41. URL:

http://www.ameu.org/uploads/sayegh_march1_03.pdf

After the fall of the Soviet Union, which had long sponsored racial integration (*see*: "Circus" a motion picture released in 1936 directed by Grigori Alexandrov starring Lyubov Orlova), the U. N. withdrew this resolution under great pressure from Zionists.

344. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.

345. E. Gehrcke, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** "Über den Äther", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** "Zur Diskussion über den Äther", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; **and** "Was beweisen die Beobachtungen über die Richtigkeit der Relativitätstheorie?", *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 1, (1920), p. 123; **and** "Die Relativitätstheorie, eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion", Lecture Delivered in the Berlin Philharmonic on August 24th, 1920, published in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 54-68; **and** "Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie", *Kosmos*, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298.

346. A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann, Ed., *Albert Einstein / Arnold Sommerfeld: Briefwechsel: Sechzig Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

347. L. Infeld, *Quest—An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980), p. 258.

348. O. Kraus, "Zum Kampf gegen Einstein und die Relativitätstheorie", *Bohemia*, Prag, (2 September 1920); **and** "Zur Lehre vom Raum und Zeit" Nachlaß Brentano, *Kantstudien*, Volume 25, (1920); **and** "Fiktion und Hypothese in der Relativitätstheorie", *Schmidt's Annalen der Philosophie*, Volume 2, Number 3, (1921), pp. 335-396; **and** "Die Verwechslungen von 'Beschreibungsmittel' und 'Beschreibungsobjekt' in der Einsteinschen speziellen und allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Kantstudien, Philosophische Zeitschrift der Kant-Gesellschaft, Berlin*, Volume 26, (1921), pp. 454-486; **and** "Einwendungen gegen Einstein: Philosophische Betrachtungen gegen die Relativitätstheorie", *Neue Freie Presse*, Wien, (11 September (192?)), Number 20130, pp. 2ff.; **and** "Die Unmöglichkeit der Einsteinschen Bewegungslehre", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (12 November 1921), pp. 681-684; **and** *Zur Relativitäts Theorie*, Meiner, Leipzig, (1921); **and** *Lotos*, Volume 70, (1922), pp. 333ff.; **and** *Offene Briefe an Albert Einstein und Max von Laue über die gedanklichen Grundlagen der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie*, Braumüller, Wien, (1925); **and** "Zur Relativitätstheorie", *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Number 163, 3, Volume 3, reprinted in *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländers Verlag, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 17-19.

349. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes", *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16.

350. L. Infeld, quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), pp. 256-257; Clark cites: L. Infeld, *Die Wahrheit*, (March 15-16, 1969).

351. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 161.

352. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 167.