

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	

4.7.1.3 Reuterdahl Pursues Einstein, Who Continues to Run
4.7.2 Einstein All Hype
4.8 Assassination Plots
4.9 Wolff Crying, Dirty Tricks, Censorship, Smear Campaigns and Anonymous Threats in the Name of Einstein

5 THE PROTOCOLS OF THE LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION

5.1 Introduction
5.2 <i>The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion</i>
5.3 Did Anyone Believe that the <i>Protocols</i> were Genuine?
5.3.1 Human Sacrifice and the Plan to Discredit Gentile Government—Fulfilled
5.3.2 The World Awakens to the “Jewish Peril”
5.3.3 America Becomes the “New Jerusalem”
5.3.4 “The Jewish Peril”
5.3.5 The Inhumanity of the Bolsheviks
5.4 International Zionist and Communist Intimidation
5.4.1 Suppression of Free Speech
5.4.2 Jewish Terrorism
5.5 Attempts to Prove the <i>Protocols</i> Inauthentic
5.5.1 Why Did Henry Ford Criticize the Jews?
5.5.2 Controlled Opposition and “The Trust”
5.5.3 The Sinking of the “Peace Ship”
5.5.4 Ford Comes Under Attack—The War Against Pacifism
5.5.5 Zionists Proscribe Free Speech
5.5.6 President Woodrow Wilson Becomes a Zionist Dictator
5.6 Why Did the Zionists Trouble the Jews?
5.6.1 The Zionist Myth of the Extinction of the “Jewish Race” Through Philo-Semitism and Assimilation
5.6.2 The Zionists Set the Stage for the Second World War... and the Third

4 EINSTEIN THE RACIST COWARD

Albert Einstein was a genocidal racist Zionist. He was appalled by the fact that most German Jews did not share his racist and segregationist views. Einstein ridiculed Jews who assimilated into German society. Einstein hypocritically and disingenuously dubbed all of his critics “anti-Semites”. He was a coward who hid from criticism by smearing his critics. When he was finally forced to debate in Bad Nauheim, he made a fool of himself and ran away in the middle of the argument.

“*The General Assembly, [***] Determines that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.*”—UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NUMBER 3379³⁴³

“I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”—ALBERT EINSTEIN³⁴⁴

4.1 Introduction

The massive emigration of Eastern European Jews, coupled with the financial might of the Rothschild family and their lesser branches, and with the disproportionate Jewish domination of the press, resulted in tremendous power for the Jewish community, especially in America, England and Germany. Einstein used this organized Jewish power in a cowardly fashion to suppress open debate on the theory of relativity and his career of plagiarism. Einstein, himself a racist, hypocritically and disingenuously accused his critics of racism for saying the same things that Einstein himself had said both publicly and privately. Einstein counted on fellow racist Jews to rush to his defense simply because he was a Jew. His expectations were rewarded.

4.2 The Power of Jewish Tribalism Inhibits the Progress of Science and Deliberately Promotes “Racial” Discord

Just as the “Jewish press” refused to entertain criticism of Judaism in the *Kulturkampf* while they relentlessly ridiculed Catholicism specifically and Christianity generally, they refused to entertain criticism of their Jewish Messiah, Albert Einstein. However, Einstein’s Nobel Prize was not awarded for the theory of relativity, because so many were aware of the fact that Albert Einstein had plagiarized the theory. Ernst Gehrcke³⁴⁵ demonstrated that Paul Gerber had anticipated the general theory of relativity, as had Johann Georg von Soldner,

making a Nobel Prize for that theory impossible. It was long known that Einstein had plagiarized the special theory of relativity from Lorentz and Poincaré. Instead of exposing the public to these facts, the Jewish dominated press smeared Einstein's critics, obstructed their access to the public, and shamelessly hyped Albert Einstein and the theory of relativity.

Reassured that corrupt elements in the press would rescue him, Einstein decided to stay in Berlin after the Berlin Philharmonic meeting where he had been publicly humiliated. On 3 September 1920, the *Berliner Tageblatt* proudly reported that Einstein would not run away:

“Prof. Albert Einstein wird, wie wir erfahren, einer Berufung ins Ausland nicht Folge leisten, sondern in Berlin bleiben. Dieser erfreuliche Entschluß des Gelehrten ist mit die Folge der zustimmenden Briefe, die infolge der Aktion der sogenannten Gesellschaft der Naturforscher an Einstein gelangt sind. Prof. Einstein wird, ehe er seine Gastvorlesungen an der Universität Leiden hält, noch auf der Kieler Woche für Kunst und Wissenschaft über die Relativitätstheorie sprechen und auf der Naturforscherversammlung in Bad Nauheim seine Theorie zur Diskussion stellen. Ob er im kommenden Wintersemester die angekündigten Vorlesungen an der Berliner Universität halten wird, ist noch nicht sicher.”

Einstein recorded his fears and his sudden courage upon learning that he would not have to defend himself, but would instead be defended by sycophants who were more competent than he was, which emboldened him to publish his response in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. Albert Einstein wrote to Arnold Sommerfeld on 6 September 1920:

“Ich hatte in der That jenem Unternehmen gegen mich zu viel Bedeutung zugeschrieben, indem ich glaubte, dass ein grosser Teil unserer Physiker dabei beteiligt sei. So dachte ich wirklich zwei Tage lang an «Fahnenflucht», wie Sie das nennen. Bald aber kam die Besinnung und die Erkenntnis, dass es falsch wäre, den Kreis meiner bewährten Freunde zu verlassen. Den Artikel hätte ich vielleicht nicht schreiben sollen. Aber ich wollte verhindern, dass mein dauerndes Schweigen zu den Einwänden und Beschuldigungen, welche systematisch wiederholt werden, als Zustimmung gedeutet werden. Schlimm ist, dass jede Äusserung von mir von Journalisten geschäftlich verwertet wird. Ich muss mich eben sehr abschliessen.”³⁴⁶

4.3 A Jew is Not Allowed to Speak Out Against a Jew

The second meeting of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft* took place on 2 September 1920. The famous Jewish philosopher Oskar Kraus of Prague was scheduled to deliver a lecture stating his objections to the special theory of relativity. The Czechoslovakian government refused Kraus a visa for “political reasons” thereby preventing his appearance at the

meeting and actively obstructing a public expression of anti-relativism by a famous intellectual figure of Jewish descent. Kraus had known Einstein while Einstein lived in Prague. Kraus believed that Einstein was nothing more than an amateurish Metaphysician. Einstein told Leopold Infeld, “I am really more of a philosopher than a physicist.”³⁴⁷ Einstein was a poor philosopher, as well. He argued in redundancies based on unproven assertions.

The pro-Einstein forces—forces so powerful that they were able to deny a man’s right to speak and to corrupt the workings of a nation’s government—prevented Kraus’ speech, which would have been far more interesting and readily understood by a crowd of laymen and news correspondents than was Glaser’s technical lecture which replaced it. Kraus’ arguments³⁴⁸ against the metaphysical absurdities in relativity theory make a powerful impression on the lay public—one Einstein’s advocates were frantic to prevent. Einstein did not grasp the distinction between Metaphysics and science. He stated in 1930, “Science itself is metaphysics.”³⁴⁹

This maneuver enabled pro-Einstein newspapers and Max von Laue to:

1. Criticize Weyland for being too popular and allegedly racist. Leopold Infeld stated that Weyland was a, “handsome dark-haired man of about thirty who wore a frockcoat and spoke with enthusiasm about interesting things[. . .] He said that uproar about the theory of relativity was hostile to the German spirit.”³⁵⁰ Weyland denied that his opposition to Einstein was anti-Semitic.

2. Attack Gehrcke’s credibility in handwaving personal attacks which would sound impressive to the lay public. Philipp Frank attacked Gehrcke as, “a competent experimental physicist of Berlin, who criticized the theory from a point of view of a man who, while making no mistakes in his experiments, simply lacks the acute understanding and flight of imagination to pass from individual facts to a synthesis.”³⁵¹ Frank also stated that Gehrcke was, “a hardworking observer in the laboratory”.³⁵² Shortly before Max von Laue joined the dishonest campaign to smear Gehrcke, Laue wrote to Einstein on 18 October 1919 that Gehrcke was, “a very seasoned optics specialist with a genuine interest in moving bodies.”³⁵³ Philipp Lenard, himself a Nobel Prize laureate, nominated Gehrcke for the Nobel Prize. Einstein and his friends tried to destroy Gehrcke’s career and censored him on numerous occasions.

3. Attack Lenard as an alleged racist (Arnold Sommerfeld praised Lenard’s book in a letter to Einstein,

“In seiner neu aufgelegten Broschüre «Rel[ativität], Äther, Grav[it]ation» hat [Lenard] sich sehr anständig über Sie [Einstein] geäußert.”³⁵⁴

Lenard, while expressing his patriotism and the dignity and integrity he demanded of German science, did not publicly express racial sentiments until after Einstein had attacked him and smeared his name without grounds around

the world.

4. Avoid Glaser's objections as dry and uninteresting pedantic gobbledygook.
5. Prevent Kraus' dramatic public exposition of the fatal flaws in the theory of relativity, which could not be misconstrued as if "anti-Semitic" even by the shameless pro-Einstein press.

All of this was done to change the subject from Einstein's plagiarism, Einstein's self-promotion and gross exaggeration of the significance of his theories, the relativists' corrupt misrepresentation of the available evidence to the public, and the absurdities of the theory of relativity—all of this was done to change the subject to the irrelevant issue of anti-Semitism. Einstein and his friends were completely unethical. They inhibited the progress of science and took away fundamental human liberties.

Max von Laue reported in the evening edition of *Vossische Zeitung* on 4 September 1920 that the Czechoslovakian government denied Kraus, of Prag, the right to leave the country "for political reasons". Laue, racist Zionist Albert Einstein's "Shabbas Goy", again tried to change the subject to racial issues in a cowardly effort to avoid the relevant facts,

“Der Einstein-Effekt im Spektrum.

Von
Max von Laue.

Professor Max von Laue, Ordinarius für theoretische Physik an der Berliner Universität, Träger des Nobelpreises für Physik im Jahre 1914, stellt uns folgende Ausführungen zur Verfügung:

Die Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher für Rassereinheit der Wissenschaft veranstaltete am 2. 9. ihren zweiten Vortragsabend in der Philharmonie. Zunächst mußte ihr geistiges Haupt, Herr Paul Weyland, das Ausbleiben von Prof. Kraus aus Prag mitteilen, dem die tschecho-slowakische Regierung aus politischen Gründen die Ausreise verweigert hat.

Sodann ergriff Herr Dr.-Ing. Glaser das Wort zu dem angekündigten Vortrage, der sich nach ein paar einleitenden Bemerkungen über die Lichtablenkung bei der Sonnenfinsternis 1919 ausführlich mit der Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien auf der Sonne beschäftigte, deren Dasein die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie notwendig fordern muß. Hier sprach nun ein gescheiter Mann über eine Sache, von der er etwas versteht — ganz im Gegensatz zum ersten Vortragsabend. Schon daraus geht hervor, daß der Physiker viel dabei lernen konnte. Ob auch der Laie? Manchmal schien uns das zweifelhaft.

Der Redner zeigte zunächst in wohlgeordneten-Projektionsbildern die sogenannten Cyanbanden im Sonnenspektrum, an denen die wichtigsten

Beobachtungen gemacht sind, und deren Auflösung in einzelne Linien. Er ging dann aus von den Messungen Schwarzschilds, bei denen er selbst mitgearbeitet hat. Deren Ergebnis sprach eher gegen als für den Einsteineffekt. Er führte weiter die langen Messungsreihen vor, die sich in Arbeiten von St. John, Evershed und Royds sowie Hale befinden. Letztere sind in Deutschland zurzeit schwer zugänglich, und die Mühe, mit der der Vortragende sie sich zu verschaffen gewußt hat, muß sehr anerkannt werden. Mit vollster Bewunderung und einem gewissen Neid muß es erfüllen, wenn man von den großartigen Hilfsmitteln hört, welche die Sternwarte des Mount Wilson für solche Versuche bietet, und dazu die Projektionsbilder sieht. Alle diese Forscher finden Verschiebungen der Spektrallinien, doch welchen diese meist in der Größe, manchmal auch in der Richtung vom Einsteineffekt an, auch lassen sich noch manche andere Erklärungen dafür ersinnen, so daß ein einheitliches Bild nicht entsteht.

Sodann ging der Vortragende zu den kurzen Veröffentlichungen zweier Deutscher über. Grebe und Bachem haben nämlich seit 1919 in Bonn mit weit bescheideneren Mitteln dieselben Untersuchungen angestellt. Und sie kommen zu dem Ergebnis, daß man nicht wahllos jede Linie im Spektrum zur Entscheidung der Frage heranziehen dürfe. Unsymmetrien im Linienbau sowie die unvermeidbaren Unterschiede zwischen Absorptionsspektren, wie wir sie im Sonnenlicht haben, und den irdischen Emissionsspektren, mit denen man sie vergleicht, können nach ihnen das Ergebnis einer genauen Messung vollständig fälschen. Beschränkt man die Untersuchung auf acht Linien, die von solchen Uebelständen frei sind, so findet man aus ihren eigenen Messungen, sowie aus denen ihrer Vorgänger eine Rotverschiebung, welche mit dem von Einstein verlangten Effekt recht gut übereinstimmt.

Hiergegen wandte sich der Redner. Das wesentlichste Instrument der Bonner Untersuchung ist ein Gitter, und die bisherigen Gitter sind nicht hinreichend fehlerfrei, um diese Untersuchung zu ermöglichen. Er zeigte im Bild vortreffliche photographische Aufnahmen von Gittern und stellte dabei sein eigenes Licht etwas unter den Scheffel, indem er verschwie, daß solche Aufnahme niemandem vor ihm selbst gesungen sind. Die dabei zutage tretenden Fehler verursachen Schleier um die Spektralanalyse; diese beim Bonner Apparat auftretenden, bei geeigneteren Anordnungen aber fehlenden Schleier sind es nach Glaser, welche Grebe und Bachem zur Ausscheidung der Mehrzahl der bisher untersuchten Linien veranlaßt haben. Glaser hält demgegenüber die älteren Untersuchungen für maßgebend und schloß mit den Worten, er glaube auch die Anhänger der Relativitätstheorie überzeugt zu haben, daß sie von der Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien nichts mehr zu hoffen hätten.

Darin zeigt sich nun wieder die einseitige Parteinahme dieses sonst nicht schlechten Vortrages. Warum verschwie der Redner, daß, selbst wenn die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie sich an der Erfahrung nicht

bestätigen sollte, doch dann immer noch die beschränkte Relativitätstheorie, welche uns Einstein 1905 beschert hat, bestehen bleibt? Warum erwähnte er nicht, daß Schwarzschild, auch nachdem er die theoretische Rotverschiebung nicht hatte finden können, noch kurz vor seinem Tode in zwei höchst wertvollen Untersuchungen an dem mathematischen Ausbau der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie mitgearbeitet hat? Er muß diese doch wohl noch nicht für ganz erledigt gehalten haben. Ferner haben die Bonner Gelehrten gewiß nicht mit den Mitteln Hales arbeiten können. Aber sie haben dafür einen sehr beachtenswerten Gedanken in die Erörterung geworfen, den ihre englischen und amerikanischen Vorgänger nicht gehabt und deswegen auch nicht mit ihren besseren Mitteln geprüft hatten. Wie denn nun, wenn diese Forscher die Grebe-Bachemsche Prüfung der Spektrallinien auf ihre Braucharbeit wiederholen — was sehr zu wünschen ist — und dabei vielleicht deren Ergebnis bestätigen? Kann man denn diese Möglichkeit von vornherein ausschließen? Der richtige Schluß aus dem vorliegenden Beobachtungsmaterial wäre für einen sehr skeptischen Beurteiler doch wohl der gewesen: Die älteren Untersuchungen sind durch Grebe und Bachem in ihrer Bedeutung zweifelhaft gemacht. Deren eigene Untersuchungen sind bisher von anderer Seite nicht nachgeprüft. Also ist die ganze Frage noch in der Schwebe.

Und noch ein paar allgemeinere Bemerkungen seien hier gestattet: Hört man die Vorträge der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft“, so muß man glauben, mit der Relativitätstheorie wäre der ganze Einstein erledigt. Und dabei ist unter denen, die da gesprochen haben und sprechen wollen, höchstens einer — zur Vorsicht wollen wir sagen, daß wir nicht Herrn Weyland meinen — dessen Leistungen für die Physik sich mit dem messen können, was Einstein außer der Relativitätstheorie getan hat. Sein Nachweis der Elektronenbewegung in den Magneten, seine Theorie der Temperaturabhängigkeit der spezifischen Wärme und so manches andere auf dem Gebiete der Quantentheorie sind unvergängliche Ruhmesblätter in der Geschichte der Wissenschaft. Gelänge es der Arbeitsgemeinschaft, was sie — nach der Art ihrer Mittel zu urteilen — anstrebt, nämlich diesen Mann aus Berlin zu vertreiben, so hätte sie damit — ebenfalls unvergängliche Berühmtheit erworben.”

Johannes Riem stated that Oskar Kraus had wired him a telegram on 2 September 1920, which informed him that Kraus, “was refused a visa for political reasons.”³⁵⁵ Riem complained that,

“In such a way relativity theory is protected by the immigration service.”³⁵⁶

The *Berliner Tageblatt* reported in the morning edition of 3 September 1920,

“Im großen Saal der Berliner Philharmonie sollte gestern abend der Vortrag von Professor Dr. K r a u s-Prag, der von der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher

Naturforscher“ angekündigt war, stattfinden. Der Beginn des Vortrags war auf ½8 Uhr festgesetzt, um ¼9 Uhr aber erst wurde dem erschienenen Publikum mitgeteilt, daß Professor Dr. Kraus, der über „Relativitätstheorie und Erkenntnistheorie“ sprechen sollte, nicht erscheinen werde.”

In the evening edition of 3 September 1920, the *Berliner Tageblatt* wrote,

“**E. V. Die Einstein-Kampagne.** Bei den Einstein-Gegnern scheint jetzt doch die Erkenntnis Platz zu greifen, daß die Art, wie die „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ den Kampf gegen Einstein in dem ersten Vortrag eingeleitet hatte, nicht der richtige ist. Professor Kraus (Prag), der zur Relativitätstheorie vom erkenntnistheoretischen Standpunkt Stellung nehmen wollte, hatte, wie schon im Morgenblatt kurz gemeldet, telegraphisch abgesagt; er verzichtet darauf, sich als Philosoph in den Straßenkampf der allzu persönlich erhitzten Tagesmeinungen zu stellen. Es blieb als Redner des gestrigen Abends in der Philharmonie nur der Physiker Dr. Ing. Glaser, ein Gehilfe Schwarzschilds bei dessen früheren experimentellen Studien zur Relativitätstheorie. Und es muß gesagt werden, daß er sich nüchternster Sachlichkeit, man könnte beinahe sagen, Trockenheit, befleißigte. Jedenfalls, wer aus dem Publikum in diesen Vortrag gekommen war, um ein paar billige und tönende Schlagworte für seine Anti- oder Sympathie nach Hause zu tragen, ist Gott sei Dank enttäuscht worden, er saß in einem experimentalphysikalischen Seminar. Glaser begnügte sich damit, die Beobachtungsergebnisse der aus der Relativitätstheorie gefolgerten und von Einstein errechneten Effekte der *Lichtablenkung* und der *Rotverschiebung* zu untersuchen, um an Hand von Lichtbildern darzutun, das erstens die beobachteten Effekte hinter den errechneten zurückbleiben, und zweitens die beobachteten Phänomene nicht die restlos zwingende Beweiskraft als Relativitätseffekte haben, sondern, zum Beispiel die Differenz in der Verschiebung am Nordrand und am Südrand der Sonne, wie Evershed schon zeigt, sich vorläufig schwer mit dieser Erklärung vereinigen lassen. Glaser untersuchte sehr kritisch die Mittel der Beobachtung und die Möglichkeit, mit den bei den letzten Finsternissen angewandten Apparaten und Methoden ganz einwandfreie Resultate zu erzielen. Wobei zu bedenken ist, daß die Unklarheit der erzielten Bilder doch nicht ohne weiteres zuungunsten der Einsteinschen Effekte ausgelegt werden darf. Es kann auch ein Beobachtungsfehler der unzulänglichen Mittel sein, wenn die beobachteten Effekte hinter den errechneten zurückgeblieben sind.

Es wird uns wohl nichts weiter übrigbleiben, als in Geduld abzuwarten, was am 22. September 1922 die verfinsterte Sonne an den Tag bringen wird, ob die Einsteinsche Sonne aus den kritischen Nebeln, die jetzt mit etwas allzuviel Dunst darum gemacht werden, siegreich hervorgehen wird.”

Many years later, Philipp Frank spun things this way and that, and even Max

Born felt obliged to state that in the context of the history of the special theory of relativity, Philipp Frank was dishonest and distorted the facts. Frank wrote,

“An invitation had also been extended to a representative of philosophy who was to prove that Einstein’s theory was not ‘truth,’ but only a ‘fiction.’ He was of Jewish descent and was intended to be the climax of the meeting. Despite his political innocence and urgent telegrams, he declined at the last moment because some friends had explained the purpose of the meeting to him. As a result the first attack took place without the blessing of philosophy.”³⁵⁷

Max Born said of Frank,

“EINSTEIN’s work was the keystone to an arch which LORENTZ, POINCARÉ and others had built and which was to carry the structure erected by MINKOWSKI. I think it wrong to forget these other men, as it can be found in many books. Even PHILIPP FRANK’s excellent biography *Einstein, Sein Leben und seine Zeit*, cannot be acquitted of this reproach, e.g., when he says (in Chap. 3, No. 6 of the German edition) that nobody before EINSTEIN had ever considered a new type of mechanical law in which the velocity of light plays a prominent part. Both POINCARÉ and LORENTZ have been aware of this, and the relativistic expression for the mass (which contains c) has rightly been called LORENTZ’ formula.”³⁵⁸

Oskar Kraus was an outspoken critic of the theory of relativity before the Berlin Philharmonic lectures and for many years thereafter. Frank’s account does not agree with that of Paul Weyland, Max von Laue and Johannes Riem, who recorded that Kraus wished to attend the meeting, but was refused a visa for political reasons. Einstein’s advocates have always relied upon clannish Jewish racism and disproportionate Jewish influence in government, the press and in the universities to prevent a fair and open discussion of the merits of the theory of relativity and of Einstein’s career plagiarism. This is but one of many instances of Jewish censorship in the modern world. Jewish organizations have successfully criminalized opinions which deviate from their own. It is today illegal in many countries to offend or obstruct Jewish racists by revealing their destructive lies and dangerous Messianic aspirations.

4.4 The Bad Nauheim Debate

Nobel Prize winning Physicist Philipp Lenard took great offense at Einstein’s defamatory comments. Lenard had said nothing anti-Semitic in public, but instead, in the wake of Germany’s defeat in World War I, had simply asserted his national pride and declared that German science stood for high ethical standards and sound scientific practices—as opposed to the wild speculations of the British eclipse observations and the immoderate and self-glorifying advertising of Albert Einstein.

Lenard's reaction came at a time when the British and French had openly attempted to destroy German science, with Albert Einstein's help.

In the winter of 1914, Lenard criticized J. J. Thomson and England in a 16 page pamphlet³⁵⁹ in a nationalistic—not anti-Semitic—tone. Lenard, himself, may have been of Jewish descent and had a classically Jewish appearance.³⁶⁰ It was common at the time to speak of “German science” and many of Einstein's friends and supporters, many of whom were Jewish, proudly spoke in those exact terms. Lenard supported German efforts in the war, and, like Max Planck, Walter Nernst, Fritz Haber, and many others, signed the pro-German statement of 4 October 1914, as amended, with the signatories broken down by profession, by Goerg Nicolai:

“The Manifesto to the Civilized World

As representatives of German science and art we protest before the whole civilized world against the calumnies and lies with which our enemies are striving to besmirch Germany's undefiled cause in the severe struggle for existence which has been forced upon her. The course of events has mercilessly disproved the reports of fictitious German defeats. All the more vigorous are the efforts now being made to distort truth and disseminate suspicion. It is against these that we are raising our voices, and those voices shall make the truth known.

1.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT GERMANY WAS GUILTY OF THIS WAR

Neither the nation nor the Government nor the emperor wanted it. The Germans did everything possible to avert it, documentary evidence of which is before all the world. In the twenty-six years of his reign William II has frequently shown himself the defender of the world's peace, as has frequently been acknowledged even by our enemies. Indeed, this same emperor, whom they are now presuming to call an Attila, was ridiculed for twenty years and more because of his unswerving devotion to peace. Not until our people was attacked from three sides by superior forces, which had long been lying in wait at the frontier, did it rise as one man.

2.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT WE CRIMINALLY VIOLATED BELGIAN
NEUTRALITY

It can be proved that France and England had resolved to violate it, and it can be proved that Belgium had agreed to this. It would have been suicidal not to have anticipated them.

3.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT THE LIFE AND PROPERTY OF A SINGLE
BELGIAN SUBJECT WERE INTERFERED WITH BY OUR SOLDIERS
EXCEPT UNDER THE DIREST NECESSITY

Again and again, despite all warnings, did the population lie in ambush and fire on them, mutilating wounded men, and murdering doctors even while actually engaged in their noble ministrations. There could be no baser misrepresentation than to say nothing about the crime of these assassins and then to call the Germans criminals because of their having administered a just punishment to them.

4.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT OUR TROOPS BEHAVED BRUTALLY IN

REGARD TO LOUVAIN

They were forced to exercise reprisals with a heavy heart on the furious population, which treacherously attacked them in their quarters, by firing upon a portion of the town. The greater portion of Louvain is still standing, and the famous town hall is quite uninjured. It was saved from the flames owing to the self-sacrifice of our soldiers. Every German would regret works of art having been destroyed in this war or their being destroyed in the future. But just as we decline to admit that any one loves art more than we do, even so do we refuse no less decidedly to pay the price of a German defeat for the preservation of a work of art.

5.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT WE DISREGARD THE PRECEPTS OF
INTERNATIONAL LAW IN OUR METHODS OF WARFARE, IN WHICH
THERE IS NO UNBRIDLED CRUELTY

But in the East the ground is soaked with the blood of women and children slain by Russian hordes, and in the West the breasts of our soldiers are lacerated with Dumdum bullets. No one has less right to pretend to be defending European civilization than those who are the allies of Russians and Serbians, and are not ashamed to incite Mongolians and negroes to fight against white men.

6.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT FIGHTING OUR SO-CALLED MILITARISM
IS NOT FIGHTING AGAINST OUR CIVILIZATION, AS OUR ENEMIES
HYPOCRITICALLY ALLEGE

Without German militarism German civilization would be wiped off the face of the earth. The former arose out of and for the protection of the latter in a country which for centuries had suffered from invasion as no other has done. The German Army and the German people are one, and the consciousness of this makes seventy millions of Germans brothers to-day, without regard to education, rank, or party.

We cannot deprive our enemies of the poisoned weapons of falsehood. All we can do is to cry aloud to the whole world that they are bearing false witness against us. To you who know us, who, together with us, have hitherto been the guardians of man's highest possessions—to you we cry aloud, 'Believe us; believe that to the last we will fight as a civilized nation, to whom the legacy of a Goethe, a Beethoven, and a Kant is no less sacred than hearth and home.'

This we vouchsafe to you on the faith of our name and our honor.

The manifesto was signed by the following seventeen artists actually practising their profession: Peter Behrens, Franz von Defregger, Wilhelm Dörpfeld, Eduard von Gebhardt, Adolf von Hildebrand, Ludwig Hoffmann, Leopold Graf Kalkreuth, Arthur Kampf, Fritz Aug. von Kaulbach, Max Klinger, Max Liebermann, Ludwig Manzel, Bruno Paul, Fritz Schaper, Franz von Stuck, Hans Thoma, Wilh. Trübner.

By these fifteen natural scientists: Adolf von Beyer, Karl Engler, Emil Fischer, Wilhelm Foerster, Fritz Haber, Ernst Haeckel, Gustav Hellmann, Felix Klein, Philipp Lenard, Walter Nernst, Wilhelm Ostwald, Max Planck,

Wilhelm Röntgen, Wilhelm Wien, Richard Willstätter.

By these twelve theologians: Adolf Deissmann, Albert Ehrhard, Gerhard Esser, Adolf von Harnack, Wilhelm Herrmann, Alois Knöpfler, Anton Koch, Josef Mausbach, Sebastian Merkle, Adolf von Schlatter, August Schmidlin, and Reinhold Seeberg.

By these nine poets: Richard Dehmel, Herbert Eulenberg, Ludwig Fulda, Max Halbe, Gerhard and Karl Hauptmann, Hermann Sudermann, Karl Vollmöller, and Richard Voss.

By these seven jurists: Lujo Brentano, Johannes Conrad, Theodor Kipp, Paul Laband, Franz von Liszt, Georg von Mayr, and Gustav von Schmoller.

By these seven medical men: Emil von Behring, Paul Ehrlich, Albert Neisser, Albert Plehn, Max Rubner, Wilhelm Waldeyer, and August von Wassermann.

By these seven historians: Heinrich Finke, J. J. de Groot, Karl Lamprecht, Maximilian Lenz, Eduard Meyer, Karl Robert, and Martin Spahn.

By these five art critics: Wilhelm von Bode, Alois Brandt, Justus Brinkmann, Friedrich von Duhn, and Theodor Wiegand.

By these four philosophers: Rudolf Eucken, Alois Riehl, Wilhelm Windelband, and Wilh. Wundt.

By these four philologists: Andreas Heusler, Heinrich Morf, Karl Vossler, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

By these three musicians: Engelbert Humperdinck, Siegfried Wagner, and Felix von Weingartner.

By these two politicians: Friedrich Naumann and Georg Reicke.

By this theatrical manager: Max Reinhardt.”³⁶¹

Einstein covertly supported the Allies throughout the war. Though he lived in Germany—Einstein was a disloyal agent of Germany’s enemies. Einstein became a symbol to many Germans of the Jew who had “stabbed Germany in the back”. Many Germans believed that Jewish leaders in the press, the English, and Jewish world finance, had conspired to destroy pan-Germany as it tried to defend Europe from pan-Slavism, and that after the war the Jewish press in Germany sided with the Allies when they sought to punish Germany and break it apart in violation of President Wilson’s directives that no nation would lose territory at war’s end, which promise had led Germany to surrender in the good faith of that promise.³⁶² The Allies, and some leading German Jews, betrayed Germany’s good faith.

Albert Einstein, together with Wilhelm Förster and Georg Friedrich Nicolai³⁶³ (born Lewinstein)—a crypto-Jew who tried to persuade young Ilse Einstein to accept Albert Einstein’s proposal of marriage in 1918, while Albert Einstein was sleeping with her mother, who was Albert Einstein’s cousin, Elsa Einstein³⁶⁴—drafted their “Call to the Europeans”, which anticipated the European Union by calling for peace talks that would destroy the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires and replace them with a yet more universal European block, a Soviet style block that would eliminate personal property and unite the workers in their struggle against the ruling class. This came at a time when Germans were rightly concerned by the attempted

takeovers of revolutionary Jewish Communists like Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Kurt Eisner, which had shaken the German Nation. It was well known that the Bolsheviks under Jewish leadership had mass murdered millions of Christians and had destroyed the Russian Nation. It was also widely known that Jewish financiers had caused the First World War in order to profiteer from it, promote Zionist interests, and to destroy the Europeans' will to fight back against Bolshevism. The Jewish bankers believed that the war would tire the Europeans and leave susceptible to the Jewish propaganda that internationalism and Bolshevism were the solution to war. However, most Europeans realized that these same forces were behind the war and were terrified at the prospect of a Bolshevik Europe.

Raymond Recouly contrasted the French and Russian revolutions, in an article published in 1922, which stated, *inter alia*,

“Since the Bolshevik revolution, the produce of Russia has diminished from 50 to 75 per cent. Famine and the deaths of millions of people have been the consequences of that Russian expropriation.

We have now reached a subject in which a great many people seem to find the chief points of comparison between the two revolutions, namely the question of massacres.

Nothing can excuse a massacre, either in France or in Russia.

The massacres which went on in some of the Paris prisons and certain provincial towns, such as Lyons, Nantes, etc., have branded the French Revolution with bloodstains impossible to wash out.

As to the condemnations pronounced by the revolutionary tribunals during the most active period of the Terror, the very composition of those tribunals, their expeditive and summary manner of delivering the sentence, the wholesale trials and condemnations pronounced by them, were the merest parody of justice.

But between those massacres of the French Revolution and the massacres of the Russian Revolution, there are, however, some capital differences.

First, the number of the victims was in France greatly smaller than it has been in Russia.

About 1,300 people were buried at the cemetery of Picpus in Paris, where the greatest majority of the victims of the guillotine had their sepulchers. Those few thousand victims of the French Revolution seem nearly nothing as compared with the enormous number of people exterminated in Russia.

The Terror in France did not last very long. There came soon a strong reaction and the whole thing was definitely stopped.

Even at the most frightful period of the Terror, the exterior forms of justice were, to a certain extent, observed. If one wished to find extenuating circumstances, they could be found in the violence of the political struggle, especially in the fact of France being invaded, that enemy armies were marching on the capital, that a terrible revolt had broken out in the Vendée province, and insurrections were taking place in the centre and south of France.

In France, the executions were always conducted openly. When Louis XVI and the Queen were beheaded, it was in the middle of the Place de la Concorde in daylight, after they had been publicly judged and condemned.

In the Russian Revolution, on the contrary, no exterior form of justice was even observed. The executions have always taken place secretly. You have only to remember the monstrous manner in which the Czar and all his family were murdered in Ekaterinburg. It was in the middle of the night, in a cellar, by revolver shots, without any judgment whatever.

It has been nearly the same with all the Russian executions.

And what about the Tcheka, that disgusting network of police spies of all kinds, which has something Asiatic, Chinese, in the way of arresting people, of torturing them and putting them to death?

Those Bolshevik massacres have already been going on for several years. There is unfortunately no sign that they are going to decrease.

I have said enough to show you the fundamental differences existing between the two revolutions. The few points of comparison that exist do so only in appearance. They are due to the fact that most of the Russian revolutionaries were wrapped up in the superficialities of the French Revolution.

Their one aim was to imitate, to copy it as much as they could. In spite of that, the two revolutions differ as much as night from day. Nearly all the men at the head of the French Revolution were men of great energy—patriotic, and disinterested; they boldly risked their lives in the struggle; most of them forfeited them.

The French Revolution endowed the country with a far better system of organization, and a far more equitable system of justice than had hitherto existed. It raised the standard of human dignity. The higher material and moral well-being that was its direct creation were immense. The whole of France, and one may truly say a great part of Europe, owes all to those reforms. It abolished all the old privileges, did away with serfdom and feudal rights, founding the liberty and dignity of the human being. It reorganized education, justice, the administering of public affairs, gave a great impulse to the education of the masses, introduced a new system of weights and measures which has been adopted by nearly every country in Europe; it instituted higher education.

That positive, constructive work of the Revolution was, as you can see, immense. When one recalls the conditions under which all those reforms were brought about, when one attempts to conjure up visions of the troubled times rife with political strife, in which the great men of the Revolutionary Assemblies did all that creative work, one cannot help being filled with admiration for their energy and their audacity.

Their virtues far outweighed their old vices.

The Russian Revolution, on the contrary, has produced nothing, it has destroyed everything.

It has not even developed the communist theories. For Lenin, after having

wildly proclaimed their inviolability, was forced to abandon them for the greater part.

Bolshevism has for many years laid waste the material, intellectual, and moral forces of Russia.

To draw the conclusion of this article, one could say that while the French Revolution was all the time directed and strongly kept in hand, the Russian Revolution was left without any direction whatever.

Now we must not forget that the leading class in Russia formed a very small minority, that they were, in some manner, lost in the immensity of that country. The geographical, ethical, historical conditions of Russia were so different from Germany, France, and England that it was very difficult, almost impossible, for the leaders to lead effectively such a big country.”³⁶⁵

Bolshevik atrocities made the Germans very leery of Jewish Communists—even of Jews in general, especially those calling for the world government foretold in Jewish Messianic prophecies—Jewish Messianic prophecies which called for the overthrow of Kings and Queens, Princes and Princesses; as well as for a world government run by Jews, and the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine”; and for the destruction of Gentile culture, Gentile religions, Gentile nations, and ultimately the extermination of the Gentiles, themselves—all this mass murder justified on the false premise that it was necessary to achieve an era of “peace” and a new world ruled by Jews. The persona of Albert Einstein epitomized these ancient racist and genocidal Jewish objectives and made him a focal point for the legitimate concerns Germans had for their survival, grave concerns that were proven correct by the rise of the Zionist Nazis who destroyed Germany at the behest of Jewish financiers, and the further partition and loss of sovereignty of Germany after the Second World War, when a large section of Germany and Eastern Europe were taken over by the Communists, while Western Zionists who led the Western governments permitted it to happen. Many Germans were disgusted by the Jews who had stabbed Germany in the back in the First World War.

The appeal of Einstein, Förster and Nicolai follows:

“A Manifesto to Europeans

Technical science and intercommunication are clearly tending to force us to recognize the fact that international relations exist, and consequently that a world-embracing civilization exists. Yet never has any previous war caused so complete an interruption of that coöperation which should exist between civilized nations. It may, of course, be that the reason why we are so profoundly impressed by this is only that we were already united by so many ties the severing of which is painful.

That such a state of things should exist must not astonish us. Nevertheless, those who care in the slightest degree for this universal world civilization are under a twofold obligation to strive for the maintenance of these principles. Those who might have been expected to care for such things, in particular men of science and art, have hitherto almost invariably

confined their utterances to a hint that the present suspension of direct relations coincided with the cessation of any desire for their continuance.

Such feelings are not to be excused by any national passions. They are unworthy of what every one has hitherto understood by civilization, and it would be a misfortune indeed were they generally to prevail among persons of culture; and not only a misfortune for civilization, but, we are firmly convinced, a misfortune for the very purpose for which, after all, in the last resort all the present hell was let loose—the national existence of the different countries.

Technical achievement has made the world smaller, and to-day the countries of that large peninsula Europe seem brought as near to one another as the cities of each individual small Mediterranean peninsula used to be; and Europe—it might almost be said the world—is already one and indivisible, owing to its multitudinous associations.

Hence it must be the duty of educated and philanthropic Europeans to make, at any rate, an effort lest Europe, owing to her not being sufficiently strongly welded together, should suffer the same tragic fate as ancient Greece. Is Europe gradually to be exhausted by fratricidal war and perish?

The war raging at present will scarcely end in a victory for any one, but probably only in defeat. Consequently, it would seem that educated men in all countries not only should, but absolutely must, exert all their influence to prevent the conditions of peace being the source of future wars, and this no matter what the present uncertain issue of the conflict may be. Above all must they direct their efforts to seeing that advantage is taken of the fact that this war has thrown all European conditions, as it were, into a melting-pot, to mold Europe into one organic whole, for which both technical and intellectual conditions are ripe.

This is not the place to discuss how this new European order is to be brought about. We desire only to assert in principle that we are firmly convinced of the time having come for all Europe to be united together, in order to protect her soil, her inhabitants, and her civilization.

Believing as we do that the desire for such a state of things is latent in many minds, we are anxious that it should everywhere find expression and thus become a force; and with this end in view it seems to us before all else necessary that there should be a union of all in any way attached to European civilization; that is to say, who are what Goethe once almost prophetically called ‘good Europeans.’ We must never abandon hope that their collective pronouncement may be heard by some one even amidst the clash of arms, most especially if the ‘good Europeans’ of to-morrow include all those who are esteemed and considered as authorities by their fellow-men.

To begin with, however, it is needful that Europeans should unite, and if, as we hope, there are enough Europeans in Europe,—in other words, enough persons to whom Europe is no mere geographical term, but something which they have profoundly at heart,—then we mean to attempt to found such a union of Europeans. We ourselves wish only to give the first impulse to such

a union; wherefore we ask you, should you be in agreement with us, and, like us, bent upon making the determination of Europe as widely known as possible, to send us your signature.”³⁶⁶

Adolphe Isaac Crémieux, friend to Rothschild and Marx, purportedly stated before the Alliance Israélite Universelle,

“A new Messianic empire, a new Jerusalem, must arise in place of the emperors and popes.”³⁶⁷

Talmudist Jews, like Karl Marx and the Rothschilds, had always borne a deep-seated hatred of Gentiles. Racist Zionists, like Albert Einstein, also hated Gentiles and wished them dead. Outspoken Zionist Dr. Josef Samuel Bloch was famous for answering August Rohling’s criticisms of the Talmud and of anti-Christian rabbinical Talmudic culture.³⁶⁸ The Talmud and Cabalist literature have been censored to conceal anti-Christian and anti-Gentile passages.³⁶⁹ Therefore, when discussing Talmudic passages, one must at times make use of very old and difficult to obtain sources and rely upon secondary Christian sources who were highly knowledgeable, such as Martin Luther and Johannes Buxtorf.

Like Einstein, Bloch later advocated a Continental European union. The Socialist Eduard Bernstein wrote of Bloch,

“With regard to the circle around the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, one must first speak of the periodical’s editor, Dr. Josef Bloch. He is an exceptionally gifted East Prussian of Jewish origin. He is so Prussian-minded that at times he may be mistaken for a German nationalist. Before the war, he favored the defense and colonial policies of the German empire. To him, England was the power which German foreign policy must strive to conquer. During the war he was one of the most enthusiastic defenders of the war credits; today he is the guiding spirit among the socialist proponents of the so-called continental policy, that is, a policy which would tie together Germany, Russia, and France against England and, if necessary, also against the United States. This is not as a result of dislike of the English but because he believes that such a policy is necessary in the interest of Germany’s world mission. As a Socialist he is a revisionist and as a Jew he is close to the Zionists.”³⁷⁰

Though *The Manifesto to the Civilized World* managed to attract 93 signatories, *A Manifesto to Europeans* attracted only one other signatory, Otto Buek. Though Nicolai³⁷¹ spoke out against racism and nationalism in the common language of pacifists of the day, Einstein mixed his pacifistic rhetoric with contradictory racist and nationalistic Zionist rhetoric reminiscent of the Talmud. It is odd that Einstein contradicted his Socialistic and Pacifistic leanings with racist Zionist nationalism; and it is unusual that Einstein took such a strong public stance in support of Jews in the East, while most Western Jews—and he was a Western Jew—wanted to assimilate and distance themselves from segregationist Eastern Jews. Einstein was

an incestuous sexual deviant like many of the Frankist Jews of the East. Einstein's fame came soon after he became a public spokesman for Eastern Jewish Zionism, which was not a coincidence.

4.4.1 Einstein Desires a "Race" War Which Will Exterminate the European Esau

The proposed union of Europe was perhaps intended by Jews like Nicolai and Einstein to consume itself in a struggle against a united Asia. Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany, while promoting Jews and England. Einstein had consistently betrayed Germany before, during and after the war. For example, Albert Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

"[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun 'bandits.'"³⁷²

At the time Einstein made this statement, he likely knew that Bolshevik mass murderers were recruiting large numbers of Chinese.³⁷³ Jews were commonly referred to as Asiatics or Orientals (as opposed to Europeans) at that time, and the context of Einstein's statement was his hope that a Jewish state was about to be formed in Palestine. Einstein differentiates Jews from the Europeans he, like many other Jews, would exterminate.

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, 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 alchemists, 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.”

Einstein’s statements attain their full genocidal context in the writings of his friend and political cohort, the crypto-Jew Georg Friedrich Nicolai (Lewinstein), who, together with Einstein called for the “European race” to unite in their *Manifesto to Europeans*—perhaps in Nicolai’s mind to fight a preemptive race war of extermination against the “superior race” of Mongols—perhaps in Einstein’s mind for the “Mongoloid race” to exterminate the “horrid Europeans”—the “Esau” of Rome.

Nicolai saw Jews as members of the “European race”, or he at least pretended to see them as such in his efforts to draw the Europeans into a “race” war with the Asians. Einstein saw Jews as racially distinct from Europeans. Nicolai (Lewinstein) wrote in 1917,

“§ 34.—*What a War of Extermination Means*

Thus to-day the original conception of war is distorted until it has become completely reversed, simply because there is no longer anything natural about war; it is now merely a romantic reminiscence. Now, it might be, and has been said, that the benefits of war come afterward. It might be thought, however, that any one thus contemplating the remote effects of war ought seriously to reflect upon its inevitable results. That is, he ought to think out his ideas to their logical conclusions, which seems easy, but is often very difficult.

The idea of war as a factor likely to favor the selection of the fittest, and thus promote human evolution, is simple enough. War is here looked upon as representing that relentless, or rather that disinterested, justice which

allows the fit to survive and destroys the unfit. Those who consider this right should act accordingly, and proceed to draw up rules accordingly. They ought to adopt the usages of war of which we read in ancient history, rules by which old men were killed and also unborn children, but not the seemingly humane (!) rules of modern times—rules which make war a farce in the sense in which a natural scientist uses the word; that is to say, cause it to promote negative selection, and thus convert it into a means of deterioration.

The gulf which apparently separates the selfish human being of to-day from the humane promoter of civilization is merely apparent; and here I would recall what I have already said about struggle between animals and struggle between man and man. Both are justifiable in themselves and both *can* be carried on logically. Difficulties do not arise until we begin to imagine that it is allowable to carry on an animal struggle against human beings and by human methods. This is senseless, and therefore criminal; for war as waged at present can be considered only a justifiable form of struggle for existence if the nations against whom we are waging war are not looked upon as human beings, at any rate not as human beings on a level with ourselves; that is, if it is desired to carry on a war of extermination against barbarians so as to enable true humanity to find room upon and spread over the earth. No European will feel that he is justified in considering another European as a barbarian. The utmost which might be asked is whether we are not entitled to consider ourselves a superior race in comparison with certain undeveloped races, such as the Andamans or Tierra del Fuegians. What will undoubtedly occur is that these people will gradually be exterminated by the white race, though it has long been clear that it would be extremely foolish to make war upon them. They die out of themselves wherever they come in contact with whites, bloodless warfare being always more effectual than bloody.

There is only *one* race for which this question of racial superiority might be profoundly important—the Mongolian. I do not know who are the superior, the Mongolians or we ourselves, but I can quite understand our looking on the Mongolian race as enemies, and that, for instance, Europeans on the highest plane would not easily be induced to have a child by a Mongolian woman, at any rate not to own it. I can therefore also fully understand that we or the Mongolians might say, ‘Only one of us two races can rule over the world, and we want that race to be ours.’

In this case the biologically *weaker* race—that is, the one which may rest assured that in ordinary course it would fall a victim to natural selection—might *perhaps* be justified in saying, ‘As there is no chance of our getting the upper hand by natural and lawful means, we will try to take by force what nature withholds from us.’ This shows very plainly that for the really strong war is superfluous; and as obviously it is generally folly for the weak, it is self-evident that, save in the rarest instances, there can be no possible object whatever in it.

Now, it is possible that one such rare instance may be afforded by the

Mongolians, for, unlike all the other colored races, they seem to be in certain respects fitter than Europeans, although it is impossible to know exactly how they will be affected when once they are drawn into the vortex of modern civilization. Meantime, however, the sons of Heaven have the enormous advantage of being able to work equally well under all heavens, whether in the icy wastes of the tundras or under the burning sun of Sumatra. Apparently this is a special Mongolian peculiarity, for even primitive Teutonic peoples simply melted away under the Southern sun to which their impulse led them, and negro races get consumption if transferred to colder climates.

If all this is really the case, then the greater part of the habitable world belongs to the Mongols, and likewise the overlordship thereof; for it seems out of the question, seeing how much going to and fro there already is and how much more there is certain to be in the near future, that two races should live side by side and yet apart. They will mix, and one will prevail over the other.

But perhaps even the most humane of us all would not desire this, and therefore I can imagine our pointing with pardonable pride to our civilization, and saying that we are ready to take up arms in defense of it. You Mongols may be better than we are, we would say, but you are different. We do not want to know anything about your civilization, even supposing it to be superior; we mean to keep our own. From this point of view I can imagine a war, but then it must be really a relentless, merciless war.

There are now in the world five hundred millions of us Europeans or white men originally from Europe, and a thousand millions of various colored races. I believe we have even now the technical means at our disposal for exterminating these thousand millions in the course of the next twenty years. After twenty years, however, we shall no longer be in a position to do this, as soon, that is, as China has armed her whole population, constructs her own dreadnoughts, and manufactures her own cannon and shells, as Japan is already doing.

In the ensuing twenty years, therefore, it is possible that the fate of the world will be decided once and for all, and the responsibility for this decision rests with the five hundred millions of Europeans. The Mongolians need do nothing but wait, for time and space are on their side.

At a time when the fate of so many men is hanging in the balance, Europeans may, perhaps must, be asked whether on careful consideration they mean to declare all colored races barbarians, and then begin a struggle for existence, in other, words a war of extermination, and not a ridiculous war for power, against everything non-European. When once so terrible a conception as that of such a war is grasped, then, if anything save senseless cruelty is to be the result, it also must be thought out to the end, and there would have to be a war *sans trêve et sans relâche*.

We must not spare even the child in its mother's womb, and must tolerate no bastards. Such a war would be ghastly, but there would be some object in it. It is useless to talk of the justice of a war, but in a sense this ghastliest of

wars is the justest because, at any rate, 'it serves its own particular purpose.'

To me it seems at least conceivable that some such war might succeed, although I certainly do not believe this. History, indeed, proves over and over that the despair of nations fighting for their lives gives rise to strength which enables them to triumph over all technical expedients. Here, again, any attempt to interfere with the justice of history by such brutal methods might only too easily hasten the downfall of Europe. European nations, as I think, would do better to concentrate all their economic, technical, and scientific resources on increasing their internal vital energy, that is, on promoting race hygiene in every respect, and thus endeavor to become the equals and even the superiors of the Mongols.

This opens up vistas of victories not purchased with blood—victories which I am profoundly convinced are within the bounds of possibility. This inextinguishable hope is due to my proud European racial instinct. I will not, and I refuse to, admit that the Mongols have in the long run greater vitality than I. I trust that the majority of Europeans think as I do, and that never shall we show the Asiatics such a sign of weakness as to draw the sword against them. Even if the European nations were faint-hearted, even if they were doubtful of ultimate peaceful victory, and if nothing seemed to stand in the way of their extermination by force, even, then I would shrink from resort to force, and I am convinced that the majority of mankind agree with me.

Every one, however, must compound with his own conscience, and should any one be anxious to proceed to victory by way of force, I will go a step further to please him. I feel that all Europeans belong to the same race, and I am proud of this. But others certainly feel this less keenly than I do, and they let their wholesome race instinct run to waste in all manner of fantastic and useless notions, such as the supposed existence of a Teutonic race.[*Footnote: Cf. §§ 90-105, about race patriotism.*]

But there are those who believe in the Teutons, Germans, or Prussians having a right to predominate. I shall not here discuss the justification for such ideas, but those who would fain lead such small aggregates of human beings to victory must at any rate ask themselves whether they are *able* and, if able, also *willing*, to fight out this fight in the only way in which it can answer its purpose.

As for Teutonism, the question is as follows: take the one hundred million Germans or, properly speaking, the twenty millions more or less pure Teutons living in various parts of Europe, most of whom will have nothing whatever to do with the conception of Teutonism. Do they believe that they *can* with any prospect of success embark upon a struggle against forces from fifteen to a hundred times more numerous, and do they really *mean* to destroy these? If they have made up their minds to this, then let them make the attempt, and they will be fighting for an idea, and for an object which is at least conceivable.

We are therefore faced with the following alternative: we must either resolve to live in peace with the French, Russians, English, and whatever all

their names may be, or we must wage a war of extermination upon them, a war whose purpose it is not to leave one of them alive.

Whoever, therefore, decides for war is, at any rate, no fool, and has logic on his side. Nevertheless, I hope and believe that even those who most delight in war will incline toward peace when once they realize what is the inevitable alternative. But this senseless playing at war which is now devastating Europe must be the last of its kind.”³⁷⁴

The Bolsheviks in Russia had a strong and growing Chinese contingent very early on in the movement. These Chinese Bolsheviks brutally slaughtered Slavic Christians. Jewish leadership had long since scheduled China to become a Communist nation. Zionist Jews sought to establish a “Jewish State” in the far Eastern regions of the Soviet Union, the Jewish Autonomous Oblast in Khabarovsk Krai in the districts of Birobidzhansky, Leninsky, Obluchensky, Oktyabrsky and Smidovichsky.³⁷⁵ This plan failed, in part, due to the interference of some Zionist Socialists, who insisted that Palestine was the Jews’ national home. An even earlier attempt to found a Jewish State in Russia in the districts of Homel, Witebsk and Minsk,³⁷⁶ also failed, largely due to a lack of Jewish interest. The Zionists insisted that anti-Semitism alone could force the Jews to segregate. When the Zionists put Hitler in power, they had the needed impetus to force Jews to flee Europe and the Zionists attempted to steal Chinese territory for a “Jewish homeland” with the help of the Imperial Japanese under the “Fugu Plan”. Zionist Jews sought to establish a “Jewish State” in China, which had been taken over by the Imperial Japanese whom the Jews had been financing since the days when Jacob Schiff loaned them \$200,000,000.00 in the Russo-Japanese War. The Zionists used the Imperial Japanese to destroy the Chinese government in preparation for the formation of a Jewish nation in China under the “Fugu Plan” in Manchuria or Shanghai. The Jews even promoted the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* to the Japanese as evidence as to how powerful they were. The “Fugu Plan” failed to attract enough Jews, even under Nazi pressure, and die hard Zionists wanted Palestine. The Zionists then arranged for war between the United States and Japan. When America declared war on Japan, Hitler, seemingly inexplicably, declared war on the United States ensuring the ultimate defeat of Germany. Hitler also went to war with the Soviets, which gave him access to large numbers of Jews the Zionists could then segregate and ready for deportation to Palestine.

It is interesting to note that the famous pilot Charles A. Lindbergh warned that the Jews, the British, and the Roosevelt administration were planning a Pearl Harbor type event, in a speech Lindbergh delivered on 11 September 1941 in Des Moines, Iowa.³⁷⁷ Lindbergh was viciously smeared in the press, so viciously, that few dared to defend him. After the Pearl Harbor attack, any who might otherwise have said, “I told you so!” would have been branded a traitor and a Nazi. It is further interesting to note that Adolf Hitler declared war against America immediately after the United States declared war on Japan—this in the full knowledge that America’s entrance into the war had cost Germany victory in the First World War—then Hitler declared war on the Soviets, thereby ensuring the destruction of Germany. Zbigniew

Brzezinski wrote in his book *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Basic Books, New York, (1997), pp. 24-25,

“The attitude of the American public toward the external projection of American power has been much more ambivalent. The public supported America’s engagement in World War II largely because of the shock effect of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.”

Project for the New American Century published a report entitled *REBUILDING AMERICA’S DEFENSES: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century*, Project for the New American Century, Washington, D.C., (September, 2000); which states on page 51,

“Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.”³⁷⁸

There is evidence that Zionists of Einstein’s Era planned to use the Chinese and Japanese to destroy the Europeans, and as a slave populace to protect and provide for Israel, in conformity with Jewish Messianic myth. China is likely slated to become the new America for Zionist interests. Racist Jews have long considered themselves to be “Orientals” and have felt closer to Asia than to Europe.

Nicolai wrote his statement while in prison, much like Hitler would later write *Mein Kampf* while incarcerated. One has a right to ask if agents provocateur like Nicolai were behind Hitler, or if Hitler himself was merely another Nicolai forwarding the interests of genocidal Judaism and racist Zionism. Nicolai (Lewinstein) further indulged in Jewish self-glorification when he wrote, ironically criticizing anti-Semitism, and under the false assumption that Jews were “racially” pure,

“Europe, at all events, is an absolute national medley, and any one who does not consider the Jews the flower of the human race should not make such foolish assertions as that concerning the superiority of unmixed races.”³⁷⁹

Nicolai’s venture into genocidal fantasies was not an anomaly among politically minded persons in the West. Theodore Roosevelt was a racist who worried that the Occidental American “race” was menaced by the superior Oriental “race”. Roosevelt, like Nicolai, wrote, in the context of the disappearance of “races”, that “The military supremacy of the whites”³⁸⁰ could by no means be taken for granted and that Asians must be prevented from emigrating to America and Australia. Roosevelt and many others were concerned by the growing industrial might of the Japanese and dreaded the day when the Chinese might likewise grow their military strength. Zionist Napoleon Bonaparte is said to have called China a “sleeping giant”.

The infamous Hungarian Jew Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Ignatius Trebitsch-Lincoln, a. k. a. Chao Kung; who was a Methodist preacher, a pretend spy, a real spy, a Tory

member of the British Parliament, one of the early financiers of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party, and a very early political activist for the German right wing who argued that genetic mutation had rendered him an Aryan; became a Buddhist monk who claimed to be the Dalai Lama and the Tashi Lama in 1937 and worked with the Imperial Japanese to subjugate the Chinese and create a Jewish Nation near Shanghai—where the Nazis’ allies, the Imperial Japanese, had brutalized the Chinese, though the 20,000 Jewish colonizers³⁸¹ remained in comfort.³⁸²

Like the Frankist Jews, Schopenhauer, Wagner, and Rudolf Glandeck Freiherr von Sebottendorf (b. Adam Alfred Rudolf Glauer), Trebitsch-Lincoln preached Metempsychosis.³⁸³ The Lurian Cabalah of Isaac Ben Solomon Luria taught Metempsychosis,³⁸⁴ and it was the spiritual guide which influenced the Jewish Messianic movement of Shabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank. The Lurian Cabalah provided the dogma for the Frankists’ belief that the Messiahship would pass from one Jewish king to another Jewish king, either as a dynasty, or through Metempsychosis from one person to another person not genetically related to the previous “Messiah”.

This belief system has survived among the Lubavitchers, who today proclaim the advent of the Jewish Messiah. Luria was born of an Ashkenazi father and a Sephardic mother. Some believe that the Lurian Cabalah is expressive of the mysticism of the Hasidic Ashkenazi and forms the basis of much of modern Hasidism, who represent the descendants of the Shabbataians and the Frankists. Others dispute these assertions. It is important to note the differences between the various Jewish conceptions of the Messiah[s], and the Christian story of a loving Jesus. According to the Old Testament and various Cabalistic writings, the Jewish Messiah will ruin the nations and exterminate the Gentiles. The Cabalist Jews hold sacred another rabidly anti-Gentile, anti-Christian, and anti-Moslem racist religious tract, the Cabalist *Zohar*.

Lubavitch Hasidim continue a tradition of Frankist Jewish Dualism, which sees evil as good, and which practices evil as if it were observance to God and a means of summoning forth the Messiah. Many suspect that the Lubavitchers, who are very well-connected in politics and in the media and who have pronounced that the Messiah is among us, plan to rule the world and fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy.

Frankist Jews intentionally caused the persecution of Rabbinical Jews by calling the attention of Catholics to the horrifically anti-Christian and anti-Gentile teachings of the Talmud. The Frankists delighted in the deaths and sufferings of Jews, because they believed it would bring on the Messianic Era; and because it provided them with a means to worm their way into Gentile government and the Church so as to subvert them as crypto-Jews. *The North American Review* wrote as early as 1845,

“The common expectation of a Messiah has given a wide scope for enthusiasm and fanaticism. About the year 1666, when the whole nation were looking for some remarkable event, there appeared in the East one of the most notable of the many, who, in different ages, have claimed to be Messiahs. Banished from Aleppo, his birth-place, and subsequently from Salonichi, this man, Zabathai Tzevi, travelled much, and then took up his

residence at Smyrna. Great multitudes followed him; and when, to save his life, he professed the Mohammedan faith, though without renouncing his pretensions to the Messiahship, many imitated his example. His followers, denominated Zabathaites, are still found at Salonichi, outwardly professing Islamism, but Jews at heart, —a separate community, all living in the same quarter of the city, and mingling with the Turks only at the mosques and in business. He had many adherents in Poland, Holland, England, and other parts of Europe, some of whose descendants are said still to revere his memory; and would, perhaps, agree with a class of Jews, which the chief rabbi of Cairo told Dr. Wolff was numerous, and who, without being avowed followers of Tzevi, declare, when embarrassed by passages of Scripture which speak of a suffering Messiah, that they think Tzevi may have been he. Tzevi and some of his followers pretended to work miracles, and to have visions and prophetic raptures.

In 1750, a Polish Jew named Frank, or Frenk, formed a new congregation in Podolia, sometimes called that of the Zoharites, after the much earlier admirers of the celebrated mystical book Zohar; and these are improperly regarded by some persons as followers of Tzevi [Shabbatai Zevi]. These Frankists, as they are also denominated, were undoubtedly tainted with mysticism; but their chief distinction seems to have been the rejection of the Talmud, which brought upon them the persecuting hate of the Rabbinites. Their faith, indeed, approximated to Christianity, which many of them embraced. They were once numerous, and are still found in Hungary and Poland.

The sect called at the present day *Chasidim*, the *Holy*, or *Pious*, who are not to be confounded with a party bearing the same name in the time of the Maccabees, date from about the year 1760; when, at Miedzyvorz in the Ukraine, a rabbi named Israel, taking the surname of Baalshem, 'possessor of the name of God,' by means of outward sanctity, and the pretended power of exorcism and working miracles, gained great multitudes of adherents. He obtained ten thousand followers within ten years, and before his death, which took place five years afterwards, forty thousand. The doctrines of the Chasidim are said to be of most pernicious tendency, promising the faithful absolution from the vilest enormities, and supernatural protection from the hostility of all earthly powers; and the sect has been reproached for every species of immorality and crime. Probably, however, these accounts are exaggerated; and the Chasidim have doubtless improved since the age of their founder. Though they receive the traditions, they are at enmity with all other Jews; and are especially bigoted in their hatred of Christianity. Their number seems to have been increasing ever since Baalshem's day, and now to be very large. Dr. Jost, a Jew opposed to them, declares, nevertheless, that their religion is at present that of nine tenths of all the Jews in Galicia, South Hungary, Wallachia, and West and South Russia; and of great numbers in Bohemia, Moravia, Moldavia, and Poland. Their worship is marked by many extravagances; they have been called 'Jewish Jumpers.' Working themselves

into ecstasies, they laugh hysterically, clap their hands, and leap with frantic zeal about the synagogue, turning their faces and raising their clenched fists towards heaven, as if daring the Almighty to refuse their requests.

Rabbinism is the Catholic faith, from which all these sects are, in modern phrase, dissenters. It is the lineal descendant of Pharisaism, and distinguished by its blind adherence to the Talmud. The estimation in which strict Rabbinites hold this book is unbounded. 'He that has learned the Scripture, and not the Mishna,' says the Gemara, 'is a blockhead.' Isaac, a distinguished rabbi, says, 'Do not imagine that the written law is the foundation of our religion, which is really founded on the oral law.' The Rabbinical doctrine is, 'The Bible is like water, the Mishna like wine, and the Gemara like spiced wine.' Some even say, that 'to study the Bible is but a waste of time.' For strict Rabbinism, a melancholy compound of superstition and fanaticism, we must look to Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Palestine, of which we speak, in describing the system. In those countries, the Rabbinites, or Talmudists, discountenance as profane all other study than that of the Bible and Talmud, but are very careful to educate their sons in their religious lore."³⁸⁵

In 1933, Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Trebitsch-Lincoln, tried to spread Buddhism in Europe. In 1939, he made a Frankist appeal to the combatant governments to disband under the threat that he would otherwise unleash "Tibetan Buddhist Supreme Masters" who would destroy them—which harkens back to the Theosophic myths surrounding the Messianic Cabalist Comte de Saint Germain and the "White Lodge of the Himalayas" and the "lost secrets of Atlantis".³⁸⁶ When Trebitsch-Lincoln died, Nazi Party ideologist, and Editor-in-Chief, Alfred Rosenberg published an obituary to honor Pinkeles, a Jew, on the front page of the official Nazi Party organ the *Völkische Beobachter*. Pinkeles, a Hungarian Zionist Jew, had given Adolf Hitler the money to buy the newspaper *Völkische Beobachter*. Trebitsch-Lincoln was remembered in a somewhat different fashion by *The New York Times* on 9 October 1943 on page 13. Trebitsch-Lincoln asserted that Jews are Orientals, which he apparently considered a superior "race" to Europeans. While a member of the British Parliament, he responded on 13 June 1910 to the assertion that the allegedly superior white "race" must subjugate the allegedly inferior "races",

"I submit that if the white man cannot rule races which we call inferior races save by resort to arms, then his prestige is already gone. I speak, I confess, as an Oriental myself. I have Oriental blood in my veins, and I cannot but laugh at the doctrine of hon. Members opposite that Orientals must receive treatment in some way different from that given to other peoples. May I be permitted to point out that one of the greatest men who ever lived, Jesus Christ, was an Oriental, and did He differentiate His treatment when dealing with Orientals?"³⁸⁷

The Nazis launched a major effort to turn the Indians of India against the British, which they directed through Tibet, in which effort Trebitsch-Lincoln sought to lend

his influence among Buddhists and the Imperial Japanese.

The British obstructed the Nazis' efforts to send Jews to Palestine. Moses Pinkeles sought to remove British influence from Asia and supplant it with Nazi and Imperial Japanese influence.³⁸⁸ He no doubt wanted to forward the "Fugu Plan" for a Jewish State in Manchuria or Shanghai.

It is interesting to note that Communist China is the largest nation on Earth, in terms of population, but is rarely in the news in the United States. Israel, with its vastly smaller population, dominates the news, though the Palestinian viewpoint is largely ignored. Very little effort is made by United States politicians and by the American press to reform China and free its two billion citizens from tyranny, and enormous sums of money are given to Israel to help the Jews to oppress the Palestinians. Neo-Conservatives and Israeli spies have been accused of providing the Red Chinese with top secret American military secrets and materials. As China's financial power increases, it will come to play a major rôle, if not the dominant rôle, in world politics.

4.4.2 Genocidal Judaism—Pruning the Branches of the Human Family Tree

There are many Jewish traditions of human sacrifice and of the genocide of their own people, as well as of their enemies. A Jew named Saul carried these traditions over into Christianity (*Romans* 11). Jewish mythology begins with Baal worship, a Canaanite religion in which fathers burn their own firstborn children as a sacrifice to God.

The Jewish mythology of Abraham states that Abraham believed in and feared God. As a reward, God made a covenant with Abraham and gave the land that was to become Israel to the seed of Abraham. *Genesis* 15:18-21 states (*see also: Deuteronomy* 11:24-28, and *Joshua* 1:3-4. These passages—which promise the Jews an enormous domain—in some minds the entire world—are troubling because the Kahanists are pursuing these lands³⁸⁹ and the Neo-Conservative Zionists in America are assisting Israel to obtain hegemony over the Middle East):

“18 In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt [the Nile] unto the great river, the river Euphrates: 19 The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, 20 And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, 21 And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.”

Genesis 17:8 states:

“8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.”

Ari Shavit wrote in his article, “White Man’s Burden”, in the Israeli news source

Haaretz,

“The war in Iraq was conceived by 25 neoconservative intellectuals, most of them Jewish, who are pushing President Bush to change the course of history.”³⁹⁰

In an article entitled, “Top White House Posts Go to Jews” published in *The Jerusalem Post* on 25 April 2006, Nathan Guttman named some of the Jews in the Clinton and Bush Administrations and in the State Department: Joshua Bolten, Joel Kaplan, Michael Chertoff, Elliott Abrams, Jay Lefkowitz, Paul Wolfowitz, Doug Feith, Lewis “Scooter” Libby, Ken Mehlman, Robert Reich, Robert Rubin, Sandy Berger, Lawrence Summers, Madeline Albright, Dennis Ross, Martin Indyk, and Aaron Miller. Guttman wrote,

“One tradition likely to go on is the reading of the Purim megilla led by Chabad Rabbi Levi Shemtov, which attracts many of the Jewish staffers.”³⁹¹

In addition to the United States Government, the American news media are in predominantly Zionist hands. Against the best interests of the American People, the United States has literally fought for Israel to obtain its goal of hegemony in the Middle East, and a Greater Israel whose borders will extend from the Nile to the Euphrates. Many American lives have been sacrificed to Israel.

In one of the early instances of human sacrifice in the history of the Hebrews, God asked Abraham to make a burnt offering of his only and beloved son Isaac to God as a human sacrifice (*Genesis* 22:2). This story reveals that Judaism is an outgrowth of Canaanite Baal worship. Baal worship required parents to sacrifice their firstborn children by burning them to ashes, by “passing them through the flame”. Note that the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth was another of countless human sacrifices in the Jewish tradition, in which Baal or God sacrifices His own firstborn child Jesus, as Jews so often did in the Old Testament.³⁹² Since Abraham was willing to murder his child by burning him as a sacrifice to God, an obvious instance of Baal worship, God spared Isaac and blessed Abraham by multiplying his seed (*Genesis* 22). Abraham’s son Isaac came to fear God and so inherited the blessing.

An alternative explanation is that the entire story is a Jewish fabrication of self-aggrandizement meant to justify the theft of the land of other peoples. It might be that someone in the history of the Canaanites was so traumatized by the action of burning his only and beloved son alive, that he hallucinated God, or invented a story to excuse himself from sacrilege and so founded a new form of the worship of Baal, which became Judaism. Yet another alternative explanation, and this is perhaps the most plausible explanation, is that the Judeans fabricated the story in order to hide their Baal worshipping practice of human sacrifice from, among others, the Greeks and Egyptians, who often criticized them for it; and took the opportunity to give themselves their neighbor’s land.

In point of fact, in the story Abraham’s firstborn child was not Isaac, but Ishmael.

Abraham's wife was named Sarah. She was also Abraham's sister and perhaps prostituted herself, as was customary among Hebrew Baal worshipers, and slept with the Pharaoh (*Genesis* 12:10-20), and with Abimelech, who was perhaps the true father of Isaac in the earliest traditions which preceded the Torah (*Genesis* 20; 21:22-34). Mary, mother of Jesus of Nazareth, was also said by the Jews to have been a prostitute and the mother of the son of the new covenant. Jesus was said by the Jews to have been the bastard child of a whore, whose reputation was improved by the legend of royal descent through his father Joseph, though it was contradictorily claimed that he was the son of God through virgin birth to Mary (*Matthew* 1. *Luke* 3:23-38). The stories of Abraham and Jesus were conceived in comparatively close timing to one another, despite the dates claimed for them, and they were fabricated under similar circumstances and towards the same ends (*Matthew* 1:21-23).

One should note that the Jews of the First Century and before had a myth which exists to this day, that there would be two Messiahs, one descended from David, (II *Samuel* 7; 22:44-51; 23:1-5. *Isaiah* 9:6-7. *Jeremiah* 23:5; 33:15, 17. *Ezekiel* 37:24-25); and another from Joseph (through the tribe of Ephraim: *Exodus* 40. *Isaiah* 53). Perhaps this explains why two different lineages emerged, perhaps not. It should be noted that King David is a fictional character, and that the ten northern tribes of Israel and the Temple of Solomon probably never existed. Even those who believe in the existence of King David as a matter of faith, may wish to consider that his descendants can not be traced, as the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* states in its article "Messiah",

"The Davidic origin of the kingly Messiah was supposed; but, as it seems, the Messianic pretender had to prove his authenticity by his deeds—in the period of the Second Temple Davidic descendants were not traceable."³⁹³

Since Sarah was barren, Abraham slept with Sarah's maidservant Hagar, an Egyptian, who bore him Ishmael (*Genesis* 16) who grew into a "wild man" at perpetual war with other men. Examining the story from the perspective of Baal worshiping Hebrews, Baal required the Hebrews to sacrifice the firstborn child of each family to God.

Why should we consider the Jews to have been Baal worshipers? The book of *Ezekiel* and other places in the Old Testament make clear that the practices of Baal worship of cutting one's self with a knife to the point of covering one's self with one's own blood, of prostitution in the Temple in celebration of fertility, of homosexuality in the Temple as an expression of devotion to the male fertility god, of immolating one's firstborn child by incineration, were all widely practiced by the Jews for very long periods of time. Abraham's father, Terah, worshiped idols (*Joshua* 24:2). Abraham violated the law that he must burn his firstborn child, Ishmael. Perhaps he did so at the insistence of Ishmael's Egyptian mother, Hagar. More likely is the alternative explanation that "Hagar" (like "Moses") is a symbol of the Egyptian proselytizers who converted the Judeans to Egyptian monotheism—the two religions intertwining in a new genocidal form of *Baal* worship called Judaism, which had to reconcile its past history and recent present of

human sacrifice with the need to improve its image in the then-modern ancient world, where such barbarities were frowned upon.

The Biblical myth of the sacrificial mass murder of the firstborn of Egypt, for the sake of Zionism, probably relates to a lost traditional myth of the human sacrifice of the firstborn of the Egyptian Hagar and Abraham. Their firstborn son was Ishmael. There may well have been a tradition which claimed that he was sacrificed for the sake of Zionism, and that Abraham and Sarah's son Isaac became heir to the covenant, and had twin sons Esau and Jacob. These mythological characters were symbols of entire peoples—peoples meant for world domination (Jacob=Jews) and peoples destined for extermination (Esau=Gentiles). The Jews pruned off entire "races" from the human family in their religious and political mythologies, often cutting off some of their own blood lines. Ishmael is to this day made a human sacrifice made for the sake of Zionism. Zionist Jews today ascribe "Esau" to the Iranians, Iraqis, Palestinians, Syrians, Lebanese, etc. And "Esau", the Christian United States and Great Britain, are the sword and the servant of Jacob, the Zionist State, the sword and the servant who slays "Esau" and "Ishmael" the Moslems (*Genesis* 25:23; 27:38-41). The reader is advised that these inconsistencies are due to the mythologies of opportunistic Jewish racists, not your humble author. At any rate, it seems clear that the story of the murder of the firstborn of Egypt is the story of a Canaanite sacrifice to Baal made as an offering for the land of Greater Israel.

Perhaps, to a Baal worshiper, Ishmael, the son of Abraham and Hagar, should have been sacrificed to God through the fire; and Hagar, an Egyptian, intervened and would not let her child Ishmael be sacrificed to Baal. It was Ishmael, not Isaac, who was the eldest son of Abraham and he, not Isaac, should have inherited the Covenant with God. It is likely that the Egyptian Hagar would have her son Ishmael circumcised, given that circumcision was an Egyptian custom, and the Covenant was given to the circumcised, Abraham and Ishmael (*Genesis* 17—indeed, the prophet Mohammed taught that the Covenant was with Abraham and Ishmael, not Isaac), but because Ishmael should have been sacrificed to God, rights to the Covenant instead passed to a prophesied second child, Isaac born of Sarah; and, apparently, Abimelech, King of Gerar. Ishmael is demonized as a wild man of a foreign inferior race, so as to justify the unjustifiable wrongs done to him by the descendants of the Jews. In the mythology the Judeans composed to glorify themselves, Isaac inherits Abraham's blessings and the Judeans eventually steal the lands of Abimelech.

As Thomas Jefferson admonished us to do, we should eliminate the supernatural superstition in the Bible. A clearer picture of the story emerges if we eliminate the myth of the Covenant with God for the land of Canaan, and substitute the more realistic picture presented in the story of the covenant between Abraham and King Abimelech. *Genesis* 21:22-33 states:

"22 And it came to pass at that time, that Abimelech and Phichol the chief captain of his host spake unto Abraham, saying, God *is* with thee in all that thou doest: 23 Now therefore swear unto me here by God that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, nor with my son, nor with my son's son: *but* according to the kindness that I have done unto thee, thou shalt do unto me, and to the

land wherein thou hast sojourned. 24 And Abraham said, I will swear. 25 And Abraham reproved Abimelech because of a well of water, which Abimelech's servants had violently taken away. 26 And Abimelech said, I wot not who hath done this thing: neither didst thou tell me, neither yet heard I of *it*, but to day. 27 And Abraham took sheep and oxen, and gave them unto Abimelech; and both of them made a covenant. 28 And Abraham set seven ewe lambs of the flock by themselves. 29 And Abimelech said unto Abraham, What *mean* these seven ewe lambs which thou hast set by themselves? 30 And he said, For these *seven* ewe lambs shalt thou take of my hand, that they may be a witness unto me, that I have digged this well. 31 Wherefore he called that place Beer-sheba; because there they sware both of them. 32 Thus they made a covenant at Beer-sheba: then Abimelech rose up, and Phichol the chief captain of his host, and they returned into the land of the Philistines. 33 And *Abraham* planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the everlasting God."

Your author proposes that, given the many identities, we should assume that the stories of: Sarah and the Pharaoh, Sarah and Abimelech, Sarah and Og, Rebekah and Abimelech; are all the same story told in various traditions. Also assume that the stories of: Adam and Eve; Abraham, Abimelech, Hagar and Sarah; Isaac, Abimelech and Rebekah; and perhaps even Aaron and Moses; are all the same story told in various traditions—quite likely Egyptian traditions stemming from the life of Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaton IV, who pioneered Egyptian monotheism. Still further assume that: Cain and Abel, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Aaron and Moses; are the same story told in different traditions. All of these fabricated and racist stories are awkwardly threaded together in the Bible, as if different stories, and are linked together by a fabricated genealogy which places Israel at perpetual war with other peoples, so as to explain away the fact that the same story is told over and over again with different characters.

A predominant racist element repeated again and again in the Old Testament is the story that a leader's family is led into corruption by a foreign wife or servant; and, conversely, that Jewish woman are sent to corrupt foreign leaders—a practice practiced and lauded by prominent Jews, such as Josephus, who wrote of the alleged corruption of Nero by his Jewish wife Poppæa.³⁹⁴ We know that the more modern Frankist Jews, among many other Jews, carried on this tradition, whether the ancient stories are in fact true, or not. Stalin feared that the Jewish wives of members of the government were seeking to undermine his authority, or so he claimed, and Stalin proscribed intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles,³⁹⁵ though he himself loved Jewish women.³⁹⁶ These proscriptions against intermarriage had the benefit of helping to preserve the Jewish religion and the Jewish race, in the minds of Jewish bigots (*Exodus* 34:16. *Deuteronomy* 7:2-3. *Ezra* 9. *Nehemiah* 9:2; 13:3, 23-30). The Jewish faith is traditionally passed down through the mother, which ensures that the blood of the child is at least half the blood of the tribe, because a woman may sleep with many men but carries her own eggs.

The covenant for land for the Jews in Judah is then strictly a deal struck between

Abimelech and Abraham, not God and Abraham, and was made to give Abimelech's offspring through Sarah a kingdom and secure peace, not to create a Holy contract that must be obeyed forever by all the world. The supposed "tribes" were ruled by the descendants of Abimelech and his wives, including Sarah, Abraham's sister—not by the descendants of Abraham. Abraham is merely the guardian of Abimelech and Sarah's child, Isaac/Jacob; and Abraham promotes him over his own son, Ishmael/Esau—in effect sacrifices his firstborn Ishmael/Esau, whose seed (all Gentiles) then becomes a perpetual human sacrifice to God for the sake of Jacob (all Jews), in fulfilment of the Canaanites'/Jews' worship of Baal. Note that Ishmael is said to sire twelve Princes and to be the father of a great nation (*Genesis* 17:20). Note further that the union of Sarah and Pharaoh is said to have caused plagues on Egypt—which is quite similar to the stories of Aaron, Moses and the Pharaoh (*Genesis* 12:17).

The same story transfers to Moses and Aaron, where Moses and Aaron must convince those Egyptians who would follow them to give up their bondage to the worship of Pharaoh and adopt the worship of Baal—historically perhaps a group of Egyptian lepers oppressed by the Hyksos—perhaps even ostracized Hyksos lepers, who migrated to Judah and taught the Judeans Egyptian monotheism. Moses and Aaron bring plagues on the Egyptians, which is perhaps symbolic of the diseases the Hyksos brought to Egypt. In an act of Baal worship, Moses sacrifices the firstborn of the Egyptians among his people, and so hopes to transfer the loyalty of the Egyptians from Pharaoh and the Sun, to Baal, and the loyalty of Baal to the Egyptian converts. Moses and Aaron eventually succeed and the people worship Baal, though, perhaps, Moses then seeks to convert them to an Egyptian sect of Monotheism and Eleatic Monism—which is the same story as the inexplicable break in religion between Terah and his son Abraham.

Jewish authors may have added this break from pure Baalism while under the influence of the Greeks, or an Egyptian sect in Alexandria. There might well have been a sect that sought to convert Jews from Baalism which incorporated other gods, to a strict Baalism that worshiped only jealous Baal; and so fabricated the stories and legends of Monotheism from Eleatic Monism, and Egyptian and Socratic Monotheism. The sect of Dualist Judaism took from Heraclitean and Platonic dialectics to invent Christianity, which was probably intended as a stumbling block for the Romans and means to preserve the Jewish Nation.

Had Gnostic Christianity succeeded, it would have exterminated the Romans. Epiphanius wrote of the Gnostics,

“For all the sects have gathered their imposture from Greek mythology, and altered it for themselves by revising it for another and worse purpose.”³⁹⁷

There are also elements of Hindu Metempsychosis in Dualist Judaism, especially as it reached the Frankists *viz.* the Lurian Cabala. The Jews were exposed to Metempsychosis through Origen, Pathagoras, and many ancient Greek philosophers; then through the Schoolmen. The Cabala adopts many of the beliefs of the Stoics and Eleatics, such as the Eleatic notions of pantheism and space-time—the belief that all

space and all time is one, that everything *is*, and God is *all*. This found its way into the Old Testament, which was fabricated and modified in the era of the Eleatics and of Heraclitus, then further modified by the Alexandrian Jews in the *Septuagint* and by Philo, who heavily Hellenized Judaism and set the stage for the early Christian apologists, who were in many instances Jewish apologists and Jewish nationalists—as was Philo of Alexandria. Ultimately, these beliefs are Hindu in origin and many Jewish Cabalists have succeeded in infusing them into modern Physics. The modern notions of the “big bang”, space-time, pantheism, etc. were passed down to Giordano Bruno, Isaac Newton, etc. by Cabalist Jews, who adopted the ideas of the Hindus via the Eleatics, Heraclitus, Plato, Aristotle, Origen of Alexandria, the Schoolmen, etc.

An important aspect of the Abraham myth, which weeds off certain races (the Old Testament is filled with mythologies whereby individuals symbolize entire peoples), is the declaration that God would shield Abraham (*Genesis* 15:1). Jews promoted the myth that God would annihilate anyone who challenged Israel. Jews celebrated the genocide of the Egyptian army in *Exodus* 14:15-15:1. *Deuteronomy* 11:24-28 states,

“24 Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be. 25 There shall no man be able to stand before you: *for* 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 said unto you. 26 Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; 27 A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you this day: 28 And a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known.”

As a threat against the nations, Jews sought to promote the myth of their invincibility and tried desperately to preserve the Gentiles’ “fear of the inaccessibility of Israel”. Frederick the Great is reputed to have stated, “to oppress the Jews never brought prosperity to any Government”.³⁹⁸ In 1906, Herbert N. Casson tried to intimidate Americans into welcoming the massive influx of Eastern European Jews,

“It seems as if the American plan of giving the Jews fair play was succeeding. At any rate, all the other plans failed. ‘No nations prospers that persecutes the Jews,’ said Frederick the Great. Egypt tried persecution, and the Jews went to its funeral. Assyria made the same blunder. So did Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain. Say the Jew is not a fighter!”³⁹⁹

This prompts the question if America will share the sorry fate of those nations which had a significantly large number of racist Jews in its midst. *Jeremiah* 24:9 states,

“And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for *their* hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whither I shall drive them.”

Malachi 1:14 states,

“[. . .]I am a great King, saith the LORD of hosts, and my name is dreadful among the heathen.”

Cyprian exposted upon the ancient practice of threatening one’s enemies with one’s gods, and asserted that a single God, whose power was undiluted and universal, posed the greatest threat of all to one’s enemies. Consider Cyprian’s doctrine *circa* A.D. 247,

“TREATISE VI.

ON THE VANITY OF IDOLS: SHOWING THAT THE IDOLS ARE NOT GODS, AND THAT GOD IS ONE, AND THAT THROUGH CHRIST SALVATION IS GIVEN TO BELIEVERS.

ARGUMNET.—THIS HEADING EMBRACES THE THREE LEADING DIVISIONS OF THIS TREATISE. THE WRITER FIRST OF ALL SHOWS THAT THEY IN WHOSE HONOUR TEMPLES WERE FOUNDED, STATUES MODELLED, VICTIMS SACRIFICED, AND FESTAL DAYS CELEBRATED, WERE KINGS AND MEN AND NOT GODS; AND THEREFORE THAT THEIR WORSHIP COULD BE OF NO AVAIL EITHER TO STRANGERS OR TO ROMANS, AND THAT THE POWER OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE WAS TO ATTRIBUTED TO FATE RATHER THAN TO THEM, INASMUCH AS IT HAD ARISEN BY A CERTAIN GOOD FORTUNE, AND WAS ASHAMED OF ITS OWN ORIGIN.

1. That those are no gods whom the common people worship, is known from this. They were formerly kings, who on account of their royal memory subsequently began to be adored by their people even in death. Thence temples were founded to them; thence images were sculptured to retain the countenances of the deceased by the likeness; and men sacrificed victims, and celebrated festal days, by way of giving them honour. Thence to posterity those rites became sacred which at first had been adopted as a consolation. And now let us see whether this truth is confirmed in individual instances.

2. Melicertes and Leucothea are precipitated into the sea, and subsequently become sea-divinities. The Castors die by turns, that they may live. Æsculapius is struck by lightning, that he may rise into a god. Hercules, that he may put off the man, is burnt up in the fires of Oeta. Apollo fed the

flocks of Admetus; Neptune founded walls for Laomedon, and received—unfortunate builder—no wages for his work. The cave of Jupiter is to be seen in Crete, and his sepulchre is shown; and it is manifest that Saturn was driven away by him, and that from him Latium received its name, as being his lurking-place. He was the first that taught to print letters; he was the first that taught to stamp money in Italy, and thence the treasury is called the treasury of Saturn. And he also was the cultivator of the rustic life, whence he is painted as an old man carrying a sickle. Janus had received him to hospitality when he was driven away, from whose name the Janiculum is so called, and the month of January is appointed. He himself is portrayed with two faces, because, placed in the middle, he seems to look equally towards the commencing and the closing year. The Mauri, indeed, manifestly worship kings, and do not conceal their name by any disguise.

3. From this the religion of the gods is variously changed among individual nations and provinces, inasmuch as no one god is worshipped by all, but by each one the worship of its own ancestors is kept peculiar. Proving that this is so, Alexander the Great writes in the remarkable volume addressed to his mother, that through fear of his power the doctrine of the gods being men, which was kept secret, had been disclosed to him by a priest, that it was the memory of ancestors and kings that was (really) kept up, and that from this the rites of worship and sacrifice have grown up. But if gods were born at any time, why are they not born in these days also?—unless, indeed, Jupiter possibly has grown too old, or the faculty of bearing has failed Juno.

4. But why do you think that the gods can avail on behalf of the Romans, when you see that they can do nothing for their own worshipers in opposition to the Roman arms? For we know that the gods of the Romans are indigenous. Romulus was made a god by the perjury of Proculus, and Picus, and Tiberinus, and Pilumnus, and Consus, whom as a god of treachery Romulus would have to be worshipped, just as if he had been a god of counsels, when his perfidy resulted in the rape of the Sabines. Tatius also both invented and worshipped the goddess Cloacina; Hostilius, Fear and Paleness. By and by, I know not by whom, Fever was dedicated, and Acca and Flora the harlots. These are the Roman gods. But Mars is a Thracian, and Jupiter a Cretan, and Juno either Argive or Samian or Carthaginian, and Diana of Taurus, and the mother of the gods of Ida; and there are Egyptian monsters, not deities, who assuredly, if they had had any power, would have preserved their own and their people's kingdoms. Certainly there are also among the Romans the conquered Penates whom the fugitive Æneas introduced thither. There is also Venus the bald,—far more dishonoured by the fact of her baldness in Rome than by her having been wounded in Homer.

5. Kingdoms do not rise to supremacy through merit, but are varied by chance. Empire was formerly held by both Assyrians and Medes and Persians; and we know, too, that both Greeks and Egyptians have had dominion. Thus, in the varying vicissitudes of power, the period of empire

has also come to the Romans as to the others. But if you recur to its origin, you must needs blush. A people is collected together from profligates and criminals, and by founding an asylum, impunity for crimes makes the number great; and that their king himself may have a superiority in crime, Romulus becomes a fratricide; and in order to promote marriage, he makes a beginning of that affair of concord by discords. They steal, they do violence, they deceive in order to increase the population of the state; their marriage consists of the broken covenants of hospitality and cruel wars with their fathers-in-law. The consulship, moreover, is the highest degree in Roman honours, yet we see that the consulship began even as did the kingdom. Brutus puts his sons to death, that the commendation of his dignity may increase by the approval of his wickedness. The Roman kingdom, therefore, did not grow from the sanctities of religion, nor from auspices and auguries, but it keeps its appointed time within a definite limit. Moreover, Regulus observed the auspices, yet was taken prisoner; and Mancinus observed their religious obligation, yet was sent under the yoke. Paulus had chickens that fed, and yet he was slain at Cannæ. Caius Cæsar despised the auguries and auspices that were opposed to his sending ships before the winter to Africa; yet so much the more easily he both sailed and conquered.

6. Of all these, however, the principle is the same, which misleads and deceives, and with tricks which darken the truth, leads away a credulous and foolish rabble. They are impure and wandering spirits, who, after having been steeped in earthly vices, have departed from their celestial vigour by the contagion of earth, and do not cease, when ruined themselves, to seek the ruin of others; and when degraded themselves, to infuse into others the error of their own degradation. These demons the poets also acknowledge, and Socrates declared that he was instructed and ruled at the will of a demon; and thence the Magi have a power either for mischief or for mockery, of whom, however, the chief Hostanes both says that the form of the true God cannot be seen, and declares that true angels stand round about His throne. Wherein Plato also on the same principle concurs, and, maintaining one God, calls the rest angels or demons. Moreover, Hermes Trismegistus speaks of one God, and confesses that He is incomprehensible, and beyond our estimation.

7. These spirits, therefore, are lurking under the statues and consecrated images: these inspire the breasts of their prophets with their afflatus, animate the fibres of the entrails, direct the flights of birds, rule the lots, give efficiency to oracles, are always mixing up falsehood with truth, for they are both deceived and they deceive; they disturb their life, they disquiet their slumbers; their spirits creeping also into their bodies, secretly terrify their minds, distort their limbs, break their health, excite diseases to force them to worship of themselves, so that when glutted with the steam of the altars and the piles of cattle, they may unloose what they had bound, and so appear to have effected a cure. The only remedy from them is when their own mischief ceases; nor have they any other desire than to call men away from God, and to turn them from the understanding of the true religion, to superstition with

respect to themselves; and since they themselves are under punishment, (they wish) to seek for themselves companions in punishment whom they may by their misguidance make sharers in their crime. These, however, when adjured by us through the true God, at once yield and confess, and are constrained to go out from the bodies possessed. You may see them at our voice, and by the operation of the hidden majesty, smitten with stripes, burnt with fire, stretched out with the increase of a growing punishment, howling, groaning, entreating, confessing whence they came and when depart, even in the hearing of those very persons who worship them, and either springing forth at once or vanishing gradually, even as the faith of the sufferer comes in aid, or the grace of the healer effects. Hence they urge the common people to detest our name, so that men begin to hate us before they know us, lest they should either imitate us if known, or not be able to condemn us.

8. Therefore the one Lord of all is God. For that sublimity cannot possibly have any compeer, since it alone possesses all power. Moreover, let us borrow an illustration for the divine government from the earth. When ever did an alliance in royalty either begin with good faith or end without bloodshed? Thus the brotherhood of the Thebans was broken, and discord endured even in death in their disunited ashes. And one kingdom could not contain the Roman twins, although the shelter of one womb had held them. Pompey and Cæsar were kinsmen, and yet they did not maintain the bond of their relationship in their envious power. Neither should you marvel at this in respect of man, since herein all nature consents. The bees have one king, and in the flocks there is one leader, and in the herds one ruler. Much rather is the Ruler of the world one; who commands all things, whatsoever they are, with His word, disposes them by His wisdom, and accomplishes them by His power.

9. He cannot be seen—He is too bright for vision; nor comprehended—He is too pure for our discernment; nor estimated—He is too great for our perception; and therefore we are only worthily estimating Him when we say that He is inconceivable. But what temple can God have, whose temple is the whole world? And while man dwells far and wide, shall I shut up the power of such great majesty within one small building? He must be dedicated in our mind; in our breast He must be consecrated. Neither must you ask the name of God. God is His name. Among those there is need of names where a multitude is to be distinguished by the appropriate characteristics of appellations. To God who alone is, belongs the whole name of God; therefore He is one, and He in His entirety is everywhere diffused. For even the common people in many things naturally confess God, when their mind and soul are admonished of their author and origin. We frequently hear it said, ‘O God,’ and ‘God sees,’ and ‘I commend to God,’ and ‘God give you,’ and ‘as God will,’ and ‘if God should grant;’ and this is the very height of sinfulness, to refuse to acknowledge Him whom you cannot but know.”⁴⁰⁰

The *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah* 38:13 tells that Abraham's father worshiped and sold idols. One day, Abraham smashed all of the idols but the largest idol and then placed a stick in its hand. He told his father that the largest god had destroyed the others. Note the lesson that the Jewish monotheistic God is dominant and will destroy the gods of other peoples. The myth of Abraham differs from the myth of Cyprian, in that Christianity is taught as a universal religion, and the story of Abraham is a racist myth, which elects the Judeans as a unique and chosen race descended through Jacob to Abraham, a race who have an exclusive contract with God which makes them divine.

Jews have long sought to provoke superstitious fear of their God. The Judeans fabricated a history of persecution in Egypt, which never occurred, in order to defame the Egyptians and to blame the Egyptians for Jewish ethnocentrism, as well as to justify their claim that their God was stronger than the Pharaoh. The "Lost Tribes" of Israelites, the "ten northern tribes" allegedly taken captive by Assyrian King Shalmaneser V, and corralled by the river Sambatyon in Syria and Iraq (II *Kings* 17), never existed beyond the imagination of the "southern tribes" of Judeans and supposedly "Benjamin", who were allegedly taken captive in exile in Assyria (II *Kings* 18:13) and in Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar (II *Kings* 24:3-16; 25), and who wanted to steal the land of the indigenous peoples from the Nile to the Euphrates. The myth of the Egyptian captivity, and of the ten northern tribes, was fabricated by the Judeans in an attempt to justify their desires on lands and religious beliefs which were not originally theirs. They created the "prophecy" of these "events" in order to admonish their tribe to obey their racist and tribalistic leaders out of fear (*Leviticus* 26. *Deuteronomy* 4:24-27; 28:15-68; 30:1-3. II *Chronicles* 7:19-22. *Jeremiah* 29:1-7). Many argue that the prophecies of the Old Testament must have been written after the events they "foretold" and were merely a means for Jewish leaders to subjugate their followers. Præterist Christians believe that the Apocalyptic "prophecies" have all been fulfilled by the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. and the Diaspora of 135 A.D., and that the story of Gog and Magog in *Ezekiel* 38 is post-Millennial. They see Christian Zionists as dangerous dupes, who are serving the "Beast".

The process continues in the modern world. David 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."⁴⁰¹

Judaism, Christianity and Islam are among the most dogmatic and intolerant of religions, in part due to the superstitious fear they would impose on humanity in order to preserve and promote their own power. They threaten their critics with damnation and ruin, as if it were a self-evident truth that ruin will befall non-believers and enemies of the faith. British Zionist Winston Churchill promoted the myth of Jewish invincibility and the necessarily sorry fate of any who would oppose the Jews.⁴⁰² Zionist Reverend Scofield annotated the *Scofield Reference Bible*, published by Oxford University Press, with threats against any who would oppose the Jews. In reference to *Genesis* 12:1-3, which states:

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee: 2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: 3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

Scofield wrote in the 1909 edition of the *Scofield Reference Bible*, in oddly Zionist terms,

“(6) ‘And curse him that curseth thee.’ Wonderfully fulfilled in the history of the dispersion. It has invariably fared ill with the people who have persecuted the Jew—well with those who have protected him. The future will still more remarkably prove this principle.”⁴⁰³

It is noteworthy that Scofield, though annotating a Christian Bible, did not repeat the Christian dogma, which transferred this blessing and curse to the Christians *viz.* *Matthew* 12:30; 21:43-45. *Romans* 4; 9; 11:7-8. *Galatians* 3:16, 28-29; 4 and *Hebrews* 8:6-10.

Scofield’s intentional corruption of Christian doctrines to favor Zionist interests was not a new phenomenon. *The North American Review* published the following statement in 1845,

“But religious belief—the Jewish, even, and much more the Christian—heightens immeasurably the importance and the attractiveness of this wonderful theme. To the confiding student of the Bible, the Jews assume high dignity, and challenge earnest attention, as God’s chosen, covenant people; as the descendants of holy patriarchs, to whom Jehovah spake ‘face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend’; as a nation long visibly led and governed, upheld, protected, and punished, by an almighty hand; as a people whose ancient history, recorded by inspiration, expressly and clearly shows—what all uninspired annals leave to be faintly and uncertainly traced out by the dim light of human reason—the connection between every outward event and an unseen Providence; as the special depositaries of divine communications intended for all times and every people; as that race, ‘of

whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came,' and who, although they rejected and crucified the Saviour of the world, are themselves rejected and outcast, 'scattered among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other,' 'to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places' of their sojourn; as still beloved of God in his covenant faithfulness, and 'for the fathers' sake'; as still inheriting the prophetic benediction, 'Cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee'; as yet to be 'grafted again into their own olive-tree,' the church of God; and, as many believe, to be restored to that goodly land which was confirmed to them by oath before they were a nation; which was taken from its original possessors to be given to them, when they were homeless pilgrims; which is still theirs, twice exiled from it as they have been,—now for nearly eighteen hundred years,—and wonderfully kept from permanent occupation by any Gentile people;—in a word, as the standing miracle of modern times, changing in themselves nature's most firmly established laws, without interfering with the harmony that everywhere else prevails in convincing contrast. Such are the Jews in the eye of Christian faith.'⁴⁰⁴

Judeans have continuously and heavily promoted the myth that they are the divinely inspired chosen people, who have a right to enslave the rest of humanity. Ancient Jews taught their children to be absolutely intolerant of any dissent against Jews, or Jewish mythology, and to quash any dissent by exterminating those who have opposed the Jews, or Jewish mythologies. They feared that any challenge, or competition, to Judaism would reveal that they had fabricated and plagiarized their myths, which were little but a bluff meant to intimidate others far stronger than themselves. Even an unsuccessful challenge to any Jew, or to Jewish myths, would show to the world the intrinsic weakness of the position of the Jewish people and the inanity and meanspiritedness of the mythologies they had appropriated and corrupted. It is important to note that the Jews wanted other peoples to fear and to obey them, and to never entertain the slightest doubt of Jewish infallibility, or to challenge them. To this day the strongest taboos in society are the prohibition against questioning the existence of the Jewish God who chose the Jews to rule, and the prohibition against criticizing the modern State of Israel.

God commands the Jews to exterminate Amalek, because Amalek was the first to attack Israel and expose its terrible vulnerability. Jews so viciously attack anyone who even hints at challenging their supremacy, because they are in a very vulnerable position and must cut off all challenges before they grow. Jews must maintain the illusion that they are protected by God and invulnerable and cannot be challenged. Jews must maintain the lie that they are a divine blessing and a divine curse. That is why they are so hateful of Amalek and have carried the lesson down through history that they must not only tribalistically attack all who question any Jew, but that they must nip such challenges in the bud, or better yet prevent them from ever occurring, lest a significant number of Gentiles learn of their ill intentions and their vulnerability and put an end to the threat they pose. Rather than modify their behavior to socially acceptable norms, they band together to quash all challengers

and feel no compunctions about committing immoral acts in order to defend the tribe from the truth. They are out to exterminate any and all who do not obey them and they are out to exterminate the truth of what they are doing.

The modern State of Israel has practiced censorship of the press and kept important historical information under lock and key. Israeli soldiers have gone so far as to murder journalists and activists who record the Israelis' atrocities against the Palestinians. In the illegally Occupied Territories, Israelis humiliate and degrade their fellow human beings, while declaring to the world that Israel, one of the most undemocratic of the nations formed in the Twentieth Century, is the only democracy in the Middle East—a false declaration intended to degrade their Moslem enemies. The Jews have always had strong prohibitions against blasphemy and Judeans and Christians have held back the progress of science and politics for two thousand years in order to preserve their mythologies by preventing any open challenges to them. Pious Jews cling to the myth of a Jewish cult-hero, Moses, who gave to them God's Law, which cannot be questioned. Christians cling to the myth of a Jewish cult-hero, Jesus, who came to fulfill the Law, which cannot be questioned. "Einstein's" irrational and physically contradicted theories are promoted as if irrefutable, and challenges to the theories are regularly excluded from publication as if a matter of principle. Dissent against the theories is punished by ridicule and career infringement, as well as by charges of anti-Semitism where there are no grounds for such charges.

The ancient Jews fabricated the mythology that they have genetic enemies, whom they must subjugate, then exterminate. Jacob's brother, Esau, is said to be the father of a people who are inherently antagonistic to Jews and who must be exterminated. Louis Ginzberg states in his *The Legend of the Jews* (and bear in mind that Amalek represents Esau, his grandfather, and ultimately Haman, Rome, and Christianity; and, though Islam is traditionally associated with Abraham and Hagar's son Ishmael, when it comes to the genocide of the Palestinians, Arabs, Turks and Persians, they are called Amalek⁴⁰⁵; as are Gentiles in general—enemies of the Jews in general, as is revealed in various other passages in Ginzberg's many volumes),

“Although Amalek had now received the merited punishment from the hands of Joshua, still his enterprise against Israel had not been entirely unavailing. The miraculous exodus of Israel out of Egypt, and especially the cleaving of the sea, had created such alarm among the heathens, that none among them had dared to approach Israel. But this fear vanished as soon as Amalek attempted to compete in battle with Israel. Although he was terribly beaten, still the fear of the inaccessibility of Israel was gone. It was with Amalek as with that foolhardy wight who plunged into a scalding-hot tub. He scalded himself terribly, yet the tub became a little cooled through his plunge into it. Hence God was not content with the punishment Amalek received in the time of Moses, but swore by His throne and by His right hand that He would never forget Amalek's misdeeds, that in this world as well as in the time of the Messiah He would visit punishment upon him, and would completely exterminate him in the future world. So long as the seed of

Amalek exists, the face of God is, as it were, covered, and will only then come to view, when the seed of Amalek shall have been entirely exterminated.

God had at first left the war against Amalek in the hands of His people, therefore He bade Joshua, the future leader of the people, never to forget the war against Amalek; and if Moses had listened intently, he would have perceived from this command of God that Joshua was destined to lead the people into the promised land. But later, when Amalek took part in the destruction of Jerusalem, God Himself took up the war against Amalek, saying, 'By My throne I vow not to leave a single descendant of Amalek under the heavens, yea, no one shall even be able to say that this sheep or that wether belonged to an Amalekite.'

God bade Moses impress upon the Jews to repulse no heathen should he desire conversion, but never to accept an Amalekite as a proselyte. It was in consideration of this word of God that David slew the Amalekite, who announced to him the death of Saul and Jonathan; for he saw in him only a heathen, although he appeared in the guise of a Jew.

Part of the blame for the destruction of Amalek falls upon his father, Eliphaz. He used to say to Amalek: 'My son, dost thou indeed know who will possess this world and the future world?' Amalek paid no attention to this allusion to the future fortune of Israel, and his father urged it no more strongly upon him, although it would have been his duty to instruct his son clearly and fully. He should have said to him: 'My son, Israel will possess this world as well as the future world; dig wells then for their use and build roads for them, so that thou mayest be judged worthy to share in the future world.' But as Amalek had not been sufficiently instructed by his father, in his wantonness he undertook to destroy the whole world. God, who tries the reins and the heart, said to him: 'O thou fool, I created thee after all the seventy nations, but for thy sins thou shalt be the first to descend into hell.'

To glorify the victory over Amalek, Moses built an altar, which God called 'My Miracle,' for the miracle God wrought against Amalek in the war of Israel was, as it were, a miracle for God. For so long as the Israelites dwell in sorrow, God feels with them, and a joy for Israel is a joy for God, hence, too, the miraculous victory over Israel's foe was a victory for God."⁴⁰⁶

In the jargon of Jewish racists, the Gentiles are called "Esau" or "Edom", and the Jews, "Jacob". The Old Testament book of *Obadiah* instructs the Jews to destroy the wise among the Gentiles, and then to exterminate the Gentiles ("cut off"="murder")—much as the Communists have done. Noted Hebrew and Rabbinical scholar Johannes Buxtorf wrote in 1603, quoting from Machir of Toledo's *Avkat Rokhel*, Constantinople/Istanbul, (1516):

"Then shall *Armillus* with his whole army die, and the Atheistical Edomites (the Christians they mean) who laid waste the house of our God, and led us captive into a strange land, shall miserably perish; then shall the Jews be

revenged upon them, as it is written, {Obad. 18} *The house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau* (that is, we Christians, as the Jews interpret, whom they Christen Edomites) *shall be for stubble*. This stubble the Jews shall set in fire, that nothing be left to us Edomites which shall not be burnt and turned into ashes."⁴⁰⁷

The book of *Obadiah*:

"1 The vision of Obadiah. Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom; We have heard a rumour from the LORD, and an ambassador is sent among the heathen, Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle. 2 Behold, I have made thee small among the heathen: thou art greatly despised. 3 ¶ The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, whose habitation *is* high; that saith in his heart, Who shall bring me down to the ground? 4 Though thou exalt *thyself* as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the LORD. 5 If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night, (how art thou cut off!) would they not have stolen till they had enough? if the grapegatherers came to thee, would they not leave *some* grapes? 6 How are *the things* of Esau searched out! *how* are his hidden things sought up! 7 All the men of thy confederacy have brought thee *even* to the border: the men that were at peace with thee have deceived thee, *and* prevailed against thee; *they that eat* thy bread have laid a wound under thee: *there is* none understanding in him. 8 Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, even destroy the wise *men* out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esau? 9 And thy mighty *men*, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter. 10 For *thy* violence against thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever. 11 In the day that thou stoodest on the other side, in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou *wast* as one of them. 12 But thou shouldest not have looked on the day of thy brother in the day that he became a stranger; 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 looked 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 did 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 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*. 19 And *they* of the south shall possess the mount of Esau; and *they of* the plain the Philistines: and they shall possess the fields of Ephraim, and the fields of Samaria: and Benjamin *shall possess* Gilead. 20 And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel *shall possess* that of the Canaanites, *even* unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which *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."

Sanhedrin 59a states that Gentiles who study the Torah must be killed. *Soferim*, Chapter 15, Rule 10, states, quoting the much celebrated genocidal racist Jew Simon ben Yohai:

"The best among the Gentiles deserves to be killed."⁴⁰⁸

Michael Berenbaum wrote in his book, *After Tragedy and Triumph*,

"Menachim Begin built upon this realization and constructed a usable past upon the twin pillars of antisemitism and the need for power. *Goyim* (literally, 'the nations') hate Jews, Begin maintained. In traditional language, Esau hates Jacob. According to Begin's worldview, Jews are a people that dwells alone. Power is essential. Powerlessness invites victimization. Jews must determine their own morality. The world's pronouncements toward the Jews mask—sometimes more successfully and sometimes less so—their genocidal intent. The desire to make the world *Judenrein* continues, and only fools would allow themselves to be deceived."⁴⁰⁹

Isaac and his wife Rebekah had twin sons: Esau,⁴¹⁰ the firstborn, and Jacob, the younger son. Even before the twins were born, they fought each other in the womb (*Genesis* 25:22). God told Rebekah that her sons would father two peoples and that Esau, the elder, would serve Jacob, the younger (*Genesis* 25:23). Isaac favored Esau, but Rebekah favored Jacob. Esau was a hunter, and Jacob, a farmer. Isaac and Rebekah did not sacrifice Esau and pass him through the fire to the gods of heaven, which is perhaps why Rebekah did not favor Esau, the firstborn who opened her womb—the firstborn who had rights to the covenant.

The differences of character between Esau and Jacob became key features in Jewish mythology. Esau, the hunter, came to represent strong warrior peoples—Esau was a belligerent people like the Hyksos.⁴¹¹ Jacob, whom God renamed "Israel" (*Genesis* 25:26; 32:27-28; 35:10), came to represent the agrarian, weak and scholarly peoples, who were allegedly entitled by God to be immoral—even genocidal—especially genocidal—and to use Esau as their sword and their slave (*Genesis* 25:23; 27:38-41)—Jacob was a people like the ancient Egyptians.

When some Jews attempted to stigmatize Germans, Christians and Gentiles as genetically predisposed to be warlike and anti-Semitic, as they often have, they were recalling Esau and Jacob, and stating that they (Jacob/Israel) have the God-given right to exploit the Germans, Christians, Moslems and Gentiles in general (Esau) as slaves and warriors, then to exterminate them in accordance with God's wishes; because the Gentiles are by nature ungodly and anti-Semitic, according to Jewish mythologies. In accord with the Old Testament, Zionists repeatedly asserted that the Gentile nations were obliged to fight for Israel and to finance it—hence the common paradox of the anti-nationalist pacifist Zionist warmonger.

It is noteworthy that the British and Americans fought to secure Palestine from the Turks—those Turks who had for centuries treated the Jews better than anyone else—and to end the Nazi régime, which had instilled tremendous fear in Jews—all of which cleared the way for the formation of the State of Israel. It is also noteworthy that today America is fighting wars for Israel, and that the comparatively insignificant and wealthy nation of Israel receives more foreign aid from the United States of America than any other nation on Earth, though it has carried out worse espionage campaigns against the United States⁴¹² than even the outspoken enemies of the United States, these wasted monies donated to sponsor oppression while millions of the unchosen needlessly perish from starvation and disease around the world. Israel plays a prominent rôle in international politics and the media, in spite of the fact that the world faces far more important issues than the fate of a comparatively small, and forever troublesome, minority among humanity. Jewish selfishness apparently knows no bounds. It is deeply entrenched in Jewish religious mythology.

One day, after returning home from the field so hungry that he was starving to death, Esau asked Jacob to spare his life and give him some food. Jacob took advantage of the situation to coerce Esau into surrendering his birthright to Jacob for some lentil porridge (*Genesis* 25:29-34). Through deceit, Rebekah and Jacob, whom God renamed Israel (*Genesis* 32:27-28), stole Esau's blessing from Isaac, who had inherited it from Abraham, and gave it to treacherous Jacob. Esau pledged to kill his younger twin brother Jacob, thereby expressing the genocidal imagery between Jews and Gentiles, and Jewish self-obsession and selfishness found throughout Jewish history:

“1 And it came to pass, that when Isaac was old, and his eyes were dim, so that he could not see, he called Esau his eldest son, and said unto him, My son: and he said unto him, Behold, *here am I*. 2 And he said, Behold now, I am old, I know not the day of my death: 3 Now therefore take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out to the field, and take me *some* venison; 4 And make me savoury meat, such as I love, and bring *it* to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die. 5 And Rebekah heard when Isaac spake to Esau his son. And Esau went to the field to hunt *for* venison, *and* to bring *it*. 6 And Rebekah spake unto Jacob her son, saying, Behold, I heard thy father speak unto Esau thy brother, saying, 7 Bring me venison, and make me savoury meat, that I may eat, and bless thee before the

LORD before my death. 8 Now therefore, my son, obey my voice according to that which I command thee. 9 Go now to the flock, and fetch me from thence two good kids of the goats; and I will make them savoury meat for thy father, such as he loveth: 10 And thou shalt bring *it* to thy father, that he may eat, and that he may bless thee before his death. 11 And Jacob said to Rebekah his mother, Behold, Esau my brother *is* a hairy man, and I *am* a smooth man: 12 My father peradventure will feel me, and I shall seem to him as a deceiver; and I shall bring a curse upon me, and not a blessing. 13 And his mother said unto him, Upon me *be* thy curse, my son: only obey my voice, and go fetch me *them*. 14 And he went, and fetched, and brought *them* to his mother: and his mother made savoury meat, such as his father loved. 15 And Rebekah took goodly raiment of her eldest son Esau, which *were* with her in the house, and put them upon Jacob her younger son: 16 And she put the skins of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck: 17 And she gave the savoury meat and the bread, which she had prepared, into the hand of her son Jacob. 18 And he came unto his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here *am* I; who *art* thou, my son? 19 And Jacob said unto his father, I *am* Esau thy firstborn; I have done according as thou badest me: arise, I pray thee, sit and eat of my venison, that thy soul may bless me. 20 And Isaac said unto his son, How *is it* that thou hast found *it* so quickly, my son? And he said, Because the LORD thy God brought *it* to me. 21 And Isaac said unto Jacob, Come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou *be* my very son Esau or not. 22 And Jacob went near unto Isaac his father; and he felt him, and said, The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands *are* the hands of Esau. 23 And he discerned him not, because his hands were hairy, as his brother Esau's hands: so he blessed him. 24 And he said, *Art* thou my very son Esau? And he said, I *am*. 25 And he said, Bring *it* near to me, and I will eat of my son's venison, that my soul may bless thee. And he brought *it* near to him, and he did eat: and he brought him wine, and he drank. 26 And his father Isaac said unto him, Come near now, and kiss me, my son. 27 And he came near, and kissed him: and he smelled the smell of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell of my son *is* as the smell of a field which the LORD hath blessed: 28 Therefore God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: 29 Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed *be* he that blesseth thee. 30 And it came to pass, as soon as Isaac had made an end of blessing Jacob, and Jacob was yet scarce gone out from the presence of Isaac his father, that Esau his brother came in from his hunting. 31 And he also had made savoury meat, and brought it unto his father, and said unto his father, Let my father arise, and eat of his son's venison, that thy soul may bless me. 32 And Isaac his father said unto him, Who *art* thou? And he said, I *am* thy son, thy firstborn Esau. 33 And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said, Who? where *is* he that hath taken venison, and brought *it* me, and I have eaten of all before thou

camest, and have blessed him? yea, *and* he shall be blessed. 34 And when Esau heard the words of his father, he cried with a great and exceeding bitter cry, and said unto his father, Bless me, *even* me also, O my father. 35 And he said, Thy brother came with subtilty, and hath taken away thy blessing. 36 And he said, Is not he rightly named Jacob? for he hath supplanted me these two times: he took away my birthright; and, behold, now he hath taken away my blessing. And he said, Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me? 37 And Isaac answered and said unto Esau, Behold, I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants; and with corn and wine have I sustained him: and what shall I do now unto thee, my son? 38 And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, *even* me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. 39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. 41 And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob. 42 And these words of Esau her elder son were told to Rebekah: and she sent and called Jacob her younger son, and said unto him, Behold, thy brother Esau, as touching thee, doth comfort himself, *purposing* to kill thee. 43 Now therefore, my son, obey my voice; and arise, flee thou to Laban my brother to Haran; 44 And tarry with him a few days, until thy brother's fury turn away; 45 Until thy brother's anger turn away from thee, and he forget *that* which thou hast done to him: then I will send, and fetch thee from thence: why should I be deprived also of you both in one day? 46 And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these *which are* of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me?"—*Genesis 27:1-46*

This story conveys many of the tenets of Zionism—that other nations shall serve Israel, and especially that they shall fight its wars and secure its borders—that deceit is encouraged in the pursuit of Israel—and that Edom will be the mortal enemy of Israel. In the minds of many Jews, Edom became associated with Amalek, Haman, Rome and with European Gentiles and Christians in general. Esau's grandson Amalek (*Genesis 36:9-12*) was first to wage war on Israel, and therefore the first to expose the vulnerability of the Jews. God obliged the descendants of Jacob—Israel, to utterly destroy the seed of Amalek (*Sanhedrin 20b. P188L Dvarim 25:19*)—obliged Israel to exterminate Gentiles, Christians, Moslems, etc.:

“Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt; How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, *even* all *that* were feeble behind thee, when thou *wast* faint and weary; and he feared not God.”—*Deuteronomy 25:17-18*

“And the LORD said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven. And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi: For he said, Because the LORD hath sworn *that* the LORD *will have* war with Amalek from generation to generation.”—*Exodus* 17:14-16

“Therefore it shall be, when the LORD thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee *for* an inheritance to possess it, *that* thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget *it*.”—*Deuteronomy* 25:19

[Should the Zionists continue in their attempts to carry out their ancient plans we can expect that when Israel gains hegemony over the Middle East, it will seek to exterminate the peoples of European descent. Zionists are clearly attempting to destroy the militaries of those Moslem nations which would react with rage and which would likely attack Israel, when the Cabalistic Jews and their Christian Dispensationalist slaves destroy the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque and build in their place a Jewish Temple. Should Israel succeed in destroying Iran and Syria, they will likely destroy the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque, and the Moslem world will be unable to stop them. They will then unleash the priests of Aaron, and reinstitute ritual sacrifices. Greater Israel will emerge and occupy the territory from the Nile to the Euphrates. Zionists will generate anti-Semitism around the world in order to force “racial” Jews to emigrate to Israel, who will then populate the greater Israel of the Covenant. Then the Jewish King, perhaps a descendent of the Rothschilds, will emerge and many Jews will likely take up Judaism—the “Messiah” will be a dynasty passing from father to son, or a supposed incarnation from one man to the next in the Shabbataian style, much like the Dalai Lama, *see: 2 Samuel* 7. Perhaps the proposed Jewish King is alive today, hidden from view. The Lubavitchers, under the leadership of the now deceased Rebbe Schneerson, have declared that the Messiah is alive today and will soon be anointed. They are an immensely powerful Cabalistic Jewish sect, which has infiltrated governments around the world. We can expect that Soviet-style oppression will grip the West—one already sees that news organizations restrict the international news Americans see, much as happened in the Soviet Union. China will likely become the new America for the Zionists, and their “Iron Scepter”, which Israel will utilize to smash the West, which will have plunged into deep depression and an international police state. Racist Jews, who view themselves as Orientals, will then enslave the rest of humanity, and through laws mandating miscegenation dilute the blood of “Esau”. Then they will likely break up Israel into classes, where Ashkanazi Jews reign over Sephardic and Coptic Jews—a process which is already well underway. Those who

doubt it are invited to consider what happened to Germany and Russia at the hands of Jewish financiers and to further consider the precarious economic condition of the United States as a result of the organized efforts of Zionists to undermine the sovereignty of America, its moral and educational strengths, and to export its industries.]

“1 The burden of the word of the LORD to Israel by Malachi. 2 I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? *Was* not Esau Jacob’s brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob, 3 And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. 4 Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the LORD of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the LORD hath indignation for ever. 5 And *your* eyes shall see, and ye shall say, The LORD will be magnified from the border of Israel. 6 A son honoureth *his* father, and a servant his master: if then I *be* a father, where *is* mine honour? and if I *be* a master, where *is* my fear? saith the LORD of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name? 7 Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the LORD *is* contemptible. 8 And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, *is it* not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, *is it* not evil? offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the LORD of hosts. 9 And now, I pray you, beseech God that he will be gracious unto us: this hath been by your means: will he regard your persons? saith the LORD of hosts. 10 Who *is there* even among you that would shut the doors *for nought*? neither do ye kindle *fire* on mine altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the LORD of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. 11 For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name *shall* be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense *shall* be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name *shall* be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts. 12 But ye have profaned it, in that ye say, The table of the LORD *is* polluted; and the fruit thereof, *even* his meat, *is* contemptible. 13 Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness *is it!* and ye have snuffed at it, saith the LORD of hosts; and ye brought *that which was* torn, and the lame, and the sick; thus ye brought an offering: should I accept this of your hand? saith the LORD. 14 But cursed *be* the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the LORD a corrupt thing: for I *am* a great King, saith the LORD of hosts, and my name *is* dreadful among the heathen.”—*Malachi* 1:1-14

Rabbi Shlomo Yitzhaki’s (Rashi’s) *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, Exodus 17:14-16, states,

“14. Write this (for) a memorial that Amalek came to battle against Israel

prior to all the (other) nations. **And rehearse (it) in the ears of Joshua** who will bring into the land, that he should command Israel to recompense him (Amalek) for his deed. Here it was hinted to Moses that Joshua would bring in Israel to the land. **For I will utterly blot out** Therefore I admonish you thus, for I desire to blot them out. **15. And he called the name of it** (I. e.,) of the altar. Adonai-nissi (lit., the Lord is my banner (or miracle). The Holy One Blessed Be He wrought for us here a ‘miracle’. It is not that the altar was called ‘Lord’ but (that) he who mentioned the name of the altar would recall the miracle which the Omnipresent wrought: ‘The Lord He is our miracle.’ **16. And he said** (I. e.,) Moses, **The hand upon the throne of the Lord** The hand of the Holy One Blessed Be He was raised to swear by His throne that there would be for Him war and hatred against Amalek forever. And why is (it written) (throne) and not stated [***]? Is then the (Divine) Name also divided in half (i. e.: [***] instead of the full name)? The Holy One Blessed Be He swore that His name will not be whole (i. e., [***] instead of the full name) nor His throne whole (i. e. [***]) instead of [***] until there will be blotted out the name of Amalek utterly. And when his (Amalek’s) name will be blotted out (then) will the (Divine) Name be whole, and it is stated (Ps. 9.7): ‘O thou enemy, the waste places are come to an end forever’ this refers to Amalek, regarding whom it is written Amos 1.11): ‘And his anger he kept forever,’ ‘And the cities which thou didst uproot Their very memorial is perished’ (Ps., *ibid.* 7). What does (Scripture) state after this? ‘But the Lord is enthroned forever’ (verse 8)—behold the (Divine) Name is whole (expressed in full); ‘He hath established His throne for judgment’ (*ibid.*)—behold his throne is whole [***].”⁴¹³

The Judaic religious doctrine of the genocide of the seed of Amalek is alive today. Yehoshafat Harkabi wrote in his book *Israel’s Fateful Hour*,

“Some nationalistic religious extremists frequently identify the Arabs with Amalek, whom the Jews are commanded to annihilate totally (Deuteronomy 25:17-19). As children, we were taught that this was a relic of a bygone and primitive era, a commandment that had lapsed because Sennacherib the Assyrian king had mixed up all the nations so it was no longer possible to know who comes of the seed of Amalek. Yet some rabbis insist on injecting a contemporary significance into the commandment to blot out Amalek.”⁴¹⁴

Some Jews to this day celebrate the genocidal destruction of their enemies and their hatred of Gentiles once a year at the festival of Purim; which commemorates the execution of Haman and the genocidal mass murder of “enemies of the Jews”. Haman is said to have descended from Amalek through Hammedatha the Agagite,⁴¹⁵ and was allegedly the archenemy of the Jews and sought to exterminate them (*Esther* 3)—it is clear that the story of Esther fabricates the pretext of a Haman conspiracy in order to justify the Jewish genocide of the “Amalekites”. Esther and Mordecai wormed their way into power under false pretensions, concealing the fact that

“Esther” was Jewish. The name “Esther” means “that which is hidden”.⁴¹⁶ Her true Jewish name was Hadassah. She was one of the first “crypto-Jews”, who conceal their identity in order to corrupt societies and betray those who trust in them.

It should be noted that it is well known that the *Book of Esther* is work of fiction and does not correspond to the historical facts of Persian history. The Judeans fabricated a history of captive exile in Babylon in order to justify the theft of Jerusalem and the lands of all of the other inhabitants of Canaan. Based on *Ezra* 1-6, one might even conclude that the Judeans themselves were an alien horde of Babylonians—or Persians—who the Persians placed in power to rule over the Canaanites and gather the gold and silver of the world as a tribute to the Persian King. They fabricated the entire Old Testament in order to justify their theft of land, their racist credos, their self-declared right to conquer and rule the world, and in order to inspire superstitious fear of their God, and, thereby, fear of them.

4.4.3 Crypto-Jews

Cabalistic Jews have the pantheistic belief that God is hidden in all things and only reveals himself to the enlightened. They believe that the Jews are God among the beasts of the Earth who are the Gentiles. Based on these myths, Cabalistic Jews hold that they should play God’s hidden rôle as the secret controller and ruler over the Earth, the secret and divine master of the Gentile beasts—just as God is the secret and divine master of the Universe.

When the Jews of Spain were ordered to convert to Christianity, or leave the country, Jewish leadership instructed them to become crypto-Jews—Jews who feign conversion, but secretly remain Jews and attempt to subvert the churches and the societies in which they live. The crypto-Jews of Spain became known as “Marranos”. The correspondence advising the Jews of Spain to feign Christian conversion and destroy Gentile Spanish society was republished in Julio Iniguez de Medrano’s book, *La Silva curiosa*, Marc Orry, Paris, (1608), pp. 157-157, and an English translation appears in: L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 73-74,

“Respuesta de los Iudios de Constantinopla,
a los Iudios de España

AMados hermanos en Moysen vuestra carta recibimos, en la qual nos significais los trabajos & infortunios que padescéis, de cuyo sentimiento nos a cabido tanta parte como a vosotros. El parescer de los grandes Satrapas, y Rabi es lo siguiente.

A lo que dezis que el Rey de España os haze boluer Christianos, que lo hagias pues no podeis hazer otto. A lo que dezis que os mandan quitar vuestras haziendas, hazed vuestros hijos mercaderes, para que poco a poco les quiten las suyas. A lo que dezis que os quita las vidas, hazed vuestros hijos medicos y boticarios, para que les quiten las suyas. A lo que dezis que os destruyen vuestras Sinagogas, hazed vuestros hijos clerigos y theologos, para que les destruyan sus templos. Ya lo que dezis que os hazen otras

vexaciones, procurad que vuestros hijos sean abogados, procuradores, notarios, y consejeros, y que siempre entiendan en negocios de Republicas, para que sujetandolos ganeis tierra, y os podais vengar dellos, y no salgais desta orden que os damos, porque por experiencia vereis que de abatidos, verneis a ser tenidos en algo.

V s s v s f f Principe de los Iudios de Constantinopla.”⁴¹⁷

Many of the Bolshevik mass murderers were crypto-Jews, as were many of the “Young Turks”,⁴¹⁸ who committed genocide against the Armenian Christians—the Spanish Civil War was led and fought by many Cabalistic and crypto-Jews, on both sides of the struggle, and served as a prototype for the bloodshed of World War II. The Frankist crypto-Jews of Poland wormed their way into the Catholic Church of Poland and came to dominate Polish aristocracy.

Jews and crypto-Jews also worked for the Czar—at least they pretended to work for the Czar—they were notorious assassins and double agents who murdered members of State, like Vyacheslav Plehve and Peter Stolypin, and who betrayed State secrets to the Jewish revolutionaries. In an article entitled, “The Protocol Forgery” published in *The London Times* on 17 August 1921 on page 9, it states,

“THE FIRST REVOLUTION.

But the principal importance of the Protocols was their use during the first Russian revolution. This revolution was supported by the Jewish element in Russia, notably by the Jewish Bund. The Okhrana organization knew this perfectly well; it had its Jewish and crypto-Jewish agents, one of whom afterwards assassinated M. Stolypin; it was in league with the powerful Conservative faction with its allies it sought to gain the Tsar’s ear. For many years before the Russian revolution of 1905-1906 there had been a tale of a secret council of Rabbis who plotted ceaselessly against the Orthodox.”

Some Jewish revolutionaries, like Emma Goldberg, did not hide their “Jewish sounding names”, though they often did not mention—perhaps a very small few did not even realize—that they were fulfilling Judaic Messianic prophecies. Other Jewish Communist radicals did conceal their Jewish identities by changing names; including “Miss Rose Pastor”, a Russian Jew, and Morris Hillquit, born Moses Hillkowitz in Riga, Latvia,⁴¹⁹ and Leon Trotsky, born Lev Davidovich Bronstein in Yanovka, Ukraine, and Leo Kameneff, born Rosenfeld, and married to Trotsky’s sister.⁴²⁰

These Jewish radicals, often born into wealthy Jewish families,⁴²¹ were funded by unimaginably wealthy Jewish financiers, who profited from the strife they caused; and who, being pious Jews, sought to fulfill their Messianic goals. These goals included the utter destruction of all nations but Israel, all religions but Judaism, all cultures but Jewish culture; and the “restoration” of the Jews to Palestine, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the anointment of the Messiah, the King of the Jews, who would rule a ruined world. Crypto-Jews and Gentiles married to Jews continued

to dominate the Soviet Régime through the 1930's and beyond.⁴²²

The United States Government published a report entitled “Bolshevism and Judaism” dated 13 November 1918, which is found in State Department Decimal File (861.00/5339).⁴²³ The report was translated into French and then translated back into English in Denis Fahey’s *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan, Dublin, London, (1935), pp. 89-91, 90, *see also*: pp. 77, 86, 92-93. Fahey cites: *La Vieille France*, (1920); and E. Jouin, “Les ‘Protocoles’ des Sages de Sion: Coup d’Oeil d’Ensemble”, *Le Pêril Judéo-Maçonnique*, Part 3, *Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes*, Paris, (1921), pp. 249-250. *La Vieille-France*, Volume 160, published the following French translation of the report in 1920 under the heading “Les Juifs ont créé le Bolchevisme. Les Gouvernements de l’Entente le savent.” which was republished in the French translation of the *Protocols* published by *La Vieille-France* as: *La Conspiration Juive Contre les Peuples: «Protocols» Procès-verbaux de Réunions Secrètes des Sages d’Israël*, La Vieille-France, Paris, (1920), pp. 90-91:

“En février 1916, pour la première fois, on apprit qu’une Révolution se préparait en Russie. On découvrit que les personnes et maisons suivantes étaient engagées dans cette œuvre de destruction:

Jakob Schiff — Kuhn, Loeb et Co — Félix Warburg — Otto Kahn Mortimoff L. Schiff — Jérôme H. Hahauer — Guggenheim — Max Breitung.

Il n’y a donc guère de doute que la Révolution russe, qui éclaira en 1917 cette information de 1916, fut fomentée et lancée par des influences purement **Juives**.

En fait, au mois d’avril 1917, Jakob Schiff déclara *publiquement* que la Révolution russe avait réussi *grâce à son appui financier*.

Au printemps de 1917, Jakob Schiff commença de commanditer Trotsky (Juif Braunstein) pour organiser en Russie la Révolution sociale. Le *Forward*, journal juif bolcheviste de New-York, versa sa contribution.

De Stockholm, le Juif Max Warburg commanditait également Trotsky. A ce *consortium* de Juifs bolchevicks et de Juifs multimillionnaires participaient le syndicat (juif) Westphalien-Rhénan, le Juif Olet Aschberg de la *Nye Banken* (Stockholm) et le Juif Jivolovsky, dont la fille a épousé Trotsky.

En octobre 1917, quand les Soviets établirent leur pouvoir sur le peuple russe, on y remarquait: *Oulianov* dit Lénine, *Braunstein* (Trotsky), *Nachamkes* (Stockloff), *Zederbaum* (Martoff), *Apfelbaum* (Zinovieff), *Rosenfeld* (Kameneff), *Gimel* (Souchanoff), *Krochmann* (Sagerski), *Silberstein* (Bogdanoff), *Lurge* (Larin), *Goldmann* (Gorev), *Radomislsky* (Uritzky), *Katz* (Kamenev), *Furtenberg* (Ganetzky), *Gourevitch* (Dan), *Goldberg* (Meschkovsky), *Goldfandt* (Parvus), *Goldenbach* (Riasanov), *Zibar* (Martinoff), *Chernomordkin* (Chernomorsky), *Bleichmann* (Solntzeff), *Zivin* (Piatnisky), *Rein* (Abromovitch), *Voinsten* (Zvesdin), *Rosenblum* (Maklakosky), *Loevenschen* (Lapinsky), *Natansohn* (Bobriev), *Orthodox* (Axelrod), *Garfeld* (Garin), *Schultze* (Glasonnoff), *Ioffe*: **tous Juifs** sous de

faux noms russes.

En même temps, aux Etats-Unis, le **Juif** Paul Warburg laissait voir des relations si étroites avec les personnalités bolchevistes qu'il ne fut pas réélu au *Federal Reserve Board*.

Jakob Schiff a pour intime ami et pour agent très actif le rabbin Judas Magne, protagoniste du Judaïsme international, qui a lancé aux Etats-Unis la première organisation ouvertement bolcheviste, dite *Conseil du Peuple*. Le 24 octobre 1918, Judas Magne a fait la déclaration publique de son adhésion sans réserve au Bolchevisme, dans une réunion du Comité Juif d'Amérique à New-York. Commandité par Jakob Schiff, administrant avec lui la *Kebillah* juive, le rabbin Judas Magne est le directeur effectif de l'organisation sioniste *Poale*, et du «Parti travailliste juif».

La firme juive Kuhn, Loeb et Co est étroitement liée au Syndicat Westphalien-Rhénan, aux Juifs Lazard de Paris, à la firme juive Gunsbourg (Petrograd-Paris-Tokio), à la firme juive Speyer et Co (Londres-New-York-Francfort) et à la firme juive *Nye Banken* (Stockholm): d'où il apparaît que *le Bolchevisme est l'expression d'un mouvement général juif, où sont intéressées les grandes banques juives*.

La reconnaissance formelle d'un **Etat Juif** en Palestine, la constitution de Républiques juives en Allemagne et en Autriche ne sont que les premiers pas vers la domination du monde. La Juiverie internationale s'agite fiévreusement. Elle a réuni dernièrement, en peu de jours, aux Etats-Unis, sous prétexte d'écoles en Palestine, un fonds de guerre d'un **milliard de dollars**."

Whether or not Lenin was of partial Jewish descent, he was married to a Jewish woman, and was put in power by Jewish bankers. The Jews who put Lenin in power were not likely to put a known full-blooded Jew into the position of dictator over Russia unless left with no other choice. Jewish leaders believed that a known Jew would have a difficult time dominating Russia. Max Nordau wrote in 1909,

"In Russia today it would be impossible for a Jew, whether he had been baptized or no, to rouse a mass movement like that led by Lasalle in Germany in the fifties and sixties; or to rise to the premiership, as Disraeli did in England."⁴²⁴

Lenin was clearly serving the interests of Jewish leadership. His personal ethnic heritage is largely irrelevant. The Jews may have chosen Lenin to be the dictator over Russia for the very reason that he was not a full-blooded Jew. That does not render Bolshevism any less of a Jewish led movement. Lenin served that movement. He was not its ultimate leader. However, the fact that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement does not mean that all Jews were Bolsheviks.

The Jewish Chronicle published the following article on 11 April 1919 on page 10,

"Percentage of Jewish Bolsheviks in Petrograd.

COPENHAGEN [F. O. C.]

On the trustworthy authority of the well-known Zionist leader, M. Idelson (of Petrograd), I am in a position to state that only two and a-half per cent. of the Jews in Petrograd have declared themselves in sympathy with Bolshevism. Although sixty per cent. of the Bolshevik leaders are Jews, and although a declaration against Bolshevism involves serious sacrifices, the Jews of Petrograd have fearlessly stated their attitude towards the movement. We are, therefore, confronted with the anomaly of the Jews furnishing for the Bolsheviks the majority of their leaders, although a smaller percentage of Jews than of any other nationality approve of Bolshevism."

"Janus" wrote a Letter to the Editor of the *London Times* which was published on 26 November 1919 on page 8,

**"JEWS AND BOLSHEVISM.
REVOLUTIONARY ELEMENTS.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.**

Sir,—I have read with much interest the letters you published on the 21st and 25th instant from Mr. Israel Cohen and that signed 'Philojudæus' in your issue of the 22nd instant. Without being concerned in the question of whether the Jewish population of Russia as a whole is for or against Bolshevism, or, as one should more correctly describe it, Communism, it is certainly a remarkable fact that the following 28 conspicuous Bolsheviks, most of them Commissaries, are either full-blooded Jews or of Jewish extraction. Nearly all possess a Russianized name. In Hungary also the Commissaries were nearly all Jews, and so are the Bolshevik propagandists in the United States and other countries. This is no more a reflection upon the Jewish race as a whole than the exploits of Marat are a reflection upon the French. All that one can say is that wherever there are subversive movements the restless and enterprising boil up to the surface. The list is as follows:

RUSSIAN NAME.	FORMER NAME.
Lunacharsky	—
Uritsky	—
Litvinov	Fineklstein.
Trotsky	Bronstein.
Steklov	Nahamkes.
Zinoviev	Apfelbaum.
Chernov	Liebermann.

Volodarsky	Cohen.
Kamkov	Katz.
Kamenev	Rosenfeldt.
Solntsev	Goldstein.
Naut	Ginsburg.
Dau	Gurevicz.
Martov	Zederbaum
Zvezdich	Feinstein.
Lebedeva	Simon.
Meshkovsky	Goldenberg.
Parvus	Goldfarb.
Kamensky	Hoffmann.
Gorev	Goldmann.
Sukhanov	Himmer.
Rjazanov	Goldenbach.
Zagorsky	Krachmalnik.
Izgoev	Goldmann
Bogdanov	Silberstein.
Larin	Lurier.
Bunakov	Fundamentsky.
Radek	

Yours faithfully,

JANUS.”

Israel Cohen responded in *The London Times* on 27 November 1919 on page 15,

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In your issue of to-day your correspondent ‘Janus’ gives a list of 28 ‘conspicuous Bolsheviks’ who, he states, ‘are either full-blooded Jews or of Jewish extraction.’ It is only fair to your readers that they should be informed that as many as 10 names in this list are those either of non-Jews or of anti-Bolsheviks or of dead Bolsheviks:—

(1-3) Lunacharsky, Chernov, and Bogdanov are pure Russian Bolsheviks.

(4) Zagorsky is neither a Jew nor a Bolshevik, but a Russian Radical.

(5-6) Kamkov and Bunakov are Social Revolutionaries—*i.e.*, anti-Bolsheviks. Kamkov (-Katz), after his participation in the assassination of Count Mirbach, had to flee from Bolshevik Russia to Archangel.

(7-8) Dan and Martov are the Jewish leaders of the Mensheviks—*i.e.*, the most determined opponents of Lenin and his group. They were referred to as anti-Bolsheviks in your columns only a few days ago.

(9-10) Uritsky and Volodarsky have both been murdered, the former by the Jew Kannesgiesser.

I have no doubt that 'Janus' has sent you his list in good faith, but the fact that it has to be discounted to such a great extent is typical of the general misrepresentations of the Jewish share in Bolshevism.

Yours faithfully,

ISRAEL COHEN.

77, Great Russell-street, W.C., Nov. 26."

The New York Times reported on 20 April 1906 on page 20 on a Jewish revolutionary from Russia, who hid his identity with a "Gentile sounding name", and who traveled through America with falsified passports seeking support (note that there is no call for his arrest),

"MAXIME COMES HERE
 TO AID REVOLUTION
 To Stir Up Sentiment Among the
 Jews of America.
 TELLS OF RUSSIAN BUND
 Declares Upheaval Is Coming Soon—
 Thinks Father Gapon an Agent
 of the Government.

Sent for by the Revolutionary Bund of this city, an organization of Jewish citizens helping the Jewish revolutionary movement in Russia, a young man with a high forehead and piercing, black eyes, and describing himself as Gregory Maxime of St. Petersburg, arrived yesterday in New York as the representative of the parent bund in Russia. How he came and where he agitated last he declined to say. He admits that Maxime is not his real name, and that he may address the Jewish people of some other large city by some other name in a few weeks.

Maxime is the representative of the powerful Jewish revolutionary party in Russia. It is known that he is of fine education, and that his father is a wealthy Jew in Russia. Under the name of Maxime he headed the provisional government in Riga after the big railroad strike, and, while the names of the central committee of the Bund are known to very few sympathizers in the old

country or abroad, he is believed to be a member of it, and also a controlling mind in the direction of the Jewish end of the revolutionary work.

The Bund is strong, and contributes largely to the work of the organization in Russia. As all the Bund's work is done underground, and as many members of it are subject to imprisonment, exile, or death at the hands of the Russian Government, Maxime changes his passports, his name, and as far as possible his appearance as frequently as he deems it necessary to dodge Russian spies. At present he looks the student. He is 27 years old, dresses simply and neatly, and wears a neatly trimmed black beard and mustache. He might easily pass as a university instructor.

Maxime's practical rule of Riga came to an end when the Czar's agents poured into that city sufficient troops to overwhelm the large revolutionary population of Jews and Letts. Maxime says that he was addressing an audience in the theatre of the city when the place was surrounded and artillery trained on it. He had escaped from exile in Siberia just prior to the strike, and he knew that he was wanted. He dropped through a trap in the stage as the officers entered the theatre, and was hurried to the roof of an adjoining building, which was the home of a member of the Bund. He was then shaven and in a few moments was in the garments of a woman and rushing out with the women of the household as they fled to the streets and the Czar's officers rushed in. The Government Secret Service has not had trace of him since.

Maxime will remain in New York about three weeks, addressing the Jews of the city on the revolutionary movement in Russia. Next Sunday night he will talk at Grand Central Palace. After several addresses in Yiddish in this city he will visit other cities with large Jewish populations.

Asked what he thought of Maxim Gorky's plight in this country, he said yesterday: 'I have never met Gorky. In Russia we accept him as a great writer and factor for good, and do not pry into his private affairs. The Mme. Gorky who is with him here was accepted in Russia as Mme. Gorky by the best people. As for me, I'm here unmarried—that is, my wife's in Russia.'

'What do the Jewish revolutionists think of Father Gapon?' he was asked.

'They think him an agent of the Government.'

'What is the opinion of Count Witte?'

'Witte is first for himself and the emoluments,' was the reply. 'He would serve any form of government for the price.'"

On 30 June 1912, on page 9, *The New York Times* published a letter from the radical Jewish Communist Zionist of the Poale Zion, Baruch Charney Vladeck—a. k. a. B. Charney Vladeck, a. k. a. Bruce Vladeck—born Baruch Nachman Charney in Minsk—spent time in prison for attempting to overthrow the Government of Russia—fled to America under a false name—a correspondent for the Jewish Socialist Federation's *Naye Velt* and City Editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward*; a New York City Alderman who led the *Bund* until 1908—and who would later become a member of the New York City Housing Authority and first President of the

Jewish Labor Committee—and who made an unsuccessful bid for the United States Congress,

“REAL NAMES IN RUSSIA.

Lenin’s not German—Other Radicals

May Be from Baltic Provinces.

New York, June 25, 1917.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

In this morning’s TIMES there is a little item of news from Petrograd, under the headline ‘Leader’s Names Assumed,’ credited to The London Post, which is full of misinformation, and ought to be corrected. The item referred to contains the following two statements:

1—That the real name of the leader of the extremist faction, Lenin, is Zedarbluhm or Zedarbaum.

2—That of the eighteen members of the Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates the real names of fourteen sound German.

As to Lenin, his real name is Ulianoff, a ‘Stolbovoy Dvorianin,’ which means a member of the nobility. He is of Russian parentage, born in one of the innermost Russian provinces. Zedarbaum is the real name of an influential Socialist of the moderate faction whose nom de plume is Martoff.

As for the Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates, it consists of fifty-four members, not of eighteen, these fifty-four being divided into a majority of thirty-two moderates or minimalists and twenty-two extremists or maximalists.

Of the fourteen members referred to in the news item, several represent the Jewish Socialist organization known as the Bund, as Goldman, Lurie, &c. The seven or eight whose real names sound German may come from provinces with a large German population, like the Baltic provinces, or they may simply have a name that sounds German, but has nothing to do with German policies.

It is perfectly legitimate to disagree with the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates in Petrograd, but I don’t see why the council and its members should be constantly vilified by people who, for lack of insight into the great Russian crisis, try to explain away events of historical importance by insignificant trifles.

It is true that most of them have studied statesmanship in prison, but so have many others whose names now shine forth from the pages of history. Everybody at all acquainted with the recent history of Russia knows that nearly every able writer from Lermontov down to Gorky: every original thinker from Herzen down to the present Minister Chernov or Plekhnov; every independent citizen from the Becabrists down to Breshkovskaya, the grandmother of the revolution, were persecuted, humiliated, and imprisoned by the old régime, so that very often the prison was the only place where they

could learn anything.

B. C. VLADECK,
City Editor Jewish Daily Forward.”

Simon Sebag Montefiore wrote in his book *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar*,

“In 1937, 5.7 percent of the Party were Jews yet they formed a majority in the government. Lenin himself (who was partly Jewish by ancestry) said that if the Commissar was Jewish, the deputy should be Russian: Stalin followed this rule. [***] Many Jewish Bolsheviks used Russian pseudonyms. As early as 1936, Stalin ordered Mekhlis at *Pravda* to use these pseudonyms: ‘No need to excite Hitler!’”⁴²⁵

In another among many instances of organized Jewish censorship, many Jews made corrupt use of their power in the media, universities and government to censor and ridicule anyone who told the truth about the dominant and destructive rôle Jews played in Bolshevism, Socialism and Communism. While Jews who chose to do so were free to boast of the commonality of Judaism and Bolshevism, Gentiles who pointed out that same linkage were ruined. In the Soviet Union, outing a crypto-Jew was an offense punishable by death.

Denis Fahey wrote extensively of organized Jewish power to censor and punish those who told those truths leading Jews did not want exposed to the public. Fahey quoted a June, 1924, article “The Russian Revolution and the English Official White Paper, Russia, No. 1, 1919,” by G. P. Mudge, which was published in *Loyalty League*, in which Mudge wrote, *inter alia*,

“WHY DOES THE BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE SUPPRESS THE
TRUTH UNPALATABLE TO JEWRY?

In the April issue of the *Loyalty League* I dealt with the attempt made, in the course of a series of lectures by a Mr. M. Farbman, at the London School of Economics, to transfer the responsibility for the hideous Russian revolution of 1917 from the real perpetrators, the Jews, and to ascribe it to a purely agrarian movement among the peasants. I undertook in that article to marshal the voluminous and conclusive evidence that this revolution was entirely Jewish in organization and operation, to show that it had nothing to do with an agrarian movement, or indeed with any cause that had Russian interests in view.

Perhaps one of the most damning pieces of evidence, not only that this revolution, but also the world-revolution which is planned, is Jewish, lies in the strenuous and partially successful efforts which organized Jewry has made to suppress the truth about it. Not only has Jewry succeeded in large measure in suppressing the truth, but it has seemingly been able to intimidate or cajole the *British Foreign Office to suppress a very vital part of one of its own official publications.*”⁴²⁶

Mudge went on to quote from the British War Cabinet's unabridged "White Paper" of April, 1919, which includes Oudendyke's report of 6 September 1918. Oudendyke was the Netherlands' Minister at St. Petersburg,

"The following collection of Reports from His Majesty's official representatives in Russia, from other British subjects who have recently returned from that country, and from independent witnesses of various nationalities, covers the period of the Bolshevik *régime* from the Summer of 1918 to the present date. *They are issued in accordance with a decision of the War Cabinet in January last.* They are unaccompanied by anything in the nature either of comment or introduction, since they speak for themselves in the picture which they present of the principles and methods of Bolshevik rule, the appalling incidents by which it has been accompanied, the economic consequences which have flowed from it, and the almost incalculable misery which it has produced. [***] The foregoing report will indicate the extremely critical nature of the present situation. The danger is now so great that I feel it my duty to call the attention of the British and all other Governments to the fact that, if an end is not put to Bolshevism in Russia at once, the civilization of the whole world will be threatened. This is not an exaggeration, but a sober matter of fact; and the most unusual action of German and Austrian consuls-general, before referred to, in joining in protest of neutral legations, appears to indicate that the danger is also being realized in German and Austrian quarters. I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, *Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world,* AS IT IS ORGANIZED AND WORKED BY JEWS WHO HAVE NO NATIONALITY, AND WHOSE ONE OBJECT IS TO DESTROY FOR THEIR OWN ENDS THE EXISTING ORDER OF THINGS. . . . *I would beg that this report may be telegraphed as soon as possible in cypher in full to the British Office in view of its importance.*"⁴²⁷

Denis Fahey quoted an 18 July 1929 article "Censorship of the Anglo-Saxons" in the *Patriot*, which stated, among other things,

"The censorship in force is Jewish in character, in backing, and in its operative machinery. But it is not confined in its supervision and operation to a definitely organized body of men, even if there be such an organization unknown to us. The Jewish race is absolutely apart from all others in its solidarity, which is maintained in spite of complete dispersion over the globe, and in spite of fundamental differences in religion, in politics, and in material and spiritual attachments within many different nations. The dispersion of the individuals—accompanied as it is by close inter-communications, through business relations in all countries, and by literature on racial interests—permits of the exercise of an ever-growing world power. [***]

Other countries have also organizations aiding Jewish solidarity; and that this solidarity does exist can be shown by two illustrations: First, the amazing way in which the whole world was shaken up on several occasions during the long period of the trials for treason of a single French Army officer, Dreyfus; and second, by the persistent policy of concealment, from all peoples, of the leading part played by a section of revolutionary Jews in all the bloodshed and commercial destruction of the Russian people. That concealment is enforced so successfully that neither writers of books nor editors of newspapers can safely forget the interdict. Even a Government White Book issued in April, 1919, and making clear the world-danger of the Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy against civilization was, by some unknown influence, suppressed, and a bowdlerised abridgement was substituted.

The over-riding power in literature and publicity of a small Jewish minority in most countries is made up of a variety of elements. There is vast wealth to be drawn on for racial objects; there is ownership or control of large numbers of newspapers; and that control is not merely over the complexion given to some news, but over those reviews of new publications which affect largely their sales. The news agencies feeding the newspapers are mostly under Jewish control. The power exercised in film and theatrical productions is pretty generally known. The enormous potential force of a combination of the wealthy Jewish advertisers in all important papers is fully recognized by journalists, for whom advertisements are the life blood of commercial publication. While the political power of Jews might appear negligible because they are equally active in all three Parties here, it is a fact that the division works to great advantage; for, not only is the power exercised out of proportion to numbers in each Party, but it is multiplied by three in matters of racial interest. This is clearly expressed in the words of Emanuel Shinwell, M. P. (Financial Secretary to the War Office), in a speech at the annual dinner of 'B'nai B'rith,' on 23rd, June: *The Jews in the House of Commons, whatever their political opinions may be, will always stand in that assembly for the rights of the Jewish community. It has been said that they must emphasize the fact of the Judaism before the fact of citizenship. He held that they must regard themselves as Jews and citizens equally.*"⁴²⁸

Fahey also quoted from a 20 February 1930 article in the *Patriot*,

"As bearing on the part taken by Red Jews in the Bolshevik triumph over Russia, we quote Dr. Angelo S. Rappaport, a Jewish writer, who published a book in 1918 called *Pioneers of the Russian Revolution*:—

'To a greater degree than the Poles, the Letts, or Finns, or, indeed, any other ethnic group in the vast Empire of the Romanovs, the Jews have been the artisans of the revolution of 1917. . . . It is no exaggeration to say that the small, even insignificant, amount of freedom obtained by the Russian Liberals in 1905 and 1906 was largely due to the effort of the Jews. . . . There was no political organization in the vast Empire that was not influenced by

Jews or directed by them. . . . Throughout history the spirit of the Jew has always been revolutionary and subversive. . . . Long before they had been formulated in French, the principles of the 'Rights of Man' had been announced in Hebrew. . . . The Russian Jews, the pioneers of the revolution, are now continuing to fight for the cause of Justice, for the principles of Democracy against German Militarism.'

When the Jewish and Russian Bolsheviks seized power, Red Jews flocked to the scene from all countries, and reinforced the brains and hands of the murderous tyranny. Mr. Robert Wilton, for seventeen years correspondent of *The Times* in Russia [***] wrote a book, *The Last Days of the Romanoffs*. This book showed that the murder of the Czar and his family was the work of Red Jews, and that they prepared the whole revolution, and became masters of Russia from their domination of all the important offices under the Soviet. He wrote in 1920: 'The Jewish domination in Russia is supported by certain Russians. . . they are all mere screens or dummies behind which the Sverdlovs and the thousand and one Jews of Sovdepiia continue their work of destruction.'

After this Mr. Wilton's chances in English journalism were gone. He was a true British patriot; and he died in very straitened circumstances in France in January, 1925. No one who has paid the slightest attention to the course of Russian events since the Bolshevik accession to power in November, 1917, can have failed to know that, when all the important members of the Russian aristocracy, the learned profession, the Army and Navy, had been executed, or imprisoned, or driven abroad, Red Jews were in possession of the great majority of responsible positions in and under the Soviet. So clear was this that, in the past, Jewish apologists, here and in America, have explained the fact by the true statement that only among the Jews could be found any longer the brains and business experience for filling important posts. Yet in the face of this situation there have been dozens of books published in English, and innumerable articles throughout the Press, and any number of lectures delivered, all with the astounding omission of any mention of Jewish handiwork in Russian Bolshevism. There have been public references to the sufferings of some orthodox non-Communist Jews at the hands of the Soviet.

Newspapers bear witness to a censorship over them by what they omit to publish, and by their sketchy apologetic mention of incidents tending to produce undesired conclusions about the march of events. Authors can safely reckon on the refusal of book publishers to produce any book unorthodox to current propaganda which supports the censorship."⁴²⁹

Gorky stated soon after the Russian Revolution of 1917, that the crypto-Jews "Lenin" and "Trotsky" (Lev Davidovitch Bronstein) had turned the revolutionary movement for democracy, liberty, equality and fraternity into a dictatorship; which suppressed human rights and civil liberties; and which censored the press, including Gorky's own daily newspaper, *Новая Жизнь* or "New Life" published in Petrograd.

It was a common practice for Cabalist Jews to foment revolution with cries for liberty, equality and fraternity—especially in the press, which they owned—then destroy the nation, culture and religion of a people after the revolution, and declare that only a dictatorship, run by one of their agents, would have the ability to restore order among the chaos, which insufferable chaos they themselves had intentionally created. The dictatorship would then set about to destroy the people themselves, and spread war and famine to the nation and to its neighbors. The English Revolution, the French Revolution, the Young Turk Revolution, the Russian Revolution, Hitler's burning of the Reichstag, etc. followed this Cabalistic Jewish model, which we know was employed by Jews at least since the time of the Roman Caesars, and which appears in Jewish literature in their fabricated tales of "exile" and "captivity" in Egypt and Babylon.

At the festival of Purim, Jews wear costumes which conceal their identity in order to symbolize the status of a crypto-Jew, one who undermines the nation in which he or she resides. Some have interpreted the festival of Purim as an occasion for the Rabbis to augment their power by manufacturing an artificial common enemy for their followers to fear and to hate.⁴³⁰ Purim is based on the story of Esther, which story is read at the festival.

In the story of "Esther" (a crypto-Jewish name, her actual name was Hadassah) the Jews manipulated and betrayed the Persian Kings, who had freed the Jews from their captivity and exile among the Babylonians. If the stories can be believed—and they cannot, Cyrus, King of Persia, freed the Jews and restored them to Palestine and helped them to "rebuild" the Temple. Ahasuerus, King of Persia, (no such king ever existed) married and obeyed Esther, a deceitful crypto-Jewish agent placed in his midst after Ahasuerus' first wife had died, or had been killed. The Jews repaid the generosity of the Persians with deceit and genocide, in their own mythologies, which genocidal mythologies are inculcated into the minds of Jewish youth.

We find parallels to this ancient story today. The President of Iran (Persia) may be an agent of the Zionists and a traitor to the Iranian people. Judging by his actions, this modern "Persian King" wants to lead the Iranians toward their own destruction in order to benefit the Israelis. Like the Turks who followed the crypto-Jewish Young Turks,⁴³¹ who mass murdered Armenians; like the Russians who followed crypto-Jewish Bolsheviks, who mass murdered Russians, Jews and countless others; like the Germans who followed crypto-Jewish Nazis, who mass murdered Germans, Jews and countless others; Americans, Iranians, British, etc. are today led by Zionist Jews and crypto-Jews, who are bringing about their destruction.

Celebrated annually, the festival of Purim is widely considered to be the Jews' favorite holiday. The Biblical book of *Esther* (whose "real" name was Hadassah) and the "war against Amalek" are discussed in the *Tractate Megillah*, Chapter 1. On Purim, Jewish children are encouraged to commit symbolic acts of violence while in a frenzy, and to cry out for genocide and curse the Gentiles (*Orach Chaim* 690:16). In 1603, Johannes Buxtorf, the world's foremost expert on Judaism and Jews, wrote of Purim, a drunken Jewish festival celebrating genocide and hatred, and the use of crypto-Jews to subvert a government,

“CHAP. XXIV.

Of their Feast of Purim.

THe word *Purim* is a Persian word, and is rendered by the Hebrew *Goral*, which signifies a lot. This Feast therefore took its name from that plot and wicked device of *Haman* the Agagite, {*Esther* 3.} who in the moneth *Nisan* in the twelfth year of *Ahasuerus* cast *Pur*, that is a lot, whereby all the Jews, both young and old, children and women in all the Kings Provinces should be destroyed and rooted out in one day, even upon the thirteenth day of the twelfth moneth, which is the moneth *Adar* of February; which decree was written in the name of the King, and sealed with his Ring.

The end of this conspiracy fell far contrary to *Hamans* intent. For *Haman* was hanged upon a pair of Gallows fifty foot high, and the King granted the Jews {*Esther* 8.} in what Cities soever they were to gather themselves together, and to stand for their life to root out, slay, and destroy, all them that vexed them. So that strengthened by the Kings Letter Patents, they put their adversaries to death. In *Shushan* the Palace they slew five hundred men, and the ten sons of *Haman*; and the Jews that were in the Provinces of King *Ahasuerus* slew of them that hated them seventy five thousand men, upon the thirteenth day of the moneth *Adar*, and rested upon the fourteenth and fifteenth thereof. Wherefore it is instituted and ordained, that upon the fourteenth and the fifteenth day of the said moneth every yeer should a Feast be kept by the Jews in all quarters, in remembrance of this great deliverance throughout their generations by an ordinance for ever. Wherein they rested from their enemies, in the moneth which turned unto them from sorrow to joy, from mourning to a joyful day: as we may read in the ninth Chapter of the book of *Esther*.

These two dayes are celebrated at this day by the Jews imitation of their ancestors, but in that manner, that they rather deserve the name of the dayes of profanation and drunkennesse, then of joy and gladnesse.

Although upon these dayes working is not prohibited by the text of Scripture: yet the Jewes at this day rest from all manner of labour, writing and affirming in the Talmud, {*Tract. Megilah.*} that he will never thrive or prosper that does any work upon them. For there it is recorded, that upon a certain time that a man being sowing line-seed upon one of these dayes, a certain Rabbine coming by and seeing him, began to reprove and curse him. Whereupon it came to passe, that the seed never came to growth, nor did ever peep out of the ground.

In the first place therefore the women are enjoined in a more peculiar manner to sanctifie and celebrate this Festival, because this deliverance was wrought by the hands of Queen *Esther*. The night being come, they light the Lamps of joy in the Synagogue, and the *Chasan* or the Minister expounding the book of *Esther*, reads it from end to end: whereat the women and children

ought to be present, and give diligent attention; and they have a custome that the little ones so often as *Haman* is named, keep a vile stir and a tumultuous noise in the terrible and forcible explosion thereof. {Orach chajim, nu. 690. Sect. 16.} In former times they were wont to provide themselves two stones, upon one of which the name of *Haman* was written. These they did beat one against the other, until the name was quite demolished and worn out; which when they perceived, they presently cried aloud, *Let his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot; Accursed be Haman; Blessed by Mordecai; Cursed be Zeresh; Blessed be Esther the wife Ahasueras. Cursed be all they that worship idols or the host of heaven. Blessed be all the people of Israel.* When the Lecturer comes to that place where mention is made of the ten sons of *Haman*, he is bound to read it with one breath, for they write, that all these sons of *Haman* perished in the twinkling of an eye, and their souls in a very moment took their farewell of their beloved lodging the body. They celebrate this Feast in a very voluptuous manner, sousing their guts in wine and beer, because *Esther* the Queen found favour and grace in the eyes of King *Ahasuerus* when he sate at her banquet, and obtained pardon for the Jews, and a grant that they might stand for their lives. And hence it comes to pass, that for the space of these two dayes, they busie themselves with no other things then eating and drinking, smelling, and bibbing, dancing, and piping, singing, and roaring, feasting, and sporting, riming, and scoffing, the women putting on mens apparrell and the men clothing themselves in womens attire, which although it be expresly forbid in the law of *Moses*, yet they make there one exception, {Orach:chajim num: 615.} saying, that it is lawful and no offence to practice it upon this day, and this occasion: seeing it is done by them only for worldly joy and recreation, *Rabbi Isaac Tirna* in this *Minhagim* hath left in record to posterity, {De rit: Jud: p. 61.} that it is commanded as a work of great excellency, to make merry as upon these dayes, to goe a whoring, to drink and be drunke, yea in that measure, that he cannot make any difference between *Mordecai* the blessed, and *Haman* the accursed, that is to say, untill he be so besotted with the ale tappe, that he cannot for his heart declare how many letters be contained in any of these words, yea moreover, any one is permitted at this time to poure in strong drink, until he knowes not how many fingers he hath on either hand. Which precept indeed is most diligently observed and kept, according to the very rigour thereof by the Jews at this day, and that chiefly by the beggerly crew, to whom the richer sort send gifts and presents in a far greater measure then they do at other times, to the end that one may not mock another for being drunk, being commanded and strictly prohibited to send away their meat and drink to any other end and purpose. With these Bacchanal rites, drunken fits, and besotting beastliness, they put an end to their annual feasts. For this of Purim is the last festival in the year, having no more until the feast of the passover. If the Prophet *Isaiah* were alive at this day, or should rise from the dead, truly and really might he take occasion, and that both forcible and urgent to cry out, *Woe and alass unto them that rise up early to follow*

*drunkenness, and to them that continue until the night, till the wine do inflame them.*⁴³²

4.4.4 The Gentiles Must be Exterminated Lest God Cut Off the Jews

An important aspect of the Jewish Alamek mythology is the belief that Esau, or Edom, sought to destroy a belief in the Creator God of the Old Testament. This offense against God makes it easier for Jewish religious fanatics to justify their merciless genocide of Gentiles—they believe that any evil done in the name of God is good. *Deuteronomy* 7:2-3 states:

“2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.”

Deuteronomy 7:16-18 states:

“16 And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. 17 If thou shalt say in thine heart, These nations *are* more than I; how can I dispossess them? 18 Thou shalt not be afraid of them: *but* shalt well remember what the LORD thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt;”

Some Jews have seen Amalek in Haman, Marcion, Rome, Christianity, Islam, Germany, Russia, even in all Gentiles; and though the Moslems—especially the Islamic Turkish Empire—are traditionally associated with Isaac’s half-brother Ishmael, rather than Esau, they are often referred to today as Amalek, as the race that must be exterminated.⁴³³ Jewish mythology emphasizes the threat that God will be angry with, and punish, any Jew who fails to exterminate the seed of Amalek. I *Samuel* 15:1-35 states (one wonders, together with Voltaire,⁴³⁴ if Agag was meant as a human sacrifice to Baal):

“Samuel also said unto Saul, The LORD sent me to anoint thee *to be* king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the LORD. 2 Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I remember *that* which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid *wait* for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. 3 Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass. 4 And Saul gathered the people together, and numbered them in Telaim, two hundred thousand footmen, and ten thousand men of Judah. 5 And Saul came to a city of Amalek, and laid wait in the valley. 6 ¶ And Saul said unto the Kenites, Go, depart, get you down from

among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them: for ye shewed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt. So the Kenites departed from among the Amalekites. 7 And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah *until* thou comest to Shur, that *is* over against Egypt. 8 And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. 9 But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all *that* was good, and would not utterly destroy them: but every thing *that was* vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly. 10 Then came the word of the LORD unto Samuel, saying, 11 It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments. And it grieved Samuel; and he cried unto the LORD all night. 12 And when Samuel rose early to meet Saul in the morning, it was told Samuel, saying, Saul came to Carmel, and, behold, he set him up a place, and is gone about, and passed on, and gone down to Gilgal. 13 And Samuel came to Saul: and Saul said unto him, Blessed *be* thou of the LORD: I have performed the commandment of the LORD. 14 And Samuel said, What *meaneth* then this bleating of the sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear? 15 And Saul said, They have brought them from the Amalekites: for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God; and the rest we have utterly destroyed. 16 Then Samuel said unto Saul, Stay, and I will tell thee what the LORD hath said to me this night. And he said unto him, Say on. 17 And Samuel said, When thou *wast* little in thine own sight, *wast* thou not *made* the head of the tribes of Israel, and the LORD anointed thee king over Israel? 18 And the LORD sent thee on a journey, and said, Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. 19 Wherefore then didst thou not obey the voice of the LORD, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the LORD? 20 And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, I have obeyed the voice of the LORD, and have gone the way which the LORD sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. 21 But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God in Gilgal. 22 And Samuel said, Hath the LORD *as great* delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey *is* better than sacrifice, *and* to hearken than the fat of rams. 23 For rebellion *is as* the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness *is as* iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from *being* king. 24 ¶ And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice. 25 Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD. 26 And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, and the LORD hath rejected thee from being king over Israel. 27 And as Samuel turned about to

go away, he laid hold upon the skirt of his mantle, and it rent. 28 And Samuel said unto him, The LORD hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, *that is* better than thou. 29 And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he *is* not a man, that he should repent. 30 Then he said, I have sinned: yet honour me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people, and before Israel, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD thy God. 31 So Samuel turned again after Saul; and Saul worshipped the LORD. 32 ¶ Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag the king of the Amalekites. And Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past. 33 And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the LORD in Gilgal. 34 ¶ Then Samuel went to Ramah; and Saul went up to his house to Gibeah of Saul. 35 And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death: nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul: and the LORD repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.”

The Jewish God of the Old Testament preferred genocidal extermination to mercy and tolerance, as revealed in *Joshua* 10:34-42,

“And from Lachish Joshua passed unto Eglon, and all Israel with him; and they encamped against it, and fought against it: 35 And they took it on that day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that *were* therein he utterly destroyed that day, according to all that he had done to Lachish. 36 And Joshua went up from Eglon, and all Israel with him, unto Hebron; and they fought against it: 37 And they took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof, and all the cities thereof, and all the souls that *were* therein; he left none remaining, according to all that he had done to Eglon; but destroyed it utterly, and all the souls that *were* therein. 38 And Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to Debir; and fought against it: 39 And he took it, and the king thereof, and all the cities thereof; and they smote them with the edge of the sword, and utterly destroyed all the souls that *were* therein; he left none remaining: as he had done to Hebron, so he did to Debir, and to the king thereof; as he had done also to Libnah, and to her king. 40 So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vale, and of the springs, and all their kings: he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the LORD God of Israel commanded. 41 And Joshua smote them from Kadesh-barnea even unto Gaza, and all the country of Goshen, even unto Gibeon. 42 And all these kings and their land did Joshua take at one time, because the LORD God of Israel fought for Israel.”

Deuteronomy 3:4-7; 7:2, 16-18; 20:16; 26:19; and 28:9 state:

“And we took all his cities at that time, there was not a city which we took

not from them, threescore cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these cities *were* fenced *with* high walls, gates, and bars; beside unwall'd towns a great many. And we utterly destroyed them, as we did unto Sihon king of Heshbon, utterly destroying the men, women, and children, of every city. But all the cattle, and the spoil of the cities, we took for a prey to ourselves. [***] And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: [***] And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. [***] But of the cities of these people, which the LORD thy God doth give thee *for* an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: [***] And to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the LORD thy God, as he hath spoken. [***] The LORD shall establish thee an holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the LORD thy God, and walk in his ways."

Numbers 21:3, 35; and 31:1-18 state:

"3 And the LORD hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities: and he called the name of the place Hormah. [***] 35 So they smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none left him alive: and they possessed his land. [***] And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, 2 Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites: afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people. 3 And Moses spake unto the people, saying, Arm some of yourselves unto the war, and let them go against the Midianites, and avenge the LORD of Midian. 4 Of every tribe a thousand, throughout all the tribes of Israel, shall ye send to the war. 5 So there were delivered out of the thousands of Israel, a thousand of *every* tribe, twelve thousand armed for war. 6 And Moses sent them to the war, a thousand of *every* tribe, them and Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest, to the war, with the holy instruments, and the trumpets to blow in his hand. 7 And they warred against the Midianites, as the LORD commanded Moses; and they slew all the males. 8 And they slew the kings of Midian, beside the rest of them that were slain; *namely*, Evi, and Rekem, and Zur, and Hur, and Reba, five kings of Midian: Balaam also the son of Beor they slew with the sword. 9 And the children of Israel took *all* the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. 10 And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles, with fire. 11 And they took all the spoil, and all the prey, *both* of men and of beasts. 12 And they brought the captives, and the prey, and the spoil, unto Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and unto the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the camp at

the plains of Moab, which are by Jordan *near* Jericho. 13 And Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp. 14 And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, *with* the captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, which came from the battle. 15 And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive? 16 Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the LORD in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the LORD. 17 Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. 18 But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.”

See also: *The Book of Jubilees* 32:17-20.

In Jewish mythology, the Messiah of the Jews will destroy the nations, destroy all the religion of the Gentiles, enslave the Gentiles and then exterminate them. It is very important to remember that the Messiah of genocidal Judaism is not the gentle healer of the sick, and willing victim of the powerful, whom we call Jesus of Nazareth. The Messiah of genocidal Judaism is a demonic figure who will lay the Gentiles to waste—he is worse than those who were promoted in the press of their day as messiahs—worse than Napoleon, worse than Marx, worse than Hitler, worse even than Stalin. *Psalms* 2:1-12 states:

“Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? 2 The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, *saying*, 3 Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. 4 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. 5 Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. 6 Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. 7 I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou *art* my Son; this day have I begotten thee. 8 Ask of me, and I shall give *thee* the heathen *for* thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth *for* thy possession. 9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel. 10 Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. 11 Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. 12 Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish *from* the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him.”

Psalms 110:1-7 states,

“The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. 2 The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. 3 Thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. 4 The LORD hath sworn, and will

not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. 5 The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. 6 He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill *the places with* the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries. 7 He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head.”

The Jews scoffed at that idea that Jesus should have been the Messiah of the Jews, because Jesus did not commit genocide against the Gentiles with an iron scepter as was prophesied (*Numbers* 24:17-20. *Psalms* 2:9). Jesus was humble, not a demonic and wealthy king who destroyed the nations, enslaved the Gentiles and then murdered them, as some sects of Judaism design and desire to this day.

Israel is today a nation. The Jewish religion, as practiced by some, calls for the extermination of the seed of Amalek. This meant to some Jews the sterilization of Germans, assimilationists, criminals, etc.; to others the planned effects of “race-mixing”, which would dilute and weaken the seed of Amalek; to others, it has meant the obliteration of Islamic Nations.⁴³⁵ There have been allegations that Israel is developing genetically targeted biological weapons. Israel is heavily armed with nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. *The Sunday Times* of London reported, among other things, on 15 November 1998, in an article by Uzi Mahnaimi and Marie Colvin entitled “Israel Planning ‘Ethnic’ Bomb as Saddam Caves in / Pentagon Warns Over ‘Ethno Bomb’”, on pages 1 and 2,

“In developing their ‘ethno bomb’, Israeli scientists are trying to exploit medical advances by identifying genes carried by some Arabs, then create a genetically modified bacterium or virus. [***] The programme is based at the biological institute in Nes Tziyona, the main research facility for Israel’s clandestine arsenal of chemical and biological weapons.”

Israel plans to destroy all human life on Earth, if its Messianic goals are not fulfilled. The Israeli government, which represents only a few million persons, has prepared a doom’s day device called the “Samson Option”, which will detonate enough nuclear devices to kill off all of humanity. They plan to use it if the State of Israel fails.⁴³⁶ Judaism calls on the “righteous”—fanatically religious Jews—to mass murder the rest of humanity in the Messianic Era.⁴³⁷ *Deuteronomy* 32:9, states,

“For the LORD’s portion *is* his people; Jacob *is* the lot of his inheritance.”

The criminal Israeli cult of assassination and espionage, the Mossad, wages war on the rest of the world. The Mossad’s motto is, “By way of deception, thou shalt do war.”⁴³⁸

The ultimate purpose of the racist Jews’ war on humanity is ultimately to leave no one left alive but “righteous” Jews.⁴³⁹ All Gentiles are destined to be killed. All assimilated Jews are destined to be killed. Michael Higger wrote in his book *The Jewish Utopia*,

“First, no line will be drawn between bad Jews and bad non-Jews. There will be no room for the unrighteous, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, in the Kingdom of God. All of them will have disappeared before the advent of the ideal era on this earth.⁸⁴ Unrighteous Israelites will be punished equally with the wicked of other nations.⁸⁵ [***] In general, the peoples of the world will be divided into two main groups, the Israelitic and the non-Israelitic. The former will be righteous; they will live in accordance with the wishes of one, universal God; they will be thirsty for knowledge, and willing, even to the point of martyrdom, to spread ethical truths to the world. All the other peoples, on the other hand, will be known for their detestable practices, idolatry, and similar acts of wickedness. They will be destroyed and will disappear from earth before the ushering in of the ideal era.²¹⁸ All these unrighteous nations will be called to judgment, before they are punished and doomed. The severe sentence of their doom will be pronounced upon them only after they have been given a fair trial, when it will have become evident that their existence would hinder the advent of the ideal era.²¹⁹ Thus, at the coming of the Messiah, when all righteous nations will pay homage to the ideal righteous leader, and offer gifts to him, the wicked and corrupt nations, by realizing the approach of their doom, will bring similar presents to the Messiah. Their gifts and pretended acknowledgment of the new era, will be bluntly rejected.²²⁰ For the really wicked nations, like the wicked individuals, must disappear from earth before an ideal human society of righteous nations can be established. No ideal era of mankind can be established as long as there are peoples living idolatrous, ungodly lives ; as long as there are oppressors of the righteous, friends of slavery, enemies of freedom and liberty, and defiant enemies of God.²²¹ [***] Moreover, rabbinic sources, in speaking of Israel’s fate in the ideal era, ascribe Israel’s spiritual victory in the future to the fact that righteousness will be victorious over wickedness, and that the upright and just will succeed in bringing about the disappearance of the unrighteous from the earth.²²⁶ [***] Consequently, before the Kingdom of God will be established, a number of important reforms and changes will take place. Idolatry and idol worshippers, wicked people, unrighteous nations will disappear from the earth.^{230,440}

It should be noted that Higger asserts that Gentiles will first be offered an opportunity to join the “righteous Jews”, but those whom the Jewish Messiah rejects will be mass murdered in a broad genocide. What is to prevent the Jewish Messiah, a political Jewish King, not a divine being, from merely pronouncing all Gentiles “unrighteous” as is the case in the Hebrew Bible? What is “righteous” about genocide? Why do religious disagreements give the “righteous Jews” the right to slaughter their Catholic, Buddhist, Hindu, and assimilated Jewish neighbors?

Tom Segev quoted Ehud Praver in Segev’s book, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*,

““In the wake of Kahane, we heard more and more about soldiers who,

exposed to the history of the Holocaust, were planning all sorts of ways to exterminate the Arabs,' recalled education-corps officer Ehud Praver. 'It concerned us very much, because we saw that the Holocaust was legitimizing the appearance of Jewish racism. We learned that it was necessary to deal not only with the Holocaust but also with the rise of fascism and to explain what racism is and what dangers it holds for democracy.' According to Praver, 'too many soldiers were deducing that the Holocaust justifies every kind of disgraceful action.'"⁴⁴¹

Jewish hatred of the Gentiles spans across history. The *Zohar*, I, 28b, states,

"One kind is from the side of the serpent; another from the side of the Gentiles, who are compared to the beasts of the field[.]"⁴⁴²

We also find the racist Jews Isaac Luria, Nachman of Bratslav and Shneur Zalman degrading Gentiles as if sub-human. Shneur Zalman believed that,

"Gentile souls are of a completely different and inferior order. They are totally evil, with no redeeming qualities whatsoever. Consequently, references to gentiles in Rabbi Shneur Zalman's teachings are invariably invidious. . . . Their material abundance derives from supernal refuse. Indeed, they themselves derive from refuse, which is why they are more numerous than the Jews, as the pieces of chaff outnumber the kernels. . . . All Jews were innately good, all gentiles innately evil. Jews were the pinnacle of creation and served the Creator, gentiles its nadir and worshiped the heavenly hosts."⁴⁴³

Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook wrote in the Twentieth Century that,

"the difference between the Israelite soul. . . and the souls of all non-Jews, no matter what their level, is bigger and deeper than the difference between the human soul and the animal soul."⁴⁴⁴

The Jewish Encyclopedia wrote in its article "Gentile",

"According to Hananiah b. Akabia the word רעהו (Ex. xxi. 14) may perhaps exclude the Gentile; but the shedding of the blood of non-Israelites, while not cognizable by human courts, will be punished by the heavenly tribunal (Mek., Mishpatim, 80b). [***] Another reason for discrimination [against Gentiles] was the vile and vicious character of the Gentiles: 'I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation' (נכל = 'vile,' 'contemptible'; Deut. xxxii. 21). The Talmud says that the passage refers to the Gentiles of Barbary and Mauretania, who walked nude in the streets (Yeb. 63b), and to similar Gentiles, 'whose flesh is as the flesh of asses and whose issue is like the issue of horses' (Ezek. xxiii. 20); who can not claim a father (Yeb. 98a). The

Gentiles were so strongly suspected of unnatural crimes that it was necessary to prohibit the stabling of a cow in their stalls ('Ab. Zarah ii. 1). Assaults on women were most frequent, especially at invasions and after sieges (Ket. 3b), the Rabbis declaring that in case of rape by a Gentile the issue should not be allowed to affect a Jewish woman's relation to her husband. 'The Torah outlawed the issue of a Gentile as that of a beast' (Mik. viii. 4, referring to Ezek. i. c.).⁴⁴⁵

Albert Einstein's friend Georg Friedrich Nicolai (Lewinstein) stated in 1917,

"Apart from this strange story of Cain, however, murder is forbidden in the Bible, and very sternly forbidden. But—it is only the murder of Jews. As is natural, considering the period from which it dates, the Bible is absolutely national, in character. Only the Jew is really considered as a human being; cattle and strangers might be slain without the slayer himself being slain. In this case there was a ransom. Accordingly, war was of course allowed also, and the Jews were no more illogical than the Moslem who kills the outlander. Of late years the Jews and the Old Testament have often been reproached for their contempt for those who were not Jews; and in practice even Christ acted in precisely the same way."⁴⁴⁶

In an article "Begin and the 'Beasts'", *New Statesman*, Volume 103, Number 2674, (25 June 1982), page 12, Amnon Kapeliuk wrote of Menachem Begin, the Prime Minister of Israel,

"The war in Lebanon cannot be interpreted, even by its most devoted proponents in Israel, as a war of survival. For this reason, the government has gone to extraordinary lengths to dehumanise the Palestinians. Begin described them in a speech in the Knesset as 'beasts walking on two legs'. Palestinians have often been called 'bugs' while their refugee camps in Lebanon are referred to as 'tourist camps'. In order to rationalise the bombing of civilian populations, Begin emotively declared: 'If Hitler was sitting in a house with 20 other people, would it be correct to blow up the house?'"⁴⁴⁷

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. [***] 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.”

Racist Zionist Moses Hess declared that Germans are the genetic enemies of Israel in 1862 (contrast Hess’ views with Goldhagen’s negative analysis of Germans under Hitler⁴⁴⁸ and see Hartmut Stern’s response to Goldhagen⁴⁴⁹). Moses Hess’ statement must be seen in the context of Jacob and Esau, and Isaac’s “blessing” to Esau that Esau should be the servant and the sword of Jacob, of Israel. *Genesis* 25:23 states,

“And the LORD said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger.”

Genesis 27:38-41 states,

“38 And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, *even* me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. 39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. 41¶ And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.”

Hess may have envisioned the annihilation of the German “race”—referred to by some Jews as the people of the sword. It was clearly better for the Jews to kill off

Esau before his descendants “broke his yoke from off his neck” than to let them live and potentially seek revenge on the Jews. Hess’ book told his fellow Jews that Germans were the seed of Amalek and must be exterminated. At least as early as the 1860’s, Moses Hess argued that the “German race” had a genetically programmed antagonism towards the “Jewish race”—the implication being that one must destroy the other in order to survive. In the Jewish mythology, this confrontation called for the extermination of the Germans. Two World Wars nearly accomplished the destruction of Germany and ended their prominence in world affairs. Two World Wars killed off many of the strongest, smartest and most assertive Germans. Hess wrote in 1862,

“It seems that German education is not compatible with our Jewish national aspirations. Had I not once lived in France, it would never have entered my mind to interest myself with the revival of Jewish nationality. Our views and strivings are determined by the social environment which surrounds us. Every Living, acting people, like every active individual, has its special field. Indeed, every man, every member of the historical nations, is a political, or as we say at present, a social animal; yet within this sphere of the common social world, there are special places reserved by Nature for individuals according to their particular calling. The specialty of the German of the higher class, of course, is his interest in abstract thought; and because he is too much of a universal philosopher, it is difficult for him to be inspired by national tendencies. ‘Its whole tendency,’ my former publisher, Otto Wigand, once wrote to me, when I showed him an outline of a work on Jewish national aspirations, ‘is contrary to my pure human nature.’

The ‘pure human nature’ of the Germans is, in reality, the character of the pure German race, which rises to the conception of humanity in theory only, but in practice it has not succeeded in overcoming the natural sympathies and antipathies of the race. German antagonism to Jewish national aspiration has a double origin, though the motives are really contrary to each other. The duplicity and contrariety of the human personality, such as we can see in the union of the spiritual and the natural, the theoretical and the practical sides, are in no other nation so sharply marked in their points of opposition as in the German. Jewish national aspirations are antagonistic to the theoretical cosmopolitan tendencies of the German. But in addition to this, the German opposes Jewish national aspirations because of his racial antipathy, from which even the noblest Germans have not as yet emancipated themselves. The publisher, whose ‘pure human’ conscience revolted against publishing a book advocating the revival of Jewish nationality, published books preaching hatred to Jews and Judaism without the slightest remorse, in spite of the fact that the motive of such works is essentially opposed to the ‘pure human conscience.’ This contradictory action was due to inborn racial antagonism to the Jews. But the German, it seems, has no clear conception of his racial prejudices; he sees in his egoistic as well as in his spiritual endeavors, not German or Teutonic, but ‘humanitarian tendencies’; and he

does not know that he follows the latter only in theory, while in practice he clings to his egoistic ideas.

[***]

In 1858, there appeared, at Leipzig, a work written by Otto Wigand under the title *Two discourses concerning the desertion from Judaism*, being an analysis of the views on this question expressed in the recently published correspondence of Dr. Abraham Geiger. The author endeavors to prove that the conclusions of Dr. Geiger are untenable both from a philosophic and from a social standpoint. Here are his social arguments:

‘My friend,’ says the author, ‘there are certain conclusions which you cannot escape. The stamp of slavery, if we may use this expression, which centuries of oppression have deeply impressed upon the Jewish features, might have been obliterated by the blessed hand of regained civil liberty. The gait of the Jews, buoyed up by the happy reminiscences of the victory won in the struggle for the noble possession of liberty, might have been straighter and prouder. The Jewish face may certainly beam with pride, as it views the tremendous progress made by the Jews in a brief time, their mighty flight to the spiritual height upon which they now stand, which is especially notable considering the fact that their poets and writers at whose greatness the nation is astonished, and of whose talents the entire people takes account, have sprung from those who, a generation ago, could hardly converse correctly in the language of the land. Such a state of affairs should undoubtedly call forth admiration in the hearts of the present German generation, and yet, in spite of these achievements, the wall separating Jew and Christian still stands unshattered, for the watchman that guards them is one who will not be caught napping. It is the race difference between the Jewish and Christian populations. If this assertion of mine surprises or astonishes you, I ask you to consider whether it is not almost a rule with the Germans that race differences generate prejudices which cannot be overcome by any manifestation of good-will on the part of the other race. The relations existing between the German and the Slavic populations in Bohemia, in Hungary and Transylvania, between the Germans and the Danes in Schleswig, or between the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon settlers in Ireland, illustrates well the power of race antagonism in the German world. In all these countries the different elements of the population have lived side by side for centuries, sharing equally all political rights, and yet, so strong are the national or racial differences, that a social amalgamation of the various elements of the population is even at the present day quite unthinkable. And what comparison is there between the race differences of a German and Slav, a Celt and Anglo-Saxon, or a German and Dane, and the race antagonism between the children of the Sons of Jacob, who are of Asiatic descent, and the descendants of Teut and Herman, the ancestors of whom have inhabited Europe from time immemorial; between the proud and the tall blond German and the small of figure, black-haired and black-eyed Jew? Races which differ in such a degree oppose each other instinctively and against such opposition

reason and good sense are powerless.’

These expressions are certainly frank and sincere in their meaning, though they by no means prove the conclusions to which the author wishes to arrive, namely, the desirability of conversion; for conversion will not turn a Jew into a German. But they at least contain the confession, that an instinctive race antagonism triumphs in Germany above all humanitarian sentiments. The ‘pure human nature’ resolves itself, according to the Germans, in the nature of pure Germanism. The ‘high-born blond race’ looks with contempt upon the regeneration of the ‘black-haired, quick-moving mannikins,’ without regard to whether they are descendants of the Biblical patriarchs, or of the ancient Romans and Gauls.

While other civilized western nations mention the shameful oppression to which the Jews were formerly subjected, only as an act of theirs of which they are ashamed, the German remembers only the ‘stamp of slavery’ which he impressed upon ‘the Jewish physiognomy.’

In a *feuilleton* which appeared recently in the *Bonnerzeitung*, entitled ‘Bonn Eighty Years Ago,’ the author speaks of the Jews in mocking terms and describes them as people who lived in separate quarters and supported themselves by petty trades. I believe that we should wonder less at the fact that the Jews, who were forbidden to participate in the important branches of industry and commerce, lived on petty trade, than at the fact that they were able to live at all in those centuries of oppression. As a matter of fact, almost every means of existence, including the right of domicile, was denied them. It was only by means of bribes that every Jewish generation could procure anew the ‘privilege’ not to be driven out of their homes in Bonn, and they felt happy indeed if, in spite of the contract, they were not robbed of their property and exiled, or attacked by a fanatical mob in the bargain. I, also, can tell a story of ‘eighty years ago.’ A Jew won the high favor of the Kurfuerst of Bonn, that he and his descendants were granted the ‘privilege’ to settle in Ebendich.

[***]

Gabriel Riesser, the editor of the magazine, *The Jew*, as far as I can recollect, never fell into the error, common to all modern German Jews, that the emancipation of the Jews is irreconcilable with the development of Jewish Nationalism. He demanded emancipation for the Jews on the one condition only, that of their receiving all civil and political rights in return for their assuming all civil and political burdens.”⁴⁵⁰

Jewish financiers including Jacob Schiff brought about the downfall of Russia in the name of saving the Children of Israel from Edom. England, France, Germany, Turkey and Russia caused each other great harm, but their wars resulted in the emancipation of the Jews, a reduction in the power of the Roman Catholic Church, and, ultimately, in the formation of the State of Israel. *Micah* 5:8 states,

“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.”

The *Zohar* I, 25a-25b, states that peoples other than the Jews will be exterminated when the Jews form a state in Palestine,

“But as ‘*tohu* and ‘*bohu*’ gave place to light, so when God reveals Himself they will be wiped off the earth. But withal redemption will not be complete until Amalek will be exterminated, for against Amalek the oath was taken that ‘the Lord will have war against Amalek from generation to generation’ (Ex. XVII, 16).”⁴⁵¹

Amalek and Esau are seen as the genetic and reincarnate spirit of Cain who slew Abel. I *Enoch* 22:7, states that the spirit of Abel prays for the extermination of the seed of Cain:

“And he answered and said to me, saying: ‘That is the spirit that proceeded from Abel, whom his brother Cain slew; and it laments on his account till his seed is destroyed from the face of the earth and his seed disappear from among the seed of men.’”⁴⁵²

Genesis 3:14-15 implies that Eve and the serpent which tempted Eve had a son, Cain who slew Abel. *Yebamoth* 103b states that serpent infused Eve with lust when they copulated. The Jews were supposedly cleansed of this lust infused into Eve by the serpent, on Mount Sinai (*Abodah Zarah* 22b. *Shabbath* 145b-146a). *Yebamoth* 63a states that Adam had intercourse with all animals and beasts, but only derived satisfaction from Eve. Voltaire ridiculed Judaism and Jews for their laws against sexual relations with animals, which laws Voltaire alleged indicate that the practice of bestiality was common among ancient Jews, for otherwise Jews would have required no laws proscribing bestiality.⁴⁵³

It is significant that Enoch is given two different lineages in *Genesis* and that Cain was a farmer, while Abel was a shepherd. God (like Isaac) preferred Abel’s (Esau’s) offering of flesh to Cain’s (Jacob’s) offering of fruit (*Genesis* 4). This relates Cain to Jacob and Abel to Esau. Cain, the first murderer, might be said to have been the first “wandering Jew” and his descendants were city dwellers. *Genesis* 3:14-15 states,

“And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

Certain Cabalists believe that Jews descend from Cain.⁴⁵⁴

4.4.5 Jewish Dualism and Human Sacrifice—Evil is Good

The Dualism implicit in the stories of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, and Jacob and Esau, has been interpreted in Marcionistic and Gnostic terms as the blessings and curses of two distinct gods. There is the good spiritual god who brought us Jesus, and the evil Creator god who created the corpse of the flesh in which divine spirits are trapped—the lesser creator God of the Old Testament. Jewish Dualism is apparent in the Old and New Testament *Logos*, mistranslated as divine “Word”, which word in fact signifies the dialectic and Dualistic principles of Heraclitus and Plato—the dialectic of good and evil, light and darkness, flesh and spirit, which is the eternal flame of the Universe.

These Dualistic mythologies have been put to great political effect over the centuries and are intentionally confused to bewilder the uninitiated into believing that all Jews worship the Devil; or, alternatively, that Catholics worship the Devil and that the Pope is the anti-Christ; or, alternatively, that all Dualist sects actually worship the Devil alone; etc.

However, it is true that Jewish Dualism teaches Jews to view evil as a good thing which originates in God, as do all things. Many Dualistic Jews even see evil as a stronger force for action than good, because they fear evil, but have no fear of good. Many Dualistic Jews view evil as a more powerful force, because they believe it attracts God’s attention and causes Him to act. Many Dualistic Jews teach their adherents to commit acts of evil, the worse the better, as a means to summon the Messianic Era.

In many Jewish racist myths, various myths which frequently contradict one another, angels are blamed for bringing evil to mankind and for interbreeding with human females to create, alternatively, depending upon political and religious bias, an evil or a divine race, which race of demigods must be exterminated, or defended (*Genesis* 6:1-5. *Numbers* 13:25-33. I *Enoch*). The Dualism expressed in Jewish writings may have its origin in the Sumerian myths of An, Enlil and Enki. The Biblical legend of evil giants descended from angels may derive from the epic of *Gilgamesh*—as well as in the Greek myths of giants and demi-gods. Jewish Dualism has always been a dangerously racist belief system which defines specific peoples as “elect” and “good”, and other peoples as an evil race destined to be exterminated (*Isaiah* 65; 66. *See also: Enoch*).

Judaism is likely a mixed-up sect of the Canaanite religions, incorporating Mesopotamian, Greek and Egyptian myths. Jacob worships the god “El” (*Genesis* 35) and was himself called El (*Tractate Megillah*, Chapter 2). El was a Canaanite god who bore Baal-Hadad, a calf, and is sometimes depicted seated and with the head and horns of a bull. This god was a fertility god. “Baal” has been translated as “Lord” and the Hebrews referred to their God as “Baal”. In Canaanite myth, Baal is a mighty storm and in the Bible the word we know of today as “spirit” or “ghost”, as in “Holy Ghost”, is in fact “wind” in the original languages. From the beginnings of *Genesis* through the New Testament, God is a mighty and wrathful storm, or wind, or “Holy Wind”, which we today call “Holy Ghost”. This poetic imagery was likely derived from the Canaanite religion. Baal worship, especially the worship of

Moloch, involves human sacrifice, in particular, that of burning one's firstborn child—the child who opens the womb, as did Esau. Gentiles are to be human sacrifices to Baal for the sake of Jacob, the Jews.

The Canaanite Baal and El, like the Jews' God, were jealous gods and there was an enmity between them. Perhaps this enmity between gods and tribes is what led Jews—Judeans—into accepting a stubborn and intolerant Egyptian monotheism violently and fanatically opposed to all other religions. The Jews have also had several sects which have worshiped a form of Eleatic Monism. Perhaps, the enmity between Baal and El is the source of the Dualistic beliefs of some Jewish and Christian sects. Perhaps the original authors of Judaism made their God a jealous God because they created their God to protect their racism. God's jealousy is linked to commandments not to intermarry with other peoples, because this would lead the Hebrews to worship foreign gods, but the real underlying motive is the preservation of "racial purity" and the religious mythology was merely a means of controlling people and thereby preserving the "race". The Jewish religion was a survival tactic and a very effective one.

The Jews of Judea knew that peoples could disappear, and that even to conquer another people could lead to intermarriage and the disappearance of one's own people. This is clearly spelled out in *Ezra* 9:

"Now when these *things* were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, *doing* according to their abominations, *even* of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. 2 For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of *those* lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass. 3 And when I heard this thing, I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonished. 4 Then were assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the transgression of those that had been carried away; and I sat astonished until the evening sacrifice. 5 And at the evening sacrifice I arose up from my heaviness; and having rent my garment and my mantle, I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the LORD my God. 6 And said, O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities are increased over *our* head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens. 7 Since the days of our fathers *have* we *been* in a great trespass unto this day; and for our iniquities have we, our kings, *and* our priests, been delivered into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to a spoil, and to confusion of face, as *it is* this day. 8 And now for a little space grace hath been *shewed* from the LORD our God, to leave us a remnant to escape, and to give us a nail in his holy place, that our God may lighten our eyes, and give us a little reviving in our bondage. 9 For we *were* bondmen; yet our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath

extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia, to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God, and to repair the desolations thereof, and to give us a wall in Judah and in Jerusalem. 10 And now, O our God, what shall we say after this? for we have forsaken thy commandments, 11 Which thou hast commanded by thy servants the prophets, saying, The land, *unto* which ye go to possess it, *is* an unclean land with the filthiness of the people of the lands, with their abominations, which have filled it from one end to another with their uncleanness. 12 Now therefore give not your daughters unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, nor seek their peace or their wealth for ever: that ye may be strong, and eat the good of the land, and leave *it* for an inheritance to your children for ever. 13 And after all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God hast punished us less than our iniquities *deserve*, and hast given us *such* deliverance as this; 14 Should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations? wouldest not thou be angry with us till *thou* hadst consumed us, so that *there should be* no remnant nor escaping? 15 O LORD God of Israel, thou *art* righteous: for we remain *yet* escaped, as *it is* this day: behold, we *are* before thee in our trespasses: for *we* cannot stand before thee because of this.”

Nehemiah 9:2; 13:3, 23-30 state:

“9:2 And the seed of Israel separated themselves from all strangers, and stood and confessed their sins, and the iniquities of their fathers. [***] 13:3 Now it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude. [***] 13:23¶ In those days also saw I Jews *that* had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, *and* of Moab: 13:24 And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people. 13:25 And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, *saying*, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. 13:26 Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these *things*? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: *nevertheless* even him did outlandish women cause to sin. 13:27 Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives? 13:28 And *one* of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest, *was* son in law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. 13:29 Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites. 13:30 Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his business;”

Exodus 34:11-17 states (note that Zionist Jews have repeatedly committed such atrocities against Palestinians):

“11 Observe thou that which I command thee *this* day: behold, I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite. 12 Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: 13 But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves: 14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous God: 15 Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and *one* call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; 16 And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods. 17 Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.”

Deuteronomy 7:2-3 states:

“2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.”

El was the supreme god of the Canaanites, but Baal ruled the Earth. Baal, a god of fertility, dies and is resurrected each year. From these myths emerged Christianity, which in its earliest incarnation preached that Jesus was the son of a supreme and spiritual God, perhaps “El”; and that Judaism worshiped the earthly and devilish “Covenant of Baal” (*Exodus* 32. *Leviticus* 26:30. *Numbers* 22:41. *Judges* 2:11-14; 3:7; 6:25, 31; 8:33; 9:4; 11:31, 39. *I Kings* 14:22-24; 16:31-33; 18:18-19, 26; 19:10, 14, 18; 22:53. *II Kings* 3:2-3; 8:18, 27; 10:18-28; 11:18; 16:3-4; 17:10, 16-18, 23; 18:4-5; 21:6; 22:5; 23:5, 12, 32, 37; 24:9, 19. *I Chronicles* 12:5 “Bealiah”; *II Chronicles* 23:17; 24:7; 28:1-4. *Jeremiah* 7:3, 9, 31; 11:12-13; 17:2; 19:5, 13; 32:29, 35. *Ezekiel* 14:11. *Hosea* 2:16)—a. k. a. Baal-Berith (*Judges* 8:33, 9:4), also called El-Berith (*Judges* 9:46), Baal-Zebub (*II Kings*, 1:2, 3, 6, 16. *Shabbath* 83b. *Sanhedrin* 63b), Baal-Peor (*Numbers* 25:1-9, 18; 31:16. *Deuteronomy* 3:29. *Joshua* 22:17. *Hosea* 9:10. *Psalms* 106:28 [eating the sacrifices of the dead]), Baal-Habab, Baal-Moloch (*II Chronicles* 28:1-4)—the God of Flies, the Golden Calf, the religion of Devil worship and human sacrifices (*Genesis* 22:1-18. *Exodus* 8:26; 13:2. *Leviticus* 27:28-29. *Joshua* 13:14. *Judges* 11:31, 39. *I Kings* 13:1-2. *II Kings* 16:3-4; 17:17; 21:6; 23:20-25. *II Chronicles* 28:1-4. *Jeremiah* 7:3; 19:5; 32:35. *Ezekiel* 16:20-21; 20:26, 31; 23:37).

Early Christians accepted Dualism and worshiped Jesus as Lucifer, the light, the Canaanites’ god of the Sun. In the tradition of the Dualist principles of good and evil, male and female, corpse and spirit, they ate semen and drank menstrual blood as a

form of prayer to the fertility gods they worshiped and as a form of protest against the alleged “evil” of procreation—of capturing a spirit in a corpse—a protest against the birth of a child into the morbid flesh. Here we see the stumbling stone the Jews laid on the path of the Romans in an attempt to exterminate them with Jewish Liberalism. Epiphanius wrote,

“[26] 4,1 But I shall pass to the substance of their deadly story—they vary in their wicked teaching of what they please—because in the first place, they hold their wives in common. (2) And if a guest who is of their persuasion arrives, they have a sign that men give women and women give men, the tickling of the palm as they clasp hands in pretended greeting, to show that the visitor is of their religion.

4,3 And now that they know each other from this, the next thing they do is feast—and though they may be poor, they set the table with lavish provisions for eating meat and drinking wine. But then, after a drinking bout and practically filling the boy’s veins, they next go crazy for each other. (4) And the husband will withdraw from his wife and tell her— speaking to his own wife!—‘Get up, perform the Agape with the brother.’ And when the wretched couple has made love—and I am truly ashamed to mention the vile things they do, for as the holy apostle says, ‘It is a shame even to speak’ of what goes on among them. Still, I shall not be ashamed to say what they are not ashamed to do, to arouse horror by every method in those who hear what obscenities they are prepared to perform. (5) For besides, to extend their blasphemy to heaven after making love in a state of fornication, the woman and man receive the male emission on their own hands. And they stand with their eyes raised heavenward but the filth on their hands, and pray, if you please—(6) the ones called Stratotics and Gnostics—and offer that stuff on their hands to the actual Father of all, and say, ‘We offer thee this gift, the body of Christ.’ (7) And then they eat and partake of their own dirt, and they say, ‘This is the body of Christ; and this is the Pascha, because of which our bodies suffer and are made to acknowledge the passion of Christ.’

4,8 And so with the woman’s emission when she happens to be having her period—they likewise take the unclean menstrual blood they gather from her, and eat it in common. And ‘This,’ they say, ‘is the blood of Christ.’ (5,1) And thus, when they read, ‘I saw a tree bearing twelve manner of fruits every year, and he said unto me, This is the tree of life,’ in apocryphal writings, they interpret this allegorically of the menses.

5, 2 But though they copulate they forbid procreation. Their eager pursuit of seduction is for enjoyment, not procreation, since the devil mocks people like these, and makes fun of the creature fashioned by God. (3) They come to climax but absorb the seeds in their dirt—not by implanting them for procreation, but by eating the dirt themselves.

5, 4 But even though one of them gets caught and implants the start of the normal emission, and the woman becomes pregnant, let me tell you what more dreadful thing such people venture to do. (5) They extract the fetus at

the stage appropriate for their enterprise, take this aborted infant, and cut it up in a trough shaped like a pestle. And they mix honey, pepper, and certain other perfumes and spices with it to keep from getting sick, and then all the revellers in this <herd> of swine and dogs assemble, and each eats a piece of the child with his fingers. (6) And now, after this cannibalism, they pray to God and say, ‘We were not mocked by the archon of lust, but have gathered the brother’s blunder up!’ And this, if you please, is their idea of the ‘perfect Passover.’”⁴⁵⁵

In addition to the appearance of these practices in numerous apocryphal books, the Gnostics claimed that these anti-procreation practices stemmed from Jesus, himself, and cited canonical passages like *Luke* 20:34-38, *John* 6:26-71, and I *Corinthians* 7:32-40 as evidence of their claim. I *Timothy* 4:3 proves that among the earliest of Christians, like the Cathars who descended from them, were vegetarians who forbade marriage. This was one means the Jewish Dualists had to exterminate “Goy races” which converted to Christianity, and to prevent them from sacrificing animals, which sacrifices the Baalists believed would give their enemies power and divine protection. It was a Jewish means to weaken and exterminate the enemies of the Jews by giving them a foreign religion as a stumbling block.

The fall of Rome coincided with the rise of Christendom. Dogmatic Judaism in the form of dogmatic Christianity proved fatal to European progress and plunged Europe into the Dark Ages.

While the Romans were gullible, they were not quite so gullible as to adopt the outright suicidal practices of the Gnostic Christian Jews, at least not in large numbers—Americans are far more vulnerable to Jewish mythologies which destroy Gentiles. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* writes of the Gnostic Cathar sect known as the “Albigenses”,

“What the Church combated was principles that led directly not only to the ruin of Christianity, but to the very extinction of the human race.”⁴⁵⁶

Centuries of censorship and fabrication have modified the presence of Baal in the Jewish faith and no doubt in the minds of most of the modern Jews and Christians who practice their faiths outside of Dualist sects—but the ancient, and even Medieval and no small number of modern Jews were superstitious, told and believed fables, segregated themselves and participated in Dualist sects and Baal worship. The worship of Dualism is pervasive in the religious myth that free will requires that there be evil as well as good.

The story of Jesus was interpreted by many Gnostic cults as an instance of Heraclitian dialectics. The *Logos*, the eternal fire of change, incorporates both good and evil. Jesus and Judas were often seen as opposing forces of the same divine principle—they bore the same name—the Jew. Jesus was also referred to as Lucifer, the Light. Jesus was both the son of man and the son of God. It was only through death, through human sacrifice, through the shedding of the evil flesh, that Jesus attained life, existence as pure Spirit, the wind of flame, and this death which

brought life came at the hands of Jesus' alter ego, Judas, whose evil betrayal brought good tidings. This Dualistic Heraclitian dialectical theme was already many centuries old at the time the Gospels were written—the end is the beginning, death is life, bad is good, the way up the stairs is the way down the stairs, etc.

The Jews set out to ruin the Gentiles with a suicidal liberalism based on these Hellenistic dialectics. The Jews witnessed many examples of hermetic monks wasting away their lives in childless ruin, endlessly contemplating meaningless idealistic and self-destructive dogmas, which likely inspired the Jews to ruin the Romans in this fashion. They were largely successful.

4.4.6 Gentiles are Destined to Slave for the Jews, Then the Slaves Will be Exterminated

The *Zohar*, I, 28b-29a, states that the peoples who are descended from Eve and the serpent, through Cain, are Esau, Amalek, the Christians, and that they will be exterminated,

“At that time the mixed multitude shall pass away from the world [***] The mixed multitude are the impurity which the serpent injected into Eve. From this impurity came forth Cain, who killed Abel. [***] for they are the seed of Amalek, of whom it is said, ‘thou shalt blot out the memory of Amalek’ [***] Various impurities are mingled in the composition of Israel, like animals among men. One kind is from the side of the serpent; another from the side of the Gentiles, who are compared to the beasts of the field; another from the *mazikin* (goblins), for the souls [29a] of the wicked are literally the *mazikin* (goblins) of the world; and there is an impurity from the side of the demons and evil spirits; and there is none so cursed among them as Amalek, who is the evil serpent, the ‘strange god’. He is the cause of all unchastity and murder, and his twin-soul is the poison of idolatry, the two together being called Samael (lit. poison-god). There is more than one Samael, and they are not all equal, but this side of the serpent is accursed above all of them.”⁴⁵⁷

Zohar, II, 219b, states,

“So they went nearer and they heard him saying: ‘Crown, crown, two sons are kept outside, and there will be no peace or rest until the bird is thrown down in Cæsarea.’ R. Jose wept and said: ‘Verily the *Galuth* is drawn out, and therefore the birds of heaven will not depart until the dominion of the idolatrous nations is removed from the earth, which will not be till the day when God will bring the world to judgement.’”⁴⁵⁸

Jews often took a predominant rôle in the production of revolutionary literature in Europe and in revolutions meant to create world government. Many Jews were eager to destroy all “princes”, to eliminate the monarchies of Europe. The

Rothschilds caused war after war in order to make the Gentile peoples weary of war and clamor for peace. This proscription for Jewish domination was spelled out in the Old Testament. Jews then offered the Gentiles a solution to the wars the Jews had covertly caused. The Jews preached the message that the only solution to war was world government—world government run by Jews out of Jerusalem in an era of peace, as prophesied in *Isaiah*. The Jews have employed this model for centuries to lure the nations into surrendering their sovereignty to Jewish domination. The *Zohar*, III, 19b, states,

“It is, however, as R. Abba has said: all the other days are given over to the angelic principalities of the nations, but there is *one* day which will be the day of the Holy One, blessed be He, in which He will judge the heathen nations, and when their principalities shall fall from their high estate.”⁴⁵⁹

Zohar, III, 43a, states that Gentiles must be converted to Judaism and used as the work animal, the horse or ass, of the Jews’ (or “lambs”) desire to destroy the Gentiles’ own governments. Should any resist conversion and the destruction of their own nations, they are to be killed. Bear in mind that to many Jews, as Moses Hess stated, Judaism is not a religion but a “racially” based nation; and the religion is the expression of this prophetic “race”; and that which is attributed to God, must in their minds be their mandate to themselves, a mandate represented by the genocidal murder of the firstborn of Egypt. The *Zohar*, III, 43a,

“To these He appointed as ministers Samael and all his groups—these are like clouds to ride upon when He descends to earth: they are like horses. That the clouds are called ‘chariots’ is expressed in the words, ‘Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt’ (Isa. XIX, 1). Thus the Egyptians saw their Chieftain like a horse bearing the chariot of the Holy One, and straightaway ‘the idols of Egypt were moved at His presence, and the heart of Egypt melted in the midst of it’ (*Ibid.*), i. e. they were ‘moved’ from their faith in their own Chieftain. AND EVERY FIRSTLING OF AN ASS THOU SHALT REDEEM WITH A LAMB, AND IF THOU WILT NOT REDEEM IT. . . THOU SHALT BREAK HIS NECK.”⁴⁶⁰

Zohar, III, 282a, states,

“From the side of idolatry Shabbethaj (Saturn) is called Lilith [*Footnote*: Lilith is a female demon, comp. Is. XXXIV. 14 and Weber, *Altsynagogale palästinische Theologie*, p. 246.], mixed dung, on account of the filth mixed from all kinds of dirt and worms, into which they throw dead dogs and dead asses, the sons of ‘Esau and Ishma‘el, and there (read ובה) Jesus and Mohammed, who are dead dogs, are buried among them. She (Lilith) is the grave of idolatry, where they bury the uncircumcised, (who are) dead dogs, abomination and bad smell, soiled and fetid, a bad family. She (Lilith) is the ligament [*Footnote*: מַדְכָּא is a fibre attached to the lungs] which holds fast the

‘mixed multitude’ (Ex. xii. 38), which is mixed among Israel, and which holds fast bone and flesh, that is, the sons of ‘Esau and Ishma‘el, dead bone and unclean flesh torn of beasts in the field, of which it is said (Ex. xxii. 31): ‘Ye shall cast it to the dogs.’”⁴⁶¹

In commenting on the *Abodah Zarah*, the *Tosefta* states (the bracketed text is original to the Neusner edition),

“8:5 A. *For bloodshed — how so?*

B. A gentile [who kills] a gentile and a gentile who kills an Israelite are liable. An Israelite [who kills] a gentile is exempt.

C. *Concerning thievery?*

D. [If] one has stolen, or robbed, and so too in the case of finding a beautiful captive [woman], and in similar cases:

E. a gentile in regard to a gentile, or a gentile in regard to an Israelite — it is prohibited. And an Israelite in regard to a gentile — it is permitted.”⁴⁶²

The Old Testament book of *Numbers* 24:17-20, which prophesies the Messiah, also prophesies the extermination of Amalek,

“I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city. And when he looked on Amalek, he took up his parable, and said, Amalek *was* the first of the nations; but his latter end *shall* be that he perish for ever.”

In addition to the well-known prophecies of Jewish world domination, the destruction of Gentile nations, Gentile servitude and the extermination of Gentiles found in the Old Testament (*see also: The Book of Jubilees* 32:17-20), the apocalyptic literature of the Qumran is overtly racist and genocidal—and this Jewish literature forms the basis for the genocidal visions of the Christian apocalyptic nightmares, which were iterated soon after. Horrific genocidal visions, and racist invectives are found in 1 *Enoch*, 2 *Baruch*, *The War Scroll*, and 4 *Ezra*.⁴⁶³ If the Jews who wrote these genocidal works had their way, not a single Gentile or apostate Jew would be left alive.

Some Christians also look to the mythology of Esau and Jacob to justify their belief that the Jews will be “justly” annihilated should they refuse to accept the sacrifice of Jesus Christ as their salvation. Isaac’s blessing to Esau stated that Esau would someday break off the yoke of Jacob,

“39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 40

And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.”—*Genesis* 27:39-40

In the early days of Christianity, Cyprian wrote in his Twelfth Treatise, “Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews”, First Book, Testimony 19,

“19. That two peoples were foretold, the elder and the younger; that is, the old people of the Jews, and the new one which should consist of us.

In *Genesis*: ‘And the Lord said unto Rebekah, Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples shall be separated from thy belly; and the one people shall overcome the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger.’ [*Footnote*: *Gen.* xxv. 23.] Also in *Hosea*: ‘I will call them my people that are not my people, and her beloved that was not beloved. For it shall be, in that place in which it shall be called not my people, they shall be called the sons of the living God.’ [*Footnote*: *Hos.* ii. 23. i. 10.]”⁴⁶⁴

Abraham’s covenant with God is both a blessing and a curse to Jews—and to Gentiles. *Genesis* 12:1-3 states:

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee: 2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: 3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

Zionists and Christians use the Old Testament and the New Testament to justify the murder of apostate Jews. *Deuteronomy* 11:24-28 states,

“24 Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be. 25 There shall no man be able to stand before you: *for* 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 said unto you. 26 Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; 27 A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you this day: 28 And a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known.”

Romans 9 states (*see also*: *Matthew* 12:30; 21:43-45. *Romans* 11:7-8. *Galatians* 3:16. *Hebrews* 8:6-10):

“I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, 2 That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. 3 For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: 4 Who are Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service *of God*, and the promises; 5 Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. 6 Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they *are* not all Israel, which are of Israel: 7 Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, *are they* all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. 8 That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. 9 For this *is* the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. 10 And not only *this*; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, *even* by our father Isaac; 11 (For *the children* being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) 12 It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. 13 As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. 14 What shall we say then? *Is there* unrighteousness with God? God forbid. 15 For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. 16 So then *it is* not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. 17 For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. 18 Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will *have mercy*, and whom he will he hardeneth. 19 Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? 20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed *it*, Why hast thou made me thus? 21 Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? 22 *What* if God, willing to shew *his* wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: 23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, 24 Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? 25 As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. 26 And it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God. 27 Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved: 28 For he will finish the work, and cut *it* short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth. 29 And as Esaias said before, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrha. 30 What shall we say then? That the

Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. 31 But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. 32 Wherefore? Because *they sought it* not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone; 33 As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.”

One of the reasons some Jews attempt to degrade other cultures, especially Christian cultures, is that they want Christians to become decadent and lose favor in the eyes of God. Though Esau broke the yoke, Jacob’s yoke will yet again—and forever—fall upon Esau should the Christians become decadent. Should this happen, the Jews will then again find favor with the Lord, according to Paul—and in some minds, Jesus (*Luke 21:24*). In some minds, the period of Gentile rule began as God’s punishment to unfaithful Jews in 606 B. C. with the ascendance of Nebuchadnezzar and eventual captivity and exile of the Jews in Babylon and the destruction of Jerusalem. According to this belief system, Gentile rule is supposed to have lasted for a period of 2520 years, which time span ended in 1914—the first year of the First World War, when the Jews began to rule the world.

Jews have dominated the mass media in many societies in which they have lived. Though within their own families they wisely promote education, thrift, tradition and morality, these same values are often absent from the messages they convey through the mass media. Though Jews have a racist tradition of segregation and nationalism, they often promote miscegenation and internationalism to the Gentiles. The Old Testament teaches the Jews again and again that a nation which loses favor in the eyes of God will be utterly destroyed—for example in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (*Genesis 18; 19*). These lessons teach Racist and tribalistic Jews that if they can rob a nation of its righteousness, they will have destroyed it before God. They are taught that if they can turn the entire Gentile world to “evil”, then any righteous Jews remaining will inherit God’s blessing and the era of Gentile domination will be at an end.⁴⁶⁵

Those throughout history who best knew the Jews, men like Cyprian, John Chrysostom, Martin Luther, Johannes Buxtorf, etc., warned Christians that Jews were out to destroy them, and that they ought not to stumble over the stumbling stones the Jews threw on their path, and must remain righteous, or lose the favor of the Lord, which the Jews believed would then return to them. Johannes Buxtorf wrote in the preface of his *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensubung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657),

“THE AUTHORS

PREFACE

To the Christian Reader.

Christian Reader,

When once we exactly ponder in the Scales of our understanding that thrice pressing load of Jewish ingratitude, disobedience, and obstinacy, for which they were daily branded by *Moses* and the rest of the Prophets with a foul guilt, to which was annexed a vehement reprehension. When we seriously consider those horrid threats and execrations where with God in his justice would depress them, unless they framed their lives according to the strict rule of his Commandments; this ought to be a warning piece unto us to entertain such blessings with a more gratefull acceptance, and hitherto to bend all our studies, that by our unthankfulness we should not make our selves unworthy of them, and so be dis-inherited of such a possession. *Moses* in this manner prophesies of the Jews ingratitude, {Deut. 32.15.} *Jesurun waxed fat, and kicked. (thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness) then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the worke of his salvation.* This issued from a propheticall spirit, declaring that as already present, which after the revolution of many a year was to be fulfilled and accomplished. This ingratitude was in its swadling clouts when *Joshua* led *Israel* into the land of promise, which is ratified by the unanimous suffrage of the whole College of Prophets, and almost in the very same terms by *Hosea* in chap. 13. *Jeremy* arraigns them as guilty of the same crime. The bill of inditement runs thus: {Jer. 11.10.} *They are turned back to the iniquities of their fore-fathers which refused to hear my words, and they went after other gods to serve them: the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken the Covenant which I made with their Fathers.* And God himselfe by the mouth of his Prophet thus proclaims their obstinacy: {Jer. 7.25.26.} *Since the day that your Fathers came out of the Land of Egypt unto this day, I have even sent unto you all my servants the Prophets, dayly rising up early and sending them; yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their eare, but hardened their neck, they did worse then their Fathers.* The obstinacy of this People at last grew to so high a pitch, that they stopt their ears at the admonition of the Prophets, who cried aloud unto them to amend their waies, and curbed their offences with tart reprehensions, killing, stoning, rewarding every one with some bitter death; which act of theirs is faithfully registred by the holy Spirit, *Ezra* 2: {Nehem. 9.25.26.} *They tooke strong Cities and a fat Land, and possessed houses full of all goods, wels digged, Vineyards and Oliveyards and fruit trees in abundance: so they did eat and were filled, and became fat, and delighted themselves in thy great goodness: nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against thee, and cast thy Law behind their backs, and slew thy Prophets which testified against them to turn them to thee, and wrought great provocations.* And *Jeremy* also may be cited for

a witness, for his words are these: {Ier. 2.29 30.} *Wherefore will ye plead with me? ye all have transgressed against me, saith the Lord. In vain have I smitten your children, they have received no correction: your own sword hath devoured your Prophets like a destroying Lion.* When the Lord sees this his people thus altogether incapable of corection, he afflicts them with all the punishments which *Moses* by the spirit of God had denounced against them, neither their bodies nor goods can now escape the lash of his fury; he sends among them the sword, famine and pestilence, tempests, diseases, imbred dissention, and discord; and to make their misery compleat, casts them out of that Land flowing with milk and hony, and causes them to trace the captives steps into another which they knew not. The ten tribes together with their King *Hoshea* is carried by *Salmanasser* into *Assyria*, 2 *Kin.* {2 Reg. 17.} and when the two remaining Tribes, *Juda* and *Benjamin*, were not hurried to repentance by the present view of their brethrens afflictions, God sends *Nebuchadnezzar* King of *Babel* against them, who leads them captive into the Land of *Chaldea*, makes *Jerusalem* a desolate heap, and turns their Temple, their chief beauty into ashes. Nevertheless the space of 70 years fully expired, these 2 tribes were again brought out of the house of bondage, because it was the Almighty's pleasure to preserve the tribe of *Judah* even unto that time, when according to his promise, out of that tribe, and in the promised land the *Messias* should be incarnate. But for all this these 2 tribes did not much outstrip the other 10 in the practice of holiness; for they always following their own devices, seriously traced the forbidden by-paths of their forefathers, for which the later Prophets, *Haggai*, *Zachary* and *Malachi* were earnest declamitants against them: the last of which being a Priest, & proclaiming them guilty of a wicked life, threatens them with a final rejection.

But

[There are pages missing from both the microfilm and digital reproductions of this text which were used in this transcription. Your author apologizes and would be grateful if an intact copy were found and the missing text provided.]

out in obscurity, that so we might again be cast headlong into that darknesse in which we sate, before it was the Lords pleasure by his mercy to impart unto us the saving knowledge of his heavenly word.

My second Motive was this, that the hardened in heart, and blindfolded Jews at last descending into the Chambers of their strict cogitations, might have some glimpse of the greatness of their infidelity, and so convicted before the face of the whole world of that more than brutish folly in the expounding of the holy Scriptures, and of their old wives tales, whereby God for the most part is blasphemed, and his saving word against all humane reason after an execrable manner perverted, they might begin to be ashamed, who with such a whorish forehead, and want of wit did not fear to speak or write in this manner of God Almighty, and his holy word, and that at length they might think, that they had stumbled at that stone of stumbling, and rock of offence laid in *Sion*, and thereupon that they shall fall prostrate upon the

ground, be broken, to Gods Law ensnared and captivated, and finally that God {Isa. 29.10,11.} *poured upon them the spirit of deep sleep*, and so closed their eyes, that every prophesie and the whole Scripture was to them as the words of a book that is sealed, & that the wisdom of their wise men is now altogether perished, and the understanding of their prudent men hid, as the Prophet *Isaiah* foretold them. The God of mercies have mercy upon them, and convert them, and keep us firm and immoveable in the knowledge of his truth, that in it we may hope to gain eternall life, as Christ himself witnesseth to our comfort, when he saith, {John 17.3} *This is eternall life, that they might know thee the onely true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, To him be ascribed, praise, honour and glory for evermore, Amen.

MICAH c. 4 v. 1, 2.

IN the last dayes it shall come to passe, that the mountains of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it.

And many Nations shall come and say, come, and let us go up to the mountains of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Iacob, and he will teach us of his wayes, and we will walk in his paths; for the Law shall go forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

Luther upon these words of Micah, hath left this consequent paragraph in memory concerning the Iews. So goes the matter, hereupon arise these mentall divisions, this is that which makes the Jews mad and foolish, that which forceth them to a sense so damnable, that they are compelled without the least shew of honesty, to wrest every parcell of the Scripture, because it contradicts their will, and they cannot endure that we Gentiles should be equal copartners with them in Gods favour, and the Messias should in a like measure administer to us and them joy and consolation. Moreover, rather than they would vouchsafe, that we the offspring of the Gentiles (who are by them daily condemned, accursed and devoted to the infernall haggas, torn and cut in pieces by their sladerous back-bitings) should participate in the Merits of the Messias, and enjoy the title of coheirs and brethren, they had rather ten Messias should suffer the shamefull death of the crosse, and afflict God himself (if there were any possibility in nature) the holy Angels and all other creatures with the stroke of death, nay, they would not be afraid of the fact, though a thousand hellish torments were to be endured for the effecting of it, so incomprehensible and austere is the pride mixed with the honourable blood of these Fathers, and circumcised Saints, who alone would enjoy the promised Messias, and be capped for the sole *Donns* of the world. {Chjim.} The Nations or Gentiles ought onely to be these accursed vassals, and to give up their desire, that is their silver and gold unto the Iews, and that they should be constrained to submit themselves unto them after the manner of beasts prepared to the slaughter, rather then they will relinquish one whit of this their assertion, they will not refuse wittingly to be damned eternally."

Though Johannes Buxtorf, Martin Luther, and many others expressed anger at

the Jews for not converting to Christianity, Jews simply could not accept that Jesus was their Messiah, or that Gentiles, whom they considered to be less than human—less than Jews, had a right to Jewish beliefs. Jesus did not level the nations with an iron scepter. He did not make the Jews rulers of the world and the Gentiles their slaves. He did not lay to waste the lands outside of Israel. He was not the repressive and horrible Messiah the Jews prophesied in the Old Testament.

Unlike Christians, Jews were not concerned with eternal life on an individual basis, but were concerned with the survival, the immortality, of the Jewish “race”. Judaism is less a spiritual religion than is Christianity. It is much more materialistic, and combines religion, politics, commerce and mundane laws with religion, such that the boundaries between the secular and the religious do not really exist. A Jewish racist and/or tribalist can erase God from the Old Testament and still find in it his or her identity as a “Jew”, and a mission in life. For him or her, this belief system is meant for none other than those who created it, the Jews. Racist secular Jews merely believe that “God” is the product of Jewish “racial instincts”. God is a Jew and Jews embrace Judaism as the expression of their Jewish “soul”, the material product of a chosen people, not an individual, but a people bold enough and superior enough to chose themselves to be the natural rulers of the Earth, rulers over the “lesser races” of non-Jews, whom they will eventually exterminate.

For many Jews, Jesus was far too weak and ineffective, far too universal in his message, to have been their Jewish Messiah, the tyrannical Jewish King promised to give them the world. Jews do not wish to wait for death to obtain paradise. They want a Jewish Utopia on Earth and they want their rewards on this Earth in this lifetime. They do not believe in a Christian Heaven and they do not believe poverty and sacrifice and repression will earn them eternal rewards. Nor do they believe that they will be eternally punished for doing wrong. They are out to obtain what they can here on this Earth in this lifetime. Judaism is a very different religion from Christianity. It is more of a mundane racist and genocidal political movement than it is a spiritual and ethical religion.

Many have accused leading Jews of using their power in the American media to degrade American culture and Christianity. The same accusations appeared in Germany. Leading Jews used Communism to destroy cultures, nations and religions. In the Spanish, Nazi, Turkish, Russian, French and English revolutions, leading Jews followed the same model of requesting liberal freedoms, which resulted in revolution, which resulted in chaos. Then, leading Jews spread word through their channels which control public opinion, that it would be impossible for anyone but a dictator to restore order out of the chaos—chaos the Jews had covertly intentionally created. The foolish Gentiles who were duped into clamoring for liberty, equality and freedom by the means of nihilistic revolution, are then duped into clamoring for an absolute dictatorship to restore order. The whole process is overseen by Jewish and crypto-Jewish leaders. After they have a dictator in place and the Gentiles have surrendered all of their rights to the Jews’ puppet dictator, they destroy religion and culture, and mass murder the leading class of intellectual elites. For them it is the process of breeding the type of cattle they want to serve them—degenerate, stupid and compliant cattle.

4.4.7 Lenard Sickens of Einstein's Libels

Germany had been very good to the Jews. German Jews were the wealthiest people in the world. In the years following the First World War, the Germans resented the fact that the Jews, Einstein being their chief spokesman, had stabbed the Germans in the back during the war, and then twisted the knife at the peace negotiations in France, where a large contingent of Jews decided Germany's fate, and reneged on Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, one of which assured Germany that it would lose no territory. The Germans had thought that Wilson's pledge would be honored after the Germans had surrendered in good faith. Had not the Germans received this promise of the Fourteen Points, they would not have surrendered and were in a position to continue the war. The promise was broken.

In addition, the Allies insisted that Germany pay draconian war reparations that would forever ruin the nation. Leading Jews in Germany sided with the Allies against their native land. It was obvious that leading Jews were profiteering from the war in every way possible, at the expense of the German nation and its People. Jewish leaders instigated crippling strikes in the arms industry, which left German troops without adequate armaments. Jewish revolutionaries took advantage of Germany's weakened state, which Jews had deliberately caused for the purpose, and created a Soviet Republic in Bavaria and overthrew the monarchy. German-Jewish bankers cut off Germany's access to funds. German-Jewish Zionists moved to London and brought America into the war on the side of the British at the very moment Germany was about to win the war.

Those arms which were produced were often substandard and were peddled by Jews to Jews in the German Government, which also left the German troops without adequate arms, while making Jews immensely wealthy. German-Jewish bankers conspired with German arms manufacturers to produce weapons for both sides. The German-Jewish press, which had initially beat the war drums louder than anyone else, teamed up with leading Jews in the German Government at the end of the war and demanded that Germany submit to the demands of the Allies, give up vast territories and make the reparations payments. The German-Jewish press and Jews in the German Government, many of whom were the same persons who had most boisterously called upon the German People to go to war, insisted that the Germans accept responsibility for causing the war, though they had not caused it. Etc. Etc. Etc.

While millions of Germans were starving to death, many Jews in Germany had never known better times. Whenever anyone revealed the truth of what was happening, the Jewish press immediately smeared them by calling them "anti-Semites". The situation was similar to, though even worse than, the situation in America today.

Many German Jews were very wealthy after the war. They had a great deal of power, and many were very arrogant, especially in their dealings with German Gentiles. A famous German engineer and physicist, who had anticipated many aspects of the theory of relativity, Rudolf Mewes proved that Einstein was a plagiarist. Mewes demonstrated that Albert Einstein had stolen many of his ideas from German scientists.

Albert Einstein made a great show of ridiculing Germans, though he was born in Germany, lived and earned his living in Germany throughout the war, worked for the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin, and published in German journals. Einstein assisted in, and pushed hard for, plans to punish and oppress German scientists after the war—to punish and oppress his German colleagues while he was feted in the British press as the “Swiss Jew”. Einstein’s ingratitude and treachery were unbearable and he epitomized the Jewish betrayal of Germany in the First World War.

Rudolf Mewes was not afraid to challenge Einstein, or the “Einstein myth” of the “Jewish Newton” which was based on lies, plagiarism, ingratitude, self-glorification and Jewish racism,

“But then, given the above exposé, one must admit that [Max] Born’s contention is correct, that the relativistic ideas were not only first conceived and recorded in the German language, but rather also that they demonstrably derived from pure German scientists, namely Christian Doppler, Wilhelm Weber and Rudolf Mewes, though not from the Semitic Professor and Communist Dr. Albert Einstein. The relationship of Mewes to Einstein can accordingly be briefly characterized by the slogans:

‘German versus Jew
 Increaser of Knowledge versus Fleecer of Knowledge
 Rightful Ownership versus Plagiarism
 Monarchist versus Communist”

“Dagegen muß man nach den vorstehenden Darlegungen die Behauptung Borns als richtig zugeben, daß die relativistischen Ideen zuerst nicht nur in deutscher Sprache gedacht und aufgezeichnet worden sind, sondern auch von rein deutschen Forschern, nämlich Christian Doppler, Wilhelm Weber und Rudolf Mewes, nachweislich herrühren, aber nicht von dem semitischen Professor und Kommunisten Dr. Albert Einstein. Das Verhältnis von Mewes zu Einstein läßt sich demgemäß kurz mit den Schlagworten kennzeichnen:

„Deutscher gegen Jude,
 Wissensschöpfer gegen Wissensschöpfer,
 Eigentum gegen Diebstahl,
 Monarchist gegen Kommunist.“⁴⁶⁶

Germans then knew far more about the genocidal prophecies of Judaism than they do today. They could see them deliberately fulfilled before their eyes. They recognized that Bolshevism and the “Great War”, the “War to End All Wars”, which prepared the way for the “League of Nations”, was largely accomplished under the directorship of Jews and deliberately fulfilled Jewish Messianic prophecy. They knew that leading Jews had lured Germany into the war and then destroyed Germany and profited as much as possible from the destruction.

In addition, an unwise and unproductive rift between British science and German science had existed at least since the time of the Leibnitz-Newton priorities dispute

over the invention of calculus, and before that there were strong controversies between the Continent and the Island among Giordano Bruno, Henry More, Isaac Newton, Samuel Clark, René Des Cartes, Christiaan Huyghens, and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz. Einstein sided with the British against the Germans during and after the war, despite the fact he was treated like royalty in Berlin.

Jewish news sources promoted the causes of the Social Democrats, Liberal Democrats, Marxists, Bolsheviks, Anarchists or Chernyshevskiiist revolution, and they also promoted Albert Einstein, which inspired suspicion of ethnic bias.⁴⁶⁷ The segregationist policies of Albert Einstein, Chaim Weizmann—the political Zionists in general—caused many to suspect that the shameless promotion of Albert Einstein involved a Jewish ethnic bias in favor of Einstein.⁴⁶⁸ This unfair and unethical Jewish bias preceded and caused the reactions of Ludwig Glaser, Philipp Lenard, Johannes Stark, Willy Wien, Hugo Dingler, Bruno Thüring, and others who sought to defend themselves, their students and their nation.

Einstein was famously quoted in the forward of the first edition to Lucien Fabre's French book, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d'Einstein avec une Préface de M. Einstein*, Payot, Paris, (1921), pp. 15-18; not long after the First World War ended,

"I am a German (Jew) by birth, but I lived in Switzerland from the age of 15 until I was 35, except for brief interruptions. I earned my degree in Zurich; I am a pacifist in favor of an international agreement and have always faithfully conducted myself according to this ideal."

"Je suis Allemand (israélite) de naissance, mais j'ai vécu en Suisse de l'âge de 15 à celui de 35 ans, sauf de courtes interruptions. J'ai conquis mes grades à Zurich; je suis pacifiste, partisan d'une entente internationale et resté toujours fidèle dans ma ligne de conduite à cet idéal."

Einstein's political statements were scripted. He repeated his script and asked others to repeat it. Einstein was quoted in *The Literary Digest* of 16 April 1921, pages 33-34,

"Dr. Einstein asked whether he could not see a copy of my interview with him before it was printed. I told him that I would not write the interview until after my return to America.

'In that event,' he said, 'when you write it, be sure not to omit to state that I am a convinced pacifist, that I believe that the world has had enough of war. Some sort of an international agreement must be reached among nations preventing the recurrence of another war, as another war will ruin our civilization completely. Continental civilization, European civilization, has been badly damaged and set back by this war, but the loss is not irreparable. Another war may prove fatal to Europe.'"

Note that Einstein's scripted statements are classic Jewish propaganda and typify the

Jewish method of undermining the sovereignty of the Gentile nations. First, the Zionists caused the war. Then they prolonged it by bringing America into it. Then they threatened the war weary nations with a worse war and offered up what they claimed was the only solution: A world led by Israel with a world government in fulfillment of Judaic Messianic prophecies. The conference Einstein hoped for was a conference where the Zionists could push the Palestine Mandate and demand a nation for the Jews. It was a conference that Einstein knew would be dominated by Jews, who would dictate to the ruined nations their future. Einstein was not concerned for humanity. He was an ardent and thoroughly scripted Jewish Zionist propagandist.

The language used in Einstein's statement in French was somewhat open to interpretation. For example, Stjepan Mohorovičić wrote in 1922,

“Einstein selbst sagt in dem Vorwort des Werkes von L. Fabre (Anmerk. 30) den Franzosen ausdrücklich, daß er nur in Deutschland geboren sei, sonst sei er ein Jude, Pazifist und Mitglied einer internationalen Verbindung.... Es ist nicht schwer zu raten, warum Einstein dies gerade den Franzosen gegenüber gesagt hat (mit eigener Unterschrift), aber lassen wir das, es ist dies nur Geschmacksache...; unsere Arbeit hier ist eine wissenschaftliche. Es ist traurig genug, daß ich gezwungen bin, dies hier zu erwähnen!”⁴⁶⁹

Einstein's use of the word “entente” might also have been interpreted by Germans as a subtle allusion to the Allies. In 1904, England and France entered into an “Entente Cordiale”—an agreement between the two governments; which, while resolving colonial disputes between England and France, created tensions with Germany. In 1906 the “Entente” evolved into a military alliance, which came to include Russia in 1907. This alliance was opposed to the “Triple Alliance” of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. England, France and Russia, who fought against Germany in World War I, were often referred to as the “Entente” and it might have appeared from Einstein's statement that he had always been a devout enemy of Germany and a partisan for the enemies of Germany, though he had lived in Germany throughout the war. We know that this was in fact the case, whether or not it was what Einstein meant to say in his scripted letter to Fabre. It was almost certainly not what Einstein meant to say in that letter.

Einstein used the word “Entente” to describe the Allies in many of his letters and should have been more careful with “his” words. For example, in a letter to Paul Ehrenfest of 6 December 1918,

“Ich werde nächster Tage über die Schweiz nach Paris reisen, um die Entente zu bitten, die hiesige ausgehungerte Bevölkerung vor dem Hungertod zu retten.”⁴⁷⁰

Einstein wrote to Emil Zürcher on 15 April 1919,

“Wenn die Entente gut orientiert[. . .]”⁴⁷¹

Einstein wrote to Hedwig Born on 31 August 1919,

“Intervention der Entente in Schlessien”⁴⁷²

Einstein wrote to the *Neue Freie Presse* on 6 December 1919,

“[. . .]der Centralmächte und denen der Entente[. . .]”⁴⁷³

Einstein wrote to Hedwig and Max Born on 27 January 1920,

“Jedenfalls ist die Wirkekraft ihrer Parole gross, denn die Kriegsgeräte der Entente, welche das deutsche Heer aufgerieben haben, schmelzen in Russland dahin wie der Schnee in der Märzensonne.”⁴⁷⁴

Einstein was careless in “his” letter to Fabre, which letter was quoted in Fabre’s book.

Einstein did often assert that he was an internationalist and a pacifist, without implying that he had sided with the Allies in the First World War. However, we learn from Einstein’s statements to the Frenchman Romain Rolland, as recorded in Rolland’s diary after conversations with Einstein in Switzerland on 16 September 1915, that Einstein was indeed loyal to the Entente, not Germany. Rolland wrote,

“What I hear from [Einstein] is not exactly encouraging, for it shows the impossibility of arriving at a lasting peace with Germany without first totally crushing it. Einstein says the situation looks to him far less favorable than a few months back. The victories over Russia have reawakened German arrogance and appetite. The word ‘greedy’ seems to Einstein best to characterize Germany. [***] Einstein does not expect any renewal of Germany out of itself; it lacks the energy for it, and the boldness for initiative. He hopes for a victory of the Allies, which would smash the power of Prussia and the dynasty. . . . Einstein and Zangger dream of a divided Germany—on the one side Southern Germany and Austria, on the other side Prussia. [***] We speak of the deliberate blindness and the lack of psychology in the Germans.”⁴⁷⁵

Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany and for the Jews and England. He betrayed Germany before, during and after the war. For example, Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”⁴⁷⁶

Einstein almost certainly was not referring to the Allies when referring to an *entente internationale*, but rather to an international agreement. His wording caused further consternation given that there was the soon to appear *Entente Internationale des Partis Radicaux et des Partis Démocratiques similaires*, a group of liberals from many nations who based their movement on the spirit of the *Plan des Libéraux pour recommencer la révolution*, Paris, (1821); probably in the form of the *Carté*. There was also the First International of Marx and Engels, and its offspring: The International Workingmen's Association, the Second International, the Socialist International, the Third International, the Comintern, the Vienna International, the Two-and-a-half International, the Labor and Socialist International, the Fourth International, the Trotsky International, etc. The *Carté* was founded by Communist Henri Barbusse and Einstein's friend and confidant, pacifist Socialist Romain Rolland. In late 1919 and early 1920, Einstein sought to establish a German chapter of the *Clarté* for the purposes of promoting Internationalism.⁴⁷⁷ This in itself troubled many Germans, who had come to believe that "Internationalism" was a code word for "Jewish supremacy". Even before the war, the "Proclamation of the Alliance Against the Arrogance of Jewry" of 1912 stated,

"The Reichstag elections of 1912 have taken place under the sign of Jewry—that is, under the sign of open and clandestine republicanism and internationalism. 'National is irrational' . . . was and is the slogan that misled millions of Germans, blinded by the fraudulent Jewish catchwords of international culture and international progress. [***] Jewry is international in the sense of Schopenhauer's phrase: 'The fatherland of the Jews is other Jews.'"⁴⁷⁸

Einstein's declarations of his "tribal"—to use his term—loyalty, his public insults against Germans, and his allegedly privileged Zionist nationalism were viewed as legitimate causes for concern—as was the modern terror of the Internationalism of the Bolsheviks, who had made Bavaria a Soviet Republic for a short span of time.

Many Germans were outraged by Einstein's statement as quoted in Fabre's book,⁴⁷⁹ which was an obvious attempt by Einstein to distance himself from Germany (Gentiles) and ingratiate himself to the French, no matter how one translated it—and Einstein and his friends instigated a smear campaign against Fabre in order to deflect attention from Einstein's volatile comments.⁴⁸⁰ Einstein's friend Solovine smeared Fabre, claiming that he was an anti-Semite—even though Fabre had written a book which was highly flattering to Einstein.

Einstein charged that Fabre cobbled together the forward from Einstein's statements and published this compilation of quotes without Einstein's approval. Einstein protested that Fabre had no right to designate this compilation as if it were a forward Einstein intended to write for Fabre, because he allegedly had not written it in the form in which it appeared and had not approved its publication as a forward to Fabre's book—though he had made the statements—a fact he appeared to publicly deny. Einstein alleged to Solovine that his words were corrupted in translation though the addition of French *gentillesse* by an acquaintance of his, who Einstein

implies wrote the letters.

In the second edition of his book, Fabre stated that he had only given a public expression to Einstein's views to a wanting public, with the best of intentions. Fabre stated that Einstein had repudiated Einstein's own statements. Einstein's friends let Einstein know that Fabre had begun to spread the word after Einstein had attacked Fabre, that Henri Poincaré was the true father of the special theory of relativity. Einstein hid from Fabre's accusation that Einstein had plagiarized Poincaré's theory.⁴⁸¹

The preface to Fabre's first edition states,

“PRÉFACE

L'ouvrage de M. Fabre est des plus intéressants et fort bien écrit. Ses explications sur l'œuvre de Newton, de Faraday et de Maxwell sont admirablement réussies. L'auteur est un vrai enthousiaste rempli d'un sentiment vibrant pour la beauté scientifique.

L'éloge dont il veut bien honorer mes théories est terriblement exagéré. La théorie de la relativité ne peut ni veut donner aucun système du monde, mais seulement une condition restrictive à laquelle les lois de la nature doivent se soumettre, comme par exemple les deux principaux axiomes de la thermodynamique. Celui-là même qui ne reconnaîtrait pas la théorie de la relativité se voit cependant obligé d'admettre une interprétation physique claire des coordonnées de l'espace et du temps. C'est justement à ce point de vue que pèchent les écrits de certains des savants cités par l'auteur.

L'ouvrage de l'un d'entre eux défend une thèse sans espoir qui, traduite en termes géométriques dirait ceci: «Parmi toutes les directions X possibles dans l'espace, il n'existe qu'une seule direction de coordonnée X absolue» (il s'agit en l'espèce d'un temps absolu devant être préposé aux transformations Lorentz), entreprise sans espoir appuyée sur quelques ambiguïtés involontaires mathématiques.

Un autre de ces savants ne remarque pas — abstraction faite de ce qu'il oublie d'interpréter physiquement l'espace et le temps — que la vitesse de la lumière conformément à l'expérience joue un rôle spécial. Les deux erreurs étroitement liées se cachent sous une enveloppe épaisse de formules mathématiques. Aucun homme raisonnable n'admettra cependant que le son se propage, relativement à l'air en repos, selon les mêmes lois que relativement à l'air en mouvement. L'expérience nous a appris, par contre, que, seule, la vitesse de la lumière est indépendante de l'état de mouvement du système de coordonnées.

On ne peut pas dire non plus que la théorie générale de la relativité ait abandonné, par rapport à la vitesse de la lumière, le principe de la continuité. La vitesse de la lumière, mesurée avec perche et horloge unitaires, dans l'entourage infinitésimal d'un point est toujours, dans la théorie de la relativité aussi, invariablement la même.

Albert EINSTEIN.

Je crois devoir joindre à cette préface quelques extraits d'une lettre de M. Einstein qui me paraissent éclairer la physionomie du savant allemand.

L. F.

Cher Monsieur,

5-VII-20

J'ai reçu, par notre ami Oppenheim, au retour d'un long voyage, votre amicale lettre du 19 juin. J'ai étudié votre intéressant travail et j'y ai pris beaucoup de plaisir (en particulier dans l'exposé du développement historique de la théorie). Parmi les savants français, Langevin a parfaitement pénétré la théorie de la relativité. C'est un esprit merveilleusement clair et un homme sympathique Je joins à ma lettre le curriculum vitae que vous souhaitez. — Je suis Allemand (israélite) de naissance, mais j'ai vécu en Suisse de l'âge de 15 à celui de 35 ans, sauf de courtes interruptions. J'ai conquis mes grades à Zurich; je suis pacifiste, partisan d'une entente internationale et resté toujours fidèle dans ma ligne de conduite à cet idéal.

Agréez,

A. EINSTEIN.

Voici les renseignements biographiques fournis par M. Einstein:

Albert Einstein est né à Ulm le 14 mars 1879. Il était âgé de six semaines lorsque ses parents émigrèrent vers Munich où il passa son enfance et fréquenta les écoles jusqu'à sa quatorzième année. A quinze ans il se rendit en Suisse, resta un an au collège de Aarau et y obtint son *abiturium*. Il étudia ensuite les mathématiques et la physique à Zurich. En 1902, Einstein fut attaché au bureau des brevets à Berne et prépara simultanément son examen du doctorat auquel il fut admis en 1905. Il fut appelé comme professeur à l'Université de Zurich en 1909, à celle de Prague en 1911 et retourna à Zurich en 1912 comme professeur au Polytechnikum, qu'il quitta en 1914 pour aller occuper un siège à l'académie royale de Prusse à Berlin. Il est également directeur de l'Institut Kaiser-Wilhelm pour la physique."

Einstein wrote in *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, Number 13, (1 April 1921), p. 219, giving the false impression that he had not said what he had said,

“Zuschriften an die Herausgeber.

Zur Abwehr.

Herr *Lucien Fabre* hat im Verlage von Payot in Paris ein Buch „Les théories d'Einstein“ mit dem Zusatz „Avec une préface de M. Einstein“ herausgegeben. Ich erkläre, daß ich keine Vorrede zu dem Buche geschrieben

habe und protestiere gegen diesen Mißbrauch meines Namens. Ich bringe den Protest zu Ihrer Kenntnis in der Hoffnung, daß er aus Ihrer Zeitschrift den Weg in die weitere Öffentlichkeit und im besonderen auch in die Zeitschriften des Auslandes finden wird.

Berlin, 16. März 1921.

Albert Einstein.”

According to Ernst Gehrcke, Einstein’s statement was indeed reprinted in the popular press. Fabre responded with a statement published in the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* on 9 May 1921, and in many other papers, and Gehrcke quoted the following from it:

“Diese Vorrede besteht aus drei Dokumenten: sie enthält biographische Daten, wissenschaftliche Ansichten und zuletzt ein internationalistisches Glaubensbekenntnis. Ich halte aufs entschiedenste folgende Behauptungen aufrecht: 1. Verfasser dieser Vorrede ist Herr EINSTEIN. 2. Er selbst hat sie mir zugeschickt und zwar in der Form von Briefen und als Antwort auf briefliche Anfragen meinerseits. 3. Sie war ausschließlich dazu bestimmt, meinen Lesern, d. h. dem französischen Publikum, die moralische und wissenschaftliche Persönlichkeit dieses Gelehrten vorzustellen. Ich bin bereit, obige Behauptungen durch unwiderlegliche Schriftstücke zu bezeugen. . .”⁴⁸²

Fabre had composed the forward from letters he had received from Einstein, and he still held them as proof that Einstein had made the statements he later disowned.

Fabre wrote in the second edition *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: Les Théories d'Einstein. Accrue de notes Liminaires, d'un Exposé des Théories de Weyl, et de Trois Notes de M. M. Guillaume, Brillouin et Sagnac sur Leurs Propres Idées*, Payot, Paris, (1922),

“NOTES LIMINAIRES

La présente édition de cet ouvrage diffère des précédentes.

J'ai procédé à une épuration et à une mise à jour.

*
* *

J'ai d'abord purgé mon livre des déclarations de M. Einstein qui lui servaient de préface. Une partie de la presse et des amis qui me sont chers, avaient critiqué la forme et le fond de ces déclarations. Je ne les avais moi-même insérées que pour permettre au savant israélite allemand de dire publiquement du haut de cette tribune ce qu'il voulait donner comme vrai sur ses opinions politiques, sa vie, sa nationalité, ses sentiments, en un mot, sa physionomie non scientifique, laquelle, on le sait de reste, est extrêmement discutée.

Bien que j'eusse laissé à M. Einstein la responsabilité de ses déclarations je m'en sentais un peu complice puisque je leur donnais l'hospitalité. Mais je n'en aurais pas purgé ce livre, même si leur teneur m'eût été démontrée mensongère, car elles donnaient sur ce grand savant le témoignage le plus précieux puisqu'il émanait de lui.

L'événement le plus imprévu m'a décidé; M. Einstein a, en effet, renié ses déclarations dans la presse allemande. Je me hâte donc de les retrancher de cet ouvrage qui n'aura à connaître que de la figure purement scientifique du grand théoricien; c'est la seule qu'on puisse considérer avec sérénité et même avec quelque sympathie.

*
* *

Il va sans dire que j'ai également indiqué sur le mode dubitatif, ou même supprimé, les assertions que j'avais, dans le cours de l'ouvrage, avancées sur la foi des paroles d'Einstein, les autographes de celles-ci demeurant entre mes mains pour exercer la sagacité des psychologues futurs.

*
* *

Il m'a semblé indispensable d'ajouter à ce travail un bref exposé des théories de Weyl qui complètent très heureusement celles d'Einstein. Leur audace et leur beauté ne peut guère à l'heure actuelle apparaître qu'aux savants. Il est toutefois dès à présent certain que le disciple égale au moins le maître; et peut-être le dépasse-t-il.

*
* *

Les nombreuses lettres qui me sont parvenues m'ont aussi convaincu de l'intérêt que présente pour le public la question du temps relatif. J'ai donné avec assez de détails le point de vue einsteinien pour n'y pas revenir. Mais j'ai pensé que le lecteur entendrait avec plaisir sur le même sujet la voix de M. Guillaume dont j'avais brièvement exposé les théories. Le savant bernois a bien voulu écrire, spécialement pour le présent ouvrage, la note qu'on lira en appendice. On trouvera agrément et profit à la méditer.

M. Brillouin a bien voulu également indiquer lui-même son point de vue aux lecteurs du présent ouvrage; on trouvera sa lettre en appendice.

Il faut admirer la sûreté, la clarté de cette belle page bien française. Elle met exactement à sa place scientifique la théorie einsteinienne; elle en dégage la convenance et l'utilité en tant qu'hypothèse; très sobrement, elle met en garde contre les commentaires où se peuvent aventurer ceux qui confondent l'hypothèse et le réel; j'y discerne, sans vouloir engager la

pensée de son auteur, une méfiance à l'égard des conceptions philosophiques déduites des travaux einsteiniens.

Il n'est pas possible de ne pas souscrire à un jugement si parfaitement lucide; sa réserve et sa sagesse ne diminuent en rien l'enthousiasme que les théories d'Einstein et celles de Weyl, peuvent, indépendamment de leur adéquation au réel, inspirer à qui y recherche un excitant intellectuel.

*
* *

Enfin M. Sagnac, dont on a pu écrire, en faisant allusion à la phrase qui termine ce livre, qu'il était peut-être le nouveau Poincaré, le seul capable de nous donner une réponse définitive sur la valeur des théories einsteiniennes, a accepté de confier à ce petit ouvrage le sort d'une note originale dont l'extraordinaire importance n'échappera à personne.

Cette note:

—d'une part résume l'effet Sagnac sur la rotation dans l'éther (auquel nous avons fait allusion dans notre ouvrage);

—d'autre part institue une théorie générale des champs en translation par une extension de la pure mécanique des petits mouvements.

Nous sommes extrêmement heureux de pouvoir donner à nos lecteurs la primeur d'un travail qui nous paraît contenir en germe les plus belles découvertes."

Many interesting and telling facts emerge from the affair—smear tactic and vilification used to rescue Einstein by means of personal attack meant to divert attention from the real issue, and Einstein's dependence upon collaborators to write his statements, as well as Einstein's image. The preface to Fabre's book was only one of many of Einstein's anti-German, pro-Allies, and, elsewhere, Anglophilic, statements made public.⁴⁸³

Suspicion also fell upon Einstein because the "war to end all wars", *i. e.* the end of war—pacifism, socialism, revolution and economic hardship—which were great concerns of the Germans in the post-war period—were forecast in Ivan Stanislavovich Bloch's book, *The Future of War in Its Technical, Economic, and Political Relations; Is War Now Impossible?*, Doubleday & McClure Co., New York, (1899). Bolch was a hero and an inspiration to many Jews and to many Socialists. He was part of the culture that inspired H. G. Wells, Russell, Lorentz and Einstein; and Einstein was seen as a believer in, and vocal advocate of, this Blochian philosophy. The concept of the "war to end all wars" is also a prophetic and Apocalyptic one of Jewish world leadership foretold in the period of peace of the book of *Enoch*, with its "elect" and "Elect One" (*see also: Isaiah 65; 66*) and in the final war in the Old Testament in, among other places, *Isaiah 2:1-4*:

"1 The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. 2 And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of

the LORD's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. 3 And many people 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. 4 And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: 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."

"Pacifists" often promoted the Apocalyptic prophesy of a "war to end all wars", which would establish a "world government" according to prophecy, one run by Jews in Jerusalem. Albert Einstein was one of the many advocates of this plan. "Pacifists" often sought to provoke the most terrible of wars humankind has yet endured on the false premise that it would end war. What these brutal and genocidal wars instead did was weaken the nations making them vulnerable to Jewish revolution, while simultaneously making the Jewish financiers unimaginably wealthy. Thereby, the Jewish financiers could sponsor revolution, dictatorship and genocide, and could buy up the world at reduced rates. The people were intentionally made so weary of war, that they become vulnerable to the sophistical message that the only means to secure peace is to destroy all nations such that there will be no nations left to war with each other. Some Jews press this message in order to bring to fulfillment the Messianic prophecy that the Jews will destroy all nations and religions, and rule the Earth. The false message that the loss of sovereignty leads to peace was a fundamental theme in Communist régimes. The loss of Gentile sovereignty has instead led to the enslavement and extermination of the Gentile peoples, in fulfillment of Judaic Messianic prophecy.

In the era of the German Enlightenment, Moses Mendelssohn asserted that the "Jewish mission" was to convert the world to monotheism and to instill in all peoples the principles of the Jewish moral code, which according to some initially only applied only to Jews, with the ancient Jews viewing Gentiles as subhuman and therefore undeserving of moral treatment. Einstein's friend Georg Friedrich Nicolai (Lewinstein) stated in 1917,

"Apart from this strange story of Cain, however, murder is forbidden in the Bible, and very sternly forbidden. But—it is only the murder of Jews. As is natural, considering the period from which it dates, the Bible is absolutely national, in character. Only the Jew is really considered as a human being; cattle and strangers might be slain without the slayer himself being slain. In this case there was a ransom. Accordingly, war was of course allowed also, and the Jews were no more illogical than the Moslem who kills the outlander. Of late years the Jews and the Old Testament have often been reproached for their contempt for those who were not Jews; and in practice even Christ acted in precisely the same way."⁴⁸⁴

Mendelssohn's message was not very different from that of Jesus Christ, as expressed in the Gospels; or, indeed, that of Islam, "There is no God but God." The political Zionists tended to be secular and racist, and based their beliefs on biological, Darwinistic principles. Albert Einstein saw Judaism as step away from paganistic Polytheism towards utilitarian and scientific morality, with the objectionable premise in the ancient tradition that one is led to morality through fear of the "imaginary" God.⁴⁸⁵ However, all of these movements, which meant to lessen the suspicion among Gentiles of Jewish religious aspirations, perpetuated those aspirations which were always more political and racist in nature, than spiritual. Moses of the ten commandments was little different from Moses Mendelssohn.

Einstein followed the line of thought which sponsored European Liberalism, "such as Jacobinism, Fourierism, Owenism, Fabian Socialism, Marxism, and the like",⁴⁸⁶ as essentially adopting the moral values of Judaism and replacing the source of these values, "God", with a quasi-Deistic conception of nature. Many critics of the Jews found this irrational, in that the removal of "God" *a priori* removes the fundamental premise of all that can be deduced from this premise, including codes of moral and just conduct, without providing a substitute premise which rationally deduces their conclusions. These critics sought a more synthetic basis for morality than neo-Platonism, and many arrived at pragmatic Darwinism and Metempsychosis, which they argued were logically consistent and empirically justified. In reality, there was less difference between the two points of view than was apparent on the face of the dispute.

Before Bloch were Bertha von Suttner and Alfred Hermann Fried of the *Friedensbewegung* (peace movement) which attracted pacifist physicist and Einstein-supporter Hans Thirring. Suttner published *Die Waffen nieder!*⁴⁸⁷ in 1892, which emphasized the harm done to civilians in modern warfare. The American Civil War had demonstrated the destructive force of modern industry applied to warfare. Friedrich Nietzsche, whose work was well known, predicted the massive destruction this would cause in the Twentieth Century.

Unlike Albert Einstein, Philipp Lenard had expressed his loyalty to Germany during and after the First World War. After Einstein smeared him without cause, Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard demanded a very public personal apology from Albert Einstein, which was not forthcoming. Einstein repeatedly made harshly anti-German and warmly Anglophilic statements before and after the Bad Nauheim debate which outraged many Germans.⁴⁸⁸ Einstein was member of a commission which intended to investigate and publicize alleged German war atrocities, in 1919, for the purposes of a psychological attack on the German psyche attempting to coerce them into accepting Einstein's view that Germany's defeat was a victory for humanity.⁴⁸⁹ Einstein also wanted to increase the hardships on the already starving Germans with foreign boycotts on German products soon after the First World War ended.⁴⁹⁰ Many hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Germans had starved to death during a naval blockade in the war. Einstein's, and like minded vindictive spirits', love of punishing Germans made the Germans resentful of the Jews who had stabbed them in the back.

Ethnocentric attacks against German science appeared in America⁴⁹¹ in 1918, and

in England⁴⁹² in 1919. In addition, English and French scientists, in collusion with traitors like Albert Einstein, took punitive actions against German scientists under the auspices of the International Research Council. Among other punitive sanctions, they excluded German and Austrian nationals from international congresses and banned the Nations of the former Central Powers from membership for a period of ten years. Einstein was marketed to the Allies as a Swiss Jew who had opposed Germany from the beginning of the war and Einstein, the “Swiss Jew”, was safe from these vicious attacks on the liberty and dignity of German scientists.

Max Born knew that Hendrik Antoon Lorentz was a friend of the Allies after the First World War and Born disliked him.⁴⁹³ Einstein, who had lived in Germany throughout the war, in spite of the fact that he hated Germany and wanted to see the nation destroyed, wrote to Lorentz on 1 August 1919,

“Exclusion of German scholars from social international scholarly exchanges for a number of years might perhaps be a lesson in humility for them, which will not do much harm at all—and, it is to be hoped, might even help.”⁴⁹⁴

Many German scientists resented Einstein’s treachery. Indeed, under pressure from Lenard for his anti-German activities and as a result of the economic conditions in Germany, Einstein published an appeal to ease the punitive measures taken against German science, which he himself had initially sponsored.⁴⁹⁵ However, racist Zionist Albert Einstein saw to it that no German scientist would be present at the Solvay Conference in April of 1921. His friend Hendrik Antoon Lorentz invited only one German scientist to attend the conference, Albert Einstein. Racist Zionist Albert Einstein then refused the invitation with the excuse that he was heading for America to exploit his ill-founded fame to raise money for his fellow racist Zionists. Einstein wrote to Lorentz,

“As this venture lies close to my heart, and as I, as a Jew, feel a duty to contribute, as far as I am able, to its success, I accepted.”⁴⁹⁶

Fellow German Jew Fritz Haber was outraged at Albert Einstein’s racist treachery and disloyalty. Einstein confirmed that he was disloyal and a racist, and was obligated,

“[. . .] to step in for my persecuted and morally depressed fellow tribesmen, as far as this lies within my power[.]”⁴⁹⁷

In point of fact, Einstein was instead promoting himself and hiding from his critics.

In response to the Berlin Philharmonic lectures, Einstein and his friends arranged for a discussion of the theory of relativity at the Eighty-Sixth Meeting of German Natural Scientists in Bad Nauheim in late September of 1920. These were annual gatherings which had been interrupted by the war. Einstein threatened that Lenard and all critics of the theory of relativity would be humiliated. Einstein was known for his childish and evasive responses to criticism. He was known for hiding from

criticism. Einstein responded,

“The best proof that I by no means dodge criticism is that I myself arranged that the theory of relativity be discussed at the meeting of the GDNA in Nauheim.”⁴⁹⁸

Einstein stated in his challenge that anyone brave enough should speak in Bad Nauheim.

Einstein, himself, was not brave enough. Contrary to his public bravado, Einstein feared the confrontation he had created and wanted others to speak on his behalf. He knew that he could not defend the theory of relativity and that he had no legitimate defense for his plagiarism. Einstein instead wanted to hide from the criticism directed at him.

Albert Einstein wrote to Arnold Sommerfeld on 6 September 1920 that he wanted to hide from the debate,

“But I do not on any account want to speak myself[.]”⁴⁹⁹

4.4.8 Let the Debate Begin

Einstein, against his better judgement, did speak at Nauheim. The event was highly publicized by Einstein and his supporters and thousands showed up to see the debate. The theory of relativity was hyped beyond all reasonable limits and many were certain that the great hero Einstein would crush his opponents, as advertised. The much anticipated debate between Lenard and Einstein over the general theory of relativity began on Thursday, at 12:45 PM. Einstein’s advocates, Max Planck who chaired the session, *et al.*, employed armed police to keep anti-relativists and neutral parties out of the audience and attempted to stack the audience with a pro-Einstein claque. This resulted in a tumultuous protest and unbiased audience members stormed the hall and held their ground.

After long and boring lectures by Einstein and his friends which began at 9:00 AM, the bell sounded at 12:45 PM for the time allotted to Einstein-critics to begin. Einstein and Lenard began to debate.

Though accounts of the meeting are incomplete and vary,⁵⁰⁰ Lenard clearly made Einstein look very foolish in a very short time. Einstein was flustered and could not give cogent responses, even though Lenard repeated his questions. In a prearranged maneuver, Max Planck called the session, which had begun at 12:45 PM, to an end at about 1:00 PM, after only a few minutes of debate, so as to let Einstein off the hook and prevent a fuller exposure of Einstein’s incompetence. Fifteen minutes before the afternoon session began, Einstein ran away. Gehrcke, who had humiliated Einstein at the Berlin Philharmonic, and whom Einstein had openly challenged to speak at Bad Nauheim, repeatedly demanded time to speak, but Max Planck refused to allow Gehrcke a chance to speak, and delayed Gehrcke until the session was closed. Planck also refused to allow Rudolph, another Einstein critic, time to speak.

Pursuant to Planck’s corrupt plan, Einstein’s critics were only allotted fifteen

minutes to speak, including responses from Einstein and his friends, after hours of pro-Relativity lectures. Planck tried to arrange it so that only pro-Einstein mathematical lectures would occur, which would be entirely uninteresting to the public and to the press.

Max Planck fed Friedrich von Müller, the opening speaker to the Bad Nauheim gathering, a prepared speech Planck and Arnold Sommerfeld had written lauding Einstein and unfairly degrading his opponents. Planck arranged it so that armed guards would intimidate anti-Einstein participants and prevent them from attending the meeting hall and attempted to stack the audience and the stage with a pro-Einstein clique. Planck not only limited the time of the anti-Relativists at the Thursday meeting to a few minutes, Planck also greatly restricted their time at the Friday meeting to 12 minutes including discussion—a meeting which Einstein and his cronies did not attend. Einstein hid from his opponents and ran away from the debate, even after Max Planck had arranged it so that Einstein would have every conceivable advantage.

Albert Einstein was ashamed of the fact that he had run away. He wrote to Max Born in October of 1920,

“I will live through all that is in store for me like an unconcerned spectator and will not allow myself to get excited again, as in Nauheim. It is quite inconceivable to me how I could have lost my sense of humour to such an extent through being in bad company.”⁵⁰¹

4.4.8.1 Einstein Disappoints—“Albertus Maximus” is a Laughingstock

Einstein’s cowardice and incompetence did not go unnoticed. Johannes Riem ridiculed Albert Einstein,

“Amerika über Einstein

Von

Professor Dr. Johannes Riem.

Es ist kaum anzunehmen, daß Einstein mit reiner Freude an seine amerikanische Rundreise zurückdenken wird. Ein großer Teil der dortigen Physiker und Astronomen stand von vornherein ablehnend da, vor allem der bekannte Michelson, dessen berühmtes Experiment in seiner falschen Deutung mit den Anlaß für die Relativitätstheorie gegeben hat. Vor mir liegen zwei Zeitungsblätter, „The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune“, 1921 May 22, und „The St. Paul Daily News“, 1921 May 8. Beide beschäftigen sich mit der Relativitätstheorie und Einsteins Auftreten drüben. Zunächst die Feststellung, daß Einstein gleichzeitig mit der Abordnung der Zionisten drüben ankam, und daß die Presse davon in ausgedehntem Maße Kenntnis nahm. Doch habe man sehr bald dies als bezahlte Mache erkannt, und die ganze Einsteinsche Reise von Beginn an als einen Bluff erfaßt.

Die Amerikaner wären denn doch zu skeptisch gewesen, ihn ohne weitere Beweise für größer als Kopernikus und Newton zu halten, bloß, weil seine Lehre unverständlicher sei. Denn die Wahrheit sei einfach und verständlich. Man habe die Relativitätstheorie deswegen als einen Schwindel zurückgewiesen, und Reuter dahl vom College St. Paul bezeichnet Einstein als den „Barnum der wissenschaftlichen Welt, der die ganze Welt mit seiner mythischen Theorie zum Narren halte“. Derselbe Reuter dahl hat Einstein zu einer Erörterung aufgefordert, auch ihm ist es ergangen, wie voriges Jahr den Gegnern Einsteins in Nauheim, denn Einstein zog sich beizeiten zurück, so daß Reuter dahl die ganze Einsteinfahrt für eine von vornherein abgekartete Geschäftsreise erklärt.

Er führt des längeren aus, daß Leute, wie Mewes, Gehrecke und andere durchaus recht hätten, wenn sie Einstein des Plagiates beschuldigen. Er hat seine Gedanken zum Teil den Arbeiten Zieglers in Bern entnommen, wo ja Einstein früher wohnte, dessen Gedanken aber von der Wissenschaft unterdrückt seien, ferner von Gerber, dessen Arbeiten auch schwer zugänglich waren. Die Zeitungen sind beide über die Gelehrten bei uns gut unterrichtet, die gegen Einstein arbeiten, Leonard, Gehrecke, Fricke.

Der Reklamefeldzug, den die Presse vor einiger Zeit mit und für Einstein machte, wird den Amerikanern als eine Art Film vorgeführt, der aber für die deutsche Wissenschaft, für ihre Ehre und Förderung wenig nützlich gewesen sei. Es sei sehr zu bedauern, daß die Deutsche Wissenschaft durch einen ihrer Vertreter selbst lächerlich gemacht werde. Lodge, Reuter dahl, Heidenreich und andere haben drüben vorher gewarnt, man solle den Einsteinismus nicht so ohne weiteres annehmen. Natürlich zuerst vergeblich, denn dieser neue Ismus rollte wie eine Flutwelle ungehemmt dahin, aber die Ernüchterung kam bald.

Man geht gegen Einstein vor als den Goliath des Skeptizismus. Vorlesungen dagegen werden veranstaltet. In scharfsinniger Weise wird in einem viel gelesenen Buche „Relativität oder innere Abhängigkeit“ die Unhaltbarkeit der Relativitätstheorie nachgewiesen. Der Einwand Einsteins, dies sei nur eine besondere Form des Antisemitismus, wird sehr energisch zurückgewiesen, und mit der Anerkennung Spinozas beantwortet.

Man ist sich darüber klar, daß es sich dabei vor allem darum handelt, mit allen Mitteln die Grundlagen der Theorie zu bekämpfen, da diese fehlerhaft, unvollständig und geeignet ist, das Universum in mechanistische Ideen aufzulösen. Es ist eine widerrechtliche Besitzergreifung durch die Mathematik. Der Astronom Glanville bezeichnet die Relativitätstheorie als eine neue Droge, die als ein neues Allheilmittel angepriesen wird. Dr. Skidmore hat die Sache richtig erfaßt, wenn er sagt, daß die Relativitätstheorie ausgehe von der Nichteuklidischen, sogenannten Metageometrie, sie bestehe aus rein gedanklichen Konstruktionen, die durchaus subjektiv sind und denen in der Natur nichts entspricht. Sehr hübsch ist folgendes Bild: Man nehme der Relativitätstheorie den mathematischen blauen Dunst, in den sie sich hüllt, dann bleibt nur ein

leblooses Skelett und dessen Einsteinscher Schädel grinst andauernd seine Zehen an, die auf der Grundlage Galileis stehen. Man stelle sich das einmal vor!”⁵⁰²

On 22 April 1922, the *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten* ridiculed Einstein’s flight from the debate (Einstein would often repeat the cliché that great truths are simple, as if he were the first to make use of it),

“‘Americans have too much common sense for that. They know that all the great truths are simple and easily understood, and are, therefore, justly suspicious of the unintelligible theory of relativity of Einstein. More than that they have rejected it as a swindle. Just for example Reuterdahl, dean of engineering of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, calls Einstein a ‘Barnum of the scientific world who is trying to fool the whole world with a mythical theory.’ It is further reported that Reuterdahl has challenged Einstein to a debate, into which he is as likely to enter as in the debate announced last year at the meeting for scientific investigation in Bad Nauheim, where he preferred to withdraw himself quietly before the announced opponents of his theory could say what they had to say. To these opponents was expressed the regret that Mr. Einstein was unable, because of circumstances, to answer them. This, of course, was another prearranged matter of his general trafficking. It is very likely that he is acting in a similar manner towards Reuterdahl. The more so because the latter has accused him of scientific theft, for Reuterdahl maintains that Einstein has taken the fundamentals of his theory from a work which appeared in 1866 under the pseudonym of ‘Kinertia.’”⁵⁰³

“Dazu haben die Amerikaner noch zu viel gesunden Menschenverstand. Sie sind sich der großen Tatsachen bewußt, daß alle großen Mehrheiten auch einfach und leicht verständlich sind, und bringen daher der unverständlichen Relativitätslehre Einsteins ein durchaus gerechtfertigtes Mißtrauen entgegen. Ja, mehr als das: sie lehnen sie als Schwindel ab. So nennt Reuterdahl, der Dekan des St. Thomas College in Minneapolis, Einstein „einen Barnum in der wissenschaftlichen Welt“, der mit seiner mystischen Theorie alle Welt zum Besten halte. Auch soll Reuterdahl Einstein zu einer Disputation aufgefordert haben, zu welcher sich dieser aber wohl ebenso wenig stellen dürfte, wie zu der an der letztjährigen deutschen Naturforscher-Versammlung in Bad Nauheim angekündigten, wo er es vorzog, sich in aller Stille zu drücken, bevor die zum Worte vorgemerkten Gegner seiner Theorie an die Reihe kamen. Man drückte ihnen dann das Bedauern aus, daß ihnen Herr Einstein nicht habe Rede und Antwort stehen können. Das war natürlich eine abgekartete Sache seines Klüngels. Aehnlich dürfte er sich nun auch gegenüber Reuterdahl verhalten, umso mehr, als ihn dieser des wissenschaftlichen Diebstahls bezichtigt. Reuterdahl behauptet nämlich, Einstein habe die Grundlage seiner Theorie einem Werke entlehnt, welches

1866 unter dem Pseudonym „Inertia“ erschien.”

J. E. G. Hirzel wrote in the *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten* of 20 September 1921,

“Albertus Maximus und die Blamage der Schulweisheit.

Warum Maximus? — In Amerika gefeiert und herausgefordert. — Seine Vorläufer als Duellanten: Reuter dahl in Amerika und Dr. J. H. Ziegler in der Schweiz. — Der Reklameturm von Potsdam.

Am 1. April dieses Jahres wurden in Neuyork die letzten Vorbereitungen zum Empfang des größten Genies getroffen, welches die Welt bisher hervorzubringen imstande war. Wenigstens hieß es allgemein, daß alle großen Denker und Entdecker, denen unsere Wissenschaft und Kultur ihr Dasein verdanken, in Zukunft nur noch als bescheidene Vorläufer oder als Herolde jenes größern Genies gelten könnten, so daß fortan Namen wie die eines Heraklit, Giordano Bruno, Kopernikus, Kepler, Newton und wie sei sonst noch heißen mögen die großen Leuchten des Menschengeschlechts, neben dem seinigen ihren Glanz verlören. Dieses alles überstrahlende Gestirn am Himmel der heutigen Wissenschaft heißt *Al b e r t E i n s t e i n*. Ein findiger Berliner Journalist fand jedoch diesen Namen zu bürgerlich und nannte ihn kurz *Albertus M a x i m u s*. So heißt er jetzt im Hinblick auf jenen berühmten Zeitgenossen des Roger Baco, welcher den Gelehrten seiner Zeit allgemein als *doctor mirabilis* bekannt war und als der gelehrteste von allen galt, *Albertus Magnus*: dem großen Lehrer des Kirchenvaters Thomas Aquinas, dem *doctor angelicus* und eigentlichen Begründer der thomistisch-aristotelischen Philosophie, welche die Wissenschaft das ganze Mittelalter hindurch bis auf die Neuzeit beherrschte. Da diese beiden gewaltigen Männer bekanntlich später von der katholischen Kirche kanonisiert wurden, so erwarteten die Amerikaner den ihnen avisierten ganz Großen mit einer Art heiliger Scheu, auch schon deshalb, weil seine Lehre noch schwerer verständlich sein sollte, als die des heiligen Thomas, welche bereits den gelehrten Theologen schon genug harte Nüsse zu knacken gegeben hatte. Von der Lehre Einsteins hieß es allgemein, sie sei nur für die größten Mathematiker verständlich. Den meisten *A m e r i k e r n* genügte es darum, den Namen dieser Wunderlehre zu kennen, und man war praktisch genug, sich nicht auch noch um ihren Inhalt zu kümmern. Trotzdem war man allgemein von ihr entzückt, und zwar eben deshalb, weil sie so geheimnisvoll war. Nach ihr sollte es überhaupt nichts Absolutes mehr geben, alles sollte nur noch relativ sein. Aber Einstein sagte nicht, warum. Doch nannte er sie die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie. Sie bedeutet die vollste Freiheit im Denken und Handeln, denn sie befreit alle von jeder absoluten Verpflichtung. Der Glaube an das Absolute ist mit ihr erledigt. Er gehörte zu den Grundirrtümern einer veralteten Weisheit, welche einst durch den Teufel in

die Welt gekommen sein mußten. Einstein wollte nun gründlich damit aufräumen. Darum die große Spannung. Man hoffte in ihm den kommenden Erlöser aus der Not des Unverstandes, des Zweifels und Irrtums begrüßen zu dürfen, und den Schlichter jeglichen Streites, den Friedensfürsten, welcher im Glorienschein schon vollbrachter und noch zu vollbringender Wundertaten der geplagten Menschheit den geistlichen und weltlichen Frieden bringen und das Reich Gottes auf Erden errichten werde. Einstein aber hatte ganz eigene Absichten. Der Verkünder der Relativitätstheorie wußte, daß alles nur relativ sei, also auch seine Messiasmission, und daß es deshalb am klügsten für ihn sei, dies den Amerikanern nicht zu sagen. Er wollte ihnen im Bluff einmal den Meister zeigen.

Am 1. April ließ er sie hangen und bängen, aber am 2. erschien er, vorläufig aber erst im Hafen von Neuyork. Da die Ankunft programmgemäß auf einen Samstag fiel, so halten Einstein und seine Begleiter dadurch Gelegenheit, ihren frommen Landslauten in New-Jerusalem gleich einen Beweis ihrer orthodoxen Frömmigkeit zu geben. Man wartete deshalb mit der Ausschiffung noch bis zum Sabbath-Ende. Dann erst ließ man sich von einem mit der amerikanischen und jüdischen Flagge versehenen, vom Bürgermeister extra zur Verfügung gestellten majors cutter ans Land setzen. Umgeben von einer zionistischen Delegation, unter Führung des Oberzionisten Weizmann und dessen Adjutanten Ussischkin und Mossinsohn betrat der neue Messias den Boden des gelobten Goldlandes Dollarika. Bei der Fahrt durch die Stadt (so berichtet die jüdische Pressezentrale vom 15. April) harpte ihrer eine unabsehbar Menge — ein Bericht spricht sogar von einer Million — von der sie enthusiastisch akklamiert wurde, so daß der *E i n z u g E i n s t e i n s* in New-Jerusalem den einfachen von Christus in Alt-Jerusalem vollständig in den Schatten stellte. Offenbar war er viel besser gemanaged. Alles schrie Hosiannah, denn alle Zuschauer waren Juden. Einstein selbst berichtet, er habe in Neuyork zum erstenmal jüdische Volkshaufen gesehen. Aber diese streuten keine Palmblätter, sondern, was den Zionisten viel lieber war, Banknoten und Schecks auf die Bank von England. Denn die jüdische Delegation hatte es nicht auf die Bekehrung der Yankees abgesehen, sondern nur auf die Erleichterung ihrer Börsen. Sie spekulierte nicht auf Seelenfang, sondern auf Gold, und dieses war nach alttestamentlicher Tradition am reichlichsten in Amerika zu finden. Schon Salomo hatte seine Knechte mit denen Hiram's nach dem Lande Ophir geschickt, welches nach Mewes mit Peru identisch ist, und sie hatten ihm von dort 450 Zentner Gold zurückgebracht. Jetzt brauchte man es nicht mehr im rohen Zustande. Für die in Jerusalem zu gründende Welt-Universität dienten solide Papiere noch besser, und diese waren in Nordamerika leichter zu beschaffen. Und wirklich brachten die Zionisten hier mit Einstein als „great attraction“ in ebenso viel Monaten, als Salomos Knechte Jahre gebraucht hatten, 23 Millionen Dollars zusammen, womit für derartige Expeditionen ein neuer Weltrekord aufgestellt war. Einstein brauchte dabei nicht einmal zu reden. Erstens geriet so sein Geheimnis weniger in Gefahr und zweitens

verstärkte sein Schweigen den Nimbus seiner Theorie. Auch wäre ohnedies niemand genial genug gewesen, ihn zu verstehen. Denjenigen, die ihn durchaus hören wollten, spielte er etwas auf seiner Geige vor. Der Präsident und der Vizepräsident der Union bezeugten ihm für seine Leistungen ihre Anerkennung dadurch, daß sie sich mit ihm zusammen photographieren ließen.

Leider wurde Einstein vor seiner Abreise noch ein schlimmer Streich gespielt, ohne den er seinen lukrativen Aufenthalt wahrscheinlich noch erheblich verlängert hätte. Ich erwähnte bereits, daß seine Mission mehr darin bestand, den Amerikanern einen Propheten zu zeigen, als ihnen seine Theorie auseinanderzusetzen. Reden ist Silber, Schweigen ist Gold. Seine Abneigung gegen das Disputieren hatte Einstein schon an der Naturforscher-Versammlung in Bad Nauheim gezeigt. Ueberhaupt läßt sich kein Prophet, der an sich glaubt, aufs Disputieren ein und einer, der es nicht tut, noch viel weniger. Leider hatte nun aber ein amerikanischer Professor hiefür weder das richtige Verständnis, noch das nötige Zartgefühl. Dieser wollte nicht begreifen, daß eine wertvolle Lehre unverständlich sein müsse, sondern meinte, alle großen Wahrheiten müßten notwendig auch einfach und leicht verständlich sein. Aus diesem Grunde forderte er Herrn Einstein auf, diese Meinungsverschiedenheit mit ihm auf dem Wege einer öffentlichen Disputation auszutragen. Eine derartige Zumutung einem öffentlich beglaubigten Genie gegenüber erscheint etwas brutal und erinnert beinahe an den Boxermatsch Dempsen-Carpentier. Da aber dem Friedensfürsten jede Art von Streit ein Greuel ist, so strafte er die taktlose Herausforderung des Professors Arvid Reuterdahl mit stiller Verachtung. Vielleicht fürchtete er auch, er könnte in der Hitze des Zweikampfes seinem Gegner mit seiner übermenschlich-geistigen Kraft schweren Schaden zufügen. Sei dem, wie ihm wolle, jedenfalls verbot ihm seine Menschenliebe den Zweikampf. Aber die Amerikaner verkanteten die hohe Moralität Einsteins und glaubten, er fürchte sich vor Reuterdahl und wäre deshalb vor ihm ausgekniffen. Und so fingen sie an, ihn plötzlich und von allen Seiten so grausam zu verhöhnen und lächerlich zu machen, daß sie dabei sogar den guten Ton verletzten und ihre gute Erziehung vergaßen. Das mußte Einstein noch tiefer schmerzen. Denn jetzt kamen sogar die „guten Eindrücke“ in Gefahr, welche er von den Amerikanern empfangen hatte. Um diese zu retten, brach er nun schleunigst seine Tournee ab und schiffte sich so rasch als möglich nach England ein, wo er sich dann von Lord Haldane, einem gefühlvollen Stammesgenossen, über die gehabte Enttäuschung trösten ließ.

So endigte das anfängliche Hosiannah auch bei Einsteins Messiade mit einem Kreuziget ihn! Doch ist es heute nicht mehr Brauch, seine Ueberzeugung durch das Martyrium zu bekräftigen. Darum drückte sich der Prophet, bevor seine Sache eine tragische Wendung nahm. Erst, als er sich in Berlin ganz in Sicherheit wußte, stellte er wieder seinen Mann, machte den Amerikanern eine lange Nase und plimperte mit dem Geld in seiner Tasche. Es klang wie fröhliches Kichern. So endigte sein Triumphzug durch Amerika

fast genau so, wie es die „Luzerner Neuesten Nachrichten am 22. April vorausgesagt hatten.

Und Reuter dahl? Nun, Reuter dahl konnte sich darüber trösten, daß ihn Einsteins Flucht um den Triumph gebracht hatte, ihm in öffentlicher Disputation die Richtigkeit seiner famosen Relativitätstheorie zu beweisen und ihm dabei die Denkermaske vom Gesicht zu reißen und dem Publikum nur dasjenige eines schlaun wissenschaftlichen Schiebers zu zeigen. Reuter dahl brauchte diesen Triumph nicht. Als Dekan der Ingenieur- und Architektenabteilung des St. Thomas College in St. Paul (Minnesota) genoß er schon Ansehen genug, auch stand sein Ruf als tiefer Denker und bedeutender Mathematiker längst zu fest, als daß er seiner bedurft hätte. Ernsten Forschern liegt nur die Wahrheit am Herzen und sie verachten die Reklame. Die Flucht Einsteins war das schmachvolle Eingeständnis seiner Niederlage. Nach der hochgeachteten Monatsschrift „The Dearborn Independent“ vom 30. Juli sollen bei Einsteins Abfahrt von Neuyork nur noch ein halbes Dutzend Freunde zugegen gewesen sein. Ein stilles Leichenbegängnis! Die Hunderttausende, welche den Ankömmling begrüßt hatten, blieben zu Hause. Viele von ihnen studierten bereits Reuter dahls Werk „Wissenschaftlicher Deismus gegen Materialismus“. Die Tendenz dieses Buches ist eine rein absolutistische, radikal antirelativistische, wenn man den Relativismus im Einsteinschen Sinne versteht. Reuter dahl zeigt darin, daß die heutige agnostische Wissenschaft bloß auf vereinbarten Unbestimmtheiten beruht, „scientific unknowns“, und daß diesem unsichern Zustande nur durch die sichere Bestimmung der notwendig absolut einfachen Grundlage abgeholfen werden könne. Dieses Absolute nennt er, so wie es die Religion tut, Gott. Aber als Mann der Wissenschaft begnügt er sich nicht mit dem unbestimmten Begriff von Gott. Vielmehr faßt er das Prinzip des allmächtig alles Bewirkenden und Durchwirkenden wieder ähnlich auf, wie es früher die beiden gelehrten Jesuiten Athanasius Kircher und Pater Joseph Boskowich getan hatten. Der letztere starb als Professor der Philosophie, Physik, Astronomie und Mathematik im Jahre 1787 in Mailand. Auch war er Verfasser einer Atomistik. Das ewige Grundprinzip von allen Weltlichen bestand nach ihm aus lauter Kraftzentren. Zu eben diesem Schlusse kam auch Reuter dahl. Er vereinigt aber damit ferner auch die beiden Grundbegriffe von Raum und Zeit. Alle zusammen bilden den absoluten Urgrund, auf dem oder woraus sich dann alles Relativ in verständlicher Weise entwickelt. Damit sichert er diesem von Anfang an ein festes System, während in einer bloßen Relativität ohne Voraussetzung eines bestimmten Absoluten selbstverständlich alles systemlos bleibt, so wie es bei Einsteins Lehre der Fall ist. Diese ist darum nicht nur unverständlich, sondern sogar höchst gefährlich. Sie ist absolut ordnungswidrig, nihilistisch und negativ. Beidenkapp nannte sie bolschewistisch. Und sie wirkt deshalb nur zersetzend auf Religion und Wissenschaft ein, anstatt stützend und fördernd. Beiden entzieht sie den festen Boden. Bei Reuter dahl ist das Gegenteil davon der Fall. Darum stimmt er aufs Beste mit den Lehren und Bestrebungen J.

H. Zieglers überein, dessen Werk er in seiner jüngsten Schrift: „Einstein and The New Science“ mit unverhehlter Freude rühmt und als grundlegend für die neue und wahre Wissenschaft anerkennt. Zieglers System fußt bekanntlich ebenfalls auf den drei Begriffen von Urkraft, Urraum und Urzeit, deren Einheit nachzuweisen ihm gelungen ist. Einstein spricht dagegen die Zeit als vierte Dimension des Raumes an! Reuterdahl und Ziegler, der Mathematiker und der Chemiker, ergänzen sich gegenseitig. Einstein dagegen bringt nur mißtönende Anklänge an die Theorie des letztern vor. Immerhin muß man ihm eines lassen. Niemand hat mehr wie er und seine zionistischen und nichtzionistischen Freunde zum Sturze der agnostischen Wissenschaft beigetragen. Denn nichts konnte ihre innere Hohlheit der Menschheit besser zum Bewußtsein bringen, als das marktschreierische Treiben der Einsteinianer. Dieses Treiben lenkte erst die Aufmerksamkeit auf den Schaden und machte sie auf dem ganzen Erdenrund lächerlich und unhaltbar. Das war nun allerdings nicht beabsichtigt, aber es ebnete der neuen, wahren Wissenschaft den Weg. Einstein wurde dadurch nolens volens, zwar nicht zu ihrem Begründer, aber doch wenigstens zu ihrem Herold. Es geht eben oft anders, als man denkt. Das müssen jetzt auch die Koryphäen der alten Wissenschaft erfahren, denn damit, daß sie sich wie ein Mann hinter einen Nachtreter stellen, um mit ihm den ihnen unbequemen Hauptbegründer der neuen Wissenschaft gemeinsam an die Wand zu drücken, gerieten sie nur noch tiefer in den Sumpf einer bodenlosen Relativität, wobei sie ihre Autorität gänzlich einbüßen. Sie suchen sie jetzt vergeblich zu retten; alle Kniffe werden ihnen nichts mehr helfen. In diesen Tagen taufte sie gelegentlich eines Astronomen-Kongresses in Potsdam ein dort errichtetes Observatorium auf den Namen Einsteins und ließen dieses welterschütternde Ereignis sofort durch den Telegraphen urbi et orbi bekannt machen. Der Einsteinturm paradiert daher schon heute in jeder illustrierten Zeitung als aktuellste Sehenswürdigkeit. Er soll dazu dienen, die öffentliche Aufmerksamkeit von den ruhig und still vor sich gehenden Hauptereignissen abzulenken. Ob er aber den Ruhm des großen Mannes verewigen werde, ist daher noch fraglich. Dieser Reklameturm dürfte meines Erachtens in Zukunft eine weiser gewordene Menschheit an die ungeheure Geistesverwirrung unserer agnostischen Zeit erinnern. Der Einsteinturm wäre demnach nur mehr ein Denkmal für ihre letzte Torheit und größte Blamage.

J. E. G. Hirzel.”

Artur Fürst and Alexander Moszkowski stated in 1916 that Einstein was the Galileo of the Twentieth Century. They suggested that since the designation *Albertus Magnus* was already taken (by Albert Graf von Bollstädt), the title “*Albertus Maximus*”⁵⁰⁴ might be reserved for Einstein:

“So ist auch das jenseitige Ufer der neuen Theorie, der Relativität, nur unter Gefahr zu gewinnen. Aber der Wagemutige, der hinüberkommt, sieht sich in einer unermeßlichen neuen Welt, in der auf Schritt und Tritt

ungeahnte Wahrheitswunder erblühen. Und mit Bewunderung gedenkt er der Männer, stie ihm diesen Weg wiesen. Zu ihnen gehören die Physiker und Mathematiker L o r e n t z und M i n k o w s k i , vor allen aber der gewaltige Baumeister des neuen Relativitätsgebäudes, der Galilei des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts: A l b e r t E i n s t e i n.

Vor sieben Jahrhunderten lebte ein Wundermann der Naturlehre, der Graf von Bollstädt, der sich den Namen eines Großen, A l b e r t u s M a g n u s , errang. Die Bezeichnung Albertus Maximus ist noch frei. Es könnte sein, daß dieser Titel für Albert Einstein vorbehalten bleibt und ihm dereinst verliehen wird.”⁵⁰⁵

Fürst and Moszkowski were copying Eugen Karl Dühring’s pronouncement that Robert Mayer was the “Galileo of the Nineteenth Century” in Dühring’s book *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Eine Einführung in seine Leistungen und Schicksale*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880).

The feature article Hirzel referred to was published in the *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten* on 22 April 1921:

**“Feuilleton.
Professor Einstein „Triumphzug“
durch Amerika.**

In Nr. 164 vom 9. April brachte die „Vosissche Zeitung“ folgende überseeische Depesche: „Prof. Albert Einstein und die gleichzeitig mit ihm eingetroffene zionistische Delegation wurden bei ihrer Ankunft in Neuyork sehr warm begrüßt. Die gesamte Neuyorker Presse widmet dem Ereignis als solchem und der Persönlichkeit Einsteins ausführliche Artikel.“ Man sieht auf den ersten Blick, daß es sich hierbei wieder um eine bestellte Reklame handelt, wie denn überhaupt das ganze Einsteinsche Unternehmen von Anfang an auf den Bluff berechnet war. Diesmal sollten nun die Amerikaner „dran glauben“. Aber die Yankees scheinen weniger naiv zu sein, als die guten Deutschen und Schweizer und sich nicht so leicht zum Glauben an den neuen Propheten kommandieren zu lassen. Sie sind zu skeptisch, um ohne weiteres zu glauben, daß er ein größeres Genie sei, als Kopernikus und Newton, bloß weil er unverständlicher sei als diese. Dazu haben die Amerikaner noch zu viel gesunden Menschenverstand. Sie sind sich der großen Tatsachen bewußt, daß alle großen Mehrheiten auch einfach und leicht verständlich sind, und bringen daher der unverständlichen Relativitätslehre Einsteins ein durchaus gerechtfertigtes Mißtrauen entgegen. Ja, mehr als das: sie lehnen sie als Schwindel ab. So nennt Reuterdahl, der Dekan des St. Thomas College in Minneapolis, Einstein „einen Barnum in der wissenschaftlichen Welt“, der mit seiner mystischen Theorie alle Welt zum Besten halte. Auch soll Reuterdahl Einstein zu einer Disputation aufgefordert haben, zu welcher sich dieser aber wohl ebenso wenig stellen dürfte, wie zu der an der letztjährigen deutschen Naturforscher-Versammlung in Bad Nauheim angekündigten, wo er es vorzog, sich in aller Stille zu

drücken, bevor die zum Worte vorgemerkten Gegner seiner Theorie an die Reihe kamen. Man drückte ihnen dann das Bedauern aus, daß ihnen Herr Einstein nicht habe Rede und Antwort stehen können. Das war natürlich eine abgekartete Sache seines Klüngels. Aehnlich dürfte er sich nun auch gegenüber Reuterdaahl verhalten, umso mehr, als ihn dieser des wissenschaftlichen Diebstahls bezichtigt. Reuterdaahl behauptet nämlich, Einstein habe die Grundlage seiner Theorie einem Werke entlehnt, welches 1866 unter dem Pseudonym „Inertia“ erschien. Da indessen dieses Werk in Europa kaum bekannt geworden ist, so dürfte Beschuldigung grundlos sein. Aehnliche Beschuldigungen wurden übrigens auch schon von deutschen Gelehrten, wie dem Ingenieur Rudolf Mewes, Prof. E. Gehrke, Paul Weyland u. a. erhoben. Nach ihnen soll sich Einstein aus einer schwer zugänglichen Veröffentlichung vom Jahre 1898 des verstorbenen Oberlehrers Gerber stillschweigend eine Formel angeeignet haben. Wie es sich damit tatsächlich verhält, wird schwer festzustellen sein. Immerhin gibt schon das eigentümliche Gebaren Einsteins und die ungebührliche und auffällige Reklame seines Klüngels genügend Anlaß, seiner Sache nicht ganz zu trauen. Doch scheinen die meisten auf falscher Fährte zu sein, weil sie die Umstände, welche bei der Entstehung der Einsteinschen Lehre herrschten und darauf Einfluß haben konnten, nicht genügend kennen. Und doch können eigentlich nur diese den äußerst verdächtigen Widerspruch erklären, der uns in Einsteins Lehre von Anfang an entgegentritt und darin besteht, daß sie sich einerseits auf eine zwar durchaus richtige, aber von Einstein gar nicht näher begründete, sondern rein hypothetische Annahme abstellt, nämlich auf die Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit im Vakuum, währenddem anderseits seine weiteren Begründungen dermaßen verworren und widerspruchsvoll sind, daß sie einem ganz andern Geiste entslossen zu sein scheinen. Diese sonderbaren Begründungen und die noch sonderbareren daraus gezogenen Schlüsse wurden von vielen Gelehrten, speziell von Prof. Lenard, einem der frühern Nobelpreisträger für Physik, gerügt. Lenard bemerkte ganz richtig, daß sie dem gesunden Menschenverstand direkt ins Gesicht schlügen. Was dagegen die Annahme von der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit betrifft, welche Einstein als feststehendes Bezugsobjekt im uferlosen Ozean seiner Relativitätstheorie annimmt, so scheint es damit eine eigene Bewandnis zu haben. Sie ist schon deshalb verdächtig, weil die Physiker zu jener Zeit die Existenz eines absolut leeren Raumes bestimmt leugneten und als unmöglich hinstellten, sie aber dann mit der Annahme von Einsteins Hypothese ohne weiteres zugaben und ihm diese zudem als eine hervorragende geniale Tat anrechneten. Tatsächlich scheint sie aber eine B e r a u b u n g der nur fünf Jahre früher von J. H. Ziegler aufgestellten universellen Lichtlehre zu sein. Das würde den Verzicht Einsteins auf ihre nähere Begründung zur Genüge erklären. Es gibt aber auch noch andere Gründe, welche mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit darauf hindeuten, daß die Lehre Zieglers der verborgene Quell der Einsteinschen Entdeckung war, u. a. den,

daß sie damals besonders in Bern, wo Einstein domiziliert war, stark diskutiert worden war. Zieglers Lehre gründet sich auf den unwiderleglichen Beweis, das die Grundlage der Welt in dem Urgegensatz von der Masse der unbedingt vollen Urlichtatome, dem Urlicht, und von der Masse des unbedingt leeren Raumes gebildet ist, deren gegenseitiges aktiv-passives Durchdringungsverhältnis Ziegler als Urzeit bezeichnet. Ziegler sprach deshalb von einer Dreieinigkeit von Kraft, Raum und Zeit, einer Dreieinigkeit, welche dann auch Herr Einstein, allerdings in verschleierte Form, brachte. Da die klare und einfache Lehre Zieglers, wonach alle Wirkungen der ewigen Wirklichkeit, d. h. alle Naturerscheinungen, lediglich Mischformen des strahlenden Urlichts und des bewegten Leeren sind, den Vertretern der offiziellen Physik sehr unbequem war, weil sie so ziemlich das Gegenteil von den lehrte, was diese bis anhin gelehrt hatten, so suchten sie dieselbe von Anfang an zu unterdrücken und totzuschweigen, und schufen so einen Zustand, der einem schlaun und geschickten Plagiator die günstigste Gelegenheit zur Aneignung ihrer Hauptlehren darboten mußte. Ja, ein solcher konnte dabei sogar des Beifalls und der Unterstützung der Physiker sicher sein, besonders für den Fall, daß er sein Plagiat in einer nur ihrer Zunft verständlichen, dem großen Publikum aber unverständlichen Form vortrug. Dazu eignete sich die Mathematik am besten. Wer in ihrer Sprache schreibt, kann nur vom Mathematiker und Physiker verstanden werden, und diese haben dann volle Freiheit, der Laienwelt davon mitzuteilen, was sie für gut halten. Die gewöhnliche, gebildete Welt ist dann ganz von ihnen abhängig. Der Chemiker und Nichtmathematiker Ziegler aber hatte den „Fehler“ gemacht, allgemein verständlich zu schreiben und dadurch auch die heutige Physik öffentlich bloßzustellen. Darum erschien Einstein den Physikern wie ein Deus ex machina. Er wurde zum Retter aus der Not. Kein Wunder, daß man ihn denn auch sofort auf den Schild erhob und ihm vor allem Volke als dem längst ersehnten Messias, d. h. dem wahren Lichtbringer, huldigte. Sein Ruhm wurde durch die Zeitungen in alle Weltteile ausposaunt. Das Volk mußte überall an ihm glauben und glaubte auch schließlich an ihn, weil es seine Lehre ja doch nicht selbst auf ihren Wahrheitsgehalt prüfen konnte. Es sah und hörte nur, wie der große Einstein in der Hierarchie der Physiker mit unglaublicher Schnelligkeit von Stufe zu Stufe stieg. Dies wirkte überzeugend, und die große internationale Presse, welche sich fast ganz in den Händen der Volksgenossen Einsteins befindet, bestärkt es fortwährend in dieser Ueberzeugung. Von dem Schweizer Ziegler hörte dagegen niemand etwas. Und so stände denn alles schön und herrlich für die Einsteinianer, hätte die Sache ihres Helden eben nicht auch ihre Achillesferse. Ziegler hatte seine Lehre nicht immer so ausführlich ausgedrückt, daß sie jeder bei oberflächlicher Kenntnisaufnahme sofort richtig verstehen könnte. Dadurch bot sie Anlaß zu allerlei Mißverständnissen. Und so wird es leicht verständlich, woher die vielen Irrtümer der Relativitätslehre herrühren. Wie sollte sie einheitlich und klar sein können, wenn sie nur einem Mixedpickles aus

vielen, mehr oder weniger irrigen Plagiaten gleicht. Daß sie der Zieglerschen Lichtlehre von Jahr zu Jahr ähnlicher wurde, ist auch kein Gegenbeweis dafür, daß man die letztere nicht als den Urquell für die Einsteinsche Weisheit zu betrachten habe, so wenig als der schon seit zwanzig Jahren andauernde Boykott, in den die Einstein-Presse Ziegler getan hat. Davon wissen nun zwar die Herren Amerikaner nichts. Wenn sie Einstein ablehnen, so dürfte es vielmehr nur aus dem Grunde geschehen, daß sie sich darüber ärgern, für dumm genug gehalten zu werden, um die größten wissenschaftlichen Entdeckungen auch für die unverständlichsten zu halten. Die Amerikaner wissen ganz genau, daß das Gegenteil davon der Fall ist. Und schon darum dürfte sich die Geschäftsreise des falschen Propheten im Lande Dollarika wohl kaum zu einem Triumphzuge gestalten. —G—

Another newspaper article notable for its mention of the Bad Nauheim debate wrote,

“Wie steht’s um Einstein?”

Jüdische Propaganda. — Astronomen in Potsdam. — „Silbersteine“ des Einsteinturms. — Die Verschobene Rot-Linie. — Konzessionierter Aether. — Kneip-Knippe in Nauheim und Amerika. — Schlichte Presse.

Wie es vom alten Odysseus heißt, daß er der vielgewandte und erfindungsreiche war, der vieler Menschen Länder und Städte gesehen hatte, und dessen Name bis zum Himmel reichte, so haben wir gegenwärtig in *E i n s t e i n* einen Mann, von dem die ihm nahestehende Presse das gleiche behauptet, — daß er die größten Größen der Wissenschaft, Kopernikus, Kepler Newton bei weitem überträffe, — deren Werke haben bis in die Gegenwart gedauert, das Gedankenwerk Einsteins aber währe in alle Zeiten!

Merkwürdig, daß man das schon voriges Jahr so genau wußte! Jetzt wäre manch’ einer froh, es nicht geschrieben zu haben. Vorschußlorbeeren sind immer ein Ding mit zwei verschiedenen Seiten. Denn nachdem die Einsteinpresse das Lob ihres Heros gar zu laut gesungen hatte, so daß die Gegner sich der Sache gründlicher annahmen, da wandte sich das Blatt. Eine lange Reihe von Denkern wurden genannt, bis Descartes zurück, die das, was an der Relativitätstheorie richtig ist, schon lange von Einstein gefunden hatten, daß aber die Theorie in der Form, die ihr Einstein gegeben hat, den allerheftigsten Widerspruch herausfordert.

In Einsteins Gegenwart, und ohne daß dieser oder ein anderer der Seinen etwas dagegen sagen konnte, ist auf der *A s t r o n o m e n v e r s a m m l u n g* in Potsdam im August dieses Jahres gezeigt worden, daß weder die Beobachtungen der Sterne bei totalen Sonnenfinsternissen, noch die Bewegungen des Planeten Merkur irgendwie eine Beweiskraft für die Relativitätstheorie haben. Die beobachteten Größen finden ihre befriedigende Erklärung auf andere einfache Weise.

Aber hoch ragt jetzt in Potsdam der Einsteinturm, dessen Baugerüst gerade am Tage des Besuches der Astronomenversammlung abgenommen wurde, damit die Fachmänner ihn besuchen konnten. Wie am Vormittag in einem Vortrage gesagt wurde, soll damit eine Messungsreihe gemacht werden, die die Theorie unmittelbar bestätigen würde. Der Turm dient also den Theorien von Einstein, beobachten wird daran Freundlich, erbaut hat den Turm der Architekt Mendelsohn, und das Geld soll, wie erzählt wurde, stammen von der Firma Silberstein. So ist es denn auch ein Bauwerk geworden, was den andern einheitlich gestalteten Bauwerken des astrophysikalischen Observatoriums gegenüber sich verhält, wie der Geist Einsteins zum Geiste von Vogel und Lohse, Müller, Kempf und den andern Astronomen, die die Anstalt berühmt gemacht haben. Es sieht aus wie der Vorderteil eines Kriegsschiffes, von der Seite gesehen. Einer nannte es Bismarckturm, da Freundlich gesagt hatte, seine Formgebung entspräche modernen Anschauungen, ein anderer den Tempel Salomonis, denn wir fanden, daß der unterirdische Raum sieben Vorhöfe hatte!

Aber es ist nur gut, daß die Einrichtung vielseitig gebraucht werden kann, denn es ist unzweifelhaft nachgewiesen, daß der gewünscht Betrag einer Verschiebung der Spektrallinien nach Rot nicht vorhanden. — Sehr peinlich! Denn Einstein sagt, daß mit dieser Verschiebung seine Theorie stehe und falle.

Die ganze Theorie gleicht überhaupt einem Proteus, sie nimmt dauernd neue Formen an: zuerst die spezielle, dann die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie; gegenwärtig hat sie wieder eine neue Gestalt. So ist sie unfassbar, unverständlich, weil sie nach Gehrcke unverständlich ist! Eine Massensuggestion!

Bekannt ist die Leugnung des Aethers. Jetzt hat ihn Einstein unter anderer Form wieder in der Theorie drin. Und Lenard sagt, daß bei einer vernünftigen Aethertheorie überhaupt gar kein Raum mehr für die Relativitätstheorie in der Physik bleibe; sie habe gewissermaßen von den Lücken in unserer Erkenntnis gelebt. Daher auch das Verhalten Einsteins den Gegnern gegenüber in der Öffentlichkeit. Man erinnere sich an Nauheim voriges Jahr, wo er versprochen hatte, in öffentlicher Diskussion Rede und Antwort zu stehen. Als es so weit war, erschien er nicht, und die Geschäftsordnung machte die Gegner mundtot. In Amerika hat er es ebenso gemacht; der als Mathematiker, Physiker und Philosoph bekannte Prof. Reuterdahl von St. Thomas College hat Einstein bei seiner Amerikafahrt aufgefordert, eine Erörterung öffentlich stattfinden zu lassen. Der Erfolg war der gleiche wie in Nauheim, er paßte nicht in das Reiseprogramm. Dadurch ist die amerikanische Presse sehr ernüchtert worden. Als Einstein drüben ankam, waren gegen 150 000 Menschen am Schiff, darunter zahllose Photographen, bei der Abreise ein halbes Dutzend! Es trat eben gar zu kraß hervor, daß die ganze Fahrt eine Verherrlichung des jüdischen Geistes sein sollte. Die Ankunft

gleichzeitig mit den Vertretern der Zionisten, der Kreis von jüdischen Lokalkomitees, der den Gefeierten umschloß, die Kritik amerikanischer Zustände durch Einstein nach seiner Rückreise haben bewirkt, daß die dortige Presse mit einer Deutlichkeit sich über den erst Gefeierten ausdrückt, die uns erstaunlich vorkommt. Hält man sich dies vor Augen, dazu die Einblicke in seine Gedankenwelt, wie sie Moszkowski gibt, politisch und wissenschaftlich, dazu die Tatsache, daß er mit der Sowjetregierung Beziehungen hat und gleichzeitig Mitglied der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaft ist, so sagt man mit dem echten Berliner: Das ist wirklich allerhand! R.”

Ernst Gehrcke wrote in 1924,

“Auf dem Deutschen Naturforschertag in Nauheim, wo Tausende aus allen Teilen Deutschlands und viele ausländische Besucher zusammenströmten, wurde von den Anhängern der Relativitätstheorie eine „Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie“ in die Wege geleitet. Am 20. September stellte der Vorsitzende der *Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte* in seiner Einführungsrede diese mit neugieriger Spannung erwartete Relativitätsdiskussion in Aussicht, wobei er gleich seine Meinung dahin äußerte, daß die Physik «die größten Veränderungen ihrer wissenschaftlichen Grundlage» erlitten habe, indem «der Begriff des Äthers im Weltall verschwindet und durch die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins die Begriffe von Raum und Zeit wandelbar wurden.» (Bericht der *Frankfurter Zeitung* vom 20. September 1920). Diese Aussprache begann am 23. September. Sie wurde von EINSTEIN eröffnet, der zu drei vorher gehaltenen Vorträgen anderer Redner (WEYL, GREBE, v. LAUE) Stellung nahm: «EINSTEIN lehnte die WEYLsche Theorie» (eine von der Einsteinschen verschiedene, formale Relativitätstheorie) «ab, wogegen dieser von EINSTEIN den Beweis für seine Theorie aus den Naturgesetzen verlangte» (Bericht des *Berliner Lokal-Anzeigers* vom 24. September 1920). Besonderen Eindruck machte der öffentliche Meinungsaustausch zwischen EINSTEIN und dem berühmten Heidelberger Physiker LENARD. «LENARD . . . wandte sich gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, nach welcher jede Art von Bewegung für uns unerkennbar sein soll, und wir nicht entscheiden können, ob wir uns zum Beispiel in drehender Bewegung befinden oder die gesamte Umwelt sich gegen uns drehe» (aus dem Bericht der *Frankfurter Zeitung* vom 24. September 1920). Eine Einigung zwischen LENARD und EINSTEIN wurde nicht erzielt, und nachdem noch andere Redner für (z. B. Prof. BORN) und wider (Prof. PALAGYI-Budapest) die Relativitätstheorie gesprochen hatten, wurde die weitere Erörterung vertagt, da, wie der Vorsitzende der Sitzung, der berühmte Physiker PLANCK aus Berlin, bemerkte, «die Relativitätstheorie es leider bisher noch nicht fertig gebracht habe, die für die Sitzung verfügbare absolute Zeit von neun bis ein Uhr zu verlängern» (*Kölnische Zeitung* vom 30. September 1920).—Die vertagte Diskussion

wurde dann ohne EINSTEIN beendet, der eine Viertelstunde vor Beginn der Nachmittagssitzung abgereist war. Ein mit großen Erwartungen ins Werk gesetztes Ereignis war vorübergegangen, das Pendel der relativistischen Massenbewegung hatte geschwankt und eine Dämpfung erfahren, ohne aber schon zur Ruhe zu kommen.”⁵⁰⁶

Philipp Lenard was surprised by Albert Einstein’s poor performance. Lenard was hoping for a stimulating debate that might challenge his beliefs. Einstein was instead evasive and ill-prepared, then ran away. When Einstein hid from Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl’s challenge to debate the following year, many likened it to his flight from Bad Nauheim—this after all the hype assuring the public that Einstein would humiliate the opponents of relativity theory. Lenard wrote after the debate,

“Auch sonst war ich schließlich erstaunt, wie wenig Herr Einstein auf die Beantwortung meiner Fragen vorbereitet zu sein schien — die doch schon zwei Jahre lang mit seiner Kenntnis gedruckt vorgelegen haben, — während von seiner Seite und auch von einem andern Fachmann Zeitungslesern gegenüber ganz ausdrücklich der Anschein der unbedingten Überlegenheit meinen Gedankengängen gegenüber erweckt worden war. Da ich weder Anhänger noch Gegner irgendeines Prinzips bin, sondern nur Naturforscher sein möchte — wie auf S. 12 schon zu erkennen gegeben, — hätte ich den Nachweis, daß und an welcher Stelle meine Überlegungen nicht genügend gründlich waren, als Gewinn entgegennehmen müssen, wenn er geführt worden wäre (vgl. auch Note k, S. 23), zumal in der rein auf die Sache gerichteten Form, in welcher die Nauheimer Aussprache ablief. Die einzige Aufklärung, welche ich von der Diskussion mitgenommen habe, stammt von seiten des Herrn Mie; sie wird im weiter Folgenden bezeichnet werden.”⁵⁰⁷

Einstein lost all credibility at the debate and knew that the scientific community was against him. He undoubtedly wanted only to flee Germany and retreat from the public eye. As happened after Einstein’s public humiliation at the Berlin Philharmonic, the Einstein sycophants and the ethnically biased pro-Einstein Jewish press came to his rescue after his public humiliation at Bad Nauheim and carried him through this time of criticism as he traveled the world promoting himself, relativity theory and Zionism, until his second rush of fame, which came with the announcement of the award of his Nobel Prize in late 1922. Many found the award scandalous, given that Einstein was a proven sophist and plagiarist.

Lorentz, Born, von Laue and the others were loyal to Einstein. The acceptance of their fatally flawed theories hinged on the cult of personality which was created for Einstein. If Lorentz exposed Einstein, Lorentz’ beliefs and legacy would suffer. The relativists were, and are, so pernicious in their suppression of opposing views, because they were, and are, so insecure and politically motivated. They were, and are, so vicious in their defense of Einstein, because their mythologies are so easily defeated. The theory attacks gullible persons who are willing to accept irrational

arguments and who act out of hero worship. Therefore, it is not surprising that these same individuals behave in an unscrupulous and adolescent manner when confronted with the facts.

Knowing they had lost at the debate, Einstein and his friends sought a rapprochement with Lenard which would dull the sting of Einstein's humiliation at Nauheim. Tragically, Lenard and Stark, (Nobel Prize laureates each) who were initially very helpful to Einstein in the early years of the special theory of relativity, after witnessing the corruption in the press and in the German Physical Society, after witnessing the Zionist betrayal of Germany, succumbed to the racial mythologies of the National Socialists and became outspoken advocates of Nazism, and in so doing were yet again the victims of Zionist Jews, though they did not realize it. Einstein's actions played no small rôle in elevating Adolf Hitler to power, in that the Nazis exploited Einstein as an example to stereotype millions of innocent people. The Nazis also exploited Einsteinian racist Zionist mythology to promote their own racial myths, which they imposed on the German People at the behest of Jewish Zionists who wanted assimilating Jews segregated from the allegedly inferior "Goyim".⁵⁰⁸

This was, and is, a common practice among Zionists and anti-Semites. They promote one another's common racism. This compounds the problem by creating an incentive for non-racists to forgive the intolerable behavior of characters like Einstein and to refuse to speak out against it for fear of having that behavior generalized in a sense unfavorable to them. An article in the *Patriot* of 18 July 1929, stated,

"When Ambassador Page was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* he gave the following advice to a young journalist: '*The most interesting fellow in America is the Jew: but don't write about Jews: without intending it, you may precipitate the calamity America should be most anxious to avoid—I mean Jew-baiting.*' Incidentally we may mention that an English book which happened to contain that quotation was suppressed, soon after birth, by a very obvious withdrawal of the usual advertising nourishment."⁵⁰⁹

The young journalist was Rollin Lynde Hartt.⁵¹⁰ This censorship further results in a group dynamic whereby one member of the group who speaks out against another is chastised for "betraying" the group which will allegedly be unfairly stereotyped by the exposure of the behavior of an individual like Albert Einstein. Of course, it is human nature to think in symbols and to generalize, especially when viciously and unfairly attacked and threatened, as were the anti-Relativists Lenard and Stark.

4.4.8.2 Contemporary Accounts of the Bad Nauheim Debate

As many have recognized,⁵¹¹ Max Born and others gave a very unrealistic portrayal of the events which took place in Germany in the 1920's and 1930's, vilifying Lenard, Gehrcke and Weyland with falsehoods; which accounts, while dramatic and shocking, simply do not agree with the facts. It is probably best to reproduce

contemporary accounts from the period in order to obtain a realistic picture of what occurred at Nauheim.

The *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 666-668 gave a partial account of the debate between Lenard and Einstein:

“Allgemeine Diskussion über Relativitätstheorie.

Lenard: Ich habe mich gefreut, heute in einer Gravitationstheorie vom Äther sprechen gehört zu haben. Ich muß aber sagen, daß, sobald man von der Gravitationstheorie auf andere als massenproportionale Kräfte übergeht, sich der einfache Verstand eines Naturforschers an der Theorie stößt. Ich verweise auf das Beispiel vom gebremsten Eisenbahnzug. Damit das Relativitätsprinzip gilt, werden bei Benutzung nicht massenproportionaler Kräfte die Gravitationsfelder hinzugedacht. Ich möchte sagen, daß man sich im physikalischen Denken zweier Bilder bedienen kann, die ich als Bilder erster und zweiter Art bezeichnet habe. In den Bildern erster Art sprach z. B. Herr Weyl, indem er alle Vorgänge durch Gleichungen ausdrückt. Die Bilder zweiter Art deuten die Gleichungen als Vorgänge im Raume. Ich möchte lieber die Bilder zweiter Art bevorzugen, während Herr Einstein bei der ersten Art stehen bleibt. Bei den Bildern zweiter Art ist der Äther unentbehrlich. Er war stets eines der wichtigsten Hilfsmittel beim Fortschritt in der Naturforschung, und seine Abschaffung bedeutet das Abschaffen des Denkens aller Naturforscher mittels des Bildes zweiter Art. Ich möchte zuerst die Frage stellen: Wie kommt es, daß es nach der Relativitätstheorie nicht unterscheidbar sein soll, ob im Falle des gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges der Zug gebremst oder die umgebende Welt gebremst wird?

Einstein: Es ist sicher, daß wir relativ zum Zug Wirkungen beobachten und wenn wir wollen, diese als Trägheitswirkungen deuten können. Die Relativitätstheorie kann sie ebenso gut als Wirkungen eines Gravitationsfeldes deuten. Woher kommt nun das Feld? Sie meinen, daß es die Erfindung des Herrn Relativitätstheoretikers ist. Es ist aber keine freie Erfindung, weil es dieselben Differentialgesetze erfüllt wie diejenigen Felder, die wir als Wirkungen von Massen aufzufassen gewohnt sind. Es ist richtig, daß etwas von der Lösung willkürlich bleibt, wenn man einen begrenzten Teil der Welt ins Auge faßt. Das relativ zum gebremsten Zug herrschende Gravitationsfeld entspricht einer Induktionswirkung, die durch die entfernten Massen hervorgerufen wird. Ich möchte also kurz zusammenfassend sagen: Das Feld ist nicht willkürlich erfunden, weil es die allgemeinen Differentialgleichungen erfüllt und weil es zurückgeführt werden kann auf die Wirkung aller fernen Massen.

Lenard: Herrn Einsteins Ausführungen haben mir nichts Neues gesagt; sie sind auch nicht über die Kluft von den Bildern erster Art zu den anschaulichen Bildern zweiter Art hinweggekommen. Ich meine, die hinzugedachten Gravitationsfelder müssen Vorgängen entsprechen und diese Vorgänge haben sich in der Erfahrung nicht gemeldet.

E i n s t e i n : Ich möchte sagen, daß das, was der Mensch als anschaulich ansieht, und was nicht, gewechselt hat. Die Ansicht über Anschaulichkeit ist gewissermaßen eine Funktion der Zeit. Ich meine, die Physik ist begrifflich und nicht anschaulich. Als Beispiel über die wechselnde Ansicht über Anschaulichkeit erinnere ich Sie an die Auffassung über die Anschaulichkeit der galileischen Mechanik zu den verschiedenen Zeiten.

L e n a r d : Ich habe meine Meinung in der Druckschrift „Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation“ zum Ausdruck gebracht, daß der Äther in gewissen Beziehungen versagt hat, weil man ihn noch nicht in der rechten Weise behandelt hat. Das Relativitätsprinzip arbeitet mit einem nichteuklidischen Raum, der von Stelle zu Stelle und zeitlich nacheinander verschiedene Eigenschaften annimmt; dann kann nun eben in dem Raum ein Etwas sein, dessen Zustände diese verschiedenen Eigenschaften bedingen, und dieses Etwas ist eben der Äther. Ich sehe die Nützlichkeit des Relativitätsprinzips ein, solange es nur auf Gravitationskräfte angewandt wird. Für nicht massenproportionale Kräfte halte ich es für ungültig.

E i n s t e i n : Es liegt in der Natur der Sache, daß von einer Gültigkeit des Relativitätsprinzips nur dann gesprochen werden kann, wenn es bezüglich aller Naturgesetze gilt.

L e n a r d : Nur wenn man geeignete Felder hinzudichtet. Ich meine, das Relativitätsprinzip kann auch nur über Gravitation neue Aussagen machen, weil die im Falle der nichtmassenproportionalen Kräfte hinzugenommenen Gravitationsfelder gar keinen neuen Gesichtspunkt hinzufügen, als nur eben den, das Prinzip gültig erscheinen zu lassen. Auch macht die Gleichwertigkeit aller Bezugssysteme dem Prinzip Schwierigkeiten.

E i n s t e i n : Es gibt kein durch seine Einfachheit prinzipiell bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem; deshalb gibt es auch keine Methode, um zwischen „wirklichen“ und „nichtwirklichen“ Gravitationsfeldern zu unterscheiden. Meine zweite Frage lautet: Was sagt das Relativitätsprinzip zu dem unerlaubten Gedankenexperiment, welches darin besteht, daß man z. B. die Erde ruhen und die übrige Welt um die Erdachse sich drehen läßt, wobei Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten aufheben?

Der erste Satz ist keine Behauptung, sondern eine neuartige Definition für den Begriff „Äther“.

Ein Gedankenexperiment ist ein prinzipiell, wenn auch nicht faktisch ausführbares Experiment. Es dient dazu, wirkliche Erfahrungen übersichtlich zusammenzufassen, um aus ihnen theoretische Folgerungen zu ziehen. Unerlaubt ist ein Gedankenexperiment nur dann, wenn eine Realisierung prinzipiell unmöglich ist.

L e n a r d : Ich glaube zusammenzufassen zu können: 1. Daß man doch besser unterläßt, die „Abschaffung des Äthers“ zu verkünden. 2. Daß ich die Einschränkung des Relativitätsprinzips zu einem Gravitationsprinzip immer noch für angezeigt halte, und 3., daß die Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten dem Relativitätsprinzip doch eine Schwierigkeit zu bereiten scheinen; denn sie heben bei der Relation jedes beliebigen Körpers auf, sobald man dieselbe

nicht diesem, sondern der Gesamtwelt zuschreiben will, was aber das Relativitätsprinzip in seiner einfachsten und bisherigen Form als gleichwertig zuläßt.

Rudolph: Daß sich die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie glänzend bewährt hat, ist kein Beweis gegen den Äther. Die E i n s t e i n'sche Theorie ist richtig, nur ihre Ansicht über den Äther ist nicht richtig. Auch wird sie erst annehmbar mit der W e y l'schen Ergänzung, geht dann aber sogar aus der Ätherhypothese hervor, wenn zwischen den beim Fließen verschobenen Ätherwänden L ü c k e n bleiben, die durch Schleuderkraft infolge Richtungsänderung der Sternfäden l e e r gehalten werden.

P a l a g y i: Die Diskussion zwischen E i n s t e i n und L e n a r d hat auf mich einen tiefen Eindruck gemacht. Man begegnet hier wieder den alten historischen Gegensätzen zwischen experimentaler und mathematischer Physik, wie sie schon z. B. zwischen F a r a d a y und M a x w e l l bestanden. Herr E i n s t e i n sagt, daß es kein ausgezeichnetes Koordinatensystem gibt. Es gibt eins. Lassen Sie mich biologisch denken. Dann trägt jeder Mensch sein Koordinatensystem in sich. In der Verfolgung dieses Gedankens ist eine Widerlegung der Relativitätstheorie enthalten.

E i n s t e i n weist darauf hin, daß kein Gegensatz zwischen Theorie und Experiment besteht.

B o r n: Die Relativitätstheorie bevorzugt sogar die Bilder zweiter Art. Ich betrachte als Beispiel die Erde und die Sonne. Wäre die Anziehung nicht, liefe die Erde geradlinig davon usw.

M i e: Daß die Ansicht, der Äther sei der greifbaren Materie wesensgleich, erst durch die Relativitätstheorie als unmöglich erkannt sein solle, habe ich nie verstehen können. Das war doch schon lange vorher durch L o r e n t z in seinem Buch „Elektrische und optische Erscheinungen in bewegten Körpern“ geschehen. Auch A b r a h a m hat in seinem Lehrbuch schon damals, als er der Relativitätstheorie noch ablehnend gegenüberstand, gesagt: „Der Äther ist der leere Raum.“

Ich bin der Ansicht, daß man auch bei Annahme der E i n s t e i n'schen Gravitationstheorie doch ganz scharf unterscheiden muß zwischen den bloß fingierten Gravitationsfeldern, die man nur durch die Wahl des Koordinatensystems in das Weltbild hineinbringt, und den wirklichen Gravitationsfeldern, die durch den objektiven Tatbestand gegeben sind. Ich habe kürzlich einen Weg gezeigt, wie man zu einem „bevorzugten“ Koordinatensystem kommen kann, in welchem von vornherein alle bloß fingierten Felder ausgeschlossen sind.

E i n s t e i n: Ich kann nicht einsehen, wieso es ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem geben soll. Höchstens könnte man daran denken, solche Koordinatensysteme zu bevorzugen, in bezug auf welche der M i n k o w s k i'sche Ausdruck für ds^2 a n n ä h e r n d gilt. Aber abgesehen davon, daß es für große Räume solche Systeme gar nicht geben dürfte, sind diese Koordinatensysteme sicherlich nicht exakt, sondern nur approximativer definierbar.

K r a u s weist auf eine erkenntnistheoretische Differenz zwischen den Bildern erster und zweiter Art hin, indem er die Bilder erster Art für höherwertig als die Bilder zweiter Art hält.

L e n a r d: Es ist soeben das Schwerpunktsprinzip hineingebracht worden; ich glaube jedoch, daß das auf prinzipielle Fragen keinen Einfluß haben kann.”

The *Berliner Tageblatt* published a report on 24 September 1920, which fills in some of the gaps in the incomplete account presented in the *Physikalische Zeitschrift*,

“Die Einstein-Debatte auf dem Naturforschertag.

Vier physikalisch-mathematische Vorträge. — Ein
Rededuell Einstein-Lenard.

(Telegramm unseres Sonderkorrespondenten.)

G. G. Bad Nauheim, 23. September.

Vorläufiger Bericht. Heute vormittag fand vor dichtgefülltem Saale unter dem Vorsitz des Geheimrats Planck und in Gegenwart sämtlicher großen Physiker und auch der Berliner Einstein-Gegner die E i n s t e i n - S i t z u n g der mathematischen und physikalischen Abteilung des Naturforschertages statt. Die Vorträge behandelten zumeist den Gegenstand in streng mathematischer Weise. Es sprachen hintereinander: **Weyl** (Zürich), **Mie** (Halle), **Laue** (Berlin), **Grebe** (Bonn). Dieser berichtete über Vergleichsmessungen der Sonnenspektren und irdischer Spektre, die sich auf die dritte experimentelle Bestätigung der Relativitätstheorie beziehen. Bei der Diskussion, in welcher u. a. Laue und Mie eingriffen, entspann sich **ein lebhaftes Rededuell zwischen Einstein und Lenard**. Dieser warf ein, daß die Einsteinsche Theorie der Anschaulichkeit für den gesunden Menschenverstand entbehre. Seine E i n z e l a r g u m e n t e, die Einstein die willkürliche Annahme irrealer Gravitationsfeldes vorwarfen und Widerspruch der Theorie in sich über die Lichtgeschwindigkeit behaupteten, widerlegte Einstein. Die spannende Diskussion zog sich durch mehrere Stunden hin. (Siehe auch Seite 4.)

[***]

Ein neuer Beweis für die Einstein-Theorie. Das Rededuell Einstein-Lenard.

Die Rotverschiebung im Sonnenspektrum.

(Telegramm unseres Sonderberichterstatters.)

G. S. Bad Nauheim, 23. September.

Wie wir schon gemeldet haben, spielte sich heute unter ungeheuerem

Interesse die mit Spannung erwartete große **Einstein-Debatte** des Naturforscherkongresses ab. Der Saal des Badehauses war bis auf die letzte Ecke gefüllt.

Alle unsere großen Physiker, auch die Physikochemiker und eine Menge Interessierter aus anderen Wissensgebieten hatten sich eingefunden. Der scharfe Mathematikerkopf **Planck's** blickt vom Vorstandstisch her. Ihm gegenüber sitzt in der vordersten Reihe der, um dessen Werk es geht, **Einstein**. Was die Physiker in Erwartung und zur abwehr des kolossalen Ansturms angekündigt hatten, bewahrheitete sich: „Die Sitzung wird die Theorie in rein wissenschaftlicher, **streng mathematischer Form** behandeln.“ Die Einzelheiten der Darlegungen und der vorgebrachten Beweisführung entziehen sich denn auch der summarischen Wiedergabe in eiliger Berichterstattung. Als erster spricht **Weyl** (Zürich) über seine Theorie von „Elektrizität und Gravitation“, dann Professor **Mie** (Halle) über „das elektrische Feld eines um ein Gravitationszentrum rotierenden geladenen Partikelchens“, endlich **v. Laue** (Berlin) über „neue Versuche zur Optik bewegter Körper“. Es hagelt jetzt Differentiale, Koordinateninvarianz, elementare Wirkungsquanten, Transformationen, Vectorialsysteme usw. Gespannt lauschen die Fachleute, **Einstein** seelenruhig, **Rubens** mit seinem bezeichnenden Kopfnicken, **Nernst** erhobenen Hauptes, **Frank** interessiert lächelnd, **Haber** in bequemer Stellung die Decke betrachtend. Dem Laien aber graut es. Einzelne verlassen den Saal, die meisten aber harren in der Schwüle tapfer der Dinge, die da kommen sollen. Und sie werden nicht betrogen.

Professor **Grebe** aus Bonn ergreift jetzt das Wort. Und was er berichtet, ist des Aufhorchens wert: „Einsteins Theorie hat ihre vorläufige **Bestätigung** erfahren durch die gelungene Berechnung der Merkurbahn und der Lichtablenkung im Gravitationsfeld der Sonne. Es fehlte noch **der Nachweis der von Einstein geforderten Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien der Sonne**. Dazu muß das Absorptionsspektrum der Sonne mit einem irdischen Emissionsspektrum verglichen werden. Mannigfache Einflüsse machen die Messungen schwierig. Wir fanden aber schließlich im **Bandenspektrum des Stickstoffes**, dem früher so genannten Cyanspektrum, ein gut verwertbares Spektrum. Unser **Vergleichsspektrum** wurde im Kohlenlichtbogen erzeugt. An jeder einzelnen Linie wurden zwanzig bis vierundzwanzig Messungen gemacht.“ Es folgt ein Projektionsbild, das in mehreren Linienpaaren die Abweichungen zwischen Sonnen- und irdischen Spektrallinien, zugleich aber auch die Schwierigkeiten der Beobachtung und die vielfachen gegenseitigen Störungen der Linien zeigt. Redner fährt fort: „Der von uns gefundene Unterschied in der Lage der Linien stimmt gut überein mit dem anderer, amerikanischer Beobachtungen. Jedoch war die Verschiebung bei den einzelnen Linien verschieden. Berücksichtigt man aber die gegenseitigen Beeinflussungen, so kommt man zu einem Wert von etwa 0,66, der mit dem Einsteinschen Wert für die Verschiebung von 0,62 bis 0,68 übereinstimmt.“

Zweifellos müssen auch noch weitere Experimente gemacht werden. Aber wir haben jetzt schon guten Grund zu der Annahme, daß die von der Einsteinschen Theorie verlangte Rotverschiebung wirklich vorhanden ist.“

Nun eröffnet Planck die *D i s k u s s i o n*. Einstein ist der erste Redner. Unwillkürlich tritt feierliche stille ein. Einstein bespricht die Weylsche Theorie. Weyl, Mie, Laue sprechen weiterhin. Es handelt sich zuerst um die vorhin gehaltenen Vorträge. Dann kommt die Generaldiskussion über die Relativitätstheorie überhaupt. Sie ist ein Zwiegespräch zwischen Geheimrat **Lenard** (Heidelberg) und Einstein, der sein eigener Anwalt ist. Jetzt kann auch der nicht auf den Höhen der Wissenschaft Thronende wieder leidlich folgen. Es kommt Leben in die Menge. Die zerstreuten Blicke konzentrieren sich jetzt auf die beiden Gegner. Es ist wie ein Turnier. Lenard läßt nicht locker, aber Einstein pariert vorzüglich. Hinter mir steht *Weyland*, der Berliner Einstein-Töter. Auf dem Boden dieser *w i s s e n s c h a f t l i c h e n* Versammlung hält er sich im Hintergrunde der Ereignisse und gibt sein Interesse nur durch nervöses Schütteln der Mähne und leise Beifallsrufe bei **Lenards** Worten zu erkennen. Dieser sagt: „Ich bewege mich nicht in Formeln, sondern in den tatsächlichen Vorgängen im Raume. Daß ist die Kluft zwischen Einstein und mir. Gegen seine spezielle Relativitätstheorie habe ich gar nicht. Aber seine Gravitationslehre? Wenn ein fahrender Zug brennt, so tritt doch die Wirkung tatsächlich nur im Zuge auf, nicht draußen, wo alle Kirchtürme stehen bleiben!“

Einstein: „Die Erscheinungen im Zuge sind die Wirkungen eines Gravitationsfeldes, das induziert ist durch die Gesamtheit der näheren und fernerer Massen.

Lenard: „Ein solches Gravitationsfeld müßte doch auch anderweitig noch Vorgänge hervorrufen, wenn ich mir sein Vorhandensein *a n s c h a u l i c h* machen will!“

Einstein: „Was der Mensch *a n s c h a u l i c h* betrachtet, ist großen Aenderungen unterworfen, ist eine Funktion der Zeit. Ein Zeitgenosse Galileis hätte dessen Mechanik auch für sehr unanschaulich erklärt. Diese „anschaulichen“ Vorstellungen haben ihre Lücken, genau wie der viel zitierte „gesunde Menschenverstand“. (Heiterkeit.)

Lenard: „Diese Diskussion wird unfruchtbar. Eine andere Frage: Wenn die Erde rotiert, so sagt Einstein, man könne genau so gut sagen, die Erde ruhe, und alle Materie rotiere um sie. Dann kommt man aber für die fernsten Gestirne zu Geschwindigkeiten, die weit über Lichtgeschwindigkeit liegen. Diese soll nach der Theorie aber eine Grenzgeschwindigkeit sein. Das ist ein Widerspruch in sich.“

Einstein: Nein, die Lichtgeschwindigkeit ist Grenzgeschwindigkeit nur für die geradlinig gleichförmigen Bewegungen der speziellen Relativität; bei beliebig bewegten Systemen können beliebige Geschwindigkeiten des Lichts auftreten.“

Es griffen dann noch verschiedene Herren in die Debatte ein, der Wert und Sinn von Gedankenexperimenten, die „Kluft“ zwischen mathematischen

und praktischen Physikern, philosophische und erkenntnistheoretische Fragen werden gestreift. Da aber, wie Professor Planck humorvoll bemerkt, die Versammlung nicht beschließen kann, daß die absolute Zeit von 9-1 länger als vier Stunden dauert, so muß man sich schließlich trennen.”

Vossische Zeitung reported on 24 September 1920,

“Der Kampf um Einstein. Die Auseinandersetzung auf dem Naturforschertag.

Dr. **B. Bad Nauheim**, 23. September.

Die Einzelheiten der Relativitätstheorie führen in schwierige Gebiete, die nur mit der Kenntnis der höheren Mathematik zu bewältigen sind. Man sollte daher glauben, einer Diskussion über ihre Grundlagen würden andere, als Fachphysiker und Mathematiker, kein besonderes Interesse entgegenbringen. Aber durch die bekannten Vorgänge in Berlin, wo man die Leistungen Einsteins in öffentlichen Versammlungen angreift und sich auch zu persönlichen Beschimpfungen des Gelehrten versteigt, ist die allgemeine Aufmerksamkeit noch mehr, als durch die Erfolge der Theorie bei der jüngsten Sonnenfinsternis, auf sie gelenkt worden.

Kein Wunder, daß auch auf der Naturforscherversammlung die Sitzung der Physikalischen und Mathematischen Abteilung, in der über Dinge, die mit der Relativitätstheorie zusammenhängen, gesprochen werden sollte, das größte Interesse erregte. Um zu verhindern, daß die Physiker und Mathematiker selbst von einem Publikum verdrängt würden, dessen Sensationsluft bei dieser wissenschaftlichen Behandlung sicher nicht befriedigt werden konnte, wurden zunächst nur Mitglieder der Physikalischen und Mathematischen Gesellschaft als Hörer zugelassen und dann erst der Eingang für weitere Besucher geöffnet. Schnell war der große Raum völlig gefüllt, der zusammen mit der Galerie wohl 500 bis 600 Personen faßte.

In nüchtern fachlicher Weise, seine Ausführungen reichlich mit mathematischen Formeln erläuternd, trug nun Weyl-Zürich seine Erweiterung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie vor, durch die er neben der Gravitation auch die elektrischen Erscheinungen umfassen will. Es folgte Mie-Greifswald, der das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip lieber durch ein Prinzip der Relativität der Gravitation ersetzen will. Dann leitet Laue-Berlin rechnerisch aus den Grundlagen der Theorie die bekannte Folgerung ab, daß ein Lichtstrahl in einem Gravitationsfeld sich krümmen müsse, also z. B. beim Vorbeipassieren an der Sonne, und daß die Spektrallinien in einem solchen Gravitationsfeld sich noch dem roten Ende des Spektrums verschieben müßten. Schließlich berichtete Grebe-Bonn über seine gemeinsam mit Herrn Bachem angestellten Versuche, diese Rotverschiebung

der Spektrallinien als wirklich zu erweisen.

Nachdem einige Einzelheiten dieser Vorträge noch besprochen waren, wurde die allgemeine Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie eröffnet. In ihrer Art erinnerte sie an die Wettkämpfe mittelalterlicher Gelehrter, denn in ihrem Hauptteil gestaltete sie sich zu einer Zwiesprache zwischen dem bedeutenden Experimentalphysiker L e n a r d-Heidelberg und E i n s t e i n. Sie konnte, wie vorauszusehen war, zu keinem Ergebnis führen. Lenard stellte zum Schluß fest, daß weder er überzeugt sei, noch wohl auch seinen Gegner überzeugt habe. Es handle sich um den Gegensatz zwischen experimentellen und mathematischen Physikern, der nicht zu überbrücken sei, wenn der mathematische Physiker nicht von den Bildern erster Art, nach Lenards Ausdruck, in denen er zu denken gewohnt sei, zu den Bildern zweiter Art übergehe, den anschaulichen Bildern, in denen der Experimentalphysiker denke.

Von anderen Rednern wurde das Vorhandensein eines solchen Gegensatzes lebhaft bestritten; der mathematische Physiker fasse vielmehr die Erscheinungen, die der Experimentalphysiker erforsche, unter einheitlichen Gesichtspunkten zusammen. M i e hob lebhaft hervor, daß Einstein keineswegs nur als Mathematiker zu betrachten sei, sondern durchaus als Physiker, der seine bedeutende mathematische Geschicklichkeit mit großem physikalischen Blick verbinde.

E i n s t e i n selbst bemerkte, die Meinung, was anschaulich oder was nicht anschaulich sei, habe sich im Wechsel der Zeit sehr beträchtlich gewandelt, sie sei im wahrsten Sinne selbst eine Funktion der Zeit. Die Physik sei eben ihrem Wesen nach b e g r e i f l i c h und nicht anschaulich. Den Zeitgenossen Galileis war dessen Mechanik gewiß recht wenig anschaulich, heute aber, und zwar schon lange vor Begründung der Relativitätstheorie betrachtet man die elektrischen Felder als die elementarsten Gebilde, mit denen man arbeitet. Es gibt sogar Elektriker, die sich mechanische Vorgänge erst mit Hilfe der elektrischen Felder anschaulich machen können. L e n a r d führte das Beispiel des plötzlich gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges an, in dem der darin Sitzende eine gewaltige Erschütterung erleide; es würde jedem gesunden Menschenverstand widersprechen, wenn man annehmen wollte, nicht der Mensch sei in Bewegung gewesen, sondern die gesamte Umwelt.

E i n s t e i n warnte vor dem Operieren mit dem „gesunden Menschenverstand“, der sehr leicht in die Irre gehe; es komme darauf an, ein für die Rechnung bequemes Koordinatensystem zu wählen, an sich gäbe es in der Welt kein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem. Das erwiderte er auch auf den Vorhalt, daß bei der Annahme, die Erde ruhe und um sie bewege sich die gesamte Umwelt, man für gar nicht so weit entfernte Massen zu Ueberlichtgeschwindigkeiten kommen müsse. Einstein scheut sich nicht vor diesen Geschwindigkeiten, die keineswegs dem allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzip widersprächen, er sieht in ihnen keinen Grund, ein Koordinatensystem zu verwerfen, wenn nur sonst bei seiner Wahl die

Rechnung einfach werde.

In diesem Punkte trat M i e den Einwänden Lenards bei; auch er will die fingierten Gravitationsfelder fortlassen. Sie haben, meint er, keinen Erkenntniswert; ihm kämen diese Dinge als „zu feinspintisiert“ vor, er wolle demgegenüber doch lieber an dem gesunden Menschenverstand festhalten. Er glaube auch, daß es tatsächlich ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem gäbe. Aber auf die Frage Einsteins, wodurch denn eine solche Bevorzugung eines Koordinatensystemes verständlich gemacht werden sollte, mußte er die Antwort schuldig bleiben.

Am deutlichsten wird für den Leser der Gegensatz der Anschauungen vielleicht, wenn man sich erinnert, daß Lenard immer und immer wieder betont, an dem „Aether“ müsse festgehalten werden, der Aether könne gar nicht abgeschafft werden, der „Aether“ sei keine Hypothese, sondern Wirklichkeit, denn wenn es keinen „Aether“ gäbe, könne man ja die Welt nicht mechanisch begreifen, dann könne man nicht alle physikalischen Erscheinungen auf Bewegungsvorgänge zurückführen. Demgegenüber muß doch betont werden, daß fast alle modernen Physiker die Forderung von der mechanischen Begreifbarkeit der Natur längst aufgegeben haben — es sei nur an den glänzenden Vortrag Plancks auf der Königsberger Naturforscherversammlung vor 10 Jahren erinnert. Es ist eben eine unbegründete Forderung, daß die Natur mechanisch begreifbar sein soll. Der Physiker hat an die Natur keine Forderungen, sondern nur Fragen zu stellen und zu sehen, was die Natur auf diese Fragen antwortet. In Verkennung dieses Verhältnisses hat man lange Jahre von der Natur ihre mechanische Begreifbarkeit gefordert. Die Natur ist aber nicht so liebenswürdig gewesen, diese Forderung zu erfüllen.

Im Verfolg der Erörterungen hob M i e mit Nachdruck hervor, daß die Abschaffung des Aethers ja gar nichts mit der Relativitätstheorie zu tun habe, er sei vielmehr schon in den 80er Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts durch die grundlegenden Arbeiten von Lorentz beseitigt worden.

Professor Born-Göttingen meinte, daß gerade die Relativitätstheorie das Bedürfnis nach Anschaulichkeit befriedige. Nach der Newtonschen Auffassung werde die Erde bei dem Lauf um die Sonne von der Anziehung der Sonne und der Trägheit in ihrer Bahn gehalten, denke man sich die Sonne weg, so müßte die Erde in gerader Linie weitergehen. Warum aber denn in gerader Linie und wohin, müß man doch fragen. Hier sage nun die Einsteinsche Theorie, selbst wenn die Sonne weggedacht wird, so bleibt in der Umwelt noch eine große Massenverteilung übrig, und diese wirkt auf der Erde, so daß die Erde in eine gradlinige Bahn gezwungen wird. Im Grunde gebe die Newtonsche Anschauung dem leeren Raum bestimmte Eigenschaften, während die Einsteinsche Theorie nur Wechselwirkungen kennt. Daß die Einsteinsche Theorie darüber hinaus noch zu den Beziehungen der Anziehung zwischen Sonne und Erde komme, und sie erklären könne, obwohl sie gar nicht ihren Voraussetzungen stecke, sei eine glänzende Leistung.

So weit das Wesentliche der Erörterungen.

Ein dem Berichterstatter nahestehendes Lehrbuch aus dem Jahre 1892 beginnt mit den Worten „Die Physik hat die Aufgabe, die Erscheinungen der Natur als Bewegungsvorgänge zu beschreiben“. Auf Grund der seitherigen Erfahrungen über Elektrizität hat der Verfasser diese Auffassung preisgegeben. Aus dem Festhalten an ihr kann man die Gegnerschaft gegen Einsteins Theorie verstehen. Aus ihrer Preisgabe leiten sich die Denkrichtungen Einsteins und seiner Anhänger ab.

*

Einsteins Ernennung zum Leydener Professor. Aus dem H a a g meldet „Holl. Nieuwsbüro“: Die Regierung genehmigte die Ernennung von Professor Dr. Einstein zum „außerordentlichen Professor“ der Naturwissenschaften an der Universität in L e y d e n. (Die Meldung ist in der vorliegenden Form geeignet, Anlaß zu Mißverständnissen zu geben. Prof. Einstein hat sich, wie bereits vor längerer Zeit berichtet, auf Ersuchen der Leydener Universität bereit erklärt, dort in jedem Jahre während einiger Frühjahrswochen Vorlesungen über Relativitätstheorie und andere Kapitel der theoretischen Physik zu halten. Wohl um diese Verpflichtung äußerlich zu kennzeichnen, hat man die Form der Ernennung zum Honorarprofessor gewählt; von einer dauernden Uebersiedelung des berühmten Gelehrten an die holländische Hochschule kann kein Rede sein. D. Red.)”

The *Frankfurter Zeitung* reported,

“86. Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte.

Bad Nauheim, 24. September.

Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie wurde gestern vor dem zuständigen Forum, in den vereinigten mathematischen und physikalischen Abteilungen der deutschen Naturforscher- und Aerzteversammlung behandelt. Da es bekannt war, daß Professor E i n s t e i n selbst das Wort zu den Referaten den Professoren Dr. W e y l-Zürich, L a u e-Berlin, M i e-Halle und G r e b e-Bonn über seine Theorie in der Aussprache nehmen werde, hatte sich eine zahlreiche Zuhörerschaft eingefunden. Der geräumige Saal des Badehauses 8 und die Galerie waren gedrängt voll. Ganz auf dem Standpunkt Einsteins stand das Referat von Mie und auch Grebe-Bonn vertrat die Ansicht, daß sich für die von ihm angestellten Spezialstudien über die Cyanbande des Sonnenspektrums die Einsteinsche Theorie mit den von ihm gefundenen Werten decken. Professor Weyl-Zürich und Lau-Berlin stimmten zwar nicht vollständig mit Einstein überein, lehnten ihn aber keineswegs prinzipiell ab. Das tat nur Professor L e n a r d-Heidelberg. Einstein selbst ging auf jeden erhobenen Einwand der Reihe nach ein und tat das in vornehmer, bescheidener, ja fast schüchterner und gerade dadurch überlegener Weise. Zum Schluß trat noch der erst jüngst von

Frankfurt nach Göttingen berufene Physiker Professor Dr. Born in entschiedener Weise für Einstein ein, der auf alle Fälle die große Mehrheit der Versammlung auf seiner Seite hatte. Wir geben aus der Aussprache Folgendes wieder:

W e y l-Zürich sprach über eine von ihm vorgenommene Erweiterung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, die auch die elektrischen Erscheinungen mitumfassen und aus allgemeinen Grundlagen erklären will. Dann trug M i e die Durchrechnung eines Spezialproblems vor, demzufolge er lieber von der Relativität der Gravitation als von der allgemeinen Relativität sprechen will. Hierauf leitete L a u e-Berlin die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls durch ein Gravitationsfeld und die Rot-Verschiebung der Spektrallinien in einem solchen aus der Theorie her, und schließlich berichtete G r e b e-Bonn über seine gemeinsam mit B a c h e m ausgeführten Messungen, die diese von der Theorie geforderte Rot-Verschiebung der Spektrallinien auf der Sonne wirklich zeigen. Die sich anschließende Diskussion mußte streng auf diese Vorträge selbst beschränkt bleiben. Erst nach ihrer Erledigung wurde in eine allgemeine Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie eingetreten. Sie gestaltete sich sehr lebendig, in der Hauptsache zu einer Diskussion zwischen Einstein und Professor Lenard. Lenard bekannte sich zu einem Anhänger der speziellen Relativitätstheorie, nach welcher eine vollkommen gleichförmige Translationsbewegung durchaus unerkennbar sein muß, dagegen wandte er sich gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, nach welcher jede Art von Bewegung für uns unerkennbar sein soll und wir nicht entscheiden können, ob wir uns zum Beispiel in drehender Bewegung befinden oder die gesamte Umwelt sich gegen uns drehe, oder ob wir, wenn wir in einem plötzlich gebremsten Eisenbahnzug eine schwere Erschütterung erleiden, diese erleiden zufolge einer Veränderung der Bewegung des Eisenbahnzuges oder nicht vielmehr durch die entsprechend entgegengesetzte Bewegung der Erde. Das letztere widerspricht nach seiner Meinung jedem gesunden Menschenverstand, den der Physiker gerade so gut braucht und anwenden muß wie jeder andere. Auch die Abschaffung des Aethers durch die Relativitätstheorie lehnt Lenard ab, er hält seine Existenz vielmehr für durchaus erwiesen, weil wir ohne ihn die physikalischen Erscheinungen nicht restlos als mechanische Bewegungsvorgänge erklären können — eine Forderung, die notwendig sei, um die Erscheinungen anschaulich begreifen zu können. In Bezug auf diese letzte Bemerkung erwiderte Einstein, was der Mensch als anschaulich oder nicht anschaulich betrachtet, das hat im Laufe der Zeit beträchtlich gewechselt, die Physik ist eben ihrem Wesen nach begrifflich und nicht anschaulich. Den Zeitgenossen Galileis war dessen Mechanik gewiß recht unanschaulich, heute aber, und zwar schon lange vor der Relativitätstheorie betrachtet man die elektrischen Felder als die elementarsten Gebilde, mit denen man arbeitet; dem Elektriker ist das elektrische Feld das anschaulichste, was nicht überholen werden kann, und es gibt Elektriker, die sich mechanische Vorgänge erst mit Hilfe der elektrischen Felder anschaulich machen können. Was den gebremsten

Eisenbahnzug betrifft, so handelt es sich eben um die Wechselwirkung zwischen diesem und allen übrigen in der Welt vorhandenen Massen, wobei es ganz gleichgültig ist, welche von beiden gegen die andere bewegt wird. Mit dem gesunden Menschenverstand zu operieren, sei sehr gefährlich. Für die mathematische Behandlung gibt es eben kein an sich bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem und man wird daher jedesmal das für die Durchführung der Rechnung bequemste wählen. Das gleiche gilt von den Rotationsbewegungen. Wenn man bei der Annahme, die Umwelt bewege sich rotierend, und die Erde stehe still, zu Ueberlicht-Geschwindigkeiten komme, so sei das auch kein Widerspruch gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, die garnicht wie die spezielle eine konstante Lichtgeschwindigkeit fordere. In Bezug auf die Abschaffung des Aethers betonte Professor Mie, daß sie nichts mit der Relativitätstheorie zu tun habe. Schon in den 80er Jahren ist der Aether durch die grundlegenden Arbeiten von L o r e n t z abgeschafft worden. Im übrigen bekannte sich Mie zwar als begeisterten Anhänger der Relativitätstheorie, trat aber in einem Punkte Herrn Lenard bei, nämlich, daß er glaube es gäbe wirklich ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem und man könne fingierte Gravitationsfelder fortlassen. Es scheine ihm nicht als ob ihre Einführung erkenntnistheoretischen Wert habe, es komme ihm vor, als ob man da zu sein spintisiere demgegenüber lobt er sich doch immer unseren gesunden Menschenverstand. Inwiefern es aber ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem in der Welt geben soll, konnte er Herrn Einstein nicht sagen. Lenard meinte, die Diskussion habe zu einer Einigung der abweichenden Anschauungen und zu einer gegenseitigen Ueberzeugung ihrer Vertreter nicht führen können, weil der Gegensatz der experimentellen und mathematischen Physiker hier zum Ausdruck komme, eine Meinung, der von anderer Seite lebhaft widersprochen wurde, denn der mathematische Physiker stehe nicht im Gegensatz zum Experimentalphysiker, sondern stelle die von diesem erforschten Erscheinungen unter einheitlichen Gesichtspunkten dar.”

The *Frankfurter Zeitung*, on 21 September 1921, and the *Berliner Tageblatt*, Evening Edition, 20 September 1920, had reported on the Eighty-Sixth Meeting of German Natural Scientists. In the opening address to the meeting of natural scientists, Friedrich von Müller performed a staged and scripted homage to Einstein, and slandered anyone and everyone who disagreed with Einstein. Max Planck and Arnold Sommerfeld provided Müller with the speech. Planck and Sommerfeld also made certain that their personal attacks against Einstein’s critics would be accompanied by scripted applause from Einstein’s friends.⁵¹² The *Frankfurter Zeitung* stated on 21 September 1920, first morning edition:

**“Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher
und Aerzte.**

(Privattelegramm der „Frankfurter Zeitung“.)

L—z Bad Nauheim, 20. Septbr.

Mit einem phantastischen Schmuck bunter Herbstfarben hat sich das mit Naturreizen so überaus reich versehene Bad Nauheim bekleidet, um die Teilnehmer der 86. Versammlung Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte zu begrüßen. Der große Saal des Konzerthauses und seine Galerien sind dicht besetzt mit Männern und Frauen, als bald nach 9 Uhr der Geschäftsführer der 86. Versammlung, Prof. Dr. Grödel (Bad Nauheim) die Erschienenen begrüßt. Dabei gedenkt er nicht nur der Auslandsdeutschen, sondern auch der wenigen Ausländer, die zur Versammlung gekommen sind, und betont, daß die Wissenschaft bei uns keine nationalen Grenzen kenne. Zugleich weist er auf den Unterschied dieser Versammlung gegenüber den früheren hin, der in der veränderten allgemeinen Lage begründet ist. Diese Tagung soll eine Tagung des Ernstes sein. — Als zweiter Redner begrüßte der Präsident des hessischen Bildungsamtes Dr. Strecker die Versammlung. Er bezeichnet die Versammlung als ein Symbol des Aufbaus. Insbesondere sei eine der wichtigsten Aufgaben der deutschen Aerzteschaft, den physischen Wiederaufbau der Bevölkerung zu leiten und zu ermöglichen. Dem Naturforscher und Wissenschaftler im allgemeineren Sinne liegt der geistige Wiederaufbau ob. Die Bedeutung der Natur als Lehrerin bei unserm Nachwuchs zur Geltung zu bringen, sei seine wichtigste Aufgabe. Aus den allgemeinen Betrachtungen heraus fällt das Wort, daß wir nicht nur die Kräfte der Natur beherrschen lernen müssen, sondern auch die im Menschen lebenden Naturkräfte. — Hatte diese politische Anspielung schon den Beifall der Versammlung hervorgerufen, so nimmt die Teilnahme der Zuhörer außerordentlich zu, als nach einigen kurzen Begrüßungsworten des Ministerialrats Balse als Vertreter des hessischen Finanzministeriums, des Hausherrn der Versammlung als Besitzerin des staatlichen Bades Nauheim, und des Bürgermeisters der Stadt Nauheim Dr. Kaiser der Rektor der hessischen Landesuniversität Gießen im Namen der vier benachbarten Hochschulen Marburg, Gießen, Frankfurt und Darmstadt das Wort ergreift. Er nennt als führenden Namen der Hochschulen auf dem Gebiete der Naturwissenschaften Ehrlich für Frankfurt, Behring für Marburg, Liebig für Gießen und Merck für Darmstadt und löst den ersten Beifall aus, als er wünscht, daß nun auch ein leider scheinbar abhanden gekommenes Gefühl sich wieder einstellen möge, das Gefühl des Stolzes, ein Deutscher zu sein. Deutsche Forschung und Wissenschaft kann uns nicht genommen werden; sie müssen zwar darben, aber können nicht untergehen. Helmholtz, Virchow und Haber kann man nicht wegleugnen und annekieren.

Der Vorsitzende der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte, Prof. Dr. Friedrich v. Müller (München), der nunmehr die eigentlichen Arbeiten der Versammlung einleitet, gedenkt zunächst der zahlreichen Toten, die die Gesellschaft, besonders der Vorstand, in den sechs Jahren, in denen die Versammlungen unterbrochen waren, zu beklagen hat. Er bezeichnet dann den Beschluß, schon in diesem Jahre eine Naturforscherversammlung

abzuhalten, als eine mutige Tat, deren Ausführung besonders durch Ernährungs- und Unterkunftsschwierigkeiten in Gefahr geriet. Deshalb mußte Hannover als Versammlungsort aufgegeben werden, und dem hessischen Staat wie der Stadt Nauheim sei besonderer Dank dafür abgestattet, daß sie die Abhaltung der Versammlung durch ihr außerordentliches Entgegenkommen ermöglicht haben. Der Redner streift dann die Aufgaben der Versammlung und deren besondere Bedeutung in den heutigen Tagen. Die *S e u c h e n b e k ä m p f u n g* ist während des Krieges dank unserer medizinischen Wissenschaft und den Männern des Kriegssanitätsdienstes in großem Maße möglich gewesen, so daß wir vor schweren Seuchen bewahrt geblieben sind. Aber drei furchtbare Seuchen gilt es zu bekämpfen: Grippe, Schlafkrankheit und Syphilis. Diesen Krankheiten werden die Arbeiten der Versammlung besonderes Augenmerk widmen. Unter den Naturwissenschaften haben Chemie und Physik in dieser Zeit die größten Veränderungen ihrer wissenschaftlichen Grundlage erlitten: die Chemie dadurch, daß der Grundsatz der Unteilbarkeit der Atome zu Fall gekommen ist, die Physik dadurch, daß der Begriff des Aethers im Weltall verschwindet und durch die Relativitätstheorie *E i n s t e i n*s die Begriffe von Raum und Zeit wandelbar wurden. Damit ist dem Redner Gelegenheit gegeben, in ausdrucksvollen Worten gegen die Berliner *V o r g ä n g e* zu protestieren. Die außerordentlichen geistigen Taten eines Einstein gehören nicht vor das Forum einer mit Schlagworten und aus politischen Motiven arbeitenden öffentlichen Versammlung, sondern eines Berufskreises von Gelehrten. — Diese offene und deutliche Ehrung Einsteins erweckt lauten Beifall. Müller kommt dann auf die weiteren großen Probleme, deren Behandlung der Versammlung obliegt, zu sprechen: Stickstoff und Eiweiß und die Fragen des Unterrichts. Er betont den Wert der humanistischen Bildung und warnt vor einer Geichmachung des geistigen Besitzes in Anlehnung an die Bestrebungen zur Ausgleicheung materiellen Besitzes. Die Beziehungen zum Ausland bezeichnet der Redner als noch gering. Die Zeit für internationale Kongresse ist noch nicht für uns gekommen. Diese sind auch nicht so nötig wie die fremde Literatur. Die Zeitschriften- und Büchernot ist eine große Gefahr für die Wissenschaft. Die Aufrichtung einer absperrenden Mauer gegen unsere geistigen Erzeugnisse erscheint dem Redner weniger gefährlich. Sie spreche eher für eine eistige Armut dessen, der sie aufrichtet. Denn geistig positive Völker vertragen keinen Abschluß, sie brauchen die andern Völker für die Publikation ihrer geistigen Tätigkeit. Von den allgemeinen Betrachtungen gleitet der Redner dann aber ab, als er auf die frühere Gewohnheit, des Landesherren bei solchen Anlässen zu gedenken, hinweist. Diese Gewohnheit habe nun in Fortfall kommen müssen. Aber er halte es für seine Pflicht, der deutschen Fürsten als Förderer der Wissenschaften zu gedenken. Setzt bei diesen Worten schon ein starker Beifall ein, so steigert er sich noch, als der Redner sagt, die Monarchie pflege, die Republik schütze die Wissenschaft, die Revolution zerstöre. Er erinnert dabei an die Hinrichtung *L a v o i s i e r*s

während der französischen Revolution und die sie begleitenden Worte des Richters: *nous n'avons plus besoin de savants*. Aber er hofft, ebenso wie im Frankreich der Revolution ein gewaltiger geistiger Aufschwung folgte, daß auch wir neben dem materiellen einen geistigen Aufschwung erreichen. — Der langdauernde Beifall der Versammlung sprach dafür, daß der Redner mit seiner kleinen Abschweifung auf politisches Gebiet doch sehr den Zuhörern aus dem Herzen gesprochen hat, und das mag bei einer Versammlung von wissenschaftlich gebildeten Zuhörern doch von Bedeutung sein.

Im Anschluß an diese einführenden Worte sprachen Dr. B o s c h, der Direktor der Badischen Anilin- und Sodafabriken, Prof. E h r e n b e r g (Göttingen) und Geheimrat R u b n e r (Berlin) zu dem Thema des Stickstoffes, worüber weiterer Bericht folgt.”

Paul Weyland redressed the dishonest press reports disseminated by Einstein's friends in a statement Weyland published in “Die Naturforschertagung in Nauheim. Erdrosselung der Einsteingegner!”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, Number 449, (26 September 1920), Morgen-Ausgabe, 1. Beiblatt, p. 1;⁵¹³ reprinted as “Die Naturforschertagung in Nauheim”, *Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift für praktische Politik, für politische Bildung und Erziehung auf biologischer Grundlage*, Volume 19, (1920), pp. 365-370:

“Die Naturforschertagung in Nauheim.

W e y l a n d.

Begünstigt von blendend schönem Wetter, gefördert durch den Opfersinn von Bevölkerung und Badeverwaltung, tagte in dieser Woche in dem unvergleichlich schönen Bad Nauheim die 86. Versammlung Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte. Seit der 85., die in Wien stattfand, wo im Jahre 1913 der greise Kaiser Franz Joseph es sich nicht nehmen ließ, den wissenschaftlichen Gästen seine Hofburg zur Verfügung zu stellen, liegt der Weltkrieg, der hemmend in die Wissenschaft eingriff und nur die Gebiete der Kriegs-Chirurgie und Kriegsmedizin befruchtend beeinflusste. Lediglich die Physik hatte neben der Medizin eine Frage von weitgehender wissenschaftlicher Bedeutung zu erörtern, und dieses war die Relativitätstheorie, die seit 1911 und 1915 von Einstein eingeführt wurde. So ist es denn kein Wunder, daß sich mangels jeder anderen wissenschaftlichen Ausbeute dieser fünf Jahre das Hauptinteresse auf die Donnerstag- und Freitagssitzung konzentrierte, in welcher Einstein seiner wachsenden Opposition Rede und Antwort zu stehen hatte.

Um es gleich vorweg zu nehmen: er hat nicht sehr glänzend abgeschnitten, wenngleich die unter Einsteinschem Einfluß stehenden Presse-Referate der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft völlig entstellte Berichte in die Welt jagten, die natürlich ein einseitiges Bild der Situation geben. Wir

wollen versuchen, so kurz wie möglich die wichtigsten Vorträge herauszugreifen und müssen dabei leider bemerken, daß tatsächlich in diesen fünf Jahren außer der mathematischen Abstraktion der Relativitätstheorie nichts Neues hervorgebracht wurde, es sei denn, daß man als Fortschritt feststellt, daß die physikalische Forschung im Sinne ihrer jetzigen geistigen Leitung völlig zum Sklaven mathematischer Abstraktionen herabgesunken ist und jedes vernunftgemäße Forschen ausschaltet. Einstein hat denn auch eine Art Glaubensbekenntnis abgelegt, indem er die denkwürdigen Worte aussprach: „Gesunden Menschenverstand in die Physik einzuführen, ist gefährlich.“ Der einzige positive Gewinn dieser Naturforschertagung ist denn auch der, daß die Scheidung der Geister sich vollzogen hat und unter der Leitung Lenards die Vergewaltigung der Physik durch mathematische Dogmen abgelehnt wird, während auf der anderen Seite die Einsteinophilen auf ihrem Standpunkt beharren und hurtig den Parnas ihres Formelkrames zu erklimmen versuchen . . . bis sie von ihren „eisigen Höhen“ einmal jäh herabfallen werden.

Schon in der Eröffnungssitzung wies Herr v o n M ü l l e r darauf hin, das diese Versammlung im Zeichen der Relativitätstheorie steht, indem er in einem ihm von dem Einsteinleuten unterschobenen Konzept bemerkte, daß von Einstein eine der größten Geistestaten geschehen ist: er hat ja den Äther abgeschafft. Im übrigen wies Herr von Müller in seiner glänzenden Rede auf die Errungenschaften der Kriegsmedizin und Chirurgie hin, gedachte der Toten der deutschen Naturforscher und leitete in taktvoll feinen Worten die Versammlung ein. Als Vertreter der Regierung Hessens sprach der ehemalige Patriot und jetzige Linksmann Professor Strecker einige Begrüßungsworte, indem er um sich einige Phrasen verbreitete, daß die Naturforscher der Wahrheit dienen sollen und nun auch dafür zu sorgen hätten, daß die Wahrheit auch in uns Deutschen selbst einzudringen hat, daß nicht wieder durch deutsches Verschulden ein solcher Krieg entsteht. Diese versuchte Politisierung wurde merkwürdigerweise schweigend hingenommen und von einem Teil der Versammlung beklatscht. Als aber der Rektor der Gießener Universität K a l b f l e i s c h sich in einer kernigen deutschen Rede an das Auditorium wandte und den famosen Vorredner glatt abfallen ließ, brauste ein nicht endenwollender Beifall durch das Haus. Ein erhebendes Bekenntnis zum Deutschtum lag in dieser Akklamation, und als ferner Herr von Müller in einem weiteren Referat mit Wehmut feststellte, daß man zum ersten Male, so lange die deutschen Naturforscher tagen, nicht mehr des Kaisers gedenken darf und es der Versammlung anheimstellte, in Dankbarkeit der deutschen Fürsten zu gedenken, unter deren Fürsorge die deutsche Wissenschaft blühte und gedieh, zog es wie schmerzlich durch die so zahlreich erschienenen aufrechten deutschen Männer, und mancher gedachte der schönen Zeiten, wo deutsche Wissenschaft an der Spitze aller Wissenschaft stand und die deutschen Institutsleiter nicht von Herrn Haenisch mit Androhung von Disziplinarstrafen belästigt wurden, wenn sie nicht mit ihrem Friedensetat auskamen. Wohl selten hat der Theatersaal

einen derartigen Sturm des Beifalls erlebt, wie er durch die Worte von Müllers, der deutschen Fürsten zu gedenken, ausgelöst wurde.

Die allgemeinen Vorträge behandelten die Atom- und Molekulartheorie, welche hauptsächlich von Debye, Frank und Kossel referiert wurden. Das Ernährungsproblem wurde von Bosch, Ehrenberg, von Grube und Paul behandelt.

Neue fundamentale Tatsachen wurden in diesen Vorträgen nicht verkündet. Lediglich des jungen Debyes blendender Vortragskunst gelang es, auch den Wissenden zu fesseln und sein Sammelreferat über Atomstruktur als Plus zu verbuchen. Er gipfelte *summa summarum* in der Andeutung, daß sich die Welt wahrscheinlich aus Vielheiten des Wasserstoffatoms zusammensetzt, wie dies die letzten Rutherfordschen Untersuchungen gezeigt haben, so daß also mit Wahrscheinlichkeit anzunehmen ist, daß die mehr als hundertjährige Proutische Hypothese wieder zu Ehren gelangt und wahrscheinlich auch Goethes Standpunkt in der Farbenlehre von seinem oppositionellen Standpunkt gegen Newton wieder zur Anerkennung gelangt. Die Vorträge von Frank und Kossel bewegten sich in ähnlichem Rahmen und bestätigten auf anderem Wege die Ausführungen Debyes. In der Medizin war es besonders Sudhoff, dessen greiser Charakterkopf überall in der Versammlung auffiel, der durch eine mit seltener Liebe und Sorgfalt zusammengebrachte Vesal-Ausstellung zu Ehren des 400 jährigen Geburtstages des Begründers der deutschen Anatomie fesselte. Lehmann erfreute sein dankbares Auditorium mit kinematographischen Aufnahmen über die neuesten Ergebnisse in der Forschung der flüssigen Kristalle, und Rinn löste Beifallstürme seiner Zuhörerschaft aus, die er in seiner lebenswürdigen humoristischen Art mit blendendem Material an sein Thema über Kristallgitter fesselte.

Sehr zu erwähnen ist ferner der von außerordentlicher Fachkenntnis getragene Vortrag von Stuer über die Geologie der Nauheimer Quellen.

Es waren dies ungefähr die Höhepunkte der allgemeinen Vorträge, wenn man von den naturwissenschaftlichen Filmen absehen will, welche die „Ufa“ durch Adam vortragen ließ, auf die wir vom pädagogischen Standpunkt aus noch einmal zurückkommen werden. Mittwoch nachmittag begannen die Spezialsitzungen der einzelnen Fakultäten, welche der Öffentlichkeit nichts Bemerkenswerthes boten und über die zu referieren zu weit führen würde. Es sei nur bemerkt, daß allein die Physiker z. B. 56 solcher Vorträge zu erledigen hatten, die jedoch samt und sonders nicht über den Rahmen üblicher Laboratoriumstätigkeit hinausgingen und auch ohne Naturforschertag in Zeitschriften ihre Erledigung hätten finden können. So nahte der Donnerstag nachmittag mit seiner Hauptsitzung heran, wo sich zahlreiche Opponenten gegen Einstein gemeldet hatten. Diese Sitzung ist nun wohl eine von den denkwürdigsten, die in der Geschichte der deutschen Naturforschung stattgefunden hat. Obwohl es jedem Tagesteilnehmer freistand, mit seinem Ausweis jeden Vortrag zu besuchen, hatte der Vorstand der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft die Stirn, an der Eingangstür eine

scharfe Siebung vorzunehmen, um nur diejenigen hineinzulassen, welche ihm genehm waren. Es erhob sich ein gewaltiger Tumult, das empörte Auditorium schob die wissenschaftliche Polizei beiseite, stürmte den Saal und behauptete sich. Auf diesem Wege gelangten auch andere als Einstein-Freunde hinein. Und nun geschah das Unglaubliche. Statt daß es zu einer wissenschaftlichen Auseinandersetzung kam, wurde von der Vorstandsleitung unter dem Vorsitz von M a x P l a n c k dafür gesorgt, daß die Opposition einfach mundtot gemacht wurde. In stundenlangen Reden verbreiteten sich W e y l, M i e, v o n L a u e und G r e b e über das Relativitätsprinzip, während den gegnerischen Rednern einschließlich Diskussion 15 Minuten zugestanden wurden. Um 1 Uhr sollte die Sitzung beendet sein, um $\frac{3}{4}$ 1 Uhr war man noch mit der Diskussion der Einstein-Vorträge beschäftigt, und der Apparat der Erdrosselung klappte so vorzüglich, daß tatsächlich die Diskussion ausschließlich von Einstein-Leuten geführt wurde, hauptsächlich von Einstein selbst. G e h r c k e-Berlin, der sich mehrfach energisch zum Wort meldete, wurde bis zuletzt gelassen, um ihm dann mitzuteilen, daß die Diskussion geschlossen sei. R u d o l p h-Koblenz versuchte, wenigstens im Wege einer Geschäftsordnungsbemerkung zu Worte zu kommen: ihm wurde von Planck bedeutet, daß er nicht das Wort habe. L e n a r d-Heidelberg wurde schon nach drei Sätzen von Planck in die Parade gefahren, so daß Lenard auf das Wort verzichtete. P a l a g y i-Ofenpest, von dem hauptsächlich neben Mach Einstein seine Weisheit bezog, wurde $\frac{1}{2}$ Minute Redezeit bewilligt (in Worten eine halbe Minute), die dann auf 3 Minuten ausgedehnt wurde (!!!) und ähnlich Anmutigkeiten mehr. Der ehrwürdigen und geachteten Persönlichkeit Lenards, über den sich selbst ein Planck nicht hinwegzusetzen vermochte, gelang es schließlich, sich mit aller Energie Gehör zu verschaffen und Einstein zur Rede zu stellen. Er führte kurz aus, daß es nach seiner Auffassung wohl zwei Möglichkeiten physikalischer Forschung gäbe, nämlich die logisch verständliche und die mathematisch abstrakte. Er richtete an Einstein die klar präzierte Frage und die dringende Bitte, ihm vernünftig zu erklären, wie es denn komme, daß beim plötzlichen Anrücken des berühmten Eisenbahnzuges nicht der Kirchturm des benachbarten Dorfes umfalle, sondern der Mann im Zuge, welche Voraussetzungen durch die Einsteinsche Theorie gegeben seien. Einstein drückte sich in seinen bekannten gewundenen Erklärungen und billigen Witzeleien um die Beantwortung der Frage herum, was Lenard zu weiterer zweimaliger Anfrage an Einstein veranlaßte, ihm Rede und Antwort zu stehen. Als es ihm nicht gelang, von Einstein eine sachliche Antwort zu erlangen, verzichtete Lenard auf das Wort mit der Feststellung, daß es ihm nicht gelungen sei, eine Übereinstimmung zwischen Einstein und ihm in dem Sinne zu erzielen, daß Einstein eine an ihn klar gerichtete Frage ebenso klar beantworten konnte. M i e trat Lenard zur Seite und erklärte, daß die vernünftige Anschauungsweise nicht ausgeschaltet werden dürfe. Hierauf gefiel sich Einstein in der denkwürdigen Bemerkung, daß es gefährlich sei, mit dem menschlichen Verstand zu operieren, womit er vor aller Welt

kundgab, daß er mit der Vernunft nichts mehr zu tun hat. Die im vorhergehenden mitgeteilten Tatsachen finden sich nun nicht in dem offiziellen Pressebericht der Naturforschertagung, der selbstverständlich von den Einsteinleuten herausgegeben wurde. Es verdient hiermit festgenagelt zu werden, in welcher geradezu korrupten Art und Weise die Berichterstattung dieser Leute vonstatten geht und die freie wissenschaftliche Meinung systematisch geknebelt wird. Daß ein Max Planck sich zu derartigen Machenschaften hergab, ist bedauerlich, aber wohl dadurch verständlich, daß er sich, wie die anderen Spitzen der deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft, mit Einstein wissenschaftlich und noch anders zu eng liiert hat, um anders handeln zu können.

Die zu Wort gemeldeten Gegner Einsteins wurden auf den Freitag versetzt, wo ihnen 12 Minuten Redezeit einschließlich Diskussion bewilligt wurde. Selbstverständlich war es am Freitag nachmittag nicht möglich, fünf Vorträge in einer Stunde à 12 Minuten wissenschaftlich zu erledigen, sie gaben nur Bruchstücke oder wurden schon in der Einleitung vom Vorsitzenden abgesetzt. Wir werden die Berichte jedoch nach dem Manuskript an dieser Stelle später behandeln.

Zu bemerken ist ferner, daß weder Einstein noch seine Freunde diesen Vorträgen beiwohnten.

Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, daß die Art und Weise der freien Forschung, wie sie von der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft verstanden wird, ein in der Geschichte der deutschen Wissenschaft beispielloser Skandal ist und daß es wohl die höchste Zeit wird, daß in dieses Rattenest wissenschaftlicher Korruption einmal frische Luft kommt. Wenn man bedenkt, daß Einstein sogar Weyl ablehnt, weil dessen Mathematik wieder zur einfachen euklidischen Geometrie hinüberführt, so versteht man wohl, daß es sich nicht darum handelt, in der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft noch zu dienen, sondern daß es nur gilt, ihrem Papste Einstein die Tiara zu erhalten. Mit einem Gefühl tiefster Beschämung mußte man diese Versammlung verlassen, und auf der Kurpromenade und allen Gängen, wo das Thema besprochen wurde, gab es nur ein Wort der Entrüstung über das unerhörte Gebaren des Vorstandes, besonders seines Vorsitzenden Max Planck. Forscher von Ruf versichern mir, in dieser Gesellschaft kein Wort mehr zu sprechen.

Im übrigen verlief die Tagung in vollster Harmonie, kleine technische Mängel, die ja schließlich überall vorkommen, waren vorhanden. Die Ausstellung war glänzend beschickt, besonders von den optischen Firmen. Hier ragten insbesondere die Stände von Goerz, Leitz und Winkel hervor. Besonders Leitz fesselte durch ein neues dermatologisches Mikroskop, welches durch einfaches Aufsetzen auf den menschlichen Organismus, z. B. durch einfaches Auftragen einer Immersionsflüssigkeit das Leben des Gewebes erkennen ließ und die Blutkörperchen in Vene und Arterie deutlich machte. Höchst beachtenswert war ferner der neue Helldunkelfeldkondensator, welcher der biologisch-bakteriologischen

Forschung neue Wege zu weisen berufen ist.”

Franz Kleinschrod, who had a theory and an agenda of his own to promote, wrote,

“Die Einsteinsche Relativitätslehre ist bereits zur *cause célèbre* der Wissenschaft geworden. Noch vor wenigen Monaten nur der nächsten Umgebung bekannt, ist heute der Name Einstein im Munde, man darf sagen, wohl der gesamten Wissenschaft. Es dürfte wohl wenig wissenschaftliche Persönlichkeit geben, die in so kurzer Zeit den höchsten Gipfel wissenschaftlicher Popularität ersteigen. Man kann es verstehen, wenn man die Behauptungen und die schrankenlose Begeisterung seiner Anhänger liest: „Damit ist aber die alte Newtonsche Mechanik durch das Relativitätsprinzip über den Haufen geworfen. Das RP greift somit in alle durch Alter geheiligten Denkgewohnheiten ein, es zerstört alle Begriffe, mit denen wir aufgewachsen sind, und es verlangt von uns außerdem eine Fähigkeit zur Abstraktion, gegen die selbst die Anforderungen der vierdimensionalen Mathematik ein Kinderspiel sind. Aber als Gegengabe beschert uns das RP eine Fülle neuer Einsichten; es beschert uns Tag, wo vordem Dämmerung oder Nacht war. Kurz, es ist eine geistige Befreiung, wie die Tat des Kopernikus.“ (Das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip. A. Pflüger. 2. Aufl. 1920. Cohen-Bonn.) Im ähnlichen Tone ergehen sich alle Anhänger.—

Aber bald erhob sich auch dagegen, wie vorauszusehen war, die Kritik und setzte mächtig ein. Mit großer Spannung erwartete man auf der Naturforscherversammlung in Nauheim die Aussprache der Gegner mit Einstein. Sie verlief, wie auch hier vorauszusehen war, resultatlos. Es stand wohl der größere Teil der Gelehrten auf Seite von Einstein, aber Einstein konnte seine Gegner, besonders seinen Hauptgegner, Lenard (Heidelberg), nicht widerlegen, — aber die Gegner konnten auch Einstein nicht widerlegen. So blieb der Streit unentschieden und wird es auch bleiben, denn beide Parteien schossen mit ihren Angriffen immer dicht an dem Ziel vorbei. Keiner traf den andern richtig. [***] „Ja, selbst die Begriffe von Raum und Zeit, die wir seit Jahrtausenden als feststehend anzusehen gewohnt sind, sind w a n d e l b a r geworden durch die Relativitätstheorie.“ Mit diesen Worten eröffnete Friedr. von Müller die 86. Naturforscherversammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte zu Nauheim 1920.”⁵¹⁴

Philipp Lenard commented on the Bad Nauheim debate in the third edition of his booklet *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 36-44:

“Zusatz,
betreffend die Nauheimer Diskussion über das

Relativitätsprinzip.

Während der Vorbereitung der vorliegenden Neuauflage hat am 23. Sept. d. J. die Diskussion über das Relativitätsprinzip bei der Nauheimer Naturforscherversammlung stattgefunden. Es hat dabei Herr E i n s t e i n auf die in dieser Schrift hervorgehobenen Schwierigkeiten einzugehen und die dabei sich ergebenden Fragen zu beantworten versucht, nachdem die Herren W e y l und M i e in ihren Vorträgen über Elektrizität und Gravitation besondere Anregungen gegeben hatten.

Der Eindruck, welchen die Aussprache hinterließ, an welcher außer den genannten Herren auch andere Vertreter der Mathematik und der Physik sich beteiligten, ging nach meinem Urteil im allgemeinen dahin, daß in der Tat an den in dieser Schrift gekennzeichneten Stellen Schwierigkeiten und Fragen vorliegen, deren Erledigung nicht ohne weiteres in befriedigender Weise gelingt und deren Hervorhebung also wohl berechtigt war. Es darf wohl scheinen, daß das Weitergehen auf dieselben bei Überwindung der vorhandenen Hindernisse eine Weiterführung der Theorie mit Beseitigung ihrer gegenwärtigen Härten ergeben sollte, wie denn auch besonders die von Herrn M i e gelieferten Beiträge nach einer Weiterführung strebten, und zwar nicht ohne teilweises Abgehen von Herrn E i n s t e i n s ursprünglichem Wege [*Footnote*: Vgl. in verwandtem Sinne auch E. W i e c h e r t, Astron. Nachr. Bd. 211, Nr. 5054, S. 275, 1920, woselbst auch auf eine bevorstehende weitergehende Veröffentlichung desselben Verfassers über Gravitation in den Annalen der Physik hingewiesen wird. (Erschienen während der Drucklegung des Vorliegenden in Bd. 63, S. 301.)]. Die Hindernisse gegen volles Eingehen auf die von mir hervorgehobenen Schwierigkeiten und Fragen liegen, wie auch bei der Diskussion wieder erkennbar wurde, in der Kluft, welche für gewöhnlich zwischen den Benutzern der beiden auf Seite 25 des Vorliegenden erläuterten Bilderarten besteht.

[*Page 25*: Daß Andere den Äther in ihrem Gesamtbilde und auch bei ihrer Arbeit entbehren können, beweist nichts gegen den Äther, sondern ist vollkommen selbstverständlich, wenn man die Zweifachheit der B i l d e r bedenkt, die der Menscheng Geist von der (unbelebten) Natur bisher sich zu machen verstand. Es sei gestattet, diese Zweifachheit hier mit schon einmal gebrauchten Worten zu erläutern [*Footnote*: „Über Äther und Materie“, Heidelberg (C. Winter) 1911, S. 5.]: „Nun sind aber diese Bilder des Naturforschers doch von zweierlei Art. Quantitativ sind sie immer; sie können aber — und das ist die erste Art — sich sogar ganz darin erschöpfen, quantitative Beziehungen zwischen beobachtbaren Größen zu sein. In diesem Falle sind sie vollkommen darstellbar in Gestalt mathematischer Formeln, meist Differentialgleichungen. Dies ist der Weg, den Kirchhoff und Helmholtz bevorzugt haben, von Kirchhoff die mathematische

Beschreibung der Natur genannt. Die denknotwendigen Folgen der Bilder, in deren Entwicklung die Benutzung und zugleich die Prüfung der Bilder besteht, sind dann die mathematischen Folgen jener Gleichungen, und auch weiter nichts. Man kann aber weitergehen — und dies ergibt die *zweite Art* der Bilder —, indem man sich von einer Überzeugung leiten läßt, ohne welche die Naturforschung sicherlich nie Erfolg gehabt hätte. Von der Überzeugung nämlich, daß alle Vorgänge in der Natur — in der unbelebten Natur wenigstens — bloße Bewegungsvorgänge sind, d. i. nur in Ortsveränderungen ein für allemal gegebenen Stoffes bestehen. Dann würde es sich in jedem Falle um Mechanismen handeln, und die Gleichungen, welche wir uns als Bilder erster Art gemacht haben, müssen Gleichungen der Mechanik sein, sie müssen ganz bestimmten Mechanismen entsprechen, und dann können wir auch geradezu diese Mechanismen als die Bilder betrachten, die wir uns von den Naturvorgängen gemacht haben. Wir haben dann mechanische Modelle, dynamische Modelle der Dinge als Bilder derselben in unserem Geiste. Die mechanischen Modelle und die Gleichungen, also die beiden Bildarten, sind, wenn die beide richtige Bilder sind, einander in den Resultaten, welche sie ergeben, vollkommen gleichwertig“ [*Footnote*: Man sieht aus dieser Erörterung, daß ich die Bilder zweiter Art als höherstehend betrachte, gegenüber denen erster Art, da sie, wenn vollendet, eine Weiterentwicklung der letzteren sind, obgleich sie in den Anfängen auch umgekehrt oft einleitend diesen letzteren vorausgehen. Allerdings kommt es aus diesem in der Entwicklung liegenden Grunde stellenweise vor, daß bereits gute Bilder erster Art vorhanden sind, wo die Herstellung vollendeter Bilder zweiter Art noch nicht gelungen ist, und dies verleiht den Bildern erster Art an solchen Stellen Überlegenheit.]]

Die Benutzer der Bilder erster Art, zu welchen besonders auch Herr *Einstein* zählt, scheinen zumeist nicht geneigt, sich nach dem Standpunkt der Bilder zweiter Art zu begeben, um die Schwierigkeiten und Fragen, die von dort aus am deutlichsten zu erkennen sind, überhaupt genügend ins Auge zu fassen. Unzweifelhaft ist es aber, daß eine Theorie, mag sie auf Bilder erster oder zweiter Art gegründet sein, erst dann als einwandfrei gelten kann, wenn sie von beiden Standpunkten aus standhält; denn beide Standpunkte haben sich im Fortschreiten der Naturforschung als voll berechtigt gezeigt, und alle bisherigen gut bewährten Theorien sind von beiden Standpunkten aus widerspruchsfrei erschienen. Wer freilich die „Abschaffung des Äthers“ verkündet

[*Footnote*: Die „Abschaffung des Äthers“ wurde in Nauheim in großer Eröffnungssitzung wieder als Resultat verkündet (zur früheren Verkündung in Salzburg, von Herrn *Einstein* selbst, siehe das Zitat in Note 17, S. 27). {*Footnote 17, Pages 27-28*: Als das Überspringen eines Abgrundes konnte wohl seinerzeit die Entdeckung der *Lichtquanten* erscheinen: Auf der einen Seite waren die Wellen des Lichtes, auf der anderen die neuartigen

Lichtquanten, und die Kluft zwischen ihnen wurde leer gelassen, was allerdings dem kühnen Springer selber niemand verdenken wird. Weitergehend war aber, nach der negativen Seite hin, der an diese Entdeckung geknüpfte Ausspruch (Naturforscherversammlung zu Salzburg am 21. September 1909, Verh. d. D. Phys. Ges. S. 482, Physik. Zeitschr. Bd. 10, S. 817, 1909): „Heute aber müssen wir wohl die Ätherhypothese als einen überwundenen Standpunkt ansehen“, was zu einer nachträglichen Überbrückung der Kluft, die doch im Interesse der Wissenschaften zu wünschen war, nicht eben ermunterte. Ich habe dennoch eine solche Überbrückung versucht und bin dabei zu dem Resultat gelangt, daß die Lichtquanten dasselbe seien, was man als kohärente Lichtwellenzüge schon lange vorher ins Auge gefaßt hatte, allerdings mit dem wesentlichen neuen Zusatze der Konzentrierung der Energie auf einen Strahl von bestimmter Richtung, welches letztere ich durch die auch sonst naheliegende Annahme nur eines elektrischen Kraftlinienringes (gedacht als diskreter Ätherwirbelring) in jeder durch die Schwingung eines einzelnen Elektrons emittierten Lichtwelle erklärte (S. „Über Äther und Materie“, Heidelberg 1911, S. 19 u. f. und die Untersuchung über Phosphoreszenz, Heidelb. Akad. 1913 A 19, S. 34 Fußnote 61. Als kohärente Wellenzüge hat, wie ich nachträglich finde, auch bereits H. A. Lorentz die Lichtquanten erklärt; Physikal. Zeitschr. Bd. 11, S. 353, 1910). Man sieht aus solcher Erklärungsmöglichkeit, was für das Gesamtbild des Naturforschers doch nicht unwichtig ist, daß die Lichtquanten nichts Umstürzendes für die Theorie des Lichtes sind, namentlich auch, daß sie für oder gegen die „Ätherhypothese“ überhaupt gar nichts aussagen, sondern daß sie in der Hauptsache eine besondere, bis dahin unbekannt gewesene Eigenschaft der lichtemittierenden Atome betreffen, nämlich die, auf kohärente Wellenzüge von bestimmtem mit der Schwingungsdauer zusammenhängenden Energieinhalt eingerichtet zu sein.

Die Vorstellung, daß das Lichtquant ein kohärenter Wellenzug sei, dessen Länge demnach in jedem Falle durch optische Interferenzversuche feststellbar wäre, hat durch neuartige Versuche von Herrn W. Wien (Annalen d. Phys., Bd. 60, S. 597, 1919) eine augenfällige Bestätigung erfahren, indem die Zeitdauer der Emission des Lichtquants gemessen wurde. Sehr bemerkenswert ist dabei die hier als unmittelbares Beobachtungsergebnis auftretende Erkenntnis, daß die Energie des Lichtquants ungleichmäßig über die Länge des Wellenzugs verteilt ist, indem ein allmähliches Abklingen des emittierenden Atoms stattfindet (nach einer Exponentialfunktion, wie beim akustischen Wellenzuge einer angeschlagenen Glocke), so daß eine bestimmte Länge des Wellenzuges nur dann sich ergibt, wenn man festsetzt, in welchem Stadium des Abklingens man das Ende als erreicht ansehen will. Setzt man beispielsweise das Ende bei $1/7$ (genauer $1/e^2$) der Anfangsintensität fest, so ergibt sich nach Herrn W. Wiens Messungen die Länge des Lichtquants zu rund 10 m, und zwar gilt diese Länge — was an sich wieder sehr bemerkenswert ist —

nach den bisherigen Messungen für Lichtquanten aller Wellenlängen, trotz des verschiedenen Energieinhalts der Lichtquanten verschiedener Wellenlänge. Es käme das darauf hinaus (wenn man bei diesen neuartigen Versuchen schon jetzt verallgemeinern darf), daß die Energie jeder einzelnen Welle irgendeines Lichtquants bei gleichem Abstände vom Anfange des Wellenzuges die gleiche ist. Der verschiedene Energieinhalt verschieden weit vom Anfange abstehender Wellen bestünde dabei in unserer Vorstellung in verschieden großer senkrecht zum Strahl gemessener Breite des elektrischen Kraftlinienringes dieser Wellen.} Man hat nicht dazu gelacht. Ich weiß nicht, ob es anders gewesen wäre, wenn die Abschaffung der Luft verkündet worden wäre.]

und vertritt, der will die Bilder zweiter Art hinwegleugnen (vgl. S. 27); er kann dann allerdings nicht in der Lage sein, auf deren Standpunkt sich zu begeben, und von ihm ist dann die Lösung der Schwierigkeiten und der damit verbundene Fortschritt auch nicht zu erwarten. Es wäre unnütz, hierauf weiter eingehen zu wollen, und es war dankenswert, daß die Aussprache an diesem Punkte in Nauheim von selber abbrach;

[*Footnote:* Die Frage des vierdimensionalen Raumzeitbegriffes war in der Diskussion von vornherein außer Spiel geblieben. Es wäre in Gegenwart so vieler Mathematiker (die oft dem mathematischen Hilfsmittel ebensoviel Bedeutung beilegen, als dem physikalischen Sinn) nicht förderlich gewesen, den mir als Naturforscher (der aber nicht nur die materielle Welt sehen will) allein annehmbar erscheinenden diesbezüglichen Standpunkt (vgl. S. 7 u. Anm. 7, S. 14) zu betonen, da es als Geschmackssache betrachtet werden kann, wieviel Denkfreiheit man zugunsten der „Relativierung der Zeit“ opfern will.]

man findet sich hier von der zu Bescheidenheit mahnenden Erkenntnis der ganz außerordentlichen Ansprüche, welche an dieser Stelle der Entwicklung an den Geistesumfang des Naturforschers gestellt werden. Große mathematische Begabung, welche die Bilder erster Art mit Leichtigkeit meistert, scheint nicht oft in demselben Kopfe mit der Leichtigkeit der inneren dynamischen, physikalischen Anschauung verbunden zu sein, welche mehr Vorliebe für die Bilder zweiter Art verleiht, — und umgekehrt [Footnote: Man kann hieraus wohl auch ermessen, wie wenig Zweck es hat, wenn volkstümliche Schriften oder Vortragende von einseitigem Standpunkt aus das Relativitätsprinzip vor die Öffentlichkeit bringen, wobei auch der Verdacht kaum abzuweisen ist, daß die Einseitigkeit um des größeren Aufsehens willen, das sie hervorbringt, geliebt wird. Es ist das eine bedauerliche Erscheinung; aber sie besteht, und es wäre ein ungesundes Zeichen, und als solches sicherlich noch viel bedauerlicher, wenn darauf nicht Gegenwirkung einträte. Die „Relativisten“ müßten aber eine von ihnen selbst hervorgerufene Gegenwirkung jederzeit ruhig hinzunehmen wissen.]

Im Einzelnen ergab die Aussprache etwa das Folgende:

Es wurden zwei Fragen gesondert diskutiert, deren Zusammenhang aber doch so wesentlich sich zeigte, daß wir sie hier der Kürze halber teilweise zusammenfassen können, nämlich 1. die Frage (vgl. S. 15, 16): Wie ist es im Beispiel des gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges, wo die Folgen der ungleichförmigen Bewegung nur innerhalb des Zuges sich zeigen, möglich, den Sitz der ungleichförmigen Bewegung trotz dieser Einseitigkeit der Erscheinung für unauffindbar erklären zu wollen, wie es die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie tut? Und 2. die Frage des unerlaubten Gedankenexperiments (vgl. Note 10, S. 16, 17): Bedeutet nicht das Auftreten von Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten im Falle einer Drehung der Gesamtwelt, z. B. um die Erde, die von der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie als eine mit der Drehung irgendeines Körpers, z. B. der Erde, bei ruhender Gesamtwelt gleichwertige Annahme angesehen wird, einen inneren Widerspruch, da doch Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten nach eben derselben Theorie ausgeschlossen seien?

Es wurde von Herr E i n s t e i n s Seite selbstverständlich Gewicht auf die Gravitationsfelder gelegt, welche in seiner Theorie jeden Fall ungleichförmiger Bewegung begleiten müssen; aber es blieb doch dabei, daß diese Felder zunächst nur zu dem Zwecke hinzugenommen seien, um das Relativitätsprinzip allgemeingültig erscheinen zu lassen und auf alle Fälle anwenden zu können, woraus aber noch nicht hervorgeht, daß diese Felder weitere Beziehungen zur Wirklichkeit haben, die die Notwendigkeit ihrer Einführung den sie begleitenden Härten gegenüber erweisen (vgl. S. 22). Dabei sollte nicht bezweifelt sein, daß jedes Auftreten einer ungleichförmigen Bewegung mit gewissen Zuständen des Äthers (des „Raumes“ liebt die Relativitätstheorie zu sagen, vgl. S. 28) in ihrer Umgebung verbunden sei; aber so lange die E i n s t e i n s chen Gravitationsfelder mit ihrem Zubehör den gesunden Verstand nicht befriedigen, wird man zweifeln dürfen, ob sie diese Zustände des Äthers ganz allgemein richtig abbilden. Vergeblich mahnt hierbei Herr E i n s t e i n zu Mißtrauen gegenüber dem gesunden Verstand: Eine Theorie, die nicht in der Lage ist, auf so einfache Fragen, wie die obigen beiden es sind, eine entsprechende einfache, den gewöhnlichen Verstand befriedigende Antwort zu geben, ist nicht einwandfrei. Sie kann Erfolge haben und man kann solche bewundern, sie kann verbesserungsfähig, ja vielleicht schon in Verbesserung begriffen sein, aber sie darf nicht mit den üblichen weit gesteigerten Ansprüchen auftreten, welche wir in der vorliegenden Schrift getadelt haben, und sie darf das am allerwenigsten vor der Allgemeinheit tun, die als nicht sachkundig leicht beliebig irre zu führen ist. Es ist besser, der Allgemeinheit neben den Resultaten auch die Zweifel vorzuführen, um ihr den Ernst der Forschung zu zeigen, — oder aber gar nichts.

Auf die zweite Frage ist übrigens überhaupt keine entscheidende Antwort erfolgt [*Footnote*: Auch sonst war ich schließlich erstaunt, wie wenig Herr E i n s t e i n auf die Beantwortung meiner Fragen vorbereitet zu sein schien

— die doch schon zwei Jahre lang mit seiner Kenntnis gedruckt vorgelegen haben, — während von seiner Seite und auch von einem andern Fachmann Zeitungslesern gegenüber ganz ausdrücklich der Anschein der unbedingten Überlegenheit meinen Gedankengängen gegenüber erweckt worden war. Da ich weder Anhänger noch Gegner irgendeines Prinzips bin, sondern nur Naturforscher sein möchte — wie auf S. 12 schon zu erkennen gegeben, — hätte ich den Nachweis, daß und an welcher Stelle meine Überlegungen nicht genügend gründlich waren, als Gewinn entgegennehmen müssen, wenn er geführt worden wäre (vgl. auch Note k, S. 23), zumal in der rein auf die Sache gerichteten Form, in welcher die Nauheimer Aussprache ablief. Die einzige Aufklärung, welche ich von der Diskussion mitgenommen habe, stammt von seiten des Herrn M i e ; sie wird im weiter Folgenden bezeichnet werden.], und man darf daher wohl sagen, daß die Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten des unerlaubten Gedankenexperiments der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie in der Tat eine Schwierigkeit bereiten [Footnote: Man muß immer bedenken, daß jeder beliebige rotierende Körper auf Erden, mag er auch nur eine Umdrehung in 3000 Jahren ausführen, Überlichtgeschwindigkeit schon der Orionsterne, vielhundertfache Lichtgeschwindigkeit der vielhundertfach fernerer Nebelsysteme ergibt, sobald man die Rotation nicht a b s o l u t dem Körper, sondern also der Umwelt zuschreiben will.]. Dies bedeutet aber nicht weniger, als daß diese Theorie in sich selbst — ganz abgesehen von ihrer Übereinstimmung oder Nichtübereinstimmungen mit der Wirklichkeit, — d. i. logisch nicht in Ordnung ist. Der innere Widerspruch, welchen sie enthält, fällt weg, wenn man nach Herrn M i e s Vorschlag gewisse, von ihm „vernunftgemäß“ genannte Koordinatensysteme für bevorzugt erklärt [Footnote: Vgl. G. M i e , Physikal. Zeitschr. 18, S. 551, 574, 596, 1917 und Annalen d. Physik 62, S. 46, 1920.] und die anderen möglichen Koordinatensysteme ausschließt [Footnote: Ganz im Sinne der auf S. 15 des Vorliegenden Gesagten; vgl. besonders auch die Note 8a.] Gleichzeitig wäre damit auch die erste Frage erledigt; man braucht nur ein mit dem Eisenbahnzug verbundenes Koordinatensystem als ruhend gedachtes Bezugssystem auszuschließen und dafür das mit dem Erdboden verbundene Koordinatensystem als vernunftgemäß in Benutzung zu nehmen, um der Schwierigkeit der Frage enthoben zu sein. Aber dieser Ausweg bedeutet nicht eine Rettung, sondern eine Vernichtung des Relativitätsprinzips in seiner allgemeinsten, von Herrn E i n s t e i n aufgestellten, einem einfachen und zugleich allumfassenden Naturgesetz entsprechenden und daher das besondere philosophische Interesse in Anspruch nehmenden Form. Denn das Prinzip sagt in dieser Form aus, daß der Ablauf allen Naturgeschehens — die Formulierung der allgemeinen Naturgesetze — unabhängig ist von der Wahl des Bezugssystems [Footnote: Dies ist auch wirklich nach dem Ursprung des Prinzips sein einfacher Sinn, wenn überhaupt einer vorhanden ist. Es nützte in philosophischer Beziehung nichts, kompliziertere, verklausulierte Fassungen einzuführen; sind solche notwendig, so hat damit das Prinzip nicht

zwar seinen möglichen Wert als Hilfsmittel der Naturforschung, aber doch seine Ansprüche auf Wichtigkeit für das allgemeine Denken, für die Naturauffassung im Ganzen verloren.], wodurch es in allen Fällen unmöglich würde, durch irgendwelche Naturbeobachtungen absolut über Vorhandensein von Ruhe oder Bewegung zu entscheiden. Es müßten dann alle Bezugssysteme durchaus gleichwertig sein für die Schlüsse die sie ergeben (weshalb auch Herr E i n s t e i n die verschiedenen Koordinatensysteme, auch die, welche zu den offensichtlichsten Schwierigkeiten oder zu inneren Widersprüchen führen, immer wieder als prinzipiell gleichwertig hinstellen will), [*Footnote:* Nur praktische, nicht prinzipielle Gründe sollten nach Herrn E i n s t e i n s Äußerung von der Wahl gewisser Koordinatensysteme abhalten. Hierin liegt aber, wenn man sich vergegenwärtigt, daß gewisse, durch das Prinzip selbst gar nicht gekennzeichnete Koordinatensysteme in die Irre führen, eben der (wenn auch versteckte) Hinweis auf die Nichtigkeit der höchsten theoretischen Ansprüche des Prinzips; ganz unbeschadet natürlich seines etwaigen heuristischen und auch entwicklungsfördernden Wertes.] was aber nicht der Fall ist, wie die Beispielsfälle unserer beiden Fragen und in strengerer Form Herrn M i e s Untersuchungen zeigen.

Man kann dann also — wie die Sache bis heute steht — das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip nicht als Naturgesetz in strengem Sinne hinnehmen, und zwar, wie aus den Untersuchungen von Herrn M i e hervorzugehen scheint — und was hier als über den Inhalt der vorstehenden Teile dieser Schrift hinausgehend besonders hervorzuheben ist, — selbst dann nicht, wenn man seine behauptete Allgemeingültigkeit einschränken will auf massenproportionale Kräfte (Gravitationsprinzip, vgl. S. 18);

[*Footnote:* Das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip ohne Einschränkung scheitert, wenn wirklich ernst genommen, an b e i d e n oben ausgesprochenen Fragen. Das Gravitationsprinzip (die von mir vorgeschlagene Einschränkung des allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzips) ist dagegen allerdings fern von jeder Schwierigkeit der e r s t e n Frage gegenüber (da es sich auf deren Fall gar nicht bezieht), zeigt aber doch der zweiten Frage gegenüber den inneren Widerspruch, der, wie es nun scheint, jeder Anwendung des Relativitätsprinzips auf ungleichförmige Bewegungen gefährlich werden muß, wenn nicht geeignete Kunstgriffe dagegen schützen. Man könnte danach sagen, daß das Gravitationsprinzip zwar in höherem Grade einwandfrei erscheint als das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip, daß es aber doch ebenfalls nicht völlig und ohne weiteres einwandfrei ist. Immerhin erscheint der Unterschied in den Mängeln der beiden Prinzipien groß genug, um die in der vorliegenden Schrift geschehene Einführung und Hervorhebung des Gravitationsprinzips zu rechtfertigen.]

sondern man kann es — will man Irreführung vermeiden — nur als ein heuristisches Prinzip hinstellen (vgl. Note 11, S. 17), dessen Anwendung von der Hinzunahme nicht in dem Prinzip liegender Festsetzungen oder von

besonderem Geschick oder Glück in Nebenannahmen begleitet sein muß, um das Ausmünden in falsche Resultate zu vermeiden, als ein Prinzip also, das unter Umständen richtige, wertvolle, ganz neue Zusammenhänge beobachtbarer Dinge liefern kann, wobei aber doch der wirkliche Beweis für die Richtigkeit der so vorausgesagten Zusammenhänge nur in noch hinzuzunehmender Erfahrung zu suchen wäre, mit der sie besonders verglichen werden müssen, nicht in mathematisch noch so einwandfreier Ableitung aus dem Prinzip.

[Footnote: Man bemerkt hier einen Unterschied gegenüber den sonstigen physikalischen Prinzipien, beispielweise dem Energieprinzip. Die aus solchen Prinzipien bei richtiger Beachtung der zugehörigen Begriffe mathematisch fehlerlos gezogenen Schlüsse darf man ohne weiteres für ebenso zutreffend halten wie die Gesamtheit der Erfahrungen, welche dem Prinzip zugrunde liegen und an welchen es bereits bewährt ist. Der Unterschied mag an der Neuheit des Relativitätsprinzips liegen (vgl. S. 14), die noch nicht genügend Klarheit hat aufkommen lassen über Gültigkeitsbereich oder über Zusatzbedingungen, welche bei der Anwendung einzuhalten und also als wesentlich zum Prinzip gehörig zu betrachten sind. Jedenfalls scheint mir bei dieser Sachlage im Falle der Perihelverschiebung des Merkur doch immer noch Gerbers „Ableitung“ des richtigen quantitativen Zusammenhanges (sei sie auch nur Scheinableitung gewesen) mit Berücksichtigung der Frühzeitigkeit nennenswert zu bleiben gegenüber der nach dem Gesagten doch auch nur scheinbar aus strenger Anwendung eines Prinzips allein hervorgegangenen Ableitung E i n s t e i n s (vgl. S. 10-12 u. 30). Ganz abgesehen ist dabei in bezug auf G e r b e r davon, daß es mir durchaus unzulässig erscheint, einem längst Verstorbenen, der einen für richtig gehaltenen Zusammenhang (nämlich die Endgleichung für die Perihelverschiebung), also etwas Nützliches gebracht hat (mit dem Ungeschick der Hinzufügung eines anfechtbaren Beweises, aber auch ohne jedes Streben damit hervorzutreten), Puscherei oder dergleichen vorzuwerfen, wie es geschehen ist. Ich glaube, daß man den Pythagoräischen Lehrsatz, wenn ihn Pythagoras bloß veröffentlicht und nicht bewiesen hätte, doch heute noch nach ihm benennen würde — damaliges genügend schnelles Bekanntwerden des Satzes angenommen, — da er richtig und wertvoll ist.]

Ein möglicherweise praktisch wertvolles Prinzip ist das Relativitätsprinzip also, aber keines, auf das eine neue Weltanschauung sich gründen ließe, oder das berufen sein könnte, bewährte anders geartete Wege der Naturforschung nun auf einmal als abgetan erscheinen zu lassen, wenn es auch selber einen neuen, augenblicklich vielbeschrittenen Weg eröffnet hat.

[Footnote: Man kann dann auch wohl sagen, daß es sich beim verallgemeinerten Relativitätsprinzip um ein durch Mathematik in quantitative Bahnen gedämmtes System des Erratens von Naturvorgängen

handelt. Solches Erraten unter Aufwand eines ziemlich ausgedehnten mathematischen Apparats spielt auch sonst in der gegenwärtigen Physik eine früher nicht in gleichem Maße dagewesene Rolle, z. B. bei den quantentheoretischen Betrachtungen, und das Verfahren hat sich als sehr förderlich erwiesen, insofern die Kontrolle durch die Beobachtung nicht fehlte. Aber es wäre doch falsch, wenn man — wie einige Mathematiker es tun — nun eine Verwandlung der Physik in einen Nebenzweig der Mathematik als Endziel der Entwicklung vor sich sehen wollte. Die Natur, deren Erforschung Aufgabe der Physik ist, wird mit ihren Wundern, die jederzeit auch tiefsinnigste Forscher überrascht haben, noch nicht so bald zu Ende sein. — Offenbar ist es auch nur Geschmackssache, ob man lieber mit oder ohne mathematische Ableitung sich auf neue, der erfahrungsmäßigen Prüfung wert erscheinende Thesen bringen läßt, wenn die Ableitung nicht exakten Anschluß der Thesen an Erfahrungsergebnisse und an Annahmen von einfacher physikalischer Bedeutung liefert.]

Der mögliche praktische Wert des Prinzips kann umso höher bemessen werden, als es vielleicht richtige Zusammenhänge hat angeben helfen, die auf die Gravitation sich beziehen, auf eine Kraft, der man seit *Newton* und *Cavendish*, also über 100 Jahre lang nicht mehr weiter systematisch hat beikommen können [*Footnote*: Wozu, wenn solche Leistungen in Frage stehen, noch — genau besehen — übertriebene Ansprüche stellen?] Es liegen in dieser Beziehung bekanntlich drei Resultate vor: Die (schon von *Gerber* angegebene) Perihelverschiebungsgleichung, die Lichtstrahlenkrümmung und die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Gravitationszentren, und es handelt sich um deren Prüfung an der Erfahrung, die auch über den mehr oder weniger großen Wert der Theorie entscheiden muß.

Der gegenwärtige Stand dieser Prüfung ist für die beiden erstgenannten Zusammenhänge, Perihelverschiebung und Lichtstrahlenkrümmung, im Vorliegenden bereits besprochen worden (S. 19, 20), und es kann hier der Lage der Sache nach auch nicht so schnell neue Erfahrung hinzukommen. Die Frage des drittgenannten Zusammenhangs, der Rotverschiebung (vgl. Note 6, S. 19), ist dagegen augenblicklich mehr in Fluß. Es scheint dabei fast, als ob die mit besten Mitteln und von bewährtesten Seiten bisher ausgeführten Beobachtungen zu negativem Resultat sich vereinigten. [*Footnote*: Siehe die reichhaltige Zusammenstellung der in Betracht kommenden Veröffentlichungen in der auf S. 36 zitierten, soeben in den *Annalen der Physik* erschienenen Arbeit von *E. Wiechert*.] Jedenfalls erschien es bei der hierauf bezüglichen Diskussion in *Nauheim* nicht günstig für einwandfreien Überblick, daß nur die *Bonner Beobachter* (mit positivem Resultat) zu Wort kommen konnten, deren Hilfsmittel, so weit bekannt, weniger vollkommen waren als die der amerikanischen Beobachter, deren Resultat ebenso wie das kürzlich noch hinzugekommene von *Julius* in *Utrecht* [*Footnote*: *W. H. Julius* u. *P. H. van Cittert*, *Kon. Akad.*

van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, 29. Mai 1920.] aber negativ war. [Footnote: Die in bezug auf die Bonner Beobachtungen noch vorhandenen Zweifel erinnern mich an zwei Fälle, die zeigen, daß im Bonner Physikalischen Institut bei spektralanalytischen Beobachtungen nicht gerade traditionelles Glück vorhanden ist. Man vergleiche die gänzlich unrichtigen Angaben über die räumliche Verteilung der spektralen Lichtemission in den Alkalibogenflammen, die noch heute in nicht genügend kritisch bearbeiteten Werken eine irreführende Rolle spielen (s. dazu Heidelb. Akad. 1914 A 17, Fußnote 94, S. 48, auch Stark's Jahrb. 13, S. 234, 1916) und ebenso die Beobachtungen über spektrale Erregungsverteilungen von Phosphoreszenzbanden, die ebenfalls mit der Annahme in die Irre gingen, bereits vorhandene Beobachtungen an Feinheit übertroffen zu haben (siehe dazu Heidelb. Akad. 1913 A 19, Fußnote 1, S. 3.)]

Man kann daher bei der Rotverschiebung gegenwärtig noch von keiner experimentellen Bestätigung reden. Die beiden anderen Zusammenhänge sind zwar bestätigt, jedoch — wie auf S. 19, 20 erläutert — so, daß es noch fraglich blieb, ob diese Bestätigung überhaupt auf das Gravitationsprinzip sich beziehen läßt. Weiteres muß erst die Zukunft zeigen. Man wird dann sehen können, wie weit das Gravitationsprinzip — neben dem schon durch einfachste alltäglich Erfahrung widerlegten allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzip — wenigstens heuristischen Wert bewährt.”

Hermann Weyl defended Einstein, though Einstein did not agree with Weyl's work.⁵¹⁵ Weyl repeatedly demonstrated dishonesty and his unscientific, unfair and adolescent pro-Einstein bias. In addition to being unfair to Gehrcke, Weyl intentionally underrated David Hilbert's priority for the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity. Though Weyl acknowledged Hilbert's work, he failed to emphasize Hilbert's priority as the first to deduce the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity. Weyl committed this vile act over Hilbert's objections, in Weyl's book *Space-Time-Matter*.⁵¹⁶

Weyl published an article in *Die Umschau*, Volume 24, Number 42, (23 October 1920) pp. 609-610, which was not accessible to your author up to time of this publication. Other references to contemporary accounts which do not appear herein include: “Einladung zur 86. Vers. Dt. Naturforscher.”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 37, IV; and *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 September 1920) Morning edition, p. 2.

Ernst Gehrcke redressed Hermann Weyl's (and Kleinschrod's) statement regarding the Bad Nauheim debate,

“Der in der Umschau vom 23. Oktober 1920, Seite 610, erstattete Bericht von WEYL über die Relativitätssitzung in Nauheim bedarf in mehrfacher Hinsicht der Ergänzung.

Ein nicht ganz unwichtiger Punkt, der auf der Nauheimer Tagung mit bemerkenswerter Deutlichkeit hervortrat, ist dem Berichte von Herrn WEYL

nachzutragen: EINSTEIN hat nämlich unzweideutig und klar in der Diskussion seine Mißbilligung der WEYLschen Theorie zum Ausdruck gebracht und die Erklärung abgegeben, daß eine aus rein mathematischen Forderungen der Symmetrie aufgebaute Theorie, wie die von WEYL, abzulehnen sei. Wenn Herr WEYL es unternimmt, seine Gedanken der Öffentlichkeit näher zu führen, so sollte er einen so interessanten Punkt wie den der Stellungnahme EINSTEINs zur WEYLschen Theorie nicht unerwähnt lassen, damit in der Öffentlichkeit von vornherein keine irrige Meinung darüber entstehen kann, wie der Urheber der Relativitätstheorie zur species Relativismus von WEYL steht.

Herr WEYL glaubt in seinem Bericht konstatieren zu dürfen, daß LENARD den Sinn der Relativitätstheorie nicht erfaßt habe. Dies ist nur eine Zurückgabe der von LENARD auf der Nauheimer Tagung gemachten Feststellung, daß die Relativisten kein Verständnis für die Erfordernisse der Wirklichkeitsforschung in der Physik gezeigt hätten, und daß sie keinen Versuch machen, die „Kluft“ zu überbrücken. WEYL sollte bedenken, daß auch wenn jemand als Mathematiker virtuose Geschicklichkeit in der Handhabung mathematischer Symbole besitzt, er doch für andere Abstraktionen als Größenbeziehungen der Mathematik einen Mangel an Verständnis bezeigen kann, von dem universeller begabte Naturen frei sind. An Hand der WEYLschen Schriften würde sich leicht eine Liste von erkenntnistheoretischen Schnitzern und begrifflichen Wirrnissen anlegen lassen; es sei in diesem Zusammenhang übrigens auch auf die kürzlich erschienene Schrift von RIPKE-KÜHN: KANT contra EINSTEIN, Verlag von KEYSER-Erfurt, verwiesen.

Der von Herrn WEYL in seinem Bericht näher ausgeführte Punkt in der Diskussion zwischen EINSTEIN und LENARD hinsichtlich dessen Beispiel des gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges läßt den wesentlichen, von LENARD näher erläuterten Einwand vermissen, daß zur Erzeugung eines Gravitationsfeldes doch nach unseren heutigen physikalischen Kenntnissen Massen da sein sollten, die das Gravitationsfeld hervorbringen. Im Falle des Eisenbahnunglücks, wo nach Angabe des Relativisten nicht der Zug, sondern die ganze Umgebung gebremst worden sein soll, ist keine Massenanordnung und nichts ersichtlich, was das zur Bremsung der Umgebung erforderliche Gravitationsfeld erzeugt haben könnte. Der Relativist wurde denn auch in Nauheim veranlaßt, ausdrücklich Gravitationsfelder ohne erzeugende, gravitierende Massen anzunehmen, wobei er allerdings u. a. offen ließ, woher die Energie dieser Gravitationsfelder genommen wird. Von all dem berichtet uns Herr WEYL nichts.

Endlich hat die Diskussion in Nauheim die Erklärung EINSTEINs gezeitigt, daß nach der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie der Körper jede beliebige Geschwindigkeit, größer als die Lichtgeschwindigkeit, besitzen dürfen. Auch diese in ihren Folgerungen hier nicht weiter zu behandelnde Angelegenheit erwähnt Herr WEYL nicht. „Ergebnislos“ war

die Debatte in Nauheim also keineswegs.”⁵¹⁷

Weyl answered *Die Umschau* a.k.a. *Die Umschau; Wochenschrift über die Fortschritte in Wissenschaft und Technik*; a. k. a. *Umschau in Wissenschaft und Technik*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 123.

Ernst Gehrcke wrote,

“Ich möchte hier zum Ausdruck bringen, daß EINSTEIN auf der Nauheimer Naturforscherversammlung die Möglichkeit der Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten vom Standpunkt seines allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzips zugestanden hat. Wenn Herr WEYL dies leugnen zu können glaubt, so ist nur ein neuer Widerspruch zwischen ihm und EINSTEIN — wenigstens zur Zeit der Nauheimer Tagung — festzustellen. Die Erklärung EINSTEINs über die Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten, so unbefriedigend sie sein mag, ist tatsächlich abgegeben worden, und Herr WEYL hätte besser getan, das Beweismaterial zu prüfen, als einen Irrtum LENARDS anzunehmen.”⁵¹⁸

Hermann Weyl wrote in 1921:

**“Die Relativitätstheorie auf der Naturforscherversammlung
in Bad Nauheim.**

Von H. WEYL in Zürich.

Auf Veranlassung der Deutschen Mathematikervereinigung war auf der letztjährigen Naturforscherversammlung in Bad Nauheim die Relativitätstheorie in einer kombinierten Sitzung der mathematischen und physikalischen Sektion zum Mittelpunkt einer Reihe von Vorträgen und einer allgemeinen Diskussion gemacht worden; darüber sei hier — nach reichlich langer Zeit, die aber vielleicht der Klärung und ruhigen Beurteilung der Sachlage zugute kommt — Bericht erstattet.

Den ersten Teil der Sitzung bildeten vier Vorträge aus dem Gebiete der Relativitätstheorie: 1. H. W e y l , Elektrizität und Gravitation; 2. G. M i e , Das elektrische Feld eines um ein Gravitationszentrum rotierenden geladenen Partikelchens; 3. M. v. L a u e , Theoretisches über neuere optische Beobachtungen zur Relativitätstheorie; 4. L. G r e b e , Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Fraunhoferschen Linien. Den vier Vorträgen folgte die auf ihren Inhalt sich beziehende „Spezial“-Diskussion. Der letzte und dramatischste Teil, die allgemeine Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie, gestaltete sich im wesentlichen zu einem Zweikampf zwischen E i n s t e i n und L e n a r d . Mit großem Geschick, Strenge und Unparteilichkeit waltete P l a n c k seines Amtes als Vorsitzender; ihm war es nicht zum wenigsten zu danken, daß dieses „Nauheimer Relativitätsgespräch“, in welchem entgegengesetzte erkenntnistheoretische Grundauffassungen der Wissenschaft aufeinanderstießen, einen würdigen

Verlauf nahm.

Auf den Inhalt der Vorträge werde hier nur insoweit eingegangen, als er mit den prinzipiellen Fragen der Relativitätstheorie in Zusammenhang steht. Nach der speziellen Relativitätstheorie beruht der *Dopplereffekt* auf den folgenden beiden Tatsachen: 1. Die Frequenzen der von zwei Atomen der gleichen Konstitution, etwa zwei Wasserstoffatomen, ausgesendeten Spektrallinien sind einander gleich, wenn jede von ihnen gemessen wird in der dem Atom eigentümlichen *Eigenzeit*. 2. Die Frequenz einer Lichtwelle ist im ganzen Raum überall die gleiche, wenn sie gemessen wird in der „kosmischen“ Zeit t , die zusammen mit den drei Raumkoordinaten ein System linearer Koordinaten für die ganze Welt bildet. Wie übertragen sich diese beiden Tatsachen in die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie? Hier wird die Eigenzeit nach E i n s t e i n definiert durch die „metrische Fundamentalform“ $ds^2 = \sum g_{ik} dx_i dx_k$, eine quadratische Differentialform der vier willkürlichen Weltkoordinaten x_i vom Trägheitsindex 3; und das Analogon zu 1. lautet: für zwei Atome gleicher Konstitution hat das Integral $\int ds$, erstreckt über eine volle Periode, den gleichen Wert. Fragt man indes danach — um der Sache etwas mehr auf den Grund zu gehen —, wodurch das ds^2 physikalisch bestimmt ist, wodurch insbesondere der Vergleich der Maßeinheiten des ds an verschiedenen Weltstellen ermöglicht wird, so antwortet E i n s t e i n, daß dazu die Atomuhren das Mittel bilden (auch starre Maßstäbe oder, physikalisch etwas strenger gesprochen, die Gitterabstände in einem Kristall können zum gleichen Zwecke dienen): kommt die Atomuhr im Laufe ihrer Geschichte vom Weltpunkt O nach dem Weltpunkt O' und legt sie beim Passieren von O während einer Periode die unendlichkleine Weltstrecke \mathfrak{s} , beim Passieren von O' während einer Periode die unendlichkleine Weltstrecke \mathfrak{s}' zurück, so hat *definitionsgemäß* \mathfrak{s}' die gleiche Länge ds wie \mathfrak{s} . 1. ist danach keine erklärungsbedürftige Tatsache, sondern ds ist physikalisch so definiert, daß 1. zutrifft. Dennoch schließt die Möglichkeit dieser Festsetzung über den Transport der Maßeinheit eine physikalische Grundtatsache ein, nämlich die folgende: Haben zwei Atomuhren, die sich an derselben Weltstelle O befinden, dort die gleiche Frequenz und treffen sie, nachdem sie verschiedene Wege in der Welt durchlaufen haben, in einem anderen Weltpunkt O' wieder zusammen, so haben sie auch dort gleiche Frequenz. Meine Theorie von Elektrizität und Gravitation, auf einer Weltgeometrie beruhend, in welcher die Übertragung einer Strecke durch kongruente Verpflanzung längs eines Weges vom Wege abhängig ist, war von den Physikern meist dahin mißverstanden worden, als wolle ich an dieser Tatsache rütteln. Der Hauptzweck meines Vortrages in Nauheim war, dem entgegenzutreten. Ich akzeptiere jene Grundtatsache so gut wie E i n s t e i n; wir weichen voneinander ab in ihrer theoretischen Deutung. Nach E i n s t e i n ist die metrische Struktur des Äthers von der

Art, wie sie R i e m a n n annimmt, die Streckenübertragung vom Wege unabhängig. Die Frequenzen der Atomuhren folgen dieser kongruenten Verpflanzung; die Erhaltung der Frequenz beruht also auf einer von Augenblick zu Augenblick infinitesimal wirksamen *Beharrungstendenz*. Im Gegensatz dazu scheint mir die einzig mögliche physikalische Deutung jener Grundtatsache die zu sein, daß sich die Frequenz durch *Einstellung* auf eine gewisse Feldgröße (von der Dimension einer Länge) bestimmen muß: zufolge ihrer *Konstitution* hat die Atomuhr an einer beliebigen Feldstelle eine Periode, die im Verhältnis zu jener Feldgröße einen bestimmten numerischen Gleichgewichtswert besitzt. [Footnote: In einer jüngst erschienenen Note (Berliner Sitzungsberichte 1921, S. 261). akzeptiert E i n s t e i n, wenn ich ihn recht verstehe, diesen Standpunkt, nicht aber meine weltgeometrische Deutung der Elektrizität.] In der Tat ergeben die Naturgesetze, daß sich die materiellen Körper so verhalten, und zwar ist die Feldgröße, auf welche sich die Längen einstellen, der aus der skalaren Krümmung des Feldes zu berechnende Krümmungsradius. Die aus dem Verhalten der materiellen Körper in der geläufigen Weise abgelesene Maßgeometrie ist also mit der metrischen Struktur des Äthers nicht identisch, sondern geht aus ihr hervor, indem die kongruente Verpflanzung ersetzt wird durch die Einstellung auf den Krümmungsradius. In der anschließenden Diskussion wurde der beiderseitige Standpunkt klar und knapp zum Ausdruck gebracht, ohne daß einer den andern zu bekehren oder zu widerlegen suchte. [Footnote: Eine ausführliche Darstellung meiner Auffassung wurde von mir gerade jetzt veröffentlicht in zwei Arbeiten in den Ann. d. Physik **65** und der Physik. Zeitschrift **22** unter den Titeln: „Feld und Materie“, „Über die physikalischen Grundlagen der erweiterten Relativitätstheorie“.]

Ich komme zu der oben erwähnten Tatsache 2. und ihrer Übertragung in die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie. Davon handelte der Lauesche Vortrag. Ein *statisches* Gravitationsfeld ist dadurch gekennzeichnet: man kann die vier Weltkoordinaten $x_0 = t, x_1 x_2 x_3$ (statische Koordinaten) so wählen, daß sich Zeit (t) und Raum ($x_1 x_2 x_3$) vollständig trennen und die Beschaffenheit des Feldes zeitlich konstant ist; d. h. es wird

$$ds^2 = f^2 dt^2 - d\sigma^2,$$

wo f , die Lichtgeschwindigkeit, und $d\sigma^2$, die metrische Fundamentalform des Raumes, nur von dem Raumkoordinaten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ abhängen; $d\sigma^2$ ist positiv-definit. In einem solchen statischen Gravitationsfeld haben die Maxwell'schen Gleichungen (komplexe) Lösungen von folgender Art: das elektromagnetische Feld ist gleich einem zeitlich konstanten Felde multipliziert mit dem von der Zeit abhängigen rein periodischen Term $e^{i\nu t}$; ν ist die konstante Frequenz. Sind derartige „einfache Schwingungen“, wie wir es annehmen wollen, für den tatsächlichen Vorgang der

Lichtausbreitung maßgebend, so heißt das: 2. In einem statischen Gravitationsfeld ist die Frequenz der von einem ruhenden Körper ausgesendeten Lichtwelle überall im Raum die gleiche, gemessen in der kosmischen Zeit t , der Zeitkoordinate im System der vier statischen Koordinaten. Aus den beiden Tatsachen 1. und 2. ergibt sich mit Notwendigkeit die von Einstein behauptete *Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien* in der Nähe großer Massen, die ja nach dem Äquivalenzprinzip mit dem Dopplerschen Prinzip auf engste zusammenhängt; denn im statischen Gravitationsfeld hat f in der Nähe großer Massen einen kleineren Wert als fern von ihnen. — Außerdem leitete L a u e in seinem Vortrag nach dem Muster des von D e b y e für die klassische Elektrodynamik vorgeschlagenen Verfahrens aus den Maxwellschen Gleichungen als erste Näherung für hohe Frequenzen das Grundgesetz der geometrischen Optik her, daß ein Lichtsignal eine geodätische Nulllinie beschreibt. Man macht den Ansatz, daß alle Feldkomponenten multiplikativ den Term e^{ivE} enthalten mit einem sehr großen konstanten v , und erhält dann für die „Eikonalfunktion“ E die partielle Differentialgleichung

$$\sum_{ik} g^{ik} \frac{\partial E}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial E}{\partial x_k} = 0,$$

deren Charakteristiken die geodätischen Nulllinien sind.

An das eben aufgestellte Prinzip 2. sei es gestattet, hier eine kritische Bemerkung anzuknüpfen. Das Prinzip ist eindeutig, wenn durch die Forderung der statischen Koordinaten die Zeit t bis auf eine lineare Transformation in sich, die drei Raumkoordinaten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ bis auf eine willkürliche Transformation untereinander festgelegt sind. Im allgemeinen ist das der Fall, aber nicht immer. Die gravitationslose Welt der speziellen Relativitätstheorie:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - (dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2)$$

ist ein Beispiel dafür. Doch wird hier unter den linearen Koordinatensystemen eine bestimmte kosmische Zeit t dadurch ausgezeichnet, daß man fordert, der licht-aussendende Körper solle ruhen; und so gestatten in diesem Falle unsere beiden Forderungen 1. und 2. die Lichtwellen zu vergleichen, die von zwei relativ zueinander bewegten Körpern ausgehen (Dopplersches Prinzip). Ein anderes wichtiges Beispiel ist die leere Welt, wie sie sich ergibt, wenn man in den Gravitationsgleichungen das Einsteinsche kosmologische Glied mitberücksichtigt. Nach d e S i t t e r [*Footnote: On Einsteins theory of gravitation and its astronomical consequences III, Monthly Notices of the R. Astron. Society, Nov. 1917.*] ist

diese leere Welt ein „Kegelschnitt“ $\Omega(x) = a^2$ in einem 5-dimensionalen Euklidischen Raum mit dem Linienelement $ds^2 = -\Omega(dx)$;

$$\Omega(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 - x_5^2.$$

Durch die Substitution

$$(*) \quad x_4 = z \cdot \cos \frac{t}{a}, \quad x_5 = z \cdot \sin \frac{t}{a}$$

kommt man hier auf statische Koordinaten t, x_1, x_2, x_3 ; es wird nämlich

$$-ds^2 = (dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2 + dz^2) - \frac{z^2}{a^2} dt^2$$

mit
$$z^2 = a^2 - r^2, \quad r^2 = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2.$$

$f^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{r}{a}\right)^2$ nimmt vom Werte 1 im Nullpunkt bis zum Werte 0 auf dem

Äquator ab. Ist diese statische Zeit für die Ausbreitung des Lichtes maßgebend, so würden also die Spektrallinien von Sternen um so stärker nach dem Rot verschoben sein, je weiter sie vom Nullpunkt entfernt liegen. De Sitter hat die Möglichkeit erwogen, auf diese Weise die tatsächlich vorhandene systematische starke Rotverschiebung in den Spektren der Spiralnebel kosmologisch zu deuten. Nun ist aber t offenbar keineswegs die einzige „statische Zeit“; zu dem Spiralnebel als Nullpunkt wird ebenso eine solche Zeit gehören wie zu der bisher als Nullpunkt angenommenen Sonne. In der Tat kann man ja vor Ausführung der Substitution (*) die Koordinaten $x_1 \dots x_5$ einer willkürlichen linearen Transformation unterwerfen, welche $\Omega(x)$ invariant läßt; dann bekommt man ein ganz anderes t . Welches soll nun nach dem Prinzip 2. maßgebend sein für die Ausbreitung des Lichtes? Die durch (*) eingeführten statischen Koordinaten stellen nicht den ganzen de Sitterschen Kegelschnitt, sondern nur den Keil $x_4^2 - x_5^2 > 0$ reell dar. Ist die wirkliche Welt der ganze de Sittersche Kegelschnitt, so ist also das Prinzip 2. völlig unberechtigt. Wenn aber die Welt nur aus einem derartigen Keil besteht, wie Einstein es annimmt, ist natürlich dasjenige, bis auf eine lineare Transformation eindeutig bestimmte t zu nehmen, welches diesem Keil entspricht. Steht das im Einklang mit der Wirklichkeit, so ist also auf die Ausbreitung einer Lichtwelle vom Moment ihrer Entstehung an der Zusammenschluß der Welt im Ganzen von Einfluß, während man doch erwarten sollte, daß die Lichtwelle darauf erst reagieren kann, wenn sie den

ganzen Weltraum durchlaufen hat. Mit der in den retardierten Potentialen zum Ausdruck kommenden alten Hertzschen Vorstellung von der Entstehung einer Lichtwelle ist das gewiß unverträglich. So bedarf das Prinzip 2., der Mechanismus der Übertragung der Frequenz in einer Lichtwelle, noch sehr der physikalischen Aufklärung.

Inwieweit die nach Einstein zu erwartende *Rotverschiebung* der Fraunhoferschen Linien im Sonnenspektrum gegenüber den von irdischen Lichtquellen stammenden Linien durch die *Experimente* bestätigt wird, darüber berichtete Grebe. Die Messungen sind angestellt worden von Schwarzschild, dann von Evershed und Røys, später von St. John, schließlich von Bachem und Grebe. Namentlich die mit den schärfsten Hilfsmitteln ausgeführten Beobachtungen von St. John sprachen *gegen* das Vorhandensein des Einsteineffektes. Alle Beobachter stellen aber übereinstimmend fest, daß verschiedene Linien verschiedene Verschiebungen aufweisen. Grebe und Bachem machten nun darauf aufmerksam, daß für die Erklärung dieser Unregelmäßigkeiten vor allem der Umstand in Betracht fällt, daß unmittelbar benachbarte Linien sich gegenseitig in der Lage ihrer Intensitätsmaxima stören. Sie sonderten deshalb auf Grund mikrophotometrischer Aufnahmen aus den von ihnen gemessenen 36 Linien der sogenannten Cyanbande 11 aus, die sie als störungsfrei glaubten in Anspruch nehmen zu dürfen; diese zeigen nun im Mittel eine Rotverschiebung, welche dem Einsteineffekt ungefähr entspricht. Ebenso ergab sich als Mittel der Verschiebungen von 100 *aufeinanderfolgenden* Cyanbandenlinien *ohne jede Auswahl* — wo man erwarten darf, daß die gegenseitigen Störungen sich ausgleichen — nahezu derselbe Wert. Wenn man diese Untersuchungen auch noch kaum als eine definitive experimentelle Bestätigung des Einsteineffektes ansprechen darf, so verstärken sie doch die Wahrscheinlichkeit seines wirklichen Vorhandenseins erheblich. In der seit der Nauheimer Tagung verflossenen Zeit hat sich die Situation in dieser Hinsicht durch neue Beobachtungen noch weiter verbessert.

Um Sinn und Tragweite des Einsteinschen *Äquivalenzprinzips* durch ein vollständig zu übersehendes, nicht triviales Beispiel zu illustrieren, berechnete Mie nach diesem Prinzip das elektrische Feld eines geladenen Teilchens, das um ein elektrisch neutrales Gravitationszentrum unter dem Einfluß der Gravitation eine Kreisbahn beschreibt. Die statischen Koordinaten, in welchen das kugelsymmetrische Gravitationsfeld die von Schwarzschild angegebene Form besitzt, bezeichnet Mie als das vernünftige Koordinatensystem. In einem gewissen „künstlichen“ Koordinatensystem, in welchem sowohl das Teilchen ruht wie auch das Gravitationsfeld stationär ist, haben die Maxwellschen Gleichungen eine von der Zeit unabhängige Lösung, welche in der unmittelbaren Nähe des Teilchens mit der elektrostatischen Lösung identisch ist. Transformiert man sie auf das vernünftige Koordinatensystem, so erhält man diejenige Lösung des Problems, welche nach dem Äquivalenzprinzip dem elektrostatischen

Feld eines ruhenden Teilchens gleichwertig ist. Das Feld ist in unendlichgroßer Entfernung nicht von solcher Art, daß eine Ausstrahlung von Energie stattfindet, sondern man erhält es dort, wenn einem nach den Liénard-Wiechertschen Formeln berechneten ausstrahlenden Feld ein einstrahlendes von gleicher Stärke superponiert wird. Zweifellos ist das eine mit den uns bekannten Feldgesetzen verträgliche Lösung; dennoch ist es sicher, daß das wirkliche Verhalten eines elektrisch geladenen Körpers, der um ein Gravitationszentrum rotiert, nicht ihr entspricht, sondern eine elektromagnetische Welle ausstrahlt und dadurch selber in seiner Bewegung modifiziert wird. Die *tatsächlichen* Vorgänge bei Ruhe und Rotation sind also *nicht* einander äquivalent. M i e äußert sich darüber so: Man denke sich ein Einsteinsches Kupee, welches auf einer Kreisbahn um das Gravitationszentrum herumfährt; die Beobachter stellen an einem mitgeführten elektrischen Teilchen Beobachtungen an. Bestehen die Wandungen des Kupees aus Metall, so daß das von dem Teilchen erregte elektrische Feld dort endigt, so gilt das Äquivalenzprinzip; bestehen die Wandungen jedoch aus isolierendem Material, so können die Beobachter im Kupee ihre Bewegung feststellen; die Feldlinien des Teilchens sind sozusagen Fühler, die sie aus dem Kupee heraus ins Unendliche strecken. Damit kann man sich sehr wohl auch vom Einsteinschen Standpunkt aus einverstanden erklären. Solange man mit einem unendlichen Raum operiert, hat man immer den unendlich fernen Saum dieses Raumes zu berücksichtigen, über den gewissermaßen ein das Feld bestimmendes Agens ebenso herüberwirkt wie über die inneren Feldsäume, welche den verschiedenen Materieteilchen entsprechen. Mathematisch äußert sich das darin, daß nur solche Koordinaten zulässig sind, für welche im Unendlichen das ds^2 die Gestalt der speziellen Relativitätstheorie hat. In Einsteins geschlossenem Raum aber fällt der unendlich ferne Saum weg, an seine Stelle treten die weit entfernten Massen.

Der Durchrechnung dieses speziellen Problems schickte M i e einige grundsätzliche Bemerkungen voraus, welche zeigen, daß er in einigen Punkten einen andern Standpunkt einnimmt als Einstein. Insbesondere glaubt er an ein ausgezeichnetes „vernunftgemäßes“ Koordinatensystem. Nun ist ja zuzugeben, daß sich in speziellen Problemen oft aus der Beschaffenheit des metrischen Feldes heraus ein besonders einfaches und zweckmäßiges Koordinatensystem definieren läßt. So kann man im Schwarzschildschen Fall des statischen kugelsymmetrischen Gravitationsfeldes die Raumkoordinaten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ derart wählen, daß, wenn man mit ihrer Hilfe den wirklichen Raum auf einen Cartesischen abbildet, das lineare Vergrößerungsverhältnis für Linienelemente, welche senkrecht zu den Radien im Bildraum stehen, $= 1$ wird (für radiale Linienelemente wird es dann, wie aus den Gravitationsgleichungen hervorgeht, $= 1/f$, und f^2 ist $= 1 - \frac{2\alpha}{r}$; α eine Konstante, r die im Bildraum gemessene Entfernung von Zentrum). Aber

gerade in diesem Fall kann man über die radiale Maßskala z. B. doch auch so verfügen, daß die Abbildung auf den Cartesischen Bildraum konform ist (dann wird das Vergrößerungsverhältnis für alle Linienelemente

$$= \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{r}\right)^2, \text{ und } f \text{ ist } = \frac{r - \alpha/2}{r + \alpha/2}.$$

Hier ist gar nicht abzusehen, warum man das eine dieser beiden Koordinatensysteme als „vernunftgemäßer“ ansprechen soll denn das andere. Die Frage nach der Existenz eines vernunftgemäßen Koordinatensystems hängt aufs engste mit der andern zusammen, inwiefern es berechtigt ist, zu behaupten: die wahre Geometrie des Raumes sei die *euklidische*; daß materielle Maßstäbe nicht die Relationen erfüllen, welche diese Geometrie für den idealen starren Körper angibt, liege daran, daß die materiellen Körper durch das Gravitationsfeld in bestimmter Weise deformiert werden. Dieser Standpunkt, den z. B. Dingler und Hamel vertreten [*Footnote*: Dingler: Der starre Körper, Physik. Zeitschr. 1920 S. 487; Hamel: Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Mathem. Gesellschaft 1921. S. 65.], ist zunächst natürlich gegenüber der Gravitation physikalisch ebenso berechtigt wie gegenüber der Temperatur (Einstein selbst zieht diese Parallele in seiner populären Schrift über die Relativitätstheorie): kein Mensch behauptet, daß auf einer ungleichförmig erwärmten Platte eine nichteuklidische Geometrie gilt, sondern daß die zur Ausmessung verwendeten Maßstäbe durch die verschiedenen Temperaturen verschiedene Ausdehnungen erfahren. Aber in diesem Fall existiert eine absolut ausgezeichnete Reduktion, die Reduktion auf „gleiche Temperatur“, durch welche das Verhalten der Maßstäbe mit der euklidischen Geometrie in Einklang gebracht wird. Im Fall der Gravitation existiert zwar auch eine „Reduktion auf Euklid“ (das ist sogar selbstverständlich), aber unter den unendlich vielen möglichen derartigen Korrekturvorschriften, deren jede zu andern Resultaten führt, ist keine physikalisch so ausgezeichnet, daß sie sich zwingend als die „einzig richtige“ aufdrängt. Darum ist es hier wertlos, den an den materiellen Körpern abgelesenen Maßzahlen durch Korrektur eine euklidische Geometrie zu supponieren. Vielleicht hat der Philosoph immer noch Recht mit seiner Ansicht, daß man ohne einen idealen euklidischen Anschauungsraum nicht auskomme; ihm entspräche in der mathematischen Darstellung die Notwendigkeit, ein Koordinatensystem zu verwenden. Aber seine Beziehung auf das Ordnungsschema der physikalischen Ereignisse ist wie die Wahl des Koordinatensystems in hohem Maße willkürlich. Die universelle Konstruktion, welche Mie selber für das vernunftgemäße Koordinatensystem andeutet (mit Hilfe einer Einbettung des vierdimensionalen wirklichen Raumes in einen zehndimensionalen euklidischen) ist vieldeutig und ohne inneres Vorzugsrecht. Es ist gar nicht einzusehen, welche Erleichterung dadurch für die Beschreibung der physikalischen Vorgänge geschaffen werden soll; sie läßt sich ja immer mittels invarianter Begriffe vollziehen. — Noch in einem andern Punkte weicht Mie von Einstein ab; er meint, man dürfe nicht von allgemeiner

Relativität, sondern nur von einer Relativität der Gravitationswirkungen sprechen, da man nach der Einsteinschen Theorie das Verhalten eines beschleunigt bewegten materiellen Systems aus dem des ruhenden nur dann berechnen kann, wenn die wirkende Kraft die eines Gravitationsfeldes ist. Mir scheint, das ist kein Einwand gegen die Allgemeinheit des Relativitätsprinzips, sondern eine Bemerkung über seine Tragweite: nur für die im „Führungsfeld“ neben der Trägheit mitgehaltenen Kräfte (Zentrifugalkraft, Gravitation), die man an ihrer Massenproportionalität erkennt, ist dieses Prinzip ausreichend, ihre Wirkungsweise *a priori* aus dem Galileischen Trägheitsprinzip abzuleiten.

Die beiden zuletzt erörterten Punkte kamen auch in der *allgemeinen Diskussion*, die vor allem von L e n a r d benutzt wurde, zwischen L e n a r d und E i n s t e i n zur Sprache. Es sei um der Übersichtlichkeit willen gestattet, aus diesem Wechselgespräch zunächst noch zwei weitere Streitfragen herauszuschälen, die neben der am Schluß zu besprechenden Hauptdifferenz nur von nebensächlicher Bedeutung sind. Das ist erstens die *Existenz des Äthers*. L e n a r d meint, E i n s t e i n habe, bei Aufstellung der speziellen Relativitätstheorie, allzu voreilig die Abschaffung des Äthers verkündet. In der Tat kann er ja darauf hinweisen, daß E i n s t e i n heute wieder in der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie von einem Äther spricht. [Footnote: Siehe namentlich die Leidener Antrittsvorlesung E i n s t e i n s über Äther und Relativitätstheorie, Springer 1920.] Man darf sich doch aber durch das gleichlautende Wort nicht über die Verschiedenheit der Sache täuschen lassen! Der alte Äther der Lichttheorie war ein *substantielles* Medium, ein dreidimensionales Kontinuum, von welchem sich jede Stelle *P* in jedem Augenblick *t* in einem bestimmten Raumpunkt *p* (oder an einer bestimmten Weltstelle) befindet; die Wiedererkennbarkeit derselben Ätherstelle zu verschiedenen Zeiten ist dabei das Wesentliche. Durch diesen Äther löst sich die vierdimensionale Welt auf in ein dreifach unendliches Kontinuum von eindimensionalen Weltlinien; infolgedessen gestattet er, *Ruhe* und *Bewegung* absolut voneinander zu unterscheiden. In diesem Sinne, etwas anderes hat E i n s t e i n nicht behauptet, ist der Äther durch die spezielle Relativitätstheorie abgeschafft; er wurde ersetzt durch die affingometrische Struktur der Welt, welche nicht den Unterschied zwischen Ruhe und Bewegung festlegt, sondern die *gleichförmige Translation* von allen andern Bewegungen absondert. Der substantielle Äther war von seinen Erfindern als etwas Reales, den ponderablen Körpern Vergleichbares gedacht. In der Lorentzschen Elektrodynamik hatte er sich in eine rein geometrische, d. h. ein für allemal feste, von der Materie nicht beeinflusste Struktur verwandelt. In E i n s t e i n s spezieller Relativitätstheorie trat an ihre Stelle eine andere, die affingometrische Struktur. In der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie endlich verwandelte sich die letztere, als „affiner Zusammenhang“ oder „Führungsfeld“, wieder zurück in ein mit der Materie in Wirkungszusammenhang stehendes Zustandsfeld von physikalischer Realität. Und darum hielt es E i n s t e i n für angezeigt, das alte Wort Äther

für den vollständig gewandelten Begriff wieder einzuführen; ob das zweckmäßig war oder nicht, ist weniger eine physikalische als eine philologische Frage.

Zweitens: die *Überlichtgeschwindigkeit*. L e n a r d meint, die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie führe die Überlichtgeschwindigkeit wieder ein, da sie als Bezugssystem z. B. die rotierende Erde zuläßt; in hinreichend großen Entfernungen treten dabei Überlichtgeschwindigkeit auf. Dies ist ein offenes Mißverständnis. Sind $x_1 x_2 x_3$ die in bezug auf die rotierende Erde gemessenen Raumkoordinaten, x_0 die zugehörige „Zeit“ (auf ihre präzise Definition kommt es jetzt nicht an), so werden die Koordinatenlinien x_0 , auf denen bei konstanten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ nur x_0 variiert, nicht alle zeitartige Richtung haben, d. h. es wird in diesen Koordinaten nicht überall $g_{00} > 0$ sein. Nun behauptet E i n s t e i n allerdings, daß auch solche Koordinatensysteme zulässig sind; auch in solchen Koordinatensystemen gelten seine allgemein invarianten Gravitationsgesetze. Dagegen hält er durchaus daran fest, daß die *Weltlinie eines materiellen Körpers* stets zeitartige Richtung besitzt, daß an einem materiellen Körper (und als „Signalgeschwindigkeit“) keine Überlichtgeschwindigkeit auftreten kann. Ein Koordinatensystem von der oben angegebenen Art läßt sich infolgedessen nicht in seiner ganzen Ausdehnung durch einen „Bezugsmollusken“ wiedergeben, d. h. man kann sich kein materielles Medium denken, dessen einzelne Elemente die Koordinatenlinien x_0 jenes Koordinatensystems als Weltlinien beschreiben.—

Aber es wird Zeit, daß ich auf den entscheidenden Gegensatz zwischen L e n a r d und E i n s t e i n zu sprechen komme. L e n a r d behauptet, daß die Einsteinsche Theorie mit *fingierten Gravitationsfeldern* operiere, zu denen sich keine erzeugende Materie nachweisen ließe und welche nur dem Relativitätsprinzip zuliebe eingeführt würden. Das anschauliche Lenardsche Beispiel des durch einen entgegenfahrenden Zug plötzlich gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges diene auch hier als Unterlage der Diskussion. Warum, fragt L e n a r d, geht der Zug in Trümmer und nicht der Kirchturm neben dem Zug, da doch nach E i n s t e i n ebensogut von ihm wie von dem Eisenbahnzug gesagt werden kann, daß er gebremst werde? Hierauf scheint mir die Antwort leicht. In der Einsteinschen Theorie gibt es so gut wie nach alter Auffassung das *Führungsfeld*, dem ein Körper nach dem Galileischen Prinzip folgt, solange auf ihn keine Kräfte wirken. Die Katastrophe ereignet sich am Zuge und nicht am Kirchturm, weil der erstere durch die Molekularkräfte des entgegenfahrenden Zuges aus der Bahn des Führungsfeldes herausgeworfen wird, der Kirchturm hingegen nicht. Diese Antwort ist auch vollkommen im Einklang mit dem „gesunden Menschenverstand“, der von Herzen damit einverstanden ist, die sich den Kräften entgegenstimmende Beharrungstendenz des Führungsfeldes mit E i n s t e i n als eine physikalische Realität anzusehen. Die Frage ist jetzt

aber weiter die: ist dieses Führungsfeld eine Einheit oder lassen sich in ihr zwei Bestandteile, die „Trägheit“ und die „Gravitation“, grundsätzlich voneinander trennen, derart daß die erste von selber ein für allemal vorhanden ist als affin-lineare Struktur der vierdimensionalen Welt und nur die zweite durch die Materie erzeugt wird? Hier, für die Gleichberechtigung aller Bewegungszustände, ist die Sachlage eine ganz analoge wie für die Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen im Raum. Nach *Demokrit* gibt es an sich ein absolutes Oben-Unten; die wirkliche Fallrichtung eines Körpers setzt sich zusammen aus dieser absoluten Richtung und einer aus physikalischen Ursachen entspringenden Abweichung davon. *Demokrit* könnte etwa gegen *Newton*, der die Fallrichtung als Einheit ansieht, genau so argumentieren wie *Lenard* gegen *Einstein*: Macht man eine andere als jene wahre Richtung zur Normalrichtung, so muß man außer ihr und der wirklichen Abweichung drittens noch eine überall gleiche und nicht in der Materie verankerte fingierte Abweichung einführen; und das nur, um dem Prinzip von der Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen im Raume zu genügen. Sobald man die absolute Richtung Oben-Unten zugibt, kann man scheiden zwischen wirklicher und fingierter Abweichung; sobald man ein ausgezeichnetes, „vernunftgemäßes“ Koordinatensystem annimmt, muß man (mit *Mie* und *Lenard*) scheiden zwischen wirklichen und fingierten Gravitationsfeldern. Auf dem Relativitätsstandpunkt hingegen wird eine solche Scheidung unmöglich. Wenn wir aber mit *Newton* gegen *Demokrit* die Unzerlegbarkeit der wirklichen Fallrichtung in ein absolutes Oben-Unten und eine Abweichung davon behaupten, so müssen wir auch nicht nur für die *Abweichung*, sondern für die *Fallrichtung als Ganzes eine physikalische Ursache* angeben; genau so hat *Einstein* die Verpflichtung, zu zeigen, *wie und nach welchem Gesetz das Führungsfeld als Ganzes durch die Materie erzeugt wird*. Das verlangt *Lenard* mit vollem Recht von ihm, und das ist der tiefste und eigentlich entscheidende Punkt seiner Einwände. Es muß unverhohlen zugegeben werden, daß hier für die Relativitätstheorie bei ihrer jetzigen Formulierung noch ernstliche Schwierigkeiten vorliegen. *Einstein* weist zur Beantwortung auf seine *Kosmologie* der räumlich geschlossenen Welt hin; er erwidert *Lenard*: Das Feld ist nicht willkürlich erfunden, weil es die allgemeinen Differentialgleichungen erfüllt und weil es zurückgeführt werden kann auf die Wirkung aller fernen Massen. Solange man überhaupt an dem Gegensatz von Materie und Feld festhält (und nur dann ist ja die Forderung, daß die Materie das Feld erzeuge, sinnvoll und berechtigt), bedeutet die Einsteinsche Kosmologie dies, daß neben den inneren Säumen des Feldes, über welche die einzelnen Materieteilchen feldbestimmend herüberwirken, nicht noch ein weiterer unendlichferner Saum als ein das Feld im Unendlichen bestimmendes Agens hinzukommt; an seine Stelle ist die Gesamtheit der fernen Massen getreten. Das Mitdrehen der Ebene des Foucaultschen Pendels mit dem Fixsternhimmel macht das ganz sinnfällig. Behoben ist damit die Schwierigkeit aber noch nicht. Erstens ist zu sagen, daß von *Einstein* nur

die Gesetze angegeben werden, welche den inneren differentiellen Zusammenhang des Feldes binden, aber noch keine klare Formulierung der Gesetze vorliegt, nach welchen die Materie das Feld determiniert (das liegt übrigens beim elektromagnetischen Feld nicht wesentlich anders). Zweitens aber und vor allem ist es sogar ganz ausgeschlossen, daß die Materie das Feld eindeutig bestimmen kann, wenn man als Charakteristika der Materie, wie kaum anders möglich, *Masse, Ladung und Bewegungszustand* ansieht. Man kann nämlich in der Welt ein solches Koordinatensystem einführen, daß für die dadurch bewirkte Abbildung der Welt auf einen vierdimensionalen Cartesischen Bildraum nicht nur der Weltkanal *eines* Teilchens, sondern *aller* Teilchen simultan vorgegebene Gestalt annimmt, z. B. alle diese Kanäle vertikale Geraden werden. Im Vergleich zu *M a c h*, dessen Bezugskörper stets ein starrer Körper ist, hat sich bei *E i n s t e i n* das Koordinatensystem so „erweicht“, daß es sich simultan den Bewegungen aller Teilchen anschmiegen kann, daß man alle Teilchen zugleich auf Ruhe transformieren kann; es hat also hier nicht einmal einen Sinn mehr, vom *relativen* Bewegungszustand verschiedener Körper gegeneinander zu sprechen. Diese Schwierigkeit hat neuerdings *R e i c h e n b ä c h e r* deutlicher hervorgehoben. [*Footnote*: Schwere und Trägheit, Physik. Zeitschr. **22** (1921), S. 234-243.] Das Prinzip, daß die Materie das Feld erzeuge, wird sich danach nur aufrechterhalten lassen, wenn der Begriff der Bewegung ein dynamisches Moment mit in sich aufnimmt; nicht um den Gegensatz *absolut* oder *relativ*, sondern *kinematisch* oder *dynamisch* dreht es sich bei der Analyse des Bewegungsbegriffs. —

In einer zweiten Sitzung am andern Tage demonstrierte *F. P. L i e s e g a n g* (Düsseldorf) einige treffliche Schaubilder zur Darstellung der Zeitraumverhältnisse in der speziellen Relativitätstheorie, und es verlas *H. D i n g l e r* (München), wie es schien nur zu formalem Protest gegen die Relativitätstheorie, ohne sich um das Publikum zu kümmern, seine kritischen Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Theorie; es ist sonderbar, daß sich bei *D i n g l e r* mit seinem an *P o i n c a r é* orientierten konventionalistischen Standpunkt die dogmatische Halsstarrigkeit des geborenen Apriorikers verbindet. Daß der Tragödie am Schluß das Satyrspiel nicht fehle, entwickelte *H r. R u d o l p h* eine phantastische Äthertheorie mit „Lücken“ zwischen fließenden Ätherwänden, Sternfäden usw., mit Hilfe deren er aus Nichts die Sonnenmasse auf eine beliebige Anzahl von Dezimalen genau bestimmte . . .

Ich habe hier in freier Weise die Fragen kennzeichnen wollen, die in der Nauheimer Diskussion zur Sprache kamen, nicht aber einen objektiven Bericht über den Verlauf der Sitzung erstatten wollen; für eine gekürzte, aber sinngetreue Wiedergabe der Vorträge und der Diskussion sei der Leser auf das Dezemberheft 1920 der Physikalischen Zeitschrift verwiesen.

(Eingegangen am 29. 8. 21.)⁵¹⁹

Bruno Thüring wrote,

“Im selben Jahre 1920 fand in Bad Nauheim auf der dortigen Naturforschertagung die berühmt gewordene Diskussion zwischen Philipp Lenard und Albert Einstein statt. In dieser Diskussion, welche in echt jüdischer Weise zu einer Sensation aufgebauscht wurde, verglich Einstein sein Werk mit demjenigen Galileis und tat, als sich Lenard auf den gesunden Menschenverstand berief, die Äußerung, daß es gefährlich sei, den gesunden Menschenverstand in der Physik zur Anwendung zu bringen. Diese seltsame Argumentation ist dann auch in die populärwissenschaftliche Literatur eingegangen.

Im übrigen kam es bei dieser Tagung auch zu tumultuarischen Szenen. Der Vorsitzende Max Planck sah es als seine Hauptaufgabe an, die Einsteinpartei gegen ihre wissenschaftlichen Gegner möglichst gleich durch organisatorische Maßnahmen zu schützen. Er ließ, wie aus Presseveröffentlichungen hervorgeht, an der Eingangstüre eine Siebung vornehmen, um ihm nicht genehme Personen fernzuhalten. Darauf erhob sich zwar ein großer Tumult, und das empörte Auditorium stürmte den Saal. Planck erreichte seinen Zweck schließlich dadurch, daß er die Relativisten in stundenlangen Vorträgen sich verbreiten ließ, während den antirelativistischen Rednern einschließlich Diskussion insgesamt nur 15 Minuten zugestimmt werden sollten. Unter den Rednern dieser Tagung befand sich auch der im Kampf gegen Einstein an vorderster Stelle stehende Hugo Dingler.

Freilich erlag die Opposition gegen den relativistischen Wissenschaftsbetrieb in der Folgezeit der Übermacht der jüdischen Pressepropaganda und der staatlichen Schutzmaßnahmen. Bald wurde Einsteins Lehre als eine „Selbstverständlichkeit“ bezeichnet, und die maßgebenden Männer der internationalen Gelehrtenrepublik hielten nach Möglichkeit jeden von einem Lehrstuhl fern, der sich gegen das relativistische Dogma — sei es auch in der wissenschaftlich-sachlichsten Weise — ausgesprochen hatte. So wurden diese Dogmatismen an die junge Physikergeneration so gut wie widerspruchslos weitergegeben.”⁵²⁰

4.5 Einstein the Genocidal Racist

Albert Einstein was himself a racist; and, therefore, a hypocrite when criticizing the racism of others. John Stachel wrote,

“While he lived in Germany, however, Einstein seems to have accepted the then-prevalent racist mode of thought, often invoking such concepts as ‘race’ and ‘instinct,’ and the idea that the Jews form a race.”⁵²¹

On 8 July 1901, Einstein wrote to Winteler,

“There is no exaggeration in what you said about the German professors. I have got to know another sad specimen of this kind — one of the foremost

physicists of Germany.”⁵²²

Einstein wrote to Besso sometime after 1 January 1914,

“A free, unprejudiced look is not at all characteristic of the (adult) Germans (blindness!).”⁵²³

After the war Einstein and some of his friends alluded to much earlier conversations with Einstein, where he had correctly predicted the eventual outcome of the war. In his diaries, Romain Rolland recorded his conversations with Einstein in Switzerland at their meeting of 16 September 1915,

“What I hear from [Einstein] is not exactly encouraging, for it shows the impossibility of arriving at a lasting peace with Germany without first totally crushing it. Einstein says the situation looks to him far less favorable than a few months back. The victories over Russia have reawakened German arrogance and appetite. The word ‘greedy’ seems to Einstein best to characterize Germany. [***] Einstein does not expect any renewal of Germany out of itself; it lacks the energy for it, and the boldness for initiative. He hopes for a victory of the Allies, which would smash the power of Prussia and the dynasty. . . . Einstein and Zangger dream of a divided Germany—on the one side Southern Germany and Austria, on the other side Prussia. [***] We speak of the deliberate blindness and the lack of psychology in the Germans.”⁵²⁴

Einstein’s dreams during the First World War remind one of the “Carthaginian Peace” of the Henry Morgenthau, Jr. plan for the destruction of Germany following the Second World War. Morgenthau worked with Lord Cherwell (Frederick Alexander Lindemann), Churchill’s friend and advisor, who planned to bomb German civilian populations into submission. Lindemann studied under Einstein’s friend, Walther Nernst, who worked with Fritz Haber, a Jewish developer of poisonous gas. James Bacque argues that the Allies, under the direction of General Eisenhower, starved hundreds of thousands, if not millions of German prisoners of war to death. Dwight David Eisenhower was called “the terrible Swedish-Jew” in his yearbook for West Point, *The 1915 Howitzer*, West Point, New York, (1915), p. 80. He was also called “Ike”, as in. . . Eisenhower? The Soviets also abused and murdered countless German POW’s after the Second World War.⁵²⁵

Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany, and for the Jews and England, and he betrayed Germany before, during and after the war. Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than

these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”⁵²⁶

While responsible people were trying to preserve some sanity in the turbulent period following World War I, Zionists like Albert Einstein sought to validate and encourage the racism of anti-Semites. The Dreyfus Affair taught them that anti-Semitism had a powerful effect to unite Jews around the world. The Zionists were afraid that the “Jewish race” was disappearing through assimilation. They wanted to use anti-Semitism to force the segregation of Jews from Gentiles and to unite Jews, and thereby preserve the “Jewish race”. They hoped that if they put a Hitler-type into power—as Zionists had done in the past, they could use him to herd up the Jews and force the Jews into Palestine against their will. This would also help the Zionists to inspire distrust and contempt for Gentile government, while giving the Zionists the moral high-ground in international affairs, despite the fact that the Zionists were secretly behind the atrocities. In 1896, Theodor Herzl wrote his book *The Jewish State*,

“Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”⁵²⁷

Albert Einstein wrote to Max Born on 9 November 1919. Einstein encouraged anti-Semitism and advocated segregation (one must wonder what rôle Albert’s increasing racism played in his divorce from Mileva Marić—a Gentile Serb),

“Antisemitism must be seen as a real thing, based on true hereditary qualities, even if for us Jews it is often unpleasant. I could well imagine that I myself would choose a Jew as my companion, given the choice. On the other hand I would consider it reasonable for the Jews themselves to collect the money to support Jewish research workers outside the universities and to provide them with teaching opportunities.”⁵²⁸

In 1933, the Zionists publicly declared their allegiance to the Nazis. They wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on 13 June 1933,

“Zionism recognizes the existence of the Jewish question and wants to solve it in a generous and constructive manner. For this purpose, it wants to enlist the aid of all peoples; those who are friendly to the Jews as well as those who are hostile to them, since according to its conception, this is not a question of sentimentality, but one dealing with a real problem in whose solution all

peoples are interested.”⁵²⁹

On 21 June 1933, the Zionists issued a declaration of their position with respect to the Nazi régime, in which they expressed a belief in the legitimacy of the Nazis’ racist belief system and condemned anti-Fascist forces.⁵³⁰

Michele Besso wrote that it might have been Albert Einstein’s racism and bigotry which caused him to separate from his first wife Mileva Marić in 1914. Besso wrote to Einstein on 17 January 1928,

“[. . .]perhaps it is due in part to me, with my defense of Judaism and the Jewish family, that your family life took the turn that it did, and that I had to bring Mileva from Berlin to Zurich[.]”⁵³¹

The hypocrisy of racist Zionists often manifested itself. As another example, consider the fact that racist Zionist Moses Hess was married to a Christian Gentile prostitute named Sybille Pritsch.

Einstein may have been effected by his mother’s early racist opposition to his relationship with Marić. Another factor in the Einsteins’ divorce was, of course, Albert’s incestuous relationship with his cousin Else Einstein, and his desire to bed her daughters, as well as Albert’s general promiscuity—some believe he was a whore monger. Albert Einstein opposed his sister Maja’s marriage to the Gentile Paul Winteler on racist grounds and thought they should divorce. Albert Einstein wrote to Michele Besso on 12 December 1919 and stated that, “No mixed marriages are any good (Anna says: oh!)”⁵³² Besso, himself, was married to a Gentile, Anna Besso-Winteler. Denis Brian wrote,

“When asked what he thought of Jews marrying non-Jews, which, of course, had been the case with him and Mileva, [Albert Einstein] replied with a laugh, ‘It’s dangerous, but then all marriages are dangerous.’”⁵³³

On 3 April 1920, Einstein wrote, criticizing assimilationist Jews,

“And this is precisely what he does *not* want to reveal in his confession. He talks about religious faith instead of tribal affiliation, of ‘Mosaic’ instead of ‘Jewish’ because the latter term, which is much more familiar to him, would emphasize affiliation to his tribe.”⁵³⁴

After declaring that Jewish children segregate due to natural forces and that they are “different from other children”,⁵³⁵ not due to religion or tradition, but due to genetic features and “heritage”, Einstein continued his 3 April 1920 statement,

“With adults it is quite similar as with children. Due to race and temperament as well as traditions (which are only to a small extent of religious origin) they form a community more or less separate from non-Jews. [***] It is this basic community of race and tradition that I have in mind when I speak of ‘Jewish

nationality.’ In my opinion, aversion to Jews is simply based upon the fact that Jews and non-Jews are different. [***] Where feelings are sufficiently vivid there is no shortage of reasons; and the feeling of aversion toward people of a foreign race with whom one has, more or less, to share daily life will emerge by necessity.”⁵³⁶

Einstein made similar comments in a document dated sometime “after 3 April 1920”. Einstein was in agreement with Philipp Lenard that a “Jewish heritage” (read for “heritage”, “racial instinct”) could be seen in intellectual works published by Jews. Einstein stated,

“The psychological root of anti-Semitism lies in the fact that the Jews are a group of people unto themselves. Their Jewishness is visible in their physical appearance, and one notices their Jewish heritage in their intellectual works, and one can sense that there are among them deep connections in their disposition and numerous possibilities of communicating that are based on the same way of thinking and of feeling. The Jewish child is already aware of these differences as soon as it starts school. Jewish children feel the resentment that grows out of an instinctive suspicion of their strangeness that naturally is often met with a closing of the ranks. [***] [Jews] are the target of instinctive resentment because they are of a different tribe than the majority of the population.”⁵³⁷

Albert Einstein often referred to Jews as “tribesmen” and Jewry as the “tribe”. Fellow German Jew Fritz Haber was outraged at Albert Einstein’s racist treachery and disloyalty. Einstein confirmed that he was disloyal and a racist, and was obligated,

“[. . .] to step in for my persecuted and morally depressed fellow tribesmen, as far as this lies within my power[.]”⁵³⁸

In a draft letter of 3 April 1920, Einstein wrote that children are conscious of “racial characteristics” and that this alleged “racial” gulf between children results in conflicts, which instill a sense of foreignness in the persecuted child. Einstein wrote,

“Unter den Kindern war besonders in der Volksschule der Antisemitismus lebendig. Er gründete ich auf die den Kindern merkwürdig bewussten Rassenmerkmale und auf Eindrücke im Religionsunterricht. Thätliche Angriffe und Beschimpfungen auf dem Schulwege waren häufig, aber meist nicht gar zu böse. Sie genügten immerhin, um ein lebhaftes Gefühl des Fremdseins schon im Kinde zu befestigen.”⁵³⁹

Einstein’s racism was perhaps a defense mechanism to depersonalize the attacks he faced as a child and to counter the hurt with a sense of communal love and communal hatred, which was sponsored by his racist mother. Like Adolf Stoecker

before him,⁵⁴⁰ Albert Einstein advocated the segregation of Jewish students. Peter A. Bucky quoted Albert Einstein,

“I think that Jewish students should have their own student societies. [***] One way that it won’t be solved is for Jewish people to take on Christian fashions and manners. [***] In this way, it is entirely possible to be a civilized person, a good citizen, and at the same time be a faithful Jew who loves his race and honors his fathers.”⁵⁴¹

Einstein stated,

“We must be conscious of our alien race and draw the logical conclusions from it. [***] We must have our own students’ societies and adopt an attitude of courteous but consistent reserve to the Gentiles. [***] It is possible to be [***] a faithful Jew who loves his race and honours his fathers.”⁵⁴²

On 5 April 1920, Einstein repeated what he had heard from his political Zionist friends who believed that anti-Semitism was necessary to the preservation of the “Jewish race”,

“Anti-Semitism will be a psychological phenomenon as long as Jews come in contact with non-Jews—what harm can there be in that? Perhaps it is due to anti-Semitism that we survive as a race: at least that is what I believe.”⁵⁴³

and,

“I am neither a German citizen, nor is there in me anything that can be described as ‘Jewish faith.’ But I am happy to belong to the Jewish people, even though I don’t regard them as the Chosen People. Why don’t we just let the Goy keep his anti-Semitism, while we preserve our love for the likes of us?”⁵⁴⁴

This letter was published in the *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die Schweiz*, on 24 September 1920, on page 10. It became famous and was widely discussed in newspapers and was used as a political issue. Einstein’s racism had already become a weapon for Jewish critics to wield against German Jews who were loyal to the Fatherland. Einstein ridiculed the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*, an organization that combated anti-Semitism and vigorously defended and celebrated Jews, because Einstein sought to promote anti-Semitism and because Einstein believed that being “Jewish” was a racial, not a religious, state. Einstein knew quite well that the letter had been published. The *C. V.* contacted him about it and published a statement regarding it in their periodical *Im deutschen Reich* in March of 1921,

“So wurde auch in einzelnen Versammlungen der b e k a n n t e B r i e f des

Naturforschers Professor Einstein, den dieser an den Central-Verein gerichtet hat, und in welchem er die Bestrebungen des Central-Vereins ablehnt, weil sie zu national-deutsch und zu wenig jüdisch orientiert seien, zum Gegenstand der Erörterungen gemacht. Dieser Brief hat in der öffentlichen Erörterung der jüdischen und judengegnerischen Presse in den letzten Monaten und auch bei den Wahlen eine gewisse Rolle gespielt und Anlaß zu den verschiedenartigsten Betrachtungen je nach der Parteistellung der Versammlungsredner und der verschiedenen Zeitungen gegeben. So hat sich z. B. die jüdisch-nationale „Wiener Morgenzeitung“ veranlaßt gesehen, den Central-Verein in wenig vornehmer Weise anzugreifen und ihn wegen seines nationaldeutschen Standpunktes zu verdächtigen. Diese Angriffe würden durch die Auffassung von Professor Einstein nicht gedeckt worden sein, wenn die „Wiener Morgenzeitung“ gewußt hätte, daß Professor Einstein ohne nähere Kenntnis der Bestrebungen und der Arbeit des Central-Vereins seinen Brief geschrieben und keineswegs an eine Veröffentlichung, die nur durch eine Indiskretion erfolgt ist, gedacht hat. Erst nach der Veröffentlichung hat er von der Art und Weise der Tätigkeit des Central-Vereins Kenntnis erhalten und hat, wie mit gutem Grund versichert werden kann, infolge dieser Kenntnisse eine wesentlich andere Auffassung vom Werte der Arbeit unseres Central-Vereins gewonnen. Auch dieser Vorfall sollte Anlaß geben, Urteile in der Öffentlichkeit erst dann zu fällen, wenn die Sachlage einigermaßen geklärt ist.”⁵⁴⁵

On 24 May 1931, the *Sunday Express* of London published an interview it claimed it had had with Einstein while he was visiting Oxford. The interview contained inflammatory statements similar to those published in the *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die Schweiz* on 24 September 1920. These statements were repeated in several German language newspapers across Europe together with scathing editorial indictments of Einstein. Einstein claimed that no interview had taken place and the quotations were taken from a letter he had written eleven years prior. Einstein stated in a letter to Michael Traub of 22 August 1931 that this letter had never been published,⁵⁴⁶ though it had been published and Einstein knew quite well that it had been published.

Einstein accused the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens e. V.* of instigating the “forgery”. The C.V. denied that it was behind the publication in the *Sunday Express* and invited Einstein to respond in their official organ the *Central-Verein Zeitung*. Einstein took the opportunity and stated, “Es wurden mir schon wiederholt Auszüge aus einem Artikel der „S u n d a y E x p r e ß“ zugesandt, aus denen ich ersehe, daß es sich **um eine glatte Fälschung** handelt. Ich habe in O x f o r d überhaupt kein einziges Zeitungsinterview gegeben. Der Inhalt ist eine böswillige Entstellung eines vor elf Jahren geschriebenen, nicht für die Öffentlichkeit bestimmten Briefes.”⁵⁴⁷ He affirmed in 1931 that he had made the statements in 1920 and did not repudiate them.

In 1932, Einstein stated, referring to the “deplorably high development of

nationalism everywhere”—his own rabid Zionism apparently excepted,

“The introduction of compulsory service is therefore, to my mind, the prime cause of the moral collapse of the white race, which seriously threatens not merely the survival of our civilization but our very existence. This curse, along with great social blessings, started with the French Revolution, and before long dragged all the other nations in its train.”⁵⁴⁸

Einstein had a reputation as a rabid anti-assimilationist—here again Einstein merely parroted the racist anti-assimilationism of his Zionist predecessors, like Solomon Schechter who dreaded assimilation more than pogroms—and Zionists encouraged pogroms in order to discourage assimilation.

Zionists were by no means alone in the anti-assimilationist panic that struck the western world at the end of the Nineteenth Century. In 1906, Chaim Weizmann had persuaded Arthur James Balfour to become a racist Zionist.⁵⁴⁹ In 1908, Balfour published a racist and nationalistic lecture on the subject of race degeneration and stagnation called *Decadence*.⁵⁵⁰ In America, Theodore Roosevelt had an enduring interest in racial questions and feared “racial suicide” and the decline of a race like the decline of an organism in old age.⁵⁵¹ On 5 March 1908, Roosevelt wrote to Balfour, later signatory of the Balfour Declaration,

“Most emphatically there is such a thing as ‘decadence’ of a nation, a race, a type; and it is no less true that we cannot give any adequate explanation of the phenomenon. Of course there are many partial explanations, and in some cases, as with the decay of the Mongol or Turkish monarchies, the sum of these partial explanations may represent the whole. But there are other cases, notably, of course, that of Rome in the ancient world, and, as I believe, that of Spain in the modern world, on a much smaller scale, where the sum of all the explanations is that they do not wholly explain. Something seems to have gone out of the people or peoples affected, and what it is no one can say.”⁵⁵²

The London Times wrote on 12 February 1919 on page 9, confirming that Balfour’s Declaration was based on precisely the same racist myths of “Blut und Boden” the Nazis would later assert to justify the racism of Nazi Germany,

“MR. BALFOUR ON ZIONISM. THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL HOME.

Mr. Balfour, in whose hands has been placed the interests of Palestinian Jewry at the Peace Conference, has written a preface to the History of Zionism, shortly to be published from the pen of M. Sokolow, one of the four leaders of the Zionist Executive Committee.

Mr. Balfour says that convinced by conversations with Dr. Weizmann in January, 1906, that if a home was to be found for the Jewish people,

homeless now for nearly 1900 years, it was vain to seek it anywhere but in Palestine. Answering the question why local sentiment is to be more considered in the case of the Jew than (say) in that of the Christian or the Buddhist, Mr. Balfour says:—‘The answer is, that the cases are not parallel. The position of the Jews is unique. For them race, religion, and country are interrelated, as they are interrelated in the case of no other race, no other religion, and no other country on earth. By a strange and most unhappy fate it is this people of all others which, retaining to the full its racial self-consciousness, has been severed from its home, has wandered into all lands and has nowhere been able to create for itself an organized social commonwealth. Only Zionism—so at least Zionists believe—can provide some mitigation of this great tragedy.

‘Doubtless there are difficulties, doubtless there are objections—great difficulties, very real objections. . . . Yet no one can reasonably doubt that if, as I believe, Zionism can be developed into a working scheme, the benefit it would bring to the Jewish people, especially perhaps to that section of it which most deserves our pity, would be great and lasting.’

The criticism that the Jews use their gifts to exploit for personal ends a civilization which they have not created, in communities they do little to maintain, Mr. Balfour declares to be false. He admits, however, that in large parts of Europe their loyalty to the State in which they dwell is (to put it mildly) feeble compared with their loyalty to their religion and their race. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? he asks. ‘In none of the regions of which I speak have they been given the advantages of equal citizenship; in some they have been given no right of citizenship at all.’

‘It seems evident that Zionism will mitigate the lot and elevate the status of no negligible fraction of the Jewish race. Those who go to Palestine will not be like those who now migrate to London or New York. . . . They will go in order to join a civil community which completely harmonizes with their historical and religious sentiments; a community bound to the land it inhabits by something deeper even than custom; a community whose members will suffer from no divided loyalty nor any temptation to hate the laws under which they are forced to live. To them the material gain should be great; but surely the spiritual gain will be greater still.’

Mr. Balfour goes on to consider the position of those, though Jews by descent, and often by religion, who desire wholly to identify themselves with the life of the country wherein they have made their home, many of them distinguished in art, medicine, politics, and law. ‘Many of this class,’ he says, ‘look with a certain measure of suspicion and even dislike upon the Zionist movement. They fear that it will adversely affect their position in the country of their adoption. The great majority of them have no desire to settle in Palestine. Even supposing a Zionist community were established, they would not join it. . . .

‘I cannot share these fears. I do not deny that, in some countries where legal equality is firmly established, Jews may still be regarded with a certain

measure of prejudice. But this prejudice, where it exists, is not due to Zionism, nor will Zionism embitter it. The tendency should surely be the other way. Everything which assimilates the national and international status of the Jews to that of other races ought to mitigate what remains of ancient antipathies; and evidently this assimilation would be promoted by giving them that which all other nations possess—a local habitation and a national home.”

Others repeated Theodor Herzl’s theme, that Jews could not assimilate, because the presence of Jews in a host nation ultimately led to anti-Semitism due to Jewish parasitism—according to Herzl. Hilaire Belloc was a strong advocate of the view that Jews should not integrate. Belloc published a book on the subject entitled *The Jews* in 1922, and expressed similar convictions in *G. K. ’s Weekly* in the 1930’s. Belloc wrote biographies of men who had fallen under the influence of Zionists, like Oliver Cromwell and Napoleon. Belloc, however, was strongly opposed to Nazism. Douglas Reed took a similar Zionist stance on the alleged unassimilability of Jews in the late 1930’s,⁵⁵³ though he later opposed Zionism.

Racist Zionist Solomon Schecter stated, in harmony with numerous political Zionists, though in opposition to the vast majority of Jews,

“It is this kind of assimilation [the death of a “race” through integration], with the terrible consequences indicated, that I dread most; even more than pogroms.”⁵⁵⁴

On 15 March 1921, Kurt Blumenfeld wrote to Chaim Weizmann,

“Einstein [***] is interested in our cause most strongly because of his revulsion from assimilatory Jewry.”⁵⁵⁵

Einstein stated in 1921,

“To deny the Jew’s nationality in the Diaspora is, indeed, deplorable. If one adopts the point of view of confining Jewish ethnical nationalism to Palestine, then one, to all intents and purposes, denies the existence of a Jewish people. In that case one should have the courage to carry through, in the quickest and most complete manner, entire assimilation. We live in a time of intense and perhaps exaggerated nationalism. But my Zionism does not exclude in me cosmopolitan views. I believe in the actuality of Jewish nationality, and I believe that every Jew has duties towards his coreligionists. [***] [T]he principal point is that Zionism must tend to strengthen the dignity and self-respect of the Jews in the Diaspora. I have always been annoyed by the undignified assimilationist cravings and strivings which I have observed in so many of my friends.”⁵⁵⁶

In 1921, Einstein declared, referring to Eastern European Jews,

“These men and women retain a healthy national feeling; it has not yet been destroyed by the process of atomisation and dispersion.”⁵⁵⁷

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[.]”⁵⁵⁸

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.”⁵⁵⁹

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.”

On 1 July 1921, Einstein was quoted in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on page 371,

“Let us take brief look at the *development of German Jews* over the last hundred years. With few exceptions, one hundred years ago our forefathers

still lived in the Ghetto. They were poor and separated from the Gentiles by a wall of religious tradition, secular lifestyles and statutory confinement and were confined in their spiritual development to their own literature, only relatively weakly influenced by the forceful progress which intellectual life in Europe had undergone in the Renaissance. However, these little noticed, modestly living people had one thing over us: *Every one of them belonged with all his heart to a community*, into which he was incorporated, in which he felt a worthwhile member, in which nothing was asked of him which conflicted with his normal processes of thought. Our forefathers of that era were pretty pathetic both bodily and spiritually, but—in social relations—in an enviable state of mental equilibrium. Then came emancipation. It offered undreamt of opportunities for advancement. The isolated individual quickly found their way into the upper financial and social circles of society. They eagerly absorbed the great achievements of art and science which the Occidentals⁵⁶⁰ had created. They contributed to the development with passionate affection, and themselves made contributions of lasting value. They thereby took on the lifestyle of the Gentile world, turning away from their religious and social traditions in growing masses—took on Gentile customs, manners and mentality. It appeared as if they were being completely dissolved into the numerically superior, politically and culturally better organized host peoples, such that no trace of them would be left after a few generations. The complete eradication of the Jewish nationality in Middle and Western Europe appeared to be inevitable. However, it didn't turn out that way. It appears that racially distinct nations have instincts which work against interbreeding. The adaptation of the Jews to the European peoples among whom they have lived in language, customs and indeed even partially in religious practices *was unable to eliminate all feelings of foreignness* which exist between Jews and their European host peoples. In short, this spontaneous feeling of foreignness is ultimately due to a loss of energy.⁵⁶¹ For this reason, *not even well-meant arguments can eradicate it*. Nationalities do not want to be mixed together, rather they want to go their own separate ways. A state of peace can only be achieved by mutual tolerance and respect.”

Einstein stated that Jews should not participate in the German Government,

“I regretted the fact that [Rathenau] became a Minister. In view of the attitude which large numbers of the educated classes in Germany assume towards the Jews, I have always thought that their natural conduct in public should be one of proud reserve.”⁵⁶²

Einstein merely parroted the Zionist Party line. Werner E. Mosse wrote,

“While the leaders of the CV saw it as their special duty to represent the interests of the German Jews in the active political struggle, Zionism stood

for. . . systematic Jewish non-participation in German public life. It rejected as a matter of principle any participation in the struggle led by the CV.”⁵⁶³

In 1925, Einstein wrote in the official Zionist organ *Jüdische Rundschau*,

“By study of their past, by a better understanding of the spirit [Geist] that accords with their race, they must learn to know anew the mission that they are capable of fulfilling. [***] What one must be thankful to Zionism for is the fact that it is the only movement that has given many Jews a justified pride, that it has once again given a despairing race the necessary faith, if I may so express myself, given new flesh to an exhausted people.”⁵⁶⁴

On 12 October 1929, Albert Einstein wrote to the *Manchester Guardian*,

“In the re-establishment of the Jewish nation in the ancient home of the race, where Jewish spiritual values could again be developed in a Jewish atmosphere, the most enlightened representatives of Jewish individuality see the essential preliminary to the regeneration of the race and the setting free of its spiritual creativeness.”⁵⁶⁵

Einstein’s public racism eventually waned, but he continued to publicly express his segregationist philosophy in the same terms as anti-Semites, as well as his belief that Jews “thrived on” and owed their “continued existence” to anti-Semitism. Einstein stated in December of 1930 to an American audience,

“There is something indefinable which holds the Jews together. Race does not make much for solidarity. Here in America you have many races, and yet you have the solidarity. Race is not the cause of the Jews’ solidarity, nor is their religion. It is something else—which is indefinable.”⁵⁶⁶

Einstein’s confusing public statement perhaps resulted from his desire to promote multi-culturalism in America, which had the benefit of freeing up Jewish immigration to the United States.⁵⁶⁷ Einstein was also likely parroting, or trying to parrot, a fellow anti-assimilationist political Zionist whose pamphlet was well known in America, Solomon Schechter and his *Zionism: A Statement*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1906), in which Schechter states, among other things, “Zionism is an ideal, and as such is indefinable.”⁵⁶⁸

Einstein stated in 1938,

“JUST WHAT IS A JEW?”

The formation of groups has an invigorating effect in all spheres of human striving, perhaps mostly due to the struggle between the convictions and aims represented by the different groups. The Jews, too, form such a group with a definite character of its own, and anti-Semitism is nothing but the antagonistic attitude produced in the non-Jews by the Jewish group. This

is a normal social reaction. But for the political abuse resulting from it, it might never have been designated by a special name.

What are the characteristics of the Jewish group? What, in the first place, is a Jew? There are no quick answers to this question. The most obvious answer would be the following: A Jew is a person professing the Jewish faith. The superficial character of this answer is easily recognized by means of a simple parallel. Let us ask the question: What is a snail? An answer similar in kind to the one given above might be: A snail is an animal inhabiting a snail shell. This answer is not altogether incorrect; nor, to be sure, is it exhaustive; for the snail shell happens to be but one of the material products of the snail. Similarly, the Jewish faith is but one of the characteristic products of the Jewish community. It is, furthermore, known that a snail can shed its shell without thereby ceasing to be a snail. The Jew who abandons his faith (in the formal sense of the word) is in a similar position. He remains a Jew.

[***]

WHERE OPPRESSION IS A STIMULUS

[***]

Perhaps even more than on its own tradition, the Jewish group has thrived on oppression and on the antagonism it has forever met in the world. Here undoubtedly lies one of the main reasons for its continued existence through so many thousands of years."

Albert Einstein was parroting racist political Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, who wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

"Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps

actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”⁵⁶⁹

In 1938, Einstein stated in his essay “Our Debt to Zionism”,

“Rarely since the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus has the Jewish community experienced a period of greater oppression than prevails at the present time. [***] Yet we shall survive this period too, no matter how much sorrow, no matter how heavy a loss in life it may bring. A community like ours, which is a community purely by reason of tradition, can only be strengthened by pressure from without.”⁵⁷⁰

Einstein avowed *circa* 3 April 1920, that,

“If what anti-Semites claim were true, then indeed there would be nothing weaker, more wretched, and unfit for life, than the German people”.⁵⁷¹

Einstein often avowed that the anti-Semites’ beliefs were true, and, hence, Einstein wished the Germans dead. When discussing the meaning of life, Einstein spoke to Peter A. Bucky about persons and creatures who “[do] not deserve to be in our world” and are “hardly fit for life.”⁵⁷² Einstein’s language is quite similar to the language of Hitler’s “T4” “*Euthanasia-Programme*”.

After siding with Germany’s enemies in the First World War—while living in Germany, and after intentionally provoking Germans into increased anti-Semitism, which he thought was good for Jews, and after defaming German Nobel Prize laureates in the international press to the point where they felt obliged to join Hitler’s cause, which cause eventually resulted in the genocide of Europe’s Jews; Einstein sponsored the production of genocidal weapons to mass murder Germans, whom he had hated all of his life, in the famous letter to President Roosevelt that Einstein signed urging Roosevelt to begin the development of atomic bombs—before the mass murder of Jews had begun.⁵⁷³

Einstein callously asserted that the use of atomic bombs on civilian populations was “morally justified”. I quote Einstein without delving into the question of who first bombed civilian centers,

“It should not be forgotten that the atomic bomb was made in this country as a preventive measure; it was to head off its use by the Germans, if they discovered it. The bombing of civilian centers was initiated by the Germans and adopted by the Japanese. To it the Allies responded in kind—as it turned out, with greater effectiveness—and they were morally justified in doing so.”⁵⁷⁴

Einstein advocated genocidal collective punishment,

“The Germans as an entire people are responsible for these mass murders and

must be punished as a people if there is justice in the world and if the consciousness of collective responsibility in the nations is not to perish from the earth entirely.”⁵⁷⁵

and,

“It is possible either to destroy the German people or keep them suppressed; it is not possible to educate them to think and act along democratic lines in the foreseeable future.”⁵⁷⁶

Albrecht Fölsing has assembled a compilation of post-WW II quotations from Einstein, which evince Einstein’s lifelong habit of stereotyping people based on their ethnicity. Einstein expressed his hatred in the horrific post-Holocaust context—a temptation Max Born had resisted,

“With the Germans having murdered my Jewish brethren in Europe, I do not wish to have anything more to do with Germans, not even with a relatively harmless Academy. [***] The crimes of the Germans are really the most hideous that the history of the so-called civilized nations has to show. [***] [It was] evident that a proud Jew no longer wishes to be connected with any kind of German official event or institution. [***] After the mass murder committed by the Germans against my Jewish brethren I do not wish any publications of mine to appear in Germany.”⁵⁷⁷

Einstein wrote to Born on 15 September 1950 that his views towards Germans predated the Nazi period,

“I have not changed my attitude to the Germans, which, by the way, dates not just from the Nazi period. All human beings are more or less the same from birth. The Germans, however, have a far more dangerous tradition than any of the other so-called civilized nations. The present behavior of these other nations towards the Germans merely proves to me how little human beings learn even from their most painful experiences.”⁵⁷⁸

and on learning that Born would return to Germany, Einstein wrote on 12 October 1953,

“If anyone can be held responsible for the fact that you are migrating back to the land of the mass-murderers of our kinsmen, it is certainly your adopted fatherland — universally notorious for its parsimony.”⁵⁷⁹

4.6 Racist Jewish Hypocrisy, Intimidation and Censorship

Sigmund Freud used prominent Gentiles, or “Goyim” as Freud called them, to promote his theories of psychology. He did this to give himself and the theories he

plagiarized from Plato and others credibility in the broader “Gentile world”. Though Freud thought that Gentiles were inferior to Jews, Freud was after fame.

Freud was another feted Jewish racist, who believed that the Jews were a superior race. Kevin MacDonald wrote in his book *The Culture of Critique*,

“Freud’s powerful racial sense of ingroup-outgroup barriers between Jews and gentiles may also be seen in the personal dynamics of the psychoanalytic movement. We have seen that Jews were numerically dominant within psychoanalysis, especially in the early stages when all the members were Jews. ‘The fact that these were Jews was certainly not accidental. I also think that in a profound though unacknowledged sense Freud wanted it that way’ (Yerushalmi 1991, 41). As in other forms of Judaism, there was a sense of being an ingroup within a specifically Jewish milieu. ‘Whatever the reasons—historical, sociological—group bonds did provide a warm shelter from the outside world. In social relations with other Jews, informality and familiarity formed a kind of inner security, a ‘we-feeling,’ illustrated even by the selection of jokes and stories recounted within the group’ (Grollman 1965, 41). Also adding to the Jewish milieu of the movement was the fact that Freud was idolized by Jews generally. Freud himself noted in his letters that ‘from all sides and places, the Jews have enthusiastically seized me for themselves.’ ‘He was embarrassed by the way they treated him as if he were ‘a God-fearing Chief Rabbi,’ or ‘a national hero,’ and by the way they viewed his work as ‘genuinely Jewish’ (in Klein 1981, 85; see also Gay 1988, 599).

As in the case of several Jewish movements and political activities reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3 (see also *SAID*, Ch. 6), Freud took great pains to ensure that a gentile, Jung, would be the head of his psychoanalytic movement—a move that infuriated his Jewish colleagues in Vienna, but one that was clearly intended to deemphasize the very large overrepresentation of Jews in the movement during this period. To persuade his Jewish colleagues of the need for Jung to head the society, he argued, ‘Most of you are Jews, and therefore you are incompetent to win friends for the new teaching. Jews must be content with the modest role of preparing the ground. It is absolutely essential that I should form ties in the world of science’ (in Gay 1988, 218). As Yerushalmi (1991, 41) notes, ‘To put it very crudely, Freud needed a goy, and not just any goy but one of genuine intellectual stature and influence.’ Later, when the movement was reconstituted after World War I, another gentile, the sycophantic and submissive Ernest Jones, became president of the International Psychoanalytic Association.”⁵⁸⁰

The aggressive rôle that the “Shabbas Goy” Max von Laue played in personally attacking Einstein’s critics was a part of this pattern.⁵⁸¹ He put a Gentile face on the assault against the rights of Einstein’s critics to hold their own opinions and express them in public. Laue championed a smear campaign against Einstein’s critics in the full knowledge that Einstein had plagiarized the works of Poincaré and Lorentz, and

in full knowledge of the fact that the experimental evidence which had allegedly confirmed the general theory of relativity, did not confirm it, but rather disproved it.

Laue must have known that Einstein was an outspoken Jewish racist, but instead of condemning Einstein for his racism, Laue let himself be used to miscast the scientific and ethical critique of Einstein as if it were an expression of anti-Jewish racism. Einstein played a central rôle in corrupting the universities, the journals and the popular press of his day with Jewish racists and sycophantic Gentiles, who would promote him and the theories he appropriated from others.

Freud did not invent the field of psychology. He was a career plagiarist and he largely deprived the field of its synthetic scientific basis, which appeared in the earlier work of Spencer and James. Freud converted psychology into an introspective metaphysical analysis of his own mental maladies. Freud abused the pseudoscientific doctrines he plagiarized, and the fame he had achieved through the Jewish community, to make political attacks against persons whom he hated, and against Rome—against the Catholic Church. Largely under the directorship of Jews, the field of psychology degenerated into a sadistic house of tortures and mutilation. It was exploited as a means to suppress dissent, especially in Marxist countries, and particularly in the hands of Jews. Psychology, under Freud, also become a means to enrich psychiatrists by providing sick persons with someone with whom they could talk, and giving them the false hope that this panacea of talk would cure them of their physical ailments.

Max Born intimated in his 16 July 1955 lecture in Bern (as had Moszkowski and Freundlich) that the hype promoting Einstein in 1919 was intended, in part, as a *rapprochement* between Great Britain and Germany after the war. Eddington wrote to Einstein on 1 December 1919,

“It is the best possible thing that could have happened for scientific relations between England and Germany. I do not anticipate rapid progress towards official reunion, but there is a big advance towards a more reasonable frame of mind among scientific men, and that is even more important than the renewal of formal associations. [***] [T]hings have turned out very fortunately in giving this object-lesson of the solidarity of German and British science even in time of war.”⁵⁸²

Others wrote of their excitement that the eclipse sensation would promote better international relations.⁵⁸³

This indicates that the eclipse “observations” signified a political maneuver, not a legitimate experiment. At the time much was made of the fact that Einstein’s book had been translated into English and was the first book to be translated from German to English after the war.⁵⁸⁴ Einstein’s correspondence regarding this translation and his article for the *The London Times* also reveal some of the political motives of *rapprochement* behind the Einstein hype of 1919, and beyond.⁵⁸⁵

In 1955, Born stated that the eclipse expeditions of 1919 created an undescrivable stir around the world,

“EINSTEIN became at once the most famous and popular figure, the man who had broken through the wall of hatred and united the scientists to a common effort, the man who had replaced ISAAC NEWTON’s system of the world by another and better one. But at the same time an opposition, which had already been apparent while I was in Berlin, grew under the leadership of PHILIPP LENARD and JOHANNES STARK. It was springing from the most absurd mixture of scientific conservatism and prejudice with racial and political emotions, due to EINSTEIN’s Jewish descent and pacifistic, antimilitaristic convictions.”⁵⁸⁶

Born also stated,

“[. . .]EINSTEIN’s theory was new and revolutionary, an effort was needed to assimilate it. Not everybody was able or willing to do so. Thus the period after EINSTEIN’s discovery was full of controversy, sometime of bitter strife.”⁵⁸⁷

Nobel Prize laureates Philipp Lenard (1905 Nobel Prize for Physics) and Johannes Stark (1919 Nobel Prize for Physics) had initially sponsored Einstein and his work, and it was only after Einstein played the race card—publicly and internationally smearing Philipp Lenard without cause, that race became an issue in the debate over relativity theory—mostly for Einstein, Max von Laue and Max Born, who had a financial interest in the Einstein myth, and for the press people who smeared Einstein’s opponents. They desperately wanted to change the subject from the legitimate claims of Einstein’s plagiarism, legitimate arguments against the irrationality of the theory of relativity and the shameless hype and misrepresentation of experimental evidence by Einstein and his friends, to name-calling and racial strife provoked by them.

Lenard and Stark initially opposed Einstein on purely scientific and ethical grounds related to Einstein’s sophistry, self-promotion and plagiarism. They later embraced Nazism and its racial mythologies.

Einstein eventually succeeded in bringing racial politics into the debate, though it was initially a larger issue for him than for his opponents. Einstein most often outright refused to discuss his plagiarism or purely scientific, non-political critiques of the theory of relativity; but he did not hesitate to name-call and smear his critics. He could not win in a dispute over the scientific and historical facts, so he provoked a race war over relativity theory in order to avoid legitimate criticism. It was a war everyone would ultimately lose.

Einstein’s complaints were hypocritical. He himself sought ethnically segregated educational institutions and an ethnically segregated society and often stated that anti-Semitism was both correct and good for Jews. Einstein had bad experiences early in his youth⁵⁸⁸ and always bore a stereotypical prejudice against Gentile Germans, which is consistent with the racism inherent in genocidal Judaism.

Max Born, himself, “played the race card” and misrepresented events at the Bad Nauheim debate. Born stated,

“[Philipp Lenard] directed sharp, nasty attacks against Einstein, with a blatantly anti-Semitic tendency. Einstein became agitated and answered him sharply, and I believe I remember that I supported him.”⁵⁸⁹

Born took pride in his biased and unfair efforts to quash any opposition to Einstein’s mythologies. Born stated,

“There appeared attacks against EINSTEIN by well-known scientists and philosophers in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* which aroused my pugnacity. I answered in a rather sharp article.”⁵⁹⁰

Born’s contradictory claim that Einstein had concurrently united and divided scientists indicates Born’s blindness to his own hypocrisy and the magnitude of the zealotry he felt for his political cause, which he believed would make him rich. While Born and his ilk boasted of their opposition to anti-Semitism, they themselves were elements in the atmosphere which created Hitler’s tragic ascent to power, and for them to pretend to victory among that horror, greatly dishonors the innocent lives lost in the Holocaust. Political Zionists, Einstein among them—Born not, saw anti-Semitism as a good thing and promoted segregation and racial tension. Some even delighted in the fact that forced segregation would bring more Jews into the political Zionist camp.

Albert Einstein was one of the world’s leading political Zionists. Political Zionism was a new form of racism that emerged at the end of the Nineteenth Century. It held that Jews were a pure race that could not coexist with non-Jews. Einstein had many powerful friends in the Zionist and Socialist press. Einstein’s friends and supporters, in what political Zionist founder Theodor Herzl called the “Jewish papers”,⁵⁹¹ libeled those who opposed Einstein or the theory of relativity and deflected attention from Einstein’s plagiarism by misrepresenting any criticism of Einstein as if it were anti-Semitism, *per se*.⁵⁹²

There was also an anti-Einstein press and an unbiased press which documented Einstein’s plagiarism and his scientific and philosophical defeats. Like radicals in general, radical Socialists, Zionists and Communists had well-deserved reputations as defamers, which manifested itself in their vitriolic attacks on Jewish leaders who refused to fund their schemes; or, in the case of Zionism, opposed their racist agenda. Einstein stated, “But in Germany the judgement of my theory depended on the party politics of the Press[.]”⁵⁹³ German newspapers had well-deserved reputations as being organs for the many political parties which were active in Germany in the Teens of the Twentieth Century. They brought politics into science in a way not previously known.

Einstein took advantage of the political climate after World War I to change the subject from the accusations of plagiarism against him, which were easily proven, to racial politics, which were explosive at the time. It is tragic that the search for the truth in Physics, and in Ethics related to priorities, became a political issue centered on “the Jewish question”, but Einstein succeeded in making it one.

Political Zionists, Einstein and his friends among them, have earned a reputation

throughout their history for preventing free and open public dialog about important issues they would rather not see discussed. They have often had open access to the press to publish their smears and the means to largely prevent those who have been wronged from responding. They accomplish these feats by: spuriously presuming to speak for all persons of Jewish descent, organized intimidation, boycott, smear tactic, intensive letter writing campaigns which give an inflated appearance that their views are widely held, threats and acts of violence, etc.

Even the disciples of Christ are said to have feared Jewish tribalism and Jewish religious intolerance, for example in *John* 20:19:

“Then the same day at evening, being the first *day* of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you.”

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 143 and 165,

“IN his defense of Flaccus [*Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28], a Roman governor who had ‘squeezed’ his Jewish subjects, Cicero lowers his voice when he comes to speak of the Jews, for, as he explains to the judges, there are persons who might excite against him this numerous, clannish and powerful element. With much greater reason might an American lower his voice to-day in discussing two million Hebrew immigrants united by a strong race consciousness and already ably represented at every level of wealth, power, and influence in the United States. [***] This cruel prejudice—for all lump condemnations are cruel—is no importation, no hang-over from the past. It appears to spring out of contemporary experience and is invading circle after circle of broad-minded. People who give their lives to befriending immigrants shake their heads over the Galician Hebrews. It is astonishing how much of the sympathy that twenty years ago went out to the fugitives from Russian massacres has turned sour. Through fear of retaliation little criticism gets into print; in the open the Philo-semites have it all their way. The situation is: Honey above, gall beneath. If the Czar, by keeping up the pressure which has already rid him of two million undesired subjects, should succeed in driving the bulk of his six million Jews to the United States, we shall see the rise of the Jewish question here, perhaps riots and anti-Jewish legislation. No doubt thirty or forty thousand Hebrews from eastern Europe might be absorbed by this country each year without any marked growth of race prejudice; but when they come in two or three or even four times as fast, the lump outgrows the leaven, and there will be trouble.”

Cicero’s *Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28, states,

“XXVIII. The next thing is that charge about the Jewish gold. And this, forsooth, is the reason why this cause is pleaded near the steps of Aurelius. It is on account of this charge, O Lælius, that this place and that mob has been selected by you. You know how numerous that crowd is, how great is its unanimity, and of what weight it is in the popular assemblies. I will speak in a low voice, just so as to let the judges hear me. For men are not wanting who would be glad to excite that people against me and against every eminent man; and I will not assist them and enable them to do so more easily. As gold, under pretence of being given to the Jews, was accustomed every year to be exported out of Italy and all the provinces to Jerusalem, Flaccus issued an edict establishing a law that it should not be lawful for gold to be exported out of Asia. And who is there, O judges, who cannot honestly praise this measure? The senate had often decided, and when I was consul it came to a most solemn resolution that gold ought not to be exported. But to resist this barbarous superstition were an act of dignity, to despise the multitude of Jews, which at times was most unruly in the assemblies in defence of the interests of the republic, was an act of the greatest wisdom. ‘But Cnæus Pompeius, after he had taken Jerusalem, though he was a conqueror, touched nothing which was in that temple.’ In the first place, he acted wisely, as he did in many other instances, in leaving no room for his detractors to say anything against him, in a city so prone to suspicion and to evil speaking. For I do not suppose that the religion of the Jews, our enemies, was any obstacle to that most illustrious general, but that he was hindered by his own modesty. Where then is the guilt? Since you nowhere impute any theft to us, since you approve of the edict, and confess that it was passed in due form, and do not deny that the gold was openly sought for and produced, the facts of the case themselves show that the business was executed by the instrumentality of men of the highest character. There was a hundredweight of gold, more or less, openly seized at Apamea, and weighed out in the forum at the feet of the prætor, by Sextus Cæsius, a Roman knight, a most excellent and upright man; twenty pounds weight or a little more were seized at Laodicea, by Lucius Peducæus, who is here in court, one of our judges; some was seized also at Adramyttium, by Cnæus Domitius, the lieutenant, and a small quantity at Pergamus. The amount of the gold is known; the gold is in the treasury; no theft is imputed to him; but it is attempted to render him unpopular. The speaker turns away from the judges, and addresses himself to the surrounding multitude. Each city, O Lælius, has its own peculiar religion; we have ours. While Jerusalem was flourishing, and while the Jews were in a peaceful state, still the religious ceremonies and observances of that people were very much at variance with the splendour of this empire, and the dignity of our name, and the institutions of our ancestors. And they are the more odious to us now, because that nation has shown by arms what were its feelings towards our supremacy. How dear it was to the immortal gods is proved by its having been defeated, by its revenues having been farmed out to our contractors, by its being reduced to a state of subjection.”⁵⁹⁴

United States Army Captain Montgomery Schuyler reported on 1 March 1919,

“It is probably unwise to say this loudly in the United States but the Bolshevik movement is and has been since its beginning guided and controlled by Russian Jews of the greasiest type[. . .]”⁵⁹⁵

Senator Ernest F. Hollings argued before the United States that his position was being mischaracterized, when he put America’s interests ahead of the Neo-Conservatives’ plan for providing Israel with hegemony in the Mid-East and was called “anti-Semitic”. Senator Hollings’ comments appear in the *Congressional Record* (Proceedings and Debates of the 108th Congress, Second Session), Volume 150, Number 72, (20 May 2004), pages S5921-S5925; which includes Senator Hollings’ article, “Bush’s Failed Mideast Policy is Creating More Terrorism”, *Charleston Post and Courier*, 6 May 2004, which article has appeared in several websites. The *Congressional Record* is also available online. At pages S5921-S5925, Senator Hollings states, *inter alia*,

“Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues. I have, this afternoon, the opportunity to respond to being charged as anti-Semitic when I proclaimed the policy of President Bush in the Mideast as not for Iraq or really for democracy in the sense that he is worried about Saddam and democracy. If he were worried about democracy in the Mideast, as we wanted to spread it as a policy, we would have invaded Lebanon, which is half a democracy and has terrorism and terrorists who have been problems to the interests of Israel and the United States. [***] I want to read an article that appeared in the Post and Courier in Charleston on May 6; thereafter, I think in the State newspaper in Columbia a couple days later; and in the Greenville News—all three major newspapers in South Carolina. You will find that there is no anti-Semitic reference whatsoever in it. [***] But in any event, the better way to do it is go right in and establish our predominance in Iraq and then, as they say, and I have different articles here I could refer to, next is Iran and then Syria. And it is the domino theory, and they genuinely believe it. I differ. I think, frankly, we have caused more terrorism than we have gotten rid of. That is my Israel policy. You can’t have an Israel policy other than what AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee] gives you around here. I have followed them mostly in the main, but I have also resisted signing certain letters from time to time, to give the poor President a chance. I can tell you no President takes office—I don’t care whether it is a Republican or a Democrat—that all of a sudden AIPAC will tell him exactly what the policy is, and Senators and members of Congress ought to sign letters. I read those carefully and I have joined in most of them. On some I have held back. I have my own idea and my own policy. I have stated it categorically. [***] Again, let me read: Bush thought tax cuts would hold his crowd together and that spreading democracy in the Mideast to secure Israel would take the Jewish vote from the Democrats. Is there anything

wrong with referring to the Jewish vote? Good gosh, every 1 of us of the 100, with pollsters and all, refer to the Jewish vote. That is not anti-Semitic. It is appreciating them. We campaigned for it. I just read about President Bush's appearance before the AIPAC. He confirmed his support of the Jewish vote, referring to adopting Ariel Sharon's policy, and the dickens with the 1967 borders, the heck with negotiating the return of refugees, the heck with the settlements he had objected to originally. They had those borders, Resolution No. 242—no, no, President Bush said: I am going along with Sharon, and he was going to get that and he got the wonderful reception he got with the Jewish vote. There is nothing like politicizing or a conspiracy, as my friend from Virginia, Senator ALLEN, says—that it is an anti-Semitic, political, conspiracy statement. That is not a conspiracy. That is the policy. I didn't like to keep it a secret, maybe; but I can tell you now, I will challenge any 1 of the other 99 Senators to tell us why we are in Iraq, other than what this policy is here. It is an adopted policy, a domino theory of The Project For The New American Century. Everybody knows it because we want to secure our friend, Israel. If we can get in there and take it in 7 days, as Paul Wolfowitz says, then we would get rid of Saddam, and when we got rid of Saddam, now all they can do is fall back and say: Aren't you getting rid of Saddam? Let me get to that point. What happens is, they say he is a monster. We continued to give him aid after he gassed his own people and everything else of that kind. George Herbert Walker Bush said in his book *All The Best* in 1999, never commit American GIs into an unwinnable urban guerrilla war and lose the support of the Arab world, lose their friendship and support. That is a general rephrasing of it. The point is, my authority is the President's daddy. I want everybody to know that. I don't apologize for this column. I want them to apologize to me for talking about anti-Semitism. They are not getting by with it. I will come down here every day—I have nothing else to do—and we will talk about it and find out what the policy is. [***] We are losing the terrorism war because we thought we could do it militarily under the domino policy of President Bush, going into Iraq. That is my point. That is not anti-Semite or whatever they say in here about people's faith and ethnicity. I never referred to any faith. I should have added those other names from the Project For The New American Century, but I picked out the names I had quotes for. And for space, I left other things out. Mr. President, on May 12 of this year, I had printed in the *RECORD* the article in its entirety. I diverted from the reading of the article several times, so for the sake of accuracy I wanted the whole article printed. This particular op-ed piece appeared in the *Post and Courier*. Never would they have thought, having read it, if it was anti-Semitic, that they would have ever put it in there. Nor would the *Knight Ridder* newspapers in Columbia, SC. Nor would the *Metro Media* newspapers in Greenville, SC. But the Anti-Defamation League picked it up and now they have given it to my good friend, Senator ALLEN of Virginia. I have his particular admonition how I am anti-Semitic and I cannot let that stay there. [***] Come on. So we have to go out and not speak

sense with respect to policy, and when you want to talk about policy, they say it is anti-Semitic. Well, come on the floor, let's debate it. Because my friend from Virginia admonishes me. Referring to me he says, 'I suggest he should learn from history before making accusations.' I didn't make any accusations. I stated facts. That is their policy. That is not my policy."

Former Illinois Congressman Paul Findley experienced first hand the ability and willingness of Zionists in more recent times to defame those who call for open public debate on issues the Zionists would rather suppress, or would have told from their heavily biased perspective and from their perspective only. Findley has written several books exposing the Zionists' ability to unfairly smear him and others, and to force silence through intimidation on any who would otherwise side with Findley in his efforts to involve the American people in an honest and open dialog about the rights of Palestinians.⁵⁹⁶ Just as the Zionists have often sought to suppress public discussion of the Palestinians' rights and an honest discussion of what is in America's best interests, as opposed to the Zionists' perceived self-interests, political Zionists—and indeed like minded Marxist-leaning Socialists—have often obstructed public debate about Einstein's plagiarism from the moment Einstein became their most famous and important spokesman.

Many have been wrongfully and viciously smeared as alleged "anti-Semites" because they refuse to discriminate in their opposition to racism, including but not limited to, their opposition to political Zionist racism. The vast majority of Jews initially opposed political Zionism due to its expressed racism. Their leaders were smeared. After the founding of Israel, debate was largely stifled.

Prof. Tony Martin was attacked when he added the book *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*⁵⁹⁷ among his offerings in the school bookstore at the university at which he taught. In his book, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993); Prof. Martin details the organized attacks he faced when exposing Jewish involvement in the slave trade and Jewish racism towards blacks. Prof. Martin expositis upon the fact that the Hamitic myth, the "curse of Ham", which condemns Blacks to perpetual slavery and degrades the stereotypical phenotype of a black person or "Canaanite", stems from the story of Noah and his son Ham in the Old Testament (*Genesis* 9:20-27); and from the racist Talmudic interpretations of this story; as well as their misuse to justify the injustice and inhumanity of Black slavery, which was a profitable industry for Jews, especially the trade to Brazil, where the Jews also profited from agriculture—in particular sugar cane.⁵⁹⁸

Genesis 9:20-27:

"20 And Noah began *to be* an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: 21 And he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. 22 And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. 23 And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid *it* upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces *were* backward, and they saw not

their father's nakedness. 24 And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. 25 And he said, Cursed *be* Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. 26 And he said, Blessed *be* the LORD God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. 27 God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

Harold Brackman wrote of the evolution of the Hamitic myth in his PhD dissertation in 1977,

"The opening centuries of the Christian era constituted an interregnum in the native African record of historical achievement separating Cush's era of ancient prominence from the medieval accomplishments of the great Negro states of the Sudan. These same centuries formed the seedbed of rabbinic Judaism. And this fateful coincidence goes far toward explaining why they also formed such fertile soil for the growth of Jewish lore demeaning the Negro. The most famous of these anti-Negro legends cluster about Ham and Noah's cursing of Canaan [***] There is no denying that the Babylonian Talmud was the first source to read a Negrophobic content into the episode by stressing Canaan's fraternal connections with Cush [***] The Talmudic glosses of the episode added the stigma of blackness to the fate of enslavement that Noah predicted for Ham's progeny [***] According to it, Ham is told by his outraged father [Noah] that, because you have abused me in the darkness of the night, your children shall be born black and ugly; because you have twisted your head to cause me embarrassment, they shall have kinky hair and red eyes; because your lips jested at my exposure, theirs shall swell; and because you neglected my nakedness, they shall go naked[.]"⁵⁹⁹

The racist Talmud states in *Sanhedrin* 70a,

"Ubar the Galilean gave the following exposition: The letter *waw* [*and*]⁴ occurs thirteen times in the passage dealing with wine: *And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: And he drank of the wine and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. And Ham the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father, and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him.*⁵ [With respect to the last verse] Rab and Samuel [differ,] one maintaining that he castrated him, whilst the other says that he sexually abused him. He who maintains that he castrated him, [reasons thus;] Since he cursed him by his fourth son,⁶ he must have injured him with respect to a fourth son.⁷ But he who says that he sexually abused him, draws an analogy between '*and he*

saw' written twice. Here it is written, *And Ham the father of Canaan saw the nakedness of his father*; whilst elsewhere it is written, *And when Shechem the son of Hamor saw her [he took her and lay with her and defiled here]*.⁸ Now, on the view that he emasculated him, it is right that he cursed him by his fourth son; but on the view that he abused him, why did he curse his fourth son: he should have cursed him himself?—Both indignities were perpetrated.^{1,600}

The racist Talmud states in *Sanhedrin* 108b,

“Our Rabbis taught: Three copulated in the ark, and they were all punished—the dog, the raven, and Ham. The dog was doomed to be tied, the raven expectorates [his seed into his mates mouth], and Ham was smitten in his skin. [*Footnote*: I.e., from him descended Cush (the negro) who is black-skinned.]”⁶⁰¹

The racist *Midrash Rabbah* (Genesis 36:7) states,

“7. AND NOAH AWOKE FROM HIS WINE (IX, 24): he was sobered from his wine.

AND KNEW WHAT HIS YOUNGEST SON HAD DONE UNTO HIM. Here it means, his worthless son, as you read, *Because the brazen altar that was before the Lord was too little to receive the burnt-offering*, etc. (I Kings VIII, 64).¹

AND HE SAID: CURSED BE CANAAN (IX, 25): Ham sinned and Canaan is cursed! R. Judah and R. Nehemiah disagreed. R. Judah said: Since it is written, *And God blessed Noah and his sons* (Gen. IX, 1), while there cannot be a curse where a blessing has been given, consequently, HE SAID: CURSED BE CANAAN. R. Nehemiah explained: It was Canaan who saw it [in the first place] and informed them, therefore the curse is attached to him who did wrong.

R. Berekiah said: Noah grieved very much in the Ark that he had no young son to wait on him, and declared, ‘When I go out I will beget a young son to do this for me.’ But when Ham acted thus to him, he exclaimed, ‘You have prevented me from begetting a young son to serve me,’² therefore that man [your son] will be a servant to his brethren!’ R. Huna said in R. Joseph’s name: [Noah declared], ‘You have prevented me from begetting a fourth son, therefore I curse your fourth son.’³ R. Huna also said in R. Joseph’s name: You have prevented me from doing something in the dark [sc. cohabitation], therefore your seed will be ugly and dark-skinned. R. Hiyya said: Ham and the dog copulated in the Ark, therefore Ham came forth black-skinned while the dog publicly exposes its copulation. R. Levi said: This may be compared to one who minted his own coinage⁴ in the very palace of the king, whereupon the king ordered: I decree that his effigy be defaced and his coinage cancelled. Similarly, Ham and the dog copulated in the Ark and were

punished.⁵⁹⁹⁶⁰²

Moses Maimonides, a famous Jewish philosopher and a racist, wrote in the Twelfth Century in his *Guide of the Perplexed*,

“Now I shall interpret to you this parable that I have invented. I say then: Those who are outside the city are all human individuals who have no doctrinal belief, neither one based on speculation nor one that accepts the authority of tradition: such individuals as the furthestmost Turks found in the remote North, the Negroes found in the remote South, and those who resemble them from among them that are with us in these climes. The status of those is like that of irrational animals. To my mind they do not have the rank of men, but have among the beings a rank lower than the rank of man but higher than the rank of the apes. For they have the external shape and lineaments of a man and a faculty of discernment that is superior to that of the apes.”⁶⁰³

The racist cabalistic doctrine of the *Zohar*, I, 73a, associates Blacks with the racist Jewish legend that Eve copulated with the serpent and produced a demonic race that descends from Cain, who slew his brother Abel. Racist Jews claimed that the dark skin of Blacks was the “mark of Cain” (*Genesis* 4:10-12, 15), and the “curse of Ham”. The *Zohar* states,

“Of the three sons of Noah that went forth from the ark, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Shem is symbolic of the right side, Ham of the left side, whilst Japheth represents the ‘purple’, which is a mixture of the two. AND HAM WAS THE FATHER OF CANAAN. Ham represents the refuse and dross of the gold, the stirring and rousing of the unclean spirit of the ancient serpent. It is for that reason that he is designated the ‘father of Canaan’, namely, of Canaan who brought curses on the world, of Canaan who was cursed, of Canaan who darkened the faces of mankind. For this reason, too, Ham is given a special mention in the words, ‘Ham, the father of Canaan’, that is, the notorious world-darkener, whereas we are not told that Shem was the father of such-a-one, or that Japheth was the father of such-a-one. No sooner is Ham mentioned, than he is pointed to as the father of Canaan. Hence when Abraham came on the scene, it is written, ‘And Abraham passed through the land’ (Gen. xii, 6), for this was before the establishment of the patriarchs and before the seed of Israel existed in the world, so that the land could not yet be designated by this honoured and holy name. Observe that when Israel were virtuous the land was called by their name, the Land of Israel; but when they were not worthy it was called by another name, to wit, the Land of Canaan. Hence it is written: AND HE SAID, CURSED BE CANAAN, A SERVANT OF SERVANTS SHALL HE BE UNTO HIS BRETHREN, for the reason that he brought curses on the world, in the same way as the serpent, against whom was pronounced the doom, ‘Cursed art thou among all cattle’ (Gen. III,

14).”⁶⁰⁴

The stigmata of the “mark of Cain”, which Jewish racists placed on Blacks, had a lasting destructive effect and was used to justify slavery in the Americas and anti-miscegenation laws. A black slave named Phillis Wheatley published a poem in 1773, which evinces the racist accusation that blacks bear the mark of Cain,

“On being brought from AFRICA to
AMERICA.

’T WAS mercy brought me from my *Pagan*
land,
Taught my benighted soul to understand
That there’s a God, that there’s a *Saviour* too:
Once I redemption neither sought nor knew,
Some view our sable race with scornful eye,
‘Their colour is a diabolic die.’
Remember, *Christians, Negros*, black as *Cain*,
May be refin’d, and join th’ angelic train.”⁶⁰⁵

Congressman Paul Findley stated, among his many revealing remarks about Zionist influence,

“Journalist Harold R. Piety observes that ‘the ugly cry of anti-Semitism is the bludgeon used by the Zionists to bully non-Jews into accepting the Zionist view of world events, or to keep silent.’ In late 1978 Piety, withholding his identity in order not to irritate his employer, wrote an article on ‘Zionism and the American Press’ for *Middle East International* in which he decried ‘the inaccuracies, distortions and—perhaps worst—inexcusable omission of significant news and background material by the American media in its treatment of the Arab-Israeli conflict.’

Piety traces the deficiency of U.S. media in reporting on the Middle East to largely successful efforts by the pro-Israel lobby to ‘overwhelm the American media with a highly professional public relations campaign, to intimidate the media through various means and, finally, to impose censorship when the media are compliant and craven.’ He lists threats to editors and advertising departments, orchestrated boycotts, slanders, campaigns of character assassination, and personal vendettas among the weapons employed against balanced journalism.”⁶⁰⁶

Former Mossad agent Victor Ostrovsky wrote in his book *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad’s Secret Agenda* (note that a “Sayanim” is a disloyal and deceitful Jew, who is prepared to betray his or her neighbors at any time in order to advance a perceived Israeli interest),

“The American Jewish community was divided into a three-stage action team. First were the individual *sayanim* (if the situation had been reversed and the United States had convinced Americans working in Israel to work secretly on behalf of the United States, they would be treated as spies by the Israeli government). Then there was the large pro-Israeli lobby. It would mobilize the Jewish community in a forceful effort in whatever direction the Mossad pointed them. And last was B’nai Brith. Members of that organization could be relied on to make friends among non-Jews and tarnish as anti-Semitic whomever they couldn’t sway to the Israeli cause. With that sort of one-two-three tactic, there was no way we could strike out.”⁶⁰⁷

Prof. Norman G. Finkelstein writes in his book, *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (2005), pp. 21-22, 32, and 66,

“**THE LATEST PRODUCTION** of Israel’s apologists is the ‘new anti-Semitism.’ [***] The main purpose behind these periodic, meticulously orchestrated media extravaganzas is not to fight anti-Semitism but rather to exploit the historical suffering of Jews in order to immunize Israel against criticism. [***] Finally, whereas in the original *New Anti-Semitism* marginal left-wing organizations like the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party were cast as the heart of the anti-Semitic darkness, in the current revival Israel’s apologists, having lurched to the right end of the political spectrum, cast mainstream organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch in this role. [***] **WHAT’S CURRENTLY CALLED** the new anti-Semitism actually incorporates three main components: (1) exaggeration and fabrication, (2) mislabeling legitimate criticism of Israeli policy, and (3) the unjustified yet predictable spillover from criticism of Israel to Jews generally. **EXAGGERATION AND FABRICATION** The evidence of a new anti-Semitism comes mostly from organizations directly or indirectly linked to Israel or having a material stake in inflating the findings of anti-Semitism.”⁶⁰⁸

In 2006, Professors John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt wrote in their paper, “The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy”,

“No discussion of how the Lobby operates would be complete without examining one of its most powerful weapons: the charge of anti-Semitism. Anyone who criticizes Israeli actions or says that pro-Israel groups have significant influence over U. S. Middle East policy—an influence that AIPAC celebrates—stands a good chance of getting labeled an anti-Semite. In fact, anyone who says that there is an Israel Lobby runs the risk of being charged with anti-Semitism, even though the Israeli media themselves refer to America’s ‘Jewish Lobby.’ In effect, the Lobby boasts of its power and then attacks anyone who calls attention to it. This tactic is very effective,

because anti-Semitism is loathsome and no responsible person wants to be accused of it.”⁶⁰⁹

There is nothing new about fabricated accusations of anti-Semitism. The Judeans who fabricated the Old Testament fabricated a history of Egyptian tyranny which never occurred, and which fictions recklessly defamed the Egyptians as anti-Semites. Esau was defamed as an hereditary anti-Semite for daring to be angry at Jacob for stealing the Covenant from him.⁶¹⁰ Jewish historians defamed Caligula for not tolerating Judean intolerance (etc. etc. etc.).

Douglas Reed, who was a British journalist, but was forced out of the profession, because he reported on Zionist brutality, wrote in December of 1950,

“More important still, during all that period and to the present time, it was not possible freely to report or discuss a third vital matter: Zionist Nationalism. In this case the freedom of the press has become a fallacy during the past two decades. Newspaper-writers have become less and less free to express any criticism, or report any fact unfavourable to this new ambition of the Twentieth Century. When I eventually went to America I found that this ban, for such it is in practice, prevailed even more rigidly there than in my own country.

Today an awakening is supposed to have occurred in the matter of Communism. During the most fateful and decisive years of the Second War, when the things were being done which obviously set the stage for a third one, it was in fact almost impossible for any independent writer to publish any reasonable criticism, supported by no matter what evidence, about Soviet Communism and its intentions. Now, when the damage is done, Communism is much attacked, but even so the mass of Communist writers who were planted in the American and British press during those years has by no means been displaced; and the attentive newspaper-reader in either country may see for himself how the most specious Communist sophistries are daily injected into the editorial arguments and the news-columns of newspapers professing the most respectable principles.

In the matter of Zionist Nationalism, which I hold to be allied in its roots to Soviet Communism, the ban is much more severe. In my own adult lifetime as a journalist, now covering thirty years, I have seen this secret ban grow from nothing into something approaching a law of *lèse majesté* at some absolute court of the dark past. In daily usage, no American or British newspaper, apparently, now dares to print a line of news or comment unfavourable to the Zionist ambition; and under this thrall matters are reported favourably or non-committally, if they are reported at all, which if they occurred elsewhere would be denounced with the most piteous cries of outraged morality. The inference to me is plain: the Zionist Nationalists are powerful enough to govern governments in the great countries of the remaining West!

I believe Zionist Nationalism to be a political movement organized in all

countries, which aims to bring all Jews under its thrall just as Communism enslaved the Russians and National Socialism the Germans. I hold it to be as dangerous as both of those, and when I recall the results that came of the subtle suppression of information in the cases of Stalinism and Hitlerism, I judge that the consequences of this even more rigorous suppression will not be less grave.

I think it a cardinal error to identify 'Jews' with Zionist Nationalism, 'Russians' with Communism, or 'Germans' with National Socialism. I saw the enslavement of Germans and Russians and know different. I believe that the astonishingly powerful attempt to prevent any discussion of Zionist Nationalism by dismissing it as the expression of an aversion to Jews, as Jews, is merely meant to stop any public discussion of its objects, which seem to me to be as dangerous to Jew as to Gentile. Of the three groups which have appeared, like stormy petrels, to presage the tempests of our century, the Zionist Nationalists appear to me the most powerful. National Socialism, I think, was but a stooge or stalking horse for the pursuit of Communist aims. Communism is genuinely tigerish, and was strong enough to infest governments everywhere and distort the policies which were pursued behind the screen of military operations; but, if forced into a corner by the rising unease of their peoples, Western politicians are prepared in the last resort to turn against it.

But Zionist Nationalism! . . . That is a different matter. Today American Presidents and British Prime Ministers, and all their colleagues, watch it as anxiously as Muslim priests watch for the crescent moon on the eve of Ramadan, and bow to it as the faithful prostrating themselves in the mosque at Mecca. The thing was but a word unknown to the masses forty years ago; today Western politicians hardly dare take the seals of office without first, or immediately afterwards, making public obeisance towards this strange new ambition."⁶¹¹

Gore Vidal wrote,

"Currently, there is little open debate in the United States on any of these matters. The Soviet Union must be permanently demonized in order to keep the money flowing to the Pentagon for 'defense,' while Arabs are characterized as subhuman terrorists. Israel may not be criticized at all. (Ironically, the press in Israel is far more open and self-critical than ours.) We do have one token Palestinian who is allowed an occasional word in the press, Professor Edward Said, who wrote (*Guardian*, December 21, 1986): since the '1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon . . . it was felt by the Zionist lobby that the spectacle of ruthless Israeli power on the TV screen would have to be effaced from memory, by the strategy of incriminating the media as anti-Semitic for showing these scenes at all.' A wide range of Americans were then exuberantly defamed, including myself."⁶¹²

Robert I. Friedman wrote in 1987,

“Indeed, Americans have very little idea about how severely troubled Israel is, or how critical many Israelis are of their own government’s policies, such as arming the contras, Khomeini’s Iran, and South Africa. And some prominent U.S. editors and publishers who have dropped all pretense of objectivity to become public-relations advisors for the Israeli government hope to keep it that way. [***] And many others who have tried to defy this orthodoxy have come under unrelenting attack from the Israel lobby—a coalition of editors and publishers, pro-Israel PACs, and wealthy businessmen—which tries to silence dissidents with accusations of anti-Israel bias or anti-Semitism. [***] Yet these tactics of intimidation in the service of Israel may backfire. ‘It is precisely the fact that it is the job of the national press to be fair and objective that gets these superoverheated Jews foaming,’ said the *Washington Post*’s Stephen Rosenfeld. ‘They want 100 percent. They don’t want fairness: they want unfairness on their side, and when they don’t get it they accuse the press of being unfair. Most journalists get so much uninformed, unfair whining from the organized Jews that Jewish organizations—and ultimately Israel—may lose their credibility.’”⁶¹³

Arvid Reuter Dahl wrote to William L. Fisher on 17 October 1931,

“My dear Mr. Fisher,

Dr. Erich Ruckhaber recently sent you a letter of Aug. 29, 1931, addressed here to me for consideration.

Having lived through the Einstein Battle, I am well aware of all the difficulties which opposition to Einsteinism meets with everywhere, and not the least in the United States. I have had articles refused by Scientific Societies of which I am a member, because they clearly exposed the Einsteinian Sham.

It would be a great stroke for truth if we could find the means of getting ‘100 Autoren Gegen Einstein’ published in the English. I managed to get a reference in a St. Paul Paper, and another indirect reference in the Kansas City Star, on the occasion of a visit to Kansas City. I enclose a copy of the latter. Through friends, elsewhere, I tried to get newspaper notices, but without success.

The forces behind Einstein have excellent control over the press and scientific journals. They control our mathematical and scientific departments (indirectly) in our universities and colleges—a most deplorable condition. I know, by actual experience, whereof I speak.

I fear that no American publishing house will lend its name to ‘100 Autoren’, because of possible boycott and persecution (financial). Hence the publication involves raising the required funds independently and creating a marketing organization. Where the funds can be raised, at the present time of depression, is a stupendous problem. I too know Dr. Dayton C. Miller

through correspondence—a splendid gentleman and true scientist. I have had correspondence with Dr. Charles Lane Poor and he knows of my efforts against Einsteinism. But,—are they in a position to back such a venture? My prolonged illness has incapacitated me financially.

I have seen references to the stand taken by Dr. L. J. Moore of Cincinnati, and he is sound on the Einstein fiasco. There are others. There are other U[niversity] scientists—a few besides these three—who are aware of the Einsteinian nonsense, but many are afraid of losing scientific caste, and perhaps their positions.

Since you are personally acquainted with Dr. Dayton C. Miller, it may be possible for you to approach him on the subject in order to learn his reaction. From his answer, conclusions may be drawn which will be of solid and practical value.

If you will kindly take this step, then we can confer again by correspondence. You may, of course, mention my name to Dr. Miller, stating my position in reference to the urgent need of an English translation of ‘100 Autoren --’.

If a fearless champion can be found who has the financial resources, then ‘100 Autoren --’ can be gotten to the intelligent public and the days of Einsteinism in the U. S. will soon be numbered—such is the power of ‘100 Autoren’ as I appraise it.

Of course, I am ready to serve in such way as Dean in order to bring this most desirable purpose to a realization.

With best wishes, I remain,
Most cordially yours,”⁶¹⁴

Stjepan Mohorovičić wrote,

“Eine vorzügliche und sehr scharfsinnige Kritik veröffentlichte G. v. GLEICH 1930, wo er alle seine diesbezüglichen Arbeiten gesammelt und geordnet hatte, obwohl das ‘Relativitätssyndikat’ mit allen Mitteln trachtete, das Erscheinen dieses Werkes zu verhindern. Nun es war sehr schwer die Kritik gänzlich zu unterdrücken, da man in der Wahl der Mittel nicht kleinlich war. Alle, für die Relativitätstheorie ungünstigen Arbeiten wurden einfach kurzerhand als unrichtig, fehlerhaft oder falsch bezeichnet oder als *unwichtig* (heutzutage ein sehr beliebtes Wort!) oder wenigstens als *uninteressant* verschwiegen. Von den Philosophen erhielten nur die Applaudierenden das Wort, den kritisch Gesinnten warf man ihre mathematischen Unkenntnisse vor; wer sich darüber unterrichten will, sollte die offenen Briefe des bekannten Philosophen O. KRAUS nachlesen,

[Endnote: Vgl. Lit. [*Oskar Kraus : Offene Briefe an Albert Einstein u. Max v. Laue über die gedanklichen Grundlagen der speziellen und allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Wien u. Leipzig 1925.*] S. 78 u. ff., dann S. 96 u. ff. So sagte beispielsweise O. KRAUS wörtlich S. 94-95: ‘Herr

EINSTEIN selbst ist philosophisch Laie. . . Mit der Zuwendung zu Reichenbachs radikalem Konventionalismus hat er, scheint es, nun den Standpunkt erreicht, der seiner Theorie kongenial ist. . . Der Konventionalismus fälscht den Wahrheitsbegriff pragmatistisch. Diesem Niveau entspricht die Relativitätstheorie vom philosophischen Standpunkt aus.' (O. KRAUS war Professor an der deutschen Universität in Prag zu gleicher Zeit wie auch A. EINSTEIN).]

und doch haben die Philosophen die Grundlage der Rechnung, nicht aber die Rechnung selbst untersucht. Aber die Relativisten haben übersehen, daß die modernen Relativitätstheorien, ähnlich wie die moderne Musik, voll von Dissonanzen sind, (eine solche Musik entzückt den heutigen Snob außerordentlich und er kann nicht begreifen, daß es gebildete Leute gibt, welche die moderne Musik nicht ausstehen können, aber dafür muß man das Ohr und die richtige musikalische Erziehung haben!). O. KRAUS hat besonders den Umstand hervorgehoben (l. c. S. 96.), 'daß jeder Quark, der für die Theorie zu sein scheint, von den Relativisten mit freundlicher Gebärde begrüßt wird. . . während eine ernste Kritik mißhandelt wird'.

[*Endnote*: Ein erschreckendes Beispiel ist z. B. der beschleunigte Tod des verdienstvollen 80-jährigen Physikers. C. ISENKRAHE, (vgl. 317 [*Oskar Kraus : Offene Briefe an Albert Einstein u. Max v. Laue über die gedanklichen Grundlagen der speziellen und allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Wien u. Leipzig 1925.*] S. 96-97); dann wie M. ABRAHAM behandelt wurde; oder, wenn man einen Physiker als den Gegner der modernen Relativitätstheorien bezeichnet, so sind dann alle seine wissenschaftlichen Verdienste umsonst und ein jeder Stümper bildet sich ein, er habe das Recht ihn zu verleumden.— Ein anderes Beispiel ist der weltbekannte und große deutsche Philosoph HUGO DINGLER; in [*Hans Wagner : Hugo Dinglers Beitrag zur Thematik der Letztbegründung. Kantstud. 47, 148-167, 1955-56. Sonderdruck, Köln 1956.*] S. 1. lesen wir folgendes über den von ihm geführten Kampf für die strenge Wissenschaft: '...ein Kampf, der unter schweren äußeren Bedingungen hatte geführt werden müssen — erst unter dem Vorwurf des Antisemitismus, seit er der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie entgegengetreten war, nach 1933 unter dem Vorwurf der Semitophilie, welcher ihn alsbald auch seinen Darmstädter Lehrstuhl kostete, 1945 unter dem Vorwurf einer Verbundenheit mit dem Ungeist des Hitlerreichs, der ihn abermals von der Lehrtätigkeit verwies und über ihn die aktuelle Gefahr eines buchstäblichen Hungertodes heraufführte, schließlich nach seiner Rehabilitierung unter der Last eines schweren Augenleidens.' usw. usw. Der Verfasser könnte noch vieles aus eigener Erfahrung beifügen, aber man wird das alles nach seinem Tode erfahren. . . (vgl. Anm. 90 [Dies alles sage ich aus eigener Erfahrung. Was ich z. B. persönlich in dieser Beziehung erlebt und zu ertragen habe, wird

man erst nach meinem Tode erfahren. Dies wird eine wahre Anklage gegen die relativistischen unerhörten Kampfmethoden sein, welche nur mit der mittelalterlichen Inquisition verglichen werden können.])). Siehe auch [*Wilhelm Krampf: Die Philosophie Hugo Dinglers. München 1955.*] u. [A. FRITSCH, G. BARTH, S. MOHOROVIČIĆ: Hugo Dingler Gedenkbuch zum 75. Geburtstag. Wissen im Werden 2, H. 4, 169-183, 1958 (und als selbständige Broschüre München 1959).].

Dies wirkte aber verhängnisvoll und diese modernen Theorien wurden größtenteils ein Tätigkeitsfeld pour ceux qui savent vivre ...oder wie ein lachender Philosoph sagte:

[Endnote: * * * Demokritos oder hinterlassene Papiere eines lachenden Philosophen. 4. Aufl. Bd. VII., Stuttgart 1853., S. 322.—Wir müßten ebenfalls mit JULIAN APOSTATA eine Rede gegen die ungebildeten. . . halten.—Siehe auch [*Clyde R. Miller: Kunstgriffe der Propaganda (Das Institut für Propaganda-Analyse d. Columbia University). Neue Auslese 3, 93-97; 1948 (übersetzt aus d. Jb. 'New Directions', New York).*—Hier lesen wir folgendes (S. 96): 'Mit falschen Karten spielen ist ein Kunstgriff, bei dem der Propagandist alle Künste der Täuschung und des Truges anwendet, um unsere Unterstützung für sich selbst, seine Gruppe, Nation, Rasse, Politik, Methoden und Ideale zu gewinnen. Er entstellt bewusst die Wahrheit. Er übertreibt oder 'untertreibt', um sich um Diskussionen zu drücken und den Tatsachen aus dem Weg zu gehen. Er 'vernebelt' eine peinlich Angelegenheit, indem er mit grossem Trara eine neue Streitfrage aufs Tapet bringt. Er liefert Halbwahrheiten unter der Maske der Wahrheit (von uns unterstrichen). Durch den Kunstgriff der 'falschen Karten' wird ein mittelmässiger Kandidat als ein Genie hingestellt; . . . Zu dieser Art von Falschspielerei gehören Täuschung, Heuchelei und Unverschämtheit'.]

‘. . . an Höfen ist Höflichkeit der Verstand und die Münze. . .’⁶¹⁵

4.7 Einstein's Trip to America

Einstein was discredited in Germany in late 1920. In early 1921, Einstein desperately needed a boost and a break. Zionist Kurt Blumenfeld arranged for Einstein to take a trip to America in order to spread propaganda for political Zionism and to raise money for the cause, on the deceitful premise that the money would go to fund an university in Jerusalem, the “Jewish university”⁶¹⁶ or “Hebrew University”. Einstein was deceived. The real goal of the Zionists who took advantage of him was to exploit Einstein's fame for profit.

Elements of the American press again promoted Einstein as the greatest genius of all time. For Jewish racists, this provided helpful racist propaganda claiming that all important contributions to the world of thought were made by Jews. The racist

political Zionist United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis wrote in a letter dated 1 March 1921,

“You have doubtless heard that the Great Einstein is coming to America soon with Dr. Weizmann, our Zionist Chief. Palestine may need something more now than a new conception of the Universe or of several additional dimensions; but it is well to remind the Gentile world, when the wave of anti-Semitism is rising, that in the world of thought the conspicuous contributions are being made by Jews.”⁶¹⁷

Viktor G. Ehrenberg, Hedwig Born’s father, wrote to Einstein on 23 November 1919,

“So it uplifts the heart and strengthens one’s faith in the future of mankind when one sees the researchers of all nations prostrating themselves before a man of Jewish blood, who thinks and writes in the German language, in full recognition of his greatness.”⁶¹⁸

Paul Ehrenfest wrote to Einstein that he had heard that the Zionists were using Einstein to promote the myth that he was a “Jewish Newton” and a Zionist. Ehrenfest was tortured by the fact that his character would not allow him to participate in the dishonest promotion of Einstein to the public. He believed it would ultimately be destructive to Jews. Ehrenfest committed suicide in 1933.

In 1905 and 1906, Paul Ehrenfest considered Lorentz’ 1904 paper⁶¹⁹ on special relativity and Poincaré’s 1905 Rendiconti paper⁶²⁰ 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. They knew that Einstein did not create the theory of relativity. 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.”⁶²¹

Immediately upon his arrival at America’s shores, Einstein mischaracterized any and all opposition to him and the theory of relativity as if it were anti-Semitism, *per se*.⁶²² After Einstein returned to Europe and after these Zionists bilked many generous Americans in the name of ethnic pride and duty, the promised funding of the university did not materialize. The nationalists allegedly could not agree on the final form this ethnically segregated school should take.⁶²³ We learn from American Zionist Louis Dembitz Brandeis’ letters that the University was nothing but a “side

show”,

“The University, important & dear to us, is merely a side show. It can wait. Nothing must be done in relation to it which would embarrass or confuse the main issue. It should be taken up—if and only if it would be helpful in furthering our fight on the main issue.”⁶²⁴

And where did the money go, which good-hearted Americans had donated for a university? Again, Brandeis’ letters provide us with some likely answers,

“In telling [Einstein] of the misappropriation of which we learned in London, I mentioned the diversion also of a University Fund & our apprehension as to further diversion.”⁶²⁵

The editors of Brandeis’ letters wrote,

“It was L[ouis] D[embitz] B[randeis]’s belief that the funds earmarked for the Hebrew University had been used for various projects in the Haifa area, and he wanted deHaas to provide whatever information they had on the matter to Einstein.”⁶²⁶

Zionist racists set the tone for the racist “Aryan Physics” movement that would soon follow the political Zionists’ smear campaigns against Germans, which followed centuries of active discrimination against Jews which was only then beginning to lessen, and so the cycle of hatred continued. These political Zionists had little respect for the truth or for the innocents they bilked. Einstein’s “secretary” on the trip, Salomon Ginzberg, later wrote,

“It was also hoped that the University, being a non-political institution of great spiritual appeal, would find supporters among the wealthier non-Zionist Jews who might not contribute to Zionist funds proper.”⁶²⁷

Salomon Ginzberg, a. k. a. Simon Ginsberg, was the son of the famous Zionist Ha’am. Ginzberg apparently thought that Einstein was a somewhat ridiculous person. Ginzberg mocked Einstein’s “speech”—a Goebbels-like plea for ethnic unity behind a lone *Führer*.⁶²⁸ Einstein declared to the Zionists of America,

“You have one leader — Weizmann. Follow him and no other!”⁶²⁹

Jewish lore had long inspired a desire among Jews for a charismatic leader, be it another Moses, or the Messiah King. In the 1600 and 1700's many would-be messiahs appeared and some, like Shabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank, attracted large followings numbering in the millions. Graetz famously called for a charismatic leader to lead the Jews in the modern world. On the Zionists’ quest to find a “great man” to be their “dictator” and on the naturalness of dictatorships to Zionists,

see: N. Goldman, "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 4, (1920-1921), pp. 237-242, at 240-242; which was part of a series including: "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 45-47; and "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 7, (1920-1921), pp. 423-425.

When Albert Einstein traveled to America in April of 1921 to promote his Zionist agenda he had received a triumphant welcome, but soon met with great and growing opposition. Einstein was lampooned and humiliated in certain segments of the international press. Einstein left America in defeat. He expressed his bitterness towards America in an interview for the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*. Einstein stated, as reported in *The New York Times* on 8 July 1921 on page 9,

"BERLIN, July 7.—Dr. Albert Einstein, the famous scientist, made an amazing discovery relative to America on his trip which he recently explained to a sympathetic-looking Hollander as follows:

'The excessive enthusiasm for me in America appears to be typically American. And if I grasp it correctly the reason is that the people in America are so colossally bored, very much more than is the case with us. After all, there is so little for them there!' he exclaimed.

Dr. Einstein said this with vibrant sympathy. He continued:

'New York, Boston, Chicago and other cities have their theatres and concerts, but for the rest? There are cities with 1,000,000 inhabitants, despite which what poverty, intellectual poverty! The people are, therefore, glad when something is given them with which they can play and over which they can enthuse. And that they do, then, with monstrous intensity.

'Above all things are the women who, as a literal fact, dominate the entire life in America. The men take an interest in absolutely nothing at all. They work and work, the like of which I have never seen anywhere yet. For the rest they are the toy dogs of the women, who spend the money in a most unmeasurable, illimitable way and wrap themselves in a fog of extravagance. They do everything which is the vogue and now quite by chance they have thrown themselves on the Einstein fashion.

'You ask whether it makes a ludicrous impression on me to observe the excitement of the crowd for my teaching and my theory, of which it, after all, understands nothing? I find it funny and at the same time interesting to observe this game.

'I believe quite positively that it is the mysteriousness of what they cannot conceive which places them under a magic spell. One tells them of something big which will influence all future life, of a theory which only a small group, highly learned, can comprehend. Big names are mentioned of men who have made discoveries, of which the crowd grasps nothing. But it impresses them, takes on color and the magic power of mystery, and thus one becomes enthusiastic and excited.

'My impressions of scientific life in America? Well, I met with great interest several extraordinarily meritorious professors, like Professor

Milliken [*sic*]. I unfortunately missed Professor Michelson in Chicago, but to compare the general scientific life in America with Europe is nonsense.”⁶³⁰

This is but a part of a longer polemic interview, in which Einstein also smeared all Germans as corrupt. Einstein repeated some of what Gehrcke had said, though Einstein had called Gehrcke “anti-Semitic” for saying the same thing. The full interview of 29 June 1921 is reproduced in Dutch and English, together with an interpretation initially published in German in the *Berliner Tageblatt* on 7 July 1921, in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix D, (2002), pp. 620-627.

Einstein’s comments met with much criticism and a damage control apparatus quickly began to repair the harm he had done to his reputation, by denying that he had said what he had said.⁶³¹ Some Americans stepped forward to say, “I told you so!” *The Minneapolis Evening Tribune* wrote on 8 July 1921,

“Einstein Has No Valid Cause to Congratulate Self, Reuter Dahl Says

In Calling Americans ‘Lot of
Bored Low Brows,’ He
Forgets the Ungullible.

Makes No Mention of Terrific
Lampooning He Received at
Hands of His Critics.

Professor Albert Einstein’s lofty conception of the American people as a lot of bored lowbrows who couldn’t find intellectual amusement elsewhere and so turned to his theory of relativity without understanding it, drew a sharp rejoinder today from Prof. Arvid Reuter Dahl, dean of the department of engineering and architecture at St. Thomas college. The remarks by the scientist whose recent visit to the United States attracted nation-wide attention, were cabled last night from Berlin.

‘Doctor Einstein has omitted all reference to the terrific lampooning to

which he was subjected by the Eastern newspapers during the last week of his sojourn with us,' Professor Reuterdaahl remarked. 'He has no valid reason to congratulate himself while smiling at the unsophistication and gullibility of the American people.

Einstein Appeared Amused.

'The radio dispatch from Berlin, which appeared in The Minneapolis Morning Tribune today, conveys the impression that Doctor Einstein was greatly amused by his recent reception in the United States,' he continued. 'He attributes the exaggerated enthusiasm shown him to the fact that our people are bored. In that connection he points out that we have theaters to alleviate the weariness of our dull existence but he intimates that we, nevertheless, welcome new thrills. His remarks indicate that he believes that he furnished us with a new 'thrill,' which accounts for the alleged enthusiasm.

'Professor Einstein found this attitude very comical and consequently confirmative of his pre-established conviction that Americans are lacking in intelligence. However, Doctor Einstein did not hesitate to come to our shores in order to lend zest to the financial campaign of the Zionists, who do not underestimate the advertising value of an international celebrity. This remark is not intended to be derogatory to the Zionist movement, which, undoubtedly is a worthy cause. Nevertheless, we cannot avoid feeling like a man who, having been outwitted in a trade, must remain impassive while the victor laughs at him.

Entire Tale Untold.

'Dr. Einstein, however, has not told the entire tale. He has adroitly omitted all reference to the terrific lampooning to which he was subjected by the eastern newspapers during the last week of his sojourn with us. Never before has a man been subjected to such colossal ridicule. He was even likened to the notorious Dr. Cook and Friedmann.

'Mr. Nelson Robbins, in the Baltimore Evening Sun, April 29, 1921, says: 'But the proletariat having forgotten Friedmann and his unexplainable discoveries, it hasn't forgotten a host of men like him. Remembering them, the proletariat will be ding-busted if it will swear allegiance to any idea that it cannot understand and which is labeled unexplainable by the 'mentally equipped,' who tap the individual inquirer on the head and, with kindly smile, tell him to run along and not bother his little brain about things he cannot understand.'

'Dr. Einstein, therefore, has no valid reason to congratulate himself enthusiastically while smiling outwardly at the unsophistication and gullibility of the American people.'"

Einstein's feigned amusement is belied by his bitterness at being mocked in America. Contrast Einstein's later remarks, after he had left America, with an interview he gave to *The New York Times* while in America, which was published in *The New York Times Book Review and Magazine* on 1 May 1921 on page 50. In

this interview Einstein appears as an especially odd and childlike man, who had wondered from his script. On 15 March 1921, Zionist Kurt Blumenfeld had warned Zionist Chaim Weizmann that it would be unwise to let Einstein make speeches during his trip to America, “Einstein is a poor speaker and often says things out of naiveté that are unwelcome to us[.]”⁶³² The “secretary” who broke into the conversation during the interview was the son of Zionist Ha’am, Salomon Ginzberg. Many of Einstein’s comments are reminiscent of the spirit of Zionist Israel Zangwill’s play *The Melting-Pot: Drama in Four Acts*, Macmillan, New York, (1909); and Einstein may have been encouraged to promote the melting-pot idea in order to promote the immigration of Eastern European Jews to America. Einstein’s interview:

“Einstein on Irrelevancies

By DON ARNALD

How comfortable you make everything in the hotel! Every door, every window, is perfect; nothing is out of order. It is all so well planned and well organized. I never saw such rooms; such care for details; such hotel lobbies, with so many to serve you. Everything—everything is systematized, down to the bathrooms. You people in America are very practical. I like the way you light up the windows with the signs. I like the cheerful way you arrange the electricity up and down the streets.’

So spoke Professor Albert Einstein, apostle of relativity, in the course of a talk about his experiences in New York.

‘What was it that impressed you most when you arrived?’ the interviewer asked.

‘Ah! I see so many nationalities living together so well. America is a country of many different peoples at peace with one another. Then, too, I like the restaurants with the ‘color’ of the nations in the air. Each has its own atmosphere. It is like a zoological garden of nationalities, when you go from one to the other.

‘Are you a bit disappointed not to find some beer in our dining rooms?’

‘I cannot say alcohol is as bad as people think it is,’ replied the professor. ‘It may not be so good for men to spend all their wages on drinking. But it is more an economic question than a question of health. Some workmen must have liquor, it seems. We must not take everything away. Prohibition shows the strength of your democratic Government against private interests. In a corrupt State this could not be done.’

‘Do you consider it against personal liberty to take liquor away?’

‘How could that be in America? You have a republic. You have no dictator who makes slaves of people. Nothing is done by a democratic Government could be done against freedom. I think you will find it best for the economic welfare of the people in the end.’

‘How about tobacco?’ was the next question. ‘Some people want to take

that away, too.'

Dr. Einstein drew back in surprise. 'Oh, my, no! I never heard of it. So some one is starting this? Who is doing this?'

'Some temperance organization here in the United States.'

The professor said: 'If I do not wish to smoke, I say it is excellent to take my tobacco away. But I do wish to smoke, so I say I do not like you to do that.'

'But they say it is not healthful.'

'If you take our tobacco and everything else away, what have you left?' cried Professor Einstein. 'It may be healthful to take away tobacco, but it is mighty lonesome.' He thought a moment. 'But this is economic, too,' he said at last. 'The men spend too much money on cigars, and their wives kick; therefore, they take it away. They say it costs too much money to smoke. I do not know! I have never heard of such a thing as taking away a man's smoking! I'll stick to my pipe. I do not care who will not smoke. I will! If you take everything away, life is not worth while!'

'And the blue laws—how about them?'

'Blue laws? Blue laws? I never heard of those blue laws in my life. What are you saying?' The professor fairly blazed with consternation.

'They want to pass laws to close up all places of amusement on Sunday,' the interviewer explained. 'All theatres, music shows, baseball and other places will be shut down, including everything for relaxation, even amusement parks and the movies.'

'For Heaven's sake. More laws? I never heard of such a thing. Here's what I say: Men must have rest, yes? But what is the right rest? You cannot make a law to tell people how to do it. See—some people have rest when they lie down and go to sleep. Others have rest when they are wide awake and are stimulated. They must work or write or go to amusements to find rest. If you pass one law to show all people how to rest, that means you make everybody alike. But everybody is not alike. No, I do not care for these blue laws. They will do no good for the country or the people.'

'Many workmen want to go to movies on Sunday because they have no time during the week days, so they find rest there,' he continued. 'And that is very good.'

'What do you think of our movies and the theatres?'

'I've been so busy that I haven't had much time, but I have never in my life seen such theatres—everything for your taste, all sorts of plays, comedy, tragedy, romance, pageants. And the movies? I am enthusiastic about them—I mean for the presentation of living moving things. They will develop more and more. In general, the pictures shown now are not so artistic, but they will get better, very much better, all the time. The art is not high enough now, but soon you will have science through this art, as well as you are now having art through this science. I see how the movies will be used in the future for science in bacteriology and technology. Perhaps not so soon for astronomy, because the motions of the heavenly bodies are too

quick for measurement. But the movies must only be fitted well, and they can be used most adequately for instruction in all science! I think, all in all, the movies are only in their infancy. They are very beautiful, but they will get better, until the best plays can be shown. You deserve much credit for doing such fine pictures. I compliment you, and I hope for more artistic plays right along.'

At this point his wife, a charming little gray-haired lady, slipped into the room and sat by her husband's side.

'Maybe I can help you,' she said kindly. 'I speak English, and I can interpret for him.' The interview up to that point had been in German.

'Perhaps you can tell me something about the professor's life,' I asked. Dr. Einstein laughed heartily.

'He does not want my life,' said he. 'That is of no use to him. Why should he care for that. He is asking what I think of New York. I tell him glorious! I tell him I see here the greatest city in the world, like Paris, like London, only better! I tell him here all people of all nationalities are melted together—and are happy. I tell him the stranger comes here and is full of joy because he goes to his people at once and feels at home.'

'But your book on relativity translated into English, maybe he wants that,' queried Mrs. Einstein.

'No, why that?' said the professor. 'He doesn't come here for relativity. He comes here to see me. I want to say something to the people, how I like the restaurants and the theatres and the movies and the hotels, and how I do not like the blue laws—and if they take away my tobacco—I do not know what I'll do, but I'll take America anyway, no matter what they do.'

At this the secretary arrived. He wanted to add a word on the professor's mission in America. He said:

'I suppose you know Professor Einstein is here to help the University of Palestine. Its foundation stone was laid by Dr. Weizmann in 1918, and since then the university site has been expanded. There is also a library with more than 3,000 volumes and rapidly growing. Plans have been worked out both for the complete university of the future and for a comparatively modest beginning. The time has now come for us to make a foundation fund, part of which will go to the university. American people play a great part in world politics, showing that their aspirations are noble, and we have come from sick and suffering Europe with feelings of hope, convinced that our spiritual aims will command the full sympathy of the American Nation.'

Dr. Einstein broke in: 'We will receive their enthusiastic approval, we are sure, but the people know all this. This gentleman asks me other things, and I tell him what I think of New York.'

He slapped me on the back and added: 'You greet for me all the good people of America and you say, 'I feel at home here among people, many different people from all the nations in the world.'"

4.7.1 Einstein Faces Criticism in America

Though Einstein had hoped to run away from his critics, he had an international reputation as a coward, a plagiarist and a scientific fraud. Things were not as easy for Einstein in America as he had hoped they would be.

4.7.1.1 Einstein Hides from Reuterdahl's Challenge to Debate

On 10 April 1921, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune* reported Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl's charges against Einstein,

*“Einstein Branded Barnum of Science,
Minnesota Man Calls Relativity ‘Bunk’*

St. Thomas Dean of Engineering Challenges German to Debate.

Teuton's Pet 'Cult' Born 13 Years Before Him, Says Professor.

Reuterdahl Cites Passages in 1914 Treatise to Back Assertions.

Branding Prof. Albert Einstein as a sophist, a dealer in 'might-have-beens' and the Barnum of the scientific world, Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl, dean of the Engineering school of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, yesterday challenged the German savant to a written debate on his theory of relativity.

Professor Reuterdahl, who has been exploring the worlds conquered by Einstein since 1902, declared that he was willing to meet the much-heralded mathematician at any time in a written debate, and that he was prepared to prove that Einstein's theory is largely 'bunk.' Professor Reuterdahl used the scientific word for it, but that is what he meant.

‘Work Antedated by Another.’

Coupled with his challenge to a debate, Professor Reuterdahl declared Einstein was not only deceiving scientists with a mythical theory, but that he was either a plagiarist, or his work has been antedated by another without his knowledge.

‘Einstein is at liberty to accept either horn of the dilemma,’ he said.

That the Einstein theory of relativity in its gravitational aspects was advanced in 1866, 13 years before Einstein was born, by a scientist known under the pen name of 'Kinertia' is the contention of Professor Reuterdahl, in a statement in which he gives the life history of both men, and gives references and dates to prove his charge. While not accepting the theory, he

gives 'Kinertia' credit for its origin.

American Scientists 'Jolted.'

Professor Reuterdaahl, however, gives credit to Einstein for one thing, which, he says, more than justifies his claim to prominence. The German savant, he says, has broken down the barriers of set ideas in science, and made it possible for a hearing for new ideas.

'The American scientists,' said Professor Reuterdaahl, 'are the most clannish and orthodox in the world. In the Old World the scientific journals publish articles advancing new theories. Here they will not consider anything except that which is based on their own knowledge and belief. If Einstein has done anything, he has jolted American scientists into accepting something new.' Professor Reuterdaahl paid tribute to Einstein's genius as a mathematician, declaring him to be one of the greatest in the world.

Magazine Articles Cited.

Professor Reuterdaahl refers to 11 articles which appeared in Harper's Weekly in 1914 giving 'Kinertia' credit for originating the so-called Einstein theory of gravitation.

'If it is true that 'Kinertia' actually considered the Einsteinian problem in these essays,' he says, 'then the question of priority is inevitably raised and the unparalleled originality claimed for Einstein's work becomes a debatable matter.'

Einstein's investigation of his theory is traced by articles which appeared in German publications.

'The year 1905 is considered, by most authorities on Einstein's work,' he says, 'as the birth year of the theory of relativity.'

Theory Announced in 1915.

'Careful search, however, has revealed a paper on this subject which was published in Berlin during the year 1904 in the journal 'Sitzungsberichte.' That portion of Einstein's theory which deals with the phenomenon of gravitation is a later development. Einstein first gave his attention to the problem of gravitation in 1911, when he developed the principle of equivalence of gravitational and accelerative fields.

'Other phases of this subject were dealt with in papers which appeared in the years 1912 and 1913. A further elaboration, the joint work of Einstein and Marcel Grossman, appeared in 1914. The theory in its final and complete form was announced in the year 1915.

Historical Summary.

'A brief historical summary of the work of 'Kinertia' is now in order. Lord Kelvin first aroused 'Kinertia's' interest in the problem of gravitation. That was in the year 1866, when 'Kinertia' was a student under Lord Kelvin. 'Kinertia' even then did not agree with the Newtonian theory of force as presented by Lord Kelvin. Incidentally, we desire to call the reader's attention to the fact that Albert Einstein was born in 1879 in Ulm, Germany, 13 years later.

'During the period from 1877 to 1881, 'Kinertia' became convinced that

acceleration was the basic cause of what we generally speak of as 'weight.'

'Kinertia' Ridiculed in U. S.

'The reader undoubtedly is aware of the fact that acceleration plays the fundamental role in Einstein's theory of gravitation. 'Kinertia' corresponded with Kelvin, Tait and Niven of Cambridge with the hope that he would be able to interest these men in his startling theory. This attempt met with little or no sympathy.

'His attempts, dating from the year 1899, to persuade our stubborn American scientists that the Newtonian theory of gravitation must be revised met with nothing but ridicule and indifference. To Harper's Weekly and its managing editor, Mr H. D. Wheeler, belongs the credit of having published 'Kinertia's' series of articles entitled 'Do Bodies Fall?' The first article appeared in the issue of August 29, 1914, Vol. 59.

Similarity of Views Pointed Out.

The final article is dated November 7, 1914. From the preceding it is evident that 'Kinertia' derived his norm of gravitation before Einstein was born.

Professor Reuterdaahl quotes from the writing of Einstein and 'Kinertia' to prove the similarity of their views, and says:

'It is noteworthy that the only real difference between these two citations is that Einstein derives his conclusions from a hypothetical case, whereas 'Kinertia' draws his conclusions from an actual experiment upon himself.'

Further quotations are from Prof. A. S. Eddington's 'Space Time Gravitation,' published by the Cambridge University Press in 1920; from an article by Prof. Edwin B. Wilson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and from 'Kinertia's' articles.

Striking Similarity.

These quotations, he says. 'show the striking similarity existing between Einstein and 'Kinertia' when they consider the relation between acceleration and gravitation, a similarity which extends not only to intent but affects even the very words.'

The following quotation from Einstein's 'Relatively' illustrates that scientist's theory as to the relation between acceleration and gravitation, according to Professor Reuterdaahl:

'We imagine a large portion of empty space, so far removed from stars and other appreciable masses that we have before us approximately the conditions required by the fundamental law of Galilei.

Hypothetical Example.

As reference body let us imagine a spacious chest resembling a room with an observer inside who is equipped with apparatus. Gravitation naturally does not exist for this observer. He must fasten himself with strings to the floor, otherwise the slightest impact against the floor will cause him to rise slowly toward the ceiling of the room.

'To the middle of the lid of the chest is fixed externally a hook with rope attached, and now a 'being' (what kind of a 'being' is immaterial to us)

begins pulling at this with a constant force. The chest, together with the observer, then begins to move upwards with a uniformly accelerated motion. In course of time their velocity will reach unheard of values, provided that we are viewing all this from another reference body which is not being pulled with a rope.

Viewpoint of Man in Chest.

‘But how does the man in the chest regard the process? The acceleration of the chest will be transmitted to him by the reaction of the floor of the chest. He must therefore take up this pressure by means of his legs if he does not wish to be laid out full length on the floor. He is then standing in the chest in exactly the same way as anyone stands in a room of a house on our earth. If he releases a body which he previously had in his hand, the acceleration of the chest will no longer be transmitted to this body, and for this reason the body will approach the floor of the chest with an accelerated motion.

The observer will further convince himself that the acceleration of the body towards the floor of the chest is always of the same magnitude, whatever kind of body he may happen to use for the experiment.’

‘Kinertia’ Quoted.

‘Kinertia’s’ theory of the relation between acceleration and gravitation is set forth in the following quotation from ‘Do Bodies Fall?’ and is used by Professor Reuterdaahl in building up his argument:

‘I set to work to find out by experiment whether bodies actually did fall with the acceleration which the force of attraction was said to produce. Years before that, when in England, where some of our coal mines had vertical shafts about 1,500 feet deep, I had studied the cause of weight by having the hoisting engine drop me down with the full acceleration for about 500 feet. Then, by retardation during the lowest 500 feet, I could experience increase of weight all over me so marked that my legs could hardly support me.

Weight Not a Force.

‘That taught me that acceleration was the proximate cause of weight, but at the time of these experiments I still thought the acceleration of the falling cage was really caused by the earth’s attraction.

‘Weight is not a kinetic force because it cannot produce acceleration. If a body were accelerated in proportion to its weight, then weight would be a force.’

‘Laying aside the right of Einstein to claim originality for his theory,’ said Professor Reuterdaahl yesterday, ‘he is a sophist, and the world will know him as such in due time. He is dealing with mythical beings. They are ‘might-have-beens.’

‘His fourth dimension is a composite of time and space. That cannot be, because time and space never can be one. Space may be referred to as the distance between two points, A and B. We may travel from A and B, and return to find the same permanent objects in their places. We may require a certain amount of time to make the journey, but when we turn back that time

is gone.

‘I demand that Einstein show me his proof. I believe in dealing in the physical things of this world. In other words, I am from Missouri. I shall be glad to meet Professor Einstein at any time or place and debate this subject. But I shall demand an actual demonstration of his theory, not a journey into the realm of the mythical. That demonstration he can never give.’”

The story of Reuterdaahl’s challenge to Einstein was covered by newspapers around the world. *The New York Times* reported on 10 April 1921,

“CHALLENGES PROF. EINSTEIN

St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866.

Special to The New York Times.

MINNEAPOLIS, April 9.—Professor Arvid Deuterdaahl, Dean of the College of Engineering of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, yesterday challenged Prof. Albert Einstein to a written debate on his theory of relativity.

That the Einstein theory was advanced in 1866, thirteen years before he was born, by a scientist known under the pen name of ‘Kinertia,’ is the contention of Professor Reuterdaahl, in a statement in which he gives the life history of both men, and gives references and dates to support his contention.

Professor Reuterdaahl, however, says the fact that Professor Einstein has broken down the barriers of set ideas in science and made it possible for a hearing for new ideas more than justifies his claim to prominence.

‘The American scientists,’ said Professor Reuterdaahl, ‘are the most clannish, I should say the most pig-headed, in the world. In the Old World the scientific journals publish articles advancing new theories. Here they will not accept anything that is not based on their own knowledge and belief. If Einstein has done anything he has jolted American scientists into accepting something new.’

Professor Reuterdaahl refers to eleven articles which appeared in Harper’s Weekly in 1914, in giving ‘Kinertia’ credit for originating the Einstein theory.

‘Kinertia,’ Professor Reuterdaahl says, is the nom de plume of a professor believed to be living in California now.”

The Chicago Tribune (European Edition, Paris) reported on 11 April 1921,

“*AMERICAN CALLS EINSTEIN ‘BARNUM’*”

(Special Cable to **The Tribune**.)

MINNEAPOLIS, April 10.—Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the college of engineers at St. Thomas college, has styled Dr. Einstein, discoverer of the theory of relativity, ‘the Barnum of the scientific world’ and challenges him to a written debate on his theory.

Dr. Reuterdaahl asserted that Einstein is not only ‘fooling scientists with his mystical theory’ but is a plagiarist. He declares the ‘Einstein theory’ was advanced in 1866 by a scientist under the pen name of ‘Inertia.’”

On 11 April 1921, *The Sun* of New York reported,

“Challenges Einstein, Calls Him Plagiarist

MINNEAPOLIS, April 11. — Not only has Einstein’s theory of relativity been challenged but the scientist himself has been charged with being a plagiarist and the ‘Barnum of Science’ by Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the Engineering School of St. Thomas’s College, St. Paul. He has issued a challenge to the German scientist to meet him in a written debate.

The gravitational aspects of the Einstein theory were presented in 1866 in *Harper’s Weekly* by a writer who called himself ‘Kinertia,’ Prof. Reuterdaahl asserts. But the professor does give Prof. Einstein credit for blazing a new trail in thought for American scientists whom Dr. Reuterdaahl declares to be more orthodox than European scientists.”

On 11 April 1921, the *New York American* wrote,

“EINSTEIN CHARGED WITH PLAGIARISM

St. Paul Educator Says Theory of
Relativity Was Advanced in
Harper’s Weekly in 1866.

Special Dispatch to the New York American.

MINNEAPOLIS, April 10.—That the Albert Einstein theory of relativity in its gravitational aspects was advanced in 1866, thirteen years before Einstein was born, by a scientist known under pen name of ‘Kinertia’ was the assertion made to-day by Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the engineering school of St. Thomas College in St. Paul. He challenged the German savant to defend his theories in a written debate.

Professor Reuterdahl declared Einstein was not only deceiving scientists with a mythical theory, but that he was either a plagiarist or his work had been antedated by another without his knowledge.

He then cited ‘Kinertia,’ whose theory was expounded in eleven articles running in Harper’s Weekly in 1914, according to Professor Reuterdahl. These give ‘Kinertia’ credit for the so-called Einstein theory of gravitation, which is a later development of the theory of relativity.

The theory of relativity itself, says Einstein’s challenger, was made public exactly one year before authorities on Einstein’s work credit him with having made the discovery. In 1904, says Professor Reuterdahl, there was a paper on this subject, published in Berlin in the Journal *Sitzungsberichte*.”

On 12 April 1921, the *New York American* reported,

“EINSTEIN REFUSES TO DEBATE THEORY

Dean Reuterdahl’s Challenge to
Discuss Relativity Declined as
Detraction from Mission.

Dr. Albert Einstein was interviewed yesterday in his headquarters at the Hotel Commodore regarding the attack on his theory of relativity made by Dean Arvid Renterdahl, of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Einstein smilingly listened to newspaper accounts of the Reuterdahl attack. Through his secretary he said:

‘I came here with one object—the promotion of the establishment of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. I will not be led into a discussion of my theory with persons who may not understand. There may be some personal intent in the remarks of this gentleman, whom I have not the honor of knowing.

‘The great purpose of my mission to this country must not be overshadowed by my theory. I will be here a short time, and all of that time must be devoted to the great Palestine reconstruction project.

‘I have consented to deliver a few lectures, but beyond that I do not wish to encroach upon my limited time. It must be seen plainly that I cannot enter into newspaper discussions with persons who doubt or misunderstand my theories or question my integrity.

‘I have not had the opportunity to look into this challenge to debate issued by Dean Reuterdahl. Being without knowledge of the person called ‘Kinertia’ who is said to have written on the subject, I am not prepared to

express any opinion.

It was further said for Dr. Einstein that he had no desire to popularize his theory of relativity; that he had writ-*[Unfortunately your author's photocopy of this article lacks the remainder.]*"

Segments of the press came to Einstein's defense. The *World* of New York wrote on 12 April 1921, quoting Einstein,

"EINSTEIN AMUSED BY A NEW ATTACK

'Being Called P. T. Barnum of
Scientific World Only What
I Get at Home.'

DECLINES REUTERDAHL'S CHALLENGE TO A DEBATE.

He, Prof. Weizmann and Others
to Be Guests at Jewish
Mass Meeting To-Night.

Prof. Albert Einstein was not greatly disturbed yesterday when he learned that Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the engineering school of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., had called him the 'P. T. Barnum of the scientific world.' In fact, Prof. Einstein was amused.

'It reminds me of home,' he said, 'In Germany I am quite accustomed to being called names by persons who disagree with me.'

Prof. Einstein said he had never heard of Prof. Reuterdaahl and that he was not in the least interested in the latter's challenge to a written debate on the subject of relativity. He intimated that he might read an article written by Prof. Reuterdaahl if he happened to come across it, but as for entering a controversy, he couldn't waste the time.

The professor's mail is flooded with letters from persons who have pet theories which they wish to put before him, or who wish to argue on the subject of relativity. Several letters have been received from 'Messiahs' with plans for leading the Jews back to Palestine.

Prof. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization,

Prof. Einstein, M. M. Ussishkin, Chairman of the Zionist Commission to Palestine, Dr. Ben Zion Mosesohn, Principal of the Hebrew High School in Jaffe, and Dr. Schmaya Levine, member of the International Zionist Committee, will be the principal guests at an all-Jewish mass meeting to-night in the 69th Regiment Armory, 25th Street and Lexington Avenue. This reception is in charge of a committee of 100, representing more than 1,800 local Jewish organizations of every variety and type.

Senator Calder and Dr. Butler, President of Columbia University, will be the principal speakers. In addition there will be addresses by prominent Jewish leaders representing the various elements in Jewry. Morris Rothenberg will welcome the guests in behalf of the American Jewish Congress.

Tickets are free and the seats will be reserved for ticket holders until 8 P. M., and after that all the seats will be thrown open to the public. Reservations have been made for a large delegation of Jewish wounded veterans of the World War. They will be brought from the nearby hospitals under an escort of Jewish legionnaires who fought in Palestine under Gen. Allenby."

4.7.1.2 Cowardly Einstein Caught in a Lie

Einstein hypocritically called his critics name-callers, when in fact Einstein had been recklessly defaming his critics for years, and had encouraged others to not respond to criticism of relativity theory other than by way of personal attack. The newspaper tried to deflect attention away from Einstein's evasiveness, but their story also unwittingly revealed that Albert Einstein was dishonest. E. Lee Heidenreich wrote in the *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, on 16 May 1921,

"Calls Einstein's Statements Irreconcilable.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

The scientific world has lately been much entertained and somewhat mystified by the increasing doubts, which have gradually crept into the press, regarding both the authenticity and the reliability of Professor Einstein's much-vaunted theory of relativity.

Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college has challenged Professor Einstein to a written debate on the latter's theory, but has so far only been met with more or less evasive statements by Professor Einstein, some of which appear to the writer simply irreconcilable.

Thus, the New York World of April 12, 1921, says: 'Professor Einstein said he never heard of Professor Reuterdaahl, and that he was not in the least interested in the latter's challenge to a written debate on the subject of relativity. He intimated that he might read an article written by Professor Reuterdaahl, if he happened to come across it, but as for entering a controversy, he could not waste his time.'

The writer spent four months in Norway in 1920, and took occasion to give to 'Aftenposten' in Christiania a brief synopsis of Professor

Reuter Dahl's theory of interdependence, containing also considerable adverse criticism of both the authenticity and reliability of Professor Einstein's theory of relativity. The latter at that time was in Christiania, where he gave a lecture on his relativity.

'Aftenposten,' Christiania, of June 18, 1920, says: 'But what does Professor Einstein say to this? It would be interesting to know whether he is acquainted with the product of Professor Reuter Dahl's pen. 'No,' answers Professor Einstein at our question, 'I do not know the name of Professor Reuter Dahl and have never heard mentioned that he is said to have worked on the theory of relativity. I have often corresponded with Professor Mittag-Leffler, but he never mentioned any such work'.'

And later, in the same interview, Professor Einstein continues: 'Ein rechter mensch (a man of justice) would not have made the public announcement which Professor Reuter Dahl has made through the American press.'

During the 'frequent correspondence' between Professor Mittag-Leffler and Professor Einstein, the original manuscript by Professor Reuter Dahl of his space-time potential remained in the hands of Professor Mittag-Leffler for about four years, sometime between 1914 and 1918, and we have to take Professor Einstein's word for it that no discussion of the space-time potential took place during this 'frequent correspondence'—it would not have mattered much—except for the peculiar fact that Professor Einstein so carefully disclaims any notice of Reuter Dahl's existence.

In spite of this, on the 12th day of April, 1921, Professor Einstein, in an interview, stated that 'he had never heard of Professor Reuter Dahl.'

One might ask why the professor is afraid of admitting that he has heard of Reuter Dahl? Does a ghost of a MS held by Mittag-Leffler lurk around somewhere? Have we here a sword of Damocles?

Professor Einstein denies that he has heard of Reuter Dahl on April 12, 1921, in New York World, whereas he did hear of him and discussed his statements in Christiania to Aftenposten June 18, 1920, nearly a year earlier!

Either his memory has slipped away into the four dimensional space-time continuum, or for some reason he misrepresents facts.

As one of the remaining champions of materialistic and atheistic science, why does not the professor bravely come forth to defend the moss-grown theories against the onslaught of Scientific theism, and valiantly charge into the shrinking form of his adversary, right in the arena of the public eye? Does it behoove a world acclaimed scientist, a giant of mathematics, to say: 'My arguments you will not understand, I cast not my pearls before swine.'

It reminds one of the old fairy tale by H. C. Anderson, 'The Emperor's New Clothes,' which were so intricately and fearfully spun that they could not be seen by persons who were not wise, or who could not properly serve his majesty—and thus the visibility of the emperor's new clothes became a criterion of intellect of his subjects—only to have the bubble pricked by an unsophisticated street gamin, who cried out in astonishment: 'But the

emperor is stark naked!’—tableau!

If someone has said that only seven, or was it twelve, men in the whole world would understand Einstein’s theory of relativity, he should add ‘as Einstein dresses it’—for relativity with common sense and logic instead of a lot of sophistic embellishments is not such a formidable study.

The writer was amazed at the spectacular ascendancy of Professor Einstein in the public view and the acquiescent attitude of a seemingly bewildered lot of scientific institutions—an attitude almost similar to the impulsive reception of Dr. Cook of North Pole fame.

When the reaction comes, when Professor Einstein has left the United States, covered with decorations, the professor probably will realize that it were better had he met the questions squarely in the spirit in which they were made, because they now will stand as though cut in granite: Relativity or Interdependence? And must sooner or later be met without beating the devil around a bush with evasive and irreconcilable statements.—E. Lee Heidenreich, Kansas City, Mo.”

As Heidenreich had affirmed, the *Aftenposten* of Oslo, Norway wrote on 18 June 1920,

“Diskussionen om relativitetsteorien.

En amerikansk professor, som gjør krav paa at være
teoriens skaber.

En udtalelse af professor Einstein.

Vi har liggende foran os et eksemplar af den amerikanske avis »St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press«, som udkommer i St. Paul, Minnesota. Numeret er dateret 1ste februar 1920 og indeholder bl. a. en længere artikel om relativitetsteorien. Bladet giver en fremstilling af det arbejde, som den amerikanske professor Arvid Reuterdahl har nedlagt til udforskning af den saa meget omtalte relativitetsteori. Det dreier sig om en meget mystisk affære, idet det heder, at professor Reuterdahl saa tidlig som i 1902 har skapt teorien, men paa en lidt usandsynlig maade er hans manuskript kommet paa afveje. Hvordan? Jo, historien lyder som følgende i »St. Pauls Pioneer«:

Professor Einstein offentliggjorde sin teori i »Annalen der Physik« for 1905. Reuterdahl foretog sin teori den 5te april 1902 i »The American Electrochemical society« ved dets aabningstnode i Philadelphia. Udviklingen af teorien beskæftigede ham helt til 1914, da han var færdig med udarbeidelsen. Hans teori vakte straks stor interesse og i februar 1915 gav han forelæsninger over sin teori ved Kansas State Agricultural College og senere ved Kansas universitet.

Den 19de februar 1915 blev professor Reuterdahls manuskript sendt til Norge, hvor det var meningen, at redaktør Oppedal skulde offentliggøre

det i »Verdens Gang«. Redaktør Oppedal refererede professor Reuterdahls arbeide til professor Størmer; men presserende arbeide hindrede en undersøgelse og overveielse. Det blev saa refereret for professor Mittag-Leffler i Stockholm. Her mister man ethvert spor af manuskriptet.

Albert Einstein er nu medlem af en tysk videnskabelig kommission. Hans sidste arbeide hader »Time, Space and Gravitation«. Reuterdahls manuskript bærer titelen »Space, Time Potential, a new concept of Gravitation and Electricity«. Postprotokoller viser, at manuskriptet var et sted i Europa i hænde hos en tysk professor i begyndelsen af 1915.

Professor Reuterdahl har nu under udarbeidelse en ny bog om sin teori og denne bog vil blive hans livsverk.

Saavidt vor amerikanske kilde. Alle de forsøg vi har sat igang for at finde sporet efter det forsvundne manuskript er mislykket og nogen berettiget mening om den mystiske affæres vitterlighed skal vi ikke driste os til at have.

Men hvad siger professor Einstein til dette. Det vilde have sin interesse at vide, om han kjender professor Reuterdahls arbeider. »Nei«, svarer professor Einstein paa vor forespørgsel. »Jeg kjender ikke professor Reuterdahls navn og har aldrig hørt tale om, at han skal have arbeidet paa relativitetsteorien. Jeg har ofte korresponderet med professor Mittag-Leffler, men han omtalte aldrig noget saadant arbeide. Jeg vil ikke bestemt paastaa umuligheden i det, som nævnes i den amerikanske avis, men jeg finder det hele lidet sandsynlig. Hvis professor Reuterdahl virkelig har opdaget relativitetsteorien, vilde vi med stor sandsynlighed have faaet underretning om det. Jeg kjender størstedelen af den literatur om dette emne, men noget arbeide af Reuterdahl har jeg ikke truffet paa. Dette er jo ikke bevis«, slutter professor Einstein, og tilføier: »Ein rechter Mensch vilde ikke have gjort den reklame, som professor Reuterdahl har gjort gennem den amerikanske avis«.

Det var Einsteins svar, som ikke stiller professor Reuterdahls paastand i noget godt lys. Et moment, som taler for den samme antagelse, ligger deri, at hvis professor Reuterdahl havde ret, vilde et universitet som University of Columbia have tildet ham sin store guldmedalje. Som vi tidligere har meddelt, har Columbiauniversitetet tildelt professor Einstein denne medalje.”

4.7.1.3 Reuterdahl Pursues Einstein, Who Continues to Run

Heidenreich was right, Einstein’s refusal to respond to charges that he was a plagiarist haunted Einstein around the world and throughout his lifetime. The *Minneapolis Evening Tribune* wrote on 15 April 1921,

**“Einstein, Jolted
Out of Silence,**

Defends Theory

Challenged by St. Thomas Mentor,
Scientist Goes Deeper Into
Relativity Explanation.

Mathematician Ignores Charge
That He Is Not Originator of
Deductions Reached.

Professor Albert Einstein has been jolted out of a silence he has maintained since his arrival in America by the challenge of Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college, according to dispatches today from New York.

Plagiarism Charge Ignored.

The charge that the famous mathematician is a plagiarist or at least not the originator of the theory which upset the scientific world is ignored, on the ground that it is not important. Professor Reuterdaahl, however, has succeeded in bringing out a specific statement as to a test of the Einstein theory of relativity, and today the St. Thomas professor declared he was ready to meet the assertions concerning that test, and would make a statement later.

Einstein's Test Stated.

Professor Einstein's test, upon which he declares he is willing to rest his whole theory, was stated as follows:

'You know the solar spectrum. Everybody has seen it in the rainbow. You have also seen it when the sunlight passes through a triangular glass prism and falls upon a screen.

'Any light-giving body produces a spectrum, but the spectra from a different bodies are not alike. The spectrum from sodium for instance, shows only two yellow lines. The hydrogen spectrum shows only four colors.

Band With Seven Colors.

'The solar spectrum is a colored band, showing seven primary and secondary colors, ranging from red at one side to violet at the other.

'My theory demands that the spectrum of solar light, as compared with similar spectra from all other bodies, must be different in this respect.

'The lines of the solar spectrum must be found displaced—that is out of line—in the direction of red. If my theory of relativity is true, then this must be true. Why? Because of the nearness of the original solar light to the great mass which is the sun. If my theory is true, that mass must affect the spectral lines as I have said.'”

The *Minneapolis Morning Tribune* reported on 16 April 1921,

“Relativity Hit Counter Blow By Reuterdaahl

Twin City Man Says Einstein
Cult Has Not Attained
Dignity of Theory.

Conceding that Prof. Albert Einstein, famous mathematician, whose theory of relativity startled the scientific world, has been supported by the results of one experiment, but contending that his theory still is a mere hypothesis without a foundation in fact, Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college yesterday renewed his attack upon the theory.

Replying to Professor Reuterdaahl's challenge, Professor Einstein gave out a statement in New York, the first since his arrival in America, in which he declared that he was willing to rest his whole theory upon one experiment.

‘Admission Proves Contention.’

In turn, Professor Reuterdaahl declared that the mathematicians' admission that the theory had not been proved substantiated his contention that relativity had not been established and never would be.

One effect of the challenge by Professor Reuterdaahl was that the man whom he had called the Barnum of the scientific world was jolted out of a profound silence. To the charge of plagiarism Professor Einstein gave no heed, but he did rush to the defense of his pet theory.

Einstein's Test Stated.

Professor Einstein's test, upon which he declares he is willing to rest his whole theory, was stated as follows:

‘You know the solar spectrum. Everybody has seen it when the sunlight passes through a triangular glass prism and falls upon a screen.

‘Any light-giving body produces a spectrum, but the spectra from different bodies are not alike. The spectrum from sodium, for instance, shows only two yellow lines. The hydrogen spectrum shows only four colors.

Band With Seven Colors.

‘The solar spectrum is a colored band, showing seven primary and secondary colors, ranging from red at one side to violet at the other.

‘My theory demands that the spectrum of solar light, as compared with

similar spectra from all other bodies, must be different in this respect.

‘The lines of the solar spectrum must be found displaced—that is out of line—in the direction of red. If my theory of relativity is true, then this must be true. Why? Because of the nearness of the original solar light to the great mass which is the sun. If my theory is true, that mass must affect the spectral lines as I have said.’

Professor Reuterdaahl’s answer to this statement follows:

‘Professor Einstein refuses to enter into a written debate with me concerning the correctness of the basic tenets of the theory of relativity for the reason that he is willing to risk the validity of the entire theory on the result of an experiment. The theory of relativity assumes the displacement of the solar spectral lines toward the red will take place when the original solar light is near to a great mass like the sun. Professor Einstein admits that if this displacement does not take place then the general theory of relativity must be abandoned as untenable.

‘Upon the results of this experiment Dr. Einstein rests the validity of his entire theory. Many experiments intended to discover this displacement have already been made. Had these experiments been successful Professor Einstein would not have made the statement which has this very day been transmitted to me by The Minneapolis Tribune.

‘Professor Einstein’s admission of the absence of this verification transforms the entire situation and leaves the theory as an hypothesis yet to be verified.

‘Furthermore, Professor Einstein has admitted that it is extremely difficult to observe the deflection, even if it does exist, because of the fact that the predicted displacement is extremely small.

‘Moreover, Professor Einstein has conceded the further fact that it is very difficult to make any calculations whatsoever, because of the indefiniteness of the involved facts.

‘Now Professor Einstein himself admits that he rests the validity of his entire intellectual structure upon the future results of this extremely delicate experiment involving conditions difficult of realization.

‘Professor Einstein, in his reply to my challenge, makes no mention of the significance of the observations made by the English solar expedition and the observed motion of the planet Mercury.

‘Apparently he magnanimously waives the right to contend that the result of his predictions and calculations concerning the bending of light rays and the perihelion-perturbation of Mercury has bearing upon the validity of his theory.

‘I gladly grant the importance and bearing of these mathematical deductions of Professor Einstein. The granting of these contentions, however, in no way modifies my conviction that the theory of relativity is grounded upon fallacious assumptions, and therefore cannot survive. The history of science shows that one mathematic-physical theory after another has been abandoned because of inadequacy, unnecessary complexities, and

untenability in the light of wider knowledge.

‘It is true, of course, that this is the price which must be paid for intellectual advancement.

‘Nevertheless it is also true that an hypothesis based upon fallacious assumptions contains the leaven of its own ultimate dissolution, despite the fact that some of the results of its applications to physical phenomena may be approximately correct.

‘This I am prepared to prove is the status of Professor Einstein’s theory of relativity. I am, indeed, surprised that Professor Einstein, while claiming that he had written his book from scientific motives and not for the sake of notoriety, lightly brushes to one side a challenge to a debate upon the validity of his theory. In no better way can the cause of science be served.

‘A theory which so completely upsets all common-sense deductions concerning realities cannot hope forever to go unchallenged. Certainly it is not in keeping with the scientific motives of which Professor Einstein claims to be so ardent an exponent, continuously to reiterate the platitude that those who do not accept his theory are incapable of comprehending its alleged profundities.

‘I desire to disabuse Professor Einstein of the correctness of the inference that any ulterior personal motive caused me to issue my challenge to him. The matter of nationality of an earnest investigator or any other ulterior motive never has had and never will have any bearing upon my attitude toward the significance and value of his work.’”

The Kansas City Post reported on 17 April 1921,

“DUBS EINSTEIN ‘BARNUM OF SCIENCE’ AND ‘KIDDER’

German Savant Challenges
Theorist to Written Debate
on Relativity.

Charges Feted Jew With
Having Plagiarized Material
From the Past.

A ‘Barnum of science.’

Thus is Prof. Albert Einstein, German scientist, who at present is making a triumphal visit to the United States, branded by a former Kansas City public school professor, Dr. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the engineering school of St. Thomas college, St. Paul.

While New York hands the celebrated discoverer of the theory of relativity the key to the city, and while savants, scholars, bankers, butchers, hang on his non-understandable words, Dr. Reuterdaahl steps out and boldly calls him names.

A 'sophist,' a dealer in 'might have beens,' says Dr. Reuterdaahl of Einstein.

The former Kansas City teacher then challenges the widely heralded mathematician to a written debate.

Dr. Reuterdaahl, speaking of course in scientific language, has said in effect that he is prepared to prove the Einstein theory largely 'bunk,' and a borrowing from older scientists. It is easy enough, he insinuates, to set forth a theory of any kind, so long as you make it sufficiently abstruse not to be understood.

Long before Einstein announced his visit to America, Dr. Reuterdaahl and he had become involved in an international dispute over his theory. The controversy has attracted wide attention in the old world from Norway to Italy.

Dr. Reuterdaahl, who was an instructor at the Polytechnic institute here, left Kansas City in 1915. In the fall of the same year he gave lectures at the Kansas State Agricultural college at Manhattan and at Kansas university on 'Space-Time-Potential,' in which he set forth some of the same views enunciated by Einstein, crediting them to scientists who lived before Einstein was born.

At that time Dr. E. Lee Heidenreich of the Heidenreich Engineering company of Kansas City, a friend of Dr. Reuterdaahl, wrote the Carnegie institute of Dr. Reuterdaahl's lectures, saying:

'It takes a scientific giant to gainsay a Newton and such a giant we have with us today.'

Coupled with his challenge to a debate, Dr. Reuterdaahl now asserts that Einstein is deceiving scientists with a mythical theory and that he is a plagiarist, his works being antedated by another.

Dr. Reuterdaahl points out that the Einstein theory of relativity in its gravitational aspects was advanced in 1866 by a scientist who wrote under the pen name of 'Kinertia.' The latter, when a student under Lord Kelvin, is said to have questioned the Newton theory of force.

Dr. Reuterdaahl gives Einstein credit for breaking down the barriers of set ideas in science and making it possible for hearing new ideas.

'The American scientists,' says Dr. Reuterdaahl, 'are the most clannish and orthodox in the world. They will not consider anything but what is based on their own knowledge and belief.'

Dr. Reuterdaahl, while giving Einstein credit for being one of the greatest

mathematicians in the world, 'calls' him on many parts of his theory.

'I demand that Einstein show me his proof,' says the American professor. 'I believe in dealing in the physical things in the world. In other words, I am from Missouri. I shall be glad to meet Professor Einstein at any time or place and debate this subject. But I shall demand an actual demonstration of his theory, not a journey into the realm of the mythical. That demonstration he can never give.'"

Ernst Gehrcke noted in his book *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 29-30; that the *Neue Preußische (Kreuz-) Zeitung* wrote on 11 April 1921, together with many other papers,

"EINSTEIN als Plagiator herausgefordert. Aus Paris, 11. April, wird gedrahtet: Aus Minneapolis erfährt die „*Chicago Tribune*“ Prof. ARVID REUTERDAUL, der Präsident der Ingenieure der St. Thomas-Universität, erklärt über die Theorie des Professor EINSTEIN, daß dieser der „BARNUM“ der Wissenschaft für die Welt sei. Professor REUTERDAUL fordert EINSTEIN zu einer schriftlichen Debatte über die Relativitätstheorie heraus. REUTERDAUL nennt EINSTEIN nicht nur einen verrückten Wissenschaftler mit mystischer Theorie, sondern auch einen Plagiator und behauptete, daß die EINSTEINSche Theorie bereits 1866 von einem Gelehrten unter dem Namen „INERTIA“ entdeckt worden sei."

Gehrcke further notes that the *Vorwärts* wrote on 18 April 1921,

"Ein amerikanischer Professor hat die Theorie des Prof. EINSTEIN für eitel Humbug erklärt und ihn als einen Mann hingestellt, der einfach die wissenschaftliche Welt an der Nase herumführe. EINSTEIN ist der Schöpfer von etwas Neuem, nicht Dagewesenem, der Menge vor der Hand Unbegreiflichem, und daß alle neuen und großen Entdeckungen ihre Gegner haben und in der Geschichte stets hatten, scheint beinahe eine Notwendigkeit zu sein."

According to Gehrcke, the *Dresdner Anzeiger* reported on 18 April 1921,

"Professor EINSTEIN äußerte mit Bezug auf das Urteil des amerikanischen Prof. REUTERDAHL vom Thomas-College über seine Relativitätstheorie, sie sei die Leistung eines „Barnum der Wissenschaft“, daß solche Angriffe ihn sehr an seine deutsche Heimat gemahnten . . . Prof. EINSTEIN lehnte es formell ab, mit Professor REUTERDAHL sich in eine wissenschaftliche Aussprache einzulassen."

Die Hamburger Woche wrote on 9 June 1921,

“Jenseits des großen Teiches hat A l b e r t E i n s t e i n, der mit seiner Relativitätstheorie raschen Weltruhm gewann, große Ehrungen erfahren. Beim Besuch der Princeton-Universität wurde er in Anwesenheit vieler Gelehrter anderer amerikanischer Hochschulen zum Ehrendoktor ernannt. Von einer anderen amerikanischen Hochschuleseite dagegen ist Einstein ein neuer scharfer Gegner erstanden. Professor A r v i d R e u t e r d a h l, der Präsident der Ingenieure der St. Thomas-Universität, erklärte über die Theorie des Professors Einstien, daß dieser der „Barnum der Wissenschaft“ für die Welt sei. Professor Reuterdahl fordert Einstein zu einer schriftlichen Debatte über die Relativitätstheorie heraus. Reuterdahl nennt Einstein nicht nur einen „verrückten Wissenschaftler mit hysterischer Theorie“, sondern auch einen P l a g i a t o r und behauptet, daß die Einsteinsche Theorie bereits 1866 von einem Gelehrten unter dem Namen „I n e r t i a“ entdeckt worden sei.

Man darf gespannt sein, welches objektive Endergebnis sich aus den Kämpfen für und wider Einstein die Wissenschaft schließlich herausdestillieren wird! . . .”

4.7.2 Einstein All Hype

On 27 April 1921, Gertrude Besse King wrote about the publicity campaign for Einstein in *The Freeman* of New York,

“ALADDIN EINSTEIN. THE popular interest in America in Professor Einstein’s theories has astonished the professor. The public who does not know whether the theory of relativity has accounted for the alteration of mercury or of Mercury, waylays his steps, and delights, with the exception of a mere alderman or two, to do him honour. Gifted newspaper-reporters herald him as the originator of the theory of relativity, which, by the way he is not, and question him as to the ultimate nature of space, though only a mathematical physicist who is also a philosopher could understand the professor’s answers.

This general interest in an extremely difficult science is not quite what it seems. Probably Professor Einstein does not realize how sensationally and cunningly he has been advertised. From the point of view of awakening popular curiosity, his press-notices could hardly have been improved. The newspapers first announced his discovery as revolutionizing science. This sounds well, but its meaning, after all, is rather vague. Then they printed a series of entertaining oddities, supposedly deducible from his hypothesis, although most of them could have been equally well deduced from the conclusions of Lorentz or Poincaré: for example, moving objects are shortened in the direction of their motion. This is a gay novelty until one learns the proportion of the reduction, which is calculated to divest the statement of interest to any but scientists. Further, our newspapers told us that if we were to travel from the earth with the speed of light, and could see

the clock we left behind, it would always remain at the same moment, permanently pausing, unable to reach the next tick. But we should be unable to travel at the rate of light for a number of reasons, the most interesting and perhaps the most decisive being that such a speed would cause our mass to be infinite! Finally, our informants assert that no point in space, no moment of time can serve as a permanent base for measurement; we can measure only the relations of space, the relations of time, never absolute space or time; and even to measure space-relations, we have to take into account time! What a fascinating dervish-dance of what we used to regard as immutable fixities! Is it possible that these delicious contradictions are serious and accredited doctrines among those who know? Yet so they appear, for though Professor Einstein is always careful in stating that his hypothesis enjoys as yet only a tentative security, his methods are vouched for by the experts, his procedure is according to Hoyle, and the crowd is at liberty to gorge its appetite for marvels untroubled by the ogres of scientific orthodoxy.

Aside from the fact that Professor Einstein comes as a distinguished and somewhat mysterious foreigner to partake of our insatiable hospitality, his popular welcome is to be accounted for by the spell of wizardry that the press has cast upon his interpretations. For it is the necromancy of these strange theories, not their science, that catches the gaping crowd. Reporters are often good, practical psychologists. Instinctively they have divined the public eagerness for miracles, without grasping the factors that feed this taste. They know that most of us are essentially children still clamouring for fairy tales. Man is congenitally restless with the prison-house of this too, too solid world. He is always looking for short-cuts to power. Since he can not find them to his mental satisfaction as once he could through the miracles and divine dispensations of the Church, or through the magic and occultism that were his legitimate resources in the Middle Ages, he now turns to the wonders of science and philosophy. Here, even in theories that he does not understand, he can find release for his cramped position, here he can taste the intoxicating freedom of a boundless universe, and renew his sense of personal potency. [. . .]”⁶³³

Thomas Jefferson Jackson See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal* on 27 May 1923,

“If anyone should ask how Einstein managed to get such vast publicity in the matter of relativity, we may observe that he has the habit of a promoter. Mark Twain humorously wrote to the president of the St. Louis exposition in 1904, that he ‘would like to attend the exposition and exhibit himself.’ So also does Einstein contrive constantly to be seen among men in conspicuous places. When he came to America, with the Zionist committee, some two years ago, he had to go to the White House at Washington and talk relativity to President Harding. The President, with becoming modesty, said he could not understand the subject.

Things in Europe afterwards became uncomfortable for Einstein, and he sought refuge in an Oriental trip. When in Tokyo he called upon the emperor of Japan, and it was advertised over the world that he was without a dress suit. This report is spectacular and like that of a skillful advertiser.

His return trip is duly chronicled by the press. Thus he finally arrives in Egypt, and on reaching Spain addresses the Academy of Science, at a session held in the presence of the king of Spain. If this is not the trumpeting of an organized press agency, what is it?

Einstein is not liked in Germany. A year or so ago, the students at the University of Berlin hooted him down. It was reported that he was in fear of assassination—but it probably was only a ruse to gain public sympathy.”⁶³⁴

The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune published a letter from Arvid Reuter Dahl on 22 May 1921, which, while not the best work on the subject, is notable for its ridicule of Einstein for running away from the Bad Nauheim debate, as well as Einstein’s refusal to debate Reuter Dahl. It quotes a Swiss newspaper’s statement that Einstein’s flight from the Nauheim debate, “was another prearranged matter of his general trafficking.” The alleged corruption is proven by Philipp Frank, who described Max Planck’s biased control over the debate and his abuse of his power to censor speakers, intimidate the would-be audience and anti-Einstein speakers with armed guards, and restrict the topics of discussion in a way that would favor Einstein and prevent Einstein’s having to face criticisms of the Metaphysics in the theory of relativity.⁶³⁵ Frank wrote,

“[Max Planck] arranged it so that the greatest part of the available time was filled with papers that were purely mathematical and technical. Not much time remained for Lenard’s attack and the debate that would ensue. The entire arrangement was made to prevent any dramatic effects. [***] The armed policemen who had watched the building were withdrawn.”⁶³⁶

The theory of relativity is largely a metaphysical theory, not a scientific theory. In order to oppose the Metaphysics of relativity theory one must, of course, discuss Metaphysics. Proponents of relativity theory often refuse to discuss Metaphysics claiming that Metaphysics has nothing to do with science, and they thereby insulate their theory from criticism. Einstein did not grasp the distinction between Metaphysics and science. He stated in 1930, “Science itself is metaphysics.”⁶³⁷

Hugo Dingler, a critic of relativity theory, confirmed that severe time restrictions were placed on the opponents of relativity theory at the Bad Nauheim debate. Others complained that Einstein’s followers had stacked the audience with a pro-Einstein clique and tried to prevent the admission of neutral “unauthorized” persons into the forum.⁶³⁸ Philipp Frank admitted that the corruption backfired—every fairminded person smelled a rat, and knew that Einstein and the relativists were avoiding the facts and dodging the issues. Just when Nobel Prize winner Philipp Lenard, Einstein’s primary opponent, had cornered Einstein at the debate, Einstein ran away. Max Planck stopped the discussion for a break, and Einstein never returned. It is

difficult to believe that this was not a prearranged maneuver to save face for Einstein.

Reuterdahl's article published in *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune* on 22 May 1921,:

“Science’s ‘Baby Guy’ Was Simple Child Till Einstein Adopted It

Clothed in a Garbled Dress of Mathematical Theories,
the Youngster, ‘Relativity,’ Joined Ranks of
Unintelligible Genii—Swiss Paper Backs Reuterdal.

By Arvid Reuterdahl.

Dean Department of Engineering and Architecture
the College of St. Thomas.

In a signed statement published in *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, issue of May 16, Dr. E. Lee Heidenreich, the eminent engineer, mathematician, and philosopher of Kansas City, Mo., points out that Dr. Einstein does not hesitate to make irreconcilable statements in order to avoid facing issues squarely. I now have in my possession a copy of the ‘Aftenposten’ article which was cited by Dr. Heidenreich in his communication to *The Tribune*. I also have a copy of the *New York World* interview with Dr. Einstein. The date of the ‘Aftenposten’ article is June 18, 1920, and the *New York World* interview is dated April 12, 1921.

There is only one verdict possible when a comparison is made of these two conflicting statements of Professor Einstein, either his statements are relativistic conveniences or his memory has been weakened by relativistic sophistries. Dr. Einstein, it seems, is permitted to say anything he pleases without being held accountable.

Access to Ziegler’s Work.

From abroad I have received copies of publications which convey the idea, in no uncertain terms, that while Dr. Einstein was in Switzerland he had access to the work of Dr. J. H. Ziegler and that he used the results of this able investigator’s work without giving him any credit whatsoever.

I have now in my possession evidence furnished by ‘Kinertia,’ which shows conclusively that in the year 1903, copies of certain contributions of ‘Kinertia’ were in the hands of the imperial Prussian academy of science in Berlin. Did Dr. Einstein avail himself of those easily accessible records? Moreover in September, 1904, a well-known American journal published a statement setting forth ‘Kinertia’s’ theory of gravitation.

Swiss Paper on Einstein.

The following quotations from the well known Swiss paper, ‘the Lucerne

Daily News,' of April 22, 1921, should have been interesting reading to Dr. Einstein under the heading, 'Professor Einstein's Triumphal March Through America,' a translation of the article reads:

'Professor Albert Einstein and the Zionist delegation which arrived simultaneously with him, was accorded a very warm welcome on its arrival in New York. The entire New York press devoted a good deal of space to this happening, as well as to the personality of Einstein. One can clearly see that there is again question here of the previously ordered advertising, just as the whole Einstein undertaking has been from its very beginning a bluff. This time the Americans were supposed to believe, but the good Yankee seemed to be less naive than the good Germans and Swiss, and were not so easily forced into a belief in the new prophet. They are too skeptical to believe without a further proof that he is a greater genius than Copernicus and Newton, simply because he is more unintelligible.

Too Much Common Sense.

'Americans have too much common sense for that. They know that all the great truths are simple and easily understood, and are, therefore, justly suspicious of the unintelligible theory of relativity of Einstein. More than that they have rejected it as a swindle. Just for example Reuterdaahl, dean of engineering of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, calls Einstein a 'Barnum of the scientific world who is trying to fool the whole world with a mythical theory.' It is further reported that Reuterdaahl has challenged Einstein to a debate, into which he is as likely to enter as in the debate announced last year at the meeting for scientific investigation in Bad Nauheim, where he preferred to withdraw himself quietly before the announced opponents of his theory could say what they had to say. To these opponents was expressed the regret that Mr. Einstein was unable, because of circumstances, to answer them. This, of course, was another prearranged matter of his general trafficking. It is very likely that he is acting in a similar manner towards Reuterdaahl. The more so because the latter has accused him of scientific theft, for Reuterdaahl maintains that Einstein has taken the fundamentals of his theory from a work which appeared in 1866 under the pseudonym of 'Kinertia.'

Work Little Known In Europe.

'As this work is scarcely known in Europe, the accusation may possibly be groundless. Similar accusations have been made by German scientists, such as the Engineer Rudolph Mewes, Professors E. Gehrke and Paul Weyland, etc. According to them, Einstein is supposed to have secretly taken a formula from a publication of the deceased Professor Gerber which appeared in 1898, and was very inaccessible, and to have made it his own. The facts in the matter are, of course, difficult to prove, nevertheless, the peculiar conduct of Einstein and his sensational advertising campaign lead one to believe that his whole business is very suspicious. However, most of these opponents seem to be upon a wrong scent, because they do not understand the circumstances which existed at the time of the origination of

the Einsteinian teaching, and do not sufficiently understand the influences that may have been at work in regard to his theory. He seems to have started with the correct notion of the constancy of the velocity of light, and of vacuum; which portion, however, he did not test out further, but simply accepted hypothetically; whereas, the other teachings of his theory are so tangled and contradictory that they seem to have come from an entirely different source.

Deductions Criticized.

‘These other peculiar assumed proofs, and the still more peculiar deductions made from them have been criticized by many scientists, notably by Professor Lenard, a former Nobel Prize winner in physics. Lenard calls attention to the fact that these suppositions and deductions are contradictory to common sense. Einstein’s acceptance of constancy of the velocity of light, which he makes the one stable concept in the shoreless ocean of his theory of relativity, seems to be a special case. It is already suspicious, because the physicists at that time denied the existence of absolute empty space, and regarded such a thing as impossible, but then conceded it without more adieu when they accepted Einstein’s hypotheses, and in addition regarded him as having performed a very acceptable thing. As a matter of fact Einstein’s theory of velocity of light seems to be a direct theft of the universal theory of light given out by J. H. Ziegler five years previous. There are reasons that seem to point with great probability to the fact that the teaching of Ziegler was the hidden spring of Einstein’s discovery.

The Unmoved Emptiness.

‘Just to mention one of them, the findings of Ziegler were very much discussed in Berne, which was at the time Einstein’s domicile. Ziegler speaks of the trinity of energy, space and time, a trinity which Mr. Einstein then brought forth in a modified form. The clear and simple teaching of Ziegler, according to which all natural phenomena are mixed forms of radiating source light (urlicht), and unmoved (unergized) emptiness, were very inconvenient to the exponents of accepted physics, and so they tried from the beginning to suppress it. Thus they created an opportunity for a clever and foxy plagiarist to possess himself of these principle teachings. He would get all the greater hearing and support from those physicists if he would proffer his plagiarism in a manner intelligible to them, but unintelligible to the general public. Mathematics served as an excellent medium. The chemist (not the mathematician) Ziegler, had made the mistake of writing intelligibly and of revealing the mistakes in modern physics, thus Einstein appeared to these physicists as a Deus ex Machina, he was a friend in need. It is no wonder that he was hailed as long-expected Messiah of the world of physics, the true bringer of light.

Ziegler’s Name Forgotten.

‘Ziegler’s name was forgotten in the great propaganda which the papers carried on for Einstein. Ziegler has not always propounded his teachings so clearly that superficial study would lead to a great understanding of it. Thus,

there was occasion of all sorts of misconception. Hence the many mistakes of the theory of relativity. How could this theory of relativity be unified and clear when it was only a mixed pickle affair of erroneous plagiarisms. The fact that Einstein's theory approached the Ziegler light theory more and more every year does not disprove that the Ziegler theory is a source of Einsteinian wisdom, even though the Einsteinian press has carefully boycotted Ziegler for 20 years. The Americans, of course, know nothing of this. If they reject Einstein, it is rather because they are angry to be considered so stupid as to regard the greatest scientific discovery as the most unintelligible. The Americans know well enough that the opposite is the case, and for this reason the business trip of the false prophet in the United States will scarcely constitute a triumphal march.

From German Journal.

The following excerpts from the Scientific journal 'Weltwissen,' May, 1921, published in Munich, Germany, is significant:

'From numerous sources we have previously received various printed articles and manuscripts directed against Einstein, among others, one from the 'Regierungsrat,' Dr. H. Fricke, 'The Error In Einstein's Theory of Relativity' and from the Engineer A. Patschke, 'The Overthrow of the Einsteinian Theory of Relativity.' The tremendous advertising campaign, which Einstein has for some time conducted throughout the world has been carried on to such an extent as to throw a sort of protective film over his work. Such procedure does not redound to the honor and furtherance of science, in special letters, at the beginning of the year 1920, we called the attention of the University of Berlin and of the minister of education to this horn-tooting for Einstein. It is a very deplorable fact that German science should be laid open to ridicule by one of Germany's own scientists.'

This statement emanated from Dr. Johannes Zacharias of the editorial department of the journal 'Weltwissen.'⁶³⁹

4.8 Assassination Plots

Though Theodor Wolff, editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, had stated that there was no anti-Semitic movement in the German government in 1915, Wolff spread the rumor in 1922 (which was denied by the German police) that assassins were out to murder him and Albert Einstein. Wolff's pronouncement followed on the heels of the assassination of Walter Rathenau. Rathenau was a German Jew who found a way around the Treaty of Versailles (which he had supported—profiteering off of the reparations payments made by Germany) by restoring Germany's military in Russia with the Rapallo Treaty. It was alleged that he and his friends could financially profit from this venture and that they sought to sponsor Bolshevism. Bolshevism itself stole the wealth of Russia and channeled it other hands. Rathenau was preparing the way for the Second World War.

Wolff's baseless claims of assassination plots may have been a pretext for Einstein's withdrawal from the meetings of the League of Nations, where he would

have had to have met with his critic Henri Bergson, and been publicly challenged to debate his positions. Instead of running this risk, Einstein ran around the world promoting himself and advertising the theory of relativity—and Zionism, at a critical point in the history of the Zionist Movement. In this same period, Wickham Steed prevented Lord Northcliffe, principal owner of *The London Times* and outspoken critic of Zionism, from voicing his objections to the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine of 24 July 1922 (reproduced in the endnote⁶⁴⁰). Perhaps the Zionists sought sympathy for their cause by spreading rumors that Einstein was in danger from those who had murdered Rathenau. They failed to explain how exposing himself in public and traveling abroad safeguarded Einstein.

Einstein's Internationalism and his anti-Germanism did indeed cause some Germans to wish him dead; and a year earlier, in 1921, Rudolph Leibus put a bounty on Einstein's head and Leibus was prosecuted for it. *The New York Times* carried the story reported by the *Chicago Tribune*,

**“Urged Murder of Einstein,
Pays \$16 Fine in Berlin Court**

Copyright, 1921, by The Chicago Tribune Co.

BERLIN, April 7.—Charged with attempting to incite the murder of Professor Albert Einstein, who is now in America on a lecture tour, Rudolph Leibus, an anti-Semitic leader, was assessed a fine of \$16 by a Berlin Judge.

Leibus recently offered a reward for the murder of Einstein, Professor Foerster and Maximilian Harden, saying that it was a patriotic duty to shoot these leaders of pacifist sentiment.”

Jewish anti-Zionist Walter Rathenau was assassinated on 24 June 1922. Both nationalist Germans and political Zionists hated Rathenau. The political Zionists resented Rathenau for being an advocate for, and prime example of, the possibility of assimilation; and for being a vocal anti-Zionist who believed that assimilation was the best means to end anti-Semitism. Rathenau published an article in Maximilian Harden's newspaper *Die Zukunft* in 1897, in which Rathenau called on Jews to assimilate by adopting the Teutonic values of honesty, manhood and integrity, because they were allegedly not an integral part of German society, but were instead an “alien organism in its body.”⁶⁴¹ He famously wrote, *inter alia*,

“What a peculiar sight! Amidst German life, a segregated and heterogeneous tribal race, glitteringly and gaudily garnished, with a hot-blooded and restless temperament. An Asiatic horde on the soil of Brandenburg.”

“Seltsame Vision! Inmitten deutschen Lebens ein abgesondert fremdartiger Menschenstamm, glänzend und auffällig staffiert, von heißblütig beweglichem Gebaren. Auf märkischem Sand eine asiatische Horde.”⁶⁴²

Rathenau also famously stated that there was a committee of 300 persons, known to each other, who effectively ruled the world. Some believed that Rathenau was one

of them, and that they were the “Elders of Zion”. Rathenau was considered one of the many leading Jews who stabbed Germany in the back in the First World War.

The Zionists had stated that it was *impossible* for Jews to assimilate in a Gentile nation and Rathenau’s murder bolstered their contention and lent sympathy to their cause. German nationalists believed that Rathenau, who had numerous connections to big business and was the son of the founder of AEG and became its chairman in 1915, had profiteered from the war in his role as Director of Economic Mobilization in control of military spending in the German War Ministry, and had bought inferior goods from Jewish merchants at inflated prices, then at war’s end sold off Germany’s machinery of war to his Jewish friends. They quoted statements by Rathenau, in which Rathenau declared that he wanted Germany to lose the war. German nationalists resisted Rathenau, who became Minister of Reconstruction in 1921 and Foreign Minister in 1922, because he had sponsored the punitive Versailles Treaty and had demanded that Germany pay the oppressive reparations it imposed. Furthermore, they thought that the Rapallo Treaty was but another opportunity for Jews to profit from war and that it aided the Bolsheviks.

Anti-Communist *Freikorps* soldier Ernst von Salomon, who served a five year prison sentence for conspiring to assassinate Rathenau, may have believed that Rathenau was one of the alleged Elders of Zion, who wanted to bring Bolshevism to Germany. Rathenau brought about the Rapallo Treaty with the Bolsheviks, and Rathenau had alleged that 300 men controlled the economic destiny of Europe, which 300 some German nationalists assumed were the alleged Elders of Zion. The murder of Rathenau on 24 June 1922, no matter who had committed it and irregardless of the reasons behind it, served as a convenient propaganda tool for the Zionists’ promotion of the adoption of the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine on 24 July 1922.

Racist-segregationist and genocidal-Zionist Albert Einstein stated,

“I regretted the fact that [Rathenau] became a Minister. In view of the attitude which large numbers of the educated classes in Germany assume towards the Jews, I have always thought that their natural conduct in public should be one of proud reserve.”⁶⁴³

Chaim Weizmann wrote,

“[Rathenau’s] attitude was, of course, all too typical of that of many assimilated German Jews; they seemed to have no idea that they were sitting on a volcano; they believed quite sincerely that such difficulties as admittedly existed for German Jews were purely temporary and transitory phenomena, primarily due to the influx of East European Jews, who did not fit into the framework of German life, and thus offered targets for anti-Semitic attacks.”⁶⁴⁴

The *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen-Ausgabe, reported on 5 August 1922,

“Einsteins Absage an den Naturforschertag.

Auf der Liste der Mörderorganisation.

(Telegramm unseres Korrespondenten.)

Leipzig, 4. August.

Die „Leipziger Neuesten Nachrichten“ bringen in ihrer Sonnabendnummer vom 5. August folgende Aufsehen erregende Meldung aus Naturforscherkreisen: Professor Albert Einstein hatte zugesagt, auf der Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte in Leipzig einen Vortrag über die Relativitätstheorie zu halten. Kurz nach der Ermordung Rathenaus teilte aber Einstein dem Vorsitzenden der Gesellschaft, Geheimrat Planck, mit, daß er seine Beteiligung an der Hundertjahrfeier absagen müsse, weil er für mehrere Monate ins Ausland gehe. Diesen plötzlichen Entschluß faßte Einstein, als er erfuhr, daß auch sein Name auf der Liste der Opfer stehe, die von der Mörderorganisation beseitigt werden sollten, der schon Rathenau zum Opfer gefallen ist. Der Entschluß Einsteins, unter diesen Umständen auf längere Zeit ins Ausland zu gehen, war vollkommen zu begreifen. Inzwischen hat sich durch das tatkräftige Eingreifen der Regierung die Lage im Reich erfreulicherweise bedeutend gebessert. Die Mörderorganisation ist aufgedeckt. Alle Schuldigen und Verdächtigen sind in Gewahrsam gebracht worden, so daß nun hoffentlich dem schädlichen Treiben dieser Kreise ein für allemal ein Ende bereitet worden ist. Der Vorsitzende der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte hat nun den Versuch unternommen, Einstein zur Rückkehr nach Deutschland und zur Teilnahme an der Leipziger Hundertjahrfeier zu bewegen, und er bedauert sehr, daß es seinen Bemühungen bisher noch nicht gelungen ist, Einstein zur Rückkehr zu bewegen. Es scheint, daß ein den Gelehrten umgebender engerer Kreis von Freunden und Bewunderern besorgter ist als Einstein selbst. Denn von dieser Seite wird alles getan, die Rückkehr des Gelehrten nach Deutschland zu verhindern oder doch hinaus zu schieben. Hoffentlich aber lassen sich noch diese Schwierigkeiten rechtzeitig überwinden, damit Einstein seinen Vortrag über die Relativitätstheorie in Leipzig doch noch persönlich halten kann.

*

Wie wir erfahren, trifft es zu, daß Professor Einstein an der Leipziger Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte nicht teilnehmen wird. Gewiß ist es ein tief bedauerlicher Vorgang, daß einer der ersten Gelehrten unserer Zeit an einer Veranstaltung von dem Range der Leipziger Tagung deshalb nicht teilnehmen kann, weil er befürchten muß, in Deutschland, seiner Heimat, statt der Ehrungen, die ihm in der ganzen Welt entgegengebracht worden sind, der Kugel eines Meuchelmörders ausgesetzt zu sein. Die Meldung, die das Leipziger Blatt aus Naturforscherkreisen veröffentlicht, ist gewiß sehr gut gemeint. Wir vermögen auch nicht zu beurteilen, in welchem Grade das Leben und die

Sicherheit des großen Gelehrten gefährdet sind. Aber wenn sich auch durch das tatkräftige Eingreifen der Regierung die Lage gebessert hat, so ist doch die Behauptung, daß alle Schuldigen und Verdächtigen in Gewahrsam gebracht seien, etwas kühn und schwerlich zu verantworten. Der Mordbube, der den Anschlag auf Maximilian Harden ausgeführt hat, ist beispielsweise noch nicht gefaßt und Erzbergers Mörder leben in Freiheit und in Saus und Braus. Es ist auch sehr begreiflich, daß die Freunde des Gelehrten in höherem Maße besorgt sind, als er selbst, und es ist sehr bedauerlich, daß Rathenau trotz vielfacher Warnung so wenig besorgt gewesen ist. Vielleicht dient dieser Vorgang, dessen tief beschämender Charakter niemandem entgehen kann, endlich dazu, der moralischen Verwilderung, die aus den genügend gekennzeichneten Gründen in weiten Kreisen des Rechtsradikalismus eingerissen ist, durch die entschiedene Abwehr der anständigen Elemente aus allen Lagern im Interesse des deutschen Namens und der deutschen Ehre Einhalt zu tun."

The *Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung* (Essen a. Ruhr) reported on 5 August 1922 that the whole affair was contrived as a means to advertize Einstein, whose stardom was fading,

"Die flüchtige Relativität"

Eine Teilnahme Einsteins am deutschen Naturforscherkongreß in Leipzig ist, wie das B. T. meldet, nicht zu erwarten. Einstein sollte dort einen Vortrag über seine Relativitätstheorie halten. Nach dem Morde Rathenaus ist er aber ins Ausland gereist, da er, wie er erklärte, auf der schwarzen Liste stände.

*

Die Propagierung der Einsteinschen allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie hat zwar einen für das deutsche Kulturleben gemeingefährlichen Charakter, doch hat Einsteins Person damit nichts zu tun. Seine Flucht und die erdachte schwarze Liste sind eins der vielen jetzt auftauchenden republikanischen Propagandamittel, die man sachlich nicht ernst zu nehmen hat. Einsteins Person ist viel zu unwichtig, als daß jemand um ihretwillen sein Leben aufs Spiel setzen wollte. Daß die von ihm in Szene gesetzte Flucht als Reklame auszulegen ist, die seinen schon merklich verblaßten Stern in neuem Glanze erstrahlen lassen soll, dürfte wohl des Pudels Kern in dieser Affäre bedeuten."

Thomas Jefferson Jackson See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal* on 27 May 1923,

"If anyone should ask how Einstein managed to get such vast publicity in the matter of relativity, we may observe that he has the habit of a promoter. Mark Twain humorously wrote to the president of the St. Louis exposition in 1904, that he 'would like to attend the exposition and exhibit

himself.' So also does Einstein contrive constantly to be seen among men in conspicuous places. When he came to America, with the Zionist committee, some two years ago, he had to go to the White House at Washington and talk relativity to President Harding. The President, with becoming modesty, said he could not understand the subject.

Things in Europe afterwards became uncomfortable for Einstein, and he sought refuge in an Oriental trip. When in Tokyo he called upon the emperor of Japan, and it was advertised over the world that he was without a dress suit. This report is spectacular and like that of a skillful advertiser.

His return trip is duly chronicled by the press. Thus he finally arrives in Egypt, and on reaching Spain addresses the Academy of Science, at a session held in the presence of the king of Spain. If this is not the trumpeting of an organized press agency, what is it?

Einstein is not liked in Germany. A year or so ago, the students at the University of Berlin hooted him down. It was reported that he was in fear of assassination—but it probably was only a ruse to gain public sympathy."⁶⁴⁵

The Associated Press spread Theodor Wolff's rumors of assassination plots. *The New York Times* wrote on 6 August 1922 in Section 2, on page 1,

“Einstein Has Fled Temporarily From Germany Because of Threats That He Will Be Killed

LEIPSIC, Aug. 5 (Associated Press).—Professor Albert Einstein, originator of the theory of relativity, has fled from Germany temporarily because he was threatened with assassination by the group that caused the murder of Dr. Walter Rathenau, German Foreign Minister, according to a letter from Professor Einstein canceling an engagement to address a meeting here.

Efforts to induce the noted scientist to return, in view of the Government's success in coping with the situation, are said to have so far proved unavailing.

Receipt of the letter was announced by the President of the German Physicists' Association, before which Dr. Einstein was to discuss his relativity theory at the organization's 100th anniversary meeting. It was received soon after Dr. Rathenau's assassination, and stated that Dr. Einstein had learned that he also was listed to be killed and had, therefore, decided to go abroad.

It appears that Dr. Einstein's friends and admirers had been more concerned in keeping the scientist safe in this manner than was he himself, and were doing their utmost to prevent, or at least postpone, his return. Dr. Einstein is not accompanying the expedition to Christmas Island, contrary to previously announced plans.

Considerable comment was caused in Geneva early last week by the absence of Dr. Einstein from the meeting of the members of the Intellectual Committee of the League of Nations to begin the work of organization. He had been designated to represent Germany, but did not appear. It was said he was unable to leave his work at the University of Berlin.

Dispatches from Germany soon after the Rathenau murder quoted police authorities there as accusing the notorious 'Consul' organization of having marked twelve leading politicians, editors and financiers of Jewish extraction for assassination, including Dr. Rathenau, Theodor Wolff, editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, and Max Warburg, the Hamburg banker."

The New York Times wrote on 8 August 1922 on page 7,

"URGE EINSTEIN TO HIDE.

Friends Fear Because He Is on Anti-Semite Blacklist.

BERLIN, Aug. 7 (Jewish Telegraph Agency).—Friends of Professor Albert Einstein insist upon his remaining abroad, where he is understood to be hiding from the 'Deutsche Nationale' plotters, by whom he has been blacklisted, together with a number of other leading German Jews.

The fear of Professor Einstein's friends is justified, in the opinion of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, whose editor, Theodor Wolff, is included in the monarchists' blacklist.

'Professor Einstein's continued concealment is advisable,' the *Tageblatt* says, 'because the assailants of Maximilian Harden and Mathias Erzberger have not been apprehended. Professor Einstein's enforced absence is a blot on the German name and honor.'"

The New York Times published a statement on 9 August 1922 on page 10, that perpetuated the myth that anyone who disagreed with Einstein did so out of envy and resultant malice,

"His Offense Can Be Imagined.

It takes not a little thought to arrive at even a suspicion why anybody wants to assassinate Dr. EINSTEIN. Whoever has seen his picture knows how unlikely he is to excite angry passions in any minds. He is gentleness personified, and it is incredible that he ever gave anybody any of the ordinary forms of offense.

But wait! Not long ago he announced, or at least allowed somebody else, without denial, to announce, that there were not more than twelve people in the world who could understand his new theory of relativity. That, come to think of it, did waken something of animosity in every mind whose possessor lacked the self-confidence to number himself among the so exceptional dozen. Humiliation is an unpleasing sensation, and few if any turn more

readily to dislike of him who causes it, and hatred is not far away.

This may not be the basis of the rumored plot against Dr. EINSTEIN, but it is a working hypothesis that will stand until facts are brought forward to prove it untenable.”

The German police refuted Wolff’s alarmist claims. The *Casseler Allgemeine Zeitung* reported on 12 August 1922, that the alleged “blacklist” did not exist and that the pro-Einstein press was corrupt:

“Eine nicht vorhandene Mordliste. Nach der Ermordung RATHENAU’s lief die Meldung durch die Presse, es sei eine Liste der Mörderorganisation aufgefunden worden, auf der die Namen Prof. EINSTEIN’s u. a. verzeichnet gewesen sein sollen. Jetzt endlich wird von der zuständigen Berliner Stelle versichert, daß die polizeilichen Erhebungen . . . eine derartige Liste nicht ans Licht gefördert haben. Daß die amtlichen Stellen der Veröffentlichung dieser Gerüchte in der gesamten Presse nicht sofort ein Dementi entgegengesetzt haben, kann selbst in der politischen Verwirrung jener Tage keine zureichende Erklärung finden.”⁶⁴⁶

There were many more reasons why some suspected that Einstein’s flight from the League of Nations, and the Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte in Leipzig, on the pretext of unsubstantiated murder plots against him, was a contrived affair to create a false panic over anti-Semitism and to promote sympathy for Einstein, the theory of relativity and Zionism in anticipation of a grand world tour. German science had turned against Einstein. Philipp Lenard and others promised to again embarrass Einstein at the Leipzig meeting as they had done in Bad Nauheim. The racist coward Albert Einstein wanted to hide from them, as Ernst Gehrcke recorded in his book *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 62-64. Though Einstein was scheduled to deliver a lecture at the centenary of the Association of German Scientists and Physicians in Leipzig, which was overseen by the corrupt sycophant Max Planck, Einstein again took the coward’s way out. Max Planck and Max von Laue again rescued Albert Einstein from certain embarrassment. Laue, who was far more competent, though no less childish, than Einstein, delivered a lecture on the theory of relativity, while Einstein again hid from his critics.

Several top Physicists, Mathematicians and Philosophers joined Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard in protesting Max Planck’s attempt to deceive the German Public into believing that the scientific community had accepted the theory of relativity as if it were the climax of modern science. These scholars joined together to protect the lay public from the self-aggrandizement and lies of Max Planck and Albert Einstein. Their published protest revealed that the majority of Physicists, Mathematicians and Philosophers considered the theory of relativity to be an unproven hypothesis and a fundamentally flawed, irrational and untenable fiction,

“Die Leitung der „Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte“ hat es für richtig gehalten, unter den wissenschaftlichen Darbietungen der Leipziger Jahrhundertfeier Vorträge über *Relativitätstheorie* auf die Tagesordnung einer großen, allgemeinen Sitzung aufzunehmen. Es muß und soll dadurch wohl der Eindruck erweckt werden, als stelle die Relativitätstheorie einen Höhepunkt der modernen wissenschaftlichen Forschung dar.

Hiergegen legen die unterzeichneten Physiker, Mathematiker und Philosophen entschiedene Verwahrung ein. Sie beklagen aufs tiefste die Irreführung der öffentlichen Meinung, welcher die Relativitätstheorie als Lösung des Welträtsels angepriesen wird, und welche man über die Tatsache im Unklaren hält, daß viele und auch sehr angesehene Gelehrte der drei genannten Forschungsgebiete die Relativitätstheorie nicht nur als eine unbewiesene Hypothese ansehen, sondern sie sogar als eine im Grunde verfehlt und logisch unhaltbare Fiktion ablehnen. Die Unterzeichneten betrachten es als unvereinbar mit dem Ernst und der Würde deutscher Wissenschaft, wenn eine im höchsten Maße anfechtbare Theorie voreilig und marktschreierisch in die Laienwelt getragen wird, und wenn die Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte benutzt wird, um solche Bestrebungen unterstützen.”

After his crushing defeat at Bad Nauheim and humiliation at the Berlin Philharmonic, Einstein elected to run away and hide from Lenard and Gehrcke at the Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte in Leipzig.

The First World War had emancipated all the Jews of the world. Kerensky and the the Bolsheviks had completely liberated the Jews of Russia. Political Zionism was dying a political death. Would not a world tour expose Einstein to greater danger, not less? Einstein had written to the Generalsekretär des Volkerbundes in Genf in July that he was planning to visit Japan.

The Zionist movement was fractionalizing.⁶⁴⁷ Even Louis Brandeis was coming to realize that the Jews did not want to emigrate to the Palestinian desert in large enough numbers to form a majority population and American Zionists were softening. Weizmann and Einstein had a tense relationship. Zionism needed a common enemy, real or manufactured, to hold it together. *The New York Times* reported on 20 July 1922 on page 19,

“JERUSALEM, June 22 (Correspondence of the Associated Press).—The inhabitants of Palestine, both Moslem and Christian, are immeasurably pleased that the British House of Lords yesterday passed the Islington motion disapproving the Balfour declaration of 1917. The native press is jubilant; pan-Arab demonstrations are being held and the local cable office is swamped with congratulatory messages from Arabs to the House of Lords.

The Balfour declaration pledged the erection of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The resolution passed yesterday by a vote of 60 to 29 set forth that

‘the mandate for Palestine in its present form is unacceptable to this House, because it directly violates the pledges made by his Majesty’s Government to the people of Palestine in the declaration of October, 1915, and again in the declaration of November, 1918 (pledges given to the Arabs), and is as at present framed opposed to the sentiments and wishes of the great majority of the people of Palestine. That, therefore, its acceptance by the Council of the League of Nations should be postponed until such modifications have therein been effected as will comply with pledges given by his Majesty’s Government.’

The Arabs regard this incident as a great victory. ‘It is the bounden duty,’ says an Arab call to a demonstration of celebration, ‘of all of us to set forth our gratitude to the House of Lords for having proved to the world that God and justice still live in Great Britain.’

Miraat el Shark, a Jerusalem newspaper, says: ‘We will win our fight for freedom; we have God and right on our side.’ Beit el Makdes, another local paper, says: ‘Our victory in the House of Lords is the beginning of the end of political Zionism.’

The Zionists are correspondingly disappointed at the news. They have not failed to cable strong protests to London. The Chairman of the Zionist organization here said to the Associated Press:

‘All our hopes have been shattered on the rocks of political expediency. If the House of Commons follows the lead of the House of Lords, then Jews of the world will have been dealt a more staggering blow than that administered by the Emperor Hadrian 1,800 years ago, when his persecutions brought about the last dispersion of the Jewish race.’”

The New York Times reported on 26 August 1922, on page 4,

**“ARABS COMING HERE
TO OPPOSE ZIONISM
*Declaring Against Palestine Mandate,
They Seek American and
British Support.***

Copyright 1922, by The New York Times Company.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES

CAIRO, Egypt, Aug. 25.—Following the news last night that the Mesopotamian Ministry had resigned because it was unable to agree with the British regarding the Anglo-Irak treaty comes the news today that the situation in the Irak is restive, due to the efforts of extremists to stir anti-British feeling, while excitement is spreading. The Arab delegation meeting in Congress at Nablus reports that hopes for the success of their Palestine cause against the Jews depend largely on sympathetic action from America and England. Feeling in these two countries is to be aroused for protests against Zionism in Palestine, which will be sent from different Moslem

countries if the Arab propagandists succeed in inducing the Moslems to produce protests.

America may be interested to learn that the Nablus Congress has decided to send an Arab mission to the United States to collect subscriptions for the Arab organization to enable it to continue the campaign against a Jewish national home in Palestine on the present conditions.

A message from Mecca, which is confirmed by Pilgrims recently at Mecca, says Moslems from all Arab countries met there recently and agreed to organize a movement throughout the Moslem Arab world for the elimination of all foreign political and commercial influence from Moslem Arab countries in the Mid-East. Details of the preliminary organization are to be submitted to the Congress which reassembles at Mecca on the occasion of next year's pilgrimage. The native press of Egypt does not favor the Mecca Congress policy on the ground that an exclusively Ismalic policy nowadays is doomed to react on Islam and to the advantage of Islam's opponents.

JERUSALEM, Aug. 25 (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).—The Arab Congress, meeting at Nablus, 33 miles north of here, has adopted a resolution, rejecting the League of Nations mandate plan for Palestine, refusing Palestinian nationality and declining participation in the elections to the Legislature Council.

The congress instructed the political committee to prepare a national covenant and send missions to all Arab settlements in order to create a union of eastern nations. It was also decided to establish propaganda headquarters in London.

The congress was attended by over 100 delegates from all parts of the country. The deliberations ran quietly, undisturbed by demonstrations. Most of the speakers in a determined tone advised the policy of non-co-operation with the British Administration in Palestine.

ZIONISTS URGE UNION.

Karlsbad Congress Seeks to Reconcile

Two American Factions.

KARLSBAD, Aug. 25 (Jewish Telegraph Agency)—Many more delegates to the World Zionist Congress are arriving, the total number now reaching over 150, besides many visitors from Europe and America. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization, was to preside at the formal opening today, which follows the meetings of executive committees.

A determined effort is being made to effect a reconciliation between the two Zionist factions in the United States. The delegates chiefly interested in this movement are from Germany, France, Holland and Belgium. It is fostered by the strong sentiment for peace existing among the delegates.

Nahum Sokolow, Chairman of the World Zionist Executive Committee, is said to be advocating an immediate settlement of the differences between

the two American groups in order to unite all the Zionist forces in the task of upbuilding Palestine.”

It is clear that the Zionists needed a common enemy to unite them, and the alleged murder threats against Einstein, real, contrived or imagined, played a rôle in the promotion of that goal. The Zionists then worked to create economic conditions which would make Germany ripe for a Zionist dictator named Adolf Hitler. The history of the political Zionists’ involvement in German wartime politics is discussed in Isaiah Friedman’s *Germany, Turkey, and Zionism, 1897-1918*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1977).

4.9 Wolff Crying, Dirty Tricks, Censorship, Smear Campaigns and Anonymous Threats in the Name of Einstein

The promoters of Einstein and the theory of relativity have employed many of the same tactics and strategies common to such corrupt Jewish political movements as Zionism and Bolshevism. Charles Lane Poor worked hard to expose Einstein as a fraud.⁶⁴⁸ Poor complained of terrible censorship of his efforts to expose Einstein and the experiments taken as evidence in support of the theory of relativity. This was and is a common complaint among those who raise concerns about the shameless promotion of the plagiarist Albert Einstein, and who question the metaphysical fallacies and internal contradictions of the theory of relativity.

In 1930, C. L. Poor wrote,

“Thus the claim of Einstein to have found a new law of gravitation and the many assertions that the theory of relativity has worked in accounting for the motions of Mercury and has been conclusively proved by the eclipse observations and by the displacement of spectral lines are all merely unproved, and, so far, really unsupported illusions. Einstein and his followers have been dwelling in the ‘pleasing land of drowsyshed—’; in the land ‘Of dreams that wave before the half shut eye.’”⁶⁴⁹

Though the theory of relativity was hyped in the 1920's as a well-proven and perfectly exact, perfectly logical theory, such claims were just that, just hype. There were few people who were competent to try to defend the theory, and the nonexistence of empirical justification for its fantastical claims led to a great insecurity in the academic community—some members of which had stretched out their necks when the press promoted Einstein as the new and improved “Jewish Newton”—and which was worried that the public might discover that Einstein was a fraud and his theories had no rational justification.

Those brave enough to speak out against the degeneration of science into bizarre mysticism, and the demise of professional integrity in science, faced intimidation, censorship, and the classic pernicious political tactics of crowd manipulation by Einstein’s supporters. Einstein and his followers were not above employing dirty tricks to suppress opposition and the public disclosure of the truth.

Hubert Goenner tells the story of how Oskar Kraus was scheduled to deliver a speech in Berlin against the theory of relativity on 2 September 1920. Kraus was not able to give his speech, because he was not allowed to go to Germany. Johannes Riem stated that Kraus had wired him a telegram on 2 September 1920, which informed him that Kraus, “was refused a visa for political reasons.”⁶⁵⁰ Riem complained that,

“In such a way relativity theory is protected by the immigration service.”⁶⁵¹

Goenner notes that Ernst Gehrcke believed that he was censored at Einstein’s request⁶⁵² from publishing Einstein’s verbal assertion that accelerations are absolute in the theory of relativity. Gehrcke, who was a well published and well respected physicist, attempted to draw attention to Einstein’s beliefs in the journal *Die Naturwissenschaften*, a Julius Springer publication edited by Einstein’s friend and supporter Arnold Berliner,⁶⁵³ which was quick to provide Einstein with an outlet to attack Lucien Fabre,⁶⁵⁴ and which published *ad hominem* attacks against anti-relativists in the form of polemic book “reviews” written by Einstein’s friends of anti-relativistic literature.⁶⁵⁵ Einstein once commented that Springer had “powerful advertising resources”,⁶⁵⁶ and indeed the publishing house was large, influential and long-lived. Einstein was very well connected and most of his friends looked to him for letters of recommendation and for his intervention to obtain them positions, grants and increased salaries.⁶⁵⁷

Arvid Reuterdaahl wrote of the political atmosphere surrounding the corrupt promotion of Einstein,

“The Academy of Nations—Its Aims and Hopes
World-Wide Organization of Learned Men Will Study
Scientific Questions for the Benefit of All Mankind
By ARVID REUTERDAHL

Dean, Department of Engineering and Architecture, the
College of St. Thomas. St. Paul, Minn.

WE ARE emerging from a period of material and intellectual chaos. Nations have clashed in war. The intellectual world is still in conflict on the fields of knowledge. Never before has the demarcation between intellectual camps been so clearly defined. The meteoric rise of Einstein marks the beginning of this division in the modern kingdom of intellect. The history of civilization shows us that there is nothing exceptional in this condition of things. There were distinct schools of philosophy in ancient India and Greece. The Middle Ages tell the same story of intellectual diversity. In more recent times we find the schools of Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Comte, Mill, Spencer, Darwin, Lotze, Nietzsche, Bergson and Haeckel.

Now the intellectual world is divided broadly into the Relativistic and

Anti-Relativistic schools. Einstein has served as a chemical reagent which has precipitated relativity from the present content of knowledge as a mass insoluble to the average man. Never before has the attention of the entire world been drawn to an intellectual system in so short a time. What are the reasons for this unprecedented occurrence? Does the theory of Einstein contain elements of unique value to the human race? These and many other questions come to us as we ponder over the almost miraculous and sudden advent of Einsteinism. No one will dispute the truth of the statement that, as far as the general public is concerned, the theory of Einstein has little or no value. The intricacies of its mathematics and the subtleties of its sophistries are beyond the average man.

How Einsteinism Was 'Put Over'

WE DO not deny that certain features of Einstein's theory cannot fail to fascinate the general public. The world's greatest masters of the art of appeal have, with infallible accuracy, provided sufficient potions from the 'world-of-make-believe' to excite the imagination and interest of even the most prosaic and matter-of-fact individual. Effective advertising when coupled with equally potent measures of suppression of all that might be inimical to the propaganda, together constitute a moving force capable of converting the world in a very brief time. By these doubtful means Einsteinism has conquered the world.

Were the Theory of Relativity sound, upright men must, nevertheless, protest against such questionable means of forcing its acceptance. Hidden forces, inimical to the frank and open discussion of alleged merits of this theory, have been at work in every civilized land.

I am in possession of letters from eminent European scientists describing the deplorable methods employed to hinder and, if possible, completely prevent an unbiased and free discussion of the problem of relativity. In addition to this evidence my own experience is proof conclusive that the known evil effects are not due to accidental causes, but arise from a well defined and strongly organized plan.

Scientific journals and societies in the United States have been loath to accept articles which even mildly criticized Einstein's theories. The advertisement of a book which contains a criticism of relativity, written by a well-known opponent of Einstein, was refused by a journal known for its vigorous publicity campaign in favor of Einsteinism. Two leading American journals, whose main alleged purpose is the unbiased presentation of both sides of every question, have until recently refrained from publishing any statements inimical and detrimental to the theory of relativity. The change of attitude is undoubtedly due to the potent fact that despite the attempted suppression of free discussion, the entire world is now fearlessly and openly challenging the foundations of Einsteinism. A reaction against relativity, of unprecedented proportions and intensity, has set in and Einstein now finds

himself on the defensive.

Discrimination Against Scientists

THE writer's article entitled 'Kinertia Versus Enstein' was rejected by a well-known eastern journal. The editor of this journal, after admitting that I had presented a strong case against Einstein, one that would cause something of a sensation, confided that after many misgivings, he, nevertheless, felt that he must return my article.

To draw certain inevitable inferences concerning the real reason for the rejection of the article was undoubtedly justifiable. It was then that THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT accepted the article for publication.

Many of our scientific societies have discriminated against comparatively unknown scientists. Their papers have been returned without even a hasty perusal, because the writers were not members of the inner controlling circle. This criticism is, moreover, true also in the case of many scientific journals. In certain instances material has been appropriated from the articles before being returned. No credit has, in these cases, been given to the original contributors. The sacred unwritten law that credit should always be freely given to a contributor for even the smallest addition made to our quota of knowledge has been entirely ignored in many cases. The writer does not desire to convey the impression that these corrupt practices are universal; on the contrary, the splendid standards of purity and integrity of some scientific societies and journals constitute ideals which all should emulate.

There is, at the present time, a distressful lack of co-operation between learned societies. This unsound condition inevitably retards intellectual progress. International intellectual co-operation is, as yet, entirely unknown. Many years are required to transmit, through the laborious machinery of scientific approval, results and discoveries made in one country to another isolated from the former by language and geographical location. No common clearing house exists in which the appraisal and valuation of theories may be expeditiously effected. Organized attempts at unification, co-ordination and standardization of systems of knowledge to expedite educational progress are entirely lacking. The general public must oftentimes wait many years before receiving even a small measure of benefit from valuable discoveries because of the absence of organized means of systematic dissemination of accurate knowledge in a simple and easily understood form.

Many of these unfortunate conditions and deficiencies have been emphasized by the arrival of the theory of relativity. The rapid advent of Einsteinism, however, has taught us the lesson that a theory can be speedily 'promoted' by systematic publicity, fortified by a campaign of suppression of honest criticism. There is a twofold aspect to the lesson taught:

First, a benevolent aspect, consisting in the exemplified truth that knowledge can be rapidly disseminated by systematic co-operation.

Second, a malevolent aspect, involving the imposition of unproved

hypotheses on the public by coercive means.

The intellectual world should benefit by both aspects of the lesson taught by the rise of relativity. The intellectual world must organize, sanely and safely, for co-operative derivation and dissemination of knowledge by dignified, simple, and accurate means. The world of intellect must protect itself from the evil effects of coercive effort in the 'promotion' of hypotheses.

The crucial question which now faces us may be briefly stated as follows: Can the errors and deficiencies of the *modus operandi* of the intellectual world, forcibly brought to our attention by the advent of Einsteinism, be eliminated and overcome? Have we the remedy at hand which will make impossible the recurrence of these unfortunate and lamentable conditions?

Would Keep World Informed

THE writer herewith presents for the serious consideration of the thinking world a brief outline of the purposes, scope and organization of The Academy of Nations, with the firm conviction that this instrument, when wielded co-operatively by the intellectual world, will transform the existing intellectual chaos into a cosmos of knowledge, advance the general status of education, protect the public against fallacious theories, disseminate knowledge of value to mankind, and enrich the world by the development of the common good.

Before a synopsis of this significant and important movement is presented, it is eminently fitting that a short statement be made concerning its origin.

Dr. Robert T. Browne, one of America's greatest thinkers, and author of the most profound work ever written on the hyperspace movement (The Mystery of Space) in a letter, May 9, 1921, to the writer, indicated that a renaissance in the field of education was not only necessary but inevitable at the present time. This conviction of Dr. Browne's was particularly gratifying to the writer because he had held the same view since that memorable day in 1919, when it became known here that Einstein's theory *seemed* to be confirmed by the results of the observations of the English Solar Expedition.

After some correspondence I submitted a plan for an international organization which met with the unqualified approval of Dr. Browne. At the request of the writer Dr. Browne proceeded to amplify the original outline of the plan with the result that an epoch-making document has been produced. The following excerpts from the original document will convey a brief idea of the causes, purposes and scope of the plan:

'The intellectual world is passing through a period of reconstruction. The entire body of knowledge is being reconstituted. New and radical developments are becoming manifest in science, philosophy, religion, and art; and these are approaching a synthesis hitherto undreamed of, being brought to this consummation by the advent of a movement of far-reaching

significance and importance.

‘A powerful creative spirit is at work in the world energizing and illumining the minds of men everywhere. The energies of humankind are seeking new and advanced avenues of expression, demanding freedom, certainty, security and the opportunity for the peaceful pursuit of the highest good.

‘In the mind of man a new consciousness is broadening; the foundations of a new race of superior men are being laid; the seeds of a higher and better civilization which may bless the nations of the earth are beginning to germinate. The development and fruition of these mighty factors in the advancement of mankind demand the earnest intellectual co-operation of strong men throughout the world to give direction and tendance to the new impulses, which as yet are without adequate determination and means of expression.

‘This new order in the world should not and must not be allowed to lose its regenerating power on account of the lack of intelligent co-operation and conscious direction and guidance. The stream of potent human energies must be harnessed and its power utilized for the enrichment of the common good.’

To meet ‘the urgency of the call for the accomplishment of these high purposes’ an international organization known as *The Academy of Nations* has been formed.

The principal purposes of this organization are:

1. Unification of national effort in the world of knowledge.
2. Discovery, investigation and dissemination of truth.
3. Classification, standardization. and evaluation of the data of science, philosophy, religion and art.
4. Dialectic treatment of data with the view of arriving at synthetic judgment thereon.
5. Publication of findings under the impress of The Academy of Nations.
6. Announcement at prescribed intervals of the status of knowledge in the four major branches, viz: science, philosophy, religion, art.

Note—This to be equivalent to the charting of the bounds of material knowledge.

7. Recognition and encouragement of individual effort amid contributions to the body of knowledge.

Will Seek Co-operation

UNDER the plan each national unit will publish a journal at suitable intervals. The most important of these contributions will appear in the journal of the academy, which will be published in the languages of all the nations represented. The Year Book of the Academy of Nations will contain announcement of the advance of knowledge (the knowledge status) for the current year of publication. It will be compiled by an international board composed of members elected by the nation units.

The results of this organized work will be made available to the general public, in simple form, through the medium of the public press and by other suitable means.

The Academy of Nations will function in the unification and co-ordination of systems of knowledge, thus procuring the development of synthesized body of knowledge as against the highly specialized conditions now existing. The methods, aims and programs of education will be standardized. Another important function of the academy will be the promotion of the co-operative commonwealth of man in which the wealth-producing energies, the civilizing energies and the energies inherent in the social heritage of humanity shall be co-ordinated and made to yield the maximum value for the welfare of all mankind. Moreover, the academy will promote the use of scientific knowledge as a guiding principle in every department of human endeavor and it will encourage and develop the application of the principles of scientific human engineering to the problems of humanity and to the shaping of its destiny. There will be instituted a world tribunal for the adjudication of controversies in matters connected with theories, philosophical systems, hypotheses, and so on. The academy will be a powerful instrumentality for effecting international solidarity and for the promotion of good will and accord among the nations of the world. It will function also as a supreme centralized authority for the conferring of honors, merits, prizes, degrees, and so on, for distinguished services and for contributions to the body of knowledge. Heretofore, there has been no world society or authority which could bestow academic honors or recognitions on individuals. Affiliations with governments and other national agencies will be established to advance the cause of knowledge and the execution of its programs.

Organization Meeting Is Held

THE above consists in the main of direct quotations, suitably rearranged, from the original classic document.

In this great academy intellectual freedom will be reborn. There will be no arbitrary exclusion of hypotheses, theories, views and beliefs. The academy will ever function as an open and free forum for the discussion of all the great problems of humanity.

One of the first duties to be assigned to the academy will be the adjudication and appraisal of the precise value and merit of the Theory of Relativity definitely to fix its 'knowledge status.'

The organization meeting of the College of Fellows of the Academy of Nations was held December 28 and 30, 1921, in Brooklyn. National institutes of the Academy of Nations are now being formed in Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, Czecho-Slovakia and Spain. Steps are being taken for the organization of institutes in Norway, Denmark, England, Holland, France and Italy. Within the ensuing year national institutes will be organized in

every civilized country of the world.

The field of the academy embraces every general and special class of knowledge and its interests will, therefore, be universal.”⁶⁵⁸

In the spring of 1922, Edouard Guillaume gave Einstein fair warning that he would debate him in Paris. Guillaume and others had published their findings that the special theory of relativity derives from a particular light sphere in a preferred frame of reference, and that in translational frames of reference this sphere becomes an ellipsoid.⁶⁵⁹ Jánossy and others have since published works which also favor Lorentz’ physical interpretation of light speed anisotropy in “moving” frames of reference, without relying solely upon the paradox of the twins.⁶⁶⁰

The Chicago Tribune reported on 31 March 1922,

**“EINSTEIN FACES
IN PARIS GRAVE
BLOW AT THEORY**

[Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.]

BERNE, March 30.—Edmond Guillaume says he has discovered a fundamental error in the Einstein theory and is en route to Paris to attend the savant’s lecture and to challenge the relativity discoverer.

M. Guillaume hopes for a public debate in which he can use his ellipsoid to demonstrate Prof. Einstein’s error.

Former Premier Painleve, a celebrated mathematician, has reached the same conclusions as M. Guillaume, but through a different process. M. Guillaume is a cousin of Charles Albert Guillaume, a recent Nobel Prize winner.”

The Minneapolis Journal wrote on 9 April 1922,

**“DR. GUILLAUME’S PROOFS OF
EINSTEIN THEORY’S FALLACY
REVEALED TO THE JOURNAL**

Professor Reuterdahl of St. Thomas Makes Public
Correspondence With Swiss Savant Disclosing
Latter’s Weapons of Attack on Relativity

**BARES FACTS FOR WHICH SCIENTIFIC
WORLD NOW EAGERLY WAITS AT PARIS**

Simple Experience of Every Day Railroad Operation

Relied On to Show That Man Who Upset Accepted Laws of Nature Is All Wrong

With the scientific world awaiting Dr. Edmund Guillaume's appearance in Paris to challenge and attempt to destroy the very foundation of the Einstein theory of relativity, Professor Arvid Reuterdahl, dean of the department of engineering and architecture at the College of St. Thomas, Midway, last night revealed to The Journal the purported proof of the fallacy of 'Einsteinism' which Dr. Guillaume will use in his Paris attack.

Professor Reuterdahl all along has contended the Einstein theory was all wrong and is now preparing a book, 'Fallacies of Einstein.' When Einstein was in America Reuterdahl challenged him to a debate without avail. He has been in correspondence with Dr. Guillaume and has received from the noted Swiss scientist a special contribution for his book containing the very matter which Guillaume will use in his forthcoming Paris attack on relativity. Until Professor Reuterdahl disclosed Dr. Guillaume's proofs to The Journal last night, the St. Thomas dean was the only man in the United States who possessed the explanation that is expected by its advocate to knock the whole Einstein theory of relativity into a cocked hat when Professor Einstein is confronted with it at his forthcoming lecture in Paris.

According to a special cable dispatch published in The Journal March 31, Dr. Guillaume claims that the matter now in possession of Professor Reuterdahl and revealed to the public today, discloses a fundamental error in the Einstein theory. The cable dispatch stated that Dr. Guillaume hoped for a public debate with Einstein in which he would have a chance to hurl his proofs at the author of the relativity theory.

'The final death blow to Einsteinism is about to be delivered by the eminent Swiss physicist and mathematician. Dr. Edouard Guillaume when the scientists convene at Paris,' said Professor Reuterdahl last night. 'Dr. Guillaume in two letters written to me and dated July 25 and Aug. 13, 1921, pointed out a fundamental error in the mathematical speculations of Einstein which explodes the entire theory proving that relativity is the greatest scientific fiasco of all times. Dr. Guillaume shows that Einstein, in his first article entitled, 'Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Koeper,' which appeared in 1905 in Annalen der Physik, volume 17, commits 'the greatest scientific blunder of modern times.'

Swiss Savant's Proofs Revealed

'Einsteinism stands or falls upon the so-called postulate of the absolute velocity of light. Dr. Guillaume in a brilliant analysis, shows that this very postulate is destroyed by a fatal error in Einstein's mathematics.'

The following is a translation of Professor Guillaume's final summary communicated to Professor Reuterdahl:

'Einstein considers a luminous signal produced, for instance, on a track by means of an electric pocket lamp. A brief signal gives rise to a wave which moves through space and in all directions with a velocity of 300,000

kilometers per second. This wave forms at each moment a spherical surface, the ray of which increases with this velocity and the center of which is motionless. Let us inquire now how the wave appears to an observer carried along with the train. Let us apply the transformation of Lorentz. What is found? Einstein maintains that the wave appears also as a sphere with its center motionless as regards the train, and whose ray grows likewise with the velocity of 300,000 kilometers a second.

Simple Test Cited

“Die betrachtete Welle,” says Einstein in conclusion, ‘ist auch in bewegten System (Wagon) betrachte eine Kugelwelle von der Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit 300,000 km-sec.’ But if we look more closely we detect an error in the famous physicist’s calculation: the wave seen from the train is not a sphere, but rather an ellipsoid, and the famous principle of the absolute constancy of light vanishes! At the same time collapse all the paradoxes, and at last we are clear of this inextricable web and beyond the reach of the entangling challenges that Einstein has hurled at our good sense, free from what Americans have so well termed ‘Einsteinism.’”

‘Einstein has been challenged to meet Dr. Guillaume at Paris,’ said Professor Reuterdaahl last night. ‘The evidence presented by Dr. Guillaume is so conclusive that Einstein will hasten the death of the already dying theory of relativity by accepting the challenge. If Einstein uses the same caution that he exhibited when challenged by me he will again carefully avoid the issue by veiling himself in sphynx like silence.’”

On 22 April 1922, Edouard Guillaume complained to Arvid Reuterdaahl, in a letter which was reproduced in *The Minneapolis Journal*, which newspaper wrote on 14 May 1922,

“Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion

Savant, in letter to Professor Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas, Says
Ideals of Science Were Treated With Ignominy in Paris

Failing in an attempt to force a public debate which they hoped would disclose fundamental errors in the Einstein theory of relativity, scientists in the antirelativity group will continue their fight on ‘Einsteinism,’ Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college said last night.

Dean of the department of engineering and architecture at St. Thomas, a prominent figure in the scientific world because of his research work, Professor Reuterdaahl has collaborated with Dr. Edouard Guillaume, Swiss savant, in disputing the theory which has brought fame to Einstein.

When Einstein visited the United States Professor Reuterdaahl challenged him to an open debate.

Guillaume Meets Einstein

In Paris recently Dr. Guillaume faced Dr. Einstein on a platform, before French scientists convened at the College of France. His appearance had been awaited eagerly by scientists throughout the world.

‘In a letter which I just have received,’ Professor Reuterdaahl said, ‘Dr. Guillaume gives a vivid picture of the scene which ever will remain a blot on the fair escutcheon of science.

Dr. Guillaume had lectured only a few minutes when he was silenced peremptorily in order to give way to the illustrious man of the hour, Einstein, who dismissed the entire matter with the gesture of a conqueror.’

Floor Given to Einstein

‘I had hoped to be permitted quietly to present the results of my researches,’ reads the letter from Dr. Guillaume to Professor Reuterdaahl. Unfortunately, I had barely lectured for five minutes when I was interrupted in order to give the floor to Einstein, who was forced to acknowledge the fact that an ellipsoid results from his own mathematics.

(Einstein’s theory is that a wave surface of light, traveling outward from any luminous body, such as an electric light, is a spherical surface. Dr. Guillaume and Professor Reuterdaahl contend that this surface is ellipsoidal under certain conditions.)

‘Einstein dismissed the matter,’ the letter continues, ‘by saying that he was not interested. At this statement of Einstein’s the large audience present applauded vociferously. I then saw that it was absolutely impossible to carry on a scientific discussion under these conditions.

‘That, my dear Professor Reuterdaahl, is the ignominious treatment which the high ideals of science receive at the present time.

Called Political Reunions

‘Scientific congresses of this kind are nothing more than political reunions. It is urgent that all honest men unite to fight against these deplorable methods, which can only lead to the death of science. You may say definitely in America that all discussion was prevented and made impossible by the fanatic attitude of the relativists.’

When Professor Reuterdaahl revealed April 9, through *The Journal*, the points to be used by Dr. Guillaume in his Paris debate, he predicted that that attempt to force Einstein into an honest discussion of his own theory would prove a total failure.

Professor Reuterdaahl now is preparing a book, ‘Fallacies of Einstein,’ to which Dr. Guillaume has made a contribution. Dr. Guillaume issued a public statement March 31, which was cabled to *The Journal*, in which he said a fundamental error had been found in the Einstein theory.”

Guillaume’s letter, which was also reproduced in *The New York Times*, Arvid Reuterdaahl, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8:

“I had hoped to be permitted quietly to present the results of my researches. Unfortunately, I had barely lectured for five minutes when I was interrupted

in order to give the floor to Einstein, who was forced to acknowledge that an ellipsoid results from his own mathematics. Einstein dismissed the matter by saying that he was not interested. At this statement of Einstein's the large audience present applauded vociferously. I then saw that it was absolutely impossible to carry on a scientific discussion under these conditions. That, my dear Professor Reuterdaahl, is the ignominious treatment which the high ideals of science receive at the present time. Scientific congresses of this kind are nothing more than political reunions. It is urgent that all honest men unite to fight against these deplorable methods, which can only lead to the death of science. You may say definitely in America that all discussion was prevented and made impossible by the fanatic attitude of the relativists."⁶⁶¹

William Cardinal O'Connell, who had written a letter condemning anti-Semitism and who had signed John Spargo's protest against anti-Semitism,⁶⁶² accused Einstein and his clique of promoting atheism in a lecture the Cardinal had given. Cardinal O'Connell was quoted in the 12 April 1929 issue of the *Boston Evening American*,

"That there is in certain quarters such a heated defense of an unprovable, certainly unproved hypothesis, only again makes it doubly clear that what I said to the students was true—the claque is applauding noisily so as to drown honest criticism. But that has been from all accounts the Einstein method of answer to all who disagree with him."

Other such staged interruptions as happened to Guillaume took place in defense of the indefensible, in defense of Einstein and his metaphysical nonsense. For example, when Arvid Reuterdaahl spoke at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in March of 1926 about the Einstein swindle, the faculty there allegedly disrupted his lecture.⁶⁶³ The University's newspaper, *The Daily Cardinal*, reported,

"Not even a tithe of courtesy is being shown Prof. Reuterdaahl [***] At the lecture Wednesday night instructors of the mathematics department interfered with the lecturer so that he was unable to finish his talk. [***] **Staff Tries To Stop Talk** [***] members of the instructional staff of the mathematical department tinkered with the water pressure apparatus which operates the projection screen [***] and made it impossible for the lecturer to continue [***] the members of the department also blinked the lights in the auditorium while the speaker was lecturing, putting the auditorium in darkness temporarily. This is said to have occurred three times."⁶⁶⁴

Johannes Stark alleged that Ernst Gehrcke was denied a full professorship in Germany, because he had argued against the theory of relativity,

"G e h r c k e ist der Kampf gegen die Relativitätstheorie übel bekommen; trotz seiner zahlreichen hervorragenden experimentellen Arbeiten wird er von Fakultäten nicht für ein physikalisches Ordinat vorgeschlagen."⁶⁶⁵

In 1882, Franz Mehring quoted a Jewish author who criticized Jews for, among other things, “the malicious gloating when veritable conspiracies deprived of their livelihoods people who were suspected of anti-Jewish feelings[.]”⁶⁶⁶ Einstein and his friends sought to stigmatize *any* criticism of him or of the theory of relativity as if it were “anti-Semitism” *per se*.⁶⁶⁷ They thereby threatened anyone who dared speak out with career infringement or the absolute inability to find work. Whether or not significant numbers of people interfered with the careers of persons suspected of anti-Jewish feelings for merely questioning Einstein or discussing the facts, the impression that they would existed and had a chilling effect on Einstein’s opposition in the debate over the merits of relativity theory and Einstein’s obvious plagiarism. This has been very detrimental to the progress of Physics.

Hugo Dingler’s allotted time to speak against the theory of relativity at the Bad Nauheim meeting was severely restricted. Ernst Mach wrote of his admiration for Dingler,

“I myself—seventy-four years old, and struck down by a grave malady—shall not cause any more revolutions. But I hope for important progress from a young mathematician, Dr. Hugo Dingler, who, judging from his publications, has proved that he has attained to a free and unprejudiced survey of *both* sides of science.”⁶⁶⁸

Gehrcke’s accusations that Einstein was a plagiarist were fully justified by the facts, and Dingler correctly pointed out several fatal flaws in the metaphysical formulation of the theory of relativity.⁶⁶⁹

Hubert Goenner wrote,

“[Gehrcke] blame[d] Einstein’s reply of 27 August [1920] for arousing political and racial instincts and deflecting public attention from the facts of relativity theory.”

Paul Weyland made the same charge, that Einstein’s defense of his theory and his claims of originality were so weak that he was forced to run away from Germany, and to change the subject to fabricated accusations of anti-Semitism. Arvid Reuterdaahl made a similar claim when the *Scientific American* raised the issue of anti-Semitism in the context of Reuterdaahl’s questioning of Einstein’s priority, while being forced to concede that Reuterdaahl was factually correct in his arguments.⁶⁷⁰ Reuterdaahl responded, stating on 18 June 1921, *inter alia*:

“IN AN article published in this journal, April 30, 1921, Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl presented definite evidence proving the similarity between the work of the unknown scientist ‘Kinertia’ and the much-advertised Einsteinian Theory of Relativity. The similarity is so pronounced that any fair-minded person at once must wonder if the alleged contributions of Dr. Einstein rest upon borrowed foundations. It is a fact that ‘Kinertia’s’ work antedates that of Einstein. It is difficult to prove a direct charge of plagiarism.

This is particularly true whenever the person involved is surrounded by a veritable host of protectors who refuse to permit an honest investigation.

Professor Reuterdaahl's reply to his critics follows in part:

In the case of 'Kinertia' Versus Einstein the present writer did not state that Einstein is a plagiarist. To make such a bald statement one must have indisputable proofs. I did state and again repeat the statement: 'If Einstein was aware of 'Kinertia's' discovery then the appellation 'plagiarist,' bestowed upon him by his German professional colleagues, is eminently fitting. If, on the contrary, Einstein was unaware of this work, then he is, nevertheless, antedated by the work of 'Kinertia'. Einstein is at liberty to choose either horn of the dilemma.'

Referring to an editorial criticism in the *Scientific American* of May 14, Professor Reuterdaahl continues: 'The *Scientific American* is particularly disturbed by my article entitled "'Kinertia' Versus Einstein.' On the cover of this issue the following question appeared in bold type 'Is Einstein a Plagiarist?' In reference to this question the *Scientific American* states: 'It will be at once understood that according to Professor Reuterdaahl he is.' What I actually stated in my article has been again recorded above in order to refresh the memory of the editorial writer. After this perversion of truth a subtle atmosphere is created in order to link, by contrastive suggestion, both the present writer and THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT with the ambitions of the former Kaiser of Germany. A diversion is thereby adroitly produced which removes the reader's attention from the actual question in hand, that is, "'Kinertia' Versus Einstein,' to an entirely different issue. Moreover, another irrelevant issue is deftly imposed, that is, anti-Semitism.

The present writer emphatically denies and resents both insinuations created in this questionable manner. I am a loyal citizen of the United States. I was born in Sweden. I came to the United States when I was six and a half years of age. Furthermore, the allegation, also by innuendo, that my attack upon the theories of Einstein are due to anti-Semitic feeling, I brand as a gross misrepresentation.

The *Scientific American* editorial then becomes a plea for Professor Einstein's mathematical product. There seems to be urgent need to show that although Einstein has benefitted by 'ideas which have had a rather nebulous existence before him' nevertheless in the hands of this master craftsman they have been mathematically welded into a 'crowning achievement' which 'has never been approached or approximated in any way.'

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that we grant that this concession in no way affects the real issue which we may state in the form of a question: Has Einstein given proper credit to the creators of the 'nebulous ideas' which he used in constructing this supreme masterpiece of the human intellect? We are not aware that he has ever referred to their humble contributions to his stupendous structure. It seems that he has ruthlessly discarded the scaffolding which he used in building his edifice without paying for its use. Do we find the name of Dr. J. H. Ziegler mentioned in any of his writings? Is there any

reference to the contributions of ‘Kinertia’? Has he ever answered the charges made by Engineer Rudolph Mewes, Professors E. Gehrke and Paul Weyland that he appropriated a formula which appeared in a work published by the late Professor Gerber in the year, 1898? If perchance Professor Einstein should plead ignorance of these contributions at the time when he developed his mathematical analysis, then we demand that he publicly admit their previous existence and definite worth. It remains to be seen if Dr. Einstein will even condescend to comply with this eminently just demand. We trust that we may be permitted to state that what we have granted in the above, for the sake of argument, we do not admit as an actual fact. The writer is prepared to show that Einsteinism is a pernicious fallacy.”⁶⁷¹

Below is the article in *Scientific American*, which Reuterdaahl rejoined. The author of the *Scientific American* article dubbed the practice of standing up for ethical practices and giving due credit to those who deserve it, “picking the bones”. The author sought to characterize anyone who would assert their priority for ideas Einstein repeated without an attribution, as if a “vulture”. Whereas Reuterdaahl focused on the facts, the author of the *Scientific American* article launched a hand-waving personal attack against Reuterdaahl, *conceding that he was factually correct*, and mischaracterized the general theory of relativity as an exposition on the mechanism and cause of gravitation, which it is not. The author asserted that, “Nobody would claim that Einstein’s entire structure is novel[. . .]” However, that is exactly what Einstein did do by publishing papers completely devoid of references to the work of his predecessors. Daniel Kennefick wrote in his article, “Einstein Versus the *Physical Review*”, *Physics Today*, (September, 2005), pp. 43-48, at 46:

“Although it now bears Einstein and Rosen’s names, the solution for cylindrical gravitational waves had been previously published by the Austrian physicist Guido Beck in 1925. But Beck’s paper was completely unknown to relativists with the single exception of his student Peter Havas, who entered the field in the late 1950’s. In a 1926 paper by the English mathematicians O. R. Baldwin and George B. Jeffery, and in the referee’s report on Einstein’s paper, there was discussion of the fact that singularities in the metric coefficients are unavoidable when describing plane waves with infinite wavefronts. But although such a wave shows some distortion, in the words of the referee, ‘the field itself is flat’ at infinity.”⁹

Clearly, the referee’s familiarity with the literature exceeded Einstein’s, but then Einstein was notoriously lax in that regard. The published Einstein-Rosen paper contains no direct reference to any other paper whatsoever and only two other authors are even mentioned by name. In response to Infeld’s suggestion that he search the literature for previous work, Einstein laughed and said, ‘Oh yes. Do it by all means. Already I have sinned too often in this respect.’^{5,672}

The *Scientific American* of 14 May 1921 stated:

“The Anti-Einstein Campaign

THE intellectual world moves slowly in the matter of extending recognition to those who have consecrated their lives to the cause of reason. Mendel had been dead many years before the remarkable nature of his work was recognized. When we contrast Mendel’s case with that of Einstein we are forced to admit that the German physicist’s sensational rise is the most extraordinary in the history of science. Barnum, king of advertisers, could not have staged a more effective or expeditious advertising campaign.”

With so much of Professor Reuterdaahl’s article in the *Dearborn Independent* we suppose anyone will agree. But this article is given its real place by the scare-head of the cover, which asks, in $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch letters, “IS EINSTEIN A PLAGIARIST?” It will be at once understood that according to Professor Reuterdaahl he is. We expect this sort of thing from the anti-Semites of Germany, and from those of the former Kaiser’s loyal supporters who resent Dr. Einstein’s refusal to have anything to do with the celebrated Manifesto of the 93 Immortals. But from a reputable American source—even one celebrated for its anti-Semitism—we should look for something a little different.

It is not easy for a layman to form a just estimate of Einstein’s work. And whatever temptation to error is presented to him will be in the direction of underestimation. The phrase “relativity of motion” is not new. The Greeks had it, Newton had it, every popular explanation of Einstein starts by reminding us that this is something we have always known but chosen to ignore. It is easy to overlook that Einstein has taken this familiar notion, applied it with a rigor and a consistency and a generality which it has never before enjoyed, given it a significance and got results out of it which it had never before been dreamed lay in it.

Again with the problem of gravitation. We all know that Newton solved this problem empirically only. We all know that he said nothing about the causes or the mechanism of gravitation—for the excellent reason that he could learn nothing of these. We all know that since his time thousands of scientists have searched for the cause and the mechanism. We do not all know what is equally true, that many of these searchers have been led to propose slight modifications in Newton’s mathematical law—modifications which were in agreement with this or that observed fact.

All this makes it very easy to accuse Einstein of plagiarism. Not alone is everyone acquainted with classical relativity apt to judge the contents by the label on the container and assume that Einstein’s relativity is the same old stuff, but the claim may with some show of plausibility be made that any investigator of gravitation has anticipated Einstein. This claim gains color in the far-from-rare case that its beneficiary can be shown to have attained results which are included in Einstein’s, or to have supplied Einstein with some of his material. Nobody would claim that Einstein’s entire structure is

novel—the sum total of human knowledge is today too large to make it possible for a contribution like his to be made out of whole cloth.

Everyone who possesses enough mathematics to follow Einstein knows that he has made a very material original contribution—that he has formulated mathematically and as a concrete whole ideas which have had a rather nebulous existence before him, cementing the structure with ideas to which he has himself given birth. His crowning achievement is the precise mathematical formulation; this has never been approached or approximated in any way.

We can paraphrase Professor Reuter Dahl with some profit. Never in the history of science has anyone ever made an epoch-marking advance, but what the vultures have flocked about his trail, demanding credit for what he has done and claiming ownership of the work which he has put out. But never before has it been the case that the really big men of science have accepted an advance so promptly and so whole-heartedly, and left this business of picking the bones to the small fry whose names will be forgotten fifty years from now.”

In 1846, an author in the *Scientific American* had demonstrated an interest in Zionist affairs,

“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.”⁶⁷³

The maltreatment of anyone who disagreed with Einstein, pointed out his plagiarism or questioned the theory of relativity, reminds one of the fanatical and truly vicious abuse political Zionists inflicted upon anyone who dared disagree with them. Albert T. Clay documented the methods of the political Zionists in Palestine in 1921, in an article, “Political Zionism”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 127, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 268-279, at 276-277,

“The old resident Jews of Palestine certainly have other than religious grounds for their indifference toward the efforts of the Political Zionists. Last winter the Council of Jerusalem Jews appointed a commission of representative men holding leading positions, to visit parents who were sending their children to proscribed schools, in order to secure their withdrawal. Among these schools, which included those conducted by the convents and churches, some of which have existed in Jerusalem for a long

time, are the British High School for Girls, the English College for Boys, and the Jewish School for Girls. In the latter, conducted by Miss Landau, an educated English Jewess, all the teachers are Jewish; most of the teaching is in the English language. This school, which is financed by enlightened Jews of England, was denounced more severely than the others, because, not being in sympathy with the programme of the Political Zionists, Miss Landau refused to teach the Zionist curriculum. She was even informed that her school would be closed.

In a series of articles that appeared in *Doar Hayom*, the Hebrew daily paper, last December, it was stated that the parents who refused to comply with the requests of the Commission [of the Council of Jerusalem Jews] were to be boycotted, cast out from all intercourse with Jews, denied share in Zionist funds, and deprived of all custom for their shops and hotels. 'Anyone who refused, let him know that it is forbidden for him to be called by the name of Jew; and there is to be for him no portion or inheritance with his brethren.' They were given notice that they would 'be fought by all lawful means.' Their names were to be put 'upon a monument of shame, as a reproach forever, and their deeds writte unto the last generation.' 'If they are supported, their support will cease; if they are merchants, the finger of scorn will be pointed at them; if they are rabbis, they will be moved far from their office; they shall be put under the ban and persecuted, and all the people of the world shall know that there is no mercy in justice.'

A month later the results of this 'warfare' were reviewed. We were informed that some Jews had been influenced, 'but others—and the greater number, and those of the Orthodox,—those who fear God—having read the letters [signed by the head of its delegates and the Zionist Commission] became angry at the 'audacity' of the Council of Jerusalem Jews 'which mix themselves up in private affairs,' have torn the letter up, and that finished it.'

Then followed a long diatribe against these parents, boys, and girls, in which it was demanded that the blacklist of traitors to the people be sent to 'those who perform circumcision, who control the cemeteries and hospitals'; that an order go forth so that 'doctors will not visit their sick, that assistance when in need, if they are on the list of the American Relief Fund, will not be given to them.' 'Men will cry to them, 'Out of the way, unclean, unclean.' . . . They are in no sense Israelites.'

It is to be regretted that only these few paraphrases and quotations from the series of articles published can be presented here.

The work of the Councils Committee met with not a little success; pupils left schools, and teachers gave up their positions. Two instructors in the English College, whose fathers were rabbis, and a third, whose brother was a teacher in a Zionist school, resigned. Another refused to do so, and declared himself ready, in the interests of the Orthodox Jews, who were suffering under this tyranny, which they deplored, to give the fullest testimony to the authorities concerning this persecution. The administration, under Governor Bols, finally intervened, and at least no further public efforts to carry out

their programme were made.

If, in this early stage of the development of Political Zionism, even the Palestinian Religious Jews already find themselves under such a tyranny, what will happen if these men are allowed to have full control of the government? And what kind of treatment can the Christian and th Moslem expect in their efforts to educate their children, if the Political Zionists are allowed to develop their Jewish state to such a point that they can dispense with their mandatory and tell the British to clear out? When such things happen under British administration, what will take place if the Jewish State is ever realized, and such men are in full control?"

Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl was quoted in *The St. Paul Daily News* on 8 May 1921,

*“Einstein’s Theory of Relativity
Upset by St. Paul Scientist Whose
New Book Charges Gross Errors*

World Has Gone Mad About Mythical Unrealities, Declares Prof.
Arvid Reuterdaahl, Dean of Engineering and Architecture at St.
Thomas College—Offers to Debate Question.

Editor’s Note.—The visit to the United States of Prof. Einstein has brought on a countrywide discussion of his theory of relativity. Not many persons know anything about relativity, but nevertheless, they are talking about it and Einstein. In St. Paul there is a man, Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean, department of engineering and architecture, St. Thomas college, who disputes the Einstein theory. He is writing a book now called ‘The Fallacies of Einstein.’ Prof. Reuterdaahl is a distinguished scientist, both in America and abroad. He is the author of various scientific works and a frequent contributor to magazines. At the request of The Daily News he has written the following article dealing with the Einstein theory of relativity.

* * *

**BY ARVID REUTERDAHL,
Dean, Department of Engineering and
Architecture,**

The College of St. Thomas.

AT THE present time we often hear this question asked:

‘What is the theory of relativity?’

Whenever the question is asked Einstein’s name is invariably mentioned.

To be exact this question should take the following form:

‘What Is Einsteinism?’

A complete answer would require a book of many pages.

However, we may answer the latter question briefly as follows:

Einsteinism is a mind-product produced by combining a few consistent concepts with numerous mythical unrealities into a mental world system with the hope it will correspond with the real physical universe.

‘SWEPT ENTIRE COUNTRY.’

We may say Einsteinism in the United States began with the publication of a dispatch cabled from Berlin Dec. 2, 1919, to the New York Times.

Like an enormous tidal wave Einsteinism then swept from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast.

Mr. Average Man soon began talking about the theory of relativity. Humorous publications gave versions of Einsteinism which for accuracy in presentation oftentimes surpassed the mathematical outbursts of over-enthusiastic savants.

Nowhere could one hear a dissenting voice.

EXPOSED LAST YEAR.

The first brief exposition of the fallacies of Einstein, published in the United States, appeared in my work, ‘Scientific Theism Versus Materialism: the Space-Time Potential.’ This book was published in the fall of 1920 by the Devin-Adair Co., New York. Sir Oliver Lodge a few months previously, however, had issued a warning against the too ready acceptance of Einsteinism.

His warning went unheeded and the great wave of Einsteinism rolled on unchecked. I found myself almost alone in the fight against the greatest and most pernicious scientific fallacy of modern times.

However, I was not entirely alone at this time in my battle against the great sophist of all times.

AIDED BY HEIDENREICH.

In fact, since the year 1914 my dear friend, Dr. E. Lee Heidenreich, the eminent engineer, mathematician and philosopher, had espoused my cause. With the clear vision of a seer, Dr. Heidenreich realized that the old science must give way before a broader cosmic theory based upon sound philosophic principles grounded in fact.

He courageously and fearlessly championed the cause of my Space-Time Potential. He was instrumental in arranging lectures for me at the Kansas state agricultural college and the University of Kansas.

The commendatory letters concerning these lectures which I received from Dr. A. A. Potter, then dean of the agricultural college, and Dr. H. E. Rice, Kansas state university, have been a source of great encouragement to me during my long and arduous fight for the recognition of a broader and more universally consistent view of the physical universe.

Dr. Heidenreich, being a descendant of the Vikings, gloried in the single combat.

Persistently and fearlessly he has championed my cause both in the

United States and in Norway.

When Einsteinism overran the world Dr. Heidenreich refused to accept its fallacious tenets and gave vigorous battle to this new intellectual Frankenstein.

In the early part of the year 1921 an able and fearless writer championed my cause in an article entitled 'Relativity or Interdependence.' This article has since been referred to, time and again, as a classic.

Its author, Rev. Prof. John T. Blankart, in no uncertain terms and with keen acumen points out the inherent inconsistencies in Einsteinism. He brings his masterly article to a close with the following statement:

'Einstein has stated, 'If any deduction from it (the theory of relativity) should prove untenable it must be given up. A modification of it seems impossible without destruction of the whole.'

MORE AID NECESSARY.

'If this article has indicated to the reader that by that statement Einstein has perhaps signed the death warrant of his theory of relativity, the writer shall feel that part of his purpose has been accomplished.'

This exceptionally meritorious contribution exercised a beneficent influence in limited circles. However, one could hardly expect that a lone volume and a single article, without proper publicity, could stem the onrush of the Einsteinistic heresy.

Now, however, the tide is turning. After I issued my challenge to Einstein to a written debate on the theory of relativity I have received letters from prominent scientists and thinkers who assure me they will do their utmost to help vanish this Goliath of skepticism. Prof. Einstein has insinuated that my attack on his theory of relativity is merely a form of anti-Semitic propaganda.

This insinuation is absolutely without foundation in fact.

REVERES BARUCH SPINOZA.

If the originator of the theory of relativity had been born in Sweden, my native land, I would have denounced the tenets of his theory with no less vigor. The fact that Dr. Einstein is of Jewish extraction is not the reason for my attack on his theory.

I desire that this be distinctly understood now and for all future time.

My challenge to Prof. Einstein is based upon purely intellectual grounds. I contend his theory is a monstrous and dangerous fallacy which leads to absolute skepticism. I have profound reverence for Baruch Spinoza, the great philosopher. Spinoza was a Jew.

Certain erroneous inferences and unjust insinuations have been made concerning the appearance of my article entitled 'Kinertia Versus Einstein' in the Dearborn Independent.

Before I submitted this article to the Dearborn Independent I sent it to a well-known eastern journal.

MANUSCRIPT RETURNED.

The editor of this journal finally returned my manuscript with a most courteously worded letter in which he expressed his regret that he could not

risk its publication, despite the fact he felt confident I had made out a particularly strong case against Einstein. In fact, he went so far as to state my article would create a sensation if published. Evidently it would have been unwise for this eastern journal to publish my article. The path of truth is beset with many thorns.

It grieves me to be forced into the admission that our scientific journals, while professing to be the free and untrammelled vehicles of truth for its own sake, generally manage by means of plausible excuses to permanently prevent the publication of contributions which do not conform with the intellectual welfare of the clique in control.

The journals which are free from this destructive influence are generally too timid to assert their own independence.

FREEDOM IN DAILY PRESS.

This latter class is composed of journals which depend upon the European scientists to put the stamp of approval or disapproval upon that which is new or disturbing. It would seem there is much more genuine freedom in the daily press.

The spirit of revolt against this czar of science is growing.

Many independent thinkers have joined the anti-Einsteinism ranks. I believe Einstein himself is now beginning to see the handwriting on the wall.

One may be permitted, not without considerable show of justice, to infer his persistent refusal to enter into any controversial discussion is an indication he tacitly admits the relativity bubble is practically ready to collapse.

The following quotation from a letter which I have recently received from Dr. Robert T. Browne, author of the truly great work, 'The Mystery of Space,' is indeed noteworthy:

'The gods of science have placed their imprimatur upon the theory of relativity and consequently it will be exceedingly difficult to break through the iron ring.

BROWNE PLEDGES AID.

'Primarily, however, I should think with you, as with me, the consideration of greatest importance is not so much with the incidentals of this movement itself. The theory of relativity is but a phase of that deeper and broader movement of mechanistic conceptualism against which you have argued so incontrovertibly in 'Scientific Theism.' The task, then, is not so much to combat the theory, as I see it, as it is to strike with might and main at the vitals, the fundamental premises of that erroneous, fragmentary and biased view which seeks to interpret the universe in terms of mechanistic concepts.'

Dr. Browne concludes his letter to me with the following assurance:

'Please be assured that should the opportunity come my way I shall be allied with you in the fight against this mathematical usurpation.'

COMPARED TO DRUG.

Dr. W. E. Glanville, the eminent astronomer of Baltimore, who is a

member of British, French and American astronomical societies, states:

‘The Einstein theory is like a newly discovered drug which is brought forth and acclaimed as a universal scientific panacea.’

Dr. Sydney T. Skidmore of Philadelphia writes:

‘It (Einsteinism) is shapen from non-Euclidean, otherwise called meta-geometry, and this consists entirely of mental constructions that are purely subjective and correspond to nothing in nature.’

‘Kinertia’ states: ‘Science wants more than agnosticism; it wants to know the absolute truth before accepting any such theory; even if D’Alembert’s ghost is dressed in Hamiltonian functions.’

QUOTES SWISS BOOK.

I have just received a complimentary copy of an exceptionally meritorious work written by Dr. Edouard Guillaume of the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. The title of this work is ‘La Theorie de la Relativite, Et Sa Signification.’

I quote the following from this work:

‘We have gradually come to substitute for Descarte’s rigid system of relation, systems of unheard of subtleness, to which Einstein has given the picturesque name of ‘mollusk systems.’ Our mathematical constructions become, as it were, devilfish which strive, while adapting themselves to fasten upon subtle natural manifestations.’

Note the keen rapier thrusts against Einsteinism by this famous scientific ‘maitre d’armes.’

WORK NEARS COMPLETION.

Dr. Guillaume has not been hoodwinked by the delicate sophism of Einstein.

My work entitled ‘The Fallacies of Einstein’ is now nearing completion.

In this work I have stripped Einsteinism of its mathematical adornment.

Without this mathematical camouflage Einsteinism is scarcely more than a mere devitalized skeleton whose Einsteinian skull is forever grinning at its Galileian toes.”

While it is true that *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* published broad criticisms of Jews, Reuterdaahl’s article was not in any way anti-Semitic and an allegation of ethnic bias is not a racist attack, but is rather a defense against racism. Reuterdaahl first sought to publish his article elsewhere and it was refused without stated grounds. Reuterdaahl asserted that the circulation of Henry Ford’s paper was about 750,000 readers, which offered Reuterdaahl the opportunity he had been denied elsewhere to bring his message to a wide audience. Jewish racists ought not to be allowed to censor out all open debate on issues they want suppressed and Reuterdaahl had a right and an obligation to express his views wherever he could.

Frederick Drew Bond raised the issue of Reuterdaahl’s publication of articles in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* in a polemic against Reuterdaahl in *The New York Times* in 1923.⁶⁷⁴ Bond’s second and then current wife was first cousin of the racist Zionist blackmailer United States Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who

was an ardent and politically influential Zionist with close connections to President Wilson and Chaim Weizmann, and who attained his seat in the Supreme Court by blackmailing President Woodrow Wilson. Bond, perhaps speaking from a guilty conscience, denied that his connection to Brandeis had anything to do with his attack on Reuterdaahl, in private correspondence with Reuterdaahl.⁶⁷⁵ However, it was Bond who raised the issue of his connection to Brandeis, which was not known to Reuterdaahl, and Bond's denial was made as an unsolicited confession. Brandeis had expressed an interest in promoting Einstein. The racist Zionist blackmailer United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis wrote in a letter dated 1 March 1921,

“You have doubtless heard that the Great Einstein is coming to America soon with Dr. Weizmann, our Zionist Chief. Palestine may need something more now than a new conception of the Universe or of several additional dimensions; but it is well to remind the Gentile world, when the wave of anti-Semitism is rising, that in the world of thought the conspicuous contributions are being made by Jews.”⁶⁷⁶

The series of letters exchanged in *The New York Times* began with a letter from Dr. Harris A. Houghton, M. D., of No. 97/100 Riverside Drive, New York City, dated 13 April 1923; which accused Einstein of publishing a “Newtonian Duplication”.⁶⁷⁷ Houghton was involved with U. S. Army Intelligence and had called the attention of the U. S. Government to the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* in 1918, informing President Wilson and his cabinet of an alleged plot by Zionists to overthrow the governments of the world and to destroy Christianity.⁶⁷⁸ Brandeis, who controlled Wilson, assured the U. S. Government that the document was a forgery.⁶⁷⁹ Houghton published the “Beckwith” English translation of the *Protocols* in 1920.⁶⁸⁰ Dr. Houghton also wrote to John Spargo, about Louis Marshall's letter to Max Senior of 26 September 1918, in an effort to convince Spargo that Marshall feared Zionists and believed Zionism was a part of a larger Jewish plot—which accusations Marshall denied.⁶⁸¹ Boris Brasol⁶⁸² may have been the one who brought the *Protocols* to U. S. Army Intelligence and convinced them of their authenticity, viz. Dr. Harris Houghton and Natalie De Bogory.⁶⁸³ Houghton wrote to Arvid Reuterdaahl on 15 July 1923.⁶⁸⁴

Here is Reuterdaahl's 30 April 1921 article, to which an author responded in the *Scientific American* with an obnoxious *ad hominem* attack,

“‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein

By ARVID REUTERDAHL

Dean, Department of Engineering and Architecture.

The College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota

Citations That Raise Delicate Question

on Age of Theory of Relativity

THE intellectual world generally moves slowly in the matter of extending recognition to those who have consecrated their lives to the cause of reason. Mendel had been dead many years before the remarkable nature of his work was recognized. When we contrast Mendel's case with that of Einstein we are forced to admit that the German physicist's sensational rise is the most extraordinary in the history of science. Barnum, the king of advertisers, could not have staged a more effective and expeditious advertising campaign. Within the brief period of a few months, Einstein's name became known in every civilized country in the world. The Theory of Relativity afforded cartoonists material for humorous sketches, and the doctor and his doctrine became subjects for mirth and merriment.

After the first volcanic outburst of scientific approval and humorous recognition, rumblings of discontent were heard from Einstein's native land. A group of German scientists, in no uncertain terms, expressed their doubts concerning the precise value and originality of Einstein's theory. There were even those who boldly charged the author with deliberate plagiarism. In England Sir Oliver Lodge and a few other able men cautioned the world against a too hasty acceptance of the new doctrine of relativity. In the United States, however, Einstein's theory met with immediate and complete success. Even at the present time we rarely hear a dissenting voice. This is particularly strange for the reason that in the year 1914 a well-known American journal published a series of articles by an unknown investigator who discussed the very same problem which brought fame to Einstein. We refer to the eleven articles written by the unknown 'Kinertia,' which appeared in *Harper's Weekly* under the caption 'Do Bodies Fall?' If it is true that 'Kinertia' actually considered the Einsteinian problem in these essays, then the question of priority is inevitably raised and the unparalleled originality claimed for Einstein's work becomes a debatable matter. Indeed, the presentation of the very facts which raise these questions is the main purpose of this article. Since the matter of priority is involved, the introduction in this article of a brief chronological survey of the work of both Einstein and 'Kinertia' is of the utmost importance.

The most significant contributions of Albert Einstein have been published in *Annalen Der Physik*. His papers deal with the Special Theory of Relativity, Theory of the Brownian Movements, Inertia of Energy, the Quantum Law of the Emission and Absorption of Light, Theory of the Specific Heat of Solid Bodies, and the General Theory of Relativity. The year 1905 is considered, by most authorities on Einstein's work, as the birth-year of the Theory of Relativity. Careful search, however, has revealed a paper on this subject which was published in Berlin during the year 1904 in the journal *Sitzungsberichte*. That portion of Einstein's theory which deals with the phenomenon of gravitation is a later development. Einstein first gave his attention to the problem of gravitation in 1911, when he developed the Principle of Equivalence of gravitational and accelerative fields. Other phases of this subject were dealt with in papers which appeared in the years

1912 and 1913. A further elaboration, the joint work of Einstein and Marcel Grossman, appeared in 1914. The theory in its final and complete form was announced in the year 1915.

'Kinertia's' contribution deals principally with the problem of gravitation. The question of priority of 'Kinertia' over Einstein consequently involves the phenomenon of gravitation in particular. It must be admitted, however, that 'Kinertia' has also considered Einstein's earlier problem which involved the significance of motion in reference to an observer. Einstein distinguishes this earlier problem from his theory of gravitation by the separate designation, 'Special Theory of Relativity.' A brief historical summary of the work of 'Kinertia' is now in order.

Lord Kelvin first aroused 'Kinertia's' interest in the problem of gravitation. That was in the year 1866 when 'Kinertia' was a student under Lord Kelvin. 'Kinertia' even then did not agree with the Newtonian theory of force as presented by Lord Kelvin. Incidentally, we desire to call the reader's attention to the fact that Albert Einstein was born in 1879 in Ulm, Germany, thirteen years later. It is a curious coincidence that both 'Kinertia' and Einstein were engineers. During the period of time from 1877 to 1881, 'Kinertia' became convinced that *acceleration* was the basic cause of what we generally speak of as 'weight.' The reader is undoubtedly aware of the fact that *acceleration* plays the fundamental role in Einstein's theory of gravitation. 'Kinertia' corresponded with Kelvin, Tait, and Niven, of Cambridge, with the hope that he would be able to interest these men in his startling theory. This attempt met with little or no sympathy. Some years later, through an accident, 'Kinertia' was unfortunately deprived of his hearing. This misfortune forced him to abandon his engineering profession for a rancher's life in the state of California. This new occupation gave 'Kinertia' the requisite leisure to complete his investigations which resulted in confirming his supposition that *acceleration* was the great norm of the phenomenon of gravitation. His attempts, dating from the year 1899, to persuade our stubborn American scientists that the Newtonian theory of gravitation must be revised met with nothing but ridicule or indifference. To *Harper's Weekly* and its managing editor (1914), Mr. H. D. Wheeler, belongs the credit of having published 'Kinertia's' series of articles entitled, 'Do Bodies Fall?' The first article appeared in the issue of August 29, 1914, Vol. 59. The final article is dated November 7, 1914. From the preceding it is evident that 'Kinertia' derived his norm of gravitation before Einstein was born. The question of priority is therefore definitely and irrefutably established in favor of 'Kinertia' in the case of the General Theory of Relativity considered as a discussion of the problem of gravitation and acceleration.

We turn our attention now to the content of these two gravitational theories. We propose, by means of direct quotations from the works of these two men, to set forth their remarkable similarity. In the case of Einstein we shall quote from his recent book, 'Relativity' (Henry Holt and Company,

1920), and in 'Kinertia's' case our quotations will be from the *Harper's Weekly* articles.

The following comparative quotations show the striking similarity existing between Einstein and 'Kinertia' when they consider the relation between acceleration and gravitation, a similarity which extends not only to intent but affects even the very words.

Einstein.

'We imagine a large portion of empty space, so far removed from stars and other appreciable masses that we have before us approximately the conditions required by the fundamental law of Galilei.—As reference-body let us imagine a spacious chest resembling a room with an observer inside who is equipped with apparatus. Gravitation naturally does not exist for this observer. He must fasten himself with strings to the floor, otherwise the slightest impact against the floor will cause him to rise slowly toward the ceiling of the room.

'To the middle of the lid of the chest is fixed externally a hook with rope attached, and now a 'being' (what kind of a being is immaterial to us) begins pulling at this with a constant force. The chest together with the observer then begin to move 'upwards' with a uniformly accelerated motion. In course of time their velocity will reach unheard of values—provided that we are viewing all this from another reference-body which is not being pulled with a rope.

'But how does the man in the chest regard the process? The acceleration of the chest will be transmitted to him by the reaction of the floor of the chest. He must therefore take up this pressure by means of his legs if he does not wish to be laid out full length on the floor. He is then standing in the chest in exactly the same way as anyone stands in a room of a house on our earth. If he release a body which he previously had in his hand, the acceleration of the chest will no longer be transmitted to this body, and for this reason the body will approach the floor of the chest with an accelerated motion. The observer will further convince himself *that the acceleration of the body toward the floor of the chest is always of the same magnitude, whatever kind of body he may happen to use for the experiment.*'— ('*Relativity*,' pages 78 and 79.)

'Kinertia.'

'I set to work to find out by experiment whether bodies actually did fall with the acceleration which the force of attraction was said to produce. Years before that, when in England, where some of our coal mines had vertical shafts about 1,500 feet deep, I had studied the cause of weight by having the hoisting engine drop me down with the full acceleration for about 500 feet. Then, by retardation during the lowest 500 feet, I could experience increase of weight all over me so marked that my legs could hardly support me. That taught me that acceleration was the proximate cause of weight, but at the

time of these experiments I still thought the acceleration of the falling cage was really caused by the earth's attraction.' —('Do Bodies Fall?' *Harper's Weekly*, August 29, 1914, page 210). 'Weight is not a kinetic force because it cannot produce acceleration. *If a body were accelerated in proportion to its weight, then weight would be a force.*' —('Do Bodies Fall ?' *Harper's Weekly*, October 17, 1914, page 383).

It is noteworthy that the only real difference between these two citations is that Einstein derives his conclusions from an hypothetical case, whereas 'Kinertia' draws his conclusions from an actual experiment upon himself.

The interpreters of Einstein furnish us with further corroborative material which we submit as additional evidence in the case of 'Kinertia' versus Einstein. Professor A. S. Eddington's interpretation of Einstein's theory is authoritative. The following quotations are from his work, 'Space, Time and Gravitation' (Cambridge University Press, 1920). These quotations from Eddington's work also consider the equivalence of acceleration and gravitation.

Eddington.

'The nature of gravitation has seemed very mysterious, yet it is a remarkable fact that in a limited region it is possible to create an artificial field of force which imitates a natural gravitational field so exactly that, so far as experiments have yet gone, no one can tell the difference. Those who seek for an explanation of gravitation naturally aim to find a model which will reproduce its effects; *but no one before Einstein seems to have thought of finding the clue in these artificial fields, familiar as they are.*

'When a lift starts to move upward the occupants feel a characteristic sensation, which is actually identical with a sensation of increased weight.—In fact, the upward acceleration of the lift is in its mechanical effects exactly similar to an additional gravitational field superimposed on that normally present.'—('Space, Time and Gravitation,' page 64.)

On the eminent authority of Eddington we may therefore state with absolute certainty that Einstein found his clue to the nature of gravitation in the *artificial field* created by acceleration. Eddington's statement, however, that Einstein was the first scientist to think of this *clue* is evidently erroneous in view of the preceding quotations from the work of 'Kinertia.'

The remarkable similarity in thought of the following quotations pertaining to the relative effects produced by accelerated and uniform motion, is of high evidential interest.

Eddington.

'The observer in the accelerated lift travels upward in a straight line, say 1 foot in the first second, 4 feet in two seconds, 9 feet in three seconds, and so on. If we plot these points as x and t on a diagram we obtain a curved

track. Presently the speed of the lift becomes uniform and the track in the diagram becomes straight. So long as the track is curved (accelerated motion) a field of force is perceived; it disappears when the track becomes straight (uniform motion) .’—(‘Space, Time and Gravitation,’ page 66.)

‘Kinertia.’

‘The proof that matter can exist without weight depends on the first law of motion; because if a mass moves uniformly in a straight line in space, it cannot have weight. If weight is caused by the mutual attraction of matter, then a mass subject to attraction must move in a curve. If weight is caused by acceleration then it cannot follow Newton’s law and move with uniform velocity in a straight line.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, October 10, 1914, page 350.)

The conclusions of Einstein and ‘Kinertia’ concerning the very existence of the force of gravitational attraction are identical in content. This is apparent from the following citations from an article by Professor Edwin B. Wilson, (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and ‘Kinertia’s’ basic articles.

Wilson.

‘But just suppose that somebody tells us that the force of gravity is physically non-existing quite as much as the centrifugal or Coriolis force, and that the reason we think that gravity is real is essentially the same that leads the untutored mind to believe there is a physical force acting to move objects to one side when a train goes around a curve—namely, an unhappily ignorant view of Nature. This is what Einstein asserts.’ —(‘Space, Time and Gravitation,’ the *Scientific Monthly*, March, 1920, page 226.)

‘Kinertia.’

‘But now, since it can be proved that there is no such force in the universe as attraction and that the supposed fall of bodies toward the earth *by that force* is only an illusion of the senses, there will be new ground upon which theologians can meet the Laplace attractionists, and Haeckel and his materialists.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, September 19, 1914, page 285.)

The preceding citations are sufficient to establish conclusively the fact that, in underlying essence, ‘Kinertia’s’ theory of gravitation is identical with Einstein’s. Both men find the crux of the problem in acceleration, and the development of both theories is based upon the very same experiment.

It will be particularly interesting to compare the conclusions of the two men concerning the nature of the path of the earth’s motion in space.

Eddington.

‘Consider, for example, two events in space-time, namely, the position of the earth at the present moment, and its position a hundred years ago. Call these events P^2 and P^1 . In the interim the earth (being undisturbed by impacts) has moved so as to take the longest possible track from P^1 to P^2 —or, if we prefer, so as to take the longest possible proper-time over the journey. In the weird geometry of the part of space-time through which it passes (a geometry which is no doubt associated in some way with our perception of the existence of a massive body, the sun) this longest track is a *spiral*—a circle in space drawn out into a spiral by continuous displacement in time. Any other course would have had a shorter interval-length.’—(‘Space, Time and Gravitation,’ page 72.)

Wilson.

‘Draw from the sun perpendicular to the plane of the earth’s orbit a line which shall represent the time-axis and disregard the third spatial dimension. Now for each kilometer that the earth moves around in its orbit, it must be considered to move in time by 10,000 kilometers. The path of the earth in space and time on this diagram is therefore a *helix* with an extremely steep pitch winding once a year about the cylinder standing in the earth’s orbit but advancing ten thousand billion kilometers while ‘circulating’ one billion kilometers.’—(‘Space, Time and Gravitation.’ *The Scientific Monthly*, March, 1920, page 227.)

‘Kinertia.’

‘The possible motion of the sun in space, as adrift with the planets, was anticipated by Newton; but the laws of motion prevented him from reaching the true *corkscrew* path of the planets in space as they revolve round the sun.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, September 19, 1914, page 285.)

In this connection we submit as corroborative evidence of the highest import, the illustration of this *corkscrew* path of the earth and moon which was used to elucidate ‘Kinertia’s’ article in *Harper’s Weekly*, September 19, 1914, page 285.

This illustration, taken in conjunction with ‘Kinertia’s’ statement, quoted above, proves conclusively that the unknown ‘Kinertia’ derived the same type of path for the earth’s motion in space that Einstein claims as his original contribution.

We introduce the following final quotation in order definitely to fix the date of ‘Kinertia’s’ contribution:

‘Kinertia.’

‘This statement is concerning a discovery in natural science and the ordinary phenomena of daily life, which I discovered about fifteen years ago while engaged in carrying on some experiments to verify what I had

previously suspected to be the true physical cause of *Elasticity, Gravity, Weight and Energy*.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, August 29, 1914, page 210.)

Since this article bears the date 1914, it is clear that the year 1899, fifteen years earlier, is the date which can safely be regarded as the birth-year of ‘Kinertia’s’ theory of gravitation. We have seen that Einstein’s first work on gravitation was done in the year 1911; consequently ‘Kinertia’ antedates Einstein by twelve years.

We rest the case of ‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein on the evidence submitted in this article. If Einstein was aware of ‘Kinertia’s’ discovery then the appellation ‘plagiarist,’ bestowed upon him by his German professional colleagues, is eminently fitting. If, on the contrary, Einstein was unaware of this work, then he is, nevertheless, antedated by the work of ‘Kinertia.’ Einstein is at liberty to choose either horn of the dilemma.”⁶⁸⁵

On 12 February 1920, Einstein gave a speech at the University of Berlin. He allowed non-students to attend, in direct violation of the University’s rules. A similar situation had occurred a year earlier at the University of Zürich, where persons not entitled to attend Einstein’s lectures did attend, and those who had purchased tickets, but whose seats were taken by those without tickets, requested a refund.⁶⁸⁶ During his lecture in Berlin, Einstein called the student council the “dregs of humanity”. Einstein was met again and again with applause and left to general applause.⁶⁸⁷ The only disturbance of any kind was the reaction of the crowd of Eastern European Jews when Einstein spoke of cancelling future lectures should non-students not be permitted to attend, and returning their fees. Eastern European Jews created a series of disturbances,⁶⁸⁸ because they wanted to attend the lectures, which the rules would not allow them to attend. Eastern European Jews were noted for producing Zionists, prostitutes, Frankist revolutionaries and for their pronounced tribalism⁶⁸⁹—their appearance and actions identified them, as the *Deutsche Zeitung* noted,

“[The audience had] a predominantly Asiatic imprint. One saw distinguished matrons, young ladies of questionable quality, schoolboys with the sacred colors of Zion on the blazonry of the Jewish wandering club[.]”⁶⁹⁰

According to Einstein, and the newspaper *Berliner Tageblatt* (14 February 1920), and a petition signed by almost 300 students, nothing anti-Semitic was said or done at the meeting.⁶⁹¹ A young Jewish student, Hans Toby Cohn, wrote to Einstein to apologize for his and his fellow Jews actions, because they were too young to decipher yet whether to be,

“a Communist or a Monarchist, whether an atheist or a nationalistic Jew.”⁶⁹²

The uproar did not involve any anti-Semitic statements, but according to Cohn

did include such statements as, “‘Socialist’ and ‘money refund’ or ‘Are we still students?!’”⁶⁹³ which were made by young Jews. Despite these facts, numerous sources have misrepresented the events which took place and misrepresented the disorderly outbursts of Eastern European Jews, as if anti-Semitic attacks by German Gentiles. As with the Berlin Philharmonic affair, it was Einstein and his friends who made an issue of anti-Semitism, where it was not a legitimate issue. It was yet another example of their Jewish racism and Jewish tribalism. Recall that Einstein called the Student Council, the “refuse of humankind”.⁶⁹⁴

The newspaper *Vorwärts* published an article on 13 February 1920 and wrote of alleged “excesses of an anti-Semitic student mob” “Exzessen eines antisemitischen Studentenpöbels”.⁶⁹⁵ The newspaper *8-Uhr Abendblatt* wrote on 13 February 1920,

“Tumultszenen bei einer Einstein-Vorlesung.

Professor Einstein verzichtet auf weitere Vorlesungen an der Universität. —
Rückzahlung der Kollegien an die Studenten.

Bei der gestrigen Vorlesung des Universitätsprofessors Einstein über seine Relativitätstheorie and der Berliner Universität kam es zu unliebsamen Szenen, die eine Unterbrechung der Vorlesung bewirkten und Professor Einstein zwangen, die Studenten aufzufordern, sich die eingezahlten *Kollegiangelder zurückzahlen* zu lassen. Nach einer uns übermittelten Darstellung dieses Zwischenfalles wollte der Studentenausschuß es nicht zulassen, daß die Vorlesungen des Professors *Einstein* außer den immatrikulierten [*sic*] Studenten auch von *Richtstudenten* besucht werden. Als nun Professor Einstein die gestrige Vorlesung dazu benutzte, um an die Studentenschaft [*sic*] die Bitte zu richten, ihren Standpunkt zu verlassen, wurde dieses Ersuchen mit einem Tumult beantwortet, bei dem auch *Aeußerungen antisemitischen Charakters* fielen. Professor Einstein sah sich infolge dieses unqualifizierbaren Verhaltens der Studentenschaft gezwungen, die Vorlesung abubrechen und an seine studentische Zuhörerschaft die Aufforderung zu richten, sich die *Kollegiangelder zurückzahlen* [*sic*] zu lassen.

Eine Erklärung Professor Einsteins.

Auf unsere Anfrage teilte uns Herr Professor Einstein über den gestrigen Vorfall folgendes mit:

„Meine populär gehaltenen Vorträge über die Relativitätstheorie besuchten nicht nur Studenten, sondern auch viele andere Leute, die dazu eigentlich nicht berechtigt sind. Der Studentenausschuß erklärte deshalb, dies nicht länger zulassen zu wollen. Ich machte darauf aufmerksam, daß der große Saal für alle Platz habe, die zuhören wollen und daß es dadurch zu keinen Unzulänglichkeiten kommen müsse. Der Studentenausschuß hat sich damit jedoch nicht zufrieden gegeben, sondern sich in dieser Frage an den

Rektor gewandt. Der Rektor schrieb mir einen *Brief*, in dem er darauf hinwies, daß nach der bestehenden Vorschrift jene Leute nicht die Berechtigung haben, den Saal zu betreten. Dies ist *formellrichtig*. Ich habe mich jedoch auf den Standpunkt gestellt, daß es mir widerstrebe, ohne inneren Grund es Leuten unmöglich zu machen, weiter zu hören, und ich habe deswegen gestern, statt zu lesen, eine Besprechung mit meiner Zuhörerschaft veranstaltet, die jedoch zu einem bestimmten Ergebnis nicht führte. Ich habe mich daher veranlaßt gesehen, auf meine weiteren Vorlesungen zu verzichten und der Studentenschaft erklärt, sie könne ihre eingezahlten Kollegiengelder sich zurückzahlen lassen. Ich habe aber nicht die Absicht, meine Vorlesungen überhaupt zu unterlassen, ich werde sie vielmehr in anderer Form wieder aufnehmen. In welchem Saal ist aber noch unbestimmt. Sollte es noch einmal zu solchen Szenen wie gestern kommen, dann höre ich überhaupt auf. Von einem *Skandal*, der sich gestern abgespielt haben soll, kann nicht die Rede sein, immerhin bewiesen manche Äußerungen, die fielen, eine gewisse animose Gesinnung mir gegenüber. *Antisemitische Äußerungen* als solche fielen nicht, doch konnte ihr *Unterton* so gedeutet werden.”

Eduard Meyer, Rector of the University of Berlin, was astonished by these reports of anti-Semitism, which he knew were utterly false. On 13 February 1920, Meyer wrote to the Ministry of Culture, stating, *inter alia*,

“Vorausschicken muß ich, daß ich zu meinem größten Erstaunen durch Herrn Seeberg erfuhr, daß behauptet wird, dabei habe der Antisemitismus eine Rolle gespielt und sei von Judentum u. ä. die Rede gewesen. Demgegenüber muß ich erklären, daß das völlig unbegründet ist und ich gar nicht begreife, wie solche Behauptungen haben entstehen können. Das Gespräch, das ich gestern mit Herrn Kollegen Einstein über die Sache hatte, ist in der friedlichsten Weise ganz glatt verlaufen, und ebenso erklärt mir der offizielle Vertreter des studentischen Ausschusses, den ich darum befragt habe, daß in den Diskussionen in der gestrigen Vorlesung, an denen er selbst Anteil genommen hat, mit keinem Wort von Antisemitismus, Judentum usw. die Rede gewesen ist.”⁶⁹⁶

In 1962, Peter Michelmores conveyed an even more alarming, though also purely fictional, account of the events at the University of Berlin, than had the Jewish newspapers,

“A group of black-shirted students broke up one of Einstein’s lectures at the University of Berlin. A blond youth screamed above the din, ‘I’m going to cut the throat of that dirty Jew.’”⁶⁹⁷

This alarmist script, this Jewish canard, appeared many times and was attributed to many different events. Ernst Gehrcke recorded that the newspaper *Freiheit* changed

its story repeatedly after the events at the Berlin Philharmonic of 24 August 1920:

“[. . .]So sprach die *Freiheit*, das Parteiorgan EINSTEINS, am 26. August noch von «wissenschaftlichen Einwänden», am 27. August von der «auf ihre Urheber zurückfallenden, schimpflichen Art, in der der Kampf gegen Professor EINSTEIN und seine Relativitätstheorie geführt wird», am 31. August setzte sich das Blatt über gesellschaftliche und parlamentarische Formen der Berichterstattung hinweg, indem es «einen studentischen Rowdy» sagen läßt, er wolle dem «Saujud EINSTEIN an die Gurgel», und am 4. September: «Die ernsthafte exakte Wissenschaft ist also ein Geschäft, das mit Schiebergewinnen abschließt.»

Die Umschau, Volume 24, (1920), page 554, alleged that someone said,

“man sollte diesem Juden an die Gurgel fahren.”⁶⁹⁸

Vossische Zeitung reported on 29 August 1920, Morning Edition, Supplement 4, front page, that someone loudly stated,

“Diesem Saujuden müßte man eigentlich an die Gurgel springen.”⁶⁹⁹

Yet another account, again by interested pro-Einstein parties, in 1927, places the alleged incident at an unnamed “public meeting in the spring of 1919.”⁷⁰⁰

Johannes Riem, who was not bashful, wrote on 1 July 1921, in reference to Reuterdaahl,

“Man geht gegen Einstein vor als den Goliath des Skeptizismus. Vorlesungen dagegen werden veranstaltet. In scharfsinniger Weise wird in einem viel gelesenen Buche „Relativität oder innere Abhängigkeit“ die Unhaltbarkeit der Relativitätstheorie nachgewiesen. Der Einwand Einsteins, dies sei nur eine besondere Form des Antisemitismus, wird sehr energisch zurückgewiesen, und mit der Anerkennung Spinozas beantwortet.”⁷⁰¹

Physicist Stjepan Mohorovičić declared that he was intimidated out of opposing Einstein’s myths and plagiarism, through fear of being labeled an anti-Semite and by anonymous threats. Johannes Jürgenson writes,

“Ein weiterer Punkt war, daß es Einstein, der selbst Jude war, geschickt verstand, seinen Gegnern Antisemitismus zu unterstellen: ‘Die erste Opposition der wissenschaftlichen Welt gegen die neuen Relativitätstheorien hat man einfach gebrochen, indem man sie als eine Folge des Antisemitismus dem breiten Publikum vorgestellt hat’ sagte Mohorovicic 1962. Auch er hatte in jener Zeit in Zagreb seine Kritik zurückgestellt, um nicht als Antisemit zu gelten.”⁷⁰²

Mohorovičić wrote in 1962 in the second volume of *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*,

“The initial opposition in the scientific world against the new theory of relativity was easily crushed by convincing the general public that it was a product of anti-Semitism, although no one could reliably make such an accusation against M. ABRAHAM, O. KRAUS, O. D. CHWOLSON, etc.! But it disgusts me to speak further of such things; those wanting to learn more about it can glean the facts from many sources, for example [269-270] through [316-317] and others.”

“Die erste Opposition in der wissenschaftlichen Welt gegen die neuen Relativitätstheorien hat man einfach gebrochen, indem man sie als eine Folge des Antisemitismus dem breiten Publikum vorgestellt hat, obwohl man dies sicher nicht einem M. ABRAHAM, O. KRAUS, O. D. CHWOLSON, etc. vorwerfen konnte! (usw.). Aber es ekelt mir, über solche Verhältnisse weiter zu sprechen; wer sich darüber unterrichten will, müßte vieles nachlese, wie z. B. [269-270] bis [316-317] und manches andere.”⁷⁰³

Mohorovičić also stated that the “Relativity Syndicate” vehemently obstructed the publication of works which criticized the theory of relativity (your author has personally witnessed such corrupt practices):

“Eine vorzügliche und sehr scharfsinnige Kritik veröffentlichte G. v. GLEICH 1930, wo er alle seine diesbezüglichen Arbeiten gesammelt und geordnet hatte, obwohl das ‘Relativitätssyndikat’ mit allen Mitteln trachtete, das Erscheinen dieses Werkes zu verhindern. Nun es war sehr schwer die Kritik gänzlich zu unterdrücken, da man in der Wahl der Mittel nicht kleinlich war. Alle, für die Relativitätstheorie ungünstigen Arbeiten wurden einfach kurzerhand als unrichtig, fehlerhaft oder falsch bezeichnet oder als unwichtig (heutzutage ein sehr beliebtes Wort!) oder wenigstens als uninteressant verschwiegen. Von den Philosophen erhielten nur die Applaudierenden das Wort, den kritisch Gesinnten warf man ihre mathematischen Unkenntnisse vor; wer sich darüber unterrichten will, sollte die offenen Briefe des bekannten Philosophen O. KRAUS nachlesen¹⁰⁸), und doch haben die Philosophen die Grundlage der Rechnung, nicht aber die Rechnung selbst untersucht. Aber die Relativisten haben übersehen, daß die modernen Relativitätstheorien, ähnlich wie die moderne Musik, voll von Dissonanzen sind, (eine solche Musik entzückt den heutigen Snob außerordentlich und er kann nicht begreifen, daß es gebildete Leute gibt, welche die moderne Musik nicht ausstehen können, aber dafür muß man das Ohr und die richtige musikalische Erziehung haben!). O. KRAUS hat besonders den Umstand hervorgehoben (l. c. S. 96.), ‘daß jeder Quark, der für die Theorie zu sein scheint, von den Relativisten mit freundlicher Gebärde begrüßt wird... während eine ernste Kritik mißhandelt wird’¹⁰⁹).

Dies wirkte aber verhängnisvoll und diese modernen Theorien wurden größtenteils ein Tätigkeitsfeld pour ceux qui savent vivre... oder wie ein lachender Philosoph sagte ¹¹⁰): ‘...an Höfen ist Höflichkeit der Verstand und die Münze...’.”⁷⁰⁴

Mohorovičić stated in 1922 that he had received anonymous threats for opposing relativity theory,

“Viele wurden von der Behauptung geblendet, daß diese Theorie sich mit der Erfahrung in Übereinstimmung befinde (vgl. II, 4), was von den Anhängern der Einsteinschen Theorie sehr geschickt zu Propagandazwecken ausgenutzt wurde. Das letzte (nämlich diese gewissenlose Reklame) ist gerade auch die dunkelste Seite des erwähnten Kampfes, welcher nie in einer so scharfen Form ausgebrochen wäre, wenn nicht diese unglückliche und unerhörte Propaganda gewesen wäre, welche in der Geschichte fast aller Wissenschaften beispiellos ist [*Footnote deleted*]. Alles dies wird noch durch die Tatsache verschärft, daß Einstein und die Mehrzahl seiner ersten Anhänger Juden sind — (ich hätte keinen Grund, die Rasse Einsteins zu erwähnen, wenn nicht Einstein *selbst* so häufig betont hätte, daß er ein Jude sei) [*Footnote*: Einstein selbst sagt in dem Vorwort des Werkes von L. Fabre (Anmerk. 30) den Franzosen ausdrücklich, daß er nur in Deutschland geboren sei, sonst sei er ein Jude, Pazifist und Mitglied einer internationalen Verbindung.... Es ist nicht schwer zu raten, warum Einstein dies gerade den Franzosen gegenüber gesagt hat (mit eigener Unterschrift), aber lassen wir das, es ist dies nur Geschmacksache...; unsere Arbeit hier ist eine wissenschaftliche. Es ist traurig genug, daß ich gezwungen bin, dies hier zu erwähnen!]

—, und da die letzteren fast die ganze Weltpresse in den Händen haben, so bereiteten sie für Einstein eine kolossale Reklame und haben fast jede Arbeit, welche gegen diese Theorie gerichtet wurde, zu unterdrücken gesucht. Zu diesem religiös-sozialen Moment kommt noch ein politisches Moment hinzu, worüber ich hier nicht zu reden wünsche. *Ich bin nur überzeugt, daß wir, die wir uns ziemlich weit von diesem Kampfe befinden, viel ruhiger und objektiver über diese neue Richtung urteilen können, und daß wir nicht sofort blind und kritiklos jede neue Richtung, welche zu uns aus dem Ausland gelangt, anzunehmen brauchen.* [*Footnote*: Leider sind diese »Methoden« des Streits auch zu uns gekommen. Mitglieder einer philosophischen Fakultät, die in ihrem fanatischem Abscheu gegen jede sachliche, kritische Stellungnahme zur Relativitätstheorie offenbar ganz vergessen hatten, daß die Wissenschaft eine *über* den Parteien stehende Sache ist, haben sich nicht gescheut, persönliche Gehässigkeit gegen mich als Kritiker der Relativitätstheorie an den Tag zu legen, wie ich mehrfach erfahren mußte. Einige Herren Relativisten haben mir *anonyme Drohbriefe* zugestellt und sich anderer, sonst in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen sehr ungewöhnlicher Mittel bedient. Es ist die höchste Zeit, mit solchen Methoden endlich aufzuhören!]

”⁷⁰⁵

Einstein, too, was attacked by lunatics—who made death threats and plots against him, but these were political attacks which were not directly related to the theory of relativity. In the spring of 1921, Rudolph Leibus offered a reward to anyone who murdered Einstein, Harden or Foerster. Theodor Wolff, editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, spread the false rumor that Einstein and he were targets of assassins after the murder of Walter Rathenau in 1922. This may have been a pretext to give Einstein an excuse to back away from his commitment with the League of Nations and the police denied Wolff's charges. *The New York Times* reported on the front page on 19 February 1923 that Prof. Herzen of Lausanne University told a meeting of the Brussels Engineering Association in a discussion on the theory of relativity that Einstein was on a death list. *The New York Times* reported on 1 February 1925 on page 13 that Marie Evgenievna Dickson was arrested after she showed up at the Einstein's home and frightened Mrs. Einstein. Dickson had been expelled from France for planning to murder the Soviet Ambassador Leonid Krassin. Years later, after the World Committee for Help for Victims of German Fascism, for which Einstein was a figurehead, published *The Brown Book of the Hitler Terror*,⁷⁰⁶ the rumor spread that the Nazis had put a bounty on Einstein's head.⁷⁰⁷

Ad hominem attack and smear campaigns were Einstein's preferred method of response to challenges to Einstein's priority and challenges to relativity theory, as even Einstein's advocates were forced to concede in 1931. Von Brunn, a defender of Einstein, wrote,

“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[.]”⁷⁰⁸

This was published in a pro-Einstein “review” of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, which anti-Einstein book stated,

“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 [of the theory of relativity] and opposing arguments.”⁷⁰⁹

Sadly, the *ad hominem* attacks against anyone who criticized Einstein or relativity theory were not relegated to history, despite Brunn's claims; and, ironically, one need only read his “review” of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* to see that the so-called “review” was itself an *ad hominem* attack against the authors. *One Hundred Authors Against Einstein* was a response to personal attacks from Einstein and his followers, and largely contained philosophical objections to relativity theory, some better than others.

Charles Lane Poor complained of severe censorship.

Einstein liked to smear his critics. Henri Bergson published a book, which was, according to Abraham Pais, not included in his collected works, and which was a negative critique of relativity theory titled *Duration and Simultaneity*. Pais wrote,

“In his presentation speech on December 10, 1922, Arrhenius said, ‘Most discussion [of Einstein’s oeuvre] centers on his theory of relativity. This pertains to epistemology and has therefore been the subject of lively debate in philosophical circles. It will be no secret that the famous philosopher Bergson in Paris has challenged this theory, while other philosophers have acclaimed it wholeheartedly’.

Bergson’s collected works appeared in 1970 [B3]. The editors did not include his book *Durée et Simultanéité: A Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*. Einstein came to know, like, and respect Bergson. Of Bergson’s philosophy he used to say, ‘Gott verzeih ihm,’ God forgive him.”⁷¹⁰

In the 1965 English translation of Bergson’s book, *Duration and Simultaneity*, physicist Herbert Dingle wrote an introductory piece detailing the suppression of criticisms of relativity theory. Dingle warned of the dangers of the anti-rational state of awareness induced by Logical Positivism in its pseudo-relativistic adherents, with its celebration of the denial of physical reality, its solipsism, hypocrisy, numerology, and semantics; with the positivists’ acceptance of metaphysical fallacy as if fact.

Dingle asked us all to consider the fact that we place our lives in the hands of a class of scientists who see as their goal the denial of the physical world, as for them it is an illusion supplanted by numbers, and who corruptly pursue the unchecked promotion of their myths. Herbert Dingle, whose words were often suppressed, stated, *inter alia*,

“The facts must be faced. To a degree never previously attained, the material future of the world is in the hands of a small body of men, on whose not merely superficially apparent but absolute, intuitive (in Bergson’s sense of the word) integrity the fate of all depends, and that quality is lacking. Where there was once intellectual honesty they have now merely the idea that they possess it, the most insidious and the most dangerous of all usurpers; the substitution is shown by the fruits, which are displayed in unmistakable clarity in the facts described here. After years of effort I am forced to conclude that attempts with the scientific world to awaken it from its dogmatic slumber are in vain. I can only hope that some reader of these pages, whose sense of reality exceeds that of the mathematicians and physicists and who can command sufficient influence, might be able from the outside to enforce attention to the danger before it is too late.”⁷¹¹

Under the headline “When a scientist challenges dogma, he’s the one who gets mauled”, Scott LaFee wrote in the *The San Diego Union-Tribune* of 2 November 1994,

“But unfortunate things can still happen when a novel contention challenges the perceived or popular ‘truth.’ Instead of receiving an honest but critical evaluation, the new idea can be ridiculed or, worse, ignored, its creator punished professionally and personally.

‘I wouldn’t do it again,’ says Wallace Kantor, a retired local physicist who questioned Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity in several scientific papers and a book. ‘Reaction to my work ranged from intense rage to contemptuous pity. It was career-damaging. It wasn’t worth it.’”⁷¹²

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.

353. Letter from M. v. Laue to A. Einstein of 18 October 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 145, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 122-124, at 123.

354. A. Sommerfeld to A. Einstein, in A. Hermann, *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 71. Prof. Lewis Elton stresses this point.

355. 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 118.

356. 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 118-119.

357. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1967), p. 161.

358. M. Born, "Physics and Relativity", *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 106.

359. P. Lenard, *England und Deutschland zur Zeit des grossen Krieges*, Heidelberg, (1914).

360. 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.

361. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. xi-xiv.

362. F. K. Wiebe, *Deutschland und die Judenfrage*, M. Müller & Sohn, Hrsg. im Auftrage des Instituts zum Studium der Judenfrage, Berlin, (1939); **English** translation, *Germany and the Jewish Problem*, Published on behalf of the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Problem, Berlin, (1939); **French** translation, *L'Allemagne et la Question Juive*, Berlin, Edité sous les auspices de l'Institut pour l'étude de la question juive, (1939); **Spanish** translation, *Alemania y la Cuestión Judía*, Publicado por encargo del Instituto para el Estudio de la Cuestión Judía, Berlín, (1939).

363. W. W. Zuelzer, *The Nicolai Case: A Biography*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, (1982). Christoph Friedrich Nicolai was a friend of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Moses Mendelssohn; and a critic of Kant, Fichte, Goethe and Schiller. I do know if Georg Friedrich Nicolai was a namesake.

364. Letter from Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai of 22 May 1918, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998). **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).

365. R. Recouly, "Contrasts Between the French and Russian Revolutions", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 1, (November, 1922), pp. 67-80, at 78-80.

366. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. xvii-xix.

367. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 284. **See also:** L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 30, 98, 101-105.

368. A. Rohling, *Der Talmudjude: zur beherzigung für Juden und Christen aller Stände*, Adolph Russel, Münster, (1871); English translation: *The Jew According to the Talmud*,

Sons of Liberty, Metairie, Louisiana, (1978); **and** *Der Antichrist und das Ende der Welt: Zur Erwägung für alle Christen*, B. Herder, St. Louis, (1875); **and** *Der Katechismus des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, für Juden und Protestanten, den auch Katholiken lesen dürfen*, F. Kirchheim, Mainz, (1877); **and** *Franz Delitzsch und die Judenfrage, Antwortlich beleuchtet*. . . , J.B. Reinitz, Prag, (1881); **and** *Fünf Briefe über den Talmudismus und das Blutritual der Juden*, Prag, (1881); **and** *Die Polemik das Menschenopfer des Rabbinismus; eine wissenschaftliche Antwort ohne Polemik für die Rabbiner und ihre Genossen*, Bonifacius-Druckerei, Paderborn, (1883); **and** *Meine Antworten an die Rabbiner, oder Fünf Briefe über den Talmudismus und das Blut-Ritual der Juden*, Cyrillo-Method'sche Buchdruckerei, Prag, (1883); **and** *Die Ehre Israels: Neue Briefe an die Juden*, Prag, (1889); **and** *Erklärung der Apokalypse des h. Johannes des grossen Propheten von Patmos*, Verlag der Liebfrauen-Druckerei (Dr. W. Wingerth), München, (1895); **and** *Aufnach Zion!: oder die grosse Hoffnung Israels und aller Menschen*, Jos. Kosel'schen Buchhandlung, Kempten, (1901); **and** *Das Judentum nach neurabbinischer Darstellung der Hochfinanz Israels*, G. Schuh, München, (1903). **See also:** A. Rohling and M. de Lamarque, *Le juif-talmudiste*, A. Vromant, Paris, Bruxelles, (1888). **See also:** A. Rohling and E. A. Drumont, *Le juif selon le Talmud*, Albert Savine, Paris, (1889); German translation: *Prof. Dr. Aug. Rohling's Talmud-Jude*, T. Fritsch, Leipzig, (1891). **See also:** J. A. Eisenmenger, A. Rohling and J. Ecker, *Die Sittenlehre des Juden. Auszug aus dem Talmud (Schulchan-Aruch)*, Deutschen Schutz- und Trutz-bund, Landesverein Bayern, Nürnberg, (1920).

Rohling's work is derivative of J. A. Eisenmenger, *Des bey 40. Jahr von der Judenschafft mit Arrest bestrickt gewesene, nunmehr aber durch Autorität eines hohen Reichsvicariats relaxirte Johann Andreä Eismengers*. . . *Endecktes Judenthum, oder: Gründlicher und wahrhaffter Bericht: welchergestalt die verstockte Juden die hochheilige Dreyeinigkeit, Gott Vater, Sohn und Heiligen Geist, erschrecklicher Weise lästern und verunehren, die heil. Mutter Christi verschmähen, das Neue Testament, die Evangelisten und Aposteln, die christliche Religion spöttlich durchziehen, und die gantze Christenheit auf das äusserste verachten und verfluchen; dabey noch viele andere, bishero unter den Christen entweder gar nicht, oder nur zum Theil bekant-gewesene Dinge und grosse Irrthüme der jüdischen Religion und Theologie, wie auch viel lächerliche und kurtzweilige Fabeln und andere ungereimte Sachen an den Tag kommen*, Frankfurt, (1700); **and** *Entdecktes Judenthum oder, Gründlicher und wahrhaffter Bericht, welchergestalt die verstockte Juden die hochheilige Drey-einigkeit. . . verunehren, die heil. Mutter Christi verschmähen. . . die christliche Religion spöttisch durchziehen, und die gantze Christenheit. . . verachten und verfluchen; dabey noch viel andere. . . nur zum Theil bekant gewesene Dinge und grosse Irrthüme der jüdischen Religion und Theologie, wie auch viel lächerliche und kurtzweilige Fabeln. . . an den Tag kommen. Alles aus ihren eigenen. . . Büchern. . . kräftiglich erwiesen, und in zweyen Theilen verfasset. . . Allen Christen zur treuhertzigen Nachricht verfertigt, und mit vollkommenen Registern versehen*, Königsberg in Preussen, (1711); English translation by J. P. Stehelin, *The Traditions of the Jews: With the Expositions and Doctrines of the Rabbins Contain'd in the Talmud and Other Rabbinical Writings*, Volume 1, Printed for G. Smith, London, (1732); **and** *The Traditions of the Jews: Or the Doctrines and Expositions Contain'd in the Talmud and other Rabbinical Writings*, Printed for G. Smith, London, (1742-1743). **See also:** E. L. Roblik J. A. Eisenmenger, *Jüdische Augen-Gläser, das ist: Ein. . . denen Juden zur Erkanntnuss des wahren Glaubens vorgesteltes Buch. Allwo in dem ersten Theil (wider die jüdische irrende Lehr) durch die heil. Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments, gantz klar bewiesen wird, dass Jesus Christus seye ein wahrer Sohn des lebendigen Gottes. . . In dem anderten Theil aber, wird aus dem jüdischen Buch (Talmud genannt) bewiesen, dass der jetzige jüdische Glauben, ein falscher und gottslästerlicher*

Glauben seye. . ., Gedruckt bey M.B. Swobodin, Brünn, (1741-1743). **See also:** C. Anton and J. A. Eisenmenger, *Einleitung in die rabbinischen Rechte, dabey insonderheit von einem Judeneide, wie solchen eine christliche Obrigkeit am verbindlichsten abnehmen kann umständlich ist gehandelt worden*, F.W. Meyer, Braunschweig, (1756).

Bloch accused Rohling of forging sources, and Rohling sued Bloch for libel, though the suit was dropped: A. Rohling and J. S. Bloch, *Acten und Gutachten in dem Prozesse Rohling contra Bloch*, Volume 1, M. Breitenstein, Wien, (1890); **and** *Anhang zum ersten Bande der Acten und Gutachten in dem Prozesse Rohling contra Bloch*, W. Breitenstein's Verlagsbuchhandlung, Wien, (1890).

Rohling had numerous critics: J. S. Bloch, *Gegen die Anti-semiten. Eine Streitschrift*, D. Löwy, Wien, (1882); and *Prof. Rohling und das Wiener Rabbinat: oder, "Die arge Schelmerei"*, Im Selbstverlage des Verfassers, Wien, (1882); and *Des k.k. prof. Rohling neueste Fälschungen*, Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung, Wien (1883); and *Einblicke in die Geschichte der Entstehung der talmudischn Literatur*, D. Löwy, Wien, (1884); and *Einblicke in die Geschichte der Entstehung der talmudischen Literatur*, D. Löwy, Wien, (1884); and *Talmud und Judenthum in der Oesterr. Volksvertretung*, Oesterreichische Wochenschrift, Wien, (1900); and *Talmud und Judenthum in der Oesterr Volksvertretung*, Oesterreichische Wochenschrift, Wien, (1900); and *"Kol Nidre" und seine Entstehungsgeschichte*, Löwit, Wien, (1918); and *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, R. Löwit, Wien, Leipzig, (1922); English translation: *My Reminiscences*, Arno Press, New York, (1973). **See also:** M. L. Rodkinson and J. S. Bloch, *Wahrheit gegen Lüge*, Wien, (1886). **See also:** Rabbiner Dr. Kroner, *Entstelltes Unwahres und Erfundenes in dem „Talmudjuden“* Professor Dr. August Rohling's, E. Obertüschen, Münster, (1871); which is described in: "Litarischer Wochenbericht", *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, Volume 35, Number 34, (22 August 1871), pp. 673-674, at 674. **See also:** J. E. Fraenkel, P. Mansch, Philipp and A. Rohling, *Erwiderung auf die vom Professor Dr. Aug. Rohling Verfasste Schrift der Talmudjude*, Kugel, Lemberg, (1874). **See also:** P. Bloch, *Prof. Rohling's Falschmünzerei auf talmudischem Gebiet*, L. Merzbach, Posen, (1876). **See also:** F. Delitzsch, *Rohlings Talmudjude beleuchtet*, Dörffling & Franke, Leipzig, (1881); **and** *Schachmatt den Blutlügen Rohling & Justus*, A. Deichert, Erlangen, (1883); **and** *Was d. Aug. Rohling beschworen hat und beschwören will*, Dörffling & Franke, Leipzig, (1883). **See also:** J. Kopp, *Zur Judenfrage nach den Akten des Prozesses Rohling-Bloch*, Leipsic, (1886). **See also:** C. A. Victor, *Prof. Dr. Rohling, die Judenfrage und die öffentliche Meinung*, T. Fritsch, Leipzig, (1887). **See also:** *Acten und Gutachten in dem Prozesse Rohling contra Bloch*, M. Breitenstein, Wien, (1890). **See also:** *Jüdische Presse*, Number 46, (1902).

369. See: D. Kimhi, *Hesronot ha-Shas: ve-hu sefer kevutsat ha-hashmatot: kolel kol ha-devarim ha-haserim be-Talmud Bavli ve-Rashi ve-Tosafot ve Rosh veba-G. a. u-fe. ha-mishnayot leha-Rambam; mini az nidpesu `al yede `Emanu'el Bambashti be-'Amsterdam shenat 410 ve-khen hashlamat ha-hisaron hidushe halakhot. . .*, Jos. Schlesinger, Budapest, (1865). **See also:** G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893). **See also:** W. Popper, *The Censorship of Hebrew Books: Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, Columbia University, Knickerbocker Press, New York, (1899). **See also:** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 70-72.

370. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 326.

371. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York,

(1918).

372. 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.

373. Letter from A. Einstein to E. Zürcher of 15 April 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 23, Princeton University Press, (2004).

374. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. 84-89.

375. "Jews", *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, (1973), pp. 292-293, at 293.

376. I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

377.

<<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/lindbergh/filmmore/reference/primary/desmoinesspeech.html>>

378. <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>>

379. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 276.

380. J. B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time Shown in His Own Letters*, Volume 2, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920), pp. 104-110, at 109.

381. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), pp. 273, 284.

382. I. T. T. Lincoln, *The Autobiography of an Adventurer*, H. Holt and Co., New York, (1932). 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), picture page between pages 35 and 36 and pp. 50-52, 62-63. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988).

383. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), p. 271.

384. "LURIA, ISAAC BEN SOLOMON, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 572-578, at 576.

385. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 356-357.

386. "Ex-Spy Warns World of Buddhist Wrath", *The New York Times*, (20 December 1939), p. 5

387. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), p. 72. Wasserstein cites: *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard). House of Commons Official Report*, Series 5, Volume 17, H.M.S.O., London, (1910), cols. 1135-1139.

388. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), p. 245.

389. J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, Ecco, New York, (2003), pp. 85-106.

390. <http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=280279>

391.

<<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1143498911316&pagename=JPost%2FJPostArticle%2FPrinter>>

392. W. W. Reade, *The Martyrdom of Man*, Trübner & Co., London, (1872).

- 393.** “Messiah”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 1407-1417, at 1410.
- 394.** Josephus, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book XX, Chapter 8, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 609-613, at 612-613.
- 395.** L. Rapoport, *Stalin’s War Against the Jews: The Doctors’ Plot and the Soviet Solution*, Free Press, New York, (1990), pp. 139, 208-210.
- 396.** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), p. 267.
- 397.** Epiphanius, translated by F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Volume 1, 26.16.7, E. J. Brill, New York, (1987), p. 97.
- 398.** “Jews, Modern”, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Volume 13, Ninth Edition, Charles Scribner’s Sons, (1881), p. 680.
- 399.** H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey’s Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 394.
- 400.** Cyprian, “The Treatises of Cyprian”, Treatise VI, *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Volume 5, Christian Literature Publishing Company, New York, (1886), pp. 465-467.
- 401.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*, Delacorte Press, New York, (1978), p. 166.
- 402.** W. Churchill, “Zionism Versus Bolshevism. A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People.”, *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, (8 February 1920), p. 5.
- 403.** C. I. Scofield, Editor, *The Scofield reference Bible. The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments. Authorized version, with a new system of connected topical references to all the greater themes of Scripture, with annotations, revised marginal renderings, summaries, definitions, and index; to which are added helps at hard places, explanations of seeming discrepancies, and a new system of paragraphs*, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, (1909), p. 25.
- 404.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 331.
- 405.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel’s Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 149-150.
- 406.** L. Ginzberg, *The Legend of the Jews*, Volume 3, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1911/1954), pp. 61-63.
- 407.** J. Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensubung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657), p. 323.
- 408.** “Gentile”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 5, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 617. **See also:** A. Cohen, “Soferim 41a”, *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud Massektoth Ketannoth in Two Volumes*, Volume 1, The Socino Press, London, (1965), pp. 287-288, especially note 50.
- 409.** M. Berenbaum, *After Tragedy and Triumph: Essays in Modern Jewish Thought and the American Experience*, Cambridge University Press, (1990), p.7.
- 410.** “Esau” is also referred to as “Edom” *Genesis* 36:8.
- 411.** I. Velikovsky, *Ages in Chaos*, Volume 1, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, (1952), p. 95.

- 412.** D. B. Ball and G. W. Ball, *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement with Israel, 1947 to the Present*, W. W. Norton, New York, (1992), pp. 204-206.
- 413.** A. Ben Isaiah, et al., *The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English*, S. S. & R. Publishing Company, Brooklyn, New York, (1949), pp. 187-188.
- 414.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), p. 149.
- 415.** I Samuel 15:9. Esther 3:1. G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), pp. 39-40.
- 416.** Marc-Alain Ouaknin, *Symbols of Judaism*, Barnes & Noble Books, New York, (2000), p. 84.
- 417.** J. I. de Medrano, *La Silva curiosa*, Marc Orry, Paris, (1608), pp. 157-157. Cf. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 81-82.
- 418.** 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.
- 419.** B. J. Hendrick, "Radicalism among the Polish Jews", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 597.
- 420.** R. Recouly, "Contrasts Between the French and Russian Revolutions", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 1, (November, 1922), pp. 67-80, at 78.
- 421.** R. Recouly, "Contrasts Between the French and Russian Revolutions", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 1, (November, 1922), pp. 67-80, at 75, 78.
- 422.** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 304-306.
- 423.** A. C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, (1974), pp. 186-187.
- 424.** M. Nordau, *The Interpretation of History*, Willey Book Company, New York, (1910), pp. 290-297; which is an English translation by M. A. Hamilton of *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1909).
- 425.** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 305-306.
- 426.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 247.
- 427.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 247-248, *see also*: pp. 87-88.
- 428.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 252-254.
- 429.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 256-257.
- 430.** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 108-109.
- 431.** 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.
- 432.** J. Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensubung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657), pp. 243-245.
- 433.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 149-150.

- 434.** Voltaire in English translation in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), p. 46.
- 435.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 149-150.
- 436.** S. M. Hersh, *The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy*, Random House, New York, (1991).
- 437.** *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalm* 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.
- 438.** V. Ostrovsky and C. Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, St. Martin's Paperbacks, New York, (1990), p. 53. **See also:** V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, Harper Paperbacks, New York, (1994).
- 439.** *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalm* 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.
- 440.** M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932), pp. 20, 37-39.
- 441.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 407.
- 442.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 110.
- 443.** *From:* A. Nadler, "Last Exit to Brooklyn: The Lubavitcher's Powerful and Preposterous Messianism", *The New Republic*, (4 May 1992), pp. 27-35, at 33. Nadler appears to quote from: R. A. Foxbrunner, *Habad: The Hasidism of R. Shneur Zalman of Lyady*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, (1992).
- 444.** Y. Sheleg, "A dark reminder of the Dark Ages", *Haaretz.com*, (28 June 2005).
- 445.** "Gentile", *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 618 and 621.
- 446.** G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Kriegeres, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 531.
- 447.** *See also:* J. Kuttub, "West Bank Arabs Foresee Expulsion", *The New York Times*, (1 August 1983), p. A15.
- 448.** D. J. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, Knopf, New York, (1996). **See also:** É. Durkheim, "Germany above All" *The German Mental Attitude and the War*, Librairie Armand Colin, Paris, (1915). **See also:** "By a German", *I Accuse! (J'Accuse!)*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, (1915). **See also:** W. F. Barry, *The World's Debate: An Historical Defence of the Allies*, George H. Doran, New York, (1917). **See also:** W. T. Hornaday, *A Searchlight on Germany: Germany's Blunders, Crimes and Punishment*, American Defense Society, New York, (1917). **See also:** D. W. Johnson, *Plain Words from America: A Letter to a German Professor*, London, New York, Toronto, Hodder & Stoughton, (1917).
- 449.** H. Stern, *KZ-Lügen: Antwort auf Goldhagen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (1998), ISBN: 3924309361; **and** *Jüdische Kriegserklärungen an Deutschland: Wortlaut, Vorgeschichte, Folgen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (2000), ISBN: 3924309507.
- 450.** M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: "Fourth Letter", "Note III" and "Note IV", *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918), pp. 56-57, 240-244.

- 451.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 100.
- 452.** G. H. Schodde, *The Book of Enoch: Translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes*, Warren F. Draper, Andover, (1882), p. 98. Note that *Genesis* 4:17 gives a different lineage for Enoch than *Genesis* 5:18-24, and that in the former, Enoch is the son of Cain!
- 453.** Voltaire in English translation in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), p. 46.
- 454.** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 110-111.
- 455.** Epiphanius, translated by F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Volume 1, 26.4.1-26.5.6, E. J. Brill, New York, (1987), pp. 85-87.
- 456.** "Albigenses", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 1, Robert Appleton Company, (1907), pp. 267-269, at 269.
- 457.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), pp. 108-110.
- 458.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 2, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 311.
- 459.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 3, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 63.
- 460.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 3, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 132.
- 461.** G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), p. 40. Though work is given an ancient attribution by its "discoverer", the Muhammadans are also mentioned in *Zohar*, II, 32a. Some consider the author to have been divinely inspired, some say the work evolved over time, some say the work is a fabrication—in any event, it is an now a very old writing and was very influential in Jewish political movements like the Frankists.
- 462.** J. Neusner, *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew: Fourth Division: Neziqin (The Order of Damages)*, Volume 4, Ktav Publishing House Inc., New York, (1981), p. 342. **See also:** *Sanhedrin* 57a. **See also:** *Abodah Zarah* 26b.
- 463.** Selections from these texts are found in: M. G. Reddish, *Apocalyptic Literature: A Reader*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, (1990).
- 464.** Cyprian, Twelfth Treatise, "Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews", First Book, Testimony 19, *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Volume 5, Christian Literature Publishing Company, New York, (1886), p. 512.
- 465.** *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.
- 466.** R. Mewes, "Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Relativitäts- oder Raumzeitlehre", Chapter 4, "Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang", *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 48-78, at 78.
- 467.** See, for example, On the occasion of Einstein's 50th birthday, "Die Relativitätstheorie und der dialektische Materialismus", *Arbeiterstimme*, (1929), which is quoted by B. Thüring, "Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen", *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162, at 144-145. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren*

Möglichkeiten und Ursachen, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941).

468. Cf. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949).

469. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 52-53.

470. A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest, (6 December 1918), *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part B, Document 664, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 960-961.

471. A. Einstein to E. Zürcher, (15 April 1919), *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 23, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 35-36, at 36.

472. A. Einstein to H. Born, (31 August 1919), *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 97, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 142-144, at 143.

473. A. Einstein to the *Neue Freie Presse*, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 193, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 273.

474. Letter from A. Einstein to the Borns of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 386-390, at 387.

475. R. Romain, *La Conscience de l'Europe*, Volume 1, pp. 696ff. English translation from A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 365-367. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 15 September 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 118, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 22 August 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 374, Princeton University Press, (1998).

476. Letter from A. Einstein to Paul 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.

477. Letter from A. Einstein to R. W. Lawson of 26 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 234, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** A. Einstein, "Welcoming Address to Paul Colin", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 27, Princeton University Press, (2002). **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 222, 230, 237, 249, 275, 297 and 331, Princeton University Press, (2004).

478. R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 129-130, at 129.

479. Cf. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), p. 53. Einstein stated in the *Jüdische Pressezentral*, Number 111, (21 September 1920), that it irked him to read that he was a German citizen of Jewish faith. He stated that he was not a German citizen, but was a Jew. Cf. B. Thüring, *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 24-25.

480. D. K. Buchwald, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 417-419. A. Einstein, "Zuschriften an die Herausgeber: Zur Abwehr", *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 219. **See also:** L. Fabre's response to A. Einstein's objections: L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: Les Théories d'Einstein*, Payot, Paris, (1922), pp. 15-16.

481. D. K. Buchwald, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 417-419.

482. E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 67.

483. “Time, Space, and Gravitation”, *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen Ausgabe, (27 August 1920), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Einstein and Newton”, *The London Times*, (14 June 1921), p. 8. **See also:** “Wie ich Zionist wurde”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, (21 June 1921), pp. 351-352; English translation by A. Engel, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-237. Einstein stated in the *Jüdische Pressezentral*, Number 111, (21 September 1920), that it irked him to read that he was a German citizen of Jewish faith. He stated that he was not a German citizen, but was a Jew. Confer: B. Thüring, *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 24-25.

484. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 531.

485. A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. 91.

486. R. P. Oliver, “Liberalism”, *America’s Decline: The Education of a Conservative*, Londinium Press, London, (1981).

487. English translation, B. v. Suttner, *Ground Arms!* = “*Die Waffen nieder!*” *A Romance of European War*, A.C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, (1906). **See also:** B. v. Suttner, *Martha’s Kinder: eine Fortsetzung zu “Die Waffen nieder!”*, E. Pierson, Dresden, (1903).

488. “Time, Space, and Gravitation”, *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen Ausgabe, (27 August 1920), pp. 1-2. **See also:** L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: Les Théories d’Einstein*, Payot & Cie, Paris, (1921), pp. 15-18. **See also:** “Einstein and Newton”, *The London Times*, (14 June 1921), p. 8. **See also:** “Wie ich Zionist wurde”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, (21 June 1921), pp. 351-352; English translation by A. Engel, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-237. Einstein stated in the *Jüdische Pressezentral*, Number 111, (21 September 1920), that it irked him to read that he was a German citizen of Jewish faith. He stated that he was not a German citizen, but was a Jew. Confer: B. Thüring, *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 24-25. **See also Einstein’s private correspondence, for example:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 10, 28, 36, 78, 79, 80, 92, 94, 96 and 108, Princeton University Press, (2004).

489. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 26 April 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 28, Princeton University Press, (2004). Letter from A. Einstein to W. de Haas of 9 May 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 36, Princeton University Press, (2004).

490. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 21 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 108, Princeton University Press, (2004).

491. P. G. Nutting, “National Prestige in Scientific Achievement”, *Science*, Volume 48, (1918), pp. 605-608.

492. “America and German Science”, *Nature*, Volume 102, (1919), pp. 446-447.

493. Letter from M. Born to A. Einstein of 28 October 1920, M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 43-45.

494. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 1 August 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 80, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 67-68, at 68. See also Document 108, the letter from Einstein to Lorentz of 21 September 1919, at pages 92-93.

- 495.** A. Einstein, *Thoughts on Reconciliation*, Deutscher Gesellig-Wissenschaftlicher Verein von New York, New York, (1920), pp. 10-11; facsimile republished in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 47, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 360-364.
- 496.** A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 315.
- 497.** A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 316.
- 498.** A. Einstein quoted in *Vossische Zeitung*, Morning Edition, Supplement 4, (29 August 1920), p. 1. English translation from, D. K. Buchwald, et. al. Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), Note 1, p. 357.
- 499.** 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.
- 500.** A biased and heavily redacted version of the discussion appeared in: *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 666-668. That this version is incomplete and biased is proven in: P. Lenard, *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, Third Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921); **and** "Zur zweiten Auflage. Ein Mahnwort an deutsche Naturforscher.", *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922), pp. 5-10. E. Gehrcke, "Die Relativitätstheorie auf dem Naturforschertage in Nauheim", *Umschau, Wochenschrift über die Fortschritte in Wissenschaften und Technik*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 99; **and** "Zur Relativitätsfrage", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 227. *Berliner Tageblatt*, Evening Edition, (24 September 1920), p. 3. *Vossische Zeitung*, Evening Edition, (24 September 1920), p. 1-2.
- 501.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 41.
- 502.** J. Riem, "Amerika über Einstein", *Deutsche Zeitung*, Abend Ausgabe, (1 July 1921).
- 503.** From A. Reuterdahl, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, (22 May 1921). Reuterdahl translates parts of "Professor Einsteins „Triumphzug“ durch Amerika", *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (22 April 1921).
- 504.** Rudolf Peters picked up on the ridiculous title "Albertus Maximus". See: *The Collected papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 388, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 523, note 2.
- 505.** A. Fürst and A. Moszkowski, *Das Buch der 1000 Wunder*, A. Langen, München, (1916), pp. 263-264.
- 506.** E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 16-17.
- 507.** P. Lenard, *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, Third Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921), Note 1, p. 39.
- 508.** D. Eckart and A. Hitler, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. L. Pierce, "Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin", *National Socialist World*, (1966). URL: <<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/DOCs/Eckart.doc>> p. 7. J. Klatzkin, *Krisis und Entscheidung im Judentum; der Probleme des modernen Judentums*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, (1921). Heinrich Class under the pseudonym Daniel Frymann, *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär': politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten*, Dieterich, Leipzig, (1912); English translation, R. S. Levy, "If I were the Kaiser / Daniel Freymann", *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, Chapter 14, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991).

509. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 254.

510. R. L. Hartt, "New York and the Real Jew", *Independent* (New York), (25 June 1921). Cf. "Jews Are Silent, the National Voice Is Heard", *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, (30 July 1921).

511. *Confer*: A. Unsöld, "Albert Einstein — Ein Jahr danach", *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, (1980), pp.337-339; **and** Volume 37, Number 7, (1981), p. 229. L. R. B. Elton, "Einstein, General Relativity, and the German Press, 1919-1920", *Isis*, Volume 77, Number 1, (March, 1986), pp. 95-103; **and** "Letters: Einstein and Germany", *Physics Today*, Volume 40, Number 7, (July, 1987), pp. 15, 106. W. Krause, "Letters: Einstein and Germany", *Physics Today*, Volume 40, Number 7, (July, 1987), pp. 106, 108. H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 107-133. M. Janssen *et al*, Editors, "Einstein's Encounters with German Anti-Relativists", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7 (Hardbound), Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 101-113.

512. Cf. D. K. Buchwald, et al. Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p.108.

513. S. Grundmann, "Das moralische Antlitz der Anti-Einstein-Liga", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Technischen Universität Dresden*, Volume 16, pp. 1623-1626.

514. 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. 1-2, 63-64.

515. *See, for example*: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 26, 52, 59, 189, 207, 216, Princeton University Press, (2004).

516. T. Sauer, "The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert's First Note on the Foundations of Physics", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 568, note 156.

517. E. Gehrcke, "Die Relativitätstheorie auf dem Naturforschertage in Nauheim", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 99.

518. E. Gehrcke, "Zur Relativitätsfrage", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 227.

519. H. Weyl, "Die Relativitätstheorie auf der Naturforscherversammlung in Bad Nauheim", *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 31, (1922), pp. 51-63.

520. B. Thüring, "Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen", *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162, at 159. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 59-60.

521. J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 68.

522. A. Einstein to J. Winteler, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 115, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 176-177, at 177.

523. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 499, Princeton University Press, (1995), pp. 373-374, at 374.

524. R. Romain, *La Conscience de l'Europe*, Volume 1, pp. 696ff. English translation from A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 365-367. **See also**: Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 15 September 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 118, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 22 August 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume

8, Document 374, Princeton University Press, (1998).

525. J. Bacque, *Other Losses: An Investigation into the Mass Deaths of German Prisoners at the Hands of the French and Americans after World War II*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1989).

526. Letter from A. Einstein to Paul 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.

527. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 68, 93.

528. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 16.

529. English translation in: 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 59.

530. L. S. Dawidowicz, "The Zionist Federation of Germany Addresses the New German State", *A Holocaust Reader*, Behrman House, Inc., West Orange, New Jersey, (1976), pp. 150-155. **See also:** H. Tramer, Editor, S. Moses, *In zwei Welten: Siegfried Moses zum fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, Verlag Bitauon, Tel-Aviv, (1962), pp. 118. ff; cited in 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 59.

531. English translation quoted from J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 78. Stachel cites M. Besso, A. Einstein, *Correspondance, 1903-1955*, Hermann, Paris, (1972), p. 238.

532. 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 179.

533. D. Brian, *The Unexpected Einstein: The Real Man Behind the Icon*, Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, (2005), p. 42.

534. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153.

535. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153.

536. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153-154.

537. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.

538. A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 316.

539. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Nathan of 3 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 366, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 492. Also: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. lx, note 44.

540. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-294.

541. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 88.

542. A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 107-108.

543. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 159.

544. A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, English translation by E. Osers, *Albert Einstein, a Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 494; which cites speech to the *Central-Verein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens*, in Berlin on 5 April 1920, in D. Reichenstein, *Albert Einstein. Sein Lebensbild und seine Weltanschauung*, Berlin, (1932). This letter from Einstein to the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith of 5 April 1920 is reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 368, Princeton University Press, (2004).

545. “Zeitschau”, *Im deutschen Reich*, Volume 27, Number 3, (March, 1921), pp. 90-97, at 92.

546. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 304, note 8.

547. “Professor Einstein erklärt das „Sunday Express“-Interview für gefälscht”, *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume 10, Number 37, (11 September 1931), p. 443.

548. A. Einstein, translated by A. Harris, “The Disarmament Conference of 1932. I.” *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 59-60.

549. “Mr. Balfour on Zionism”, *The London Times*, (12 February 1919), p. 9.

550. Arthur James Balfour, Earl of Balfour, *Decadence: Henry Sidgwick Memorial Lecture*, Cambridge, University Press, (1908).

551. T. G. Dyer, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Idea of Race*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, (1992).

552. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, Volume 24, Memorial Edition, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1923-1926), p. 122. J. B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time Shown in His Own Letters*, Volume 2, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920), pp. 104-110, at 105.

553. D. Reed, *Disgrace Abounding*, Jonathan Cape, London, (1939).

554. S. Schechter, *Zionism: A Statement*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1906); reprinted in the relevant part in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 507.

555. J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

556. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

557. J. Stachel, “Einstein's Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 48-49. For Zionist Ha-Am's use of the image of atomisation and dispersion, see: A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 276.

558. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

559. 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.

560. At the time Einstein made his statement, Jews and Gentiles often referred to Jews as “Orientals”.

561. Einstein repeatedly spoke of the Germans as “greedy” to acquire territory and of the “loss of energy” when different “races” attempted to live together. He have been speaking literally. Georg Friedrich Nicolai wrote of the struggle of life to acquire the energy of the sun and he applied this struggle to humanity. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. 36-39, 44-53.

- 562.** R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 292. Clarck refers to: *Neue Rundschau*, Volume 33, Part 2, pp. 815-816.
- 563.** W. E. Mosse, "Die Niedergang der deutschen Republik und die Juden", *The Crucial Year 1932*, p. 38; English translation in: 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 56-57.
- 564.** English translation by John Stachel in J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 67. Stachel cites, "Botschaft", *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 30, (1925), p. 129; French translation, *La Revue Juive*, Volume 1, (1925), pp. 14-16.
- 565.** J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 78-79.
- 566.** 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.
- 567.** E. A. Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of past and Present Immigration to the American People*, Century Company, New York, (1914), p. 144.
- 568.** Reprinted in the relevant part in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 505.
- 569.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.
- 570.** A. Einstein, "Our Debt to Zionism", *Out of My Later Years*, Carol Publishing Group, New York, (1995), pp. 262-264, at 262.
- 571.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.
- 572.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 111.
- 573.** A. Unsöld, "Albert Einstein — Ein Jahr danach", *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, (1980), pp.337-339; **and** Volume 37, Number 7, (1981), p. 229.
- 574.** A. Einstein, "Atomic War or Peace", *Atlantic Monthly*, (November, 1945, and November 1947); *as reprinted in*: A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 125.
- 575.** A. Einstein, "To the Heroes of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto", *Bulletin of the Society of Polish Jews*, New York, (1944), reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 212-213.
- 576.** A. Einstein, quoted in O. Nathan and H. Norton, *Einstein on Peace*, Avenel Books, New York, (1981), p. 331.
- 577.** A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 727-728.
- 578.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 189.
- 579.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 199.
- 580.** K. MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, London, (1998), pp. 113-114; **citing**: E. A. Grollman, *Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World*, Bloch, New York, (1965); **and** D. B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, Praeger, New York, (1981); **and** P. Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*, W. W. Norton, New York, (1988); **and** Y. H. Yerushalmi, *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*, Yale University Press, (1991); **and** K. MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, (1998).

581. See: Letter from M. Planck to W. Wien of 9 July 1922 in J. L. Heilbron, *Max Planck: Ein Leben für die Wissenschaft 1858-1947. Mit einer Auswahl der allgemeinverständlichen Schriften von Max Planck*, S. Hirzel, Stuttgart, (1988), p. 127.

582. Letter from A. S. Eddington to A. Einstein of 1 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 186, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 262-263, at 263.

583. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 203, 220, 227, 238, 249, 253, Princeton University Press, (2004).

584. See, for example: “Literarische Mitteilungen”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 25, Number 33, (21 May 1920), p. 254.

585. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 177, 180, 182, 185, 186 and 194, Princeton University Press, (2004).

586. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 110-111.

587. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 100.

588. J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 59.

589. M. Born quoted and translated in: D. A. Buchwald, *et al.* Editors, “Einstein’s Encounters with German Anti-Relativists”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 109, footnote 52.

590. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 112.

591. 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. *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* which became an anti-Semitic paper, praised the *New York Herald*. “When Editors Were Independent of the Jews”, *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, (5 February 1921).

592. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

593. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

594. M. T. Cicero, *Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28; translated by C. D. Yonge, *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, Volume 2, George Bell & Sons, London, (1880), pp. 454-455.

595. K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 66.

596. P. Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel’s Lobby*, Lawrence Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1985); **and** *Deliberate Deceptions: Facing the Facts about the U.S.-Israeli Relationship*, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1993); **and** *Silent No More: Confronting America’s False Images of Islam*, D : Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2001).

597. Historical Research Department of the Nation of Islam (Chicago), *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, Chicago, Latimer Associates, (1991). **For counter-argument, see:** H. D. Brackman, *Ministry of Lies: The Truth behind the Nation of Islam’s The Secret Relationship between Blacks and Jews*, Four Walls Eight Windows, New York, (1994); **and** “Jews Had Negligible Role in Slave Trade”, *The New York Times*, (14 February 1994), p. A16. **Contrast these with Brackman’s own statements in his PhD dissertation:**

H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977); **and see:** T. Martin, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993). **See also:** L. Brenner, Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (28 February 1994), p. A16; **and** “Harold Brackman Believes in Recycling Garbage”, *New York Amsterdam News*, (11 March 1995). **See also:** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 66-67.

598. H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977), pp. 163-164.

599. H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977), pp. 79-81. Cf. T. Martin, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993). L. Brenner, Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (28 February 1994), p. A16; **and** “Harold Brackman Believes in Recycling Garbage”, *New York Amsterdam News*, (11 March 1995). M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 66-67.

600. I. Epstein, Editor, Sanhedrin 70a, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 28 (Sanhedrin II), The Soncino Press, (1935), pp. 477-478.

601. I. Epstein, Editor, Sanhedrin 108b, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 28 (Sanhedrin II), The Soncino Press, (1935), p. 745.

602. H. Freedman and M. Simon, Editors, *Midrash Rabbah*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, London, (1939), pp. 292-293.

603. M. Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, University of Chicago Press, (1963), pp. 618-619.

604. Translated by H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, London, New York, (1933), pp. 246-247.

605. P. Wheatly, “On Being Brought from Africa to America”, *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral*, A. Bell, London, (1773), p. 18.

606. P. Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel’s Lobby*, Lawrence Hill & Company, Westport, Connecticut, (1985), p. 296.

607. V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad’s Secret Agenda*, Harper Collins, New York, (1994), p. 32.

608. *See also:* N. G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Second Edition, Verso, London, New York, (2003).

609. J. J. Mearsheimer and S. M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy*, Faculty Research Working Papers Series, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (March, 2006), p. 23.

610. D. Duke, *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening on the Jewish Question*, Free Speech Press, Covington, Louisiana, (2002), pp. 200-205.

611. D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair, U. S. A., (1951), pp. 8-10.

612. G. Vidal, *Imperial America*, Nation Books, New York, (2004), pp. 76-77; originally, *The Observer*, London, (15 November 1987), “But written as of March 1987 In *The Nation*.”

613. R. I. Friedman, “Selling Israel in America: The Hasbara Project Targets the U.S. Media”, *Mother Jones*, (February/March, 1987), pp. 1-9; reprinted “Selling Israel to America”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 16, Number 4, (Summer, 1987), pp. 169-179, at 170, 178.

614. Courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.

615. S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt”, in two parts in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281, at 277, 279, notes 317, 352, 364, 365; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273, 317, 319, 329, notes 90, 108, 109, 110, 637.

616. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Bergman of 5 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 155, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 132-133, at 132. **See also:** H. N. Bialik, “Bialik on the Hebrew University”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 281-288, at 284-285.

617. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 536-537.

618. Letter from V. G. Ehrenberg to A. Einstein of 23 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 173, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 145.

619. H. A. Lorentz, “Electromagnetische Verschijselen 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.

620. 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.

621. 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.

622. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

623. Cf. Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, “Early Days”, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-’uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74.

- 624.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 555.
- 625.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 556.
- 626.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 556.
- 627.** Cf. Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, “Early Days”, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-’uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74, at 72.
- 628.** See, for example, J. Goebbels, “Der Führer”, *Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP, Munich, (1935), pp. 214-216; and “Goldene Worte für einen Diktator und für solche, die es werden wollen”, *Der Angriff*, (1 September 1932); reprinted in: *Wetterleuchten: Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP., Franz Eher Nachf., München, (1939), pp. 325-327. On the Zionists’ quest to find a “great man” to be their “dictator”, see: N. Goldman, “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 4, (1920-1921), pp. 237-242, at 240-242; which was part of a series including: “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 45-47; and “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 7, (1920-1921), pp. 423-425.
- 629.** Cf. Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, “Early Days”, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-’uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74, at 73. **See also:** J. Stachel, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.
- 630.** *The New York Times*, (8 July 1921), p. 9.
- 631.** N. Robbins, *Baltimore Evening Sun*, (29 April 1921). “Americans Tremendously Bored, Einstein Says, Explaining ‘Exaggerated Welcome’”, *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (8 July 1921). “Einstein Has No Valid Cause to Congratulate Self, Reuter Dahl Says”, *Minneapolis Evening Tribune*, (8 July 1921), p. 10. “The Amused Mr. Einstein”, *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (9 July 1921). “Reuter Dahl Sees No Cause for Einstein’s Slurs on Americans”, *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (9 July 1921). “Chicago Women Resent Einstein’s Opinions”, *The New York Times*, (9 July 1921), p. 7. “Probably He Did Say It All”, *The New York Times*, (9 July 1921), p. 8. K. W. Payne, “Einstein on Americans, wherein the Eminent Scientist Failed to Understand Us”, *The New York Times*, Section 2, (10 July 1921), p. 2. Response, “Einsteins amerikanische Eindrücke. Was er wirklich sah”, *Vossische Zeitung*, Morning Edition, Supplement 1, (10 July 1921), Front Page. A transcription is found in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix E, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 628-630. “A Product of His Education”, *The New York Times*, (11 July 1921), p. 10. “Explanation Rather than Denial”, *The New York Times*, (12 July 1921), p. 12. “Prohibition Stays, Says Dr. Einstein”, *The New York Times*, Section 2, (31 July 1921), p. 4. An anti-Semitic article appeared in *The Dearborn Independent*, “Relatively Unimportant, Extremely Typical”, (30 July 1921), p. 14. Einstein had declared America “violently” “anti-German”, which statement also brought criticism. See: “Dr. Einstein Found America Anti-German. Violently So, He Says, Though He Noted That a Reaction Was Setting In”, *The New York Times*, (2 July 1921), p. 3. “A Genius Makes a Mistake”, *The New York Times*, (4 July 1921), p. 8. *New York Herald Magazine*, (26 June 1921). J. Riem, “Amerika über Einstein”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (Berlin), (1 July 1921); and “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (Berlin), (13 September 1921).
- 632.** J. Stachel, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

633. “Aladdin Einstein”, *The Freeman* (New York), Volume 3, Number 59, (27 April 1921), pp. 153-154.

634. T. J. J. See, “EINSTEIN A TRICKSTER?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923). Peter A. Bucky recalls that others intimated that Einstein’s disheveled appearance was meant to attract publicity. Bucky discounted the notion, as did Einstein. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 4, 111.

635. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), pp. 163-166.

636. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 163.

637. 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

638. Cf. 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 125.

639. A. Reuterdaahl, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, (22 May 1921). Reuterdaahl translates parts of “Professor Einsteins „Triumphzug“ durch Amerika”, *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (22 April 1921).

640.

The Palestine Mandate

The Council of the League of Nations:

July 24, 1922

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have agreed, for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to entrust to a Mandatory selected by the said Powers the administration of the territory of Palestine, which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire, within such boundaries as may be fixed by them; and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the Mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on November 2nd, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said Powers, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and

Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country; and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have selected His Britannic Majesty as the Mandatory for Palestine; and

Whereas the mandate in respect of Palestine has been formulated in the following terms and submitted to the Council of the League for approval; and

Whereas His Britannic Majesty has accepted the mandate in respect of Palestine and undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations in conformity with the following provisions; and

Whereas by the afore-mentioned Article 22 (paragraph 8), it is provided that the degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory, not having been previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, shall be explicitly defined by the Council of the League Of Nations; confirming the said Mandate, defines its terms as follows:

ARTICLE 1. The Mandatory shall have full powers of legislation and of administration, save as they may be limited by the terms of this mandate.

ART. 2. The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion.

ART. 3. The Mandatory shall, so far as circumstances permit, encourage local autonomy.

ART. 4. An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration to assist and take part in the development of the country. The Zionist organization, so long as its organization and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.

ART. 5. The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of the Government of any foreign Power.

ART. 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.

ART. 7. The Administration of Palestine shall be responsible for enacting a nationality law. There shall be included in this law provisions framed so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine.

ART. 8. The privileges and immunities of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by Capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, shall not be applicable in Palestine. Unless the Powers whose nationals enjoyed the afore-mentioned privileges and immunities on August 1st, 1914, shall have previously renounced the right to their re-establishment, or shall have agreed to their non-application for a specified period, these privileges and immunities shall, at the expiration of the mandate, be immediately reestablished in their entirety or with such modifications as may have been agreed upon between the Powers concerned.

ART. 9. The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that the judicial system established in Palestine shall assure to foreigners, as well as to natives, a complete guarantee of their rights. Respect for the personal status of the various peoples and communities and for their religious interests shall be fully guaranteed. In particular, the control and administration of Wakfs shall be exercised in accordance with religious law and the dispositions of the founders.

ART. 10. Pending the making of special extradition agreements relating to Palestine, the extradition treaties in force between the Mandatory and other foreign Powers shall apply to Palestine.

ART. 11. The Administration of Palestine shall take all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the community in connection with the development of the country, and, subject to any international obligations accepted by the Mandatory, shall have full power to provide for public ownership or control of any of the natural resources of the

country or of the public works, services and utilities established or to be established therein. It shall introduce a land system appropriate to the needs of the country, having regard, among other things, to the desirability of promoting the close settlement and intensive cultivation of the land. The Administration may arrange with the Jewish agency mentioned in Article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and utilities, and to develop any of the natural resources of the country, in so far as these matters are not directly undertaken by the Administration. Any such arrangements shall provide that no profits distributed by such agency, directly or indirectly, shall exceed a reasonable rate of interest on the capital, and any further profits shall be utilised by it for the benefit of the country in a manner approved by the Administration.

ART. 12. The Mandatory shall be entrusted with the control of the foreign relations of Palestine and the right to issue exequaturs to consuls appointed by foreign Powers. He shall also be entitled to afford diplomatic and consular protection to citizens of Palestine when outside its territorial limits.

ART. 13. All responsibility in connection with the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, including that of preserving existing rights and of securing free access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites and the free exercise of worship, while ensuring the requirements of public order and decorum, is assumed by the Mandatory, who shall be responsible solely to the League of Nations in all matters connected herewith, provided that nothing in this article shall prevent the Mandatory from entering into such arrangements as he may deem reasonable with the Administration for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this article into effect; and provided also that nothing in this mandate shall be construed as conferring upon the Mandatory authority to interfere with the fabric or the management of purely Moslem sacred shrines, the immunities of which are guaranteed.

ART. 14. A special commission shall be appointed by the Mandatory to study, define and determine the rights and claims in connection with the Holy Places and the rights and claims relating to the different religious communities in Palestine. The method of nomination, the composition and the functions of this Commission shall be submitted to the Council of the League for its approval, and the Commission shall not be appointed or enter upon its functions without the approval of the Council.

ART. 15. The Mandatory shall see that complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, are ensured to all. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief. The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language, while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Administration may impose, shall not be denied or impaired.

ART. 16. The Mandatory shall be responsible for exercising such supervision over religious or eleemosynary bodies of all faiths in Palestine as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government. Subject to such supervision, no measures shall be taken in Palestine to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of such bodies or to discriminate against any representative or member of them on the ground of his religion or nationality.

ART. 17. The Administration of Palestine may organise on a voluntary basis the forces necessary for the preservation of peace and order, and also for the defence of the country, subject, however, to the supervision of the Mandatory, but shall not use them for purposes other than those above specified save with the consent of the Mandatory. Except for such purposes, no military, naval or air forces shall be raised or maintained by the

Administration of Palestine. Nothing in this article shall preclude the Administration of Palestine from contributing to the cost of the maintenance of the forces of the Mandatory in Palestine. The Mandatory shall be entitled at all times to use the roads, railways and ports of Palestine for the movement of armed forces and the carriage of fuel and supplies.

ART. 18. The Mandatory shall see that there is no discrimination in Palestine against the nationals of any State Member of the League of Nations (including companies incorporated under its laws) as compared with those of the Mandatory or of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft. Similarly, there shall be no discrimination in Palestine against goods originating in or destined for any of the said States, and there shall be freedom of transit under equitable conditions across the mandated area. Subject as aforesaid and to the other provisions of this mandate, the Administration of Palestine may, on the advice of the Mandatory, impose such taxes and customs duties as it may consider necessary, and take such steps as it may think best to promote the development of the natural resources of the country and to safeguard the interests of the population. It may also, on the advice of the Mandatory, conclude a special customs agreement with any State the territory of which in 1914 was wholly included in Asiatic Turkey or Arabia.

ART. 19. The Mandatory shall adhere on behalf of the Administration of Palestine to any general international conventions already existing, or which may be concluded hereafter with the approval of the League of Nations, respecting the slave traffic, the traffic in arms and ammunition, or the traffic in drugs, or relating to commercial equality, freedom of transit and navigation, aerial navigation and postal, telegraphic and wireless communication or literary, artistic or industrial property.

ART. 20. The Mandatory shall co-operate on behalf of the Administration of Palestine, so far as religious, social and other conditions may permit, in the execution of any common policy adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating disease, including diseases of plants and animals.

ART. 21. The Mandatory shall secure the enactment within twelve months from this date, and shall ensure the execution of a Law of Antiquities based on the following rules. This law shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of excavations and archaeological research to the nationals of all States Members of the League of Nations.

(1) "Antiquity" means any construction or any product of human activity earlier than the year 1700 A. D.

(2) The law for the protection of antiquities shall proceed by encouragement rather than by threat. Any person who, having discovered an antiquity without being furnished with the authorization referred to in paragraph 5, reports the same to an official of the competent Department, shall be rewarded according to the value of the discovery.

(3) No antiquity may be disposed of except to the competent Department, unless this Department renounces the acquisition of any such antiquity. No antiquity may leave the country without an export licence from the said Department.

(4) Any person who maliciously or negligently destroys or damages an antiquity shall be liable to a penalty to be fixed.

(5) No clearing of ground or digging with the object of finding antiquities shall be permitted, under penalty of fine, except to persons authorised by the competent Department.

(6) Equitable terms shall be fixed for expropriation, temporary or permanent, of lands which might be of historical or archaeological interest.

(7) Authorization to excavate shall only be granted to persons who show sufficient guarantees of archaeological experience. The Administration of Palestine shall not, in granting these authorizations, act in such a way as to exclude scholars of any nation without

good grounds.

(8) The proceeds of excavations may be divided between the excavator and the competent Department in a proportion fixed by that Department. If division seems impossible for scientific reasons, the excavator shall receive a fair indemnity in lieu of a part of the find.

ART. 22. English, Arabic and Hebrew shall be the official languages of Palestine. Any statement or inscription in Arabic on stamps or money in Palestine shall be repeated in Hebrew and any statement or inscription in Hebrew shall be repeated in Arabic.

ART. 23. The Administration of Palestine shall recognise the holy days of the respective communities in Palestine as legal days of rest for the members of such communities.

ART. 24. The Mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report to the satisfaction of the Council as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of the mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ART. 25. In the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, the Mandatory shall be entitled, with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations, to postpone or withhold application of such provisions of this mandate as he may consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions, and to make such provision for the administration of the territories as he may consider suitable to those conditions, provided that no action shall be taken which is inconsistent with the provisions of Articles 15, 16 and 18.

ART. 26. The Mandatory agrees that, if any dispute whatever should arise between the Mandatory and another member of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or the application of the provisions of the mandate, such dispute, if it cannot be settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

ART. 27. The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate.

ART. 28. In the event of the termination of the mandate hereby conferred upon the Mandatory, the Council of the League of Nations shall make such arrangements as may be deemed necessary for safeguarding in perpetuity, under guarantee of the League, the rights secured by Articles 13 and 14, and shall use its influence for securing, under the guarantee of the League, that the Government of Palestine will fully honour the financial obligations legitimately incurred by the Administration of Palestine during the period of the mandate, including the rights of public servants to pensions or gratuities.

The present instrument shall be deposited in original in the archives of the League of Nations and certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to all members of the League.

Done at London the twenty-fourth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

641. H. Kessler, *Walter Rathenau: His Life and Work*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, (1930).

642. W. Hartenau (W. Rathenau), "Höre, Israel!", *Die Zukunft*, Volume 18, (6 March 1897), pp. 454-462.

643. R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 292. Clarck refers to: *Neue Rundschau*, Volume 33, Part 2, pp. 815-816.

644. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 289.

645. T. J. J. See, "EINSTEIN A TRICKSTER?", *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923).

646. *Casseler Allgemeine Zeitung*, (12 August 1922), as recorded by Ernst Gehrcke in his book: *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 63.

647. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii. "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.

648. C. L. Poor, "Planetary Motions and the Einstein Theories", *Scientific American Monthly*, Volume 3, (June, 1921), pp. 484-486; **and** "Alternative to Einstein: How Dr. Poor Would Save Newton's Law and the Classical Time and Space Concept", *Scientific American*, Volume 124, (11 June 1921), p. 468; **and** "Motions of the Planets and the Relativity Theory", *Science*, New Series, Volume 54, (8 July 1921), pp. 30-34; **and** "Test for Eclipse Plates", *Science*, New Series, Volume 57, (25 May 1923), pp. 613-614; **and** C. L. Poor and A. Henderson, "Is Einstein Wrong? A Debate", *Forum*, Volumes 71 & 72, (June/July, 1924), pp. 705-715, 13-21; replies *Forum*, Volume 72, (August 1924), pp. 277-281; **and** C. L. Poor, "Relativity and the Motion of Mercury", *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Volume 29, (15 July 1925), pp. 285-319; **and** "The Deflection of Light as Observed at Total Solar Eclipses", *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 20, (1930), pp. 173-211; **and** "What Einstein Really Did", *Scribner's Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December, 1930), pp. 527-538; discussion follows in *Commonweal*, Volume 13, (24 December 1930, 7 January 1931, 11 February 1931), pp. 203-204, 271-272, 412-413. **See also:** "Alternative to Einstein; How Dr. Poor would Save Newton's Law and the Classical Time and Space Concept", *Scientific American*, Volume 124, (11 June 1921), p. 468.

649. C. L. Poor, "What Einstein Really Did", *Scribner's Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December 1930), pp. 527-538, at 538.

650. 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 118.

651. 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 118-119.

652. E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 34-35. Cf. 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 112.

653. A. Einstein, "In Honour of Arnold Berliner's Seventieth Birthday", *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. 14.

654. A. Einstein, "Zuschriften an die Herausgeber. Zur Abwehr", *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, Number 13, (1 April 1921), p. 219.

655. *Die Naturwissenschaften* exhibited a long history of personal attack by "book review". See, for example: *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 11, Number 2, (12 January 1923), pp. 252-256; **and** *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 19, Number 11, (13 March 1931), pp. 252-256.

656. Letter from A. Einstein to W. Dällenbach of 27 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 112, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 97-98, at 97.

657. See, as but one of countless examples, the letter from W. Dällenbach to A. Einstein of 19 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 107,

Princeton University Press, (2004).

658. A. Reuterdaahl, “The Academy of Nations—Its Aims and Hopes”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (7 January 1922), p. 14.

659. E. Guillaume’s letter, translated by A. Reuterdaahl, “Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (14 May 1922), p. 14; reprinted with slight modifications, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8. **See also:** “Einstein Faces in Paris Grave Blow at Theory”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (31 March 1922). **See also:** “Dr. Guillaume’s Proofs of Einstein Theory’s Fallacy Revealed to the Journal”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (9 April 1922). **See also:** E. Guillaume, “Un Résultat des Discussions de la Théorie d’Einstein au Collège de France”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, Number 11, (15 June 1922), pp. 322-324. **See also:** “Les Bases de la Physique moderne”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1917), pp. 5-21, 89-112, 185-198; **and** “Sur le Possibilité d’Exprimer la Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1917), pp. 48-52; **and** “La Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 46, (1918), pp. 281-325; **and** “Sur la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 1, (1919), pp. 246-251; **and** “Représentation et Mesure du Temps”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), pp. 125-146; **and** “La Théorie de la Relativité et sa Signification”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 27, (1920), pp. 423-469; **and** “Relativité et Gravitation”, *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Volume 53, (1920), pp. 311-340; **and** “Les Bases de la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, (15 April 1920) pp. 200-210; **and** C. Willigens, “Représentation Géométrique du Temps Universel dans la Théorie de la Relativité Restreinte”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), p. 289; **and** E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité. Résumé des Conférences Faites à l’Université de Lausanne au Semestre d’été 1920*, Rouge & Co., Lausanne, (1921); **and** E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388; **and** Guillaume’s Appendix II, “Temps Relatif et Temps Universel”, in L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d’Einstein*, Second Edition, Payot, Paris, (1922); **and** E. Guillaume, “Y a-t-il une Erreur dans le Premier Mémoire d’Einstein?”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 5-10; **and** “La Question du Temps d’après M. Bergson, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 573-582; **and** Guillaume’s introduction 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. V-XVI; **and** H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein’s Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv. **See also:** P. Painlevé, “La Mécanique Classique et la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 173, (1921), pp. 677-680. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil”, in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273-275. **See also:** K. Hentschel, *Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin,

(1990). **See also:** A. Genovesi, *Il Carteggio tra Albert Einstein ed Edouard Guillaume. "Tempo Universale" e Teoria della Relatività Ristretta nella Filosofia Francese Contemporanea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, (2000). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 September 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 383, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 3 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 385, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 387, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 17 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 392, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 394, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 25 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 280, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from M. Grossmann to A. Einstein of 5 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 300, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 305, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 15 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Grossmann of 27 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 330, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Oppenheim of 29 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 399, Princeton University Press, (2004).

660. L. Jánossy, "Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322; **and** *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971). **See also:** S. J. Prokhorov, *The Logic of Special Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1967). **See also:** K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, In Two Volumes, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria, (1958/1962).

661. E. Guillaume's letter, translated by A. Reuter Dahl, "Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion", *Minneapolis Journal*, (14 May 1922), p. 14; reprinted with slight modifications, "The Origin of Einsteinism", *The New York Times*, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8. **See also:** "Einstein Faces in Paris Grave Blow at Theory", *The Chicago Tribune*, (31 March 1922). **See also:** "Dr. Guillaume's Proofs of Einstein Theory's Fallacy Revealed to the Journal", *Minneapolis Journal*, (9 April 1922). **See also:** E. Guillaume, "Un Résultat des Discussions de la Théorie d'Einstein au Collège de France", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, Number 11, (15 June 1922), pp. 322-324. **See also:** "Les Bases de la Physique moderne", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1917), pp. 5-21, 89-112, 185-198; **and** "Sur la Possibilité d'Exprimer la Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1917), pp. 48-52; **and** "La Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 46, (1918), pp. 281-325; **and** "Sur la Théorie de la Relativité", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 1, (1919), pp. 246-251; **and** "Représentation et Mesure du Temps", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), pp. 125-146; **and** "La Théorie de la Relativité et sa Signification", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 27, (1920), pp. 423-469;

and “Relativité et Gravitation”, *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Volume 53, (1920), pp. 311-340; and “Les Bases de la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, (15 April 1920) pp. 200-210; and C. Willigens, “Représentation Géométrique du Temps Universel dans la Théorie de la Relativité Restreinte”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), p. 289; and E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité. Résumé des Conférences Faites à l’Université de Lausanne au Semestre d’été 1920*, Rouge & Co., Lausanne, (1921); and E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; and E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388; and Guillaume’s Appendix II, “Temps Relatif et Temps Universel”, in L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d’Einstein*, Second Edition, Payot, Paris, (1922); and E. Guillaume, “Y a-t-il une Erreur dans le Premier Mémoire d’Einstein?”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 5-10; and “La Question du Temps d’après M. Bergson, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 573-582; and Guillaume’s introduction 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. V-XVI; and H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein’s Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv. **See also:** P. Painlevé, “La Mécanique Classique et la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 173, (1921), pp. 677-680. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil”, in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273-275. **See also:** K. Hentschel, *Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1990). **See also:** A. Genovesi, *Il Carteggio tra Albert Einstein ed Edouard Guillaume. “Tempo Universale” e Teoria della Relatività Ristretta nella Filosofia Francese Contemporanea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, (2000). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 September 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 383, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 3 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 385, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 387, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 17 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 392, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 394, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 25 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 280, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from M. Grossmann to A. Einstein of 5 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 300, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 305, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 15 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to M.

Grossmann of 27 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 330, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Oppenheim of 29 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 399, Princeton University Press, (2004).

662. “Issue a Protest on Anti-Semitism”, *The New York Times*, (17 January 1921), p. 10.

663. “Reuter Dahl Gives Mathematic Lectures”, *The Daily Cardinal* (University of Wisconsin, Madison), (11 March 1926). “Prof. Reuter Dahl Talks Despite All Faculty Efforts”, *The Daily Cardinal* (University of Wisconsin, Madison), (12 March 1926), Front Page. “St. Paulite Piqued by Badger Faculty”, *The St. Paul Daily News*, Final Pink, (12 March 1926), Front Page. “Intolerance”, *The St. Paul Daily News*, (13 March 1926), Front Page or page 2???. “Everything Fine, Reuter Dahl Says of Badger Antics”, *St. Paul Dispatch*, (13 March 1926), Front Page. “Reuter Dahl Says He Had a ‘Bully’ Time in Madison”, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, (14 March 1926). “Wisconsin U Mathematics Professors ‘Act Like Children’ Says Reuter Dahl; Had a Fine Time”, *The St. Paul Daily News*, (14 March 1926), Front Page. “Reuter Dahl Takes Fling at Madison”, *St. Paul Dispatch*, (19 March 1926), p. 17. “Intellectual Despotism Is Menace to Honest Research in Science, Dr. Reuter Dahl Declares”, *St. Paul Daily News*, (19 March 1926), p. 2.

664. “PROF. REUTER DAHL TALKS DESPITE ALL FACULTY EFFORTS: Instructors Place Auditorium in Darkness in Attempt to Stop Lecture”, *The Daily Cardinal* (University of Wisconsin, Madison), (12 March 1926).

665. Cf. H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: ‘A Hundred Authors against Einstein’”, *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 250. J. Stark, *Die gegenwärtige Krisis in der Deutschen Physik*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1922), p. 16.

666. English translation from: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967). p. 315.

667. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

668. E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, (1960), p. xxviii.

669. 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.

670. “The Anti-Einstein Campaign”, *Scientific American*, (14 May 1921). *See also:* “Getting Back at Einstein”, *The Literary Digest*, (4 June 1921).

671. A. Reuter Dahl, quoted in “The Pro-Truth Campaign”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (18 June 1921).

672. Kennefick cites: Note 9, “G. Beck, *Z. Phys.* **33**, 713 (1925); O. R. Baldwin, G. B. Jeffery, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London, Sect. A.* **111**, 95 (1926)”; **and** Note 5, “L. Infeld, *Quest: An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980)”, p. 277.

673. *Scientific American*, Volume 1, Number 42, (9 July 1846), p. 3.

674. A. Reuter Dahl, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond’s response, “Reuter Dahl and the Einstein Theory”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuter Dahl, “Einstein’s Predecessors”, *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, “Relating to Relativity”, *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8.

Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, “A Newtonian Duplication?”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10.

675. F. D. Bond, 24 Manhattan Avenue, New York City, letter to A. Reuter Dahl dated 10 July 1923, Department of Special Collections, O’Shaughnessy-Frey Library, University of St. Thomas, Minnesota.

676. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 536-537.

677. H. A. Houghton, “A Newtonian Duplication?”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10.

678. H. Bernstein, *The Truth about ‘The Protocols of Zion’*, Ktav Publishing House, New York, (1971), pp. 43-44.

679. Letters from L. Brandeis to J. W. Mack, *et al.* of 26 November 1918, 22 March 1920, 17 November 1920 and 18 November 1920, L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 365, 452-453, 506-508.

680. *The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*, Beckwith, New York, (1920). H. Bernstein, *The Truth about ‘The Protocols of Zion’*, Ktav Publishing House, New York, (1971), p. 55.

681. L. Marshall to J. Spargo, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 351-353.

682. B. Brasol, *The Protocols and World Revolution, Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, (1920); **and** *Socialism Vs. Civilization*, C. Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1920); **and** *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1921); **and** *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism*, Duffield, New York, (1922).

683. S. G. Marks, “Destroying the Agents of Modernity: Russian Antisemitism”, *How Russia Shaped the Modern World*, Chapter 5, Princeton University Press, (2003), pp. 140-175; notes 354-358.

684. Houghton’s letter is found in the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota.

685. A. Reuter Dahl, “‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein”, *The Dearborn Independent*, 30 April 1921, pp. 2 and 14.

686. Letter from T. Vetter to A. Einstein of 28 January 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 4, Princeton University Press, (2004).

687. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 312, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 426-427, at 427, note 3.

688. *Deutsche Zeitung*, (17 February 1920), p. 5. *Deutsche Zeitung*, (19 February 1920).

689. E. A. Ross, “The East European Hebrews”, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, Chapter 7, The Century Co., New York, (1914), pp. 143-167. **See also:** 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; **and** “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286; **and** “The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377; **and** “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601.

690. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 311, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 425-426, at 426, note 2.

- 691.** Cf. M. Janssen, *et al*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 284-288.
- 692.** Letter from H. T. Cohn to A. Einstein of 12 February 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 309, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 258-259, at 258.
- 693.** Letter from H. T. Cohn to A. Einstein of 12 February 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 309, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 258-259, at 258.
- 694.** Letter from Eduard Meyer to A. Einstein of 13 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 312, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 260.
- 695.** C. Kirsten and Hans-Jürgen Treder, Editors, *Albert Einstein in Berlin, 1913-1933 : Teil I, Darstellung und Dokumente*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, (1979), p. 202.
- 696.** C. Kirsten and Hans-Jürgen Treder, Editors, *Albert Einstein in Berlin, 1913-1933 : Teil I, Darstellung und Dokumente*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, (1979), p. 201.
- 697.** P. Micheltore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 88.
- 698.** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 348, note 3.
- 699.** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 348, note 3.
- 700.** 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 112.
- 701.** J. Riem, "Amerika über Einstein", *Deutsche Zeitung*, (1 July 1921).
- 702.** J. Jürgenson, "Es lebe die Theorie - oder das Recht auf freie Phantasie", *Die lukrativen Lügen der Wissenschaft*, Ewert, (1998), ISBN: 389478699X.

URL:<<http://www.un glaublichkeiten.info/un glaublichkeiten/htmlphp/erfindungeneslebed ietheorie.html>>

This is likely a reference to: S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil", in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352.

703. S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt", in two parts in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 317, note 89.

704. S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt", in two parts in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273.

705. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 52-53.

706. "Einstein Denies Part in Book on Hitlerism", *The New York Times*, (4 September 1933), p. 2.

707. "Price Declared Put on Einstein's Head", *The New York Times*, (7 September 1933), p. 8. "Wants Only Peace", *The New York Times*, (11 September 1933), p. 9.

708. 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.

709. 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.

710. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1982), p. 510.

711. H. Dingle, in his introduction to H. Bergson’s, *Duration and Simultaneity*, Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., Indianapolis, New York, Kansas City, (1965), p. xlii. **See also:** H. Dingle, *Science at the Crossroads*, Martin, Brian and O’Keefe Ltd., London, (1972).

712. “The Outsiders: When a scientist challenges dogma, he’s the one who gets mauled”, *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, Lifestyle Section, (2 November 1994), p. E-1. URL: <<http://www.aidsinfobbs.org/articles/rethink/rethink1/434>>

713. Bishop M. Sasse, Eisenach, *Martin Luther and the Jews*, Second Printing, Sons of Liberty, Hollywood, California, (1967), p. 5.

714. *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.

715. M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932). Higger’s book is analyzed in: R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?).

716. R. B. Spence, *Trust No One: The Secret World of Sidney Reilly*, Feral House, Los Angeles, (2002), pp. 65-67.

717. L. Fry, *L’Auteur des Protocols Achad ha-Am et le Sionisme*, Editions de la Vieille-France, Paris, (1921); **Russian** *Akhad-Khem (Asher Geintsberg); Tainyi vozhd’ iudeiskii*, Berlin, (1922); **German**, Th v. Winberg, translator, *Achad Cham (Ascher Hinzberg)*, München, (1923). **See also:** N. D. Zhevakhov, *Il retroscena dei Protocolli di Sion: la vita e le opere del loro editore, Sergio Nilus e del loro autore Ascher Ghinsberg*, Unione editoriale d’Italia, Roma, (1939). **See also:** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), pp. 107-108, 266.

718. D. K. Buchwald, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix D, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 623.

719. English: S. Nilus, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920); **and** *Præmonitus præmunitus. The protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*, Beckwith Co., New York, (1920); **and** *The Jewish Peril: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, (1920); **and** *The Jewish Peril: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, The Britons, 62 Oxford Street, London, (1920). **Russian:** G. Butmi, *Vragi roda cheloviecheskago*, Izd. Soiuza russkago naroda, S.-Peterburg, Second Edition, ispr. izd., (1906). **German:** Gottfried zur Beek, under the nom de plume Ludwig Müller von Hausen, *Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion*, Verlag Auf Vorposten, Charlottenburg, (1919). **French:** *La Conspiration Juive Contre les Peuples; “Protocols”, Procès-verbaux de Reunions Secrètes des Sages d’Israël*, La Vieille-France, Paris, (1920). **Italian:** *I “Protocolli” dei “Savi Anziani” di Sion : Versione Italiana con Appendice e Introduzione*, Third Edition, G. Preziosi, (1938). *L’Internazionale Ebraica: I “Protocolli” dei “Savi Anziani” di Sion*, La Vita italiana, rassegna mensile di politica, Roma, (1938). **Swedish:** *Förlåten Faller—: Det Tillkommande Världssjälhärskardömet Enligt “Sions vises Hemliga Protokoll”*, Enskilt Förlag, Helsingfors, (1919). **Danish:** S. Nilus translated by L. Carlsen,